## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Delphine Allen, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Oakland, California
City of Oakland, et al.,

Defendants.

Defendants.

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JUDGE

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Official Court Reporter:

Cathy J. Taylor, RMR, CRR, CRC (Reported Remotely)

Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312

401 West Washington Street, SPC 31

Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2151

(602) 322-7249

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>
2	For the Plaintiffs: THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS
3	By: John L. Burris, Esq.
4	Airport Corporate Centre 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120
_	Oakland, California 94621
5	LAW OFFICES OF JAMES B. CHANIN
6	By: <b>James B. Chanin, Esq.</b> 3050 Shattuck Avenue
7	Berkeley, California 94705
8	For the Defendants:
9	OAKLAND CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  By: Brigid S. Martin, Esq.
10	<b>Ryan G. Richardson, Esq.</b> One Frank Ogawa Plaza, Sixth Floor Oakland, California 94612
11	
12	For the Intervenors: RAINS, LUCIA, STERN, ST. PHALLE & SILVER, PC
13	By: Rockne A. Lucia, Jr., Esq. 2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 500
	Pleasant Hill, California 94523
14	
15	Also Present: Chief Floyd Mitchell
16	Acting Chief Bryan Hubbard
17	Chair, Oakland Police Commission, Ricardo Garcia-Acosta Mayor Barbara Lee
18	City Attorney Brian Richardson City Administrator Jestin Johnson
	Inspector General Zurvohn Maloof
19	Community Police Review Agency Director Antonio Lawson
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

2425

PROCEEDINGS

(Court was called to order by the courtroom deputy.)

(Proceedings commence at 3:32 p.m.)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Court is now in session, the Honorable William H. Orrick presiding.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everybody. Please be seated.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: We are here in Case

Number 00-4599, Allen, et al., vs. City of Oakland, et al.

Counsel, if would please come forward to the podium and state your appearance for the record.

MR. BURRIS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Burris for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Nice --

MR. BURRIS: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Nice to see you.

MR. LUCIA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Rockne Lucia for Intervenor Oakland POA.

MR. CHANIN: James Chanin for plaintiffs, Your Honor. Good morning -- good afternoon.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. MARTIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brigid

Martin for Defendants City of Oakland. And I have with me City

Attorney Brian Richardson and Mayor Barbara Lee, as well as

Police Chief Floyd Mitchell and the City Administrator Jestin

Johnson, the Police Commission Chair Ricardo Garcia-Acosta, the Inspector General Zurvohn Maloof, and the Community Police Review Agency Director Antonio Lawson.

THE COURT: Great.

Good afternoon to you all.

So, Mayor Lee in particular, I want to welcome you to this courtroom. I've admired your courage and your leadership for at least the last 25 years. And I'm hopeful that your commitment to constitutional policing in Oakland will bring Court oversight of the Oakland Police Department to an end in short order. I'm looking forward to your assessment of where things stand at the end of the conference.

Let me frame for you all the issues as I see them. As I've said before, the Police Department has come a long way since the negotiated settlement agreement was first signed, and there's reason to be proud of what's been accomplished. It's developed and implemented policies that address critical areas that needed change and employed intelligence-led stops to dramatically reduce negative interactions with Oakland's residents, particularly black residents. It's employed state-of-the-art technology to improve police work across the board. It's used that technology to focus attention and supervision where it's most required. And all of these efforts are still working today, but there are tasks that are still out of compliance.

These are tasks that the parties agreed to at the outset of the negotiated settlement agreement. They're specific. I'm sure the parties expected them to be achieved within a few years of signing the agreement. I know that Judge Henderson expected the Police Department to reach full compliance before he retired. And for several years now I've been thinking about a final settlement conference status conference that would celebrate the City's and OPD's success in achieving full compliance, but we're not there yet. And for some reason progress has stalled, seems to have stalled. not because the goalposts have shifted. They're where they were in 2003 with leadership, focus, and commitment. There's no reason why they won't be achieved. We're now focused on three principal tasks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Regarding Task 2, which addresses investigative timeliness, I agree with the plaintiffs' concern -- concerns regarding OPD's, quote, "staggering number of excuses for not being in compliance with Task 2."

The requirement that internal investigations be completed within 180 days is consistent with national practices. The 85 percent compliance standard is generous. With respect to sworn personnel, there were 231 fewer cases in 2024 than there were in 2023's -- 2023, yet the timeline's have regressed.

Regarding Task 5 which addresses investigative

quality, the City concedes that it's addressing persistent cultural issues hindering compliance with Task 5. A monitorship is not the best tool to address cultural issues, which have been endemic since the initiation of Court supervision. Leadership from the City and OPD is the key.

2.1

I'll be asking Acting Deputy Chief Hubbard about the quality of the Department's implementation of my September 6th, 2024, order and the measure to which the new reporting relationship between the leadership of IAB and the Chief is improving the effectiveness of the Internal Affair -- Affairs function.

Regarding Task 45, which addresses consistency of discipline, I'm not sure that a police department should be bragging that it is sustaining fewer cases. I would think to foster a culture of un- -- of accountability there'd be an increase in the number of sustained findings, even if the explanation is that the risk management practices and other reforms implemented by the NSA have been successful. According to the City's figures, in 2024 there were 1,417 total cases involving sworn officers. Of those, 5 percent, 64, were sustained. In 2023, 8 percent were sustained. And that's also concerning that of the 64 cases that were sustained in 2024, four were of white officers, and the remaining 60 were either black, Latin -- Latino, Asian, or other.

I appreciate that the City indicates that the

Department is committed to searching for and eliminating disparity in investigative outcomes and discipline. I should just say with respect to this task and compliance with the NSA in general, culture change requires strong leadership at all levels. Executive leadership has to drive culture. The culture cannot drive the leadership.

I'm going to make a couple more comments, and then I have some questions for the Chief and the Internal Affairs commander. And after that, I'd like to hear the perspectives of the parties and the Police Commission.

I want to make clear that the focus of this Court is on the City's compliance with the NSA. That scope is broad, but it is fairly well defined. There are always going to be significant issues that OPD has to face, but that doesn't mean that the Court has a role in them unless it's mandated by the NSA. And for that reason, issues regarding high-speed pursuits, as important as they are, are not part of the NSA, and I'm not going to weigh in on them. I am aware of other matters of concern that may impact the ability of the City to comply with the NSA, and the monitor does keep me advised of any ongoing sensitive issues.

I know that the voters have given the Police

Commission an important role to play with respect to OPD. I read with interest the report that addresses a possible future transition of the IAB function to the CPRA. I commend the City

for its thoughtful approach to this potential paradigm shift.

It's up to the City leaders to determine how best to proceed.

And I know that the Police Commission has been taking a more active role in its interaction with the Police Department, and I appreciate its work, along with the City, the Department, the plaintiffs' attorneys, and the monitoring team to develop policies and practices that enhance constitutional policing in Oakland.

So those are my comments.

And, Chief Mitchell, could I ask you to come up to the podium, please.

Good afternoon.

CHIEF MITCHELL: Good afternoon, sir.

THE COURT: So I'm interested in what you have been doing to address the problems that the plaintiffs have identified, particularly as it respects Task 2 and investigative time limits.

CHIEF MITCHELL: Yes, sir. If it -- if you'll allow me, I'm kind of hardwired to -- I write some of my thoughts down and kind of put them in an opening statement --

THE COURT: That is --

CHIEF MITCHELL: -- that went to --

THE COURT: That is fine. And it's been ten months since I've seen you, so I'm happy to hear whatever you have to say.

CHIEF MITCHELL: Yes, sir. And -- and I will go through kind of each of the tasks and kind of where we are and some of the things that I've observed and what we're doing if that's okay?

THE COURT: Okay.

CHIEF MITCHELL: All right.

Regarding Task 2, standards of IAB investigations, the IMT has deemed the Department is not in compliance with this task. I would like to provide the Court with the following command assessment completed by IAB Deputy Chief Bryan Hubbard after the restructuring that occurred on September 6th after our last meeting and made the IAB its own bureau that reports directly to the Chief of Police.

In February of 2023, the City of Oakland experienced a devastating ransomware attack that fundamentally disrupted the operations and particularly severe consequences for the Oakland Police Department and its Internal Affairs Bureau. The attack compromised our Vision case report management system, a critical platform used for processing, tracking, and managing misconduct complaints rendering it completely inoperable until March 24th of 2023, this six-week system outage created unprecedented backlog of Internal Affairs cases that could not be processed during the shutdown period. And, again, this is part of the assessment done after September 6th.

When the Vision system was finally restored, the

Department faced a surge of delayed case assignments requiring immediate distribution and investigation. The sudden influx overwhelmed existing personnel capacity triggering unplanned overtime expenditures and created significant costs as resources was averted from ongoing case investigations to address the backlog of cases that were lost. This operation was strained and extended far beyond the immediate technical disruption of the ransomware attack. Delayed case assignments compromised investigative timelines and created substantial pressure on the statutory deadlines, particularly the 180-day administrative deadline and the one-year Governmental Code Section 3304 limitation period for a disciplinary action deadline.

The cumulative effect of this systemwide direct limitation in case management would persist for more than 18 months. Now, while the exact number of affected cases remains difficult to quantify, the Department acknowledges that at least two of the cases with sustained findings missed their 3304 deadline as a direct result of the system problems and human administrative failures.

The broader impact extended across the entire Internal Affairs system affecting case processing, investigative timelines, and disciplinary procedures. And, accordingly, a current ongoing Internal Affairs investigation with examining command-level accountability failures -- failures to prevent

similar 3304 violations.

While the ransomware attack initially created disruption, the extended administrative lapses, or failures, particularly in cases where deadlines could have been met through proper administrative oversight, have prompted several comprehensive reviews. The -- I'm sorry -- reforms.

These reform measures: The Department has implemented extensive reforms to address the systematic failures and prevent future failures to include enhanced case management. All cases are now distributed promptly without ransomware-related delays. Weekly accountability track -- tracks both 180-day and 3304 deadlines. Realtime monitoring systems prevent cases from entering any type of administrative limbo status, improve inner-agency coordination. Biweekly case management -- case status meetings with CPRA help ensure clear communication and concurrent investigations -- on concurrent investigations. Standardized communication protocols immediately help resolve investigative gaps between agencies. And the regular coordination meeting prevent misunderstandings about case status and approaching deadlines.

Accountability and plaining systems: Weekly Internal Affairs reviews holds supervisors and commanders accountable for deadline compliances. The preemptive planning protocol engagement -- engaging commanders when cases approach critical deadlines, forward-looking disciplinary planning meetings are

integrated into the case management review process.

Institutional strengthening: Work to expand the IAB investigative workforce reduce strain on field personnel. We continually work to keep IAB fully staffed. And it's very difficult to do right now as we are attritioning down, losing almost 5.5 officers a month. Regular IAB meetings and command staff meetings maintain awareness of deadline requirements, and culture emphasis on thorough unbiased investigation is reinforced at every level of the Department.

The current status in moving forward: The Department has successfully cleared the assignment -- cleared the assignment backlog of cases related to the ransomware incident and restored normal operational capacity. The circumstances that previously undermined the Internal Affairs investigative process, poor communication, inadequate deadline monitoring, and insufficient inner-agency coordination are being systematically addressed through these institution reforms. While the Department cannot reverse the administrative failures that occurred during the -- during and after the ransomware attack, these comprehensive responses demonstrate a commitment to accountability and continuous improvement.

The enhanced systems now in place provide greater transparency, more responsive case management, and stronger safeguards against future disruptions. It is my belief that with the forms out—— with the reforms outlined above, the

opportunity for one missed case will no longer push the Department below the 85 percentile mark and result in us being held in noncompliance by the IMT.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

As it relates to Task 5, the complaint procedures in regards to IAB: The IMT deemed the Department to not be in compliance with this task. In IMT's tenth NSA sustainability report, specifically beginning on page 7, the commentary section, and continuing through page 7, the IMT meticulously and clearly documents that the Department is in compliance with each of the identified subtasks contained within their report, yet the IMT found the Department that was -- the Department was not in compliance with the task without providing any real quidance on what the Department should be or could be working on to gain compliance. The IMT in its conclusion on page 7 and in the second paragraph discusses the steps taken over the last two years by the Department to address the large-scale executive failures that occurred in April of 2022 regarding the Chung investigation and in August of 20 -- 20 -- 2022 involving the Tran investigation.

I believe it's important for the Court to note that the Department has taken enormous steps to prevent these type of failures from occurring again and has fully documented and published the lessons learned from these investigative failures so they will never happen again.

It has been over two years since these failures

occurred, and the IMT has not clearly indicated what activities or actions the Department should be taking to -- should be taking or current failures that continue to keep us not in compliance with Task 5. As such, I would ask the Court to have the IMT clearly identify to the Department what it can do to help get into compliance with this task.

2.1

As it relates to Task 45, consistency of discipline, the IMT has deemed the Department to be in partial compliance with this task. The IMT -- in the IMT's tenth sustainability report, specifically on page 7, the commentary section, the IMT points out that the -- that the most recent completed analysis using 2023 data did not identify statistically significant disparities and outcomes and discipline of non-white members. The IMT goes on to state while OPD has made progress with Task 45, recent metrics that the Department displayed during our most recent site visit gave pause for concern.

On page 33 of the joint case management statement to the Court, Attorney Brigid Martin speaks to the 2024 data and shows — that shows an unusually low number of cases for white officers in general and a low number of sustained cases.

However, when looking at the five-year review of case outcomes data, Attorney Marlin — Attorney Martin correctly identifies that, and I quote, "Collectively, however, from 2020 to 2024, officers across all races have similar five-year average sustain rates with white officers average having a higher

sustain rate. When numbers fluctuate year to year but maintain a stable five-year average, it suggests that the fluctuations are not indicative of long-term trends but, rather, variations around a stable baseline."

2.1

Attorney Martin continues later in that same paragraph to say, quote, "This indicates that the variations observed in 2024 are not part of an engrained training of disparate treatment or demonstrated" -- "or administration of communicative disparate impact," end quote.

It is my observation that we will continue to see a sawtooth effect when looking at disparate data on a year-to-year basis. It's an important — it's an important metric that provides an early indication of potential problems that we can address. The five-year average paints a clearer picture that should guide the Department's long-term initiatives and decision-making process as it relates to this process — this topic of addressing disparate impact. As such, I would again ask the Court to have the IMT clearly identify the steps they would like us to take to address this specific task as we move forward looking at the data on a year-to-year basis.

I am fully committed to helping this Department become in compliance with all three of these actions. There are certain things that we have to do better, and I believe right now that we have the steps in place to help us get better in

all of these things. However, when you look at Task 5 and Task 45, I would ask for some clarification as to exactly what we should be doing to try to get there, because as indicated in the IMT's report, all the tasks in Task 5 he has us in compliance, yet he holds us out of that. And that is confusing not only to me, but to our command staff.

THE COURT: So you meet with some regularity with the IMT?

CHIEF MITCHELL: We speak on the phone. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. And so I -- I agree that you -- that clarity is -- is very important and -- and communication is very important. And so I -- I hope that in your next conversation with the IMT you say exactly what you just said to me. I will emphasize that as well.

But let me ask you a couple of -- of questions.

Is the -- do you think that the sustained rate of 5 percent is -- shows -- is -- is typical, in your experience, of -- in police departments?

CHIEF MITCHELL: Well, when I look at the sustained rate and whether it is -- it -- whether it's increasing or dis- -- or decreasing, I think there's several factors to look at.

We have been in the NSA and going through this process for over two decades. When you look at it and you see that it's going down, it doesn't mean that your investigations are

getting weaker or your command staff is -- is being noncommittal to it. It could mean that the officers in the Department have taken hold and the change in the culture has taken hold, and we're finding less opportunity for us to sustain officers for violations because they're not doing those. The violations aren't occurring. They understand on the front end.

2.1

If you see an increase in the specific type of violation, and let's take the thing that happened a couple years ago in regards to failure to accept -- or -- or refer a complaint. The Department properly addressed that. They addressed that with training. They addressed that through policy and procedure. And you saw a reduction in the number of those -- those specific complaints.

So to say that 5 percent is that sweet spot is -- it's hard to say yes to that. There could be new technology that comes out tomorrow that creates a whole 'nother level of complaints that we miss, you know, that goes off the charts. So I think you have to look at all of those things on a case-by-case basis and determine that, hey, just because they're going down -- and I must have missed it. I didn't see where we were bragging about sustaining fewer complaints. I sustain complaints based on the information that is provided to me at that point in time, and that's -- I believe that's the procedural injustice not that we expect our officers to show

the individuals on the street, but it's the procedural justice that I need to show to the officers going through the disciplinary process. I -- I look at the information that's -- that's presented to me, and I make the decisions based on the facts presented to me at that time. Whether they're sustained or not are based on those facts and not necessarily I have to hit a certain number.

THE COURT: Okay. And let me ask you about the order that -- that I made in September which required a direct reporting relationship between the Deputy Chief overseeing IAB and you.

I'll also asked that biweekly meetings for OPD to update City -- City leadership about important IAB matters. How's that working out?

CHIEF MITCHELL: Well, I'll tell you, in my experience, and this is being my fourth department, there's always been Internal Affairs would report directly, you know, through the chain of command to the Chief of Police or directly through the Chief of Police to the Chief of Staff. So making that change is -- is -- it -- it's not anything foreign to me from that standpoint.

What I've seen in regards to what I've experienced in regards to it being here in Internal Affairs is it is working because we are having the biweekly meetings, in 4.1 meetings, the high-profile meetings. And we're following that up with

our NSA meetings that involve everyone involved.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

One of the things that I -- that I think is really good that comes out of that particular piece is everyone's situational awareness is -- is really on point. We know -and, again, this helps us with Tasks 5 and 45. Everyone in the room knows what's going on in the police department because we're getting updated on any new cases that come forward on a biweekly basis. We had our -- our NSA meeting -- our biweekly NSA meeting yesterday, I believe. And we're at the point now to where we didn't have any new cases coming in, so we're regurgitating all of the old cases. We are slowly starting to catch up with our cases and getting to a point to where I believe that -- my role in it right now is -- is very intense, but I think at some point in time I won't have to spend so much time reading the cases, because hopefully the number of cases will reduce as we catch up with the ones that are backlogged. I've seen cases dating back to 2019. So we're -- we're catching up with some of those cases.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

And I guess the last question that I have, last week I got a letter from the Coalition of Police Accountability that's on the docket, and it was -- it was kind of critical of you.

It said that you were dismissive of the need of reform, that OPD and the CPRA are disagreeing far more frequently on discipline, that OPD's not agreeing with discipline within the

discipline metrics notwithstanding compelling evidence.

And I wondered how you would respond to that, those criticisms.

CHIEF MITCHELL: Yes, sir. I -- I read that letter as well.

First -- first off, I would say that I am far from dismissive of the NSA. I live in the NSA each and every day. Everything that comes across my plate has -- has something to do with the NSA.

One of the things that I think is -- is important for this Court and this community to understand, that when I speak on behalf of the Police Department and as a representative of the leader of the Police Department, I'm going to speak from the position of truth. I'm going to tell them exactly what I see going on within the Police Department and how it's affecting the overall organization.

And the NSA is meant to address specific things, but it's not a perfect -- a perfect document. And there's going to have to be adjustments for unintended consequences that come up. What I am bringing up and voicing to whether it be the Commission, the City Administrator, or the community are things that I see that are affecting the operation of the Department, not -- not outside of the NSA. These are things that come up that have specifically to do with things that are going on in the NSA.

I believe some of the comments they're talking about are -- are specific to the decision to reopen and look at the pursuit policy. They're not happy about that. And some of those comments about, you know, officers taking a -- a hard look at whether or not to initiate a pursuit are -- are part of their concern. Like officers do not want to put themselves in a situation to where we know the car is going over 50 miles an hour right now, so why even initiate that pursuit? When you look at the 19 risk factors, they fall into that, and there's no need for them to initiate the pursuit. It is having an effect on our day-to-day operations.

So I go back to how I started this conversation. I'm going to come to you with the truth. The truth may not be what you want to hear, but that is the truth. And it's affecting the operation and the safety of this community, and it's my responsibility, whether you like to hear it or not, to tell you what the truth is.

THE COURT: So is that the issue that's been going on on the disciplinary matters, the difference between OPD's position --

CHIEF MITCHELL: No, no, no, no.

THE COURT: Okay. So tell me about that.

CHIEF MITCHELL: I apologize.

From -- from the disciplinary matter standpoint, CPRA and I, we more than -- more than not agree on the sustain and

not sustains. But where we sometimes disagree are where they may see the increase in disagreement is on the level of discipline that goes with that.

2.1

When you look at progressive discipline -- and when I look at discipline, I look at it from the standpoint of can I change behavior, and what can I do to change behavior with the minimal -- minimal impact on the Department. And how I go about that is if -- if I am looking at a failure to -- or a -- a failure to accept or refer a complaint or delayed body-warn activation or something even bigger than that, I may look at it from a five-day standpoint, and CPRA is looking at it from a 15-day standpoint or a 14-day standpoint or 13-day standpoint.

I've had these conversations in our meetings with everyone in the room, and -- and I look at it as how can I change behavior starting from progressive behavior moving my way up.

And we don't always meet in the middle. And that's what the Disciplinary Commission -- or the -- the Disciplinary Commander -- Panel is for. And we go there, but more than not we agree on whether or not it's sustained or not. There are times where we disagree, and -- and I think that's part of this process, is -- is understanding: Okay. You see it from this standpoint. I see it from this standpoint. How can we come together?

And one of the -- I'll tell you one of the ones that

come up, has come up quite often, is *Miranda* violations. Whether the officer's chasing the guy and he sees him throw something or thinks he sees him throw something and once he catches up to him: What did you -- what did you throw?

