1	
2	REPORTER'S RECORD
3	VOLUME 41 OF ? VOLUMES CAUSE NO. 11DCR056513
4	THE STATE OF TEXAS) IN THE DISTRICT COURT)
5	vs.) FORT BEND COUNTY, TEXAS
6	CORNELIUS MILAN HARPER) 434TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
7	
8	
9	PRETRIAL MOTION
10	
11	
12	
13	On the 14TH day of May, 2014, the following
1 4	proceedings came on to be held in the above-titled and
15	numbered cause before the Honorable James H. Shoemake,
16	Judge Presiding, held in Richmond, Fort Bend County,
L 7	Texas.
18	Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype
L 9	machine.
2 0	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Mark Hanna SBOT NO. 00787638
4	Fort Bend County District Attorney's Office 301 Jackson Street Richmond, Texas 77469
5	Telephone: (281) 341-4460 Fax: (281) 341-4440
6	Attorney for State of Texas
7	
8	Amanda Bolin SBOT NO. 24045521
9	Fort Bend County Attorney's Office 301 Jackson Street
10	Richmond, Texas 77469 Telephone: (281) 341-4551
11	Attorney for State of Texas
12	Fred Felcman SBOT NO. 06881500
13	Fort Bend County Attorney's Office 301 Jackson Street
14 15	Richmond, Texas 77469 Telephone: (281) 341-4551 Attorney for State of Texas
16	-AND-
17	Stephen Doggett SBOT NO. 05945700
18	201 S. 11TH STREET Richmond, Texas 77469
19	Telephone: 281.342.3321 Attorney for Defendant
20	Katherine Scardino
21	SBOT NO. 17718625 3730 Kirby, Ste 1120
22	Houston, Texas 77098 Telephone: 713.520.5223
23	Counsel for Defendant
24	
25	

(May 14, 2014) 1 2 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. 3 MS. SCARDINO: Good morning. 4 5 MR. HANNA: Good morning. THE COURT: Everybody ready to go forward? 6 7 MR. HANNA: State's ready, Your Honor. MR. DOGGETT: We're ready, Judge. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. DOGGETT: Before we start, I just 11 wanted to alert you of something. Mark and I have been 12 talking. We are -- because of the amount of evidence --1.3 and I don't know how long these witnesses are going to 14 take, but we're concerned that we might not be able to 15 get through everything we need to get through with today. We don't know. I guess we'll just have to play 16 it by ear. 17 18 But I did want to warn you that based on 19 our -- my prep time that -- I have a concern along those I've warned my witnesses, they've made potential 2.0 arrangements to extend their stay an extra night, if 21 22 necessary. But that's where we are. 23 I have in my notes we're going to take up 24 the Daubert issue. After we finish that, we were going

to try to take up the disputed issues in the motion to

exclude parts of Harper's statement.

1.3

2.0

And I think those are the main things. I do have some material to give the Court on instructions to the jurors about note taking. That's not going to take up any time, we're just going to give you the report.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. HANNA: Judge, if I may.

THE COURT: Please, I'm sorry.

MR. HANNA: We did have some discussions about the length of this hearing. I want to remind the Court that this case has being pending for maybe four years, Judge. And this motion was not urged up until — a little less than maybe two weeks ago. We have prepared for it and we're ready to go forward today. However, we're also prepared to start our case and we've coordinated with witnesses and travel times and additional expense and inconvenience on those witnesses to be here. And we're asking that there not be any delay in beginning the trial tomorrow. And we encourage the Court to have this hearing concluded today.

THE COURT: Well, I'm prepared to stay here, but I will say this. I'm also supposed to lead a little troop of cub scouts on the Pledge of Allegiance at a memorial for fallen police officers, first

```
responders that Missouri City's having, so -- at 6:30,
 1
 2
     so, you know, we can go up to -- well, we can't even go
     up to 5:00 o'clock. It's probably going to -- we'll
 3
     have to stop at 4:30 because there's a counsel of Judges
 4
 5
     meeting at 4:30. So, we'll just do the best we can.
     don't know how to do it any different, you know, if it
 6
 7
     carries till tomorrow, we'll see about that.
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                 It may go faster than what
 8
     I'm thinking.
 9
10
                   THE COURT:
                               Well I'm hoping to be able to
11
     prod y'all along a little bit in case it starts getting
12
     stuck.
1.3
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  Okay.
14
                   THE COURT: Okay? All right. For
15
     purposes of the record, counsel are -- for both sides
     are present as is of the defendant. And at this time
16
     it's my understanding we're going to start a Daubert
17
               And with that, Mr. Doggett.
18
     hearing.
19
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                Well, Judge --
2.0
                   THE COURT: Is that the order in which you
     had planned to go?
21
2.2
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                 Well, I had assumed that the
23
     State would call their witnesses first since we have a
24
     little bit of questioning their qualifications and their
     basis for which they're rendering their opinions, so
25
```

that was how I anticipated it would go. 1 2 THE COURT: Well, I'm just giving you the opportunity to --3 MR. DOGGETT: Right. 4 THE COURT: -- to make that statement 5 6 because it always --7 MR. DOGGETT: Right. THE COURT: -- although you objected, it 8 suddenly turns, and the State has the duty to put their 9 witness on and make them -- make their case for their 10 credibility and their ability to testify about expert 11 12 matters. Okay. We're prepared to go first, 1.3 MR. HANNA: 14 Judge. 15 THE COURT: All right. Then go first. MR. HANNA: And with that, I'd like to 16 take an opportunity to make a brief opening statement to 17 what I expect the Court to hear today. 18 19 THE COURT: You may. 2.0 OPENING STATEMENT Okay. Judge, the defendant 21 MR. HANNA: 22 filed a general or a very generic Motion for Discovery 23 Production of Rule 702, and requested a Rule 702 hearing a number of years ago, I believe. Since then, as of 24 4:30, yesterday afternoon, he filed a more specific 25

motion, a Motion to Exclude Firearm Expert Testimony concerning toolmark and firearm identification. And it's the State's understanding that's the motion that you choose to go forward on.

MR. DOGGETT: Right.

Mr. DOGGETT. RIGHT.

MR. HANNA: The one that was filed yesterday.

1.3

MR. DOGGETT: Right.

MR. HANNA: Okay. And with that, I will curtail my arguments to that particular, more specific motion.

What Defense counsel is asking you to do here, Judge, is to exclude one of the most well settled and long existing forensic examinations and, slash, sciences for consideration for the jury in this case, and that's ballistics or firearms toolmark comparisons and identifications.

In the defendant's motion and their brief, they included not a single case in which a court, in any jurisdiction across the land, has excluded this kind of testimony. And in opposition to that, Judge, I'm prepared to provide you with some cases in which the courts have repeatedly allowed for such testimony that the Defense is trying to keep out today.

For purposes of the record and the Court's

consideration, the State has a case for the Court, one of Cantu V. State, 144 -- I'm sorry, 141, Texas Crim 99. This is a 1939 case, Judge, this is when they started admitting this type of testimony.

We then move to 2002 where the Court of Criminal Appeals in Sexton V. State, 93 S.W.3d 96, recognized that toolmark and firearms examinations is a reliable science and evidence should be admitted.

Sexton is an unusual case, and it actually excluded the testimony from a particular scientist on that day because of the *leeps he was attempting to make, for lack of a better term, but they ultimately said that this is a reliable science, just not in this particular case.

I also cite an unpublished Court of Criminal Appeals of Texas case, which is cited in 2009 Westlaw, 335276, which is *Rammy V. State, *and that's this Court again. And I offer that just as a demonstration that the Court of Criminal Appeals has continued to allow this type of testimony in cases.

Federally, Judge, this is United States versus Hicks which is 389, Federal Supplement 3rd, 514. And this case is also a 5th Circuit where they allowed the testimony to actually cite Sexton and some other Texas cases in which it is admissible. And I'm only

offering a tiny portion of it, the case law that's out there that the courts have allowed this type of testimony. Now, while there are many cases that you do a search that demonstrate that this kind of testimony has been admitted, there are very few cases in which courts have held Daubert hearings in regards to this type of evidence and that's because it's so rarely filed. It's such a well settled evidence that — well settled practice and area of expertise that people aren't filing Daubert hearings, at least in the State of Texas and very few outside the State of Texas.

1.3

There was one case that the defendant mentioned in his motion and his brief. That's from the 3rd Circuit, I believe or it's the United States of America versus Otero, and it's 849, F. Supp. 2nd 425. And I encourage the Court to read this case, Judge. It is a very well written opinion and it addresses the issues in which the Defense is bringing before this Court today.

And as in every other case, the Court ultimately reviewed the evidence and concluded that this is a well settled science and that it is reliable and it passes the Daubert, Frye, Kelly, names of all the tests that this Court would be considering in determining whether or not the evidence should be admissible.

Lastly, Judge, since the Rules of Evidence do not apply in this type of hearing, the Court is permitted to review articles and other types of articles and treatises in regards to its decision on whether or not to admit this evidence. And at the conclusion of my witnesses' testimony, because she'll refer to some of these articles, I intend to offer those for the Court. And there's an abundance of articles in which this science has been well tested, it's been peer-reviewed and it's been accepted in the scientific community as a valid area.

And with that, Judge, I'll call the State's first witness, Donna Eudaley.

MR. DOGGETT: Judge, can I make a brief response?

THE COURT: You may.

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. DOGGETT: Judge, this is a Daubert hearing. The whole point of the Daubert case and the Kelly case is to impress upon the Court that scientific evidence is powerful evidence. Jurors have a tendency to believe it, perhaps more than other evidence because it purports to be quote, scientific, unquote. And that is the underpinning of those decisions that put all these standards in place that the Court is to use in

reviewing -- in acting as a gatekeeper in reviewing the evidence and deciding whether or not to expose the jury to the evidence.

1.3

I know the Court is familiar with the Daubert and Kelly standards, we'll be talking about those, I'll use those as a basis for many of my questions. But what the Court is going to find is that yes, it is true, this evidence has been admitted for many, many, many decades. But like other, quote, scientific, unquote, evidence, when the Court hears how this stuff is done, you're going to have some serious misgivings, I believe about whether it really is scientific and whether it's sufficiently reliable to be admitted.

There's other scientific evidence that well known law enforcement agencies that relied on for years that had been in recent times abrogated, such as bullet lead analysis comparison, hair follicle comparison. These are things that for decades law enforcement relied on to help make their cases. And now, it's been discovered or determined that they are not sufficiently reliable to be allowed as evidence, we believe that ballistic evidence falls in that category.

There is a -- and you'll hear more about this -- but a recent, a couple of reports from the

```
National Academy of Sciences that specifically address
 1
 2
     the reliability of firearms and toolmark evidence.
     the problem they say with the evidence is that it
 3
     remains a subjective decision based on unarticulated
 4
 5
     standards with no statistical foundation for the
     estimation of error rates.
 6
 7
                    And I believe the evidence is going to
     show that they do not have solid error rates to
 8
 9
     determine how often they're wrong, that it is extremely
10
     subjective -- subjective and that the standards are
11
     really non-existent as to how they determine whether or
12
     not they think something is a match or not.
                    So we look forward to presenting you with
1.3
14
     this information and we're ready to proceed.
15
                    THE COURT: All right. If we could get
     the first witness in here.
16
                    (Witness sworn.)
17
18
                                You may proceed when you're
                    THE COURT:
19
     ready.
2.0
                   MR. HANNA:
                                Thank you, Your Honor.
21
                           DONNA EUDALEY,
22
     having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
23
               (By Mr. Hanna) Ms. Eudaley, would you please
24
     introduce yourself to the Court.
25
```

A. My name is Donna Eudaley.

1.3

1.5

2.0

- Q. Donna, what do you for a living?
- A. I'm a firearms examiner with the Houston Forensic Science Center, Forensic Analysis Division, Firearm Section.
- Q. And how long have you been employed in that capacity?
- A. The Houston Forensic Science Center has been since April 3rd of this year. I've been a firearms examiner for seven years, I have been with the Crime Lab for a total of twelve years.
- Q. Okay. And that recent hiring is because the organization that does the evidence examination for HPD has changed.
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Explain to the Court what it went from and what it is now.
- A. We used to be the Houston Police Department Crime Laboratory. In an effort to be separated from any law enforcement agency, there has been a reorganization, so we are now the Houston Forensic Science Center Local Government Corporation, Incorporated. It's a private company that now manages the employees in the —— that were in the crime laboratory as well as the identification division and the crime scene unit.

- Q. So you've been continually employed in same the capacity, it's just that your boss has changed names.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. What is your educational background, where did you go to college?
- A. I went to Texas A&M University where I earned a Bachelor of Science.
 - O. In what?

- A. Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences.
- Q. Okay. And then what education did you obtain in order to do the job you're doing now?
- A. An approximate two-year long on the job training program under the experience -- or the supervision of more experienced firearms examiners.
- Q. Okay. So did you -- do you have to obtain any kind of certificates or any kind of degrees in order to get a job with the HPD Crime Lab?
- A. No, there's no particular certification or degree that's required except that it is a requirement to have a Bachelor of Science or a closely related science field engineering, stuff like that.
- Q. Okay. And so you've met those criteria, and you first got hired on by HPD, you said twelve years ago?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. In what capacity?
- A. I worked in the Centralized Evidence Receiving Section. We received and processed narcotics, enter data into the database and process destruction orders --
 - Q. Okay.

- A. -- for those narcotics. I transferred into the Firearms Section of the Crime Laboratory about nine and a half years ago.
- Q. Okay. And is that when you began to obtain that two years of training that you mentioned to the Judge?
- A. Yes. My training did not begin right away. I started doing some more technician type responsibilities and then my training began and it was approximately two years long.
 - Q. What did that training entail?
- A. We follow the recommended training guide published by the Association of Firearms and Toolmark Examiners as well as the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. It's a comprehensive training program that covers the history of firearms, the manufacturing, the history of ammunition manufacturing, a history of firearms identification. We learn how to troubleshoot firearms so we learn how to take apart and put back together firearms, how the firearms are manufactured currently

and in the past, we also then of course have microscopic training. So we actually learn how to do the job that I do which is compare fired components that were fired from a particular firearm and try to determine if unknown components were fired in that firearm.

- Q. Okay. Now in regards to your training, you mentioned that you have some training in regards to where these firearms are manufactured?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

- Q. Does that entail visiting the firearm manufacturers and learning from the actual manufacturers?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Are there any particular ones that you attended?
 - A. Yes. I have visited Ruger Arms, Smith and Wesson Arms, Beretta Arms, STI International, those are the factories that I toured.
- Q. Okay. And there, they give you a tour and give you a class, I guess, on how they go about manufacturing their firearms?
- A. During the tour, we're able to ask questions.

 Ideally it's a person -- every tour that I've been in,

 it's -- the person who is leading the tour is very

 knowledgeable in the manufacturing techniques and knows

what types of questions we will be asking and how to answer them as far as the manufacturing of those firearms.

- Q. So the tour is designed to educate firearms examiners?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

2.2

- Q. And do you find that having awareness of the method in the way these firearms are manufactured is beneficial in carrying out your responsibilities?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Tell the Judge a little bit about your -- you mentioned the microscopic aspect of your job. Tell the Judge a little bit about what your training entailed in regards to that?
- A. The training itself, we review the AFTE theory of identification and the range of conclusions that AFTE -- or the Association of Firearms and Toolmark Examiners says that we can make. So the training begins with actually just test-firing firearms and comparing those test-fires within each other. So I take three cartridge cases with three bullets and I look and I see the agreement of the characteristics that were left on those cartridge cases with the bullets by the firearm, I see the amount of agreement and the amount of disagreement of the characteristics. I also compare

- test-fires from firearms that I know are not the same, 1 2 so I take a Ruger and compare it to test-fires from another Ruger. And I look at those -- I look at those 3 markings and I see what similarities and what 4 5 differences, I note and reviewing hundreds if not thousands of test-fires. 6 Okay. Now, you mentioned -- at the beginning, 7 you mentioned A-F-T-E, what is that? 8 The AFTE is the Association of Firearms and 9 Α. 10 Toolmark Examiners. Okay. And what organization is that? 11 Ο. 12 Α. It's the -- the only one that I am aware of, a professional organization for firearms and toolmark 13 14 examiners. 1.5 Ο. Okay. Now are you a member of that? Yes, I am. 16 Α. Okay. You also mentioned that your lab is --17 Ο. your lab is accredited. 18
- 19 A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. And was it back in 2010 accredited?
- 21 A. Yes, it was.
 - Q. Okay. Who is it accredited by?
- A. ASCLD Lab and Texas Department of Public Safety.
- Q. Okay. And it's maintained its accreditation

for the entire time? 1 2 Α. Yes. Okay. You began to discuss a little bit, 3 Q. the -- in regards to this field of expertise, have there 4 5 been articles written in regards to firearms examination and toolmark examination? 6 7 Α. Yes. Many or few? Ο. 8 9 Α. Many. 10 Okay. And do you have access to those Q. articles? 11 12 Α. Yes. And do you review them in your continuing 1.3 14 education in carrying out your responsibilities? 15 Α. Yes. Okay. And are those articles subject to peer 16 review? 17 18 Α. Yes, they are. 19 Okay. And the peer review is -- explain to the Court what peer review means. 20

A. Peer review means that other experts in the field have a chance — before the article is published as well as after the article is published — to review the content of an article, make comments. It can be submitted for a rewrite or to clarify questions before,

21

22

23

24

- and then after, obviously it would be rewritten but there can be clarification on any questions.
 - Q. Okay. So it's a way to insure the integrity and the reliability and the scientize that many people are having an input in.
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

- Q. Okay. Now you mentioned that -- I'm going to call it AFTE, is that the acronym for the Association of Firearms and Toolmark Examiners?
 - A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Okay. So we'll refer to it as AFTE from here
 12 on out. You mention that AFTE is the only organization
 13 that you're aware of?
 - A. That is specifically for firearm and toolmark examiners, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Is it nation-wide?
- A. Yes, it's international.
 - Q. International?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And are you required to be a member of that association for your employment?
- 22 A. No.
- Q. No. But that's something you've chosen to do?
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Are most of the examiners in your facility also

AFTE members?

1.3

2.0

- A. Yes.
- Q. Does AFTE provide continuing education and continuing publications for your consideration as a firearms examiner?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now have you heard of an organization called SWGGUN?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Can you tell the Court what SWGGUN is.
- A. SWGGUN is a -- I'm not a hundred percent familiar with SWGGUN. I believe that it's an organization that was kind of, like, each of the forensic disciplines has a SWGGUN, it's a scientific working group. And it's composed of members of that forensic discipline from around the country, and they may or may not be AFTE members in the SWGGUN corporation. But they try to give technical guidance and procedure -- on procedures and methods within a particular forensic discipline.
 - Q. Okay. Do you ever use that organization as a resource for obtaining additional information about firearms examinations?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Is it something that you rely on?

- A. Maybe not rely on. Sometimes the guidance provided in SWGGUN is relied upon by assessors when they're making sure that a technical procedure or a way that we're documenting something is accepted within the field. And so I have checked the SWGGUN guideline listings to make sure that what we are doing is in line with what is recommended in the field.
- Q. Okay. And does -- let's go back to AFTE. Is your lab in compliance with the policies and procedures set out by AFTE?
- A. AFTE doesn't really set out policies around procedures, they make recommendations for how to do things; and yes, we are in compliance with those guidelines.
- Q. Okay. And you are a member of AFTE; is that correct?
- A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. Are there any other professional organizations that are -- for your job related that you're a member of?
- A. I'm not a member of any other professional organizations, no.
- Q. Okay. Now have you ever testified before as an expert?
- 25 A. Yes.

```
On few or many occasions?
         Q.
 1
 2
         Α.
              No.
              About how many times?
 3
         Q.
              Probably twenty-five.
 4
         Α.
 5
         Q.
              Okay. And that's in regards to your
     examination of specific evidence in a case?
 6
 7
         Α.
              Yes.
              Have you ever testified in a Daubert hearing
         Ο.
 8
     before?
 9
10
         Α.
              No, I have not.
              Okay. Have you ever heard of a firearms
11
         Ο.
12
     examiner testifying in a Daubert hearing prior to today?
               I have heard of, not within my laboratory.
1.3
         Α.
14
                      So that's -- I should have narrowed it.
         Q.
              Okay.
15
     In -- as far as your laboratory, nobody's said, hey,
     I've done that before?
16
         Α.
17
              No.
18
              Okay.
                      So it's an unusual thing?
         Q.
19
         Α.
               Yes.
              Okay. Now, does -- let's talk more about now
20
         Q.
     the expertise that -- your firearms examination
21
22
     expertise, does that field rely on accepted principles?
23
         Α.
               Yes.
              Okay. What is that -- those principles that
24
         Q.
     that field relies on?
25
```

A. The principle that we rely on is that when a firearm is manufactured, it's manufactured by a tool that works on that firearm or multiple tools and the tool, as it's working on that firearm, leaves marks behind. And those marks change from one firearm to the next, in fact, they change within the same firearm many times. So that — that firearm then has unique markings to the next firearm that is manufactured by that same tool, the same time, and the same place.

And when a bullet or a cartridge case is fired in that firearm, those unique markings can be imparted from the firearm onto the fired evidence. So we can then, as firearms examiners, look at the fired evidence that we know was fired in a particular firearm and compare it to unknown samples and determine whether or not based on the agreement of individual markings whether or not it was fired in the same firearm.

- Q. And then that's, in essence what you do, that's the principle you rely on?
 - A. That is the principle that I rely on, yes.
- Q. Now, has this information been gathered overtime?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

Q. Okay. And I guess AFTE is probably one of the organizations, but in this area of expertise, is this

```
kind of information communicated amongst the experts in
 1
     that field?
 2
         Α.
              Yes.
 3
              Now, you said you testified twenty-five times
         Ο.
 4
 5
     as an expert --
         Α.
               About.
 6
 7
              About, approximately, okay. And there are how
     many other examiners are there in your lab?
 8
               That are currently doing --
 9
         Α.
10
         Q.
              Firearms.
               Case work would be three other examiners, two
11
         Α.
12
     trainees and my boss who does firearm examination but
     he's not full-time.
1.3
14
              Okay. And so have they testified before that
         Q.
15
     you're aware of --
              Yes.
16
         Α.
17
         Ο.
              -- as experts?
18
         Α.
              Yes.
19
         Q.
                      So, is it safe to say that this firearm
     examination has been recognized as a legitimate endeavor
20
     and a legitimate science, therefore, as a field of
21
22
     expertise?
23
         Α.
              Yes.
              Okay. And not only in Texas, but across the
24
         Q.
     country?
25
```

A. Yes.

- Q. Do you believe that your testimony in regards to this kind of evidence, ballistics evidence or firearms evidence would assist a jury in making a determination on the value and credibility of some evidence?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You've explained it a little bit about what -- when you explained the principle, but tell the Judge what you do when you obtain the evidence that you're required to examine. For instance, just generally, and let's say you get shell casings and a bullet and a gun, tell the Judge the process that you go through when you get that piece of evidence.
- A. The first thing I would do is actually examine the firearm. I would examine the firearm to make sure that it was safe to fire. And then as long as the firearm was safe to fire, I would test-fire the firearm to collect a set of known bullets and cartridge cases so that I could then compare to my unknown samples that have been submitted as well. I would take those bullets and the cartridge cases from that firearm and examine them under a comparison microscope. The comparison microscope is two microscopes that have actually been combined into one so that I have two stages and one eye

piece, so that when I look through my eye pieces, I can see two separate objects at the same time. I examine the bullets from the cartridge cases for the individual markings left on those cartridge cases by the firearm. And I know they're individual because of the previous research that has been done as well as what I have personally seen. And we can go into more —

Q. We'll talk about it in a moment.

1.3

A. Not right now. Once I establish that there's agreement of individual characteristics within the test-fires that I know were fired in that same firearm, I will then examine the unknowns that have been submitted as well.

