UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

+ + + + +

RESPONSE SYSTEMS TO ADULT SEXUAL ASSAULT CRIMES PANEL

ROLE OF THE COMMANDER SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

DELIBERATION SESSION

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JANUARY 13, 2014

+ + + + +

The Panel convened telephonically at 4:00 p.m., Barbara Jones, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Barbara Jones, Chair
Major General John Altenburg, Retired
Professor Geoffrey Corn
Joye Frost
General Carter Ham, Retired
Professor Elizabeth Hillman
The Honorable Elizabeth Holtzman
Vice Admiral James Houck, Retired
Colonel Lisa Turner

ALSO PRESENT:

William Sprance, Designated Federal Official
Colonel Patricia Ham, Staff Director
Lieutenant Colonel Kyle Green, Supervisory
Attorney

Ms. Shannon Green, Legislative Analyst

No surprise.

PROF. HILLMAN: I figure I owed you, since I stalled the deliberations last

20

21

22

	Page 4
1	time by checking out early. So I was trying
2	to
3	CHAIR JONES: Well, I heard you
4	offered to do some written comments, and you
5	have gone way beyond that. It's wonderful.
6	Thank you.
7	So I don't know where the I
8	think probably starting with the outline may
9	be the most helpful. And are there general
10	comments, and then we could we could take
11	it everyone has this, right, and has been
12	able to take a look at it, or, if not, can do
13	that now?
14	PROF. HILLMAN: Which outline are
15	you referring to?
16	CHAIR JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm
17	talking about the I'm talking about the
18	draft of the report outline that the staff
19	prepared.
20	PROF. HILLMAN: Okay.
21	CHAIR JONES: And it's got nine
22	sections, I believe. Wait a minute. Yes, I

Professor Hillman. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

What I wanted to do is to start with the report outline, and the point of the report outline is basically for us to go through, indicate whether yes, we think this should be in the report, these subjects should be in the report, and have the staff start writing.

Obviously, we haven't deliberated. We don't have -- we will have to do that at some point today, start today at least. don't have proposed findings yet, but this is meant to be something to help the staff -- for us to tell the staff go ahead and start writing on some of the informational stuff.

I'm sorry. I don't know -- I can't hear you. Sorry.

(Muffled voice in background.)

(Muffled voice in background.)

Is anybody else -- is it just -- I

COL TURNER: This is Colonel

22

can't understand what --

Turner. I'm at the airport. If the noise you're hearing is the background from the airport, I will just hang up and catch up with you later.

CHAIR JONES: No, no, I can hear you. I can hear you perfectly now. I just couldn't hear you a minute ago. Go ahead, please.

PROF. HILLMAN: Can you put your phone on mute? Then, we should be okay.

LT COL GREEN: Judge Jones, let me just say up front I did receive feedback from Ms. Holtzman on a couple of points to add, just kind of to maybe focus other people's thoughts in terms of the order of the outline, Representative Holtzman pointed out that we should move the arguments or issues regarding the pro and con discussion more towards the end.

So I think our goal will be to put all of the factual, sort of the predicate material up front. And so I think if you look

1 at the outline arguments for it --

CHAIR JONES: Yes. No, I agree.

those towards the back. And then she had also a couple of additional arguments that we have heard from presenters, both proponents for change and those recommending against change, such as for the proponent arguments eliminating potential conflicts of interest for commanders; second, sending signals to the survivor community; and, third, sort of the catch-all, is nothing else has worked, so it's time to try this.

On the other side for keeping commanders in the role, the arguments are that commanders rely on staff judge advocates in the referral decisions, and that there's no evidence that commanders have ever ignored such advice in the making of decisions on referral. And, then, too, some of the problems raised by presenters in terms of the alternative proposed.

Page 10 1 So those were a couple of 2 additional arguments that, I mean, I think are fairly represented by material that we heard, 3 4 so we will look to add those to the sections, 5 unless anyone has objection to it. VADM HOUCK: This is Jim Houck. 6 7 Can I ask a question? I apologize. I'm a 8 little confused as to what we're talking 9 about. Are we talking about the outline that 10 Kyle sent out on the 6th of January? Or are 11 we talking about the draft findings that Beth 12 prepared recently? 13 CHAIR JONES: We're talking about the outline. 14 15 VADM HOUCK: Okay. Okay. 16 CHAIR JONES: Which was prepared 17 by the staff --18 VADM HOUCK: Right. 19 CHAIR JONES: -- and has 10 20 sections, the tenth being recommendations.

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

I'm not sure what the date was that it was put

21

22

out, but --

Page 11 LT COL GREEN: The draft that we 1 2 sent out, sir, should say 9 Jan 14 across the 3 bottom. It was sent out on Friday. 4 VADM HOUCK: Okay. My apologies. 5 I will try to track that down. 6 LT COL GREEN: Yes, sir. 7 VADM HOUCK: Okay. Thanks. 8 LT COL GREEN: And we --9 PROF. CORN: Kyle? 10 LT COL GREEN: Yes, sir. 11 Professor Corn? 12 This is Geoff -- yes, PROF. CORN: 13 this is Geoff Corn. I don't have any 14 objection to any of those additions. I just 15 had two minor points. 16 On the -- I think it's on IV.F, 17 fundamentals of the system and perception of 18 process transparency. I think we need to 19 emphasize fundamentals there to -- it's such 20 a general term for both victims and individuals accused of the offense. 21 22 think that's one of the concerns that

typically I remember being raised by the defense -- was their concern that the focus is -- that the protection of an accused's rights has to be emphasized in the discussion.

And the other is probably -- I'm not sure whether it would fit under IV or V, but somehow I think we have to figure out how to fit in the conflation of -- the conflation of the role of the commander at different levels and how this may impact or distort the perception of the relative merits of the role of the convening authority. More specifically, conflating investigatory failures of junior level commanders with an overall failure of the convening authority system.

CHAIR JONES: Well, I know in here there is a -- there would be a description of the difference between commanders and convening authority. Is that part of what you're talking about, Geoff?

PROF. CORN: It may actually be

more of a finding, Your Honor, that one of the

-- if we -- I mean, I don't know if we would

agree on this, but if there would be some

consensus that there has been a general

conflation of command failures without a

necessarily precise dissection of where -- of

the nature and locus of those failures

generally. I think probably more of a

finding, but, yes, I think in the description

of the functions it would be some -- the

factual basis would be captured there.

GEN HAM: This is Carter Ham. I think Professor Corn is right. I think because of the pending bill by -- proposed by Senator Gillibrand that we have focused -- and perhaps properly so -- on the issue as stated on the -- on the draft outline.

But it seems to me that that's -that while that is perhaps -- and probably is
-- the single most important issue, when I
look at the first bullet of the subcommittee's
objectives and scope, I don't think that the

outline adequately addresses the point that

Professor Corn is making -- is that there is

-- and I would put myself in the category as

a former commander that commanders in their

commander role have had significant problems

and challenges in addressing the sexual

assault as distinct from the role as

commanders as convening authority.

So I would -- I'm thinking out loud here a little bit, but I think the -- we could strengthen the discussion on the evidence we've heard of the role of the commander as distinct from the role of the convening authority. And that probably goes in -- I mean, it talks a little bit about that in III.B, but I think it probably needs to be strengthened.

CHAIR JONES: Yes. No, I actually think that's a very important area, because I think it's something that people don't understand. And I think there has to be a discussion of exactly who does what when in

the process of -- from the point of the reported sexual assault through disposition. So I would expect that to be in there.

And, Geoff, I think you were also talking about the fact that there are also all of these other proponents, military investigators, many of whom are -- some are all civilian, but the military investigation portion, was that your notion?

PROF. CORN: Well, you know, the stated issue on the outline is whether or not to retain the role of the convening authority as it is currently conceived. And I just -- you know, exactly what General Ham is suggesting, if we are going to answer that question, I think we have to be very precise about some of our perceptions of the -- when it comes to attribution for failures of the system, whether that attribution was precisely and accurately based on evidence of failures of convening authorities or failures of other components of the system ranging from response

know, commanders have -- commanders have

22

failed to date, convening authorities, and some would argue that commanders have failed, so we've got to change the system and change the law.

So my point would be that the U.S. Secretary failed to racially integrate in a proper manner, failed to accommodate expanding roles for women, some would say failed with regard to protecting gay and lesbian service members.

In each of those instances, the law and some policies changed, and commanders were given responsibility for implementing that law -- that change in law or policy.

And, obviously, I have some personal scar tissue on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell stuff.

But the argument is the law changed in a substantive way. Commanders were given responsibility for implementing the change, and it has worked pretty well.

CHAIR JONES: I understand exactly what you are talking about now. Past models

of really important problems and issues, where commanders have been part of the very successful changes.

Okay. I've got it. Other comments on the outline?

PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, this is Beth. I wonder if we could take care of some of this by just -- I don't want to really add more sections to the staff outline, if we don't have to. Could we --

CHAIR JONES: Right.

PROF. HILLMAN: -- broaden Section
III and make it overview of the commander's
role in sexual assault cases, and then add in
there what would be sort of an -- rather than
having III.B be the place where we talk about
commanders' additional responsibilities for -for preventing sexual assault and responding
to reports, which is in that first bullet of
our objectives and scope. Could we add
another section there that said, you know,
commanders' responsibility for the atmosphere

1 and culture.

And I also think, likewise, we could add something to -- I think this goes to what both Professor Corn and General Ham were saying, and then in II there, historical overview of the role of the commander, we could actually, again, cut out "in the military justice process" in Section II, and add another subheading there that said the commander's role in prior personnel challenges or --

CHAIR JONES: Right.

PROF. HILLMAN: -- integration -- General Ham's comment that we just heard.

CHAIR JONES: Right. I couldn't go too far down that road, because I find each one of those historical sort of trajectories very complicated, about why it worked and when it worked and how it played out. But I think it is relevant to note that we are talking about -- it flags the significance of the culture and legal change that we are looking

for here, and it connects this battle to those other battles. And I think that's a useful intervention.

So I appreciate that, that General Ham brought that up.

CHAIR JONES: Yes. I do, too, and I -- it wasn't there before. Thanks.

COL HAM: Ma'am, this is the strategic leadership -- this is Colonel Ham. This is the strategic leadership piece that was raised at the last subcommittee meeting as a subject that the subcommittee may want to hear more on, if you determined it was appropriate.

CHAIR JONES: Okay. What was -- can you give more of an outline of what the presentation would be like?

COL HAM: General Ham can fill in some of this, too, but there are -- leaders are taught at the strategic level how to lead change and how to lead cultural change as a -- both a part of their experience and a part of

their training. I think that's what General Ham is referring to, but I don't want to put words in his mouth.

CHAIR JONES: No. I think it is,
too, and I think that it is something that is
relevant, and it's also not -- not something
that we have a lot of information before us
on. So that may be an important piece here if
we go ahead and do that.

noted -- this is Kyle again. You noted that
-- and we will go back and take a look at all
of the presentations. I would agree. I don't
recall offhand a lot of information presented
by presenters. But if we incorporate that
into the historical sections, perhaps had
something in the findings section, that you -my recommendation is maybe consider whether
the subcommittee wants to look at that as a
finding or have some consideration.

CHAIR JONES: Well, I mean, I think then we are basically all in agreement.

There isn't a lot on that before us, if much at all, but we can -- I don't know, and how do people feel about having a presentation on this?

GEN HAM: This is Carter. I think it's certainly worth considering. Do we want to invite, you know, military historians or military sociologists or someone who can give us some perspective on the range of opinion? There will be some who will say, you know, these changes -- race, women, gay and lesbian -- they are only changed because of commanders. And there will be others that say, "Well, it only changed because of the law."

So we have to keep that -- I think a couple of different folks with different perspectives if we were going to do that. But it's certainly worth considering.

CHAIR JONES: All right. Well, why don't we let the staff see what they can come up with with respect to both -- you know,

the different sides on this, and then we can see if we can arrange a presentation.

GEN HAM: And, Judge, this is

Carter again. I'm sorry to be a spring-butt

here. On IX.A, what I'm unclear about, I

think it's -- actually, it's a great topic.

I don't know -- has that information already

been ascertained by the Comparative Systems

Subcommittee? Did they already have that?

Perhaps we could import some of what they have already garnered.

PROF. HILLMAN: What section are we talking about? IX.A?

CHAIR JONES: IX.A, yes. I think that's on -- give me one second and then I'll go to you. I think there are plenty of misperceptions about the whole process of the response and the resolution, and some of it is undoubtedly -- well, or may be part of what the Comparative Systems Subcommittee is looking at.

I also see this as what is going

actually reported, cancelled, et cetera -- in other words, where we talk about what is the process. I mean, for me the misperceptions can be anything from who the convening authority is to you must report to your commander to -- I don't know -- there are a number of them. And I think those get resolved with facts about how the process works.

MS. FROST: This is Joye. I want to jump in here, because I think that is actually one of the most -- both VIII and IX, because there are so many misconceptions. And specifically the annual statistics, the reporting statistics, has done a great disservice, which should have been a good news story, is being bandied about by the media. All of these women are being sexually assaulted.

And the average person in the media, in the public, does not understand the

And many of the questions that it asks -- or maybe it's not so much that they ask, but how they report it back, because if it's not military-on-military sexual assault, that needs to be treated somewhat differently, for example.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR JONES: I think from the beginning this has been a very important

issue, and it is almost something that would, to my mind anyway, go into, you know, what is the problem, and part of that will also be comparison with -- to the extent we could do it, with civilian systems.

And so I happily go to Beth
Hillman. Beth, do you see this in the role of
the commander's section or -- I think I see it
in sort of the background. What's the
problem? You know, sort of -- and some of the
comparisons, and can the studies be done
better by the military?

PROF. HILLMAN: To best honest,

I'm feeling pragmatic here, and I'm looking at
the subcommittee mission statement. And I'm
trying to think how we are going to actually
manage to come up with a report that has some
limits on it, given how big the topic is, even
that we just set out here, which is assess the
role and effectiveness of commanders.