The officer is saying that, hey, I -- you know, I'm asking that question from a public safety standpoint. But we only have one violation. We have a Class 1 violation for that.

And when you look at some of the -- the different scenarios that pop up, where's the person in a position to where you're trying to, you know, ask him questions that would incriminate that person, or -- or are they trying to do something that from a public safety standpoint they threw a gun, and I need to know where that gun is. So we're -- we're having conversations of can we identify or possibly initiate a Class 2 violation for that.

So when we disagree, it's things like that that occur. And they're going to continue to occur to where they will see it through one lens, and I might see it through another. There are several people in the room. And we generally go around the room and ask: How are you seeing these -- these -- these types of things?

So I don't know that the process or the system -- it doesn't appear to me that the system was meant that we're supposed to be a rubber stamp for each other, and we're not. They take their stances on things, and I take my stance on

others. And evidently that's being communicated to the -- the CPA, and they're taking issue with us having disagreements.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. I appreciate it. Appreciate your time.

Let me ask Acting Deputy Chief Hubbard. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY CHIEF HUBBARD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you heard me ask the Chief about some of the work that you're doing, so let me get your perspective.

Can you talk about how the more direct, if -- if it is more direct communication, how that's working and affecting the processes of IAB.

DEPUTY CHIEF HUBBARD: Yeah. I appreciate, first, creating a Deputy Chief position for IA. It's -- actually, when I came to IA late last year, I was surprised of how -- how much work a captain does there, so I think a Deputy Chief really softened that. Also, direct access to the Chief has been very helpful. But I would say the most helpful thing, Your Honor, is the biweekly NSA updates that we do with all the stakeholders.

So just to educate those in the room, we have a spreadsheet that has all the high-profile cases, and the Chief selects the high-profile cases that he would like Internal Affairs to present. And then what I do is I go through each case top to bottom. I use our Vision system and also the case

itself to understand the -- the -- the background of the complaint, the investigative steps thus far.

2.1

So it's a healthy exercise for me to do that. But, moreover, when I'm actually presented it, it is a very detailed presentation. There's no anonymity. Everything is out -- out in the open. I really appreciate the stakeholders and the questions that they ask, because it allows me to have an understanding of what they're looking at, where I can go back, then, to the investigator and say: This is what we can do better.

Also, with that is we've -- since the last court hearing, we have gone through all the high-profile cases, and now we're actually going back and addressing them again. So there are no high-profile cases that the Chief, nor the stakeholders, are not aware of.

THE COURT: Great. And so what issues do you think still need to be addressed within Internal Affairs?

DEPUTY CHIEF HUBBARD: Yes, Your Honor. I -
timeline's certainly a priority for me, Task 2. To combat

that, we've created a system where if there is anticipated

discipline, we have already coordinated with the -- the

member's captain. So there's no delay there. So if there -
if the officer or the employee is on leave, then we can work

that in advance. So we have that already set in place.

There's a feedback loop to go with it.

Also, we -- we have a very healthy close relationship with the CPRA. We also meet biweekly, which was never done in the past, and we go over these cases. And they're also -- they also highly value timelines, and we make sure that those are met.

Lastly, the last two quarterly command retreats with all the commanders, and there's another one coming up in a couple weeks, I make it a point to talk about Task 2 and Task 5. Surprisingly, there are a lot of commanders who don't know the intricacies of Task 2 and Task 5, so I go over each one top to bottom. And there's accountability loop with that.

If a sergeant falls shorts -- short on timeline,

Internal Affairs quickly responds to their chain of command and
say: We first want you to be aware of this, number 1, but also
provide mentorship and training, maybe intervention and
monitoring for our pass, and then, finally, if necessary, an
Internal Affairs Investigation.

THE COURT: So are you satisfied, then, at this point that every -- everything -- all the processes are in place and that you're in a place to be able to be in full compliance with Task 2 and Task 5 in the very near future?

DEPUTY CHIEF HUBBARD: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Glad to hear that. Thank you.

DEPUTY CHIEF HUBBARD: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go to counsel. So let's

2.1

start with the plaintiffs.

MR. CHANIN: On -- Your Honor, I have a couple of things to say about what the Chief had to say. He mentioned ransomware attack, which was two years ago. And I had never heard that the ransomware attack was in any way responsible for missing deadlines. It's not mentioned in the defendants' brief.

And I just want to say that if -- I didn't -- this is news to me. But let's say for the sake of discussion that it had had an effect. So what would -- what would you do if you were head of the Department or close to it?

Well, I would write down every single case in IA and what the 3304 was and that -- and then I would go off of that, even if it had to be rewritten by hand, because it just doesn't take that much time, and then I would just say: Well, gee, we have a problem here, here, and here.

And that -- that was not done. It just wasn't. It just didn't happen. And I -- I -- I didn't even know that the ransomware attack was a problem in terms of 3304 and 180 days. But even if it had been a problem, it was a curable problem in terms of blowing deadlines. It just was. Sorry.

But -- and then, Your Honor, your order of

September 6th, 2024, was violated by the Chief and by the City

Attorney and by the City of Oakland. There's not one thing you asked for. You asked for compliance with Task 2. It didn't

happen. You asked for compliance with Task 5. It didn't happen. Your entire order was about Task 2 and 5, and we're here today largely because the Department did not comply with Task 2 or 5. So to give some reason why they -- they didn't understand your order or they -- they're not in compliance is -- is -- is not good enough. They have to give a reason, and then they have to do something about it.

2.1

I -- I am very pleased with the performance of Deputy Chief Hubbard, and there's going to be training on the matters that he's identified in his memos on IA. That's coming up very shortly. And we're looking forward to participating -- you know, not participating, but just knowing what's going on in the training so I don't come here a year from now and complain that this wasn't done and that wasn't done, because I don't want to be here doing that a year from now. It -- no one -- you know, I just don't.

And, you know, so I -- I don't see that your order was followed at all, Your Honor. I just don't see it. And they have lots of people in this Department. I know we -- I live in Oakland. I've lived here 45 years, or there, and I know they have a big problem with crime. I myself have been a victim. My wife has been a victim. But that's not -- that's not a reasonable answer to why they can't do constitutional policing.

THE COURT: Right. You're -- you're referring to the -- the end game, the -- you're not saying that procedurally

as a result of my order they didn't change the reporting obligations and the meetings with the City and so forth.

MR. CHANIN: Exactly.

You're just saying: Why didn't it work?

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. So -- so that's -- we've been here before on that, so I -- I hear you.

What -- what more would you tell me, Mr. Chanin?

MR. CHANIN: Nothing.

THE COURT: Perfect.

MR. CHANIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Burris.

MR. BURRIS: Your Honor, there are areas that have taken place, and I think the Court has mentioned them as well, that I'm truly quite pleased about as well. The stop data and the profiling issues, as the Court knows, have been issues that are paramount to me, and -- and to see those numbers consistently going down really makes me feel that a sense of accomplishment for the process that has taken place. And -- and I'd give a lot of credit to those officers and people who was involved in that process, because I look at these processes, it's for -- it's for the people unborn or unseen who are getting the benefit of this.

And when you see those numbers go down like that, it makes me feel great about those people out there who have no

idea the progress that has been made, but we know there has been. So that part is extraordinarily important.

2.1

I'm not as offended by the consistency of discipline issues. I think that my initial reaction was that this is not good. When I saw that no whites were -- had a discipline matter in small numbers and the blacks had high numbers, and that is alarming, but maybe less so if you take the five-year period and look at the context of it. And that -- that means something to look forward to, but, you know -- you don't know. You got to look at the numbers and -- and we'll see.

And maybe that is a bit of a warning as well that for those officers who have to make these judgments and evaluations of the individual officers have to go along. And maybe just knowing that those numbers are there and potentially could get out of whack could have a deterrent effect. And hopefully that's true.

Although I'm not as -- as sanguine as the Chief about the facts that the sustained number has gone down, because that doesn't sit particularly right in terms of my own view of the world, in terms of my looking at cases around the country and seeing what the sustain rate looks like. I mean, it really is a 70 to 80 -- 70 to 80 percent number that traditionally is out there. For it to go down at this rate, as the Chief suggests, might be a numbers factor. Maybe we have to see next time whether or not that's true or not. But I am -- I'm not as

willing to accept that as -- as a fact that things are hunky-dory and they're all great.

But I will tell you this, and I will say this to the Chief: I'm not impressed at all by this notion that -- that the monitor has to tell them what to do. I mean, these are -- these are professional people, all of them. The Chief has been the Chief for a long time. These are hearings that -- that from a reasonable point of view should be able to see and assess. And if a problem's there before, and there's a problem there the next day, why that problem can't be fixed without someone telling you how to fix it?

So I don't think it's appropriate -- I don't think it's a response to say that -- that -- that the monitor has to tell us what to do. And that, to me, is the responsibility of the Chief and his staff to fix it. We've been here for 20-some years, and this is not -- these are not new issues. This is not something that's first come up. And it's been a problem consistently.

So I don't think we should be saying that -- throwing shade on the monitor for not having telling them. The shade is on the Police Chief and his staff for not getting it done. And I don't think that there's a reason to suggest in any way that it can't get done by them, and I don't think we leave here until it gets done by them.

Now, my last point is I've read this Coalition for

Police Accountability. And I know the Court has gone through it -- some of it. Some of these things have been said about the Chief. I would hope they're not true, but they're quite disturbing, and -- and it's something that should be dealt with, particularly when statements are made to the effect that -- that the -- the reforms themselves are hindering them -- hindering police work, affecting police. That is a tired whole statement that has been made, and it just cannot be true. But it is being said by these -- it's being interpreted by this group as a statement that's being made. And if that's being a position, then that's true.

Now, I have heard it's a problem. Now, I surely have heard on more than one occasion that there's this real sense that the pursuit policy itself is calling officers not to do their job, that they're unwilling to do it. That, to me, is inexcusable. That's a Chief problem. That's a leadership problem. That there should be no justification for not doing your job because there's rules in effect that you don't like or you don't -- therefore, it seems, to me, that those -- those are not justifications for it.

But the pursuit policy, the Court -- our position -- generally our position has been clearly stated, and it is one that I feel very strongly about, that you shouldn't have speed limits over 50 miles an hour going into the City of Oakland on the streets. I've been involved in more than five cases down

through the years where people have been killed unnecessarily so by high-speed chases. We just had one more recently in Oakland when CHP caused one with a young man 40 years old, killed. And if you look at the -- so the national data out there, and there's plenty of it that's been reported, that high-speed chases is not a positive event for any community. Bad things happen to people. And sometimes these speed chases take place on some minor traffic offense that does not in anyway justify a high-speed chase through a community.

And I'm certainly willing to concede, and I've said this, there are circumstances where you may have to engage in speed chases, but it ought not be arbitrary, it not ought be at the whim of a 25-year-old, 22-year-old, 23-year-old officer making a decision without some real monitoring taking place from above by -- by command people.

So I am concerned and we have not resolved these particular issues. I think they have to be. But any kind of justification and rationalization that it's the community's fault or it's the NSA's fault while accomplishments have to take place, it's not acceptable and should not be in any way — and we will not accept it, Jim and I.

And so it may or may not be totally accurate as what's being said here, but it's alarming, because if it is true, partially true, that means that the Department is not being run in such a way that it's committed to constitutional policing

and excuses and justifications are being made for rationalizations. And that's just unacceptable at this stage of the game.

So I just want to make it clear that -- that I am concerned about some of these issues. A lot of positive things have taken place, of which I have said and readily appear.

And I will say this to the Court so the Court knows, and others will know as well, that I've been involved in a similar case in the area, and much of the policy that we've developed here I have transferred and utilized those in developing policy in the other city. So I love the policies. And so it's not the policies that's the problem. It's the implications of the policies. And that's where we still are here. So the future is one that can get done, but I don't think rationalization and scapegoating is the way to go.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Burris.

Mr. Lucia.

MR. LUCIA: Your Honor, unless you have some questions or concerns that relate to the OPOA, we really have nothing to add at this point.

THE COURT: Got nothing for you.

MR. LUCIA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. LUCIA: Okay. That sounds good to me.

THE COURT: All right. And is there someone who was going to speak on behalf of the Police Commission?

MR. GARCIA-ACOSTA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

2.1

THE COURT REPORTER: Could I get a name, please.

THE COURT: The -- the vacant voice is the court reporter asking for your name.

MR. GARCIA-ACOSTA: There you go. Yes, indeed. So thank you.

So on behalf of the Oakland Police Commission, I am Chair Garcia-Acosta serving in my role for the majority of this past year at this current capacity. In my professional life, I'm a dedicated community advocate, thought leader, with over 25 years of experience in community violence prevention and intervention strategies here in the Bay area. My passion for collective healing and accountability within the community work that I lead has carried over directly of how I have been recently leading this wonderful group of professionals that make up the Oakland Police Commission.

The Court has received the Commission's written submission, which is worth the Court's time to fully consider. But rather than summarizing each of my written points in our filing, I want to use my time today to urge the Court to more formally integrate the Police Commission's work into the oversight process. The Commission's perspective is that reform

would be strengthened by explicit Court guidance to the City and to the monitor to embrace the Commission's role.

2.1

Last year we presented ideas to the Court on areas the Commission would like to focus on to do our part to develop the proactive measures that we felt would help OPD lead to long-term cultural change and sustainability. These suggestions included developing an educational campaign, assessing the effectiveness of disciplinary actions, and collaborating with stakeholders to form the NSA ad hoc to name a few. The Commission has made progress in certain areas and identified additional policies and practices where its unique perspective and position can further contribute to the advancement of sustained culture change within the Department. However, there's still challenges addressing certain perspectives, and often we find ourselves on the outside looking in.

An undervalued and unappreciated resource in a city where resources are finite just doesn't make any sense. So directing the City to formally embrace the work of OPC would compliment the current director -- Compliance Director's efforts. And in addition to collaboration with IAG -- with our OIG -- excuse me -- we assure the Department integrates OPC's work and our unique perspective within a safe 52 tasks as we integrate that into our cultural identity of the Department.

We also have examples of KPIs that we're working on to

address achieve -- to address achieving compliance, and we would really welcome both the Court and the monitor's perspective in finalizing what those involve.

2.1

This kind of cooperative and informed oversight strengthens the City's ability to meet NSA benchmarks or build the capacity of OPC and the internal accountability mechanism -- mechanisms that will en- -- ensure that OPC sustains their progress beyond just the federal monitoring.

Your Honor, over the long term, the Commission would diligently prepare and will continue to resume and take on additional responsibilities. We're now almost fully staffed. We have changed the culture and the overall ability engagement of our commissioners, and we believe that our proposal to the Court represents a significant step in that direction. OPC through the IG and CPRA offices see the day-to-day functions of OPD, and we know the trends and the practices. And it's through these lenses that we have the ability to change the culture.

Our focus should -- today should be on why Oakland has not reached sustained compliance with the NSA and how OPC, along with our key partners, can serve as an additional tool that will assist the City of Oakland to reach and maintain sustained compliance, which is difficult to achieve without day-to-day daily on-site oversight of OPD. We have the reach, the lens, the proximity to be able to -- to carry out this task

and really answer the questions that we've heard from the public in some of these Court filings. We have the ability to look at allegations of misconduct by category and frequency at all levels within OPD. We have the ability to look sustained findings of misconduct and the factors that contribute to that conduct and the disagreements between OPD and CPRA and what are the root causes of that. And OPD's reporting on issues not only monitored by the NSA, but other contributing factors to OPD's inability to meet the NSA objectives, we also have insight and close proximity to that.

And with this increased understanding of the day-to-day operations of OPD, the Oakland Police Commission can work with the Compliance Director to create the culture and practices that have mirrored the OPD in 20-plus years of judicial oversight. At this point we can't -- we cannot expect compliance without changes in the interventions themselves.

Lastly, I also want to emphasize that we are also here to listen, learn, and embrace the feedback provided by all the multiple state -- state quarters and parties about what we can do to compel the Court that now is the right time to embrace this new vision of constitutional policing in Oakland and allowing us to lean in on our charter mandates.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. GARCIA-ACOSTA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Acosta. Appreciate it.

Ms. Martin.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Well, it's been nine months since the Internal Affairs
Division has restructured as its own bureau, it's been more
than a year since Chief Mitchell has begun leading this Police
Department, and it's been more than two years since the
investigatory failures in Tran occurred. And during that more
than two-year period, the City and the Department have taken
action. They've taken action, and they've identified and
prevented similar investigatory failures. And that's important
to say "identified" and "prevented" l similar actions from
occurring.

And what's important is that the City and that the Department are not sitting by waiting for time to pass with their fingers crossed hoping that there's not another investigatory failure. The City and the Department are taking action to make sure that there's not a similar failure and that that doesn't happen again.

The City and the Department actions prove that NSA compliance is a priority. Their actions prove that changing the lingering culture issues in the Department is a priority.

And actions speak louder than words. Words can be misinterpreted sometimes or misunderstood. And while words and

messaging are important, actions are more important.

And I would like to share some of the actions that the City and that the Department have undertaken since the last court hearing that didn't make it into the monitor's reports and that maybe the public is not aware of but that are all very important and that all positively impact the culture of the Department and work toward that change. And there's many, and I want to list a lot of them. I won't list all of them, but some of the more important actions that have been taken on, because I -- I want us to all consider those as well.

The Chief extended the contract with Stanford for technical assistance.

The Chief went to City Council and got approval for a new five-year agreement for data sharing between the City of Oakland Police Department and Stanford University so Stanford could continue its groundbreaking research using Oakland's data and directly helping Oakland change its culture.

The Chief directed the Bureau of Risk Management to reinitiate inspections on all NSA tasks, not only the tasks that are still under affirmative review.

The Court -- City Administrator, with the CPRA

Director and the Police Commission, presented the report from the consultant on transferring responsibility from IAB to the CPRA.

The Mayor and the City Administrator very purposefully

worked together to recruit and rehire Minneapolis's Director of Civil Rights, Michelle Phillips, who used to be the City's Inspector General. She'll be coming back and joining the City in Oakland and working on special projects related to NSA compliance and cultural change.

THE COURT: And I meant to say that's a -- I'm delighted with that.

2.1

MS. MARTIN: And the Mayor's only been here one month, Your Honor, but taking action.

The Inspector General began an audit of several tasks that implicated Internal Affairs procedures that haven't been reviewed by the monitor in years.

The Department's Office of Internal Accountability completed an audit of the race and equity measures that the Department has to see if they -- if those are continuing and whether they're effective. As a result, the Department has now reestablished its race and equity team.

The Office of Internal Accountability also just recently sent out its biannual survey to understand members' perceptions of Internal Affairs investigations and processes.

And that same office is just about finished up with its 2024 internal investigations outcomes and discipline report, so that should be published soon.

We have our assist -- Acting Assistant Chief Tedesco continuing to lead the command review of force and force

investigations that has proven to be so effective.

2.1

Our risk management program is continuing.

As we've discussed a bit, Acting Deputy Chief Hubbard led an analysis of lessons learned from the Tran investigation and made sure that that was provided to the entire Department and to the public so that everyone can understand what went wrong and we can prevent it from happening again.

All of these accomplishments are in addition, of course, to the Court-mandated biweekly meetings, which we've also heard have made a difference and have really improved communication across City leadership and the Department.

And all of these things positively impact the culture of the Department, particularly have an impact on Tasks 5 and 45. And the City is very hopeful that through its continued action, that by the next court hearing, we will have a compliance endorsement from the monitor and the plaintiffs' counsel. Not because it's been more than two years because of a failure in the Tran case, and not because the City of Oakland's charter mandates NSA compliance and auditing even after Court oversight is gone, but because the City and the Department have taken specific actions to allow the Court and the community to have confidence that the City and the Department will continue substantial compliance with the NSA even after Court oversight is — has ended.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: So, Mayor Lee, I would love to hear your assessment of where things stand and where things are going to go forward.

MAYOR LEE: Yes. Well, good afternoon, Your Honor.

First of all, yes, my name is Barbara Lee, Mayor of Oakland, California. It's really a privilege to be here with you representing the people of Oakland. Now, I was sworn in as the Mayor of Oakland May 20th. This is my -- I believe my 51st day. And I just want to tell you a large portion of my work has been supporting NSA compliance. This is truly a priority for me.

I want to start by saying how much I appreciate all of the work that so many people have already put into achieving real progress under the NSA. So I want to sincerely thank the Court, Chief Warshaw, and the monitoring team -- monitoring team, and our plaintiffs' counsel, Mr. Burris, who I've known for a long, long time, and Mr. Chan- -- Chanin, Mr. Lucia, and the Oakland Police Officers Association, and, of course, Chief Mitchell and his executive team. Of course, our oversight bodies, the Police Commission, Inspector General, CPRA, as well as the City Attorney's Office, and all of our community members who are engaged with these issues.

I am very grateful that you understand, hopefully, that a lot has been accomplished under the NSA thus far, but I

look forward also to working with this incredible team to finally achieve full compliance with the NSA. I must also acknowledge and I'd like to take a minute to acknowledge the men and women of the Police Department, the true heart of the organization. The overall success of our public safety depends on them.

2.1

While we work to set the tone of organizational professionalism and accountability and to model the behavior and organizational culture that we expect, we expect each member of the Department to uphold this. We must remain attentive also to the physical and the well-being and the mental wellness of the public servants who have chosen this challenging profession. But constitutional policing, yes, is at the core of this important profession.

Now, after more than 20 years -- and I remember very clearly when this began. Over 20 years Court oversight.

There's some urgency to get these remaining tasks completed. A lot of urgency. Oaklanders, we deserve results. We are very aware that the community wants a functioning and a fair police department, a department that we see as part of our community and that sees itself as part of our community and that truly shares our community values.