First, what I look for on the unknowns are agreement of class characteristics. Class characteristics are general characteristics that many firearms, even firearms that are not from the same manufacturer may have in common, things like caliber, the way that markings that are left — for instance, there may be parallel markings or circular markings on the breech face of the firearm, that's a class characteristic, the shape of the firing pin. For a bullet, it might be the number of lands and grooves, the width of the lands and grooves and the twist of the lands and grooves, so I'm looking for agreement in

```
class.
       If there's no agreement in class
characteristics, then I can actually eliminate and say
that these two items were not fired in the same firearm.
If I establish that there are consistent class markings,
then I look for individual markings. When I look for
agreement of individual markings, before I say
identification, not only do I look for agreement that
exceeds what we say is the best known non-match, which
would be the best agreement that I have seen between
cartridge cases or bullets that I know were not fired in
the same firearm.
                  There's still going to be some random
agreement that we see, and especially if they were
consecutively manufactured, we may see some similarity,
more so than two random items, so one firearm
manufactured right after the other may show some
similarity marking. So I must establish that the
markings that I'm looking at are in agreement beyond the
best known non-match, even considering those
consecutively manufactured. And then I look for
agreement that is consistent with agreement that I have
seen in my known matches, meaning when I look at the
test-fires and I see agreement between my test-fires, I
look for the same or similar types of agreement, levels
of agreement when I'm looking at the fired evidence
components. If I see enough agreements then I determine
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that there is enough for me to say identification, that this cartridge case for this bullet was fired in that firearm. I can't say that without absolute certainty because I have not test-fired every single firearm that there is or ever will be in existence. I say that with the knowledge that it is — I consider it practically impossible that another selected firearm would have these same unique markings; and so it's to a level of practical impossibility that I say, not absolute certainty.

- Q. Okay. That was a long answer.
- A. It was a long answer.
 - Q. Which is fine, which is what this is for so the Judge can understand what it is that you do and some of the issues that Defense counsel's brought up in the brief. I'm going to slow you down a little bit though. Okay? And go back over a little bit on -- you mentioned class characteristics.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. And one of the attacks on this science is subclass characteristics, right?
 - A. Yes.
- 0. Versus individual characteristics.
- 24 A. Yes.
- Q. Explain to the Court again what is a subclass

characteristic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

18

19

2.0

21

22

- A. A subclass characteristic would be a characteristic that is unique to the tool that made the firearm but not unique to the firearm itself. So when we're talking about consecutively manufactured firearms or firearm parts, consecutively manufactured barrels, consecutively manufactured slides. The tool may leave markings that are similar from one firearm to the next.
- Q. So in essence, based on the principle of a firearms examination, if that tool has an imperfection -- I will use that as a lay term -- or some mark on it, when it makes the breech phase or when it creates the firing pin, it will impart a certain toolmark onto that part of the gun.
 - A. Yes.
 - O. Does that make sense?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then when a cartridge is fired or a bullet is fired, that imperfection will be transferred onto the cartridge or onto the bullet.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And that's the comparison that you do.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But the concern is that you have these subclass characteristics that may be transferred from the first

gun that's made, the second gun that's made or the third gun that's made with that same tool.

- A. That's correct, that is the concern of subclass characteristics.
- Q. Okay. And so then that tool was impart, that same imperfection on all three or ten or a hundred, however many guns are manufactured with that particular tool.
- A. And it may or may not be, it may be something fleeting, it may be something that only lasts for two guns or it may be something that lasts for a hundred guns and we don't necessarily know.
- Q. Okay. So the Defense attack is that, well since you can't determine that, then we can't say that this gun is unique to a particular gun but that this evidence came from a particular gun because it could have been from ten guns that have that same imperfection.
- A. That is a challenge that has been proposed, yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, has your area of expertise, your field and you, specifically, done anything to address that subclass characteristic issue?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

Q. What kind of studies have been done in regards

to that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What firearms examiners have done is obtain consecutively manufactured parts from various firearm manufacturers, ten consecutively manufactured Ruger barrels, ten consecutively manufactured Glock slides. Whatever the case may be, we go to -- and when I say we, I mean firearms examiners of communities in general -will go to a firearm manufacturer and either observe or receive certified from that manufacturer that these objects were fired -- or were manufactured, one right after the other by the same person or by the same machine using the same tools from the same lot of metal, all of the same type, and they are then provided to a laboratory or whoever is doing the research. They will then create test-fires from that -- those consecutively manufactured barrels or slides or whatever the case may be, and either within their own laboratory or they will send the test out to many laboratories and give many individuals the option to review those -- and I have seen several myself from consecutively manufactured -barrels and slides.

When you compare the bullets fired from ten consecutively manufactured barrels or when you compare the cartridge cases fired from ten consecutively manufactured slides, while there may be some

overlapping, some characteristics, they're not enough that they do -- those -- of that agreement, of those subclass characteristics, do not exceed the agreement that I see in the best known non-match, meaning I would not make an identification based on those markings.

- Q. Okay. You keep using that best known non-match and that's a mouthful.
 - A. It is a mouthful, yes.
- Q. Okay. But, in essence what you said, and tell me if I'm wrong. Okay? You've examined cartridges and bullets fired from consecutively manufactured parts of a gun and were still able to distinguish that they were fired from different parts of a gun.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. Because of this microscopic examination.
- A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. And there are significant differences between those test-fires that you could determine that they were fired from different guns.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You used this -- this language about the best known non-match. What do you mean by that when you're making a comparison? Is there another way of phrasing that?
 - A. If I examine cartridge cases or bullets that I

know were fired from different firearms, I'm still going to see some level of agreement. I mean, you're just going to -- especially if they have similar class characteristics, if they were both manufactured by the same manufacturer or a manufacturer using similar techniques, and the markings are going to look perhaps similar. And so in my training and then in my continuing experience I have seen things, I have seen test-fires, bullets and cartridge cases that I know, because I did, I know they were fired in two different firearms. And so there is a level where sometimes you just can't tell, you can't say identification, you can't say elimination. There is some level of unknown where you don't -- that there is some agreement, it's just not enough to say identification. And so, when I say I'm looking for agreement beyond the best known non-match, and in fact, agreement that is consistent with agreement that I have seen in my known matches. That's what I mean, I am looking for agreement beyond the agreement that you may see between two different firearms when compared to each other, and I'm looking for the agreement that I know I see within one firearm when I compare the test-fires.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. You mentioned that there are, I guess other -- three possible results after an examination.

- A. There's actually four possible.
- Q. Four. Okay. What are those?

1.3

A. The possible results are identification where I say that this was fired in this same firearm to a practical possibility; elimination, that these two items were not fired in the same firearm; inclusive, meaning I can't tell the individual or the class characteristics are not sufficient enough for me to be able to say, one way or another if they were or were not fired from the same firearm or I could say unsuitable.

It's highly unlikely for me to say unsuitable; with a cartridge case, usually there are some markings, but sometimes bullet fragments just don't have any individual characteristics or markings on them. And so unsuitable is another possible conclusion that I can reach.

- Q. Okay. So what's the distinction between unsuitable and inconclusive?
- A. When I say unsuitable, I mean that there are no marks left for comparison, I just really can't do anything with the item.
- Q. Okay. And you say that's most commonly done with bullet fragments?
 - A. Bullet fragments, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about what

Defense counsel brought up in his opening statement about this concept called an error rate. Okay? Have you — has the AFTE and the literature in which you relied for your field of expertise address this error rate issue?

A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. And tell the Judge what is an error rate.
- A. An error rate --
- Q. In regards to firearms examination.
- A. An error rate would be, in firearms where I say an identification but it is in fact not an identification, or I say elimination when it is in fact not an elimination.
 - Q. Okay. And of course when you're dealing with evidence that you found in a crime scene, there's no way of determining whether or not the firearms examiner is accurate or not?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. I mean, because we're going off what the firearms examiner says, nobody knows in reality. So is there some way, some system they've created that helps try to obtain error rates for purposes of firearms examinations?
- A. Well, I think what you're asking about is proficiency testing?

Q. Yes, exactly.

1.3

- A. The goal of proficiency testing is not to establish an error rate, so I don't want to say yes to your question but --
- Q. Okay. Well then explain to the Judge what proficiency testing is.
- A. Proficiency testing was designed to provide individuals and laboratories with samples that would test the ability of an individual to obtain a correct or an expected answer but also to test the laboratory's system in general. The peer review process that we go through the both verification and administrative technical review, so the proficiency testing does not only test whether or not a person can get an expected answer but also that the whole entire lab system is working that it would catch any errors and the verification process works.
- Q. Okay. How are these proficiency tests conducted?
- A. The most common external proficiency test provider is going to be CTS or Collaborative Testing Services.

So most of the time, it's not all the time, most of the time a laboratory will obtain a proficiency test sample -- or more than one proficiency

test sample perhaps from CTS and that proficiency test is then issued to an individual examiner.

- Q. Okay. So basically the organization creates casings and test-fires and sends them for examination and that organization knows what the result should be.
- A. They don't know the results ahead of time, the expected results are published once all the respondents have answered.
- Q. Well, no, I mean, they know whether or not if the -- which cartridges are fired from which gun and those kinds of things.
 - A. CTS knows that, yes.

- Q. Correct, that's what I meant. And then they'll send them to you as if it's an actual case, and you'll handle it as if it's actual evidence and send it back and then they'll determine whether or not that individual firearms examiner got it right or not.
- A. Correct. Typically the firearms examiner knows that they're being tested, we know it's a proficiency test, so but we try to handle it as closely as possible to case work, as we possibly can, still knowing that we're being tested.
- Q. Okay. Now you mentioned that these proficiency tests don't really give you an error rate. Why is that?
 - A. They're not designed to give you an error rate,

and the reason is CTS will sell their tests to anybody.

So, while laboratories participate in the proficiency testing program, nothing stops a lawyer or a student or my parents from buying a proficiency test and submitting answers. And CTS has no control over how that proficiency test is handled, they have no control over whether or not somebody actually examines it, they have no control over whether or not a laboratory or individuals may collaborate and come up with one answer. And their goal is to try to create test samples that are consistent across all of the samples. They want everybody that's getting those samples to get very similar samples so they don't necessarily try to mimic what we would see in case work.

- Q. Okay. So the three shell casings that she may examine for those tests are different than what somebody does in Florida?
 - A. They are separate, they are not the same --
 - O. The same.

1.3

- A. -- casings. But the goal of CTS is to try to make the casings as close as possible.
- Q. Okay. And so in essence, does a firearm examiners -- are there error rates involved associated with your kind of work?
 - A. Yes, there are limitations to using the CTS

proficiency tests as a basis for error rates. But like the prosecutor pointed out, because in the real world, we don't have the right answer, we don't know the right answer, so it is the best basis for error rates that we have.

- Q. Okay. It's the best way of measuring?
- A. It's the best way that we have been able to measure, yes.
- Q. Okay. And have you had an opportunity to read or examine some of the results of those proficiency tests?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And what is generally the error rate that's assigned to firearms examiners in regards to the error rate?
- A. When you take into consideration more recent proficiency tests. So there's a published study that looked at the results of a proficiency test from 1978 through 1991 and that provided an overall error rate of 1.4 percent per firearms, that includes mis-elimination, an error rate of elimination; for false identifications only, it's .6 percent.
- Q. Okay. Let's slow down and make sure that we understand. You said, what was the 1.4 error rate?
 - A. 1.4 percent is the error rate that includes

both mis-identifications and mis-eliminations.

- Q. Okay. And so, getting them wrong?
- A. Right.

1.3

2.2

- Q. Okay. And then the -- what was the other one that you said?
- A. When you're just talking about mis-identifications and you filter out the mis-eliminations, it's .6 percent.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. When you take into account -- that was from 1978 through 1991. And when you look at more recent CTS proficiency testing data that takes into account that more and more laboratories are going to a proficiency testing program that is required by an accrediting body where we have to have the peer review. There was no necessarily peer review in those old -- in those old numbers. So now that we must go through peer review, we do try to treat those proficiency tests as case work. The numbers from 1998 through 2002, the error rate is one percent for mis-identifications, and that percentage is not including inconclusive, none of the -- none of the numbers are inconclusive.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. So, you know, I'm comfortable sticking with the old number of 1.4 percent because that's higher.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Α. But one percent, less than two percent.
- And all those, that one percent, that Q. 1.4 percent, that does not include when an examiner may
- say it's inconclusive, I can't decide.
 - That does not include inconclusive. Α.
- Okay. Which sort of skews or changes the way, Q. because you have a hundred cartridges to look at, and twenty-five, and your rate is based on a hundred examinations and twenty-five of them are inclusive that sort of changes the percentages considerably.
- Α. It would make the error rate much higher, because it would -- if we included inconclusive, yes, but inconclusive is not considered an unacceptable answer.
- Right, because even though we know it was --Ο. the cartridge was -- either was or was not fired, there may not be sufficient markings for an examiner to make a determination.
 - Α. That is absolutely correct.
- Okay. Now you've been working in this field Q. for how long now?
- I've been in the firearms section either doing technical work or observation work for nine and a half 24 years; and I've been a fully qualified firearms examiner 25

1 for seven years.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. And you mentioned you've testified approximately twenty-five times.
 - A. Give or take.
- Q. I suspect you've looked at more than twenty-five different cases.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Approximately -- and I know that you may not have an accurate representation -- how many examinations and comparisons have you done?
- A. Examinations and comparisons, it would have to be in the thousands, if not tens of thousands, when you're talking about on the scope, two different items, looking at the comparisons.
- Q. And you think over that time period that you've gotten better as time has gone on?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. You develop a sense of comparing marks and seeing things in the past and discussing it with other people in the field and gotten better at it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Because one of the knocks on this is that the Defense has brought up is subjective.
 - A. It is subjective.
- Q. There's no machine that we can stick these

cartridges in and just say, okay, it's a match.

A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Now -- now that I mentioned that, there are some machines that are helpful in this type of investigation, I guess, for lack of a better term; what is the NIBIN or IBIS machine?
- NIBIN or IBIS. NIBIN is the National Α. Integrated Ballistics Information Network -- I can never remember the acronym and IBIS is the Integrated Ballistics Imaging System. IBIS doesn't exist anymore, IBIS was the instruments, now there are -- there's brass tracks and bullet tracks, but they all are still operated under the database which is NIBIN. And that is run by the Association -- I'm sorry, no, the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms -- the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, but they have a contract with FPI, Forensic Pathologies, Incorporated, which has recently been bought out by somebody, I don't remember who. NIBIN, IBIS, bullet tracks, brass tracks, is a way for us as firearms examiners to take images of fired components, fired shot shells, fired cartridge cases and fired bullets for bullet tracks or an AFIS system to bullets and compare -- the computer has an algorithm that compares the markings that are in -- that are photographed, and the computer tries to come up with

other potential matches to that cartridge case or to that bullet that have been entered into the database.

- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the AFIS System regarding fingerprints?
- A. I mean I know it's very similar, the AFIS and CODIS is similar to it as well.
- Q. So from a practical standpoint, an examiner examines a cartridge or a gun or a piece of evidence, they can take an image of that evidence and enter it into the database.
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And this database will compare other images to the image that -- let's say, for instance, that you put in there and see if there's some other similar images that have been input by another examiner.
 - A. Or by me, any examiner.
 - Q. Or by you, I'm sorry, yeah, or any examiner.
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Just as maybe in an investigative lead, to sort of tell you, hey, here's a gun, it's similar, you might want to take a look at it or here's a bullet that was found in a different location that you might want to take a look at that.
 - A. Correct. The computer -- honestly it's just dumb. And it's -- it's based on programming and it's

not based on an actual visual inspection of the image.

What the algorithm -- the way it's been explained to

me -- is that the computer actually -- it's a gray scale

and it assigns a value to each pixel in the image based

on how light or how dark it is between zero and one.

And then the computer takes the overall values, somehow

of the pixels and the image, and compares them to all

those values of all the other appropriate images of

cartridge casings and bullet images in the system and it

comes back with a list of potential matches.

1.3

Now, our hit rate is somewhere maybe around one percent, which means that most of the images that come back as potential hits by the computer are not in fact similar. In fact, if — there could be differences in class characteristics between the two images, the computer doesn't know any better.

- Q. So, it doesn't sound like a very variable tool if only one percent of the ones that send you is actually the right one.
- A. What we do, once we see that there may be a potential match on the computer, we actually take the evidence and physically compare it, and yes, it is a very low hit rate. But if if we can provide investigators with the lead that they didn't know before, then it's helpful, it's still a helpful tool.

- Q. And are you aware of any machines that does what you do?
- A. No. I know that there's some people that are trying to develop it, but as far as I know nobody is using it and it has not been validated for case work.
- Q. Okay. And so in essence, this field of expertise is relied on in subjectivity of its individual examiners for the last eighty years?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. Now one other thing I want to talk to you about is you mentioned that you're aware of studies, and I think you may even have mentioned it in one of your answers previously. In regards to the the studies in which examiners have fired a large number of rounds or cartridges from a particular weapon and they compared those hundreds or thousands of projectiles or casings, are you familiar with studies that work that way?
- A. Yes. You're talking about persistence of marks.
 - O. Correct.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Explain to the Judge what the goal of those studies are.
- A. Well we want to see when we fire a hundred rounds through a barrel of a firearm or looking at --

you know, a hundred rounds that are fired by the firearms are the slide markings or ten thousand rounds or fifty thousand rounds, are the individual markings that are left by the firearms, on the bullets or on the cartridge cases going to change or stay the same. And if they change, are they going to change to the extent that we can still make identifications, or are we going to not be able to identify those markings back to -- you know, one of the first initial bullets that were fired in that firearm.

- Q. Okay. And what are the results of those studies been?
- A. Most of the results of those studies show that we can, even after ten thousand rounds, identify those late rounds back to early rounds.
- Q. Okay. So there's a comparison that's done and it's of identification?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. From the first one and the hundredth one?
- 20 A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. And I'm sure the studies vary but that's generally, the consensus say that's a legitimate experiment and it's resulted in positive identifications.
 - A. Yes, it shows that the marks are persistent and

can be identified.

1.3

- Q. Now there are other changes between one hundred and one?
- A. There may be changes between one hundred well usually there's a change after one. The first shot fired through the barrel typically is going to change the marks. But say beyond one, number two, and sometimes there's not changes after the first one, but there might be changes from one to one hundred or there might not be changes from one to one hundred. And that kind of goes into the method used to manufacturer the firearm, the quality of the metal that the firearm is made of and what type of bullet. Is it a steel coated bullet versus very soft lead or copper that has been fired through the firearm.
 - Q. Okay. The way that you perform your examination, is that prescribed or recommended by AFTE?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And is that the way that the other firearms examiners, throughout the state conduct their examinations?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. How many firearms labs are there in Texas, do you know?
- A. I don't know.

- Q. Do you know that there are other ones?
- 2 A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Okay. What are the ones that you do know of?
- A. I know that the Texas Department of Public Safety operates several branches of firearms labs including there is one in Houston, I know there's one Austin, I know there's one in McAllen. There's several other sites.

The Harris County Institute of Forensic Sciences operates a firearms section, Austin Police Department has one, I know Dallas has at least one, Bexar County.

- Q. So many?
- A. Many.
- Q. What about national organizations like the FBI and the CIA? Do you know whether or not they have any?
- A. I'm pretty sure that the FBI has one, I know the ATF has one. I think -- I don't know who does their work -- I think -- maybe NCIS operates one but they may have their work done by someone else.
- Q. Okay. So it's pretty well accepted throughout the country?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And internationally, as you mentioned earlier.
- 25 A. Yes. One of my former colleague works in a lab

in Saudi Arabia, I think. 1 2 Ο. Okay. Okay. MR. HANNA: Your Honor, I'll pass the 3 witness. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Doggett. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 (By Mr. Doggett) Ms. Eudaley, I'm Stephen Q I'm one of the lawyers for Cornelius Harper. Doggett. 8 Your degree from Texas A&M in Wildlife and Fishery 9 Sciences, that has nothing to do with firearms/toolmark 10 analysis, correct? 11 12 Α. Other than the fact that it gives me a background in science, which is what is required for the 13 14 job, yes. 15 But they didn't teach you anything about firearms/toolmark analysis at A&M, right? 16 Α. No. 17 And then after you graduated from A&M, 18 0. Okav. 19 you took some courses to become a secondary school teacher, correct? 20 I did, that's true. 21 Α. 22 And you actually became a science teacher at Q. 23 Katy High School for what, a couple of years? Uh, not even a full year, teaching was not 24 really for me. 25

- Q. Teaching was not for you?
- A. Not for me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Well, it must not have been a total bust because then you went on to teach the younger ones, the sixth and seventh graders at a private school, a private Catholic school, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And you were there from February to May of 2002?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And after that, was that when you went to work for the Houston Crime Lab?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. And your first few years at the crime lab had really nothing to do with firearms analysis, you were working, I guess, in like the evidence room or the --
 - A. That's correct, for two and a half years.
 - Q. Receiving stuff and logging it in, and all that sort of thing.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Who was your teacher at the Houston Crime Lab that taught you about firearms/toolmark analysis?
 - A. My main trainer was -- he's now my supervisor,

 Darrell Stein. I also receive training from Kim Downs,

 Mike Al-Mohamed -- Mohamed Al-Mohamed, is his name, and

1 Michael Lyons.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Are they all still there?
- A. Darrell Stein and Kim Downs are. Mike Lyons and Mr. Al-Mohamed have both retired.
- Q. All right. You talked a little bit early on in your testimony about the fact that you now work for the Houston Forensic Science Center, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And that started in April of 2014, correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
 - Q. And how is that different from working from the Houston Police Department?
 - A. When I worked for the Houston Police

 Department, I was a Houston Police Department employee,
 I was a civilian employee with the police department.

 Now I am not an employee of the Houston Police

 Department, I am a City of Houston employee and I'm

 managed by the management of the Houston Forensic

 Science Center.
 - Q. All right. Why the change?
 - A. We it was actually the NAS report where they suggested that crime laboratories should not be affiliated with law enforcement or prosecution offices, that we should be independent and of course, as an examiner, I am a dependent. But the appearance and the

management scheme should be such that we are independent from law enforcement influence. And so that is why the change began right away, but it was a process to actually implement the change in management from the Houston Police Department over to the Houston Forensic Science Center.

- Q. Now you mentioned the NAS report, what is NAS?
- A. National Academy of Sciences.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you recognize that as scientific for the authoritative body in your field?
- A. I think that they have good input on what crime laboratories and forensics, in general should, for good practices.
- Q. You know that NAS consist of many of the leading scientists in the United States?
- A. Yes, they're not an authoritative body. You asked about do I recognize it as a scientific --
 - Q. It's not an authoritative body?
 - A. Not authoritative, no.
 - Q. Not as far as you know.
 - A. No, not to my knowledge.
- Q. Okay. But apparently they're authoritative enough to cause you guys to change your organizational structure and who runs who has ultimate authority over your laboratories?

- A. They -- like I said, they made excellent recommendations for that -- for that but they didn't have the authority to demand that we become independent. That's what I mean by they're not authoritative.
- Q. Did you know that the -- well, the reason it changed, wasn't it, it's -- the problem started long before the NAS report came out, didn't it?
 - A. What do you mean the problem?
- Q. There were many problems at the HPD Crime Lab, correct?
 - A. There were issues that --
- Q. Big issues, right?
- A. -- they came up in the news media, they were mostly involved in the DNA section.
- Q. All right. But there were some really big serious issues that caused the lab to get a lot of bad publicity, correct?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And that's been going -- that went on for ten years.
 - A. I don't know how long it went on. I know it that the problems came to light shortly after I began my employment there.
- Q. Okay. Well anyway, ultimately they did change over to the -- they changed the name from the HPD Crime

1 Lab to the Houston Forensic Science Center, correct?

- A. Yes. And before that we obtained accreditation for the laboratory in 2005.
- Q. You're actually still in the same laboratory you were always in, right?
- A. It's a slow process, so yes, the facilities are still the same.
- Q. 1200 Travis, 20th floor, Houston Texas, 77002, correct?
- A. The Crime Lab is on the 24th, 25th and 26th floors, not the 20th.
 - Q. The same place so that really hadn't changed?
 - A. That has not changed.
- Q. And really, most of the employees are the same, aren't they?
 - A. Most of the employees are the same, yes.
 - Q. When they made a switch over, they just said, okay, take off your HPD hat and now you're going to put on your Houston Forensic Science Center hat, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So, probably somewhere between ninety and a hundred percent of the employees are Ex-HPD employees, right?
- 24 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

Q. The same criminalists, the same -- what about

management, same -- same lab managers?

- A. Yes. There have been some additional management people that some came from the outside and some from other divisions that were apart of the crime laboratory before that are now management within the management system.
- Q. Okay. Now, you have what we call standard operating procedures at the Firearm Section of the lab, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.2

- Q. And I've looked at those, and I don't see anything in there about how you determine whether or not there's a match.
- A. The SOP's wouldn't necessarily have the AFTE theory of identification and the range of conclusions. That's part of the training manual, it's part of the training and it would be included in the training manual.
- Q. So the lab does not have any standard operating procedures on what the criteria is for a criminalist to -- am I using the right term? A criminalist to examine a firearm and determine whether or not something was fired from that firearm.
- A. Again those standards are in the training manual, they are part of the training, and any

criminalist can find it -- can find reference to that in the training manual.

- Q. But it's not --
- A. It's not part of the SOP's, it's part of the training manual which is part of the management. It's one of the controlled documents that we have in the laboratory is the training manual.
 - O. Who wrote the SOP's?
- A. My supervisor wrote most of them with input from all of the individuals in the laboratory.
- Q. Anyway, you guys are supposed to follow your SOP's, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. And it's important that you follow your SOP's because that's part of how you maintain your accreditation; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And how often are y'all checked out to see whether or not you're complying with your SOP's?
- A. There is an internal audit conducted by the laboratory itself every year. And that audit is conducted not by members of our section but by members who have been trained to conduct internal audits and they're typically from other sections of the laboratory, so they don't know what we do, so they're —

we try to have them be as impartial as possible. And then once every -- currently it's every five years is the accreditation cycle where we have an external or we have to have an external assessment by the accrediting body. Our laboratory has tried to do more than what is the bare minimum and so we have had -- we have been accredited since 2005 but we have had more than two or three outside assessments. We -- for awhile, we were doing one assessment -- outside assessment every year in addition to our internal assessment.

- Q. When's the last time an outside assessment was done?
- A. I believe it was 2010 or 2011. We have also had some consultants, and we're planning on applying for accreditation under the ISO/IEC 17025 accreditation standards rather than the legacy standard for ASCLAD Lab, which is what we're accredited under now. So we've had some outside input getting prepared for the ISO/IEC 17025, but it has not a formal assessment.
- Q. All right. So you were there the last time an outside assessment was done?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

Q. And what did they do regarding assessing a firearms lab as to whether or not y'all were -- what are they looking at when they do an audit?

A. When they do an audit -- and I am actually a qualified assessor through ASCLAD Lab. So not only do I know what they're looking for, because I have been through one but I have done an assessment myself at another laboratory.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You look and read the quality manual and the standard operating procedures to make sure that not only are the people who are doing the work following those procedures that are laid out, but those procedures are in line with the accreditation requirements as well as what is generally accepted in the field. They do case review, so when you have an outside assessment you actually do have firearms examiners, people who know the field come in, it's not impartial people who are DNA analysts, so an outside assessment is conducted by firearms examiners. And they look through our case files and make sure that we document what we're doing, that we follow our own procedures, that we meet accreditation requirements, that we follow our SOP's. They make sure that not only are we doing those things but that we know what we're doing. We can answer questions, that we're handling evidence appropriately, I mean it's a very large, broad spectrum assessment.

Q. Okay. Well I read -- what I read in the SOP's from 2010 and 2014, things like make sure the gun is not

1 loaded and stuff like that.

- A. Safety is part of it, that is of course not all that's in the SOP --
 - Q. Right.

- A. -- manual. But certainly, yes, making sure that the gun is not loaded is part of it.
- Q. And when you write a report, make sure you put the make and the caliber of the weapon in it, what day you looked at it and stuff like that, I mean, it was very detailed SOP's about how to write your reports.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. So that's the kind of thing auditors are looking for, they take your SOP and -- your SOP procedures for how you write a report, and they select some reports and they compare them and they say, yes, they were writing the reports in accordance with the SOP's.
 - A. That's part of it, yes.
- Q. Okay. And you said you're a member of AFTE, correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. How long have you been a member of AFTE?
 - A. I don't know. I'm a regular member so I know
 I've been a -- you're a provisional member for three -three years, and then you have to become a regular

member and I believe I've been a regular member for a year or more, so at least four years, maybe longer. I don't remember when I applied.

- Q. And do you have to have any sort of college degree to become a member of AFTE?
 - A. Not to become a member of AFTE, no.
- Q. Are there educational requirements at all to become a member of AFTE?
- A. To become a member of AFTE, you must be working in the field of firearms and toolmark examination.
- Q. But you might not even have a high school diploma, and if you're working in a field of firearms identification, you could become a member of AFTE.
- A. If that if the laboratory hired somebody or had somebody employed that doesn't have a high school degree but they are conducting firearms and toolmark examinations, then yes, they can become a member of AFTE.
- Q. And AFTE is -- it's really just a trade association, isn't it?
 - A. No.
 - Q. It's not?
- 23 A. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Q. Isn't there a judicial decision where a Judge held that AFTE is just a trade association, not a scientific organization?

1.3

- A. Not to my knowledge, no. In fact, I believe that there were judicial decisions saying it's not trade organizations.
 - Q. Do you have that decision?
 - A. I don't.
- Q. Okay. But it's -- whatever type of organization it is, as long as you're working in the firearms/toolmark identification, there's no real educational requirements?
- A. Not to my knowledge. I never really paid attention to that part because I have a college diploma.
- Q. And I think you already said you're not a member of any other organizations?
 - A. I am not, no.
- Q. Are there any other scientific organizations that deal with the subject of firearms/toolmark identification?
- A. Not exclusively, but there are other scientific organizations that do cover those topics in their publications and in their conferences.
 - Q. Can you give us some examples of some of those?
- A. Journal of Forensic Sciences, SWAFS or the Southwest Association of Forensic Sciences, I know -- I have been to a conference where they had a firearms

discussion, there are some others.

- Q. What about the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, do they --
- A. I believe that the Journal of Forensic Sciences is the publication from the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, so yes.
- Q. Now, your tours of your firearms places, did you actually go to the factories?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. And were there some non-forensic scientists -- non-firearms, toolmark people there on those tours?
- A. For some of them there were because I was attending Armorer's courses, so there were police officers who are -- just as part of their job are Armorer's where they wanted to learn more about the guns.
 - Q. Anybody non-law enforcement?
- A. No, typically the Armorer's courses that I've been to have all been offered to law enforcement or to law enforcement affiliated like firearms examiners.
 - Q. And how long did those tours last?
- A. Half a day, several hours to half a day. I think Beretta was -- yeah, half a day.
 - Q. So is it like walking through the Blue Bell

Ice-Cream deal and they say, here's where we mix this and here's where do this there and there's the machine that does this and they show you the process and tell you -- and answer questions about what they do?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And one of the things they -- what did they tell you about the tools they use to manufacturer the firearms?
- A. They told us a lot about the tools, so I don't know.
 - O. You can't remember or --
- A. No, I can remember it. Just it's a wide range of things that they tell us about the tools.
- Q. What did they tell you about what the materials are that they're made out of?
- A. Typically they're very hard steel. Some are actually -- Smith & Wesson uses a diamond encrusted lasers.
- Q. Okay. Why are they made that way?
- A. They're very hard so that they are able to cut the very hard steel of the firearms that they're trying to produce.
 - Q. And are they designed to last a long time?
- A. They're designed so that -- yes, they can last a long time.

Q. And they're supposed to -- the goal is to try to -- whatever you're trying to make, you make it the same in every gun you -- that comes off the line, right?

- A. Their concern is to make firearms or firearm parts that meet specific tolerances as far as size, shape, smoothness, whatever, they're not concerned with making sure that the marks are the same.
- Q. Right. But they are trying to make, more or less identical firearms there that make it -- can take out and sell at stores and they're going to work the way they're supposed to work, right?
- A. I don't necessarily know that their goal is to make identical firearms. Their goal is to make firearms that they can take the the parts that are made over here and those parts they make over here will fit on this gun or this frame that they make over here. They want all the parts to be within specified tolerances, they want the holes to be the same size so that they fire the gun efficiently. They want the rifling to be to the right size so that the bullet has the most gas behind it so that when it passes down the barrel it obtains a desired velocity.
- Q. And they monitor -- the stuff that comes off their manufacturing assembly line -- they monitor the guns to make sure that they're being manufactured within

the tolerances that they want, correct?

A. Yes.

- Q. And what happens when something comes -- gets out of tolerance, what do they do?
- A. I don't know for sure, it probably depends on what is out of tolerance and why. I'm sure that they would investigate the machine or the tool that is being used to produce that particular part and then try to fix that machine or that tool so that the parts would be back within tolerance again.
- Q. Do they give you any specific information about how long the tools they use to make firing pins last?
- A. It every time we ask that question, the answer is, it just varies. Sometimes the tool can make a thousand parts or ten thousand parts, sometimes the tools need to be sharpened in between there to get back to making things within tolerance. But sometimes the tools break right away and they can't use them for making more than a few guns.
- Q. So if I went on one of these factory tours or went on five or six of them, I couldn't say that I was -- just because I became more knowledgeable about how they make guns, I couldn't call myself a firearms, toolmark examiner, could I?
 - A. No.

Q. I couldn't call myself an expert in 1 2 firearms/toolmark identification, could I? Α. No. 3 I notice you've become a criminalist specialist Ο. 4 5 and it looks like now you have some -- you're not just looking at guns, you're supervising some other people? 6 7 Α. I have some supervisory responsibility, yes. You supervise two criminalists; is that Ο. 8 9 correct? Two criminalists and an evidence technician. 10 Α. 11 Okay. Did you -- you participated in the Ο. 12 examinations that are a subject of this case, correct? 1.3 Α. Yes. 14 Did you do the original examination? Q. 15 Α. Not for most of it. Who did the original examination? 16 Q. Criminalist Joseph Colca. 17 Α. Okay. Is Criminalist Colca still employed at 18 Ο. 19 the Houston Forensic Science Center? 2.0 Α. No. Okay. When did he leave? 21 Q. 22 MR. HANNA: Your Honor, I'm going to 23 object, Mr. Colca's here for that testimony if he requires it. This is outside the purview of her 24

expertise why somebody else isn't still employed.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) So he did the original examination, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

2.2

- Q. And did you check his work?
- A. I verified his results or if it wasn't subject for -- to verification, I typically reviewed his original results, yes.
 - Q. Say that part again about --
- A. I verified his conclusions or if the conclusions weren't suitable for verification, for example, his work on test-firing firearms. That's not subject to verification, I can't verify test-firing, so I technically reviewed that work.
 - Q. Why can't you verify the test-firing?
- A. He test-fired the firearm, he examined the firearm and made observations about the firearm, and that's just not really something that can be verified, his observations. I have since examined the firearm and verified those results, but his initial examination of the firearm was not verified, it was technically reviewed.
- Q. All right. What is the standard operating procedure in the lab -- or what was it, back in 2010 when Mr. Colca did his examination concerning the

handling of the gun when it first comes into the lab?

- A. We the safety is always the first priority when it comes to firearms examiners. So I believe that this firearm was received in a biohazardous condition which means it had blood or possible body fluids on it. And so I believe that this firearm was decontaminated prior to any sort of examination, let me confirm that. Yes, Mr. Colca decontaminated it. And again that wouldn't be what we would normally do, normally we would not disassemble a firearm before we test-fired it because we do not want to handle and test-fire a firearm that is contaminated in body fluids, that's our first priority is safety. So the SOP was to safety first, to contaminate the firearm and then examine it.
 - Q. Why you not normally disassemble a firearm?
- A. Disassembling a firearm could potentially -- we may not notice that a part was put together incorrectly, and when we put it back together, we may put it back together correctly, so we may not have noticed that the firearm could have been in an inoperable condition when we received it. You also may lose the opportunity to examine the bore of the firearm which is something that we do. Of course, if the bore is occluded with blood then we can't look for -- we typically look for gun powder residue in the bore just to see if the firearm

has been cleaned since it has fired. And so sometimes you may lose that opportunity if you clean it before you test-fire it or examine it.

- Q. When you disassemble a gun like that, you're altering it from what its condition was from when it was brought in, correct?
- A. You're altering the physical condition of the firearm, you don't alter the marks that the firearm may leave behind, or you're not even really altering the physical condition of the firearm, you're just altering the way that the parts were put together.
- Q. And why wouldn't you just take them apart and clean them and oil them, all of them instead of -- why wouldn't you do that in all cases?
- A. Well first of all, we don't have the time to disassemble and reassemble and clean and oil every single firearm that we receive. So if the firearm is received in an operable condition, there's no need for us to disassemble and clean it and oil it.
- Q. Do you know where the contamination was that -the bio-contamination was on this weapon that caused him
 to clean it?
 - A. No.
- 24 Q. No?

25 A. No.

- Q. Shouldn't that be documented under your SOP's in your report?
- A. I don't believe that the SOP's specifically note that we should say where or how the firearm is contaminated, just that it was received in a biohazardous condition.
- Q. Well I mean, this has something to do with the integrity of what you're looking at. Normally you wouldn't alter evidence, if you had evidence that you wanted to look at, you wouldn't change it, right? You want to keep it in the condition, if possible that you got it in, correct?
 - A. If possible.

1.3

- Q. All right. And if you don't document it in your report whether it was completely encrusted in blood and guts or whether it had one drop of blood on the tip of the barrel, I mean, shouldn't that make a difference, shouldn't that be documented in your records?
- A. If -- we have the flexibility in how we decontaminate an item, and so if there had just been one drop of blood, Mr. Colca would not have disassembled the firearm and decontaminated it. He would have wiped that drop of blood off and he would have noted that he wiped it rather than he decontaminated it. His notes actually say that both the firearm and the magazine were

contaminated, and it's unusual for a magazine to be contaminated with biohazard, so I would expect that the gun was very bloody.

Q. So how did he decontaminate it?

1.3

1.5

- A. He washed it in a solution that is ten percent bleach. He then --
 - Q. Is that what it says in the report?
- A. In the report, no, I don't believe that the report specifically states. Our SOP's state that he would wash it in this ten percent bleach solution.
- Q. But you don't know what he did because it's not documented?
- A. Item fifteen is disassembled, decontaminated, rinsed, dried, oiled and reassembled. That's what -- that's what the document states.
- Q. All right. Anyway, after he examined it and formed some conclusions about whether or not other items that were brought in were fired in that particular gun?
- A. Yes, he test-fired the firearm and then made some comparisons between unknown samples that were submitted.
- Q. And he had trouble making the gun work, didn't he?
- A. I wouldn't say that he had trouble making the gun work. The magazine that was submitted with the

firearm was broken and so he hand loaded the firearm.

One -- the firearm failed to eject, the first and third cartridge cases, which means that in the cycling -- this is a semi-automatic firearm, so in the cycling of the firearm, it should have extracted the cartridge case from the chamber and then ejected it clear of the firearm. And in this case, the first and third cartridge cases did not eject properly, they extracted but then they got caught in the action so that they didn't eject from the firearm.

- Q. Did he put a different magazine in the gun to fire it?
- A. He did not, he hand loaded the firearm to fire it.
- Q. He -- when he disassembled it, he noticed that apparently the magazine was broken so he made the decision to take one bullet at a time and put it into the chamber of a gun and shoot it and he did that three times, correct?
 - A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. And two of the three times the bullet wouldn't even eject from the qun, correct?
 - A. The cartridge case did not --
 - Q. The case wouldn't eject from the qun.
- A. -- did not eject from the gun. It was

extracted from the gun and it did not eject.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. All right. And when did you -- he did that on a particular day. When did you go back and recheck his work?
 - A. When did I check his work?
- Q. Right. I mean, it is part of the standard operating procedure that whenever a criminalist examines a gun, a second person is supposed to go back and check the work, correct?
- Yes, we have two ways that we check work. Α. verify conclusions, identifications and eliminations on a class. So conclusions about the fired evidence and whether or not it was fired from a particular firearm, those identifications are actually verified, meaning that a second examiner physically examines that evidence on a comparison microscope and eventually must come to the same conclusion or we wouldn't report it as an identification. We also have what's called a technical review where I reviewed Mr. Colca's work that he did and determined that he followed the standard operating procedures, that what he did was technically sound and -- that was prior to the issue of the report. I don't have a note of exactly when I technically reviewed his work, but it would have been technically reviewed prior to the report being issued.

Q. And you technically reviewed it and you did what else?

1.3

- A. I also verified the identification conclusions that were drawn.
- Q. When you do that, do you -- is Mr. Colca sitting right there with you and says, look at this part of the bullet, this is what I think shows it's a match, or how do y'all go about doing that?
- A. Sometimes if -- if the case is a priority, I may look at it. After he's done looking at it in the microscope, I will sit down while the items are still set up on the scope and conduct my own analysis or I may come back at a later date, and in this case, I did both things. There was part -- part of the request was a priority. We issued some preliminary results prior to the issuance of the report and then there were some verifications that I did on a later date that he was not there for.
- Q. And what sort of preliminary report was issued?

 I don't remember seeing that.
- A. I'm assuming it was a report. It wasn't a preliminary report, it would have been verbal results.
 - O. Given to who?
- A. Mr. Colca released the results to HPD investigators, Sergeant Elliott and Officer Stahlin, and

it -- they had requested that a particular cartridge case be compared to the firearm.

And so he issued a preliminary result of the single cartridge case that he examined was fired in that firearm. That conclusion is also contained in the report that is written, but we don't separately say that we provided it to the investigators on a prior day.

- Q. Now, were any of the factories that you visited, factories that manufactured Lorcin pistols?
 - A. You mean the factories that I toured?
- Q. The same -- yeah, the same type of pistol that was examined in this case.
- A. Have I toured Lorcin's facility, is that what you're asking?
 - Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A. No, I have not.
- Q. Okay. And why do you tour different facilities? Why do you go to different ones rather than just go to one and get a feel for what they do?
- A. Different manufacturers use different techniques and they're a manufacturer of their firearms, and so we try to go to a wide range of firearms manufacturers to get exposure to the different types of manufacturing techniques that are out there.
 - Q. So do you know whether or not you or

Mr. Colca -- but I know you didn't, but did Mr. Colca ever visit a facility where they manufacture Lorcin's?

A. Not to my knowledge.

1.3

- Q. Do you think it would be important to have knowledge about the particular techniques that Lorcin Manufacture is using in helping you to assess whether or not you could make an identification?
- A. It's not a hundred percent necessary to know specifically because we have exposure to the different manufacturing techniques. We don't necessarily need to know exactly how each manufacturer makes a firearm to know, overall, just the general procedures that are used. There is some literature out about how Lorcin's are manufactured, so, you know, I haven't reviewed that literature. But again it's not it's not vital to what we do to know how each individual manufacturer makes their firearms.
- Q. I didn't see any of the Lorcin materials in any of the written materials that I was provided in all this stuff. Is that in your file, the Lorcin, the written materials?
- A. In this case file? No, they're published in the AFTE journal.
- Q. And is it your opinion based on your review of the stuff you looked at in this case that that

particular pistol fired the items that you examined to the exclusion of all other pistols in the world?

1.3

- A. To the exclusion of all other pistols in the world, to me implies absolute certainty and I can't say absolute certainty. I have not test-fired every single firearm that has ever existed or will ever exist so I cannot compare all of those. What I say is that the likelihood that another firearm would create these types of markings on a cartridge case or on a bullet is so remote as to be considered practically impossible. It's a practical impossibility, not an absolute impossibility.
- Q. And what's your scientific basis for saying that?
- A. After reviewing all of the literature and the research that has been done and published in the AFTE Journals on consecutively manufactured barrels and slides as well as actually me physically being able to examine bullets and cartridge cases fired from consecutively manufactured slides, I am confident that the markings left by the tool that creates the firearm are unique to that firearm and will then that firearm will then impart those unique markings to the cartridge cases and the bullets that are fired in them.
 - Q. So how does the -- how does AFTE help you --

you said that's one of the basis for your scientific -- scientific basis for your conclusion. What in the AFTE literature tells you that you can draw that conclusion?

- A. Well the AFTE theory of identification is that the tools that make firearms are the markings that are left on the firearms by the tools rapidly change from, not only from one firearm to the next but within that same firearm. And so that theory is based on the research that has been done by many firearms examiners across the world for over a hundred years now. There's published literature by AFTE, there's books that have been published by Gunther and Gunther that and other authors that are considered the father's of developing this forensic science that determined over and over and over again that these markings are unique to firearms.
- Q. Are you aware, since you said you knew about the NAS report, you know there's a heated debate going on in the scientific community about whether or not there really is such a thing as uniqueness in any particular firearm, you know that that's an ongoing --
- A. I know that the NAS report draws that into question, yes.
- Q. Okay. There is a debate amongst scientists as to whether or not what AFTE believes is correct or not.
 - A. I'm aware that there is a question, yes.

Q. Now, you said awhile ago that there is no 1 2 computer system developed by the FBI or anybody else, like they use for fingerprints where they put in a 3 fingerprint in AFIS and a print will pop up and they 4 say, yeah, that guy's sitting over in prison over here 5 for rape and now we think maybe he raped this other 6 woman, there's no comparable system for 7 firearms/toolmarks? 8 The IBIS system is comparable 9 Well, there is. 10 to the AFIS system. It doesn't have the same number of hits as you 11 0. 12 would in a fingerprint system. 1.3 Judge, that's a misstatement MR. HANNA: 14 of the law that the AFIS system exists and it does 15 require an independent examination by an examiner in order to make that comparison to the same tool that 16 IBIS -- It's just that, hey, here are two that are 17 similar, you need to look at this and make sure they're 18 19 of the same person and the same weapon and the same It's the same. He's misstating it, the 20 cartridge. 21 accuracy of the AFIS system. 22 No, I'm saying it wasn't as MR. DOGGETT: 23 accurate, that's what I said. MR. HANNA: But you exceeded -- you said 24

that you will conclude that there's a match based on

AFIS, which is not exactly the case.

THE COURT: A point I'm sure you will make on redirect.

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) But you said the NIBIN system, what was it? About one percent, you said.
 - A. I believe that's our laboratory hit rate.
- Q. Did you ever -- did y'all enter this particular gun in the NIBIN system?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did you get any hits?
- 11 A. No.

1.3

- Q. And when you get a hit in the NIBIN system, isn't it true that most of them turn out -- you already testified, you said that it might even be a different kind of gun.
- A. Well, we don't consider it a hit in the NIBIN system until it's confirmed by two examiners that are physically examining the evidence. What you're asking about is the results, the correlation results that the computer gives back, that we review on the screen of the computer. Most of the -- 99 percent of those are not legitimate, high confidence hits where we think we need to review that evidence.
- Q. Even the one percent -- are you saying

 99 percent of the one percent turn out not to be valid?

A. No. What I'm saying is that the 99 -- 99 percent of the evidence that we enter into the NIBIN system, when we review the correlation for that piece of evidence, 99 percent of the time we don't get a high confidence hit. About one percent, maybe two percent of the time, we do get high a confidence hit that we then compare. And I don't have -- I don't know the statistics on, once we decide to compare those two items, how many times we would actually say it's a confirmed match. Most of the time they are, but sometimes they are inconclusive or elimination.

- Q. So when you said awhile ago that using NIBIN that sometimes the class characteristics don't even match, what you meant by that is that it might be -- NIBIN might come back and say, this is a 38, and you're looking at a 40 caliber or whatever; the class characteristics might not even be the same.
- A. Well, not the caliber. The caliber is filtered out by the system. But there are other markings on the breech face that might not there might be circular marks on one and parallel marks on the other.
- Q. Have y'all taken this gun -- you said there are other crime labs, there's a DPS lab in Houston -- have y'all sent this gun and the shell casings and the bullets out to get your results verified by a different

lab?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

- A. Our laboratory did not do that nor do we practice that typically. I don't know if anyone else has sent off that firearm for examination.
- Q. Are you familiar with the specific mass provisions that talk about the validity of firearm/toolmarks analysis?
 - A. I've read them, I don't know them by heart.
- Q. Are you familiar with the -- where they say the validity of the fundamental assumptions of uniqueness and reproducibility of firearms related toolmarks has not yet been fully demonstrated.
 - A. I've read that quote, yes.
 - Q. And what does that mean to you?
- A. To me, they're scientists who are not firearms examiners and have not taken the consecutively manufactured bullets and cartridge cases that are available to firearms examiners and looked at them to see what we base our opinion on as far as the uniqueness of the markings. They would like to see more research.
 - Q. They what?
 - A. They would like to see more research.
- Q. Right. To establish whether or not the AFTE assumption of uniqueness is valid, right?
 - A. That is what they would like.

- Q. And also to establish whether or not you can have reproducibility in the test results, correct?
- A. I don't remember that quote being there, I know that there is reproducibility.
 - Q. What does reproducibility mean?

1.3

- A. Reproducibility, to me means two different things, either that the marks themselves are reproducing or that a test result is reproducible.
- Q. Another quote from NAS, "The science regarding firearms examinations does not permit examiner testimony that a specific gun fired a specific bullet to the exclusion of all other guns in the world". Do you agree with that?
- A. That's why we don't say to the exclusion of all of the guns in the world.
 - Q. What do you say then?
- A. It's a practical impossibility for another gun to make the same marks. It's not an absolute possibility, I can't say for sure it's an absolute possibility. Do I believe it is possible? No.
- Q. I understand the distinction you're making, but to a layperson that you're telling that to, isn't that basically the same thing? That this is the gun that fired the bullet? No other gun could have fired it?
 - A. I don't think that that's -- I think that the

distinction is not lost on the layperson, I think that they could make that distinction and understand it.

- Q. Do you know what the rate of error is in firearms/toolmark analysis?
- A. I don't necessarily think that there is a solid answer for the rate of error. I think that the closest rate of error comes from a proficiency test which is demonstrated as depending on how you look at, one percent, 1.4 percent.
- Q. But you, yourself, said awhile ago that those proficiency tests do not measure the error rate.
- A. They're not designed to measure the error rate. Can you take the error rate that is evident from the CTS proficiency test and assign an error rate to that? Yes, you can.
- Q. Well, you can make an argument that that has something to do with the error rates. But again, you said those tests are not designed to determine error rate for firearms/toolmarks analysis.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the competency tests, are they done they're not done blindly.
 - A. A competency test?
- Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

A. No, a competency test is the test --

Q. The proficiency test.

- A. No. Typically -- and I mean I can only speak for our laboratory's policies and procedures -- just the way that we handle and process evidence, an examiner -- even if he tried to make it a blind test, usually an examiner would figure it out that's it's not blind, because of -- there's just going to be a lot of background information that would be in the system that wouldn't be there with a -- in a blind test, in a proficiency test. So yes, we are typically aware that we're being tested -- I have taken a blind proficiency test and it has been done.
 - Q. But genuinely they're not, they're not blind, they're told that they're going to -- here's a proficiency test --
- A. We -- generally we know that we're being proficiency tested.
- Q. And one of the -- and so -- and they use -- do they use -- where do they fire the bullets? Do they fire them in the bodies of pigs or do they fire them into water tanks or where do they fire the bullets?
- A. I don't know, you'd have to find out from CTS how they develop their tests.
- Q. But generally they're pretty -- the bullets are pretty pristine, aren't they?

A. Yes, the bullets are pristine. And that goes back to the idea that they want to make proficiency tests that are similar across all of the bullets that are being test-fired, so they want to provide similar samples to all of their clients.

1.3

- Q. And so they're not real world, they're not like bullets that you've actually examined and have been shot into people or buildings or -- that you look at in your lab, right?
- A. I do get pristine bullets in case work, I just don't always get pristine bullets in case work. So it does mimic some of what I see in case work, it's just not all, it's not the entire gamut of what I see in case work.
- Q. You're not and -- they don't get counted off if they put inconclusive, right?
 - A. Inconclusive is not considered incorrect.
- Q. And are you aware of the studies that have shown that when they get proficiency tests, firearms examiners rate of inconclusive goes up to about forty percent, but in the real world it's much more than that?
- A. No, I'm not aware of any kind of studies like that.
 - Q. You haven't heard about that?

A. No.

- Q. The examiners know that if they put inconclusive, they're not going to be counted off for that, right?
- A. Well, counted off is not a very good way of putting it. I can speak from personal experience that if you put inconclusive when the expected answer was identification or elimination, it's not a no consequence's situation. You may not necessarily be punished or fired for that result, but if you don't get answers that are consistent with what the expected answer is in the test. You do -- you may have to go through remedial training, you -- at the very least, need to justify that answer to like -- I've had to do that to my supervisor. I said, look, this is what I said inconclusive, because I do see disagreement here and here and I'm not sure that it's an elimination or I'm not sure it's an identification.
 - Q. How do you grade the proficiency test?
- A. It's not graded. You're either -- it's either acceptable or unacceptable, I think are the terms we use.
- Q. Well, where did I get this -- I read somewhere that when you put inconclusive, it doesn't count against you. Where did I get that from? Have you heard that

before?

- A. Again, it's not counted against you, but you should -- you may have to go through retraining to -- especially if you miss an identification, your supervisor is probably going -- and your trainer is going to be concerned with why you missed that identification. And you may have to go through some retraining, so it's not a -- it's not a no consequence situation. It's just not -- it's not meant to be a punitive situation, if you say inconclusive.
- Q. All right. How many individual characteristics would you look for on a typical cartridge case before you could determine that it was fired by a particular weapon?
- A. I don't have a set number of individual markings that I would -- that I would look for.
- Q. And there's nothing in the literature from AFTE or your SOP's or anything that tells you how many characteristics you would have to have before you could opine that this particular casing was fired by a particular weapon?
 - A. There's no requirement, no.
 - Q. There's no standard.
- A. No.
- Q. What about examining the bullet? Is the answer

the same? There's no standard for the number of characteristics?

- A. There's no standard, no.
- Q. And how many individual characteristics do you think you would find on a typical bullet casing before you would say it was fired by a particular weapon, just on average.
- A. I don't count the number of agreements -- or agreeing lines, agreeing striations or agreeing marks.

 If it's not -- it's a pattern match, so I'm looking for groupings of markings that match, not a hard number.
 - Q. Same answer on the bullet?
- 13 A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Is this part of the reason why they say this is entirely subjective?
- A. That is why -- it's not entirely subjective but that is the subjective part of it. Each examiner must determine for themselves when they say identification, and that's why we have verification of identification so that two examiners say it's an ID before it's an ID.
- Q. Well the verification doesn't always work, does it?
 - A. I think it does.
- Q. Do you know about the Williams' case that came out of y'all's lab a few years ago? Williams, where a

wrong match was declared. 1 2 Α. No. It was checked by two different supervisors who 3 supposedly did what you did and they said, yeah, it's 4 5 the same gun and they were wrong. I don't know what you're talking about. 6 Α. You never heard of that case? 7 Q. Α. No. 8 It was part of the reason why the criticism of 9 Q. the lab --10 Your Honor, the witness has 11 MR. HANNA: indicated she's not familiar with what Defense counsel 12 is speaking of. 1.3 14 MR. DOGGETT: Okay. 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 0 (By Mr. Doggett) In this particular case, how many points of similarity did you identify on the 17 cartridge casings? 18 19 Again, the same answer, I don't count the number of matches. I'm looking for groups of similar 20 markings that exceed what I would expect to see in a 21 22 best known non-match and the agree -- or is it 23 consistent, in agreement, with known matches that I have 24 seen. The same -- I mean, based on your review of 25 Q.

Colca's work, the same answer for him? You didn't put in the report, I found six areas of agreement or --

1.3

- A. No, we take photographs of our identification or the area that we used for identification, so we don't record specific numbers.
- Q. What do you do when you have some areas of agreement and some areas of disagreement, what do you do?
- A. Well typically -- disagreement is kind of a strong word. If there's disagreement because the item is damaged, or I can say, well, there's disagreement here because the cartridge case didn't come in -- maybe not so much a disagreement as a lack of markings in a particular area. I may be able to say, well, the cartridge case didn't come into contact with the breech face of the firearm or the land impression didn't make a good of a mark here because the bullet was crooked. If I see strong disagreement in any area then I'm going to call into question whether or not that agreement that I'm seeing is individual or subclass in nature.
- Q. So, if there's disagreement, sometimes you come up with explanations about why that doesn't matter, why you still think it's a match?
- A. Why there -- not why it doesn't matter, but why there would be disagreement or a lack of agreement in

that area.

- Q. And again that's all subjective?
- A. Yes.
- Q. So somebody reviewing -- some outside person or expert reviewing the report could not necessarily tell -- the reports in this case, they couldn't tell from what was documented really what the basis of your subjective opinion was as to why you thought this particular gun fired the items that were identified, correct?
- A. In reviewing the report itself, no. In reviewing the documentation, yes.
- Q. Well, but you don't tell them in there, what you thought agreed, or if there were any areas of disagreement and what your explanation was for that, that's not in the report.
- A. We have photo documentation of the areas of agreement, not all of them but what we based our identification on or at least a representative of what we sometimes it's not possible to capture a photograph, all of the areas of identification.
- Q. Now in this particular case, this gun was tested by Mr. Colca, then you checked it and you reviewed what he did and then it got test-fired again, correct?

A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Why was that?
- A. The prosecution requested that I test-fire the gun again so that I would be able to testify about the functionality of the firearm.
- Q. And that was because Mr. Colca is no longer with the Forensic Science Center?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And did you test-fire the gun again?
- A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Did you also have problems making the gun function properly?
- A. Again I found that the magazine was broken and so instead of using the magazine that was provided and instead of hand loading, I used a reference magazine.

 And then when I test-fired the firearm, I found that when -- as a review, when Mr. Colca test-fired the firearm, he had two cartridge cases that didn't eject from the firearm. I had two cartridge cases that actually did not even extract from the firearm and I believe that was due to the corrosion in the barrel and in the chamber.
 - Q. What do you mean -- explain so it's clear on the record that they did not extract.
 - A. In the cycle of a semi-automatic firearm; when

the cartridge is discharged, the bullet comes out of the cartridge case and goes down the barrel of the firearm. Once the bullet is out of the barrel of the firearm then the slide begins to move back, the slide is the top part of the firearm. As it moves back, the slide has an extractor on the side which hooks into the rim of the cartridge case or hooks onto the rim of the cartridge case and pulls back on the cartridge case and then there's an ejector. In this particular firearm the ejector is the firearm pin. The ejector knocks the cartridge case clear of the firearm. So when Mr. Colca test-fired the firearm, the cartridge case is extracted but then got stuck in the action as the slide was closing back again. When I test-fired the firearm, the cartridge case did not even extract out and I had to take a wooden dowel, put it down the barrel and kind of tap the wooden dowel to get the cartridge cases out.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. So the gun was not in the same condition when you refired it as it was in 2010?
- A. As far as I could tell the gun was in the same condition. It may have been a condition of the ammunition that I was using, I used different ammunition than what Mr. Colca did. It could have been that I had a magazine in the firearm or just that Colca didn't. I don't know why he had and I did have one cartridge

case that did extract and eject properly, so I don't know where the difference was. It may be in the same condition, those two randomly just didn't extract and eject.

- Q. Why didn't you use the same type of ammunition?
- A. I don't know. Let me see what ammunition I did use. I used Remington Peter's stock ammunition,
 Mr. Colca used Winchester.
- Q. Do you know what kind of bullet was -- there was a bullet found in the gun when it was originally brought in. Do you know what make that was?
- A. I know the cartridge cases were PMC, I don't know what brand the bullet was. It's difficult to assign a manufacturer to a bullet unless there's something very unique about it.
- Q. And there's variabilities -- just like in guns, there's variabilities in ammunition, right? As far as the metals used and hardness and all that sort of stuff.
 - A. That's correct.

1.3

- Q. So changing ammunition could change the results, right?
- A. Changing ammunition could change the results. Sometimes you can test-fire a firearm with one type of ammunition and then test-fire it with another type of -- with different types, and you may get -- not specific --

you're not going to have a disagreement of marks, but you may have other marks in one area than another. So if you're trying to reproduce markings on a particular area, you may change the ammunition that you use, it doesn't change the results.

1.3

- Q. Now, when you test-fired it the second time, what did you compare your test-fire bullets and cartridges to?
- A. Initially I didn't compare them to anything. Later the prosecutor requested that I compare my test-fires to the test-fires created Mr. Colca. And the test-fires that were created by Mr. Colca was what we used to identify the unknown cartridge cases and bullets that were submitted with the case. So, when I test-fired my cartridge cases to the test-fires created by Mr. Colca, we were able to establish that my test-fires and Mr. Colca's test-fires were fired in the same firearm which is what I already knew.
- Q. So you -- when you test-fired it the second time, you compared your test-fire objects to the first test-fire objects.
- A. I compared my test-fires objects to one another, and then yes, I took one representative and compared a cartridge case and a bullet back to the test-fires created by Mr. Colca.

- Q. You didn't compare it to the original evidence that was brought in.
 - A. No, I did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Q. Did you do it that way because that's what the prosecutor told you to do?
- A. No. We —— we didn't even feel it was necessary to actually compare the two test-fires. I had every confidence that the test-fires created by Mr. Colca were the test-fires created in this firearm because he followed our standard operating procedure, and we treat test-fires as evidence meaning they have a chain of custody and they've been sealed. The prosecutor wanted us to do it. And so my boss told me what we're going to do is this, we're going to compare the two sets of test-fires to each other.
- Q. So you didn't make that decision; your boss made that decision.
 - A. I did not make the decision.
 - Q. Who is your boss?
- A. Darrell Stein.
- Q. Did the test-fires from the second test-fire cartridge cases have extractor marks on them?
 - A. I didn't look for extractor marks.
- Q. Did you look for extractor marks in your review of Mr. Colca's work?

A. No.

1.3

- Q. Is that something that you would normally look at or you could look at?
 - A. It's something I could look at.
 - Q. But y'all didn't do it in this case?
 - A. Mr. Colca may have looked for extractor marks.
 - Q. Is that in his report?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Why wouldn't that be documented in his report?
- A. Typically we don't use extractor marks for identification. We would look for an extractor mark to try and determine the orientation that the cartridge case should be in when we image it into IBIS.
- Q. So you think this whole test-fired thing, the second test-fire was -- from your perspective, really just a waste of time?
- A. I mean, I appreciate that the prosecutor wanted me to be able to talk about the functionality of the firearms. But as far as comparing one set of test-fires to another, it was unnecessary, it was an unnecessary comparison.
- Q. Do -- do you guys, you criminalists ever go sit and drink a beer together and talk about your work? You know, talk about your work, about how you do these identifications? You don't have to drink beer, but I

mean do you ever talk about it?

1.3

- A. I mean, not unusually in a social setting, at least, I don't usually socialize with my coworkers, I'm sure people do.
- Q. Well, that's not the point of my question. The point of my question is, do y'all ever talk about how you go about making these identifications?
 - A. Outside of work, no.
- Q. I mean, is there a difference of opinion amongst the criminalists as to how many points of comparison you have to have that match before you can make an identification or exclude a firearm?
- A. I mean, each individual examiner has developed their own opinion as to what is agreement, enough to say identification. But it's difficult to actually communicate back without sitting at a microscope and looking at something together. So, to be able to sit and talk about, oh, I -- and again, we don't even count points. But even if we did to -- all points are not created equal. So I may see seven on this one and that's not going to be the same as seeing seven on a different item.
- Q. So I guess the bottom line is each of you has your own internal standards as to what you think you have to see before you can declare identification or an

exclusion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Based on my training and experience and review of the literature, I have developed my own level that I expect cartridge cases or bullets to see or to -- for a level of agreement that I need to see before I would say identification, yes.
- Q. And that's based on your -- as best I could tell the only words you said that talk about a standard is the AFTE standard of best known non-match.
- Α. It has to exceed the agreement that we see on a best known non-match. And in my training and my experience and the experience of examiners that have published literature, the best known non-matches are the test-fires, bullets or cartridge cases fired in consecutively manufactured firearms. And so since examiners, myself included are able to distinguish between cartridge cases fired in consecutively manufactured firearms or bullets fired in consecutively manufactured firearms, we are able to say that those markings that we are seeing are unique. And so, when I see a certain level of agreement in a best known non-match, I look for agreements that exceeds that and that is consistent with the agreements that I have seen from cartridge cases or bullets that I know were fired in the same firearm, test-fires.

- Q. Are you familiar with a case, I've seen pictures of it where two bullets are -- two casings are fired in separate weapons and they were declared to be a match?
- A. I'm not aware of where they were declared to be a match, no.
 - Q. You never heard of that?
 - A. No.

2.0

- Q. Okay. That would go against the uniqueness hypothesis that you guys rely on, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know whether or not -- are there any protocols used by the DPS lab that are different than y'all's as to how many areas of agreement you have to have or disagreement before you can make a decision about whether or not you've identified something?
- A. I don't know, I don't believe DPS has any set standard number.
 - Q. You don't think they have standards either?
- A. Not to my knowledge.
 - Q. What about all these other labs you talked about, all over the United States and all over the world, have you ever seen there if they have any, their standards as far as what you have to have that declare something identified versus —

- A. Not to my knowledge.
 - Q. And that's because they don't exist.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. What's the difference between an individual characteristic and a subclass characteristic?
- A. A subclass characteristic is a marking that is unique to the tool that created the firearm, not a marking that is unique to the firearm. So a subclass characteristic is one where the tool that created the firearm had some flaw or some set of markings that carried over when it created one tool or one firearm to the next. An individual mark are markings left by that same tool or different tools when creating that firearm that did not carry over one firearm to the next and are therefore is unique and individual.
- Q. Did you guys test-fire any other Lorcin pistols like the one that was the subject of the investigation in trying to make your determination in this case?
- A. No. I have fired a Lorcin but not specifically for comparison in this case.
- Q. Do you have Lorcins in your -- what do you call it, your --
 - A. Reference collection.
- Q. Reference collection?
- 25 A. Yes.

- O. You have Lorcins like this one?
- A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. Y'all didn't test-fire any of them to compare them to this gun?
 - A. No.
- Q. AFTE agrees with you that this -- these examinations of determinations are subjective, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did you notice any -- with regard to this particular gun, did you notice any individual characteristics?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What were they?
- A. Well, the firearm barrel is completely corroded. There's actually no lands and grooves left in the barrel of the firearm when I examined the inside of the bore. It was in that condition when Mr. Colca, because he made the same observation that the barrel and the chamber are completely corroded, it's pitted. And there is no way that another firearm, even if it was manufactured, one right after the other that a firearm would be in the same conditions that caused it to be corroded, which I don't know what they were and then corrode in the same fashion. The individual structure of the metal itself is going to corrode at different

rates because there's going to be imperfections within the metal, so it's going to corrode in different rates and different points. So the inside of the barrel is completely unique in every way that I could ever imagine, because I can't imagine another firearm that could ever corrode in the same way. The breech face did not have many unique markings from what I could tell. The firearm pin, however was pitted and had unique markings on it.

1.3

- Q. And again, you don't know anything about the specific manner in which they manufactured these Lorcin's, do you?
- A. I have at some point, Lorcin's were manufactured with the breech face being stamped, and then at some point they turned into a different process, so I'm not sure where this Lorcin fell in the manufacturing because they changed their procedures. I don't know how they manufactured the barrel, but again it was completely corroded so it doesn't really matter.
- Q. You don't have any idea of what the particular -- the casings that you examined, you have no idea when they were fired?
- A. That's correct, I have no idea when they were fired.
 - Q. There's no way to determine that scientifically

when they were fired.

1.3

- A. Other than if they happened to look corroded, you could maybe establish that they were older but they could have been in a corroded condition before they were fired.
- Q. I assume you guys got the gun after other forensic people got it and swabbed it for DNA and stuff like that. Y'all wouldn't do what you did to it before they did their work.
- A. We rely typically on the investigators to make decisions about how what sort of testing they want done on a firearm. So if they submit it to us but said they want fingerprints or DNA done, we would have, of course, not touch it until that happened. But if the investigator doesn't want DNA or fingerprint processing done on a firearm, we would take it directly and do our thing, quote, unquote with it.

MR. DOGGETT: I pass the witness.

MR. HANNA: May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. HANNA: May I approach the witness,

Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

Q. (BY MR. HANNA) Ms. Eudaley, one of the things

that Defense counsel has relied on, not only in his questions, but heavily in his brief to the Court, is this NAS report, and you're familiar that report?

A. I've read it, yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Now, you've read the entire thing?
- A. I've read the executive summary.
- Q. Okay. And so that NAS report, if you recall, covers three hundred and something pages long.
 - A. It covers all forensic disciplines.
- Q. All forensic disciplines. And in reality, the NAS report includes maybe six pages regarding firearms and toolmark identifications?
 - A. That sounds about right.
- Q. Okay. Defense counsel asked you if you were familiar with a particular line that's included, and I'm showing you what I'll purport to you does that look like the forensic science report, Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States, a Path Forward?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And that was your understanding of what Defense counsel was referring to.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. He quoted this line to you, "The validity of the fundamental assumptions of uniqueness and producibility of firearms related toolmark has not

yet been fully demonstrated". 1 Α. 2 Um-hum. Do you recall that? 3 Q. Α. 4 Yes. 5 Q. Did you notice that in this publication, that's actually in quotation marks? 6 7 Α. I do see that it is in quotes, yes. Okay. So that would give you, the reader, the Ο. 8 impression that this is something that in essence, 9 saying it's coming from some other source. 10 That is what I would assume. 11 Α. 12 Q. Okay. And if you look at this paragraph, it 13 actually reads, the National Academy --14 Α. Academy. 15 Academy. I'm sorry, the National Academy's Q. report, Ballistic Imaging in Italics. 16 Α. Yes. 17 Are you familiar with Ballistic Imaging Report? 18 Q. 19 Α. I've read that. What was the purpose of the ballistic imaging 20 Q. report? 21 22 Α. I believe it was to determine whether or not it 23 would be feasible to create a ballistic imaging 24 database.

Sort of like a CODIS for DNA?

25

Ο.

- A. Or what exist in NIBIN.
- Q. Okay. And so that was the focus of the ballistic imaging report.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. So that truly is what that is referring, the feasibility of creating that.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Ballistic imaging machine, or the process.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. But the Defense attorney also failed to mention the rest of that paragraph, is that it starts out, that while not claiming to be a definitive study on firearms identification, observed that, the National Academy, that the validity of the fundamental assumptions of uniqueness and reproducibility, of firearms related toolmarks has not yet been fully demonstrated, end quote. And then continues, that that study recognized the logic involved in trying to compare firearms related toolmarks by noting that, in quotes again, although they are subject to numerous sources of variability, firearms related toolmarks are not completely random and volatile; one can find similar marks on bullets and cartridge cases from the same gun.
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. But it does go on to say that a

significant amount of research is necessary in order to come up with that error rate.

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Not that it can't be done, or that the NAS is telling you that this is junk science.
 - A. Right.
- Q. Just that, if you want to come up with an error rate, you're going to have to do a lot more research.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. As a matter of fact, I believe that one of the participants who wrote the National Ballistic Imaging report wrote an affidavit specifically for Court purposes saying that that report is not to be used in conjunction with trying to determine the admissibility of firearms related evidence in Court.
- Q. And so it would be an error to try to do that via the NAS report?
 - A. NAS report.
- Q. Okay. And in those other forensic sciences, the NAS report concluded biological evidence, controlled substances, friction ridge analysis, pattern impression, like shoe prints and tire tracks, hair evidence, fiber evidence, document examinations, paint and coating evidence, explosive evidence and fire degrees, forensic

odontology, blood stain pattern analysis; are those all ones that you recall seeing in the NAS report?

A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. And didn't that NAS report identify proficiencies in all of those sciences, in all of the forensic identification disciplines? I mean, even if you didn't know the proficiency.
- A. I don't remember. I paid particular attention to the firearms portion.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I didn't pay as close attention to the other sections.
- Q. But that report addressed different ways all those different practices or areas of expertise could improve.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Defense counsel asked you a few questions about your actual examination of the case in this -- the evidence in this particular case and Mr. Colca's examination. Now, you talked about the techniques that you used, the AFTE technique and the SOP's that you have in your department; did you guys -- did you and Mr. Colca apply that technique properly in this particular case?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. He also had a number of questions about how many characteristics do you have to find before you make an identification or an elimination? And you said there are none, there is no standard.
- A. There is no set standard, no number of markings that we have to find before we can say identification.
 - Q. Do you know -- why is that?
- A. Well, for one, not all marks are created equal. So we have to be mindful that seven markings on one cartridge case or bullet may not be equal to seven markings on another one. You're always looking for fine striate, fine agreement because those fine striate are much less likely to be subclass, and in fact sometimes we know there's no possibility that they could be subclass in nature.
- But if I found seven gross markings, then those would not be equal to seven fine markings -- and I'm just throwing seven out. I would look for much more than seven markings before I said identification.
- Q. But each marking or characteristic is unique, in and of itself and has different value and weight based on your training and experience.
- A. It's not necessarily each marking, it's the groupings of markings, it's the consecutive nature of striations, both -- not that the fact that the

striations are there but that they're of the same depth and the same width, of the same general contour, and that they occur in the same area of land impression or in the same area of the breech face. Similar markings are the same markings that look the same, they have the same appearance that are on the same relative positions of the cartridge case or the bullets.

- Q. Things that a trained examiner can evaluate based on their experience and their eyes.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

- Q. And all these characteristics that we've been talking about as far as the subclass characteristics and the individual characteristics are typically microscopic, right?
 - A. They're always microscopic.
- Q. Okay. So they're not something -- I can't just look at and go, okay, these are the same, it's something that has to be done in a microscopic level.
- A. Correct. You may be able to distinguish a class just by visually inspecting an item but you can't establish subclass or individual characteristics without microscopes.
- Q. Okay. You also testified a little bit about these guns in this situation, and what I gathered from your description, this is a unique firearm. It's not

because of the way it was manufactured or that it's a Lorcin but the condition it was in is unique.

A. Yes.

- Q. Was it a -- what was the quality of the firearm?
- A. The firearm started out not -- not of very high quality, but it was -- like I said, the inside of the barrel was corroded. So while the exterior of the firearm was in okay condition, the interior of the barrel was not in very good condition at all, that was still functional but --
- Q. Okay. Is there a distinction -- is there -- do you draft when you're looking at making toolmark comparisons, does the quality of the firearm come into play at all if you have a known firearm?
- A. It can, in that if it's very rusted, then that rust or that corrosion is actually going to lend more individuality to the markings than because of the markings that I saw on the bullet, they were very gross, heavy striations, which might lead me to believe that they have could been subclass in nature; except that upon examining the bore of the firearm, I realized that it was totally corroded and those markings were not from land and groove impressions, but were in fact from the corroded condition of the bore itself, which made them

```
unique.
 1
 2
                   MR. HANNA: Pass the witness, Your Honor.
                   MR. DOGGETT: No further questions at this
 3
     time. I would like her to stick around.
 4
 5
                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you very
     much, ma'am. You can leave the stand, but please don't
 6
     leave the building other than for lunch.
 7
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Okav.
 8
                   THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 9
10
                   Next witness.
                   MR. HANNA: Judge, I don't have any
11
12
     additional witnesses, but I do want to offer some of
1.3
     those articles that I mentioned to you during my opening
14
     and also the case law in which I referenced during my
15
     opening also.
                   THE COURT: All right.
16
                   MR. HANNA: And I don't expect that you
17
     read them all but they're there to support the record
18
     and the case law is also in there.
19
20
                   THE COURT: All right.
                   MR. HANNA: And this United States versus
21
22
     Otero is the case I've referenced that I think is a good
23
     read to give the Court some guidance on just the thought
     process of another court that faced the very same
24
25
     allegations.
```

```
THE COURT:
                                All right. Thank you.
 1
                                                          State
 2
     rests?
                                Yes, Your Honor, I'm sorry.
                    MR. HANNA:
 3
                    THE COURT: Defense?
 4
 5
                    MR. DOGGETT:
                                  We call Mr. Colca.
 6
                    (Witness sworn)
 7
                                  May I proceed.
                    MR. DOGGETT:
                    THE COURT:
                                You may.
 8
 9
                            JOSEPH COLCA,
10
     having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
12
         Q
               (By Mr. Doggett) State your name for the
     record, please, sir.
13
14
              My name is Joseph Colca.
         Α.
15
              Are you the same Joseph Colca who did an
         Ο.
     analysis -- or did an examination on a firearm that
16
     we've been talking about today here in the courtroom?
17
18
         Α.
               I did, yes.
19
         Ο.
              And were you present in the courtroom while
     Ms. Eudaley testified?
20
         Α.
               I was.
21
22
              And are you -- you are no longer employed by
         Q.
     the Houston Science Forensic Center?
23
         Α.
              No, I'm not.
24
              And when did you leave their employment?
25
         Q.
```

March 23rd of 2014. Α. 1 2 Ο. And what was the reason why you left? I was terminated. 3 Α. Ο. And why were you terminated? 4 5 MR. HANNA: Your Honor, at this time, I'm going to lodge an objection so that I don't waive it. 6 7 understand that this is one of the Motion in Limines that I filed is that impeachment purposes of extraneous 8 conduct. And I expect the Court to go into this and 9 make a determination of whether or not it's admissible. 10 But I want to urge my objection that this is not 11 12 relevant; the reason for his termination do not go to 1.3 his credibility. 14 And so, while I don't expect the Court to 15 make a ruling, I didn't want to waive an objection later 16 on in front of the jury. THE COURT: I understand. Your objection 17 is noted. 18 19 0 (By Mr. Doggett) Why were you terminated? I was terminated for insubordination. 2.0 Α. And who were you insubordinate with? 21 Q. My supervisor. 22 Α. 23 And how were you insubordinate? Ο. Now, I'm going to object that 24 MR. HANNA: he's going into beyond the- the specific instance 25

```
of conduct --
 1
 2
                    MR. DOGGETT: -- It goes to his
     credibility, Judge.
 3
                                You can't rely on specific
                   MR. HANNA:
 4
 5
     instances of conduct in attacking someone's credibility.
                                I'm going to -- I'm going to
 6
                    THE COURT:
     allow the testimony for purposes of this hearing.
 7
               (By Mr. Doggett) First, who was your
 8
 9
     supervisor?
10
         Α.
              My supervisor was Darrell Stein.
              And is that also Ms. Eudaley's supervisor?
11
         Ο.
12
         Α.
              Yes, that is correct.
              Okay. And how were you -- how did they say you
1.3
         0.
     were insubordinate to this person?
14
15
               I refused to sign a document that was a work
         Α.
16
     plan that was assigned to me.
               Is it correct that they thought you were having
17
     some sort of behavioral issues and wanted to change your
18
19
     work duties?
               I don't really know. As far as the reason for
2.0
         Α.
     the insubordination was that I also was not provided the
21
     information that I thought was necessary.
22
23
              Anyway, they tried to change your work duties,
         Ο.
     correct?
24
               I was temporarily removed from handling
25
         Α.
```

firearms in the firearm section along with a second 1 2 employee. When did that occur? 3 Q. May or June of 2013. Α. 4 5 Q. How long had you been a firearms examiner before that? 6 7 Five and a half years. Α. And what is your educational background? 0. 8 I have a Forensic Science Degree, a Bachelor of 9 Α. 10 Science Degree from the University of Central Florida. Central Florida? 11 Ο. 12 Α. Yes. When did you get that degree? 1.3 Ο. 14 I received that degree in 2007. Α. 15 In your education, did they cover all areas of Q. forensic science? 16 For the most part, there were a few disciplines 17 Α. that we were not able to get into that were not involved 18 19 in our program, mainly handwriting analysis and toxicology specifically. 2.0 But you covered everything else. 21 Q. 22 For the most part, yes. Α. 23 Q. DNA. DNA, controlled substances, firearms, 24 Α.

fingerprints, trace analysis, the whole gamut, we were

allowed to select what courses we wanted to.

- Q. Anyway they -- in May or approximately May of 2013, they removed you from -- they stopped letting you handle firearms analysis?
 - A. Yes, myself and another employee.
 - Q. And who was the other employee?
 - A. Kim Downs.

- O. Is he another firearms examiner?
- A. She is another firearms examiner.
- Q. And they -- after they removed you from doing firearms examinations -- you're saying you don't know why that happened?
- 13 A. No, I know why.
 - Q. And why was that?
 - A. We had an argument in our laboratory and an Assistant Chief of Police with the Houston Police Department made the determination that he did not want to keep two people who are angry at each other handling firearms; so he told us to not handle firearms.
 - Q. So it was you and this other criminalist that got into the argument?
 - A. She is a criminalist specialist, the same rank as Donna Eudaley.
 - Q. Y'all had some sort of an argument and the HPD person saw that and decided you guys shouldn't be

- A. To my knowledge, it was reported by Kim Downs and not by some other employee.
- Q. And then when did they come to you and tell you that they were altering your work and they wanted you to do something else?
- A. Within a few days we were instructed to tie up the work that we were performing, to finish any priority cases we were conducting and that we wouldn't be handling firearms for a period of time.
- Q. And whatever work plan they had for you, you refused to sign on that, right?
- A. That was much later in the process, that was about a month after. I was initially assigned two projects which I was attempting to complete, and one of those projects was taken away from me and I was told to stop working on it.

And that project then later appeared in that work plan which was another issue that I had with what was going on.

Q. And according to the report I have, that there were some other problems where you changed some supervisor -- deleted two supervisors' accounts, what does that mean?

the Laboratory Information Management System, without

telling me, without my knowledge. He negated six

24

1 month's worth of my work, and so I did the same thing 2 back to him.

- Q. There was something about changing one of the analyst's names to Queen Bitch?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Who was that?
- A. It was Kim Downs. At the time that that I did that, she was standing two feet from me. There are examiners here who were also present at the time in this courtroom when that happened.

That got thrown in the investigation, no matter what I did, and I couldn't get rid of it. It was a joke. She knew it was a joke; she laughed, I laughed, others laughed, and I typed the name in and hit save.

Later they went back through the Medio System and looked at everything I had did in the four years of using that system and found one instance where I made a joke in the presence of somebody, and used that in an investigation.

Q. Okay. Now when you looked at the gun in this particular case, the Lorcin 380, how long did it take you to do the examination that resulted in your first report where you made the determination that that particular gun had fired some shell casings and two bullets that you examined?

- I do not have a copy of the case record before 1 Α. 2 me, but I know it did not take me very long. 3
 - And what do you mean by not very long? Q. Okay.
 - A day, maybe two. Are you talking about the Α. initial report?
 - Yes, the initial examination. Ο.
 - I could provide more information if I could get Α. that case file.
- How does that compare to the other examinations 9 Q. you have done as far as the length of time? 10
 - MR. HANNA: Do you want to give him the case file?
- 1.3 MR. DOGGETT: No, I don't.
- MR. HANNA: Judge, for the record, I'm 14
- 15 providing Mr. Colca with the case file.
- 16 THE COURT: Thank you.
- Just to be clear, it appears that from the time 17 Α. I received the initial evidence to the initial report, 18 19 it took less than a day.
 - (By Mr. Doggett) Less than one day? 0
- 21 Α. Yes.

5

6

7

8

11

12

2.0

- And did you work on anything else while you 22 Q. 23 were working on this particular case?
 - Meaning did I --Α.
- Did you examine any other firearms during that 25 Q.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A. I wouldn't be able to tell you that without looking at a chain of custody records, you know, during that time period.
- Q. Is it possible you did other examinations during that same time period, but there's no way to know it for sure?
- A. It is possible, but there is a way to know it for sure, it's just I do not have access to it here, no.
- Q. Okay. And you -- when you got this gun, apparently you took it apart, cleaned it, oiled it and put it back together again, right?
- A. Yes, I disassembled, decontaminated, rinsed, dried, oiled and reassembled the firearm.
- Q. All right. And is that a standard operating procedure?
- A. It is when dealing with something that could potentially be biohazardous and hazardous to myself.
 - Q. Okay. And why was this gun a biohazard?
- A. It would have appeared to have some sort of contamination or I would have been told that it was contaminated in some way by the individuals who submitted the firearm.
 - Q. All right. So -- do you believe you had a

```
conversation with the individuals who submitted the
 1
     firearm?
 2
         Α.
               It is possible.
 3
               Is that documented in any way?
         0.
 4
 5
         Α.
               I'm sorry, what?
               Is it documented in that case file in any way
 6
         0.
 7
     whether or not you talked to the officer who submitted
     the evidence to you?
 8
              No, it does not.
 9
         Α.
               Should it have been documented?
         Q.
10
11
               It is not a requirement, no.
         Α.
12
         Q.
              Well, shouldn't it be documented?
               In my opinion, no.
1.3
         Α.
14
                    That's not part of your standard operating
         Q.
15
     procedure?
               It is not.
16
         Α.
               So you could have had a conversation with the
17
     submitting officer or they could have told you all sorts
18
     of things about the case and that wouldn't be
19
     documented?
2.0
                                 I'm going to object, asked and
21
                    MR. HANNA:
     answered, argumentative.
22
                                Sustained.
23
                    THE COURT:
                    MR. DOGGETT: Well, Judge, the reason why
24
     it's important is because there is a problem in the
25
```

```
literature where examiners know what results they're
 1
 2
     trying to get and they sometimes skew the results to
     help the officer to make a case, so what he may have
 3
     been told before he did the examination could be
 4
 5
     important.
 6
                   MR. HANNA:
                                That's great for argument,
 7
     Judge, but that's not -- he's asked the guestion --
                   THE COURT: Well you can ask him the
 8
 9
     question of whether he was told something but that's not
10
     the question I understood you were asking.
11
                   MR. DOGGETT: Let me clarify.
12
                   THE COURT: Yours was a could have
1.3
     question, was it not?
14
                   MR. HANNA:
                                It should have.
                                                 Should you
     have done it?
1.5
                   THE COURT: Or should have but not a did
16
17
     you or were you.
18
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  I'll clarify.
19
                   THE COURT:
                                Maybe I'm wrong.
               (By Mr. Doggett) Do you recollect having a
20
     conversation with the officer who submitted this
21
22
     evidence to you be examined?
23
              No, I do not recollect.
         Α.
              Is it possible you had such a conversation?
24
         Q.
              It is possible that we had a conversation at
25
         Α.
```

the time of the submission, yes. 1 2 Ο. Okay. But you don't remember whether you did or didn't -- did or did not have that conversation? 3 Not for something received September 27th of 4 2010. 5 Okay. And there's no documentation in your 6 0. records about whether you had or did not have a 7 conversation with the officer who submitted the evidence 8 9 to you for examination. Α. There is a record that there was a request made 10 and that the evidence was submitted but that's all I 11 12 have. But there's no documentation as to whether or 1.3 not you had further conversation about the case? 14 1.5 No, there is not. Α. 16 Ο. Okay. And you do not do that as a matter of --THE COURT: May I ask? When you say 17 18 further conversation, do you mean a conversation after the conversation he said he didn't have or didn't 19 20 remember, or are you talking about the conversation he said he didn't remember? 21 What I'm getting at is 22 MR. DOGGETT:

MR. DOGGETT: What I'm getting at is whether or not he had a conversation with the officer about the case -- the facts of the case or anything that -- where they found the gun and the circumstances

23

24