So I would -- I don't think that has much to do with public perceptions about

military response. So I would actually axe
that from this Section IX here. And I don't
think that the Comparative Systems
Subcommittee has all of the answers on that
issue, but I do think we will set out
affirmatively what the -- in that
subcommittee's report, which actually Kelly
sent an outline earlier today I think that I
haven't had a chance to look at yet, but we
are meeting on Wednesday.

That I think we will set out affirmatively, not so much misperception because, frankly, we are not doing the work to poll everybody about what their perceptions are. So to set up misperceptions and knock them down would be a different task than what we have undertaken, but we will set out what the military data collection and compilation of analysis effort is like compared to comparable civilian -- or there is really no comparable civilian jurisdictions, but compared to available civilian jurisdictions

from the beginning, the culture and the atmosphere right through the adjudication and sentencing process of this.

And so we're -- you know, I do
think that we will address some of that,
because part of what I think you are all
pointing at is that the military has been
singled out. I don't really -- I don't think
the best way to change that is to state the
myth and then undercut it. I would rather set
out what the reality is and try to undertake
the educational effort from that direction.
But I don't think -- I think it will be in the
comparative systems piece.

CHAIR JONES: Yes, I agree. And I think it's really sort of just putting things in perspective, which I would -- that's all we can do to some extent. And I think it should be comparative systems.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Can I just raise a different point? Which is really to follow up on what General Ham said about how commanders

1 have implemented policies.

CHAIR JONES: Yes.

REP. HOLTZMAN: I mean, I think
he's right, but what troubles me a lot about
that is that we still don't have a policy of
equality for women in the military. So,
therefore, how does that fit into commanders
who are carrying out the policy and their
role? I mean, I think there's a kind of real
ambiguity here, and, you know, the military is
on kind of both sides of this.

You can't say, "We want women -full respect for women; hold on, women can't
do A, and they can't do B, and now, by the
way, they've got to do these pullups in the
Marines." And so I don't know how this fits
in. I wasn't -- that's nothing that occurred
to me before, but, I mean, if we're going to
say, "Hey, they've done a great job," I mean,
there's a kind of bigger issue here, which is,
what's the overall policy in the military
towards equality of women? They are still

Page 31 1 trying to assess what combat roles women can 2 play. 3 So, I mean, I -- if we are going 4 to do that, we have to say something about --5 I think, maybe I'm wrong -- you may all 6 disagree with me about that, but --7 PROF. HILLMAN: This is Beth. Ι 8 do not disagree. If we get into the impact of 9 commanders -- and I think the conclusion that 10 commanders have to play a role in effective 11 culture change is inescapable. 12 CHAIR JONES: Yes. 13 PROF. HILLMAN: But the question 14 of what role they have played in all of these 15 different -- and what point we're at in the 16 evolution towards Shangri-La is an open 17 question. And if you ask historians and 18 sociologists, you are going to get a lot of 19 different answers. 20 VADM HOUCK: This is Jim Houck. Ι 21 may disagree. I don't know, shooting from the 22 hip right off the top of my head, to what

extent the remaining barriers, such as they are, on women in combat are a function of the law, not commanders. I may be misspeaking, but my sense is is that to the extent that the armed forces have had the authority to integrate women, they have done so, and some would argue that they have gone beyond what their authority is. So I don't know if that's the issue that is in play right now, but that is just another perspective on it.

mean, I was really speaking -- because I hadn't really thought this point through, but my point is not so much to blame, you know, the focus on the commanders, but if the overall policy is still one that disrespects women, then you have two -- I mean, then the military is going at this in a -- I mean, it's kind of a self-contradictory approach to this problem.

If you want to treat women with respect, then you've got to say, okay, you

know, we're going to do that. You can't -- I mean, I don't really know -- I'm not a sociologist, I'm not a group psychologist, I'm not any -- I don't have those credentials. So I can't really tell you what messages are sent by, you know, that overall inequality, but I would be surprised if no message was sent.

So I'm not necessarily blaming the commander there. I'm just saying that that's the context in which a commander also is expected to function, and so we can't just say, "Oh, they've done a great job of doing X, Y, and Z," because in this case it's a little bit more complicated, because we have a policy that's not explicitly in favor of equality or of full respect for women yet.

So whatever we do is against that background. That's all -- that's really my point. I don't know where that comes in here, but --

LT COL GREEN: Ma'am, this is

Kyle. One of the things we looked at in terms

of scoping this report, this initial assessment, was trying to get the dividing line to where, I mean, we had a manageable issue. And one of the concerns we had was climate culture and command culture is a bigger issue, and whether or not -- I'm not sure how that directly relates to the commander's role as convening authority and oversight of the military justice system.

And obviously, I mean, this is an interim or an initial report. I mean, the larger report for June or the larger report for the subcommittee in April or the larger report report for the panel in June can maybe address that more, would be my recommendation.

MS. GREEN: That's a great point, because there are so many issues related to whatá--

CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I'm having a little trouble hearing.

LT COL GREEN: Shannon Green just says that -- and she just pointed out that the

issues raised by Representative Holtzman spin off a lot of additional issues that would probably rate some consideration by the subcommittee or panel. And I just get concerned that we're -- we would move out to an area different from convening authority responsibility.

CHAIR JONES: Well, yes, I mean, I think the one thing that is clear is there is not -- we don't have enough force now, and we might never have enough to make -- you know, to be able to make a statement on this. I think it's a pretty broad concept.

I had taken General Ham's comments to mean more that, look, when faced with large, you know, important issues relating to equality, commanders got involved and were integral to the solution.

Now, I think, you know -- I don't know how much we can say about it, and we can -- you know, we can take a look at the strategic planning and presentation, but I

agree that it's a little broad, it's possibly a little broad for the commander, and we might not be able to do it in time for, you know, our deliberating at the end of this month for instance.

I would just take it off the table. That's all.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Okay. I'm going to refine my point just a little bit more clearly now that you've responded, which is simply in these cases what you're talking about -- even those two cases areN'T necessarily a complete analogy, is because in those cases policy was explicit -- no racial discrimination. No discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

Here the policy is not completely explicit with regard to no discrimination against women. That's the difference I see.

It's a little bit more complicated.

Now maybe we don't put that in, or maybe we leave it for a different point, but

1 that is the difference I think.

GEN HAM: This is Carter. So I guess fundamentally I think Professor Hillman -- and she always does -- gave it exactly right. The real issue is just to make the point to those who think that changing the law will solve all of the problems. It is -- maybe a change in law is necessary, but it will be commanders who implement a change in the law.

And with regard to women, obviously that is also a matter of law, as Professor Corn stated.

But I'd go back again to -- again, my scar tissue on Don't Ask, Don't Tell. When Don't Ask, Don't Tell became the law, it was highly unsatisfying to everyone, but it was the law and it was commanders who implemented that law, because that's what it was. And when that law was repealed, it was, again, commanders who implemented that change.

That's the only point I'm trying

1 to make.

PROF. CORN: Can I jump in? This is Professor Corn. It strikes me that this may be an introductory point emphasizing that whatever reforms are proposed or imposed, the commander is going to continue to play an essential role in implementing them.

General Pede's exact response to the question, what would happen if Senator Gillibrand's proposal was enacted? He said the Army would make it work. That's what we do. And I think that it's a fair comment that whatever the criticisms or accolades for commanders in any other context, we have to be confident that whatever changes are imposed on the system they are going to work with it and be instrumental in implementing it.

CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I can't hear. Is somebody speaking?

LT COL GREEN: I think that's just background noise, ma'am.

1 CHAIR JONES: Oh, I'm sorry.

Okay. I thought somebody was talking.

Well, I don't disagree with that at all.

We are going to have a lot more -we are going to have a lot -- I'm sorry. I
thought I heard someone again. I'm just going
to keep talking. We're going to have a lot of
things that we will be adding or changing or
fine-tuning once we see staff's effort at
filling in this report.

what if -- and I think everything so far in terms of re-ordering and putting things into different sections so far has worked, and putting a finer point on some of the topics. What else, if anything, with respect to this? Any other comments?

PROF. CORN: Ma'am, this is

Professor Corn again. One issue that I

thought might be worth addressing somehow that
was discussed periodically was, in the current
function as convening authority, the balance

between the judicial or the function of the military judge in pre-trial matters and the convening authority.

Maybe it would be captured under fundamental fairness, but what I'm getting to are things like some of the discussions or comments that we had on whether or not the law should be changed to empower the military judge to have authority over certain pretrial issues prior to referral, as opposed to the existing model where the convening authority exercises that -- those functions.

And I don't know if that's worth addressing in the initial outline, or whether Kyle thinks that is already captured somewhere within there.

CHAIR JONES: I would expect the whole notion that the convening authority relies on the Staff Judge Advocate's advice is part and parcel of the -- sort of the overview. And then, if we -- there is lots of legislation and policy that we would probably

want to talk about after we, you know, have this laid out a little bit more -- with more definition.

Hello?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

LT COL GREEN: Professor Corn, I think we have -- under the it's Kyle. procedural overview of the commander's role, you have the referral requirements and investigation responsibility for reports. Ι mean, we can certainly talk about the military judge's current role there, and then I guess it's a question for the subcommittee is, if there are findings specific to the military judge -- expanding the military judge's role, maintaining the military judge's role, that we could either make in this report or, I mean, I -- I guess my concern is whether the subcommittee has had time to really talk through those issues and whether you will be ready to make those types of recommendations within the next three weeks.

CHAIR JONES: You know what,

Geoff? I'm sorry, I didn't -- I didn't appreciate you were talking about the judge's role. Sorry.

PROF. CORN: Yes. Kyle, that's fine with me. I agree that we probably haven't had a chance to discuss it fully. I just think it's -- it just seemed to be a point where there was some significant consensus that even if we retain the current convening function, there may be wisdom in expanding the pretrial authority of a military judge. But we can leave that for another day if you think it makes sense.

LT COL GREEN: Or, sir, maybe something broad like that, but then more specific recommendations as time goes on.

Certainly, that's -- I think it's a very good point for the discussion on findings.

VADM HOUCK: I wanted to raise a point -- Jim Houck here -- that is potentially complex, but I will raise it anyway and the group can do with it what it likes. There is

the notion that has been expressed -- that was expressed last week by some of the witnesses we had -- and I don't know whether it will show up in our writings or not -- that since 1992, since Tailhook, that the military has had a lot of good words, but has essentially sat still and done nothing on sexual assault and that the problem remains.

And, truly, the problem does remain. But if we are going to go down the road that the military has done, nothing has changed, basically. I think we need to explore balancing that with the notion that the social structure and the social dynamic within the military and within our young people who are coming into the military has changed as well and has made the problem in some ways much more complex.

And I'm referring to, by way of example, the situation that the prosecutor from New York referred to back in December and that Captain Manning talked about the other

day, about the culture today that commanders are faced with of -- which is a different culture than it was in 1992 of alcohol abuse and mores of recruits, as well as the increased number of women that are in the military and -- which is a good thing -- but the additional exposure it creates for our young people of both genders to each other in a close environment, which is a decidedly different dynamic than existed in the early '90s.

And so whether or not that is beyond the scope of what we're trying to do on -- I can see that it might be, but I think that if there is a notion -- I don't want to accept at face value the notion that nothing has changed since 1992, and the military has been sitting with its hands -- sitting on its hands.

CHAIR JONES: I am always seeing that kind of information, which I think is important, as important as sort of what is the

problem, what are we dealing with here. And
I think it should be part of the report.

Again, I'm not sure it's -- I
don't see it in the role of the commander
necessarily. I mean, maybe a comment in the
role of the commander, but I think it's
something that has to be laid out in a -- all
right, so, you know, what are the
demographics? Things you just mentioned, the
statistics about who the sexual assault
victims are, their ages, some of the
information that the background report gives
us.

VADM HOUCK: My sense is that its connection to the role of the commander is this -- that the point is made to say that commanders are -- you know, may well be inadequate for the task, because they have had 20 years to fix this and they -- CHAIR JONES: Oh. I see your

point. Yes.

VADM HOUCK: And my point is that

the dynamic has been evolving and changing, and it is the problem -- the problem is a problem, but it's a different problem than it was 20 years ago, and that we should not --

CHAIR JONES: Yes. A moving target concept. Also, the amount of training and the turnover in soldiers and sailors.

COL HAM: And there was no measuring, ma'am. There was no measuring, there was no DoD SAPRO report until 2008. So there is a 2008, a 2010, and a 2012. I'm not certain what there was before then.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I mean, I think that really makes a very good point in the sense that the background here is really useful in understanding the problem. But I'm not so sure that we can -- I mean, I think -- I don't know that we really know that -- we know what the mores are now, or at least as they have been described. I'm not so sure that we have enough information that we can say they have changed from 1992. So that's

1 one question I have.

And, I mean, maybe we -- if
everybody feels comfortable saying that,
that's one thing. But the attitudes of
disrespect to women, and the attitudes towards
women in the society, I don't know that those
have changed since 1992. That's something
that I'm not so sure that things -- I mean,
that there has been this changing panorama for
us.

That's all I'm saying.

VADM HOUCK: I just -- I will offer one last comment, and then I will stop dominating the conversation.

I think the notion that has emerged from some of the testimony is that the social interactions, if not the mores -- mores may be much too difficult to measure -- but the way of interacting among young people has changed. And that it is -- and combined with the fact that our young people are together now in close quarters and in ways that are

byproducts of positive change in the military, has just created a different dynamic.

And I think that part is difficult to dispute, if only because of the way the numbers have changed, as well as the fact that -- well, I'll leave it at that. And if, you know, we can -- I have no need to -- I have no desire to make this a prominent part of the report. But I think if we are going to make statements to the effect that nothing has changed in 20 years, that would need to be more nuanced in the way we talk about that. And that's all from my standpoint.

CHAIR JONES: Right. And I think that without characterizing beyond what maybe we should about mores, we can do a lot of this with numbers and sort of what I keep calling the demographics of explaining what -- you know, where this is happening.