Your Honor -- Your Honor, I understand, however, that Court oversight, it cannot end until there is full compliance.

And I want -- I want you to know that I am committed to getting

there. I'm committed to fulfilling the promise the City's made to this community when it agreed to the NSA. I appreciate that the belief and the respect for the mission and the policies has to be felt and communicated from the top; from the Mayor, from the City Administrator, and from the Police Chief. This is about true cultural change, I understand that, and the Police Department as an organization and how we view our relationship with and our responsibility to our community.

Your Honor, I recognize that what is keeping the City from attaining full compliance on the remaining NSA tasks is a fundamental culture issue in the Department pertaining to internal investigations and discipline. To effect the culture change necessary, I must make it extremely clear that as Mayor of the City, what I expect from this Chief and from the Department. And what I expect is integrity and courage not only in policing, but in accountability. This is a tough job in investigating allegations of officer misconduct, holding officers accountable when they violate our community trust, and making sure that accountability is fair, consistent, and prompt.

As the Mayor, it's up to me to send the message from the top to the Police Chief and all the way to the newest employee -- employee of the Department that part, also, of that message is that the integrity of the work of the Internal Affairs Bureau is pivotal. And I mean it's pivotal, as you

know, and we all know, to the Department -- Department's
mission.

2.1

So ultimately, Your Honor, I know that to achieve the culture change that we need to sustain compliance we need more than words. We need action, and we need a plan. One of the things that I have done in my short time, and it's been pretty short, is to work with the City Administrator to recruit with purpose and with intention and a system City Administrator with the background, the knowledge, and the ability to help me communicate my vision, our City's vision, and values to the Department and to help me understand on a day-to-day basis, mind you, day to day, the progress that we're making and where we are still falling short.

As mentioned earlier, I'm excited to share, again, that Michelle Phillips, who previously served as the City's first Inspector General, and who is here with us today in the courtroom, she will rejoin the City on August 30th as an Assistant City Administrator. Ms. Phillips' most important assignment will be to work directly for and with me and my office on the special project of the NSA compliance and culture change within the Police Department. A crucial part of Ms. Phillips' work will be to engage with the Police Chief, with Chief Warshaw and his team. And I look forward to continuing to have the monitor serve in his current role as we continue forward.

Under my leadership, the City will focus not only on NSA compliance, Your Honor, but what comes after compliance -- after -- excuse me -- Court oversight ends. Ends. We will remain attentive to the long term and the perpetual task of maintaining a culture in the Police Department that mirrors the culture of the community that it serves and that brings the Department into the fold. As you said, it takes leadership, it takes focus, and it takes commitment.

Your Honor, we are making progress. And let me tell you I want this done under my watch as quickly as possible but in full compliance. And I want to assure you, Your Honor, that it's all hands on deck. I intend to make sure of that.

Thank you again.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mayor Lee. And so I have to tell you, first of all, I share your goal more than you know. It is time for -- for the Court's oversight to end and for -- for the City and the Department to go forth without Court oversight but with full compliance with every element of constitutional policing.

I've delayed -- we haven't had a -- a hearing for nine months in part, and there have been a couple of longer gaps over the last few years because of the lack of leadership that was in place. There is leadership in place, and I want to move rapidly, and I want to see the City move rapidly to -- to full compliance.

So this is what I want to do: First, the -- with respect to the -- for the monitor and the Compliance Director, in any way that you think the team can be of more benefit to you, call on them. And they have -- they know that my desire is that every resource that they have that would be useful to you should be made available to you in order to -- to get this done.

I'm going to set the next case management conference in December, on December 9th, at 3:30. And I'm going to ask for either in status reports from Ms. Martin or the City on August -- by August 26th and October 21st updating me on the efforts, the ongoing efforts and -- and -- and any new efforts to achieve compliance. So -- so I want to be working hand in glove with every effort you make in order to -- to complete satisfaction of the -- the NSA.

MAYOR LEE: Thank you, Your Honor. We're very serious about this project we intend to make. And with Ms. Phillips, myself, our Police Department, and with our community organizations, our partners, with the entire team in Oakland, we want to make this work, and we want to be in full compliance.

THE COURT: It is great. And there is no doubt from the -- the comments that I have received from the public the entire community wants to make this happen. They may have different ideas about how it ought to happen, but using all of

their talents in the best way that you are perfectly poised to make that happen. So I hope you do. MAYOR LEE: Thank you, Your Honor, very much. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Thank you all. (Proceedings conclude at 4:43 p.m.) ---000---

CERTIFICATE

I, CATHY J. TAYLOR, do hereby certify that I am duly appointed and qualified to act as Official Court Reporter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript of all of that portion of the proceedings contained herein, had in the above-entitled cause on the date specified therein, and that said transcript was prepared under my direction and control.

DATED this 18h day of July, 2025.

/s/Cothy J. Taylor Cathy J. Taylor, RMR,

1	<b>21st</b> [1] 1:48:11	,	Accountability [4]	1:37:1
	22-year-old [1]	6	1:19:21_, 1:32:1_,	addressed [5]
In a th an 4.47.47	1:33:13	20 515 4 0 00	1:41:13_, 1:41:18	1:12:17_, 1:17:11_,
'nother [1] 1:17:17		<b>60</b> [1]_ <b>-</b> 1:6:23	· ·	
_	23-year-old [1]	<b>602</b> [1] - 1:1:23	accountability [11]	1:17:12_, 1:25:17
/	1:33:13	<b>64</b> [2]_ <b>-</b> 1:6:20_,	1:6:15_, 1:10:25_,	addresses [4]
	<b>2300</b> [1] - 1:2:13	1:6:22	1:11:11_, 1:11:21_,	1:5:15_, 1:5:25_,
/s/Cathy [1] - 1:50:18	<b>231</b> [1] 1:5:22	6th [4] 1:6:7_,	1:12:21_, 1:26:11_,	1:6:12_, 1:7:24
• 11	<b>24th</b> [1] 1:9:21	1:9:11_, 1:9:24_,	1:35:16_, 1:37:6_,	addressing [4]
0	<b>25</b> [2] 1:4:8_,	1:27:23	1:44:8_, 1:45:16_,	1:6:1_, 1:15:17_,
U	1:35:14	1.27.25	1:45:19	1:25:13_, 1:36:14
00 4500 (1) 1,2,0		_	accountable [2]	adjustments [1]
<b>00-4599</b> [1] 1:3:9	25-year-old [1]	7		
	1:33:13		1:11:22_, 1:45:18	1:20:19
1	<b>26th</b> [1] 1:48:11	<b>7</b> [4] 1:13:7_, 1:13:8.	accurate [2]	administration [1]
		_, 1:13:14_, 1:14:10	1:33:22, 1:50:10	1:15:8
<b>1</b> [2]_ <b>-</b> 1:23:7,	3	<b>70</b> [2] 1:30:22	achieve [5] 1:37:1_,	administrative [6]
1:26:14	G	<b>7677</b> [1] - 1:2:4	1:37:23_, 1:44:2_,	1:10:11_, 1:10:20_,
<b>1,417</b> [1] 1:6:19	<b>3050</b> [1] - 1:2:6		1:46:3_, 1:48:13	1:11:3_, 1:11:5_,
<b>10</b> [1] - 1:1:7	<b>30th</b> [1]= 1:46:17	0	achieved [2] 1:5:3_,	1:11:13_, 1:12:18
		8	1:5:13	Administrator [9]
<b>1120</b> [1] - 1:2:4	<b>31</b> [1] - 1:1:22	• 4001		
<b>11th</b> [1] - 1:50:14	<b>312</b> [1] - 1:1:21	<b>8</b> [1] 1:6:21	achieving [3] 1:5:9	1:2:18_, 1:3:25_,
<b>13-day</b> [1] 1:22:12	<b>322-7249</b> [1] - 1:1:23	<b>80</b> [2] 1:30:22	_, 1:37:1_, 1:43:14	1:20:21_, 1:40:21_,
<b>14-day</b> [1] 1:22:12	<b>33</b> [1] 1:14:17	<b>85</b> [2] 1:5:21_,	acknowledge [2]	1:40:25_, 1:45:5_,
<b>15-day</b> [1] 1:22:12	<b>3304</b> [6] 1:10:12_,	1:13:2	1:44:3	1:46:7_, 1:46:8_,
<b>18</b> <sub>[1]</sub> 1:10:16	1:10:19_, 1:11:1_,	<b>85003-2151</b> [1] -	acknowledges [1]	1:46:18
<b>180</b> [2] 1:5:20_,	1:11:12_, 1:27:13_,	1:1:22	1:10:17	admired [1] 1:4:7
1:27:19	1:27:19	1.1.22	Acosta [4] - 1:2:16_,	advance[1] 1:25:24
			1:4:1_, 1:35:11_,	advancement [1]
<b>180-day</b> [2] 1:10:10	3:00-cv-04599-WHO	9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• •
_, 1:11:12	[1] - 1:1:5		1:39:1	1:36:13
<b>19</b> [1] 1:21:9	<b>3:30</b> [1] 1:48:9	<b>94523</b> [1] - 1:2:13	ACOSTA[3] 1:35:3	advised [1] 1:7:20
	<b>3:32</b> [1] 1:3:3	<b>94612</b> [1] - 1:2:10	_, 1:35:8_, 1:38:25	advocate [1]
2	<b>3:33</b> [1] - 1:1:8	<b>94621</b> [1] - 1:2:4	act [1] - 1:50:8	1:35:13
_		<b>94705</b> [1] - 1:2:7	Acting [5] - 1:2:16_,	<b>Affair</b> [1] 1:6:10
<b>2</b> [12]_ <b>-</b> 1:5:15_,	4	<b>9th</b> [1] 1:48:9	1:6:6_, 1:24:5_,	Affairs [18] 1:6:10_,
1:5:18_, 1:8:16_,	4	<b>911</b> [1] 1.40.9	1:41:24_, 1:42:3	1:7:8_, 1:9:17_,
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4.4 4.40.04		action [7] 1:10:12_,	1:9:22_, 1:10:22_,
1:9:7_, 1:23:15_,	<b>4.1</b> [1] 1:18:24	Α	1:39:11_, 1:39:19_,	
1:25:19_, 1:26:8_,	<b>40</b> [1] 1:33:3		, ,	1:10:24_, 1:11:22_,
1:26:10_, 1:26:21_,	<b>401</b> [1] - 1:1:22	<b>ability</b> [7] 1:7:19_,	1:41:9_, 1:42:15_,	1:12:14_, 1:18:17_,
1:27:25_, 1:28:2_,	<b>45</b> [7] 1:6:12_,	1:37:5_, 1:37:12_,	1:46:5	1:18:23_, 1:24:24_,
1:28:4	1:14:7_, 1:14:15_,	1:37:17_, 1:38:2_,	actions [11] 1:14:2	1:25:17_, 1:26:13_,
<b>20</b> [4] 1:13:18_,	1:16:2_, 1:19:5_,	1:38:4_, 1:46:9	_, 1:15:23_, 1:36:8_,	1:26:17_, 1:39:5_,
1:44:15_, 1:44:16	1:28:20_, 1:42:14	able [3] 1:26:20_,	1:39:13_, 1:39:21_,	1:41:11_, 1:41:20_,
<b>20-plus</b> [1] 1:38:14	<b>4:43</b> [1] 1:49:5	1:31:8_, 1:37:25	1:39:22_, 1:39:24_,	1:45:25
<b>20-some</b> [1] 1:31:15	T.43.J	above-entitled [1] -	1:40:1_, 1:40:2_,	affected [1] 1:10:16
	<u>-</u>		1:40:9_, 1:42:21	affecting [6]
<b>2003</b> [1] 1:5:12	5	1:50:11	activation [1]	1:10:22_, 1:20:16_,
<b>2019</b> [1] 1:19:17		accept [4] 1:17:10_,		
<b>2020</b> [1] 1:14:23	<b>5</b> [17]_ <b>-</b> 1:5:25_, 1:6:2	1:22:9_, 1:31:1_,	1:22:10	1:20:22_, 1:21:14_,
<b>2022</b> [2] 1:13:17_,	_, 1:6:20_, 1:13:4_,	1:33:21	active [1] 1:8:4	1:24:11_, 1:32:7
1:13:18	1:14:4_, 1:16:1_,	acceptable [1]	activities [1] 1:14:1	<b>afternoon</b> [14] 1:3:6
<b>2023</b> [5] 1:5:23_,	1:16:4_, 1:16:17_,	1:33:20	<b>ad</b> [1] 1:36:9	_, 1:3:12_, 1:3:15_,
1:6:21_, 1:9:14_,	1:17:15_, 1:19:5_,	access [1] 1:24:17	add [1] 1:34:21	1:3:17_, 1:3:20_,
1:9:21_, 1:14:12	1:26:9_, 1:26:10_,	accomplished [2]	addition [2] 1:36:21	1:3:22_, 1:4:5_,
<b>2023's</b> [1] 1:5:23	1:26:21_, 1:28:1_,	1:4:16_, 1:43:25	_, 1:42:8	1:8:12_, 1:8:13_,
	1:28:2_, 1:28:4_,		additional [3]	1:24:6_, 1:24:7_,
<b>2024</b> [9] 1:5:23_,		accomplishment [1]_	1:36:11_, 1:37:11_,	1:35:3_, 1:35:4_,
1:6:8_, 1:6:19_,	1:42:13	- 1:29:19		1:43:5
1:6:22_, 1:14:18_,	<b>5.5</b> [1] 1:12:6	accomplishments [2]	1:37:21	
1:14:23_, 1:15:7_,	<b>50</b> [2] 1:21:7_,	1:33:19_, 1:42:8	address [11] 1:4:17.	agencies [1]
1:27:23_, 1:41:21	1:32:24	according [1]	_, 1:6:3_, 1:8:15_,	1:11:18
<b>2025</b> [2] - 1:1:7,	<b>500</b> [1] - 1:2:13	1:6:18	1:10:6_, 1:11:8_,	<b>Agency</b> [2] 1:2:19_,
				1.4.2
• • •		accordingly [1]	1:13:16_, 1:15:14_,	1:4:3
1:50:14	<b>51st</b> [1] 1:43:9	accordingly [1] 1:10:23		agency [2] 1:11:14
• • •		accordingly [1] 1:10:23	1:13:16_, 1:15:14_, 1:15:19_, 1:20:17_,	

\_, 1:12:16 **arbitrary** [1]\_ - 1:33:12 1:15:14 1:42:3 car [1]\_ - 1:21:7 ago [2]\_ - 1:17:10\_, area [2]\_ - 1:34:9\_, averted [1]\_ - 1:10:5 biweekly [8]\_ carried [1]\_ - 1:35:17 1:27:4 1:35:15 aware [5]\_ - 1:7:18\_, 1:11:14\_, 1:18:12\_, carry [1]\_ - 1:37:25 agree [4]\_ - 1:5:16\_, areas [4]\_ - 1:4:17\_, 1:25:15\_, 1:26:14\_, 1:18:24\_, 1:19:8\_, Case [1]\_ - 1:3:8 1:16:10\_, 1:21:25\_, 1:29:13\_, 1:36:3\_, 1:40:5\_, 1:44:19 1:24:19\_, 1:26:2\_, CASE [1] - 1:1:14 1.22.20 1:36:10 awareness [2]\_ -1:42:9 case [23]\_ - 1:9:18\_, black [2]\_ - 1:4:20\_, agreed [2]\_ - 1:5:1\_, Arizona [1] - 1:1:22 1:12:7\_, 1:19:4 1:10:1\_, 1:10:5\_, 1:45:2 1:6:24 art [1]\_ - 1:4:21 1:10:8\_, 1:10:15\_, blacks [1]\_ - 1:30:6 agreeing [1]\_ -Asian [1]\_ - 1:6:24 В 1:10:22\_, 1:11:9\_, blowing [1]\_ - 1:27:21 1:19:25 assess [1]\_ - 1:31:9 1:11:14\_, 1:11:15\_, background [2]\_ agreement [4]\_ board [1]\_ - 1:4:22 1:11:20\_, 1:12:1\_, assessing [1]\_ -1:25:1\_, 1:46:9 1:4:15\_, 1:5:2\_, bodies [1]\_ - 1:43:21 1:12:23\_, 1:13:1\_, 1:36:8 1:5:4\_, 1:40:14 backlog [3]\_ - 1:9:22\_, body [1]\_ - 1:22:9 1:14:17\_, 1:14:21\_, assessment [4]\_ -Aided [1] - 1:1:24 1:4:11\_, 1:9:10\_, 1:10:6\_, 1:12:12 body-warn [1]\_ -1:17:20\_, 1:24:25\_, Airport [1] - 1:2:3 1:9:24\_, 1:43:3 backlogged [1]\_ -1:27:12\_, 1:34:9\_, 1:22:9 1:19:16 1:42:18\_, 1:48:8 **al** [4] - 1:1:4, 1:1:7\_, **bottom** [2]\_ - 1:24:25 assignment [3]\_ bad [1]\_ - 1:33:7 \_, 1:26:11 1:3:9 case-by-case [1]\_ -1:12:11\_, 1:12:12\_, alarming [2]\_ - 1:30:7 Barbara [3] - 1:2:17\_, 1:17:20 1:46:19 Boulevard [1] - 1:2:13 \_, 1:33:23 1:3:24\_, 1:43:6 cases [30] - 1:5:22, assignments [2] -- bragging [2]\_ - 1:6:14 allegations [2]\_ based [3]\_ - 1:17:23\_, 1:6:14\_, 1:6:19\_, 1:10:1\_, 1:10:8 \_, 1:17:22 1:18:4\_, 1:18:6 1:6:22\_, 1:9:22\_, 1:38:3\_, 1:45:17 assist [2]\_ - 1:37:22\_, Brian [2] - 1:2:17, baseline [1]\_ - 1:15:4 1:10:6\_, 1:10:16\_, Allen [2] - 1:1:4\_, 1:3:9 1:41:24 1:3:24 basis [5]\_ - 1:15:12\_, 1:10:18\_, 1:11:4\_, allow [2]\_ - 1:8:18\_, assistance [1]\_ brief [1]\_ - 1:27:7 1:11:10\_, 1:11:13\_, 1:15:21\_, 1:17:20\_, 1:42:21 1:40:12 Brigid [3] - 1:2:9\_, 1:11:24\_, 1:12:12\_, 1:19:8\_, 1:46:11 allowing [1] - 1:38:22 1:3:22\_, 1:14:18 Assistant [2]\_ -1:14:19\_, 1:14:20\_, Bay [1]\_ - 1:35:15 allows [1] - 1:25:7 1:41:24\_, 1:46:18 bring [1]\_ - 1:4:9 1:19:7\_, 1:19:10\_, become [1]... - 1:15:22 almost [2]\_ - 1:12:6\_, Association [1]\_ bringing [1]\_ - 1:20:20 1:19:11\_, 1:19:12\_, 1:37:11 1:43:19 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:1:11 brings [1]\_ - 1:47:6 1:19:15\_, 1:19:17\_, analysis [2] - 1:14:11. assure [2]\_ - 1:36:22\_, began [2]\_ - 1:41:10\_, broad [1]\_ - 1:7:12 1:19:18\_, 1:24:22\_, \_, 1:42:4 1.47.11 1:44:16 broader [1]\_ - 1:10:21 1:24:23\_, 1:25:12\_, beginning [1]\_ anonymity  $[1]_-$  attack [8] - 1:9:15 -, Bryan [2] - 1:2:16\_, 1:25:14\_, 1:26:3\_, 1:9:17\_, 1:10:8\_, 1:13:7 1:25:5 1:9:10 1:30:20\_, 1:32:25 1:11:2\_, 1:12:20\_, begun [1]\_ - 1:39:7 answer [2]\_ - 1:28:23. **build** [1]\_ - 1:37:5 catch [2]\_ - 1:19:12\_, 1:27:4\_, 1:27:5\_, behalf [3]\_ - 1:20:12\_, \_, 1:38:1 bureau [2]\_ - 1:9:12\_, 1:19:16 1:27:19 1:35:2\_, 1:35:10 anticipated [1]\_ -1:39:6 catches [1]\_ - 1:23:4 1:25:20 attaining [1]... behavior [5]\_ - 1:22:6. Bureau [3]\_ - 1:9:17\_, catching [1]\_ - 1:19:18 Antonio [2]\_ - 1:2:19\_, 1:45:10 \_, 1:22:15\_, 1:44:8 1:40:18\_. 1:45:25 category [1]\_ - 1:38:3 1:4:3 attention [1]\_ - 1:4:22 belief [2]\_ - 1:12:24\_, BURRIS [4] - 1:2:2\_, CATHY [1] - 1:50:7 attentive [2]\_ - 1:44:11. 1:45:3 anyway [1]\_ - 1:33:9 1:3:12\_, 1:3:15\_, Cathy [2] - 1:1:21, \_, 1:47:4 below [1]\_ - 1:13:2 apologize [1]\_ -1:29:13 1:50:18 attorney [1]\_ - 1:15:5 1:21:23 benchmarks [1]\_ -Burris [5] - 1:2:3\_, caused [1]\_ - 1:33:3 appear [2]\_ - 1:23:23\_, Attorney [6]\_ - 1:2:17. 1:37:5 1:3:12\_, 1:29:12\_, causes [1]\_ - 1:38:7 \_, 1:3:24\_, 1:14:18\_, benefit [2]\_ - 1:29:23\_, 1:34:6 1:34:17\_, 1:43:17 celebrate [1]\_ - 1:5:8 1:14:22\_, 1:27:24 1:48:3 appearance [1] --Centre [1] - 1:2:3 ATTORNEY'S [1] -Berkeley [1] - 1:2:7 1:3:11 C certain [4]\_ - 1:15:24\_, best [3]\_ - 1:6:3\_, appointed [1] - 1:50:8 1.2.8 1:18:7\_, 1:36:10\_, Attorney's [1]\_ -CALIFORNIA[1] -1:8:2\_, 1:49:1 appreciate [9]\_ -1:36:14 1:43:22 1:6:25\_, 1:8:5\_, better [3]\_ - 1:15:24\_, 1:1:2 certainly [2]\_ - 1:25:19 1:24:4\_, 1:24:13\_, attorneys [1]\_ - 1:8:6 1:15:25\_, 1:25:10 California [6] - 1:1:7, \_, 1:33:10 1:25:6\_, 1:39:2\_, attritioning [1]\_ between [6]\_ - 1:6:9\_, 1:2:4, 1:2:7, 1:2:10, certify [1] - 1:50:7 1:43:13\_, 1:45:2 1:12:5 1:11:18\_, 1:18:10\_, 1:2:13\_, 1:43:7 CERTIFY [1] - 1:50:9 approach [2]\_ - 1:8:1. audit [2]\_ - 1:41:10\_, 1:21:19\_, 1:38:6\_, campaign [1] - 1:36:7 chain [2]\_ - 1:18:18\_, \_, 1:11:24 1:41:14 1:40:14 cannot [5]\_ - 1:7:6\_, 1:26:13 auditing [1]\_ - 1:42:19 beyond [2]\_ - 1:10:7\_, 1:12:18\_, 1:32:8\_, approaching [1]\_ -1:37:8 Chair [3] - 1:2:16\_, 1:11:20 August [4]\_ - 1:13:18. 1:38:15\_, 1:44:24 1:4:1\_, 1:35:11 appropriate [1]\_ -\_, 1:46:17\_, 1:48:11 biannual [1]\_ capacity [4]\_ - 1:10:3 challenges [1]\_ -1:31:12 available [1]\_ - 1:48:6 1:41:19 \_. 1:12:13\_. 1:35:12 **big** [1]\_ - 1:28:21 \_. 1:37:6 1:36:14 approval [1]\_ -Avenue [1] - 1:2:6 captain [2]\_ - 1:24:16 challenging [1]\_ -1:40:13 average [4]\_ - 1:14:24. bigger [1]\_ - 1:22:10 \_, 1:25:22 1:44:13 April [1]\_ - 1:13:17 \_, 1:14:25\_, 1:15:2\_, bit [2]\_ - 1:30:11\_,