```
of the killings, anything like that, anything
 1
 2
     substantive about the facts of the case, other than just
     the fact that here, here's a gun, we want you to examine
 3
     it. And I'm not talking about, hey, how about those
 4
 5
     Astros; they won a game. I'm not talking about --
                   THE COURT: I understand.
 6
 7
                   MR. DOGGETT: -- superfluous --
                   THE COURT: No, I understand that but I
 8
 9
     thought the question you asked him was did you have a
     conversation with the officer about the case or the gun.
10
11
     Wasn't that the question --
12
                   MR. DOGGETT: Yes.
                   THE COURT: -- originally, and he said no.
1.3
                   MR. DOGGETT: I think he said he didn't
14
15
     know whether he did.
                   THE COURT: He said he didn't remember
16
           And you said could you have had one.
17
18
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  Yes.
19
                   THE COURT: Okay. Now, where are we going
     from there?
2.0
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  Well I think I made the
21
     point. He doesn't remember whether he had the
22
23
     conversation, it's not documented whether he had one or
     not.
24
                   THE COURT: You've made that point twice,
25
```

now three times. Okay. Go right ahead.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) Now, you said you took less than a day, according to what you reviewed in the case file to come to the conclusions you did in this case.
- A. From the time I started my examinations, yes.

 And it appears that the firearm was received and decontaminated on one day and my examination started on the following day.
- Q. Okay. Do you actually note the times in the report?
- A. In the report, no. But there would be an electronic chain of custody that records the times I handled the evidence.
 - Q. But you don't have access to that?
- A. Uh, yeah, I do not have access to that.
- Q. All right. And in this case, you -- if I understand you correctly just now, you said you got the gun, decontaminated it, disassembled it, reassembled it but didn't begin your examination until the next day.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And there's nothing in the report that details the nature of the contamination, correct?
 - A. No, there is not.
- Q. So you don't say in the report whether the gun was covered in blood or whether it was one speck of

blood or what the nature of the contamination was. 1 2 Α. No, just that it was contaminated. But it does say in the report how you 3 Q. decontaminated it, correct? 4 5 Α. Yes. And how did you decontaminate it? 6 Ο. 7 Again that was -- it was followed by our Α. standard operating procedures of using a ten percent 8 bleach solution for ten minutes, so all the parts were 9 10 placed in that solution for a period of ten minutes, 11 they were removed and then they were rinsed with water 12 to dilute the chlorine so that we don't cause any excess corrosion overtime. 1.3 14 So to decontaminate it, you first took it Q. 15 apart? 16 Α. Yes. And then you put it in the bleach solution? 17 Ο. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Ο. And then you rinsed it to get the chlorine off 20 of it to prevent further corrosion. Correct. 21 Α. And then you oiled it and reassembled it, 22 Q. 23 correct? I would have dried it, in between there, I 24 Α.

would have dried it after the rinsing and then oiled and

then reassembled it.

- Q. All right. And you agree with me that that changes the condition of the gun from the way it was when it was brought in, do you not?
- A. Like Ms. Eudaley stated earlier, it changes the condition how the parts fit together, not necessarily the condition of the metal itself.
- Q. But it wasn't oiled when you -- it wasn't freshly oiled when you got it as far as you could tell, was it?
- A. I mean, we don't really make those observations of whether or not a firearm is oiled.
- Q. Could that affect the way the toolmarks are made if it's oiled or not oiled, the condition of the qun is in when it's fired?
- A. If it's -- if it's to the point where the firearm is stuck together, it's that corroded from lack of oiling, then yes, there may be some issues. But for the most part, for the general firearm that comes into the lab on a daily basis, whether they're heavily oiled or a little oily, it does not make a difference.
- Q. All right. When you -- when you took the gun apart to clean it, you put it back together then -- well, first of all, why did you -- can you tell from your report, four years after the fact or three and a

1.3

half years after the fact, can you tell why you thought it was necessary to take the whole gun apart and put the whole gun in a bleach solution as opposed to just wiping whatever it was off the gun?

- A. I cannot tell the condition of the firearm and why I made that determination, but I know that I made that determination because it the firearm did pose a hazard to myself and anyone else who handled that firearm.
- Q. And when you took it apart to put it in the bleach solution, how did you handle it? With your bare hands?
- A. No. I am one of the few examiners who would never handle a firearm without gloves on.
- Q. So you had gloves on when you took it apart to decontaminate it, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Why don't you just use the gloves the whole time and skip the decontamination?
- A. During the firing process, any pathogens that could be potentially located in that blood can be aerosolized in the firing process, all that heat, all that pressure could spread those pathogens throughout the test-firing room exposing myself and anyone else in that room to those pathogens.

- examination of the gun took excluding the
- 1.5 decontamination and disassembly and reassembly process?
 - Do you want hours, minutes? Α.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Whatever you can tell from looking at the Ο. documents.
 - I examined the firearm on September 28th of 2010, and that was -- my completed examination took place during that day.
 - So you can't tell how long it took the actual Ο. examination from the documents?
- It took place on that day, within the context Α. of that day. Any other examinations that occurred

outside of 9-28 of 2010 would have been noted as taking place outside of that date.

- Q. Well I'm just trying to clarify, you said earlier that the whole process took less than a day. And I'm trying to differentiate between the decontamination process and the actual test-firing examination process, do you have any recollection or can you do the records reflect refresh your memory in any way as to how long the actual examination process took?
- A. As I stated that the -- the decontamination process took place on September 27th, 2010, and my examination of the firearm, after it was reassembled started on September 28th, 2010 and was completed on September 28th, 2010.
 - Q. Well, what do you work, an eight-hour day?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. Okay. You can't tell whether it took one hour versus eight hours?
 - A. No, I cannot.
- Q. Do you have -- based on what you know about from reviewing the report, did that refresh your memory as to this gun and the particular items that you looked at?
 - A. No, I mean I have the information in front of

me.

1.3

- Q. Well you looked at shell casings and you looked at a couple of bullets and you test-fired the gun and you took your three test-fires and you -- I assumed you compared your three test-fires to the casings and to the bullets, right?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Did you look at every -- if you could tell us, did you use every test-fire in the process or did you just use one test-fire?
- A. The way that I conduct my examination is like Donna Eudaley, I look at my test-fires first, the three individual test-fires, compare them to each other to determine if the consistency between those test-fires to determine where are they marking the same and where is my best consistent area of reproducible marks.
 - Q. Right.
- A. I then will take that area from one of those samples and compare those to any evidence or unknown samples that are submitted to determine if I can -- if I can tell that they were -- they came from the same origin, they were fired in the same gun.
- Q. Now, do you remember or can you refresh your memory by looking at the report and tell us how many bullets you looked at to compare to the test-firing

bullets? 1 There were three bullets submitted in this 2 particular case. 3 How many casings? 0. 4 5 Α. Nine. Nine? 6 Ο. 7 Α. Yes. And your work was -- after you wrote your 8 0. 9 report, was your work checked by Ms. Eudaley? 10 Α. Yes, I went through both a verification process 11 and through the administrative and technical review 12 process. Do you remember that -- you actually remember 1.3 14 that happening or were you present when that happened? 15 I was -- I was present for part of the Α. verification process, and then I would have either 16 physically handed her the folder when my work was 17 completed or left it on her chair or her desk for 18 19 review. 2.0 Ο. What do you remember about being physically present during the verification process? 21 22 Α. For the initial request to examine the one

item, that would have been done -- with me under the

conclusion, generated the paperwork and then asked for

scope, I would have made my determination, my

23

24

an available firearms examiner to verify that work so that we could release the result. Whoever was available at the time would have volunteered and looked under the exhibit -- under my microscope.

- Q. And so would you have already placed the item in the microscope for viewing and then you would have found somebody else and said, come over here and take a look at this, and can you verify my conclusions?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Q. Do you tell them before they look what your conclusion is?
 - A. I try not to, no.
 - Q. Do you sometimes tell them?
- A. Sometimes it's -- we work very closely together in cubicles that are right next to each other, we have paperwork that's spread out. So, preventing an examiner from seeing that paperwork or overhearing a discussion I'm having with another examiner is very hard to do in the limited space that we have. But I'm not like, hey, come check out this I.D., no, I'm not doing that.
- Q. I understand. Hey, come here, look, it's a match.
- A. No.
- Q. You're saying you don't do that.
- 25 A. I'm saying I do not do that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And do you remember how long Ms. Eudaley took to do the verification?
 - Α. I do not.
- Do you know how she -- did she look at each and Ο. every item or did she just check, spot check one item?
- She would be required to verify all of my Α. identification conclusions.
- And do they do that by independently themselves looking at each and every item under the microscope or how is that done?
- She would look at the comparison notes that I Α. have which lists what item I used on the left side of the scope, what item I used on the right side of my scope and what area I was looking at. She would then set up those same items under the same condition, the left side and right side or they would already be set up And she would independently look at, take as for her. much time as she or another firearm examiner needs before coming to a conclusion. If her conclusion matches my conclusion, we come to the same conclusion, we're then able to release those results, either preliminary through email or some other line of communication if it's a priority or through our final report.
 - All right. Now is it correct that there is no Q.

- rate of error.
- Q. So there is no -- there is no published rate of error for firearms examiners as to how often they get it right or get it wrong.
- A. Or the -- outside of the studies already discussed --
 - Q. Right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- A. -- in this? Then none that I'm aware of.
- Q. And those are proficiency studies which are not designed to detect a rate of error, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And do you know that there is a big debate in the scientific community about whether or not uniqueness is a valid assumption?
- A. There are discussions on how the forensic sciences that rely on uniqueness can improve themselves and to make their scientists more reliable.
- Q. There are scientists who do not agree with -- are you aware that there are scientists who do not agree that uniqueness is a fact?
- A. It's -- that there are different opinions.
 - Q. Right.

- Q. Well did you read the NAS report like Ms. Eudaley?
 - A. Yes, I did.

1.3

- Q. And there are scientists in there that say that uniqueness has not been proven correctly, correct?
- A. What they have suggested is again, more research to be performed, just like in any science so that our theory can stand on firmer ground.
- Q. But there's no -- that science -- that research, additional research has not been completed yet, has it?
- A. Completed, no. But whether it's been ongoing and published, at least to some extent, I'm not aware of it.
 - O. You're not aware of that.
- A. No, I've been out of firearms examinations for about a little over a year now.
 - Q. But before you left, nothing has been published on that giving you a definitive conclusion, right?
 - A. We have been gaining more publications on reproducibility of marks, on consecutively manufactured tests, those things have been published since the NAS report was released.

- Q. Can you cite any of those publications?
- 2 Α. No. I do know that one, there was a three-barrel test performed by the -- I can't remember 3 the county -- but it was basically out of Miami, 4 5 Florida. FIE was the manufacturer, they submitted a three-barrel test to examiners who -- volunteered 6 7 examiners from other laboratories, those three consecutively manufactured tests, and I did partake in 8 that testing program and released my results back to the 9

researchers who were going to publish a paper on that.

- Q. Do you know if it's been published?
- 12 A. I do not.

1

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. Have you ever published anything?
- A. Yes, I have.
 - Q. What have you published?
 - A. I'm published as a co-author in a research project for arson investigation and I'm also published in the AFTE journal for research testing different substances to prevent hallow point expansion when firing bullets into a water tank.
 - Q. Is it correct that there is no set standard as to what it takes to say whether or not you have determined a match or not?
- A. No, there is no set standard, as Ms. Eudaley stated. It is subjective; it is going to vary slightly

```
from examiner to examiner. We all have our own training
 1
 2
     and experience as background that help us determine when
     we reach the -- our on criteria for identification.
 3
                   MR. DOGGETT: Pass the witness.
 4
                   THE COURT: Let's break for lunch at this
 5
           We'll resume at 1:30.
 6
     time.
 7
                   (Luncheon recess)
                   THE COURT:
                               Thank you, folks, please be
 8
 9
     seated.
             Let's get our witness back up here.
                   MR. HANNA:
                               Judge, the State has no
10
11
     questions for Mr. Colca.
12
                   THE COURT: Oh, okay. All right. Very
     well, in that case, you're fine, sir.
13
14
                   MR. DOGGETT: We don't mind letting him
     stand down from the stand. I don't want to hold him
15
     today. But I would like him, without re-subpoenaing
16
     him, I would like him to be on call to return to testify
17
     here in the trial of the merits. So, if he will just
18
19
     give the telephone number or something to the clerk.
20
                   THE COURT:
                               Yes, sir. Do you understand
     what's being asked? They don't -- rather than
21
     subpoenaing you again and having somebody come bother
22
     you to hand it to you, they have asked that I simply
23
     swear you to return on a telephone call to be a witness
24
     at trial.
25
```

```
THE WITNESS:
                                 I understand that.
 1
 2
                   THE COURT: Okay. So, you have been
     sworn, you were sworn today, and I'm telling you under
 3
     that oath that I'm simply ordering you to come back.
 4
 5
     How much time -- how much time does it take from the
     time you get a call to get down here without breaking
 6
 7
     all land speed records?
                   THE WITNESS: Probably two and a half
 8
     hours.
 9
10
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay. We'll give you two and
11
     a half hours notice. Mr. Doggett, can you do that?
12
                   MR. DOGGETT: We'll even try to beat that
     if we can and give him even more notice than that.
1.3
14
                   THE COURT: Okay. Very well. In that
     case, you're free to go if you wish or you may stay as
15
16
     you wish. Okay?
17
                   MR. DOGGETT: Do we have a way to contact
     him? I don't think I do.
18
19
                   THE COURT: Yes.
                                      If you would, give your
20
     cell number to my bailiff, and that way that gives us a
     way to call you.
21
22
                   THE WITNESS:
                                  Okay.
23
                   THE COURT: Next witness.
                   MR. DOGGETT: We call Irma Rios.
24
                    (Witness sworn.)
25
```

All right. You may proceed 1 THE COURT: 2 when you're ready. 3 IRMA RIOS, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 4 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 Q (By Mr. Doggett) State your name for the 7 record, please, ma'am. Irma Rios. Α. 8 And what is your job title? 9 Q. Α. I'm the director for the Forensic Analysis 10 Division for the Houston Forensic Science Center. 11 12 Ο. And is that -- does your directorship include the firearms section of the Forensic Analysis Section? 1.3 14 Yes, it does. Α. Okay. And the reason I called you to testify 15 Q. today was to talk about the issue of trying to get 16 access to the lab to allow a Defense expert to examine 17 the evidence. 18 19 MR. HANNA: I'm going to object, this is 20 completely outside the scope of a Daubert hearing. MR. DOGGETT: Judge, I just wanted to get 21 a brief statement on the record about why it happened. 22 23 I realize it's not directly on point to the Daubert issue. But my -- it effects it because my expert was 24 not able to look at the evidence before he's going to 25

```
testify today, so I just wanted to get something in the
 1
 2
     record about it.
                   MR. HANNA: We can -- Judge, that's
 3
     still -- unless she gets a subpoena *support, you don't
 4
 5
     bring people in here because you have a question about
     some other issues. It doesn't have anything to do with
 6
     the admissibility of the evidence in this case.
 7
                   THE COURT: Well he's trying to make his
 8
 9
     record, I'm going to let him make his record.
                                                     First of
     all, I think the inconvenience is not enough, it's
10
     over-shadowed by the importance of him being able to
11
12
     make a record. So, I'd like you to keep it pretty
     limited so --
1.3
14
                                 It will be really short.
                   MR. DOGGETT:
15
                   THE COURT: -- because we're really here
16
     for the Daubert part.
                                 That means Stephen's going
17
                   MR. FELCMAN:
18
     to be a witness, if we're going to have to do that
19
     because we're going to have to reply to the record he's
     about to do, and then maybe Mark would have to be a
20
     witness because --
21
22
                   THE COURT:
                               Well --
23
                   MR. FELCMAN: So I mean, that goes way
     outside what the purpose of this is.
24
                   THE COURT: -- I can wait until the
25
```

```
Daubert is over and then we'll have this lady wait and
 1
 2
     then we'll have her do that at that time separate and
 3
     apart.
                   MR. DOGGETT: I was trying to accommodate
 4
 5
     her.
                   THE COURT: All he's trying to do is like
 6
 7
     interjecting a witness out of line. But I mean, if it's
     going to be a problem that's what I'll do. One way or
 8
     the other it's going to occur, so it makes sense to do
 9
10
     it right now and get it over with and go on with what
     we're here for.
11
12
                   MR. HANNA:
                                Okay.
                                Yes, sir, go ahead.
13
                   THE COURT:
              (By Mr. Doggett) How long have you been a
14
15
     director of the Forensic Analysis Section of the HFSC?
              Houston Forensic Science Center, since -- just
16
         Α.
     the last couple of months. I used to be -- well, I was
17
     hired to be the crime lab director for the Houston
18
19
     Police Department until we transitioned over to the
     Houston Forensic Science Center.
2.0
              I see. And how long were you the directer of
21
         0.
22
     the crime lab?
23
              I was employed in October, 2003.
         Α.
              So you're one of the carryovers from HPD to the
24
     Houston Forensic Science Center, correct?
25
```

- A. Yes, I did transition over.
- Q. Okay. Now, recently, last week sometime, did you receive a copy of an order from Judge Shoemake directing that the Forensic Science Center give access to the lab to the firearms section of the lab in order for a John Nixon to come and examine the firearms evidence in this case and use your lab equipment to look at the items in question?
 - A. Yes, we did -- I did receive an order, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And it is the position of your lab that you would not allow Mr. Nixon access to the lab.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. Okay. And why was that?
- A. Based on policy and procedures that we have on our Quality Assurance Manual which is what we use for accreditation purposes.
- Q. Let me make sure I understood. Policies and procedures --
 - A. In our Quality Assurance Manual as part of our accreditation process.
 - Q. And can you tell us specifically where in the Quality Assurance Manual it says no one else can come into the lab.
- A. It is on Page 69 of 71 on our manual. It's laboratory equipment will not be used by any independent

analyst or outside expert.

- Q. All right. And you're relying on that position that that might jeopardize your accreditation if you violated that part of your policy manual?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Even with the court order directing you to do it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And did you communicate that information to the Fort Bend County District Attorney's Office?
- A. I did communicate that there was a problem with entering our facility to use our equipment, yes.
- Q. Did you have any -- prior to last week when this issue came up about Mr. Nixon getting access to the lab -- had you had any communications with the Fort Bend County District Attorney's Office about this possibility about somebody coming down from the Defense side, coming to look at the evidence at the lab?
- A. Personally, I did not.
- Q. Are you aware of anybody else in the -- at the center having those conversations?
 - A. I am not aware of any.
- Q. Okay. Would there have had -- would there have been a problem if you had been directed to ship this evidence to the independent expert for his analysis in

be turned over to the police department to release

Nothing further, Your Honor.

All right. Can this lady go

evidence. 1 2 0. Release it to who? Α. To the District Attorney's Office. 3 As far as you know, was that done? 0. 4 Α. I don't know for a fact what exactly what was 5 I have no personal knowledge of exactly what 6 happened with it. 7 To your knowledge, can you recollect the -- do 8 you have any knowledge of anyone from the District 9 Attorney's Office contacting the lab and asking if it 10 would be appropriate or okay to ship the evidence to an 11 12 independent examiner? I don't have a specific recollection of that 1.3 conversation. I know we discussed about having another 14 15 person look at evidence, like I said, we do release We did have that conversation with the 16 evidence. examiner. 17 18 Ο. How long ago was that? 19 Α. It would have been last week. Oh, last week. Okay. But nothing before that? 20 Q. Nothing before that. 21 Α. All right. 22 Q. 23 MR. DOGGETT: I pass.

MR. HANNA:

THE COURT:

24

```
about her business?
 1
 2
                   MR. DOGGETT: Yes, she can be released.
                                Thank you, ma'am. You are
 3
                   THE COURT:
     excused and you can go do what -- whatever you want to
 4
     do. You can stay if you wish, you can leave if you
 5
     wish.
 6
 7
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Okay. Thank you.
                   THE COURT: Now for purposes of the
 8
 9
     record, I'd like to have that excluded from the record
10
     of the Daubert hearing, as I heard nothing in it that
11
     had anything to do with Daubert. So, do we have that
12
     agreement?
                                  That's fine. I just wanted
                   MR. DOGGETT:
13
     to get in the record about the denial of access by the
14
15
     lab.
16
                   THE COURT:
                                I understand and that's why I
     let you do that. But I don't want it -- if for some
17
18
     reason the Daubert hearing is packaged to go up at a
19
     later date, then I don't want that to be part of it
20
     because they'll all be scratching their heads wondering
     what we're doing, so.
21
22
                   MR. DOGGETT: That's fine as long as it's
23
     part of the record.
                                It may be germane --
24
                   THE COURT:
                   MR. FELCMAN: We're going to have to
25
```

```
expand on it and ask Mr. Doggett why he waited till the
 1
 2
     last minute. We can do that later.
                   MR. DOGGETT: I can expand on that, I have
 3
     a folder ready to go.
 4
 5
                   MR. FELCMAN:
                                  I'm not going to ask that it
     be done now, I'm here for Daubert.
 6
 7
                    THE COURT: Let's finish with the Daubert
     hearing --
 8
                   MS. SCARDINO: -- do it now.
 9
                   MR. DOGGETT: Okay. We call William
10
     Tobin.
11
12
                    THE COURT: Okay.
                    (Witness sworn.)
13
14
                           WILLIAM TOBIN,
     having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
15
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
16
         Q
17
               (By Mr. Doggett) State your name for the
18
     record, please, sir.
              I'm William Tobin, T-O-B-I-N.
19
         Α.
              All right. I'm going to hand you --
20
         Q.
                   MR. DOGGETT: May I approach, Your Honor?
21
22
                    THE COURT:
                                You may.
23
               (By Mr. Doggett) I'm going to hand you what has
     been marked as Defendant's Exhibit No. 1 and ask you to
24
     identify that, please.
25
```

```
Α.
              This is a copy of my most recent curriculum
 1
     vitae, C.V.
 2
              All right.
 3
         Q.
                   MR. DOGGETT: Your Honor, I move to admit
 4
 5
     Defense Exhibit Number One.
                    MR. HANNA: Can I look at it first?
 6
 7
                   MR. DOGGETT: Well you had one, I saw it.
                                I want to make sure it's the
                   MR. HANNA:
 8
 9
     same.
10
                   MR. DOGGETT: You want to make sure it's
     the same?
11
12
                   MR. HANNA:
                                I do.
1.3
                                  Yes, you can look at it.
                   MR. DOGGETT:
14
                                I have no objection, Your
                   MR. HANNA:
1.5
     Honor.
                    THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit 1 is
16
     admitted.
17
               (By Mr. Doggett) What is your current
18
19
     occupation, Mr. Tobin?
               I'm a forensic metallurgical and material
2.0
     science consultant in -- for criminal, civil and
21
22
     non-litigious matters.
              All right. And tell us a little bit -- I don't
23
         0.
24
     want to go through everything that's in your C.V., but
     tell us a little bit about your background.
25
```

A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in metallurgy, which many institutions now change it to material science, from Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

I continued my formal education in graduate school at Ohio State University, at George Washington University and the University of Virginia. I acquired practical experience from my employments with Chase Brass and Copper Company as a plant metallurgist, at Monarch Aluminum, and in nuclear research with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Battelle, B-A-T-T-E-L-L-E, Memorial Institute.

I then spent twenty-seven years as a special agent in the FBI. I retired as a supervisor as special agent in 1998.

I was head of the Metallurgy -- Forensic Metallurgy Operation. I acquired -- sorry, I visited numerous metal manufacturing and processing plants throughout the United States and in Taiwan.

And I've been a guest lecturer for most, if not all, of the professional metallurgical societies in the United States and in Canada, and I have authored numerous publications in the field of forensic metallurgy and material science.

Q. And for dummies like me, tell us what the

relationship is between metallurgy and firearms toolmark identification.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- A. Metallurgy is the most seminal science -- true scientific discipline related to the tribological issues, T-R-I-B-O-L-O-G-I-C-A-L, which derives from tribology which is the study of friction, lubrication and wear. That's the most seminal aspect for the current case at bar. But metallurgy is the most relevant discipline, all the way from extraction of the oar in the ground, even through refining processes through fabrication and forming and finishing processes and even in ultimate consumer use.
- Q. Your experience as a plant metallurgist, could you tell us a little bit more about that, what your duties were and what that entailed?
- A. I was responsible for production continuity primarily but which generally -- the harder production continuity is generally the tool and dye -- the tool, as in dye, is used in the forming and shaping operations. That's pretty much the heart -- or the nerve center of the operation.
 - Q. And what sort of plant was that?
- A. It was Chase, Brass and Copper was -- our products primarily were wire and tubing. And then Monarch Aluminum Company was a fabricator of aluminum

products; products, primarily kitchenware, pots and pans for example.

- Q. Did you get your degree after you completed your service in the Marine Corps or while you were in the Marine Corps?
- A. My undergraduate degree was prior to my -- before I went in the Marine Corps.
 - Q. Okay. And how long were you in the Marine's?
 - A. Three years.

1.3

2.0

2.2.

- Q. You served in Vietnam?
- A. Yes, two years.
- Q. And then -- when you came back from that, was that when you started the job as a -- working in the -- as a plant metallurgist?
- A. No. Actually, I went back to graduate school at Ohio State University and went back to Battelle Memorial Institute as a research metallurgist there. So and it was some period of it was about six months after that, when the FBI had indicated that they had accepted my application, which I never expected to, the ratio at the time was three hundred to one. So I was trying to be realistic and went back to graduate school.
- Q. All right. So in your work at the FBI, you said you worked in metallurgy; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, forensic metallurgy.

Q. And what were your -- in general terms, what did that involve?

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

A. In the simplest terms, it was evaluating the interactions of solids and fluids; fluids being gases and liquids in all manners of activities and events, primarily the traumatic type events involving high strung rate behavior impacts, violence, shootings, bombings, plane crashes, train derailments, mine disasters.

Toward the end, the last nine years, I believe it was, I was responsible for not only the technical aspects of the operation but also the administrative aspects of budgeting the equipment, the purchases, personnel performance, appraisals and other activities.

- Q. All right. And you were in charge of the FBI's Metallurgy Lab; is that a fair way of saying it?
- A. I declined in 1986. When my predecessor retired, I was offered, on two different occasions the title of Chief Forensic Metallurgist. But I really wanted to stay scientific and technical and I really loaved administrative work, so I declined the offer. But as it turns out, it wasn't a smart move, it was like a fifteen thousand dollar pay scale improvement. But I ended up having to do all of the duties, hence the term,

```
de facto chief forensic metallurgist, but didn't
 1
 2
     actually get compensated for it, so --
                    THE COURT: Was that a no?
 3
                                  That was a no.
                    MR. FELCMAN:
 4
 5
                    THE COURT: Was that a no? I'm not sure.
                                  I'm not real -- I don't
 6
                    THE WITNESS:
     remember the question.
 7
                                The question was, were you --
                    THE COURT:
 8
                                  Were you the chief
 9
                   MR. FELCMAN:
10
     metallurgist.
11
                    THE COURT: In charge of the labs.
12
     that -- wasn't that it?
                                  It's a no.
1.3
                    MR. FELCMAN:
14
                    THE COURT: And I'm not sure if I know the
15
     answer to that from what you said, so is it a yes or a
     no?
16
                                  Well the answer, for the
17
                    THE WITNESS:
18
     last -- for the last nine years, yes, the answer was
19
     yes.
2.0
                    THE COURT: Okay. Good. Thank you.
                    THE WITNESS:
21
                                  Sorry.
               (By Mr. Doggett) All right. Did you do any
22
         Q
23
     toolmark examinations while you were working as a
     metallurgist with the FBI?
24
              Yes, for twenty-four years.
25
         Α.
```

- Q. And would that include firearms toolmark examinations?
- A. The only time I generally got involved in toolmarks or relating to firearms was when examiners in the firearms unit firearms toolmarks unit might encounter difficulties and were looking to explain why they were seeing what they didn't expect to see or why they weren't seeing what they expected to see. So, the only time I really got involved in those is when they came down to consult with me for special issues.
- Q. All right. And how often would that occur where you got involved in consulting on firearms issues like that?
- A. Not often, I would say maybe several times a year, probably, it's just a guess.
- Q. But you worked with the firearms toolmark examiners while you were with the FBI?
 - A. Worked with them?
 - Q. Yeah.
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

2.2

- Q. Were you their supervisor or --
- A. Oh, no, no, we were in separate units but we collaborated periodically.
- Q. Okay. Whenever they had an issue like you were describing that you might be consulted on.

A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. All right.
- A. Let me amend that, if you don't mind. There would be cases where the military, for example, like the USSI or some other case where they would actually be seek our input that did turn out to end up being toolmarks related issues on if you want to call eight—inch guns or sixteen—inch guns, firearms, but in armament issues and firearms.
- Q. Okay. And you listed your professional and scientific organizations that you are a member of in your -- in Defense Exhibit Number One. But can you give us like the top -- the top three that would be pertinent to this -- what we're talking about today?
- A. Oh, that's difficult. I would say maybe the Society for Experimental Mechanics, the National Association of Corrosion Engineers, the American Society for Testing and Materials, the American Society for Metals, International. I need to refresh my recollection.
- Q. That's enough. Can you -- can you give me some of the publications, hone in on some of the publications that you made that relate to firearms toolmark analysis?
- A. The very first publication that I co-authored was relating to toolmarks, and then the last two are the

most relevant publications I would indicate and that 1 2 would be Number's 18 and 19 on my C.V. All right. 3 Ο. MR. DOGGETT: May I approach again? 4 THE COURT: You may. 5 (By Mr. Doggett) I'm going to hand you what's 6 0 been marked as Defendant's Exhibit 2, is this one of the 7 publications that you have written that relates directly 8 to the issue of firearms toolmark analysis? 9 10 Α. Yes. And that was published in when, 2012? 11 12 Α. 2012 or 2013. We submitted it in 2012, but I don't know if it made the 2013 -- the 12 issues or 13. 1.3 14 And where was it published? Q. 15 That was published in Law Probability and Risk. Α. All right. Is that a peer-review journal? 16 Ο. Yes. 17 Α. I'm going to show you Defense Exhibit 3, ask 18 Ο. you if you can identify that? 19 2.0 Α. This is a copy of my most recent paper captioned Hypothesis Testing of the Critical Underlying 21 2.2 Premise of Discernable Uniqueness in Firearms Toolmarks Forensic Practice. 23

And where was that published?

That was published in Jurimetrics Journal,

24

25

Q.

Α.

properly cited as 53 Jurimetrics, Journal 121 dash 142, parenthesis, 2013.

- Q. All right. And are both -- and that's also a peer-review journal?
 - A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. All right. Tell me about some of the forensic science projects that you worked on?
 - A. As far as research goes?
- Q. Well, let's talk about bullet lead analysis.

 Do you know anything about bullet lead analysis?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And what was that?
- A. That was my second major research into forensic practices that did not appear, initially, to have any scientific foundation to it. And that was a forensic practice wherein it questioned and known thread materials or bullets couldn't be compared by the conventional, quote, ballistics examinations.

So the second choice -- the second examination of choice for forensic comparison was, it was thought that comparing compositions in parts, per million would provide a chemical, quote, fingerprint of the item. And that because of the precision of the analytical instrumentation, that that would be a prima facia indicator or dispositive of source. In other

words, by analyzing and comparing compositions, the elements in the bullets, that if they were found to be statistically similar, quote, unquote, they would be then inferred to be or the opinion would be proffered that therefore, they must have originated from the same source.

So it was a second level choice examination for bullets that couldn't be forensically compared ballistically.

- Q. And was this a forensic method where they were to cut to the chase, this is where a police officer or whoever was testifying about this method would say, I can testify based on this lead bullet analysis that this bullet came from the same box, the bullets that we found in the defendant's apartment or something of that fashion.
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. And that was -- that was a forensic method that was accepted by courts for a long time, wasn't it?
 - A. Almost four decades, yes.
 - Q. All right. And --
 - A. Three and a half to be more specific.
 - Q. And it was used by the FBI, wasn't it?
- A. Yes, they were the primary proponent of the evidence.

- Q. All right. And is it used any longer by the FBI?
 - A. No.

1.3

1.5

2.2

- Q. Why not?
- A. On September the 1st, 2005, they -- a press release indicated that they were discontinuing the operation because -- and as close as I can recall the exact phrasing, quote, neither scientists nor manufacturers can determine the probative value of a claimed match, end quote.
- Q. And did you have anything to do with the FBI abandoning that forensic method as a tool of law enforcement?
 - A. I did, yes.
 - Q. And what was your role in that?
- A. I was asked by a doctor, a PHD, after -immediately after I retired to research the process to
 see if it had any scientific foundations.

Initially, I tried to decline that but -for a couple of reasons, but eventually I undertook and
commissioned the first research team. And we looked
into the underlying premises that are biological
necessity required to be valid for the practice to have
probative value and be of value. And we were quite
stunned at what we found. So, I guess you could -- I've

been called the architecture of the pioneer of that
particular research project. That was our first
research.

The second related to probative value of availability in the commercial market, in other words, distribution availability, what's the probative value of a claimed match as indicia of guilt or innocence used in that regard. That was the second major research project, and we published our results in both of those research projects.

- Q. As a result of that, that forty-year forensic tool that was used to convict people and put them in prison was abandoned.
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Did you also do some forensic work in the area of arson and firearm investigation?
- A. Yes, I did.

1.3

2.0

2.2

- Q. And you're not an arson and fire investigator, are you?
 - A. No. I had examined investigated hundreds of them but I wasn't a, quote, certified fire investigator, no.
 - Q. But you were asked to consult as a metallurgist to review some of the science that was being used in arson cases, correct?

A. Yes.

1.3

2.2

- Q. And what was the result of that work that you did?
- A. My research eventually concluded -- confirmed that a practice that had been admitted for several decades, certain indicia of whether an accelerate or a long slow smoldering fire, such as from a smoldering cigarette could have caused the fire. It turned out to be junk science and it was eventually abandoned. And my research now is part of the handouts by the National Firearm Administration, I believe is the name of the organization.
- Q. All right. Now, I want to jump to kind of a side issue. There was some testimony today that -
 THE COURT: Hold it just a minute, I'm sorry, I apologize.

MR. DOGGETT: That's all right.

(Discussion off the record.)

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) Anyway, you talked about the journals you published ended up being peer-reviewed, and I assume that involved something similar to what Ms. Eudaley testified about things being submitted in advance and reviewed. Now, you know who AFTE is, right? You know what AFTE is, right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And does -- is AFTE a peer-reviewed journal in the same sense as the journals that you published in?
 - A. No.

1.3

2.2.

- Q. Why is it not, why is it different?
- A. In the true scientific community, we use what's called refereeing which is a more rigorous peer-review. Refereeing, for example, when I submit the manuscripts to the editor, my name is redacted. It's submitted to three anonymous scientists in the mainstream or true scientific community. They critique the manuscript, they submit their critique back to the editor, their name is then redacted from that critique and that critique is sent to me as the author. And then it's up to me to accept or reject the suggestions in the critique. That is the best blind peer-reviewing -- and we call that refereeing. Peer-reviewing is riffed -- as generally used is riffed with potential biases and is not the most rigorous review of submitted manuscripts.
- Q. So the blind part of that is what we consider to be pretty important, the fact that they don't know who you are and you don't know who they are.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Does AFTE do it the same way, is theirs done by a blind peer-review or do you know?
 - A. AFTE is a very insular community. And to my

knowledge, the papers are not submitted outside the community of firearms examiners generally to be refereed. So I can't -- I'm not an AFTE member so I can't personally speak to -- but I'm not aware that they use the refereeing process as it is used in the scientific arena.

- Q. What is an index journal, what does that term mean?
- A. An index journal is part of the web of knowledge. It's an ISI function. And ISI is the Institute for Scientific Information, which is a proxy for the scientific importance or contribution to the scientific community as a particular journal and they're and authors as well, by the way they're given what are known as impact factors.

So in other words, the scientific community can gauge the significance or the importance of particular journals or media to their particular professional domain.

- Q. Now are the two journals that you mentioned that you published in, are they index journals?
 - A. Yes, I believe they both are.
- Q. All right. What about the AFTE publication or whatever it's called, is it an index journal?
 - A. No.

1.3

2.0

```
Have you testified before on firearms
 1
         Q.
 2
     ballistics issues as an expert?
         Α.
              Yes.
 3
              How many times?
         0.
 4
 5
         Α.
               In -- oh, the firearms would be thirteen times,
     I believe was the last count I had on firearms toolmarks
 6
 7
     issues.
              All right. And what states -- just, is
         Ο.
 8
 9
     multiple states?
10
         Α.
              Multiple states, D.C., Florida, Texas -- and I
     believe Texas is there, too. I've testified in Texas --
11
12
     ten times in Texas but I'm not -- I don't remember how
1.3
     many firearms issues in Texas.
14
              All right. Now you've had the opportunity to
15
     be present in the courtroom and hear Ms. Eudaley's
     testimony and Mr. Colca's testimony and Ms. Rios,
16
     correct?
17
18
         Α.
              Yes.
19
         Q.
              Okay.
2.0
                    MR. DOGGETT: Is the slide deal working on
21
     the Power Point?
22
                    MR. PHILLIPS: This one looks like
23
     pictures.
                 There we go.
24
               (By Mr. Doggett) It is the -- no, that's not
     it.
25
```

```
And it should say trial final, I believe.
 1
         Α.
 2
     might need to expand the first column so you can see the
     remainder of the file names.
 3
                   MR. PHILLIPS: Oh, okay.
 4
                   THE WITNESS: I prefer the PPTX, if you
 5
 6
     can.
 7
                   MR. PHILLIPS: Which one?
                                  The one that has the file
                   THE WITNESS:
 8
 9
     extension, PPTX, assuming this computer can handle --
                   MR. PHILLIPS: Well, this one doesn't show
10
     what the --
11
12
                   THE WITNESS:
                                  Oh, it doesn't show the file
                 Then go ahead and use the PDF version so the
1.3
     extension.
14
     text is formatting the remaining -- there you go. It
15
     will be the second file, the trial final and it shows
16
     PDF file.
                There you go.
               (By Mr. Doggett) There you go. That's your
17
18
     slide show you prepared for us?
              It is, but actually the more I think about it,
19
20
     you want it for the full screen. That doesn't give
     me -- you may have to go back and use the PPTX version.
21
22
                                  Well, can everybody that
                   MR. DOGGETT:
23
     needs to see it, see it like it is or do we need to go
24
     to full screen?
25
                   THE COURT:
                                I can see it.
```

MR. DOGGETT: Okay. You can skip over that one.

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) Okay. When a firearms examiner is looking at something, trying to determine whether or not a particular gun fired a projectile or fired a casing, a bullet casing, this is what they look at, right?
 - A. Yes, striations and impressions generally.
- Q. And striations are what? The little lines that you see on the -- on the picture, and then the impression would be like a firing pin mark, is that a good, quick summary?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. Okay. Ms. Eudaley already told the Judge what class characteristics are. Was she right in that about the way she defined it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then subclass is something you might see on a bullet or a casing that would be what? Why do you call it subclass?
- A. The overview is, the class characteristics are designed into the item, subclass are fortuitously transferred to the item typically from manufacturing. In other words, it's -- they're not designed into the item but they just, coincidentally because of the

fabrication process are transferred to the work piece.

- Q. And to give an example, something specific that would relate to firearms toolmark identification, that would be a subclass item.
- A. Well, for example, the -- in a broaching process of forming the barrels of a firearm, the broaching tool will typically transfer characteristics to the barrel as it's being fabricated, and then that barrel will transfer characteristics to a thread material for a projectile or a bullet.
 - Q. All right. And individual --
- A. -- Individual characteristics are, by definition are -- and there's a reason for that caveat, are unique to one particular item; and by definition in AFTE, individual characteristics would be unique to that item.
- Q. All right. That's a picture of the comparison microscope, right?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- Q. They put one bullet on one side and one bullet on the other, and they try to compare them, right?
- A. That's correct. The images that may typically be seen are shown on the right-hand side of this particular slide. There's a split screen image where the questioning sample is on one side and the known

sample is on the other side, and they're able to be directly compared as demonstrated.

1.3

2.2

- Q. On the far right-hand side of that slide where it looks like the back of something, what is that showing a picture of?
- A. On the right-hand side -- on the upper photo would be a close up view of the breech face -- of the cartridge after it's been fired of breech face impressions and striations and actually some firing pin on the right.
- Q. All right. And is there any significance to those two photos or are they just examples of what you would look at?
- A. They're just examples of what one might see using a comparison microscope.
- Q. Okay. Now, this slide is kind of an AFTE theory of identification. Is this a quote from the AFTE materials about what their theory of identification is?
- A. Yes. This is the primary substance of the underlying guideline used by the AFTE community to make their associations.
- Q. And is this what most toolmark -- or firearms analysts use when they try to determine if there's an identification or exclusion of a particular weapon as being the weapon that fired a bullet?

A. Yes.

1.3

- Q. All right. Tell the Judge what, in your opinion is the problem with the AFTE theory of identification as it relates to science -- or problems, maybe I should say.
- A. Thank you. This is problems are pervasive in this document or this these excerpts. This does first, does not constitute a scientific protocol for numerous reasons, there are about five reasons. But what I have done is this AFTE theory of identification is highlighted nonscientific terms that are vague, vacuous, ambiguous. It's some of the flaws in this theory of identification is, is that it uses circular logic and I'll use an analogy of baking a cake here shortly. But it also exhibits what are known as fallacies of presumptions. And fallacy of presumption is basically premises that presume what they purport to prove.
- Q. And what do they presume that they purport to prove?
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. What do they presume that they are purporting to prove?
- A. Well first presumption here. And there's several is what's known as suppression of evidence --

suppression of evidence and false dichotomy. But in this case, for example, this starts out by presuming uniqueness, presuming an underlying premise of uniqueness. And the colored words in here are, for example, what is sufficient? Well sufficient is going to vary between -- what you might consider sufficient might be insufficient as far as I'm concerned and vice versa. It's a very general term. This does not constitute a scientific protocol.

- Q. Well, surely, they go further than just this paragraph here. Don't they have standards to tell you what is sufficient and what's not sufficient?
 - A. No.

1.3

- Q. No?
- A. No. And the most salient flaw in this, with regard to scientific protocol is scientific theory must exhibit what's known as falsifiability, has to have refutability for it to be a proper scientific theory. Refutability -- I'm sorry, falsifiability is the ability to disprove the premise. And typically in the scientific arena, you don't establish a theory to be what you want to prove as the theory, you create what's known as a null hypothesis and you try your darndest to prove the null hypothesis. But let's -- if I can, just give you an example of why this is an inadequate -- it's

not even a protocol, I'll say guideline. Let's say we're making a cake; and the circular logic that is exhibited by this AFTE theory of identification, this says that if you have sufficient agreement, then you can declare an identification; and then it later goes to show that you have an identification if the items exhibit sufficient agreement. And in the cake baking analogy, it would be tantamount to saying, if you have the right ingredients, you can make a cake; and you can make a cake if you have the right ingredients. And so that's one of the numerous flaws exhibited by this theory of identification. It's vague, it's subjective, and the NAS has confirmed it does not present a defined pattern of process that can be used. And the two most critical cornerstones of the scientific method are repeatability and reproducibility.

Q. And what is repeatability?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

A. It does not allow for that. Repeatability is the condition by which an experimenter, himself or herself, can repeat their own experiment and obtain the same results. Reproducibility, in the scientific domain is the property of allowing an external or a different experimenter to reproduce the results of the original experiment, in other words, to conduct the experiment again and to reproduce the results. And as, again

- confirmed by the National Academy of Sciences, this guidelines does not allow for two critical cornerstones of the scientific method.
 - Q. The National Academy of Sciences has not -it's not just you that's being critical of the AFTE
 methodology or standards, the National Academy of
 Sciences has also issued reports that are critical for
 the reasons you've just stated.
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. I have --

1.3

2.2

- MR. DOGGETT: For the record, this would be marked Exhibit 5 and 6. May I approach, Judge?

 THE COURT: Yes, sir, you may.
- Q. (BY MR. DOGGETT) I'm going to hand you Defense Exhibit 4 which is the -- do you recognize that as being the Toolmark and Firearms Identification excerpt from the 2009 NAS report?
 - A. I do, yes.
- Q. All right. And then Exhibit's 5 and 6, do you recognize that as being the 2008 NAS Ballistic Imaging Report?
 - A. Yes.
- MR. DOGGETT: Judge, I move to admit -- if
 I hadn't already moved it, just for purposes of this
 hearing, one through six, if I haven't already -- I know

```
I moved on one but I can't remember if I did two through
 1
 2
     six.
                   THE COURT: You haven't.
 3
                   MR. HANNA: Does he have two through six?
 4
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  He does.
 5
                                What's the difference between
 6
                   MR. HANNA:
 7
     five and six?
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  It's the same report, it's
 8
 9
     just so thick, I couldn't get one binder clip around it.
10
                   MR. HANNA:
                                Okay. No objection, Your
     Honor.
11
12
                   THE COURT: All right. I'm going to call
     this Defendant's Daubert 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, along with
1.3
14
     one that was previously admitted, are admitted.
15
               (By Mr. Doggett) What is this -- I heard
     Ms. Eudaley, I think talking about a non match. Can you
16
     tell the Judge what your understanding is about AFTE's
17
     non match criteria?
18
              As the slide indicates, it requires an examiner
19
20
     to try to recall interspatial relationships of these,
     let's just say, striations, that they can recall from
21
2.2
     the past -- from prior examinations, which I think I've
23
     indicated in one or more of my papers, it requires a
     super-human effort to recall -- the simplest geometric
24
     form is a line, and to try to recall the interspatial
25
```

relationships of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of prior images that they have seen during their matches. So, as indicated on the slide here, they're told to think back on the best matching, known non-match that they can remember, which puts it in the -- virtually a hundred percent subjective mode.

1.3

2.0

And this is one of the primary — of the five reasons why the practice is not considered a science. There is no science that allows for a hundred percent subjective input. And based on training and experience, there is no science that allows for that as the determinant of an inference.

- Q. All right. You talked about this, problems with the AFTE theory identification. There's no articulated protocol, meaning they don't tell you how many lines have to match or that there really is no standard written down anywhere, any place that tells you what you have to do to declare an identification or a match.
- A. That's a good overview -- a lay overview of it, what we would characterize it -- and I've indicated I believe in one or more of my papers, is that there are no parameters of detection specified. And there are then also no rate -- no process of application of any rates of parameters. So in other words, there are no

metrics or indicia of detection and then there are no rules for application of any such. So they're missing two critical characteristics required in a -- of the scientific practice.

Q. All right --

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- A. -- I'm sorry; I didn't realize --
- Q. You've got no parameters of detection, in other words, of application. All right. What's the problem with subclass versus individual?
- A. Subclass versus individual is one of the two 900 pound gorillas in the room. What the practice requires is that a forensic examiner be able to look at a -- some characteristics, let's just say striations, and decide, are those individual characteristics or they characteristics that actually derive from manufacturing called subclass carryover.

And one of the major problems that the NAS and my colleagues and I have is there are no literature reviews, no papers, indicating how an examiner is to discern subclass characteristics from purportedly individual characteristics.

Prior to 1989, the field did not even recognize the existence of subclass characteristics in any of their documents or official rules and regulations.

They finally memorialized in 1989 that, hey, you better start looking for the possibility of subclass carryover which -- in subclass carryover, the importance of that is that manufacturing characteristics that do carryover could belong to a very unknown or even a very large lot of similar products. And I think the key issue that needs to be under focus in this particular practice is they make their identifications based on a few similarities or a handful of similarities in many, if not, most cases. They rationalize away all of the dissimilarities. And there is no other forensic practice -- let's just say bullet lead, for example; bullet comparisons used the single dissimilarity rule to exclude items. For example, when they were comparing the antimony, bismuth, arsenic or other elemental constituents of bullet lead. If any one of those indicia or metrics were found to be dissimilar, the examiner would then eliminate or exclude that item as a possible match. The field of firearms toolmarks examiners -- examinations do not use the single dissimilarity rule, so that dramatically increases the possibility of misattributions or errors. So in other words, what they're focusing on is a subset, a few in many cases, similarities and rationalizing away all of the dissimilarities. And in fact, one of the studies

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

has shown that it's not uncommon for items to exhibit more dissimilarities than similarities.

Q. That have been identified as a match?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- That have been identified as a match. Α. one particular study, one of the problems with the lack of parameters and detection and overrules of applications, they ask examiners, are these, quote, They would render their matches or not matches. opinions, but then those examiners were then asked which characteristics did you use to form your match. And one of the studies showed fifty-one percent disagreement up to thirty-one lines as to whether they matched or not. In other words, the examiners might have agreed -- it's called a type three error, but might have agreed that this was a match, but they disagree as to what formed the match, what caused -- what allowed them to opine that it was a match.
 - Q. What are you talking about here on this line?
- A. That's the general opinion of the true scientific community. It's the practice forensic practice of firearms toolmarks is considered a fallacy individualization, rather, is considered a fallacy, and generally characterized as what's known as pathological science.

Pathological science was a term coined in

1953 by a nobel laureate at the Atomic -- Knolls Atomic Laboratory. And pathological science is a process by which an experimenter is exhibiting wishful thinking, self deceptions and some other characteristics. So it's not to indicate any nefarious attempts, but rather they're misleading themselves in interpreting their results.

- Q. What are you talking about on here when you say probability of matching evidence came from the same batch source versus this bottom one that says came from a different batch source?
- A. Well, that's actually -- this presentation wasn't customized for this proceeding, so that's a statistical set of issues that relates to what's called the likelihood ratio.
 - Q. Skip over.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- A. It's very, statistically, complex.
- Q. I'm going to skip over this, and in the interest of time, do you need to talk about it or not?
- A. I would just say with this that their experimentations, the scores and scores of these purported validation studies do not comport to the scientific method for many reasons, so I'm just outlining what the scientific method is here, so I'd say let's go ahead and skip it.

- Q. All right. What's wrong with their validation studies -- who did the validation studies?
- A. The various firearm toolmark examiners have done this.
 - Q. Primarily AFTE?
 - A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- Q. What are examples of what's wrong with the validation studies from a scientific point of view?
- A. That's the subject of one -- my next to my last paper, primarily. We point out the flaws, there are so many flaws that -- the general flaws are that the purported validation studies do not mirror real world cases, they don't mimic real world case work. They're not blind or -- I'm sorry, they're not double blind or even blind. They're typically pristine samples that are even prescreened to make sure they are -- have demonstrative characteristics on there.

And then there are many other problems with it. But the most glaring issue, from a scientific perspective is they are used to form what are known as inductive inferences as opposed to deductive inference. And that is a critical issue for the particular case at bar and the other situations where examiners are opining to some reasonable degree of ballistic certainly, practical certainty or — and the difference is, if I

can just put it in lay language is, during one my congressional testimonies, I've indicated, for example, deductive logics would be where, if the experimenter can sample the entire — all samples in the possible sample pool, then one can properly use deductive logic.

1.3

2.0

And the example I used on Capital Hill was the Blue Chevy Nova that I'm told by Senator Bradford that they still use it to this day -- if one knows that all Chevy Novas that were ever made were Blue and one finds a vehicle emblem at a -- let's say, the scene of a bombing that says Chevy Nova. One can properly deduce that the vehicle must have been blue, that's deductive inference.

Now, that doesn't mean all blue cars are Chevy Novas, that's another issue. But one can properly deduce that all -- that the vehicle was blue.

Inductive inference, however is the only available process in logic that can be used when the experimenter cannot test the entire sample pool. That is the case with firearms. It's not feasible or plausible that firearms examiners can sample the entire possible sample pool. So therefore, they must use a process of inference called inductive logic.

But that is very riffed with potential flaws and vulnerabilities. Inductive inference is used

everyday by people. For example, let's say you need a pair of shoes, you bought three or four pairs of shoes from Payless Shoes. And so you reason that, well, they've worn well in the past, this company's been good, I'm going to buy my next pair of shoes from Payless, that's in-acceptable use of inductive logic.

1.3

But in the scientific arena, inductive inferences must be appended by a confidence interval or a probabilistic statement of certainty that is founded. What the NAS 2009 --

- Q. Well, don't they do that by -- Ms. Eudaley said, I can say, to a practical certainty, that this is the same gun that fired these bullets and fired these shell casings; is that something she's doing?
- A. No, sir, that is scientifically objectionable and unacceptable. That is a vacuous statement; an *ipse dixit* that has no scientific foundation for that type of a statement.

What the NAS 2009 basically said was, there is no forensic practice, other than DNA, that uses the proper — the inference process. And it can be seen, for example, if anyone has seen Maury Povich or one of those TV shows, where they say that so and so was found to be the father or the blood samples' DNA match to a 95.7 percent, that is a proper use of inductive

logic. And as the NAS report points out in 2009, there's only one forensic practice that is properly employing inductive logic and that's the DNA. So they have basically said there is no other forensic practice that has currently shown to be able to scientifically make specific source attributions or individualizations. That's the different -- and if I would, one last color comment here. To show the vulnerability of inductive logic when used in the courtroom, a judicial setting, and particularly with firearms toolmarks issues -- you know what -- actually I think I have a slide for this. Do you want me to cover the Texas -- the guns in Texas? Do you want me to keep going? Ο. Sorry, I didn't -- yeah, go ahead, keep going. Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I think you've already talked about that.
- A. Yes. Okay. We can stop here, if you would. One can never, quote, prove an inductive hypothesis by what's known as simple enumeration; or in this case, we can call it sample enumeration, it's the same thing. And what that means is an accumulation of positive instances. No matter how many combinations of firearms an examiner might try to test to, quote, prove the hypothesis of uniqueness, or even let's say in a specific case that there's a match, it is not scientifically possible. And I think the next slide

shows the guns in Texas -- oh here, we go.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

To show the folly of trying to quote, prove, end quotes, inductive hypothesis. Let's assume, hypothetically, there are a hundred thousand guns in Fort Bend and maybe Harris County. Let's say that of those hundred thousand guns that are available, there are one hundred pairs that have confusingly similar striations, and let's also say that there are one hundred firearms examiners in the police department or in a crime laboratory, and every one of those firearms examiners conducts ten pairwise examinations per day for the next ten years of their life including weekends, at the end of 3.65 million comparisons, there is still a ninety-three percent chance that none of those hundred guns were ever compared. That is -- it demonstrates the folly of simple enumeration in the use of inductive logic. So for an examiner to opine a match, there is no scientific validation; and to opine it to some vacuous degree of certainty that they could have come from -that they were fired from the same gun is without scientific foundation.

- Q. All right. You've already covered all of that.
- A. Yes.
- Q. Is this the AFTE critique again or the AFTE standards?

- A. Yes, this is basically saying that there's no rules governing what's to be considered the same and what's considered to be different.
 - Q. All right.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. Okay. Do you want to hold it here a second? Ι also conducted a personal experiment to demonstrate one of the issues in these types of examinations. My working hypothesis was that one -- for example, let's say we're looking at firing pins. You're talking very tiny surface areas. My working hypothesis was, there are only so much space in order, where one can -- let's say, you manually place striations or lines on that surface area, there's only so many combinations in so much space that one can use to have striations. Therefore that suggests -- before my experiment, a priority, that there would be a certain likelihood of coincidental matches in such a tiny space. performed an experiment -- and my wife works at Cracker Barrel -- and I noticed you happen to have one right up the street here -- she's on the retail side. So I asked her, I said, please give me several hundred UPC or bar codes from your different products. And I then asked her, do you all put marketing information in your bar And she said, no, we don't. For example, let's say you buy something at Wal-Mart, you can take it back,