In any event, I think that's a piece that should be in the report, and then we can see how -- the numbers, if you will,

and how many women were there then and how many are here now, and the extent we have different roles. And then we can see how it might fit into the role of the commander piece.

But I think that just describing
the problem is a large part of what -- or some
part of what has to be done in this report in
the beginning, just to put everything in
perspective. And we could see where we go
from there.

Any other comments?
(No response.)

off to the extent that we'll have the staff take a first shot at all of the parts of this that are informational and all of the evidence that is -- and testimony, et cetera, that has been presented to us, so that they can get started writing. And any of us who want to also start drafting can send that in to the staff as well. Does that make sense?

REP. HOLTZMAN: How do you hope to get to the unspoken issue here, which is any conclusions by the subcommittee? When are we--

CHAIR JONES: I think we are going there next, Liz. I just wanted to try to get a signoff on not -- not the findings part of this report -- well, there aren't really any findings. The rest of the report is questions, and that's really our deliberations.

Professor Hillman, you suggested these proposed findings for us. And I wonder if you would -- when I finished reading them, I thought they were largely great, but I wasn't sure that they were actually findings -- I mean, they are findings, but they are not the ultimate finding that we are -- that are the answer to the ultimate question we are being asked about whether or not commanders should remain convening authorities.

Shall we take it through your

Page 51 1 proposed findings and then go to the next step 2 with respect to where you leave us, paragraph 3 by paragraph? 4 PROF. HILLMAN: Sure. We can do 5 I wrote these in response to looking at that. 6 the outline and thinking that these are 7 intended not to answer the ultimate question, 8 but to sort of set out the things that became 9 apparent to me in the process. 10 So I am happy to walk through I'm aware of the sort of limited time 11 them. 12 that we have, and there is likely to be 13 responses to this. So maybe we should just go 14 and take -- I mean, does somebody not have 15 their phone on mute? Is that why --16 CHAIR JONES: Yes. I don't know. 17 I can hear -- I'm having trouble hearing as 18 well. 19 PROF. HILLMAN: Well, now there were some beeps, but it sounds a little 20 21 quieter. Thank you.

So shall I just take objections to

22

PROF. CORN:

Hey, this is

22

Professor Corn. I'd just like to chime in.

First off, thank you for doing this, you know,

starting off the discussion. I really wonder

if it might -- I mean, I didn't get this -- I

think we got this today. And if these are

proposed or initial findings -- candidly, I

was just caught a little off guard by it,

because I didn't realize we were necessarily

at that point.

I wonder if it might be more
efficient to -- I don't know, to maybe give us
a little bit of time to look at these and
maybe comment on them or -- I just worry that
trying to go through it paragraph by paragraph
or line by line beyond maybe the first
paragraph -- for example, just as an
illustration, I totally agree with paragraph
2, but I think -- I think that it would be
more logical to emphasize the primary
responsibility of a commander, which is to
prepare his unit for its warfighting mission.

And then, you know, an aspect of

that is to ensure exactly what you're saying.

But it is little things like that, and then

some other little bit more significant -- I

think that if we could maybe comment on it in

writing -- I don't know. That's just one

thing I would raise.

VADM HOUCK: This is Jim Houck. I agree. I'd just like some time to spend with them.

CHAIR JONES: Maybe a different way to approach this, then, is to go to the outline where the staff has laid out, and now we have added to, arguments advocating for the removal of the convening authority, since we are focused on that, because at least one of them has been emphasized by Congress and the NDAA as an additional task for us, which is to evaluate what, if any, effect removing the commander will have on reporting. I don't know. Maybe we can get some preliminary discussion about that.

I see that as an issue that we

Page 55 1 have to, you know, either say we can't make a 2 finding, or make a finding, we're not sure, we are sure, and then where would that leave us. 3 4 It will increase it, it won't increase it, we 5 can't tell whether it would increase it. There are any number of conclusions we might 6 7 reach based on what we have heard so far. 8 And, I mean, one of the things may 9 be that we still want to know more. I don't 10 know. But that seems to me to be an area that we have talked about a little bit before back 11 12 in October, and we might want to talk about it 13 again now if we have any time. I don't really know how much time we have left. 14 15 Kyle? 16 LT COL GREEN: We have about a 17 half an hour, ma'am. 18 CHAIR JONES: Okay. 19 PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, this 20 is Beth. 21 CHAIR JONES: Yes. 22 I would go with C PROF. HILLMAN:

1 on your litany. Do we know what --

2 CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I can't

hear you, Beth. Sorry?

PROF. HILLMAN: I think that C of your choices -- can you hear me now -- would be my choice, which is that I just don't think that we know whether this change will increase reporting. If that's the empirical question on the table, I don't think anyone can answer that for us.

CHAIR JONES: Right.

PROF. HILLMAN: And I think we've heard opinions on all sides of it. I also don't think that hearing more from more people will give us more traction on that issue.

I actually don't think we can say with any sort of definitive evidentiary basis that -- either that this change will increase reporting or will not increase reporting.

That's my opinion.

CHAIR JONES: I agree with you.

There are certainly plenty of statistics, and

to some extent there is -- there is some thought that other programs might increase reporting, but I don't -- I'm not prepared to say that even those necessarily are enough to convince me about other programs.

But I agree that I don't think we have the ability to -- I don't think there is any empirical data that shows that removing a commander will increase reporting.

PROF. HILLMAN: Right. But if you don't mind, Judge Jones, I think that's the key. It's not that -- it's not that -- I mean, I think the key is that there has been no evidence adduced before us, no factual basis from which such a conclusion could be drawn or could not be drawn. It's speculation. That's all.

CHAIR JONES: Anybody else have any additional different thoughts on that?

Disagree?

MG ALTENBURG: This is Altenburg.

I agree with that, but I'm wondering if we

should address it in other contexts because that's one reason that has been proposed for removing the commanders. Some people have argued anyway, not persuasively, that taking the commanders away will somehow increase prosecutions or increase convictions, neither of which I think has been demonstrated empirically either, as Congresswoman Holtzman alluded to with regard to reporting.

But there are various criticisms of commanders in the role, and it may be that we should address each one. That there is not empirical data to support any of them.

with that. And I think it is an argument that
-- I think everything down here that the staff
has already printed is an argument. I suppose
there has been -- I don't know whether or not
there is agreement that -- in the past by
people who are in favor of removing the
commander that there will be more convictions
or somehow better results.

Would agree that I don't know there is any basis to find that, and I -- so I'm just not sure whether that's one of the arguments. I think -- well, or at least it's not -- to me, I think the argument is more -- it's almost one of "We don't care what the results are, but we want to have confidence in the system. We want to make it fairer."

Those are just my comments. I could not agree with you more that, based on what we know at the moment, I don't think there is anything to -- that would convince me that there is evidence that prosecution -- you know, investigations would be more effective or that there would be more prosecutions or there would be more convictions.

What do other people think about that?

PROF. CORN: Well, this is

Professor Corn. I agree with everything that
has been said. I think it's pure speculation

that removing the commander from the convening authority role will increase reporting or prosecution rates. It might, it might not, but I don't think we know.

REP. HOLTZMAN: Well, I don't think anybody knows. That's the point.

CHAIR JONES: Right.

REP. HOLTZMAN: If they are,
they're keeping it a big secret. But I think
also the point is, too, Judge Jones, sort of
a little nuance, a footnote to this, is that
while some people made the argument at the
beginning that it would lead to more
convictions or prosecutions, those arguments
have, to some extent, been abandoned to be in
favor of the argument that removing the
commander will make the system fairer.

CHAIR JONES: Right. And which leads us to the question of, if we're talking about fairness in general, is that our mandate? Or are we supposed to be responding to sexual assault?

So its fairness in the context of the arguments that are made for proponents of removing a commander I think is only relevant if they mean fairness to sexual assault victims.

PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, this is Beth. I think that's right. I think there is an argument. I mean, I do think it's a finding that there isn't evidence about the direction in which this would tilt the reporting rate. I think --

CHAIR JONES: That's right.

PROF. HILLMAN: I think that's actually a finding. The conclusion, the recommendation that you're aiming at is, does this mean we recommend that the change not be made? To me, I'm not -- those aren't the same things.

The first one is easy; the second one is more difficult. And I -- there are other reasons to remove the commander that go to fairness to victims of sexual assault and

the fundamental fairness of the system that -in which those assaults get or don't get
prosecuted and investigated, et cetera.

So, but on -- the first point is the easy one. The second one is the harder one. I'm in the minority on this. I don't see good reasons to leave commanders in this role for a number of --

CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

PROF. HILLMAN: I don't think

there are good enough reasons to leave

commanders in this role, but mine is a

minority viewpoint among all of you, I

realize. And I drafted the findings, which I

agree, you should all have time to look at.

I sent them around this morning. Kyle

forwarded them to you immediately. So it was

not our staff that held them up, it was me.

But I -- those findings are not intended to justify a particular recommendation, so -- because it doesn't feel

to me that I think the strong majority of the subcommittee thinks commander should stay, should retain that role of convening authority.

So to the extent you want to get us to that ultimate issue, I think you should go ahead and get there and poll people. I think that's where they are.

CHAIR JONES: Hello? Hello?

LT COL GREEN: Yes, Judge Jones.

You're there.

VADM HOUCK: I am still here.

CHAIR JONES: Oh, okay. I heard you say, Beth, that you think we should get to the ultimate issue. Is that right? I missed a little bit in the middle, but --

PROF. HILLMAN: Isn't that what you asked -- you'd like to get on this particular piece, which is a small part of the overall -- or whatever, one part of the role of the commander, you'd like to know what we think about that -- the convening authority

1 issue, right?

CHAIR JONES: Absolutely.

PROF. HILLMAN: I don't think we are going to get much more information that will help, so I do think we are prepared to reach a recommendation on that. Right? I mean, I'm opening this up to the rest of you. I mean, I'm not the one to articulate that because I disagree with what you're going to send out. But that's where I think we are, right?

think there was a remark made back in October that keeps coming back to me, which is who -- is there a burden here? We have a system in place with commanders. Is there a burden for people who want to remove the commander to establish, you know, good reasons for it? And we don't think that increasing reporting is one of them.

I don't think that, basically, there will be more convictions, there will be

more trials is one of them. So if we start to go to the next one, I think that makes a lot of sense.

that there's little to glean from our comparison with our Allies and their systems. I think we have to focus on this whole notion of, is there something -- is removing a commander actually going to have an impact? How is it going to have an impact on sexual assault victims? What is it they say that is going to happen here with the removal of the commander that is going to improve the military's response to the problem?

And I guess I would like to hear you on that, Beth. I understand the perception issue. Is that where we're going? Is that where you're going? We haven't heard from anybody else yet.

PROF. HILLMAN: There are sirens outside now. I apologize if you hear them, as well as me. But I -- to speak specifically to

that, I am reluctant to substitute the judgment of others for what -- the victims who have come forward through primarily the victims advocacy organizations.

And I understand the lack of representativeness of those organizations of the entire universe of victims, but I am not persuaded that we should substitute the judgment of senior military commanders or judge advocates or prosecutors who tell us that this is not what victims want, or what victims themselves are telling us they want.

And they have told us this is what they want and I don't -- the other reason that this seems a salutary change to me is I don't view it as undermining what I agree is essential as the unity of command -- General Ham called it the totality of command -- within -- any more than what many other things have already done in terms of altering the sort of absolute control of commanding officers over there -- over the system of

1 prosecution.

And, likewise, I do think it's a fundamental fairness issue, so that certainly has an influence on my -- my assessment. But the key issue that you asked me to address just now is the question of how it would help -- how it would help victims, and I think that victims at least -- you know, and I don't know whether this would increase reporting rates, I really don't.

But I don't feel like an independent view of this issue is one that privileges the viewpoints of those who have the authority to resolve this problem as opposed to those who have suffered at -- the incidents in the past and ongoing, and so I just would put my faith with them and suggest that they have a perspective to -- that we ought to privilege. That's it.

MS. FROST: This is Joye. I guess
I have to -- I think you have captured the
perspective of victims perfectly, but I guess

what I am concerned about are I think some pretty unrealistic expectations on the part of some victims. At the panel last week I -- one of the persons who was testifying basically said doing this would change military culture overnight.

I think there are some pretty
unrealistic expectations, and I think
everybody is -- we don't really know what
would happen, but I -- but having seen some --

CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I just had to call back in. My phone went out.

Where are we?

MS. FROST: Yes. I was just saying that I have some concerns about very unrealistic expectations, and I -- I do think that reporting might increase. I think convictions, successful prosecutions, will actually decrease. That's intuitive and that's not something that I would ever, you know, put in the report. But just seeing over and over the issues in the civilian sector,

and particularly on college campuses, that's my primary concern.

REP HOLTZMAN: Well, my view about this is that, I mean, I -- my initial predilection when I started was that, hey, you know, this sounds like a good idea, not being familiar with how the military works.

But I, frankly, haven't heard any argument that is coherent to me, aside from I think it's going to work or it's going to send a signal to the survivor group, which is important.

But if the signal is about something that is not necessarily going to work, I don't know that I want to say that this is going to work to anybody, nor do I think sending signals is necessarily the right -- I mean, maybe if it really sent a huge signal to those would-be perpetrators and victims, I could be persuaded. But I don't know what kind of signal this will send, because I don't know that most people in the

military even understand how -- what the convening authority may do.

I mean, the arguments that I heard last week were -- well, the fairness argument, which has nothing to do with sexual assault, so while I completely agree and sympathize with the issue of fairness, I can't relate it to the sexual -- to how this will affect the incidence of sexual assault, which is what our assignment was.

The second -- the major argument they came up with was, aside from sending a signal, was the conflict of interest, that somehow because you are a commander with two people from the same unit you cannot -- that's a conflict of interest, but that is of course not a conflict of interest. People have to make decisions, employers have to make decisions about two employees when they get into a fight, parents have to make a decision when two children get into a fight. Resolving issues between two people is something that is

done normally. It's not -- just because there are two people doesn't mean you have a conflict. It's ridiculous in my view.