Chan [1]\_ - 1:43:18 1:36:9 1:45:10\_, 1:46:4\_, chosen [1]\_ - 1:44:12 1:12:15\_, 1:16:11\_, change [18]\_ - 1:4:18. CHP [1]\_ - 1:33:3 collaboration [1]\_ -1:24:11\_, 1:42:11 1:46:20\_, 1:47:2\_, 1:36:21 communicative [1]\_ -1:47:11\_, 1:47:18\_, \_, 1:7:4\_, 1:17:3\_, Chung [1]\_ - 1:13:18 1:47:25\_, 1:48:13\_, 1:18:20\_, 1:22:6\_, collective [1]... -1:15:9 circumstances [2]\_ -1:22:15\_, 1:29:1\_, 1:35:16 community [20]\_ -1.48.21 1:12:13\_, 1:33:11 1:36:6\_, 1:36:13\_, Collectively [1]\_ -1:20:11\_, 1:20:21\_, compliances [1]\_ city [2]\_ - 1:34:11\_, 1:37:17\_, 1:40:7\_, 1:11:23 1:36:17 1:14:23 1:21:15\_, 1:33:6\_, compliment [1]\_ -1:40:17\_, 1:41:5\_, 1:33:9\_, 1:35:13\_, CITY [1] - 1:2:8 combat [1]\_ - 1:25:19 1:45:6\_, 1:45:13\_, 1:35:14\_, 1:35:16\_, 1:36:20 City [52] - 1:1:7\_, coming [4]\_ - 1:19:10 1:42:22\_, 1:43:23\_, 1:46:4\_, 1:46:21 \_, 1:26:7\_, 1:28:10\_, comply [2]\_ - 1:7:20\_, 1:2:17\_, 1:2:18\_, 1:44:19\_, 1:44:20\_, changed [1]\_ - 1:37:12 1:28:3 1:3:9\_, 1:3:23\_, 1:41:3 changes [1]\_ - 1:38:16 1:44:21\_, 1:44:22\_, command [10]\_ comprehensive [2]\_ -1:3:25\_, 1:6:1\_, 1:45:2\_, 1:45:8\_, changing [1]\_ -1:6:5\_, 1:6:25\_, 1:9:10\_, 1:10:25\_, 1:11:6\_, 1:12:20 1:45:18\_, 1:47:6\_, 1:39:22 1:7:19\_, 1:7:25\_, 1:12:6\_, 1:16:6\_, compromised [2]\_ -1:48:18\_, 1:48:24 CHANIN [6] - 1:2:5\_, 1:17:1\_, 1:18:18\_, 1:9:18\_, 1:10:9 1:8:2\_, 1:8:5\_, Community [2]\_ -1:3:19\_, 1:27:2\_, 1:26:6\_, 1:26:13\_, Computer [1] - 1:1:24 1:9:14\_, 1:18:13\_, 1:2:19\_, 1:4:2 1:29:4\_, 1:29:8\_, 1:20:21\_, 1:27:23\_, 1:33:15\_, 1:41:25 Computer-Aided [1] community's [1]\_ -1:29:10 1:27:24\_, 1:29:2\_, command-level [1]\_ -1:1:24 Chanin [4] - 1:2:6\_, 1:32:24\_, 1:36:1\_, 1:10:25 1:33:18 concede [1]\_ - 1:33:10 compel [1]\_ - 1:38:20 1:3:19\_, 1:29:7\_, 1:36:19\_, 1:37:22\_, commander [1]\_ concedes [1]\_ - 1:6:1 1:43:18 1:39:10\_, 1:39:15\_, 1:7:9 compelling [1]\_ concern [4]\_ - 1:5:16\_, charter [2]\_ - 1:38:22 1:39:18\_, 1:39:21\_, 1:20:1 Commander [1]\_ -1:7:19\_, 1:14:16\_, \_, 1:42:19 1:40:3\_, 1:40:13\_, 1:22:19 complain [1]\_ -1:21:6 charts [1] - 1:17:18 1:40:14\_, 1:40:21\_, 1:28:13 commanders [4]\_ concerned [2]\_ -1:40:25\_, 1:41:3\_, chase [1]... - 1:33:9 1:11:22\_, 1:11:24\_, complaint [4]\_ -1:33:16\_, 1:34:5 chases [4]\_ - 1:33:2\_, 1:42:11\_, 1:42:14\_, 1:13:4\_, 1:17:11\_, 1:26:7\_, 1:26:9 concerning [1] ... -1:42:18\_, 1:42:20\_, 1:33:6\_, 1:33:7\_, commence [1]\_ - 1:3:3 1:22:9\_, 1:25:2 1:6:22 1:42:22\_, 1:43:22\_, complaints [5] -1:33:12 commend [1]\_ concerns [2] - 1:5:16 1:45:5\_, 1:45:9\_, 1:9:20\_, 1:17:14\_, chasing [1]\_ - 1:23:2 1:7:25 \_, 1:34:20 1:45:14\_, 1:46:7\_, 1:17:18\_, 1:17:22\_, Chief [45] - 1:2:15, commentary [2]\_ **conclude** [1]\_ - 1:49:5 1:46:8\_, 1:46:17\_, 1:17:23 1:2:16\_, 1:3:25\_, 1:13:7\_, 1:14:10 conclusion [1]\_ -1:46:18\_, 1:47:1\_, 1:6:6\_, 1:6:9\_, 1:7:8 complete [1]\_ comments [5]\_ - 1:7:7. 1:13:14 1:47:17\_, 1:47:24\_, 1:48:14 \_, 1:8:10\_, 1:9:10\_, \_, 1:8:9\_, 1:21:1\_, concurrent [2]\_ -1.48.10 1:9:13\_, 1:18:10\_, 1:21:4\_, 1:48:23 completed [5]\_ -1:11:16 City's [8]... - 1:5:8..., 1:5:20\_, 1:9:10\_, 1:18:18\_, 1:18:19\_, Commission [16] conduct [1]\_ - 1:38:6 1:6:19\_, 1:7:12\_, 1:14:11\_, 1:41:14\_, 1:24:5\_, 1:24:8\_, 1:2:16\_, 1:4:1\_, CONFERENCE [1] -1:37:5\_, 1:41:2\_, 1:44:17 1:24:14\_, 1:24:16\_, 1:7:10\_, 1:7:23\_, 1:1:14 1:45:1\_, 1:46:10\_, completely [1]\_ -1:24:17\_, 1:24:22\_, 1:8:3\_, 1:20:21\_, conference [4]\_ -1:46:15 1:25:14\_, 1:27:3\_, 1:22:18\_, 1:35:2\_, 1:9:20 1:4:12\_, 1:5:7\_, Civil [1]\_ - 1:41:2 1:27:23\_, 1:28:9\_, 1:35:10\_, 1:35:19\_, Compliance [3]\_ -1:5:8\_, 1:48:8 1:30:17\_, 1:30:23\_, clarification [1]\_ -1:36:4\_, 1:36:10\_, 1:36:20\_, 1:38:13\_, confidence [1]\_ -1:16:2 1:31:4\_, 1:31:6\_, 1:37:9\_, 1:38:12\_, 1:48:2 1:42:22 clarity [1]\_ - 1:16:11 1:31:7\_, 1:31:15\_, 1:40:22\_, 1:43:21 compliance [44]\_ confusing [1]\_ -1:31:21\_, 1:32:3\_, Class [2]\_ - 1:23:7\_, 1:4:25\_, 1:5:6\_, Commission's [4]\_ -1:16:5 1:32:16\_. 1:39:7\_. 1:23:15 1:5:9\_, 1:5:18\_, 1:35:20\_, 1:35:24\_, consequences [2]\_ -1:40:11\_, 1:40:13\_, clear [4]\_ - 1:7:11\_, 1:5:21\_, 1:6:2\_, 1:35:25\_, 1:36:2 1:9:16\_, 1:20:19 1:40:18\_, 1:41:24\_, 1:11:15\_, 1:34:4\_, 1:7:3\_, 1:7:12\_, commissioners [1]\_ consider [2]\_ -1:42:3\_, 1:43:16\_, 1:45:13 1:9:8\_, 1:13:6\_, 1:37:13 1:35:21\_, 1:40:10 1:43:20\_, 1:45:5\_, cleared [2]\_ - 1:12:11 1:13:9\_, 1:13:12\_, commitment [4]\_ consistency [3]\_ -1:45:14\_, 1:45:22\_, clearer [1]\_ - 1:15:14 1:13:14\_, 1:14:4\_, 1:4:9\_, 1:5:12\_, 1:6:12\_, 1:14:7\_, 1:46:22\_, 1:46:23 1:14:6\_, 1:14:8\_, clearly [6]\_ - 1:13:9\_, 1:12:20\_, 1:47:8 1:30:3 CHIEF [16]\_ - 1:8:13\_, 1:15:23\_, 1:16:5\_, 1:14:1\_, 1:14:5\_, committed [5]\_ - 1:7:1. consistent [2]\_ -1:26:20\_, 1:27:25\_, 1:8:18\_, 1:8:22\_, 1:15:18\_, 1:32:22\_, \_, 1:15:22\_, 1:33:25 1:5:20\_, 1:45:19 1:28:1\_, 1:28:5\_, 1:9:1\_, 1:9:6\_, 1:44:16 \_, 1:44:25\_, 1:45:1 consistently [2]\_ -1:16:9\_, 1:16:19\_, 1:37:1\_, 1:37:20\_, close [3]\_ - 1:26:1\_, communicate [1]\_ -1:29:18\_, 1:31:18 1:18:15\_, 1:20:4\_, 1:37:23\_, 1:38:16\_, 1:27:11\_, 1:38:10 1:46:10 constitute [1] - 1:50:9 1:21:21\_, 1:21:23\_, 1:39:22\_, 1:41:5\_, Coalition [2]\_ communicated [2] -constitutional [7]\_ -1:24:7\_, 1:24:13\_, 1:19:21\_, 1:31:25 1:42:16\_, 1:42:19\_, 1:24:1\_, 1:45:4 1:4:9\_, 1:8:7\_, 1:25:18\_, 1:26:22\_, Code [1]\_ - 1:10:11 1:42:23\_, 1:43:11\_, communication [6]... -1:28:23\_, 1:33:25\_, 1:26:24 1:44:2\_, 1:44:24\_, collaborating [1]\_ -1:11:16\_, 1:11:17\_, 1:38:21\_, 1:44:13\_,

1:47:19 CRC [2] - 1:1:21, 1:28:19\_, 1:33:24\_, 1:35:6\_, 1:40:4\_, \_, 1:11:23\_, 1:12:7\_, consultant [1]\_ -1:42:15 1:50:18 1:12:15 1:36:13\_, 1:36:22\_, 1:40:23 COURT [41] - 1:1:1\_, deadlines [7]\_ -1:36:24\_, 1:39:8\_, create [1]\_ - 1:38:13 contained [2]\_ -1:3:6\_, 1:3:14\_, 1:10:10\_, 1:11:4\_, 1:39:10\_, 1:39:16\_, created [5]\_ - 1:9:21\_, 1:13:10, 1:50:11 1:3:16\_, 1:3:21\_, 1:11:12\_, 1:11:20\_, 1:39:18\_, 1:39:21\_, 1:10:4\_, 1:10:9\_, context [1] - 1:30:8 1:4:4\_. 1:8:14\_. 1:11:2\_, 1:25:20 1:11:25\_, 1:27:6\_, 1:39:23\_, 1:40:3\_, 1:8:21\_. 1:8:23\_. 1:40:7\_, 1:40:15\_, continually [1]\_ creates [1] - 1:17:17 1.27.21 1:9:5\_, 1:16:7\_. dealt [1]\_ - 1:32:4 1:41:15\_, 1:41:16\_, 1:12:4 creating [1] - 1:24:14 1:16:10\_, 1:18:8\_, 1:42:5\_, 1:42:11\_, decades [1]\_ - 1:16:24 continue [7]\_ - 1:14:3. credit [1]\_ - 1:29:20 1:42:13\_, 1:42:21\_, 1:19:19\_, 1:21:18\_, \_, 1:15:10\_, 1:23:17 crime [1] - 1:28:21 December [2]\_ -1:21:22\_, 1:24:3\_, 1:42:23\_, 1:44:4\_, \_, 1:37:10\_, 1:40:16 1:48:9 critical [4]\_ - 1:4:17\_, 1:44:10\_, 1:45:7\_, 1:24:8\_, 1:25:16\_, \_, 1:42:23\_, 1:46:25 decision [3]\_ - 1:15:16. 1:9:19\_, 1:11:24\_, 1:26:18\_, 1:26:23\_, 1:45:11\_, 1:45:15\_, continued [1]\_ -\_, 1:21:2\_, 1:33:14 1:19:22 1:26:25\_, 1:28:24\_, 1:45:23\_, 1:46:1\_, 1:42:14 criticisms [1] - 1:20:3 decision-making [1]\_ 1:46:11\_, 1:46:21\_, 1:29:5\_, 1:29:9\_, continues [1]\_ crossed [1] - 1:39:17 - 1:15:16 1:29:11\_, 1:34:17\_, 1:47:5\_. 1:47:7\_. 1:15:5 decisions [1] - 1:18:4 **CRR** [2] - 1:1:21, 1:47:17\_, 1:48:18 1:34:22\_, 1:34:24\_, continuing [5]\_ deck [1]\_ - 1:47:12 1:50:18 1:35:1\_, 1:35:4\_, Department's [4]\_ -1:13:8\_, 1:41:15\_, decreasing [1]\_ **crucial** [1]\_ - 1:46:21 1:35:5\_, 1:35:6\_, 1:6:7\_, 1:15:15\_, 1:41:25\_, 1:42:2\_, 1:16:21 cultural [6]\_ - 1:6:2\_, 1:38:24\_, 1:39:1\_, 1:41:13\_, 1:46:1 1:46:24 dedicated [1]\_ -1:6:3\_, 1:36:6\_, 1:41:6\_, 1:42:25\_, departments [1]\_ continuous [1]\_ -1:35:13 1:36:24\_, 1:41:5\_, 1:43:2\_, 1:47:14\_, 1:16:18 1:12:21 1:45:6 deemed [3]\_ - 1:9:8\_, 1:48:22\_, 1:49:4 **Deputy** [8]\_ - 1:6:6\_, Contra [1] - 1:2:13 culture [21] - 1:6:15 -, 1:13:5\_, 1:14:8 Court [39] - 1:1:20, 1:9:10\_, 1:18:10\_, contract [1]\_ - 1:40:11 Defendants [3] -1:7:4\_, 1:7:5\_, 1:7:6. 1:1:24\_, 1:3:2\_, 1:24:5\_, 1:24:14\_, contribute [2]\_ -\_, 1:12:8\_, 1:17:3\_, 1:1:8, 1:2:8\_, 1:3:23 1:3:4\_, 1:4:10\_, 1:24:16\_, 1:28:8\_, 1:36:12\_, 1:38:5 defendants' [1]\_ -1:36:13\_, 1:37:12\_, 1:6:4\_, 1:7:11\_, 1:42:3 contributing [1]\_ -1:37:18\_, 1:38:13\_, 1:27:6 1:7:15\_, 1:9:9\_, deputy [1]\_ - 1:3:2 1:38:8 1:39:23\_, 1:40:6\_, defined [1]\_ - 1:7:13 1:13:20\_, 1:14:4\_, **DEPUTY** [7]\_ - 1:3:4\_, control [1] - 1:50:13 1:40:17\_, 1:42:12\_, delay [1]\_ - 1:25:22 1:14:18\_, 1:15:18\_, 1:3:8\_, 1:24:7\_, conversation [2]\_ -1:44:9\_, 1:45:11\_, delayed [4]\_ - 1:10:1\_, 1:20:11\_, 1:29:14\_, 1:24:13\_, 1:25:18\_, 1:45:12\_, 1:46:4\_, 1:10:8\_. 1:22:9\_. 1:16:13\_, 1:21:12 1:29:16\_, 1:32:1\_, 1:26:22\_, 1:26:24 1:46:20\_, 1:47:5\_, 1:47:20 conversations [2]\_ -1:32:21\_, 1:34:7\_, deserve[1]\_ - 1:44:18 1:47:6 1:22:13\_, 1:23:14 delays [1] - 1:11:11 1:35:20\_, 1:35:23\_, desire [1]\_ - 1:48:4 cumulative [1]\_ cooperative [1]\_ delighted [1]\_ - 1:41:7 1:36:1\_, 1:36:3\_, detailed [1]\_ - 1:25:4 1:10:14 1:37:4 **Delphine** [1] - 1:1:4 1:37:2-, 1:37:14-, determine [2]\_ - 1:8:2 curable [1]\_ - 1:27:20 coordinated [1]\_ demonstrate [1]\_ -1:38:2\_, 1:38:20\_, \_, 1:17:20 current [6]\_ - 1:10:24. 1:25:21 1:12:20 1:40:21\_, 1:42:9\_, deterrent [1]\_ -\_, 1:12:10\_, 1:14:3\_, coordination [3] ... demonstrated [1]\_ -1:42:20\_, 1:42:21\_, 1:30:15 1:35:12\_, 1:36:20\_, 1:11:14\_, 1:11:19\_, 1:15:8 1:42:24\_, 1:43:16\_, devastating [1]\_ -1:46:24 1:12:16 department [5]\_ -1:44:16\_, 1:44:24\_, 1:9:15 core [1]\_ - 1:44:14 1:6:13\_, 1:18:16\_, 1:47:3\_, 1:47:18, develop [2]\_ - 1:8:7\_, Corporate [1] - 1:2:3 D 1:19:6\_, 1:44:20 1:50:8 1:36:4 correctly [1]\_ -Department [70]\_ -Court's [2]\_ - 1:35:21. developed [2]\_ daily [1]\_ - 1:37:24 1:14:22 1:4:10\_, 1:4:14\_, \_, 1:47:16 1:4:17\_. 1:34:10 data [9]\_ - 1:14:12\_, Costa [1] - 1:2:13 1:5:5\_, 1:7:1\_, 1:8:5 Court-mandated [1]\_ developing [2]\_ -1:14:18\_, 1:14:22\_, costs [1]\_ - 1:10:4 \_, 1:8:6\_, 1:9:8\_, 1:42:9 1:34:11\_, 1:36:7 1:15:11\_, 1:15:20\_, 1:9:17\_, 1:10:1\_, Council [1]\_ - 1:40:13 Courthouse [1] -1:29:15\_, 1:33:4\_, difference [2]\_ -1:10:17\_, 1:11:7\_, counsel [4]\_ - 1:3:10\_, 1.1.21 1:21:19\_, 1:42:10 1:40:14\_, 1:40:16 1:12:9\_, 1:12:10\_, 1:26:25\_, 1:42:17\_, courtroom [3]\_ - 1:3:2 date [1] - 1:50:12 1:12:18\_, 1:13:2\_, different [2]\_ - 1:23:8. 1:43:17 \_, 1:4:7\_, 1:46:17 \_, 1:48:25 **DATED**[1] - 1:50:14 country [1]\_ - 1:30:20 1:13:5\_, 1:13:9\_, COURTROOM [2]\_ difficult [3]\_ - 1:10:17. dating [1] - 1:19:17 couple [6]\_ - 1:7:7\_, 1:13:11\_, 1:13:13\_, 1:3:4\_, 1:3:8 \_, 1:12:5\_, 1:37:23 day-to-day [5]\_ -1:13:16\_, 1:13:21\_, 1:16:15\_, 1:17:9\_, CPA [1]\_ - 1:24:2 1:21:11\_, 1:37:15\_, diligently [1]\_ -1:14:2\_, 1:14:5\_, 1:26:8\_, 1:27:2\_, CPRA [11]\_ - 1:7:25\_, 1:37:24\_, 1:38:12\_, 1:14:8\_, 1:14:15\_, 1:37:10 1:47:21 1:11:15\_, 1:19:24\_, direct [6]\_ - 1:10:14\_, 1:46:11 1:15:22\_, 1:17:3\_, courage [2]\_ - 1:4:7\_, 1:21:24\_, 1:22:11\_, 1:10:19\_, 1:18:9\_, days [2]\_ - 1:5:20\_, 1:17:11\_, 1:20:12\_, 1:45:15 1:26:2\_, 1:37:15\_, 1:24:10\_, 1:24:11\_, 1:27:19 1:20:13\_, 1:20:15\_, course [3]\_ - 1:42:9\_, 1:38:6\_, 1:40:21\_, 1.24.17 1:20:22\_, 1:22:7\_, deadline [6]\_ - 1:10:11. 1:43:20 1:40:24\_, 1:43:22 directed [1] - 1:40:18 1:27:11\_, 1:28:3\_, \_, 1:10:13\_, 1:10:19. court [4]\_ - 1:25:11\_,