```
they know that you bought it from Wal-mart and/or even
which store you bought it. But she says, no, we don't
put any marketing demographics in our bar codes.
just to be scientifically accurate, what I decided to
do, when I put them both -- I just randomly selected two
products that were totally unrelated, put the UPC's next
to each other under a microscope; but to moot out the
possibility that she was wrong about the marketing
information, I turned one of the UPC symbol stickers
upside down and I then compared them. Now, in many
cases that I work, examiners typically -- I've seen
three lines, four lines, six lines -- on the West Coast,
under the CMS process, they only require six, two sets
of threes or six consecutive matching stria before they
will declare an ident or a match.
              So I've seen three, four, five, six on
purported matches. So, to see what the chance was of
coincidental matches of the most simple geometric form
on a very small finite surface area, this is what I
saw -- you can go ahead -- under the microscope -- the
split screen, down the middle, separates the two UPC's.
And let's count -- I'll have to do it with my --
              THE WITNESS: Oh, can I write on the
screen, Your Honor?
```

Sure.

THE COURT:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Let's count the number of coincidental matches Α. 1 2 here. Let's say one -- whoops -- okay. Two, three, arguably four, we'll talk about the arguably; five, 3 arguably six, arguably seven, arguably eight, nine, ten, 4 eleven, twelve, thirteen, arguably fourteen, arguably 5 fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, eighteen and nineteen. 6 Just in this experiment, we're showing already nineteen 7 characteristics that would be probably declared to be 8 Now, what's the arguably that I discussed? 9 10 decision needs to be made by the evaluator, is a fat line and a thin line a match or a non match. 11 12 other words, there is now required a judgment call to --1.3 some examiner might declare these -- how do I eliminate? 14 THE COURT: Touch the right corner and the 15 left corner, left corner.

THE WITNESS: Oh, thank you.

- A. So, some examiner might declare, let's just might say that this one, for example, is not a match; other examiners might say it is a match. So the quality of the lines themselves have to be subjectively assessed as to whether that's a match or not.
- Q. (BY MR. DOGGETT) But the point of all this was that we just took these bar codes and matched them and you had a bunch of random matches.
 - A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. And they came from different bar codes.
- A. Yes.

1.3

1.5

2.0

2.2

- Q. And basically, you're extrapolating that same -- the same thing can happen with bullets.
- A. Well, yes. And I'm using this to demonstrate that there is a -- on a finite surface area, there is a probability of coincidental matches.
- Q. All right. What's the difference in this photo?
- A. This particular these are two photos that were presented in the AFTE literature to firearms examiners the split screen again in the middle of comparing two cartridge cases. And the caveat to examiners was look at the significant degree of concordance in these characteristics. And in it would be very easy, as the NAS has pointed out to confuse these and declare this these to be a match, when in fact —
- Q. It looks like a match to me, the lines seem to line up. Is it a match or not?
- MR. FELCMAN: We'll stipulate it's a match. I know what he's talking about.
- A. That's the issue is this -- from my purposes, looking at this from a -- my twenty-four years of doing this -- this could very easily be declared a, quote,

match, when --

1.3

2.0

- Q. (BY MR. DOGGETT) Was it a match or not?
- A. No, they were known to have been fired from two different firearms. I believe that NAS may have even cited this as well as when I was -- I believe they may have cited it as well.
- Q. All right. Do we need to talk about this or move on?
- A. No, we covered all this. The only I think significant part of this slide would be the first bullet point. To this day, there's still no working methodology for distinguishing individual from subclass characteristics. I've actually had firearms examiners, through the years, kind of whisper in my ear. We just presume everything we see are individual characteristics. I'm not meaning from the FBI, I'm talking about from crime labs.

We can move on -- oh, I've already discussed this. This is one of the studies from Miller that shows -- and this supports my earlier comment that it's not uncommon that bullets or cartridge cases will actually show more characteristics of this similarity than those that were similar.

Oh, the second bullet point is critical, and that refers to what is known as the A-B-1717 study.

And this surprised experimenters. But what they were developing was a federal database like NIBIN or IBIS What they were surprised at, it even at the time. shouldn't have surprised -- it wouldn't be a surprise in the scientific community, but what the experimenters were surprised at is, as they would enter known matches, in other words, they would test-fire bullets or cartridge cases and enter the images into the database. Then when they were cued or when they were quarried, the system would spit out information as to the top ten or fifteen, depending on the number they wanted, most likely matches. But what they were surprised at was the more data that got entered, the more irrelevant hits were resulted to the point where the position of known candidacy was degraded as more and more data were entered, such that the known firings didn't even show up in the top fifteen most likely candidates. Does that make sense? Do I need to rephrase that?

- Q. You're saying that they have known something they knew was fired by the same gun --
 - A. Correct.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. -- that should have shown up in the database as a match and it wasn't showing up in the database, other things were showing up.
 - A. Correct. If you run the same sample over a

longer period of time, or Delta T as we would say, early on, the known source would show up in the top -- in the top ten or fifteen levels of candidacy. But over a longer period of time, when you start entering more and more firearms or bullets or cartridge case images into there, the known one didn't even show up in the top ten or fifteen.

1.3

2.0

- Q. Is this a NIBIN system you're talking about or some other study?
- A. I don't know which -- remember which study it was. The study is known as the AB1717, the author was DeKinder, but I don't remember which database they used. I believe it might have been, but maybe not.
- Q. Okay. What's your point here about the effects of technology?
- A. My point here is that, as a plant metallurgist, production continuity is critical. Down-time is very costly. So we did everything we could to try to keep tools and dyes from wearing. Plus technology, being what it was, it was a lot of research into trying to reduce the tribological or the wear of these tools. But the import for forensic purposes and judicial purposes is the less wear in production, the larger possible lot sizes result that could have subclass carryover.

In other words, maybe in the stone age, you might get one or two weapons out of a particular tool; but now, you can get thousands upon thousands of samples, depending on the product. I remember when I was working at Federal Bombing, the -- Judge Robert Vance was killed in a bomb -- a package bomb --MR. HANNA: -- Your Honor, I'm going to

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

object to the nonresponsiveness.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- (By Mr. Doggett) Well, what are you talking What types of metals do they use on these tools, say manufactured guns, what sort of metals do they use?
- Well, minimally they'll use alloy steels or high strength low-alloy steels, possibly or even alloyed steels. But, generally the trend had been toward -what's WC, it's a simple tungsten carbide, and, of course, diamond inserts is a possibility. But those two items are two of the hardest substances known to man so, particularly in production so, it's generally tool steels or tungsten carbide.
- And how long does something like that last? Ο. Does it have to be changed out every day or once a week or once every six months or how long do those tools I guess it depends on the tool and what it's being been used for, I guess.

A. D, all of the above. It depends on the stresses, the forces, the amount of lubrication, the lubrication regime itself — and there are three or five levels of lubrication regime. But it's just variable, and it depends on the manufacturer, it depends on the work piece, the item, the types of stresses that are imposed during the forming of operation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

- Q. All right. You've already talked about these, haven't you? The problem of uniqueness and repeatability.
- No, actually we didn't discuss repeatability. Α. But I would point out on the issue of uniqueness, my last paper indicates that in reality, uniqueness is always discussed in these forensic issues. But what we point out in the paper is, uniqueness is a moot issue for forensic purposes. The critical issue is not whether uniqueness exist, it has never been proven to exist, but the key issue is, for forensic purposes, is not whether uniqueness exist, the critical issue is whether discernable uniqueness exist. And the difference is, as I point out in the paper, it's not a general disagreement in the scientific community that uniqueness, above the subatomic level, probably does But the critical issue is can a human observe, discern that uniqueness at some level. And the answer

is there has been no scientific showing, no showing, to date that discernable uniqueness exist, such that examiners can say, this probably came from this source or from this firearm.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

The issue of repeatability is a double edge sword that has been overlooked in the forensic community for decades.

And dichotomy is that the examiners presume that a bullet fired from a firing platform or from a firearm, today will be able to be, quote, matched to a bullet recovered six months, six years or sixty years from now. So the presumption there is that the firings result in repeatable transfer of characteristics over long periods of time. The problem is, however, how are you ignoring that some of the hardest substances known to man used in the fabrication processes are not repeatable. They claim that every firearm manufactured, one right after the other, after the other, that the, quote, tool is wearing so rapidly, end quote, that it's not repeatable. And that is, I think as we point out is nonsensical. The two assumptions can't be reconciled and haven't been to date. So they're assuming repeatability when it works to show -- or for the claim of a match that a bullet came from a certain firearm that was maybe used six years ago in a crime; and yet

within seconds, this hard tooling doesn't change -- I'm sorry, changes so rapidly that you can't -- that two items that are produced sequentially can't be confusingly similar. So that's a serious issue that has never been reconciled and it's a required underlying presumption for the practice.

1.3

2.0

2.2

We've already discussed this, there are two issues. Does uniqueness exist, but discernable uniqueness is the key issue.

- Q. Well what -- why do you say that uniqueness has not been scientifically established? You say that, as a scientist, you can recognize that it could exist. Why do you say it hadn't been established though?
- A. First you can't prove an inductive hypothesis, we've already talked about that. But there have been no studies to even do it properly, to do studies that have a properly appended probabilistic assessment to a certain confidence level or degree of certainty. So there's not been any meaningful studies to show to demonstrate, to any degree any confidence level, or as the NAS has indicated, to any agree of reliability or certainty or any confidence interval.
- Q. Now the NAS -- the studies I read, the ones that have been introduced into evidence -- call for more studies to be done to try to determine whether or not

uniqueness can be scientifically demonstrated. Is it --1 2 is anybody working on that? Is somebody doing those studies? 3 I'm not aware of that issue. First of all, I think they would agree that uniqueness is not the 5 seminal issue, but rather discernable uniqueness is, so 6 -- but I don't know if there are any research projects 7 under way. 8 All right. I think we've covered this. 9 Q. Α. The purpose of this slide is to show that 10 11 internally --12 MR. HANNA: -- Your Honor, I haven't heard a question. We've sort of been through this. 1.3 14 there's a question and an answering format, it would be 1.5 more appropriate. THE COURT: Sustained. Let's do O and A. 16 (By Mr. Doggett) Does AFTE itself recognize 17 0 that there's some problems in their definition? 18 19 Many years ago they internally acknowledged that it's not a science and that there are 2.0 serious problems and that the process is both 21 2.2 inefficient and ineffective, by a memo that I got on the

Q. Who is Alfred Biasoti, what does he have to do with AFTE?

23

24

25

screen here from 1983.

- A. Alfred Biasoti is one of the most respected researchers in the firearms community, it's considered an authoritative figure in the field.
 - Q. Is he an AFTE or is he --
 - A. Yes, he was, I believe.

1.3

2.0

2.2

- Q. But he was critiquing their method back -- as far as back as 1983, correct?
- A. Yes. They was basically stating that we had serious problems, that it's an inefficient process, it's an ineffective process, it's not a science, and I believe that's the import of this particular memo.
- Q. Now they finally have some --

THE COURT: Mr. Doggett, let's take about a ten-minute break and we'll come back.

(Recess taken)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Doggett, you may resume.

- Q (By Mr. Doggett) Mr. Tobin, I think it was Ms. Eudaley that said something about there being some validation studies. Have you looked at the -- there's quite a number of the validation studies that AFTE and similar organizations have produced to try to validate their methodology?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What's -- is there anything wrong with those

studies?

- A. Yes. As I point out actually we point out, they're pervasively flawed. We've studied probably the overwhelming majority of the purported validation studies and find them to be persuasively flawed.
- Q. In what way are they flawed, without going in a lot of detail. Scientifically, how are they flawed studies?
- A. I don't think we have enough time today, but we probably are talking fifteen to twenty significant flaws in the studies. The bottom line is they do not measure what they represent to courts that they represent, I mean, unknowingly, in other words, it's not intentional. But they don't capture what they believe that they capture, they don't represent what they think what they're offered or typically proffer the studies to show.
 - Q. We've seen the problems with the studies?
- A. Yes, we've already talked about the top two. The third is -- relates to case work. They don't engage in error detection in case work. That's the -- no access to ground truth. So typically, examiners will go testify and go back and never, except fortuitously, find out that they made an error.

The last bullet point is -- relates to the

statements of certainty that they typically will append to a claimed match, and that is to some, quote, reasonable degree of some kind of ballistic certainty — practical certainty. For decades, they were testifying to an absolute certainty.

1.3

2.0

2.2

But now, with the paradigm shift, that statement is now changing to practical certainty, ballistics certainty, all of which are still vacuous. There is no acceptable -- scientifically acceptable probabilistic model to be making such statements.

- Q. And why do you say there's no model or no scientifically model to make those statements?
- A. The practice and the experiments and the validation -- purported validation studies do not comport to the scientific method, and again they do not capture what they believe they captured.

That fact is even recognized within their own literature, because the -- some of the authoritative -- or the role models in the firearms toolmarks community have indicated in their own internal memos and even in some of the scientific papers that these validation studies are not -- they're only of value to the experimenters and -- and scientifically, we would say they don't have external validity.

There are two types of validity, there's

internal validity with an experiment and there's external validity.

1.3

2.0

2.2

Internal validity is the property by which the experiment has enough information data that it can be interpreted, that's called internal validity.

However, external validity, which these validation studies do not exhibit — and probably the simple word to associate with it would be called generalizability. So external validity means can the experiment — the results of that experiment be generalized to the field. And the short answer to that is virtually every one of those purported validation studies are irrelevant to any specific case at bar for many reasons.

- Q. All right. I think she mentioned -- maybe she didn't. I thought she mentioned a ten-gun study. You have an example of a ten-gun study that was done -- let's run over the ten-gun study like the one you're talking about.
- A. I think you would just go down the list. There are many, many problems with it. But, probably the most understandable problems is that it use -- they use what are known as -- what -- the deductive logic.

And the analogy that I use in one of the papers is an analogy involving Octomom or a similar

situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

Let's say that one of eight octuplets are cloned, and let's say that a respondent is presented contemporaneously with all eight possible samples in the sample pool. I have no problem with representations that there would be a low rate of error in associating the cloned octuplets with whatever — whichever octuplet was cloned. I don't doubt that there could be a low rate of practice error in making that association.

But that doesn't mirror real case work or real world scenarios. That is called deductive logic. The entire possible sample pool is presented and can be compared contemporaneously. That's not the real world. What is closer to real world but still not imitation of real world -- the reproduction of real world is, let's say that the clone and octuplet number three is presented this month for examination or comparison. Then let's say that it's three or four months down the line, octuplet number seven is presented and down the line and so forth. So, assuredly the rate of error in the non-contemporaneously comparisons would insignificantly increase. It still does not represent real case work because they're not generally presented with any other firearms, so that is a major issue with regard to these ten guns. There are metallurgical

issues with the studies that is the subject of our next paper in tribology. But there are many, many problems with these studies, as you've seen from the slide.

1.3

2.0

2.2.

- Q. Let's talk about rates of error. Ms. Eudaley said there really aren't any real rates of error studies, and the closest they could come is try to extrapolate from their proficiency studies, which she agrees are not really a rate of error studies. Have there been any rate of error studies relating to firearm toolmarks identification?
- A. Well, I've actually researched the rates of error, but are there any funded or research studies? I don't know, I'm not aware of any.
- Q. This next slide where you talk about rates of error, where did you get this information?
- A. These are based on, largely on literature reviews. These are declared error -- rates of error for various -- from various sources showing rates of error from 2.3 percent to 28.2 percent. And I would point out that these are minima based on some of the detection techniques or processes to show that rates of error are -- these proficiency tests are not good proxies for rates of error in the domain, in the field.
- Q. Now you've got some examples in your slide presentations about specific cases where firearms have

```
been misidentified. The Evan Thompson case, the
 1
 2
     firearms examiner where he did an audit of his work --
     audit of his work and found errors in all of his cases,
 3
     and other examples, we won't go through all of them
 4
 5
     but --
              Yeah, there are numerous ones. I just picked
 6
         Α.
     several that involved police officers typically -- or
 7
     officers of the court that were wrongly accused, as
 8
     somewhat demonstrative, but in this particular case,
 9
     Trotter V. Missouri, a police officer was believed to
10
11
     have been shot with his own weapon --
12
                   MR. HANNA:
                                I object to nonresponsiveness,
     actually it wasn't a question at all, Judge.
1.3
14
                   THE COURT:
                                Yeah, let's go to a Q and A.
15
              (By Mr. Doggett) What about this case that's on
     the slide, the Trotter case?
16
                                I'm going to object to
17
                   MR. HANNA:
     irrelevant, Judge, it's outside the scope of this
18
19
     hearing.
                   MR. DOGGETT: I'm just giving an example
2.0
     of this stuff, Judge.
21
2.2
                   MR. HANNA: It doesn't even go towards the
23
     Daubert issue that you brought up.
                   MR. DOGGETT: Well it does because it
24
     explains how misidentification occurred. And they say
25
```

they don't have them or they're only -- they're zero to 1 2 one percent. THE COURT: Well, we've gone over several 3 so I think we need to push on. 4 (By Mr. Doggett) Okay. This Williams versus 5 Quarterman, is that out of the HPD Lab? 6 Yes -- well, as you indicated it was. I didn't 7 Α. associate it with the HPD but --8 9 -- All right. And this was one where they misidentified a twenty-two as a twenty-five or vice 10 versa, correct, out of the lab? 11 12 Α. Yes. And it was checked several times by supervisors 1.3 or the people in accordance with the procedures that 14 15 Ms. Eudaley said they were supposed to do, and they still missed it, right? 16 Yes. But this isn't as statistically 17 Α. 18 significant with regard to rates of error as the 19 previous case that's -- yes, that's what you've indicated. 2.0 All right. When you talked about the 2008 NAS 21 study and the 2009 NAS study, and you've already talked 22 23 about this quote -- I believe you have -- that DNA is the only one that uses the scientific method --24

acceptable scientific. There's problems with the

others, right? 1 2 Α. Yes. And that was the conclusion -- that's not just 3 your conclusion, that's the NAS conclusion, right? 4 5 They're basically saying that only DNA practices -- is able to make a scientific valid 6 association with specific sources. 7 All right. And they concluded the same thing 8 0. you did, which was that extreme probability statements 9 are without scientific foundation. 10 11 Α. And that relates to the statement of, to Yes. 12 some kind of degree of certainty that this came from 1.3 that. 14 All right. Again, these are quotes that --15 most of these you've already talked about, I believe and they're included in the exhibits that we've introduced. 16 I'll skip over this. This is a reference to your paper, 17 right? 18 19 Α. Yes. Okay. Which we've introduced as one of the 2.0 Q. exhibits, right? 21 22 Yes -- well, actually, I don't know. Have they Α. 23 been proffered yet, I don't know.

All right. I'm going to skip through these

24

25

real quick.

This is, again, you're listing the problems with the validation studies and proficiency tests?

A. Yes.

1.3

2.0

- Q. All right. Now, based on your study of this problem and your publication in this problem, what—what, as the state of the science is today, do you believe it's appropriate for firearms examiners to make statements like Ms. Eudaley said that she can say I forget her exact words practical certainty that this is the same gun that fired the bullets that she looked at and the casings that she looked at, does the science support that?
- A. If I answer that, that indicates that I acquiesce to your premise, this is not a science. So I'll -- however, the answer would be yes, we do object to that as scientifically unfounded.
- Q. All right. What -- I'm talking about, what does -- do you believe the science allows, not the forensic --
 - A. Oh, I'm sorry.
- Q. -- not the forensic -- believability versus the science -- what do you believe the science, as it stands today, would support -- as far as a forensic firearms examiners stating, regarding the probability that she

got a match? What do you think it would allow?

- A. As indicated in my latest paper, based on the state of the art as it exist today, the most scientifically defensible opinion that can be rendered by a firearms examiner is either that the firearm cannot be eliminated as the firing platform or the source of the bullets or the cartridge casings that are being fired. Or in the alternative, the examiner would be on scientific ground to be able to conclude something like, quote, in my opinion and that's the first caveat, that it's an opinion statement in my opinion, the characteristics I observe are consistent with having been fired from this particular firearm, end quote. That would be scientifically justifiable.
 - O. One of those two?
 - A. One of those two, yes.
- Q. You do not believe it's appropriate for an examiner to get up and say, it's probably the same gun or it's, to a practical certainly, the same weapon.
 - A. No.

1.3

1.5

2.0

MR. DOGGETT: Pass the witness.

MR. HANNA: May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir, you may.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Q. (BY MR. HANNA) Mr. Tobin, you've been hired to

testify in here for this hearing for that opinion right there that you just gave?

- A. Well, you had to ask my --
- Q. I mean, we've gone through all this --
- A. -- Mr. Doggett is why I was hired, but I'm here testifying to my opinion.
- Q. Okay. This entire last two hours of testimony is based -- and your conclusions, based on all your research and everything is that a firearms examiner shouldn't say with -- should limit the language they use in identifying their identification?
 - A. Yes, sir.

2.0

- Q. But that -- not that's it not a valid identification, just that they should temper their language.
- A. Sure. I don't rebut the truth of the matter asserted of a claimed match. I only -- I'm only indicating, in my opinion that the firearm toolmarks examiner's opinion must be constrained to proper scientific framing.
- Q. But the same -- now you're saying firearms examination is not a science, right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. So why would you take something that's not a science and try to apply the same standards that

you have in the world of science and apply those same standards?

- A. Because in the overwhelming majority of their publications and their court testimonies and their through transcripts or personal observation, they're continually representing this as a science. And our position is science, to a lay observer is imbued with the perception has a talismanic perception of infallibility. And all we're trying to say is look, juries and triers of fact and law rather need to know that this is opinion testimony, it's not Gospel from the mount, that it's based on this CSI belief that most prospective jurors would believe it to be. That's all we're doing.
- Q. Wouldn't they have to apply that same thought process to your testimony?
 - A. I'm sorry?

1.3

2.0

- Q. Wouldn't they need to apply that same skepticism that you encourage them to apply in firearms examination to your testimony also?
 - A. Well, sure.
 - O. It's not uncommon.
- A. I'm not going to usurp their role of judging my credibility.
 - Q. Okay. I want to talk to you about your

1 | curriculum vitae, please.

A. Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

- Q. And at the very top, you have -- and I'm going to reconcile what you said on the stand with what's in your Defense Exhibit Number One. What degree do you hold?
- A. I have a Bachelor of Science Degree in Metallurgy. Like I said, now it's called Material Science, and I have a Master's Degree.
 - Q. Okay. Where is your Master's Degree from?
 - A. George Washington University.
- Q. And in what discipline?
- A. It's called Special Science -- Special Studies.
- Q. Okay. And what is Special Studies?
- A. It was taught by the law school and by the Forensic Department, but it was primarily law. Nine of my twelve courses were law courses.
- Q. So twelve courses got you a Masters of Arts in Special Studies from George Washington University?
- A. Yes.
- Q. What kind of subject matter of the law did it cover?
- A. Criminal Law One, Criminal Law Two, Criminal
 Law Three, Criminal Law Four, conspiracy, evidence law.
 Shoot, I don't even remember, that was, what,

```
seventeen -- thirty-one years ago. That's -- those I do
 1
 2
     remember -- business law, I'm sorry, that was another
     one --
 3
              And --
         Ο.
 4
 5
         Α.
              -- primarily the UCC.
              Do you hold any other degrees, other than the
 6
         Q.
 7
     two you've mentioned so far?
         Α.
              No.
 8
              Then in your curriculum vitae, what does the
 9
     line called Graduate Studies in Material Science
10
     Engineering at University of Virginia? What is that
11
     for?
12
              Graduate Studies in Material Science, I don't
1.3
         Α.
14
     know how to rephrase that.
15
              Can you explain to the Court what that -- did
         Ο.
     you obtain a degree from the University of Virginia?
16
                    The FBI would not --
         Α.
17
              No.
              You took some classes?
18
         Ο.
19
         Α.
              I'm sorry?
              You took some classes?
2.0
         Ο.
                     The FBI would not allow me to complete my
21
         Α.
              Yes.
22
     PHD, so I -- and I wasn't really trying to collect
23
     degrees anyway. So I was taking courses at the graduate
     level, some of whom actually became collaborated and
24
     colleagues with me, but --
25
```

- Q. Okay. So, do -- you just took some courses and stopped and didn't obtain a degree from University of Virginia.
- A. No, but I was also a subject. I had to pronounce, for example, the cause of the TWA, a midair explosion. That was ninety days out of my life that I had to spend, so I was continually interrupted with very high profile cases. But the answer is I don't have a graduate degree in Material Science or Metallurgy.
- Q. Mr. Tobin, I'm going to try to be very specific in my questions, and I'll ask that you try to be very specific with your answers. Okay?
 - A. I'll try yes or no.

1.3

2.0

- Q. In regards to your time with the FBI, I think you may have given two answers when you were on the stand. Were you ever designated a chief of the Metallurgy Division?
- A. No, not the title of chief forensic metallurgist and that's what the term de facto means.
 - Q. Okay. What do you mean by de facto?
- A. De facto means that the title was not codified or not -- was not codified. But in reality, I practiced as the chief forensic metallurgist. Two separate section chiefs indicated to me, I was in fact their de facto forensic chief metallurgist.

- Q. So there's not a document saying that you held that. This is -- you're just saying you did the work so you should be called that.
- A. Well that's what de facto means. It means not in reality, not codified but I performed all the functions of it, so.
 - Q. Okay. Was there an actual chief?
 - A. Was there what?
- Q. Was there a chief who was assigned to perform the functions that you took over?
- A. No, because I declined the position, they merged me into elemental and analysis unit.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any firearms or toolmarks examination experience?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. Have you ever testified as a firearms examiner?
- 17 A. As a firearms examiner?
- 18 Q. Correct.
- 19 A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

20

21

- Q. Okay. You were over the FBI lab while they were conducting firearms examinations; is that correct?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. But you just were their boss, you didn't do the actual examinations and go testify on behalf of the FBI?

- A. I think there's a misconception there. I was not -- as the de facto chief forensic metallurgist, I was not involved with the firearms unit per se -- directly. I -- in other words, I didn't write their performance appraisals, I didn't work in the unit or none of them worked under me directly.
- Q. Okay. So you never had the job where you're supposed to look at evidence that's submitted to a lab and make the conclusion or elimination in regards to the evidence submitted, you never had that position?
- A. I think you left out a key phrase. Yeah, I did that everyday for twenty-four years.
 - Q. From firearms evidence.
 - A. I think that's the part you left out.
- 15 Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

21

22

23

24

- 16 A. Not a firearms evidence.
- Q. Okay. And you're not a member of AFTE?
- 18 A. Is that a question?
- 19 Q. Yes, it is.
- 20 A. No.
 - Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the guidelines that Texas Courts have prior to the admission of evidence in that -- from a specialized area?
 - A. That's a pretty broad question, I'm not sure, you mean 702 issues?

- Q. Yeah, 702 issues. These hearings are often referred to as Daubert hearings. Are you familiar to that case?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the other requirements that courts are required to comply with in the admission of what are referred to as soft sciences?
 - A. Yes, in most states in -- yes.
 - Q. Okay. Are you in Texas?
- A. From my knowledge, Texas fairly closely tracts the federal rules but I'll just say to some degree.
- Q. Okay. And what is your understanding of those requirements that courts require to comply with before it admits evidence -- well, for lack of a better term, I'll refer to it as a soft science.
- A. I -- the general 702 is, if I have information that would be of -- helpful to a trier of fact.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. But are you looking for the specific Daubert criteria?
- Q. No, I'm not. I'm looking for something less than Daubert criteria.
- A. Okay. Well, that's -- I'll leave my answer then.
 - Q. So you're not familiar with that?

- A. Well I don't know what it is you're looking for. I can't cite the --
 - Q. Are you familiar with the case, it's called Nenno, N-E-N-N-O?
 - A. Oh, no.
 - Q. You're not familiar with that?
 - A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Okay. At the conclusion of your testimony when you finished a little while ago, it sounded like -- and then, I think during my initial question, you're okay with forensic firearm examination testimony coming before a jury to help them understand.
- A. Sure. And I'm on public record as indicating that that's one of my three most effective forensic tools for investigative purposes. And if properly used for potential guilt or innocence assessment a guilt or innocence assessment, yes.
- Q. Okay. So you're not here advocating to this

 Court that he -- this Court should not allow the

 firearms examiners in this particular case to testify in

 front of a jury?
- A. Well, now that's the Judge's. I don't want to usurp his and --
- Q. -- I'm not asking you to make the decision.
- 25 I'm saying --

A. Sure.

- Q. -- you're not of the opinion that he shouldn't allow them, because you just admitted that it's very valuable for a jury to hear.
 - A. So your question is?
- Q. My question is, are you here to tell the Court that it should not allow firearms examiners to testify in front of a jury?
 - A. Not as it's been offered today.
- Q. I don't know what that means, as what's been offered today?
- A. As the potential testimony or the ultimate inference would be presented to the jury.
- Q. Okay. As Ms. Eudaley mentioned that she -- the way she classifies her conclusions is okay. Because she doesn't say within one hundred percent certainly and she doesn't say to the exclusion of all other firearms.
- A. In the simplest form, the answer is no. Any statement of probability or -- probability, possibility, those are all called probabilistic statements. There is no foundation for any probabilistic statement other than could have, possible, consistent with. That's as far as the current state of the art will -- the science will allow the current state of the art to present to a jury or court.

- Q. But you're applying the scientific principle to something that you're saying is not science.
 - A. Correct.

- Q. Are you familiar with the -- with the science of psychology, meaning you've heard of it?
 - A. Yes, heard.
- Q. And you recognize that there's psychologists coming in and testifying in front of juries all the time?
 - A. Sure.
 - Q. Isn't there an error rate for Psychology?
- 12 A. I'm not aware of that.
 - Q. And is that something that can be validated, a psychologist's opinion?
 - A. But not in the domain so I can't address that.

 But I can indicate that rates of error may well -- those would probably be elusive as well, but there may be ways of presenting scientifically acceptable rates of error.
 - Q. Okay. Now you mentioned during direct examination of many times about the NAS report; and that's compiled by scientists, right?
 - A. Yes -- well, scientists, and they typically will have at least two legal -- two attorneys, one of whom was the chairman of the 2009 report.
 - Q. Okay. And that's the report that you've been

1 referring to, the 2009 report.

- A. Yes, the Strengthening Forensic Science in the U.S.
 - Q. Okay.

1.3

- A. Correct.
- Q. And since then, since 2009, you've testified many times -- or how many times in regards to firearms evidence admissibility?
 - A. Since 2009?
 - Q. Um-hum.
- A. I believe all thirteen were subsequent -- were post NAS. I can't be certain of that but I believe that's true.
- Q. Okay. Which -- and I'll get back to this in a moment. But when you were with the FBI and you worked with the firearms examiners, what statements were they permitted to make in regards to the conclusions back then?
- A. I did not monitor their courtroom testimony at the time, that wasn't one of my duties. And I would say probably the same conditions has existed for decades, up until the 2009 report.
 - Q. So they would say with absolute certainty.
- A. I'm aware that that was done, yes. I don't know what policy it was but I'm aware that that was done

as many, if not most. And even reviewing of the transcripts that I did, yes, that was quite frequent in court testimony to an absolute certainty.

- Q. Okay. When did you develop your opinion that you have now that that shouldn't be occurring?
- A. I was actually asked to look into this by a professor at John J. College, Adina Schwartz is his name, and I believe that was in 2005 -- between 2004 and 2006, it was pre -- both committees of the NRC and the NAS.
- Q. And when was the first time that you testified as an expert in opposition to those statements being made by a firearms examiner?
- A. That was in Washington D.C. I believe, to the best of my current recollection, and that would have been for attorney Larry Kupers, K-U-P-E-R-S. And you can -- I think you could even get the transcript, but I don't know what year that was. My guess would be -- actually, I don't even want to guess, I'll say maybe 2009, 2010, but it could have been earlier.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. I'm only guessing now.
- Q. Okay. I'm going to bounce around a little bit because I've taken some notes during your testimony, so forgive me. But one of the things that you were asked

by Defense counsel was in regards to the peer-review of 1 2 ATF journal articles; do you recall that -- I'm not talking about ATF; AFTE, the A-F-T-E. 3 Α. Okay. You're not -- yes. 4 Q. Do you recall that? 5 6 Α. Yes. 7 And your response was that they're not peer-reviewed the same way your stuff is peer-reviewed, 8 9 right? 10 Α. Yes. And how did you -- how do you know that? 11 12 Α. Well I've worked with the community for decades and I have -- I collaborate with firearms toolmarks 1.3 14 examiners. And I've also reviewed numerous transcripts 15 from testimony, so, general knowledge that I have from my intimate interactions with the community. 16 Okay. Are you familiar with an A.F.T.E. 17 Ο. journal in the spring of 2002 that did an abstract 18 19 article on the peer-review process for that particular journal? 2.0 Α. No. 21 22 Q. Okay. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Hanna, how long do you think you're going to have on your cross? I hate to 24

bump into you.

```
MR. HANNA:
                               Judge, I do have quite awhile
 1
 2
     to go.
                   THE COURT:
                               I've got a meeting that needs
 3
     to take place at 4:00 o'clock. I don't think it's going
 4
 5
     to take more than thirty or so minutes and we could
     reconvene at maybe 4:30 or something like that. But I
 6
 7
     need to get them their time because it's a published
     meeting and they'll be people expecting to be here for
 8
     that purpose. Would you all prefer to do it, say
 9
     starting up at 4:30, and I'm good till maybe 5:30, or do
10
     you want to come back in the morning? I'll give you
11
12
     some -- y'all some input on that.
                               Judge, may I confer with
13
                   MR. HANNA:
14
     Defense counsel?
15
                   THE COURT:
                               Sure.
16
                   MR. HANNA: Judge, I'd like to be able to
     confer with my co-counsel --
17
18
                   THE COURT:
                               Sure.
19
                   MR. HANNA: -- and sort of determine how
20
     much longer we think we're going to need. Mr. Doggett's
     expressed a concern to have Mr. Tobin finish today and
21
     be able to leave by the end of the day.
22
23
                   THE COURT:
                               Okay.
                               So, if you want to go your
24
                   MR. HANNA:
     meeting and we'll let you know when we get back.
25
```

```
THE COURT: Let's break for the meeting
 1
 2
     and y'all have a chance to talk while I'm doing that and
     then we'll reassemble when the meeting is over and we'll
 3
     make a decision at that point in time. Okay?
 4
                   MR. DOGGETT: We can leave our stuff here?
 5
                   THE COURT: Yes, you may.
 6
                    (Recess taken)
 7
                   THE COURT:
                               We're going to go till when?
 8
                               It's up to the Court.
 9
                   MR. HANNA:
                   THE COURT: Well I got to be at Missouri
10
     City, a police thing at 6:15, so if I -- we got till --
11
12
     we could get in thirty, thirty-five minutes.
                   MR. DOGGETT: How much you got left?
13
                   MR. HANNA: It is the Court's inquiry
14
     whether or not you think we'll finish tonight, and if we
15
     won't, let's just start tomorrow or --
16
17
                   THE COURT:
                               That's up to y'all.
18
     if you -- I'm fine for tomorrow morning. The jury's
     going to come in and they'll just -- they'll go back in
19
     the jury room and we'll give them some break time. And
20
     I'll buy some donuts on the way up here and give it to
21
     them and let them have a chance to just chat, and then
22
23
     when we're ready to start, we'll start.
                   MR. FELCMAN: Does he have another witness
24
     after this?
25
```

```
1
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  Yeah.
 2
                   MR. HANNA:
                               Yeah. And then my preference
     would be just start in the morning.
 3
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  Well my preference would be
 4
 5
     to go and try to finish, because maybe we can finish
     with Mr. Tobin and he can leave. I hate for him just
 6
 7
     have to stay a whole extra day and --
                   THE COURT: I understand.
 8
 9
                   MR. DOGGETT: -- rearrange flight
10
     arrangements and all that.
                   THE COURT: I'm paying the expenses of all
11
12
     this.
                                  Exactly, and that's what I'm
1.3
                   MR. DOGGETT:
14
     thinking about.
15
                   THE COURT:
                               But at the same time, you're
     welcome to go for another thirty minutes if you wish.
16
17
                                Okay. That's fine, Judge,
                   MR. HANNA:
18
     we'll go.
19
                   THE COURT:
                               And see what happens.
                                                       And if
     we don't get there, we don't get think there. I don't
20
21
     want you to feel compressed into thirty minutes.
22
                   MR. HANNA:
                                I won't, I appreciate that,
23
     Judge, thank you for that leeway.
24
                   THE COURT:
                                Okay.
25
```

CROSS-EXAMINATION (CONTINUED) 1 2 Q (By Mr. Hanna) Okay. Mr. Tobin, before our break, we were talking about peer-review for the 3 A.F.T.E. article. And you had heard, based on your 4 experience that the peer-review was not similar to the 5 peer-review that you have for articles that you write. 6 And I think one of the language you used was a referee 7 type system; is that correct? 8 9 Α. Yes, sir. MR. HANNA: May I approach the witness, 10 Your Honor? 11 12 THE COURT: Yes, sir. (By Mr. Hanna) I'm going to show you, for 13 purposes of your examination, an article out of the AFTE 14 15 journal, out of 2002, entitled the History of the AFTE Journal, the Peer-review Process and Daubert issues. 16 Are you familiar with it? 17 I think I've already indicated no. 18 Α. 19 Q. Okay. Does it appear to be what it says it is? 20 I haven't read anything other that the title Α. 21 so.

Okay. But you recognize that that's what the

Okay. And on page -- this is an addition,

title says, what I just read into the record.

22

23

24

25

Q.

Α.

Q.

Yes.

- Volume 34, Number two, and then it's identified as Page
 Number 213. Under the summary, there are some
 highlighted text in there, and I highlighted it for the
 ease of finding it. Could you read that, please?
 - A. "The AFTE journal is a scientific journal published quarterly which has a formal pre-publication evaluation process" -- oh, editorial, and that's six -- "committee with subject matter experts who function as referees and a post publication peer-review process designed to insure relevant and reliable information to the criminal justice community and members of the Discipline of Forensic Firearms and Toolmark identifications".
 - Q. Does this article change your opinion as to whether or not they have that peer-review process?
 - A. No.

1.3

- Q. Do you think this is a lie?
- A. It's misleading and misrepresenting and they're loosely using words that are not correct in this as they're used in their in the scientific in the true scientific community.
- Q. Sort of like you did with the whole chief thing at the FBI?
 - A. That's not true, no.
 - Q. Oh, you say you were chief but you really

weren't. That's sort of --

1.3

- A. I've never said I was a chief forensic metallurgist, I said I was the de facto chief forensic metallurgist. The definition of de facto means it's not codified, but I was functioning in that capacity and I'll maintain that to this day.
- Q. Are you upset that you weren't actually given that position?
- A. I turned it down twice -- well, you mean now or then? The answer now, I'm upset that I missed out on the fifteen thousand. If I would have known I was going to have to do the duties of a chief forensic metallurgist, I might have changed my mind but --
- Q. Have you ever been a firearms -- I mean, I'm sorry, a toolmark examiner?
 - A. Well I don't know how to answer that.
 - Q. It's a tough one, uh?
 - A. But it is.
- Q. Okay. Why is that a hard question?
 - A. Well there's spirit and intent, so I don't know -- I mean, literal or intent. The answer is yes, I did hundreds upon hundreds, if not thousands of, quote, toolmark examinations. I think where you're going -- and I'll save you some time, was I a certified toolmark examiner? No.

- Q. Okay. But you were one in spirit, I guess is what you mean?
 - A. Well the FBI apparently considered me -- my skills to be acceptable --
 - Q. Did you ever testify --
 - A. -- as did -- if I could finish, please -- as did other firearms toolmarks examiners as they would periodically consult with me for issues they did.
 - Q. Okay. Did you ever testify as a toolmark examiner?
 - A. I testified to toolmarks findings, yes. And that's the -- one example I was trying to use was the Judge Robert Vance case, where you cut me off, but the answer is, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Isn't the standards in which you had to use in order to express your opinion as a toolmark examiner the exact same standards as are implied or as included in the firearms examiners?
- A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

22

23

- Q. They're different?
- 21 A. Yes.
 - Q. What does AFTE stand for again?
 - A. Association of Firearms and Toolmarks
 Examiners.
- Q. Okay. And so AFTE sets the criteria and -- or

- 1 I know you're not -- you say you don't really like AFTE
 2 but --
 - A. No.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. -- that's what they subscribe to.
- A. I object to you're saying that I don't like AFTE, that's misrepresenting my position.
 - Q. Okay. What is your position about AFTE?
 - A. I don't have a like or dislike for them. I just address the objective issues of scientific principles and the scientific method related to AFTE activities.
- Q. But, like you mentioned before, you don't consider the forensic discipline that AFTE is engaged in or that is associated with it as a science.
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. So why apply those scientific principles to that area, that discipline?
- A. Because they are persuasively representing the practice as a science and that's how jurors interpret the practice.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Now --
- Q. Okay. I'm sorry.
- A. As I pointed out in my last paper, you know, footnote regarding, for example the Grzybowski -- and I

think it's G-R-Z-Y-B-O-W-S-K-I --

Q. Um-hum.

- A. -- paper. I think there are seven instances of the words science and scientific in the first two or three sentences. So it's a cognitive imbuing by repetitive -- by redundancy of a misleading and untrue representation.
- Q. So it's not truly a science, but you testified earlier that it is something that you believe juries should hear.
 - A. I'm sorry, would you say that again?
- Q. You testified that it is -- you're saying now that it should not be considered a science, but as you testified earlier, it is something that jurors should hear.
- A. Well I was presuming appropriate limiting instructions to the jury when I said that. But the answer is under the right guidelines, as far as interpretation that I would say, then one of the two opinions would be acceptable. But I think jurors need to be instructed that A, this is not the perceived Gospel from the mount that most, if not many believe them to be; and B, this is an opinion from a non-demonstrated a practice that is not demonstrated to show appropriate reliability, hasn't been

appropriately tested, is not involved in rigorous peer-review, and I forgot the fourth major criterion.

But -- but when I said that, I was assuming limiting instructions to a jury, and I now understand that that's not the case in Texas, so.

Q. So you're changing your opinion?

- A. I'm not changing my opinion with regard to conforming to accepted -- acceptably conforming to the Daubert criteria.
- Q. Okay. I think the language that you used, when you testified awhile ago was, the fact that -- it's similar to this, maybe not exact -- the fact that the firearm, slash, toolmarks is still in my opinion one of the top three most effective probative tools and it has significant probative value. Is that still your belief?
- A. Yes -- well, I'm sorry, I might have missed the last few words. Could you read that again?
- Q. I find the fact that the firearm toolmarks is still in my opinion one of the top three most effective probative tools and has significant probative value.
- A. Could have significant -- could have -- I was trying to bifurcate my opinion with regard to it as an investigative tool, like a polygraph versus the probative value, but again, I was assuming limiting jury instructions.

One of my bases for that is when I was working on the streets, I worked several IOC cases in Chicago. Those are interception of communications where we recovered from a -- we recovered some tapes where police departments were bugging jury deliberations. And what I heard was startling for a new agent, I mean, I was really startled with what I heard, how juries interpret expert testimony. So, that's part of the basis by which I have reservations about allowing uninterpretable and/or potentially unreliable evidence to go before a jury.

- Q. So now you're testifying that you're concerned about the way a jury will receive the evidence that you just testified awhile ago should be admitted.
 - A. I'm sorry, say that again.
- Q. You testified earlier, very similar to the way I just quoted, and now you're qualifying that -- and this is after our break, right?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. This was after you talked to Defense counsel.
- A. Sure, yes.
- Q. I guess he was surprised by your opinion at the conclusion of -- before the break?
 - A. I don't know if he was surprised or not.
 - Q. Okay. Did you talk to him about it?

A. Yes.

2.0

- Q. Okay. And so now you've come back with a different opinion; is that correct?
 - A. A modified opinion, but I was --
- Q. Okay. And it's based on this new information that you got from the Defense attorney.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you understand your job as an expert in this particular case is to advise the Judge about the science or lack thereof, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And not to interpret the way juries may or may not perceive it, or are you saying that because of your concern of the way a jury may perceive the evidence, that will effect your decision on whether or not it should be admissible or not?
- A. When I responded to the earlier question, I was assuming that the jurors would be advised that -- of what I've already indicated.
 - Q. Why were you assuming that?
- A. Well that's the way it is in the federal venue and most of the states where I've testified that jurors do get limitations or instructions, rather on how they should interpret not the ultimate issue obviously but, about how they should evaluate expert

testimony.

- Q. And where did you learn that? What state -- what federal rule allows a court to constrain a jury's consideration of evidence?
- A. Well, that's pretty standard in the federal system. They're allowed to include, in their jury instructions the limitations on what they can and can't do with regard to how they evaluate it and the number of states that I've testified. I just was not aware that there would be no concomitant instructions to a jury in this venue.
- Q. Okay. So, you're saying that if the Judge limits it -- and you have to -- you don't know how a Judge might limit it, right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. You don't know. But if a Judge limits it then it's not junk science; but if a Judge doesn't limit it then it is junk science. Is that what you're saying?
- A. I'm not calling it junk science, I've never characterized this practice as junk science.
- Q. Okay. You don't characterize it as science at all?
- A. Well that's another issue, but it's not a science nor is it a junk science, so.
 - Q. When you testified before, and you said, no, I

think the jury should hear this. What limiting instruction, for lack of a better term, were you imagining?

- A. That this -- well, first of all, I had already indicated that there were no -- I think there was only one at the time, the Daubert criteria that I felt that this even partially complied with, so I was actually addressing the Daubert criteria for admissibility. Now, with the Judges -- obviously the Judge's decision on whether to ring the bell or not to allow the jury to hear this, so -- but that was assuming that the jury would know that this is not what you've perceived it to be watching CSI on a television that this was -- and I think the Mayfield cases really woke up a lot of people to the fact that this is not a sacrosanct Gospel from the mount forensic practice.
- Q. Okay. So that's an instruction that the Judge should say that this isn't CSI?
- A. No, I'm generally not around for the instructions nor do I get them. I don't even get them in post -- in appellate matters either. So, I -- those were not -- those would be communicated to me through my clients generally.
- Q. So, what -- when you gave your opinion earlier that it should be something for a jury to consider, what

instruction were you imagining the Judge would give to make that appropriate?

- A. Now you're -- I didn't say it should be, I did not say that this evidence should be. I said that it would be scientifically acceptable with certain limitations. That's all I was saying earlier.
- Q. Okay. And you're saying that that evidence should be admitted even though you believe that it only meets one of the Daubert criteria.
- A. I've just -- you just -- I'll say it again. I did not say it should be admitted. That's again, usurping the Judge's role, and I don't presume to do that.

All I'm addressing is that I don't find these — this practice to comport to any of the Daubert criteria. And particularly — I don't know if you've read the advisory committee notes, the proposed Rule 702 Amendment, but they pretty well articulate various criteria at the time by which evidence — this evidence should be — well, evidence, not this evidence, should be evaluated. So my current position is that I don't find the practice to comport to any standards — appropriate stands of reliability, testability of peer—review — peer—review is partially satisfied but not fully. And I forgot the fourth, you'll have to help

1 me there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Okay. Well you're going through the Daubert criteria, correct?
 - A. Sure, yes.
- Q. But are you aware that in Texas, if something isn't a hard science or not science at all, that the Daubert factors aren't applied to it? Did you know that?
- A. No, no. But there again, we're talking about now having a cake -- trying to have the cake and eat it, too. The domain adamantly represents this as a science. And yes, they're now -- now you're proposing that they look for the exception because it's a soft science; I don't understand. I mean, that's a difficult issue, a challenging issue to reconcile.
 - Q. You agree with psychologists, it's a science?
- A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Is psychology a science?
- A. I'm not qualified to address; I don't know much of the field, so I can't address the issues in psychology.
- Q. Well, do you recognize that it's considered a science?
- A. Sure, yes.
- 25 Q. Okay.

- A. I mean and again, they would use, for example, a scientific method to try to gather information inductively or by using an inductive inference to assess trends or potentials or whatever. So, yes, in good part, I would accept that it's a science.
- Q. Okay. Your testimony has changed as a result of your conversation with Defense counsel; is that correct?
 - A. It's been modified.

- Q. Okay. And you're claiming that it's because of a misunderstanding of the law. But I've asked you, what was your understanding of the law before, and you're not able to tell us.
 - A. My -- well, understanding --
- Q. What instruction did you anticipate the Court to give when you rendered your opinion prior to our break?
- A. That the practice is not a science, and that this is a personal opinion based on an examiner using a methodology that hasn't been established to be reliable, it hasn't been properly tested and is not the most rigorously peer-reviewed. And again, I'm missing the fourth criteria. But my whatever that was, I remember reviewing that as well and that failed as well.

Q. Okay. So it doesn't meet any -- it doesn't meet any one of the Daubert requirements.

- A. Well half of that one. I have a slide that graded the various criteria for CLE's, and there were three F's and a C, I think was what I --
- Q. Did you learn anything in regards to this aspect in your criminal law classes that you took towards your Masters, any specialized studies?
- A. I don't know what this aspect is here, it's under evidence -- with evidence law.
 - Q. And what year did you get out of school?
- A. 1983. In fact, I wrote a manual that the Department of Justice wanted to publish and the FBI overruled them. They didn't feel that scientists should be writing legal guidelines legal guides, it was standards for appellate review issues.
- MR. HANNA: Can I approach the witness, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You may.

Q (By Mr. Hanna) First, I have some questions.

Mr. Tobin, do you recall testifying in the United

State's District Court in the Northern District of

Georgia, in Atlanta; it looks like back on July 25th of

2012? And the case was Clifford Jackson and Clifford

Durham. (sp)

Yes, I don't remember the date, but I remember 1 Α. 2 that trial, yes. 3 Q. Okay. I'm sorry, the hearing or the trial -- actually 4 it was a hearing. 5 It was a hearing, it was a hearing about the 6 Ο. admissibility of forensic ballistics or firearms 7 examining evidence? 8 Yes, the former U.S. Attorney was a Judge in 9 10 that case. 11 Okay. And the Judge asked you some questions Q. 12 during your testimony, did he not? Α. 1.3 Yes. In an attempt to try to clarify some of the 14 Q. issues for himself, he asked you questions about your 15 testimony and your opinion. And do you remember what 16 17 your response was when the Judge asked you --18 MR. HANNA: Your Honor, just for purposes of expediency, can I approach the witness with this? 19 THE COURT: 20 Sure. (By Mr. Hanna) This is a portion of the 21 Q transcript. I'd like you to read it -- and you can read 22 it to yourself. I want to ask you if you remember this 23

dialogue between yourself and the Judge.

A. Sure.

24

- Q. And to recap so everybody else in the courtroom knows what we're talking about. The Judge asked you, so you're here today to tell me that at no level is that comparison that ballistic examiners do, which you are not one, is ever useful or admissible in a case. And your response was, oh, no, Your Honor, I'm in fact I'm on public record as indicating that I do not have issues or I don't take issue with the practice, and I find them to be very effective at finding and comparing similarities in the pattern matching practice. Is that a true statement?
- A. Sure, yes.
- Q. In other words -- you continue, this bullet exhibit -- this bullet exhibits quite an impressive concordance, if you will, or similarities to opine that they are so similar.
 - A. Yes.
 - O. That's accurate?
- 19 A. Sure.

- Q. And that was -- that was to that particular case.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And you continue on. But in fact I have even indicated, I'm on record as indicating I find the practice of firearm toolmark is still in my opinion one

of the top three most effective probative tools and has significant probative value.

- A. Sure, yes, yeah.
- Q. And then you continue on. However, the -- I'm going to paraphrase, the ultimate inference of this specific source attribution, in other words, that it came from this gun to the exclusion of all of -- or exclusion of the other ten thousand guns that came in that production lot is scientifically unfounded.
 - A. Sure, yes.
- Q. And that's consistent with what you said earlier today, correct?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- Q. You almost quoted some of that verbatim when you gave one of your answers to my questions. But nowhere in this discourse, in your correspondence with that Judge, do you qualify your opinion based on a limiting instruction that the Judge were to give the jury.
 - A. Sure, that was a federal case.
 - Q. Right.
- A. So I was assuming a limiting jury instruction as well.
- 24 Q. So --
- A. We didn't discuss that in that hearing.

- Q. Right. So you're just assuming that the Judge is going to limit it some way and then that makes it okay for it to be admissible as long as the Judge gets some kind of limiting instruction on what the jury can do with that information?
 - A. Well he did limit it.
- Q. Well there's an agreement by the parties in that case but it wasn't by law.
 - A. No, no, but you were saying that --
- Q. In your statement prior to that -- and you weren't aware of that agreement had been reached prior to your testimony.
- 13 A. No, that agreement had not been reached prior 14 to my testimony.
 - O. Correct.
 - A. That agreement occurred in my presence in the courtroom.
- 18 Q. Correct.
- 19 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

20

21

2.2

24

- Q. So your statement never qualified that, I feel this way only if you tell the jury this limiting instruction.
- 23 A. That's correct.
 - Q. But now, after you met with Defense counsel and you found out what he wants the Court to do in this

particular case, you're changing your testimony.

1.3

- A. I modified my testimony. But I was never asked -- and I try not to, as you can see where I get my knees cut off, when I try to move things along by proactively addressing issues, I try not to address questions that aren't on the table. So I was not asked by the Judge nor either advocate as to my opinion as to the limiting instructions.
- Q. Are you trying to imply that you're not -- you don't provide more than enough information in your responses to the questions that Defense counsel and myself have asked?
 - A. I try to be thorough in my responses.
- Q. Right. And make sure that the Court understands your full position.
 - A. As much as I can in the limited time.
 - Q. Okay. Let me ask it way --
 - MR. HANNA: And I'm almost done, Judge.
- Q (By Mr. Hanna) Just so that I understand and the Court understands, what is your opinion about the testimony of firearm examiners before a jury?
- A. If juries are aware that these do not -- that such a practice does not comport to the scientific method, do not comport or comply with the various Daubert criteria, and that this -- it is an opinion of

an art -- a practice of art, then -- they don't propose to usurp the Judges. All I can say is the practice does not -- is objectionable or is -- does not comply with -- from a scientific de facto to the indicia of reliability. That's all I can really say.

I don't want to -- I think it's up to the Judge, after I make that statement to -- whether this goes or not before a jury. I do see there's a risk of misinterpretation, understanding of the reliability -- again, partially, from the IOC cases that I worked with. Juries just don't get -- they perceive -- what they perceive to be scientific endeavor to be infallible. And like I said, have a talismanic --

- Q. -- You continue to mention that. But it's really outside your area. You're trying to tell the Judge what jurors -- how jurors interpret evidence and this kind of thing.
- A. That's exactly what I'm trying to tell you I don't want to do here.
- Q. Well, that's what you're doing because you're saying, don't let this evidence in, if you're not going to tell the jury how to view it. So you're saying that you're afraid that the jury will misconstrue the validity or the significance or credibility of the testimony that you've already said should be before a

jury. 1 2 I'm supposedly here to testify about issues of science. 3 Right. Ο. 4 Α. The ultimate issue of legal is obviously up to 5 His Honor. So my point is, it does not meet the 6 7 scientific acceptability with regard to the Blackman (sp) Courts criteria. And I do indicate that when I try 8 to convey this information to a lay -- just regular 9 10 citizens or people that are not scientists or attorneys, it's a bit confusing. 11 12 There's a strong CSI perception that this is infallible as was fingerprints prior to Mayfield, the 13 14 Mayfield case. 15 Q. Okay. MR. HANNA: Judge, I'll pass the witness. 16 All right. Mr. Doggett. 17 THE COURT: 18 MR. DOGGETT: May I approach? Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: 20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION (By Mr. Doggett) This is Defendant's Exhibit 7, 21 Q it's a hard copy of your -- will you verify for me that 22 23 that's a hard copy of your slide show. It looks to be, yes. 24 Α. MR. DOGGETT: I offer Defendant's Exhibit 25

```
Number 7.
 1
 2
                   MR. HANNA:
                               I have no objection, Judge.
                   THE COURT: And that's -- did you say
 3
     seven?
 4
 5
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                 Seven.
                   THE COURT: Seven is admitted.
 6
 7
                   MR. DOGGETT: And I'm done.
                   THE COURT: Okay. Very good. You can
 8
 9
     leave the stand, thank you very much.
                   THE WITNESS: Am I released, Your Honor?
10
                   THE COURT: Yes, you are.
11
12
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 Thank you.
                   THE COURT: All right. I would like to
13
14
     look at this study before I make my finding.
15
                   MR. DOGGETT: Well, I'm done with this
     witness.
16
                   THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you
17
     were done, I thought you were done. Okay.
18
19
                   MR. DOGGETT: I have another witness.
                   THE COURT: Okay. Good. Well, that gives
20
     me a chance --
21
22
                   MR. DOGGETT: We would like you to look at
23
     the study.
                   THE COURT:
                               That gives me a chance to look
24
     at the study tonight then. I'm going to call us to a
25
```

```
conclusion for today.
 1
 2
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                 Yes, sir.
                   THE COURT: And you don't have a problem
 3
     with the witness that you have remaining, right?
 4
 5
                   MR. DOGGETT: No.
                   THE COURT: The timing, that kind --
 6
 7
                   MR. DOGGETT: No. We've already made the
     arrangements to extend a little bit.
 8
                                Okay. Good, that will be
 9
                   THE COURT:
10
     fine.
                                Judge, for housekeeping
11
                   MR. HANNA:
12
     purposes, we have a witness for the guilt part of the
     trial flying in from Alaska, who we prefer to -- if we
13
     have to, put on tomorrow to comply with his needs to get
14
15
     back to Alaska in a short period of time. So we maybe
     asking the Court for not included with the hearing to --
16
     I don't know, we're going to have to come up with an
17
     idea to try and get his testimony before the jury
18
                         I don't know how much longer we
19
     sometime tomorrow.
20
     have, you've got one more witness that you think will
     not take as long as --
21
22
                   MR. DOGGETT: No, it won't take as long as
     Mr. Tobin.
23
24
                   MR. HANNA:
                               Okay.
                   MR. DOGGETT: We're going to work tonight
25
```

```
to shorten the testimony. So, I'm guessing we could be
 1
     through in maybe an hour, hour and a half, max.
 2
                   MR. HANNA: Both of us?
 3
                   MR. DOGGETT: I don't think you're going
 4
     to ask many questions -- I don't think you're going as
 5
 6
     many questions.
 7
                               Then that might make you feel
                   MR. HANNA:
     better about getting the opening statements done or
 8
 9
     anything --
10
                   THE COURT:
                               Yeah, I don't think it's going
11
     to take us a long time in the morning.
12
                   MR. HANNA: Okay. Judge, just for
     purposes of my preparation tonight, you mentioned you
13
14
     wanted to read the report. Which report is it that
15
     you're referring to?
                                The NIS report, wasn't that
16
                   THE COURT:
     it?
17
18
                   MR. HANNA:
                                The N-A-S report.
19
                   THE COURT: N-A-S report.
20
                   MR. HANNA: Yeah, it's been admitted by
     Defense counsel; it's very brief.
21
22
                               Right. That's what I wanted
                   THE COURT:
23
     to look at.
                   MR. DOGGETT:
                                  There's two of them, there's
24
     one in '09 and one in '08. The '09 is very short, the
25
```