You have a conflict if you have some connection with one of the people involved in some way. This was a family member, a client, somebody you worked with, a colleague in particular, that's a conflict of interest, but not just because someone is in your unit without anything more.

arguments, I would have a different point of view. But I don't -- change for change's sake is not something that grabs me, particularly when what they are -- what our mandate is is to find a change that will affect sexual assault in the military. And I haven't heard the arguments that -- for making this change that are coherent to me. And I have been looking for that since I got here. In fact, I was sympathetic to the issue, so I'm surprised where I'm finding myself now,

1 frankly.

VADM HOUCK: I think the conflict of interest point is -- I find it to be superficial in the sense that I think the argument for conflict of interest is that a commander will not make a just decision vis-à-vis a sexual assault because the commander is afraid to do anything that highlights a problem within his or her unit.

And the allegation is is that the commander will pull the punch, will not refer a case to a court martial, will "sweep it under the rug," because to do otherwise will make the commander look bad. And I think that's very flawed. It's a very flawed argument.

There are so many ways -- I mean,

I am agreeing with your conclusion, just for

-- just to put a different orientation on it.

I think that there are so many ways today that
the allegation of a sexual assault can be
reported and is transparent, that to suggest

that a commander can fool the system by not referring a case, and, therefore, sweep it under the rug, and then make him- or herself look good in the process, I think is deeply flawed.

MG ALTENBURG: This is Altenburg.

I would look at another aspect of the rationale supporting victims having more confidence in the system. And that is to use as a part of the logic construct that we ought to do what victims want I think can be dangerous.

And by no means do all victims

feel this way, but I think all of us would

agree that just because a segment of victims

believe that they really prefer a system where

they don't have to testify, or they don't have

to confront this beast again, why can't we

just, you know, kind of do away with Sixth

Amendment considerations because that would be

a lot easier for victims, and it truly would

be easier. But we don't let that drive us.

And, again, I'm not saying that
even most victims feel that way, but certainly
a segment of the victim society or victim
segment feels that way, and they would argue
they shouldn't have to testify. Writing a
sworn statement ought to be enough. And, you
know, we didn't even come close to considering
that seriously.

I'm only going at the rationale of, well, we've got to -- we ought to be motivated by what victims want.

REP HOLTZMAN: And I just -- if
you'll excuse me for saying one more thing and
then I'll shut up, really. But I think that
no one is really focusing enough on the
alternative. I use an example, when I became
DA in Brooklyn, just the idea that having
"professional prosecutors" handle a matter
means that it's going to be treated the way
you think it should be treated is not true
because you don't -- who is setting the
priorities in that "professional bureaucracy"?

Is that the individual prosecutors? Do we know what he or she thinks in terms of the importance?

Remember, this is going to be now all felony cases. So what is going to be the priority? Who is going to set the priorities? Who is going to say, "Yes, we should still go ahead, if there's probable cause, even if we're likely to lose the case"? Who is going to make that decision? And how do we know that's a fair decision?

when I became DA, I had 400 professional prosecutors. They would meet every single criterion that every one of those victims advocacy groups set up. And yet I wouldn't trust them in terms of how they would come out in the handling of sexual assault cases, because they would say, "Well, how is this going to affect my conviction rate?" They wouldn't know how they themselves were going to be judged. What were their own biases, and what were their own predictions,

and what were their own concerns? How would they feed into the process?

Just because you call someone a professional doesn't mean that you're going to get the right -- a fair -- even a fair result, an unbiased result. So I'm not persuaded that the alternative has been really carefully thought through, and my experience would suggest that that's -- that the idea that there is this ideal professional out there is just -- my own experience doesn't bear that out. That's all.

PROF. CORN: Yes. This is Geoff
Corn. I'd just like to make two comments.

First off, on the foundation issue of erring
on the interest of the collective group of
victims versus, for example, Beth, you
mentioned, versus the opinions of judge
advocates.

Everybody has an agenda. It is impossible to take an opinion on something without it. But certainly we would hope that

Page 77

the senior level judge advocates that we have heard of generally have a commitment to a just disposition of an allegation.

And I think my concern -- I echo
General Altenburg's concern. I think the
views of victims and victims organizations are
very important, but I think there are all
sorts of aspects of the criminal justice
system that victims perceive fail them. One
that comes to mind is plea bargaining. I
mean, prosecutors know that victims frequently
feel that the system is flawed when there are
negotiated pleas, because they don't feel like
justice was done.

Another is indeterminate sentencing, which is a huge feature of our military justice system where victims will assume that if a crime occurs they are entitled to have punishment to the maximum extent of the law, which often is not the case.

And so I tend to -- honestly, I

came at it with the opposite perspective of
Representative Holtzman, but I also have such
great respect for you, Beth, that after I read
your op-ed I tried to step back and look for
evidence that this was compromising the
integrity of the decision of what cases should
go to trial. And, again, I don't see it, and
I share Representative Holtzman's concern over
unanticipated or not fully explored secondand third-order consequences of change for the
sake of change.

And, most specifically, the concern over the self-interest of some lawyers who might want to avoid taking difficult cases, that it appears from some of the witnesses we've heard, is at times neutralized by the role of the commander.

Over.

CHAIR JONES: All right. Well, I guess at the end of the day I haven't been convinced that this particular sought-after remedy is going to have the impact of being

more effective in terms of combatting sexual assault in the military.

And so for me, if I can't see that it's going to produce a positive result, if I'm not convinced of that, at least at this stage I just don't see how I could recommend it.

I remember one of the speakers the other day saying, "And so I think we have to go to this drastic solution" in talking about his support for removing the commander. And I don't think we -- you know, it's something that should just be done, because it is the opinion of some victims and apparently all of the victims advocates that we have heard from, that this is -- this has to be done and it's going to improve things in terms of responses to sexual assault.

What I have become completely

persuaded of is that commanders should be -
can be much more important in creating a

climate that prevents sexual assault, and

Page 80

there should be a lot of complaints that this hasn't happened yet, because it has been an issue since 1991.

But I don't think that means that you then decide, okay, well, since they haven't achieved that goal yet, we should somehow reach this drastic solution. And I think that I'm impressed with what I believe commanders can do, and that's where we should go at this point, where we should start, particularly in holding them, you know, accountable and see where -- you know, see what results occur.

I'm just not persuaded. And, again, I honestly don't think that -- because it is the perception of some, many victims, and the victims advocate groups, that that means that it's right or that it's going to have -- that, you know, actually having this legislation go through is going to basically change anything.

And I'm very concerned that the

women in the military right now, the vast
majority of them -- and forgive me if somebody
said this already, because I was off the phone
for a little while -- that the vast majority
of them don't know who the convening authority
is, and so I don't think they are going to
understand necessarily what this is all about.
I just don't see the connection.

You know, it may be that evidence develops and that we could all be persuaded that this is the only and last resort. But I just don't think we're there yet. And, again, I see no -- I just can't see any -- I'm not convinced it's going to help anything.

PROF. HILLMAN: Judge Jones, this is Beth. I want to thank you for -- I don't think -- you have all taken this seriously.

I don't think you should spend more time with, you know, my angle on this. I think I differ on -- I agree in many respects with lots of what everybody said. I just disagree on -- where that leaves me with all of this.

And I don't think it is worth 1 spending more time sort of responding to me on 2 I think -- you know, I don't know that 3 this. 4 we have any more time now, but I think you should, you know -- I feel well taken care of 5 in this process. I appreciate your concern with the arguments that I raised and that 8 they're not convincing. 9 So, anyway, I just wanted to thank 10 everybody for that. 11 And, Beth, I think CHAIR JONES:

6

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

one of the things that we should be looking forward to here is that you may want to, and you should, well, in deliberations -- not only in deliberations dissent, but also write a dissent.

PROF. HILLMAN: Understood. Thank you.

> CHAIR JONES: Great.

MG ALTENBURG: Beth, I'd like to thank you for the perspective that you brought to the analysis of this issue. I think you

made all of us -- you opened all of us up a lot more and made us all drill down much more deeply than we might have otherwise, given the experience we brought to it and the preconceptions that we had. And you have made us all be much more thorough, and for that I think we all thank you. I certainly do.

PROF. HILLMAN: Thanks, General Altenburg.

REP. HOLTZMAN: I do, too. And I think if there are areas in which you can agree with the concerns that we have suggested that would be good, too. Just so that as much of a consensus as is possible can emerge from -- just from my point of view, because I think that a lot of -- as you said, you disagree with the final conclusion. But there may be a lot of our argument that you can agree with, so to that extent that would be great.

CHAIR JONES: Absolutely. All right. Then I think we should conclude tonight. Thanks, everybody, for spending an

	Page 84
1	hour and a half with interruptions and trains
2	and planes and everything else in the way.
3	And I think our next we are
4	having a public panel on January 30th.
5	Kyle, is there anything
6	LT COL GREEN: Yes, ma'am. If I
7	could just
8	CHAIR JONES: in between then
9	and now that we are supposed to actually meet
10	on as opposed to working on drafting?
11	LT COL GREEN: Well, and I guess
12	we'll see, ma'am. This has been a very
13	CHAIR JONES: I'm sorry. I can't
14	hear you.
15	LT COL GREEN: Can you hear me,
16	ma'am?
17	CHAIR JONES: Hello?
18	LT COL GREEN: Ma'am, can you hear
19	me?
20	CHAIR JONES: Yes, I can now.
21	LT COL GREEN: Okay. Ma'am, this
22	has obviously been helpful, and we can start

to craft some findings based on this discussion. One thing I would just note is, I mean, the staff will try to capture thoughts and overall impressions, but anyone who wants to write or feels particularly compelled to start the analysis on any of this, you know, we will certainly either work directly with you or take any of that that anybody wants to do.

I tried to reverse engineer this a little bit. And with the meeting on the 30th, I think we have to have the report done to the -- and to the panel by the 28th, which means we probably need to finalize the subcommittee's report by the 24th, which is a week from Friday. So the goal of the staff is to finalize our draft of this report by the 20th and 21st, which will allow discussion and deliberation for three to four days next week prior to finalizing the report.

So all of you know -- and, obviously, we're on a very tight timeline on

this, so whether we need to have another meeting, Judge Jones, I mean, we can leave that and sort of wait and see how it develops. But our goal is to try to start to draft the sections of this report and get those out to you for vetting and consideration as quickly as possible, but our goal is to have everything in everybody's hands by next Tuesday hopefully.

CHAIR JONES: All right. Why don't we see what we get on Tuesday, and then we can go from there.

LT COL GREEN: Yes, ma'am. Just one note. Obviously, I -- somebody talked about maybe providing some written comments on either the proposals or any other comments you have on the outline. Just for FACA purposes, if you could just send those to me and the staff, and then I will consolidate all of those and make sure that they get out to everyone for everyone's consideration. But just so that we keep the -- keeping our FACA

	Page 87
1	lines, please try to avoid just the
2	communications among yourselves. Just send
3	them back to us as we go through this.
4	CHAIR JONES: Okay, Kyle. Thanks.
5	MR. SPRANCE: And, ma'am, this is
6	Bill. For FACA purposes, once we're done,
7	I'll need to close this.
8	CHAIR JONES: Any last comments?
9	(No response.)
10	Okay, Bill.
11	MR. SPRANCE: Okay. This meeting
12	is now closed. And also, for the record, it
13	began at 5:00 p.m.
14	CHAIR JONES: Thanks a lot.
15	Thanks to everybody.
16	COL HAM: It began at 4:00 p.m.
17	CHAIR JONES: 4:00 p.m.
18	(Whereupon, at 5:36 p.m., the
19	proceedings were concluded.)
20	
21	
22	