eliminating [1]\_ directing [1]\_ distributed [1]\_ examples [1]\_ fairly [1]\_ - 1:7:13 1:36:19 1:11:10 1.7.1 1:36:25 fall [1]\_ - 1:21:9 direction [2]\_ distribution [1]\_ embrace [4]\_ - 1:36:2 excited [1]\_ - 1:46:14 **falling** [1]\_ - 1:46:13 1:37:14, 1:50:13 \_, 1:36:19\_, 1:38:18 excuse [2]\_ - 1:36:22 1.10.2 falls [1]\_ - 1:26:12 directly [6]\_ - 1:9:13\_, **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1:1, \_. 1:38:20 \_, 1:47:3 far [5]\_ - 1:10:7\_, 1:18:17\_, 1:18:18\_, emphasis [1] - 1:12:8 excuses [2]\_ - 1:5:17. 1:1:2 1:19:24\_, 1:20:6\_, \_, 1:34:1 1:35:17\_, 1:40:17\_, disturbing [1]\_ emphasize [2]\_ -1:25:2\_, 1:43:25 1:46:19 1:32:4 1:16:14\_, 1:38:17 executive [3]\_ - 1:7:5. fault [2] - 1:33:19 director [1]\_ - 1:36:20 Division [1]\_ - 1:39:6 employed [2]\_ - 1:4:18. \_, 1:13:17\_, 1:43:20 February [1]\_ - 1:9:14 Director [6]\_ - 1:2:19\_, docket [1]\_ - 1:19:22 \_, 1:4:20 **exercise** [1]\_ - 1:25:3 federal [1]\_ - 1:37:8 document [1]\_ -1:4:3\_, 1:38:13\_, employee [3]\_ existing [1]\_ - 1:10:3 feedback [2]\_ -1:40:22\_, 1:41:1\_, 1:25:23\_, 1:45:23 expand [1]\_ - 1:12:2 1:20:18 1:25:25\_, 1:38:18 1:48:2 en [1]\_ - 1:37:7 documented [1]\_ expect [6]\_ - 1:17:25\_, felt [2]\_ - 1:36:5\_, Director's [1] --1:13:22 end [7]\_ - 1:4:10\_, 1:38:15\_, 1:44:9\_, 1:45:4 1:36:20 1:45:14\_, 1:45:15 documents [1]\_ -1:4:12\_, 1:15:9\_, few [3]\_ - 1:5:4\_, dis [1] - 1:16:21 1:13:9 1:17:7\_, 1:28:25\_, expected [2]\_ - 1:5:3\_, 1:36:10\_, 1:47:22 disagree [3]\_ - 1:22:1. done [12]\_ - 1:9:24\_, 1:44:24\_, 1:47:16 1:5:5 fewer [3] - 1:5:22, \_, 1:22:21\_, 1:23:16 ended [1]\_ - 1:42:24 1:26:2\_, 1:27:17\_, expenditures [1]\_ -1:6:14\_, 1:17:22 disagreeing [1]\_ -1:28:14\_, 1:31:21\_, endemic [1]\_ - 1:6:4 1:10:4 field [1]\_ - 1:12:3 1:19:24 1:31:23\_, 1:31:24\_, endorsement [1]\_ experience [3]\_ figures [1]\_ - 1:6:19 disagreement [1]\_ -1:34:14\_, 1:46:6\_, 1:42:16 1:16:17\_, 1:18:16\_, filing [1]\_ - 1:35:23 1:47:10\_, 1:48:7 1:22:2 ends [2]\_ - 1:47:3 1:35:14 filings [1]\_ - 1:38:2 dory [1]\_ - 1:31:2 disagreements [2]\_ engage [2]\_ - 1:33:11 experienced [2]\_ final [1]\_ - 1:5:7 1:24:2\_, 1:38:6 doubt [1] - 1:48:22 \_, 1:46:22 1:9:14\_, 1:18:22 finalizing [1]\_ - 1:37:3 disciplinary [7]\_ down [10]\_ - 1:8:20\_, engaged [1]\_ - 1:43:23 explanation [1] -finally [3]\_ - 1:9:25\_, 1:10:12\_, 1:10:23\_, 1:12:5\_, 1:16:25\_, engagement [2]\_ -1:6:17 1:26:16\_, 1:44:2 1:11:25\_, 1:18:3\_, 1:17:21\_, 1:27:12\_, 1:11:24\_, 1:37:12 explicit [1]\_ - 1:36:1 findings [3]\_ - 1:6:16. 1:21:19\_, 1:21:24\_, 1:29:18\_, 1:29:24\_, extended [4]\_ - 1:10:7. engaging [1]\_ -\_, 1:10:18\_, 1:38:5 1:36:8 1:30:18\_, 1:30:23\_, 1:11:24 ., 1:10:21\_, 1:11:3\_, fine [1]\_ - 1:8:23 Disciplinary [2]\_ -1:32:25 engrained [1]\_ -1:40:11 fingers [1]\_ - 1:39:17 1:22:18 dramatically [1]\_ extensive [1]\_ - 1:11:8 1:15:7 finished [1] - 1:41:21 discipline [15]\_ -1:4:19 enhance [1]\_ - 1:8:7 extraordinarily [1]\_ finite [1]\_ - 1:36:18 1:6:13\_, 1:7:2\_, drive [2]\_ - 1:7:5\_, enhanced [2]\_ - 1:11:9. 1:30:2 first [10]\_ - 1:4:15\_, 1:14:7\_, 1:14:13\_, 1:7:6 \_, 1:12:22 extremely [1]\_ -1:20:6\_, 1:24:13\_, 1:19:25\_, 1:20:1\_, duly [1] - 1:50:7 enormous [1]\_ -1:45:13 1:26:14\_, 1:31:17\_, 1:22:3\_, 1:22:4\_, during [5]\_ - 1:9:23\_, 1:13:21 1:43:6\_, 1:46:16\_, 1:22:5\_, 1:25:21\_, 1:12:19\_, 1:14:15\_, ensure [2]\_ - 1:11:15\_, F 1:47:15\_, 1:48:1 1:30:3\_, 1:30:5\_, 1:39:9 1:37:7 five [8]\_ - 1:14:21\_, 1:41:22\_, 1:45:12 face [1] - 1:7:14 entering [1]\_ - 1:11:13 1:14:24\_, 1:15:2\_, discussed [1]\_ -F faced [1] - 1:10:1 entire [5]\_ - 1:10:21\_, 1:15:14\_, 1:22:11\_, 1:42:3 1:28:2\_, 1:42:5\_, fact [1]\_ - 1:31:1 1:30:7\_, 1:32:25\_, discusses [1]\_ early [1]\_ - 1:15:13 1:48:19\_, 1:48:24 factor [1]\_ - 1:30:24 1:40:14 1:13:15 educate [1]\_ - 1:24:21 entitled [1] - 1:50:11 factors [4]\_ - 1:16:21\_, five-day [1]\_ - 1:22:11 discussion [1]\_ educational [1]\_ equity [2]\_ - 1:41:14\_, 1:21:9\_, 1:38:5\_, five-year [6]\_ - 1:14:21 1:27:9 1:36:7 1:41:17 1:38:8 \_, 1:14:24\_, 1:15:2\_, dismissive [2]\_ effect [8]\_ - 1:10:14\_, facts [3]\_ - 1:18:5\_, Esq [5] - 1:2:3, 1:2:6, 1:15:14\_, 1:30:7\_, 1:19:23\_, 1:20:7 1:15:11\_, 1:21:11\_, 1:18:6\_, 1:30:18 1:2:9, 1:2:9, 1:2:12 1:40:14 disparate [4]\_ - 1:15:7. 1:27:10\_, 1:30:15\_, et [4] - 1:1:4, 1:1:7\_, failure [6]\_ - 1:17:10\_, fix [2]\_ - 1:31:11\_, \_, 1:15:9\_, 1:15:11\_, 1:32:5\_, 1:32:18\_, 1:3:9 1:22:8\_, 1:22:9\_, 1:31:15 1:15:17 1:45:12 evaluations [1]\_ -1:39:18\_, 1:39:19\_, fixed [1]\_ - 1:31:10 disparities [1]\_ effective [2]\_ - 1:41:16 1:30:12 1:42:18 Floor [1] - 1:2:10 1:14:13 \_, 1:42:1 event [1]\_ - 1:33:6 failures [14] - 1:10:20 Floyd [2] - 1:2:15\_, disparity [1]\_ - 1:7:2 effectiveness [2]\_ evidence [1]\_ - 1:20:1 \_, 1:10:25\_, 1:11:3\_, 1:3:25 1:6:10\_, 1:36:8 displayed [1]\_ -1:11:8\_, 1:11:9\_, evidently [1]\_ - 1:24:1 fluctuate [1]\_ - 1:15:1 1:14:15 effort [1]\_ - 1:48:14 1:12:18\_, 1:13:17\_, exact [1]\_ - 1:10:16 fluctuations [1] -disrupted [1]\_ - 1:9:15 efforts [5]\_ - 1:4:23\_, 1:13:22\_, 1:13:23\_, exactly [4]\_ - 1:16:2\_, 1:15:2 disruption [2]\_ -1:36:21\_, 1:48:12 1:13:25\_, 1:14:3\_, 1:16:13\_, 1:20:14\_, focus [7] - 1:4:22, 1:10:8\_, 1:11:3 either [2]\_ - 1:6:23\_, 1:39:9\_, 1:39:12 1:29:4 1:5:12\_, 1:7:11\_, disruptions [1]\_ -1:48:10 fair [2]\_ - 1:44:19\_, examining [1]\_ -1:36:4\_, 1:37:19\_, 1:12:24 element [1]\_ - 1:47:18 1:45:19 1:10:24 1:47:1\_, 1:47:8

focused [1]\_ - 1:5:13 1:21:4 1:24:19\_, 1:25:18\_, 1:14:12\_, 1:15:18\_, G fold [1]\_ - 1:47:7 hardwired [1]\_ -1:26:22\_, 1:27:2\_, 1:23:14 1:27:22\_, 1:28:18\_, 1:8:19 identity [1]\_ - 1:36:24 followed [1]\_ - 1:28:18 gain [1]\_ - 1:13:14 head [1]\_ - 1:27:11 1:29:10\_, 1:29:13\_, **IG** [1]\_ - 1:37:15 following [2]\_ - 1:9:9\_, game [2] - 1:28:25, healing [1]\_ - 1:35:16 1:34:19\_, 1:35:3\_, immediate [2]\_ -1:18:25 1:34:3 healthy [2]\_ - 1:25:3\_, 1:37:9\_, 1:39:4\_, 1:10:2\_, 1:10:7 **FOR** [1] - 1:1:2 gaps [2]\_ - 1:11:18\_, 1:41:9\_, 1:43:5\_, force [2]\_ - 1:41:25 1.26.1 immediately [1]\_ -1:47:22 1:44:23\_, 1:45:9\_, foregoing [1] - 1:50:9 GARCIA [3]\_ - 1:35:3\_, hear [7]\_ - 1:7:9\_, 1:11:18 1:46:3\_, 1:47:2\_, foreign [1] - 1:18:20 1:8:24\_, 1:21:14\_, impact [8]\_ - 1:7:19\_, 1:35:8\_, 1:38:25 1:47:9\_, 1:47:11\_, 1:10:21\_, 1:15:9\_, form [1] - 1:36:9 Garcia [3] - 1:2:16\_, 1:21:16\_, 1:26:23\_, 1:48:16\_, 1:49:3 1:29:6\_, 1:43:2 1:15:17\_, 1:22:7\_, formally [2] - 1:35:24 1:4:1\_, 1:35:11 HONORABLE [1] -\_, 1:36:19 GARCIA-ACOSTA[3]. heard [6]\_ - 1:24:8\_, 1:40:6\_, 1:42:12\_, 1:1:11 1:27:5\_, 1:32:12\_, 1:42:13 forms [1]\_ - 1:12:25 \_ - 1:35:3\_, 1:35:8\_, Honorable [1]\_ - 1:3:5 1:32:13\_, 1:38:1\_, implementation [1]\_ forth [2]\_ - 1:29:2\_, 1:38:25 hope [3]\_ - 1:16:12\_, 1:42:10 1:6:7 1:47:17 Garcia-Acosta [3] -1:32:3\_, 1:49:2 hearing [4]\_ - 1:25:12 implemented [3] -forward [12]\_ - 1:3:10 1:2:16\_, 1:4:1\_, 1:4:17\_, 1:6:18\_, \_, 1:40:4\_, 1:42:15\_, hopeful [2]\_ - 1:4:8\_, \_, 1:4:11\_, 1:11:25\_, 1:35:11 1:47:20 1:42:14 1:11:7 1:12:10\_, 1:15:20\_, gee [1]\_ - 1:27:15 hearings [1]\_ - 1:31:7 hopefully [3]\_ implicated [1]\_ -1:19:7\_, 1:28:11\_, general [2]\_ - 1:7:4\_, heart [1]\_ - 1:44:4 1:19:15\_, 1:30:15\_, 1:41:11 1:30:9\_, 1:43:4\_, 1:14:20 1:43:24 implications [1]\_ held [1]\_ - 1:13:3 1:44:1\_, 1:46:23\_, General [6]\_ - 1:2:18\_, hoping [1]\_ - 1:39:17 1:34:13 1:46:25 help [7]\_ - 1:11:15\_, 1:4:2\_, 1:41:3\_, hour [2]\_ - 1:21:8\_, important [18]\_ forward-looking [1]\_ -1:41:10\_, 1:43:21\_, 1:11:18\_, 1:14:6\_, 1:32:24 1:7:17\_, 1:7:23\_, 1:15:25\_, 1:36:5\_, 1:11:25 1:46:16 Hubbard [6] - 1:2:16\_, 1:13:20\_, 1:15:12\_, 1:46:9\_, 1:46:11 foster [1]\_ - 1:6:15 generally [2]\_ -1:6:6\_, 1:9:10\_, 1:16:11\_, 1:16:12\_, helpful [2]\_ - 1:24:18 four [1]\_ - 1:6:23 1:23:19\_, 1:32:22 helping [2]\_ - 1:15:22 1:24:5\_, 1:28:9\_, 1:18:13\_, 1:20:10\_, fourth [1]\_ - 1:18:16 generous [1]\_ - 1:5:21 \_, 1:40:17 1:42:3 1:30:2\_, 1:39:12\_, frame [1]\_ - 1:4:13 given [1]\_ - 1:7:22 HUBBARD [5]\_ helps [1]\_ - 1:19:5 1:39:15\_, 1:40:1\_, Frank [1] - 1:2:10 glad [1]\_ - 1:26:23 1:24:7\_, 1:24:13\_, 1:40:6\_, 1:40:9\_, Henderson [1]\_ - 1:5:5 frequency [1]\_ glove [1]\_ - 1:48:14 hereby [1] - 1:50:7 1:25:18\_, 1:26:22\_, 1:44:14\_, 1:46:18 1:38:3 goal [1]\_ - 1:47:15 1:26:24 herein [1] - 1:50:11 impressed [1]\_ frequently [1]\_ goalposts [1]\_ **human** [1]\_ - 1:10:20 1:31:4 high [10]\_ - 1:7:16\_, 1:19:24 1:5:11 hunky [1]\_ - 1:31:2 improve [2]\_ - 1:4:21\_, 1:18:25\_, 1:24:22\_, front [1]\_ - 1:17:7 Governmental [1]\_ hunky-dory [1]\_ -1:11:14 fulfilling [1]\_ - 1:45:1 1:10:11 1:24:23\_, 1:25:12\_, 1:31:2 improved [1]\_ -1:25:14\_, 1:30:6\_, full [11]\_ - 1:5:5\_, 1:5:9 grateful [1]\_ - 1:43:24 1:42:10 \_, 1:26:20\_, 1:44:2\_, 1:33:2\_, 1:33:6\_, great [6]\_ - 1:4:4\_, improvement [1]\_ -I 1:33:9 1:44:24\_, 1:45:10\_, 1:25:16\_, 1:29:25\_, 1:12:21 high-profile [5]\_ -1:47:11\_, 1:47:18\_, 1:31:2\_, 1:38:24\_, IA [4]\_ - 1:24:14\_, improving [1]\_ -1:47:25\_, 1:48:20, 1:18:25\_, 1:24:22\_, 1:48:22 1:24:15\_, 1:27:12\_, 1.6.10 1:24:23\_, 1:25:12\_, 1:50:10 greater [1]\_ - 1:12:22 1:28:10 IMT [15]\_ - 1:9:8\_, 1:25:14 fully [5]\_ - 1:12:4\_, groundbreaking [1]\_ -IAB [13]\_ - 1:6:9\_, 1:13:3\_, 1:13:5\_, high-speed [4]\_ -1:13:22\_, 1:15:22\_, 1:40:16 1:13:8\_, 1:13:11\_, 1:7:25\_. 1:9:7\_. 1:7:16\_, 1:33:2\_, 1:35:21\_, 1:37:11 group [2]\_ - 1:32:10\_, 1:9:10\_. 1:9:12\_. 1:13:14\_, 1:14:1\_, 1:33:6\_, 1:33:9 function [2] - 1:6:11. 1:35:18 1:12:2\_, 1:12:4\_, 1:14:5\_, 1:14:8\_, higher [1]\_ - 1:14:25 \_, 1:7:25 guess [1]\_ - 1:19:20 1:12:6\_, 1:13:5\_, 1:14:9\_, 1:14:10\_, highly [1]\_ - 1:26:4 functioning [1]\_ guidance [2]\_ -1:18:10\_, 1:18:13\_, 1:14:14\_, 1:15:18\_, Hill [1] - 1:2:13 1:44:19 1:13:13\_, 1:36:1 1:24:12\_, 1:40:23 hindering [3]\_ - 1:6:2 1:16:8\_, 1:16:13 functions [1]\_ guide [1]\_ - 1:15:15 IAG [1]\_ - 1:36:21 **IMT's** [3]\_ - 1:13:6\_, \_, 1:32:6\_, 1:32:7 1:37:15 gun [2]\_ - 1:23:13 idea [1]... - 1:30:1 1:14:9\_, 1:16:4 **hit** [1]\_ - 1:18:7 fundamental [1] -guy [1]\_ - 1:23:2 ideas [2]\_ - 1:36:3\_, inability [1]\_ - 1:38:9 1:45:11 hoc [1]\_ - 1:36:9 1:48:25 inadequate [1]\_ fundamentally [1]\_ hold [2]\_ - 1:17:3\_, Н identified [6]\_ - 1:8:16 1:12:15 1:17:4 1:9:15 \_, 1:13:10\_, 1:28:10 incident [1]\_ - 1:12:12 **FURTHER** [1] - 1:50:9 hand [2]\_ - 1:27:14\_, holding [1]\_ - 1:45:17 \_, 1:36:11\_, 1:39:11. include [1]\_ - 1:11:9 holds [2]\_ - 1:11:22\_, future [5]\_ - 1:7:24\_, 1:48:13 , 1:39:13 included [1]\_ - 1:36:7 1:16:5 1:11:9\_, 1:12:24\_, hands [1]\_ - 1:47:12 identifies [1]\_ increase [3] - 1:6:16. Honor [28]\_ - 1:3:12\_, 1:26:21\_, 1:34:14 happy [2]\_ - 1:8:24\_, 1:14:22 \_, 1:17:8\_, 1:22:2 1:3:17\_, 1:3:19\_, 1:21:3 identify [4]\_ - 1:14:5\_, increased [1]\_ -1:3:22\_, 1:24:7\_, hard [2]\_ - 1:17:16\_,

