| 1 | X |
|----|----------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD |
| 3 | PUBLIC MEETING |
| 4 | JANUARY 29, 2021 |
| 5 | 12:02 P.M. |
| 6 | X |
| 7 | |
| 8 | HELD VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | BEFORE: |
| 16 | FREDERICK R. DAVIE, CHAIR. |
| 17 | JONATHAN DARCHE, ESQ., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | TRANSCRIBED BY: |
| 24 | DANIELLE M. RIVERA |
| 25 | |
| | |

| 1 | PUBLIC MEETING AGENDA |
|----|-----------------------------------------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | 1. Welcome & Virtual Meeting Protocol |
| 4 | 2. Call to Order |
| 5 | 3. Report from the Chair |
| 6 | 4. Presentation from General Counsel's Office |
| 7 | 5. Old Business |
| 8 | 6. New Business |
| 9 | 7. Public Comment on Disciplinary Matrix |
| 10 | 8. Board Comment on Disciplinary Matrix |
| 11 | 9. Adjourn to Executive Session |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

```
1
    BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT
   _____
2
3
    FREDERICK DAVIE,
    CHAIR
4
    JOHN SIEGAL, ESQ.
5
    BOARD MEMBER
6
    ERICA BOND, ESQ.
    BOARD MEMBER
7
    CORRINE IRISH, ESQ.
8
    BOARD MEMBER
9
    JOSEPH A. PUMA
    BOARD MEMBER
10
    MICHAEL RIVADENEYRA, ESQ.
11
    BOARD MEMBER
12
    ANGELA SUNG PINSKY
    BOARD MEMBER
13
    WILLIE FREEMAN
14
    BOARD MEMBER
    FRANK DWYER
15
    BOARD MEMBER
16
    SAL CARCATERRA
17
    BOARD MEMBER
18
    NATHAN JOSEPH
    BOARD MEMBER
19
    MARBRE STAHLY-BUTTS, ESQ.
20
    BOARD MEMBER
21
    ESMERALDA SIMMONS, ESQ.
    BOARD MEMBER
22
23
   PRESENTER:
24
    HEATHER COOK,
    ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL
25
    CIVILIAN COMPLAINT REVIEW BOARD
```

```
1
   PUBLIC APPEARANCES
2
    ADRIENNE ADAMS,
    NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL MEMBER
3
    DEBORAH ROSE,
 4
    NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL MEMBER
5
    YASMEEN KHAN,
    WNYC-FM
6
    MICHAEL SISITZKY, ESQ.,
7
    SENIOR POLICY COUNSEL FOR
    THE NEW YORK CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
8
    MICHAEL NOBLE,
    MANHATTAN COMMUNITY BOARD 4
9
10
    SAMAH SISAY, ESQ.
    BERTHA FELLOW AT
11
    THE CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
12
    JACKIE CODY, M.D.,
    COMMUNITY EDUCATION COUNCIL 22
13
    JOHN TEUFEL, ESQ.,
    FORMER CCRB INVESTIGATOR
14
15
    JENNVINE WONG, ESO.,
    THE COP ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT FOR
16
    THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY
17
    KARMITA MORGAN-RANDELL, MPA
    CO-CHAIR OF MANHATTAN BOROUGH-BASED COUNCIL
18
    CAROLYN MARTINEZ-CLASS,
19
    COMMUNITIES UNITED FOR POLICE REFORM
20
    ABIGAIL LOFCHIE, M.D.
21
    LESLIE WILLIAMS
2.2
23
24
25
```

| 1 | MS. ALVAREZ: Hello. Good |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | afternoon, everyone. Before we begin, I |
| 3 | just want to announce that we have two |
| 4 | ASL interpreters here today, Craig |
| 5 | Ridgway and Felice Shays. I will send, |
| 6 | in the chat, their names and ways to |
| 7 | view their video throughout the Board |
| 8 | Meeting. Thank you. |
| 9 | CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Yojaira, |
| 10 | and good afternoon to everyone. Welcome |
| 11 | to the Civilian Complaint Review Board's |
| 12 | Special Board Meeting on the NYPD's |
| 13 | Disciplinary Matrix. |
| 14 | I am Fred Davie. I am Chair of the |
| 15 | Board. Before we get started, I would |
| 16 | like to ask my colleagues on the Board |
| 17 | to introduce themselves. I am going to |
| 18 | start on my screen with Mr. Siegal. |
| 19 | MR. SIEGAL: (No response.) |
| 20 | CHAIR DAVIE: John, are you with us? |
| 21 | MR. SIEGAL: (No response.) |
| 22 | CHAIR DAVIE: And it looks like John |
| 23 | might have frozen. So, let me go to |
| 24 | Ms. Irish. Corrine. |
| 25 | MS. IRISH: Hi, my name is Corrine |

| 1 | Irish. I live in Harlem, and I am a |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | mayoral appointee. |
| 3 | CHAIR DAVIE: Great. Ms. Bond. |
| 4 | MS. BOND: Good afternoon. My name |
| 5 | is Erica Bond. I am a mayoral designee |
| 6 | to the Board and a resident of Brooklyn. |
| 7 | CHAIR DAVIE: Ms. Simmons. |
| 8 | MS. SIMMONS: Good afternoon. |
| 9 | Esmeralda Simmons, I am the public |
| 10 | advocate's appointment to the Board, and |
| 11 | I live in Bed-Stuy, Brooklyn. |
| 12 | CHAIR DAVIE: Great. Mr. Dwyer. |
| 13 | MR. DWYER: Good afternoon. My name |
| 14 | is Frank Dwyer, and I am a Police |
| 15 | Commissioner designee. |
| 16 | CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Puma. |
| 17 | MR. PUMA: Good afternoon, everyone. |
| 18 | I am Joseph Puma, the Manhattan City |
| 19 | Council designee to the Board, a |
| 20 | lifelong resident of the Lower East Side |
| 21 | and public housing. |
| 22 | CHAIR DAVIE: Ms. Stahly-Butts? |
| 23 | MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: Hello. My name |
| 24 | is Marbre Stahly-Butts. |
| 25 | (Telephonic interruption.) |
| | 1 |

| 1 | MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: and I am a |
|----|-----------------------------------------|
| 2 | Council appointee in Brooklyn. |
| 3 | CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Rivadeneyra. |
| 4 | MR. RIVADENEYRA: Good afternoon, |
| 5 | everyone. My name is Michael |
| 6 | Rivadeneyra. I live in the Bronx, and I |
| 7 | am a Council designee to the Board. |
| 8 | CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Joseph, are you |
| 9 | there? |
| 10 | MR. JOSEPH: (No response.) |
| 11 | CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Joseph may have a |
| 12 | connection problem. Mr. Siegal, shall |
| 13 | we try you again? |
| 14 | MR. SIEGAL: Yes. Good afternoon |
| 15 | I'm John Siegal. I am a mayoral |
| 16 | appointee to the CCRB. |
| 17 | CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Joseph, I see |
| 18 | you're back. |
| 19 | MR. JOSEPH: Yes, sorry. I keep |
| 20 | getting bounced off. Yes, my name is |
| 21 | Nathan Joseph. I am a City Council |
| 22 | appointee from Staten Island. |
| 23 | CHAIR DAVIE: And is Mr. Carcaterra |
| 24 | there? |
| 25 | MR. CARCATERRA: Yes, hi. Good |

afternoon, everyone. I'm Sal

Carcaterra, and I am a Police

Commissioner designee to the Board.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. I think I got everyone; is that correct? Did I miss anyone?

(No response.)

CHAIR DAVIE: All right. I want to thank all of you. I want to start this afternoon's discussion by recognizing all the work that has been done to get us to this point. We would not be here discussing the merits of this first-of-its-kind disciplinary matrix if it weren't for the advocacy and public scrutiny that got the Department to appoint a blue ribbon panel in the first place.

We would not be here if the mayor,
Mayor DiBlasio, the City Council, the
Police Commissioner, Commissioner Dermot
Shea, and the First Deputy Police
Commissioner Ben Tucker did not take
seriously the recommendations of the
panel and need for transparency.

2.

We would not be here without the early and enthusiastic work of CCRB staff, especially Heather Cook, but all the legal staff, the executive staff and all other staff at CCRB who work to make the matrix stronger for our investigations and for our civilians.

So, first, to the Mayor, Police
Commissioner, First Deputy Commissioner,
City Council and especially the CCRB
staff and this Board, I want to say
thank you for all of your hard work to
make this matrix and the accompanying
MOU possible.

This disciplinary matrix is really an opportunity for a reset of police accountability in New York City. With clear guidelines for punishments and a written public commitment from both the CCRB and NYPD to stick to these guidelines, there should be little daylight between what the CCRB recommends and what the Police Commissioner ultimately imposes.

A myriad of allegations now have

2.2

presumptive penalties that are hasher than what previous precedent allowed the CCRB to recommend. If the Board chooses to adopt this matrix and the MOU, and I certainly hope we will today, the Board will immediately incorporate these guidelines into our recommendations.

The Administrative Prosecution
Union, the APU, will immediately pursue
sentencing under these new guidelines,
regardless of when the misconduct being
considered or prosecuted occurred.

There is room for improvement with this matrix. However, in addition to the adoption of the MOU, this disciplinary matrix will be subject to a yearly review, during which the CCRB and the community would have an opportunity to weigh in on exactly what that improvement should look like. These guidelines are also as permanent as the community and the CCRB want them to be.

If these do not materially improve the Department's application of discipline for police misconduct, the

2.

2.2

CCRB has the opportunity six months from now, then on a yearly basis, to revisit this agreement and the use of the matrix all together.

Now, it is my hope that we will be able to be continue to use the matrix and be guided by the MOU, but I'm also committed to having open and honest dialogue with the community and the advocates about the efficiency of the matrix and if it is accomplishing its stated goals.

The matrix is a step in the right direction, but isn't the only reason past, present or future to have hope for policing and police oversight in New York City.

Last year, the reforms New Yorkers voted on to empower the CCRB took hold. We began investigating false official statements made during our investigations, sped up our subpoena process and added our Board Member, Esmeralda Simmons, our first public advocate appointee to the Board.

We released a report on youth policing and our youth advisory counsel issued their own message to young New Yorkers to utilize CCRB if they experience misconduct.

New Yorkers took to the streets to demand better from their Police

Department and departments across the country. Their demands were heard loud and clear in Albany, and state lawmakers finally did away with Civil Rights Law Section 50(A), an action that this Board strongly supported.

And for a brief moment, we had the transparency promised by the 50(A) repeal, and the City learned what many who've attended these meetings and work at the CCRB already knew, that the Police Department has a lot of work to do for more consistently and justly imposition of discipline for police misconduct.

We made a lot of progress last year.

And last night, we learned just how

bright the future is for police

oversight in New York City. The Mayor's former boss, and my former boss, Mayor David Dinkins, gave New York City the potential to curb police misconduct when he created the CCRB in its current manifestation.

Mayor DiBlasio, with David Dinkins' plan, announced last night during the Mayor's State of the City speech, taps into that potential and takes critical steps toward a stronger, empowered and independent CCRB. This year, the Board and I look forward to exploring more ways we can make policing transparent, accountable and fair for all New Yorkers.

We are committed to releasing our own report on policing of last summer's protests as soon as we can, and we are eager to publish our own database of CCRB disciplinary history and deliver on the transparency promised by 50(A)'s repeal. And, we are excited to implement the Mayor, David Dinkins', plan.

2.

At the end of this past year, the CCRB recommended substantial changes that should be made to improve police oversight in New York City, including providing our agency with direct access to body-worn camera footage, again examining the Police Commissioner's disciplinary authority.

I believe we should consider giving that authority to CCRB in CCRB's adjudicated basis, making this Board's recommendation binding rather than advisory. I do want to say this has nothing to do with the current Police Commissioner. I have a great deal of respect for Commissioner Shea.

This has to do with the office of the Commissioner and the Department.

And so, I remain convinced that our binding authority would be a better way to go when it comes to CCRB-adjudicated cases.

I will also say that we have taken the law as far as it can go, in terms of our being able to create little daylight

2.

2.2

between what CCRB recommends and what
the Commissioner does in both the matrix
and particularly in the MOUs. I am
looking forward to having more
conversations about that, like this one
today, as we all chart a path forward
toward transparent and accountable
policing in New York City.

Today, we will begin with a presentation on the disciplinary matrix from CCRB Assistant General Counsel Heather Cook. We will then have an opportunity for the Board to discuss the matrix and the Memorandum of Understanding to implement the matrix.

Following the Board's discussion, we will open the floor for public comment. Please reserve your comments to two minutes and keep them on topic. If you have any concerns about other issues outside of the disciplinary matrix and MOU, please send them to our outreach unit, either over e-mail or through the Webex chat and they will do their best to assist you.

2.

2.2

Again, the comments and questions today should be focused on the MOU and the matrix following Heather Cook's presentation. To make a comment or ask a question, whether you are a member of the public or press, please use the "raise hand" button and Yojaira Alvarez, our Director of Outreach, will call on you.

Thanks to all of you, again, for attending this special board meeting today, and I'm looking forward to this discussion.

I am now going to turn it over to Heather Cook. Heather.

MS. COOK: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. I am going to share my screen really quickly. The presentation that I am about to give is pretty full. And so, I want to spend most of my time on the hypos.

So, some of the stuff, I might go through a little bit more quickly. But, as I said, I want to be able spend most of the time on the hypos. So, we are

2.2

going to go through the new disciplinary matrix.

As many of you know, the CCRB had an internal discipline framework that we've been using for a few years now. Our goal with that framework was to just increase consistency among our panels and give a little bit more transparency about what we were doing and how we were going to analyze cases so that members of service and civilians all, sort of, knew what to expect from the CCRB.

The new matrix, the overall penalty recommendations are going to be higher than both what we have been recommending and what the NYPD Deputy Commissioner of Trials has been recommending. So, basically, this is going to be greater penalties than the past precedent.

One thing that I want to bring up
that is especially interesting for our
Board is this concept of One Officer,
One Penalty. CCRB, when we vote on the
allegations, the Board Members, they
vote on each allegation, but the officer

has to get one penalty to cover all of the allegations. So, right now, that means that the way we vote is the highest penalty is what the Board votes for each officer. Then, that gets sent over to the Department.

Because the new matrix provides for a lot of the penalties to run consecutively, we will no longer be doing it that way. So, what we are going to do is, with each allegation, there will be a separate vote by the Board Members for a penalty for each allegation.

Then, those penalties will be totalled up, if they are to run consecutively, or the highest penalty will take precedent, if they are to run concurrently. What we will send to the Department, however, will be the same One Officer, One Penalty. So, the highest penalty will still control.

So, I'm going to go in and I'm going to take you through some stats really quick of what we've done in the past two

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

2.2

years, then go through some of the more popular types of cases that we get, that we see most often and how this new matrix will work.

So, you can see that for chokeholds, in 2018 to 2020, we substantiated twenty allegations, and we recommended charges for all of those allegations.

For tasers, we substantiated twenty-four allegations, charges in twenty-one of them; CD-A in two, training in one.

Unlawful entry, we subbed 123
allegations, we gave charges for
thirty-three; CD-B, twelve; CD-A,
eighteen; training for fifty-two of
those allegations and instructions for
eight.

Stop, Question and Frisk, which we do a lot of, you can see substantiated allegations, 390; charges, fifty-six of them; CD-B, 129; CD-A, eighty-five; training eighty-five; instructions, thirty-five.

And finally, offensive language, we

substantiated forty-five allegations.

We gave charges in fifteen of those allegations; CD-B in nine; CD-A in ten; training in eight and instructions in three.

So, now I'm going to take you through some hypotheticals in those categories so we can work through the matrix and see how it's going to be applied. So, the hypothetical here is, we are going to look at a chokehold, a substantiated chokehold, -- and again, the matrix only applies to the substantiated allegations.

So, we've substantiated a chokehold, and we're going to say for the purposes of our hypo, there was a serious physical injury. So, with this one, the presumptive penalty is termination.

Now, not every single chokehold allegation has a presumptive penalty of termination, but serious physical injury has a presumptive penalty of termination.

Therefore, there is no aggravating

penalty. You can't get any higher than termination. If there's mitigating factors, the mitigating penalty would be forced separation, which is basically a resignation, as opposed to a firing.

2.

2.2

That is the difference between termination and forced separation. So, the end result ends up being the same. So, under the matrix, any chokeholds that we substantiate with serious physical injury would result in the officer no longer being on the police force.

Tasers, we see a lot of cases where there is excessive force substantiated for taser use, where maybe force was justified, but there are multiple taser discharges. So, for example, the taser was discharged three or four times with only one to three seconds in between and no ability for the victim, or civilian, to comply with any directives in between.

In this case, we are going to say that the officer -- MOS stands for

Member Of Service, and we are going to say the officer has no prior history.

There will be some aggravating factors.

There's minor physical injury when it comes to tasers, they usually break the skin when the prongs hit.

In this case, we'll say there's prolonged or exaggerated duration because there's only seconds between charges, there's multiple charges and no ability to comply with the commands in between. There will be some mitigating factors, though, in that in many of these cases the complainant is actively resisting.

So, we will balance that. The presumptive penalty here would be twenty days, which, for CCRB terms, is charges. But that is the presumptive penalty on tasers in the matrix.

Here, if the aggravating factors, -and I'll go back again, just quickly -if the Board decides that the
aggravating outweighs the mitigating,
and I've just used that here, but, you

know, it's not a specific number, the
Board will have to look at each factor
and say, "Oh, you know what? Maybe the
injury here was more important than
resisting," or maybe the Board will say,
"Oh, maybe the resisting was more
important than just the minor physical
injury from the taser prongs." So, the
Board will determine that.

For the purposes of this hypo, though, I've said that the aggravating factors outweigh the mitigating. So, then you would go to the aggravated penalty in the matrix for tasers, which would be twenty-five days.

So, the recommendation would be twenty-five days, which, again, for the CCRB would still equate to charges. So, if the aggravating and the mitigating cancelled each other out, then we would have just stuck with the presumptive penalty.

For an unlawful entry, we see a lot of these entries, where officers enter an apartment for an arrest and they

2.

2.2

don't have a warrant, they have maybe an I-Card for probable cause to arrest, and sometimes other officers will intervene.

So, in this hypo, we have a situation where an officer comes to the door with an I-Card, knocks on the door, sees that the person is inside, but the person does not want to come out to be arrested. The officer then enters, engages in a little scuffle trying to pull the person out, other officers intervene and they leave.

For this example, we will say the MOS history is none, and we'll add an aggravating for the heated-ness, or escalation, of the interaction; that force was involved and that the other officers had to intervene to pull them out. Here, there are no mitigating circumstances.

So, here, the presumptive penalty for the unlawful entry -- and all of the Fourth Amendment categories; entries, searches, frisks, stops, all of them are broken down by subcategories, most of

them by intent. Unlawful entry and the entry and search are broken down, basically, by the extent of the entry or the search.

2.

2.2

So, here, we have an unlawful entry that involves substantial physical presence and/or remaining on the premises. That's our -- we have an aggravating factor here in that the other officers tried to intervene. So, that would end up going to the aggravated, presumptive penalty, which would be twenty days, which would be charges.

So, you can see, if you don't count the aggravating factor, if that's weighed out or if it's offset by a mitigating factor or if the Board just doesn't believe that that was aggravating enough to raise it to the presumptive penalty, you would have a big difference in recommendation from the CCRB.

The presumptive penalty is ten days, which is a Schedule B Command

Discipline, but with the matrix aggravating factors, the penalty would rise to twenty days, which would then make it a charges recommendation from the CCRB.

Stop, Question, Frisk, we get a lot of these. So, in this hypo, we have a vague description of a shoplifting suspect. We get a lot of vague descriptions that will just say the race and gender of a person, maybe wearing a white t-shirt and jeans, which could be any number of people.

And because it's a shoplift, it's not a violent crime. Frisk and Search, in this case, would only be limited to if there was any indicia of a weapon or that someone was armed and a threat to safety.

So, in this hypo, you have a shoplifting suspect. 911 called in, says, you know, "This is the description of the person: Black male, white t-shirt, jeans," and the officers come up and they get no additional

2.2

information.

They don't talk to anybody at the store, they just stop the first person that they see who fits the general description. They frisk that person, and they search the person, even though there's no indicia of weapons.

So, in this example, this is where it's going to get a little more complicated, the officer has two prior substantiations in the past five years, 2016 and 2018, for the same conduct.

And what they received is a Schedule A Command Discipline.

So, what we know is that a Schedule A Command Discipline can be anything from a reprimand, all the way up to five days of penalty days and vacation forfeiture.

The issue is, with the new matrix, if the officer received five days on that CD-A, then the lookback period is going to be five years, which means that the MOS history is going to include the 2016 substantiated case.

If, however, the person got less than five days; four, three, two, one or a reprimand, then the lookback period is going to be three years, which means only one prior substantiation, the 2018, would factor into the analysis.

So, here, we are going to say that it's a sergeant, so we have an aggravating factor of rank, and failure to activate body-worn camera, which we see a lot, which is also an aggravating factor under the matrix. No mitigating circumstances here, we could put in one mitigating circumstance even, if we wanted to, to say it was unfolding very quickly.

So, here, because it's basically -it's not necessarily an intentional
frisk or search, and again, the matrix
now lays it out into intentional,
negligent or reckless Stop, Frisk,
Search and Question. Here, we are going
to go under these facts, that it's a
negligent frisk and a negligent search
in that they had some information, but

they didn't actually get as much information as they should have to stop this person -- I'm sorry, to frisk and search this person.

So, the presumptive penalty under the Patrol Guide is training for both the frisk and the search. But, again, we have the MOS history. So, we would have to look and see how many actual penalty days were imposed on both of those CD-As in 2016 and 2018.

So, the number of days that we would have to add to the penalty would be anywhere from five to ten days for prior misconduct, if only the 2018 case counts; meaning that they got less than five days on one of the CD-As. But if they got more than five days on the 2016 case, then the potential additional penalty would add an extra fifteen to twenty days.

Here, again, we've talked about we have some aggravating factors. So, then you would take the aggravated frisk penalty and the aggravated search

2.2

penalty. So, that would be seven days from each. Then, because we're talking about different conduct here, a frisk is a separate action from a search, they would run consecutively.

So, here comes the math. Your matrix penalty recommendation would be somewhere between nineteen to twenty-four days, which, again, under our recommendation would be charges from the CCRB. You would have seven days for the frisk, the aggravated frisk, seven days for the aggravated search. Then, you'd have to add on -- we're going to assume that only one of them had five days -- you would add on five to ten additional days, and that's going to be a range.

So, the aggravated penalties for the frisk and the search, that's a definite. That's in the matrix, it's in the table. That's seven days. Then, when you add on for MOS history, you're going to get a range.

So, that's going to be between five

2.2

and ten days, and that's when the Board will have a little bit more discretion in determining how many more days to add on, based on the history. So, for example, even though it's five to ten days and you're not counting in the 2016 case, that can still inform where you're going to go in your five to ten days.

As you can see, there is going to be some math involved in this. There's a number of different penalties that are going to have to be set penalties, like the frisk and search, that are going to have to be combined with range penalties, like the MOS history aggravating penalties. So, it's going to take a little bit sometimes to come up with these penalties for multiple allegations.

Now, offensive language, for an example, we'll use the N-word. That's the most typical example of offensive language. We'll say MOS history, none; no aggravating factors; no mitigating factors, just something screamed out by

2.2

the officer.

So, here, the presumptive penalty for offensive language would be twenty days. Now, that would be charges under the CCRB's recommendations. But the conduct, using the N-word, that same conduct not only also satisfies offensive language, but it also satisfies discourtesy.

The presumptive penalty for discourtesy is five days. However, because it was the same underlying act that satisfies both allegations, these penalties, under the matrix, will run concurrently.

So, here, even though you have twenty days for offensive language and five days for discourtesy, you would substantiate both allegations, but we would still only end up recommending twenty days with charges to the Department, instead of twenty-five, because these penalties are going to run concurrently.

Now I'm just going to go into a

2.2

little bit of a comparison to see what happened from the draft matrix when we held our hearing and we submitted some comments to the Police Department, and seeing some of those changes; if they were made or if they weren't, just to give you a little bit of a history of what has changed since the last time we've discussed the matrix.

One of the common themes that a number of people and advocates raised were that there were inappropriate legal standards in the draft matrix. So, objectively, a reasonable mistake of fact or law was listed with a number of the Fourth Amendment allegations. That has been removed, but as I mentioned earlier, it's been replaced by specific intents of negligence, reckless and intentional.

There was a recommendation that force allegation should be analyzed by conduct, not by outcome. Half of that was taken. So, now they are analyzed both by conduct and outcome. So, for

2.2

the conduct, for example, force is now broken into deadly use, non-deadly, less lethal/device, which would be your tasers and OC-spray, and chokeholds.

2.2

But the outcome, it's still broken down. So, you would have, like, chokeholds with serious physical injury or death, chokehold with physical injury, chokehold with no injuries. So, we are still analyzing them, both based on the conduct and on the outcome.

The aggravating and mitigating factors were deemed too subjective and too vague and not consistent with progressive discipline systems. One of the things that was asked for was minimum and maximum penalty ranges. And as you can see from the hypos that we just went through, that has been put in there.

So, for the majority of allegations, especially the ones that the CCRB is going to deal with, there are now minimum and maximum penalty ranges. So, if you determine the aggravating factors

outweigh the mitigating factors, there is a specific penalty that corresponds to that aggravated allegation.

2.2

There are still, as we said, ranges you can see with the officer history.

That's an aggravating factor, but it gives a range rather than specific target. There are floors and ceilings now, where before there wasn't.

One of the suggestions was that this MOS history should be only an aggravating factor, not mitigating.

That was taken; it is no longer a mitigating factor. However, there are job responsibilities used as mitigating factors.

You know, officers are under a duty to use de-escalation tactics. They are expected to come and testify voluntarily. They are supposed to give their very honest and cooperative testimony to the CCRB about an incident. So, these are still used as mitigating factors in some allegations. And those are actually just part of their regular

job responsibilities anyway.

The BWC categories have been expanded. We asked for them to be expanded. They didn't cover everything in the draft matrix. Now they've expanded them, but they have become a little bit unclear. So, they've added a bunch of new categories, but they kind of put in intents to them as well.

And some of those intents are a little bit unclear. You have, for example, unintentional failure to record and negligent failure to record, which basically sort of says the same thing. Then, they combined failure to record and terminating a recording, which are two very distinct issues.

It's one thing to show up to an incident that you're supposed to be recording and never turn your camera on. It's another to have your camera on, then, regardless of what is happening on the scene, you turn it off too soon, then it is unclear as to how the rest of the incident unfolded.

Another issue was the allegations weren't -- they still didn't cover all of the allegations that are necessary for us to conduct our investigations.

So, for example, there is nothing that addresses officers failing to log the BWC properly at the end of the tour, failing to upload it at the end of the tour.

So, if it's not uploaded, if it's not tagged properly, if the location is not there, the identifying information is not there, when we go to investigate an incident and we request the body-worn camera footage, it's not always going to pop as a hit that there is body-worn camera footage or even if it's mistagged, and there is no repercussions for that in this matrix.

At the end of the day, the penalties for BWC are still too low to really deter any misconduct.

Tasers, we had a big concern. We thought that they should be included specifically. They weren't. Now, it is

listed under the less lethal force/device category. We still believe it should have had its own category, though.

The Right to Know Act only addressed failing to provide a business card in the draft matrix. We wanted it to also address the consent portion, which it now does. There's been an addition of an allegation of failure to comply with the Right to Know Act regarding consent to search.

The uniformity of recommendations is still a little unclear. There's the presumptive penalties, but other than that, there are still ranges. How is that going to work borough to borough, precinct to precinct?

There is a requirement that the Police Commissioner put into writing whenever he's going to deviate from a recommendation and why. But there's still no indication as to what percentage of deviations will be acceptable, what types of deviations

will be acceptable. That will be something that will have to play out as we see what types of cases will result in deviations.

Training, CCRB had a big issue with training because we never know what that means. So, when an officer is given training as a penalty, we're never told what that training entails; whether it entails a full day at the police academy, a half day at the police academy, something with the legal bureau.

We are never, sort of, told what that training is. So, because this is a progressive discipline system and because a number of these allegations have to run consecutively, in adopting this matrix, the CCRB is going to consider training as a half of a day, a half of a penalty day.

So, if, for example, there is a Stop, Question and Frisk and each one gets training, that would add up to one and a half days, which would be a

2.

recommendation of a CD-A. However, because this is non-binding, if the Board determines, "We gave training on all three allegations because we think this person needs training, not any penalty days," the Board can still do that.

The Board can say, "We gave training for all three. The recommendation is training. We're going to deviate from what the matrix would require," and just put that in writing.

The biggest issue we had is that
it's very hard to participate in a
progressive discipline without knowing
an officer's actual disciplinary
history, which we didn't have access to.
The Central Personnel Index, or the CPI,
of each officer was never provided to
us.

What we would need is something like what the APU gets at the stage when it goes to trial, which is what's called a Summary of Employment History. That includes an officer's pedigree, their

assignment, when they joined the force, their most recent evaluation, as well as any prior internal disciplinary history.

So, we know the CCRB history, but we don't know about any internal history.

And because now the matrix is supposed to be comprehensive and take into account all of an officer's history, we really need to get that information in order for us to participate in this progressive discipline system that the matrix lays out.

The NYPD has agreed to provide us with a Summary of Employment History within twenty days of the request. CCRB would only be requiring the Summary of Employment Histories for officers when an investigator is closing a case and recommending a substantiation for that officer for an allegation, or one or more allegations.

So, we would request it before the case is closed. Then, once it's received, the case would then be submitted to the Board so that at the

2.2

time of the Board vote they will have all of the relevant information in front of them.

The most important thing to remember about the matrix is that at the end of the day, the Police Commissioner will still have all the discretion to either accept or deviate from recommendations, both from the CCRB, as well as the Deputy Commissioner of Trials in the NYPD as well. Much like the PC is not mandated to follow it, it is a non-binding guide on the PC and it would be a non-binding guide on the CCRB as well.

So, that is the end of my presentation for today, and I will turn it back over to Fred.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Heather.

Thanks very much for that thorough presentation.

So, the way we are going to proceed is that we are going to ask our Board Members if they have any clarifying questions or comments. Then, after the

2.

2.2

Board has had a chance to ask its questions, we are going to ask Mr. Puma to read the resolution into the record, make a motion with regard to the resolution they've proposed.

After that motion, we will then open it up for public comment and questions and more questions from other Board Members, if necessary. Then, we will proceed.

MR. DARCHE: Mr. Chair, if it would be okay, I think there were two slides that mistakes were made on. I would just like to correct them, --

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure, yes.

MR. DARCHE: -- so we could give the people the correct information. I am going to try and share my screen so we can show the links for the Mayor's website, which has the matrix on it.

But for -- I don't think I can. Now I can, thank you so much.

As you can see, for chokeholds, the presumptive penalty is termination, regardless of the injury, and forced

separation, if there is a mitigating circumstance and there is no injury.

And then, with regard to Stop,

Question and Frisk, there is no longer a requirement for intent. It's just any stop of a person, the presumptive penalty will be three days, and the mitigative penalty would be training, and the aggravated penalty would be fifteen days.

CHAIR DAVIE: Excellent. Thank you,
Jon. So, before we go to questions from
the Board, or comments from the Board,
to Heather, let me acknowledge the
presence of two additional Board Members
that have come in since we've started;
Mr. Willie Freeman, who is a Police
Commissioner designee. Then, I think I
saw Ms. Pinsky; is that right? Angela
Pinsky, who is a designee of the
Mayor -- an appointee of the Mayor,
rather.

So, let's go to comments and questions from the Board.

MS. IRISH: I have a question.

2.2

Typically, when we make a charges recommendation, the Board does not make a recommendation as to days. It usually then goes to the APU. Is that going to be the same process, or are we actually going to be making a recommendation for charges and the number of days?

MR. DARCHE: Mr. Chair, can I answer that?

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure, absolutely.

MR. DARCHE: So, we are in the process of updating our voting app research so that it will allow you to calculate those things easily and convert them to the discipline recommendations that we currently make.

If, after the year, we decide to adopt the matrix as part of the rules, then we could change our rules and how we make discipline recommendations. I can assure you that the APU will be taking the information that is in the voting app and making their penalty recommendations on charges.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Mr. Darche.

You might want to turn your camera on 1 2 too. We'd love to see you. 3 MR. DARCHE: My apologies. 4 CHAIR DAVIE: No worries. Other 5 questions or comments? 6 MS. SIMMONS: (Indicating.) 7 CHAIR DAVIE: Ms. Simmons. 8 MS. SIMMONS: Yes. I would like 9 some clarity around the chokehold. I 10 was under the impression that the 11 chokehold, regardless of result, was 12 grounds for charges -- termination. 13 And from what I'm understanding, I 14 could be wrong, with the new matrix, 15 depending upon the result the of the 16 chokehold, an officer can now remain on 17 the Force. So, please clarify that for

CHAIR DAVIE: Jon, you want to?

MR. DARCHE: Yes. Under the matrix, officers will not be allowed to remain on the Force. If there are mitigating circumstances, they would be allowed to resign or retire from the Force before they're terminated.

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

me.

| 1 | MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: (Indicating.) |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CHAIR DAVIE: Ms. Stahly-Butts. |
| | |
| 3 | MS. SIMMONS: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. |
| 4 | But according to what Heather said, if |
| 5 | there is not serious, physical injury in |
| 6 | a chokehold, they are not terminated. |
| 7 | MR. DARCHE: I |
| 8 | MS. SIMMONS: So, is that true or |
| 9 | not? |
| 10 | MR. DARCHE: I believe Ms. Cook made |
| 11 | a mistake. |
| 12 | MS. SIMMONS: Oh, all right. Okay, |
| 13 | thank you. Thank you, Heather. |
| 14 | MR. DARCHE: If Soren could let me |
| 15 | share the screen again, I will bring us |
| 16 | back to that. |
| 17 | CHAIR DAVIE: Did Soren hear you |
| 18 | about sharing the screen? |
| 19 | MR. DARCHE: Yes. It is my fault |
| 20 | for my inability to share. So, you |
| 21 | could see here? "Application of a |
| 22 | Chokehold." The presumptive penalty is |
| 23 | termination. Then, there's a mitigative |
| 24 | penalty of forced separation. |
| 25 | MR. PUMA: Can that be further |

broken down, just in terms of how that 1 is defined? 2 3 MR. DARCHE: Can you clarify that 4 question, Mr. Puma? 5 MR. PUMA: What does forced separation mean, I guess, just to sort 6 7 of break it down for the public? MR. DARCHE: I may be incorrect, but 8 9 when you are terminated, you don't get 10 to keep your pension. But someone who 11 is forced to separate from the Force 12 would still be allowed to keep their pension and benefits, other benefits. 13 14 MR. PUMA: Okay, thank you. 15 MS. SIMMONS: On this chart, under 16 "Physical Injury," it says, "thirty 17 suspension days, dismissal, probation." 18 "No injury, ten penalty days." Then, 19 the last column says, "N/A or 20 termination." So, explain that to me, 21 please. 2.2 MR. DARCHE: Are you talking about a 23 document that you have, Ms. Simmons? 24 MS. IRISH: No, this is what's on 25 the screen underneath "chokeholds."

MR. JOSEPH: Yes, but it's 1 applicational method of restraint, other 2 3 than a chokehold. You know, sitting, 4 standing or kneeling on a person's chest 5 or back results --MR. DARCHE: Sorry. Thank you, 6 7 Mr. Joseph. The chokehold portion is just this top line. 8 MS. IRISH: I see. 9 10 MR. DARCHE: Then, below that is other than a chokehold. 11 CHAIR DAVIE: The last hand I saw, 12 13 and I can't see everyone's hand now, was 14 Ms. Stahly-Butts. Did you have a 15 question or comment? 16 MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: Yes. I mean, I 17 think the first thing was addressed, 18 which was, I think in the presentation 19 there was a conflation of being 20 terminated with this forced separation, 21 and there is clearly a huge difference 2.2 when you receive your pension and all 23 other benefits after being terminated. 24 So, I just wanted to name that 25 difference so when we see forced

termination -- or forced separation, we shouldn't assume that that is the same as termination. It's very, very different.

Also, I'm a little bit confused, to be honest with you, about this applicationable method of restraint, which means making it unable for someone to breathe by standing on them, kneeling on them, what the difference between that and the chokehold actually is in practice.

For instance, on Eric Garner, was that a chokehold, or was he restrained?

And what is the difference between those two things? And who gets to decide the difference between them?

As we can see, for chokeholds, it's not always a termination. But also, I feel there's this whole, kind of, gray area of when people are restricting breathing by standing on somebody, the same way we saw George Floyd die. That is not technically a chokehold, it may not be a chokehold.

So, some clarity on that, on who is making this distinction. This document is full of discretionary distinctions, I'm unclear about who gets to make. But this one specifically, when is it a chokehold versus when it's just choking somebody out with your knee on their neck and killing or hurting or injuring them is one question I had.

Then, I'll ask the rest after that gets addressed about this distinction between chokeholds versus applicationable method of restraint of someone's breathing and what the difference is and who gets to decide the difference.

MR. DARCHE: So, my understanding is is that when the Board is using the matrix, it's the Board Members making the decision. Then, when the Department is using the matrix, it's the Police Commissioner who makes the final decision.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: About whether something constitutes a chokehold or

2.

2.2

restraint of breathing?

2.

2.2

MR. DARCHE: Yes.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: And ultimately, the Department will be the decider of the final the penalty. So, that's the discretionary distinction that actually will matter in the long run.

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes. I mean, the purpose of this is to, again, try to ensure that there are only rare deviations from what the CCRB recommends, both in terms of disposition and penalty, and what the Department's final decision is. But both, for the CCRB and for the Department, there is a non-binding component to this.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: I guess the question that I'm asking is, in part, both because I was kind of confused, but also just to point out how, in every single one of these decisions, the amount of discretionary choice that's made -- "Is it a chokehold or not? Is it aggravated or not? Is it mitigated or not?" -- all of these, in fact, I

think showcase and undermine the actual outcome that we reach the same decision in that there are so many discretionary loopholes in all of this.

So, I just wanted to name them. And also, it feels like, even this thing about chokeholds is just a huge, kind of, question mark. Like, who decides, and how do we (inaudible), which we probably won't.

I guess my other quick question is just about, I just wanted to make sure I understood the sexual advances, kind of, the whole body of discipline that we just picked up as a result of a kind of acknowledgement how widespread that is.