A	advocating 16:10	angle 81:19	aspect 53:22 73:7	33:18 38:22 45:12
abandoned 60:15	54:13	annual 25:15	aspects 77:8	46:15
ability 57:7	affect 70:8 71:16	answer 15:15 50:19	assault 1:3 14:7	bad 72:14
able 4:12 5:10	75:19	51:7 56:9	15:2 19:14,18	balance 39:22
35:12 36:3	affirmatively 28:6	answers 28:4 31:19	26:2,18 43:7	balancing 43:13
absolute 66:21	28:12	anybody 7:20	45:10 60:22 61:4	ball 26:9
Absolutely 64:2	afraid 72:8	57:18 60:6 65:19	61:22 65:11 70:5	bandied 25:18
83:20	agenda 76:20	69:16 85:8	70:9 71:17 72:7	Barbara 1:12,15
abuse 44:3	ages 45:11	anyway 27:2 42:21	72:21 75:17 79:2	6:16
accept 44:16	ago 8:7 46:4	58:4 82:9	79:18,22	bargaining 77:10
accolades 38:14	agree 6:5 9:2 13:3	apologies 11:4	assaulted 25:20	barriers 32:1
accommodate 18:7	22:13 29:15 36:1	apologize 10:7	assaults 62:2	based 15:20 52:8
accountable 80:12	42:5 53:17 54:8	65:21	assess 27:19 31:1	55:7 59:11 85:1
accurately 15:20	56:21 57:6,22	apparent 51:9	assessment 5:3	basically 7:4 22:22
accused 11:21	59:2,11,21 62:16	apparently 79:14	34:2 67:4	43:12 64:21 68:4
accused's 12:3	64:12 66:16 70:6	appears 78:15	assignment 70:10	80:20
achieved 80:6	73:15 81:20 83:12	appreciate 21:4	assume 77:18	basis 13:11 36:16
activity 6:11	83:18	42:2 82:6	atmosphere 19:22	56:17 57:15 59:3
actual 6:1	agreeing 72:18	approach 32:19	29:2	battle 21:1
add 8:13 10:4 19:9	agreement 22:22	54:11	attitudes 47:4,5	battles 21:2
19:14,20 20:3,9	58:19	appropriate 21:14	Attorney 2:3	bear 76:11
added 54:13	ahead 7:14 8:7 22:9	April 34:13	attribution 15:18	beast 73:18
adding 39:9	63:7 75:8	area 14:19 35:6	15:19	beautifully 3:19
additional 9:5 10:2	aiming 61:15	55:10	authorities 15:21	beeps 51:20
19:17 35:2 44:7	airport 8:1,3	areas 83:11	18:1 50:21	began 87:13,16
54:17 57:19	alcohol 44:3	argue 18:2 32:7	authority 12:12,15	beginning 26:22
additions 11:14	allegation 72:10,21	74:4	12:20 14:8,14	29:1 49:9 60:13
address 16:12 29:5	77:3	argued 58:4	15:12 16:11 25:6	believe 4:22 73:16
34:14 58:1,12	Allies 65:6	argument 17:21	32:5,8 34:8 35:6	80:8
67:5	allow 85:18	18:17 58:15,17	39:22 40:3,9,11	best 27:13 29:9
addresses 14:1	alluded 58:9	59:1,6 60:12,16	40:18 42:11 54:14	Beth 3:18 10:11
addressing 14:6	Altenburg 1:15	61:8 69:9 70:4,11	60:2 63:4,22	19:7 27:6,7 31:7
39:20 40:14	57:21,21 73:6,6	72:5,16 83:18	67:14 70:2 81:5	55:20 56:3 61:7
adduced 57:14	82:20 83:9	arguments 8:17 9:1	available 28:22	63:14 65:16 76:17
adequately 14:1	Altenburg's 77:5	9:5,8,15 10:2	average 25:21	78:3 81:16 82:11
adjudication 29:2	altering 66:20	16:10 54:13 59:4	avoid 78:14 87:1	82:20
Admiral 1:18	alternative 9:22	60:14 61:2 70:3	aware 51:11	better 27:12 58:22
adopted 52:11	74:16 76:7	71:12,18 82:7	axe 28:1	beyond 4:5 32:7
ADULT 1:3	ambiguity 30:10	armed 32:5		44:13 48:15 53:15
advice 9:19 40:19	amendment 17:20	Army 38:11	<u>B</u>	biases 75:22
advocacy 66:4	73:20	arrange 24:2	B 30:14	big 27:18 60:9
75:15	amount 46:6	articulate 64:8	back 9:4 22:12	bigger 30:20 34:6
advocate 80:17	analogy 36:13	ascertained 24:8	26:17 37:14 43:21	bill 13:14 87:6,10
Advocate's 40:19	analysis 28:19	aside 69:9 70:12	55:11 64:13,14	bit 14:10,15 17:2
advocates 9:16	82:22 85:6	asked 50:20 63:18	68:12 78:4 87:3	33:14 36:9,20
66:10 76:19 77:1	Analyst 2:4	67:5	background 7:16	41:2 53:12 54:3
79:15	and/or 17:9	asks 26:15	7:19 8:2 27:9	55:11 63:16 85:11
	=	-	•	-

hlama 22.14	actors 25.2 40.10	22.11 20.16	16,20,24.5 66.17	aomnoved 20.10.22
blame 32:14	cetera 25:2 49:18	23:11 38:16	16:20 34:5 66:17	compared 28:19,22
blaming 33:8	62:3	changing 37:6 39:9	66:18	comparison 27:4
bottom 11:3	Chair 1:12,15 3:3	46:1 47:9	commander 1:4	65:6
broad 35:13 36:1,2	4:3,16,21 5:4,12	characterizing	12:9 14:4,5,13	comparisons 27:11
42:15	6:15,21 8:5 9:2	48:15	20:6 25:7 33:9,10	compelled 85:5
broaden 19:12	10:13,16,19 12:17	checking 4:1 5:11	36:2 38:6 45:4,6	compelling 71:11
Brooklyn 74:17	14:18 16:4,8	children 70:21	45:15 49:4 53:20	compilation 28:18
brought 21:5 82:21	17:13,16 18:21	chime 53:1	54:19 57:9 58:21	complaints 80:1
83:4	19:11 20:12,15	choice 56:6	60:1,17 61:3,21	complete 36:13
bullet 13:21 19:19	21:6,15 22:4,21	choices 56:5	63:2,21 64:17	completely 36:17
burden 64:15,16	23:20 24:14 26:3	civilian 15:8 27:5	65:9,13 70:14	70:6 79:19
bureaucracy 74:22	26:7,21 29:15	28:20,21,22 68:22	72:6,8,11,14 73:1	complex 42:21
byproducts 48:1	30:2 31:12 34:19	clear 35:9	78:17 79:11	43:18
	35:8 38:19 39:1	clearly 36:10	commander's	complicated 20:18
	40:17 41:22 44:20	client 71:7	19:13 20:10 27:8	33:14 36:20
C 55:22 56:4	45:20 46:5 48:14	climate 34:5 79:22	34:8 41:7	components 15:22
call 68:12 76:3	50:5 51:16 52:3	close 44:9 47:22	commanders 9:10	compromising 78:5
called 66:18	52:18,21 54:10	74:7 87:7	9:15,16,18 12:14	con 8:18
calling 48:17	55:18,21 56:2,11	closed 87:12	12:19 14:4,8	conceived 15:13
campuses 69:1	56:21 57:18 58:14	coherent 69:9	16:11 17:9,22,22	concept 35:13 46:6
cancelled 25:2	60:7,18 61:12	71:19	18:2,12,18 19:2	concern 12:2 41:17
candidly 53:6	62:9 63:9,13 64:2	COL 5:2,7 6:13	19:17,22 23:13	69:2 77:4,5 78:8
Captain 43:22	64:12 68:11 78:19	7:22 8:11 9:3 11:1	27:20 29:22 30:7	78:13 82:6
capture 85:3	82:11,19 83:20	11:6,8,10 21:8,18	31:9,10 32:3,15	concerned 35:5
captured 13:11	84:8,13,17,20	22:10 33:21 34:21	35:17 37:9,18,21	68:1 80:22
40:4,15 67:21	86:10 87:4,8,14	38:21 41:5 42:14	38:14 44:1 45:17	concerns 11:22
care 19:7 59:7 82:5	87:17	46:8 55:16 63:10	50:20 58:3,5,11	34:4 68:15 76:1
carefully 76:7	challenges 14:6	84:6,11,15,18,21	62:7,13 64:16	83:12
carrying 30:8	20:10	86:13 87:16	66:9 79:20 80:9	conclude 83:21
Carter 1:17 13:12	chance 3:14 28:9	colleague 71:8	commanding 66:21	concluded 87:19
16:6 23:5 24:4	42:6	collect 26:13	comment 3:7 20:14	conclusion 31:9
37:2	change 9:7,7 17:8	collection 28:18	38:13 45:5 47:13	57:15 61:14 72:18
case 33:13 72:12	17:10 18:3,3,14	collective 76:16	53:13 54:4	83:17
73:2 75:9 77:21	18:19 20:22 21:21	college 69:1	comments 4:4,10	conclusions 50:3
cases 19:14 36:11	21:21 29:9 31:11	Colonel 1:19 2:2,3	6:7 19:5 35:14	55:6
36:12,14 75:5,18	37:8,9,21 48:1	7:22 21:9	39:17 40:7 49:12	confidence 59:8
78:6,15	56:7,18 61:16	combat 31:1 32:2	59:10 76:14 86:15	73:9
catch 8:3	66:15 68:5 71:13	combatting 79:1	86:16 87:8	confident 38:15
catch-all 9:12	71:16,18 78:10,11	combined 47:20	commitment 77:2	conflating 12:13
category 14:3	80:21	come 23:22 25:1	communications	conflation 12:8,8
caught 53:7	change's 71:13	27:17 66:3 74:7	87:2	13:5
cause 75:8	changed 18:12,17	75:17	community 9:11	conflict 70:13,16,17
certain 40:9 46:12	23:12,14 40:8	comes 15:18 33:19	community 7.11 comparable 28:20	71:3,4,8 72:2,5
certainly 23:6,19	43:12,17 44:17	77:10	28:21	conflicts 9:9
41:10 42:17 56:22	46:22 47:7,20	comfortable 47:3	comparative 24:8	confront 73:18
67:3 74:2 76:22	48:5,11	coming 43:16 64:14	24:20 28:3 29:14	confused 10:8
83:7 85:7	changes 17:3 19:3	command 13:5	29:19	Congress 54:16
03.7 03.7	changes 17.3 19.3	Commanu 13.3	47.17	Congress 34.10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Congresswoman	39:18,19 41:5	deeply 73:4 83:3	discrimination	59:15 79:1
58:8	42:4 52:22 53:1	defense 1:1 12:2	36:15,15,18	effectiveness 27:20
connection 45:15	59:20,21 76:13,14	definition 41:3	discuss 42:6	efficient 53:11
71:5 81:8	costs 16:14	definitive 56:17	discussed 39:21	effort 28:19 29:12
connects 21:1	couple 8:13 9:5	deliberated 6:1 7:9	discussion 3:7 8:18	39:10
consensus 13:4	10:1 23:17	deliberating 5:17	12:4 14:11,22	either 41:16 55:1
42:9 83:14	course 70:16	36:4	17:2,12 42:18	56:18 58:8 85:7
consequences	court 72:12	deliberation 1:6	53:3 54:21 85:2	86:16
78:10	craft 85:1	85:19	85:18	elevation 17:17
consider 22:18	created 48:2	deliberations 3:22	discussions 40:6	eliminating 9:9
consideration	creates 44:7	50:11 82:14,15	disposition 15:2	Elizabeth 1:17,18
22:20 35:3 86:6	creating 79:21	demographics 45:9	77:3	emerge 83:14
86:21	credentials 33:4	48:18	dispute 48:4	emerged 47:16
considerations	crime 77:18	demonstrated 58:7	disrespect 47:5	emphasize 11:19
73:20	CRIMES 1:3	DEPARTMENT	disrespects 32:16	53:19
considering 23:6	criminal 77:8	1:1	dissection 13:6	emphasized 12:4
23:19 74:7	criterion 75:14	described 46:20	dissent 82:15,16	54:16
consolidate 86:19	criticisms 38:14	describing 49:6	disservice 25:17	emphasizing 38:4
construct 73:10	58:10	description 12:18	distinct 14:7,13	empirical 56:8 57:8
context 33:10 38:15	cultural 21:21	13:9	distort 12:10	58:13
61:1	culture 20:1,22	Designated 2:2	dividing 34:2	empirically 58:8
contexts 58:1	29:1 31:11 34:5,5	desire 48:8	DoD 46:10	employees 70:19
continue 38:6	44:1,3 68:5	determined 21:13	doing 28:13 33:12	employers 70:18
control 66:21	current 39:21	develops 81:10	53:2 68:5	empower 40:8
convened 1:12	41:11 42:9	86:3	dominating 47:14	enacted 38:11
convening 12:12,15	currently 15:13	differ 81:19	draft 4:18 6:18	engineer 85:10
12:20 14:8,14	cut 20:7	difference 12:19	10:11 11:1 13:17	ensure 54:1
15:12,21 16:11		26:1 36:19 37:1	85:17 86:4	enter 17:12
18:1 25:5 34:8	D	different 12:9	drafted 6:22 62:15	entire 66:7
35:6 39:22 40:3	DA 74:17 75:12	23:17,17 24:1	drafting 49:21	entitled 77:19
40:11,18 42:10	dangerous 73:12	28:16 29:21 31:15	84:10	environment 44:9
50:21 54:14 60:1	data 26:13 28:18	31:19 35:6 36:22	drastic 79:10 80:7	equality 30:6,22
63:3,22 70:2 81:5	57:8 58:13	39:14 44:2,10	drawn 57:16,16	33:15 35:17
conversation 47:14	date 10:21 18:1	46:3 48:2 49:3	drill 83:2	erring 76:15
conviction 75:19	day 42:12 44:1	54:10 57:19 71:12	drive 73:22	essential 38:7 66:17
convictions 58:6,21	78:20 79:9	72:19	dynamic 43:14	essentially 43:6
59:17 60:14 64:22	days 85:19	differently 26:19	44:10 46:1 48:2	establish 64:18
68:18	dealing 45:1	difficult 47:18 48:3		et 25:2 49:18 62:3
convince 57:5	December 43:21	61:20 78:14	E	evaluate 54:18
59:13	decide 80:5	direction 29:12	earlier 28:8	event 48:20
convinced 78:21	decided 65:4	61:10	early 4:1 44:10	everybody 6:14
79:5 81:14	decidedly 44:9	directive 17:17	easier 73:21,22	28:14 47:3 68:9
convincing 82:8	decision 70:20 72:6	directly 34:7 85:7	easy 61:19 62:5	76:20 81:21 82:10
Corn 1:16 11:9,11	75:10,11 78:6	Director 2:2	echo 52:16,20 77:4	83:22 87:15
11:12,13 12:22	decisions 9:17,19	disagree 31:6,8,21	educational 29:12	everybody's 86:8
13:13 14:2 15:10	70:18,19	39:3 57:20 58:14	effect 48:10 54:18	everyone's 86:21
20:4 37:13 38:2,3	decrease 68:19	64:9 81:21 83:16	effective 31:10 52:5	evidence 9:18
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u>- </u>	<u>- </u>