1:38:11 intelligence [1]\_ -1:25:2 increasing [1]\_ -1:4:18 investigator [1]\_ -1:16:20 intelligence-led [1]\_ -1:25:9 incredible [1]\_ -1:4:18 investigatory [3]\_ -1:44:1 intend [2]\_ - 1:47:12\_, 1:39:9\_. 1:39:12\_. incriminate [1]\_ -1:48:17 1:39:18 1:23:11 intense [1]\_ - 1:19:13 involve [2]\_ - 1:19:1\_, indeed [1]\_ - 1:35:8 1:37:3 intention [1]\_ - 1:46:8 involved [4]\_ - 1:19:1. indicated [2]\_ - 1:14:1. interaction [1]\_ - 1:8:4 \_, 1:16:3 interactions [1]\_ -\_, 1:29:21\_, 1:32:25 indicates [2]\_ - 1:6:25 1:4:19 \_, 1:34:8 \_, 1:15:6 interest [1]\_ - 1:7:24 involving [2]\_ - 1:6:20. indication [1]\_ interested [1]\_ -\_, 1:13:18 1:15:13 1:8:14 issue [3]\_ - 1:21:18\_, 1:24:2\_, 1:45:11 indicative [1]\_ - 1:15:3 Internal [20] - 1:6:10 issues [16]\_ - 1:4:13\_, individual [1]\_ -\_, 1:7:8\_, 1:9:17\_, 1:9:22\_, 1:10:21\_, 1:6:2\_, 1:6:3\_, 1:30:13 1:7:14\_, 1:7:16\_, individuals [1]\_ -1:10:24\_, 1:11:21\_, 1:7:21\_, 1:25:16\_, 1:18:1 1:12:14\_, 1:18:17\_, 1:29:16\_, 1:30:4\_, inexcusable [1]\_ -1:18:23\_, 1:24:23\_, 1:31:16\_, 1:33:17\_, 1:32:16 1:25:17\_, 1:26:13\_, 1:34:5\_, 1:38:7\_, **influx** [1]\_ - 1:10:2 1:26:17\_, 1:39:5\_, 1:39:23\_, 1:43:23 1:41:11\_, 1:41:13\_, information [2]\_ itself [3]\_ - 1:25:1\_, 1:41:18\_, 1:41:20\_, 1:17:23\_, 1:18:3 1:32:14\_, 1:44:21 1:45:24 informed [1]\_ - 1:37:4 internal [4] - 1:5:19 -, initial [1]\_ - 1:30:4 initiate [4]\_ - 1:21:5\_, 1:37:6\_, 1:41:22\_, 1:21:8\_, 1:21:10\_, 1:45:12 **JAMES** [1] - 1:2:5 1:23:14 interpreted [1]\_ -James [2] - 1:2:6\_, 1:32:9 initiation [1]\_ - 1:6:4 Intervenor [1] ... -1:3:19 initiatives [1]\_ -Jestin [2]\_ - 1:2:18\_, 1:3:18 1:15:16 1:3:25 Intervenors [1] injustice [1]\_ - 1:17:25 1:2:11 **Jim** [1]\_ - 1:33:21 inner [2]\_ - 1:11:14\_, job [3]\_ - 1:32:15\_, intervention [2]\_ -1:12:16 1:32:18\_, 1:45:16 1:26:15\_, 1:35:15 inner-agency [2]\_ interventions [1]\_ -**JOHN** [1] - 1:2:2 1:11:14\_, 1:12:16 John [2] - 1:2:3\_, 1:38:16 inoperable [1]\_ -1:3:12 intricacies [1]\_ -1:9:20 Johnson [2]\_ - 1:2:18 1:26:10 insight [1]\_ - 1:38:10 \_. 1:4:1 investigating [1] -- inspections [1] -joining [1]\_ - 1:41:3 1:45:17 1:40:19 joint [1]\_ - 1:14:17 Inspector [6]\_ - 1:2:18 Investigation [1]\_ -1:26:17 **Jr** [1] - 1:2:12 \_, 1:4:2\_, 1:41:3\_, investigation [6]\_ -JUDGE [1] - 1:1:11 1:41:10\_, 1:43:21\_, Judge [1]\_ - 1:5:5 1:10:2-, 1:10:24-, 1:46:16 1:12:8\_, 1:13:18\_, judgments [1]\_ institution [1]\_ -1:13:19\_, 1:42:4 1:30:12 1:12:17 investigations [10] judicial [1]\_ - 1:38:15 institutional [1] --1:5:19\_, 1:9:7\_, July [2] - 1:1:7, 1:12:2 1:10:5\_, 1:11:16\_, 1:50:14 insufficient [1] --1:11:17\_, 1:16:25\_, 1:12:16 justice [1]\_ - 1:18:1 1:41:20\_, 1:41:22\_, justification [2]\_ integrate [2]\_ -1:42:1\_, 1:45:12 1:32:17\_, 1:33:18 1:35:24\_, 1:36:24 investigative [11]\_ justifications [2]\_ integrated [1]\_ -1:5:15\_, 1:5:25\_, 1:32:20\_, 1:34:1 1:12:1 1:7:2\_, 1:8:17\_, justify [1]\_ - 1:33:9 integrates [1]\_ -1:10:9\_, 1:10:22\_, 1:36:22 1:11:18\_, 1:12:3\_, integrity [2] - 1:45:15. leading [2] - 1:35:18 1:12:14\_, 1:13:23\_, \_, 1:39:7 \_, 1:45:24

lean [1]\_ - 1:38:22 Κ learn [1]\_ - 1:38:18 learned [2]\_ - 1:13:23. keep [3] - 1:7:20 -, \_, 1:42:4 1:12:4\_, 1:14:3 least [2]\_ - 1:4:8\_, keeping [1]\_ - 1:45:9 key [2]\_ - 1:6:5\_, 1:10:18 leave [2] - 1:25:23 -, 1:37:21 killed [2]\_ - 1:33:1\_, 1:31:23 led [2]\_ - 1:4:18\_, 1:33:4 kind [7]\_ - 1:8:19\_, 1:42:4 1:8:20\_, 1:9:2\_, LEE [3]\_ - 1:43:5\_, 1:48:16\_, 1:49:3 1:19:22\_, 1:33:17\_, Lee [6] - 1:2:17\_, 1:37:4 1:3:24\_, 1:4:6\_, **knowing** [2]\_ - 1:28:12 \_, 1:30:14 1:43:2\_, 1:43:6\_, 1:47:14 knowledge [1]\_ lens [2]\_ - 1:23:18\_, 1:46:9 1:37:25 known [1]\_ - 1:43:17 lenses [1] - 1:37:17 knows [3]\_ - 1:19:6\_, 1:29:16\_, 1:34:7 less [2]\_ - 1:17:4\_, 1:30:7 KPIs [1] - 1:36:25 lessons [2]\_ - 1:13:23. \_, 1:42:4 L letter [2]\_ - 1:19:21\_, 1:20:4 lack [1]\_ - 1:47:22 level [4]\_ - 1:10:25\_, lapses [1]\_ - 1:11:3 large [2]\_ - 1:13:16\_, 1:12:9\_, 1:17:17\_, 1:22:2 1:43:10 levels [2]\_ - 1:7:5\_, large-scale [1]\_ -1:38:4 1:13:16 life [1]\_ - 1:35:12 largely [1]\_ - 1:28:3 limbo [1]\_ - 1:11:14 last [12]\_ - 1:4:8\_, 1:9:12\_, 1:13:15\_, limitation [2]\_ -1:19:20\_, 1:24:15\_, 1:10:12\_, 1:10:15 1:25:11\_, 1:26:6\_, limits [2]\_ - 1:8:17\_, 1:31:25\_, 1:36:3\_, 1:32:24 1:40:3\_, 1:47:22 lingering [1]\_ lastly [2]\_ - 1:26:6\_, 1:39:23 list [2]\_ - 1:40:8 1:38:17 late [1]\_ - 1:24:15 listen [1]\_ - 1:38:18 Latin [1]\_ - 1:6:24 live [2]\_ - 1:20:7\_, 1:28:19 **Latino** [1]\_ - 1:6:24 lived [1]\_ - 1:28:20 **LAW** [2] - 1:2:2, 1:2:5 long-term [3] - 1:15:3 Lawson [2]\_ - 1:2:19\_, \_, 1:15:15\_, 1:36:6 1:4:3 lead [3]\_ - 1:35:17\_, look [24]\_ - 1:16:1\_, 1:36:5\_, 1:41:25 1:16:19\_, 1:16:21\_, leader [2]\_ - 1:20:13\_, 1:16:24\_, 1:17:19\_, 1:18:3\_, 1:21:2\_, 1:35:13 1:21:5\_, 1:21:9\_, leaders [1]\_ - 1:8:2 1:22:4\_, 1:22:5\_, leadership [14]\_ -1:22:10\_, 1:22:14\_, 1:4:7\_, 1:5:12\_, 1:6:5\_, 1:6:9\_, 1:7:4 1:23:8\_, 1:29:21\_, 1:30:8\_, 1:30:9\_, \_, 1:7:5\_, 1:7:6\_, 1:30:10\_, 1:33:4\_, 1:18:13\_, 1:32:16\_, 1:38:3\_, 1:38:4\_, 1:42:11\_, 1:47:1\_, 1:44:1\_, 1:46:23 1:47:7\_, 1:47:22\_, looking [11] - 1:4:11. 1:47:23

\_, 1:11:25\_, 1:14:21

\_, 1:15:11\_, 1:15:20

\_, 1:22:8\_, 1:22:11\_, 1:25:8\_, 1:28:11\_, 1:30:20\_, 1:36:16 looks [1]\_ - 1:30:21 loop [2]\_ - 1:25:25\_, 1:26:11 losing [1]\_ - 1:12:5 lost [1]\_ - 1:10:6 louder [1]\_ - 1:39:24 love [2]\_ - 1:34:11\_, 1:43:2 low [2]\_ - 1:14:19\_, 1:14:20 LUCIA [5] - 1:2:12\_, 1:3:17\_, 1:34:19\_, 1:34:23\_, 1:34:25 Lucia [4] - 1:2:12\_, 1:3:17\_, 1:34:18\_, 1:43:19

## M

maintain [3]\_ - 1:12:7 \_, 1:15:1\_, 1:37:22 maintaining [1]\_ -1:47:5 majority [1]\_ - 1:35:11 Maloof [2]\_ - 1:2:18\_, 1:4:2 man [1]\_ - 1:33:3 MANAGEMENT[1] -1:1:14 management [10]\_ -1:6:17\_, 1:9:18\_, 1:10:15\_, 1:11:9\_, 1:11:15\_, 1:12:1\_, 1:12:23\_, 1:14:17\_, 1:42:2\_, 1:48:8 Management [1]\_ -1:40:18 managing [1]\_ -1:9:19 mandated [2]\_ -1:7:15\_, 1:42:9 mandates [2]\_ -1:38:22\_, 1:42:19 March [1] - 1:9:21 mark [1] - 1:13:2 Marlin [1]\_ - 1:14:22 Martin [7] - 1:2:9\_, 1:3:23\_, 1:14:18\_, 1:14:22\_, 1:15:5\_, 1:39:3\_, 1:48:10 MARTIN [4]\_ - 1:3:22\_, 1:39:4\_, 1:41:8\_, 1:43:1 matter [2]\_ - 1:21:24\_, 1:30:6 matters [4]\_ - 1:7:19\_,

1:18:13\_, 1:21:19\_,

Mayor [11] - 1:2:17\_, 1:3:24\_, 1:4:6\_, 1:40:25\_, 1:43:2\_, 1:43:6\_, 1:43:9\_, 1:45:4\_. 1:45:13\_. 1:45:21\_. 1:47:14 MAYOR [3]\_ - 1:43:5\_, 1:48:16\_, 1:49:3 Mayor's [1]\_ - 1:41:8 mean [6]\_ - 1:7:14\_, 1:16:25\_, 1:17:2\_, 1:30:21\_, 1:31:5\_, 1:45:25 means [2]\_ - 1:30:8\_, 1:33:24 meant [3]\_ - 1:20:17\_, 1:23:23\_, 1:41:6 measure [1]\_ - 1:6:8 measures [3]\_ - 1:11:7. \_, 1:36:5\_, 1:41:14 mechanism [1]\_ -1:37:7 mechanisms [1] --1:37:7 meet [5]\_ - 1:16:7\_, 1:22:17\_, 1:26:2\_, 1:37:5\_, 1:38:9 meeting [4]\_ - 1:9:12\_, 1:11:19\_, 1:19:8\_, 1:19:9 meetings [12]\_ -1:11:15\_, 1:11:25\_, 1:12:6\_, 1:12:7\_, 1:18:12\_, 1:18:24\_, 1:18:25\_, 1:19:1\_, 1:22:13\_, 1:29:2\_, 1:42:9 member [1]\_ - 1:44:10 member's [1]\_ -1.25.22 members [2]\_ -1:14:13\_, 1:43:23 members' [1]\_ -1:41:19 memos [1]\_ - 1:28:10 men [1]\_ - 1:44:4 mental [1] - 1:44:12 mentioned [4]\_ -1:27:3\_, 1:27:6\_, 1:29:14\_. 1:46:14 mentorship [1]\_ -1:26:15 message [2]\_ -1:45:21\_, 1:45:24 messaging [1]\_ -1:40:1 met [2]\_ - 1:11:4\_, 1:26:5 meticulously [1]\_ -

1:28:9

1.20.1 Michelle [2]\_ - 1:41:2 \_, 1:46:15 middle [1]\_ - 1:22:17 might [2]\_ - 1:23:18\_, 1:30:24 miles [2]\_ - 1:21:7\_, 1:32:24 mind [1]\_ - 1:46:12 minimal [2]\_ - 1:22:7 Minneapolis's [1]\_ -1:41:1 minor [1]\_ - 1:33:8 minute [1]\_ - 1:44:3 Miranda [1] - 1:23:1 mirrored [1]\_ - 1:38:14 mirrors [1]\_ - 1:47:5 misconduct [4]\_ -1:9:20\_, 1:38:3\_, 1:38:5\_, 1:45:17 misinterpreted [1]\_ -1:39:25 miss [1]\_ - 1:17:18 missed [3]\_ - 1:10:18. \_, 1:13:1\_, 1:17:21 missing [1]\_ - 1:27:6 mission [2]\_ - 1:45:3\_, 1:46:2 misunderstandings [1]\_ - 1:11:19 misunderstood [1]\_ -1:39:25 MITCHELL [11]\_ -1:8:13\_, 1:8:18\_, 1:8:22\_, 1:9:1\_, 1:9:6\_, 1:16:9\_, 1:16:19\_, 1:18:15\_, 1:20:4\_, 1:21:21\_, 1:21:23 Mitchell [5] - 1:2:15\_, 1:3:25\_, 1:8:10\_, 1:39:7\_, 1:43:20 model [1]\_ - 1:44:8 monitor [9]\_ - 1:7:20\_, 1:31:5\_, 1:31:13\_, 1:31:20\_, 1:36:2\_, 1:41:12\_, 1:42:16\_, 1:46:24\_, 1:48:2 monitor's [2]\_ - 1:37:2 \_, 1:40:4 monitored [1]\_ -1:38:8 monitoring [8]\_ -1:8:6\_. 1:11:12\_. 1:12:15\_, 1:26:16\_, 1:33:14\_, 1:37:8\_, 1:43:16

1:13:8

metric [1]\_ - 1:15:13

metrics [2]\_ - 1:14:15.

monitorship [1]\_ -1.6.3 month [2]\_ - 1:12:6\_, 1.41.8 months [4]\_ - 1:8:23\_, 1:10:16\_, 1:39:5\_, 1:47:21 moreover [1]\_ - 1:25:4 morning [1]\_ - 1:3:20 most [5]\_ - 1:4:23\_, 1:14:11\_, 1:14:16\_, 1:24:18\_, 1:46:18 move [3]\_ - 1:15:20\_, 1:47:24 moving [2]\_ - 1:12:10. \_, 1:22:15 MR [15] - 1:3:12 -, 1:3:15\_, 1:3:17\_, 1:3:19\_, 1:27:2\_, 1:29:4\_, 1:29:8\_, 1:29:10\_, 1:29:13\_, 1:34:19\_, 1:34:23\_, 1:34:25\_, 1:35:3\_, 1:35:8\_, 1:38:25 MS [4]\_ - 1:3:22\_, 1:39:4\_, 1:41:8\_, 1.43.1 multiple [1]\_ - 1:38:19 must [4]\_ - 1:17:21\_, 1:44:2\_, 1:44:10\_, 1:45:13 Ν

name [4]\_ - 1:35:5\_, 1:35:7\_, 1:36:9\_, 1:43:6 national [2]\_ - 1:5:20\_, 1:33:4 near [1]\_ - 1:26:21 necessarily [1]\_ -1:18:6 necessary [2]\_ -1:26:16\_, 1:45:13 need [9] - 1:18:2, 1:19:23\_, 1:21:10\_, 1:23:13\_, 1:25:17\_, 1:46:4\_, 1:46:5 needed [1]\_ - 1:4:18 negative [1]\_ - 1:4:19 negotiated [2]\_ -1:4:15\_, 1:5:2 never [3]\_ - 1:13:24\_, 1:26:2\_, 1:27:4 new [8]\_ - 1:6:8\_, 1:17:16\_, 1:19:7\_, 1:19:10\_, 1:31:16\_, 1:38:21\_, 1:40:14\_, 1:48:12 newest [1]\_ - 1:45:22

news [1]\_ - 1:27:9 next [5]\_ - 1:16:12\_, 1:30:24\_, 1:31:10\_, 1:42:15\_, 1:48:8 nice [2]\_ - 1:3:14\_, 1:3:16 nine [2]\_ - 1:39:5\_, 1:47:21 non [1]\_ - 1:14:13 non-white [1]\_ -1:14:13 noncommittal [1]\_ noncompliance [1]\_ -1:13:3 normal [1]\_ - 1:12:13 NORTHERN [1] - 1:1:2 note [1] - 1:13:20 nothing [3]\_ - 1:29:8\_, 1:34:20\_, 1:34:22 notion [1]\_ - 1:31:4 notwithstanding [1]\_ - 1:20:1 NSA [37]\_ - 1:6:18\_, 1:7:3\_, 1:7:12\_, 1:7:16\_, 1:7:17\_, 1:7:20\_, 1:13:6\_, 1:16:23\_, 1:19:1\_, 1:19:8\_, 1:19:9\_, 1:20:7\_, 1:20:9\_, 1:20:17\_. 1:20:23\_. 1:20:25\_. 1:24:19\_.. 1:36:9\_\_ 1:37:5\_\_ 1:37:20\_, 1:38:8\_, 1:38:9\_, 1:39:21\_, 1:40:19\_, 1:41:4\_, 1:42:19\_, 1:42:23\_, 1:43:11\_, 1:43:15\_, 1:43:25\_, 1:44:2\_, 1:45:2\_, 1:45:10\_, 1:46:20\_, 1:47:2\_, 1.48.15 NSA's [1]\_ - 1:33:19 **Number** [1]\_ - 1:3:9 number [11]\_ - 1:5:17. \_, 1:6:16\_, 1:10:16\_, 1:14:19\_, 1:14:20\_, 1:17:13\_, 1:18:7\_, 1:19:15\_, 1:26:14\_, 1:30:18\_, 1:30:22 numbers [8]\_ - 1:15:1. \_, 1:29:17\_, 1:29:24 \_, 1:30:6\_, 1:30:10\_,

## 0

1:30:14\_, 1:30:24

O'Connor [1] - 1:1:21 OAKLAND [1] - 1:2:8 Oakland [31] - 1:1:7,

1:5:22\_, 1:10:3\_,

1:1:7, 1:2:4, 1:2:10, 1:2:16\_, 1:3:9\_, 1:3:18\_, 1:3:23\_, 1:4:9\_, 1:4:10\_, 1:8:8\_, 1:9:14\_, 1:9:16\_, 1:27:24\_, 1:28:20\_, 1:32:24\_, 1:33:3\_, 1:35:10\_, 1:35:19\_, 1:37:19\_, 1:37:22\_, 1:38:12\_, 1:38:21\_, 1:40:15\_, 1:40:17\_, 1:41:4\_, 1:43:7\_, 1:43:8\_, 1:43:9\_, 1:43:19\_, 1:48:19 Oakland's [3]\_ -1:4:19\_, 1:40:16\_, 1:42:19 Oaklanders [1]\_ -1:44:18 Oakport [1] - 1:2:4 objectives [1]\_ -1:38:9 obligations [1]\_ -1:29:2 observation [1] --1:15:10 observed [2]\_ - 1:9:3\_, 1:15:6 occasion [1]\_ -1:32:13 occur [2]\_ - 1:23:16\_, 1:23:17 occurred [5]\_ - 1:9:11. \_, 1:12:19\_, 1:13:17. \_, 1:14:1\_, 1:39:9 occurring [3]\_ -1:13:22\_, 1:17:6\_, 1:39:14 October [1]\_ - 1:48:11 **OF** [4] - 1:1:2, 1:1:13, 1:2:2, 1:2:5 offended [1]\_ - 1:30:3 offense [1]\_ - 1:33:8 office [2]\_ - 1:41:21\_, 1:46:20 **OFFICE** [1] - 1:2:8 Office [3]\_ - 1:41:13\_, 1:41:18\_, 1:43:22 officer [4]\_ - 1:23:5\_, 1:25:23\_, 1:33:13\_, 1:45:17 officer's [1]\_ - 1:23:2 officers [17] - 1:6:20 \_, 1:6:23\_, 1:12:6\_, 1:14:20\_, 1:14:24\_, 1:14:25\_, 1:17:2\_, 1:17:5\_, 1:17:25\_, 1:18:2\_, 1:21:4\_, 1:21:6\_, 1:29:20\_, OPOA [1]\_ - 1:34:20