None of those sexual advances, propositions, none of those result in termination; is that correct?

CHAIR DAVIE: It is not a presumption of termination; is that correct, Jon?

MR. DARCHE: I believe that is correct.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: Okay. Then,

2.2

along the same lines, unlawful and unconstitutional stop and frisks also, under no circumstances, result in termination; is that also correct?

So that we have officers who consistently abuse and undermine the Constitution via stop and frisk and they can rest assured that they will not be terminated for that behavior; is that also correct, according to this matrix?

CHAIR DAVIE: I think the principle here is that there is a difference between a presumption of termination, which we've said that's where you begin, and looking at officer history, et cetera, and being able to recommend charges that then go to the APU where the recommended penalty is termination.

So, I just want us to make that distinction. That just because an infraction doesn't have a presumptive termination penalty attached to it, doesn't mean that given the officer's full history, the circumstances under which something occurred, that you can't

2.

2.2

get to charges in a Departmental trial where the recommended penalty is termination.

2.

2.2

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: But just to be clear, under this matrix, even the aggravated, which I'm assuming is this kind of, like, what you're talking about, the escalation of it, the aggravated penalty for a violation of stop and frisk, constitutional violations, is not termination either.

So, even with aggravating factors, this matrix doesn't land us on termination, even if there was a long-established pattern of an officer violating constitutional rights. So, first off, systematically, over the --

CHAIR DAVIE: It doesn't prevent us from recommending termination. It is a penalty in a Departmental trial.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: That makes it hard to understand why we'd go through all this trouble to adopt the matrix if there is a number of people who walk outside the matrix. But thank you,

those were my questions.

2.2

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure, thank you. Any other questions?

MR. DARCHE: Mr. Chair, the --

MS. COOK: Can I just jump in and clarify real quick for a moment? The matrix says that if a combined penalty is ninety days or more, the recommendation is termination.

So, if somebody has, you can see in the matrix, with each prior, it escalates. So, if you have a pattern, you're going to be escalating. Like when I went through it before and I showed you that if it was within five years, it went up five to ten days; if it was the second, it would go up ten to fifteen days, et cetera.

So, with each additional act of misconduct in the past, it goes up higher. So, you could theoretically come to a place where if you have three prior acts of misconduct or four prior acts of misconduct, and they are all twenty days extra for that misconduct,

then you're getting up into close to 1 ninety days. Then, your recommendation 2 would be. 3 4 So, I think if there is a pattern, 5 there is still -- it's math. There's a lot of math going on, but you still have 6 7 an ability, once you hit ninety days, that the recommendation goes to 8 termination. So, I think that's where 9 10 patterns come in. 11 MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: It's a lot of 12 hoops to jump through, but I appreciate the clarification. 13 14 CHAIR DAVIE: Jon, did you have a 15 comment? 16 MR. DARCHE: I did. 17 CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Darche, and then 18 John Siegal. I'm sorry, then 19 Mr. Siegal. 20 MR. DARCHE: I'm pretty sure that 21 for sexual harassment, that it is overt 2.2

for sexual harassment, that it is overt sexual touching or intimate physical contact. The presumptive penalty is termination. Then, sexual harassment, which is habitual predatory behavior,

23

24

the presumptive penalty is termination.

CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Siegal.

MR. SIEGAL: Yes. Thank you,

Mr. Chair. I have a series of questions and comments on the matrix that I think is important, or I'd at least like to make a record on, as we're considering this.

I do appreciate that it has evolved since we've reviewed it. And in particular, the concerns that we expressed about the need to tighten vague descriptions of aggravating and mitigating circumstances and factors and mistakes of fact or law that just seemed to lack standards at all, had been removed and tightened.

And I do think that orientation towards progressive discipline, the importance of de-escalation as an aggravating or mitigating factor and the supervisory responsibilities and aggravating factor are all important things that I think we have been working towards in our cases.

And so, the matrix is a step forward in all of those directions. I am going to limit my questions to the matrix and not the Memorandum of Understanding, which I don't think we are discussing now. But there is one statement in the matrix that I want to flag. It's on page 9.

It states that, "If the Department's determination is made that the misconduct is appropriately mitigated or aggravated, the relevant factors, including a description of how the factors were applied, will be documented as part of any recommendation submitted to the PC."

I now see that's "submitted to the PC." What I want to flag is that that requirement of specificity, including a description of how the factors were applied, I believe is absent from the MOU. And that is a particular concern and a place where I think there is a deviation between what is being said in the matrix and the MOU. That is of

concern to me. That, I guess, we'll get to when we get to the MOU because this description in the matrix is better.

I had a couple of questions about mitigating factors. Heather's presentation indicated that employment history has been removed as a mitigating factor. I don't think that is entirely true. At page 9, it states that a positive employment history in the form of accomplishments or Departmental recognitions are still a mitigating factor, and that just seems wrong to me.

I mean, an officer can be a hero one day, and we commend that. But if he or she then commits misconduct the next day, the fact of the prior bravery or heroism really should not be a mitigating factor. And so, I think that concept is still in here, and that is a concern.

There is a mitigating factor

described as the limited impact of the

violation on the Department and its

mission. I have no idea what that

means. The purpose of this is public safety and protection of the public.

2.2

And I don't think that the

Department should be able to find that
there was a disciplinary violation, but
it didn't really impact the departmental
rights mission. That is not a

mitigating factor. The Department's
mission is public safety, courtesy,
respect and professionalism. So, I
don't understand what that mitigating
factor is.

Third, and I know there is disagreement on this issue on the Board and in policy discussions, the fact of supervisor's participation as an aggravating factor. I think it's very important, but I do not think that the presence of a supervisor should be a mitigating factor for a member of service who commits a disciplinary violation.

We've had a lot of debate about that in panels. I know there is differences of opinion, but officers are responsible

for their conduct. And it is not excusable because there is a superior officer on the scene, if they commit misconduct.

I think the presumptive penalty of three days for an unlawful stop and frisk or vehicle search is too little. Given the history and the finding of systematic unconstitutionality that is still in place, that three days as a presumptive penalty is too little.

And I note that it's lower than this data that Heather outlined on the prior CCRB recommendations. Our recommendations, the plurality of them, at least, maybe most of them, were CD-Bs for stop, frisk and search violations and three days falls below that. So, that too is an area of concern to me.

Finally, what I want to note is that page 32, with respect to false and misleading or inaccurate statements by officers. In this, "As a mitigating factor, a member of service's inability to recall activities before or after

they made the false, misleading or inaccurate statement," that makes no sense to me. That seems, to me, to be an incentive to not remember, to not recall, and I don't understand the purpose of that.

So, I flag these to make a record to the issues that I think we should monitor. We should engage in further discussions with the Department as this matrix takes effect, and I appreciate the opportunity to do that.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Mr. Siegal.

And let me say that the document is a living document. We will revisit it in six months, and then on a yearly basis after that. We can address the issues raised at both of those points along the way, and then on a continuous basis.

That is on the matrix.

On the MOU, we can make sure that the language between the MOU and the matrix is consistent on the issue you've raised before it is formally signed.

And we will prepare that revised MOU to

2.

make sure that language is consistent with the Board before it's formally signed.

MR. SIEGAL: Well, my understanding is we're not really discussing the MOU. It hasn't been presented. I think that what you've just said would actually be a very material change to the MOU. And at the right, appropriate time, I would like to discuss that issue.

CHAIR DAVIE: To discuss which issue; that specific issue, John?

MR. SIEGAL: Yes. I think that the requirement, again, I will just raise it now since you've asked, there appears to be a substantial difference in the MOU between the obligations of the CCRB when our recommendations deviate from the matrix, and the obligations of the Police Commissioner when the Police Commissioner deviates from the matrix. And in Section 1, paragraph 2, --

MR. DARCHE: John?

MR. SIEGAL: Yes?

CHAIR DAVIE: Hold on one second.

Let me ask my colleagues if they can mute their line so that we don't get the background noise.

MR. SIEGAL: So, the CCRB is required to describe with particularity its reasons for deviating from the matrix, and there is not a corresponding requirement on the Department.

And the CCRB is required to describe how the aggravating or mitigating factors were applied, which is the language that I read from the matrix.

But the MOU does not require that in the PC's memos on deviating from the matrix.

So, those are concerns that I have about the MOU and, really, the requirement of in the extraordinary circumstances, whenever those are, that the Commissioner deviates from the matrix, it doesn't appear there is a requirement of a very reasoned explanation.

And that is the language I was flagging in the matrix that says there needs to be a reason that the

2.

2.2

recommendation submitted to the PC, and I'd like to see that carried out throughout the process. If the point of the matrix is standardization and here there is deviation, there needs to be real explanation so that all participants in the process and the public can understand what that is.

CHAIR DAVIE: Understood, and we will make sure that the language, again, between the MOU and the matrix on that, and any other issues, but I think that's the one that is flagged now, is consistent. Mr. Puma.

MR. PUMA: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Just a couple of questions; I wanted clarity as to when the matrix would start to be applied to disciplinary cases. My understanding is that since it was introduced last week by the Department, that it would only apply to incidents that occur on or after then.

CHAIR DAVIE: As I said in my remarks, it applies immediately.

MR. PUMA: Okay, including for

2.

2.2

incidents that occurred prior to the 1 release of the matrix? 2. CHAIR DAVIE: That is my 3 4 understanding, yes. 5 MR. PUMA: Oh, okay. Then, the other question is related to body-worn 6 7 cameras, which I thought was very helpful for Heather to highlight. 8 9 Currently, the Board has notes when a 10 body-worn camera has not been properly 11 used. And so, some treatment of that in 12 the presentation was helpful. 13 However, we just don't have 14 jurisdiction over building discipline 15

about those infractions. That is my understanding, and is that going to continue to be the case.

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR DAVIE: Heather or Jon, do you want to comment?

MS. COOK: We don't have jurisdiction over it, but failing to document something and make a record of something is an aggravating and mitigating factor on many of our thetos and many of the things we do have

jurisdiction over. So, it comes into 1 2 play that way for us. 3 MR. PUMA: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Joseph. 4 CHAIR DAVIE: Sure. 5 MR. JOSEPH: Thank you. I need some clarification on the matrix on page 10, 6 7 the effect of rank on discipline. I know John kind of eluded to this 8 9 earlier, but in the last paragraph, it 10 says, "A downward departure from a 11 presumptive penalty may be warranted 12 when a subordinate is acting under the 13 close supervision or direction of a 14 superior, and the supervisor is subject 15 to discipline for any misconduct related 16 to this event." 17 So, does that mean we can now look 18 at misconduct, not only of the officer, 19 but their supervisor involved; because right now, we don't do that? 20 21 CHAIR DAVIE: Jon, do you want to 2.2 answer that or Heather? 23 MS. COOK: I mean, in the panels, we 24 do do that. There are cases where if

there is an officer on the scene and the

sergeant is in charge of what's going on, we hold the sergeant accountable for what the officers are doing because the sergeant is the one directing the operation.

So, we've done cases like that where we do hold the sergeant accountable and we wouldn't hold the officer accountable. That's pretty consistent with what our general practice is and the way that the investigators write it up when it's clear. When it's clear in the way that they've described it here; when the sergeant is on the scene, the sergeant is directing.

So, for example, if we have a case where there's a car stop, and the sergeant says, "Stop that car." Then, the officers walk up to the car, we would plead the car stop, that would go against the sergeant. That we wouldn't hold every officer who was there for stopping that car because the sergeant made the decision to stop the car.

If the sergeant is on the scene and

2.

says, "Let's get them out, frisk and search them," we wouldn't hold the officer responsible for the frisk and search because the sergeant is directing them. The way that the NYPD works is that they take the order from the sergeant. So, we do that in our panels already.

MR. JOSEPH: Okay. So, is there any time when a superior officer, or the sergeant supervisor, gives an illegal order and you follow it, there is no -- you are still justified? Meaning, the member of service is still okay. The sergeant says, "Take them outside --"

MS. COOK: I think that goes to subs. I think that goes to subs. That doesn't go to what is here in the matrix, which comes into play after something has been subbed.

So, that's a discussion that the Board can have before we hit the matrix point. But once we get to the matrix, it's already determined who is getting subbed in that case.

So, I think we just don't want to conflate those two issues in terms of whether, you know, who is really responsible is a threshold that issue gets us to the matrix. Once we get to the matrix, we've already made that determination.

CHAIR DAVIE: Does that answer your question, Mr. Joseph?

MR. JOSEPH: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure. And I saw Mr. Rivadeneyra's hand.

MR. RIVADENEYRA: Yes, thank you,
Chair. I just wanted some
clarification. And I know Jon had said
this earlier, but the definition that is
within the matrix for termination and
forced separation, they still apply.

Under termination, "A member of service may be entitled to all or part of their accrued pension benefits." And I will admit, I haven't had a chance to read the case law that governs that, that's cited for that, as well as the state law that's cited there.

But I would like to have a little bit more distinction of, like, the distinction between termination and forced termination and the amount of benefits that the officer, or member of service, is entitled to if they are found guilty and then terminated.

CHAIR DAVIE: Can anyone take that one?

MR. DARCHE: Sure.

2.2

MS. COOK: I think Jon -- yes, I was going to say Jon.

MR. DARCHE: So, I think that is something we need to get back to the Board on because it's not something that we deal with very much.

And I recently learned there are differences in the tiers of which pension you are in that determine, if you were in the NYPD, how much pension you bring with you when you retire or when you are forced to separate.

So, I just don't want to give you incorrect information. So, I will come back to you with the correct

information.

2.2

CHAIR DAVIE: Jon, is that as matter of law?

MR. DARCHE: I think it's actually a matter of the contract, but it may also be a matter of law.

MR. DWYER: Jon, I believe there's law on it also. I believe after twenty years there's law. Now, what's not being pointed out here is that if a person voluntarily separates, then a Court won't order them back into employment. If they are fired, the Court may order them back into employment, if they find the proceedings unfair.

So, this is not as simple as some people might perceive it as, "Oh, you're giving the person a great benefit." If you terminate them and they go to court, and the Court finds the decision inappropriate, they can be rehired. If they voluntarily retired, they're retired. So, this is not as clear as some might perceive it.

| 1 | CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. Ms. |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | Simmons. |
| 3 | MR. RIVADENEYRA: I |
| 4 | CHAIR DAVIE: I'm sorry, go ahead. |
| 5 | You had a follow-up? |
| 6 | MR. RIVADENEYRA: I just had one |
| 7 | more question about the well, two |
| 8 | more questions about the matrix. The |
| 9 | first question, the matrix puts "Failure |
| 10 | to Intervene" under "Excessive Force." |
| 11 | I'm wondering if that's something we are |
| 12 | going to look into as having |
| 13 | jurisdiction over. |
| 14 | Then, a question to Heather in |
| 15 | regards to when we piloted our matrix, |
| 16 | we put up data on the concurrency rate, |
| 17 | meaning our charges and subs with the |
| 18 | PC. |
| 19 | CHAIR DAVIE: You mean our |
| 20 | framework? |
| 21 | MR. RIVADENEYRA: Yes, our |
| 22 | framework. |
| 23 | MS. COOK: I think that would be in |
| 24 | the standard we can run it. I think, |
| 25 | though, that would be our standard |

concurrency rate because that's just
what we've been -- right? I mean,
that's what we've been --

CHAIR DAVIE: We have disambiguated

-- is that how you say that term? -- the

charges from the, at the times in our

data, from non-charges cases. And we

looked at where the Commissioner has

concurred on both guilty verdicts, then

the following on penalties, and we've

done the same for the disposition for

the non-charges.

So, I think maybe what

Mr. Rivadeneyra is asking, can we look

at those APU cases where we refer

charges under the matrix to see what the

Commissioner's concurrency rate has

been, both on the outcome, which is

pleas and verdicts, then the penalties.

MR. RIVADENEYRA: Yes, thank you.

MS. COOK: So, the guilties, then what was the second part?

CHAIR DAVIE: The guilties and the penalties, right.

MS. COOK: So, the penalties,

2.2

remember, because we refer charges, we 1 don't give a specific penalty. 2 MR. DARCHE: But on the APU, we keep 3 the statistics of whether or not if 4 5 there is a quilty verdict and what the penalty was. 6 7 MS. COOK: And what the penalty is, 8 right. 9 CHAIR DAVIE: Right. 10 MR. DARCHE: So, we can get that 11 data for Mr. Rivadeneyra and the others. 12 MS. COOK: I just want to make sure 13 I'm clear. So, do you want to know when they deviated from the recommendation 14 15 that we asked for, that the APU asked for? 16 17 So, before trial, the APU is saying, 18 "We want twenty days," then they're 19 found quilty and they get five days; is 20 that what your question is? 21 MR. RIVADENEYRA: In regards to a 2.2 plea, but when the Commissioner deviates 23 from what has -- and even if he deviated

24

25

from the plea, but in those cases where

the framework cases went to the APU and

there was either a plea or a finding of 1 'X' days, whenever the Police 2 Commissioner deviated from those bigger 3 4 cases. 5 MR. DARCHE: So, this is going forward, Mr. Rivadeneyra, or in the 6 7 past? MR. RIVADENEYRA: Under the use of 8 our framework. 9 10 MR. DARCHE: So, we have that 11 information. We'll get it for you. CHAIR DAVIE: Yes. And I think we 12 can look at the instances where we 13 14 recommended charges, and then the 15 Department decided that they were going 16 to go with something lesser. 17 MR. DARCHE: We will break it up. 18 CHAIR DAVIE: Right. Whose hand did 19 I see? Ms. Bond. 20 MS. BOND: I just had sort of a 21 practical, procedural question in terms 2.2 of how we are going to use this matrix. 23 I think what's coming to light here is 24 that this is a fairly complicated matrix 25 to apply. And historically, when board

panels have convened to look at these cases, investigators in their reports have really just provided us with a recommendation around whether to substantiate or not. Then, it had been a relatively simple process to determine what kind of disciplinary recommendation to make.

Here, it is much more complicated, and I think for some good reason, in the sense that we will now have more information to consider from an officer's disciplinary history that will need to be applied and considerations around aggravating and mitigating circumstances that we'll, both, want to apply and then we'll want to document.

And so, I guess my question is, how is this going to work? Are the investigators now going to be trained on the matrix and be making a recommendation around both, the determination or whether something should be substantiated, as well as providing information about the kind of

discipline that we should be recommending under the matrix, or is that something that panels are going to be doing themselves?

MS. COOK: That's still something panels are going to do. What we are going to do is we're going to -- obviously CTS is going to need to be updated to add more information and more fields.

Liz and I are going to put together for you guys, the same way we usually do, you know how right now the current framework that we use, you can click on it if you need refreshers and there's buttons in CTS you can click on for the framework, for definitions of what everything means.

Thankfully, one of the good things about the matrix is, a lot of it is in chart form. So, what we are going to do is, we'll upload those charts for you. But then, Liz and I, when we are in the panels, we'll help, kind of, walk you through it, the same way we used to walk

you through the framework where, obviously, we don't vote. The staff doesn't vote.

The votes are for you guys, but if you have questions about where to find something, how to use something, we can walk you through it the same way. So, the bigger burden will probably be on Liz and myself in the panels to have more of the knowledge of where to find everything in the matrix so that we can direct you.

But we can't really -- you know, I
think it would be a larger discussion
about whether or not investigations
should be making those recommendations
because we want to make sure that we
keep all of the discretion for the
recommendations with you guys and making
sure that the result that comes, comes
from a deliberation from the Board.

So, we can certainly talk about what ways you guys want it -- how you want it to work and what would make things easier for you. And we are going to put

2.

2.2

together a training for you guys on the matrix so that we can walk you through it in more detail.

2.2

So, it will be sort of be like a much more extensive version of the hypos that we walked through here, and we'll show you where you can find all the resources to find the different tables. We're going to try to work with Lincoln to get CTS to a point where there can just be drop downs that give you the options.

So, like, drop downs with aggravating will tell you, drop downs with mitigating will tell you. It won't just say "substantiated charges." It will say, "substantiated aggravated penalty," "substantiated presumptive penalty." And that will be, hopefully, built in, so it will be sort of one less mathematical calculation that you'll have to do. We can get the computer to do that, hopefully.

But in the beginning, at least, the plan is for Liz and I to do the heavy

lifting in the panels of walking you guys through it.

MS. BOND: Okay, that's helpful.

And I raise that, in part, just as a practical issue, but also because I think it will be very important for us to be documenting in a very detailed way, where we potentially are departing. Or I think, probably, the bigger issue here is that we're going to potentially be interpreting the matrix differently than the Department.

And I think that gets a little bit to Mr. Siegal's point, which is that I think not only will we want to document, sort of, how we are using the matrix, but it's important that we get information back from the Department about the ways in which they are potentially either deviating or frankly interpreting the matrix in a way that's different than we are so that we can report to the public and we are in a position at regular intervals, as are built into this process.

I think the Chair said every six or twelve months this is going to be reviewed in some way, but I just want to make sure that we are able to really identify where there's potential pain points, where there's disagreements about what kind of penalty should be imposed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

explanations, but I think Ms. Bond is

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

one-hundred percent correct that we need to document our reasons, and the team is working on that. Lincoln and his team are going to have something that will easily track these things for you in the midst of deciding a case, but also for us so that we have an idea of what is going on, like, a global trend situation.

MS. BOND: Yes, Jon. I understand that the Charter requires some explanation and the current draft of the MOU requires some explanation, it's just not specific as to, I think, again, Mr. Siegal said earlier, the specific rationales.

And now that we have a matrix that allows for very specific mitigating factors, we've just got to make sure that we're getting all of those details, as opposed to an explanation, along the lines of, you know, "We didn't think because it's inconsistent with the Department's mission that we should impose this kind of penalty or this kind

2.

of discipline."

I just want to make sure that we're getting the level of specificity we need so we can identify where there's differences. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. I saw Ms. Irish, Ms. Simmons and then Mr. Dwyer.

MS. IRISH: Just a quick point about timing. I really think it's important that we understand the concurrence rates before that six-month review period where we have to make the decision as to how this is working. This is a lot of work for us to be doing, and it's still just a recommendation.

So, to the extent that we are -- and we are willing to do the work, but to the extent that we are seeing things getting overturned with frequency, that would not be acceptable. And I don't understand the timing of when we actually will be getting back those explanations of deviations, and I think that is important to really nail down

and to have some data at that six-month period point.

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes. I would agree,
Ms. Irish, and I just want to say that
if it is the case, that there is the
frequent -- there are frequent
deviations from CCRB's recommendations,
then we have a very serious problem with
this arrangement.

And these documents are only as good as the integrity of the people who are responsible for implementing them. We have done pretty well with the MOU related to the Administrative Prosecution Unit, so we have preference here.

And again, I'm going to ask to silence your microphones on your computers. But we have some pretty good evidence with the use of the MOU and the APU. So, the commitment has to be that the deviations will only be for extraordinary circumstances. And if that doesn't hold, then we have got a serious issue with this entire

structure. Who was next, Ms. Simmons?

MR. JOSEPH: Don't we have a problem with the deviation now, that the Police Commissioner is not sending us the reasons why he deviated?

CHAIR DAVIE: That changes with this. And if it doesn't change, then we've got a promise.

MS. SIMMONS: I'm emphasizing what the Chair has just stated, that this is a leap of faith on our part. And I, for one, have serious issues with some of the terms and I look forward to making stronger changes in the future. But if this is an exercise of futility, then at six months, I'm going to have a very strong recommendation, --

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, but I'm just -MS. SIMMONS: -- just so you know.

Let me finish. Because there's too many
problems with it, as it is right now.

So, for us go along with that in the
hopes to improve it, if, in fact, it is
a one-way deal.

CHAIR DAVIE: Right. Well, let me

just say this, that is not how this is being entered into. And I would agree with you three months, six months, down the road, if we see that this process is not holding, then, again, we've got some serious issues to reckon with. Who was next? I think it was Mr. Dwyer.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: I have something to add. It's Marbre.

CHAIR DAVIE: Okay, Mr. Dwyer, then Ms. Stahly-Butts.

MR. DWYER: Mr. Chair, I didn't open this Pandora's Box, and I will respect your response of, "We will deal with it later." But since my colleagues opened the issue of process, I will again raise the issue that disciplinary records should be viewed after a decision is made, whether an allegation is substantiated or not.

That's not how it is currently,
where I'm given the person's partial
disciplinary record, then I'm given the
case at the same time. So, if we are
going to get a comprehensive

disciplinary record, just like a jury, we should decide whether the person is substantiated or not substantiated, then we should be given their disciplinary record.

I understand that doesn't fit
exactly within today's discussion, but
I'm not the Board Member who opened how
cases will be processed. So, I join in
that discussion, but totally respect if
you want to defer it to another day.

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, I think we should. I think we should just focus on the matrix, per se, and the MOU, per se, for now. But we can decide -- I mean, we can have that discussion. I think we have a process and if we want, we can have a discussion about whether or not we are going to deviate from that process.

But we will table that for another discussion, another time, but it is on the record. Ms. Stahly-Butts, and I just want to make one point. We still haven't heard from the public, so I

would hope that we would leave some time so that we can do that.

Ms. Stahly-Butts.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: Absolutely, I agree. I just want to, I think, reiterate the suggestive point about the reality that we have been working with the Department since our inception and we have seen both extreme instances of non-adherence to our recommendations, as well as a lack of transparency in providing detailed explanations of why they deviate.

I am so bewildered about why we would act as if anything has changed in the Department at this moment and why we would put blind faith and so much effort and time and capacity into a deeply flawed matrix in light of that history and track record.

And so, I just want to reiterate that we have that requirement. I have yet to see an explanation that is actually in good faith to that, and we have a huge gap in the actual adherence

to our suggestions. This idea to just blindly trust the NYPD is so incredibly bewildering to me in this moment and in my experience, in any actual reasoning besides -- I'm actually not sure of the reasons. But I just wanted to name that that is the history that we are approaching this year with. Even if it's "a new day," that, actually, it's not a new day. It's the same Department and history. So, I just want to name that and ground us in that.

CHAIR DAVIE: And I would say that, you know, at these interviews where we're checking in, if that pertained, I'll say it again, we've got a huge issue.

So, one more. Then, I think we should really have the reso. introduced, get the motion, then let's hear from the public. Ms. Bond.

MS. BOND: I just want to make one quick point, which is that I understand the skepticism of some of my fellow Board Members. I do think this matrix

2.2

presents an opportunity to bring some consistency and transparency to the way we do our work, and also to the way that NYPD approaches discipline.

But I do think that we have to hold them accountable, and I think we have two ways of doing that. One is, that I think it needs to be very transparent, which is why I was, I think, asking the questions, and others were asking questions, about documentation and ensuring that the Department is actually providing us with detailed information about how they're applying the matrix.

And I just also would point out that I think our second option for accountability is that our MOU is subject to termination, I think, on thirty days notice. And so, to the extent that we are not getting the cooperation that we need, or we feel like this is not a good faith effort on the part of the Department, we do have the option of terminating the MOU and going about this work in a different

way.

Very good summary. The Chair will now recognize Mr. Puma to read into the record the resolution, followed by a motion. Then, we will open it to the public for comment, and Board Members can continue to comment as well and ask questions. But let's see if we can give the public an opportunity as well. So, Mr. Puma.

MR. PUMA: All right. Thank you,
Mr. Chair. Thank you, everyone,
actually, for a really substantive
discussion. And you know, there is
clearly still a lot more questions and
substantive and practical issues that
need to be clarified. It also has taken
a lot of work and input and cooperation
from others to get to this point.

And there is also a process

question, not just related to how the

matrix would be implemented, but also, I

guess, as to the current status of the

matrix and being used by the Department

2.2

and how the CCRB's work fits -- how the CCRB, within its current legal structure, how our cases would get treated.

And as I was clarifying, the

Department did adopt the disciplinary

matrix last week. So, with all this

said, I guess there is an open question

as to what is next for the Agency, which

is why we are having the meeting,

vis-a-vis the matrix.

So, with all of this said, I wanted to propose a resolution regarding adopting the matrix for a one-year pilot program. At the end of the year, we can analyze the results and determine whether CCRB's continued use of the matrix would truly serve the interest of the people of New York City.

And I am told that I must read this resolution into the record, and also understand that the text of this will be made available in the packet. So, I will read the text:

"Whereas, the New York City Police

2.2

Department, NYPD, has developed a discipline matrix that details the presumptive penalties for various forms of misconduct, including misconduct falling within the jurisdiction of the Civilian Complaint Review Board, CCRB:

Whereas, the CCRB has been using its own discipline framework to determine what level of discipline to recommend, depending on the type of allegation and the totality of circumstances and is committed to having more consistency in the level of discipline imposed on police officers found to have engaged in misconduct:

Whereas, the CCRB is committed to increase transparency of the police disciplinary process and more public awareness about the penalty an officer faces for engaging in misconduct:

Now, therefore, the Board of the CCRB resolves that, beginning February 1, 2021, it utilize the NYPD's disciplinary matrix on a trial basis for a period of one year as the non-binding

2.

framework for its discipline 1 recommendations in all CCRB cases, 2. 3 including cases handled by the CCRB's Administrative Prosecution Unit. 4 5 After the one-year trial period, the Board will examine the data collected 6 7 during the trial and determine whether continued use of the discipline matrix 8 9 by the CCRB increases transparency and 10 consistency and serves the people of the 11 City of New York." 12 CHAIR DAVIE: So, will you move it? 13 MR. PUMA: I'm sorry? 14 CHAIR DAVIE: Mr. Puma, do you move 15 that? 16 MR. PUMA: I move. 17 CHAIR DAVIE: So, the motion has 18 been made to adopt the resolution. 19 We're just going to get a second, then 20 we'll go into comment and questions from 21 the public. Is there a second? 2.2 MR. DWYER: Second. 23 CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. Now we 24 will open it up to the public for 25 comment and questions. Yojaira?

| 1 | MR. SIEGAL: Mr. Chair, can I just |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | ask a quick question? I think I know |
| 3 | the answer, but I want to be clear. We |
| 4 | are voting on the matrix and not on the |
| 5 | MOU? |
| 6 | CHAIR DAVIE: Yes. I was informed |
| 7 | by Counsel that we don't need to vote on |
| 8 | the MOU. |
| 9 | MR. SIEGAL: Okay, because I'm not |
| 10 | prepared to vote in favor of the MOU at |
| 11 | this time, but my vote is defeated. So, |
| 12 | thank you. |
| 13 | CHAIR DAVIE: So, just the matrix is |
| 14 | all we're voting on. All right. |
| 15 | MR. JOSEPH: I'm sorry, Chair. |
| 16 | CHAIR DAVIE: Yes? |
| 17 | MR. JOSEPH: Just one clarification; |
| 18 | it is said that it will be reviewed in a |
| 19 | year. Does that preclude us from |
| 20 | looking at it in three months and six |
| 21 | months? |
| 22 | CHAIR DAVIE: It does not. |
| 23 | MR. JOSEPH: Thank you. |
| 24 | CHAIR DAVIE: Sure. Yojaira. |
| 25 | MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Chair. For |

those that would like to make a comment, please use the raise-your-hand feature.

As a reminder, we are asking folks to limit comments to two minutes. We will have the timer up. Also, keep your comments limited to the discussion of the disciplinary matrix.

If you have any questions or comments outside of that, you can e-mail me at outreach@CCRB.NYC.gov.

We will first be hearing from

Council Member Adrienne Adams, followed

by Council Member Debi Rose and Michael

Sisitzky after that.

CHAIR DAVIE: Council Member Adams, welcome.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you very much, and good afternoon. Thank you for having this meeting. It has been very interesting to hear the take of the Board on the disciplinary matrix. I really don't have a whole lot to share.

I, too, would like to hear the questions from the public as well. And I, too, am looking forward to the use of

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

2.2

this matrix by the CCRB, and knowing what your feedback is as we proceed with this living document.

I ask again that all Members do realize this is a living document. I appreciate your vote today, and again, look forward to your suggestions on how to move forward to make sure that the NYPD is in compliance. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Council

Member, and we will look to the Council

to also raise with the CCRB issues that

you see emerging that you think we

should consider. So, thank you for your

leadership of the public safety

committee. Council Member Rose.

MS. ROSE: Okay, thank you. Good afternoon. I want to thank Chair Davie and the entire CCRB Board for convening this hearing to gather public input on this very important issue.

I am really heartened by the thoughtful discourse that I've heard this morning and your commitment to make

2.

2.2

accountability a reality. Last June, we in the New York City Council passed

Local Law 69, a long overdue bill which required the NYPD to develop a disciplinary matrix that would spell out a recommended range of penalties for each type of violation.

This issue was very personal to me and my constituents. More than six years ago, then Officer Daniel Pantaleo used an unauthorized chokehold that killed my constituent, Eric Garner. The officer then held his job for more than five years, even receiving overtime pay at taxpayer expense.

We had no indication that he would be dismissed from the Department until the Commissioner made the announcement in 2019, five years later and after much public pressure. What is even more painful is knowing that Pantaleo had multiple substantiated claims of misconduct before he killed Mr. Garner in 2014.

If NYPD's disciplinary system

2.

2.2

functioned the way disciplinary systems in other professions function, Pantaleo would not have been on the job and Eric Garner could possibly be alive today. That is the primary motivation for me for this matrix, to give some semblance of order to disciplinary process, to give standards that all officers are held to account.

Indeed, with regard to Pantaleo's case, I see that the matrix includes harsher penalties for repeat progressive discipline offenses, something we should've had in place a very long time ago. But unfortunately, while the new matrix moves our city in the right direction, it does not guarantee that the civil rights of all New Yorkers will be respected.

This matrix can be rendered

meaningless at the sole discretion of

the Police Commissioner, And that is

troubling to me and my constituents.

Under this document, the New York Police

Department Commissioner retains the

2.2

ultimate discretion to override the recommendation of the matrix, just as the Commissioner has had the power to override the decisions of the Civilian Complaint Review Board.

The NYPD should not have the ability to excuse or deviate violations that were committed by its own officers. The police shouldn't be able to police themselves.

Under this new matrix, the

Commissioner would merely have to issue
a memo explaining the factors he

considered for deviating from the

matrix, and the Department would be
required to report on how often the

Commissioner deviated from that matrix.

It is then up to vigilant elected officials, community activists and the press to keep an eye on these deviations and continue the call for accountability.

I was really glad to hear that the CCRB is going to re-examine that after a year's time. I have long said that

2.

accountability, transparency and consistency are necessary steps in police reform, as it relates to respecting the civil rights of New Yorkers.

This matrix brings some level of transparency and consistency to the process, as in, the public will know when officers were held to standards and when they were not. But, it fails to bring true accountability, it is not only meaningful if the New York Police Commissioner does not abide by this matrix.

The Mayor and the Commissioner have called this a living document, and I and many across the City call on them revise this non-binding matrix and make disciplinary authority independent of the NYPD and bring New Yorkers the true accountability they deserve. Thank you for allowing me to exceed my time.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Council

Member, and let's say that it is going

to take all of the stakeholders in this

2.

2.2

process to ensure that both the spirit 1 and the law of this matrix and the 2 3 accompanying MOU are carried out. 4 we are going to, as I said to Council 5 Member Adams, we are going to really depend on the New York City Council to 6 7 exercise that level of vigilance with us in this process. 8 9 And I do believe that we have gone 10 right up to the gates of what the law 11 will allow, and we look forward to continuing to monitor this process. 12 13 thank you for your leadership and all 14 that you do, and thank you for your 15 comments. 16 Who is the next speaker, Yojaira? 17 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Council 18 Member. Next we will be hearing from Michael Sisitzky followed by Yasmeen 19 20 Khan. 21 CHAIR DAVIE: Please go ahead. 2.2 Michael? 23 (No response.) 24 CHAIR DAVIE: So, do we want to go

to the next speaker then come back,

Yojaira?

2.2

MS. ALVAREZ: Yes. Next we will be hearing from Yasmeen Khan.

MS. KHAN: Hi, can you hear me okay?

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, we can.

MS. KHAN: I am a member of the media. I'm from WNYC.

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure.

MS. KHAN: Chair Davie, I know you were asked about this, but I just want to sneak in two questions. I know you were asked about this before, you said that your understanding is that the matrix will apply even to behavior prior to January 15th.

We are having a hard time getting a clear answer on that, actually, from City Hall and the NYPD. So, I'm wondering how you have come to that understanding, or if you can just tell us when the public can get an ironclad understanding of whether the matrix applies to behavior, to any acts of misconduct, before January 15th?

The other question I have is related

to the MOU. It's been touted a bunch, when is it going to be signed? And what if you don't get the employment history and the other things in the agreement in a timely manner?

CHAIR DAVIE: So, on the first question, I'm going to ask Jon or Matt Kadushin to comment if they wish, or Heather. Thank you. While we wait for them to come on, because I can't see them due to the --

MR. DARCHE: So, I think the -- can you folks hear me?

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, go ahead. Yes.

MR. DARCHE: For the purposes of the Board, we are going to follow the matrix going forward. And I think any one of the reasons why the Board is adopting the matrix is because the penalties appear to be the appropriate one in the vast majority of cases for the discipline.

So, it would seem to me that there would be no reason for the Department to deviate from the CCRB recommendation

2.2

based on this matrix merely because the conduct occurred before the adoption of the matrix. The Police Commissioner had final authority, still has final authority. And so, if he wants to use the matrix, he can use the matrix.

CHAIR DAVIE: Then, on the second question on the MOU, we hope to have that signed some time in the next week. We do have to work out any inconsistencies, as were pointed out by Mr. Siegal, between the MOU and the matrix.

I don't think those are many, although the one Mr. Siegal pointed out could be described as substantive, but I think we can make that change without any major challenges there. So, hopefully some time within the next week we will be in a position to sign the MOU.

MS. KHAN: Thank you, again. And as the next part of that, I was just wondering, part of the MOU was getting the disciplinary history of the

officers. And I know obviously you have had trouble with getting other evidence 3 and body camera footage in a timely 4 manner. What happens if you do not get this documentation in a timely manner? You said twenty days was the 7 extricated --8 CHAIR DAVIE: The Commissioner, the

public and everyone else will know about it. And part of the accountability in this entire reset, as we have called it, is a new level of transparency. We are going to -- so, we are going to anticipate that the Department is going to live up to its part of this commitment. And if they do not, we will be the first to call them to task on that.

MS. KHAN: Thank you.

Sure. Who is next, CHAIR DAVIE: Yojaira?

MS. ALVAREZ: Thanks. Next, we will be hearing from Michael Sisitzky, followed by Michael Noble from Community Board 4.

1

2.

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure. Please go ahead, speaker.