14:12 15:20 16:15	fail 77:9	62:15,20 85:1	40:12	78:7 79:10 80:10
49:17 57:14 59:14	failed 18:1,2,6,7,8	fine 42:5	fundamental 40:5	80:20 86:12 87:3
61:9 78:5 81:9	failure 12:15	fine-tuning 39:10	62:1 67:3	goal 8:20 80:6
evidentiary 56:17	failures 12:14 13:5	finer 39:15	fundamentally	85:16 86:4,7
evolution 31:16	13:7 15:18,20,21	finished 50:14	37:3	goes 14:14 20:3
evolving 46:1	fair 38:13 75:11	first 13:21 19:19	fundamentals	42:16
exact 38:9	76:5,5	49:16 53:2,15	11:17,19	going 15:15 23:18
exactly 6:11 14:22	fairer 59:9 60:17	61:19 62:4 76:15	future 52:10	24:22 27:16 30:18
15:14 18:21 37:4	fairly 10:3	fit 12:6,8 30:7 49:4		31:3,18 32:18
54:1	fairness 40:5 60:20	fits 16:21 30:16	G	33:1 36:8 38:6,17
example 26:20	61:1,4,22 62:1	fix 45:19	garnered 24:11	39:5,6,7,8 43:10
43:20 53:16 74:16	67:3 70:4,7	flags 20:21	gay 17:4 18:9 23:11	48:9 50:5 64:4,9
76:17	faith 67:17	flawed 72:15,15	GEN 13:12 16:6,9	65:9,10,12,13,17
excuse 74:13	familiar 69:7	73:5 77:12	17:15,19 23:5	65:18 69:10,10,14
exercises 40:12	family 71:6	focus 8:14 12:2	24:3 37:2	69:16 74:9,19
existed 44:10	far 20:16 26:14	32:15 65:7	genders 44:8	75:4,5,6,7,9,19,21
existing 40:11	39:13,14 55:7	focused 13:15	general 1:15,17 4:9	76:4 78:22 79:4
expanding 18:7	favor 33:15 58:20	54:15	11:20 13:4 15:14	79:17 80:18,20
41:14 42:11	60:16	focusing 74:15	16:17 20:4,14	81:6,14
expect 15:3 40:17	feature 77:16	folks 23:17	21:4,18 22:1,10	good 25:17 42:17
expectations 68:2,8	Federal 2:2	follow 29:21	29:22 35:14 38:9	43:6 44:6 46:14
68:16	feed 76:2	fool 73:1	60:20 66:17 77:5	62:7,12 64:18
expected 33:11	feedback 8:12	footnote 60:11	83:8	69:6 73:4 83:13
experience 21:22	feel 23:3 62:22	force 35:10	generally 13:8 77:2	grabs 71:14
76:8,11 83:4	67:11 73:14 74:2	forces 32:5	Geoff 11:12,13	great 3:19 6:21
explaining 48:18	77:12,13 82:5	forcible 26:1	12:21 15:4 42:1	24:6 25:16 30:19
explicit 36:14,18	feeling 27:14	forgive 81:2	76:13	33:12 34:16 50:15
explicitly 33:15	feels 47:3 74:4 85:5	former 14:4	Geoffrey 1:16	78:3 82:19 83:19
explore 43:13	felony 75:5	forth 16:3	getting 6:20 40:5	Green 2:3,4 5:2,7
explored 78:9	fight 70:20,21	forward 66:3 82:13	52:16	6:13 8:11 9:3 11:1
exposure 44:7	figure 3:21 12:7	forwarded 62:18	Gillibrand 13:15	11:6,8,10 22:10
expressed 43:1,2	fill 21:18	foundation 76:15	17:20	33:21 34:16,21,21
extent 27:4 29:18	filling 39:11	four 85:19	Gillibrand's 38:10	38:21 41:5 42:14
32:1,4 49:2,15	final 5:21 6:6 83:17	frankly 28:13 69:8	give 3:6,14 21:16	55:16 63:10 84:6
52:11 57:1 60:15	finalize 85:14,17	72:1	23:8 24:15 53:11	84:11,15,18,21
63:5 77:20 83:19	finalizing 85:20	Franks 16:17	56:15	86:13
	find 20:16 59:3	frequently 77:11	given 18:13,18	group 33:3 42:22
F	71:16 72:3	Friday 11:3 85:16	27:18 83:3	69:11 76:16
FACA 86:17,22	finding 13:1,9	front 6:17 8:12,22	gives 45:12	groups 75:15 80:17
87:6	22:20 50:18 55:2	Frost 1:16 5:7 6:20	glean 65:5	guard 53:7
face 44:16	55:2 61:9,14	25:11 26:5,9	go 6:2 7:4,14 8:7	guess 16:12 32:11
faced 35:15 44:2	71:22	67:20 68:14	20:16 22:9,12	37:3 41:11,17
fact 15:5 47:21 48:5	findings 3:17 6:1	full 30:13 33:16	24:16 27:2,6	65:15 67:20,22
71:20	6:22 7:12 10:11	fully 42:6 78:9	37:14 43:10 49:10	78:20 84:11
facts 25:9	22:17 41:13 42:18	function 32:2 33:11	51:1,13 53:14	
factual 8:21 13:11	50:7,9,13,16,17	39:22 40:1 42:10	54:11 55:22 61:21	H
57:14	51:1 52:7,13 53:6	functions 13:10	63:7 65:2 75:7	half 55:17 84:1
	I	I	1	ı

Ham 1:17 2:2 13:12	highlights 72:9	identify 3:10	information 5:15	issues 8:17 19:1
13:12 15:14 16:6	highly 37:17	ignored 9:18	6:12 22:7,14 24:7	34:17 35:1,2,16
	Hillman 1:17 3:21	II 20:5,8	44:21 45:12 46:21	40:10 41:19 68:22
16:9 17:15,19		III 19:13		
20:4 21:5,8,9,18	4:14,20 7:1 8:9		52:14 64:4	70:22
21:18 22:2,10	19:6,12 20:13	III.B 14:16 19:16	informational 3:12	IV 12:6 16:13
23:5 24:3 29:22	24:12 27:7,13	illustration 53:17	7:15 49:17	IV.F 11:16
37:2 46:8 66:18	31:7,13 37:3	immediately 62:18	initial 16:1 34:1,11	IX 25:13 28:2
87:16	50:12 51:4,19	impact 12:10 31:8	40:14 53:6 69:4	IX.A 24:5,13,14
Ham's 20:14 35:14	52:4,19 55:19,22	65:9,10 78:22	instance 6:8 36:5	J
handle 74:18	56:4,12 57:10	implement 37:9	instances 17:8	James 1:18
handling 75:17	61:6,13 62:11	implemented 17:9	18:11	Jan 11:2
hands 44:18,19	63:17 64:3 65:20	30:1 37:18,21	instrumental 38:18	January 1:9 10:10
86:8	81:15 82:17 83:8	implementing	integral 35:18	84:4
hang 8:3	Hillman's 3:17	16:15 18:13,19	integrate 18:6 32:6	Jim 10:6 31:20
happen 38:10	hip 31:22	38:7,18	integration 20:13	
65:12 68:10	historians 23:7	import 24:10	integrity 78:6	42:20 54:7
happened 80:2	31:17	importance 75:3	intended 51:7	job 30:19 33:12
happening 48:19	historical 20:5,17	important 3:8 6:9	62:21	John 1:15
happily 27:6	22:16	13:20 14:19 16:18	intent 5:13,18	Jones 1:12,15 3:3
happy 51:10	hold 30:13	19:1 22:8 26:22	interacting 47:19	4:3,16,21 5:4,12
harassment 26:2	holding 80:11	35:16 44:22,22	interactions 47:17	6:15,16,21 8:5,11
harder 62:5	Holtzman 1:18	69:12 77:7 79:21	interest 9:9 70:13	9:2 10:13,16,19
head 31:22	8:13,16 29:20	imposed 38:5,16	70:16,17 71:9	12:17 14:18 16:4
hear 7:18 8:5,6,7	30:3 32:11 35:1	impossible 76:21	72:3,5 76:16	16:8 17:13,16
21:13 38:20 51:17	36:8 46:13 50:1	impressed 80:8	interim 34:11	18:21 19:6,11
56:3,5 62:10	58:8 60:5,8 69:3	impressions 85:4	interruptions 84:1	20:12,15 21:6,15
65:15,21 84:14,15	74:12 78:2 83:10	improve 65:13	intervention 21:3	22:4,21 23:20
84:18	Holtzman's 78:8	79:17	introductory 38:4	24:14 26:3,7,21
heard 4:3 5:9,16	honest 27:13	inadequate 45:18	intuitive 68:19	29:15 30:2 31:12
9:6 10:3 14:12	honestly 77:22	incidence 70:9	investigated 62:3	34:19 35:8 38:19
17:1,1,6 20:14	80:15	incidents 67:16	investigation 15:8	39:1 40:17 41:22
39:7 55:7 56:13	Honor 13:1	incorporate 22:15	16:1 41:9	44:20 45:20 46:5
63:13 65:18 69:8	Honorable 1:15,18	increase 55:4,4,5	investigations	48:14 50:5 51:16
70:3 71:11,17	hope 50:1 76:22	56:7,18,19 57:2,9	59:15	52:3,18,21 54:10
77:2 78:16 79:15	hopefully 86:9	58:5,6 60:2 67:9	investigators 15:7	55:18,19,21 56:2
hearing 8:2 34:20	Houck 1:18 10:6,6	68:17	investigatory 12:13	56:11,21 57:11,18
51:17 52:19 56:14	10:15,18 11:4,7	increased 44:5	invite 23:7	58:14 60:7,10,18
held 62:19	31:20,20 42:19,20	increasing 64:19	involved 35:17 71:6	61:6,12 62:9 63:9
hello 6:19 41:4	45:14,22 47:12	independent 67:12	issue 5:3 13:16,20	63:10,13 64:2,12
52:18 63:9,9	54:7,7 63:12 72:2	indeterminate	15:11 27:1 28:5	68:11 78:19 81:15
84:17	hour 55:17 84:1	77:15	30:20 32:9 34:4,6	82:11,19 83:20
help 7:13 64:5 67:6	huge 69:18 77:16	indicate 7:5	37:5 39:19 50:2	84:8,13,17,20
67:7 81:14		individual 75:1	52:6 54:22 56:15	86:2,10 87:4,8,14
helpful 4:9 84:22	I	individuals 11:21	63:6,15 64:1	87:17
hey 30:19 52:22	idea 69:6 74:17	inequality 33:6	65:17 67:3,5,12	Joye 1:16 5:4 25:11
69:5	76:9	inescapable 31:11	70:7 71:21 76:15	67:20
hi 6:16	ideal 76:10	influence 67:4	80:3 82:22	judge 8:11 9:16
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

16 6 10 6 24 2	51 16 52 2 11 22	1. 1. 10 10	l	20 10 05 11 06 2
16:6 19:6 24:3	51:16 53:2,11,22	levels 12:10	M	28:10 85:11 86:2
40:2,9,19 41:14	54:5,20 55:1,9,10	Lieutenant 2:3	ma'am 5:3,9 21:8	87:11
42:12 55:19 57:11	55:14 56:1,7	likes 42:22	33:21 38:22 39:18	member 71:7
60:10 61:6 63:10	58:18 59:2,12,15	likewise 20:2 67:2	46:9 55:17 84:6	members 18:10
66:10 76:18 77:1	60:4 63:21 64:18	limited 51:11	84:12,16,18,21	mentioned 45:9
81:15 86:2	67:8,8 68:9,21	limits 27:18	86:13 87:5	76:18
judge's 41:11,14,15	69:6,15,21,22	line 34:3 53:15,15	maintaining 41:15	merits 12:11
42:2	73:19 74:7 75:2	lines 87:1	major 1:15 70:11	message 33:7
judged 75:21	75:10,20 77:11	Lisa 1:19	majority 63:1 81:2	messages 33:5
judgment 66:2,9	79:12 80:11,12,19	litany 56:1	81:4	methodology 6:10
judicial 40:1	81:5,9,19 82:3,3,5	little 10:8 14:10,15	making 9:19 14:2	MG 57:21 73:6
jump 25:12 38:2	85:6,21	16:9 17:2 33:13	71:18	82:20
June 34:12,14	knows 60:6	34:20 36:1,2,9,20	manage 27:17	middle 63:16
junior 12:14	Kyle 2:3 10:10 11:9	41:2 51:20 53:7	manageable 34:3	military 15:6,8
jurisdictions 28:21	22:11 33:22 40:15	53:12 54:2,3	mandate 60:21	17:3 20:8 23:7,8
28:22	41:6 42:4 55:15	55:11 60:11 63:16	71:15	26:14 27:12 28:1
justice 20:8 34:9	62:17 84:5 87:4	65:5 81:4 85:11	manner 18:7	28:18 29:7 30:6
77:8,14,17		Liz 50:6	Manning 43:22	30:10,21 32:18
justify 62:21	L	locus 13:7	Marines 30:16	34:9 40:2,8 41:10
	lack 66:5	logic 73:10	martial 72:12	41:13,14,15 42:11
<u>K</u>	laid 41:2 45:7 54:12	logical 53:19	material 8:22 10:3	43:5,11,15,16
keep 5:10 23:16	large 35:16 49:7	look 4:12 8:22 10:4	matter 6:5 37:12	44:6,17 48:1 66:9
39:8 48:17 86:22	largely 50:15	13:21 22:12,19	74:18	68:5 69:7 70:1
keeping 9:14 60:9	larger 34:12,12,13	28:9 35:15,21	matters 40:2	71:17 77:17 79:2
86:22	law 17:9 18:4,12,14	53:12 62:16 72:14	maximum 77:19	81:1
keeps 64:14	18:14,17 23:15	73:4,7 78:4	mean 5:13 10:2	military's 65:14
Kelly 28:7	32:3 37:6,8,10,12	looked 33:22	13:2 14:15 22:21	military-on-milit
key 52:7 57:12,13	37:16,18,19,20	looking 20:22	25:4 30:3,9,18,19	26:18
67:5	40:7 77:20	24:21 27:14 51:5	31:3 32:12,17,18	mind 27:2 57:11
kind 8:14 30:9,11	lawyers 78:13	71:20 82:12	33:2 34:3,10,11	77:10
30:20 32:19 44:21	lead 21:20,21 60:13	lose 75:9	35:8,15 41:10,16	mine 62:13
69:21 73:19	leaders 21:19	lot 22:7,14 23:1	45:5 46:13,17	minimum 3:11
knock 28:15	leadership 21:9,10	30:4 31:18 35:2	47:2,8 50:17	minor 11:15
know 4:7 5:21,22	leads 60:19	39:5,6,8 43:6	51:14 53:4 55:8	minority 62:6,14
6:12 7:17 12:17	leave 36:22 42:12	48:16 65:2 73:21	57:13 61:4,8,16	minute 4:22 8:7
13:2 15:10,14	48:6 51:2 55:3	80:1 83:2,16,18	64:7,8 69:4,18	misconceptions
17:22 19:21 23:2	62:7,12 86:2	87:14	70:3 71:2 72:17	25:14
23:7,10,22 24:7	leaves 81:22	lots 40:21 81:20	76:4 77:11 85:3	misperception
25:7 26:10 27:2	left 55:14	loud 14:10	86:2	28:12
27:10 29:4 30:10	legal 20:22	LT 5:2,7 6:13 8:11	means 73:13 74:19	misperceptions
30:16 31:21 32:8	legislation 16:16	9:3 11:1,6,8,10	80:4,18 85:13	24:17 25:4 28:15
32:14 33:1,2,6,19	40:22 80:20	22:10 33:21 34:21	meant 7:13	missed 63:15
35:11,16,19,20,21	Legislative 2:4	38:21 41:5 42:14	measure 47:18	mission 27:15
36:3 40:13 41:1	lesbian 17:4 18:9	55:16 63:10 84:6	measuring 46:9,9	53:21
41:22 43:3 45:8	23:11	84:11,15,18,21	media 25:18,22	misspeaking 32:3
45:17 46:18,18,19	level 12:14 21:20	86:13	meet 75:13 84:9	model 40:11
47:6 48:7,19	77:1		meet /3:13 84:9 meeting 21:11	models 18:22
			meeting 21.11	
	<u> </u>	l	l	l

moment 59:12 **moments** 52:12 **MONDAY** 1:8 **month** 36:4 mores 44:4 46:19 47:17,17 48:16 **morning** 62:17 motivated 74:11 mouth 22:3 move 8:17 35:5 **moving** 46:5 **Muffled** 7:16,19 multi-page 5:14 mute 8:10 51:15 myth 29:10 N nature 3:12 13:7 **NDAA** 54:17 necessarily 13:6