1:30:12\_, 1:30:13\_, 1:32:14\_, 1:45:18 Officers [1]\_ - 1:43:19 offices [1]\_ - 1:37:15 **OFFICES** [2] - 1:2:2, 1.2.5 Official [2] - 1:1:20, 1.50.8 often [2]\_ - 1:23:1\_, 1:36:15 Ogawa [1] - 1:2:10 **OIG** [1]\_ - 1:36:22 old [2]\_ - 1:19:11\_, 1:33:3 on-site [1]\_ - 1:37:24 once [1]\_ - 1:23:3 one [19]\_ - 1:10:11\_, 1:13:1\_, 1:19:2\_, 1:20:10\_, 1:22:25\_, 1:23:7\_, 1:23:18\_, 1:26:7\_, 1:26:11\_, 1:27:24\_, 1:28:15\_, 1:32:13\_, 1:32:22\_, 1:33:2\_, 1:33:3\_, 1:34:14\_, 1:41:8\_, 1:46:5 One [1] - 1:2:10 one-year [1] --1:10:11 ones [2]\_ - 1:19:16\_, 1:22:25 ongoing [4]\_ - 1:7:21. \_, 1:10:5\_, 1:10:24\_, 1:48:12 **oOo** [1] - 1:49:6 OPC [5]\_ - 1:36:19\_, 1:37:6\_, 1:37:7\_, 1:37:14\_, 1:37:20 OPC's [1]\_ - 1:36:22 OPD [13]\_ - 1:6:5\_, 1:7:14\_, 1:7:23\_, 1:14:14\_, 1:18:12\_, 1:19:24\_, 1:36:5\_, 1:37:16\_, 1:37:24\_, 1:38:4\_, 1:38:6\_, 1:38:12\_, 1:38:14 OPD's [6]\_ - 1:5:8\_, 1:5:17\_, 1:19:25\_, 1:21:19\_, 1:38:7\_, 1:38:9 open [1]\_ - 1:25:6 opening [1]\_ - 1:8:20 operation [3]\_ - 1:10:6. \_, 1:20:22\_, 1:21:15 operational [1]\_ -1:12:13 operations [3]\_ -1:9:16\_, 1:21:11\_, 1:38:12

opportunity [2]\_ -1:13:1\_, 1:17:4 order [11]\_ - 1:3:2\_, 1:4:11\_, 1:6:8\_, 1:18:8\_, 1:27:22\_, 1:28:2\_, 1:28:5\_, 1:28:17\_, 1:29:1\_, 1:48:6\_, 1:48:14 organization [3]\_ -1:20:16\_, 1:44:5\_, 1.45.7 organizational [2]\_ -1:44:7\_, 1:44:9 organizations [1]\_ -1:48:19 ORRICK [1] - 1:1:11 Orrick [1]\_ - 1:3:5 ought [3]\_ - 1:33:12\_, 1:48:25 ourselves [1]\_ -1:36:15 outage [1]\_ - 1:9:21 outcomes [4]\_ - 1:7:2 \_, 1:14:13\_, 1:14:21. \_. 1:41:22 outlined [1]\_ - 1:12:25 outset [1]\_ - 1:5:2 outside [2]\_ - 1:20:23 \_, 1:36:15 overall [3]\_ - 1:20:16\_, 1:37:12... 1:44:5 overseeing [1]\_ -1:18:10 oversight [14]\_ -1:4:10\_, 1:11:5\_, 1:35:25\_, 1:37:4\_, 1:37:24\_, 1:38:15\_, 1:42:20\_, 1:42:24\_, 1:43:21\_, 1:44:16\_, 1:44:24\_, 1:47:3\_, 1:47:16\_, 1:47:18 overtime [1]\_ - 1:10:4 overwhelmed [1]\_ -1:10:3 own [3]\_ - 1:9:12\_, 1:30:19\_, 1:39:6 Р

**p.m** [3] - 1:1:8\_\_, 1:3:3 \_, 1:49:5 page [5]\_ - 1:13:7\_, 1:13:8\_, 1:13:14\_, 1:14:10\_, 1:14:17 pages [1] - 1:50:9 paints [1]\_ - 1:15:14 Panel [1]\_ - 1:22:19 paradigm [1]\_ - 1:8:1 paragraph [2]\_ -1:13:15..., 1:15:5

paramount [1]\_ -1.29.17 part [12]\_ - 1:7:17\_, 1:9:24\_, 1:15:7\_, 1:21:5\_, 1:22:21\_, 1:30:2\_, 1:36:4\_, 1:44:20\_, 1:44:21\_, 1:45:23\_, 1:46:21\_, 1:47:21 partial [1]\_ - 1:14:8 partially [1]\_ - 1:33:24 participating [2]\_ -1:28:11\_, 1:28:12 particular [3]\_ - 1:4:6 \_, 1:19:3\_, 1:33:17 particularly [8]\_ -1:4:20\_, 1:8:16\_, 1:9:16\_, 1:10:10\_, 1:11:4\_, 1:30:19\_, 1:32:5\_, 1:42:13 parties [4]\_ - 1:5:1\_, 1:5:3\_, 1:7:10\_, 1:38:19 partners [2]\_ - 1:37:21 \_, 1:48:19 pass [2]\_ - 1:26:16\_, 1:39:16 passion [1]\_ - 1:35:15 past [2]\_ - 1:26:3\_, 1:35:12 pause [1]\_ - 1:14:16 PC [1] - 1:2:12 people [11]\_ - 1:23:19. \_, 1:28:19\_, 1:29:20 \_, 1:29:22\_, 1:29:25 \_, 1:31:6\_, 1:33:1\_, 1:33:7\_, 1:33:15\_, 1:43:8\_, 1:43:14 percent [6]\_ - 1:5:21\_, 1:6:20\_, 1:6:21\_, 1:16:17\_, 1:17:15\_, 1:30:22 percentile [1]\_ -1:13:2 perceptions [1]\_ -1:41:20 perfect [3]... - 1:20:18..., 1:29:9 perfectly [1]\_ - 1:49:1 performance [1]\_ -1:28:8 period [4]\_ - 1:9:23\_, 1:10:12\_, 1:30:8\_, 1:39:10 perpetual [1]\_ - 1:47:4 persist [1]\_ - 1:10:15 persistent [1]\_ - 1:6:1 person [2]\_ - 1:23:9\_, 1:23:11

personnel [3]... -

1:12:3 perspective [5]\_ -1:24:9\_, 1:35:25\_, 1:36:12\_, 1:36:23\_, 1:37:3 perspectives [2]\_ -1:7:9\_, 1:36:15 pertaining [1] --1:45:11 **PHALLE** [1] - 1:2:12 Phillips [3]\_ - 1:41:2\_, 1:46:15\_, 1:48:17 Phillips' [2]\_ - 1:46:18. \_, 1:46:22 Phoenix [1] - 1:1:22 phone [1] - 1:16:9 physical [1] - 1:44:11 picture [1]\_ - 1:15:15 **piece** [1]\_ - 1:19:3 **pivotal** [2]\_ - 1:45:25 place [13]\_ - 1:12:22\_, 1:15:25\_, 1:25:24\_, 1:26:19\_, 1:26:20\_, 1:29:14\_, 1:29:19\_, 1:33:8\_, 1:33:14\_, 1:33:20\_, 1:34:6\_, 1:47:23 plaining [1] - 1:11:21 **Plaintiffs** [2] - 1:1:5, 1:2:2 plaintiffs [4]\_ - 1:3:13. \_, 1:3:19\_, 1:8:15\_, 1:27:1 plaintiffs' [4]\_ - 1:5:16. \_, 1:8:6\_, 1:42:16\_, 1:43:17 **plan** [1]\_ - 1:46:5 planning [2]\_ -1:11:23\_, 1:11:25 plate [1]\_ - 1:20:8 platform [1]\_ - 1:9:19 play [1]\_ - 1:7:23 Plaza [1] - 1:2:10 Pleasant [1] - 1:2:13 pleased [2]\_ - 1:28:8\_, 1:29:15 plenty [1]\_ - 1:33:5 POA[1]\_ - 1:3:18 podium [2]\_ - 1:3:10\_, 1:8:11 point [11] - 1:17:24, 1:19:4\_, 1:19:9\_, 1:19:12\_, 1:19:14\_, 1:26:8\_, 1:26:18\_, 1:31:8\_, 1:31:25\_, 1:34:21\_. 1:38:15 points [2]\_ - 1:14:11\_, 1:35:22 poised [1]\_ - 1:49:1

Proceedings [3] provides [1]\_ police [7]\_ - 1:4:21\_, 1:36:11\_, 1:37:16\_, rate [5]\_ - 1:15:1\_, 1:6:13\_, 1:16:18\_, 1:38:14 1:1:24\_, 1:3:3\_, 1:15:13 1:16:16\_, 1:16:20\_, 1:19:6\_, 1:32:7\_, preemptive [1]\_ -1:49:5 providing [1]\_ -1:30:21\_, 1:30:23 1:44:19 1:11:23 process [11]\_ - 1:12:1. 1:13:12 rates [1]\_ - 1:14:25 \_, 1:12:15\_, 1:15:16. Police [40] - 1:2:16\_, prepare [1]\_ - 1:37:10 proximity [2]\_ rather [2]\_ - 1:15:3\_, 1:2:19\_, 1:3:25\_, Prepared [1] - 1:1:24 \_, 1:15:17\_, 1:16:23 1:37:25\_, 1:38:10 1:35:22 1:4:1\_, 1:4:2\_, prepared [1] - 1:50:13 \_, 1:18:3\_, 1:22:22\_, public [8]\_ - 1:23:6\_, rationalization [2]\_ -1:4:10\_, 1:4:14\_, 1:23:22\_, 1:29:19\_, present [1]\_ - 1:24:24 1:23:12\_, 1:38:2\_, 1:33:18\_, 1:34:15 1:5:5\_, 1:7:10\_, 1:29:21\_, 1:35:25 Present [1] - 1:2:15 1:40:5\_, 1:42:6\_, rationalizations [1]\_ -1:7:22\_, 1:8:3\_, processed [1]\_ presentation [1]\_ -1:44:5\_, 1:44:12\_, 1:34:2 1:8:4\_, 1:9:13\_, 1:9:23 1:25:5 1:48:23 reach [3]\_ - 1:5:5\_, 1:9:17\_, 1:18:18\_, processes [4]\_ published [2]\_ -1:37:22\_, 1:37:24 presented [5]\_ -1:18:19\_, 1:19:21\_, 1:24:12\_, 1:26:19\_, 1:13:23\_, 1:41:23 reached [1]\_ - 1:37:20 1:18:4\_, 1:18:5\_, 1:20:12\_, 1:20:13\_, 1:25:4\_, 1:36:3\_, 1:29:22\_, 1:41:20 purpose [1]\_ - 1:46:8 reaction [1]\_ - 1:30:4 1:20:15\_, 1:31:21\_, processing [2]\_ -1:40:22 purposefully [1]\_ read [3]\_ - 1:7:24\_, 1:32:1\_, 1:35:2\_, 1:9:19\_, 1:10:22 presiding [1]\_ - 1:3:5 1:40:25 1:20:4\_, 1:31:25 1:35:10\_, 1:35:19\_, profession [2]\_ pressure [1]\_ pursuit [6]\_ - 1:21:3\_, readily [1]\_ - 1:34:6 1:35:24\_, 1:38:12\_, 1:44:13\_, 1:44:14 1:21:5\_, 1:21:8\_, 1:10:10 reading [1]\_ - 1:19:15 1:39:7\_, 1:40:15\_, professional [2]\_ -1:21:10\_, 1:32:14\_, pretty [1]\_ - 1:46:6 real [4]\_ - 1:13:12\_, 1:40:22\_, 1:43:19\_, 1:31:6\_, 1:35:12 1:32:21 prevent [6]\_ - 1:10:25 1:32:13\_, 1:33:14\_, 1:43:21\_, 1:44:4\_, professionalism [1]\_ pursuits [1]\_ - 1:7:17 \_, 1:11:9\_, 1:11:13\_, 1:43:15 1:45:5\_, 1:45:6\_, 1:44:8 1:11:19\_, 1:13:21\_, **push** [1]\_ - 1:13:1 really [11]\_ - 1:19:2\_, 1:45:22\_, 1:46:21\_, professionals [1]\_ -1:42:7 **put** [3]\_ - 1:8:20\_, 1:19:4\_, 1:24:17\_, 1:46:22\_, 1:47:5\_, 1:35:18 prevented [2]\_ -1:21:6\_, 1:43:14 1:25:6\_, 1:29:18\_, 1:48:18 profile [5]\_ - 1:18:25\_, 1:39:12\_, 1:39:13 1:30:21\_, 1:34:20\_, policies [7]\_ - 1:4:17\_, 1:24:22\_, 1:24:23\_, 1:37:2\_, 1:38:1\_, prevention [1]\_ -Q 1:8:7\_, 1:34:11\_, 1:25:12\_, 1:25:14 1:42:10\_, 1:43:7 1:35:14 1:34:12\_, 1:34:13\_, previously [2]\_ profiling [1]\_ - 1:29:16 qualified [1] - 1:50:8 realtime [1]\_ - 1:11:12 1:36:11\_, 1:45:3 1:12:14\_, 1:46:15 program [1]\_ - 1:42:2 quality [2]\_ - 1:6:1\_, reason [7]\_ - 1:4:16\_, policing [8]\_ - 1:4:9\_, progress [8]\_ - 1:5:10 principal [1]\_ - 1:5:14 1:6:7 1:5:10\_, 1:5:13\_, 1:8:8\_, 1:28:23\_, \_, 1:14:14\_, 1:30:1\_, quantify [1]\_ - 1:10:17 priority [4]... - 1:25:19. 1:7:16\_. 1:28:4\_. 1:33:25\_, 1:38:21\_, 1:36:10\_, 1:37:8\_, \_, 1:39:22\_, 1:39:23. quarterly [1]\_ - 1:26:6 1:28:6\_. 1:31:22 1:44:13\_, 1:45:16\_, 1:43:15\_, 1:46:12\_, quarters [1] - 1:38:19 reasonable [2]\_ -... 1:43:11 1:47:19 1:47:9 questions [6]\_ - 1:7:8 1:28:23\_, 1:31:8 privilege [1]\_ - 1:43:7 policy [6]\_ - 1:17:13\_, progressive [2]\_ -\_, 1:16:15\_, 1:23:10 received [2] - 1:35:20 proactive [1]\_ - 1:36:5 1:21:3\_, 1:32:14\_, 1:22:4\_, 1:22:15 \_, 1:25:7\_, 1:34:19\_, \_, 1:48:23 problem [12]\_ -1:32:21\_, 1:34:9\_, project [2]\_ - 1:46:20\_, 1:38:1 1:27:16\_, 1:27:19\_, recent [3]\_ - 1:14:11\_, 1:34:11 1:48:17 quickly [2]\_ - 1:26:13. 1:14:15\_, 1:14:16 1:27:20\_, 1:28:21\_, poor [1]\_ - 1:12:15 projects [1]\_ - 1:41:4 1:31:9\_, 1:31:10\_, \_, 1:47:10 recently [3]\_ - 1:33:2\_, **pop** [1]\_ - 1:23:9 1:31:17\_, 1:32:12\_, **promise** [1]\_ - 1:45:1 quite [3]\_ - 1:23:1\_, 1:35:18\_, 1:41:19 **portion** [2]\_ - 1:43:10, 1:32:16\_, 1:32:17\_, **prompt** [1]\_ - 1:45:20 1:29:15\_, 1:32:3 recognize [1]\_ - 1:45:9 1:50:10 1:34:12 prompted [1]\_ - 1:11:5 quote [4]\_ - 1:5:17\_, record [1] - 1:3:11 position [8]\_ - 1:20:14 problem's [1]\_ promptly [1]\_ -1:14:23\_, 1:15:6\_, recruit [2]\_ - 1:41:1\_, \_, 1:21:20\_, 1:23:9\_, 1:15:9 1:31:9 1:11:10 1:46:7 1:24:14\_, 1:32:11\_, problems [3]\_ - 1:8:15. proper [1]... - 1:11:5 reduce [3]\_ - 1:4:19\_, 1:32:21\_, 1:32:22\_, \_, 1:10:19\_, 1:15:13 properly [1]\_ - 1:17:11 R 1:12:3\_, 1:19:16 1:36:12 procedural [2]\_ reduction [1]\_ proposal [1]\_ positive [2]\_ - 1:33:6\_, race [2]\_ - 1:41:14\_, 1:17:25\_, 1:18:1 1.37.13 1:17:13 1:34:5 1:41:17 procedurally [1]\_ protocol [1]\_ - 1:11:23 reestablished [1]\_ positively [2]\_ - 1:40:6 1:28:25 races [1]- - 1:14:24 protocols [1]\_ -1:41:17 \_, 1:42:12 **RAINS**[1] - 1:2:12 procedure [1]\_ -1:11:17 refer [2]\_ - 1:17:10\_, possible [2]... - 1:7:24 ransomware [9]\_ -1:17:13 proud [1]\_ - 1:4:16 1:22:9 \_, 1:47:10 1:9:15\_, 1:10:8\_, procedures [3]\_ prove [2]\_ - 1:39:21\_, referring [1] - 1:28:24 possibly [1]\_ - 1:23:14 1:11:2\_, 1:11:11\_, 1:10:23\_, 1:13:4\_, 1:39:22 reform [3]\_ - 1:11:7\_, potential [2] - 1:8:1, 1:12:12\_, 1:12:19\_, 1:41:11 proven [1]\_ - 1:42:1 1:19:23\_, 1:35:25 1:15:13 1:27:4\_, 1:27:5\_, proceed [1]\_ - 1:8:2 provide [3]\_ - 1:9:9\_, reforms [6]\_ - 1:6:18\_, potentially [1]\_ -1.27.19 proceedings [1] -1:12:22\_. 1:26:15 1:11:6\_. 1:11:8\_. 1:30:14 ransomware-related 1:50:11 provided [3]\_ -1:12:17\_, 1:12:25\_, practices [6]\_ - 1:5:21. 1:17:23\_, 1:38:18\_, [1]\_ - 1:11:11 PROCEEDINGS [1] -1:32:6 \_, 1:6:17\_, 1:8:7\_, rapidly [2]\_ - 1:47:24 1:1:13 1:42:5 regarding [7] - 1:5:15.