MR. SISITZKY: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Sisitzky. I'm Senior Policy Counsel with the New York Civil Liberties Union.

Because of our longstanding concerns regarding the NYPD's approach to discipline, we've historically called for the creation of the disciplinary matrix to provide objective standards and, in theory, place sone guardrails around the unrestrained exercise of discretion, and basically to serve as a metric by which we can hold public officials accountable to the rules they claim they are following.

So, while there is some significance to the fact this document now exists, it has to be viewed in the proper context.

And that context is that the NYPD simply lacks the commitment to accountability that is a necessary precursor to this, or any, matrix operating effectively.

In recent weeks, the Administration

2.2

and NYPD leadership have been touting the matrix as constituting a seat change in their approach to discipline, claiming that the NYPD is taking leadership, reforming itself and recommitting to prioritize accountability. But unacknowledged in the Administration's messaging is the simple fact that the NYPD didn't have a choice as to whether to develop a discipline matrix.

2.

2.2

As we heard from Council Member
Rose, in June 2020, the City Council
passed legislation requiring that the
Department issue a disciplinary matrix.
So, the mere fact that the Department
has complied with the law that was
passed while thousands of New Yorkers
were demonstrating in the streets,
doesn't signal a culture shift in
attitudes surrounding discipline from
the Department.

And any promises that the NYPD is going to utilize this matrix to maximize accountability are elusory when this is

the same Administration and same NYPD leadership that has long fought to keep police misconduct records secret and that in recent months persistently defended obvious instances of police violence against protesters. These problems can't be fixed through simply adopting a disciplinary matrix. They require a culture change in City Hall and One Police Plaza.

The CCRB should not put stock and assurances around the Police Commissioner that he will limit his legally unlimited discretion, and nor should the CCRB rush into any agreement that limits its own ability to make independent recommendations for cases within its jurisdiction.

Simply accepting rules written by
the NYPD subject to the Commissioner's
unilateral ability to apply, reject or
modify would undercut the independent
credibility of the CCRB as an oversight
agency.

So, the NYCLU urges the CCRB to

2.

seriously consider the propositions of this matrix from communities that are most directly impacted by police violence and respond to public advocacy for a stronger matrix.

Rather than simply accept an NYPD-generated formula, the CCRB needs to be demanding stronger accountability mechanisms and aggressively counter any efforts by NYPD to use this or any other matrix to justify their continued unwillingness to hold officers accountable. We sent in full written comments, so I will stop there and thank you for the time.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Michael.

Let me just say that I do believe that the Mayor and Police Commissioner have negotiated in good faith around this matrix and what was demanded by the legislation from the Council.

That said, this matrix is not perfect. It is a living document. And as I said before, it's just going to require all of us, including the New

York City Civil Liberties Union, to hold all parties accountable.

I do think we've got as much as we could get through by law, and we will have to refine major portions of this.

And I am sure you will make sure that we know when we need to do that, if somehow we missed the mark.

But I would not have encouraged my colleagues to enter into this if I thought the Police Commissioner or the Mayor were not proceeding with us in good faith, and I think they are, but we all have to be held accountable.

And as I said before, we are going to expect everyone, and especially the advocates in the legal community to help us do that. So, I thank you for your comments. Next speaker, please, Yojaira.

MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Michael.

Next, we will be hearing from Michael

Noble, followed by Samah Sisay, then

Dr. Jackie Cody.

CHAIR DAVIE: Will the speaker

please go ahead?

MR. NOBLE: Okay, I'm unmuted now.

Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. Everything that I had to say has already been said, more or less, by Council Member Rose, so that cuts off some of my time.

I want to thank Yojaira for the great presentation she gave to one of our committee meetings recently. She did an outstanding job, and I asked her a lot of questions, and she had the answers to them.

One question that I had, though, and I asked her this, the matrix is great, it opened our eyes in the public to not only the kinds of things that one could be charged for as a police officer, but what you do about them.

It's a huge matrix, the question is, a member of the public who wants to make a complaint to you can't be aware of the things that it took to substantiate.

And there's got to be some transparency on your end too.

15

16

17

18

19

2021

2.2

23

I tell you this from personal experience, something I observed and got an unsubstantiated finding in the mail, 3 it's disturbing to me. So, I would like 4 to know, where do we find this? Before somebody calls you to make a complaint, 7 they should know what they need to tell you in order to have their complaint be 8 substantiated. 10 CHAIR DAVIE: So, this is a process

question that I'm going to ask staff to reach out to you about. We want to take questions and comments on the matrix itself, specifically.

So, I'm going to ask Yojaira if she will reach out to you, or one of her team, to have a conversation with you about that question.

MR. NOBLE: Okay, thanks. Because we don't ever get to the matrix without getting to you first.

CHAIR DAVIE: Understood. Thank you, sir. Next speaker, please, Yojaira.

> Thank you so much, MS. ALVAREZ:

1

2

5

6

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

Michael. I will be reaching out. Next, we will be hearing from Samah Sisay, followed by Dr. Cody.

2.

2.2

MS. SISAY: Great, thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Samah Sisay. I am an attorney and a Bertha Justice Fellow at the Center for Constitutional Rights. CCR has served, for the past thirteen years, as lead Plaintiff's counsel in Floyd versus The City of New York, a federal lawsuit that successfully challenged the NYPD's unconstitutional and racially discriminatory stop and frisk practices.

In September 2020, the CCR, along with many other groups submitted a public comment and testified before the CCRB regarding detailed concerns with the NYPD's proposed discipline matrix. However, despite these efforts and concern, we believe that the finalized matrix still remains an inadequate reform.

First, many people have already mentioned this, but the matrix is filled

with broad discretion to disregard the presumptive penalties. Abuse of discretion in discipline has always been one of the primary impediments identified by impacted communities, particularly Black and Latin X communities, to accountability for police misconduct.

Yet, the finalized discipline matrix essentially emboldens the Police

Commissioner's discretion, destroying any trust in the matrix leading to meaningful change. This issue of discretion is evident throughout the matrix, especially as applied to mitigating factors.

Several factors are unexplained and have the potential to broadly shield officers from meaningful disciplinary consequences. Factors like any extraordinary circumstances or hardships that may be relevant.

Furthermore, the finalized discipline matrix uses the state of mind of an officer in the absence of intent,

2.

2.2

which is subjective to mitigate any meaningful penalty for violations. We think this just provides officers room to place blame on the characteristics or circumstances of the victims of their misconduct to get around any form of accountability.

This has already been mentioned, but the presumptive penalties for stop and frisk are inadequate. Three penalty days are inadequate and can be easily mitigated down to training through vague mitigating factors.

Unconstitutional stop and searches are grave violations that NYPD officers have been trained on repeatedly. And this inadequate penalty highlights the Department's lack of interest in holding officers accountable for these abuses.

Moreover, the matrix does not include any disciplinary penalties for improper Level 1 and 2 DeBour Investigative Encounters.

Lastly, the discipline matrix claims to define clear escalating penalties for

2.

repeated offenses by officers. However, the section of progressive discipline only states that acts of misconduct adjudicated through command discipline may be considered for progressive discipline purposes leaving discretion for them to not be considered.

2.

2.2

So, we've submitted a full written statement, so I'm going to stop in the interest of time. But, in conclusion, these issues with the matrix undermine the stated goals and they're serious issues. Therefore, we're calling on CCRB to think really hard about accepting this matrix. We're asking for it to be rejected and also the proposed MOU. Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. Next speaker, please.

MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you. Next, we will be hearing from Dr. Jackie Cody, followed by John Teufel, then Jennvine Wong.

CHAIR DAVIE: Will the speaker go ahead? Dr. Cody?

1 DR. CODY: Yes, yes.

CHAIR DAVIE: Please go ahead.

DR. CODY: Can you hear me?

CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, we can.

DR. CODY: Oh, good. Thank you so much. I'm multi-tasking. Hi, everyone. Yes. So, the matrix is a start. And I am so glad, Chair, that you gave recognition to the late Mayor Dinkins, that was excellent.

I want to -- now I've got all these less seconds. All right. So, as far as the matrix is concerned, I am really concerned about the ambiguity of the discipline. And using the word discipline, we need to find out the definition because it looks like penalty or punishment system, this is what we are given.

So, in order to lessen the ambiguity in determining violations, I want to know, is there best practices or procedures that police officers or people hired within NYPD are signing to commit to, so that if they do commit a

misconduct or violation, it is clear.

Here, you were given this training, so to speak, and you signed to it, and you clearly understood what the best practice/procedure is. This is not what you did. And that would lessen the ambiguity.

So, I want to know, are there best practices given for the officers to sign to and agree to, so that on the other side if they do commit a misconduct, the ambiguity of their actions is less -- is more -- well, there's no ambiguity?

Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. And I would say that there is a Patrol Guide that governs the officers' conduct. And when that Patrol Guide is violated, that is both where the -- that's where this entire -- or at least alleged to have been violated, that is where this entire process comes into play.

Again, we will see over the next year and with these intervals along the way, how well this matrix and the

2.2

accompanying MOU helps us to get to first more consistent application of penalties to infractions, and, to whether or not we actually get to the rare occurrence of the Department's deviations from the CCRB's recommendation. That is the goal.

Next speaker, please.

DR. CODY: Thank you.

MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Dr. Cody.

Next, we will be hearing from John

Teufel, followed by Jennvine Wong and

Karmita Morgan.

MR. TEUFEL: Yes, hello, Council

Members. My name is John Teufel. I am
a former CCRB investigator and an
attorney. I have written extensively
about this.

My first point is that, and this seems to have been skipped over, but the matrix allows an officer who calls a Black person the N-word to keep his job. I cannot image why an officer who would feel compelled to do that would ever be allowed to keep his job. I'm curious

2.

who will vote for a matrix that allows police officers to call Black people the N-word and still keep their job.

So, anyone who has followed this issue must be very frustrated by what they heard today. What I heard was, "faith in the Police Commissioner;" "trust," "hope," "faith," "good faith negotiations." What I did not hear? Sixty to seventy percent. That is the number, the percentages, of when the Police Commissioner has rejected CCRB discipline over the past few years.

This matrix does absolutely nothing to change that. The Police Commissioner and the NYPD do not deserve the trust of the CCRB. What you are doing today is you are voting on whether to bind the CCRB's hands, but not the NYPD's hands.

Council Member Rose mentioned that she would like to prevent another Eric Garner, and that is what we are all trying to do. This matrix does not do that. This matrix keeps in place the exact same system that has resulted in

2.2

one police officer being fired for misconduct in the last ten years.

There is no reason to trust the Commissioner, and right now is your leverage. Your leverage is not three months from now, it is not six months from now. If you vote for this today, you will be voting for a propaganda point for the NYPD and for Mayor DiBlasio.

Now, I am not naive. I understand that there are ten appointees from the Mayor or from the NYPD. Now I can understand why the NYPD wants you to vote for this; it doesn't affect them, quite simply. It allows them to continue the same corrupt practices that they've been doing for many, many, many years now.

But, I would ask the Board Members who still care about NYPD discipline not to allow the Mayor to keep going on TV and saying how we have completely overhauled police discipline when we know that this matrix does nothing of

2.

1 the sort.

And I would also say, please do not vote for a matrix that allows racist police officers who call Black people the N-word to keep their job. Thank you very much.

CHAIR DAVIE: Next speaker, please, Yojaira.

MS. ALVAREZ: Next, we will be hearing from Jennvine Wong.

MS. WONG: Good afternoon. Thank
you for the opportunity to testify. My
name is Jennvine Wong. I am an attorney
with the Cop Accountability Project at
The Legal Aid Society. We are the
largest provider for indigent criminal
legal services across the five boroughs.
Thanks for letting me testify.

I wanted to note, first, something that was brought up earlier was

Commissioner Shae's promise to share, publicly, investigations. And while that is a positive and welcome response after years of advocacy for greater transparency and accountability, I

wanted to bring up something that has also been brought up several times now. That the promises are not enough to address and repair the harms of this traditionally opaque disciplinary system and the harm it has brought impacted communities.

2.

2.2

Ultimately, the disciplinary matrix is still a discretionary tool that the NYPD can disregard or change at any time. And much like the Patrol Guide, while there may be progressive principles espoused, it can be and is easily undermined by the Department itself.

And so, a disciplinary matrix compromised by the Commissioner's retention of ultimate discretion over disciplinary decisions can never be considered a complete or adequate response to the NYPD's deeply entrenched culture of impunity and record of protecting bad cops.

So, the NYPD and the Mayor have a lot of work to do to rebuild trust with

New Yorkers, if they hope to have any credibility when it comes to any of these reforms within the NYPD.

Something that the Chair had brought up earlier was the application of this matrix to cases or to incidents that predate January 15th. In one of the cases where Legal Aid is Counsel, our client was brutally assaulted. He was placed in a chokehold and tased thirteen times by Detective Fabio Nunez in Washington Heights in the Summer of 2018 over a noise issue.

Detective Nunez has a lengthy misconduct history, including multiple applications of chokeholds and forty-six CCRB allegations. One thing that could be done to start to rebuild trust is to start by terminating officers, like Detective Nunez, who has not yet even had his disciplinary trial or received any discipline for these actions.

I'm running out of time, and so I just wanted to say one last thing. That the CCRB should not have to rely on the

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

2.

2.2

NYPD to produce necessary documents and body-worn camera in order to complete their investigations. They should be provided directly and without obstruction.

And so, ultimately what New Yorkers need is a disciplinary system that will not be subject to the discretion and whims of the Police Commissioner. It needs to be independent. New Yorkers deserve something more than unenforceable promises. They deserve real accountability.

And so, we hope that leadership will continue to acknowledge that the public cannot simply be told to just trust the NYPD blindly and to remember to push for greater transparency and for greater true accountability. Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, and we hope you will help us do that. Thank you.

Next speaker, Yojaira.

MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you. Next, we will be hearing from Karmita Morgan, followed by Carolyn Martinez, and then

| 1 | Abigail Lofchie. |
|----|------------------------------------------|
| 2 | CHAIR DAVIE: Is our speaker there? |
| 3 | MS. MORGAN-RANDELL: Can you hear |
| 4 | me? |
| 5 | CHAIR DAVIE: Yes. Please go ahead. |
| 6 | MS. MORGAN-RANDELL: Okay. Good |
| 7 | afternoon. My name is Karmita |
| 8 | Morgan-Randell, and I am a co-chair for |
| 9 | the Manhattan Borough-based Council. |
| 10 | As a community member, I am |
| 11 | concerned about the lack of transparency |
| 12 | regarding the training information in |
| 13 | the discipline policy. I am not sure |
| 14 | why there is not more accessibility to |
| 15 | what trainings are going to be offered |
| 16 | to officers who violate those policies. |
| 17 | So, that is what I wanted noted. |
| 18 | CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. Next |
| 19 | speaker, please. |
| 20 | MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Karmita. |
| 21 | Next, we will be hearing from Carolyn |
| 22 | Martinez-Class. |
| 23 | MS. MARTINEZ-CLASS: Hello? |
| 24 | CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, please go ahead. |
| 25 | MS. MARTINEZ-CLASS: Thank you. |

1 Hello. My name is Carolyn

Martinez-Class, and I am testifying on behalf of Communities United for Police Reform. I've submitted written comments to the Board, so my comments here will be more focused.

It's important to begin by noting that the NYPD did not elect to create a discipline matrix. It was forced to do so by City Council-advanced legislation as a result of the mass mobilizations that occurred last year in response to police violence nationally and here in New York City.

The NYPD is incapable of policing itself. Over the course of the last year, we have seen example after example of NYPD officers acting violently and with little regard for the public and the systematic lack of accountability that plagues the Department. These behaviors by the nation's largest police department have been enabled by a chronic lack of accountability.

Unfortunately, the NYPD's new

disciplinary matrix will enshrine it in policies, the NYPD's problematic approach to discipline. The NYPD's matrix is flawed, and as written, it will embolden and empower officers to engage in a wide spectrum of police violence.

Some issues include many of the presumptive penalties for police misconduct to not cover firing, despite the fact that it's harmful. That's for things like intentionally withholding medical assistance, unwanted sexual advances, improper searches of vehicles, unauthorized or unwarranted strip searches or retaliatory actions for submitting a complaint to this Agency.

Penalties for use of force are contingent on how severely injured the person is, not the illegality or the inappropriateness of the conduct, which makes it clear -- instead of making clear that all excessive force is unacceptable. This encourages coverups and continued violence.

The guidelines codify the troubling practice of allowing officers to retire from the NYPD when officers engage in police violence. That means the Department has the discretion to cut a deal with officers who have been found to have engaged in misconduct and allow them to retire with benefits, instead of facing termination.

And, as others have said, the disciplinary matrix obscures and incentivizes police violence by being overly discretionary. The NYPD has the power at any moment to disregard or make changes to the matrix and the Mayor and the NYPD are counting on the opaqueness and complexities of this discipline system to obscure their guidelines to provide cover to protect cops who kill, brutalize, sexually harass and lie in official capacity.

And these concerns are not new. In September of 2020, CPR, as well as nearly seventy organizations and sixteen families of New Yorkers killed by NYPD,

2.

2.2

including Gwen Carr, the mother of Eric Garner, signed a letter that was shared with Chair Davie and Executive Director Darche that outlined many of the same concerns with the matrix that I have shared.

2.

2.2

The CCRB has a responsibility to the public to reject the NYPD's matrix and to vote against the resolution to adopt the NYPD's discipline matrix. The CCRB was created as an agency independent of the NYPD, and it undermines CCRB's credibility to be bound to a matrix that the NYPD controls and that codifies the officers who will be able to keep their jobs after engaging in misconduct against members of the public.

Many New Yorkers currently don't file complaints with the CCRB because they don't have faith that the complaints will result in meaningful discipline. Agreeing to the NYPD's MOU will ensure that even more New Yorkers make the choice not to submit complaints.

We need the CCRB to stand up for New Yorkers whose rights have been violated and have experienced harassment and violence due to these officers. And this can't happen if the CCRB settles for a slap on the wrist instead of pursuing firing officers who engage in misconduct.

In addition to urging Members of the Board to vote against --

CHAIR DAVIE: I'd like to ask you, we have a lot of people behind you who have been waiting quite a while. So, could you take the next ten seconds and wrap up, please?

MS. MARTINEZ-CLASS: Sure. Just to close out, in addition to voting against the proposal to adopt the NYPD's matrix, we would actually ask the CCRB to create a matrix over areas that CCRB has jurisdiction for, that's been formed primarily by families of New Yorkers who have been killed by police and communities that regularly experience police violence and police

accountability organizations working
with and representing those communities.
Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: We note your comments. Thank you. Next speaker, please.

MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Carolyn.

Next, we will be hearing from Abigail

Lofchie followed by Leslie Williams and
that will conclude our public comment

portion.

CHAIR DAVIE: So, as soon as we hear from Mr. Williams, I'll ask the Board Members if they are ready to call to question. Then, we simply can proceed to a vote.

So, please, mind your two minutes because we just have some business to get to. So, thank you.

DR. LOFCHIE: Sure. My name is

Abigail Lofchie. I agree with a lot of
the comments people have made. This is
really a problematic matrix, but, as a
doctor, just as an individual who values
human life, I want to emphasize that
failure or refusal to obtain medical

assistance intentionally or when the injury is readily visible gets you thirty penalty days and probation, unless they decide -- they could also decide to give you a favor and just give you twenty days.

This is completely unacceptable. We know that people have died in police custody because they've been refused medical care. There have been court cases about how it's unconstitutional to do this, to deny medical care to people in prisons. I don't know why it would be constitutional to do it -- for a police officer to do it.

I think it shows a disregard for human life that none of us would want in our police officers. And I can also say, as someone who has treated people in police custody, it doesn't do the justice system any harm to take people to the hospital first.

They are still in handcuffs. I have to ask for them to be taken out of handcuffs to examine them. They're

2.2

still being guarded by the police. 1 not like people go unpunished, if they 2 get medical care first. There is no 3 4 justifiable reason ever to deny someone 5 medical care that they need, and this should be something that is automatic 6 7 termination. CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you for your 8 9 comments. Next speaker, please. 10 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Doctor. 11 Next, we will be hearing from Leslie 12 Williams. MR. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. 13 14 Dr. Davie, can you hear me? 15 CHAIR DAVIE: Yes, thank you. 16 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. I want to read 17 one short subject. And it says, 18 "Superior orders are often known as a 19 Nuremberg defense. Just following 20 orders." 21 That was a German way of backing up 2.2 the plea in a court of law that a 23 person, whether a member of the 24 military, law enforcement or a fighting 25 force of the civilian population should

not be considered guilty of committing actions that were ordered by a superior officer.

This is an issue that we need to deal with with the Police Department, with the rank and file. It's not just the superior ordered them, but they should be following what should be right for the public.

Secondly, we need to deal with

Albany to change the pension laws to
ensure that they reflect that a person
who is terminated for any of these
reasons that we have cited before should
not be eligible for pension. They
should not be able to retire with a
pension if they've killed someone.

Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. So, that concludes our public speakers. Let me see if there are any more questions or comments by the Board Members. We have a motion on the floor. So, questions or comments from Board Members?

(No response.)

2.

CHAIR DAVIE: All right. Hearing none, --

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: I have a comment, a few comments.

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure.

MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: First of all, I feel deeply saddened by this vote. It feels almost like a forgone conclusion, but nonetheless, I think it's really important for me to say a few things.

One is that this matrix is clearly insufficient. I think that's been shown by the folks who've spoke and shared all of the loopholes, all of their concerns, all of the egregious behavior police can engage in and not be terminated. But also, it's so full of loopholes as to be meaningless.

So, as a stated objective that, I think, Chairman, you've stated about making sure there's alignment that should be objective. But in reality, this does not achieve that because there's just a wide, wide ability for complication and discretion that's

throughout the document.

If you read page 6, it's obvious that this actually maintains full authority of the police. However, it also doesn't stop the police from policing themselves in any way, shape or form. What it does is it put our rubber stamp on them policing themselves. And I think in many ways, it just makes us a pawn of the NYPD and the Mayor's performative attempts to rescue their reputations and makes us mouthpieces for this lie.

At the end of the day, we have a Department that, for the tens of thousands of us that were in the streets this summer, we were are very well, very well aware are not accountable to the brutality and remain absolutely above the law in many ways and refuse to do that.

So, this performance that the Mayor is asking us to put on and our willingness to adhere to it, I think is really problematic and in every possible

2.

way undermines our independence and really our functionality inside this system.

And although I think we pay tribute to the incredible movement and the advocates who really made this moment possible to pass even the demand for this disciplinary matrix, that by informing it, we are really betraying them.

Not only have we heard their voices today and for the last few months that are in stark opposition to us adopting this, but the reality is we are swallowing and being handfed a policy by the NYPD, as opposed to developing one of our own.

And by doing that, we are relying on elusive promises of accountability that have been proven over and over again to be false. And we are putting our faith in a Department that has failed our people, as opposed to people who have held them accountable.

It really delegitimizes us as a body

2.

that was put into practice that was created to hold police accountable. And instead, we are literally adopting the police's own policies and binding ourselves to it and on blind faith saying, "We'll revisit this in a year," when we actually will have less power, is the reality.

So, I think if we are serious about accountability to the communities and not just the ambitions and applications to the politicians who've appointed us to this seat, we will commit to a community-based process and not adopt a handfed matrix that has huge flaws and huge loopholes and really changes nothing in terms of our power.

I also think, as it stands, we're trading our independence and our legitimacy for, at best, empty symbolism and at worst, political theater.

And I think this is a huge, huge mistake and a huge undermining of this institution and the work that advocates in the community have done, not only

2.

this year, but for the last few decades that put us into existence. I think it is a betrayal of that.

So, I am voting no, and I beg my co-workers and colleagues to do the same.

CHAIR DAVIE: Any other comments from Board Members?

(No response.)

CHAIR DAVIE: Are we ready to vote?

MR. JOSEPH: (Indicating.)

CHAIR DAVIE: Sure.

MR. JOSEPH: There are definitely issues with this matrix, but I am going to vote for it. And as we do now, we don't have to go along with it.

Where there are issues, areas, that are problematic and we don't agree with, we need to speak to it. We need to say, "Yes, this is in the matrix, but it is not something that we feel comfortable with. And so, we are going to move in a different direction." These are things that will be made public. These are things that will be documented and

1 moving forward.

By voting for this, or using this, since the City Council made the Police Department do it, does not mean that we accept it and that are just going to blindly and quietly move along with it. I, for one, will not be quiet about issues or parts of it that don't make sense and are not fair to the public.

Am I still online?

CHAIR DAVIE: We can hear you. We can hear you, but we can't see you.

MR. JOSEPH: Oh, okay. Sorry. I thought I was talking to myself. That's it. That's all I have to say.

CHAIR DAVIE: All right, thank you. Anyone else?

(No response.)

CHAIR DAVIE: All right.

MR. RIVADENEYRA: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to definitely thank all of the advocates for the work that they have done to get us to where we are right now. I do agree with Nathan on the fact that this was created, the

legislation that compelled the NYPD to do this lives within the City Council.

And I think one of the things that we need do is really push more on City Council to sure-up, and, you know, listen to the testimony from today, and we should also be sharing the testimony from today with the City Council so that they are aware of the flaws within the matrix.

I just wanted to name that and put that out there. That we do have other mechanisms to really correct and amend and push forth a more transparent and accountable matrix.

I vote yes today, though, just because I feel that we need to move this forward. And the way to move this forward and keep the conversation moving forward is by doing this.

I do not believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong, that this is only a non-binding, and we are entertaining the matrix as something to help us and guide us, but we are not bound to the matrix.

So, therefore, we still have a level of independence. And hopefully, we can work with the City Council to amend the matrix and push for more transparency and accountability.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you, Mike. Esmeralda.

(No response.)

CHAIR DAVIE: You're on mute.

MS. SIMMONS: I think that the many flaws of the matrix have been made readily apparent by colleagues here on the Board, as well as by the advocates, who actually are the ones that got the matrix created to begin with.

Let's not kid ourselves, NYPD is not reforming itself. This is not a new day for NYPD, and we are an independent body. But our job here, in my opinion, is to use the matrix to show what can be done and to monitor the matrix to show what NYPD does.

What we need to do is have the courage, if, in fact, there are contradictions indicated, which,

unfortunately, I believe will show up, to do the right thing and say that this is a farce and we're out of the MOU.

I am voting yes, but I have looked at NYPD long and hard, and I'm hoping this is a new day, but I don't think, let's see what they do. We know what we can do, document everything.

CHAIR DAVIE: Got it. Ms. Bond. Thank you, Ms. Simmons.

MS. BOND: I want to add this from myself and fellow Board Members and thank all of the speakers today, all of the advocates that have been pushing for greater accountability today and over the summer and all the years prior.

I agree with Ms. Simmons, that this is just another tool for us to help drive accountability, it is not the be all and end all, nor is it necessarily a new day. But I think it's important because it gives us another mechanism for concretely holding the NYPD accountable, holding ourselves accountable to the public, because there

2.2

will be ample opportunities to revisit aspects of this disciplinary matrix that will require change.

I think that it is one-hundred percent certain that we will be requesting changes to this matrix in the future, but I think it is a starting place. And I think, ultimately, with respect to accountability, a matrix is not what is going to drive accountability. Giving the CCRB binding disciplinary authority is what's going to truly empower the CCRB to represent the people of New York City and their interest with respect to interactions with NYPD.

So, I vote yes today, not because the matrix is a panacea, but because I do think it represents a tool for us to use in holding the Agency accountable.

Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR DAVIE: Thank you. All right.

Are we ready to vote? Mr. Dwyer, you

want to comment? And I'd like to see if

we can get a vote before we have members

2.

2.2

who have to leave. Mr. Dwyer. 1 MR. DWYER: My brief comment is I 2 believe I heard a member of staff say 3 4 that having analyzed this, the penalties 5 in this are collectively stronger than the penalties in the CCRB matrix we 6 7 adopted a year or two ago. So, I think that needs to be recognized. 8 9 CHAIR DAVIE: So noted. Thank you, 10 Mr. Dwyer. All right. Are we ready to 11 vote? 12 (No response.) 13 CHAIR DAVIE: All right. All those 14 in favor, please say, "aye." 15 ALL: Aye. 16 CHAIR DAVIE: All those opposed, 17 please say, "no." 18 MS. STAHLY-BUTTS: Absolutely no. CHAIR DAVIE: Abstentions? 19 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIR DAVIE: All right. Thank you, 2.2 Board Members. The motion passes, and 23 we appreciate staff, Board Members, the public, the Department, City Hall, City 24 25 Council and all the stakeholders,

particularly the advocates and the 1 2 public, and particularly those people 3 who have suffered egregiously at the hands of the Police Department. 4 5 This is a start. A journey of a thousand miles begins with the first 6 7 step. This is just the first step. We've got a long way to go, and I 8 9 appreciate all the input that has gone 10 into getting us here. 11 And now, we will spend a year 12 checking in periodically along the way, 13 seeing if all of us are going to hold up 14 to our part of this bargain. 15 So, thank you all. We need to do a 16 quick executive session. So, may I have 17 a motion that we adjourn to executive 18 session? 19 MS. PINSKY: So moved. 20 CHAIR DAVIE: And a second? 21 MR. SIEGAL: Second. 2.2 CHAIR DAVIE: All those in favor of 23 adjourning to executive session, please 24 say, "aye."