```
'08 is --
 1
                                I'll take both.
                    THE COURT:
 2
                    MR. HANNA: I have some of that stuff that
 3
     I offer to the Court, too.
 4
                    THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank
 5
     y'all. See you in the morning.
 6
                    (Proceedings adjourned for evening)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

THE STATE OF TEXAS 1 2 COUNTY OF FORT BEND \$ I, Karen Woolsey, Official Court Reporter in and for 3 the 434th District Court of Fort Bend County, State of 4 Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing 5 6 contains a true and correct transcription of all 7 portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in 8 9 this volume of the Reporter's Record in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court 10 11 or in chambers and were reported by me. 12 I further certify that this Reporter's Record of the 13 proceedings truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, 14 if any, offered by the respective parties. 15 I further certify that the total cost for the 16 preparation of this Reporter's Record is \$ and 17 will be paid by Fort Bend County. 18 /s/ Karen Woolsey 19 Karen Woolsey, CSR 20 Texas CSR 1828 Official Court Reporter 434th District Court 21 Fort Bend County, Texas 22 301 Jackson Richmond, Texas 77469 23 Telephone: 281.633.7654 Expiration: 12/31/2015 24

25

	100/44 100/45 007/00	
 '	136/14 136/15 227/20 2011 [1] 59/13	8
'08 [2] 256/25 257/1	 2011 [1] 59/13 2012 [4] 164/11 164/12 164/12 246/24	849 [1] 9/15
109 [2] 256/25 256/25	2013 [5] 120/4 121/3 164/12 164/13	
_	165/2	9
-	2014 [5] 1/13 3/1 53/9 60/25 118/1	9-28 [1] 136/1
-AND [1] 2/16	2015 [1] 258/23	900 pound [1] 183/11
	20th [2] 56/8 56/11	93 [1] 8/6
C [0] 40/00 44/0	213 [1] 233/2	95.7 percent [1] 189/25
.6 [2] 40/22 41/8	23rd [1] 118/1	96 [1] 8/6
.6 percent [2] 40/22 41/8	24045521 [1] 2/8 24th [1] 56/10	99 [3] 8/2 83/1 83/1 99 percent [3] 82/21 82/25 83/4
/	25th [2] 56/10 246/23	
/ s [1] 258/18	26th [1] 56/10	Α
0	27th [2] 129/4 136/12	a subpoena [1] 147/4
	28 [1] 136/1	A-B-1717 [1] 196/25
00787638 [1] 2/3	28.2 percent [1] 209/19	A-F-T-E [2] 18/8 228/3
05945700 [1] 2/17	281 [4] 2/5 2/5 2/10 2/14	A.F.T.E [2] 228/17 232/4
06881500 [1] 2/12	281.342.3321 [1] 2/19 281.633.7654 [1] 258/23	AB1717 [1] 198/11 abandoned [2] 168/13 169/9
1	[28th [3] 135/19 136/14 136/15	abandoning [1] 167/12
1.4 [1] 40/24	[2nd [1] 9/15	ability [3] 6/11 37/9 178/19
1.4 percent [5] 40/20 40/25 41/25 42/4	3	able [31] 3/14 5/10 16/22 33/12 35/8
86/9		40/7 48/8 65/20 79/18 93/14 95/4 98/16
1120 [1] 2/21	3.65 million [1] 191/13	100/18 101/17 102/16 102/19 114/19
11DCR056513 [1] 1/3	301 [4] 2/4 2/9 2/13 258/22	120/18 126/3 140/21 146/25 147/11
11TH [1] 2/18	335276 [1] 8/17	176/1 183/12 190/5 201/10 212/6 214/9
12 [1] 164/13 12/31/2015 [1] 258/23	34 [1] 233/1 341-4440 [1] 2/5	229/16 229/22 245/14 about [177] 4/4 4/11 5/7 6/11 11/5 11/12
12/31/2013 [1] 236/23 1200 [1] 56/8	341-4460 [1] 2/5	11/24 15/7 16/20 17/11 17/13 21/22
121 [1]	341-4551 [2] 2/10 2/14	23/3 23/20 25/6 25/7 26/8 27/8 30/5
13 [1] 164/13	3730 [1] 2/21	33/21 35/25 36/2 36/24 41/6 43/13
14 [1] 3/1	38 [1] 83/15	47/10 47/18 50/15 51/15 52/22 53/6
141 [1] 8/2	380 [1] 124/21	54/17 56/25 57/12 61/10 64/2 64/16
142 [1] 165/1	389 [1] 8/22	65/4 65/7 65/9 65/13 65/14 67/11 67/22
144 [1] 8/2	3rd [3] 8/22 9/14 13/9	69/9 69/17 73/17 75/12 76/8 78/5 78/13
14TH [1] 1/13 17025 [2] 59/15 59/19	4	80/16 80/18 82/5 82/19 83/5 84/6 88/20 88/25 90/25 91/24 92/6 93/22 95/4
1717 [1] 196/25	40 [1] 83/16	97/15 100/18 100/23 100/24 100/24
17718625 [1] 2/21	41 [1] 1/2	101/1 101/6 101/7 101/18 102/8 103/16
18 [1] 164/2	425 [1] 9/15	103/21 103/22 106/10 107/11 108/13
1828 [1] 258/20	434TH [3] 1/5 258/4 258/21	112/17 112/20 113/1 114/12 114/23
19 [1] 164/2	4440 [1] 2/5	117/17 122/15 124/3 125/4 127/19
1939 [1] 8/3	4460 [1] 2/5	129/7 129/14 129/20 129/24 130/2
1953 [1] 186/1 1978 [2] 40/18 41/11	4551 [2] 2/10 2/14 4:00 o'clock [1] 229/4	130/4 130/4 130/5 130/10 136/21 138/20 141/16 142/19 146/16 146/22
1983 [3] 203/23 204/7 246/12	4:30 [5] 5/4 5/5 6/25 229/6 229/10	147/2 147/5 147/20 150/14 150/16
1986 [1] 160/18		150/17 152/2 153/14 154/1 154/14
1989 [2] 183/22 184/1	5	156/25 158/14 159/18 163/14 165/6
1991 [2] 40/19 41/11	514 [1] 8/22	165/9 165/10 166/12 169/19 169/22
1998 [2] 41/19 157/15	53 [1] 165/1	171/23 173/19 174/15 176/18 177/9
1:30 [1] 144/6	5:00 [1] 5/3	181/16 181/17 182/13 185/18 186/8
1st [1] 167/5	 5:30 [1] 229/10 5th [1] 8/23	186/19 190/15 193/8 194/3 195/22 196/7 196/17 198/8 198/14 199/11
2		200/8 202/15 204/13 204/19 205/19
2.3 percent [1] 209/19	6	207/19 209/4 209/14 209/25 210/15
2002 [5] 8/5 41/19 52/9 228/18 232/15	69 [1] 149/24	211/21 211/23 212/15 213/18 216/25
2003 [1] 148/23	6:15 [1] 230/11	225/20 228/3 231/14 232/3 236/7 239/9
2004 [1] 227/8	6:30 [1] 5/1	239/13 239/25 240/9 240/25 244/9
2005 [4] 56/3 59/7 167/5 227/8	7	247/6 247/15 248/2 251/20 253/2 256/8
 2006 [1] 227/9 2007 [1] 120/14	702 [6] 6/23 6/23 221/25 222/1 222/16	above [5] 1/14 200/1 200/23 258/5 258/9
2007 [1] 120/14 2008 [2] 180/20 211/21	243/17	above-styled [1] 258/9
2009 [12] 8/16 180/17 189/10 189/19	71 [1] 149/24	above-titled [1] 1/14
190/1 211/22 225/24 226/1 226/6 226/9	713.520.5223 [1] 2/22	abrogated [1] 11/17
226/22 227/20	77002 [1] 56/8	absolute [10] 29/3 29/9 79/4 79/5 79/11
201 [1] 2/18	77098 [1] 2/22	85/18 85/19 206/5 226/23 227/3
2010 [12] 18/20 59/13 60/25 69/24	77469 [5] 2/4 2/10 2/14 2/18 258/22	absolutely [2] 42/20 43/17
96/19 129/5 135/20 136/1 136/12		abstract [1] 228/18

160/22 abundance [1] 10/8 Academy [11] 12/1 54/8 64/2 64/5 109/13 109/14 109/15 110/13 180/1 180/4 180/6 Academy's [1] 109/15 accelerate [1] 169/6 accept [2] 170/14 245/5 acceptability [1] 253/7 acceptable [9] 89/21 189/6 206/9 206/9 211/25 225/18 235/4 237/20 243/5 acceptably [1] 238/8 accepted [8] 10/10 22/4 23/22 50/21 60/11 159/20 166/19 238/8 access [11] 19/10 123/23 126/10 131/14 131/15 146/17 149/4 149/11 150/14 154/14 205/22 accommodate [1] 148/4 accordance [2] 61/16 211/14 according [2] 122/22 131/3 account [3] 41/10 41/12 123/6 accounts [5] 122/24 123/7 123/8 123/10 123/11 accreditation [11] 18/25 56/2 58/16 59/3 59/15 59/15 60/10 60/19 149/16 149/20 150/3 accredited [5] 18/18 18/20 18/22 59/7 59/17 accrediting [2] 41/14 59/4 accumulation [1] 190/20 accuracy [1] 81/21 accurate [5] 36/17 43/9 81/23 193/4 248/18 accused [1] 210/8 acknowledged [1] 203/20 acquiesce [1] 213/15 acquired [2] 157/8 157/17 acronym [2] 20/8 44/9 across [5] 7/20 25/24 39/11 80/10 88/3 acting [1] 11/1 action [2] 74/9 96/13 activities [3] 160/5 160/15 236/11 actual [11] 16/11 38/14 38/15 46/1 112/18 135/13 135/22 136/6 136/9 220/7 220/24 actually [57] 8/9 8/24 16/2 17/19 26/15 26/24 28/2 35/1 39/7 46/3 46/19 46/21 51/22 53/21 54/4 56/4 60/1 60/13 64/8 65/17 72/24 75/14 79/18 83/9 88/7 95/20 99/7 101/15 105/15 109/6 109/13 115/17 123/7 123/23 131/9 138/13 159/15 161/2 163/5 173/19 176/9 183/15 186/12 190/11 196/13 196/22 200/11 205/2 209/11 210/13 212/22 218/24 227/6 227/19 234/7 242/7 247/4 adamantly [1] 244/11 addition [2] 59/10 232/25 additional [5] 4/18 21/22 57/2 116/12 142/12 address [8] 12/1 31/22 36/4 225/15 236/9 244/19 244/20 251/5 addressed [1] 112/13 addresses [1] 9/17 addressing [3] 242/8 243/14 251/5 Adina [1] 227/7 adjourned [1] 257/7 Administration [2] 157/11 169/11

administrative [4] 37/12 138/11 160/13

```
administrator [1] 123/9
admissibility [5] 111/15 147/7 226/8
242/8 247/7
admissible [6] 8/25 9/25 118/10 240/16
248/5 250/3
admission [2] 221/22 222/7
admit [3] 10/5 156/4 180/23
admits [1] 222/14
admitted [14] 8/8 9/5 11/8 11/14 156/17
169/5 181/14 181/14 224/3 239/14
243/8 243/11 254/6 256/20
admitting [1] 8/4
advance [1] 169/23
advise [1] 240/9
advised [1] 240/18
advisory [1] 243/17
advocate [1] 251/7
advocating [1] 223/18
Aeronautics [1] 157/11
aerosolized [1] 134/22
affect [1] 133/13
affidavit [1] 111/13
affiliated [2] 53/23 64/21
AFIS [8] 44/22 45/3 45/5 81/4 81/10
81/14 81/21 82/1
afraid [1] 252/23
AFTE [76] 17/15 17/17 18/9 20/8 20/11
20/12 21/1 21/3 21/17 22/8 22/10 22/11
22/15 24/24 36/3 49/17 57/14 61/19
61/22 62/5 62/6 62/8 62/9 62/13 62/18
62/19 62/25 78/23 79/16 79/25 80/2
80/4 80/11 80/24 84/23 90/17 102/9
105/6 112/21 143/18 169/23 169/24
170/1 170/23 170/25 171/3 171/23
175/15 176/16 176/17 176/20 177/3
177/10 179/3 180/5 182/14 187/5
191/24 191/24 195/11 203/17 203/25
204/4 204/21 221/17 228/3 232/14
232/15 233/5 235/22 235/25 236/1
236/6 236/7 236/10 236/13
AFTE's [1] 181/17
after [39] 3/24 19/23 20/1 28/15 32/11
34/25 48/14 49/5 49/8 51/18 52/11
55/22 73/16 76/10 79/15 105/21 107/6
121/10 122/15 129/18 132/25 133/25
134/1 136/13 138/8 152/18 152/19
159/3 159/19 167/16 167/17 176/8
201/18 201/18 230/25 239/18 239/20
250/24 252/7
afternoon [1] 6/25
again [45] 8/18 29/25 57/24 67/10 69/9
70/8 78/15 80/15 86/17 90/2 92/19 94/2
94/24 95/4 95/9 95/13 96/14 101/18
106/10 106/18 110/19 126/13 132/7
135/2 142/8 144/22 164/4 179/25
179/25 191/24 195/12 206/15 212/14
213/1 235/22 237/11 238/17 238/24
239/15 243/10 243/11 244/9 245/1
245/23 252/10
against [3] 89/24 90/2 103/9
age [1] 199/1
agencies [1] 11/16
agency [1] 13/20
agent [3] 157/14 157/15 239/6
ago [15] 4/14 6/24 14/24 15/8 81/1
83/12 86/10 91/25 153/18 201/25
203/19 218/1 223/9 238/11 239/14
agree [8] 85/12 92/22 133/2 141/21
```

```
agreed [3] 94/14 185/13 185/14
agreeing [3] 91/9 91/9 91/9
agreement [46] 17/22 17/24 24/16 27/10
27/15 27/25 28/1 28/6 28/7 28/9 28/12
28/17 28/20 28/20 28/22 28/23 28/24
33/2 33/3 34/2 34/14 34/16 34/17 34/17
34/19 34/19 34/22 92/23 93/2 93/7
93/19 93/25 94/18 101/14 102/5 102/10
102/21 103/14 113/12 154/12 179/4
179/7 250/7 250/11 250/13 250/16
agreements [4] 28/25 91/8 102/22
102/23
agrees [2] 105/6 209/8
ahead [8] 38/6 131/1 135/6 148/13
173/13 186/25 190/14 193/20
Al [3] 52/25 52/25 53/4
Al-Mohamed [2] 52/25 52/25
Alaska [2] 255/13 255/15 Alcohol [3] 15/19 44/14 44/15
alert [1] 3/11
Alfred [2] 203/24 204/1
algorithm [2] 44/23 46/2
ali [187] 3/9 5/14 6/15 9/23 10/24 12/15
31/6 32/13 37/23 38/7 39/11 42/3 44/12
46/7 46/8 51/5 52/18 53/2 53/5 53/20
55/15 58/10 59/20 61/2 62/7 64/20
66/17 69/23 71/13 71/14 71/15 72/14
73/16 75/2 78/19 79/2 79/3 79/7 79/15
85/12 85/14 88/3 88/5 88/13 90/11 94/2
94/18 94/21 97/18 101/19 103/21
103/22 103/22 108/9 108/10 112/1
112/5 112/5 112/13 113/8 114/11
115/10 115/15 116/5 116/16 116/18
116/20 117/1 120/15 123/19 126/16
 126/25 127/18 129/11 131/16 132/9
 133/2 133/22 133/24 134/22 134/22
 140/6 140/25 144/1 144/12 145/7 146/1
147/10 148/6 150/2 151/4 151/14
152/16 153/22 153/25 154/20 155/20
156/3 156/23 157/21 158/9 159/23
160/5 160/16 160/25 161/22 162/11
 163/2 164/3 164/16 165/3 165/6 166/21
 167/1 168/15 169/13 169/17 171/23
172/8 172/14 175/11 175/17 176/11
177/2 180/19 181/12 182/13 183/5
183/8 184/10 184/24 187/1 188/4 188/9
188/14 188/16 191/22 191/22 192/4
192/23 194/22 195/8 196/7 196/9 200/1
200/8 203/4 203/9 204/16 206/8 207/15
208/4 210/3 210/4 210/13 211/9 211/21
212/8 212/14 212/24 213/5 213/18
215/4 215/8 216/9 216/14 220/5 224/17
224/20 225/8 226/11 229/9 231/10
231/11 241/22 242/4 243/6 243/14
244/6 249/7 252/2 252/5 253/17 254/13
257/5 258/6 258/10
allegations [1] 116/25
Allegiance [1] 4/24
Allen [2] 152/11 152/20
allow [14] 8/20 119/7 146/17 149/11
152/6 179/18 180/2 214/1 218/21
223/19 224/3 224/7 224/24 242/10
allowed [7] 7/23 8/23 9/2 11/22 121/1
185/16 241/6
allowing [2] 179/22 239/9
allows [4] 182/9 182/11 213/19 241/3
alloy [2] 199/13 199/14
alloyed [1] 199/14
```

141/22 202/21 203/5 244/16

April 3rd [1] 13/9 219/15 249/15 **Arabia [1]** 51/1 anticipate [1] 245/16 almost [3] 166/20 249/14 251/18 anticipated [1] 6/1 architecture [1] 168/1 along [5] 3/19 5/11 120/1 181/13 251/4 antimony [1] 184/15 are [328] already [24] 63/13 82/13 98/18 139/5 any [95] 4/5 4/19 5/6 7/19 13/19 14/15 area [22] 9/9 10/11 24/25 31/21 93/4 140/16 141/8 174/14 180/24 180/25 14/16 16/14 20/2 22/18 22/21 35/14 93/14 93/18 94/1 98/2 98/4 114/3 114/4 190/15 191/22 194/7 196/18 200/8 37/16 45/16 45/17 46/16 47/1 50/16 137/16 137/18 140/14 168/16 192/13 57/19 57/25 62/4 63/14 63/16 67/11 202/7 202/15 205/19 211/22 212/15 193/19 195/6 221/23 236/17 252/15 232/18 240/19 242/4 252/25 255/7 70/7 77/8 78/18 78/18 80/19 82/10 areas [10] 93/2 93/6 93/7 94/14 94/17 also [39] 4/16 4/23 8/15 8/23 16/1 17/25 88/23 93/18 94/14 103/12 103/17 94/21 103/14 112/14 120/15 192/10 18/17 20/25 37/10 37/15 52/24 59/13 103/23 104/16 105/3 105/9 105/10 aren't [6] 9/10 56/15 87/25 209/5 244/7 70/21 75/18 76/3 77/5 85/1 95/11 106/20 116/11 122/9 125/25 127/4 251/6 110/10 113/1 114/23 116/14 116/15 127/6 132/12 134/20 135/3 135/25 arena [3] 171/6 178/21 189/7 136/7 136/9 137/19 142/9 143/1 149/25 arguably [8] 194/3 194/3 194/4 194/4 116/19 119/11 119/21 124/9 143/17 160/12 165/3 168/15 177/15 180/7 150/13 150/15 150/22 152/5 153/9 194/4 194/5 194/5 194/9 182/24 191/8 192/6 216/20 219/4 161/22 165/14 167/1 167/18 176/11 argument [5] 86/16 121/15 121/21 228/14 182/17 182/24 183/2 183/24 184/16 121/24 128/6 alter [2] 71/8 72/9 186/5 193/3 202/19 202/20 202/20 argumentative [1] 127/22 altering [5] 71/5 71/7 71/9 71/10 122/6 202/21 202/22 203/7 207/13 208/24 arguments [1] 7/10 alternative [1] 214/8 armament [1] 163/9 209/5 209/9 209/12 209/13 218/6 although [2] 6/8 110/19 **Armorer's [3]** 64/14 64/16 64/19 220/13 224/18 224/21 243/15 243/22 **aluminum [3]** 157/10 158/25 158/25 246/1 246/2 246/8 258/14 **Arms [3]** 16/16 16/17 16/17 always [8] 6/6 56/5 70/2 88/11 91/21 anybody [6] 39/1 64/18 81/2 150/20 around [7] 21/16 22/11 46/12 116/4 181/9 227/23 242/19 113/11 114/15 200/14 151/24 203/2 **am [13]** 18/12 18/16 34/19 53/16 53/17 anymore [1] 44/10 arrangements [3] 3/21 231/10 255/8 53/25 57/21 60/1 63/15 79/20 134/13 anyone [5] 84/3 134/8 134/24 153/9 arsenic [1] 184/15 arson [4] 143/17 168/16 168/18 168/25 150/22 254/10 189/22 Amanda [1] 2/8 anything [21] 31/22 35/21 51/15 57/12 art [5] 214/3 224/23 224/24 252/1 252/1 ambiguous [1] 177/12 90/18 98/9 106/10 125/22 129/24 130/1 article [7] 19/22 19/23 19/24 228/19 amend [1] 163/3 130/1 143/13 147/6 152/23 154/11 232/4 232/14 233/14 165/10 167/11 204/25 232/20 246/6 Amendment [1] 243/18 articles [10] 10/3 10/3 10/7 10/8 19/5 America [1] 9/15 256/9 19/11 19/16 116/13 228/2 232/6 articulate [1] 243/18 American [4] 64/2 64/5 163/17 163/18 anyway [7] 55/24 58/11 73/16 119/23 ammunition [11] 15/22 96/22 96/22 97/5 121/2 169/19 218/23 articulated [1] 182/15 97/6 97/7 97/17 97/20 97/22 97/24 98/4 anywhere [1] 182/17 Arts [1] 217/18 apart [12] 15/24 57/4 71/12 126/12 amongst [3] 25/1 80/23 101/10 **ASCLAD [2]** 59/16 60/2 amount [5] 3/12 17/24 17/24 111/1 132/15 133/23 134/2 134/10 134/15 **ASCLD** [1] 18/23 135/1 135/9 148/3 ask [14] 16/22 67/13 128/8 129/17 apartment [1] 166/15 analogy [4] 177/14 179/8 207/24 207/25 155/1 155/5 155/24 164/18 185/7 215/3 **apologize** [1] 169/16 analysis [26] 11/18 13/4 51/11 51/16 219/11 247/23 251/17 256/5 52/15 52/22 76/12 84/7 86/4 86/19 apparently [4] 54/22 74/16 126/12 235/3 asked [24] 54/17 108/14 112/17 127/21 128/7 130/9 138/25 144/21 144/23 111/22 112/1 117/16 120/19 120/25 **Appeals [3]** 8/6 8/16 8/19 121/4 146/10 146/13 148/15 150/25 appear [2] 165/14 232/19 167/16 168/23 185/9 192/20 192/22 appearance [2] 53/25 114/6 163/23 164/9 165/9 165/10 166/14 227/6 227/25 245/12 247/11 247/15 APPEARANCES [1] 2/1 220/12 247/17 248/2 251/3 251/6 251/12 analyst [1] 150/1 appeared [2] 122/19 126/21 asking [10] 4/19 7/12 17/1 36/24 77/14 analyst's [1] 124/4 appears [2] 125/17 131/6 82/18 128/10 153/10 223/24 255/16 analysts [2] 60/15 176/23 appellate [2] 242/21 246/16 aspect [4] 17/12 158/7 246/7 246/9 analytical [1] 165/24 append [1] 206/1 aspects [2] 160/12 160/13 analyzing [1] 166/1 and/or [2] 193/1 239/10 angry [2] 121/18 123/21 assembly [1] 66/24 asserted [1] 215/17 assess [2] 78/6 245/4 appended [2] 189/8 202/17 application [4] 159/20 182/24 183/2 183/8 anonymous [1] 170/9 applications [1] 185/7 assessed [1] 194/20 another [32] 18/3 29/7 33/23 35/9 35/15 applied [2] 62/3 244/7 assessing [1] 59/23 45/15 60/5 79/8 85/9 85/17 97/24 98/2 assessment [14] 59/4 59/9 59/9 59/10 apply [8] 10/2 112/23 215/25 216/1 98/23 100/20 105/20 106/5 113/11 216/15 216/18 216/19 236/16 59/11 59/19 59/21 60/4 60/12 60/15 116/24 121/5 121/8 121/9 122/20 applying [2] 59/14 225/1 60/23 202/17 223/16 223/17 139/18 140/18 151/1 153/14 188/15 appraisals [2] 160/14 221/5 assessments [1] 59/8 218/2 230/24 231/16 241/23 254/19 appreciate [2] 100/17 231/22 assessor [1] 60/2 answer [35] 17/2 29/11 29/12 37/10 approach [8] 107/21 155/21 164/4 assessors [1] 22/2 37/15 39/9 40/3 40/4 42/15 60/21 65/4 180/12 232/10 246/17 247/19 253/18 assign [2] 86/14 97/14 67/14 86/6 89/7 89/12 89/14 90/25 appropriate [9] 46/8 153/11 203/15 assigned [4] 40/14 119/16 122/15 220/9 91/12 92/19 93/1 161/15 161/17 161/18 213/8 214/17 237/16 237/25 243/2 assigns [1] 46/4 assist [1] 26/4 200/25 207/11 213/14 213/16 219/8 243/23 222/23 224/18 234/10 234/16 234/21 appropriately [2] 60/22 238/1 Assistant [1] 121/16 235/14 237/18 approximate [1] 14/12 associate [2] 207/8 211/8 answered [2] 38/8 127/22 associated [2] 39/23 236/14 approximately [5] 15/14 25/7 43/3 43/8 associating [1] 208/6 answering [1] 203/14 121/2 answers [6] 39/5 47/13 89/11 219/12 April [2] 13/9 53/9 association [13] 15/18 17/17 18/9 20/8

Α

association... [9] 20/21 44/14 62/20 62/25 63/24 163/17 208/9 212/7 235/23 associations [1] 176/21 assume [4] 107/6 109/11 169/21 191/3 assumed [2] 5/22 137/4 assuming [10] 76/21 173/9 201/22 238/3 238/24 240/18 240/20 242/11 249/22 250/1 assumption [2] 84/24 141/17 assumptions [4] 84/10 108/24 110/14 **Assurance [3]** 149/15 149/19 149/22 assuredly [1] 208/20 **Astros** [1] 130/5 **ATF [3]** 50/18 228/2 228/3 Atlanta [1] 246/23 Atomic [2] 186/1 186/1 attack [1] 31/13 attacking [1] 119/5 attacks [1] 29/20 attempt [1] 247/14 attempting [2] 8/11 122/16 attempts [1] 186/5 attended [1] 16/15 attending [1] 64/14 attention [3] 63/12 112/8 112/11 attorney [8] 2/6 2/11 2/15 2/19 110/10 227/16 240/6 247/9 Attorney's [7] 2/3 2/9 2/13 150/10 150/16 153/3 153/10 attorneys [3] 152/12 225/23 253/10 attribution [1] 249/6 attributions [1] 190/6 audit [6] 58/20 58/21 59/25 60/1 210/2 210/3 auditors [1] 61/12 audits [1] 58/23 **Austin [2]** 50/7 50/10 author [3] 143/16 170/13 198/11 authored [2] 157/22 163/24 authoritative [8] 54/10 54/16 54/18 54/19 54/22 55/4 204/3 206/19 authority [2] 54/24 55/3 authors [2] 80/13 171/14 automatic [2] 74/4 95/25 availability [2] 168/5 168/6 available [5] 84/18 139/1 139/2 188/18 191/6 average [1] 91/7 aware [28] 18/12 20/13 25/15 47/1 47/11 80/16 80/25 87/10 88/18 88/23 103/5 141/11 141/22 142/15 142/17 150/20 150/22 151/17 171/4 203/4 209/13 225/12 226/24 226/25 241/9 244/5 250/11 251/22 awareness [1] 17/7 away [6] 15/12 54/3 67/18 122/17 184/10 184/24 awhile [7] 59/8 81/1 83/12 86/10 229/1 238/11 239/14

lR

B-A-T-T-E-L-LE [1] 157/12 Bachelor [5] 14/7 14/20 120/9 157/1 217/7 back [55] 15/24 18/20 22/8 29/17 38/15 46/10 46/13 48/8 48/15 67/10 67/16 69/24 70/18 70/18 75/3 75/8 76/13 82/20 83/15 88/2 96/4 96/5 96/8 96/14 98/24 101/16 124/2 124/15 126/13 133/23 135/2 143/9 144/9 145/4 159/12 159/15 159/16 159/22 170/11 173/21 176/4 182/4 192/25 204/6 204/7 204/14 205/23 226/14 226/17 229/11 229/25 230/19 240/2 246/23 255/15 background [6] 14/4 51/13 87/8 120/8

background [6] 14/4 51/13 87/8 120/8 144/2 156/25

bad [1] 55/16 bailiff [1] 145/20 baking [2] 177/14 179/7

ballistic [12] 11/23 109/16 109/18 109/20 109/23 110/3 110/8 111/12

180/20 187/24 206/3 248/4 **ballistically [1]** 166/9

ballistics [8] 7/16 26/3 44/8 44/10 165/18 172/2 206/8 247/7

bar [8] 158/8 187/23 192/21 192/23 193/3 194/23 195/1 207/13

bare [2] 59/6 134/11

barrel [20] 47/25 49/6 66/21 72/17 95/21 96/2 96/3 96/16 105/14 105/16 105/18 106/3 106/18 115/8 115/10 143/3 143/6 175/8 175/9 192/19 barrels [7] 30/6 32/5 32/16 32/21 32/23

79/17 175/6

base [1] 84/19 based [35] 3/18 12/4 24/16 30/9 33/5 42/9 45/25 46/1 46/4 78/24 80/8 81/25 92/25 94/18 102/2 102/7 113/22 114/9 123/2 136/21 149/14 166/13 182/10 184/9 209/16 209/20 213/5 214/2 215/8 215/8 216/12 232/4 240/5 245/20

bases [1] 239/1

249/17

basically [10] 38/3 85/23 143/4 177/17 189/19 190/4 192/1 195/3 204/8 212/5 basis [10] 5/25 11/6 40/1 40/4 79/13 80/1 80/2 94/7 133/20 239/9

batch [2] 186/10 186/11 **Battelle [2]** 157/12 159/16

be [276]

beat [1] 145/12

became [5] 51/22 67/22 151/17 152/12 218/24

because [73] 3/12 5/4 6/6 8/11 9/7 10/6 10/22 13/12 27/5 29/4 31/16 33/15 34/10 36/19 40/2 41/25 42/8 42/13 42/16 43/22 52/4 58/15 60/3 63/12 64/13 67/22 70/11 73/11 78/9 87/7 89/16 93/10 93/12 93/17 95/6 99/4 99/9 104/2 105/18 106/1 106/5 106/17 113/12 115/1 115/18 123/18 123/21 127/25 134/7 146/24 147/5 147/15 147/19 147/21 154/20 165/23 167/7 174/25 206/18 208/23 210/24 216/3 220/11 224/3 224/15 227/24 229/7 231/5 236/18 240/13 244/13 245/11 252/20

become [10] 51/19 55/3 61/25 62/5 62/6 62/8 62/9 62/13 62/17 68/4 been [135] 3/11 9/5 10/9 10/9 10/10 11/8 11/17 11/21 12/22 13/6 13/8 13/9 13/10 13/20 14/1 16/23 19/5 24/21 25/20 26/21 26/24 27/6 27/12 31/17 31/19 31/25 40/7 42/21 42/23 42/25 44/18 45/2 45/15 46/2 47/5 48/12 49/14

52/3 55/19 57/2 58/23 59/6 60/3 61/22 61/24 62/1 63/25 64/20 64/20 70/20 71/1 72/20 75/24 76/22 79/16 80/9 80/12 84/12 87/12 88/7 96/21 96/23 99/12 107/4 109/1 110/16 114/11 115/21 117/10 117/17 120/5 126/22 127/10 128/4 136/1 138/23 142/7 142/12 142/14 142/18 142/20 142/22 142/24 143/11 145/2 146/4 148/14 150/24 150/24 153/19 155/15 155/24 157/20 164/7 168/1 169/5 176/8 185/3 185/4 188/12 189/4 196/3 198/13 199/15 199/25 200/17 201/1 201/6 201/22 202/5 202/11 202/13 202/15 202/19 202/24 203/13 209/9 210/1 210/11 212/23 214/13 214/25 224/9 224/10 225/25 227/16 227/20 234/14 237/25 245/10 245/21 245/22 250/11 250/13 256/20

beer [2] 100/23 100/25

before [56] 1/15 3/10 9/18 19/22 19/25 22/23 23/9 23/16 25/14 28/6 46/25 55/7 56/2 57/5 70/10 71/2 90/1 90/12 90/19 91/5 91/20 101/11 101/25 102/5 103/15 107/4 107/8 113/2 113/6 113/19 120/6 125/1 128/4 139/10 140/19 142/20 146/25 153/20 153/21 159/7 172/1 192/15 193/14 222/13 223/12 232/2 236/12 239/11 239/23 241/25 245/13 251/21 252/8 252/25 254/14 255/18

began [5] 15/9 15/14 19/3 54/3 55/22 begin [2] 15/12 131/19 beginning [2] 4/20 18/7 begins [2] 17/18 96/4 behavior [1] 160/7

behavioral [1] 119/18 behind [3] 24/5 66/21 71/9 being [30] 4/12 38/19 38/22 66/25 67/7

75/25 79/18 85/3 87/11 87/16 88/4 106/14 138/20 144/21 147/11 160/4 163/6 168/24 169/20 169/22 175/8 176/25 180/5 180/15 180/20 198/19 199/25 204/19 214/7 227/12

belief [2] 216/12 238/15 believability [1] 213/22

believe [53] 6/24 9/14 10/22 11/12 11/23 12/7 21/12 26/2 59/13 62/1 63/2 64/4 70/3 70/6 72/3 73/8 82/6 85/20 95/21 103/17 109/22 111/11 115/20 126/25 152/10 160/11 169/11 171/22 172/6 172/11 173/1 182/22 196/4 196/5 198/13 204/5 204/11 205/14 206/16 211/23 212/15 213/8 213/19 213/23 214/17 216/13 226/11 226/12 227/8

227/14 237/9 237/22 243/8 believed [1] 210/10 believes [1] 80/24 bell [2] 64/25 242/10 belong [1] 184/5

belong [1] 184/5

BEND [12] 1/4 1/16 2/3 2/9 2/13 150/10 150/15 191/5 258/2 258/4 258/17 258/21

beneficial [1] 17/9
Beretta [2] 16/17 64/24
best [21] 5/5 28/8 28/9 28/18 33/4 33/6 33/22 34/16 40/4 40/6 40/7 92/22 102/7 102/9 102/11 102/13 102/21 137/16 170/15 182/4 227/15

В better [9] 8/12 43/16 43/20 44/5 46/16 184/2 222/14 242/2 256/8 between [22] 28/9 28/22 33/17 34/20 35/17 46/5 46/15 49/2 49/4 56/21 67/16 73/20 102/17 104/4 132/24 136/5 137/14 158/1 178/6 181/6 227/8 247/24 Bexar [1] 50/12 beyond [5] 28/17 34/16 34/19 49/7 118/25 biases [1] 170/17 Biasoti [2] 203/24 204/1 bifurcate [1] 238/22 big [3] 55/12 55/15 141/15 bin [3] 123/1 123/4 123/5 **binder [1]** 181/9 **bio [1]** 71/21 bio-contamination [1] 71/21 biohazard [2] 73/2 126/20 biohazardous [3] 70/4 72/6 126/19 biological [2] 111/21 167/22 |**bismuth [1]** 184/15 bit [17] 5/11 5/24 17/11 17/13 19/3 26/8 29/16 29/17 35/25 53/5 114/23 156/23 156/25 158/14 227/23 253/11 255/8 Bitch [1] 124/4 Blackman [1] 253/7 bleach [6] 73/6 73/10 132/9 132/17 134/3 134/11 blind [11] 87/5 87/6 87/9 87/11 87/13 170/15 170/19 170/24 187/14 187/14 187/15 blindly [1] 86/22 blood [11] 70/5 70/23 72/15 72/16 72/21 72/23 112/1 131/25 132/1 134/21 189/24 bloody [1] 73/3 blue [6] 64/25 188/7 188/9 188/12 188/14 188/16 bodies [1] 87/20 **body [7]** 41/14 54/10 54/16 54/18 59/5 70/5 70/12 **Bolin [1]** 2/8 bomb [2] 199/6 199/6 bombing [2] 188/11 199/5 bombings [1] 160/8 books [1] 80/11 bore [6] 70/22 70/23 70/25 105/17 115/22 115/25 **boss [6]** 14/2 25/12 99/13 99/16 99/19 220/23 both [17] 5/15 34/4 37/12 41/1 53/4 72/25 76/13 113/25 138/10 165/3 168/9 171/22 193/5 203/21 227/9 256/3 257/2 bother [1] 144/22 bottom [3] 101/23 186/10 205/11 bought [4] 44/18 189/2 193/1 193/2 bounce [1] 227/23 **box [1]** 166/14 Bradford [1] 188/7 **branches** [1] 50/5 **brand [1]** 97/13 brass [4] 44/11 44/19 157/9 158/23 break [9] 67/18 144/5 204/14 230/1 230/20 232/3 239/18 239/23 245/18 breaking [1] 145/6

breech [9] 27/21 30/12 83/20 93/15

106/6 106/14 114/4 176/7 176/8

brief [8] 6/17 7/18 9/13 10/14 29/16 108/2 146/22 256/21 bring [1] 147/5 bringing [1] 9/18 broaching [2] 175/5 175/7 broad [2] 60/23 221/24 broken [5] 74/1 74/16 95/13 135/3 135/8 brought [9] 29/15 36/1 43/23 71/6 73/18 97/11 99/2 133/4 210/23 budgeting [1] 160/13 bugging [1] 239/5 building [1] 116/7 **buildings** [1] 88/8 bullet [59] 11/18 24/10 26/13 27/23 29/2 30/19 30/20 35/13 35/23 35/24 44/12 44/19 44/22 45/2 45/21 46/9 49/13 49/14 66/20 74/17 74/21 76/7 79/9 85/11 85/24 90/25 91/5 91/12 93/17 96/1 96/3 97/9 97/10 97/13 97/14 98/24 113/10 115/19 165/9 165/10 166/13 166/14 174/6 174/19 175/10 175/20 175/20 176/25 184/12 184/13 184/16 196/10 196/24 201/9 201/11 201/24 205/25 248/13 248/14 bullets [54] 17/21 17/23 26/19 26/21 27/3 28/10 32/22 33/11 33/25 34/9 44/22 44/23 48/4 48/9 79/19 79/24 83/25 84/17 87/19 87/21 87/24 88/1 88/3 88/7 88/10 88/11 98/7 98/13 102/4 102/14 102/18 102/24 103/2 110/22 114/7 124/25 137/3 137/6 137/25 138/1 138/2 143/20 152/21 165/17 166/2 166/8 166/15 189/13 195/4 196/21 197/7 198/5 213/11 214/7 bump [1] 228/25 bunch [1] 194/24 Bureau [1] 44/15 business [2] 154/1 218/2 bust [1] 52/3 buy [3] 189/5 192/25 230/21 **buying [1]** 39/4 C.V [3] 156/2 156/24 164/2 cake [7] 177/14 179/2 179/7 179/9 179/10 244/10 244/10

calculate [1] 141/3

caliber [5] 27/18 61/8 83/16 83/18 83/18 call [23] 5/23 10/12 20/8 57/7 67/23 68/1 93/19 104/21 117/5 144/17 144/24 145/6 145/21 145/24 155/10 163/7 170/16 174/20 181/12 190/19 194/12 202/24 254/25 called [20] 21/7 36/2 75/18 146/15 168/1 170/6 171/24 183/16 185/14 186/14 188/23 207/5 207/8 208/11 217/8 217/13 218/10 220/3 223/3 224/20 calling [1] 241/19 came [20] 1/14 31/16 55/7 55/13 55/22 57/3 91/24 137/21 150/14 159/12 162/10 166/14 186/9 186/10 195/1 201/3 201/24 212/12 249/7 249/8 can [150] 5/2 5/5 10/14 17/18 19/24 20/2 21/10 24/11 24/13 27/1 27/7 28/2 29/14 35/16 37/14 38/21 43/25 44/8 45/9 46/23 48/7 48/14 49/1 58/1 58/1 60/21 62/17 63/22 65/12 65/24 66/9

66/14 67/14 69/18 80/3 85/1 86/13 86/15 86/16 87/2 89/6 93/11 97/23 101/11 101/25 103/15 110/22 113/6 114/8 115/16 116/6 128/8 133/24 134/1 134/21 135/12 135/17 136/7 137/20 137/21 137/23 139/8 141/19 142/10 143/1 145/11 145/13 147/3 147/25 149/21 149/22 153/8 153/25 154/2 154/4 154/5 154/5 155/2 155/3 156/6 156/13 163/12 163/21 163/21 164/19 166/13 167/7 167/9 171/17 173/2 173/6 173/9 173/22 173/25 174/1 178/24 179/4 179/9 179/9 179/14 179/20 181/16 181/21 182/5 188/1 188/3 188/5 188/11 188/15 188/18 188/21 189/12 189/21 190/16 190/17 190/19 192/11 192/14 192/25 193/20 193/23 195/4 196/18 199/3 200/24 201/3 202/12 203/1 207/4 207/9 208/12 213/9 214/4 218/15 225/13 225/16 227/17 230/5 231/5 231/6 241/7 246/17 247/19 247/22 250/4 251/3 251/16 252/2 252/5 254/8 can't [37] 5/2 29/3 31/14 31/14 34/12 34/12 34/12 35/7 35/20 42/5 65/11 67/18 69/13 69/15 70/24 79/4 85/19 106/5 111/4 114/16 114/20 119/4 135/22 136/18 143/3 171/3 171/4 181/1 201/21 202/2 202/3 202/14 223/2 225/15 226/12 241/7 244/20 Canada [1] 157/22 candidacy [2] 197/15 198/3 candidates [1] 197/17 cannot [5] 79/7 134/5 136/20 188/19 214/5 Cantu [1] 8/2 capacity [4] 13/7 14/2 15/1 234/5 Capital [1] 188/6 captioned [1] 164/21 capture [4] 94/20 205/14 205/15 206/16 captured [1] 206/16 carbide [2] 199/16 199/20 carried [1] 104/11 carries [1] 5/7 carry [1] 104/14 carrying [2] 17/9 19/14 carryover [5] 183/16 184/3 184/3 184/5 198/25 carryovers [1] 148/24 cars [1] 188/14 cartridge [67] 17/21 17/23 24/10 26/19 26/22 27/3 27/4 28/10 29/2 30/18 30/20 32/24 33/25 34/9 35/12 42/17 44/21 45/1 45/8 46/9 48/5 74/3 74/5 74/8 74/23 77/1 77/4 79/9 79/19 79/23 81/20 84/17 90/12 92/18 93/12 93/15 95/18 95/19 96/1 96/2 96/7 96/7 96/8 96/11 96/12 96/15 96/17 96/25 97/12 98/13 98/15 98/24 99/22 100/12 102/4 102/14 102/17 102/24 110/23 113/10 114/7

176/8 195/13 196/21 197/8 198/5 214/7 cartridges [6] 33/10 38/10 42/8 44/1

7/19 8/1 8/3 8/9 8/14 8/16 8/23 9/1 9/12

9/16 9/20 10/19 10/20 23/6 24/10 25/11 29/2 32/6 32/16 35/12 38/14 38/21

68/12 74/5 74/7 74/23 74/24 76/9 76/13

case [142] 4/12 4/16 5/11 6/10 7/15

39/14 41/18 45/1 47/5 60/12 60/16

47/15 98/8

case... [102] 77/2 77/4 77/12 78/22 78/25 79/9 82/1 88/10 88/11 88/12 88/13 90/12 91/24 92/7 92/16 93/12 93/15 94/6 94/22 96/2 96/7 96/8 96/8 96/11 96/12 96/15 97/1 98/14 98/24 100/5 100/13 103/1 104/18 104/20 112/18 112/19 112/24 113/10 114/7 116/14 116/19 116/22 123/14 124/21 125/1 125/8 125/12 125/15 125/23 126/2 127/6 127/19 128/3 129/14 129/24 129/24 130/2 130/10 131/3 131/4 131/16 135/12 138/3 144/13 145/15 147/7 149/7 152/22 157/3 158/8 163/5 178/2 187/13 187/22 188/20 190/18 190/24 198/5 205/20 205/21 207/13 208/10 208/23 210/1 210/9 210/15 210/16 211/19 222/3 223/3 223/20 235/13 238/5 240/9 246/24 247/10 248/5 248/21 249/20 250/8 251/1 253/14 cases [53] 7/22 8/20 8/25 9/3 9/5 11/20 17/21 17/23 26/19 26/22 27/3 27/4 28/10 32/24 33/25 34/9 43/6 44/21 48/5 71/14 74/3 74/8 79/19 79/24 84/17 95/18 95/19 96/17 97/12 98/13 98/15 99/22 102/4 102/14 102/17 102/24 110/23 122/10 163/4 168/25 184/10 184/24 187/13 193/11 195/13 196/21 197/8 209/25 210/3 219/8 239/2 242/14 252/10 casing [5] 90/20 91/5 174/6 174/6 174/19 casings [19] 26/12 38/4 39/15 39/20 39/21 46/9 47/16 83/24 92/18 103/2 106/21 124/24 137/2 137/5 138/4 152/21 189/14 213/12 214/7 catch [1] 37/16 category [1] 11/23 Catholic [1] 52/6 caught [1] 74/9 cause [6] 1/3 1/15 54/23 132/12 219/5 caused [5] 55/16 71/21 105/22 169/8 185/16 caveat [3] 175/13 195/13 214/11 cell [1] 145/20 center [18] 13/4 13/8 13/21 53/7 53/19 54/6 56/1 56/19 68/19 95/7 117/23 146/11 148/16 148/20 148/25 149/4 150/21 158/20 Central [2] 120/10 120/11 Centralized [1] 15/2 certain [8] 30/13 102/21 169/6 192/16 201/24 202/18 226/12 243/5 certainly [4] 61/5 187/24 214/19 224/16 certainty [20] 29/3 29/10 79/4 79/5 187/25 189/9 189/12 191/19 202/18 202/22 206/1 206/3 206/4 206/5 206/7 206/8 212/12 213/10 226/23 227/3 certificates [1] 14/16 certification [1] 14/18 certified [3] 32/9 168/21 234/24

certify [3] 258/5 258/12 258/15

151/7

chair [1] 138/18

chairman [1] 225/24

chain [5] 99/11 126/4 131/12 151/3

```
challenge [1] 31/19
challenging [1] 244/15
chamber [4] 74/6 74/18 95/22 105/19
chambers [1] 258/11
chance [7] 19/22 191/14 193/17 230/2
230/22 254/21 254/24
change [23] 24/5 24/6 48/5 48/6 48/6
49/5 49/6 53/20 54/3 54/4 54/23 55/24
72/10 80/6 97/20 97/22 98/4 98/5
119/18 119/23 157/2 202/1 233/14
changed [11] 13/14 14/2 55/6 55/25
56/12 56/13 106/17 122/23 199/22
234/13 245/7
changes [10] 42/7 42/11 49/2 49/4 49/8
49/9 49/10 133/3 133/5 202/2
changing [7] 97/20 97/22 124/3 206/7
238/6 238/7 251/1
characteristic [10] 27/22 30/1 30/2 30/3
31/23 104/5 104/5 104/6 104/9 113/20
characteristics [54] 17/22 17/25 27/10
27/15 27/16 27/16 28/2 29/18 29/21
29/23 30/25 31/4 33/1 33/3 34/4 35/7
35/14 46/15 83/13 83/17 90/11 90/19
91/2 91/4 105/11 113/2 114/11 114/12
114/13 114/21 174/15 174/21 175/7
175/9 175/12 175/15 183/3 183/13
183/14 183/15 183/20 183/21 183/23
184/4 185/10 186/4 187/17 194/8
195/15 196/13 196/16 196/22 201/13
214/12
characterize [2] 182/21 241/21 characterized [2] 185/23 241/20
charge [2] 160/16 161/11
chase [3] 157/9 158/23 166/11
chat [1] 230/22
check [7] 69/5 75/5 75/8 75/10 139/20
140/5 140/5
checked [6] 22/5 58/18 92/3 94/23
138/9 211/13
chemical [1] 165/22
Chevy [4] 188/7 188/9 188/11 188/15
Chicago [1] 239/3
chief [16] 121/16 160/20 161/1 161/9
219/16 219/18 219/23 219/25 220/7
220/9 221/2 233/22 233/25 234/2 234/3
234/12
chiefs [1] 219/24
chlorine [2] 132/12 132/19
choice [3] 165/19 165/20 166/7
choose [1] 7/4
chosen [1] 20/23
CIA [1] 50/16
cigarette [1] 169/8
Circuit [2] 8/23 9/14
circular [4] 27/20 83/20 177/13 179/2
circumstances [1] 129/25
cite [4] 8/15 8/24 143/1 223/2
cited [4] 8/16 165/1 196/5 196/6
citizens [1] 253/10
City [2] 53/17 230/11
City's [1] 5/1
civil [1] 156/21
civilian [1] 53/15
claim [2] 201/17 201/23
claimed [4] 167/10 168/7 206/2 215/17
claiming [2] 110/12 245/11
clarification [1] 20/2
clarify [5] 19/25 128/11 128/18 136/3
247/14
```

```
class [17] 16/20 27/15 27/15 27/21 28/1
28/1 28/4 29/18 34/3 35/7 46/15 75/12
83/13 83/16 114/20 174/15 174/21
classes [3] 218/18 218/20 246/7
classifies [1] 224/15
CLE's [1] 246/4
clean [6] 71/2 71/13 71/16 71/19 71/22
133/23
cleaned [2] 71/1 126/12
clear [4] 74/6 95/23 96/11 125/17
clerk [1] 144/19
Cleveland [1] 157/4
clients [2] 88/5 242/23
Clifford [2] 246/24 246/24
clip [1] 181/9
clone [1] 208/16
cloned [3] 208/3 208/7 208/8
close [4] 39/21 112/11 167/7 176/7
closely [4] 14/20 38/20 139/14 222/10
closer [1] 208/14
closest [2] 86/6 209/6
closing [1] 96/14
CMS [1] 193/13
co [3] 143/16 163/24 229/17
co-author [1] 143/16
co-authored [1] 163/24
co-counsel [1] 229/17
Coast [1] 193/12
coated [1] 49/13
coating [1] 111/24
codes [5] 192/22 192/24 193/3 194/23
195/1
codified [4] 219/21 219/22 220/5 234/5
CODIS [2] 45/6 109/25
cognitive [1] 237/5
coincidental [4] 192/17 193/18 194/1
195/7
coincidentally [1] 174/25
coined [1] 185/25
Colca [30] 68/17 68/18 69/25 70/8 72/21
76/5 76/24 78/1 78/1 94/23 95/6 95/17
96/11 96/23 96/24 97/8 98/11 98/12
98/16 98/25 99/8 100/6 105/17 112/23
117/5 117/9 117/14 117/15 125/15
144/11
Colca's [7] 68/23 75/19 93/1 98/17
99/25 112/19 172/16
collaborate [2] 39/9 228/13
collaborated [2] 162/23 218/24
Collaborative [1] 37/21
colleague [1] 50/25 colleagues [2] 183/18 218/25
collect [2] 26/19 218/22
collection [2] 104/23 104/24
college [4] 14/5 62/4 63/12 227/7
color [1] 190/7 colored [1] 178/4
column [1] 173/2
combinations [2] 190/21 192/13
combined [1] 26/25
come [30] 39/9 44/25 46/13 60/14 75/16
76/13 83/15 93/12 93/15 93/21 111/2
111/7 115/14 122/5 131/4 139/7 139/20
139/21 140/20 144/22 145/4 149/6
149/22 191/19 204/14 209/6 229/11
230/19 240/2 255/17
come from [1] 191/19
comes [9] 46/10 66/3 66/23 67/3 70/1
70/3 86/7 96/1 133/19
```

concern [6] 3/19 30/24 31/3 66/4 229/21 constitute [2] 177/8 178/9 constrain [1] 241/3 240/14 comfortable [1] 41/24 concerned [5] 3/14 66/6 90/6 178/7 constrained [1] 215/19 coming [7] 109/10 140/19 142/1 150/17 consult [3] 162/10 168/23 235/8 239/12 consultant [1] 156/21 150/17 223/11 225/8 concerning [2] 7/2 69/25 comment [2] 190/8 196/20 comments [1] 19/24 commercial [1] 168/5 consultants [1] 59/14 consulted [1] 162/25 conclude [2] 81/25 214/9 concluded [5] 4/21 9/21 111/21 169/4 consulting [1] 162/12 212/8 conclusion [20] 10/5 35/15 75/17 77/5 commissioned [1] 167/21 consumer [1] 158/12 committee [2] 233/8 243/17 80/2 80/3 138/25 139/11 140/19 140/19 contact [2] 93/15 145/17 committees [1] 227/9 contacting [1] 153/10 140/20 140/20 142/21 212/3 212/4 contained [1] 77/5 contains [1] 258/6 **common [2]** 27/18 37/20 212/4 221/9 223/8 239/23 255/1 **conclusions [14]** 17/16 57/15 69/10 69/11 73/17 75/11 75/12 76/3 131/4 commonly [1] 35/22 communicate [3] 101/16 150/9 150/11 contaminate [1] 70/14 communicated [2] 25/1 242/22 139/8 140/7 215/8 224/15 226/17 contaminated [6] 70/12 72/5 73/1 73/2 communication [1] 140/23 concomitant [1] 241/10 126/23 132/2 communications [2] 150/15 239/3 concordance [2] 195/15 248/15 contamination [5] 71/20 71/21 126/22 **condition [25]** 70/4 70/20 71/5 71/7 71/10 71/18 72/6 72/11 96/18 96/21 131/22 132/1 communities [1] 32/7 community [21] 10/10 80/18 141/16 contemporaneously [3] 208/4 208/13 142/2 170/5 170/10 170/25 171/2 96/21 97/3 105/17 107/4 115/2 115/9 208/21 171/13 171/17 176/20 185/20 197/5 115/10 115/25 133/3 133/6 133/7 content [1] 19/24 200/22 201/7 204/2 206/20 228/12 133/14 134/5 140/15 179/19 context [1] 135/24 continually [3] 14/1 216/6 219/7 228/16 233/11 233/21 conditions [2] 105/22 226/21 **conduct [8]** 49/20 58/23 76/12 118/9 119/1 119/5 137/11 179/24 company [4] 13/23 151/9 157/9 158/25 continue [4] 248/13 248/23 249/4 company's [1] 189/4 comparable [2] 81/7 81/9 continued [3] 8/20 157/5 232/1 conducted [5] 37/19 58/20 58/22 60/15 compare [28] 16/3 17/25 18/2 24/15 continues [1] 110/17 192/6 26/20 32/22 32/24 34/23 44/23 45/12 conducting [3] 62/16 122/10 220/21 continuing [4] 19/13 21/3 21/4 34/8 conducts [1] 191/11 continuity [3] 158/16 158/18 198/17 46/22 61/15 79/7 83/7 83/8 98/7 98/9 98/10 99/1 99/7 99/14 105/3 110/18 confer [2] 229/13 229/17 contour [1] 114/2 125/9 137/13 137/19 137/25 175/21 conference [1] 63/25 contract [1] 44/16 **conferences** [1] 63/21 **conferred** [1] 152/19 contribution [1] 171/12 control [3] 39/5 39/6 39/8 compared [13] 34/21 47/15 77/2 98/20 98/22 98/24 137/5 165/17 166/9 176/2 191/15 193/10 208/13 confidence [8] 82/22 83/5 83/6 99/8 controlled [3] 58/6 111/21 120/24 compares [2] 44/24 46/7 189/8 202/18 202/20 202/22 **conventional** [1] 165/18 comparing [8] 17/19 43/18 100/19 confident [1] 79/20 conversation [19] 127/1 127/17 128/21 165/21 166/1 184/14 195/13 248/9 confirm [1] 70/7 128/24 128/25 129/3 129/8 129/14 comparison [19] 11/18 11/19 26/23 **confirmed [5]** 82/17 83/10 169/4 179/13 129/18 129/18 129/19 129/20 129/23 26/23 30/22 33/23 35/20 48/16 75/16 180/1 130/10 130/23 152/11 153/14 153/16 conforming [2] 238/8 238/8 81/16 100/21 101/11 104/20 140/11 245/8 165/20 175/17 176/15 208/17 248/4 confuse [1] 195/17 conversations [2] 150/21 152/1 confusing [1] 253/11 comparisons [9] 7/16 43/10 43/11 43/14 convey [1] 253/9 confusingly [2] 191/7 202/4 73/20 115/14 184/13 191/13 208/21 convict [1] 168/12 congressional [1] 188/2 conjunction [1] 111/15 consecutive [2] 113/24 193/14 compensated [1] 161/2 coordinated [1] 4/17 competency [3] 86/21 86/23 86/25 **copper [3]** 49/14 157/9 158/23 compiled [1] 225/21 **copy [6]** 125/1 149/3 156/1 164/20 complete [2] 122/16 218/21 consecutively [21] 28/13 28/19 30/5 253/22 253/23 completed [6] 135/20 136/14 138/18 30/6 30/7 32/3 32/4 32/5 32/15 32/20 **CORNELIUS [2]** 1/5 51/8 142/12 142/14 159/3 32/23 32/24 33/11 79/17 79/20 84/16 corner [3] 194/14 194/15 194/15 completely [7] 72/15 105/14 105/19 102/15 102/17 102/18 142/23 143/8 cornerstones [2] 179/15 180/2 consensus [1] 48/22 **corporation [2]** 13/22 21/18 **Corps [3]** 159/4 159/5 159/7 106/4 106/19 110/21 146/20 complex [1] 186/17 consequence [1] 90/8 compliance [2] 22/9 22/13 consequence's [1] 89/9 correct [88] 13/15 14/3 22/16 31/3 complied [1] 242/7 consider [6] 29/6 82/16 170/19 178/6 36/18 37/9 38/13 38/18 42/20 45/24 comply [5] 222/6 222/13 251/24 252/3 47/20 51/11 51/20 52/6 52/17 53/7 53/9 236/13 242/25 considerably [1] 42/11 55/10 55/17 56/1 56/9 57/9 58/12 58/16 255/14 complying [1] 58/19 consideration [5] 7/15 8/1 21/4 40/16 61/20 67/1 68/9 68/12 69/3 71/6 72/12 components [4] 16/3 16/5 28/25 44/21 74/19 74/22 75/9 80/24 85/2 86/20 241/4 comport [6] 186/22 206/15 243/15 considered [13] 42/14 79/10 80/13 94/10 94/25 97/19 103/10 105/7 106/23 243/22 251/23 251/24 88/17 182/8 185/21 185/22 192/2 192/3 114/19 119/12 119/17 119/24 131/22 composed [1] 21/15 204/2 235/3 237/13 244/22 132/4 132/21 132/23 134/16 134/17 compositions [2] 165/21 166/1 comprehensive [1] 15/20 considering [2] 9/24 28/18 140/25 141/2 141/13 142/7 143/21 148/25 159/24 168/14 168/25 170/22 consist [1] 54/14 **consistency [1]** 137/14 compressed [1] 231/21 172/17 175/22 180/9 197/21 197/25 computer [12] 44/23 44/25 45/24 46/3 consistent [11] 28/4 28/20 34/17 39/11 204/7 211/11 215/23 220/18 220/21 46/6 46/13 46/16 46/21 81/2 82/20 89/11 92/23 102/23 137/16 214/12 225/3 226/5 232/8 233/19 236/15 240/3 240/10 241/15 244/3 245/9 249/12 82/21 173/9 224/22 249/11 computerized [1] 1/18 conspiracy [1] 217/24 250/15 250/18 250/23 258/6 concept [1] 36/2 constituents [1] 184/16 correctly [4] 70/19 131/17 142/7 258/13 create [5] 32/15 39/10 79/8 109/23

created [12] 36/21 98/11 98/12 98/15

98/25 99/8 99/9 101/20 104/7 104/9

credibility [7] 6/11 26/5 118/13 119/3

crime [22] 13/10 13/19 13/24 13/25

53/22 54/11 55/9 55/25 56/10 57/4

criminal [10] 8/6 8/16 8/19 156/21

14/17 15/7 36/15 52/12 52/14 52/21

83/23 148/18 148/22 191/10 196/17

217/23 217/23 217/23 217/24 233/11

criminalist [9] 57/20 57/21 58/1 68/4

criteria [18] 14/22 57/20 144/3 181/18

critical [12] 164/21 179/15 180/2 180/5

222/20 222/22 235/25 238/9 242/6

242/8 243/9 243/16 243/19 244/3

245/24 246/4 251/25 253/8

criterion [1] 238/2

68/17 68/18 75/7 121/20 121/22

creates [3] 30/13 38/3 79/21 **creating [2]** 104/13 110/6

119/5 216/24 252/24

178/22

104/11 113/8

Crim [1] 8/2

201/25

246/7

101/10

correlation [2] 82/19 83/3 correspondence [1] 249/16 corrode [4] 105/24 105/25 106/2 106/6 corroded [10] 105/15 105/19 105/23 106/19 107/2 107/4 115/8 115/23 115/25 133/17 corrosion [5] 95/21 115/17 132/13 132/20 163/17 cost [1] 258/15 costly [1] 198/18 could [72] 12/15 26/20 31/16 33/18 35/10 46/14 62/13 67/24 68/2 70/16 70/20 78/7 85/24 86/2 90/13 90/19 94/5 96/20 96/23 97/20 97/22 100/3 100/4 102/7 106/4 106/6 106/7 107/3 107/4 112/14 113/14 115/21 125/7 125/7 126/18 127/17 127/18 128/4 128/12 130/17 133/9 133/13 134/21 134/23 135/2 135/10 137/8 139/2 142/2 151/10 158/13 167/25 169/8 184/5 191/19 195/25 198/18 198/24 202/12 208/8 209/6 224/22 227/17 227/20 229/5 230/12 233/4 235/6 238/17 238/21 238/21 256/1 couldn't [8] 67/21 67/23 68/1 94/6 124/12 165/17 166/8 181/9 counsel [20] 2/23 3/3 5/4 5/15 7/12 36/1 92/12 108/1 108/14 108/21 112/17 228/1 229/14 229/17 239/20 245/8 250/24 251/11 256/21 258/8 counsel's [1] 29/15 count [7] 89/24 91/8 92/19 101/18 172/6 193/22 194/1 counted [4] 88/15 89/3 89/5 90/2 country [3] 21/16 25/25 50/22 county [15] 1/4 1/16 2/3 2/9 2/13 50/9 50/12 143/4 150/10 150/16 191/5 258/2 258/4 258/17 258/21 couple [5] 11/25 51/23 137/3 148/17 167/20 course [7] 16/1 36/14 53/24 61/2 70/23 107/14 199/17 courses [9] 51/19 64/14 64/19 121/1 217/17 217/17 217/18 218/23 219/1 court [57] 1/3 4/3 4/12 4/21 6/18 7/19 8/1 8/5 8/15 8/18 8/19 9/16 9/19 9/20 9/24 10/2 10/7 10/20 10/25 11/4 11/7 11/10 12/25 13/16 19/20 21/10 29/25 108/2 111/13 111/16 116/23 116/24 118/9 118/14 150/6 210/8 216/4 218/15 223/19 223/19 224/6 224/25 227/3 230/9 241/3 245/16 246/22 250/25 251/14 251/20 255/16 257/4 258/3 258/4 258/10 258/20 258/21 Court's [2] 7/25 230/14 courtroom [8] 117/17 117/19 124/10