33:8 36:13 45:5 53:8 57:4 69:14 69:17 81:7 necessary 37:8 need 3:10 11:18 26:13 43:12 48:7 48:11 85:14 86:1 87:7 needs 14:16 26:14 26:19 negotiated 77:13 neither 58:6 neutralized 78:16 never 35:11 New 43:21 news 25:17 nine 4:21 noise 8:1 38:22 normally 71:1 note 20:20 85:2 86:14 noted 22:11,11 **notion** 15:9 17:11 40:18 43:1,13 44:15,16 47:15 65:7

nuance 60:11

nuanced 48:12 number 25:8 44:5 55:6 62:8 numbers 48:5,17 48:22

 $\mathbf{0}$ objection 10:5 11:14 objections 51:22 objectives 13:22 19:20 **obviously** 6:4 7:9 18:15 34:10 37:12 84:22 85:22 86:14 occur 80:13 occurred 30:17 occurs 77:18 **October** 55:12 64:13 offense 11:21 offer 47:13 offered 4:4 offhand 22:14 **officers** 66:22 Official 2:2 **Oh** 4:16 33:12 39:1 45:20 63:13 okav 4:20 5:12 6:21 8:10 10:15,15 11:4,7 16:4 19:4 21:15 32:22 36:8 39:2 55:18 63:13 80:5 84:21 87:4 87:10,11 once 39:10 87:6 **ongoing** 67:16 op-ed 78:4 open 31:16 **opened** 83:1 opening 64:7 opinion 23:9 56:20 76:21 79:14

opinions 56:13

opposed 40:10

67:15 84:10

76:18

opposite 78:1 order 5:20 8:15 52:2 organizations 66:4 66:6 77:6 orientation 36:16 72:19 ought 16:12 17:12 67:19 73:10 74:6 74:10 outline 3:4,9 4:8,14 4:18 5:14 6:18 7:3 7:4 8:15 9:1 10:9 10:14 13:17 14:1 15:11 19:5,9 21:16 28:8 40:14 51:6 54:12 86:17 outside 65:21 overall 12:15 30:21 32:16 33:6 63:20 85:4 overnight 68:6 oversight 34:9 overview 19:13 20:6 40:21 41:7 owed 3:21

P P-R-O-C-E-E-D-... 3:1 **p.m** 1:12 3:2 87:13 87:16,17,18 panel 1:3,12 34:14 35:4 52:12 68:3 84:4 85:13 panorama 47:9 paragraph 16:19 51:2,3 53:14,14 53:16,17 parcel 40:20 parents 70:20 part 12:20 19:2 21:22,22 24:19 27:3 29:6 40:20 45:2 48:3,8 49:7,8 50:7 63:19,20 68:2 73:10

particular 62:21 63:19 71:8 78:21 particularly 69:1 71:14 80:11 85:5 **parts** 49:16 Patricia 2:2 **Pede's** 38:9 **pending** 13:14 people 14:20 23:3 43:16 44:8 47:19 47:21 56:14 58:3 58:20 59:18 60:12 63:7 64:17 69:22 70:15,17,22 71:2 71:5 people's 8:14 perceive 77:9 perception 11:17 12:11 65:17 80:16 perceptions 15:17 27:22 28:14 **perfectly** 8:6 67:22 periodically 39:21 perpetrators 69:19 **person** 25:21 personal 17:5 18:15 personnel 16:14 20:10 persons 68:4 perspective 23:9 29:17 32:10 49:10 67:18,22 78:1 82:21 perspectives 23:18 persuaded 66:8 69:20 76:6 79:20 80:14 81:10 persuasively 58:4 **phone** 8:10 51:15 68:12 81:3 **phrase** 16:19 piece 21:10 22:8 29:14 48:21 49:5

63:19

planes 84:2

place 19:16 64:16

planning 35:22 **play** 31:2,10 32:9 38:6 **played** 20:19 31:14 **plea** 77:10 **pleas** 77:13 **please** 8:8 87:1 plenty 24:16 56:22 **plus** 26:10 point 3:7 7:3,11 14:1 15:1 16:22 18:5 29:21 31:15 32:13,14 33:19 34:16 36:9,22 37:6,22 38:4 39:15 42:8,18,20 45:16.21.22 46:14 53:9 60:6,10 62:4 71:12 72:3 80:10 83:15 pointed 8:16 34:22 pointing 29:7 points 8:13 11:15 **policies** 18:12 30:1 **policy** 17:9 18:14 30:5,8,21 32:16 33:14 36:14,17 40:22 poll 28:14 63:7 portion 15:9 **positive** 48:1 79:4 **possible** 83:14 86:7 possibly 36:1 potential 9:9 potentially 42:20 pragmatic 27:14 pre-trial 40:2 **precise** 13:6 15:16 precisely 15:19 preconceptions 83:5 predicate 8:21 predictions 75:22 predilection 69:5 **prefer** 73:16 preliminary 54:20 **prepare** 53:21

prepared 3:4 4:19	produce 79:4	16:2	reach 55:7 64:6	related 17:20 34:17
6:18 10:12,16	PROF 3:21 4:14,20	providing 86:15	80:7	relates 34:7
57:3 64:5	8:9 11:9,12 12:22	psychologist 33:3	read 78:3	relating 35:16
PRESENT 1:14 2:1	15:10 19:6,12	public 25:22 27:22	reading 50:14	relative 12:11
presentation 21:17	20:13 24:12 27:13	84:4	ready 41:20	relevant 20:20 22:6
23:3 24:2 35:22	31:7,13 38:2	pull 72:11	real 30:9 37:5	61:3
presentations	39:18 42:4 51:4	pullups 30:15	reality 29:11	relies 40:19
22:13	51:19 52:4,19,22	punch 72:11	realize 53:8 62:15	reluctant 66:1
presented 22:14	55:19,22 56:4,12	punishment 77:19	really 19:1,8 26:11	rely 9:16
49:19	57:10 59:20 61:6	pure 59:22	28:20 29:8,16,21	remain 43:10 50:21
presenters 5:16 9:6	61:13 62:11 63:17	purposes 86:17	32:12,13 33:2,5	remaining 32:1
9:21 22:15	64:3 65:20 76:13	87:6	33:18 41:18 46:14	remains 43:8
presiding 1:12	81:15 82:17 83:8	push 9:3	46:15,18 50:8,10	remark 64:13
pretrial 40:9 42:11	professional 74:18	put 8:9,20 10:21	53:3 55:13 67:10	remedy 78:22
pretty 18:20 35:13	74:22 75:13 76:4	14:3 22:2 36:21	68:9 69:18 73:16	remember 12:1
68:2,7	76:10	49:9 67:17 68:21	74:14,15 76:7	75:4 79:8
preventing 19:18	Professor 1:16,17	72:19	reason 58:2 66:14	removal 54:14
prevents 79:22	3:17 7:1 11:11	putting 29:16 39:13	reasons 61:21 62:7	65:12
primarily 66:3	13:13 14:2 20:4	39:15	62:12 64:18	remove 61:21
primary 53:19 69:2	37:3,13 38:3		recall 16:20 22:14	64:17
printed 58:17	39:19 41:5 50:12	Q	38:8	removing 54:18
prior 20:10 40:10	53:1 59:21	quarters 47:22	receive 8:12	57:8 58:3,20 60:1
85:20	programs 57:2,5	question 10:7 15:16	received 3:4 5:15	60:16 61:3 65:8
priorities 74:22	prominent 48:8	31:13,17 38:9	52:15	79:11
75:6	proper 18:7	41:12 47:1 50:19	recommend 61:16	REP 29:20 30:3
priority 75:6	properly 13:16	51:7 56:8 60:19	79:6	32:11 36:8 46:13
privilege 67:19	proponent 9:8	67:6	recommendation	50:1 60:5,8 69:3
privileges 67:13	proponents 9:6	questions 26:15	22:18 34:15 52:12	74:12 83:10
pro 8:18	15:6 61:2	50:10	61:15 62:22 64:6	repealed 37:20
probable 75:8	proposal 38:11	quickly 86:6	recommendations	report 3:15 4:18
probably 4:8 12:5	proposals 86:16	quieter 51:21	6:2 10:20 26:12	5:21 6:6,6,18 7:3
13:8,19 14:14,16	proposed 3:17 6:1		41:20 42:16 52:8	7:4,6,7 16:1 25:6
16:21 35:3 40:22	6:22 7:12 9:22	R	recommending 9:7	26:17 27:17 28:7
42:5 85:14	13:14 16:16 38:5	race 17:3 23:11	record 87:12	34:1,11,12,12,14
problem 27:3,10	50:13 51:1 53:6	racial 36:14	recruits 44:4	39:11 41:16 45:2
32:20 43:8,9,17	58:2	racially 18:6	refer 72:11	45:12 46:10 48:9
45:1 46:2,2,3,3,16	prosecuted 62:3	raise 29:20 42:19	referral 9:17,20	48:21 49:8 50:8,9
49:7 65:14 67:14	prosecution 59:14	42:21 54:6	40:10 41:8	52:9 68:21 85:12
72:9	60:3 67:1	raised 9:21 12:1	referred 43:21	85:15,17,20 86:5
problems 9:21 14:5	prosecutions 58:6	21:11 35:1 82:7	referring 4:15 22:2	reported 15:2 25:2
19:1 37:7	59:16 60:14 68:18	range 23:9	43:19 73:2	72:22
procedural 41:7	prosecutor 43:20	ranging 15:22	refine 36:9	reporting 25:16
proceedings 87:19	prosecutors 66:10	rape 26:1	reforms 38:5	54:19 56:8,19,19
process 11:18 15:1	74:18 75:1,13	rate 35:3 61:11	regard 18:9 36:18	57:3,9 58:9 60:2
20:8 24:17 25:4,9	77:11	75:19	37:11 58:9	61:11 64:19 67:9
29:3 51:9 73:4	protecting 18:9	rates 60:3 67:9	regarding 8:17	68:17
76:2 82:6	protection 12:3	rationale 73:8 74:9	relate 70:7	reports 19:19 41:9
		re-ordering 39:13		_
	=	•	•	•