ALL: Aye.

```
1
                CHAIR DAVIE: Opposed?
2
                 (No response.)
3
                CHAIR DAVIE: No. We will move to
            executive session, and Soren will let us
 4
5
            know when we are ready.
6
                Thank you all. Thank you to
7
            everyone for coming out. We've got a
8
            lot of work still to do, but thank you.
9
10
                 (TIME NOTED: 2:30 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

| 1 | CERTIFICATE |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | |
| 3 | STATE OF NEW YORK) |
| 4 | ss: |
| 5 | COUNTY OF NEW YORK) |
| 6 | |
| 7 | I, Danielle Rivera, a shorthand reporter |
| 8 | within and for the State of New York, do hereby |
| 9 | certify that the within is a true and accurate |
| 10 | transcript of the statement taken on 01/29/2021. |
| 11 | I further certify that I am not related to |
| 12 | any of the parties to this action by blood or by |
| 13 | marriage, and that I am in no way interested in |
| 14 | the outcome of this matter. |
| 15 | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set |
| 16 | my hand this 29th day of January 2021. |
| 17 | |
| 18 | Danielle Bivera |
| 1.0 | DANIELLE RIVERA |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

| & 2:3 | 129:11 136:11 139:20 142:9 | 101:9 | activate 28:10 | adhere 140:24 |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 'x' 77:2 | 144:7 (57) | accountability 4:15 9:17 92:17 | actively 22:14 | adherence 90:25 |
| 01292021 152:10 | above 140:19 | 100:1 102:22 103:1,11,21 | activists 102:19 | adjourn 2:11 150:17 |
| 15th 105:15,24 127:7 | absence 117:25 | 108:10 109:22 110:7,25 112:8 | activities 62:25 | adjourning |
| 29th 152:16 | absent 59:21 | 117:7 118:7 125:14,25 | acts 56:23,24 105:23 119:3 (4) | 150:23 |
| 50a 12:12,15 | absolutely 45:10 90:4 123:14 | 128:13,19 130:20,24 135:1 | actual 29:9 40:16 | adjudicated 14:11 119:4 |
| , | 140:19 149:18 (5) | 141:19 142:10 | 53:1 90:25 91:4 | |
| 50a's 13:22 | abstentions | 146:5 147:15,19 148:9,11 (29) | (5) | administration 109:25 111:1 |
| ======================================= | 149:19 | accountable | actually 29:1 35:25 45:5 50:11 | administration's |
| ====================================== | abuse 54:6 117:2 | 13:15 15:7 69:2,7,9 92:6 | 52:6 64:7 73:4 85:23 90:24 | 110:8 |
| abide 103:13 | abuses 118:19 | 109:16 112:13 113:2,14 118:19 | 91:5,9 92:12 93:14 105:17 | administrative 10:8 86:14 96:4 |
| abigail 4:20 | academy 39:11,12 | 140:18 141:24 142:2 145:15 | 122:4 134:19 140:3 142:7 | admit 71:22 |
| 129:1 135:7,20 (4) | accept 42:8 112:6 | 147:24,25 148:20 (18) | 146:14 (19) | adopt 10:4 45:18 |
| ability 21:21 | 144:5 | , | adams 4:2 | 55:23 94:6 96:18 |
| 22:11 57:7 102:6 111:16,21 139:24 | acceptable 38:25 | accrued 71:21 | 98:12,15,17 104:5 (5) | 133:9 134:18 142:14 (8) |
| (7) | 39:1 85:21 | accurate 152:9 | add 24:14 | adopted 149:7 |
| able 11:6 14:25 16:24 54:16 61:4 | accepting 111:19 119:15 | achieve 139:23 | 29:13,20 30:14,16,22 31:3 | adopting 39:18 |
| 83:4 102:9 133:15 138:16 (9) | access 14:5 40:17 | acknowledge 44:14 128:15 | 39:24 79:9 88:9 147:11 (11) | 94:14 106:18 111:8 141:13 |
| about 11:10 | accessibility | acknowledgemen | added 11:23 36:7 | 142:3 (6) |
| 15:5,20 16:19 17:9 29:22 30:3 | 129:14 | t 53:16 | addition 10:14 | adoption 10:15 107:2 |
| 35:22 41:5 42:5 47:18 48:22 50:6 | accompanying 9:13 104:3 122:1 | across 12:8 103:17 125:17 | 38:9 134:9,17 (4) | adrienne 4:2 |
| 51:4,11,24 53:7,12 55:8 58:12 60:4 | accomplishing | act 32:12 38:5,11 | additional 26:25 29:19 30:17 44:15 | 98:12 |
| 61:23 65:16 67:15 74:7,8 78:25 | 11:11 | 56:19 90:15 (5) | 56:19 (5) | advances 53:13,17 131:14 |
| 79:20 80:5,15,22 | | acting 68:12 | address 38:8 | |
| 82:19 83:7,12 85:9 89:18 | 60.11 | 130:18 | 63:17 126:4 | advisory 12:2 14:13 |
| 90:6,14 92:11,14,25 95:19 | 60:11 | action 12:12 30:4 152:12 | addressed 38:5 49:17 51:11 | advocacy 8:15 |
| 105:10,12 108:9 114:19 115:12,18 | according 47:4 54:10 | actions 121:12 | addresses 37:6 | 112:4 125:24 |
| 119:14 120:14 122:18 124:21 | account 41:8 | 127:22 131:16 138:2 (4) | adequate 126:20 | advocate 11:25 |
| | | , , | _ | |

| advocate's 6:10 | 59:12 81:17 (14) | allegations 9:25 17:24 18:2 | although 107:15 141:4 | analyzed 33:22,24 149:4 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ad-vac-4 11 10 | a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a | | 141.4 | 33.44,44 147.4 |
| advocates 11:10 | aggravating | 19:7,8,10,14,17,21 | .1 | 24.10 |
| 33:11 113:17 | 20:25 22:3,21,24 | 20:1,3,14 31:19 | alvarez 5:1 16:7 | analyzing 34:10 |
| 141:6 142:24 | 23:11,19 24:15 | 32:13,19 33:16 | 97:25 104:17 | |
| 144:22 146:13 | 25:9,16,20 26:2 | 34:21 35:24 | 105:2 108:22 | andor 25:7 |
| 147:14 150:1 (9) | 28:9,11 29:23 | 37:1,3 39:17 40:4 | 113:21 115:25 | |
| | 31:16,24 34:12,25 | 41:21 127:17 (24) | 119:20 122:10 | angela 3:12 |
| affect 124:15 | 35:6,12 55:12 | ` , | 125:9 128:23 | 44:19 |
| | 58:13,21,23 61:17 | alleged 121:20 | 129:20 135:6 | |
| after 42:25 43:6 | 65:10 67:23 78:15 | anegea 121.20 | 137:10 (15) | announce 5:3 |
| 45:17 49:23 51:10 | | allow 45:13 | 137.10 (13) | aimounce 3.3 |
| | 81:14 (29) | | -1 27.15 | 1 12.0 |
| 62:25 63:17 66:22 | | 104:11 124:22 | always 37:15 | announced 13:8 |
| 70:19 73:8 88:18 | aggressively | 132:7 (4) | 50:19 117:3 | |
| 96:5 98:14 100:19 | 112:9 | | | announcement |
| 102:24 125:24 | | allowed 10:2 | am 5:14,14,17 | 100:18 |
| 130:17 133:16 | ago 100:10 | 46:21,23 48:12 | 6:1,5,9,14,18 | |
| (18) | 101:15 149:7 | 122:25 (5) | 7:1,7,15,21 8:2 | another 36:21 |
| | | (-) | 15:3 16:14,17,19 | 37:1 89:11,21,22 |
| afternoon 5:2,10 | agree 86:3 88:2 | allowing 103:22 | 43:17 59:2 90:14 | 123:21 147:18,22 |
| 6:4,8,13,17 7:4,14 | 90:5 121:10 | 132:2 | 94:20 98:25 99:23 | (8) |
| | | 132.2 | | (0) |
| 8:1 16:16 98:18 | 135:20 143:18 | 11 04.10 | 105:6 113:6 116:6 | 45.0 |
| 99:19 109:3 116:5 | 144:24 147:17 (8) | allows 84:18 | 120:8,13 122:15 | answer 45:8 |
| 125:11 129:7 | | 122:21 123:1 | 124:11 125:13 | 68:22 71:8 97:3 |
| 137:13 (17) | agreed 41:13 | 124:16 125:3 (5) | 129:8,10,13 130:2 | 105:17 (5) |
| | | | 143:4,14 144:10 | |
| afternoon's 8:10 | agreeing 133:22 | almost 139:8 | 147:4 152:11,13 | answers 114:13 |
| | | | (41) | |
| again 7:13 14:6 | agreement 11:3 | along 54:1 63:18 | , | anticipate 108:14 |
| 16:1,10 20:12 | 106:4 111:15 | 84:21 87:22 | ambiguity | uniticipate 10011 |
| 22:22 23:17 28:19 | 100.1 111.13 | 116:15 121:24 | 120:14,20 | anybody 27:2 |
| 29:7,22 30:9 | ahead 74:4 83:16 | 143:16 144:6 | 120.14,20 | allybody 27.2 |
| , | | | 121.7,12,13 (3) | 0.670.0 |
| 47:15 52:9 64:14 | 104:21 106:14 | 150:12 (9) | 140 11 | anyone 8:6 72:8 |
| 66:10 83:9 84:14 | 109:2 114:1 | | ambitions 142:11 | 123:4 144:17 (4) |
| 86:17 88:5,16 | 119:25 120:2 | already 12:18 | | |
| 91:16 99:4,6 | 129:5,24 (10) | 70:8,24 71:6 | amend 145:13 | anything 27:17 |
| 107:22 121:23 | | 114:5 116:24 | 146:3 | 90:15 |
| 141:20 (26) | aid 4:16 125:15 | 118:8 (7) | | |
| | 127:8 | , , | amendment | anyway 36:1 |
| against 69:21 | | also 10:21 11:7 | 24:23 33:16 | |
| 111:6 133:9,17 | albany 12:10 | 14:23 28:11 | 220 00.10 | anywhere 29:14 |
| 134:10,17 (6) | 138:11 | 32:7,8 38:7 | among 17:7 | |
| 134.10,17 (0) | 130.11 | 50:5,19 52:20 | among 17.7 | anartment 22.25 |
| 14.5.04.0 | alian-mar-4 120.01 | · · | amarm4 50:00 | apartment 23:25 |
| agency 14:5 94:9 | alignment 139:21 | 53:6 54:2,4,10 | amount 52:22 | 1 |
| 111:24 131:17 | •• | 73:5,8 82:5 84:6 | 72:4 | apologies 46:3 |
| 133:11 148:20 (6) | alive 101:4 | 92:3,15 | | |
| | | 93:18,21,23 94:21 | ample 148:1 | app 45:12,23 |
| agenda 2:1 | allegation 17:25 | 98:5 99:13 119:16 | | |
| _ | 18:11,14 20:21 | 125:2 126:2 | analysis 28:6 | apparent 146:12 |
| aggravated 23:13 | 33:22 35:3 38:10 | 136:4,18 139:17 | · | |
| 25:12 29:24,25 | 41:20 88:19 95:10 | 140:5 142:18 | analyze 17:10 | appear 65:20 |
| 30:12,13,19 35:3 | (10) | 145:7 (35) | 94:16 | 106:20 |
| 44:9 52:24 55:6,9 | (10) | 173.1 (33) | /T.10 | 100.20 |
| ++.7 34.44 33.0,9 | | | | |
| | | | | |

| appearances 4:1 | approaching | 118:10,11,15 | 75:14 92:9,10 | available 94:23 |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| | 91:8 | 120:19,24 121:8 | 98:3 119:15 | |
| appears 64:15 | | 123:17,18,22 | 140:23 (7) | aware 114:22 |
| | appropriate 64:9 | 124:12 125:15 | | 140:18 145:9 |
| application 10:24 | 106:20 | 126:3 129:15 | asl 5:4 | |
| 47:21 122:2 127:5 | | 131:18 132:16,22 | | awareness 95:19 |
| (4) | appropriately | 135:13 136:23 | aspects 148:2 | |
| , | 59:11 | 137:18 138:21 | • | away 12:11 |
| applicationable | | 140:17,18 | assaulted 127:9 | v |
| 50:7 51:13 | apu 10:9 40:22 | 141:9,13,14,18,21 | | aye 149:14,15 |
| | 45:4,21 54:17 | 142:3,9 143:10,13, | assignment 41:1 | 150:24,25 (4) |
| applicational | 75:15 | 17,18,22,23,24 | 8 | , , , |
| 49:2 | 76:3,15,17,25 | 144:5,9,23 | assist 15:25 | b 1:15 25:25 |
| | 86:21 (11) | 145:9,23,25 | | |
| applications | 00.22 (22) | 146:14,18,24 | assistance 131:13 | back 7:18 22:22 |
| 127:16 142:11 | are 5:20 7:8 | 148:23 149:5,10 | 136:1 | 42:18 47:16 49:5 |
| | 10:1,21 | 150:13 151:5 | | 72:14,25 73:12,14 |
| applied 20:10 | 13:17,19,23 | (169) | assistant 3:24 | 82:18 85:23 |
| 59:14,21 65:11 | 16:5,25 17:14 | (-0/) | 15:11 | 104:25 (12) |
| 66:18 78:14 | 18:10,16,18 20:11 | area 50:21 62:19 | 10111 | 1020 (12) |
| 117:15 (7) | 21:17,24 22:1 | 32 00 20.21 02.17 | assume 30:15 | background 65:3 |
| 11/110 (// | 24:19,24 25:2 | areas 134:20 | 50:2 | ~ 00.10 |
| applies 20:13 | 28:7,22 31:11,13 | 143:17 | | backing 137:21 |
| 66:24 105:23 | 32:23 33:24 | | assuming 55:6 | ~weg == / !== |
| | 34:10,23 35:4,8,14 | armed 26:18 | | bad 126:23 |
| apply 66:21 | ,17,18,20,23,25 | | assurances | |
| 71:18 77:25 78:17 | 36:10,16 37:3,21 | around 46:9 | 111:12 | balance 22:16 |
| 105:14 111:21 (6) | 38:16 39:14 | 78:4,15,22 109:13 | | |
| · / | 42:22,23 43:2 | 111:12 112:19 | assure 45:21 | bargain 150:14 |
| applying 92:14 | 45:5,11 46:22 | 118:6 (8) | | 8 |
| | 47:6 48:9,22 | ` ' | assured 54:8 | based 31:4 34:10 |
| appoint 8:17 | 50:21 52:10 53:3 | arrangement | | 107:1 |
| • • | 56:24 58:23 59:5 | 86:9 | attach 83:13 | |
| appointed 142:12 | 60:12 61:25 | | | basically 17:18 |
| | 65:15,18 68:24 | arrest 23:25 24:2 | attached 54:22 | 21:4 25:3 28:17 |
| appointee 6:2 | 69:3 70:13 | | | 36:14 109:14 (6) |
| 7:2,16,22 11:25 | 72:6,17,19,22 | arrested 24:9 | attempts 140:11 | ` ′ |
| 44:21 (6) | 73:13 74:11 77:22 | | _ | basis 11:2 14:11 |
| | 78:19 | ask 5:16 16:4 | attended 12:17 | 63:16,19 95:24 (5) |
| appointees | 79:3,6,6,11,21,23 | 42:23 43:1,2 | | |
| 124:12 | 80:4,25 82:8,16,19 | 51:10 65:1 86:17 | attending 16:11 | because 18:7 |
| | ,22,23,24 | 93:8 97:2 99:4 | | 22:9 26:14 28:17 |
| appointment | 83:4,9,24 84:4 | 106:7 115:11,15 | attitudes 110:21 | 30:2 32:12,23 |
| 6:10 | 85:17,18,19 | 124:20 134:11,19 | | 39:6,15,17 40:2,4 |
| | 86:6,10,11 88:24 | 135:12 136:24 | attorney 116:6 | 41:6 52:19 54:20 |
| appreciate 57:12 | 89:19 91:7 92:20 | (19) | 122:17 125:13 | 60:2 62:2 68:19 |
| 58:9 63:11 99:6 | 94:10 97:4 98:3 | | | 69:3,23 70:4 |
| 149:23 150:9 (6) | 101:8 103:2 | asked 34:16 36:3 | authority | 72:15 75:1 76:1 |
| | 104:3,4,5 105:16 | 64:15 76:15,15 | 14:8,10,20 103:19 | 80:17 82:5 |
| approach 109:8 | 106:16 107:14 | 105:10,12 | 107:4,5 140:4 | 83:9,11 84:23 |
| 110:3 131:3 | 108:12,13 109:17 | 114:11,15 (9) | 148:12 (8) | 87:20 97:9 |
| | 110:25 112:2 | | | 106:10,19 107:1 |
| approaches 92:4 | 113:13,15 117:17 | asking 52:18 | automatic 137:6 | 109:7 115:19 |
| | | | | |
| | | | 1 | |

| 120:17 133:19 | 25:19 38:2 47:10 | bill 100:3 | board's 5:11 | bright 12:25 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 135:17 136:9 | 53:23 59:21 | ~~~ | 14:11 15:16 | ~1-gv |
| 139:23 145:17 | 73:7,8 104:9 | bind 123:18 | 11.11 13.10 | bring 17:20 |
| 147:22,25 | 112:17 116:21 | bilid 123.10 | body 53:14 108:3 | 47:15 72:21 92:1 |
| 148:17,18 (46) | 145:21 147:1 | binding 14:12,20 | 141:25 146:19 (4) | 103:11,20 126:1 |
| 140.17,10 (40) | | 142:4 148:11 (4) | 141.23 140.19 (4) | · |
| h | 149:3 (14) | 142:4 148:11 (4) | h - J 14.6 | (7) |
| become 36:6 | 1 1 40 10 | 1.4 16 00 17 0 | bodyworn 14:6 | 102.6 |
| | below 49:10 | bit 16:23 17:8 | 28:10 37:14,16 | brings 103:6 |
| bedstuy 6:11 | 62:18 | 31:2,17 33:1,7 | 67:6,10 128:2 (7) | |
| | | 36:7,11 50:5 72:2 | | broad 117:1 |
| before 5:2,15 | ben 8:23 | 82:13 (11) | bond 3:6 6:3,4,5 | |
| 35:9 41:22 44:12 | | | 77:19,20 82:3 | broadly 117:18 |
| 46:24 56:14 62:25 | benefit 73:19 | black 26:23 | 83:25 84:10 | |
| 63:24 64:2 70:22 | | 117:6 122:22 | 91:21,22 147:9,11 | broken 24:25 |
| 76:17 85:12 | benefits 48:13,13 | 123:2 125:4 (5) | (13) | 25:2 34:2,5 48:1 |
| 100:23 105:12,24 | 49:23 71:21 72:5 | | | (5) |
| 107:2 112:24 | 132:8 (6) | blame 118:4 | borough | |
| 113:15 115:5 | ` ' | | 38:17,17 | bronx 7:6 |
| 116:17 138:14 | bertha 4:10 | blind 90:17 142:5 | , | |
| 148:25 (23) | 116:6 | | boroughbased | brooklyn 6:6,11 |
| 110.25 (25) | 110.0 | blindly 91:2 | 4:17 129:9 | 7:2 |
| beg 143:4 | besides 91:5 | 128:17 144:6 | 1.17 127.7 | 7.2 |
| beg 143.4 | Desides 71.5 | 120.17 144.0 | boroughs 125:17 | brought 125:20 |
| began 11:20 | best 15:24 120:22 | blood 152:12 | boroughs 123.17 | 126:2,6 127:4 (4) |
| began 11.20 | | D100u 132.12 | hoga 12.2.2 | 120.2,0 127.4 (4) |
| h 5.0 15.0 | 121:4,8 142:20 (5) | h.l 0.17 | boss 13:2,2 | L 4 - L '4 140.10 |
| begin 5:2 15:9 | h -4 l 142.2 | blue 8:17 | h-4h-0.10 15.0 | brutality 140:19 |
| 54:14 130:7 | betrayal 143:3 | 1 1 2 2 10 2 | both 9:19 15:2 | 100.00 |
| 146:15 (5) | | board 1:2 2:10 3: | 17:15 29:6,10 | brutalize 132:20 |
| | betraying 141:9 | 1,5,6,8,9,11,12,14, | 32:13,19 33:25 | |
| beginning 81:24 | | 15,17,18,20,21,25 | 34:10 42:9 | brutally 127:9 |
| 95:22 | better 12:7 14:20 | 4:9 5:7,12,15,16 | 52:12,14,19 63:18 | |
| | 60:3 | 6:6,10,19 7:7 8:3 | 75:9,18 78:16,22 | building 67:14 |
| begins 150:6 | | 9:11 10:3,5 | 83:20 90:9 104:1 | |
| | between 9:22 | 11:23,25 12:12 | 121:19 (22) | built 81:20 82:25 |
| behalf 130:3 | 15:1 21:6,20,23 | 13:12 15:13 16:11 | | |
| | 22:9,12 30:8,25 | 17:22,24 18:4,13 | bounced 7:20 | bunch 36:8 106:1 |
| behavior 54:9 | 50:10,15,17 51:12 | 22:23 23:2,5,9 | | |
| 57:25 105:14,23 | 54:13 59:24 63:22 | 25:18 31:1 | bound 133:13 | burden 80:8 |
| 139:15 (5) | 64:17 66:11 72:3 | 40:3,6,8 41:25 | 145:25 | |
| | 107:12 (20) | 42:1,23 43:1,8 | | bureau 39:13 |
| behaviors 130:22 | 107.12 (20) | 44:13,13,15,24 | box 88:13 | Survau 57.15 |
| Delia (1015 150.22 | bewildered 90:14 | 45:2 51:18,19 | JUA 00.13 | business 2:7,8 |
| behind 134:12 | Dewnacieu 70.14 | 61:14 64:2 67:9 | bravery 60:17 | 38:6 135:17 (4) |
| Demma 134.14 | bewildering 91:3 | 70:22 72:15 77:25 | DIAVELY 00.1/ | J0.0 133.17 (4) |
| hoing 10.11 | bewindering 91:3 | | heal 22.5 49.7 | hutton 16.7 |
| being 10:11 | h:~ 05.00 27:02 | 80:21 89:8 91:25 | break 22:5 48:7 | button 16:7 |
| 14:25 21:8,12 | big 25:22 37:23 | 93:7 95:6,21 96:6 | 77:17 | h44 70.16 |
| 49:19,23 54:16 | 39:5 | 98:21 99:20 102:5 | 1 41 500 | buttons 79:16 |
| 59:24 73:10 88:2 | | 106:16,18 108:25 | breathe 50:9 | |
| 93:25 124:1 | bigger 77:3 80:8 | 124:20 130:5 | | bwc 36:2 37:7,21 |
| 132:12 137:1 | 82:9 | 134:10 135:12 | breathing 50:22 | |
| 141:15 (15) | | 138:22,24 143:8 | 51:14 52:1 | c 152:1,1 |
| | biggest 40:13 | 146:13 147:12 | | |
| believe 14:9 | | 149:22,23 (90) | brief 12:14 149:2 | calculate 45:14 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | 1 |

| calculation 81:21 | can't 21:1 49:13 | categories 20:8 | ceilings 35:8 | 138:19 139:1,5 |
|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| | 54:25 80:13 | 24:23 36:2,8 (4) | 3 | 143:7,10,12 |
| call 2:4 16:8 | 106:10 111:7 | · , ~ (- / | center 4:11 116:7 | 144:11,16,19 |
| 102:21 103:17 | 114:22 134:5 | category 38:2,3 | | 146:6,9 147:9 |
| 108:17 123:2 | 144:12 (9) | 2200501, 20.2,2 | central 40:18 | 148:21,22 |
| 125:4 135:13 (8) | 111.12 ()) | cause 24:2 | Central 10.10 | 149:9,13,16,19,21 |
| 123.1133.13 (0) | cancelled 23:20 | Cause 27.2 | certain 148:5 | 150:20,22 151:1,3 |
| called 26:21 | Cancelled 25.20 | ccr 116:8,15 | Certain 140.3 | (155) |
| 40:23 103:16 | cannot 122:23 | CCI 110.6,13 | containly 10.5 | (133) |
| | | | certainly 10:5 80:22 | -1 120.20 |
| 108:11 109:9 (5) | 128:16 | ccrb 4:14 7:16 | 80:22 | chairman 139:20 |
| W 110 12 | •4 00 10 | 9:2,5,10,20,22 | 4.6 120 0 11 | 144:20 |
| calling 119:13 | capacity 90:18 | 10:3,17,22 11:1,19 | certify 152:9,11 | |
| | 132:21 | 12:4,18 13:5,12,21 | | challenged |
| calls 115:6 | | 14:2,10 15:1,11 | cetera 54:16 | 116:12 |
| 122:21 | car 69:17,18,19,2 | 17:3,12,23 22:18 | 56:18 | |
| | 0,23,24 (6) | 23:18 25:23 26:5 | | challenges |
| camera 14:6 | | 30:11 34:22 35:22 | chair 1:16 2:5 3:3 | 107:18 |
| 28:10 36:20,21 | carcaterra 3:16 | 39:5,19 41:4,15 | 5:9,14,20,22 | |
| 37:15,17 46:1 | 7:23,25 8:2 (4) | 42:9,14 52:11,15 | 6:3,7,12,16,22 | chance 43:1 |
| 67:10 108:3 128:2 | , , | 62:14 64:17 | 7:3,8,11,17,23 | 71:22 |
| (10) | card 38:6 | 65:4,9 94:2 | 8:4,8 42:19 | |
| | | 95:6,7,16,22 | 43:11,15 44:11 | change 45:19 |
| cameras 67:7 | care 124:21 | 96:2,9 99:1,13,20 | 45:8,10,25 | 64:8 83:21,23 |
| 3 | 136:10,12 137:3,5 | 102:24 106:25 | 46:4,7,19 47:2,17 | 87:7 107:17 110:2 |
| can 13:14,19 | (5) | 111:11,15,23,25 | 49:12 52:8 53:20 | 111:9 117:13 |
| 14:24 19:5,20 | | 112:7 116:18 | 54:11 55:18 | 123:15 126:10 |
| 20:8 25:15 27:16 | carolyn 4:18 | 119:14 122:16 | 56:2,4 57:14,17 | 138:11 148:3 (13) |
| 31:7,9 34:18 35:5 | 128:25 129:21 | 123:12,17 | 58:2,4 63:13 | 150.11 170.5 (15) |
| 40:6,8 | 130:1 135:6 (5) | 123.12,17 | 64:11,25 | changed 33:8 |
| 43:19,21,22,23 | 130.1 133.0 (3) | 133:7,10,19 | 66:9,15,23 67:3,18 | 90:15 |
| 1 1 1 | 00mm 122.1 | , , | | 90.13 |
| 45:8,21 46:16 | carr 133:1 | 134:1,5,19,20 | 68:4,21 71:8,11,14 | -1 14:0 |
| 47:25 48:3 50:18 | | 148:11,13 149:6 | 72:8 73:2 | changes 14:2 |
| 54:8 56:5,10 | carried 66:2 | (77) | 74:1,4,19 75:4,23 | 33:5 87:6,14 |
| 60:14 63:17,21 | 104:3 | 11 4440 00 = | 76:9 77:12,18 | 132:15 142:16 |
| 65:1 66:8 68:17 | A. A | ccrb's 14:10 32:5 | 83:1,14,16 85:5,6 | 148:6 (7) |
| 70:22 72:8 73:22 | case 21:24 22:7 | 86:7 94:1,17 96:3 | 86:3 87:6,10,18,25 | |
| 74:24 75:14 76:10 | 26:16 27:25 | 122:6 123:19 | 88:10,12 89:12 | characteristics |
| 77:13 79:14,16 | 29:15,19 31:7 | 133:12 (9) | 91:13 93:2,3,13 | 118:4 |
| 80:6,11,22 | 41:18,23,24 67:17 | | 96:12,14,17,23 97: | |
| 81:2,7,10,22 82:22 | 69:16 70:25 71:23 | ccrbadjudicated | 1,6,13,15,16,22,24 | charge 69:1 |
| 85:4 89:15,16,17 | 84:6 86:5 88:24 | 14:21 | ,25 98:15 99:11,19 | |
| 90:2 93:8,9 94:15 | 101:11 (18) | | 103:23 104:21,24 | charged 114:18 |
| 97:1 98:9 101:20 | | cda 19:11,15,22 | 105:5,8,9 106:6,14 | - |
| 105:4,5,20,21 | cases 14:22 17:10 | 20:3 27:22 40:1 | 107:7 108:8,20 | charges |
| 106:12 107:6,17 | 19:2 21:14 22:14 | (6) | 109:1 112:16 | 19:7,10,14,21 20:2 |
| 109:15 118:11 | 39:3 58:25 66:19 | , , | 113:25 115:10,22 | 22:10,10,18 23:18 |
| 120:3,4 124:13 | 68:24 69:6 | cdas 29:11,17 | 119:18,24 | 25:14 26:4 30:10 |
| 126:10,13,19 | 75:7,15 76:24,25 | | 120:2,4,8 121:15 | 32:4,21 45:1,7,24 |
| 129:3 135:14 | 77:4 78:2 89:9 | cdb 19:15,22 | 125:7 127:4 | 46:12 54:17 55:1 |
| 136:18 137:14 | 94:3 96:2,3 | 20:3 | 128:20 | 74:17 75:6,16 |
| 139:15 144:11,12 | 106:21 111:17 | 20.5 | 129:2,5,18,24 | 76:1 77:14 81:16 |
| 146:2,20 147:8 | 127:6,8 136:11 | cdbs 62:16 | 133:3 134:11 | (26) |
| 148:25 (87) | (25) | Cubs 02.10 | 135:4,11 137:8,15 | (20) |
| 170.23 (01) | (43) | | 133.7,11 137.0,13 | |
| | | | | |

| chart 15:6 48:15 | 11:17 12:16 | 93:16 121:4 | coming 77:23 | commitment |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 79:21 | 13:1,3,9 14:4 15:8 | 139:11 (4) | 151:7 | 9:19 86:21 99:25 |
| | 94:19,25 96:11 | , , | | 108:16 109:22 (5) |
| charter 83:21 | 100:2 101:16 | click 79:14,16 | command 25:25 | |
| 84:11 | 103:17 104:6 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 27:14,16 119:4 (4) | commits 60:16 |
| 01.11 | 105:18 110:13 | client 127:9 | 27.11,10 117.11(1) | 61:21 |
| charts 79:22 | 111:9 113:1 | chefit 127.9 | commands 22:11 | 01.21 |
| Charts 19.22 | 116:10 130:10,14 | close 57:1 68:13 | Commanus 22.11 | committed 11:8 |
| chat 5:6 15:24 | 144:3 145:2,4,8 | 134:17 | commend 60:15 | 13:17 95:12,16 |
| Chat 5.0 15.24 | | 134.17 | commend 60.13 | l ´ |
| 1 1 01 15 | 146:3 148:14 | 1 1 11 02 | 4 2 0 10 | 102:8 (5) |
| checking 91:15 | 149:24,24 (36) | closed 41:23 | comment 2:9,10 | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| 150:12 | | | 15:17 16:4 43:7 | committee 99:17 |
| | civil 4:7 12:11 | closing 41:18 | 49:15 57:15 67:19 | 114:10 |
| chest 49:4 | 101:18 103:4 | | 93:7,8 96:20,25 | |
| | 109:5 113:1 (6) | cochair 4:17 | 98:1 106:8 116:17 | committing |
| choice 52:22 | | 129:8 | 135:9 139:3 | 138:1 |
| 110:10 133:24 | civilian 1:2 3:25 | | 148:24 149:2 (19) | |
| | 5:11 21:21 95:6 | codifies 133:14 | | common 33:10 |
| chokehold | 102:4 137:25 (7) | | comments 15:18 | |
| 20:11,12,15,20 | | codify 132:1 | 16:1 33:4 42:25 | communities |
| 34:8,9 46:9,11,16 | civilians 9:7 | | 44:13,23 46:5 | 4:19 112:2 |
| 47:6,22 49:3,7,11 | 17:11 | cody 4:12 113:24 | 58:5 98:4,6,9 | 117:5,7 126:7 |
| 50:11,14,24,25 | | 116:3 119:21,25 | 104:15 112:14 | 130:3 134:24 |
| 51:6,25 52:23 | claim 109:17 | 120:1,3,5 122:9,10 | 113:19 115:13 | 135:2 142:10 (9) |
| 100:11 127:10 | Cause 103117 | (10) | 130:4,5 135:4,21 | 10012 112110 (2) |
| (23) | claiming 110:4 | (10) | 137:9 138:22,24 | community 4:9 |
| (23) | claiming 110.4 | colleagues 5:16 | 139:4 143:7 (24) | 10:18,22 11:9 |
| chokeholds 19:5 | claims 100:22 | 65:1 88:15 113:10 | 137.4 143.7 (24) | 102:19 108:24 |
| 21:9 34:4,7 43:23 | 118:24 | 143:5 146:12 (6) | commissioner | 113:17 129:10 |
| 1 | 110.24 | 143.3 140.12 (0) | | |
| 48:25 50:18 51:12 | -1 <u>:</u> 6'4: | | 6:15 8:3,21,21,23 | 142:25 (9) |
| 53:7 127:16 (10) | clarification | collected 96:6 | 9:9,9,24 | ., 1 |
| 1 1 71 6 | 57:13 68:6 71:15 | 11 41 1 140 5 | 14:15,16,18 15:2 | communitybased |
| choking 51:6 | 97:17 (4) | collectively 149:5 | 17:16 38:20 | 142:14 |
| | | | 42:6,10 44:18 | |
| chooses 10:3 | clarified 93:18 | column 48:19 | 51:22 64:20,21 | comparison 33:1 |
| | | | 65:19 75:8 76:22 | |
| chronic 130:24 | clarify 46:17 | combined 31:14 | 77:3 87:4 100:18 | compelled |
| | 48:3 56:6 | 36:15 56:7 | 101:22,25 | 122:24 145:1 |
| circumstance | | | 102:3,12,17 | |
| 28:14 44:2 | clarifying 42:24 | come 24:8 26:24 | 103:13,15 107:3 | complainant |
| | 94:5 | 31:17 35:19 44:16 | 108:8 111:13 | 22:14 |
| circumstances | | 56:22 57:10 72:24 | 112:18 113:11 | |
| 24:20 28:13 46:23 | clarity 46:9 51:1 | 104:25 105:19 | 123:7,12,15 124:4 | complaint 1:2 |
| 54:3,24 58:14 | 66:17 | 106:10 (11) | 125:21 128:9 (44) | 3:25 5:11 95:6 |
| 65:18 78:16 86:23 | | \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | ` ' | 102:5 114:22 |
| 95:11 117:21 | clear 9:18 12:10 | comes 14:21 22:5 | commissioner's | 115:6,8 131:17 (9) |
| 118:5 (12) | 55:5 69:12,12 | 24:5 30:6 68:1 | 14:7 75:17 111:20 | ,= (>) |
| | 73:24 76:13 97:3 | 70:19 80:20,20 | 117:11 126:17 (5) | complaints |
| cited 71:24,25 | 105:17 118:25 | 121:22 127:2 (10) | | 133:19,21,25 |
| 138:14 | 121:1 131:22,23 | | commit 62:3 | 100.17,21,20 |
| 150.17 | (13) | comfortable | 120:25,25 121:11 | complete 126:20 |
| city 4:2,4 6:18 | (13) | 143:21 | 142:13 (5) | 128:2 |
| 7:21 8:20 9:10,17 | clearly 49:21 | 173.41 | 174.13 (3) | 120.2 |
| 1.21 0.20 7.10,1/ | CICALLY 47.41 | | | |
| | | | | |

| completely 124:23 136:7 | concretely 147:23 | 92:2 95:12 96:10 103:2,7 (6) | control 18:22 | corrupt 124:17 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 124.23 130.7 | 147.23 | 103.2,7 (0) | controls 133:14 | could 26:12 |
| complexities | concurred 75:9 | consistent 34:14 | | 28:13 43:16 45:19 |
| 132:17 | concurred 73.5 | 63:23 64:1 66:14 | convened 78:1 | 46:14 47:14,21 |
| 132.17 | concurrence | 69:9 122:2 (6) | convened 70.1 | 56:21 101:4 |
| compliance 99:9 | 85:11 | 09.9 122.2 (0) | convening 99:20 | 107:16 113:4 |
| compliance 33.3 | 03.11 | consistently | convening 55.20 | 114:17 127:17 |
| complicated | concurrency | 12:20 54:6 | conversation | 134:14 136:4 (15) |
| 27:10 77:24 78:9 | 74:16 75:1,17 | 12.2000 | 115:17 145:19 | 10 111 10011 (10) |
| _,,,_,,, | | constituent | | council |
| complication | concurrently | 100:12 | conversations | 4:2,4,22,17 6:19 |
| 139:25 | 18:19 32:15,24 | | 15:5 | 7:2,7,21 8:20 9:10 |
| | | constituents | | 98:12,13,15 |
| complied 110:17 | conduct 27:12 | 100:9 101:23 | convert 45:15 | 99:11,12,17 100:2 |
| | 30:3 32:6,7 | | 0011,010 | 103:23 104:4,6,17 |
| comply 21:22 | 33:23,25 34:1,11 | constitutes 51:25 | convinced 14:19 | 110:12,13 112:21 |
| 22:11 38:10 | 37:4 62:1 107:2 | | | 114:6 122:14 |
| | 121:17 131:21 | constituting | cook 3:24 9:3 | 123:20 129:9 |
| component 52:16 | (13) | 110:2 | 15:12 16:15,16 | 144:3 145:2,5,8 |
| component 52.10 | | 110.2 | 47:10 56:5 67:20 | 146:3 149:25 (34) |
| comprehensive | conflate 71:2 | constitution 54:7 | 68:23 70:16 72:11 | 110.5 115.25 (51) |
| 41:7 88:25 | 00111111100 7112 | | 74:23 75:21,25 | counciladvanced |
| 11.7 00.20 | conflation 49:19 | constitutional | 76:7,12 79:5 (17) | 130:10 |
| compromised | Communion 19119 | 4:11 55:10,16 | 70.7,12 77.8 (17) | 150.10 |
| 126:17 | confused 50:5 | 116:7 136:14 (5) | cook's 16:3 | counsel 3:24 4:7 |
| 120.17 | 52:19 | 110.7 120.11 (2) | | 12:2 15:11 97:7 |
| computer 81:22 | 62.17 | contact 57:23 | cooperation | 109:5 116:10 |
| | connection 7:12 | 0011000 | 92:21 93:19 | 127:8 (8) |
| computers 86:19 | | context | | (-) |
| F | consecutively | 109:20,21 | cooperative | counsel's 2:6 |
| concept 17:22 | 18:9,17 30:5 | , | 35:21 | |
| 60:20 | 39:18 (4) | contingent | | count 25:15 |
| | | 131:19 | cop 4:15 125:14 | |
| concern 37:23 | consent 38:8,11 | | | counter 112:9 |
| 59:22 60:1,21 | | continue 11:6 | cops 126:23 | |
| 62:19 116:21 (6) | consequences | 67:17 93:8 102:21 | 132:19 | counting 31:6 |
| | 117:20 | 124:17 128:15 (6) | | 132:16 |
| concerned | | | correct 8:5 | - · · |
| 120:13,14 129:11 | consider 14:9 | continued 94:17 | 43:14,17 | country 12:9 |
| | 39:20 78:12 99:15 | 96:8 112:11 | 53:19,22,24 | J = 1.5 |
| concerns 15:20 | 112:1 (5) | 131:25 (4) | 54:4,10 72:25 | counts 29:16 |
| 58:11 65:15 109:7 | (-) | | 84:1 145:13,21 | |
| 116:18 132:22 | considerations | continuing | (12) | county 152:5 |
| 133:5 139:14 (8) | 78:14 | 104:12 | | <i>J</i> = === |
| (-) | | | corresponding | couple 60:4 |
| conclude 135:9 | considered 10:12 | continuous 63:19 | 65:7 | 66:16 |
| | 102:14 119:5,7 | | | |
| concludes 138:20 | 126:20 138:1 (6) | contract 73:5 | corresponds 35:2 | courage 146:24 |
| | considering 58:7 | contradictions | corrine 3:7 | course 130:16 |
| COUCINGION | constacting 50.7 | | | Course 150.10 |
| conclusion 119·10 139·8 | | 146.25 | 5.24.25 | |
| 119:10 139:8 | consistency 17:7 | 146:25 | 5:24,25 | court |