172/15 190/9 226/19 248/1 250/17

221/22 222/6 222/13 253/8

covers [3] 15/20 108/8 108/9

coworkers [1] 101/3

Cracker [1] 192/18

crashes [1] 160/8

Cream [1] 65/1

courts [9] 7/23 9/2 9/6 166/19 205/12

cover [4] 63/20 120/15 190/12 217/22

180/7 183/3 187/22 196/24 198/17 200/16 200/19 200/24 criticism [1] 92/9 critique [6] 170/10 170/11 170/12 170/13 170/15 191/24 critiquing [1] 204/6 crooked [1] 93/17 cross [5] 51/6 151/15 214/24 228/24 232/1 CROSS-EXAMINATION [4] 51/6 151/15 214/24 232/1 CSI [4] 216/12 242/13 242/18 253/12 **CSR [2]** 258/19 258/20 CTS [10] 37/21 38/1 38/12 39/1 39/5 39/20 39/25 41/11 86/13 87/22 cub [1] 4/24 cubicles [1] 139/15 cued [1] 197/9 current [6] 156/18 158/8 224/23 224/24 227/15 243/21 currently [4] 15/25 25/9 59/2 190/5 curriculum [3] 156/1 217/1 218/9 curtail [1] 7/10 custody [5] 99/12 126/4 131/12 151/3 151/8 customized [1] 186/13 cut [4] 65/20 166/11 235/13 251/4 cycle [2] 59/3 95/25 cycling [2] 74/3 74/4 D D.C [2] 172/10 227/14 daily [1] 133/20 **Dallas [1]** 50/11 damaged [1] 93/11 covered [5] 120/21 131/25 191/22 196/9 dark [1] 46/5 darndest [1] 178/23 Darrell [4] 52/24 53/3 99/20 119/10 dash [1] 165/1 data [5] 15/4 41/12 197/13 197/15 207/4 database [12] 15/4 44/13 45/2 45/10

45/12 109/24 123/14 197/2 197/8 197/22 197/23 198/12 date [8] 76/13 76/17 136/2 151/21 154/19 201/2 201/22 247/1 Daubert [34] 3/24 5/17 9/6 9/10 9/23 10/18 10/19 11/5 23/8 23/12 146/20 146/23 147/16 148/1 154/10 154/11 154/18 155/6 155/7 181/13 210/23 222/2 222/19 222/22 232/16 238/9 242/6 242/8 243/9 243/15 244/2 244/7 246/2 251/25 day [28] 1/13 8/11 61/8 64/23 64/23 64/24 75/3 77/7 125/4 125/19 125/20 126/1 131/3 131/7 131/8 131/19 135/21 135/24 135/25 136/4 136/16 188/8 191/11 196/11 199/22 229/22 231/7 234/6 days [2] 122/8 219/6 de [10] 161/1 219/19 219/20 219/21 219/24 220/4 221/2 234/3 234/4 252/4 deactivation [1] 123/8 criminalists [5] 56/25 68/8 68/10 100/22 deal [3] 63/17 65/1 172/20 dealing [2] 36/14 126/18 debate [4] 80/17 80/23 141/15 142/2 **decades [8]** 11/9 11/19 166/20 169/6 201/7 206/4 226/21 228/12 deceptions [1] 186/4 decide [3] 42/5 83/8 183/14 decided [2] 121/25 193/4 deciding [1] 11/2 **decision [14]** 10/4 12/4 62/24 63/5 74/17 99/16 99/17 99/18 103/15 194/10 223/24 230/4 240/15 242/9 decisions [4] 10/24 63/3 107/11 152/5 declare [8] 101/25 103/25 179/5 182/18 193/15 194/13 194/17 195/17 declared [6] 92/1 103/3 103/5 194/8 195/25 209/17 decline [1] 167/19 declined [3] 160/18 160/22 220/11 decontaminate [6] 72/20 73/4 132/6 132/14 134/16 135/2 decontaminated [9] 70/6 70/8 72/22 72/24 73/13 126/14 131/7 131/18 132/4 decontamination [4] 134/19 135/15 136/6 136/11 deduce [2] 188/11 188/16 deductive [6] 187/21 188/3 188/5 188/12 207/23 208/11 defendant [5] 2/19 2/23 5/16 6/21 9/12 defendant's [8] 7/18 155/24 156/16 164/7 166/15 181/13 253/21 253/25 Defense [29] 7/12 7/24 9/18 29/15 31/13 36/1 43/23 92/12 108/1 108/14 108/21 110/10 112/17 117/4 146/17 150/17 156/5 163/12 164/18 180/14 217/5 228/1 229/14 239/20 240/6 245/8 250/24 251/11 256/21 Defense's [1] 151/17 defensible [1] 214/4 defined [2] 174/16 179/13 definition [4] 175/13 175/14 203/18 234/4 definitive [2] 110/12 142/21 degraded [1] 197/15 degree [26] 14/19 51/9 62/5 62/16 120/9 120/10 120/13 120/14 157/1 159/3 159/6 187/24 191/19 195/14 202/18 202/20 206/3 212/12 217/5 217/7 217/9

degree... [5] 217/10 218/16 219/2 219/9 degrees [4] 14/16 111/25 218/6 218/23 **DeKinder [1]** 198/12 delay [1] 4/20 delete [1] 123/4 deleted [2] 122/24 123/7 deliberations [1] 239/5 Delta [1] 198/1 demand [1] 55/3 demographics [1] 193/3 demonstrate [4] 9/4 192/6 195/5 202/20 demonstrated [8] 84/12 86/8 109/1 110/16 176/2 203/1 237/24 237/24 demonstrates [1] 191/15 demonstration [1] 8/19 demonstrative [2] 187/17 210/9 denial [1] 154/14 department [17] 13/18 18/23 50/4 50/11 53/12 53/14 53/14 53/15 53/17 54/5 112/22 121/17 148/19 152/25 191/9 217/16 246/13 departments [1] 239/5 dependent [1] 53/25 depending [3] 86/8 197/11 199/4 depends [5] 67/5 199/24 200/1 200/5 200/5 depth [1] 114/1 derailments [1] 160/8 derive [1] 183/15 derives [1] 158/5 describing [1] 162/25 description [1] 114/25 designated [1] 219/16 designed [11] 17/4 37/7 38/25 65/23 65/24 86/12 86/18 141/13 174/22 174/24 233/10 desire [1] 151/17 desired [1] 66/22 desk [1] 138/18 destruction [1] 15/4 detail [1] 205/7 detailed [1] 61/10 details [1] 131/21 detect [1] 141/13 detection [6] 182/23 183/1 183/7 185/6 205/21 209/20 determinant [1] 182/12 determination [9] 26/5 42/19 104/18 118/10 121/17 124/23 134/6 134/7 determinations [1] 105/7 determine [26] 12/9 12/11 16/4 24/15 28/25 31/14 33/18 38/16 57/12 57/22 86/18 90/13 91/18 100/12 106/25 109/22 111/15 137/14 137/15 137/20 144/2 167/9 174/4 176/23 202/25 229/19 determined [4] 11/21 75/20 80/14 143/23 determining [2] 9/24 36/16 develop [4] 43/18 47/4 87/23 227/4 developed [3] 81/2 101/13 102/3 developing [2] 80/13 197/2 dialogue [1] 247/24

diamond [2] 65/17 199/17

dichotomy [2] 178/1 201/8

```
did [185] 3/18 4/10 14/5 14/10 14/15
15/12 15/16 34/10 51/21 55/5 55/24
59/23 64/7 64/22 65/6 65/14 68/11
68/14 68/16 68/21 69/2 69/5 69/25 73/4
73/11 74/8 74/11 74/13 74/18 74/23
74/25 75/1 75/2 75/2 75/3 75/5 75/19
75/21 76/1 76/13 76/17 78/1 82/7 82/7
82/10 84/2 89/23 89/25 92/4 92/4 92/17
94/24 95/9 95/10 95/11 95/20 95/24
96/15 96/23 96/25 97/1 97/6 98/7 99/3
99/4 99/18 99/21 99/24 101/19 104/14
104/16 105/9 105/10 106/6 107/8 107/9
109/5 112/22 112/22 117/15 117/16
117/18 117/25 119/13 120/3 120/13
120/15 121/17 122/5 123/6 123/8
123/18 123/18 123/20 123/21 124/1
124/8 124/12 124/16 124/21 125/2
125/22 125/24 125/25 126/6 128/4
128/16 129/2 129/3 129/3 129/7 130/9
130/15 131/4 132/6 133/24 134/7
134/11 136/22 137/8 137/9 137/9 140/4
140/5 142/3 142/5 143/8 149/1 149/2
149/9 149/9 150/9 150/11 150/13
150/19 151/23 152/1 152/18 152/23
153/16 159/3 160/2 161/22 163/6
165/14 167/11 167/14 168/15 168/17
169/3 181/1 183/22 185/10 187/2
198/18 209/15 210/2 212/9 217/21
218/15 220/2 221/11 226/19 227/2
227/4 228/11 228/18 233/22 234/22
235/5 235/6 235/7 235/8 235/9 239/25
241/2 243/3 243/11 244/7 245/16 246/6
246/11 247/12 250/6 254/3
didn't [50] 46/24 51/15 55/2 55/7 73/22
74/10 78/1 78/18 93/1 93/12 93/15
93/16 95/18 96/24 97/3 97/5 98/9 99/1
99/6 99/16 99/23 100/5 105/3 112/4
112/7 112/11 118/15 129/3 129/19
129/19 129/21 130/14 130/16 131/19
161/1 162/7 183/6 190/14 197/16 198/6
200/11 207/16 211/7 219/2 220/23
221/4 221/5 243/3 246/14 249/25
difference [9] 72/17 97/2 101/9 104/4
133/21 181/6 187/25 195/8 200/21
differences [3] 18/5 33/17 46/15
different [47] 5/6 33/13 33/19 34/1
34/10 34/20 39/16 43/6 43/13 45/22
53/11 74/11 77/17 77/18 77/20 77/20
77/23 78/9 82/14 83/25 85/6 92/3 96/22
97/25 101/22 103/13 104/13 105/25
106/2 106/3 106/15 112/13 112/14
113/21 141/24 143/18 160/19 170/4
179/22 186/11 190/7 192/3 192/22
195/1 196/4 235/20 240/3
differentiate [1] 136/5
difficult [5] 97/13 101/15 141/3 163/15
244/14
difficulties [1] 162/6
dilute [1] 132/12
diploma [2] 62/12 63/12
direct [5] 12/23 117/11 146/5 155/16
225/19
directed [1] 150/24
directer [1] 148/21
directing [2] 149/4 150/6
directly [6] 107/16 146/23 164/8 176/2
221/4 221/6
director [3] 146/10 148/15 148/18
directorship [1] 146/12
```

```
disagreement [15] 17/25 89/16 93/7
 93/9 93/10 93/11 93/13 93/18 93/21
 93/25 94/15 98/1 103/15 185/11 200/22
disassemble [5] 70/10 70/15 71/4 71/16
 71/19
disassembled [5] 72/21 73/13 74/15
126/14 131/18
Disassembling [1] 70/16
disassembly [1] 135/15
disasters [1] 160/9
discern [2] 183/20 200/25
discernable [5] 164/22 200/20 201/2
202/8 203/6
discharged [1] 96/1
discipline [8] 21/16 21/20 158/4 158/9
217/12 233/12 236/13 236/17
disciplines [5] 21/14 108/9 108/10
 112/6 120/17
discontinuing [1] 167/6
discourse [1] 249/16
discovered [1] 11/21
Discovery [1] 6/22
discuss [3] 19/3 200/11 249/25
discussed [7] 141/9 151/24 153/14 194/9 196/19 200/14 202/7
discussing [1] 43/19
discussion [3] 64/1 139/17 169/18
discussions [2] 4/10 141/18
dislike [1] 236/8
dispositive [1] 165/25
disprove [1] 178/20
disputed [1] 3/25
dissimilar [1] 184/17
dissimilarities [3] 184/11 184/25 185/2
dissimilarity [2] 184/13 184/21
distinction [5] 35/17 85/21 86/1 86/2
distinguish [3] 33/12 102/16 114/19
distinguishing [1] 196/12
distribution [1] 168/6
DISTRICT [11] 1/3 1/5 2/3 150/10
 150/16 153/3 153/9 246/22 246/22
 258/4 258/21
division [4] 13/4 13/25 146/11 219/17
divisions [1] 57/4
dixit [1] 189/17
DNA [13] 55/14 60/14 107/7 107/13
 107/15 109/25 120/23 120/24 189/20
 189/24 190/3 211/23 212/5
do [282]
doctor [1] 167/16
document [7] 60/17 72/14 73/15 111/24
 119/15 177/7 220/1
documentation [5] 94/12 94/17 123/16
 129/6 129/13
documented [11] 72/1 72/18 73/12 94/7
 100/9 127/4 127/6 127/10 127/12
 127/20 130/23
documenting [1] 22/4
documents [5] 58/6 135/12 135/18
 135/23 183/24
does [68] 13/13 16/10 21/3 22/8 23/20
23/22 25/12 30/16 37/13 39/17 39/22
 42/4 42/6 47/1 50/18 57/19 65/3 79/25
 79/25 81/14 84/14 85/5 85/10 88/12
 91/21 91/23 108/16 110/25 115/14
 122/25 125/9 127/9 132/3 133/21 145/5
 146/12 146/14 170/1 170/23 171/7
```

disagree [1] 185/15

doubt [1] 208/8 eject [10] 74/2 74/8 74/10 74/22 74/24 dowel [2] 96/16 96/17 74/25 75/1 95/18 97/1 97/4 does... [28] 177/8 177/8 178/8 179/13 down [18] 29/16 40/23 66/21 76/11 96/2 ejected [1] 74/6 96/16 144/15 145/6 150/17 162/10 ejector [3] 96/9 96/10 96/10 179/18 180/2 181/4 181/5 197/17 199/21 199/22 200/23 202/8 203/17 electronic [1] 131/12 182/17 193/10 193/21 198/17 207/20 203/24 208/22 210/24 213/12 213/19 **elemental [2]** 184/15 220/12 208/18 208/19 234/9 218/9 230/24 232/19 233/14 235/22 Down-time [1] 198/17 elements [1] 166/2 251/23 252/2 252/3 253/6 Downs [5] 52/24 53/3 121/7 122/3 124/ **eleven [1]** 194/5 **DPS** [3] 83/23 103/13 103/17 doesn't [27] 22/11 44/10 46/16 46/17 eliminate [3] 28/2 184/18 194/13 62/15 81/11 89/24 91/21 93/22 93/24 draft [1] 115/13 eliminated [1] 214/6 dramatically [1] 184/21 elimination [11] 34/13 35/5 36/12 36/13 98/5 106/19 107/15 130/22 147/6 173/10 173/12 173/20 188/14 202/1 draw [1] 80/3 40/20 40/21 83/11 89/8 89/17 113/3 208/10 210/22 224/16 224/17 241/17 drawn [1] 76/4 221/9 draws [1] 80/21 eliminations [3] 41/1 41/8 75/11 246/1 246/1 dried [4] 73/14 126/15 132/24 132/25 Doggett [10] 2/17 5/18 51/5 51/8 145/11 Elliott [1] 76/25 155/1 204/13 204/16 215/5 253/17 drink [2] 100/23 100/25 else [14] 50/20 68/25 76/2 81/2 84/3 Doggett's [1] 229/20 drop [3] 72/16 72/21 72/23 120/21 122/7 125/22 134/8 134/24 due [1] 95/21 duly [4] 12/22 117/10 146/4 155/15 doing [21] 14/11 15/13 22/6 25/9 32/14 139/7 149/22 150/20 248/1 elusive [1] 225/17 email [1] 140/22 42/23 59/9 60/8 60/17 60/20 60/21 76/8 dumb [1] 45/25 121/10 139/20 154/21 189/14 195/24 **emblem [1]** 188/10 203/2 216/14 230/2 252/20 dummies [1] 157/25 dollar [1] 160/24 **Durham [1]** 246/25 employed [7] 13/6 14/1 62/15 68/18 domain [5] 171/19 179/21 209/23 during [17] 16/22 116/13 116/14 125/25 68/25 117/22 148/23 126/1 126/4 126/7 134/20 135/21 225/15 244/11 **employee [8]** 53/14 53/15 53/16 53/17 don't [175] 3/13 3/16 5/6 31/12 34/14 138/21 182/2 188/1 200/7 223/10 120/2 121/5 121/6 122/4 225/19 227/24 247/12 employees [5] 13/23 56/14 56/16 56/22 35/13 37/3 38/6 38/24 39/13 40/3 40/3 44/18 49/25 50/18 55/21 57/11 58/25 duties [6] 119/19 119/23 158/15 160/25 56/22 61/23 62/3 62/3 63/6 65/9 66/12 67/5 226/20 234/12 employing [1] 190/3 71/8 71/15 72/3 72/14 73/8 73/11 75/23 duty [1] 6/9 employment [3] 20/21 55/23 117/25 76/20 77/6 78/10 82/16 83/4 83/7 83/7 dye [2] 158/18 158/19 employments [1] 157/8 encounter [1] 162/6 encourage [3] 4/20 9/16 216/19 encrusted [2] 65/17 72/15 dyes [1] 198/19 83/13 84/3 84/8 85/3 85/14 85/25 86/5 87/22 88/11 88/15 89/10 90/15 91/8 92/6 92/19 93/4 94/13 96/25 97/1 97/6 97/12 100/10 100/25 101/3 101/18 each [18] 17/20 21/13 34/21 46/4 78/11 end [9] 110/16 160/10 163/6 167/10 103/17 103/17 103/19 104/2 105/23 78/16 91/17 99/15 101/13 101/23 191/3 191/13 201/19 214/13 229/22 106/10 106/18 106/20 112/8 116/6 endeavor [2] 25/20 252/12 113/20 113/23 121/18 137/13 139/15 ended [2] 160/25 169/20 116/11 116/17 118/6 118/14 119/20 140/4 140/9 193/7 121/11 125/13 129/2 131/14 131/24 ear [2] 3/17 196/14 enforcement [9] 11/16 11/20 13/20 earlier [12] 50/24 133/5 136/4 196/20 132/12 133/11 134/18 139/24 144/14 53/23 54/2 64/18 64/20 64/21 167/13 144/15 144/21 145/18 147/4 151/5 227/20 237/9 237/14 239/16 240/17 engage [1] 205/20 151/22 151/22 152/1 152/2 153/5 242/24 243/6 249/12 engaged [1] 236/13 153/13 154/17 154/19 156/23 161/6 early [3] 48/15 53/5 198/1 engineering [2] 14/21 218/11 163/3 164/13 170/20 170/21 172/12 earned [1] 14/6 Engineers [1] 163/17 ease [1] 233/4 easily [1] 195/25 178/11 178/21 182/15 187/13 189/11 enough [12] 28/25 29/1 33/1 34/15 35/8 54/23 101/14 147/10 163/21 205/9 192/24 193/2 198/10 198/12 203/7 205/9 205/14 205/15 205/20 206/24 easy [1] 195/16 207/4 251/10 208/8 209/13 211/1 212/22 212/23 eat [1] 244/10 entail [2] 15/16 16/10 215/16 217/25 218/13 219/8 223/1 edge [1] 201/6 entailed [2] 17/14 158/15 223/22 224/10 226/24 227/18 227/19 editor [2] 170/8 170/11 enter [6] 15/3 45/9 82/7 83/2 197/6 editorial [1] 233/7 229/4 231/20 231/20 231/20 234/16 197/8 entered [3] 45/2 197/13 197/16 234/20 236/1 236/5 236/8 236/12 educate [1] 17/4 239/24 241/13 241/16 241/21 242/20 education [5] 14/10 19/14 21/3 120/15 entering [2] 150/12 198/4 243/12 243/14 243/16 243/21 244/14 entire [9] 19/1 37/15 88/13 108/5 188/4 157/5 educational [4] 14/4 62/7 63/10 120/8 244/19 246/9 247/1 248/8 251/10 252/1 188/19 188/21 208/12 215/7 252/6 252/11 252/19 252/21 255/3 effect [1] 240/15 entirely [2] 91/15 91/16 effective [5] 223/14 238/14 238/19 255/17 255/19 256/4 256/5 256/10 entitled [1] 232/15 enumeration [3] 190/18 190/19 191/16 done [45] 11/11 23/16 27/6 31/22 31/25 248/9 249/1 effects [2] 146/24 198/14 equal [4] 101/20 113/8 113/10 113/17 32/2 35/22 43/10 48/16 50/20 59/12 59/21 60/4 76/10 79/16 80/9 86/21 **efficiently [1]** 66/19 equipment [4] 149/7 149/25 150/12 86/22 87/12 107/12 107/13 107/16 effort [2] 13/19 181/24 160/13 eight [6] 136/16 136/19 163/8 194/4 error [59] 12/6 12/8 36/2 36/4 36/7 36/8 111/4 114/18 125/10 128/15 138/23 140/10 152/20 153/4 153/6 155/6 208/2 208/4 36/10 36/22 37/3 38/24 38/25 39/23 170/23 177/10 187/4 202/25 207/17 eight-hour [1] 136/16 40/1 40/4 40/13 40/15 40/19 40/21 226/24 226/25 251/18 254/7 254/15 eight-inch [1] 163/8 40/24 40/25 41/19 42/12 86/3 86/6 86/7 86/11 86/12 86/13 86/14 86/17 86/18 254/18 254/18 256/8 **eighteen [1]** 194/6 Donna [6] 10/13 12/21 13/1 13/2 121/23 eighty [1] 47/8 111/2 111/7 111/17 141/1 141/4 141/6 either [13] 32/8 32/17 42/17 42/23 85/7 141/13 185/14 205/21 205/24 208/6 137/12 donuts [1] 230/21 89/20 89/20 103/19 138/16 140/21 208/9 208/20 209/4 209/5 209/8 209/9 double [2] 187/14 201/5 214/5 242/21 251/7 209/12 209/15 209/17 209/17 209/18

```
E
error... [6] 209/21 209/23 211/18 225/11
225/16 225/18
errors [3] 37/16 184/22 210/3
especially [3] 28/12 34/3 90/4
essence [6] 24/18 30/9 33/9 39/22 47/6
109/9
essentially [1] 123/6
establish [10] 27/9 28/4 28/16 37/3
84/23 85/1 98/16 107/3 114/21 178/21
established [3] 202/11 202/13 245/21
estimation [1] 12/6 Eudaley [23] 10/13 12/21 12/24 13/1
51/7 107/25 117/20 121/23 133/5
137/12 138/9 140/1 142/4 143/24
169/22 174/14 181/16 189/11 204/19
209/4 211/15 213/9 224/14
Eudaley said [1] 211/15
Eudaley's [2] 119/11 172/15
evaluate [3] 114/8 240/25 241/8
evaluated [1] 243/21
evaluating [1] 160/3
evaluation [1] 233/7
evaluator [1] 194/10
Evan [1] 210/1
even [51] 5/2 27/17 28/18 42/16 47/12
48/14 51/24 62/11 71/9 74/22 82/14
82/24 83/13 83/17 87/5 95/20 96/15
99/6 101/18 101/19 105/20 112/6
145/12 145/13 150/6 158/10 158/12
179/1 183/22 184/5 187/15 187/16
190/23 193/1 196/4 197/3 197/16 198/6
199/14 202/16 206/17 206/21 210/22
217/25 227/1 227/17 227/19 242/7
242/20 243/8 248/23
evening [1] 257/7
events [2] 160/5 160/6
eventually [4] 75/16 167/20 169/4 169/9
ever [24] 21/21 22/23 23/8 23/11 29/5
78/2 79/6 79/6 82/7 100/22 101/1 101/6
103/23 106/4 106/6 143/13 188/9
191/15 219/16 220/16 234/14 235/5
235/9 248/5
every [22] 9/20 16/23 29/4 58/21 59/2
59/2 59/9 66/3 67/13 71/16 79/5 99/7
106/4 137/8 137/9 140/5 140/9 191/10
199/22 199/23 201/17 207/12
everybody [4] 3/6 39/12 173/22 248/1
everyday [2] 189/1 221/12
everything [7] 3/15 120/21 124/16
156/24 196/15 198/18 215/9
evidence [111] 3/12 8/8 9/7 9/8 9/21
9/25 10/1 10/5 10/21 10/21 10/22 11/2
11/3 11/8 11/10 11/15 11/22 11/23 12/2
12/3 12/7 13/13 15/2 23/6 24/12 24/14
26/3 26/3 26/4 26/6 26/10 26/14 28/24
31/16 36/15 38/15 45/8 45/9 46/22
52/16 60/22 68/10 72/9 72/9 75/12
75/15 82/18 82/23 83/2 83/4 87/4 99/1
99/11 111/16 111/21 111/23 111/24
111/25 111/25 112/19 125/18 127/8
128/22 129/8 129/11 131/13 137/19
146/18 146/25 147/7 149/7 150/18
150/25 151/4 151/6 151/11 151/18
152/24 153/1 153/11 153/15 153/16
166/25 177/25 178/1 186/9 202/24
217/24 221/8 221/10 221/13 221/16
```

221/23 222/14 226/8 239/10 239/13

```
240/14 241/4 243/4 243/7 243/19
243/19 243/20 243/20 246/10 246/10
247/8 252/16 252/21 258/7
evident [1] 86/13
Ex [1] 56/22
Ex-HPD [1] 56/22
exact [4] 167/8 213/10 235/17 238/12
exactly [8] 37/1 75/23 78/11 82/1 153/5
153/6 231/13 252/18
examination [58] 12/23 13/13 19/5 19/6
23/6 23/21 25/12 25/20 30/10 33/15
34/25 36/9 38/4 49/17 51/6 62/10 68/14
68/16 69/3 69/20 69/25 70/7 81/15 84/4
107/24 112/18 112/20 117/11 117/16
124/22 125/6 128/4 129/9 131/7 131/19
135/14 135/20 135/23 136/7 136/9
136/13 137/11 146/5 151/15 152/17
155/16 165/20 166/8 208/17 214/24
215/22 216/20 220/14 223/11 225/20
232/1 232/14 253/20
examinations [29] 7/14 8/7 21/23 36/23
42/10 43/9 43/11 49/21 62/17 68/12
85/10 105/7 111/24 121/11 125/9 126/6
131/5 135/25 142/18 161/23 162/2
165/18 181/22 184/20 191/11 192/7
220/21 220/24 234/23
examine [19] 26/11 26/15 26/16 26/22
27/2 27/12 33/25 39/16 40/10 57/22
70/14 70/22 71/3 79/19 125/25 130/3
138/22 146/17 149/6
examined [16] 33/10 69/16 69/19 73/16
77/4 77/12 79/1 88/7 105/16 106/21
124/25 128/22 135/19 151/18 152/22
168/20
examiner [59] 13/3 13/10 21/5 23/12
36/16 36/20 38/2 38/17 38/18 42/4
42/18 42/25 45/7 45/15 45/16 45/17
53/25 67/24 75/15 81/15 85/10 87/4
87/6 91/17 101/13 114/8 120/5 121/8
121/9 139/1 139/16 139/18 140/18
144/1 144/1 153/12 153/17 174/4
181/19 183/12 183/19 184/18 190/22
191/17 194/13 194/17 210/2 214/5
214/8 214/18 215/9 220/16 220/17
227/13 234/15 234/25 235/10 235/17
245/20
examiner's [1] 215/19
examiners [70] 14/14 15/19 17/5 17/18
18/10 18/14 20/9 20/15 20/25 24/13
25/8 25/11 32/2 32/7 39/23 40/14 44/20
47/8 47/14 49/20 60/13 60/16 64/21
70/3 80/9 82/17 84/16 84/18 88/20 89/2
91/20 102/12 102/16 124/9 128/1
134/13 141/6 143/6 143/7 162/4 162/17
171/2 184/20 185/7 185/9 185/13 187/3
187/23 188/21 191/9 191/11 193/11
194/19 195/12 195/14 196/13 201/3
201/8 205/22 213/8 213/25 223/20
224/7 226/16 228/14 235/7 235/18
235/24 248/4 251/21
examines [4] 39/7 45/8 75/7 75/15
examining [4] 82/18 90/25 115/22 247/8
example [24] 69/12 159/2 163/4 170/7
175/2 175/5 178/2 178/5 178/25 184/12
184/14 188/2 188/6 189/1 189/22 192/8
192/24 194/18 207/17 210/20 219/5
235/12 236/25 245/2
examples [6] 63/22 176/12 176/14
187/7 209/24 210/4
```

```
exceed [3] 33/3 92/21 102/10
exceeded [1] 81/24
exceeds [2] 28/8 102/22
excellent [1] 55/1
except [3] 14/19 115/21 205/23 exception [1] 244/13
excerpt [1] 180/16
excerpts [1] 177/7
excess [1] 132/12
exclude [6] 4/1 7/1 7/13 101/12 184/14
 184/18
excluded [3] 7/20 8/10 154/9
excluding [1] 135/14
exclusion [9] 79/2 79/3 85/12 85/14
102/1 176/24 224/17 249/7 249/8
exclusively [1] 63/19
excused [1] 154/4
executive [1] 108/6
exhibit [17] 139/4 155/24 156/5 156/16
 163/12 164/7 164/18 178/17 179/7
 180/12 180/15 185/1 207/7 217/5
248/14 253/21 253/25
Exhibit's [1] 180/19
exhibited [2] 179/3 179/11
exhibiting [1] 186/3
exhibits [5] 177/15 212/16 212/21
248/14 258/13
exist [13] 44/10 79/6 104/2 110/1
200/17 200/18 200/19 200/20 200/24
 201/2 202/8 202/12 214/3
existed [2] 79/6 226/21
existence [2] 29/5 183/23
existent [1] 12/11
existing [1] 7/14
exists [1] 81/14
expand [3] 155/1 155/3 173/2
expansion [1] 143/19
expect [8] 6/18 73/2 92/21 102/4 116/17
118/9 118/14 162/7
expected [7] 37/10 37/14 38/7 89/7
89/11 159/20 162/8
expecting [1] 229/8
expediency [1] 247/19
expense [1] 4/18
expenses [1] 231/11
experience [14] 14/13 34/8 89/6 102/2
102/12 102/12 113/22 114/9 144/2
157/8 158/13 182/11 220/14 232/5
experienced [1] 14/14
experiment [12] 48/23 179/20 179/24
179/24 192/6 192/15 192/18 194/7
207/1 207/4 207/10 207/10
Experimental [1] 163/16
experimentations [1] 186/21
experimenter [5] 179/19 179/23 186/3
 188/3 188/19
experimenters [3] 197/1 197/5 206/23
experiments [1] 206/13
expert [15] 6/11 7/1 22/24 25/5 68/1
94/5 146/17 146/24 150/1 150/25 172/2
 227/12 239/8 240/8 240/25
expertise [11] 9/9 19/4 23/21 23/22
24/25 25/22 31/21 36/4 47/7 68/25
112/14
experts [4] 19/21 25/1 25/17 233/8
Expiration [1] 258/23
explain [8] 13/16 19/19 29/25 37/5
47/22 95/23 162/6 218/15
explained [3] 26/8 26/9 46/2
```

225/4 228/17 232/17 230/15 231/5 231/5 235/6 finished [1] 223/9 far [24] 17/2 23/15 47/4 54/20 66/5 explains [1] 210/25 84/19 96/20 97/17 100/19 103/24 finishing [1] 158/11 **explanation** [1] 94/15 114/12 119/20 125/10 133/9 135/9 finite [2] 193/19 195/6 explanations [1] 93/22 fire [32] 26/17 26/18 26/18 47/24 66/19 153/4 165/8 176/3 178/7 204/7 213/24 explosion [1] 219/6 explosive [1] 111/25 expose [1] 11/2 218/7 224/22 237/18 70/11 71/3 74/12 74/13 87/19 87/20 fashion [2] 105/24 166/16 87/20 87/21 95/3 95/9 97/23 97/24 98/7 faster [1] 5/8 98/20 98/21 99/21 100/15 104/16 105/3 exposing [1] 134/24 fat [1] 194/10 111/25 137/9 137/10 168/18 168/21 **exposure [2]** 77/23 78/9 father [1] 189/24 169/7 169/8 197/7 express [2] 151/10 235/16 father's [1] 80/13 firearm [176] 7/1 7/2 13/5 16/4 16/5 expressed [1] 229/21 16/10 17/23 20/14 24/2 24/3 24/4 24/5 Fax [1] 2/5 **extend [2]** 3/21 255/8 **extension [2]** 173/9 173/13 FBI [21] 50/15 50/17 81/2 157/14 24/6 24/7 24/8 24/11 24/12 24/14 24/17 159/19 159/23 161/24 162/17 166/23 25/12 25/19 26/16 26/16 26/18 26/18 **extent [2]** 48/6 142/15 167/2 167/11 196/16 218/17 218/21 26/22 27/4 27/11 27/21 28/3 28/11 exterior [1] 115/8 219/14 220/20 220/25 226/15 233/23 28/14 29/3 29/4 29/7 30/4 30/4 30/6 30/8 32/3 32/8 34/22 35/4 35/6 35/10 external [8] 37/20 59/3 59/4 179/22 235/3 246/13 FBI's [1] 160/16 206/24 207/2 207/6 207/9 39/22 47/25 48/10 49/12 49/12 49/15 feasibility [1] 110/6 extra [2] 3/21 231/7 57/8 57/22 57/23 66/4 69/16 69/17 extract [5] 95/20 95/24 96/15 97/1 97/3 feasible [2] 109/23 188/20 69/17 69/19 69/21 70/4 70/6 70/10 extracted [4] 74/5 74/8 75/1 96/12 February [1] 52/8 70/11 70/14 70/15 70/16 70/20 70/22 **extraction** [1] 158/9 federal [9] 8/22 151/10 197/2 199/5 70/25 71/8 71/8 71/10 71/17 71/17 72/4 extractor [7] 96/6 99/22 99/23 99/24 72/22 72/25 73/19 74/1 74/1 74/2 74/4 222/11 240/21 241/3 241/5 249/20 100/6 100/10 100/11 Federally [1] 8/21 74/5 74/7 74/10 74/13 75/13 77/2 77/5 extraneous [1] 118/8 extrapolate [1] 209/7 feel [6] 77/19 99/6 231/21 246/14 78/11 79/6 79/8 79/21 79/22 79/22 80/7 250/20 256/7 80/8 80/20 84/4 84/7 93/16 95/5 95/16 extrapolating [1] 195/3 feet [1] 124/8 95/18 95/19 95/20 95/25 96/2 96/3 96/5 extreme [1] 212/9 Felcman [1] 2/12 96/9 96/10 96/11 96/12 96/14 96/24 extremely [1] 12/9 fell [1] 106/16 97/23 98/18 99/9 101/12 102/25 104/7 eye [2] 26/25 27/1 felt [1] 242/6 104/8 104/10 104/11 104/14 104/14 few [14] 9/5 9/11 19/8 23/1 52/14 67/19 105/14 105/16 105/20 105/21 106/5 **eyes [1]** 114/9 91/25 112/17 120/17 122/8 134/13 184/9 184/23 238/17 106/8 107/12 107/16 114/25 115/5 115/6 115/9 115/14 115/15 115/22 **F's [1]** 246/5 fiber [1] 111/23 117/16 120/1 126/15 126/24 127/2 **fabricated** [1] 175/8 **FIE [1]** 143/5 131/6 133/12 133/17 133/19 134/5 fabrication [3] 158/11 175/1 201/16 field [26] 14/21 19/4 19/22 22/5 22/7 134/7 134/9 134/14 135/19 136/13 fabricator [1] 158/25 23/22 23/25 25/2 25/21 31/22 36/4 140/18 168/16 169/11 175/6 187/3 201/4 201/10 201/17 201/24 209/9 face [8] 27/21 83/20 93/16 106/6 106/14 42/21 43/20 47/6 54/10 60/11 60/14 114/4 176/7 176/8 62/10 62/12 157/23 183/22 184/19 214/5 214/13 215/18 223/11 238/13 faced [1] 116/24 204/3 207/11 209/23 244/20 238/18 248/25 251/21 facia [1] 165/25 fifteen [9] 73/13 160/24 194/6 197/11 firearm/toolmarks [1] 84/7 facilities [2] 56/6 77/18 197/17 198/3 198/7 205/10 234/11 firearms [198] 7/16 8/7 12/2 13/3 13/9 facility [4] 20/25 77/13 78/2 150/12 fifty [2] 48/3 185/11 14/14 15/7 15/18 15/19 15/21 15/22 fact [33] 24/6 34/17 36/11 36/12 46/14 fifty-one percent [1] 185/11 15/23 15/25 15/25 16/8 16/21 17/3 17/4 figure [2] 87/6 204/3 17/8 17/17 17/19 18/1 18/9 18/13 19/5 46/14 51/12 53/6 63/2 111/11 113/13 file [17] 78/20 78/22 123/2 123/3 123/6 20/9 21/5 21/23 23/11 23/21 24/13 113/25 115/24 130/3 133/25 134/1 141/23 151/4 153/5 170/20 184/25 125/8 125/12 125/15 126/2 127/6 131/4 25/10 26/4 27/17 27/17 30/5 30/10 32/2 195/18 206/17 216/10 219/24 222/17 135/13 173/3 173/8 173/12 173/15 32/7 34/1 34/11 34/20 36/9 36/10 36/16 238/11 238/12 238/18 242/15 246/12 173/16 36/20 36/22 38/17 38/18 40/14 40/20 filed [5] 6/22 6/25 7/6 9/8 118/8 files [1] 60/17 248/6 248/23 42/23 42/25 44/15 44/16 44/20 48/2 48/4 49/19 49/23 50/5 50/10 51/10 fact that [1] 238/11 filing [1] 9/10 facto [10] 161/1 219/19 219/20 219/21 51/16 52/15 52/22 59/24 60/13 60/16 219/25 220/4 221/2 234/3 234/4 252/4 filter [1] 41/7 62/10 62/12 62/16 63/9 63/17 63/25 factories [5] 16/18 64/8 77/8 77/9 77/10 filtered [1] 83/18 64/7 64/11 64/21 65/8 65/21 66/4 66/9 final [3] 140/23 173/1 173/15 66/13 66/13 67/23 68/2 69/12 70/3 factors [2] 171/15 244/7 factory [1] 67/20 facts [2] 129/24 130/2 failed [3] 74/2 110/10 245/25 finally [2] 184/1 204/12 77/21 77/22 78/17 80/5 80/6 80/9 80/15 find [16] 11/7 17/7 58/1 58/1 87/22 91/5 81/8 84/11 84/15 84/18 85/10 86/4 86/19 88/19 100/19 102/15 102/18 110/22 113/2 113/6 205/5 205/23 fair [1] 160/17 238/18 243/14 243/22 248/9 248/24 102/19 108/11 108/25 110/12 110/15 fairly [1] 222/10 finding [3] 233/4 248/9 254/14 110/18 110/20 111/16 112/9 120/1 fallacies [1] 177/16 findings [1] 235/11 120/5 120/24 121/4 121/8 121/9 121/11 fallacy [3] 177/16 185/22 185/23 fallen [1] 4/25 finds [1] 188/10 fine [11] 29/13 113/11 113/12 113/12 121/19 121/19 122/1 122/2 122/11 125/25 139/1 141/6 142/18 146/13 falls [1] 11/23 113/17 144/13 154/13 154/22 230/18 149/5 149/6 158/1 162/1 162/4 162/5 false [2] 40/21 178/1 231/17 255/10 162/5 162/12 162/16 163/8 163/9 falsifiability [2] 178/17 178/19 fingerprint [4] 81/4 81/12 107/15 165/22 163/23 164/9 164/22 171/2 172/1 172/5 familiar [20] 11/4 21/12 45/3 47/17 84/5 fingerprints [5] 45/4 81/3 107/13 120/25 172/6 172/13 174/3 175/3 176/22 84/9 92/12 103/1 108/3 108/15 109/18 253/13 180/16 184/19 185/21 188/20 188/21 221/21 222/2 222/5 222/25 223/3 223/6 finish [8] 3/24 122/9 155/7 229/21 190/10 190/21 191/9 191/10 195/11

172/10 fluids [4] 70/5 70/12 160/4 160/4 firearms... [34] 196/4 196/13 198/5 flying [1] 255/13 focus [2] 110/2 184/7 204/2 206/19 208/24 209/25 210/2 213/8 213/24 214/5 215/9 215/21 focusing [1] 184/23 216/19 220/13 220/16 220/17 220/21 folder [3] 123/3 138/17 155/4 221/3 221/13 221/16 223/20 224/7 folks [1] 144/8 224/17 226/7 226/16 227/13 228/13 follicle [1] 11/18 233/12 234/14 235/7 235/18 235/23 follow [5] 15/17 58/11 58/14 60/18 247/7 60/19 firearms/toolmark [7] 51/10 51/16 52/22 followed [3] 75/20 99/10 132/7 63/9 63/17 68/2 86/4 following [3] 1/13 60/8 131/8 follows [4] 12/22 117/10 146/4 155/15 firearms/toolmarks [2] 81/8 86/19 folly [2] 191/2 191/16 fired [97] 16/3 16/3 16/5 24/11 24/12 24/13 24/14 24/17 27/11 28/3 28/10 footnote [1] 236/25 28/24 29/2 29/4 30/18 30/19 32/10 forces [1] 200/2 32/22 32/24 33/11 33/13 33/19 34/1 foregoing [1] 258/5 forensic [89] 7/14 13/4 13/4 13/8 13/21 34/10 35/4 35/6 35/9 38/10 42/17 44/20 44/21 44/21 44/22 47/14 48/1 48/9 49/6 21/14 21/16 21/20 44/17 50/9 53/7 49/15 57/23 69/16 70/10 71/1 73/18 53/18 54/5 56/1 56/19 63/23 63/24 64/2 73/19 75/12 75/13 77/4 79/1 79/5 79/19 64/4 64/5 64/10 68/19 80/14 95/7 107/7 79/24 85/11 85/24 85/24 88/4 89/10 108/9 108/10 108/17 108/17 111/20 90/13 90/20 91/6 94/9 94/24 95/16 111/25 112/6 117/23 120/9 120/16 95/17 96/12 96/14 98/6 98/15 98/17 141/18 146/10 146/11 146/13 148/15 98/19 100/14 102/14 102/17 102/18 148/16 148/20 148/25 149/4 156/20 102/24 103/3 104/19 106/22 106/24 157/16 157/23 159/25 160/20 161/1 107/1 107/5 124/24 133/15 137/3 164/23 165/6 165/13 165/15 165/20 137/22 174/5 174/6 176/8 176/25 166/10 166/18 167/12 168/11 168/15 189/13 189/13 191/20 196/3 197/20 183/12 184/11 185/20 189/20 190/2 201/9 213/11 214/8 214/13 190/4 198/22 200/14 200/16 200/18 fires [34] 17/20 18/1 18/2 18/6 27/11 201/6 213/20 213/22 213/24 217/16 28/22 28/22 32/15 33/18 34/9 34/23 219/18 219/23 219/25 221/2 223/11 38/4 98/11 98/11 98/12 98/15 98/17 223/14 226/2 233/12 234/2 234/3 98/17 98/22 98/25 99/7 99/8 99/9 99/11 234/12 236/13 242/16 247/7 99/15 99/21 100/19 102/14 102/25 forensically [1] 166/8 forensics [1] 54/12 137/4 137/5 137/12 137/13 137/14 firing [18] 17/19 27/22 30/13 67/12 forget [1] 213/10 69/12 69/13 69/15 134/20 134/22 forgive [1] 227/25 134/24 136/6 137/25 143/19 174/11 forgot [2] 238/2 243/25 176/9 192/9 201/9 214/6 form [5] 181/25 185/10 187/20 193/18 firings [2] 197/16 201/13 224/18 firmer [1] 142/10 formal [3] 59/19 157/5 233/6 first [53] 4/25 5/23 6/13 6/15 10/13 format [1] 203/14 12/16 12/22 14/23 26/15 27/14 30/25 formatting [1] 173/14 formed [2] 73/17 185/15 48/9 48/19 49/5 49/8 52/14 70/1 70/2 former [2] 50/25 247/9 70/12 70/13 71/15 74/2 74/7 98/20 117/10 119/8 123/19 124/22 132/14 forming [4] 158/11 158/19 175/6 200/7 133/24 137/12 146/4 147/9 151/16 FORT [12] 1/4 1/16 2/3 2/9 2/13 150/10 151/23 152/5 152/10 155/15 156/6 150/15 191/5 258/2 258/4 258/17 163/24 167/21 168/2 173/2 177/8 258/21 177/24 196/10 202/14 203/4 214/10 forth [1] 208/20 227/11 237/4 242/4 246/20 fortuitously [2] 174/22 205/23 forty [2] 88/21 168/11 Fisheries [1] 14/9 **Fishery [1]** 51/9 forty percent [1] 88/21 fit [2] 66/15 133/6 forty-year [1] 168/11 five [17] 23/4 25/4 42/9 42/10 43/3 43/6 forward [5] 3/6 4/15 7/4 12/13 108/18 59/2 67/21 120/7 177/9 181/7 182/8 found [17] 36/15 45/22 93/2 95/13 193/16 194/3 200/3 211/10 230/12 95/16 97/10 113/16 124/17 129/25 fix [1] 67/8 139/7 166/2 166/15 167/25 184/17 flaw [2] 104/10 178/15 189/24 210/3 250/25 foundation [6] 12/5 165/15 189/17 flawed [4] 205/3 205/5 205/6 205/7 flaws [7] 177/12 179/11 187/10 187/11 191/21 212/10 224/21 187/11 188/25 205/10 foundations [1] 167/18 fleeting [1] 31/10 founded [1] 189/9 flexibility [1] 72/19 four [16] 4/12 35/1 35/2 62/2 124/16 flight [1] 231/9 133/25 161/25 166/20 189/2 193/12 193/16 194/3 195/24 208/18 217/24 floor [1] 56/8 floors [1] 56/11 221/12

Florida [5] 39/17 120/10 120/11 143/5

fourteen [1] 194/5

FPI [1] 44/16 frame [1] 66/16 Fred [1] 2/12 free [1] 145/15 224/8 225/8 Frye [1] 9/23 251/15 243/25 G game [1] 130/5 gas [1] 66/20 gases [1] 160/4 generic [1] 6/22

fourth [3] 238/2 243/25 245/24 fragments [3] 35/13 35/23 35/24 framing [1] 215/20 frequent [1] 227/2 freshly [1] 133/9 friction [2] 111/22 158/6 front [6] 118/16 135/13 136/25 223/21 full [5] 25/13 51/24 173/20 173/24 full-time [1] 25/13 fully [5] 42/25 84/12 109/1 110/16 function [3] 95/12 171/10 233/8 functional [1] 115/11 functionality [2] 95/5 100/18 **functioning [2]** 135/4 234/5 **functions [2]** 220/6 220/10 fundamental [3] 84/10 108/24 110/14 funded [1] 209/12 further [8] 116/3 129/14 129/18 132/20 153/24 178/10 258/12 258/15

G-R-Z-Y-B-O-W-S-K-I [1] 237/1 gaining [1] 142/22 gamut [2] 88/13 120/25 gatekeeper [1] 11/1 gather [1] 245/2 gathered [2] 24/21 114/24 gauge [1] 171/17 gave [3] 215/2 242/24 249/15 general [15] 6/22 27/16 32/7 37/11 54/12 78/12 114/2 133/19 160/1 178/8 185/19 187/11 200/22 222/16 228/15 generalizability [1] 207/9 generalized [1] 207/11 generally [18] 26/12 40/13 48/22 60/11 87/16 87/24 158/17 158/18 162/3 170/17 171/2 174/8 185/23 199/15 199/19 208/23 242/19 242/23 generated [1] 138/25 **genuinely [1]** 87/13 geometric [2] 181/24 193/18 George [3] 157/6 217/11 217/19 Georgia [1] 246/23 germane [1] 154/24 get [64] 3/15 3/15 12/15 14/17 26/12 26/14 37/14 39/12 55/16 67/16 77/19 77/23 82/10 82/12 83/4 83/6 83/25 88/10 88/11 88/15 88/19 89/10 89/23 89/25 96/17 97/25 120/13 120/18 124/12 125/7 128/2 132/19 141/6 141/7 144/9 145/6 145/6 146/16 146/21 147/1 148/10 154/14 159/3 161/2 181/9 199/2 199/3 209/15 214/18 226/14 227/17 229/7 229/25 230/12 231/20 231/20 240/23 242/20 242/20 246/11 251/3 252/11 255/14 255/18 gets [3] 67/3 147/4 250/3