Donnegor 4o4'	27.5 45.0 40.14	10.4 20 10.0	61.4.20.65.10	gowy 1.16 7.17 10
Representative	37:5 45:8 48:14	10:4,20 19:9	61:4,22 65:10	sorry 4:16 7:17,18
8:16 35:1 78:2,8	52:1,3,3 56:11	22:16 39:14 86:5	70:5,8,9 71:16	24:4 34:19 38:19
representativeness	57:10 60:7,18	sector 68:22	72:7,21 75:17	39:1,6 42:1,3 56:2
66:6	61:7,12 63:15	see 5:21 23:21 24:2	79:1,18,22	56:3 62:9 68:11
represented 10:3	64:1,6,11 69:17	24:22 26:11 27:7	sexually 25:19	84:13
requirements 41:8	76:5 78:19 80:18	27:8 36:19 39:10	Shangri-La 31:16	sort 5:14 6:3 8:21
resolution 24:18	81:1 83:21 86:10	44:14 45:4,20	Shannon 2:4 34:21	9:11 19:15 20:17
resolve 67:14	rights 12:3	48:22 49:3,10	share 78:8	27:9,10 29:16
resolved 25:9	road 20:16 43:11	54:22 62:7 78:7	shooting 31:21	40:20 44:22 48:17
Resolving 70:21	role 1:4 9:15 12:9	79:3,6 80:12,12	shot 49:16	51:8,11 56:17
resort 81:11	12:11 14:5,7,12	81:8,13,13 84:12	show 43:4	60:10 66:21 82:2
resource 16:14	14:13 15:12 19:14	86:3,11	shows 57:8	86:3
respect 3:15 23:22	20:6,10 27:7,20	seeing 44:20 68:21 seen 68:10	shut 74:14	sorts 77:8
30:13 32:22 33:16	30:9 31:10,14		side 9:14	sought-after 78:21
39:17 51:2 78:3	34:8 38:7 41:7,11	segment 73:15 74:3 74:4	sides 24:1 30:11 56:13	sounds 51:20 69:6
respects 81:20	41:14,15 42:3 45:4,6,15 49:4			speak 65:22
responded 36:10	45:4,6,15 49:4 58:11 60:2 62:8	self-contradictory 32:19	sign 3:13 6:3 49:14	speakers 79:8
responding 19:18 60:21 82:2	62:13 63:3,20	self-interest 78:13	signal 69:11,13,19 69:21 70:13	speaking 32:12 38:20
response 1:3 5:6,8	78:17	Senator 13:15	signals 9:10 69:17	specific 26:11,14
15:22 24:18 28:1	roles 18:8 31:1 49:3	38:10	significance 20:21	41:13 42:16
38:9 49:13 51:5	rug 72:13 73:3	send 49:21 64:10	significant 14:5	specifically 12:13
65:14 87:9	Tug /2.15 /5.5	69:10,21 86:18	17:3 42:8 54:3	17:14 25:15 65:22
responses 51:13	S	87:2	signoff 50:7	78:12
79:17	sailors 46:7	sending 9:10 69:17	simply 36:11	speculation 57:17
responsibilities	sake 71:13 78:11	70:12	single 13:20 75:14	59:22
19:17	salutary 66:15	senior 66:9 77:1	singled 29:8	spend 54:8 81:18
responsibility	SAPRO 46:10	sense 32:4 42:13	sir 11:2,6,10 42:14	spending 82:2
18:13,19 19:22	sat 43:7	45:14 46:15 49:22	sirens 65:20	83:22
35:7 41:9 53:20	saying 17:19 20:5	65:3 72:4	sitting 44:18,18	spent 5:16
rest 50:9 64:7	33:9 47:3,11 54:1	sent 10:10 11:2,3	situation 43:20	spin 35:1
result 76:5,6 79:4	68:15 74:1,13	28:8 33:5,7 62:17	Sixth 73:19	Sprance 2:2 87:5
resulted 17:10	79:9	69:18	small 63:19	87:11
results 58:22 59:7	says 17:21 34:22	sentencing 29:3	social 43:14,14	spring-butt 24:4
80:13	scar 18:15 37:15	77:16	47:17	staff 2:2 3:5,5,14
retain 15:12 16:11	scope 13:22 19:20	seriously 74:8	society 47:6 74:3	4:18 6:19 7:7,13
42:9 63:3	44:13	81:17	sociologist 33:3	7:14 9:16 10:17
Retired 1:15,17,18	scoping 34:1	service 18:9	sociologists 23:8	19:9 23:21 40:19
retribution 16:2	second 9:10 24:15	SESSION 1:6	31:18	49:15,22 54:12
reverse 85:10	61:19 62:5 70:11	set 27:19 28:5,11	soldiers 46:7	58:16 62:19 85:3
review 5:14 17:5	78:9	28:15,17 29:10	solution 35:18	85:16 86:19
ridiculous 71:3	secret 60:9	51:8 75:6,15	79:10 80:7	staff's 39:10
right 4:11 5:12	Secretary 18:6	setting 74:21	solve 37:7	stage 79:6
10:18 13:13 17:17	section 19:12,21	sexual 1:3 14:6	somebody 38:20	stalled 3:22
19:11 20:12,15	20:8 22:17 24:12	15:2 19:14,18	39:2 51:14 71:7	stand 52:13
23:20 26:5,9 29:2	27:8 28:2	26:1,2,4,18 36:16	81:2 86:14	standpoint 48:13
30:4 31:22 32:9	sections 4:22 5:2	43:7 45:10 60:22	somewhat 26:19	start 7:2,7,11,14
	-	-	-	-

10.01.17.1.00.10	l	l		1
49:21 65:1 80:10	83:12	talked 43:22 55:11	79:17 82:12	75:2
84:22 85:6 86:4	suggesting 15:15	86:14	think 3:3,8 4:8 5:1	third 9:11
started 3:14 49:20	superficial 72:4	talking 4:17,17	5:18 7:5 8:20,22	third-order 78:10
69:5	Supervisory 2:3	10:8,9,11,13	10:2 11:16,18,22	thorough 83:6
starting 4:8 53:3	support 58:13	12:21 15:5 17:14	12:7 13:8,9,13,13	thought 5:17 32:13
state 29:9	79:11	17:16,18 18:22	13:22 14:10,16,19	39:2,7,20 50:15
stated 13:16 15:11	supporting 73:8	20:20 24:13 36:11	14:20,21 15:4,16	52:5 57:2 76:8
37:13	suppose 58:17	39:2,8 42:2 60:19	16:12,14,18,21	thoughts 8:15
statement 27:15	supposed 60:21	79:10	17:11,15 20:2,3	57:19 85:3
35:12 74:6	84:9	talks 14:15	20:19 21:2 22:1,4	three 41:21 85:19
statements 48:10	sure 3:7 5:17 10:21	target 46:6	22:5,22 23:5,16	tight 85:22
STATES 1:1	12:6 16:8,22 17:6	task 28:16 45:18	24:6,14,16 25:8	tilt 61:10
statistics 25:15,16	34:7 45:3 46:17	54:17	25:12 26:10,21	time 4:1 5:16 9:13
45:10 56:22	46:20 47:8 50:16	taught 21:20	27:8,16,21 28:3,5	36:3 41:18 42:16
stay 63:2	51:4 52:1 55:2,3	telephonically 1:12	28:8,11 29:5,6,8	51:11 52:13 53:12
step 51:1 78:4	59:4 86:20	tell 7:14 17:5 18:16	29:13,13,16,18	54:8 55:13,14
stop 47:13	surprise 3:20	33:5 37:15,16	30:3,9 31:5,9 35:9	62:16 81:18 82:2
story 25:18	surprised 33:7	55:5 66:10	35:13,19 37:1,3,6	82:4
strategic 21:9,10,20	71:22	telling 66:12	38:8,12,21 39:12	timeline 85:22
35:22	survivor 9:11 69:11	Ten 5:2	41:6 42:7,13,17	times 78:16
strengthen 14:11	sweep 72:12 73:2	tend 77:22	43:12 44:14,21	tissue 18:16 37:15
strengthened 14:17	sworn 74:6	tenth 10:20	45:2,6 46:14,17	today 7:11,11 28:8
strikes 38:3	sympathetic 71:21	term 11:20 16:18	47:15 48:3,9,14	44:1 53:5 72:20
strong 63:1	sympathize 70:6	terms 8:15 9:21	48:20 49:6 50:5	told 66:13
structure 6:10,11	system 11:17 12:16	25:1 33:22 39:13	52:7 53:5,18,18	tonight 83:22
43:14 52:5	15:19,22 16:16	52:4 66:20 75:2	54:4 56:4,6,9,12	top 31:22
studies 27:11	18:3 34:9 38:16	75:16 79:1,17	56:14,16 57:6,7	topic 24:6 27:18
stuff 7:15 18:16	59:8 60:17 62:1	terrific 3:6	57:11,13 58:7,15	topics 39:16
subcommittee 1:4	64:15 66:22 73:1	testify 73:17 74:5	58:16 59:5,6,12	totality 16:20 66:18
21:11,12 22:19	73:9,16 77:9,12	testifying 68:4	59:18,22 60:4,6,9	totally 53:17
24:9,20 27:15	77:17	testimony 17:1,6	61:3,7,7,8,11,13	touching 26:8
28:4 34:13 35:4	systems 1:3 24:8,20	47:16 49:18	62:11 63:1,6,8,14	track 11:5
41:12,18 50:3	27:5 28:3 29:14	text 6:4	63:22 64:3,5,10	traction 56:15
63:2	29:19 65:6	thank 3:5,18 4:6	64:13,19,21 65:2	training 22:1 46:6
subcommittee's		51:21 53:2 81:16	65:7 67:2,7,21	trains 84:1
13:21 28:7 85:15	T	82:9,17,21 83:7	68:1,7,8,16,17	trajectories 20:17
subheading 20:9	table 36:7 56:9	Thanks 11:7 21:7	69:10,17 72:2,4	transparency 11:18
subject 6:5 21:12	Tailhook 43:5	83:8,22 87:4,14	72:14,20 73:4,11	transparent 72:22
subjects 3:10 7:6	take 4:10,12 19:7	87:15	73:14 74:14,20	treat 32:21
substantive 18:18	22:12 35:21 36:6	thing 3:9,16 26:6	77:4,5,7 79:9,12	treated 26:19 74:19
substitute 66:1,8	49:16 50:22 51:14	35:9 44:6 47:4	80:4,8,15 81:6,12	74:20
successful 19:3	51:22 76:21 85:8	54:6 74:13 85:2	81:17,18,19 82:1	tremendously 3:18
68:18	taken 35:14 81:17	things 17:18 25:1	82:3,4,11,22 83:7	trial 78:7
suffered 67:15	82:5	29:16 33:22 39:9	83:11,15,21 84:3	trials 65:1
suggest 67:17 72:22	talk 6:9 19:16 25:3	39:14 40:6 45:9	85:12	tried 78:4 85:10
76:9	41:1,10,18 48:12	47:8 51:8 54:2	thinking 14:9 51:6	trouble 34:20 51:17
suggested 50:12	55:12	55:8 61:18 66:19	thinks 40:15 63:2	troubles 30:4
		22.3 01.10 00.17	10.10 00.2	
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

true 74:20	unspoken 50:2	64:17 66:11,12,14	wonderful 4:5	13 1:9
truly 43:9 73:21	unwanted 26:4,7	69:15 73:11 74:11		13 1.9 14 11:2
trust 75:16	,		wondering 57:22 word 16:17	
	use 73:9 74:16	78:14 81:16 82:13		1991 80:3
try 9:13 11:5 29:11	useful 21:2 46:16	wanted 7:2 42:19	words 22:3 25:3	1992 43:5 44:3,17
50:6 85:3 86:4	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	50:6 82:9	43:6	46:22 47:7
87:1	V 12:6 16:10,13,17	wants 22:19 85:4,8	work 28:13 38:12	2
trying 4:1 27:16	16:19,21	warfighting 53:21	38:17 69:10,15,16	2 53:18
31:1 34:2 37:22	VADM 10:6,15,18	wasn't 21:7 30:17	85:7	20 45:19 46:4 48:11
44:13 53:14	11:4,7 31:20	50:16	worked 9:12 18:20	2008 46:10,11
Tuesday 86:9,11	42:19 45:14,22	wax 26:9	20:18,19 39:15	2010 46:11
Turner 1:19 7:22	47:12 54:7 63:12	way 4:5 18:18 29:9	71:7	2010 46:11 2012 46:11
8:1	72:2	30:15 43:19 47:19	working 84:10	
turnover 46:7		48:4,12 52:9,13	works 25:10 69:7	2014 1:9
two 11:15 32:17	value 44:16	54:11 71:6 73:14	worry 53:13	20th 85:18
36:12 70:14,19,21	various 58:10	74:2,4,19 84:2	worth 23:6,19	21st 85:18
70:22 71:2 76:14	vast 81:1,4	ways 43:18 47:22	39:20 40:13 82:1	24th 85:15
types 41:20	versus 76:17,18	72:17,20	would-be 69:19	28th 85:13
typically 12:1	vetting 86:6	we'll 5:10 49:15	wouldn't 75:16,20	3
	Vice 1:18	84:12	write 3:11 82:15	30th 84:4 85:11
<u>U</u>	victim 74:3,3	we're 6:20 10:8,13	85:5	30th 64:4 63:11
U.S 18:5	victims 11:20 45:11	29:4 30:18 31:15	writing 7:8,15	4
ultimate 50:18,19	61:5,22 65:11	33:1 35:5 39:8	49:20 54:5 74:5	4:00 1:12 87:16,17
51:7 63:6,15	66:2,4,7,11,12	44:13 55:2 60:19	writings 43:4	4:07 3:2
unanticipated 78:9	67:7,8,22 68:3	65:17 75:9 81:12	written 3:19 4:4	4.0 7 5.2 400 75:12
unbiased 76:6	69:20 73:8,11,13	85:22 87:6	86:15	400 /3.12
unclear 24:5	73:15,21 74:2,11	we've 6:12 14:12	wrong 31:5	5
undercut 29:10	75:15 76:17 77:6	17:6 18:3 56:12	wrote 51:5	5:00 87:13
undermining 66:16	77:6,9,11,17	74:10 78:16		5:36 87:18
underscores 3:9	79:14,15 80:16,17	Wednesday 28:10	X	
understand 7:21	view 66:16 67:12	week 43:2 68:3	X 33:12	6
14:21 16:4 18:21	69:3 71:3,13	70:4 85:16,19	T 7	6th 10:10
25:22 52:14 65:16	83:15	weeks 41:21	Y	
66:5 70:1 81:7	viewpoint 62:14	went 68:12	Y 33:13	7
understanding	viewpoints 67:13	whatá 34:18	years 45:19 46:4	
46:16 52:9	views 77:6	William 2:2	48:11	8
Understood 82:17	VIII 25:13	wisdom 42:10	York 43:21	
undertake 29:11	vis-à-vis 72:7	witnesses 43:2	young 43:15 44:8	9
undertaken 28:17	voice 7:16,19	78:16	47:19,21	9 11:2
undoubtedly 24:19		women 17:4 18:8	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	90s 44:11
unit 53:21 70:15	W	23:11 25:19 30:6		
71:10 72:9	wait 4:22 86:3	30:12,13,13,22	Z 33:13	
UNITED 1:1	walk 51:10	31:1 32:2,6,17,21	zero 52:6	
unity 66:17	want 3:5,18 5:20	33:16 36:19 37:11	0	
universe 66:7	19:8 21:12 22:2	44:5 47:5,6 49:1		
unrealistic 68:2,8	23:6 25:11 26:12	81:1	1	
68:16	30:12 32:21 41:1	wonder 19:7 50:13	10 10:19	
unsatisfying 37:17	44:15 49:20 55:9	53:3,10	10-10.19 10-section 5:13	
	55:12 59:8,9 63:5	, -	10-Section 3.13	
	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Response Systems to Adult Sexual

Assault Crimes Panel Meeting

Before: US DOD

Date: 01-13-14

Place: Arlington, VA

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

Court Reporter

near aus &