| courtesy 61:9 cut cover 18:1 36:4 | stody 136:9,20 | 88:10 89:12 91:13 93:2 | (58) | defense 137:19 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| courtesy 61:9 cut cover 18:1 36:4 | stody 136:9,20 | 93.4 | | uctense 137.17 |
| cut cover 18:1 36:4 | | 96:12,14,17,23 97:6,13,16,22,24 | deadly 34:2 | defer 89:11 |
| | 132:5 | 98:15 99:11,19 103:23 104:21,24 | deal 14:15 34:23 72:16 87:24 88:14 | define 118:25 |
| 37:2 131:10 cut | s 114:6 | 105:5,8,9 106:6,14 107:7 108:8,20 | 132:6 138:5,10 (8) | defined 48:2 |
| dar | niel 100:10 | 107:7 108:8,20 109:1 112:16 113:25 115:10,22 | death 34:8 | definite 30:20 |
| I I | nielle 1:24 | 119:18,24 120:2,4 | debate 61:23 | definitely 143:13 144:21 |
| coworkers 143:5 152 | | 121:15 125:7 128:20 | debi 98:13 | |
| 43: | rche 1:17 11,16 | 129:2,5,18,24 133:3 134:11 | deborah 4:3 | definition 71:16 120:17 |
| 47: | 8,11,25 46:3,20 7,10,14,19 | 135:4,11 137:8,14,15 | debour 118:22 | definitions 79:17 |
| 51: | 3,8,22 49:6,10 17 52:2 53:23 | 138:19 139:1,5 143:7,10,12 | decades 143:1 | delegitimizes |
| | 4 57:16,17,20 23 72:10,13 | 144:11,16,19 146:6,9 147:9 | decide 45:17 | 141:25 |
| 1 | 4 76:3,10 | 148:22 | 50:16 51:15 | deliberation |
| 1 | 5,10,17 15,18 | 149:9,13,16,19,21 150:20,22 151:1,3 | 89:2,15 136:4,5 (7) | 80:21 |
| 144:25 146:15 (5) 106 (38 | 5:12,15 133:4 | (137) | decided 77:15 | deliver 13:21 |
| creation 109:10 | | day 37:20 | decided 77.13 | demand 12:7 |
| | ta 62:13 74:16 7 76:11 86:1 | 39:10,11,20,21 42:6 60:15,17 | decider 52:4 | 141:7 |
| 111:23 127:2 96: | 6 (6) | 89:11 91:9,10 | decides 22:23 | demanded |
| 133:13 dat | tabase 13:20 | 140:14 146:17 147:6,21 152:16 | 53:8 | 112:20 |
| crime 26:15 | | (16) | deciding 84:6 | demanding 112:8 |
| criminal 125:16 | v id 13:3,7,24 | daylight 9:22 | decision 51:20,23 | demands 12:9 |
| | vie 1:16 3:3 | 14:25 | 52:14 53:2 69:24 | J |
| | ,14,20,22 ,7,12,16,22 | days 22:18 | 73:21 85:13 88:18 (8) | demonstrating 110:19 |
| cts 79:8,16 81:10 7:3 | ,8,11,17,23 | 23:15,17 25:13,24 | , , | |
| | ,8 42:19 43:15 11 45:10,25 | 26:3 27:18,18,21 28:2 29:10,12,14,1 | decisions 52:21 102:4 126:19 | deny 136:12 137:4 |
| 111:9 126:22 46:4 | 4,7,19 47:2,17 | 7,18,21 30:1,9,11, | | |
| | 12 52:8 53:20 11 55:18 56:2 | 13,16,17,22 31:1,3,6,8 | deemed 34:13 | departing 82:8 |
| | 14,17 58:2 | 31:1,5,6,8 32:4,11,17,18,21 | deeply 90:18 | department 8:16 |
| | 13 64:11,25 | 39:25 40:6 41:15 44:7,10 45:3,7 | 126:21 139:7 | 12:8,19 14:18 18:6,20 32:22 |
| curious 122:25 63: | 9,23 67:3,18 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | , |
| curious 122:25 63: 66: current 13:5 68: | 4,21 71:8,11 | 48:17,18 | deescalation | 33:4 51:20 |
| curious 122:25 63: 66: 66: current 13:5 68: 14:14 79:13 84:12 72: | 4,21 71:8,11 8 73:2 | 56:8,16,18,25 | deescalation 35:18 58:20 | 52:4,15 60:24 |
| curious 122:25 63: 66: 66: current 13:5 68: 14:14 79:13 84:12 72: 93:24 94:2 (6) 74: | 4,21 71:8,11 8 73:2 1,4,19 75:4,23 | 56:8,16,18,25 57:2,7 62:6,10,18 | 35:18 58:20 | 52:4,15 60:24 61:4 63:10 65:8 |
| curious 122:25 63: 66: 66: current 13:5 68: 14:14 79:13 84:12 72: 93:24 94:2 (6) 74: 76: 76: | 4,21 71:8,11 8 73:2 | 56:8,16,18,25 | | 52:4,15 60:24 |

| 92:12,23 93:25 | 44:18,20 (7) | 87:5 102:17 (5) | dinkins' 13:7,24 | discipline 10:25 |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 94:6 95:1 100:17 | | | | 12:21 17:4 26:1 |
| 101:25 102:15 | despite 116:20 | deviates 64:21 | direct 14:5 80:12 | 27:14,16 34:15 |
| 106:24 108:14 | 131:10 | 65:19 76:22 83:19 | | 39:16 40:15 41:11 |
| 110:15,16,22 | | (4) | directing 69:4,15 | 45:15,20 53:14 |
| 126:14 130:21,23 | destroying | | 70:4 | 58:19 67:14 |
| 132:5 138:5 | 117:11 | deviating 65:6,14 | | 68:7,15 79:1 85:1 |
| 140:15 141:22 | | 82:20 102:14 (4) | direction 11:14 | 92:4 95:2,8,9,13 |
| 144:4 149:24 | detail 81:3 | | 68:13 101:17 | 96:1,8 101:13 |
| 150:4 (47) | | deviation 59:24 | 143:23 (4) | 106:22 109:9 |
| | detailed 82:7 | 66:5 87:3 | | 110:3,11,21 |
| department's | 90:12 92:13 | | directions 59:2 | 116:19 117:3,9,24 |
| 10:24 52:13 59:9 | 116:18 (4) | deviations | | 118:24 119:2,4,6 |
| 61:8 84:24 118:18 | | 38:24,25 39:4 | directives 21:22 | 120:15,16 123:13 |
| 122:5 (7) | details 84:20 | 52:11 85:24 | | 124:21,24 127:22 |
| | 95:2 | 86:7,22 102:20 | directly 112:3 | 129:13 130:9 |
| departmental | | 122:6 (9) | 128:4 | 131:3 132:17 |
| 55:1,20 60:11 | detective | | | 133:10,22 (52) |
| 61:6 (4) | 127:11,14,20 | dialogue 11:9 | director 1:17 | , , , |
| ` , | | O | 16:8 133:3 | discourse 99:24 |
| departments | deter 37:22 | diblasio 8:20 | | |
| 12:8 | | 13:7 124:10 | disagreement | discourtesy |
| | determination | | 61:14 | 32:9,11,18 |
| departure 68:10 | 59:10 71:7 78:23 | didn't 29:1 36:4 | | |
| • | | 37:2 40:17 61:6 | disagreements | discretion 31:2 |
| depend 104:6 | determine 23:9 | 84:22 88:12 110:9 | 83:6 | 42:7 80:18 101:21 |
| • | 34:25 72:19 78:6 | (8) | | 102:1 109:14 |
| depending 46:15 | 94:16 95:8 96:7 | · / | disambiguated | 111:14 |
| 95:10 | (7) | die 50:23 | 75:4 | 117:1,3,11,14 |
| | ` ' | | | 119:6 126:18 |
| deputy 8:22 9:9 | determined | died 136:8 | discharged 21:19 | 128:8 132:5 |
| 17:16 42:10 (4) | 70:24 | | S . | 139:25 (16) |
| , , | | difference 21:6 | discharges 21:18 | , , |
| dermot 8:21 | determines 40:3 | 25:22 49:21,25 | S . | discretionary |
| | | 50:10,15,17 | disciplinary | 51:3 52:6,22 53:3 |
| describe 65:5,9 | determining 31:3 | 51:15,16 54:12 | 2:9,10 5:13 8:14 | 126:9 132:13 (6) |
| , | 120:21 | 64:16 (11) | 9:15 10:16 13:21 | \ |
| described 60:23 | | ` ′ | 14:8 15:10,21 | discriminatory |
| 69:13 107:16 | develop 100:4 | differences 61:24 | 17:1 40:16 41:3 | 116:14 |
| | 110:10 | 72:18 83:12 85:5 | 61:5,21 66:18 | |
| description | | (4) | 78:7,13 88:17,23 | discuss 15:13 |
| 26:8,22 27:5 | developed 95:1 | , , | 89:1,4 94:6 | 64:10,11 |
| 59:13,20 60:3 (6) | 1 | different 30:3 | 95:18,24 98:7,21 | , |
| , (-) | developing | 31:11 50:4 81:8 | 100:5,25 101:1,7 | discussed 33:9 |
| descriptions | 141:16 | 82:22 92:25 | 103:19 107:25 | |
| 26:10 58:13 | | 143:23 (7) | 109:10 110:15 | discussing 8:13 |
| | deviate 38:21 | \ / | 111:8 117:19 | 59:5 64:5 |
| deserve 103:21 | 40:10 42:8 64:18 | differently 82:11 | 118:21 | |
| 123:16 128:11,12 | 89:19 90:13 102:7 | 83:10 | 126:5,8,16,19 | discussion 8:10 |
| (4) | 106:25 (8) | | 127:21 128:7 | 15:16 16:13 70:21 |
| | ` ' | dinkins 13:3 | 131:1 132:11 | 80:14 |
| designee | deviated | 120:9 | 141:8 148:2,12 | 89:7,10,16,18,22 |
| 6:5,15,19 7:7 8:3 | 76:14,23 77:3 | | (49) | 93:15 98:6 (12) |
| , , | , :- | | , , | |

| | 120 22 110 7 | | 10.10.20.1 | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| discussions 61:15 63:10 | 139:23 140:7 144:4 146:22 (20) | (4) | eight 19:18 20:4 | enabled 130:23 |
| dismissal 48:17 | doesn't 25:19 | duty 35:17 | eighteen 19:16 | encounters 118:23 |
| uisiiiissai 40.17 | 54:21,23 55:13,18 | dwyer 3:15 | eightyfive | 110.23 |
| dismissed 100:17 | 65:20 70:18 80:3 | 6:12,13,14 73:7 | 19:22,23 | encouraged |
| distilissed 100.17 | 86:24 87:7 89:6 | 85:8 88:7,10,12 | 17.22,23 | 113:9 |
| disposition 52:12 | 110:20 124:15 | 96:22 148:23 | either 15:23 42:7 | 113.7 |
| 75:11 | 136:20 140:5 (15) | 149:1,2,10 (14) | 55:11 77:1 82:20 | encourages |
| 70.11 | 100.20 1 1010 (10) | 1 . 5 . 1 , 2 , 1 0 (1 .) | 83:9 (6) | 131:24 |
| disregard 117:1 | doing 17:9 18:10 | e 1:15,15 152:1,1 | , | |
| 126:10 132:14 | 69:3 79:4 85:15 | (4) | elect 130:8 | end 14:1 21:8 |
| 136:16 (4) | 92:7 123:17 | ` ' | | 25:11 32:20 |
| | 124:18 141:18 | each 17:25 | elected 102:18 | 37:7,8,20 42:5,16 |
| distinct 36:17 | 145:20 (10) | 18:5,11,13 23:2,20 | | 94:15 114:25 |
| | | 30:2 39:23 40:19 | eligible 138:15 | 140:14 147:20 |
| distinction | done 8:11 18:25 | 56:11,19 100:7 | | (13) |
| 51:2,11 52:6 | 69:6 75:11 86:13 | (12) | else 108:9 144:17 | |
| 54:20 72:2,3 (6) | 127:18 142:25 | | | ends 21:8 |
| | 144:23 146:21 (9) | eager 13:20 | eluded 68:8 | |
| distinctions 51:3 | 1 2466 | V 22.10 | 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 | enforcement |
| 11.4 1. 11.5 4 | door 24:6,6 | earlier 33:18 | elusive 141:19 | 137:24 |
| disturbing 115:4 | J 24.25 25.2 | 68:9 71:16 84:15 | -1 110.25 | |
| doctor 135:23 | down 24:25 25:2 | 125:20 127:5 (6) | elusory 110:25 | engage 63:9 131:6 132:3 134:7 |
| 137:10 | 34:6 48:1,7 85:25 | aamly 0.2 | email 15:23 98:9 | 139:16 (5) |
| 137.10 | 88:3 118:12 (8) | early 9:2 | eman 13.23 96.9 | 139.10 (3) |
| document 48:23 | downs | easier 80:25 | embolden 131:5 | engaged 95:14 |
| 51:2 63:14,15 | 81:11,13,14 | 0000101 | | 132:7 |
| 67:22 78:17 82:15 | - ' ', - ', | easily 45:14 84:5 | emboldens | |
| 84:2 99:3,5 | downward 68:10 | 118:11 126:14 (4) | 117:10 | engages 24:10 |
| 101:24 103:16 | | , , | | |
| 109:19 112:23 | dr 113:24 116:3 | east 6:20 | emerging 99:14 | engaging 95:20 |
| 140:1 147:8 (16) | 119:21,25 | | | 133:16 |
| | 120:1,3,5 122:9,10 | education 4:22 | emphasize | |
| documentation | 135:19 137:14 | | 135:24 | enough 25:20 |
| 92:11 108:5 | (11) | effect 63:11 68:7 | | 126:3 |
| | | | emphasizing | |
| documented | draft 33:2,13 | effectively | 87:9 | enshrine 131:1 |
| 59:14 143:25 | 36:5 38:7 84:12 | 109:24 | , | 50.10 |
| 3 | (5) | . cc | employment | ensure 52:10 |
| documenting | Jul es 147:10 | efficiency 11:10 | 40:24 41:14,17 | 104:1 133:23 |
| 82:7 | drive 147:19 148:10 | effort 90:17 | 60:6,10 73:13,15 | 138:12 (4) |
| documents 86:10 | 140.10 | 92:22 | 106:3 (8) | ensuring 92:12 |
| 128:1 | drop 81:11,13,14 | 14.44 | empower 11:19 | cusuling 92.12 |
| 120.1 | urop 01.11,13,14 | efforts 112:10 | 131:5 148:13 | entails 39:9,10 |
| does 15:2 24:8 | due 106:11 134:4 | 116:20 | 131.3 170.13 | - Circuit 57.7,10 |
| 38:9 45:2 48:5 | 340 100.11 13 1.T | 110.20 | empowered | enter 23:24 |
| 65:13 68:17 71:8 | duration 22:8 | egregious 139:15 | 13:11 | 113:10 |
| 97:19,22 101:17 | | 88 | | |
| 103:13 118:20 | during 10:17 | egregiously | empty 142:20 | entered 88:2 |
| | | 0 0 | 1 1 0 | 1 |
| 123:14,23 124:25 | 11:21 13:8 96:7 | 150:3 | | |

| enters 24:9 | 3:4,6,7,10,19,21 | examine 96:6 | 134:3 | 110:9,16 131:11 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| | 4:6,10,13,15 (11) | 136:25 | | 144:25 146:24 |
| entertaining | | | explain 48:20 | (12) |
| 145:23 | essentially | examining 14:7 | 83:20 | |
| | 117:10 | _ | | factor 23:2 |
| enthusiastic 9:2 | | example 21:18 | explaining | 25:9,16,18 |
| | et 54:15 56:18 | 24:13 27:8 | 102:13 | 28:6,9,12 |
| entire 86:25 | CC 51.15 50.10 | 31:5,21,22 34:1 | 102.13 | 35:6,12,14 |
| 99:20 108:11 | evaluation 41:2 | 36:12 37:5 39:22 | explanation | 58:21,23 |
| | evaluation 41.2 | | 65:22 66:6 | , · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 121:20,21 (5) | 07 (00 14 | 69:16 130:17,17 | | 60:8,13,19,22 |
| | even 27:6 28:14 | (13) | 84:12,13,21 90:23 | 61:8,12,17,20 |
| entirely 60:8 | 31:5 32:16 37:17 | | (6) | 62:24 67:24 (22) |
| | 53:6 55:5,12,14 | exceed 103:22 | | |
| entitled 71:20 | 76:23 91:8 | | explanations | factors 21:3 |
| 72:6 | 100:14,20 105:14 | excellent 44:11 | 83:25 85:24 90:12 | 22:3,13,21 23:12 |
| | 127:20 133:23 | 120:10 | | 26:2 29:23 |
| entrenched | 141:7 (17) | | exploring 13:13 | 31:24,25 34:13,25 |
| 126:21 | - 1-11 (-11) | excessive 21:15 | 21.P1011119 13.13 | 35:1,16,24 55:12 |
| 120.21 | event 68:16 | 74:10 131:23 | ownrogged 50.12 | 58:14 59:12,14,20 |
| andria 22:24 | event 00.10 | /4.10 131.23 | expressed 58:12 | |
| entries 23:24 | 115.00 | 4 3 40 00 | . 04.7 | 60:5 65:11 84:19 |
| 24:23 | ever 115:20 | excited 13:23 | extensive 81:5 | 102:13 |
| | 122:24 137:4 | | | 117:16,17,20 |
| entry 19:13 | | excusable 62:2 | extensively | 118:13 (27) |
| 23:23 24:22 | every 20:20 | | 122:17 | |
| 25:1,2,3,5 (7) | 52:20 69:22 83:1 | excuse 102:7 | | facts 28:23 |
| , ,- ,- \- \- \ | 140:25 (5) | | extent 25:3 | |
| equate 23:18 | - : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : | executive 1:17 | 85:17,19 92:20 (4) | failed 141:22 |
| equate 23.10 | everyone 5:2,10 | 2:11 9:4 133:3 | 05.17,17 72.20 (4) | 1411CU 171.22 |
| eric 50:13 100:12 | | | ovetwo 20,20 56,25 | foiling 27.60 |
| | 6:17 7:5 8:1,5 | 150:16,17,23 | extra 29:20 56:25 | failing 37:6,8 |
| 101:3 123:21 | 16:17 93:13 108:9 | 151:4 (8) | | 38:6 67:21 (4) |
| 133:1 (5) | 113:16 120:6 | | extraordinary | |
| | 151:7 (12) | exercise 87:15 | 65:17 86:23 | fails 103:10 |
| erica 3:6 6:5 | | 104:7 109:13 | 117:21 | |
| | everyone's 49:13 | | | failure 28:9 |
| escalates 56:12 | • • • • • • • • | existence 143:2 | extreme 90:9 | 36:12,13,15 38:10 |
| 550111105 50.12 | everything 36:4 | 3.11,0001100 1 13.2 | 21111 VIII 70.7 | 74:9 135:25 (7) |
| occoloting 56.12 | 79:18 80:11 114:4 | exists 109:19 | extricated 108:7 | 17.7 133.43 (1) |
| escalating 56:13 | | exists 109.19 | extricated 108.7 | foir 12.15 144.0 |
| 118:25 | 147:8 (5) | | 102.20 | fair 13:15 144:9 |
| | | expanded | eye 102:20 | |
| escalation 24:16 | evidence 86:20 | 36:3,4,6 | | fairly 77:24 |
| 55:8 | 108:2 | | eyes 114:16 | |
| | | expect 17:12 | - | faith 87:11 |
| esmeralda 3:21 | evident 117:14 | 113:16 | f 1:15 152:1 | 90:17,24 92:22 |
| 6:9 11:24 146:7 | | - | | 112:19 113:13 |
| (4) | evolved 58:9 | expected 35:19 | fabio 127:11 | 123:7,8,8 133:20 |
| (') | Croired Jo.J | CAPCCICU 33.17 | 14010 12/.11 | 141:21 142:5 (12) |
| ognosially 0.2 10 | exact 123:25 | ownongs 100.15 | faces 95:20 | 141.41 144.3 (14) |
| especially 9:3,10 | exact 125:25 | expense 100:15 | 1aces 93:20 | f-112 05-5 |
| 17:21 34:22 | 41 40 40 | | 6 1000 | falling 95:5 |
| 113:16 117:15 (6) | exactly 10:19 | experience 12:5 | facing 132:9 | |
| | 89:7 | 91:4 115:2 134:24 | | falls 62:18 |
| espoused 126:13 | | (4) | fact 33:15 52:25 | |
| | exaggerated 22:8 | | 58:15 60:17 61:15 | false 11:20 62:21 |
| | chaggerated 22.0 | | | |
| esq 1:17 | exaggerated 22.0 | experienced | 87:23 109:19 | 63:1 141:21 (4) |

| families 132:25 | (5) | flagged 66:13 | 43:25 47:24 | 79:14,17 80:1 |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 134:22 | (3) | naggeu 00.13 | 48:5,11 49:20,25 | 95:8 96:1 (11) |
| | finalized 116:21 | flagging 65:24 | 50:1 71:18 | , |
| far 14:24 120:12 | 117:9,23 | | 72:4,22 130:9 (13) | frank 3:15 6:14 |
| | | flawed 90:19 | | |
| farce 147:3 | finally 12:11 | 131:4 | forcedevice 38:2 | frankly 82:20 |
| fault 47:19 | 19:25 62:20 | flaws 142:15 | forfeiture 27:19 | fred 5:14 42:18 |
| 1aun 47.19 | find 61:4 73:15 | 145:9 146:11 | Torretture 27.19 | 11 eu 3.14 42.16 |
| favor 97:10 | 80:5,10 81:7,8 | 113.5 110.11 | forgone 139:8 | frederick 1:16 |
| 136:5 149:14 | 115:5 120:16 (8) | floor 15:17 | 8. | 3:3 |
| 150:22 (4) | | 138:23 | form 60:10 79:21 | |
| | finding 62:8 77:1 | | 118:6 140:7 (4) | freeman 3:13 |
| feature 98:2 | 115:3 | floors 35:8 | 0 11 62 24 | 44:17 |
| fab 05.22 | finds 73:21 | flored 50.22 | formally 63:24 64:2 | f 95.20 |
| february 95:23 | 11nus /5:21 | floyd 50:23 116:10 | 04:2 | frequency 85:20 |
| federal 116:11 | finish 87:20 | 110.10 | formed 134:21 | frequent 86:6,6 |
| 1000101 110.11 | 1111ight 07.20 | focus 89:13 | 10111104 15 1121 | requent co.c,c |
| feedback 99:2 | fired 73:13 124:1 | | former 4:14 | frisk 19:19 |
| | | focused 16:2 | 13:2,2 122:16 (4) | 26:6,15 27:5 |
| feel 50:20 92:21 | firing 21:5 | 130:6 | | 28:19,21,24 |
| 122:24 139:7 | 131:10 134:7 | folks 98:3 106:13 | forms 95:3 | 29:3,7,24 |
| 143:21 145:17 (6) | first 8:17,22 | 139:13 | formula 112:7 | 30:3,12,12,20 31:13 39:23 44:4 |
| feels 53:6 139:8 | 9:8,9 11:24 27:3 | 137.13 | Tormula 112.7 | 54:7 55:10 |
| 10010 0010 10710 | 49:17 55:17 74:9 | follow 42:12 | forth 145:14 | 62:7,17 70:1,3 |
| felice 5:5 | 98:11 106:6 | 70:12 106:16 | | 116:14 118:10 |
| | 108:17 115:21 | | fortyfive 20:1 | (25) |
| fellow 4:10 91:24 | 116:24 122:2,19 | followed 93:5 | 0 1 10716 | 6 1 2 24 24 54 2 |
| 116:7 147:12 (4) | 125:19 136:22 137:3 139:6 | 98:12 104:19 108:24 113:23 | fortysix 127:16 | frisks 24:24 54:2 |
| few 17:5 123:13 | 150:6,7 (22) | 116:3 119:22 | forward 13:13 | front 42:2 |
| 139:4,10 141:12 | 130.0,7 (22) | 122:12 123:4 | 15:4,6 16:12 59:1 | 110Ht 42.2 |
| 143:1 (6) | firstofitskind | 128:25 135:8 (11) | 77:6 87:13 98:25 | frozen 5:23 |
| , , | 8:14 | , , | 99:7,8 104:11 | |
| fields 79:10 | | following 15:16 | 106:17 144:1 | frustrated 123:5 |
| ere. 20.2.20.20 | fit 89:6 | 16:3 75:10 109:17 | 145:18,19,20 (16) | 6 H 16 10 20 10 |
| fifteen 20:2 29:20 | fits 27:4 94:1 | 137:19 138:8 (6) | fought 111:2 | full 16:19 39:10 51:3 54:24 112:13 |
| 44:10 56:18 (4) | 1113 41.4 74.1 | followup 74:5 | rought 111.2 | 119:8 139:17 |
| fiftysix 19:21 | five | ionowup /T.S | found 72:7 76:19 | 140:3 (8) |
| | 27:11,18,21,23 | footage 14:6 | 95:14 132:6 (4) | (-) |
| fiftytwo 19:16 | 28:2 29:14,17,18 | 37:15,17 108:3 (4) | , | function 101:2 |
| | 30:15,16,25 31:5,8 | | four 21:19 28:2 | |
| fighting 137:24 | 32:11,18 56:15,16 | force 21:13,15,16 | 56:23 | functionality |
| fil o 122.10 120.6 | 76:19 100:14,19 | 24:17 33:22 34:1 | fountly 24.22 | 141:2 |
| file 133:19 138:6 | 125:17 (21) | 41:1 46:17,22,24 48:11 74:10 | fourth 24:23 33:16 | functioned 101:1 |
| filled 116:25 | fixed 111:7 | 131:18,23 137:25 | 33.10 | Tunchonea 101.1 |
| | | (15) | framework | further 47:25 |
| final 51:22 | flag 59:7,18 63:7 | | 17:4,6 74:20,22 | 63:9 152:11 |
| 52:5,14 107:4,4 | _ | forced 21:4,7 | 76:25 77:9 | |
| J2.J,14 10/.4,4 | | 101CCU 21.4,/ | 10.45 11.7 | |

| C41 | | I | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| furthermore 117:23 | 82:13 136:2 (10) | 70:16,17 (6) | 86:24 87:8 88:5 91:16 113:3 | 76:5,19 138:1 (5) |
| | getting 7:20 57:1 | going 5:17 | 114:24 115:2 | guys 79:12 |
| futility 87:15 | 70:24 84:20 | 16:14,17 | 120:11 146:14 | 80:4,19,23 81:1 |
| | 85:3,20,23 92:20 | 17:1,10,14,18 | 147:9 150:8 151:7 | 82:2 (6) |
| future 11:15 | 105:16 107:24 | 18:11,23,23 | (18) | , , |
| 12:25 87:14 148:7 | 108:2 115:21 | 20:6,9,11,16 21:24 | , , | gwen 133:1 |
| (4) | 150:10 (13) | 22:1 25:11 | governs 71:23 | |
| | | 27:9,23,24 | 121:17 | habitual 57:25 |
| gap 90:25 | give 16:19 17:8 | 28:4,7,22 | | |
| | 33:7 35:20 43:16 | 30:14,17,23,25 | grave 118:15 | half 33:23 |
| garner 50:13 | 72:23 76:2 81:11 | 31:8,9,12,13,16 | | 39:11,20,21,25 (5) |
| 100:12,23 101:4 | 93:9 101:6,8 | 32:23,25 34:23 | gray 50:20 | |
| 123:22 133:2 (6) | 136:5,5 (13) | 37:15 38:17,21 | | hall 105:18 111:9 |
| | | 39:19 40:10 | great 6:3,12 | 149:24 |
| gates 104:10 | given 39:7 54:23 | 42:22,23 43:2,18 | 14:15 73:19 | |
| | 62:8 88:22,23 | 45:4,6 56:13 57:6 | 114:9,15 116:4 (7) | hand 16:7 |
| gather 99:21 | 89:4 120:19 | 59:2 67:16 69:1 | | 49:12,13 71:12 |
| | 121:2,9 (9) | 72:12 74:12 | greater 17:18 | 77:18 152:16 (6) |
| gave 13:3 19:14 | | 77:5,15,22 | 125:24 128:18,18 | |
| 20:2 40:3,8 114:9 | gives 35:7 70:11 | 78:19,20 | 147:15 (5) | handcuffs |
| 120:8 (7) | 147:22 | 79:3,6,7,7,8,11,21 | | 136:23,25 |
| | | 80:25 81:9 82:10 | ground 91:12 | |
| gender 26:11 | giving 14:9 73:19 | 83:2,23,24 84:4,8 | O | handfed 141:15 |
| | 148:11 | 86:17 87:16 88:25 | grounds 46:12 | 142:15 |
| general 2:6 3:24 | | 89:19 92:25 96:19 | S | |
| 15:11 27:4 69:10 | glad 102:23 | 102:24 103:24 | groups 116:16 | handled 96:3 |
| (5) | 120:8 | 104:4,5 | 3 1 | |
| ` ' | | 106:2,7,16,17 | guarantee 101:17 | hands 123:19,19 |
| george 50:23 | global 84:8 | 108:13,13,14 | 8 | 150:4 |
| | 6 | 110:24 112:24 | guarded 137:1 | |
| german 137:21 | go 5:23 14:21,24 | 113:15 115:11,15 | o l | happen 134:5 |
| 8 | 16:22 17:1 18:23 | 119:9 124:22 | guardrails | 11 |
| get 5:15 8:11 | 19:1 22:22 23:13 | 129:15 143:14,22 | 109:12 | happened 33:2 |
| 18:1 19:2 21:1 | 28:23 31:8 32:25 | 144:5 148:10,12 | | FF |
| 26:6,9,25 27:9 | 37:13 44:12,23 | 150:13 (104) | guess 48:6 52:17 | happening 36:22 |
| 29:1 30:23 41:9 | 54:17 55:22 56:17 | (- / | 53:11 60:1 78:18 | 11 8 2 2 2 2 |
| 48:9 55:1 60:1,2 | 69:20 70:18 73:20 | gone 104:9 150:9 | 93:24 94:8 (7) | happens 108:4 |
| 65:2 70:1,23 71:5 | 74:4 77:16 83:16 | g | (-) | TI |
| 72:14 76:10,19 | 87:22 96:20 | good 5:1,10 | guide 29:6 | harass 132:20 |
| 77:11 81:10,22 | 104:21,24 106:14 | 6:4,8,13,17 | 42:13,14 | |
| 82:17 83:24 88:25 | 109:1 114:1 | 7:4,14,25 16:16 | 121:16,18 126:11 | harassment |
| 91:20 93:20 94:3 | 119:24 120:2 | 78:10 79:19 | 145:24 (7) | 57:21,24 134:3 |
| 96:19 105:21 | 129:5,24 137:2 | 86:10,19 90:24 | () | , 2 |
| 106:3 108:4 113:4 | 143:16 150:8 (38) | 92:22 93:3 98:18 | guided 11:7 | hard 9:12 40:14 |
| 115:20 118:6 | () | 99:18 109:3 | | 55:22 105:16 |
| 122:1,4 135:18 | goal 17:6 122:7 | 112:19 113:13 | guidelines | 119:14 147:5 (6) |
| 137:3 144:23 | <i></i> | 116:4 120:5 123:8 | 9:18,21 10:7,10,21 | (0) |
| 148:25 (45) | goals 11:12 | 125:11 129:6 | 132:1,18 (7) | hardships 117:21 |
| | 119:12 | 137:13 (28) | , (,) | |
| gets 18:5 39:24 | / | | guilties 75:21,23 | harlem 6:1 |
| 40:22 50:16 | goes 40:23 45:4 | got 8:5,16 28:1 | 5 | |
| | O | 29:16,18 84:19 | guilty 72:7 75:9 | harm 126:6 |
| 51:4,11,15 71:5 | 56:20 57:8 | 29.10.10 04.19 | 2011(V 12.1 1.1.9 | Hai II 120.0 |

| 136:21 | 105:4 106:13 | helps 122:1 | 22:2 24:14 27:24 | 80:6,23 82:16 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 120:3 123:9 129:3 | | 29:8 30:23 | 85:14 88:1,21 |
| harmful 131:11 | 135:11 137:14 | her 114:11,15 | 31:4,15,23 33:7 | 89:8 92:14 93:22 |
| | 144:11,12 (14) | 115:16 | 35:5,11 40:17,24 | 94:1,1,3 99:7 |
| harms 126:4 | | | 41:3,4,5,8,14 | 102:16 105:19 |
| | heard 12:9 89:25 | here 5:4 8:12,19 | 54:15,24 60:7,10 | 121:25 124:23 |
| harsher 101:12 | 99:24 110:12 | 9:1 20:10 | 62:8 78:13 90:19 | 131:19 136:11 |
| 101.12 | 123:6,6 141:11 | 22:17,21,25 23:4 | 91:7,11 106:3 | (40) |
| has 8:11 11:1 | 149:3 (8) | 24:19,21 25:5,9 | 107:25 127:15 | (40) |
| 12:19 14:13,17 | 147.3 (0) | 28:7,13,17,22 | (31) | however 10:14 |
| 17:17 18:1 | hearing 33:3 | 29:22 30:3,6 | (31) | 18:20 28:1 32:11 |
| | 0 | , and the second | h:4 22.6 27.16 | |
| 20:21,23 22:2 | 98:11 99:21 | 32:2,16 47:21 | hit 22:6 37:16 | 35:14 40:1 67:13 |
| 27:10 33:8,17 | 104:18 105:3 | 54:12 60:20 66:4 | 57:7 70:22 (4) | 116:20 119:1 |
| 34:19 41:13 | 108:23 113:22 | 69:13 70:18 73:10 | | 140:4 (10) |
| 43:1,20 56:10 | 116:2 119:21 | 77:23 78:9 81:6 | hold 11:19 64:25 | |
| 58:9 60:7 67:9,10 | 122:11 125:10 | 82:10 86:16 121:2 | 69:2,7,8,22 70:2 | huge 49:21 53:7 |
| 70:20 75:8,17 | 128:24 129:21 | 130:5,13 | 86:24 92:5 109:15 | 90:25 91:16 |
| 76:23 86:21 87:10 | 135:7 137:11 | 146:12,19 150:10 | 112:12 113:1 | 114:20 142:15,16, |
| 90:15 93:18 | 139:1 (16) | (40) | 142:2 150:13 (14) | 22,22,23 (10) |
| 95:1,7 96:17 | ` ' | , , | ` ' | |
| 98:19 102:3 107:4 | heartened 99:23 | hereby 152:8 | holding 88:5 | human 135:24 |
| 109:20 110:17 | 110011011011 >> 120 | 1101000 10210 | 118:18 147:23,24 | 136:17 |
| 111:2 114:5 116:8 | heatedness 24:15 | hereunto 152:15 | 148:20 (5) | 130.17 |
| 117:3 118:8 | neateuness 24.13 | nercunto 132.13 | 140.20 (3) | hurting 51:8 |
| 123:4,12,25 | heather 3:24 9:3 | hero 60:14 | honest 11:8 | nurung 51.0 |
| ' ' | | nero 00.14 | | h 20.17 22.10 |
| 126:1,6 127:14,20 | 15:12 16:3,15,15 | | 35:21 50:6 | hypo 20:17 23:10 |
| 132:5,13 133:7 | 42:19 44:14 | heroism 60:18 | 57.10 | 24:4 26:7,20 (5) |
| 134:20 136:19 | 47:4,13 62:13 | | hoops 57:12 | |
| 141:22 142:15 | 67:8,18 68:22 | hi 5:25 7:25 | | hypos 16:21,25 |
| 150:9 (58) | 74:14 106:9 (16) | 105:4 120:6 (4) | hope 10:5 | 34:18 81:5 (4) |
| | | | 11:5,15 90:1 | |
| | 1 41 1 60 5 | higher 17:14 | 107 0 100 0 107 1 | hypothetical |
| hasher 10:1 | heather's 60:5 | | 107:8 123:8 127:1 | |
| hasher 10:1 | heather's 60:5 | 21:1 56:21 | 107:8 123:8 127:1 128:14,20 (9) | 20:10 |
| hasher 10:1 hasn't 64:6 | heavy 81:25 | | | |
| | | 21:1 56:21 | 128:14,20 (9) | 20:10 |
| hasn't 64:6 | heavy 81:25 | 21:1 56:21 highest | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully | 20:10 hypotheticals |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 | | 21:1 56:21 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 | 20:10 |
| hasn't 64:6 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 | 21:1 56:21 highest | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 107:5,6 111:13 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) help 79:24 | 21:1 56:21 highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 127:21 (6) | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 how 12:24 17:9 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 46:13 47:3,3 50:5 51:4 52:18 55:6 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 107:5,6 111:13 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) help 79:24 113:17 128:21 | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 127:21 (6) historically 77:25 | 128:14,20 (9) hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 how 12:24 17:9 19:3 20:9 29:9 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 46:13 47:3,3 50:5 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 107:5,6 111:13 127:9 (12) | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) help 79:24 113:17 128:21 145:24 147:18 (5) | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 127:21 (6) historically 77:25 109:9 | hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 how 12:24 17:9 19:3 20:9 29:9 31:3 36:24 38:16 45:19 48:1 52:20 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 46:13 47:3,3 50:5 51:4 52:18 55:6 57:18,20 74:4,11 76:13 86:17 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 107:5,6 111:13 127:9 (12) he's 38:21 | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) help 79:24 113:17 128:21 145:24 147:18 (5) helpful 67:8,12 | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 127:21 (6) historically 77:25 | hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 how 12:24 17:9 19:3 20:9 29:9 31:3 36:24 38:16 45:19 48:1 52:20 53:9,16 59:13,20 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 46:13 47:3,3 50:5 51:4 52:18 55:6 57:18,20 74:4,11 76:13 86:17 87:9,16,18 |
| hasn't 64:6 haven't 71:22 89:25 having 11:8 15:4 74:12 94:10 95:12 98:18 105:16 149:4 (8) he 13:5 50:14 60:15 76:23 87:5 100:16,23 102:13 107:5,6 111:13 127:9 (12) | heavy 81:25 heights 127:12 held 1:8 33:3 100:13 101:9 103:9 113:14 141:24 (7) hello 5:1 6:23 122:14 129:23 130:1 (5) help 79:24 113:17 128:21 145:24 147:18 (5) | highest 18:4,17,22 highlight 67:8 highlights 118:17 hired 120:24 his 84:3 100:13 111:13 122:22,25 127:21 (6) historically 77:25 109:9 | hopefully 81:19,23 107:19 146:2 (4) hopes 87:23 hoping 147:5 hospital 136:22 housing 6:21 how 12:24 17:9 19:3 20:9 29:9 31:3 36:24 38:16 45:19 48:1 52:20 | 20:10 hypotheticals 20:7 i'd 58:6 66:2 134:11 148:24 (4) i'll 22:22 51:10 91:16 135:12 (4) i'm 7:15 8:1 11:7 16:12 18:23,23 20:6 29:3 32:25 46:13 47:3,3 50:5 51:4 52:18 55:6 57:18,20 74:4,11 76:13 86:17 |

| 97:9,15 105:7,18 | important 23:4,7 | inception 90:8 | indicated 60:6 | instance 50:13 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 106:7 109:4 114:2 | 42:4 58:6,23 | | 146:25 | |
| 115:11,15 119:9 | 61:18 82:6,17 | incident 35:22 | | instances 77:13 |
| 120:6 122:25 | 85:10,25 99:22 | 36:19,25 37:14 (4) | indicating 46:6 | 90:9 111:5 |
| 127:23 145:22 | 130:7 139:10 | (1) | 47:1 143:11 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| 147:5 (45) | 147:21 (14) | incidents 66:22 | 17.1113.11 | instead 32:22 |