G

getting [7] 5/11 39/12 41/2 59/18 129/22 150/14 256/8 give [31] 4/3 4/5 16/19 16/19 21/18 32/18 38/24 38/25 43/4 63/22 67/11 109/8 116/23 125/11 144/19 145/10 145/13 145/19 149/4 163/12 163/21 173/20 175/2 178/25 192/21 229/11 230/20 230/21 243/1 245/17 249/18 given [4] 76/23 171/15 219/15 234/7 gives [5] 51/12 82/20 145/20 254/20 254/24 giving [3] 6/2 142/21 210/20 glaring [1] 187/19 Glock [1] 32/5 gloves [3] 134/14 134/15 134/18 go [74] 3/6 4/15 5/2 5/2 5/8 5/21 6/1 6/13 6/15 7/4 14/5 16/20 22/8 26/13 27/7 29/17 32/6 32/8 37/11 41/17 64/8 75/3 75/8 76/8 77/18 77/19 77/22 89/12 90/3 90/7 100/22 101/7 103/9 110/25 114/17 118/9 118/12 131/1 135/6 145/15 148/10 148/13 153/25 154/4 154/18 155/4 156/24 172/23 173/13 173/14 173/16 173/17 173/21 173/23 178/10 186/25 190/14 191/1 193/20 205/22 205/23 207/20 210/4 210/14 210/22 220/24 229/2 229/24 230/8 230/19 231/5 231/16 231/18 239/11 goal [7] 37/2 39/10 39/20 47/22 66/1 66/12 66/13 goes [10] 49/11 88/1 88/20 96/2 119/2 123/4 147/23 165/8 179/5 252/8 going [103] 3/13 3/23 3/24 4/4 4/5 5/3 5/17 11/7 11/11 12/7 20/7 28/11 29/16 34/1 34/3 34/6 36/19 37/21 41/13 48/5 48/6 48/7 49/6 55/19 56/18 66/10 68/22 80/17 87/7 87/14 89/3 90/5 90/6 93/18 98/1 99/13 99/14 101/21 105/25 106/1 106/2 111/8 115/17 118/6 118/24 118/25 119/6 119/6 122/21 127/21 130/19 143/10 143/25 146/19 146/25 147/9 147/17 147/18 147/19 148/8 148/9 152/3 152/6 152/24 154/25 155/5 155/20 155/23 164/6 164/18 178/5 180/14 181/12 186/18 189/5 190/13 190/14 199/7 205/6 210/17 212/24 216/23 217/3 219/10 227/23 228/24 229/4 229/20 230/8 230/19 232/13 234/11 234/23 244/2 249/5 250/2 252/21 254/25 255/17 255/25 256/4 256/5 256/10 254/8 254/20 255/9 gorillas [1] 183/11 Gospel [3] 216/11 237/22 242/15

gone [3] 43/16 211/3 215/4 good [19] 3/3 3/4 3/5 54/11 54/12 89/5 93/17 115/10 116/22 161/20 174/12 182/20 189/4 209/22 229/10 245/5

got [29] 14/23 38/17 72/12 74/9 94/24 96/13 107/6 107/7 121/21 124/11 126/11 131/17 133/9 152/19 162/3 162/9 162/12 183/7 197/13 203/22 209/24 214/1 217/18 229/3 230/10 230/11 230/13 240/6 255/20

gotten [2] 43/16 43/20 governing [1] 192/2 Government [1] 13/22

grade [1] 89/19 graded [2] 89/20 246/4 graders [1] 52/5

graduate [7] 157/6 159/15 159/22 218/10 218/13 218/23 219/9

graduated [1] 51/18 gray [1] 46/3

great [1] 128/6 groove [1] 115/24

grooves [4] 27/23 27/24 27/25 105/15

gross [2] 113/16 115/19

ground [4] 142/10 158/10 205/22 214/9 group [1] 21/15

groupings [2] 91/11 113/24

groups [1] 92/20 Grzybowski [1] 236/25

guess [15] 3/16 16/20 24/24 34/24 44/5 52/16 101/23 162/15 167/25 199/24 199/25 227/18 227/19 235/1 239/22

guessing [2] 227/22 256/1

guest [1] 157/20

guidance [3] 21/18 22/1 116/23

guide [1] 15/17 guideline [3] 22/5 176/20 179/1 guidelines [5] 22/14 180/2 221/21 237/18 246/15

guides [1] 246/15

guilt [4] 168/7 223/16 223/16 255/12 gun [85] 26/13 30/14 31/1 31/1 31/2 31/15 31/15 31/16 33/12 33/13 38/10 45/8 45/20 60/25 61/6 66/3 66/16 66/19 70/1 70/24 71/4 73/3 73/18 73/22 73/25 74/11 74/18 74/22 74/24 74/25 75/1 75/8 82/8 82/15 83/22 83/24 85/11 85/17 85/23 85/24 92/5 94/9 94/22 95/4 95/9 95/11 96/18 96/20 97/10 105/4 105/10 107/6 110/23 124/20 124/24 126/11 126/20 129/25 130/3 130/10 131/18 131/24 133/3 133/15 133/22 134/2 134/3 134/4 135/1 135/3 135/14 136/23 137/3 137/22 152/20 174/5 189/13 191/20 197/20 207/16 207/17 207/18 213/11 214/18 249/7

guns [24] 31/7 31/11 31/12 31/17 33/19 64/17 66/25 67/19 67/23 68/6 85/12 85/15 97/16 114/24 163/8 163/8 190/12 191/1 191/4 191/6 191/15 199/12 208/25 249/8

Gunther [2] 80/12 80/12

guts [1] 72/16 **guy's [1]** 81/5

guys [9] 54/23 58/11 100/22 103/10 104/16 107/6 112/22 121/25 141/1

had [78] 5/21 5/22 11/17 40/9 52/14 59/6 59/7 59/14 59/18 62/15 63/25 70/5 72/9 72/16 72/20 73/22 73/24 77/1 89/14 95/18 95/19 96/15 96/23 96/25 99/7 104/10 106/8 113/1 120/5 121/15 121/24 122/12 122/20 123/22 124/16 124/24 126/2 126/25 127/17 128/24 128/25 129/7 129/14 129/23 130/17 130/22 130/23 134/15 150/15 150/15 150/23 150/24 151/23 152/11 154/11 156/7 159/19 159/19 162/24 167/18 168/20 169/5 172/6 172/14 194/24 196/13 199/15 204/8 215/3 219/4 219/7 221/7 221/10 232/4 235/15 242/4

250/11 250/13

hadn't [3] 56/12 180/24 202/13

hair [2] 11/18 111/23

half [13] 15/8 42/24 52/17 64/23 64/23 64/24 120/7 134/1 145/8 145/11 166/22 246/3 256/2

hallow [1] 143/19

hand [11] 74/1 74/13 95/15 144/23 155/20 155/23 164/6 175/23 176/3 176/6 180/14

handed [1] 138/17

handful [1] 184/9 handle [10] 38/15 38/20 70/11 87/4 121/4 121/19 122/1 134/11 134/14 173/9

handled [3] 39/6 131/13 134/8 handling [6] 60/22 70/1 119/25 121/18 122/1 122/11

handouts [1] 169/10 hands [1] 134/12 handwriting [1] 120/19 Hanna [2] 2/2 228/23

happen [3] 152/6 192/19 195/4 happened [7] 107/2 107/14 121/12

124/10 138/14 146/22 153/7 happening [1] 138/14

happens [2] 67/3 231/19

hard [10] 65/16 65/20 65/21 91/11 139/18 202/1 234/19 244/6 253/22 253/23

harder [1] 158/17 hardest [2] 199/18 201/15 hardness [1] 97/18 HARPER [2] 1/5 51/8

Harper's [1] 4/1

Harris [2] 50/9 191/5

has [89] 4/12 6/9 7/20 8/1 8/19 9/5 10/9 11/8 13/8 13/14 13/20 14/2 21/14 24/7 24/21 25/20 27/6 30/10 31/19 31/21 36/3 39/5 43/16 43/23 44/17 44/23 47/5 49/14 50/11 50/11 50/17 50/18 51/10 54/24 56/13 59/5 59/19 66/20 71/1 71/1 72/7 79/6 79/16 80/9 84/4 84/11 86/16 87/12 92/11 96/5 101/13 101/23 102/10 103/17 108/1 108/25 110/16 113/21 114/18 142/7 142/12 142/13 142/20 144/10 155/23 173/8 178/17 179/13 180/4 180/7 185/1 189/17 189/22 190/5 195/16 200/17 201/1 201/6 202/4 202/10 202/21 207/4 216/8 226/21 233/6 238/14 238/20 245/7 249/1 hasn't [3] 237/25 245/21 245/22 hat [2] 56/18 56/19

hate [2] 228/24 231/6

have [392]

haven't [8] 78/14 88/25 180/25 181/3 200/9 201/22 203/12 232/20

having [16] 5/1 12/22 17/7 20/5 117/10 119/17 128/20 139/18 144/22 146/4 150/21 153/14 155/15 160/25 214/12 244/10

hazard [1] 134/8 hazardous [1] 126/19 he [87] 6/25 8/11 68/21 68/23 69/2 69/16 69/16 72/22 72/23 72/23 72/24 73/4 73/5 73/6 73/9 73/11 73/16 73/19 73/22 73/23 73/24 74/1 74/11 74/13 74/13 74/15 74/15 74/15 74/16 74/18

75/2 75/19 75/20 75/21 76/17 77/3 77/4

he... [50] 81/6 87/5 94/24 95/18 96/25 99/9 105/18 108/23 113/1 121/8 121/17 121/19 123/25 128/3 128/4 128/9 129/19 129/19 129/20 129/21 129/23 130/13 130/14 130/14 130/15 130/16 130/16 130/22 130/22 130/23 144/18 155/1 181/4 181/5 203/24 204/4 204/4 204/5 204/6 210/2 223/19 224/2 230/24 231/6 239/22 239/24 247/12 247/15 250/6 250/25 **he's [11]** 25/13 52/23 76/10 81/20 118/25 128/7 146/25 147/8 147/19 148/6 195/22 head [1] 157/16 heads [1] 154/20 hear [8] 6/18 11/24 172/15 224/4 237/10 237/15 242/1 242/11 heard [16] 21/7 23/11 23/13 88/25 89/25 92/7 103/7 151/24 154/10 181/15 203/12 225/5 225/6 232/4 239/6 239/7 hearing [22] 4/11 4/21 5/18 6/23 10/2 10/19 23/8 23/12 119/7 146/20 154/10 154/18 155/8 180/25 210/19 215/1 247/4 247/5 247/6 247/6 249/25 255/16 hearings [4] 9/6 9/10 222/1 222/2 hears [1] 11/10 heart [2] 84/8 158/20 heat [1] 134/22 heated [1] 80/17 heavily [2] 108/2 133/20 heavy [1] 115/20 held [5] 1/14 1/16 9/6 62/25 220/2 held that [1] 220/2 help [6] 11/20 79/25 128/3 144/2 223/12 243/25 helpful [4] 44/4 46/25 46/25 222/17 helping [1] 78/6 helps [1] 36/21 hence [1] 160/25 her [14] 68/24 116/4 138/17 138/18 138/18 140/17 140/19 148/2 148/5 154/1 192/21 192/23 213/10 224/15 here [56] 4/19 4/23 7/13 12/16 20/11 66/15 66/15 66/16 68/23 81/5 81/17 89/16 89/17 93/12 93/17 117/17 124/9 126/10 130/3 139/7 139/21 144/9 144/18 145/6 147/5 147/15 148/11 155/6 177/14 177/24 178/4 178/11 182/3 185/18 186/8 186/24 190/8 190/16 191/1 192/5 192/20 194/2 198/14 198/16 203/23 215/1 215/5 223/18 224/6 229/8 230/5 230/21 246/9 248/3 252/19 253/2 here's [6] 45/20 45/21 65/1 65/2 87/14 130/3 hereby [1] 258/5 herself [1] 179/20 hey [7] 23/15 45/20 81/17 130/4 139/19 139/21 184/2 **HFSC** [1] 148/15 **Hicks** [1] 8/22 high [10] 51/23 62/11 62/15 82/22 83/4 83/6 115/6 160/6 199/14 219/8 higher [2] 41/25 42/12 highlighted [3] 177/11 233/3 233/3 highly [1] 35/11

Hill [1] 188/6

130/9 144/14 144/15 144/16 144/17 144/17 145/13 145/18 147/9 147/11 231/6 239/25 himself [2] 179/19 247/15 hired [5] 14/23 62/14 148/18 214/25 215/5 hiring [1] 13/12 his [35] 9/13 9/13 36/1 52/25 69/5 69/6 69/7 69/10 69/12 69/19 69/20 69/25 72/24 75/3 75/5 75/24 100/7 100/9 108/1 108/2 118/12 118/13 119/2 147/8 147/9 150/25 210/2 210/3 210/3 210/11 223/23 227/7 253/6 255/14 255/18 history [4] 15/21 15/21 15/22 232/15 hit [9] 46/11 46/23 82/6 82/12 82/16 83/5 83/6 123/3 124/14 hold [5] 144/15 169/15 192/5 217/6 218/6 holes [1] 66/18 hone [1] 163/22 honestly [1] 45/24 Honor [26] 3/7 12/20 51/3 68/22 92/11 107/19 107/22 116/2 117/3 118/5 152/15 153/24 155/21 156/4 156/15 181/11 193/24 199/7 203/12 214/22 232/11 246/18 247/18 248/6 253/6 254/10 Honorable [1] 1/15 hooks [2] 96/6 96/7 hoping [1] 5/10 hour [4] 136/16 136/18 256/2 256/2 hours [6] 64/23 135/16 136/19 145/9 145/11 215/7 housekeeping [1] 255/11 **Houston [29]** 2/22 13/3 13/8 13/18 13/21 50/6 52/12 52/21 53/7 53/12 53/13 53/14 53/16 53/17 53/18 54/5 54/5 56/1 56/8 56/19 68/19 83/23 117/23 121/16 146/11 148/16 148/18 148/20 148/25 how [116] 3/13 5/6 6/1 11/10 12/9 12/11 13/6 15/23 15/24 15/25 16/2 16/20 17/1 22/12 23/3 25/7 37/18 39/5 42/22 43/9 46/5 46/5 49/23 53/11 55/21 57/12 58/15 58/18 61/10 61/14 61/22 64/22 67/12 67/23 72/4 72/19 73/4 76/8 78/11 78/13 78/16 79/25 79/25 83/9 86/8 87/23 89/19 90/11 90/18 91/4 92/16 100/24 101/6 101/10 103/14 106/18 107/11 113/1 118/23 119/13 119/13 120/5 123/1 124/21 125/9 130/4 132/3 132/6 133/6 134/11 135/13 135/22 136/9 137/24 138/4 140/1 140/4 140/10 141/6 141/18 145/5 145/5 148/14 148/21 151/7 153/18 159/8 162/11 172/4 172/12 182/15 183/19 190/21 194/13 199/21 199/23 201/14 205/7 210/25 218/14 226/7 228/11 228/11 228/23 229/19 230/13 234/16 236/19 239/7 240/23 240/25 241/8 241/13 252/16 252/22 255/19 however [8] 4/16 31/7 106/8 188/17 201/14 207/6 213/16 249/4 **HPD [12]** 13/13 14/17 14/23 55/9 55/25 56/18 56/22 76/24 121/24 148/24 211/6 211/8 hum [3] 109/2 226/10 237/2 Ice-Cream [1] 65/1

him [17] 71/21 93/1 124/2 125/11 128/8 human [2] 181/24 200/24 hundred [25] 21/11 31/6 31/11 42/8 42/9 47/24 48/1 49/2 49/4 49/9 49/10 56/22 78/8 80/10 108/8 159/21 182/6 182/10 191/4 191/6 191/7 191/9 191/14 192/21 224/16 hundred percent [4] 78/8 182/6 182/10 224/16 hundreds [6] 18/5 47/16 168/20 182/1 234/22 234/22 hundredth [1] 48/19 hypothesis [10] 103/10 164/21 178/23 178/24 190/17 190/23 191/3 192/8 192/10 202/14 hypothetically [1] 191/4 hits [5] 46/13 81/11 82/10 82/22 197/13 |I'd [6] 6/16 147/12 154/9 186/24 229/16 247/22 **I'II [26]** 10/12 11/6 51/3 108/16 128/18 135/5 148/8 177/14 179/1 193/22 212/17 213/16 219/11 219/13 222/11 222/15 222/23 226/14 227/19 229/11 230/21 234/6 234/24 243/10 253/16 257/2 l'm [168] 4/9 4/22 4/23 5/9 5/10 6/2 7/21 8/2 8/25 13/3 20/7 21/11 22/21 27/25 28/17 28/24 29/16 33/10 34/1 34/15 34/21 41/24 44/14 45/17 48/21 50/17 51/7 51/8 53/17 61/23 67/6 68/22 76/21 80/25 81/22 82/2 83/1 88/23 89/17 89/18 91/10 92/20 93/18 93/20 101/3 103/5 106/16 108/15 109/15 113/18 117/3 117/24 118/5 118/24 119/6 119/6 125/14 127/5 127/21 128/19 129/22 130/4 130/5 136/3 136/5 139/18 139/19 139/20 139/25 141/11 142/15 143/16 143/17 145/3 145/4 146/10 146/19 147/9 155/5 155/6 155/19 155/20 155/23 156/20 161/5 161/6 161/14 164/6 164/18 169/15 171/3 171/4 172/12 177/21 178/7 178/19 180/14 181/12 183/6 186/18 186/23 187/14 188/7 189/5 195/5 196/16 196/16 199/7 202/1 203/4 209/13 210/17 210/20 212/24 213/18 213/21 215/5 215/17 216/17 216/23 217/3 218/2 218/19 219/10 221/24 222/21 222/21 223/13 223/24 223/25 225/12 226/24 226/25 227/22 227/23 228/2 229/10 230/2 230/18 231/11 231/13 232/13 234/10 234/14 236/23 237/11 238/7 238/16 239/15 241/19 242/19 243/14 244/17 244/19 245/23 247/4 248/6 248/7 248/24 249/4 251/18 252/18 253/2 254/7 254/15 254/17 254/25 256/1 l've [42] 3/20 13/9 16/23 23/16 42/23 42/25 57/11 61/24 62/1 64/19 84/8 84/13 89/14 103/1 108/4 108/6 109/19 116/22 142/18 157/20 167/25 172/11 181/22 182/21 188/2 193/11 193/16 196/13 196/18 209/11 227/24 228/12 228/14 229/3 232/18 234/2 240/19 240/22 241/9 241/19 243/10 245/12 I.D [1] 139/20 **IBIS [10]** 44/6 44/7 44/9 44/10 44/11 44/19 81/9 81/17 100/13 197/2 Ice [1] 65/1

in 2012 [1] 164/12 initial [8] 48/9 69/20 125/5 125/6 125/18 in a [1] 183/3 125/18 138/22 223/10 initially [4] 98/9 122/15 165/14 167/19 ID [2] 91/20 91/20 in-acceptable [1] 189/6 idea [5] 88/2 106/20 106/22 106/23 inadequate [1] 178/25 innocence [3] 168/7 223/16 223/17 255/18 inch [2] 163/8 163/8 inoperable [1] 70/20 Ideally [1] 16/23 ident [1] 193/15 include [5] 42/4 42/6 146/12 162/1 input [8] 20/5 45/15 54/11 58/9 59/18 163/6 182/10 229/12 241/6 identical [2] 66/9 66/13 included [9] 7/19 42/13 57/17 102/16 inquiry [1] 230/14 identification [62] 7/2 13/25 15/23 17/16 108/15 212/16 235/18 255/16 258/8 inserts [1] 199/17 inside [3] 105/16 106/3 115/7 28/7 29/1 33/5 34/12 34/15 35/3 36/11 includes [3] 40/20 40/25 108/11 insignificantly [1] 208/22 including [3] 41/21 50/6 191/12 36/12 48/17 57/15 62/13 63/9 63/18 inclusive [2] 35/6 42/10 inconclusive [16] 35/18 41/21 41/22 inspecting [1] 114/20 inspection [1] 46/1 68/2 75/18 76/3 78/7 80/4 89/8 89/18 90/4 90/7 91/18 91/19 93/3 93/4 94/19 42/5 42/6 42/13 42/14 83/11 88/16 94/21 100/11 101/12 101/15 101/25 instance [5] 26/11 27/19 45/13 118/25 102/6 110/13 112/6 113/3 113/6 113/19 88/17 88/20 89/3 89/7 89/16 89/24 124/17 140/7 144/3 158/2 175/3 176/17 176/18 90/10 instances [3] 119/5 190/21 237/3 inconvenience [2] 4/18 147/10 instead [3] 71/13 95/14 95/15 176/24 177/4 177/10 177/13 179/3 Incorporated [2] 13/22 44/17 Institute [5] 50/9 157/3 157/12 159/17 179/5 179/6 179/12 180/16 182/14 incorrect [2] 88/17 141/2 incorrectly [1] 70/17 182/18 209/10 215/11 215/14 institutions [1] 157/2 identifications [14] 7/17 40/21 41/1 41/7 increase [1] 208/22 instructed [2] 122/8 237/21 41/20 48/7 48/24 75/11 75/14 100/25 101/7 108/12 184/8 233/13 increases [1] 184/21 instruction [8] 242/2 242/17 243/1 identified [7] 49/1 94/9 103/16 103/25 independent [7] 53/24 54/1 55/3 81/15 245/16 249/18 249/22 250/4 250/22 149/25 150/25 153/12 185/3 185/4 233/1 instructions [9] 4/3 237/17 238/4 identify [7] 48/8 48/14 92/17 98/13 independently [2] 140/8 140/17 index [4] 171/7 171/9 171/21 171/24 238/25 240/23 241/7 241/10 242/20 112/4 155/25 164/19 251/8 identifying [1] 215/11 indicate [4] 164/1 186/5 225/16 253/8 instrumentation [1] 165/24 **IEC [2]** 59/15 59/18 indicated [18] 92/12 126/2 159/19 167/6 instruments [1] 44/11 insubordinate [3] 118/21 118/23 119/14 ignoring [1] 201/15 181/23 182/3 182/21 188/2 202/21 image [7] 45/9 45/13 46/1 46/4 46/7 206/20 211/7 211/20 214/2 219/24 insubordination [2] 118/20 119/21 100/13 175/24 232/18 240/19 242/5 248/24 insufficient [1] 178/7 insular [1] 170/25 insure [2] 20/3 233/10 images [11] 44/20 45/12 45/14 46/8 indicates [3] 181/19 200/13 213/14 indicating [5] 183/19 215/18 223/13 46/9 46/12 46/16 175/22 182/2 197/8 198/5 248/7 248/24 Integrated [2] 44/8 44/9 integrity [2] 20/3 72/8 imagine [2] 106/5 106/5 indicator [1] 165/25 intend [1] 10/7 intent [2] 234/20 234/21 indicia [5] 168/7 169/6 183/1 184/17 imaging [9] 44/10 109/16 109/18 109/20 109/23 110/3 110/8 111/12 180/20 252/4 intentional [1] 205/13 imagining [2] 242/3 243/1 individual [37] 24/16 27/3 27/5 27/10 imbued [1] 216/7 interactions [2] 160/4 228/16 28/5 28/6 29/23 35/7 35/14 37/9 38/2 imbuing [1] 237/5 38/17 47/7 48/3 78/16 90/11 90/15 91/4 interception [1] 239/3 interest [1] 186/19 imitation [1] 208/14 93/20 101/13 104/4 104/12 104/15 interior [1] 115/9 immediately [1] 167/17 105/10 105/24 114/13 114/21 137/13 interjecting [1] 148/7 internal [8] 58/20 58/23 59/10 101/24 206/20 207/1 207/3 207/5 impact [1] 171/15 impacts [1] 160/7 impart [3] 30/13 31/5 79/23 175/11 175/12 175/15 183/9 183/10 183/14 183/21 196/12 196/15 individuality [1] 115/18 imparted [1] 24/12 individualization [1] 185/22 internally [2] 203/11 203/19 impartial [2] 59/1 60/14 individualizations [1] 190/6 international [4] 16/17 20/17 20/18 impeachment [1] 118/8 individuals [6] 32/19 37/8 39/9 58/10 163/19 imperfection [4] 30/11 30/19 31/6 31/18 126/23 127/1 internationally [1] 50/24 imperfections [1] 106/1 inductive [14] 187/21 188/17 188/23 interpret [5] 236/19 239/8 240/12 **implement [1]** 54/4 188/25 189/6 189/7 189/25 190/3 190/8 240/24 252/16 interpretation [1] 237/19 implied [1] 235/17 190/17 191/3 191/16 202/14 245/3 implies [1] 79/4 inductively [1] 245/3 interpreted [1] 207/5 ineffective [2] 203/22 204/10 inefficient [2] 203/22 204/9 interpreting [1] 186/6 imply [1] 251/9 interrupted [1] 219/7 interspatial [2] 181/20 181/25 interval [2] 189/8 202/22 intimate [1] 228/16 import [2] 198/22 204/11 infallibility [1] 216/9 infallible [2] 252/12 253/13 importance [4] 147/11 171/12 171/17 184/4 inference [10] 182/12 187/21 188/13 important [5] 58/14 78/4 127/25 128/5 170/20 188/17 188/23 188/25 189/21 224/13 introduce [1] 12/25 imposed [1] 200/7 introduced [3] 202/24 212/16 212/20 245/4 249/5 investigate [1] 67/7 impossibility [4] 29/9 79/11 79/12 85/17 inferences [2] 187/21 189/8 inferred [1] 166/4 influence [1] 54/2 investigated [1] 168/20 investigation [6] 44/5 104/17 124/11 impossible [2] 29/7 79/10 impress [1] 10/20 impression [5] 93/16 109/9 111/22 124/19 143/17 168/16 information [25] 12/14 21/22 24/21 25/1 44/8 67/11 87/8 119/22 123/24 125/7 investigative [3] 45/19 223/15 238/23 114/3 174/11 impressions [3] 115/24 174/8 176/9 136/25 150/9 171/11 192/23 193/9 investigator [3] 107/15 168/18 168/21 impressive [1] 248/14 investigators [4] 46/24 76/25 77/7 197/10 207/4 209/15 222/16 233/10 improve [2] 112/15 141/19 240/5 245/3 250/5 251/10 253/9 107/10 improvement [1] 160/24 ingredients [2] 179/9 179/10 involve [1] 160/2

involved [13] 39/23 55/14 110/18 120/18 123/22 152/12 162/3 162/9 162/12 169/21 210/7 221/3 238/1 involving [2] 160/6 207/25 **IOC [2]** 239/2 252/10 ipse [1] 189/16 Irma [3] 145/24 146/3 146/8 irrelevant [3] 197/13 207/13 210/18 is [685] is a [1] 21/11 **ISI [2]** 171/10 171/10 isn't [10] 62/20 62/24 68/25 82/13 85/22 211/17 225/11 235/15 242/18 244/6 **ISO [2]** 59/15 59/18 ISO/IEC [2] 59/15 59/18 issuance [1] 76/16 issue [35] 3/24 31/23 36/5 75/22 122/20 146/16 146/24 150/14 162/24 164/9 169/14 184/7 187/19 187/22 188/15 195/23 200/12 200/15 200/16 200/18 200/19 200/24 201/5 202/4 202/9 203/4 203/6 208/24 210/23 240/24 241/23 Jackson [5] 2/4 2/9 2/13 246/24 258/22 244/14 244/15 248/8 253/5 issued [6] 38/2 75/25 76/15 76/19 77/3 180/7 issues [35] 3/25 9/18 29/15 55/11 55/12 55/16 119/18 133/18 147/6 158/5 162/10 162/12 163/7 163/9 164/13 172/2 172/7 172/13 186/14 190/10 192/7 200/14 202/8 209/1 221/25 222/1 232/16 235/8 236/9 244/20 246/16 247/15 248/8 251/5 253/2 it [609] it use [1] 207/22 it's [228] 5/3 5/17 7/3 9/7 9/8 9/14 9/15 10/9 10/10 11/13 11/21 13/22 14/2 15/20 16/23 16/24 18/12 18/25 20/3 20/17 21/12 21/14 21/15 23/18 24/2 24/4 29/8 34/14 35/11 37/23 38/14 38/15 38/19 40/6 40/7 40/22 41/8 42/5 44/1 45/5 45/20 45/24 45/25 45/25 45/25 46/2 46/3 46/25 46/25 48/17 48/23 50/21 54/18 55/6 56/6 57/16 58/3 58/4 58/4 58/5 58/14 59/2 60/14 60/23 62/19 62/22 63/3 63/7 65/12 73/1 73/11 76/7 78/8 78/15 78/15 79/10 81/17 81/20 82/17 83/9 85/17 85/18 85/19 87/6 88/12 88/13 88/21 89/8 89/17 89/18 89/20 89/20 90/2 90/8 90/8 90/9 90/9 91/10 91/10 91/16 91/20 91/20 92/4 93/23 94/20 95/23 97/13 100/4 101/15 105/19 106/2 109/10 113/23

113/23 113/24 114/17 114/25 115/1

115/16 118/10 123/3 123/14 123/14

126/10 127/25 130/23 133/14 133/15

133/16 133/16 133/17 139/14 139/21

140/23 141/24 142/1 142/14 143/11

146/23 147/10 148/7 148/9 149/24

175/8 176/8 177/12 178/8 178/25

154/22 156/8 156/10 161/13 162/15 170/8 170/13 171/10 171/24 174/24

185/13 185/20 186/4 186/17 188/20

199/24 200/4 200/21 201/19 202/5

205/13 208/18 210/18 213/8 214/11

203/20 204/2 204/9 204/9 204/10

190/19 195/21 196/21 199/16 199/19

179/12 179/12 180/5 181/8 181/8 185/1

214/17 214/18 214/19 216/11 216/12 216/22 217/8 217/13 223/3 224/3 224/9 229/4 229/7 230/9 233/1 233/18 234/4 234/17 237/1 237/5 237/8 238/11 240/5 241/17 241/23 244/13 244/16 244/22 245/5 245/10 245/11 246/9 252/6 252/14 253/11 253/22 256/10 256/20 256/21 Italics [1] 109/16 item [22] 35/21 72/20 73/13 93/10 101/22 114/20 138/23 139/5 140/5 140/5 140/9 140/12 140/13 165/23 174/22 174/23 174/25 175/4 175/14 175/16 184/18 200/6 items [17] 28/3 28/14 35/5 43/13 73/17 76/11 79/1 83/9 94/9 136/23 140/15 149/8 179/6 184/14 185/1 199/18 202/3 its [4] 10/4 18/25 47/7 71/5 itself [10] 17/15 30/4 58/21 94/11 105/25 113/21 115/25 133/7 200/3 203/17

James [1] 1/15 jeopardize [1] 150/3 job [12] 14/11 14/12 14/17 16/2 17/13 22/19 51/14 64/15 146/9 159/13 221/7 240/8 John [2] 149/6 227/7 joke [3] 124/13 124/13 124/18 Joseph [4] 68/17 117/9 117/14 117/15 journal [20] 63/23 64/4 78/23 143/18 164/16 164/25 165/1 165/4 170/1 171/7 171/9 171/13 171/24 228/2 228/18 228/20 232/15 232/16 233/5 233/5 journal and [1] 171/13 journals [6] 79/17 169/20 170/2 171/18 171/20 171/21 Judge [75] 1/16 3/8 4/8 4/13 5/19 6/14 6/21 7/13 7/21 8/3 8/21 9/16 10/1 10/12 10/14 10/18 15/11 17/11 17/13 26/10 26/13 29/14 36/7 37/5 47/22 62/24 81/13 116/11 119/3 125/14 127/24 128/7 144/10 146/21 147/3 149/3 174/14 177/2 180/12 180/23 181/17 199/5 210/13 210/18 210/21 229/1 229/13 229/16 231/17 231/23 235/13 240/9 241/12 241/14 241/16 241/17 242/17 243/1 247/9 247/11 247/17 247/24 248/2 249/17 249/18 250/1 250/3 251/7 251/18 252/7 252/16 253/16 254/2 255/11 256/12 Judge's [3] 223/22 242/9 243/12 Judges [3] 5/4 242/9 252/2 judging [1] 216/23 judgment [1] 194/12 judicial [5] 1/5 62/24 63/3 190/9 198/22 July [1] 246/23 July 25th [1] 246/23 jump [1] 169/13 June [1] 120/4 junk [7] 111/5 169/9 241/17 241/18 241/19 241/20 241/24 juries [7] 216/10 225/8 237/9 239/7 240/12 251/22 252/11 Jurimetrics [2] 164/25 165/1 jurisdiction [1] 7/20 jurors [10] 4/4 10/21 216/13 236/19

237/14 237/20 240/18 240/22 252/16 252/16 jury [34] 7/15 11/2 26/4 118/16 223/12 223/21 224/4 224/8 224/13 224/24 230/20 237/17 238/4 238/24 239/5 239/11 239/13 240/14 241/6 241/10 242/1 242/10 242/11 242/25 249/19 249/22 250/4 250/21 251/21 252/8 252/22 252/23 253/1 255/18 jury's [2] 230/18 241/3 just [121] 3/10 3/16 4/5 5/5 6/2 8/13 8/18 14/2 17/19 26/11 34/2 34/12 34/14 35/13 35/20 41/6 44/1 45/19 45/24 56/17 62/19 62/25 64/15 65/12 67/14 67/22 68/5 69/18 70/25 71/10 71/12 72/5 72/20 77/19 78/12 81/17 87/3 87/7 88/10 88/12 90/9 91/6 96/24 97/3 97/16 100/16 111/7 113/18 114/16 114/20 116/23 125/17 126/10 130/2 131/17 132/2 134/3 134/18 136/3 137/10 140/5 142/9 144/18 146/21 147/1 148/16 154/13 162/15 169/15 172/8 174/25 176/12 176/14 178/10 178/24 180/5 180/8 180/24 181/9 181/21 183/13 184/12 186/20 186/23 188/1 193/4 193/5 194/7 194/17 194/23 196/14 200/4 207/20 210/6 210/20 212/3 215/2 215/14 219/1 220/2 220/23 222/11 224/3 230/16 230/19 230/22 231/3 231/6 232/23 236/9 239/14 239/17 241/9 243/10 243/10 247/18 250/1 251/19 252/11 253/9 256/12 Just it's [1] 65/12 justice [2] 233/11 246/13 justifiable [1] 214/14 justify [1] 89/14

K-U-P-E-R-S [1] 227/16 Karen [3] 258/3 258/18 258/19 Katherine [1] 2/20 **Katy [1]** 51/23 keep [8] 7/24 33/6 72/11 121/18 147/12 190/13 190/14 198/18 Kelly [3] 9/23 10/20 11/5 key [4] 184/7 200/18 202/9 221/11 killed [1] 199/6 killings [1] 130/1 Kim [5] 52/24 53/3 121/7 122/3 124/7 kind [25] 7/20 9/4 14/16 14/16 21/13 25/1 26/3 31/25 39/24 49/11 61/12 82/15 88/23 93/9 96/16 97/9 169/13 176/16 196/14 206/3 212/12 217/21 250/4 252/17 255/6 kinds [1] 38/11 Kirby [1] 2/21 kitchenware [1] 159/1 knees [1] 251/4 knew [4] 80/16 98/18 124/13 197/20 knocks [2] 43/22 96/10 Knolls [1] 186/1 know [154] 3/13 3/16 5/2 5/6 5/6 11/4 18/1 24/14 27/5 27/11 28/10 31/12 34/1 34/9 34/10 34/22 38/6 38/9 38/19 40/3 41/24 42/16 43/8 45/5 46/16 46/24 47/3 47/4 48/1 48/9 49/24 49/25 50/1 50/3 50/4 50/6 50/7 50/11 50/16 50/17 50/18 54/14 54/20 55/5 55/21 55/21 58/25 60/3 60/13 60/21 61/23 61/23 63/24

K

know... [101] 65/10 66/12 67/5 71/20 73/11 77/25 78/1 78/8 78/11 78/12 78/14 78/16 80/17 80/20 80/21 83/7 84/3 84/8 85/3 86/3 87/16 87/22 89/2 91/24 92/6 96/25 97/2 97/6 97/9 97/11 97/12 97/13 100/24 102/24 103/12 103/17 105/23 106/10 106/18 112/7 113/7 113/14 119/20 121/11 121/13 123/1 125/2 126/4 126/7 126/9 128/1 130/15 134/6 136/21 140/4 141/15 143/2 143/11 151/22 153/4 153/5 153/14 161/14 164/13 165/10 169/23 169/24 170/20 170/21 170/24 180/25 190/11 193/1 195/22 198/10 203/7 209/13 212/22 212/23 216/11 218/14 223/1 224/10 226/25 227/18 228/11 229/25 234/16 234/21 236/1 236/24 239/24 241/13 241/16 242/12 243/16 244/7 244/19 246/9 255/17 255/19 knowing [1] 38/21

knowledge [17] 29/6 54/21 63/2 63/11 78/3 78/5 103/20 104/1 122/3 123/25 153/6 153/8 153/9 171/1 171/10 222/10 228/15

knowledgeable [2] 16/25 67/22 known [42] 11/16 26/19 28/8 28/18 28/21 33/4 33/6 33/22 34/16 34/18 92/22 92/23 102/9 102/11 102/13 102/21 115/15 141/1 165/16 171/15 175/25 177/15 177/25 178/17 178/23 182/4 185/23 187/20 190/18 196/3 196/25 197/6 197/14 197/16 197/19 198/2 198/6 198/11 199/18 201/16 207/23 234/11

knows [7] 16/25 36/20 38/5 38/12 38/18 188/8 248/2

lab [50] 13/10 14/17 18/17 18/18 18/23

Kupers [1] 227/16

22/9 25/8 37/15 50/25 52/12 52/14 52/21 55/9 55/16 56/1 56/10 57/1 57/8 57/19 59/17 59/24 60/2 69/24 70/1 83/23 84/1 88/9 91/25 92/10 103/13 133/20 146/17 148/18 148/22 149/5 149/5 149/7 149/10 149/11 149/23 150/15 150/18 151/18 153/10 154/15 160/17 211/6 211/11 220/20 221/8 laboratories [8] 32/18 37/8 39/2 41/13 53/22 54/12 54/25 143/7 laboratory [26] 13/19 13/24 15/7 23/13 23/15 32/14 32/17 37/24 39/8 56/3 56/4 57/5 58/7 58/10 58/21 58/25 59/5 60/5 62/14 82/6 84/2 121/15 123/24 149/25 186/2 191/10 laboratory's [2] 37/10 87/3 labs [6] 49/23 50/5 83/23 103/21 161/11 196/17 lack [9] 8/12 44/5 93/13 93/25 133/17 185/5 222/14 240/10 242/2 lady [2] 148/1 153/25 laid [1] 60/9 land [5] 7/20 93/16 114/3 115/24 145/7 lands [4] 27/23 27/24 27/25 105/15

language [6] 33/21 188/1 215/10 215/15

232/7 238/10

large [3] 47/14 60/23 184/6

largely [1] 209/16 larger [1] 198/23 Larry [1] 227/16 lasers [1] 65/18 last [29] 47/8 59/11 59/20 64/22 65/23 65/24 67/12 148/17 149/2 150/13 151/19 152/9 153/19 153/20 155/2 160/10 161/18 161/18 163/25 172/6 187/9 190/7 199/21 199/24 200/13 205/25 215/7 236/24 238/17 Lastly [1] 10/1 lasts [2] 31/10 31/11 late [1] 48/15 later [10] 76/13 76/17 98/10 118/15 122/14 122/19 124/15 154/19 155/2 179/5 latest [1] 214/2 laughed [3] 124/13 124/13 124/14 laureate [1] 186/1 law [30] 9/1 11/16 11/19 13/20 53/23 54/2 64/18 64/20 64/21 81/14 116/14 116/19 164/15 167/12 216/10 217/15 217/16 217/17 217/21 217/23 217/23 217/24 217/24 217/24 218/2 245/12 245/13 246/7 246/10 250/8 lawyer [1] 39/3 lawyers [1] 51/8 lay [5] 30/11 182/20 188/1 216/7 253/9 layperson [2] 85/22 86/1 lead [11] 4/23 11/18 45/19 46/24 49/14 115/20 165/9 165/10 166/13 184/12 184/16 leading [2] 16/24 54/15 learn [6] 15/23 15/24 16/2 64/16 241/2 246/6 learning [1] 16/11 least [8] 9/10 50/11 62/2 89/13 94/19 101/3 142/15 225/23 leave [12] 30/7 68/21 71/9 116/6 116/7 117/25 154/5 222/23 229/22 230/5 231/6 254/9 leaves [1] 24/4 lecturer [1] 157/20 leeps [1] 8/11 leeway [1] 231/23 left [19] 17/22 27/4 27/19 35/20 48/4 79/21 80/6 104/12 105/15 118/2 138/18 140/12 140/16 142/20 194/15 194/15 221/11 221/14 230/13 legacy [1] 59/16 legal [4] 225/23 246/15 246/15 253/5 legitimate [4] 25/20 25/21 48/22 82/22 lend [1] 115/17 length [2] 4/11 125/10 less [10] 4/14 42/2 66/9 113/13 125/19 125/20 131/2 136/4 198/23 222/21 let [11] 70/7 97/6 128/11 147/9 149/17 154/17 163/3 229/25 230/22 251/17 252/21 let's [40] 22/8 23/20 26/12 35/25 40/23 45/13 144/5 144/9 155/7 165/9 178/24 179/1 181/21 183/13 184/12 186/25

188/10 189/1 190/23 191/3 191/5 191/8 192/8 192/11 192/24 193/22 194/1 194/2 194/17 203/16 204/13 207/18 208/2 208/3 208/15 208/18 209/4 210/14 230/1 230/16 letting [2] 121/3 144/14 level [15] 29/8 34/2 34/11 34/13 102/3

102/5 102/21 114/18 166/7 200/23 200/25 202/18 202/20 218/24 248/3 levels [3] 28/23 198/3 200/4 lie [1] 233/17 life [2] 191/12 219/6 light [2] 46/5 55/22 like [77] 6/16 11/9 14/21 21/13 27/18 40/1 46/17 50/15 52/16 55/1 60/25 61/1 61/9 64/21 64/25 68/5 71/4 81/3 84/20 84/22 84/25 88/6 88/23 89/14 97/16 104/17 105/1 107/8 108/17 109/25 111/23 115/7 116/4 130/1 133/5 135/9 137/11 139/19 142/3 142/9 144/16 144/17 147/12 148/6 153/15 154/9 157/25 160/23 162/13 162/24 163/4 163/13 172/22 173/23 174/11 176/4 195/19 197/2 199/21 207/18 213/9 214/10 217/8 223/9 229/6 229/16 233/22 236/1 236/5 236/8 236/12 238/23 246/23 247/22 252/13 254/13 254/22 likelihood [3] 79/8 186/15 192/16 likely [3] 113/13 197/12 197/17 **Limines** [1] 118/7 limit [5] 215/10 241/14 241/17 250/2 250/6 limitations [4] 39/25 240/23 241/7 243/6 limited [3] 139/19 147/13 251/16 limiting [9] 237/16 238/3 238/24 242/1 249/18 249/22 250/4 250/21 251/8 limits [2] 241/13 241/16 **LIMS** [1] 123/23 **line** [18] 22/6 60/10 66/3 66/24 101/23 108/15 108/23 140/22 148/7 181/25 185/18 194/11 194/11 195/20 205/11 208/19 208/20 218/10 lines [11] 3/20 91/9 174/9 182/16 185/12 192/12 193/12 193/12 193/12 194/20 195/19 liquids [1] 160/5 list [2] 46/10 207/20 listed [1] 163/10 listing [1] 213/1 listings [1] 22/6 lists [1] 140/12 literal [1] 234/21 literature [14] 36/3 78/13 78/15 79/15 80/3 80/11 90/17 102/3 102/13 128/1 183/18 195/11 206/18 209/16 litigious [1] 156/22 little [22] 4/14 4/24 5/11 5/24 17/11 17/13 19/3 26/8 29/16 29/17 35/25 53/5 114/23 133/21 142/19 156/23 156/25 158/14 174/9 223/9 227/23 255/8 living [1] 13/2 loaded [4] 61/1 61/6 74/1 74/13 loading [1] 95/15 loaved [1] 160/22 Local [1] 13/21 located [2] 123/3 134/21 location [1] 45/22 lodge [1] 118/6 logging [1] 52/18 logic [13] 110/18 177/14 179/2 188/5 188/18 188/23 189/6 190/1 190/3 190/9 191/17 207/23 208/11 logics [1] 188/3 long [42] 3/13 7/14 13/6 14/12 15/15 26/17 29/11 29/12 42/22 55/6 55/21

long... [31] 61/22 63/8 64/22 65/23 65/25 67/12 108/8 120/5 124/21 125/2 125/3 135/13 135/22 136/9 140/1 148/14 148/21 151/2 153/18 154/22 159/8 166/19 169/7 199/21 199/23 201/14 228/23 250/3 255/21 255/22 256/11 longer [8] 62/2 95/6 117/22 167/1 198/1 198/4 229/20 255/19 look [70] 12/13 17/21 18/3 18/3 24/13 27/1 27/14 28/5 28/5 28/7 28/19 28/21 28/23 34/6 41/11 42/8 45/21 45/23 60/6 60/16 70/24 70/24 72/10 76/6 76/10 81/18 86/8 88/8 89/15 90/12 90/16 99/23 99/24 100/2 100/3 100/4 100/11 102/22 107/2 108/16 109/12 113/18 114/5 114/17 137/8 137/12 139/8 139/10 139/21 140/4 140/11 140/17 146/25 149/7 150/18 153/15 156/6 156/13 174/6 176/13 183/12 195/14 216/9 221/8 227/6 244/13 254/14 254/22 254/24 256/23 looked [18] 40/18 43/5 57/11 61/9 78/25 84/18 100/6 124/16 124/20 136/23 137/2 137/2 137/25 139/3 167/21 204/20 213/11 213/12 61/13 68/6 72/8 76/10 83/16 91/10

looking [33] 27/25 28/17 28/24 34/16 34/19 34/21 43/14 47/25 59/25 60/3 92/20 101/17 113/11 115/13 126/4 135/17 137/24 140/9 140/14 162/6 174/4 184/2 192/9 195/24 222/19 222/21 223/1

looks [6] 68/5 172/22 176/4 195/19 246/23 253/24

loosely [1] 233/19

Lorcin [9] 77/9 78/5 78/18 78/20 104/16 104/19 106/16 115/2 124/21

Lorcin's [5] 77/13 78/2 78/13 106/12 106/13

Lorcins [2] 104/21 105/1 lose [2] 70/21 71/2 lost [1] 86/1

lot [11] 32/12 55/16 65/9 87/7 111/8 184/6 198/20 198/24 205/7 242/14 249/9

low [4] 46/23 199/14 208/6 208/8 low-alloy [1] 199/14

lubrication [4] 158/6 200/2 200/3 200/4 lunch [2] 116/7 144/5 Luncheon [1] 144/7

Lyons [2] 53/1 53/3

ma'am [3] 116/6 146/7 154/3 machine [8] 1/19 32/12 43/25 44/6 65/2 67/7 67/9 110/8 machines [2] 44/4 47/1 made [34] 3/20 30/3 31/1 31/1 31/2 49/13 55/1 56/17 65/15 65/19 66/14 69/17 73/19 74/16 99/17 105/18 115/25 121/17 124/18 124/23 129/10 130/21 130/25 133/14 134/6 134/6 138/24 163/23 164/13 188/9 194/10 205/24 227/13 255/7

magazine [10] 72/25 73/1 73/25 74/11 74/16 95/13 95/14 95/15 96/24 135/7

main [2] 4/2 52/23 mainly [1] 120/19 mainstream [1] 170/9 maintain [3] 58/15 151/7 234/6 maintained [2] 18/25 151/3 major [5] 165/13 168/8 183/17 208/24 238/2 majority [2] 205/4 216/3 make [89] 6/5 6/10 6/10 6/17 8/12 10/14 11/20 17/18 19/24 22/6 22/12 26/16 30/16 33/5 39/21 40/23 42/12 42/18 48/7 60/7 60/17 60/20 60/25 61/7 61/8 66/2 66/2 66/4 66/8 66/9 66/13 66/13 66/15 66/16 66/25 67/12 67/14 67/23 72/17 78/7 80/5 81/16 81/18 82/2 85/18 86/2 86/16 87/5 88/2 93/16 97/11 99/16 99/18 101/12 103/15 104/18 107/10 113/2 118/10 118/15 128/3 133/11 133/21 141/20 147/8 147/9 147/12 149/17 156/8 156/10 176/20 179/9 179/10 184/8 187/16 190/6 197/18 206/12 212/6 213/8 221/9 223/24 226/17 230/4 243/2 251/14 252/7

254/14 256/7 makes [5] 30/12 78/11 78/17 148/9 250/2

making [17] 22/3 26/4 33/23 61/5 66/7 67/17 67/19 73/22 73/24 85/21 95/11 101/7 115/13 152/5 179/2 206/10 208/9

man [2] 199/18 201/16 managed [1] 53/18

management [9] 53/18 54/1 54/4 57/1 57/3 57/5 57/6 58/5 123/24

managers [1] 57/1 manages [1] 13/23 manner [1] 106/11

manners [1] 160/5 manual [14] 57/16 57/18 57/25 58/2 58/5 58/7 60/6 61/5 149/15 149/19 149/22 149/24 150/4 246/12

manually [1] 192/12

manufacture [2] 78/2 78/6 manufactured [41] 15/25 16/8 17/8 24/2

24/2 24/8 28/13 28/15 28/19 30/5 30/6 30/7 31/7 32/3 32/4 32/5 32/10 32/16 32/20 32/23 32/25 33/11 34/4 66/25 77/9 78/14 79/17 79/20 84/17 102/15 102/18 102/19 105/21 106/11 106/14 106/18 115/1 142/23 143/8 199/12 201/17

manufacturer [13] 27/18 32/8 32/9 34/5 34/5 49/11 65/7 77/21 78/11 78/16 97/14 143/5 200/5

manufacturers [6] 16/11 16/12 32/4 77/20 77/23 167/9

manufacturing [13] 15/21 15/22 16/20 16/25 17/2 66/24 77/24 78/10 106/17 157/18 174/23 183/15 184/4 manuscript [1] 170/10

manuscripts [2] 170/7 170/18 many [59] 9/3 11/6 11/9 11/9 11/9 19/8 19/9 20/4 23/1 23/3 24/6 25/8 27/16 31/7 32/18 32/18 43/9 49/23 50/13 50/14 54/14 55/9 80/9 83/9 90/11 90/18 91/4 92/17 101/10 103/14 106/7 113/2 137/24 138/4 157/2 172/4 172/13 182/16 184/10 184/24 186/23 187/11 187/18 190/21 192/13 193/10 203/19 207/14 207/21 207/21 209/2 209/2

225/20 226/7 226/7 227/1 237/22 256/5 256/6

March [1] 118/1 March 23rd [1] 118/1

Marine [3] 159/4 159/5 159/7

Marine's [1] 159/8 mark [8] 2/2 3/11 30/12 93/17 100/11

104/12 147/20 174/11 marked [3] 155/24 164/7 180/12 market [1] 168/5

marketing [3] 192/23 193/3 193/8 marking [6] 28/16 104/6 104/8 113/20 113/23 137/15

markings [52] 18/4 24/7 24/11 24/16 27/4 27/19 27/20 27/20 28/4 28/5 28/6 28/17 29/8 30/8 33/5 34/6 35/13 35/14 42/18 44/24 48/2 48/3 48/8 79/9 79/21 79/23 80/5 80/15 83/19 84/20 90/16 91/11 92/21 93/13 98/3 102/20 104/10 104/12 106/7 106/9 113/5 113/9 113/11 113/16 113/17 113/19 113/24 114/4 114/5 115/18 115/19 115/23

marks [26] 24/4 24/5 35/20 43/18 47/19 48/25 49/7 66/7 71/8 83/21 83/21 85/7 85/18 91/9 98/1 98/2 99/22 99/23 99/24 100/6 100/10 109/6 110/22 113/8 137/16 142/23

mart [2] 192/25 193/1

mass [1] 84/5

Master's [2] 217/9 217/10 Masters [2] 217/18 246/8

201/24 206/2 214/1 215/17

33/22 34/16 44/1 46/21 57/13 76/7 81/25 83/10 83/14 91/10 91/11 92/1 92/22 93/23 101/11 102/9 102/11 102/22 103/4 103/6 139/22 143/23 167/10 168/7 181/16 181/18 182/4 182/16 182/19 184/19 185/3 185/4 185/10 185/15 185/16 185/17 189/24 190/24 191/17 193/15 194/11 194/11 194/18 194/19 194/21 195/17 195/19 195/20 195/22 196/1 196/2 197/23

match [61] 12/12 28/8 28/18 33/4 33/6

matched [3] 185/12 194/23 201/10 matches [19] 28/21 34/18 45/1 46/10 92/20 92/23 102/13 140/20 182/3 185/8 185/8 192/17 193/17 193/18 194/1 194/24 195/7 197/6 197/12

matching [4] 182/4 186/9 193/14 248/10 material [9] 4/3 156/20 157/3 157/24 175/10 217/8 218/10 218/13 219/9 materials [7] 65/14 78/18 78/19 78/21 163/18 165/17 176/18

matter [10] 93/22 93/24 106/19 111/11 124/12 129/16 190/21 215/16 217/21

matters [3] 6/12 156/22 242/21 **Maury [1]** 189/22 max [1] 256/2

may [94] 1/13 3/1 4/8 5/8 6/19 10/16 12/18 21/17 21/17 27/18 27/20 28/13 28/15 30/7 30/25 31/9 31/9 31/9 31/10 31/11 32/6 32/16 32/25 34/20 39/9 39/15 42/4 42/18 43/8 46/20 47/12 49/4 50/19 52/8 70/17 70/18 70/19 70/21 71/2 71/8 76/10 76/12 89/9 89/12 90/3 90/7 93/14 96/21 97/2 97/25 98/2 98/4 100/6 101/20 107/19 107/21 107/23 113/10 114/19 117/7 117/8 120/4 121/2