\_, 1:5:17\_, 1:5:25\_, representing [1]\_ reviewed [1]\_ section [2]\_ - 1:13:8\_, show [2]\_ - 1:17:25\_, 1:6:12\_, 1:7:16\_, 1:43:8 1:41:12 1.14.10 1:18:2 1:9:7\_, 1:13:17 represents [1]\_ reviews [2]\_ - 1:11:6\_, see [24]\_ - 1:3:16\_, shows [3]\_ - 1:14:19\_, regards [4]\_ - 1:13:5\_, 1:37:14 1:11:22 1:4:13\_, 1:15:10\_, 1.16.17 1:17:10\_, 1:18:22\_, required [2]\_ - 1:4:23 rewritten [1]\_ -1:16:24\_, 1:17:8\_, shutdown [1]\_ -1:17:21\_, 1:20:15\_, 1:18:23 \_, 1:18:9 1:27:14 1:9:23 1:20:22\_, 1:22:2\_, regressed [1]\_ requirement [1]\_ -Ricardo [2] - 1:2:16\_, signed [1]\_ - 1:4:15 1:22:22\_, 1:22:23\_, 1:5:24 1:5:19 1.4.1 significant [4]\_ -1:23:17\_, 1:23:18\_, regular [2]\_ - 1:11:19. requirements [1]\_ -Richardson [3] - 1:2:9. 1:7:14\_, 1:10:4\_, 1:28:17\_, 1:28:18\_, \_, 1:12:6 1:12:7 \_, 1:2:17\_, 1:3:24 1:14:12\_, 1:37:14 1:29:17\_, 1:29:24\_, regularity [1]\_ - 1:16:7 requires [1]\_ - 1:7:4 **Rights** [1]\_ - 1:41:2 signing [1]\_ - 1:5:4 1:30:10\_, 1:30:24\_, regurgitating [1]\_ requiring [1]\_ - 1:10:1 rise [1]\_ - 1:3:4 SILVER [1] - 1:2:12 1:31:8\_, 1:37:15\_, 1:19:11 research [1]\_ risk [3]\_ - 1:6:17\_, **similar** [6]\_ - 1:11:1\_, 1:41:15\_, 1:44:20\_, rehire [1]\_ - 1:41:1 1:40:16 1:21:9\_, 1:42:2 1:14:24\_, 1:34:9\_, 1:47:24 reinforced [1]\_ residents [2]\_ - 1:4:20  $Risk[1]_{-} - 1:40:18$ 1:39:12\_, 1:39:13\_, seeing [2]\_ - 1:23:20\_, **RMR** [2] - 1:1:21, 1:12:9 1:39:19 resolve [1]\_ - 1:11:18 1:30:21 reinitiate [1]\_ sincerely [1]\_ resolved [1]\_ - 1:33:16 1:50:18 sees [3]\_ - 1:23:2\_, 1:40:19 1:43:15 Rockne [2] - 1:2:12\_, resource [2]\_ rejoin [1]\_ - 1:46:17 1:23:3\_, 1:44:21 single [1]\_ - 1:27:12 1:3:17 1:36:17\_, 1:48:5 selects [1]\_ - 1:24:23 relate [1]\_ - 1:34:20 sit [1]\_ - 1:30:19 resources [2]\_ role [7]\_ - 1:7:15\_, send [1]\_ - 1:45:21 related [3]\_ - 1:11:11\_, 1:10:5\_, 1:36:18 1:7:23\_, 1:8:4\_, **site** [2]\_ - 1:14:16\_, sense [3]\_ - 1:29:18\_, 1:12:12\_, 1:41:4 respect [5]\_ - 1:5:22\_, 1:19:13\_, 1:35:11\_, 1:37:24 1:32:13\_, 1:36:18 relates [3]... - 1:13:4..., 1:7:3\_, 1:7:23\_, 1:36:2\_, 1:46:24 **sitting** [1]\_ - 1:39:16 sensitive [1]\_ - 1:7:21 1:14:7\_, 1:15:16 1:45:3\_, 1:48:2 room [5]\_ - 1:19:6\_, **situation** [1]\_ - 1:21:7 sent [1]\_ - 1:41:19 relationship [4]\_ respects [1]\_ - 1:8:16 1:22:14\_, 1:23:19\_, situational [1]\_ -September [5]\_ - 1:6:7. 1:23:20\_, 1:24:21 1:6:9\_, 1:18:10\_, respond [1]\_ - 1:20:2 1:19:4 root [1]\_ - 1:38:7 \_, 1:9:11\_, 1:9:24\_, 1:26:1\_, 1:45:7 six [1]\_ - 1:9:21 responds [1]\_ remain [2]\_ - 1:44:10\_, rubber [1]\_ - 1:23:24 1:18:9\_, 1:27:23 1:26:13 six-week [1]\_ - 1:9:21 1:47:4 rules [1]\_ - 1:32:18 sergeant [1] -response [1]\_ -Sixth [1] - 1:2:10 run [1]\_ - 1:33:24 1:26:12 remaining [3]\_ -1:31:13 **slowly** [1]\_ - 1:19:11 **serious** [1]\_ - 1:48:16 1:6:23\_, 1:44:17\_, responses [1]\_ -**Ryan** [1] - 1:2:9 **small** [1]\_ - 1:30:6 servants [1] - 1:44:12 1:45:10 1:12:20 softened [1]\_ remains [1]\_ - 1:10:17 serve [2]\_ - 1:37:21\_, responsibilities [1]\_ -1:24:17 S 1:46:24 remember [1]\_\_ -1:37:11 someone [2]\_ served [1]\_ - 1:46:15 1:44:15 safe [1]\_ - 1:36:23 responsibility [4]\_ -1:31:11\_, 1:35:1 serves [1]\_ - 1:47:6 Remotely [1] - 1:1:21 1:21:16\_, 1:31:14\_, safeguards [1]\_ sometimes [3]\_ serving [1]\_ - 1:35:11 rendering [1]\_ - 1:9:20 1:40:23\_, 1:45:8 1:12:24 1:22:1\_, 1:33:7\_, session [1]\_ - 1:3:5 reopen [1]\_ - 1:21:2 responsible [1]\_ safety [4]\_ - 1:21:15\_, 1:39:25 report [9]\_ - 1:7:24\_, 1:23:6\_, 1:23:12\_, set [3]\_ - 1:25:24\_, 1:27:5 soon [1]\_ - 1:41:23 1:44:5 1:44:7\_, 1:48:8 1:9:18\_, 1:13:7\_, responsive [1]\_ sorry [2]\_ - 1:11:6\_, sake [1]\_ - 1:27:9 settlement [3]\_ -1:13:10\_, 1:14:10\_, 1:12:23 1:27:21 1:16:4\_, 1:18:17\_, Sandra [1] - 1:1:21 1:4:15\_, 1:5:2\_, restored [2]\_ - 1:9:25. sounds [1] - 1:34:25 1:40:22\_, 1:41:22 sanguine [1]\_ -1:5:7 \_, 1:12:13 **SPC** [1] - 1:1:22 several [5] - 1:5:6\_, Reported [2] - 1:1:21, 1:30:17 restructured [1] \_\_ **speaks** [1]\_ - 1:14:18 1:11:5\_, 1:16:21\_, 1:1:24 1:39:6 satisfaction [1]\_ special [2]\_ - 1:41:4\_, reported [1]\_ - 1:33:5 1:23:19\_, 1:41:10 restructuring [1]\_ -1:48:15 1:46:20 severe [1]\_ - 1:9:16 Reporter [3] - 1:1:20, satisfied [1]\_ - 1:26:18 1:9:11 specific [7]\_ - 1:5:3\_, shade [2]\_ - 1:31:20 1:1:24, 1:50:8 result [4]\_ - 1:10:19\_, saw [2]\_ - 1:17:13\_, 1:15:19\_, 1:17:8\_, share [3]\_ - 1:40:2\_, REPORTER [1]\_ -1:13:2\_, 1:29:1\_, 1:30:5 1:17:14\_, 1:20:17\_, 1:46:14\_, 1:47:15 1:35:5 1:41:16 sawtooth [1]\_ -1:21:2\_, 1:42:21 reporter [1]\_ - 1:35:7 1:15:11 **shares** [1]\_ - 1:44:22 results [1]\_ - 1:44:18 specifically [3]\_ -REPORTER'S [1] resume [1]\_ - 1:37:10 scale [1]\_ - 1:13:16 sharing [1]\_ - 1:40:14 1:13:7\_, 1:14:10\_, 1:1:13 retired [1]\_ - 1:5:6 scapegoating [1]\_ -**Shattuck** [1] - 1:2:6 1:20:24 reporting [4]\_ - 1:6:8\_, shift [1]\_ - 1:8:1 retreats [1]\_ - 1:26:6 1:34:15 specified [1] - 1:50:12 1:18:10\_, 1:29:1\_, scenarios [1]\_ - 1:23:9 **shifted** [1]\_ - 1:5:11 reverse [1]\_ - 1:12:18 **speed** [7]\_ - 1:7:16\_, short [5]\_ - 1:4:11\_, Review [2]\_ - 1:2:19\_, scope [1]\_ - 1:7:12 1:32:23\_, 1:33:2\_, reports [3]\_ - 1:9:12\_, 1:26:12\_, 1:46:6\_, 1:4:3 searching [1]\_ - 1:7:1 1:33:6\_, 1:33:7\_, 1:40:4\_.. 1:48:10 1:46:7\_, 1:46:13 review [4] - 1:12:1 -, seated [1]\_ - 1:3:7 1:33:9\_, 1:33:12 representative [1]\_ **shortly** [1]\_ - 1:28:11 1:14:21\_, 1:40:20\_, **second** [1]\_ - 1:13:15 spend [1]\_ - 1:19:14 1:20:12 shorts [1]\_ - 1:26:12 1:41:25 **Section** [1]\_ - 1:10:12 **spot** [1]\_ - 1:17:15

1:14:9\_, 1:15:20\_, tired [1]\_ - 1:32:8 spreadsheet [1]\_ step [1]\_ - 1:37:14 surprised [1]\_ steps [5]\_ - 1:13:15\_, 1:24:22 1:24:15 1:37:25\_, 1:47:4 today [5]\_ - 1:4:24\_, surprisingly [1]\_ -**ST**[1] - 1:2:12 1:13:21\_, 1:15:19\_, tasks [11]\_ - 1:4:24\_, 1:28:3\_, 1:35:23\_, stable [2]\_ - 1:15:2\_, 1:15:25\_, 1:25:2 1:26:9 1:5:1\_, 1:5:14\_, 1:37:19\_, 1:46:16 STERN [1] - 1:2:12 survey [1]\_ - 1:41:19 1:9:2\_, 1:16:4\_, together [2] - 1:22:24. 1:15:4 staff [5]\_ - 1:12:7\_, still [7]\_ - 1:4:24\_, sustain [7]\_ - 1:14:25. 1:36:23\_, 1:40:19\_, \_, 1:41:1 1:41:10\_. 1:44:17\_. 1:16:6\_, 1:17:1\_, 1:25:17\_, 1:34:13\_, \_, 1:15:1\_, 1:17:5\_, tomorrow [1]\_ -1:45:10 1:31:15\_, 1:31:21 1:36:14\_, 1:40:20\_, 1:17:23\_, 1:21:25\_, 1:17:17 Tasks [2]\_ - 1:19:5\_, Staff [1]\_ - 1:18:19 1:46:13 1:30:21\_, 1:46:4 tone [1] - 1:44:7 1:42:13 staffed [2]\_ - 1:12:4\_, **stop** [1]\_ - 1:29:15 sustainability [3]\_ tool [2]\_ - 1:6:3\_, **TAYLOR** [1] - 1:50:7 stops [1]\_ - 1:4:18 1:13:6\_, 1:14:9\_, 1:37:21 1:37:11 Taylor [3] - 1:1:21, strain [1] - 1:12:3 1:36:6 top [4]\_ - 1:24:25\_, stage [1]\_ - 1:34:2 sustained [15]\_ -1:50:18, 1:50:18 1:26:11\_, 1:45:4\_, staggering [1]\_ strained [1]\_ - 1:10:7 1:5:17 strategies [1]\_ -1:6:16\_, 1:6:21\_, team [9]\_ - 1:8:6\_, 1:45:22 1:41:17\_, 1:43:16\_, 1:6:22\_, 1:10:18\_, stakeholders [4]\_ -1:35:15 topic [1]\_ - 1:15:17 1:14:20\_, 1:16:16\_, 1:43:17\_, 1:43:20\_, Street [2] - 1:1:22, total [1]\_ - 1:6:19 1:24:20\_, 1:25:6\_, 1:16:19\_, 1:18:5\_, 1:44:1\_, 1:46:23\_, 1:25:15\_, 1:36:9 1:2:4 totally [1]\_ - 1:33:22 1:22:20\_, 1:30:18\_, 1:48:3\_, 1:48:19 stalled [2]\_ - 1:5:10 street [1]\_ - 1:18:1 tough [1]\_ - 1:45:16 1:36:13\_, 1:37:20\_, technical [2]\_ - 1:10:7. stamp [1]\_ - 1:23:24 streets [1]\_ - 1:32:25 toward [1]\_ - 1:40:7 1:37:23\_, 1:38:4 \_, 1:40:12 **stance** [1]\_ - 1:23:25 strengthened [1] ... track [1]\_ - 1:11:11 sustaining [2]\_ technology [3]\_ stances [1]\_ - 1:23:25 1:36:1 tracking [1]\_ - 1:9:19 1:6:14\_, 1:17:22 1:4:21\_, 1:4:22\_, stand [2]\_ - 1:4:12\_, strengthening [1] -tracks [1]\_ - 1:11:12 sustains [2]\_ - 1:22:1 1:17:16 1:43:3 1:12:2 traditionally [1]\_ -\_, 1:37:8 **Tedesco** [1]\_ - 1:41:24 standard [1]\_ - 1:5:21 strengthens [1]\_ -1:30:22 sweet [1]\_ - 1:17:15 ten [1]\_ - 1:8:23 standardized [1]\_ -1:37:5 traffic [1]\_ - 1:33:8 sworn [3] - 1:5:22 -, tenth [2]\_ - 1:13:6\_, strong [1]\_ - 1:7:4 1:11:17 training [5]\_ - 1:15:7\_, 1:6:20\_, 1:43:8 1:14:9 stronger [1]\_ - 1:12:23 standards [1]\_ - 1:9:7 1:17:12\_, 1:26:15\_, strongly [1]\_ - 1:32:23 system [10]\_ - 1:9:18\_, term [5]\_ - 1:15:3\_, standpoint [11]\_ -1:28:9\_, 1:28:13 1:9:21\_, 1:9:25\_, 1:15:15\_, 1:36:6\_, 1:18:21\_, 1:21:24\_, submission [1]\_ -Tran [4]\_ - 1:13:19\_, 1:10:19\_, 1:10:22\_, 1:37:9\_, 1:47:4 1:22:5\_, 1:22:11\_, 1:35:21 1:39:9\_, 1:42:4\_, 1:23:22\_, 1:23:23\_, terms [4]\_ - 1:27:19\_, 1:22:12\_, 1:22:23\_, substantial [2]\_ -1:42:18 1:24:25\_, 1:25:20\_, 1:27:21\_, 1:30:19\_, 1:23:6\_, 1:23:12 1:10:9\_, 1:42:23 TRANSCRIPT[1] -1:46:8 1:30:20 Stanford [3]\_ - 1:40:11. subtasks [1]\_ -1:1:13 systematic [1]\_ themselves [3]\_ -\_, 1:40:15 1:13:10 transcript [2] -1:11:8 1:21:6\_, 1:32:6\_, **start** [2]\_ - 1:27:1\_, success [2]\_ - 1:5:8\_, 1:50:10, 1:50:12 systematically [1]\_ -1:38:16 1:43:13 1:44:5 Transcript [1] - 1:1:24 1:12:17 there'd [1]\_ - 1:6:15 started [1]\_ - 1:21:12 successful [1]\_ -Transcription [1] therefore [1]\_ systems [3] - 1:11:13. starting [2]\_ - 1:19:11. 1:6:18 1:1:24 \_, 1:11:21\_, 1:12:22 1:32:19 \_, 1:22:15 successfully [1]\_ transferred [1]\_ therein [1] - 1:50:12 systemwide [1]\_ state [5]\_ - 1:3:11\_, 1:12:11 1:34:10 they've [2]\_ - 1:39:11 1.10.14 1:4:21\_, 1:14:14\_, sudden [1]\_ - 1:10:2 transferring [1] -- thinking [1]\_ - 1:5:7 1:38:19 1:40:23 suggest [1]\_ - 1:31:22 Т thinks [1]\_ - 1:23:3 state-of-the-art [1]\_ suggestions [1]\_ **transition** [1]\_ - 1:7:25 thorough [1]\_ - 1:12:8 1:4:21 1:36:7 transparency [1]\_ talents [1]\_ - 1:49:1 thoughtful [1]\_ - 1:8:1 statement [4]\_ suggests [2]\_ - 1:15:2 1:12:23 Task [25]\_ - 1:5:15\_, thoughts [1]\_ - 1:8:19 1:8:20\_, 1:14:17\_, \_, 1:30:23 treatment [1]\_ - 1:15:8 1:5:18\_, 1:5:25\_, three [2]\_ - 1:5:14\_, 1:32:8\_, 1:32:10 Suite [3] - 1:1:21, trends [2]\_ - 1:15:3\_, 1:6:2\_, 1:6:12\_, 1:15:23 statements [1]\_ -1:2:4, 1:2:13 1:37:16 1:8:16\_, 1:9:7\_, threw [1]\_ - 1:23:12 1:32:5 triggering [1]\_ summarizing [1]\_ -1:13:4\_, 1:14:4\_, STATES[1] - 1:1:1 throw [3]\_ - 1:23:2\_, 1:35:22 1:10:3 1:14:7\_, 1:14:15\_, 1:23:3\_, 1:23:4 statistically [1]\_ true [10]\_ - 1:30:16\_, supervision [2]\_ -1:16:1\_, 1:16:2\_, 1:14:12 throwing [1]... -1:30:25\_, 1:32:3\_, 1:4:23\_, 1:6:5 1:16:4\_, 1:25:19\_, status [6]\_ - 1:5:7\_, supervisors [1]\_ -1:31:19 1:32:9\_, 1:32:11\_, 1:26:8\_, 1:26:9\_, timeline [1]\_ - 1:26:12 1:11:14\_, 1:11:15\_, 1:33:23\_, 1:33:24\_, 1:11:22 1:26:10\_, 1:26:21\_, timeline's [2]\_ - 1:5:23. 1:11:20\_, 1:12:10\_, 1:44:4\_, 1:45:6, supporting [1]\_ -1:27:25\_, 1:28:1\_, 1:48:10 \_, 1:25:19 1:50:10 1:43:11 1:28:2\_, 1:28:4 timelines [3]\_ - 1:10:9. statutory [1]\_ supposed [1]\_ truly [3]\_ - 1:29:15\_, task [9]\_ - 1:7:3\_, 1:10:10 \_, 1:10:23\_, 1:26:4 1:43:11\_, 1:44:21 1:23:24 1:9:9\_, 1:13:6\_, Stenographic [1] timeliness [1]\_ surely [1]\_ - 1:32:12 **trust** [1]\_ - 1:45:18 1:13:12\_, 1:14:6\_, 1:1:24 1:5:16 surge [1]\_ - 1:10:1 truth [5]\_ - 1:20:14\_,

1:20:23\_, 1:22:16\_, 1:28:20\_, 1:31:16\_, 1:21:13\_, 1:21:14\_, weaker [1]\_ - 1:17:1 1:21:17 1:23:1\_, 1:23:4\_, week [2]\_ - 1:9:21\_, 1:33:1\_, 1:33:3\_, **try** [1]\_ - 1:16:3 1:23:9\_, 1:26:7\_, 1:19:20 1:35:14\_, 1:38:14\_, trying [2]\_ - 1:23:10\_, 1:28:10\_, 1:31:17\_, 1:39:8\_, 1:41:12\_, weekly [2]\_ - 1:11:11\_, 1:23:11 1:35:19\_, 1:41:21\_, 1:42:17\_, 1:44:15\_, 1:11:21 two [9]\_ - 1:10:18\_, 1:45:21 weeks [1]\_ - 1:26:8 1:44:16\_, 1:47:22 update [1]\_ - 1:18:13 vesterday[1]\_ - 1:19:9 1:13:16\_, 1:13:25\_, weigh [1]\_ - 1:7:18 updated [1]\_ - 1:19:7 young [1]\_ - 1:33:3 1:16:24\_, 1:26:6\_, welcome [2]\_ - 1:4:6\_, updates [1]\_ - 1:24:19 1:27:4\_, 1:39:8\_, 1:37:2 1:39:10\_, 1:42:17 updating [1]\_ well-being [1]\_ -Ζ two-year [1]\_ - 1:39:10 1:48:11 1:44:11 Zurvohn [2]\_ - 1:2:18. type [3]\_ - 1:11:13\_, **uphold** [1]\_ - 1:44:10 wellness [1]\_ -\_, 1:4:2 1:13:21\_, 1:17:8 urge [1]\_ - 1:35:23 1:44:12 types [1]\_ - 1:23:20 urgency [2]\_ - 1:44:17. West [1] - 1:1:22 typical [1]\_ - 1:16:17 \_, 1:44:18 whack [1]\_ - 1:30:15 useful [1]\_ - 1:48:5 **whim** [1]\_ - 1:33:13 U utilized [1]\_ - 1:34:10 **white** [4]\_ - 1:6:23\_, 1:14:13\_, 1:14:19\_, **U.S** [1] - 1:1:21 \/ 1:14:25 ultimately [1] - 1:46:3 whites [1]\_ - 1:30:5 vacant [1]\_ - 1:35:6 unacceptable [1]\_ whole [2]\_ - 1:17:17\_, 1:34:2 value [1]\_ - 1:26:4 1:32:8 unappreciated [1]\_ values [2] - 1:44:22, wife [1]\_ - 1:28:22 1:36:17 1:46:10 WILLIAM [1] - 1:1:11 unbiased [1]\_ - 1:12:8 variations [2]\_ -William [1]\_ - 1:3:5 unborn [1]\_ - 1:29:22 1:15:3\_, 1:15:6 willing [2]\_ - 1:31:1\_, under [6] - 1:40:20 -, victim [2]\_ - 1:28:21\_, 1:33:10 1:43:15\_, 1:43:25\_, 1:28:22 women [1]\_ - 1:44:4 1:47:1\_, 1:47:10, view [3]\_ - 1:30:19\_, wondered [1]\_ -1:50:13 1:31:8\_, 1:45:7 1:20:2 undermined [1]\_ violate [1]\_ - 1:45:18 wonderful [1]\_ -1:12:14 violated [1]\_ - 1:27:23 1:35:18 violation [4]... - 1:17:9. undertaken [1]\_ words [4]\_ - 1:39:24\_, 1:40:3 \_, 1:23:7\_, 1:23:15 1:39:25\_, 1:46:5 undervalued [1]\_ violations [4]\_ - 1:11:1. workforce [1]\_ -1:36:17 \_, 1:17:5\_, 1:17:6\_, 1:12:3 unintended [1]\_ -1:23:1 world [1]\_ - 1:30:20 1:20:19 violence [1]... - 1:35:14 worth [1]\_ - 1:35:21 unique [2]\_ - 1:36:11\_, Vision [3]\_ - 1:9:18\_, write [2]\_ - 1:8:19\_, 1:36:23 1:9:25\_, 1:24:25 1:27:12 UNITED [1] - 1:1:1 vision [3]\_ - 1:38:21\_, written [2]\_ - 1:35:20\_, University [1]\_ -1:46:10 1:35:22 1:40:15 visit [1]\_ - 1:14:16 unless [2]\_ - 1:7:15\_, voice [1]\_ - 1:35:6 Υ 1:34:19 voicing [1]\_ - 1:20:20 unnecessarily [1]\_ voters [1]\_ - 1:7:22 year [20]\_ - 1:10:11\_, 1:33:1 vs [2] - 1:1:6\_, 1:3:9 1:14:21\_, 1:14:24\_, unplanned [1]\_ -1:15:1\_, 1:15:2\_, 1:10:3 1:15:12\_, 1:15:14\_, W unprecedented [1]\_ -1:15:20\_, 1:24:15\_, 1:9:22 waiting [1] - 1:39:16 1:28:13\_, 1:28:15\_, unseen [1]\_ - 1:29:22 wants [2] - 1:44:19, 1:30:7\_, 1:35:12\_, unusually [1]\_ -1:48:24 1:36:3\_, 1:39:7\_, 1:14:19 1:39:10\_, 1:40:14 warn [1]\_ - 1:22:9 unwilling [1]\_ warning [1]\_ - 1:30:11 year-to-year [2]\_ -1:32:15 1:15:12\_, 1:15:20 Warshaw [2]\_ **up** [20]\_ - 1:8:2\_\_, years [19]\_ - 1:4:8\_, 1:43:16\_, 1:46:23 1:8:10\_, 1:18:25\_, 1:5:4\_, 1:5:6\_, Washington [1] -1:13:16\_, 1:13:25\_, 1:19:12\_, 1:19:16\_, 1:1:22 1:19:18\_, 1:20:20\_, watch [1]\_ - 1:47:10 1:17:10\_, 1:27:4\_,