| 147.3 (43) | 177.21 (17) | 67:1 127:6 | indication 38:23 | 131:22 132:8 |
| 00 05 00 11 | . 04.25 | 07:1 127:0 | | |
| i've 22:25 23:11 | impose 84:25 | | 100:16 | 134:6 142:3 (5) |
| 99:24 120:11 | | include 27:24 | | |
| 130:4 (5) | imposed 29:10 | 118:21 131:8 | indicia 26:17 | institution |
| | 83:8 95:13 | | 27:7 | 142:24 |
| icard 24:2,6 | | included 37:24 | | |
| 10414 2 1.2,0 | imposes 9:24 | 111c1ddd 37.2. | indigent 125:16 | instructions |
| idea 60:25 84:7 | imposes 7.24 | includes 40:25 | margent 123.10 | 19:17,23 20:4 |
| | 10.01 | | | 19:17,23 20:4 |
| 91:1 | imposition 12:21 | 101:11 | individual | |
| | | | 135:23 | insufficient |
| identified 117:5 | impression 46:10 | including 14:4 | | 139:12 |
| | - | 59:13,19 66:25 | inform 31:7 | |
| identify 83:5 | improper 118:22 | 95:4 96:3 112:25 | | integrity 86:11 |
| 85:4 | 131:14 | 127:15 133:1 (9) | information 27:1 | micgrity 00.11 |
| 63.4 | 131.14 | 127.13 133.1 (9) | | 25 1 44 5 |
| | | | 28:25 29:2 37:12 | intent 25:1 44:5 |
| identifying 37:12 | improve 10:23 | inconsistencies | 41:9 42:2 43:17 | 117:25 |
| | 14:3 87:23 | 107:11 | 45:22 72:24 73:1 | |
| illegal 70:11 | | | 77:11 78:12,25 | intentional |
| S | improvement | inconsistent | 79:9 82:18 92:13 | 28:18,20 33:20 |
| illegality 131:20 | 10:13,20 | 84:23 | 129:12 (17) | |
| meganty 131.20 | 10.15,20 | 04.23 | 127.12 (17) | intentionally |
| image 122:23 | impunity 126:22 | incorporate 10:6 | informed 97:6 | 131:12 136:1 |
| image 122.23 | impunity 120.22 | incorporate 10.0 | inioinieu 97.0 | 131.12 130.1 |
| immediately | inability 47:20 | incorrect 48:8 | informing 141:9 | intents 33:19 |
| 10:6,9 66:24 | 62:24 | 72:24 | intorning 141.7 | 36:9,10 |
| 10:0,9 00:24 | 02:24 | 12:24 | . 6 54.01 | 30.9,10 |
| | | | infraction 54:21 | |
| impact 60:23 | inaccurate 62:22 | increase 17:7 | | interaction 24:16 |
| 61:6 | 63:2 | 95:17 | infractions 67:15 | |
| | | | 122:3 | interactions |
| impacted 112:3 | inadequate | increases 96:9 | | 148:15 |
| 117:5 126:6 | 116:22 | | injured 131:19 | 1.5.15 |
| 117.5 120.0 | - · | | injureu 151.17 | |
| | 1 1 8 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | inorodible 1/11/5 | | INTOROGE U/III |
| | 118:10,11,17 (4) | incredible 141:5 | 240 | interest 94:18 |
| impediments | , | | injuries 34:9 | 118:18 119:10 |
| impediments 117:4 | inappropriate | incredible 141:5 | • | |
| - | , | incredibly 91:2 | injuries 34:9 injuring 51:8 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) |
| - | inappropriate | | • | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) |
| 117:4 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 | incredibly 91:2 | injuring 51:8 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) |
| 117:4 implement 13:24 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 |
| 117:4 implement 13:24 15:15 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 |
| 117:4 implement 13:24 15:15 implemented | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 |
| 117:4 implement 13:24 15:15 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 implementing | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 independent | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 |
| 117:4 implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 implementing | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 incapable 130:15 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 independent 13:12 103:19 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 136:2 (14) input 93:19 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 41:3,5 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 implementing 86:12 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 independent 13:12 103:19 111:17,22 128:10 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 136:2 (14) | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 implementing 86:12 importance | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 incapable 130:15 incentive 63:4 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 independent 13:12 103:19 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 136:2 (14) input 93:19 99:21 150:9 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 41:3,5 interpreters 5:4 |
| implement 13:24 15:15 implemented 93:23 implementing 86:12 | inappropriate 33:12 73:22 inappropriatenes s 131:21 inaudible 53:9 incapable 130:15 | incredibly 91:2 indeed 101:10 independence 141:1 142:19 146:2 independent 13:12 103:19 111:17,22 128:10 | injuring 51:8 injury 20:18,22 21:11 22:4 23:4,8 34:7,9 43:25 44:2 47:5 48:16,18 136:2 (14) input 93:19 | 118:18 119:10 148:15 (4) interested 152:13 interesting 17:21 98:20 internal 17:4 41:3,5 |

| interruption 6:25 | irish 3:7 5:24,25 | 68:12,14,25 | 143:3,20,20 | 125:10,13 (5) |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| | 6:1 44:25 48:24 | 69:1,4,10,14,15,25 | 145:4,20,22 | |
| intervals 82:24 | 49:9 85:7,9 86:4 | 70:4,5,9,12,14,18, | 146:16,17,20,23 | job 35:15 36:1 |
| 121:24 | (10) | 24 71:3,4,16 | 147:3,6,18,19,20 | 100:13 101:3 |
| | | 72:6,13 | 148:4,7,9,10,12,18 | 114:11 122:22,25 |
| intervene | ironclad 105:21 | 73:2,10,17,24 | 149:2 150:5,7 | 123:3 125:5 |
| 24:3,12,18 25:10 | | 75:5,14,18 | 152:9 (406) | 146:19 (10) |
| 74:10 (5) | is 5:25 6:5,14,24 | 76:5,7,17,19,20 | | |
| | 7:5,20,23 8:5 9:15 | 77:5,23,24 | island 7:22 | jobs 133:16 |
| interviews 91:14 | 10:13 11:5,11,13 | 78:9,18,19 | | |
| | 12:25 16:19 | 79:2,7,8,20,20,22 | isn't 11:14 | john 3:4 4:13 |
| intimate 57:22 | 17:18,21,22 | 81:25 82:10,14 | | 5:20,22 7:15 |
| | 18:3,4,11 | 83:2,22,22,25 | issue 27:20 37:1 | 57:18 64:12,23 |
| into 10:7 13:10 | 20:10,19,25 | 84:2,7 85:14,14,25 | 39:5 40:13 61:14 | 68:8 119:22 |
| 28:6,20 32:25 | 21:4,6,15 | 86:5,5 | 63:23 64:10,12,12 | 122:11,15 (12) |
| 34:2 38:20 41:7 | 22:14,18,19 | 87:4,10,15,21,23 | 71:4 82:5,9 86:25 | |
| 43:3 57:1 68:1 | 24:7,14 25:24,25 | 88:1,1,4,18,19,21 | 88:16,17 91:17 | join 89:9 |
| 70:19 73:12,14 | 26:22 27:8,13,15,2 | 89:2,22 90:23 | 99:22 100:8 | |
| 74:12 82:25 88:2 | 0,22,24 28:3,11 | 91:2,7,23 | 102:12 110:15 | joined 41:1 |
| 90:18 93:4 94:21 | 29:6 30:3 31:9 | 92:7,9,12,17,17,22 | 117:13 123:5 | v |
| 96:20 111:15 | 32:11 34:1,22 | 93:15,21 94:8,9,10 | 127:13 138:4 (24) | jon 44:12 46:19 |
| 113:10 121:22 | 35:2,13 36:22,24 3 | 95:11,16 96:21 | , , | 53:22 57:14 67:18 |
| 142:1 143:2 | 7:5,11,13,16,18,25 | 97:11,13,18 | issued 12:3 | 68:21 71:15 |
| 150:10 (27) | 38:13,16,19 | 99:2,5,9 100:20,21 | | 72:11,12 73:2,7 |
| ` ' | 39:7,15,15,19,22 | 101:5,22 | issues 15:20 | 83:17 84:10 106:7 |
| introduce 5:17 | 40:2,9,13,21,23 | 102:18,24 | 36:17 63:8,17 | (14) |
| | 41:6,18,23 | 103:11,24 104:16 | 66:12 71:2 87:12 | , |
| introduced 66:20 | 42:5,11,12,16,23 | 105:13,25 | 88:6 93:17 99:13 | jonathan 1:17 |
| 91:19 | 43:24 | 106:2,18,19 | 119:11,13 131:8 | • |
| | 44:1,2,4,17,19,20 | 108:12,14,20 | 143:14,17 144:8 | joseph 3:9,18 |
| investigate 37:13 | 45:4,22 | 109:4,18,21,23 | (16) | 6:18 |
| C | 47:5,8,19,22 | 110:4,8,23,25 | , , | 7:8,10,11,17,19,2 |
| investigating | 48:2,11,24 | 112:22,23 | its 11:11 13:5 | 49:1,7 68:4,5 70:9 |
| 11:20 | 49:7,10,21 | 114:15,20 115:10 | 38:3 43:1 60:24 | 71:9,10 87:2 |
| | 50:2,11,15,24 51:1 | 116:5,25 117:14 | 65:6 94:2 95:7 | 97:15,17,23 |
| investigations | ,3,5,9,15,17,18,18, | 118:1 | 96:1 102:8 108:15 | 143:11,13 144:13 |
| 9:7 11:22 37:4 | 21 52:9,14,15,18,2 | 120:7,13,18,22 12 | 111:16,18 (13) | (23) |
| 80:15 125:22 | 3,23,24 53:7,11,16 | 1:1,5,5,12,12,16,1 | , , | |
| 128:3 (6) | ,19,20,21,23 | 8,19,21 | itself 110:5 | journey 150:5 |
| | 54:4,9,12,12,18 | 122:7,15,19 | 115:14 126:15 | - - |
| investigative | 55:2,6,11,19,24 | 123:10,17,22 | 130:16 146:17 (5) | jump 56:5 57:12 |
| 118:23 | 56:8,9 | 124:3,4,5,6 | ` ' | · • |
| | 57:4,5,21,23,25 | 125:13,23 | jackie 4:12 | june 100:1 |
| investigator 4:14 | 58:1,6 59:1,6,10,1 | 126:9,13 127:8,18 | 113:24 119:21 | 110:13 |
| 41:18 122:16 | 1,18,21,22,23,24,2 | 128:7 | | |
| | 5 60:3,8,20,20,22 | 129:2,7,14,17 | january 1:4 | jurisdiction |
| investigators | 61:1,7,9,12,13,24 | 130:1,15 | 105:15,24 127:7 | 67:14,21 68:1 |
| 69:11 78:2,20 | 62:1,2,7,9,11,19,2 | 131:4,20,23 | 152:16 (5) | 74:13 95:5 111:18 |
| , | 0 63:14,20,23,24 | 135:19,21 136:2,7 | ` ' | 134:21 (7) |
| involved 24:17 | 64:1,5 | 137:3,6 138:4,13 | jeans 26:12,24 | (.) |
| 31:10 68:19 | 65:4,7,9,11,20,23 | 139:11,11 | · -,- · | jury 89:1 |
| | 66:4,5,8,13,13,19 | 140:7,23,24 | jennvine 4:15 | ₩ ₩ · |
| | | | | |
| involves 25:6 | 67:3,6,15,16,23 | 141:14 142:8,22 | 119:22 122:12 | just 5:3 12:24 |

| T | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 17:6 22:22,25 | 48:10,12 76:3 | 120:22 121:8 | 113:4 137:22,24 | 114:5 120:12 |
| 23:7,21 25:18 | 80:18 98:5 102:20 | 124:25 136:8,13 | 140:20 (18) | 121:12 142:7 (9) |
| 26:10 27:3 31:25 | 111:2 122:22,25 | 145:5 147:7 151:5 | | |
| 32:25 33:6 34:19 | 123:3 124:22 | (41) | lawmakers 12:10 | lessen 120:20 |
| 35:25 40:11 43:14 | 125:5 133:15 | (11) | 140014111111111111111111111111111111111 | 121:6 |
| 44:5 48:1,6 | 145:19 (16) | knowing 40:15 | laws 138:11 | |
| 49:8,24 51:6 | - 101-2 (- 0) | 99:1 100:21 | 200112 | lesser 77:16 |
| 52:20 | keeps 123:24 | | lawsuit 116:11 | |
| 53:5,7,12,12,15 | • | knowledge 80:10 | | let 5:23 44:14 |
| 54:19,20 55:4 | khan 4:5 104:20 | ě | lays 28:20 41:12 | 47:14 63:14 65:1 |
| 56:5 58:15 60:13 | 105:3,4,6,9 107:22 | known 137:18 | | 87:20,25 112:17 |
| 64:7,14 66:16 | 108:19 (8) | | lead 116:9 | 138:20 151:4 (10) |
| 67:13 71:1,14 | , , | lack 58:16 90:11 | | , , |
| 72:23 74:6 75:1 | kid 146:16 | 118:18 129:11 | leadership 99:16 | let's 44:23 70:1 |
| 76:12 77:20 78:3 | | 130:20,24 (6) | 104:13 110:1,5 | 91:20 93:9 103:24 |
| 81:11,16 82:4 | kill 132:19 | | 111:2 128:14 (6) | 146:16 147:7 (7) |
| 83:3,11 84:13,19 | | lacks 109:22 | | |
| 85:2,9,16 86:4 | killed 100:12,23 | | leading 117:12 | lethal 38:1 |
| 87:10,18,19 88:1 | 132:25 134:23 | land 55:13 | | |
| 89:1,13,24 90:5,21 | 138:17 (5) | | leap 87:11 | lethaldevice 34:3 |
| 91:1,6,11,22 92:15 | | language 19:25 | | |
| 93:22 96:19 | killing 51:8 | 31:20,23 32:3,8,17 | learned 12:16,24 | letter 133:2 |
| 97:1,13,17 102:2 | | 63:22 64:1 | 72:17 | |
| 105:10,20 107:23 | kind 36:8 50:20 | 65:12,23 66:10 | | letting 125:18 |
| 112:17,24 118:3 | 52:19 53:7,13,15 | (11) | least 58:6 62:16 | |
| 127:24 128:16 | 55:7 68:8 78:7,25 | | 81:24 121:20 (4) | level 85:3 95:9,13 |
| 134:16 135:17,23 | 79:24 83:7 | larger 80:14 | | 103:6 104:7 |
| 136:5 137:19 | 84:25,25 (14) | | leave 24:12 90:1 | 108:12 118:22 |
| 138:6 139:24 | | largest 125:16 | 149:1 | 146:1 (8) |
| 140:9 142:11 | kinds 83:12 | 130:22 | 110.6 | 10455 |
| 144:5,21 | 114:17 | 1 1 10 | leaving 119:6 | leverage 124:5,5 |
| 145:11,16 147:18 | | last 11:18 | 1 1 1 1 6 0 4 | 191 49 4.77 |
| 150:7 (101) | knee 51:7 | 12:23,24 13:8,18 | legal 4:16 9:4 | liberties 4:7 |
| •4• 11 <i>c</i> .c | I 14 40-4 | 33:8 48:19 49:12 | 33:12 39:12 94:2 | 109:6 113:1 |
| justice 116:6 | kneeling 49:4 | 66:20 68:9 94:7 | 113:17 125:15,17 | ! - 120.00 140.12 |
| 136:21 | 50:9 | 100:1 124:2 | 127:8 (9) | lie 132:20 140:13 |
| ingtifichle 127.4 | Iznovy 10.10 | 127:24 130:12,16 | logolly, 111.14 | life 125.24 |
| justifiable 137:4 | knew 12:18 17:12 | 141:12 143:1 (18) | legally 111:14 | life 135:24 136:17 |
| justified 21:17 | 1/.14 | lastly 118:24 | legislation | 130.17 |
| 70:13 | knocks 24:6 | 145uy 110.24 | 110:14 112:21 | lifelong 6:20 |
| 70.13 | KHOCKS 24.0 | late 120:9 | 130:10 145:1 (4) | inclong 0.20 |
| justify 112:11 | know 17:3 23:1,3 | 14tt 140.7 | 130.10 143.1 (4) | lifting 82:1 |
| Jusury 112.11 | 26:22 27:15 35:17 | later 88:15 | legitimacy | mung 02.1 |
| justly 12:20 | 38:5,11 39:6 | 100:19 | 142:20 | light 77:23 90:19 |
| justry 12.20 | 41:4,5 49:3 | 100.17 | 172.20 | ngnt 11.23 30.19 |
| kadushin 106:8 | 61:13,24 68:8 | latin 117:6 | lengthy 127:14 | like 5:16,22 |
| Madusiiii 100.0 | 71:3,15 76:13 | 14111 11/.U | icinguly 12/.14 | 10:20 15:5 |
| karmita 4:17 | 79:13 80:13 84:22 | law 12:11 14:24 | leslie 4:21 135:8 | 31:12,15 34:6 |
| 122:13 128:24 | 87:19 91:14 93:15 | 33:15 58:15 | 137:11 | 40:21 42:11 43:14 |
| 122,13 120,2 T | 97:2 103:8 | 71:23,25 | 15/,11 | 46:8 53:6,8 55:7 |
| 129:7.20 (5) | | , 1,40,40 | ĺ | 10.0 22.0,0 22.1 |
| 129:7,20 (5) | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | less 28:1 29:16 | 56:13 58:6 64:10 |
| 129:7,20 (5) keep 7:19 15:19 | 105:9,11 108:1,9 113:7 115:5,7 | 73:3,6,8,9 100:3 104:2,10 110:17 | less 28:1 29:16 34:2 38:1 81:20 | 56:13 58:6 64:10 66:2 69:6 72:1,2 |

| 81:4,13 84:8 89:1 | location 37:11 | 151:8 (22) | 45:6,23 50:8 | 81:21 |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 92:22 98:1,23 | iveation 5/.11 | 131.0 (22) | 51:2,19 78:21 | 01,21 |
| 115:4 117:20 | lofchie 4:20 | loud 12:9 | 80:16,19 87:13 | matrix 2:9,10 |
| 120:17 123:21 | | 10uu 12.9 | 131:22 139:21 | 5:13 8:14 |
| | 129:1 135:8,19,20 | 1 46.0 | | |
| 126:11 127:19 | (5) | love 46:2 | (12) | 9:6,13,15 |
| 131:12 134:11 | | | | 10:4,14,16 |
| 137:2 139:8 | log 37:6 | low 37:21 | male 26:23 | 11:3,6,11,13 |
| 148:24 (39) | | | | 15:2,10,14,15,21 |
| | long 52:7 100:3 | lower 6:20 62:12 | mandated 42:12 | 16:3 17:2,13 18:7 |
| limit 59:3 98:4 | 101:14 102:25 | | | 19:4 20:9,13 21:9 |
| 111:13 | 111:2 147:5 150:8 | m 1:24 | manhattan | 22:20 23:14 26:1 |
| | (7) | | 4:9,17 6:18 129:9 | 27:20 28:12,19 |
| limited 26:16 | | made 11:21 | (4) | 30:7,21 32:14 |
| 60:23 98:6 | longer 18:9 21:12 | 12:23 14:3 33:6 | | 33:2,9,13 36:5 |
| | 35:13 44:4 (4) | 43:13 47:10 52:23 | manifestation | 37:19 38:7 39:19 |
| limits 111:16 | | 59:10 63:1 69:24 | 13:6 | 40:11 41:6,12 |
| | longestablished | 71:6 88:19 94:23 | | 42:5 43:20 45:18 |
| lincoln 81:9 84:3 | 55:15 | 96:18 100:18 | manner 106:5 | 46:14,20 51:19,21 |
| | | 135:21 141:6 | 108:4,5 | 54:10 |
| line 49:8 65:2 | longstanding | 143:24 144:3 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 55:5,13,23,25 |
| .,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 109:7 | 146:11 (20) | many 12:16 17:3 | 56:7,11 58:5 |
| lines 54:1 84:22 | 107.7 | 110.11 (20) | 22:13 29:9 31:3 | 59:1,3,7,25 60:3 |
| 111CS 51.1 01.22 | look 10:20 13:13 | mail 115:3 | 53:3 67:24,25 | 63:11,20,23 |
| links 43:19 | 20:11 23:2 29:9 | man 113.3 | 87:20 103:17 | 64:19,21 |
| HIIKS 43.19 | 68:17 74:12 75:14 | maintains 140:3 | 107:14 116:16,24 | 65:7,12,14,20,24 |
| listed 33:15 38:1 | 77:13 78:1 87:13 | mamiams 140.3 | 124:18,18,18 | |
| IIsteu 55:15 56:1 | | | , , | 66:4,11,17 67:2 |
| P.4. 145.6 | 99:7,12 104:11 | major 107:18 | 131:8 133:4,18 | 68:6 70:19,22,23 |
| listen 145:6 | (14) | 113:5 | 140:9,20 146:10 | 71:5,6,17 |
| | | • • • • • • | (22) | 74:8,9,15 75:16 |
| literally 142:3 | lookback 27:22 | majority 34:21 | | 77:22,24 78:21 |
| | 28:3 | 106:21 | marbre 3:19 6:24 | 79:2,20 80:11 |
| little 9:21 14:25 | | | 88:9 | 81:2 82:11,16,21 |
| 16:23 17:8 24:10 | looked 75:8 | make 9:5,13 | | 83:22 84:17 89:14 |
| 27:9 31:2,17 | 147:4 | 13:14 16:4 26:4 | mark 53:8 113:8 | 90:19 91:25 92:14 |
| 33:1,7 36:7,11 | | 43:4 45:1,2,16,20 | | 93:23,25 |
| 38:14 50:5 | looking 15:4 | 51:4 53:12 54:19 | marriage 152:13 | 94:7,11,14,18 |
| 62:7,11 72:1 | 16:12 54:15 97:20 | 58:7 63:7,21 64:1 | | 95:2,24 96:8 |
| 82:13 130:19 (19) | 98:25 (5) | 66:10 67:22 76:12 | martinez 128:25 | 97:4,13 98:7,21 |
| | | 78:8 80:17,24 | | 99:1 100:5 |
| live 6:1,11 7:6 | looks 5:22 120:17 | 83:4 84:19 | martinezclass | 101:6,11,16,20 |
| 108:15 (4) | | 85:2,13 89:24 | 4:18 129:22,23,25 | 102:2,11,15,17 |
| | loopholes 53:4 | 91:22 98:1 | 130:2 134:16 (6) | 103:6,14,18 104:2 |
| lives 145:2 | 139:14,17 142:16 | 99:8,25 103:18 | | 105:14,22 |
| , •=, •= •= •= | (4) | 107:17 111:16 | mass 130:11 | 106:16,19 |
| living 63:15 | | 113:6 114:21 | | 107:1,3,6,6,13 |
| 99:3,5 103:16 | lot 12:19,23 18:8 | 115:6 132:14 | material 64:8 | 107:1,3,0,0,13 |
| 112:23 (5) | 19:20 21:14 23:23 | 133:24 144:8 (41) | material OT.O | 110:2,11,15,24 |
| 112.23 (3) | 26:6,9 28:11 | 133.27 177.0 (71) | materially 10:23 | 110.2,11,13,24 |
| liz 79:11,23 80:9 | 57:6,11 61:23 | makes 51:22 | materially 10.23 | 112:2,5,11,20,22 |
| 81:25 (4) | 79:20 85:14 | 55:21 63:2 131:22 | math 30:6 31:10 | 114:15,20 |
| 01.23 (4) | | | | , |
| local 100.2 | 93:16,19 98:22 | 140:9,12 (6) | 57:5,6 (4) | 115:13,20 |
| local 100:3 | 114:12 126:25 | | | 116:19,22,25 |
| | 134:12 135:20 | making 14:11 | mathematical | 117:9,12,15,24 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 118:20,24 | md 4:12,20 | meetings 12:17 | michael 3:10 | mission 60:25 |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 119:11,15 | , | 114:10 | 4:6,8 7:5 98:13 | 61:7,9 84:24 (4) |
| 120:7,13 121:25 | me 5:23 44:14 | | 104:19,22 | , , , , , , |
| 122:21 | 46:18 47:14 48:20 | member 3:5,6,8, | 108:23,24 109:4 | mistagged 37:18 |
| 123:1,14,23,24 | 60:1,13 62:19 | 9,11,12,14,15,17,1 | 112:16 113:21,22 | |
| 124:25 125:3 | 63:3,3,14 65:1 | 8,20,21 4:2,4 | 116:1 (14) | mistake 33:14 |
| 126:8,16 127:6 | 87:20,25 91:3 | 11:23 16:5 22:1 | , , | 47:11 142:23 |
| 130:9 131:1,4 | 98:10 100:8 | 61:20 62:24 70:14 | microphones | |
| 132:11,15 | 101:5,23 103:22 | 71:19 72:5 89:8 | 86:18 | mistakes 43:13 |
| 133:5,8,10,13 | 105:4 106:13,23 | 98:12,13,15 | | 58:15 |
| 134:18,20 135:22 | 112:17 115:4 | 99:12,17 103:24 | midst 84:6 | |
| 139:11 141:8 | 120:3 125:18 | 104:5,18 105:6 | | mitigate 118:1 |
| 142:15 143:14,20 | 129:4 137:14 | 110:12 114:6,21 | might 5:23 16:22 | |
| 145:10,15,24,25 | 138:20 139:10 | 123:20 129:10 | 46:1 73:18,25 (5) | mitigated 52:24 |
| 146:4,11,15,20,21 | 145:21 (32) | 137:23 149:3 (39) | | 59:11 118:12 |
| 148:2,6,9,18 149:6 | | | mike 146:6 | |
| (214) | mean 48:6 49:16 | members 3:1 | | mitigating 21:2,3 |
| | 52:8 54:23 60:14 | 17:10,24 18:13 | miles 150:6 | 22:12,24 23:12,19 |
| matt 106:7 | 68:17,23 74:19 | 42:24 43:9 44:15 | | 24:19 25:18 |
| | 75:2 89:15 144:4 | 51:19 91:25 93:7 | military 137:24 | 28:12,14 31:24 |
| matter 52:7 | (11) | 99:4 122:15 | | 34:12 |
| 73:2,5,6 152:14 | . 20.46 | 124:20 133:17 | mind 117:24 | 35:1,12,14,15,23 |
| (5) | meaning 29:16 | 134:9 135:13 | 135:16 | 44:1 46:22 |
| 110.24 | 70:13 74:17 | 138:22,24 143:8 | | 58:14,21 |
| maximize 110:24 | | 147:12 148:25 | minimum | 60:5,7,12,19,22 |
| • | meaningful | 149:22,23 (23) | 34:17,24 | 61:8,11,20 62:23 |
| maximum | 103:12 117:13,19 | 102.12 | 22.4.22.7 | 65:10 67:24 78:15 |
| 34:17,24 | 118:2 133:21 (5) | memo 102:13 | minor 22:4 23:7 | 81:15 84:18 |
| mov. 7.11 40.0 | maaninalaa | memorandum | minutes 15.10 | 117:16 118:13 |
| may 7:11 48:8 50:24 68:11 71:20 | meaningless 101:21 139:18 | 15:14 59:4 | minutes 15:19 98:4 135:16 | (37) |
| 73:5,14 117:22 | 101.21 139.16 | 13.14 39.4 | 96.4 133.10 | mitigative 44:8 |
| 119:5 126:12 | means 18:3 27:23 | momos 65:1/1 | misconduct | 47:23 |
| 150:16 (11) | 28:4 39:7 50:8 | 11101105 05.14 | 10:11,25 12:5,22 | 47.23 |
| 130.10 (11) | 61:1 79:18 132:4 | mentioned 33:17 | 13:4 29:15 37:22 | mobilizations |
| maybe 21:16 | (8) | 116:25 118:8 | 56:20,23,24,25 | 130:11 |
| 23:3,5,6 24:1 | | 123:20 (4) | 59:11 60:16 62:4 | 130.11 |
| 26:11 62:16 75:13 | mechanism | 123.20 (1) | 68:15,18 | modify 111:22 |
| (8) | 147:22 | mere 110:16 | 95:4,4,15,20 | |
| | | | 100:23 105:24 | moment 12:14 |
| mayor 8:19,20 | mechanisms | merely 102:12 | 111:3 117:8 118:6 | 56:6 90:16 91:3 |
| 9:8 13:2,7,24 | 112:9 145:13 | 107:1 | 119:3 121:1,11 | 132:14 141:6 (6) |
| 44:21,21 103:15 | | | 124:2 127:15 | |
| 112:18 113:12 | media 105:7 | merits 8:13 | 131:10 132:7 | monitor 63:9 |
| 120:9 124:9,13,22 | | | 133:16 134:8 (34) | 104:12 146:21 |
| 126:24 132:15 | medical 131:13 | message 12:3 | , , | |
| 140:22 (18) | 135:25 136:10,12 | | misleading 62:22 | months 11:1 |
| | 137:3,5 (6) | messaging 110:8 | 63:1 | 63:16 83:2 87:16 |
| mayor's 13:1,9 | | | | 88:3,3 97:20,21 |
| 43:19 140:10 (4) | meeting 1:3 2:1,3 | method 49:2 50:7 | miss 8:6 | 111:4 124:6,6 |
| | 5:8,12 16:11 | 51:13 | | 141:12 (12) |
| mayoral 6:2,5 | 94:10 98:19 (8) | | missed 113:8 | |
| 7:15 | | metric 109:15 | | more 12:20 13:13 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 15:4 16:23 17:8 | 107:8,12,21,24 | 146:10 | naive 124:11 | negotiated |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 19:1 23:4,6 27:9 | 119:17 122:1 | 147:9,10,11,17 | | 112:19 |
| 29:18 31:2,3 | 133:22 147:3 (37) | 149:18 150:19 | name 5:25 | 112.17 |
| 41:21 43:8 56:8 | 133.22 117.3 (37) | (102) | 6:4,13,23 7:5,20 | negotiations |
| 72:2 74:7,8 | mous 15:3 | (102) | 49:24 53:5 | 123:9 |
| 78:9,11 79:9,9 | mous 15.5 | much 29:1 | 91:6,11 109:4 | 125.7 |
| 80:10 81:3,5 | mouthpieces | 42:11,20 43:22 | 116:5 122:15 | never 36:20 |
| 1 | 140:12 | * | 125:13 129:7 | |
| 91:18 93:16 | 140:12 | 72:16,20 78:9 | | 39:6,8,14 40:19 |
| 95:12,18 | 06.12.14.16 | 81:5 90:17 98:17 | 130:1 135:19 | 126:19 (6) |
| 100:9,13,20 114:5 | move 96:12,14,16 | 99:10 100:19 | 145:11 (18) | 2.9 4.2 4.7 |
| 121:13 122:2 | 99:8 143:22 144:6 | 113:3 115:25 | 5.6 | new 2:8 4:2,4,7 |
| 128:11 129:14 | 145:17,18 151:3 | 120:6 125:6 | names 5:6 | 9:17 10:10 |
| 130:6 133:23 | (9) | 126:11 (17) | 2 10 7 21 | 11:16,18 12:3,6 |
| 138:21 145:4,14 | | | nathan 3:18 7:21 | 13:1,3,15 14:4 |
| 146:4 (43) | moved 150:19 | multiple 21:17 | 144:24 | 15:8 17:1,13 18:7 |
| | | 22:10 31:18 | | 19:3 27:20 36:8 |
| moreover 118:20 | movement 141:5 | 100:22 127:15 (5) | nation's 130:22 | 46:14 91:9,10 |
| | | | | 94:19,25 96:11 |
| morgan 122:13 | moves 101:16 | multitasking | nationally 130:13 | 100:2 |
| 128:24 | | 120:6 | | 101:15,18,24 |
| | moving 144:1 | | nearly 132:24 | 102:11 |
| morganrandell | 145:19 | must 94:20 123:5 | | 103:4,12,20 104:6 |
| 4:17 129:3,6,8 (4) | | | necessarily 28:18 | 108:12 109:5 |
| | mpa 4:17 | mute 65:2 146:9 | 147:20 | 110:18 112:25 |
| morning 99:25 | - | | | 116:10 127:1 |
| | ms 5:1,24,25 | my 5:16,18,25 | necessary 37:3 | 128:6,10 |
| mos 21:25 24:14 | 6:3,4,7,8,22,23 7:1 | 6:4,13,23 7:5,20 | 43:9 103:2 109:23 | 130:14,25 |
| 27:24 29:8 30:23 | 16:16 44:19,25 | 11:5 13:2 | 128:1 (5) | 132:22,25 |
| 31:15,23 35:11 (8) | 46:6,7,8 | 16:17,20 42:16 | () | 133:18,23 |
| | 47:1,2,3,8,10,12 | 43:18 46:3 | neck 51:8 | 134:1,22 146:17 |
| most 16:20,24 | 48:15,23,24 | 47:19,20 51:17 | | 147:6,21 148:14 |
| 19:3 24:25 31:22 | 49:9,14,16 51:24 | 53:11 56:1 59:3 | need 8:25 40:21 | 152:3,5,8 (59) |
| 41:2 42:4 62:16 | 52:3,17 53:25 | 64:4 65:1 | 41:9 58:12 68:5 | 102.0,0,0 (0) |
| 112:3 (9) | 55:4,21 56:5 | 66:19,23 67:3,15 | 72:14 78:14 | next 60:16 87:1 |
| 112.5 () | 57:11 67:20 68:23 | 78:18 88:15 | 79:8,15 84:1 85:3 | 88:7 94:9 |
| mother 133:1 | 70:16 72:11 | 91:4,24 97:11 | 92:21 93:18 97:7 | 104:16,18,25 |
| 11001101 133.1 | 74:1,23 75:21,25 | 100:9,12 101:23 | 113:7 115:7 | 105:2 107:9,19,23 |
| motion 43:4,6 | 76:7,12 77:19,20 | 103:22 109:3 | 120:16 128:7 | 108:20,22 |
| 91:20 93:6 96:17 | 79:5 82:3 83:25 | 113:9 114:7 116:5 | 134:1 137:5 | 113:19,22 115:23 |
| 138:23 149:22 | 84:10 85:7,7,9 | 122:15,19 125:12 | 138:4,10 | 116:1 119:18,20 |
| 150:17 (8) | 86:4 87:1,9,19 | 129:7 130:1,5 | 143:19,19 | 121:23 122:8,11 |
| 150.17 (0) | 88:8,11 89:23 | 135:19 143:4 | 145:4,17 146:23 | 125:7,9 128:22,23 |
| motivation 101:5 | 90:3,4 91:21,22 | 146:19 149:2 | 150:15 (28) | 129:18,21 134:14 |
| mouvation 101.3 | 97:25 98:17 99:18 | | 130.13 (20) | ′ |
| mon 0.14 10.4 15 | | 152:16 (51) | noods 40.5 65.05 | 135:5,7 137:9,11 |
| mou 9:14 10:4,15 | 104:17 105:2,4,6,9 | mymia d 0.25 | needs 40:5 65:25 | (33) |
| 11:7 15:22 16:2 | 107:22 108:19,22 | myriad 9:25 | 66:5 92:8 112:7 | night 12.24 12.0 |
| 59:22,25 60:2 | 113:21 115:25 | | 128:10 149:8 (7) | night 12:24 13:8 |
| 63:21,22,25 | 116:4 119:20 | myself 80:9 | | |
| 64:5,8,16 65:13,16 | 122:10 125:9,11 | 144:14 147:12 | negligence 33:19 | nine 20:3 |
| 66:11 84:13 | 128:23 | 40.10 | 1. | • 4 20 0 |
| 86:13,20 89:14 | 129:3,6,20,23,25 | na 48:19 | negligent | nineteen 30:8 |
| 92:17,24 97:5,8,10 | 134:16 135:6 | | 28:21,24,24 36:13 | |
| 104:3 106:1 | 137:10 139:3,6 | nail 85:25 | (4) | ninety 56:8 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 67:9 18 14:14 3:22 123:14 6 142:17 (6) 92:19 7 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 72:20 91:2 92:4 95:1 99:9 100:4 102:6 103:20 105:18 109:21 110:1,4,9,23 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | obviously 79:8 80:2 108:1 occur 66:22 occurred 10:12 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) occurrence 122:5 | 117:19 118:3,15,19 119:1 120:23 121:9 123:2 125:4 127:19 129:16 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 (41) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 67:9 19 14:14 3:22 123:14 5 142:17 (6) 92:19 5 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 102:6 103:20 105:18 109:21 110:1,4,9,23 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | 80:2 108:1 occur 66:22 occurred 10:12 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 120:23 121:9 123:2 125:4 127:19 129:16 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 67:9 19 14:14 3:22 123:14 5 142:17 (6) 92:19 5 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 102:6 103:20 105:18 109:21 110:1,4,9,23 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | occurred 10:12 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 120:23 121:9 123:2 125:4 127:19 129:16 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 92:19 130:7 125 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 105:18 109:21 110:1,4,9,23 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | occurred 10:12 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 123:2 125:4 127:19 129:16 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 92:19 92:19 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 110:1,4,9,23 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | occurred 10:12 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 127:19 129:16 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 3:22 123:14 5 142:17 (6) 92:19 5 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 111:1,20 112:10 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 130:18 131:5 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 92:19 92:19 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 118:15 120:24 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | 54:25 67:1 107:2 130:12 (5) | 132:2,3,6 133:15 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 92:19 ; 130:7 2:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 123:16 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | 130:12 (5) | 134:4,7 136:18 |
| 92:19 ; 130:7 9:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 124:9,13,14,21 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | , , | ŕ |
| ; 130:7 0:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 126:10,24 127:3 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | occurrence 122:5 | (41) |
| 2:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 128:1,17 130:8,15,18 | occurrence 122.3 | I |
| 0:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | 130:8,15,18 | | officers' 121:17 |
| 0:25 11:2,5 17:5 18:2 | ′ ′ | ocspray 34:4 | officers 121.17 |
| 17:5 18:2 | 12212121605 | ocspray 54.4 | official 11.20 |
| | 132:3,13,16,25 | ee 7.00 26.02 | official 11:20 |
| | 133:12,14 140:10 | off 7:20 36:23 | 132:21 |
| | 141:16 145:1 | 55:17 114:6 (4) | 00 1 1 100 10 |
| | 146:16,18,22 | 00 101 12 | officials 102:19 |
| | 147:5,23 148:16 | offenses 101:13 | 109:16 |
| | (52) | 119:1 | 00 . 27.1- |
| | | | offset 25:17 |
| | | | |
| | | | often 19:3 102:16 |
| | · · | (6) | 137:18 |
| 8:11,20 | 123:19 126:21 | | |
| 84:17 | 130:25 131:2,3 | offered 129:15 | oh 23:3,6 47:12 |
| 1 89:15 | 133:8,10,22 | | 67:5 73:18 120:5 |
| 5:21 96:23 | 134:18 (15) | office 2:6 14:17 | 144:13 (7) |
| 114:2 | | | |
| | nypdgenerated | officer 17:22,25 | old 2:7 |
| 6,7,11,13,19 | 112:7 | 18:5,21 21:12,25 | |
| 143:15 | | 22:2 24:5,9 | once 41:23 57:7 |
| 150:11 | o 1:15 | 27:10,21 32:1 | 70:23 71:5 (4) |
| | | 35:5 39:7 40:19 | |
| | objective 109:11 | 41:20 46:16 54:15 | one 15:5 |
| | 139:19,22 | 55:15 60:14 62:3 | 17:20,22,23 |
| 29:12 31:11 | | 68:18,25 69:8,22 | 18:1,21,21 19:12 |
| 15 39:17 | objectively 33:14 | 70:3,10 72:5 | 20:18 21:20 |
| 5:24 123:11 | | 95:19 100:10,13 | 28:2,5,13 29:17 |
| | obligations | 114:18 117:25 | 30:15 33:10 34:15 |
| | 64:17,19 | 122:21,23 124:1 | 35:10 36:18 |
| | , | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 39:23,24 41:20 |
| | obscure 132:18 | | 51:5,9 52:21 59:6 |
| , , - | | officer's 40:16.25 | 60:14 64:25 66:13 |
| berg | obscures 132:11 | | 69:4 72:9 74:6 |
| 0 | 0.5504105 152.11 | | 79:19 81:20 87:12 |
| | observed 115·2 | | 89:24 91:18,22 |
| | 55561 (CH 113.2 | officers 23·24 | 92:7 95:25 97:17 |
| | obstruction | | 106:17,20 107:15 |
| | | | 111:10 |
| | 120.0 | | 114:9,14,17 |
| 111:25 | ohtain 135:25 | | 114.9,14,17 |
| 111.43 | UUtaiii 133.23 | | 124:1 127:7,17,24 |
| 0.20 17.16 | obvious 111.5 | * | 137:17 139:11 |
| | 140:2 | 101:8 102:8 103:9 | 141:16 144:7 |
| | | | |
| | 6:5 37:25 1:6 43:21 49:13 7 64:15 68:17,20 84:17 1 89:15 5:21 96:23 0 114:2 6,7,11,13,19 143:15 1 150:11 er 23:1 29:12 31:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 1,14,20 hberg 0 1 31:21 22:22 123:3 (5) 111:25 9:20 17:16 | 6:5 37:25 1:6 43:21 49:13 7 64:15 68:17,20 8:11,20 84:17 1 89:15 5:21 96:23 0 114:2 166,7,11,13,19 143:15 1450:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 39:17 5:24 123:11 15 objective 109:11 139:19,22 objectively 33:14 objectively 33:14 | 6:5 37:25 1:6 43:21 49:13 7 64:15 68:17,20 8:11,20 81:10 81:17 1 89:15 5:21 96:23 134:18 (15) 119:1 offensive 19:25 31:20,22 32:3,8,17 (6) 8:11,20 84:17 1 30:25 131:2,3 1 89:15 5:21 96:23 134:18 (15) 114:2 nypdgenerated 112:7 office 2:6 14:17 office 17:22,25 18:5,21 21:12,25 22:2 24:5,9 27:10,21 32:1 35:5 39:7 40:19 41:20 46:16 54:15 55:24 123:11 objective 109:11 139:19,22 office 2:6 14:17 office 12:6 14:17 office 2:6 14:17 office 17:22,25 18:5,21 21:12,25 22:2 24:5,9 27:10,21 32:1 35:5 39:7 40:19 41:20 46:16 54:15 55:15 60:14 62:3 68:18,25 69:8,22 70:3,10 72:5 95:19 100:10,13 114:18 117:25 122:21,23 124:1 136:15 138:3 (38) officer's 40:16,25 41:8 54:23 78:13 (5) officers 23:24 24:3,11,18 25:10 26:24 35:17 37:6 41:17 46:21 54:5 61:25 62:23 69:3,19 95:14 |

| 145:3 (59) | opposed 21:5 84:21 141:16,23 | 84:2 87:11 90:8,10 91:1 | outweighs 22:24 | panels 17:7 61:24 68:23 70:7 78:1 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|
| onehundred 84:1 | 149:16 151:1 (6) | 92:3,16,17 94:3 | over 15:23 16:14 | 79:3,6,24 80:9 |
| 148:4 | 149.10 131.1 (0) | 101:16 109:7 | 18:6 42:18 55:17 | 82:1 (10) |
| 140.4 | annagitian | 114:10,16 127:8 | 67:14,21 68:1 | 62.1 (10) |
| ones 34:22 | opposition 141:13 | 129:2 135:9 | 74:13 121:23 | nantalaa |
| | 141.13 | | | pantaleo |
| 146:14 | | 136:18 138:20 | 122:20 123:13 | 100:10,21 101:2 |
| 07.24 | option 92:16,24 | 140:7,23 | 126:18 127:13 | |
| oneway 87:24 | 01 12 | 141:1,2,17,21,22 | 130:16 134:20 | pantaleo's |
| 04.14 | options 81:12 | 142:17,19,19 | 141:20,20 147:15 | 101:10 |
| oneyear 94:14 | • • • • • • • | 146:19 150:14 | (19) | |
| 96:5 | order 2:4 41:10 | (70) | | paragraph 64:22 |
| | 70:6,12 73:12,14 | | overall 17:13 | 68:9 |
| online 144:10 | 83:21 101:7 115:8 | ourselves 142:5 | | |
| | 120:20 128:2 (11) | 146:16 147:24 | overdue 100:3 | part 35:25 45:18 |
| only 11:14 20:13 | | | | 52:18 59:15 71:20 |
| 21:20 22:9 26:16 | ordered 138:2,7 | out 23:20 | overhauled | 75:22 82:4 87:11 |
| 28:5 29:15 30:15 | | 24:8,11,19 25:17 | 124:24 | 92:23 107:23,24 |
| 32:7,20 35:11 | orders 137:18,20 | 28:20 31:25 39:2 | | 108:10,15 150:14 |
| 38:5 41:16 52:10 | | 41:12 51:7 52:20 | overly 132:13 | (14) |
| 66:21 68:18 82:15 | organizations | 66:2 70:1 73:10 | | , |
| 86:10,22 103:12 | 132:24 135:1 | 92:15 100:5 104:3 | override 102:1,4 | partial 88:22 |
| 114:17 119:3 | 132.2 (133.1 | 107:10,11,15 | 0 102.1,1 | partial 00.22 |
| 141:11 142:25 | orientation 58:18 | 115:12,16 116:1 | oversight 11:16 | participants 66:7 |
| 145:22 (25) | orientation 50.10 | 120:16 127:23 | 13:1 14:4 111:23 | participants 00.7 |
| 143.22 (23) | other 9:5 15:20 | 134:17 136:24 | (4) | participate 40:14 |
| opaque 126:5 | 23:20 24:3,11,17 | 145:12 147:3 | (4) | 41:10 |
| opaque 120.3 | | | 57.21 | 41.10 |
| | 25:10 38:15 43:8 | 151:7 (30) | overt 57:21 | |
| opaqueness | 46:4 48:13 | | 100 14 | participation |
| 132:16 | 49:2,11,23 53:11 | outcome | overtime 100:14 | 61:16 |
| | 56:3 66:12 67:6 | 33:23,25 34:5,11 | | |
| open 11:8 15:17 | 101:2 105:25 | 53:2 75:18 152:14 | overturned 85:20 | particular 58:11 |
| 43:6 88:12 93:6 | 106:4 108:2 | (7) | | 59:22 |
| 94:8 96:24 (7) | 112:10 116:16 | | own 12:3 | |
| | 121:10 143:7 | outlined 62:13 | 13:18,20 38:3 | particularity |
| opened 88:15 | 145:12 (27) | 133:4 | 95:8 102:8 111:16 | 65:5 |
| 89:8 114:16 | | | 141:17 142:4 (9) | |
| | others 76:11 | outreach 15:22 | | particularly 15:3 |
| operating 109:24 | 92:10 93:20 | 16:8 | packet 94:23 | 117:6 150:1,2 (4) |
| • 6 | 132:10 (4) | | | , , , |
| operation 69:5 | | outreach@ccrbn | page 59:8 60:9 | parties 113:2 |
| Principal Color | our 9:6,7 10:7 | ycgov 98:10 | 62:21 68:6 140:2 | 152:12 |
| opinion 61:25 | 11:21,22,23,24 | , 250, 70.10 | (5) | |
| 146:19 | 12:2 13:17,20 | outside 15:21 | | parts 144:8 |
| 170.17 | 14:5,19,25 15:22 | 55:25 70:15 98:9 | pain 83:5 | Parts 177.0 |
| opportunities | 14.5,19,25 15.22 16:8 17:5,7,21 | (4) | pam 65.5 | pass 141:7 |
| opportunities 148:1 | 20:17 25:8 30:10 | (1) | painful 100:21 | pass 141./ |
| 170.1 | | autatandina | painiui 100.21 | negged 100.2 |
| annout | 33:3 37:4 42:23 | outstanding | mamage= 140.10 | passed 100:2 |
| opportunity 9:16 | 45:12,19 58:25 | 114:11 | panacea 148:18 | 110:14,18 |
| 10:18 11:1 15:13 | 62:14 64:18 67:24 | | | 1.40.00 |
| 60 10 00 1 00 10 | 69:10 70:7 | outweigh 23:12 | pandora's 88:13 | passes 149:22 |
| 63:12 92:1 93:10 | | | L | 1 |
| 63:12 92:1 93:10 125:12 (8) | 74:15,17,19,21,25 75:6 77:9 83:19 | 35:1 | panel 8:17,25 | past 11:15 14:1 |

| 54:18,22 55:2,9,20 | persistently | plaza 111:10 | 114:18 117:8,10 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | |
| 56:7 57:23 58:1 | 111:4 | _ | 120:23 |
| 62:5,11 68:11 | | plea 76:22,24 | 123:2,7,12,15 |
| ′ | nerson 24·7 8 11 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 124:1,24 125:4 |
| | <u> </u> | 77.1 137.22 (1) | 128:9 130:3,13,22 |
| | | nlead 69:20 | 131:6,9 132:4,12 |
| | | picau 07.20 | 134:23,25,25 |
| 120.17 130.3 (72) | * | place 75.10 | |
| | | pieas 73.19 | 136:8,15,18,20 |
| | | 15.10.22 | 137:1 138:5 |
| | 138:12 (20) | <u> </u> | 139:15 140:4,5 |
| | | | 142:2 144:3 150:4 |
| 138:11,15,17 (9) | _ | | (81) |
| | 88:22 | | |
| | | | police's 142:4 |
| | | | |
| 55:24 73:18 86:11 | 115:1 | * | policies 129:16 |
| 94:19 96:10 | | 129:5,19,24 | 131:2 142:4 |
| 116:24 120:24 | personnel 40:18 | 134:15 135:5,16 | |
| 123:2 125:4 | - | 137:9 149:14,17 | policing 11:16 |
| 134:12 135:21 | pertained 91:15 | 150:23 (26) | 12:2 13:14,18 |
| 136:8,12,19,21 | • | , , | 15:8 130:15 |
| | physical 20:18.22 | plurality 62:15 | 140:6,8 (8) |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | <u> </u> | F | |
| | | pm 1:5 151:10 | policy 4:7 61:15 |
| ner 89·14 14 | * | PIII 1.0 101.10 | 109:5 129:13 |
| pci 05.11,11 | 10.10 57.22 (11) | noint 8:12 52:20 | 141:15 (5) |
| nerceive | nicked 53:15 | | 141.13 (3) |
| - | picked 33.13 | | political 142:21 |
| 73.10,23 | nilat 04:14 | | ponucai 142.21 |
| nomoont 94.1 | pnot 94.14 | | noliticiona |
| <u>.</u> | | | politicians |
| 123:10 148:5 | photea /4:15 | 122:19 124:9 (15) | 142:12 |
| 20.24 | | 72.10 | 27.16 |
| percentage 38:24 | | | pop 37:16 |
| | , and the second | 107:11,15 | |
| | (4) | | popular 19:2 |
| 123:11 | | points 63:18 83:6 | |
| | 1 | | population |
| perfect 112:23 | | 1 | 137:25 |
| | 101:14 109:12 | 8:2,21,22 | |
| performance | 118:4 123:24 | 9:8,16,23 10:25 | portion 38:8 49:7 |
| 140:22 | 148:8 (9) | 11:16 | 135:10 |
| | | 12:7,19,21,25 13:4 | |
| performative | placed 127:10 | 14:3,7,14 21:12 | portions 113:5 |
| 140:11 | - | 33:4 38:20 | • |
| | plagues 130:21 | | position 82:24 |
| period 27:22 | . 0 | * | 107:20 |
| | plaintiff's 116.9 | | · 5 · · · · · · · |
| | r | * | positive 60:10 |
| | nlan 13·8·25 | | 125:23 |
| neriodically | | , | 1 40,40 |
| | 01.23 | | possible 9:14 |
| 150.12 | nlay 30.7 68.7 | * | 140:25 141:7 |
| | <u> </u> | 111.3,3,10,12 | 170.43 141./ |
| permanent 10:21 | 70:19 121:22 (4) | 1 1 7 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 | |
| | 76:2,6,7 81:18,19 83:7 84:25 95:19 118:2,10,17 120:17 136:3 (72) pension 48:10,13 49:22 71:21 72:19,20 138:11,15,17 (9) people 26:13 33:11 43:17 50:21 55:24 73:18 86:11 94:19 96:10 116:24 120:24 123:2 125:4 134:12 135:21 136:8,12,19,21 137:2 141:23,23 148:14 150:2 (24) per 89:14,14 perceive 73:18,25 percent 84:1 123:10 148:5 percentages 123:11 perfect 112:23 performance 140:22 performative 140:11 period 27:22 28:3 85:12 86:2 95:25 96:5 (6) periodically 150:12 | 76:2,6,7 81:18,19 83:7 84:25 95:19 118:2,10,17 120:17 136:3 (72) pension 48:10,13 49:22 71:21 72:19,20 138:11,15,17 (9) people 26:13 33:11 43:17 50:21 55:24 73:18 86:11 94:19 96:10 116:24 120:24 123:2 125:4 134:12 135:21 136:8,12,19,21 137:2 141:23,23 148:14 150:2 (24) per 89:14,14 perceive 73:18,25 per 89:14,14 percent 84:1 123:10 148:5 percentage 38:24 performance 140:22 performative 140:11 period 27:22 28:3 85:12 86:2 95:25 96:5 (6) periodically 150:12 play 39:2 68:2 play 39:2 68:2 | 76:2,6,7 81:18,19 33:7 84:25 95:19 118:2,10,17 26:11,23 27:3,5,6 28:1 29:3,4 40:5 28:1 29:3,4 40:5 28:1 29:3,4 40:5 28:1 29:3,4 50:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 28:1 29:3,4 60:5 29:2 10:2 10:2 10:2 10:2 21:10:2 122:8 113:19 114:1 115:23 119:19 29:2 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122:8 120:2 122: |

| | | | -1.10 | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| possibly 101:4 | presentation 2:6 15:10 16:4,18 | 147:16 (13) | 61:10 | protect 132:19 |
| potential 13:4,10 29:19 83:5 117:18 | 42:17,21 49:18 60:6 67:12 | prioritize 110:6 | professions 101:2 | protecting 126:23 |
| (5) | 114:4,9 (11) | prisons 136:13 | program 94:15 | protection 61:2 |
| potentially | presented 64:6 | probable 24:2 | progress 12:23 | • |
| 82:8,10,20 | presenter 3:23 | probably 53:10 | progressive | protesters 111:6 |
| power 102:3 132:14 142:7,17 | presents 92:1 | 80:8 82:9 | 34:15 39:16 40:15 41:11 58:19 | protests 13:19 |
| (4) | press 16:6 102:20 | probation 48:17 136:3 | 101:12 119:2,5 126:12 (9) | protocol 2:3 |
| practical 77:21 | press 10.0 102.20 | 130.3 | 120.12 ()) | proven 141:20 |
| 82:5 93:17 | pressure 100:20 | problem 7:12 86:8 87:2 | project 4:15 125:14 | provide 38:6 |
| practice 50:12 | presumption | | | 41:13 109:11 |
| 69:10 132:2 142:1 (4) | 53:21 54:13 | problematic 131:2 135:22 | prolonged 22:8 | 132:19 (4) |
| practiceprocedur | presumptive 10:1 20:19,21,23 | 140:25 143:18 (4) | promise 87:8 125:21 | provided 40:19 78:3 128:4 |
| e 121:5 | 22:17,19 23:21 | problems 87:21 | | |
| practices 116:14 | 24:21 25:12,21,24 29:5 32:2,10 | 111:7 | promised 12:15 13:22 | provider 125:16 |
| 120:22 121:9 | 38:15 43:24 44:6 | procedural 77:21 | . 110.22 | provides 18:7 |
| 124:17 (4) | 47:22 54:21 57:23 58:1 62:5,11 | procedures | promises 110:23 126:3 128:12 | 118:3 |
| precedent 10:2 17:19 18:18 | 68:11 81:18 95:3 117:2 118:9 131:9 | 120:23 | 141:19 (4) | providing 14:5 78:25 90:12 92:13 |
| precinct 38:18,18 | (29) | proceed 42:22 43:10 99:2 135:14 | prongs 22:6 23:8 | (4) |
| preclude 97:19 | pretty 16:19 57:20 69:9 | (4) | propaganda 124:8 | public 1:3 2:1,9 4:1 6:9,21 8:15 |
| preciude 77.17 | 86:13,19 (5) | proceeding | 124.0 | 9:19 11:24 15:17 |
| precursor 109:23 | | 113:12 | proper 109:20 | 16:6 43:7 48:7 |
| predate 127:7 | prevent 55:18 123:21 | proceedings | properly 37:7,11 | 61:1,2,9 66:8 82:23 89:25 91:21 |
| • | | 73:15 | 67:10 | 93:7,10 95:18 |
| predatory 57:25 | previous 10:2 | process 11:23 | proposal 134:18 | 96:21,24 98:24 99:16,21 100:20 |
| preference 86:15 | primarily 134:22 | 45:5,12 66:3,7 | • | 103:8 105:21 |
| premises 25:8 | primary 101:5 | 78:6 82:25 88:4,16 89:17,20 | propose 94:13 | 108:9 109:15 112:4 114:16,21 |
| premises 23.0 | 117:4 | 93:21 95:18 101:7 | proposed 43:5 | 116:17 128:15 |
| prepare 63:25 | | 103:8 104:1,8,12 | 116:19 119:16 | 130:19 133:8,17 |
| prepared 97:10 | principle 54:11 | 115:10 121:22 142:14 (21) | propositions | 135:9 138:9,20 143:24 144:9 |
| • | principles 126:13 | ` , | 53:18 112:1 | 147:25 149:24 |
| presence 25:7 | nuion 00:0 07:10 | processed 89:9 | nmagac4s J 10:12 | 150:2 (49) |
| 44:15 61:19 | prior 22:2 27:10 28:5 29:14 41:3 | produce 128:1 | prosecuted 10:12 | publicly 125:22 |
| present 3:1 11:15 | 56:11,23,23 60:17 | • | prosecution 10:8 | |
| | 62:13 67:1 105:14 | professionalism | 86:15 96:4 | publish 13:20 |
| | | | | |

| pull 24:11,18 | 115:11,18 135:14 | rank 28:9 68:7 | 142:16 145:4,13 | recommend 10:3 |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| , | (32) | 138:6 | (33) | 54:16 95:9 |
| puma 3:9 | (82) | 100.0 | (88) | 020 >0> |
| 6:16,17,18 43:2 | questions 16:1 | rare 52:10 122:5 | reason 11:14 | recommendation |
| 47:25 48:4,5,14 | 42:25 43:2,7,8 | Tare 32.10 122.3 | 65:25 78:10 | 14:12 23:16 25:22 |
| · ' ' | / / | rate 74:16 | 106:24 124:3 | |
| 66:14,15,25 67:5 | 44:12,24 46:5 | | | 26:4 30:7,10 |
| 68:3 93:4,11,12 | 56:1,3 58:4 59:3 | 75:1,17 | 137:4 (6) | 33:21 38:22 |
| 96:13,14,16 (20) | 60:4 66:16 74:8 | 05.44 | | 40:1,9 45:2,3,6 |
| | 80:5 92:10,11 | rates 85:11 | reasonable 33:14 | 56:9 57:2,8 59:15 |
| punishment | 93:9,16 96:20,25 | | | 66:1 76:14 |
| 120:18 | 98:8,24 105:11 | rather 14:12 35:7 | reasoned 65:21 | 78:4,7,22 85:16 |
| | 114:12 115:13 | 44:22 112:6 (4) | | 87:17 102:2 |
| punishments | 138:21,23 (29) | | reasoning 91:4 | 106:25 122:7 (27) |
| 9:18 | , , , | rationales 84:16 | | , , |
| | guick 18:25 | | reasons 65:6 84:2 | recommendation |
| purpose 52:9 | 53:11 56:6 85:9 | reach 53:2 | 87:5 91:6 106:18 | s 8:24 10:7 17:14 |
| 61:1 63:6 | 91:23 97:2 150:16 | 115:12,16 | 138:14 (6) | 32:5 38:13 42:8 |
| 31.1 03.0 | (7) | 110,12,10 | 150.11(0) | 45:16,20,24 |
| purposes 20:16 | (') | reaching 116:1 | rebuild 126:25 | 62:14,15 64:18 |
| 23:10 106:15 | quickly 16:18,23 | reaching 110.1 | 127:18 | 80:16,19 83:19 |
| | | read 43:3 65:12 | 14/.10 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| 119:6 (4) | 22:22 28:16 (4) | | recall 62:25 63:5 | 86:7 90:10 96:2 |
| 10.0 | • 4 1447 | 71:23 93:4 | recall 62:23 63:3 | 111:17 (19) |
| pursue 10:9 | quiet 144:7 | 94:20,24 137:16 | . 40.22 | |
| | | 140:2 (8) | receive 49:22 | recommended |
| pursuing 134:7 | quietly 144:6 | | | 14:2 19:7 54:18 |
| | | readily 136:2 | received | 55:2 77:14 100:6 |
| push 128:17 | quite 124:16 | 146:12 | 27:13,21 41:24 | (6) |
| 145:4,14 146:4 (4) | 134:13 | | 127:21 (4) | |
| | | ready 135:13 | | recommending |
| pushing 147:14 | r 1:15,16 152:1 | 143:10 148:23 | receiving 100:14 | 17:15,17 32:20 |
| | | 149:10 151:5 (5) | _ | 41:19 55:19 79:2 |
| put 28:13 34:19 | race 26:10 | | recent 41:2 | (6) |
| 36:9 38:20 40:12 | | real 56:6 66:6 | 109:25 111:4 | , , |
| 74:16 79:11 80:25 | racially 116:13 | 128:13 | | recommends |
| 90:17 111:11 | | | recently 72:17 | 9:23 15:1 52:12 |
| 140:7,23 142:1 | racist 125:3 | reality 90:7 | 114:10 | 2.20 10.1 02.12 |
| 143:2 145:11 (15) | 140100 120.0 | 100:1 139:22 | 11 | recommitting |
| 173.2 173.11 (13) | raise 16:7 25:20 | 141:14 142:8 (5) | reckless 28:21 | 110:6 |
| puts 74:9 | 64:14 82:4 88:16 | 171.17 174.0 (3) | 33:19 | 110.0 |
| puis /+./ | 99:13 (6) | realize 99:5 | 33.17 | record |
| nutting 1/1.01 |))) (U) | I CAMEC 77.J | modrom 00.4 | |
| putting 141:21 | maina J 22.11 | mac II-v 0.15 16.10 | reckon 88:6 | 36:12,13,15 43:3 |
| | raised 33:11 | really 9:15 16:18 | | 58:7 63:7 67:22 |
| question 16:5 | 63:18,24 | 18:24 37:21 41:9 | recognition | 88:23 89:1,5,23 |
| 19:19 26:6 28:22 | | 60:18 61:6 64:5 | 120:9 | 90:20 93:5 94:21 |
| 39:23 44:4,25 | raiseyourhand | 65:16 71:3 78:3 | | 126:22 (15) |
| 48:4 49:15 51:9 | 98:2 | 80:13 83:4 | recognitions | |
| 52:18 53:8,11 | | 85:10,25 91:19 | 60:12 | recording |
| 67:6 71:9 | range 30:18,24 | 93:14 98:22 99:23 | | 36:16,20 |
| 74:7,9,14 76:20 | 31:14 35:7 100:6 | 102:23 104:5 | recognize 93:4 | |
| 77:21 78:18 93:22 | (5) | 119:14 120:13 | | records 88:17 |
| 94:8 97:2 105:25 | | 135:22 139:9 | recognized 149:8 | 111:3 |
| 106:7 107:8 | ranges 34:17,24 | 140:25 | | |
| 114:14,20 | 35:4 38:16 (4) | 141:2,6,9,25 | recognizing 8:10 | reexamine |
| ĺ | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 102:24 | 123:12 | repeatedly 118:16 | rescue 140:11 | 61:25 70:3 71:4 86:12 (4) |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| refer 75:15 76:1 | related 67:6 68:15 86:14 93:22 | mananagiana | research 45:13 | rest 36:24 51:10 |
| refine 113:5 | 105:25 152:11 (6) | repercussions 37:18 | reserve 15:18 | 54:8 |
| reflect 138:12 | relates 103:3 | replaced 33:18 | reset 9:16 108:11 | restrained 50:14 |
| reform 4:19 103:3 116:23 | relatively 78:6 | report 2:5 12:1 13:18 82:23 | resident 6:6,20 | restraint 49:2 50:7 51:13 52:1 |
| 130:4 (4) | release 67:2 | 102:16 (5) | resign 46:24 | (4) |
| reforming 110:5 146:17 | released 12:1 | reporter 152:7 | resignation 21:5 | restricting 50:21 |
| reforms 11:18 | releasing 13:17 | reports 78:2 | resisting 22:15 23:5,6 | result 21:8,11 39:3 46:11,15 |
| 127:3 | relevant 42:2 59:12 117:22 | represent 148:13 | reso 91:19 | 53:15,18 54:3 80:20 130:11 |
| refreshers 79:15 | rely 127:25 | representing 135:2 | resolution 43:3,5 | 133:21 (11) |
| refusal 135:25 | relying 141:18 | represents | 93:5 94:13,21 96:18 133:9 (7) | resulted 123:25 |
| refuse 140:20 | remain 14:19 | 148:19 | resolves 95:22 | results 49:5 94:16 |
| refused 136:9 | 46:16,21 140:19 (4) | reprimand 27:17 28:3 | resources 81:8 | retains 101:25 |
| regard 43:4 44:3 | | 20.0 | 100001000 0110 | 1000110 |
| 101:10 130:19 (4) | remaining 25:7 | reputations 140:12 | respect 14:16 61:10 62:21 88:13 | retaliatory 131:16 |
| regarding 38:11 94:13 109:8 | remains 116:22 | request 37:14 | 89:10 148:9,15 (7) | retention 126:18 |
| 116:18 129:12 (5) | remarks 66:24 | 41:15,22 | respected 101:19 | notino 46:24 |
| regardless 10:11 36:22 43:25 46:11 | remember 42:4 63:4 76:1 128:17 | requesting 148:6 | respecting 103:4 | retire 46:24 72:21 132:2,8 138:16 (5) |
| (4) | (4) | require 40:11 65:13 111:9 | respond 112:4 | retired 73:23,24 |
| regards 74:15 76:21 | reminder 98:3 | 112:25 148:3 (5) | response 5:19,21 7:10 8:7 88:14 | review 1:2 3:25 |
| regular 35:25 82:24 | removed 33:17 58:17 60:7 | required 65:5,9 100:4 102:16 (4) | 104:23 125:23 126:21 130:12 138:25 143:9 | 5:11 10:17 85:12 95:6 102:5 (7) |
| 62:24 regularly 134:24 | rendered 101:20 | requirement 38:19 44:5 59:19 | 138:23 143:9 144:18 146:8 149:12,20 151:2 | reviewed 58:10 83:3 97:18 |
| • | repair 126:4 | 64:14 65:8,17,21 | (16) | |
| rehired 73:22 | repeal 12:16 | 90:22 (8) | responsibilities | revise 103:17 |
| reiterate 90:6,21 | 13:23 | requires 84:11,13 | 35:15 36:1 58:22 | revised 63:25 |
| | repeat 101:12 | , | responsibility | revisit 11:2 63:15 |
| reject 111:21 133:8 | • | requiring 41:16 | 133:7 | 142:6 148:1 (4) |

| ridgway 5:5 | running 127:23 | 139:10 143:19 | seconds 21:20 | sentencing 10:10 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | _ | 144:15 147:2 | 22:9 120:12 | |
| right 8:8 11:13 | rush 111:15 | 149:3,14,17 | 134:14 (4) | separate 18:12 |
| 18:2 38:5,11 | | 150:24 (39) | . 444.5 | 30:4 48:11 72:22 |
| 44:19 47:12 64:9 | saddened 139:7 | . 545 | secret 111:3 | (4) |
| 68:20 75:2,24 | 9 4 9 5 4 9 | saying 76:17 | | . 50.11 |
| 76:8,9 77:18 | safety 26:19 | 124:23 142:6 | section 12:12 | separates 73:11 |
| 79:13 87:21,25 | 61:2,9 99:16 (4) | 26.22.26.14 | 64:22 119:2 | 4. 21.47 |
| 93:12 97:14 | | says 26:22 36:14 | 7.17 | separation 21:4,7 |
| 101:16 104:10 | said 16:24 23:11 | 48:16,19 56:7 | see 7:17 | 44:1 47:24 48:6 |
| 120:12 124:4 | 35:4 47:4 54:14 | 65:24 68:10 69:18 | 19:3,5,20 20:9 | 49:20 50:1 71:18 |
| 138:8 139:1 | 59:24 64:7 66:23 | 70:1,15 137:17 | 21:14 23:23 25:15 | (8) |
| 144:16,19,24 147:2 148:22 | 71:15 83:1 84:15 94:8,12 97:18 | (11) | 27:4 28:11 29:9 31:9 33:1 34:18 | gantamban |
| 147.2 148.22 149:10,13,21 (33) | 102:25 104:4 | scene 36:23 62:3 | 35:5 39:3 43:23 | september 116:15 132:23 |
| 149.10,13,21 (33) | 102.23 104.4 105:12 108:6 | 68:25 69:14,25 (5) | 46:2 47:21 | 110.13 132.23 |
| rights 4:11 12:11 | 112:22,24 113:15 | 00.43 07.14,43 (3) | 49:9,13,25 50:18 | sergeant 28:8 69: |
| 55:16 61:7 101:18 | 112.22,24 113.13 | schedule 25:25 | 56:10 59:17 66:2 | 1,2,4,7,14,15,18,2 |
| 103:4 116:8 134:2 | 117.5 154.10 (45) | 27:13,16 | 75:16 77:19 88:4 | 1,23,25 |
| (8) | sal 3:16 8:1 | 27.13,10 | 90:23 93:9 99:14 | 70:4,7,11,15 (15) |
| (0) | Sai 3.10 0.1 | screamed 31:25 | 101:11 106:10 | 70.4,7,11,13 (13) |
| rise 26:3 | samah 4:10 | screamed 31.23 | 121:23 138:21 | series 58:4 |
| 1150 20.3 | 113:23 116:2,5 (4) | screen 5:18 16:17 | 144:12 147:7 | SCIES 50.4 |
| rivadeneyra 3:10 | 113.23 110.2,3 (1) | 43:18 47:15,18 | 148:24 (39) | serious 20:17,22 |
| 7:3,4,6 71:13 | same 18:20 21:8 | 48:25 (6) | 110.21 (3)) | 21:10 34:7 47:5 |
| 74:3,6,21 75:14,20 | 27:12 32:6,12 | (0) | seeing 33:5 85:19 | 86:8,25 87:12 |
| 76:11,21 77:6,8 | 36:14 45:5 | scrutiny 8:16 | 150:13 | 88:6 119:12 142:9 |
| 144:20 (15) | 50:2,23 53:2 54:1 | , | | (11) |
| , , | 75:11 79:12,25 | scuffle 24:10 | seem 106:23 | |
| rivadeneyra's | 80:7 88:24 91:10 | | | seriously 8:24 |
| 71:12 | 111:1,1 123:25 | se 89:14,14 | seemed 58:15 | 112:1 |
| | 124:17 133:4 | | | |
| rivera 1:24 152:7 | 143:6 (23) | search 25:2,4 | seems 60:13 63:3 | serve 94:18 |
| | | 26:15 27:6 | 122:20 | 109:14 |
| road 88:4 | satisfies | 28:19,22,24 | | |
| | 32:7,9,13 | 29:4,7,25 | seen 90:9 130:17 | served 116:8 |
| room 10:13 | | 30:4,13,20 31:13 | | |
| 118:3 | saw 44:19 49:12 | 38:12 62:7,17 | sees 24:7 | serves 96:10 |
| , | 50:23 71:11 85:6 | 70:2,4 (19) | | |
| rose 4:3 98:13 | (5) | | semblance 101:6 | service 17:11 |
| 99:17,18 110:13 | 0.11.14.10.00 | searches 24:24 | 1 5 5 15 22 | 22:1 61:21 70:14 |
| 114:6 123:20 (7) | say 9:11 14:13,23 | 118:14 131:14,16 | send 5:5 15:22 | 71:20 72:6 (6) |
| | 20:16 21:24 | (4) | 18:19 | gommig=1= 60 04 |
| rubber 140:7 | 22:2,7 23:3,5 | good 110:0 140 12 | aan di ra = 07 4 | service's 62:24 |
| log 45.10 10 | 24:13 26:10 | seat 110:2 142:13 | sending 87:4 | annuia - 105.17 |
| rules 45:18,19 | 28:7,15 31:23 | gooond 56.17 | gonion 4.7 100.4 | services 125:17 |
| 109:16 111:19 (4) | 40:8 63:14 72:12 75:5 81:16,17 | second 56:17 64:25 75:22 92:16 | senior 4:7 109:4 | session 2:11 |
| run 18:8,16,18 | 86:4 88:1 | 96:19,21,22 107:7 | sense 63:3 78:11 | 150:16,18,23 |
| 30:5 32:14,23 | 91:13,16 103:24 | 150:20,21 (10) | 144:9 | 151:4 (5) |
| 39:18 52:7 74:24 | 112:17 114:5 | 130.20,21 (10) | 177./ | 131.7 (3) |
| (9) | 121:16 125:2 | secondly 138:10 | sent 18:5 112:13 | set 31:12 152:15 |
| | 127:24 136:19 | secondly 130.10 | Jene 10.5 112.15 | 500 51.12 152.15 |
| | 127.21 150.17 | | | |
| | | | | |

| settles 134:5 | shorthand 152:7 | signed 63:24 64:3 | sixmonth 85:12 | 75:13,21,25 |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | 106:2 107:9 121:3 | 86:1 | 76:10,13,17 |
| seven | should 9:21 | 133:2 (6) | | 77:5,10 78:18 |
| 30:1,11,12,22 (4) | 10:20 14:3,9 16:2 | | sixteen 132:24 | 79:21 80:7,11,22 |
| 122.10 | 29:2 33:22 35:11 | significance | 122 12 | 81:2,4,13,20 82:22 |
| seventy 123:10 | 37:24 38:3 60:18 | 109:18 | sixty 123:10 | 83:24 84:7 |
| 132:24 | 61:4,19 63:8,9 | | | 85:4,17 86:15,21 |
| | 78:24 79:1 80:16 | signing 120:24 | skepticism 91:24 | 87:19,22 88:24 |
| several 117:17 | 83:7,13 84:24 | 06.10 | | 89:9,25 |
| 126:2 | 88:18 89:2,4,13,13 | silence 86:18 | skin 22:6 | 90:2,14,17,21 |
| 1 121 10 | 91:19 99:15 102:6 | 2.01 | 1 100 00 | 91:2,11,18 92:19 |
| severely 131:19 | 111:11,15 115:7 | simmons 3:21 | skipped 122:20 | 93:10 94:7,12,23 |
| | 127:25 128:3 | 6:7,8,9 11:24 | -l 124.6 | 96:12,17 97:11,13 |
| sexual 53:13,17 | 137:6,25 138:8,8,14,16 | 46:6,7,8 47:3,8,12 | slap 134:6 | 99:15 104:12,24 |
| 57:21,22,24 | 139:22 145:7 (42) | 48:15,23 74:2 85:7 87:1,9,19 | slides 43:12 | 105:18 |
| 131:13 (6) | 139.22 143.7 (42) | 146:10 147:10,17 | silues 43.12 | 106:6,12,23 107:5,18 108:13 |
| sexually 132:20 | should've 101:14 | (21) | sneak 105:11 | 107:5,18 108:13 |
| sexually 132:20 | should ve 101:14 | (21) | SHEAK 103.11 | 111:25 112:14 |
| shae's 125:21 | shouldn't 50:2 | simple 73:17 | so 5:23 9:8 14:19 | 111.23 112.14 |
| Silac 8 123.21 | 102:9 | 78:6 110:9 | 16:20,22,25 | 115:4,10,15,25 |
| shall 7:12 | 102.7 | 70.0 110.7 | 17:10,17 | 119:8,9 |
| Silaii 7.12 | show 36:18 43:19 | simply 109:21 | 18:2,10,21,23 19:5 | 120:5,7,8,12,20,25 |
| shape 140:6 | 81:7 146:20,21 | 111:7,19 112:6 | 20:6,8,10,15,18 | 121:3,8,10 123:4 |
| shape 110.0 | 147:1 (6) | 124:16 128:16 | 21:7,9,18 22:16 | 126:16,24 127:23 |
| share 16:17 | 11,11 (0) | 135:14 (7) | 23:8,12,16,18 | 128:6,14 129:17 |
| 43:18 47:15,20 | showcase 53:1 | 100111 (7) | 24:4,21 25:5,10,15 | 130:5,10 134:13 |
| 98:22 125:21 (6) | 5220 11 643 6 6 6 7 1 | since 33:8 44:16 | 26:7,20 27:8,15 | 135:11,16,18 |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | showed 56:15 | 58:10 64:15 66:19 | 28:7,8,17 | 138:19,23 |
| shared 133:2,6 | | 88:15 90:8 144:3 | 29:5,8,12,23 | 139:17,19 140:22 |
| 139:13 | shown 139:12 | (8) | 30:1,6,19,25 | 142:9 143:4,22 |
| | | ` ' | 31:4,16 32:2,16 | 145:8 146:1 |
| sharing 47:18 | shows 136:16 | single 20:20 | 33:13,24,25 | 148:17 149:7,9 |
| 145:7 | | 52:21 | 34:6,9,21,24 35:23 | 150:15,16,19 |
| | side 6:20 121:11 | | 36:7 37:5,10 | (225) |
| shays 5:5 | | sir 115:23 | 39:7,15,22 | |
| | siegal 3:4 | | 41:4,22,25 | society 4:16 |
| she 60:16 | 5:18,19,21 | sisay 4:10 113:23 | 42:16,22 | 125:15 |
| 114:9,10,12 | 7:12,14,15 | 116:2,4,5 (5) | 43:16,18,22 | |
| 115:15 123:21 (6) | 57:18,19 58:2,3 | | 44:12,23 45:11,13 | sole 101:21 |
| | 63:13 64:4,13,24 | sisitzky 4:6 98:14 | 46:17 47:8,20 | |
| shea 8:22 14:16 | 65:4 84:15 97:1,9 | 104:19 108:23 | 48:20 49:24,25 | some 16:22 18:24 |
| 11114740 | 107:12,15 150:21 | 109:3,4 (6) | 51:1,17 52:5 | 19:1 20:7 22:3,12 |
| shield 117:18 | (22) | •44• | 53:3,5 54:5,19 | 28:25 29:23 31:10 |
| 1.64 110.00 | | sitting 49:3 | 55:12,16 | 33:3,5 35:24 |
| shift 110:20 | siegal's 82:14 | | 56:10,12,19,21 | 36:10 46:9 51:1 |
| -l1:64 OC:14 | 107:20 121 0 | situation 24:5 | 57:4,9 59:1 60:19 | 67:11 68:5 71:14 |
| shoplift 26:14 | sign 107:20 121:9 | 84:9 | 61:10 62:18 63:7 | 73:17,25 78:10 |
| shonlifting | gignal 110.20 | giv 11.1 62.16 | 65:2,4,15 66:6 | 83:3 84:11,13 |
| shoplifting | signal 110:20 | six 11:1 63:16 | 67:11 68:1,17 | 86:1,19 87:12 |
| 26:8,21 | signature 152:18 | 83:1 87:16 88:3 97:20 100:9 124:6 | 69:6,16 70:7,9,21 71:1 72:13,23,24 | 88:5 90:1 91:24 92:1 101:6 103:6 |
| | signature 132:18 | (8) | 73:17,24 | 107:9,19 109:18 |
| short 137:17 | | | | |

| 114:7,24 131:8 | speaker | 57:11 88:8,11 | 62:22 | streets 12:6 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 135:17 (40) | 104:16,25 109:2 | 89:23 90:3,4 | | 110:19 140:16 |
| | 113:19,25 115:23 | 139:3,6 149:18 | staten 7:22 | |
| somebody 50:22 | 119:19,24 122:8 | (24) | | strip 131:15 |
| 51:7 56:10 115:6 | 125:7 128:22 | (21) | states 59:9 60:9 | Strip 131.13 |
| (4) | 129:2,19 135:5 | stakeholders | 119:3 | strong 87:17 |
| (4) | 137:9 (15) | 103:25 149:25 | 117.5 | strong 67.17 |
| somehow 113:7 | 137.9 (13) | 103.23 149.23 | atatiating 76.4 | atmomana 0.6 |
| somenow 113:7 | 120.20 | 4 140.0 | statistics 76:4 | stronger 9:6 |
| 26.10 | speakers 138:20 | stamp 140:8 | 10.04 | 13:11 87:14 |
| someone 26:18 | 147:13 | . 1041 | stats 18:24 | 112:5,8 149:5 (6) |
| 48:10 50:8 136:19 | • • • • • | stand 134:1 | | |
| 137:4 138:17 (6) | special 5:12 | | status 93:24 | strongly 12:13 |
| | 16:11 | standard | | |
| someone's 51:14 | | 74:24,25 | step 11:13 59:1 | structure 87:1 |
| | specific 23:1 | | 150:7,7 (4) | 94:3 |
| something 31:25 | 33:18 35:2,7 | standardization | | |
| 39:2,12 40:21 | 64:12 76:2 | 66:4 | steps 13:11 103:2 | stuck 23:21 |
| 51:25 54:25 | 84:14,15,18 (9) | | | |
| 67:22,23 70:20 | | standards 33:13 | stick 9:20 | stuff 16:22 |
| 72:14,15 74:11 | specifically 37:25 | 58:16 101:8 103:9 | | |
| 77:16 78:23 | 51:5 115:14 | 109:11 (5) | still 18:22 23:18 | subbed 19:13 |
| 79:3,5 80:6,6 84:4 | | \ / | 31:7 32:20 | 70:20,25 |
| 88:8 101:13 115:2 | specificity 59:19 | standing 49:4 | 34:5,10 35:4,23 | |
| 125:19 126:1 | 85:3 | 50:9,22 | 37:2,21 | subcategories |
| 127:4 128:11 | 00.0 | 30.5,22 | 38:2,14,16,23 40:6 | 24:25 |
| 137:6 143:21 | spectrum 131:6 | stands 21:25 | 42:7 48:12 57:5,6 | 21.23 |
| 145:24 (29) | spectrum 131.0 | 142:18 | 60:12,20 62:10 | subject 10:16 |
| 143.24 (27) | sped 11:22 | 172.10 | 70:13,14 71:18 | 68:14 92:18 |
| sometimes 24:3 | speu 11.22 | stark 141:13 | 79:5 83:24 85:15 | 111:20 128:8 |
| | gmaagh 12.0 | Stark 141.13 | | |
| 31:17 | speech 13:9 | -44 5 .10 0.0 | 89:24 93:16 107:4 | 137:17 (6) |
| 20.0 | 11 100 5 | start 5:18 8:9 | 116:22 123:3 | |
| somewhere 30:8 | spell 100:5 | 66:18 120:7 | 124:21 126:9 | subjective 34:13 |
| 100.10 | | 127:18,19 150:5 | 136:23 137:1 | 118:1 |
| sone 109:12 | spend 16:20,24 | (7) | 144:10 146:1 | |
| | 150:11 | | 151:8 (40) | submit 133:24 |
| soon 13:19 36:23 | | started 5:15 | | |
| 135:11 | spirit 104:1 | 44:16 | stock 111:11 | submitted 33:3 |
| | | | | 41:25 59:15,17 |
| soren 47:14,17 | spoke 139:13 | starting 148:7 | stop 19:19 26:6 | 66:1 116:16 119:8 |
| 151:4 | | _ | 27:3 28:21 29:2 | 130:4 (8) |
| | ss 152:4 | state 12:10 13:9 | 39:23 44:3,6 | |
| sorry 7:19 29:3 | | 71:25 117:24 | 54:2,7 55:10 | submitting |
| 47:3,3 49:6 57:18 | staff 9:3,4,4,5,11 | 152:3,8 (6) | 62:6,17 | 131:17 |
| 74:4 96:13 97:15 | 80:2 115:11 | /- \-/ | 69:17,18,20,24 | |
| 144:13 (10) | 149:3,23 (9) | stated 11:12 | 112:14 116:14 | subordinate |
| 11.115 (10) | 117.5,25 (7) | 87:10 119:12 | 118:9,14 119:9 | 68:12 |
| sort 17:11 36:14 | stage 40:22 | 139:19,20 (5) | 140:5 (23) | 55.12 |
| 39:14 48:6 77:20 | Suge 10.22 | 137.17,20 (3) | 110.5 (25) | subpoena 11:22 |
| 81:4,20 82:16 | stahlybutts 3:19 | statement 59:6 | stopping 69:23 | Buopocna 11.22 |
| 125:1 (9) | 6:22,23,24 7:1 | 63:2 119:9 152:10 | stopping 03.23 | subs 70:17,17 |
| 143.1 (7) | 1 ' ' | | gtong 24:24 | 74:17 |
| gnool: 101.2 | 47:1,2 49:14,16 | (4) | stops 24:24 | /4.1/ |
| speak 121:3 | 51:24 52:3,17 | _4_41 01 | 27.2 | |
| 143:19 | 53:25 55:4,21 | statements 11:21 | store 27:3 | substantial 14:2 |
| | | | | |

| 25:6 64:16 | supervisor's | 101:1 | team 84:2,3 | testifying 130:2 |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| • | 61:16 | | 115:17 | |
| substantiate | • | t 152:1,1 | 4 | testimony 35:22 |
| 21:10 32:19 78:5 | supervisory 58:22 | table 30:21 89:21 | technically 50:24 | 145:6,7 |
| 114:23 (4) | 36.22 | table 50.21 69.21 | telephonic 6:25 | teufel 4:13 |
| substantiated | supported 12:13 | tables 81:8 | telephonic 0.23 | 119:22 |
| 19:6,9,20 | Supported 12.10 | 0110 | tell 81:14,15 | 122:12,14,15 (5) |
| 20:1,12,14,15 | supposed 35:20 | tactics 35:18 | 105:20 115:1,7 (5) | , , , , , |
| 21:15 27:25 78:24 | 36:19 41:6 | | | text 94:22,24 |
| 81:16,17,18 88:20 | | tagged 37:11 | ten 20:3 25:24 | |
| 89:3,3 100:22 | sure 43:15 45:10 | 4 1 0 22 | 29:14 30:16 | than 10:2 14:12 |
| 115:9 (18) | 53:12 56:2 57:20 | take 8:23 | 31:1,5,8 48:18 | 17:15,19 21:1 23:4,7 28:2 |
| substantiation | 63:21 64:1 66:10 68:4 71:11 72:10 | 18:18,24 20:6 29:24 31:17 41:7 | 56:16,17 124:2,12 134:14 (13) | 29:16,18 35:7 |
| 28:5 41:19 | 76:12 80:17,20 | 70:6,15 72:8 | 134.14 (13) | 38:15 49:3,11 |
| 20.8 11.19 | 83:4 84:19 85:2 | 98:20 103:25 | tens 140:15 | 62:12 82:12,22 |
| substantiations | 91:5 97:24 99:8 | 115:12 134:14 | | 100:9,13 112:6 |
| 27:11 | 105:8 108:20 | 136:21 (15) | term 75:5 | 128:11 149:5 (22) |
| | 109:1 113:6,6 | | | |
| substantive | 129:13 134:16 | taken 14:23 | terminate 73:20 | thank 5:8,9 8:4,9 |
| 83:11 93:14,17 | 135:19 139:5,21 | 33:24 35:13 93:18 | 4 | 9:12 42:19 43:22 |
| 107:16 (4) | 143:12 (31) | 136:24 152:10 (6) | terminated 46:25 47:6 48:9 | 44:11 45:25 47:13,13 48:14 |
| successfully | sureup 145:5 | takes 13:10 63:11 | 49:20,23 54:9 | 49:6 55:25 56:2 |
| 116:12 | surcup 113.3 | takes 13.10 03.11 | 72:7 138:13 | 58:3 63:13 66:15 |
| | surrounding | taking 45:22 | 139:16 (9) | 68:3,5 71:10,13 |
| suffered 150:3 | 110:21 | 110:4 | , , | 74:1 75:20 83:14 |
| | | | terminating | 85:5,6 93:2,12,13 |
| suggestions | suspect 26:9,21 | talk 27:2 80:22 | 36:16 92:24 | 96:23 97:12,23,25 |
| 35:10 91:1 99:7 | suspension 48:17 | talked 29:22 | 127:19 | 98:17,18 99:9,11,15,18,19 |
| suggestive 90:6 | suspension 46.17 | taikeu 29.22 | termination | 103:21,23 |
| suggestive 70.0 | swallowing | talking 30:2 | 20:19,22,24 21:2,7 | 103.21,23 |
| summary 40:24 | 141:15 | 48:22 55:7 144:14 | 43:24 46:12 47:23 | 106:9 107:22 |
| 41:14,16 93:3 (4) | | (4) | 48:20 50:1,3,19 | 108:19 112:14,16 |
| | symbolism | | 53:19,21 | 113:18,21 |
| summer 127:12 | 142:20 | taps 13:9 | 54:4,13,18,22 | 114:3,3,8 |
| 140:17 147:16 | | 44 25:0 | 55:3,11,14,19 56:9 | 115:22,25 116:4 |
| summer's 13:18 | system 39:16 41:11 100:25 | target 35:8 | 57:9,24 58:1 71:17,19 72:3,4 | 119:17,18,20 120:5 121:14,15 |
| summer 5 13.10 | 120:18 123:25 | tased 127:10 | 92:18 132:9 137:7 | 120.5 121.14,15 |
| sung 3:12 | 126:5 128:7 | 127.10 | (33) | 128:19,20,21,23 |
| | 132:18 136:21 | taser 21:16,17,18 | \ \'\ | 129:18,20,25 |
| superior 62:2 | 141:3 (10) | 23:8 (4) | terms 14:24 | 135:3,5,6,18 |
| 68:14 70:10 | | | 22:18 48:1 52:12 | 137:8,10,15 |
| 137:18 138:2,7 (6) | systematic 62:9 | tasers 19:9 21:14 | 71:2 77:21 87:13 | 138:18,19 |
| gun anvicios | 130:20 | 22:5,20 23:14 | 142:17 (8) | 144:16,21 146:6 |
| supervision 68:13 | systematically | 34:4 37:23 (7) | testified 116:17 | 147:10,13 148:21,22 |
| 00.13 | 55:17 | task 108:17 | tesuneu 110.1/ | 149:9,21 150:15 |
| supervisor 61:19 | 33.17 | WOIL TOU.T! | testify 35:19 | 151:6,6,8 (98) |
| 68:14,19 70:11 (4) | systems 34:15 | taxpayer 100:15 | 125:12,18 | |
| | _ | _ * | | |
| | | | | |

| thankfully 79:19 | 22:4,7,9,10 27:7 | think 8:4 40:4 | 77:3 79:22 80:16 | 33:8 42:1 64:9 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Valuation of the state of the s | 31:10 38:9,14,22 | 43:12,21 44:18 | 84:20 85:23 98:1 | 70:10 88:24 89:22 |
| thanks 16:10 | 47:23 50:20 57:5 | 49:17,18 53:1 | 107:14 129:16 | 90:1,18 97:11 |
| 42:20 108:22 | 69:17 73:7,9 | 54:11 57:4,9 | 135:2 149:13,16 | 101:14 102:25 |
| 115:19 125:18 (5) | 79:15 83:5,6,11 | 58:5,18,24 59:5,23 | 150:2,22 (35) | 103:22 105:16 |
| | 85:4 87:20 114:24 | 60:8,19 61:3,17,18 | , , , | 107:9,19 112:15 |
| theater 142:21 | 121:13 139:21,24 | 62:5 63:8 64:6,13 | though 22:13 | 114:7 119:10 |
| | (26) | 66:12 70:16,17 | 23:11 27:6 31:5 | 126:11 127:23 |
| their 5:6,7 | ` ' | 71:1 72:11,13 | 32:16 38:4 74:25 | 151:10 (23) |
| 12:3,7,9 15:24 | therefore 20:25 | 73:4 74:23,24 | 114:14 145:16 (9) | , , |
| 35:21,25 40:25 | 95:21 119:13 | 75:13 77:12,23 | | timely 106:5 |
| 41:2 45:23 48:12 | 146:1 (4) | 78:10 80:14 | thought 37:24 | 108:3,5 |
| 51:7 62:1 65:2 | | 82:6,9,13,15 | 67:7 113:11 | |
| 68:19 71:21 78:2 | these 9:20 | 83:1,23,25 | 144:14 (4) | timer 98:5 |
| 89:4 110:3 112:11 | 10:6,10,20,23 | 84:14,22 85:10,24 | | |
| 115:8 118:5 | 12:17 22:14 23:24 | 88:7 89:12,13,16 | thoughtful 99:24 | times 21:19 75:6 |
| 121:12 123:3 | 26:7 28:23 31:18 | 90:5 91:18,25 | | 126:2 127:11 (4) |
| 125:5 128:3 | 32:13,23 35:23 | 92:5,6,8,9,16,18 | thousand 150:6 | |
| 132:18 133:15 | 39:17 52:21,25 | 97:2 99:14 | | timing 85:10,22 |
| 139:14 140:11 | 63:7 78:1 84:5 | 106:12,17 | thousands | |
| 141:11 148:14 | 86:10 91:14 | 107:14,17 | 110:18 140:16 | today 5:4 10:5 |
| (33) | 102:20 111:6 | 113:3,13 118:3 | | 15:6,9 16:2,12 |
| | 116:20 118:19 | 119:14 136:16 | threat 26:18 | 42:17 99:6 101:4 |
| them 10:22 | 119:11 120:11 | 139:9,12,20 | | 123:6,17 124:7 |
| 15:19,22 19:11,22 | 121:24 127:3,22 | 140:9,24 141:4 | three 20:5 | 141:12 145:6,8,16 |
| 24:18,24 25:1 | 130:21 132:22 | 142:9,18,22 143:2 | 21:19,20 28:2,4 | 147:13,15 148:17 |
| 30:15 34:10 | 134:4 138:13 | 145:3 146:10 | 40:4,9 44:7 56:22 | (19) |
| 36:3,6,9 42:3 | 143:23,24 (37) | 147:6,21 | 62:6,10,18 88:3 | |
| 43:14 45:15 | | 148:4,7,8,19 149:7 | 97:20 118:10 | today's 89:7 |
| 50:9,10,17 51:9 | thetos 67:24 | (93) | 124:5 (16) | |
| 53:5 62:15,16 | | | | together 11:4 |
| 70:1,2,5,15 | they're 46:25 | third 61:13 | threshold 71:4 | 79:11 81:1 |
| 73:12,14,20 86:12 | 73:23 76:18 92:14 | 41.4 116.0 | 41 1 15 00 | 4 11 20 0 14 |
| 92:6 103:17 | 119:12 136:25 (6) | thirteen 116:9 | through 15:23 | told 39:8,14 |
| 106:10,11 108:17 | 41a arrilara 26.57 | 127:10 | 16:23 17:1 18:24 | 94:20 128:16 (4) |
| 114:13,19 119:7 124:15,16 132:8 | they've 36:5,7 43:5 69:13 124:18 | 4h:4 10.16 | 19:1 20:7,8 34:19 55:22 56:14 57:12 | too 34:13,14 |
| 136:24,25 138:7 | 136:9 138:17 (7) | thirty 48:16 92:19 136:3 | 79:25 80:1,7 | 36:23 37:21 46:2 |
| 140:8 141:10,24 | 130.9 130.17 (7) | 92.19 130.3 | 81:2,6 82:2 111:7 | 62:7,11,19 87:20 |
| (48) | thing 17:20 | thirtyfive 19:24 | 113:4 118:12 | 98:23,25 114:25 |
| (40) | 36:14,18 42:4 | 1111 tyllve 17.24 | 119:4 (21) | (12) |
| themes 33:10 | 49:17 53:6 | thirtythree 19:15 | 117.4 (21) | (12) |
| themes 33.10 | 127:17,24 147:2 | difficultee 17.13 | throughout 5:7 | took 11:19 12:6 |
| themselves 5:17 | (9) | thorough 42:20 | 66:3 117:14 140:1 | 114:23 |
| 79:4 102:10 | (2) | thorough 12.20 | (4) | 111.23 |
| 140:6,8 (5) | things 34:16 | those 18:15 | \ · / | tool 126:9 147:18 |
| | 45:14 50:16 58:24 | 19:8,17 20:2,7 | tiers 72:18 | 148:19 |
| theoretically | 67:25 79:19 80:24 | 29:11 33:5 35:24 | | |
| 56:21 | 83:10 84:5 85:19 | 36:10 45:14 50:15 | tighten 58:12 | top 49:8 |
| | 106:4 114:17,23 | 53:17,18 56:1 | 6 | |
| theory 109:12 | 131:12 139:10 | 59:2 63:18 | tightened 58:17 | topic 15:19 |
| | 143:23,25 145:3 | 65:15,18 67:15 | 0 | • |
| there's 21:2 | (18) | 71:2 75:15 76:24 | time 16:20,25 | totality 95:11 |
| | • / | | , | • |
| | | | | |

| totalled 18:16 | treated 94:4 | twenty 19:6 | unconstitutional | unenforceable |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| totally 89:10 | 136:19 | 22:17 25:13 26:3 29:21 32:3,17,21 | 54:2 116:13 118:14 136:11 (4) | 128:12 |
| totany 69.10 | treatment 67:11 | 41:15 56:25 73:8 | 110.14 130.11 (4) | unexplained |
| touching 57:22 | | 76:18 108:6 136:6 | unconstitutionalit | 117:17 |
| tour 37:7,9 | trend 84:8 | (14) | y 62:9 | unfair 73:16 |
| tour 51.1,5 | trial 40:23 | twentyfive | under 10:10 21:9 | uman 73.10 |
| touted 106:1 | 55:1,20 76:17 | 23:15,17 32:22 | 28:12,23 29:5 | unfolded 36:25 |
| touting 110.1 | 95:24 96:5,7 127:21 (8) | terronterform 10:10 | 30:9 32:4,14 35:17 38:1 | unfolding 20.15 |
| touting 110:1 | 127.21 (6) | twentyfour 19:10 30:9 | 46:10,20 48:15 | unfolding 28:15 |
| toward 13:11 | trials 17:17 42:10 | | 54:3,24 55:5 | unfortunately |
| 15:7 | 4 9 4 141 4 | twentyone 19:11 | 68:12 71:19 74:10 | 101:15 130:25 |
| towards 58:19,25 | tribute 141:4 | two 5:3 15:18 | 75:16 77:8 79:2 83:20 101:24 | 147:1 |
| | tried 25:10 | 18:25 19:11 27:10 | 102:11 (25) | uniformity 38:13 |
| track 84:5 90:20 | | 28:2 36:17 43:12 | | v |
| trading 142:19 | trouble 55:23 108:2 | 44:15 50:16 71:2 74:7 92:7 98:4 | undercut 111:22 | unilateral 111:21 |
| Haumg 142.17 | 100.2 | 105:11 135:16 | underlying 32:12 | unintentional |
| traditionally | troubling 101:23 | 149:7 (17) | | 36:12 |
| 126:5 | 132:1 | type 95:10 100:7 | undermine 53:1 54:6 119:11 | union 4:7 10:9 |
| trained 78:20 | true 47:8 60:9 | type 93.10 100.7 | 34.0 119.11 | 109:6 113:1 (4) |
| 118:16 | 103:11,20 128:19 | types 19:2 38:25 | undermined | , , |
| | 152:9 (6) | 39:3 | 126:14 | unit 15:23 86:15 |
| training 19:12,16,23 20:4 | truly 94:18 | typical 31:22 | undermines | 96:4 |
| 29:6 39:5,6,8,9,15, | 148:13 | of prediction | 133:12 141:1 | united 4:19 130:3 |
| 20,24 40:3,5,8,10 | 01 2 117 12 | typically 45:1 | | 1 6 1 10 12 |
| 44:8 81:1 118:12 121:2 129:12 (21) | trust 91:2 117:12 123:8,16 124:3 | ultimate 102:1 | undermining 142:23 | unlawful 19:13 23:23 24:22 |
| 121.2 127.12 (21) | 126:25 127:18 | 126:18 | 112.23 | 25:1,5 54:1 62:6 |
| trainings 129:15 | 128:16 (8) | | underneath | (7) |
| transcribed 1:23 | try 7:13 43:18 | ultimately 9:24 52:3 126:8 128:6 | 48:25 | unless 136:4 |
| Hanschiven 1.23 | 52:9 81:9 (4) | 148:8 (5) | understand | umess 150.4 |
| transcript 152:10 | | | 55:22 61:11 63:5 | unlimited 111:14 |
| transparency | trying 24:10 123:23 | unable 50:8 | 66:8 84:10 85:11,22 89:6 | unmuted 114:2 |
| 8:25 12:15 13:22 | 123.23 | unacceptable | 91:23 94:22 | ummuteu 114.2 |
| 17:8 90:11 92:2 | tshirt 26:12,24 | 131:24 136:7 | 124:11,14 (12) | unpunished |
| 95:17 96:9 103:1,7 108:12 | tucker 8:23 | unacknowledged | understanding | 137:2 |
| 114:24 125:25 | 14CKC1 0.23 | 110:7 | 15:15 46:13 51:17 | unrestrained |
| 128:18 129:11 | turn 16:14 | | 59:4 64:4 66:19 | 109:13 |
| 146:4 (16) | 36:20,23 42:17 46:1 (5) | unauthorized 100:11 131:15 | 67:4,16 105:13,20,22 (11) | unsubstantiated |
| transparent | 1 0.1 (<i>J)</i> | 100.11 131.13 | 103.13,20,22 (11) | 115:3 |
| 13:14 15:7 92:8 | tv 124:22 | unclear | understood | |
| 145:14 (4) | twelve 19:15 83:2 | 36:7,11,24 38:14 51:4 (5) | 53:13 66:9 115:22 121:4 (4) | until 100:17 |
| | TWEIVE 17.13 03.2 | J1. T (J) | 121.7 (4) | |
| | | | | |

| unwanted 131:13 | 150:10,13 151:4 | versus 51:6,12 | 134:4,25 (9) | 24:8 46:1,19 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | (46) | 116:10 | , , , | 54:19 59:7,18 |
| unwarranted | | | violent 26:15 | 62:20 67:19 68:21 |
| 131:15 | use 11:3,6 16:6 | very 28:15 35:21 | 71010110 20110 | 71:1 72:23 |
| 151.15 | 21:16 31:21 34:2 | 36:17 40:14 42:20 | violently 130:18 | 76:12,13,18 |
| unwillingness | 35:18 77:8,22 | 50:3,3 61:17 64:8 | violently 150.10 | 78:16,17 |
| 112:12 | 79:14 80:6 86:20 | 65:21 67:7 72:16 | virtual 2:3 | 80:17,23,23 82:15 |
| 112.12 | 94:17 96:8 | 82:6,7 84:18 86:8 | viituai 2.5 | 83:3 85:2 86:4 |
| up 11:22 17:20 | 98:2,25 107:5,6 | 87:16 92:8 93:3 | visavis 94:11 | 89:11,17,24 |
| 18:16 21:8 25:11 | 112:10 131:18 | 98:17,19 99:9,22 | VISAVIS JT.11 | 90:5,21 91:11,22 |
| 26:25 27:18 31:18 | 146:20 148:20 | 100:8 101:14 | visible 136:2 | 97:3 99:19 104:24 |
| 32:20 36:18 39:24 | (22) | 123:5 125:6 | VISIBLE 130.2 | 105:10 114:8 |
| 43:7 53:15 | (22) | 140:17,17 (29) | voices 141:11 | 115:12 120:11,21 |
| 56:16,17,20 57:1 | used 22:25 | 140.17,17 (29) | voices 141.11 | 121:8 135:24 |
| 1 ' ' | | 1.0 54.7 | 141 25.20 | |
| 69:12,19 74:16 | 35:15,23 67:11 | via 1:8 54:7 | voluntarily 35:20 | 136:17 137:16 |
| 77:17 96:24 98:5 | 79:25 93:25 | .4 01 01 | 73:11,23 | 147:11 148:24 |
| 102:18 104:10 | 100:11 (7) | victim 21:21 | .4. 17.00.05 | (53) |
| 108:15 125:20 | 117.24 | 110 7 | vote 17:23,25 | 4 1 20 15 |
| 126:1,2 127:5 | uses 117:24 | victims 118:5 | 18:3,12 42:1 | wanted 28:15 |
| 134:1,15 137:21 | 17.5.22.6 | .1 | 80:2,3 97:7,10,11 | 38:7 49:24 |
| 147:1 150:13 (35) | using 17:5 32:6 | video 5:7 | 99:6 123:1 | 53:5,12 66:16 |
| o | 51:18,21 82:16 | | 124:7,15 125:3 | 71:14 91:6 94:12 |
| updated 79:9 | 95:7 120:15 144:2 | videoconference | 133:9 134:10 | 125:19 126:1 |
| 1 | (8) | 1:8 | 135:15 139:7 | 127:24 129:17 |
| updating 45:12 | | | 143:10,15 145:16 | 144:21 145:11 |
| | usually 22:5 45:3 | view 5:7 | 148:17,23,25 | (15) |
| upload 37:8 | 79:12 | | 149:11 (26) | |
| 79:22 | | viewed 88:18 | | wants 107:5 |
| | utilize 12:4 95:23 | 109:20 | voted 11:19 | 114:21 124:14 |
| uploaded 37:10 | 110:24 | | | |
| | | vigilance 104:7 | votes 18:4 80:4 | warrant 24:1 |
| upon 46:15 | vacation 27:19 | | | |
| | | vigilant 102:18 | voting 45:12,23 | warranted 68:11 |
| urges 111:25 | vague 26:8,9 | | 97:4,14 123:18 | |
| | 34:14 58:13 | violate 129:16 | 124:8 134:17 | washington |
| urging 134:9 | 118:12 (5) | | 143:4 144:2 147:4 | 127:12 |
| | | violated | (10) | |
| us 5:20 8:12 37:4 | values 135:23 | 121:18,21 134:2 | | wasn't 35:9 |
| 40:20 41:10,13 | | | wait 106:9 | |
| 47:15 54:19 | various 95:3 | violating 55:16 | | way 14:20 |
| 55:13,18 68:2 | | | waiting 134:13 | 18:3,10 27:17 |
| 71:5 78:3 82:6 | vast 106:21 | violation 55:9 | _ | 42:22 50:23 63:19 |
| 84:7 85:15 | | 60:24 61:5,22 | walk 55:24 69:19 | 68:2 69:11,13 |
| 87:4,22 91:12 | vehicle 62:7 | 100:7 121:1 (6) | 79:24,25 80:7 | 70:5 79:12,25 |
| 92:13 97:19 104:7 | | | 81:2 (6) | 80:7 82:8,21 83:3 |
| 105:21 112:25 | vehicles 131:14 | violations 55:11 | · | 92:2,3 93:1 101:1 |
| 113:12,18 122:1 | | 62:17 102:7 | walked 81:6 | 121:25 137:21 |
| 128:21 136:17 | verdict 76:5 | 118:2,15 120:21 | | 140:6 141:1 |
| 140:9,12,16,23 | | (6) | walking 82:1 | 145:18 150:8,12 |
| 141:13,25 142:12 | verdicts 75:9,19 | | | 152:13 (29) |
| 143:2 144:23 | , | violence 111:6 | want 5:3 8:8,9 | |
| 145:24,25 | version 81:5 | 112:4 130:13 | 9:11 10:22 14:13 | ways 5:6 13:14 |
| 147:18,22 148:19 | | 131:7,25 132:4,12 | 16:20,24 17:20 | 80:23 82:19 92:7 |
| | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | l |

| 140:9,20 (7) | 86:13 87:25 90:11 | 40:22 41:1,17 | 25:12,13,25 | why 38:22 55:22 |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| | 93:8,10 98:24 | 45:1 48:9 | 26:3,12 27:23 | 83:20 87:5 |
| we'd 46:2 55:22 | 121:13,25 132:23 | 49:22,25 50:21 | 28:4,10,11 30:9 | 90:12,14,16 92:9 |
| | 140:17,18 146:13 | 51:5,6,18,20 56:14 | 34:3 36:13,16 | 94:10 106:18 |
| we'll 22:7 24:14 | (21) | 60:2 64:17,20 | 38:8 39:25 | 122:23 124:14 |
| 31:21,23 60:1 | \ | 66:17 67:9 68:12 | 40:17,23 43:20 | 129:14 136:13 |
| 77:11 78:16,17 | went 34:19 | 69:12,12,14 70:10 | 49:18 50:8 53:9 | (14) |
| 79:22,24 81:6 | 56:14,16 76:25 (4) | 72:21,22 74:15 | 54:14,25 55:6 | (- ') |
| 96:20 142:6 (13) | (1) | 76:13,22 77:25 | 57:25 59:5 64:11 | wide 131:6 |
| 70.20 1 .2.0 (10) | weren't 8:15 33:6 | 79:23 85:22 | 65:11 67:7 70:19 | 139:24,24 |
| we're 20:16 | 37:2,25 (4) | 103:9,10 105:21 | 72:18 75:18 | 109121,21 |
| 30:2,14 39:8 | c / · · = ,= c (· / | 106:2 110:25 | 82:14,19 91:23 | widespread |
| 40:10 58:7 64:5 | what 9:22,23 | 113:7 121:18 | 92:9 94:9 100:3 | 53:16 |
| 79:7 81:9 82:10 | 10:2,19 12:16 | 123:11 124:24 | 109:15 118:1 | 33.10 |
| 84:20 85:2 91:15 | 15:1,1 | 127:2 132:3 136:1 | 131:21 146:25 | will 5:5 |
| 96:19 97:14 | 17:9,12,15,16 | 142:7 151:5 (56) | (48) | 10:5,6,9,16 11:5 |
| 119:13,15 142:18 | 18:4,10,19,25 23:3 | 112.7 131.3 (30) | (10) | 14:23 |
| 147:3 (19) | 27:13,15 33:1,8 | whenever 38:21 | while 101:15 | 15:9,12,17,24 16:8 |
| 171.5 (17) | 36:22 38:23,25 | 65:18 77:2 | 106:9 109:18 | 18:9,12,17,24 10.8 |
| we've 17:4 18:25 | 39:3,6,9,14 | 05.10 / /.4 | 110:18 125:22 | 0,22 19:4 |
| 20:15 29:22 33:9 | 40:11,21,22 46:13 | where 21:14,16 | 126:12 134:13 (7) | 22:3,12,16 |
| 44:16 54:14 58:10 | 47:4 48:5 | 23:24 24:5 27:8 | 120.12 134.13 (7) | 23:2,5,9 24:3,13 |
| 61:23 69:6 71:6 | 50:10,15 51:14 | 31:7 35:9 | whims 128:9 | 26:10 31:2 32:14 |
| 75:2,3,10 84:19 | 52:11,13 55:7 | 54:14,17 55:2 | WIIIIIS 120.9 | 38:24 39:1,1,2,3 |
| 87:8 88:5 91:16 | 59:18,24 60:25 | 56:22 57:9 59:23 | white 26:12,23 | 42:1,6,17 43:6,9 |
| 109:9 113:3 119:8 | 61:11 62:20 64:7 | 68:24 69:6,17 | winte 20.12,23 | 44:7 45:13,21 |
| 150:8 151:7 (23) | 66:8 69:3,10 | 75:8,15 76:24 | who 9:5 27:4 | 46:21 47:15 |
| 130.6 131.7 (23) | 70:18 | 77:13 80:1,5,10 | 44:17,20 48:10 | 52:4,7 54:8 59:14 |
| weapon 26:17 | 75:2,3,13,16,22 | 81:7,10 82:8 | 50:16 51:1,4,15,22 | 63:15,25 64:14 |
| weapon 20.17 | 76:5,7,20,23 78:7 | 83:5,6 85:4,13 | 53:8 54:5 55:24 | 66:10 71:22 72:24 |
| weapons 27:7 | 79:6,17,21 | 88:22 91:14 115:5 | 61:21 69:22 70:24 | 77:17 78:11,13 |
| weapons 27.7 | 80:22,24 83:7,12 | 121:19,19,21 | 71:3 86:11 87:1 | 80:8 81:4,14,15,17 |
| wearing 26:11 | 84:7 87:9 94:9 | 127:8 143:17 | 88:6 89:8 104:16 | ,19,20 82:6,15 |
| wearing 20.11 | 95:9 99:2 100:20 | 144:23 (39) | 108:20 114:21 | 84:4 85:23 86:22 |
| webex 15:24 | 104:10 106:2 | 144.23 (39) | | |
| webex 13:24 | | whomas 04.25 | 122:21,23 123:1,4 | 88:13,14,16 |
| 14 42-20 | 108:4 112:20 | whereas 94:25 | 124:21 125:4 | 89:9,21 93:3,6 |
| website 43:20 | 114:19 115:7 | 95:7,16 | 127:20 129:16 | 94:22,24 |
| week 66:20 94:7 | 120:18 121:4,5 | whereof 152:15 | 132:6,19 133:15 | 96:6,12,24 97:18 |
| | 123:5,6,9,17,22 | whereof 132.13 | 134:7,12,22 | 98:4,11 99:12 101:18 103:8 |
| 107:9,19 (4) | 128:6 129:15,17 | | 135:23 136:19 | |
| 1 100:25 | 138:8 140:7 | whether 16:5 | 138:13 141:6,23 | 104:11,18 |
| weeks 109:25 | 146:20,22,23 | 39:9 51:24 71:3 | 146:14 149:1 | 105:2,14 107:20 |
| | 147:7,7 148:10 | 76:4 78:4,23 | 150:3 (46) | 108:9,16,22 |
| weigh 10:19 | (97) | 80:15 88:19 | 10_17 | 111:13 112:14 |
| 05 17 | 1 . 41 . 40 00 | 89:2,18 94:17 | who've 12:17 | 113:4,6,22,25 |
| weighed 25:17 | what's 40:23 | 96:7 105:22 | 139:13 142:12 | 115:16 116:1,2 |
| | 48:24 69:1 73:9 | 110:10 122:4 | 1 1 50 20 | 119:21,24 121:23 |
| 2 2 2 4 2 | 77 00 140 10 (0) | 123:18 137:23 | whole 50:20 | 122:11 123:1 |
| welcome 2:3 5:10 | 77:23 148:12 (6) | | 50 14 00 33 | 10101070 |
| welcome 2:3 5:10 98:16 125:23 (4) | ` , | (18) | 53:14 98:22 | 124:8 125:9 |
| 98:16 125:23 (4) | when 10:11 13:4 | (18) | | 128:7,14,21,24 |
| 98:16 125:23 (4) well 36:9 41:2 | when 10:11 13:4 14:21 17:23 | (18) which 10:17 | whose 77:18 | 128:7,14,21,24 129:21 130:5 |
| 98:16 125:23 (4) | when 10:11 13:4 | (18) | | 128:7,14,21,24 |

| 135:7,9 137:11 | 9:2,5,12 12:17,19 | 70:2 | 87:18 89:12 | 48:10 49:22 51:7 |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 142:7,13 | 19:4 20:8 38:17 | | 97:6,16 105:2,5 | 57:2 71:8 76:20 |
| 143:24,25 144:7 | 78:19 80:24 81:9 | wrap 134:15 | 106:14,14 | 86:18,18 88:14 |
| 147:1 148:1,3,5 | 85:15,18 92:3,25 | "1up 15 1.15 | 120:1,1,4,7 122:14 | 98:5 |
| 150:11 151:3,4 | 93:19 94:1 107:10 | wrist 134:6 | 129:5,24 137:15 | 99:2,6,7,15,25 |
| (139) | 126:25 142:24 | Wist 151.0 | 143:20 145:16 | 104:13,14 105:13 |
| (137) | 144:22 146:3 | write 69:11 | 147:4 148:17 (45) | 113:18 114:25 |
| williams 4:21 | 151:8 (24) | witte 07.11 | 147.4 140.17 (43) | 124:4,5 135:4,16 |
| 135:8,12 | 131.0 (24) | writing 38:20 | vet 90:23 117:9 | 137:8 (33) |
| 137:12,13,16 (6) | working 58:24 | 40:12 | 127:20 | 137.0 (33) |
| 137.12,13,10 (0) | 84:3 85:14 90:7 | 40.12 | 127.20 | youth 12:1,2 |
| willie 3:13 44:17 | 135:1 (5) | written 9:19 | yojaira 5:9 16:7 | youth 12.1,2 |
| wille 5.15 44.17 | 133.1 (3) | 111:19 112:13 | 96:25 97:24 | 230 151:10 |
| willing 05.10 | works 70:5 | 111.19 112.13 | 104:16 105:1 | 230 131.10 |
| willing 85:18 | WORKS 70.3 | | | 390 19:21 |
| :11: | | 130:4 131:4 (7) | 108:21 113:20 | 390 19:21 |
| willingness 140:24 | worries 46:4 | ******* 46.14 | 114:8 115:15,24 | 011 06.01 |
| 140:24 | 1.40.01 | wrong 46:14 | 125:8 128:22 (13) | 911 26:21 |
| 106.0 | worst 142:21 | 60:13 145:22 | | 1000 1.5 |
| wish 106:8 | | 1.1 6 117:6 | york 4:2,4,7 9:17 | 1202 1:5 |
| | would 5:15 | x 1:1,6 117:6 | 11:17 13:1,3 14:4 | 2012 02 21 |
| withholding | 8:12,19 9:1 10:18 | 4 ~ | 15:8 94:19,25 | 2012 83:21 |
| 131:12 | 14:20 21:3,11 | yasmeen 4:5 | 96:11 100:2 | 0044 100 04 |
| | 22:17 | 104:19 105:3 | 101:24 103:12 | 2014 100:24 |
| within 41:15 | 23:13,15,16,18,20 | 11 10 12 22 | 104:6 109:5 113:1 | 2016 27 12 27 |
| 56:15 71:17 89:7 | 25:11,13,13,21 | year 11:18 12:23 | 116:11 130:14 | 2016 27:12,25 |
| 94:2 95:5 107:19 | 26:2,3,16 28:6 | 13:12 14:1 45:17 | 148:14 152:3,5,8 | 29:11,18 31:6 (5) |
| 111:18 120:24 | 29:8,12,13,20,24 | 91:8 94:15 95:25 | (24) | 2010 10 (25.12 |
| 127:3 145:2,9 | 30:1,5,7,10,11,16 | 97:19 121:24 | | 2018 19:6 27:12 |
| 152:8,9 (14) | 32:3,4,18,20 | 130:12,17 142:6 | yorkers 11:18 | 28:5 29:11,15 |
| • • • • • • • | 34:3,6 39:24,25 | 143:1 149:7 | 12:4,6 13:16 | 127:12 (6) |
| without 9:1 | 40:11,21 | 150:11 (16) | 101:18 103:5,20 | |
| 40:15 107:17 | 41:16,22,24 42:13 | | 110:18 127:1 | 2019 100:19 |
| 115:20 128:4 (5) | 43:11,13 44:8,9 | year's 102:25 | 128:6,10 132:25 | |
| | 46:8,23 48:12 | | 133:18,23 | 2020 19:6 110:13 |
| witness 152:15 | 56:17 57:3 64:7,9 | yearly 10:17 11:2 | 134:2,22 (16) | 116:15 132:23 (4) |
| | 66:17,21 69:20,20 | 63:16 | | |
| wnyc 105:7 | 72:1 74:23,25 | | you'd 30:14 | 2021 1:4 95:23 |
| | 80:14,24 85:21 | years 17:5 19:1 | | 152:16 |
| wnycfm 4:5 | 86:3 88:2 | 27:11,23 28:4 | you'll 81:21 | |
| | 90:1,1,15,17 91:13 | 56:16 73:9 | | |
| won't 53:10 | 92:15 93:23 | 100:10,14,19 | you're 7:18 30:23 | |
| 73:12 81:15 | 94:3,18 98:1,23 | 116:9 123:13 | 31:6,7 36:19 55:7 | |
| | 100:5,16 101:3 | 124:2,19 125:24 | 56:13 57:1 73:18 | |
| wondering 74:11 | 102:12,15 | 147:16 (16) | 146:9 (10) | |
| 105:19 107:24 | 106:23,24 111:22 | | | |
| | 113:9 115:4 | yes 7:14,19,20,25 | you've 63:23 | |
| wong 4:15 | 121:6,16 | 43:15 46:8,20 | 64:7,15 139:20 (4) | |
| 119:23 122:12 | 122:23,24 123:21 | 47:19 49:1,16 | | |
| 125:10,11,13 (6) | 124:20 125:2 | 52:2,8 58:3 | young 12:3 | |
| | 134:19 136:13,17 | 64:13,24 66:15 | | |
| word 120:15 | (101) | 67:4 71:10,13 | your 9:12 15:18 | |
| | | 72:11 74:21 75:20 | 30:6 31:8 34:3 | |
| work 8:11 | wouldn't 69:8,21 | 77:12 84:10 86:3 | 36:20,21 46:1 | |
| | | | | |
| L | | | | 1 |