M

145/15 146/1 154/24 155/21 155/22 164/4 164/5 173/21 175/22 180/12 180/13 196/4 196/5 204/17 214/22 214/23 219/15 225/16 225/17 229/13 230/6 232/10 240/12 240/12 240/14 246/19 253/18 maybe [30] 4/12 4/14 22/1 45/19 46/11 50/19 62/2 81/6 83/5 93/12 107/3 108/11 125/4 128/19 147/20 162/14 163/15 177/5 191/5 198/13 199/1 201/25 207/15 227/19 229/6 229/10 231/5 238/12 255/15 256/2 Mayfield [3] 242/14 253/13 253/14 McAllen [1] 50/7 me [58] 29/1 33/10 35/8 35/11 45/16 46/3 51/12 51/25 52/2 70/7 79/4 79/18 84/15 85/6 97/6 99/13 100/18 115/20 119/16 122/17 123/25 124/8 125/2 125/2 128/11 133/2 137/1 138/23 149/17 157/25 162/10 163/3 163/21 165/6 170/13 170/14 173/21 190/12 190/13 192/21 195/19 218/21 218/25 219/24 220/12 221/6 227/25 235/3 235/8 235/13 242/22 244/1 248/3 251/17 253/22 254/21 254/24 258/11 me a [1] 254/21 mean [48] 32/7 33/22 34/2 34/19 35/19 36/19 38/9 45/5 55/4 55/8 60/23 61/9 72/7 72/17 75/6 77/10 84/14 85/5 87/2 92/25 95/23 100/17 101/1 101/2 101/9 101/13 112/6 122/25 125/3 129/18 133/11 136/25 147/23 148/7 171/8 188/14 205/13 215/4 219/20 221/25 230/17 234/9 234/14 234/21 235/2 239/6 244/14 245/1 meaning [9] 28/21 33/4 35/6 75/14 99/11 125/24 182/15 196/16 225/5 meaningful [1] 202/19 means [15] 19/20 19/21 46/12 70/5 74/3 85/6 147/17 190/20 207/9 219/19 219/21 220/4 220/4 224/10 234/4 meant [3] 38/13 83/14 90/9 measure [4] 40/8 86/11 86/12 205/11 measuring [1] 40/6 Mechanics [1] 163/16 media [2] 55/13 171/18 Medio [3] 123/11 123/14 124/15 meet [5] 60/18 66/5 246/1 246/2 253/6 meeting [6] 5/5 229/3 229/8 229/25 230/1 230/3 meets [1] 243/9 member [21] 18/15 20/20 22/15 22/19 22/21 61/19 61/22 61/23 61/24 62/1 62/1 62/5 62/6 62/8 62/9 62/13 62/17 63/14 163/11 171/3 221/17 members [6] 21/1 21/15 21/17 58/22 58/23 233/11 memo [2] 203/22 204/11 memorial [3] 4/25 157/12 159/17 memorialized [1] 184/1 memory [3] 136/8 136/22 137/24 memos [1] 206/21 mention [3] 20/12 110/10 252/14 mentioned [26] 9/13 15/10 16/7 17/12 18/7 18/8 18/17 20/7 29/17 34/24 38/23 43/2 44/3 47/11 47/12 50/24 54/7

may... [31] 121/2 128/3 129/17 133/18

116/13 171/20 207/15 207/16 218/7 224/14 225/19 236/12 256/13 merged [1] 220/12 merits [1] 144/18 met [2] 14/22 250/24 metal [6] 32/12 49/12 105/25 106/2 133/7 157/18 metallurgical [3] 156/20 157/21 208/25 metallurgist [17] 157/9 158/13 159/14 159/17 160/20 161/1 161/10 161/24 168/23 198/16 219/19 219/23 219/25 221/2 234/3 234/4 234/13 metallurgy [13] 157/2 157/16 157/17 157/24 158/1 158/3 158/8 159/24 159/25 160/17 217/8 219/9 219/17 metals [4] 97/18 163/19 199/11 199/12 method [16] 17/8 49/11 166/10 166/12 166/18 167/12 179/15 180/3 186/23 186/24 204/6 206/15 211/24 236/10 245/2 251/24 methodology [4] 180/6 196/12 204/23 245/21 methods [1] 21/19 metrics [2] 183/1 184/17 Miami [1] 143/4 Michael [1] 53/1 microscope [13] 26/23 26/24 75/16 76/11 101/16 123/17 139/4 139/6 140/9 175/18 176/15 193/7 193/20 microscopes [2] 26/24 114/22 microscopic [6] 16/1 17/12 33/15 114/14 114/15 114/18 midair [1] 219/5 middle [2] 193/21 195/12 might [35] 3/14 27/23 45/20 45/22 49/9 49/10 62/11 82/14 83/14 83/15 83/17 83/20 83/20 115/20 150/3 162/5 162/25 173/2 174/18 176/14 178/6 178/7 185/13 185/14 190/22 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/19 198/13 199/2 234/13 238/16 241/14 256/7 Mike [2] 52/25 53/3 MILAN [1] 1/5 military [1] 163/4 Miller [1] 196/19 million [2] 165/22 191/13 millions [1] 182/1 mimic [3] 39/13 88/12 187/13 mind [3] 144/14 163/3 234/13 mindful [1] 113/9 mine [1] 160/8 minima [1] 209/20 minimally [1] 199/13 minimum [1] 59/6 minute [3] 155/2 169/15 204/14 minutes [7] 132/9 132/10 135/16 229/5 230/12 231/16 231/21 mirror [2] 187/12 208/10 mis [6] 40/20 41/1 41/1 41/7 41/8 41/20 mis-elimination [1] 40/20 mis-eliminations [2] 41/1 41/8 mis-identifications [3] 41/1 41/7 41/20 misattributions [1] 184/22 misconception [1] 221/1 misconstrue [1] 252/23 misgivings [1] 11/12 misidentification [1] 210/25 misidentified [2] 210/1 211/10 misinterpretation [1] 252/9

misrepresenting [2] 233/18 236/6 miss [1] 90/4 missed [4] 90/6 211/16 234/10 238/16 missed it [1] 211/16 missing [2] 183/2 245/23 Missouri [3] 5/1 210/10 230/10 misstatement [1] 81/13 misstating [1] 81/20 misunderstanding [1] 245/12 mix [1] 65/1 mode [1] 182/6 model [3] 206/10 206/11 206/12 models [1] 206/19 modified [3] 240/4 245/10 251/2 Mohamed [4] 52/25 52/25 52/25 53/4 moment [2] 27/8 226/15 Monarch [2] 157/10 158/25 monitor [3] 66/23 66/24 226/19 month [2] 122/15 208/17 month's [1] 124/1 months [5] 148/17 159/18 199/23 201/11 208/18 moot [2] 193/7 200/15 more [52] 6/25 7/10 10/22 11/24 14/14 15/13 23/20 27/7 28/14 37/25 40/16 41/11 41/13 41/13 43/5 59/5 59/7 62/2 64/16 66/8 67/19 67/22 84/20 84/22 88/21 111/8 113/18 115/17 125/7 141/20 142/8 142/22 145/13 158/14 166/22 170/6 173/19 181/23 182/22 185/2 196/22 197/13 197/13 197/15 197/15 198/4 198/5 202/24 203/15 229/5 251/10 255/20 morning [8] 3/3 3/4 3/5 229/11 230/18 231/3 256/11 257/6 most [49] 7/13 20/25 35/22 37/20 37/23 37/24 46/12 48/13 56/14 56/16 58/9 66/20 68/15 82/13 82/21 83/10 120/17 120/22 133/19 156/1 157/20 158/3 158/7 158/8 164/1 164/20 170/18 176/22 178/15 179/14 184/10 187/19 193/18 197/11 197/17 204/1 207/21 212/15 214/3 216/13 222/8 223/14 227/1 237/22 238/14 238/19 240/22 245/22 249/1 mostly [1] 55/14 motion [11] 1/9 3/25 4/13 6/22 7/1 7/1 7/3 7/11 7/18 9/13 118/7 mount [3] 216/12 237/22 242/16 mouthful [2] 33/7 33/8 move [8] 8/5 96/4 156/4 160/23 180/23 196/8 196/18 251/4 moved [2] 180/24 181/1 moves [1] 96/5 Mr [4] 98/25 105/17 204/18 219/10 Mr. [49] 5/18 51/5 53/4 68/23 69/25 70/8 72/21 75/19 76/5 76/24 78/1 78/1 94/23 95/6 95/17 96/11 96/23 97/8 98/11 98/12 98/16 98/17 99/8 99/25 100/6 112/19 112/23 117/5 125/15 144/11 145/11 149/11 150/14 152/20 155/1 156/19 172/16 204/13 204/16 214/25 215/5 228/23 229/20 229/21 231/6 232/2 246/21 253/17 255/23 Mr. Al-Mohamed [1] 53/4 Mr. Allen [1] 152/20 Mr. Colca [22] 69/25 70/8 72/21 76/5 76/24 78/1 78/1 94/23 95/6 95/17 96/11

misleading [3] 186/6 233/18 237/6

М

Mr. Colca... [11] 96/23 97/8 98/11 98/12 98/16 99/8 100/6 112/23 117/5 125/15 144/11

Mr. Colca's [6] 68/23 75/19 98/17 99/25 112/19 172/16

Mr. Doggett [8] 5/18 51/5 145/11 155/1 204/13 204/16 215/5 253/17

Mr. Doggett's [1] 229/20

Mr. Hanna [1] 228/23

Mr. Nixon [2] 149/11 150/14 **Mr. Tobin [7]** 156/19 214/25 229/21 231/6 232/2 246/21 255/23

Ms [17] 12/24 51/7 107/25 117/20 119/11 133/5 138/9 140/1 142/4 143/24 151/16 172/16 174/14 181/16 204/19 209/4 211/15

Ms. [5] 169/22 172/15 189/11 213/9 224/14

Ms. Eudaley [4] 169/22 189/11 213/9 224/14

Ms. Eudaley's [1] 172/15

much [19] 42/12 88/21 93/13 113/13 113/18 116/6 122/14 140/18 145/5 145/5 158/20 192/11 192/14 229/20 230/13 244/19 251/16 254/9 255/19 multiple [3] 24/3 172/9 172/10

must [12] 28/16 41/17 52/3 62/9 75/16 91/17 166/5 178/16 188/12 188/22

189/8 215/19 my [157] 3/19 3/20 3/23 5/17 7/10 10/5 11/6 13/1 15/12 15/14 23/13 25/12 26/20 27/1 28/21 28/22 34/7 34/7 34/18 39/4 50/25 52/23 52/23 54/21 55/22 58/9 63/2 63/11 76/12 78/3 89/15 98/10 98/15 98/16 98/22 99/13 101/3 101/5 101/6 102/2 102/3 102/11 102/11 103/20 104/1 116/13 116/14 117/14 118/11 118/22 119/10 122/3 123/23 123/25 124/1 127/13 131/5 131/7 135/5 135/20 136/12 137/11 137/12 137/16 138/17 138/24 138/24 139/4 139/8 140/6 140/13 140/20 143/9 145/20 146/24 146/24 152/24 156/1 157/5 157/8 159/6 159/6 159/20 160/18 163/19 164/2 164/20 165/13 169/4 169/9 170/8 170/25 181/23 182/22

183/18 187/9 187/9 188/1 189/5 192/7 192/10 192/15 192/18 193/22 195/23 195/24 196/14 196/20 198/16 200/12 214/2 214/10 214/11 215/3 215/6

215/18 216/23 217/17 218/21 219/6 219/11 222/10 222/23 223/10 223/14 224/6 226/20 227/15 227/18 228/16

229/17 231/2 231/4 234/13 235/3 236/6 236/24 238/7 238/13 238/19 238/22 239/1 242/22 243/21 245/15 245/24

248/25 249/15 250/14 250/16 251/2 251/3 251/7 251/13 253/6 254/14 256/13

myself [10] 32/20 60/4 67/23 68/1 102/16 121/5 126/19 134/8 134/24 251/12

N-A-S [2] 256/18 256/19 N-E-N-N-O [1] 223/4 name [12] 13/1 52/25 55/25 117/12 117/14 124/14 146/6 155/17 169/11 170/8 170/12 227/8

namely [1] 123/16

names [4] 9/23 14/2 124/4 173/3 narcotics [2] 15/3 15/6

narrowed [1] 23/14

NAS [36] 53/21 54/7 54/7 54/14 55/7 80/17 80/21 85/9 108/3 108/7 108/11 111/5 111/18 111/19 111/21 112/2 112/4 142/3 142/24 179/13 180/17 180/20 183/17 189/10 189/19 190/1 195/16 196/4 202/21 202/23 211/21 211/22 212/4 225/20 226/12 227/10

nation [1] 20/16 nation-wide [1] 20/16

national [14] 12/1 44/7 50/15 54/8 109/13 109/15 110/13 111/12 157/11 163/16 169/10 180/1 180/4 180/6

nature [6] 93/20 113/15 113/24 115/21 131/22 132/1

NCIS [1] 50/19

necessarily [11] 31/12 39/13 41/16 57/14 66/12 78/10 86/5 89/9 94/5 113/23 133/6

necessary [6] 3/22 78/8 99/6 111/1 119/22 134/2

necessity [1] 167/23

need [21] 3/15 67/16 71/18 78/10 81/18 82/22 89/14 102/5 163/19 173/2 173/23 186/19 189/1 196/7 197/18 211/4 216/10 216/18 229/7 229/20 237/20 needs [6] 140/18 173/23 184/7 194/10 229/3 255/14

nefarious [1] 186/5 negated [1] 123/25

neither [1] 167/8 Nenno [1] 223/4

nerve [1] 158/20 Network [1] 44/8

159/20 190/17 200/17 202/5 205/23 221/7 221/10 234/2 241/19 250/20 251/2

new [2] 239/6 240/5

news [1] 55/13

next [17] 24/6 24/8 30/8 80/7 104/12 104/14 116/10 131/19 139/15 145/23 187/9 189/5 190/25 191/12 193/6 209/1 209/14

NIBIN [15] 44/6 44/7 44/7 44/13 44/19 82/4 82/8 82/12 82/16 83/2 83/12 83/15 110/1 197/2 198/8

night [1] 3/21 nine [8] 15/7 42/24 138/5 138/6 160/10 161/18 194/4 217/16

nineteen [2] 194/6 194/7 ninety [3] 56/21 191/14 219/6

ninety-three percent [1] 191/14 NIS [1] 256/16

Nixon [3] 149/6 149/11 150/14 no [222] 1/3 2/3 2/8 2/12 2/17 2/21 12/5 14/18 14/18 20/22 20/23 22/22 23/2 23/10 23/17 28/1 35/19 36/15 38/9 39/5 39/6 39/8 41/15 43/25 44/2 44/14 47/3 51/17 54/19 54/21 62/6 62/21 62/23 63/2 63/9 63/15 64/19 65/12 67/25 68/3 68/20 71/18 71/23 71/24 71/25 73/8 77/16 78/22 81/1 81/7 81/22 82/11 83/1 85/20 85/24 86/25 87/2 88/23 89/1 89/8

91/3 92/2 92/8 93/3 94/11 95/6 99/3 99/6 100/1 100/8 101/8 103/6 103/8 104/19 105/5 105/15 105/20 106/21 106/23 106/25 113/4 113/5 113/5 113/14 116/3 117/22 117/24 121/13 124/11 125/13 126/7 126/10 127/9 127/11 127/13 127/14 128/23 129/6 129/13 129/15 130/8 130/13 131/11 131/23 132/2 134/13 136/20 136/25 139/12 139/20 139/23 140/25 141/5 141/5 142/11 142/14 142/18 143/2 143/21 143/24 143/24 144/10 149/22 151/22 153/6 155/24 156/14 159/15 161/3 161/4 161/5 161/13 161/16 162/22 162/22 167/3 168/20 168/22 170/3 171/25 172/24 178/13 178/14 178/15 181/10 182/9 182/11 182/14 182/16 182/23 182/24 182/24 182/25 183/1 183/7 183/18 183/19 184/11 189/15 189/17 189/20 190/4 190/21 191/17 192/1 192/24 193/2 196/3 196/9 196/11 200/11 201/1 201/1 202/15 205/21 206/9 206/11 206/11 208/5 214/20 218/8 218/17 219/4 219/13 219/18 220/11 220/19 221/20 222/21 223/5 223/7 224/18 224/21 228/21 232/18 233/16 233/24 234/25 235/19 236/3 241/10 241/25 242/5 242/19 244/9 244/9 248/3 248/6 250/9 250/9 250/13 254/2 255/5 255/7 255/22 nobel [1] 186/1

90/8 90/22 90/22 90/23 90/24 91/1 91/3

nobody [2] 36/20 47/4 nobody's [1] 23/15

non [23] 12/11 28/8 28/18 33/4 33/6 33/22 34/16 64/10 64/11 64/18 92/22 102/9 102/11 102/13 102/22 135/4 156/22 181/16 181/18 182/4 194/11 208/21 237/24

never [16] 44/8 63/11 92/7 103/7 134/14 non-contemporaneously [1] 208/21 non-demonstrated [1] 237/24 non-existent [1] 12/11 non-firearms [1] 64/11 non-forensic [1] 64/10

non-functioning [1] 135/4 non-law [1] 64/18

non-litigious [1] 156/22 non-match [11] 28/8 28/18 33/4 33/6 33/22 34/16 92/22 102/9 102/11 102/22 182/4

non-matches [1] 102/13 none [6] 41/21 41/21 113/4 141/11 191/14 221/6

nonresponsiveness [2] 199/8 210/12

nonscientific [1] 177/11

nonsensical [1] 201/21 normally [5] 70/9 70/9 70/15 72/8 100/2 Northern [1] 246/22

not [495]

not specific [1] 97/25

note [5] 4/4 18/5 72/4 75/23 131/9 **noted** [3] 72/23 118/18 136/1 **notes** [6] 3/23 72/24 135/5 140/11 227/24 243/17

nothing [10] 39/3 51/10 52/15 90/17 131/21 142/20 153/20 153/21 153/24 154/10

notice [7] 68/4 70/17 105/9 105/10 109/5 145/11 145/13

173/7 173/8 173/10 174/2 175/14

179/11 180/25 181/1 181/9 181/14

181/23 182/7 182/22 183/10 183/17

184/16 184/25 185/5 185/5 185/10

185/11 185/12 186/10 187/9 188/1

175/20 175/20 175/20 175/25 176/14

occurred [4] 135/25 210/25 250/16 258/10 noticed [3] 70/19 74/15 192/19 occurring [1] 227/5 October [1] 148/23 **noting [1]** 110/19 Octomom [1] 207/25 Nova [2] 188/7 188/11 Novas [2] 188/9 188/15 now [101] 9/3 11/21 13/17 13/21 13/23 octuplet [3] 208/7 208/16 208/19 octuplets [2] 208/2 208/7 14/11 16/6 18/7 18/15 20/7 21/7 22/23 odontology [1] 112/1 23/20 23/20 24/21 25/4 27/9 31/21 of conduct [1] 119/1 38/23 41/17 42/21 42/22 44/3 44/3 off [14] 36/19 56/18 66/3 66/23 72/23 84/4 88/15 89/3 89/5 132/19 134/4 44/11 46/11 47/10 49/2 52/23 53/6 53/16 54/7 56/18 57/5 57/7 59/17 64/7 169/18 235/13 251/4 68/5 77/8 80/10 81/1 81/6 94/22 98/6 offer [6] 8/18 10/7 116/12 160/22 108/5 112/20 118/24 124/20 130/19 253/25 257/4 131/1 131/2 131/17 137/23 140/25 offered [6] 64/20 160/19 205/16 224/9 142/19 148/10 149/2 151/22 152/22 224/11 258/14 154/8 155/6 155/9 157/2 169/10 169/13 offering [1] 9/1 169/23 171/20 172/14 176/16 188/14 Office [7] 2/3 2/9 2/13 150/10 150/16 193/10 194/9 194/12 199/3 201/12 153/3 153/10 202/23 204/12 206/6 206/7 209/24 officer [10] 76/25 127/7 127/18 128/3 213/5 215/21 217/8 223/22 225/19 128/21 129/8 129/23 130/10 166/12 227/5 227/22 234/9 234/10 236/22 210/10 237/12 238/4 239/12 239/17 240/2 officers [4] 4/25 64/15 210/7 210/8 242/8 243/3 244/10 244/12 244/12 offices [1] 53/23 official [3] 183/24 258/3 258/20 nowhere [1] 249/16 often [6] 12/9 58/18 141/6 162/11 NRC [1] 227/9 162/14 222/1 nuclear [1] 157/10 oh [19] 101/18 144/12 153/20 162/22 **null [2]** 178/23 178/24 163/15 172/5 173/4 173/12 191/1 number [28] 6/24 27/23 41/25 47/14 193/23 194/16 196/18 196/24 213/21 49/7 81/11 90/15 91/1 91/8 91/11 92/20 223/5 233/7 233/25 248/6 254/17 103/18 113/1 113/5 144/19 145/20 Ohio [3] 157/4 157/6 159/16 156/5 163/12 194/1 197/11 204/21 oil [3] 71/13 71/16 71/19 208/16 208/19 217/5 233/1 233/2 241/8 oiled [11] 73/14 126/12 126/15 132/22 254/1 132/25 133/8 133/9 133/12 133/14 Number's [1] 164/2 133/14 133/20 oiling [1] 133/18 oily [1] 133/21 okay [273] **numbered** [2] 1/15 258/10 numbers [4] 41/17 41/19 41/22 93/5 numerous [7] 110/20 157/18 157/23 177/9 179/11 210/6 228/14 old [3] 41/16 41/16 41/25 older [1] 107/3 O once [8] 27/9 38/7 46/20 59/2 83/8 96/3 o'clock [2] 5/3 229/4 199/22 199/23 oar [1] 158/10 one [210] 7/6 7/13 8/1 9/12 18/12 24/5 oath [1] 145/4 24/24 26/25 26/25 28/14 29/20 30/8 object [9] 68/23 118/24 127/21 146/19 32/10 34/22 35/8 37/25 39/9 41/4 41/20 199/8 210/12 210/17 213/16 236/5 42/2 42/3 43/22 46/5 46/12 46/18 46/19 objected [1] 6/8 47/10 47/12 48/9 48/19 48/19 49/2 49/3 objection [7] 118/6 118/11 118/15 49/4 49/5 49/7 49/8 49/9 49/9 49/10 118/17 156/14 181/10 254/2 49/10 50/6 50/6 50/7 50/11 50/11 50/17 objectionable [2] 189/15 252/3 50/18 50/19 50/25 51/8 58/6 59/9 60/4 **objective [1]** 236/9 65/6 67/20 72/16 72/20 74/2 74/17 **objects [5]** 27/2 32/10 98/20 98/21 77/19 80/1 80/7 82/5 82/24 82/25 83/5 98/22 83/21 86/9 87/18 96/25 97/23 98/2 observation [3] 42/24 105/18 216/5 98/22 98/23 100/19 101/20 104/9 observations [3] 69/17 69/19 133/11 104/11 104/11 104/14 104/17 105/1 observe [3] 32/8 200/24 214/12 105/21 107/25 110/22 111/11 113/8 observed [1] 110/13 113/9 113/11 118/7 122/16 124/3 124/17 125/20 130/17 130/17 130/23 **observer** [1] 216/7 obtain [11] 14/10 14/15 15/9 26/10 32/2 131/7 131/25 134/13 135/7 136/18 36/22 37/9 37/24 179/20 218/16 219/2 137/10 137/18 138/22 140/5 143/2 obtained [1] 56/2 148/8 148/24 149/22 152/11 156/5 obtaining [1] 21/22 obtains [1] 66/22 156/7 159/21 163/12 164/7 172/22

obviously [4] 20/1 240/25 242/9 253/5

occur [4] 114/3 120/3 148/9 162/11

occasions [2] 23/1 160/19

occluded [1] 70/23

occupation [1] 156/19

188/5 188/8 188/9 188/11 188/15 189/23 190/2 190/7 190/17 191/7 191/8 191/10 192/6 192/8 192/11 192/14 192/19 193/9 194/2 194/18 196/19 198/6 199/2 201/18 204/1 207/12 207/18 207/24 208/2 211/2 211/9 211/24 212/20 214/15 214/16 217/5 217/23 218/1 218/3 223/14 224/16 225/23 226/20 227/25 232/7 234/17 235/1 235/12 237/19 238/13 238/19 239/1 242/6 243/9 246/2 246/3 248/5 248/25 249/15 255/20 256/25 256/25 one percent [8] 41/20 42/2 42/3 46/12 82/24 82/25 86/9 211/2 ones [9] 16/14 46/18 50/1 50/3 52/4 77/18 112/2 202/23 210/6 ongoing [2] 80/20 142/14 only [35] 8/25 18/12 20/12 25/24 28/7 31/10 37/14 40/22 46/18 60/2 60/8 60/20 80/7 87/2 102/8 108/1 160/11 162/3 162/9 188/17 190/2 192/11 192/13 193/13 196/9 206/22 211/1 211/24 212/5 215/17 215/17 227/22 242/5 243/8 250/21 open [1] 258/10 opening [7] 6/17 6/20 10/17 36/1 116/13 116/15 256/8 operable [1] 71/18 operated [1] 44/13 operates [3] 50/5 50/10 50/19 operating [11] 57/8 57/19 60/7 69/23 75/7 75/20 99/10 123/2 126/16 127/14 132/8 operation [5] 157/17 158/21 160/12 167/7 200/7 operations [1] 158/19 opine [5] 90/20 185/16 191/17 191/18 248/15 opining [1] 187/23 opinion [42] 9/17 78/24 84/19 94/8 101/9 101/14 127/13 166/4 177/3 185/19 214/4 214/10 214/11 214/11 215/1 215/6 215/18 215/19 216/11 224/2 225/14 227/4 233/14 235/16 237/23 238/6 238/7 238/13 238/19 238/22 239/22 240/3 240/4 242/24 245/17 245/20 247/16 248/25 249/17 251/7 251/20 251/25 opinions [5] 5/25 141/2 141/24 185/9 237/20 opportunity [6] 6/3 6/17 40/9 70/21 71/2 172/14 opposed [2] 134/3 187/21 opposition [2] 7/21 227/12 option [2] 32/19 123/5 order [18] 5/20 14/11 14/16 81/16 111/1 149/3 149/6 149/9 150/6 151/20 151/25 152/2 152/3 152/4 152/8 152/19 192/11 235/16 ordering [1] 145/4 orders [1] 15/4 organization [12] 13/13 18/11 18/13 20/12 21/7 21/13 21/21 38/3 38/5 63/1 63/8 169/12 organizational [1] 54/23 organizations [10] 22/18 22/22 24/25 50/15 63/4 63/14 63/16 63/20 163/11 204/22 orientation [1] 100/12

206/20 210/11 pay [2] 112/11 160/24 paying [1] 231/11 origin [1] 137/22 Payless [2] 189/3 189/5 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S [1] 3/2 **PDF [2]** 173/13 173/16 original [6] 68/14 68/16 69/2 69/8 99/1 179/23 package [1] 199/6 peer [31] 10/9 19/16 19/19 19/20 19/21 packaged [1] 154/18 page [3] 149/24 232/25 233/1 originally [2] 97/10 130/13 37/11 41/15 41/16 41/17 164/16 165/4 originated [1] 166/5 169/20 170/1 170/6 170/15 170/16 Otero [2] 9/15 116/22 pages [2] 108/8 108/11 170/24 228/1 228/8 228/8 228/19 232/3 other [117] 8/24 9/20 10/3 10/22 11/9 paid [3] 63/11 112/8 258/17 232/5 232/6 232/16 233/9 233/15 238/2 11/15 17/20 19/21 22/18 22/21 25/8 paint [1] 111/24 243/24 243/24 245/23 peer-review [15] 164/16 165/4 170/6 25/11 28/15 32/11 34/21 34/25 41/4 pair [2] 189/2 189/5 43/19 45/1 45/12 45/14 46/8 47/10 49/2 pairs [2] 189/2 191/7 170/24 228/1 228/19 232/3 232/5 232/6 49/19 50/1 50/8 51/12 57/4 58/24 63/14 pairwise [1] 191/11 232/16 233/9 233/15 238/2 243/24 63/16 63/19 68/6 73/17 79/2 79/3 80/12 pans [1] 159/1 243/24 81/6 83/19 83/21 83/23 85/12 85/24 paper [11] 143/10 164/20 187/10 200/13 peer-reviewed [6] 10/9 169/20 170/1 98/2 99/15 103/21 104/16 105/21 107/2 200/15 200/21 209/2 212/17 214/2 228/8 228/8 245/23 peer-reviewing [2] 170/15 170/16 107/6 109/10 111/20 112/11 116/7 236/24 237/3 pending [1] 4/12 people [21] 9/9 20/4 43/20 47/3 57/3 121/6 121/18 121/20 122/4 122/23 papers [6] 171/1 181/23 182/22 183/19 125/9 125/25 126/6 130/2 135/25 206/21 207/25 paperwork [3] 138/25 139/16 139/17 137/13 139/15 140/22 143/7 147/6 60/8 60/13 60/14 64/11 68/6 88/8 101/4 paradigm [1] 206/6 148/9 152/2 152/21 160/14 163/5 107/7 121/18 147/5 168/12 189/1 165/25 168/5 171/16 174/24 175/21 paragraph [3] 109/12 110/11 178/11 211/14 229/8 242/14 253/10 176/1 179/24 182/25 183/7 184/11 parallel [2] 27/20 83/21 per [4] 40/20 165/21 191/11 221/3 184/15 184/22 185/13 186/4 187/18 parameters [4] 182/23 182/25 183/7 per se [1] 221/3 187/23 189/20 190/4 193/7 194/12 perceive [4] 240/13 240/14 252/11 paraphrase [1] 249/5 194/19 197/7 197/23 198/9 199/1 252/12 201/18 201/18 205/13 208/24 210/4 parenthesis [1] 165/2 perceived [2] 237/21 242/12 218/6 218/6 221/4 222/5 224/17 224/21 parents [1] 39/4 percent [39] 21/11 40/20 40/22 40/25 part [42] 30/14 57/16 57/16 57/25 58/4 232/20 235/7 248/13 249/6 249/8 258/7 41/8 41/20 41/25 42/2 42/2 42/3 42/4 others [3] 64/1 124/14 212/1 58/4 58/5 58/15 61/2 61/6 61/18 63/12 46/12 46/18 56/22 73/5 73/10 78/8 82/5 our [47] 3/19 4/16 46/11 58/22 59/5 64/15 67/8 69/9 70/17 75/6 76/6 76/14 82/21 82/24 82/25 82/25 83/2 83/4 83/5 76/14 91/14 91/17 92/9 96/4 120/17 83/5 86/9 86/9 88/21 132/8 182/6 59/10 60/16 60/18 60/19 70/12 73/9 120/22 127/14 133/19 138/15 147/16 82/6 84/2 84/19 87/3 93/3 94/18 99/10 182/10 185/11 189/25 191/14 209/19 107/16 120/19 121/15 123/15 123/15 149/19 150/4 154/19 154/23 169/10 209/19 211/2 224/16 123/16 132/7 140/23 142/10 144/1 170/19 171/9 196/10 221/14 239/8 **percentage** [1] 41/20 percentages [1] 42/11 245/5 255/12 144/3 144/9 149/15 149/19 149/19 partake [1] 143/8 partially [3] 242/7 243/24 252/10 149/24 150/12 150/12 158/23 163/6 perception [3] 216/8 216/8 253/12 perform [2] 49/16 220/9 168/2 168/9 193/3 209/1 216/6 230/5 participants [1] 111/12 performance [2] 160/14 221/5 232/2 239/18 245/17 performed [4] 142/9 143/3 192/18 220/5 out [69] 7/24 9/1 17/9 19/14 20/12 participate [1] 39/2 22/10 22/11 32/18 40/2 41/7 44/18 55/7 **participated** [1] 68/11 performing [1] 122/9 58/18 60/9 65/15 66/10 67/4 67/6 77/24 particular [64] 7/10 8/10 8/14 14/18 perhaps [3] 10/22 34/6 38/1 78/13 82/13 82/25 83/19 83/25 87/6 16/4 16/14 21/20 24/14 31/7 31/15 period [10] 43/15 122/11 126/1 126/5 31/16 47/15 67/8 73/18 75/3 75/13 77/1 87/22 91/25 96/1 96/3 96/15 96/17 126/7 132/10 159/18 198/1 198/4 78/5 79/1 80/20 82/7 90/13 90/20 90/21 110/11 113/18 115/6 139/16 139/20 255/15 142/18 143/4 148/7 160/23 163/6 169/8 91/6 92/16 93/14 94/9 94/22 96/9 98/3 periodically [2] 162/23 235/8 178/2 187/10 190/1 193/7 195/16 105/10 106/21 108/15 112/8 112/19 periods [1] 201/14 permit [1] 85/10 197/10 199/2 199/22 200/12 200/15 112/24 124/21 124/24 125/23 136/23 permitted [2] 10/3 226/17 200/21 201/20 205/2 205/2 205/24 138/3 152/22 168/2 171/13 171/18 209/19 211/6 211/11 219/6 221/11 171/18 174/5 175/14 175/24 176/24 persistence [1] 47/18 221/14 232/14 232/15 234/10 236/24 184/8 185/5 187/22 195/10 199/2 persistent [1] 48/25 246/11 250/25 204/11 210/9 214/13 223/20 228/19 person [11] 16/23 16/24 32/11 37/14 . 75/8 81/19 94/4 119/14 121/25 151/10 outlining [1] 186/24 240/9 248/20 251/1 outside [21] 9/11 57/3 59/8 59/9 59/11 particularly [3] 190/10 199/19 243/16 153/15 parties [3] 250/7 258/8 258/14 59/18 59/21 60/12 60/15 68/24 94/4 personal [5] 89/6 153/6 192/6 216/5 101/8 136/1 136/2 141/8 146/20 147/24 parts [18] 4/1 30/6 32/3 33/11 33/13 245/20 150/1 171/1 210/18 252/15 66/5 66/14 66/15 66/17 67/9 67/15 personally [4] 27/7 150/19 152/23 171/4 over-shadowed [1] 147/11 **personnel** [1] 160/14 67/15 71/11 132/9 133/6 135/3 135/7 overall [3] 40/19 46/6 78/12 165/21 perspective [2] 100/15 187/20 overhearing [1] 139/17 pass [9] 51/3 107/18 116/2 144/4 persuasively [2] 205/5 236/18 overlapping [1] 33/1 pertinent [1] 163/13 151/13 152/14 153/23 214/21 253/16 overlooked [1] 201/6 passes [2] 9/23 66/21 **pervasive** [1] 177/6 overruled [1] 246/14 overrules [1] 185/6 past [4] 16/1 43/19 181/22 189/4 Path [1] 108/18 pervasively [1] 205/3 **Peter's [1]** 97/7 overtime [2] 24/22 132/13 pathogens [3] 134/20 134/23 134/25 phase [1] 30/12 overview [3] 174/21 182/20 182/20 pathological [3] 185/24 185/25 186/2 **PHD [2]** 167/16 218/22 overwhelming [2] 205/4 216/3 Pathologies [1] 44/17 photo [3] 94/17 176/6 195/9 own [11] 32/17 60/18 76/12 101/14 pattern [5] 91/10 111/22 112/1 179/14 photograph [1] 94/21 101/24 102/3 144/1 179/20 206/18 248/10 photographed [1] 44/25

220/11 221/10 234/8 236/6 236/7 presumption [4] 177/16 177/24 201/12 P 243/21 251/15 202/6 photographs [1] 93/3 positions [1] 114/6 presumptions [1] 177/16 **PRETRIAL [1]** 1/9 photos [2] 176/12 195/10 positive [2] 48/23 190/20 phrase [1] 221/11 possibility [10] 35/5 85/19 85/20 113/14 pretty [10] 50/17 50/21 87/24 87/25 phrasing [2] 33/24 167/8 physical [2] 71/7 71/10 150/16 184/2 184/22 193/8 199/17 147/12 158/20 170/20 221/24 241/5 224/19 243/18 physically [6] 46/22 75/15 79/18 82/18 possible [25] 34/25 35/1 35/3 35/15 prevent [2] 132/20 143/19 138/17 138/20 38/21 39/21 59/1 70/5 72/11 72/13 preventing [1] 139/16 previous [2] 27/5 211/19 picked [1] 210/6 85/20 94/20 126/6 126/9 127/3 128/24 previously [2] 47/13 181/14 picture [3] 174/10 175/17 176/5 128/25 184/19 188/4 188/22 190/25 prima [1] 165/24 primarily [8] 158/17 158/24 159/1 160/6 187/5 187/10 217/16 218/5 pictures [3] 103/2 123/16 172/23 198/24 208/4 208/12 224/22 **possibly [2]** 38/21 199/14 **post [3]** 226/12 233/9 242/21 piece [6] 26/14 27/1 45/8 83/3 175/1 200/6 pieces [1] 27/1 potential [9] 3/20 45/1 46/10 46/13 primary [3] 166/24 176/19 182/7 pigs [1] 87/20 46/21 170/17 188/24 223/16 224/12 principle [6] 24/1 24/19 24/20 26/9 30/9 pin [6] 27/22 30/13 96/10 106/8 174/11 potentially [4] 70/16 126/19 134/21 225/1 176/9 239/10 principles [4] 23/22 23/24 236/10 pins [2] 67/12 192/9 potentials [1] 245/4 236/16 pioneer [1] 168/1 print [1] 81/4 pots [1] 159/1 pistol [2] 77/11 79/1 . **pound [1]** 183/11 prints [1] 111/23 pistols [4] 77/9 79/2 79/3 104/16 Povich [1] 189/22 prior [18] 23/12 70/7 75/22 75/25 76/15 powder [1] 70/25 Power [1] 172/21 **pitted [2]** 105/19 106/8 77/7 150/13 151/24 159/6 181/22 182/2 pixel [1] 46/4 183/22 221/22 245/17 250/10 250/11 pixels [1] 46/7 place [10] 10/25 24/9 56/12 135/21 powerful [1] 10/21 PPTX [3] 173/5 173/9 173/21 250/13 253/13 priority [7] 70/2 70/13 76/9 76/15 122/9 practical [12] 29/9 35/5 45/7 79/11 135/24 136/2 136/12 182/17 192/12 140/23 192/16 85/17 157/8 187/25 189/12 206/4 206/7 prison [2] 81/5 168/13 placed [2] 132/10 139/5 213/10 214/19 pristine [5] 87/25 88/1 88/10 88/11 places [1] 64/7 plan [3] 119/16 122/12 122/20 plane [1] 160/8 planned [1] 5/21 practically [2] 29/6 79/10 187/15 practice [33] 9/9 84/3 164/23 165/16 private [3] 13/22 52/5 52/5 167/23 169/5 182/8 183/4 183/11 184/8 proactively [1] 251/5 184/12 185/20 185/21 189/20 190/2 probabilistic [5] 189/9 202/17 206/10 planning [1] 59/14 190/4 202/6 206/13 208/9 236/19 224/20 224/21 probability [7] 164/15 186/9 195/7 plant [5] 157/9 158/13 158/22 159/14 236/20 237/24 241/20 242/16 243/15 198/16 243/22 245/19 248/8 248/10 248/25 212/9 213/25 224/19 224/19 plants [1] 157/18 platform [2] 201/9 214/6 251/23 252/1 252/2 probably [19] 5/3 23/4 24/24 56/21 67/5 practiced [1] 219/22 90/5 145/8 152/8 162/15 194/8 200/23 plausible [1] 188/21 practices [4] 54/13 112/14 165/14 212/6 201/3 205/3 205/10 207/7 207/21 pre [2] 227/9 233/6 214/18 225/17 226/21 play [2] 3/16 115/15 please [12] 4/9 12/24 116/6 117/13 pre-publication [1] 233/6 probative [11] 167/9 167/24 168/4 168/6 precision [1] 165/23 144/8 146/7 155/18 155/25 192/21 238/14 238/15 238/20 238/20 238/24 **predecessor** [1] 160/18 217/1 233/4 235/6 249/1 249/2 Pledge [1] 4/24 prefer [3] 173/5 229/9 255/13 problem [16] 12/3 55/6 55/8 127/25 Plus [1] 198/19 PMC [1] 97/12 preference [2] 231/2 231/4 148/8 150/11 150/24 151/2 177/3 183/8 preliminary [5] 76/15 76/19 76/22 77/3 200/9 201/14 208/5 213/6 213/6 255/3 point [30] 10/19 82/2 101/5 101/6 140/22 problems [19] 55/9 55/22 95/11 122/23 premise [4] 164/22 178/3 178/20 213/15 177/4 177/6 182/13 183/17 185/5 106/13 106/15 130/22 130/25 133/16 143/19 146/23 172/21 187/8 187/10 premises [2] 167/22 177/17 187/18 203/18 203/21 204/9 205/18 194/22 196/11 196/24 197/14 198/14 prep [1] 3/19 207/21 207/22 209/2 211/25 213/2 198/16 200/12 200/15 200/21 201/20 preparation [2] 256/13 258/16 procedure [7] 21/19 22/3 69/24 75/7 99/10 126/17 127/15 205/2 205/2 205/25 209/19 230/4 253/6 prepared [7] 4/15 4/16 4/22 6/13 7/22 pointed [3] 40/2 195/16 236/24 59/18 173/18 procedures [18] 21/19 22/9 22/12 57/8 points [6] 92/17 101/10 101/19 101/19 prescreened [1] 187/16 . 57/20 60/7 60/9 60/9 60/18 61/14 75/21 prescribed [1] 49/17 78/12 87/3 106/17 132/8 149/14 149/18 106/3 190/1 police [20] 4/25 13/18 50/10 53/12 presence [2] 124/18 250/16 211/14 53/13 53/14 53/15 53/16 54/5 64/14 present [9] 5/16 117/19 124/9 138/14 proceed [6] 12/14 12/18 107/19 117/7 138/15 138/21 172/15 179/13 224/24 146/1 214/22 121/16 121/16 148/19 152/25 166/11 191/9 210/7 210/10 230/11 239/5 presentation [1] 186/12 proceeding [1] 186/13 policies [4] 22/9 22/11 87/3 149/17 presentations [1] 209/25 proceedings [5] 1/14 1/18 257/7 258/7 presented [8] 152/9 195/11 208/3 258/13 policy [3] 149/14 150/4 226/25 polygraph [1] 238/23 208/12 208/17 208/19 208/23 224/13 process [46] 15/4 26/13 37/11 37/17 presenting [2] 12/13 225/18 Presiding [1] 1/16 pool [5] 188/5 188/19 188/22 208/5 54/3 56/6 65/3 87/4 106/15 110/8 208/12 116/24 122/14 134/20 134/22 135/15 press [1] 167/5 136/4 136/6 136/7 136/9 136/12 137/9 **pop [1]** 81/4 138/10 138/12 138/16 138/21 149/20 portion [3] 9/1 112/9 247/21 pressure [1] 134/23 presume [6] 177/17 177/19 177/22 portions [1] 258/7 167/17 171/5 175/1 175/6 179/14 **pose [1]** 134/7 196/15 201/9 243/12 182/24 186/2 188/18 188/23 189/21 position [11] 149/10 150/2 197/14 216/7 presuming [3] 178/2 178/3 237/16 193/13 203/21 204/9 204/10 216/16

proxy [1] 171/11 P psychologist's [1] 225/14 quick [2] 174/12 212/25 process... [5] 228/19 232/16 233/7 psychologists [2] 225/7 244/16 quite [5] 167/24 204/21 227/2 229/1 psychology [4] 225/5 225/11 244/18 233/9 233/15 248/14 **processed** [1] 15/3 quotation [1] 109/6 processes [4] 158/10 158/11 201/16 public [4] 18/23 50/4 223/13 248/7 quote [27] 10/23 11/9 84/13 85/3 85/9 publication [7] 64/5 109/5 163/24 107/17 110/17 165/18 165/22 166/3 209/21 processing [2] 107/15 157/18 171/23 213/6 233/6 233/9 167/8 167/10 168/21 176/17 185/7 prod [1] 5/11 publications [10] 21/4 63/21 142/22 190/17 190/22 191/2 195/25 201/10 produce [2] 65/22 67/8 143/1 157/23 163/22 163/22 164/1 201/19 201/19 206/2 211/23 214/10 produced [2] 202/3 204/22 164/8 216/4 214/13 234/22 producibility [1] 108/25 publicity [1] 55/17 quoted [3] 108/23 239/17 249/14 publish [2] 143/10 246/13 product [1] 199/4 quotes [4] 109/7 110/19 191/3 212/14 production [7] 6/23 158/16 158/17 published [30] 15/18 19/22 19/23 38/7 198/17 198/23 199/19 249/9 40/17 78/22 79/16 80/11 80/12 102/13 products [6] 158/24 159/1 159/1 184/6 141/5 142/15 142/20 142/24 143/11 **Rammy [1]** 8/17 random [4] 28/11 28/14 110/21 194/24 192/22 193/6 143/13 143/15 143/16 143/17 164/11 professional [6] 18/13 22/18 22/21 164/14 164/15 164/24 164/25 168/9 randomly [2] 97/3 193/5 range [4] 17/16 57/15 65/12 77/22 rank [1] 121/22 157/21 163/10 171/19 169/20 170/2 171/21 229/7 233/6 professor [1] 227/7 pulls [1] 96/8 punished [1] 89/10 rape [1] 81/6 **proffer [1]** 205/16 proffered [2] 166/4 212/23 **punitive [1]** 90/10 raped [1] 81/6 rapidly [3] 80/6 201/19 202/2 proficiencies [1] 112/5 purchases [1] 160/14 proficiency [38] 36/25 37/2 37/6 37/7 purport [3] 108/16 177/17 177/19 rarely [1] 9/7 37/13 37/18 37/20 37/25 37/25 38/1 purported [6] 186/22 187/12 193/17 rate [43] 36/2 36/5 36/7 36/8 36/10 37/3 205/4 206/14 207/12 38/19 38/23 39/2 39/4 39/6 40/1 40/10 38/24 38/25 40/13 40/15 40/19 40/21 40/17 40/18 41/12 41/13 41/18 86/7 purportedly [1] 183/20 40/24 40/25 41/19 42/9 42/12 46/11 86/11 86/14 87/1 87/10 87/11 87/15 purporting [1] 177/22 46/23 82/6 86/3 86/6 86/7 86/11 86/12 87/17 88/2 88/19 89/19 112/7 141/12 purports [1] 10/23 86/13 86/14 86/19 88/20 111/2 111/8 209/7 209/22 213/2 purpose [4] 109/20 147/24 203/10 141/1 141/4 141/5 141/13 160/7 182/24 profile [1] 219/8 208/6 208/9 208/20 209/8 209/9 225/11 purposes [19] 5/15 7/25 36/22 111/14 rates [21] 12/6 12/8 36/22 39/23 40/1 program [6] 14/13 15/20 39/3 41/14 118/8 119/7 149/16 154/8 180/24 40/4 86/17 106/1 106/2 182/25 209/4 120/19 143/9 195/23 198/22 198/23 200/16 200/18 209/5 209/11 209/14 209/17 209/18 programming [1] 45/25 project [4] 122/19 143/17 168/2 168/9 223/15 232/14 247/18 255/12 256/13 209/21 209/23 211/18 225/16 225/18 purview [1] 68/24 rather [9] 59/16 72/24 77/18 144/21 projectile [2] 174/5 175/10 projectiles [1] 47/16 projects [5] 122/16 122/17 165/7 185/22 186/5 203/6 216/10 240/23 ratio [2] 159/21 186/15 push [1] 211/4 put [33] 6/9 10/24 15/24 45/13 56/18 rationalize [1] 184/10 168/10 203/7 61/7 70/17 70/18 70/18 71/11 74/11 rationalizing [1] 184/24 pronounce [1] 219/5 74/17 81/3 88/16 89/2 89/7 89/24 93/1 **proper [7]** 151/2 151/7 151/9 178/18 96/16 126/13 132/17 133/23 134/2 re [1] 144/16 189/21 189/25 215/19 134/10 135/2 168/12 175/20 188/1 re-subpoenaing [1] 144/16 properly [13] 74/8 95/12 97/1 112/23 192/23 193/3 193/5 193/6 255/14 reach [2] 35/16 144/3 165/1 188/5 188/11 188/15 190/2 puts [1] 182/5 reached [2] 250/11 250/13 read [24] 9/16 40/9 60/6 60/24 60/24 putting [1] 89/6 202/16 202/17 223/15 245/22 84/8 84/13 89/23 108/4 108/5 108/6 property [2] 179/22 207/3 proponent [1] 166/24 109/19 116/18 116/23 142/3 202/23 qualifications [1] 5/24 propose [1] 252/1 232/20 232/23 233/4 238/17 243/17 proposed [2] 31/19 243/17 qualified [4] 42/25 60/2 244/19 250/20 247/22 247/22 256/14 proposing [1] 244/12 qualify [1] 249/17 reader [1] 109/8 prosecution [2] 53/23 95/3 qualifying [1] 239/17 reads [1] 109/13 ready [9] 3/6 3/7 3/8 4/15 12/14 12/19 prosecutor [5] 40/2 98/10 99/5 99/12 quality [9] 49/12 60/6 115/4 115/7 115/14 149/15 149/19 149/22 194/19 146/2 155/4 230/23 100/17 quarried [1] 197/9 real [16] 40/2 63/9 88/6 88/21 161/6 **prospective [1]** 216/13 protocol [5] 177/8 178/9 178/16 179/1 quarterly [1] 233/6 187/12 187/13 208/10 208/11 208/13 182/15 Quarterman [1] 211/6 208/14 208/15 208/15 208/23 209/5 Queen [1] 124/4 question [27] 37/4 67/13 80/22 80/25 protocols [1] 103/13 212/25 prove [9] 177/18 177/20 177/23 178/22 realistic [1] 159/22 . 178/24 190/17 190/22 191/3 202/14 93/19 101/5 101/6 128/7 128/9 128/10 reality [5] 36/20 108/10 200/13 219/22 proven [2] 142/7 200/17 128/13 130/9 130/11 147/5 149/8 161/7 220/5 provide [8] 7/22 21/3 37/7 46/23 88/4 161/8 203/13 203/14 210/13 221/18 realize [2] 146/23 183/6 realized [1] 115/22 125/7 165/22 251/10 221/24 223/10 224/5 224/6 234/19 provided [7] 22/2 32/13 40/19 77/7 240/17 really [35] 11/12 12/11 22/11 35/20 78/19 95/14 119/21 38/24 51/25 52/15 55/15 56/12 56/14 questioned [1] 165/16 provider [1] 37/21 62/19 63/11 69/18 71/9 80/19 94/7 questioning [2] 5/24 175/25 providing [1] 125/15 questions [21] 11/7 16/22 17/1 19/25 100/15 106/19 119/20 133/11 147/14 provisional [1] 61/24 20/2 60/22 65/4 108/2 112/17 113/1 147/15 160/20 160/21 162/9 182/16 provisions [1] 84/6 116/3 144/11 219/11 246/20 247/11 209/5 209/8 218/22 233/25 236/1 239/7 proxies [1] 209/22 247/15 249/15 251/6 251/11 256/5 242/14 252/5 252/15

repetitive [1] 237/6 refining [1] 158/10 refired [1] 96/19 rearrange [1] 231/9 reflect [1] 136/8 reason [12] 39/1 55/5 91/14 92/9 118/2 reflects [1] 258/13 118/12 119/20 127/24 146/15 154/18 refresh [4] 136/8 136/22 137/23 163/19 refused [2] 119/15 122/13 refutability [2] 178/18 178/19 175/13 189/3 reasonable [2] 187/24 206/3 reasons [7] 167/20 177/9 177/9 180/8 182/8 186/23 207/14 regard [9] 105/9 168/8 178/16 208/25 211/18 238/7 238/22 241/8 253/7 reassemble [2] 71/16 230/3 regarding [6] 45/4 59/23 85/9 108/11 reassembled [6] 73/14 126/15 131/18 213/25 236/25 132/22 133/1 136/13 regards [19] 9/6 10/4 16/6 16/7 17/14 reassembly [1] 135/15 rebut [1] 215/16 19/4 19/5 23/5 26/2 31/25 36/9 40/14 47/13 219/14 221/9 226/7 226/17 228/1 recall [13] 108/7 109/3 112/2 152/1 246/6 152/2 167/7 181/20 181/21 181/24 regime [2] 200/3 200/4 regular [4] 61/23 61/25 62/1 253/9 181/25 228/2 228/5 246/21 regulations [1] 183/25 recap [1] 248/1 reject [1] 170/14 relate [2] 163/23 175/3 receive [6] 32/9 52/24 71/17 149/3 149/9 239/13 related [12] 14/20 22/19 84/11 108/25 received [11] 15/3 70/4 70/21 71/18 258/16 72/5 120/14 125/18 129/4 131/6 151/19 110/15 110/18 110/21 111/16 158/4 152/4 163/7 168/4 236/10 94/6 180/7 receiving [3] 15/2 52/18 151/24 relates [6] 164/8 177/4 186/14 205/20 recent [7] 11/17 11/25 13/12 40/16 205/25 212/11 208/22 relating [3] 162/4 163/25 209/9 41/11 156/1 164/20 recently [3] 44/17 149/2 151/19 relationship [1] 158/1 recess [3] 144/7 204/15 230/7 relationships [2] 181/20 182/1 recheck [1] 75/3 relative [1] 114/6 recognize [10] 54/9 54/17 180/15 release [6] 139/2 140/21 152/25 153/2 153/15 167/6 180/20 183/23 202/12 203/17 225/7 released [5] 76/24 142/25 143/9 154/2 232/22 244/22 recognized [4] 8/7 25/20 110/17 206/17 254/10 recollect [3] 128/20 128/23 153/8 relevant [4] 118/12 158/9 164/1 233/10 recollection [4] 136/7 153/13 163/20 reliability [7] 12/2 20/4 202/21 237/25 243/23 252/5 252/9 227/15 recommendations [2] 22/12 55/2 reliable [8] 8/8 8/13 9/22 11/13 11/22 recommended [4] 15/17 22/7 49/17 141/20 233/10 245/21 relied [6] 11/16 11/20 22/2 36/4 47/7 258/7 reconcile [2] 217/4 244/15 108/1 reconciled [2] 201/21 202/5 relies [1] 23/25 reconvene [1] 229/6 rely [10] 21/25 22/1 23/22 24/1 24/19 record [31] 1/2 5/15 7/25 93/5 95/24 24/20 103/10 107/10 119/4 141/19 222/6 116/18 117/13 125/1 125/14 129/10 relying [1] 150/2 remainder [1] 173/3 remaining [2] 173/14 255/4 146/7 146/22 147/2 147/9 147/9 147/12 147/19 154/9 154/9 154/14 154/23 155/18 169/18 180/11 223/13 232/23 remains [1] 12/4 remedial [1] 89/13 248/7 248/24 258/9 258/12 258/16 183/12 records [6] 72/18 126/4 129/7 131/12 remember [35] 44/9 44/18 62/3 62/3 136/8 145/7 65/11 65/12 76/20 85/3 112/8 129/2 recovered [3] 201/11 239/4 239/4 129/20 129/21 130/16 130/22 137/23 **RECROSS [1]** 152/17 138/13 138/13 138/20 140/1 143/3 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION [1]** 152/17 151/21 161/7 172/12 181/1 182/5 198/10 198/12 199/4 217/25 218/2 recycling [3] 123/1 123/4 123/5 redacted [2] 170/8 170/12 245/25 247/1 247/1 247/16 247/23 redirect [3] 82/3 107/24 253/20 reduce [1] 198/21 remind [1] 4/11 **Remington [1]** 97/7 redundancy [1] 237/6 remote [1] 79/10 refer [3] 10/6 20/11 222/15 removed [5] 119/25 121/3 121/10 referee [1] 232/7 123/23 132/11 refereed [1] 171/3 render [1] 185/8 refereeing [4] 170/6 170/7 170/16 171/5 referees [1] 233/9 rendered [2] 214/4 245/17 rendering [1] 5/25 reference [5] 58/1 95/15 104/23 104/24 reorganization [1] 13/20 repeat [1] 179/20 212/17 referenced [2] 116/14 116/22 repeatability [7] 179/16 179/17 179/18 200/10 200/11 201/5 201/23 referred [2] 222/2 222/7 referring [4] 108/21 110/5 226/1 256/15 repeatable [3] 201/13 201/17 201/20 refers [1] 196/25 repeatedly [1] 7/23

rephrase [2] 197/18 218/14 **reply [1]** 147/19 report [74] 4/6 53/21 54/7 55/7 61/7 61/14 72/2 72/15 73/7 73/8 73/9 75/17 75/22 75/25 76/16 76/19 76/21 76/22 77/6 80/17 80/21 93/2 94/5 94/11 94/16 100/7 100/9 108/3 108/3 108/7 108/11 108/17 109/16 109/18 109/21 110/3 111/13 111/14 111/18 111/19 111/21 112/2 112/4 112/13 122/22 124/23 125/5 125/18 131/10 131/11 131/21 131/24 132/3 133/25 136/22 137/24 138/9 140/24 142/3 142/25 180/17 180/21 181/8 190/1 225/20 225/24 225/25 226/1 226/22 256/14 256/14 256/16 256/18 256/19 reported [3] 1/18 122/3 258/11 Reporter [2] 258/3 258/20 **REPORTER'S [4]** 1/2 258/9 258/12 reports [6] 11/25 61/10 61/15 61/16 represent [4] 205/12 205/12 205/15 representation [2] 43/9 237/7 representations [1] 208/5 representative [2] 94/19 98/23 representing [2] 216/6 236/18 represents [1] 244/11 reproduce [3] 98/3 179/23 179/25 reproducibility [9] 84/11 85/2 85/4 85/5 85/6 110/15 142/23 179/16 179/21 reproducible [2] 85/8 137/16 reproducing [1] 85/7 reproduction [1] 208/15 request [3] 76/14 129/10 138/22 requested [5] 6/23 77/1 95/3 98/10 require [3] 81/15 193/13 222/13 required [11] 14/19 20/20 26/11 41/14 51/13 140/6 167/23 183/3 194/12 202/5 requirement [3] 14/19 90/22 127/11 requirements [7] 60/10 60/19 62/7 63/10 222/6 222/13 246/2 requires [4] 68/24 181/19 181/23 research [29] 27/6 32/14 79/16 80/9 84/20 84/22 111/1 111/8 142/9 142/12 142/12 143/16 143/18 157/10 159/17 165/8 165/13 167/17 167/21 168/2 168/3 168/8 168/10 169/4 169/10 198/20 203/7 209/12 215/9 researched [1] 209/11 researchers [2] 143/10 204/2 reservations [1] 239/9 residue [1] 70/25 resource [1] 21/22 respected [1] 204/1 respective [1] 258/14 responded [1] 240/17 respondent [1] 208/3 respondents [1] 38/7 responders [1] 5/1 response [4] 10/15 228/7 247/17 248/6 responses [2] 251/11 251/13 responsibilities [3] 15/13 17/9 19/14 responsibility [1] 68/7

responsible [2] 158/16 160/11 rest [1] 110/11 restore [1] 123/5 rests [1] 117/2 result [10] 38/5 77/3 85/8 89/10 139/2 168/11 169/2 198/24 201/13 245/7 resulted [3] 48/23 124/22 197/14 results [31] 34/25 35/3 38/6 38/7 40/10 40/18 48/11 48/13 69/6 69/8 69/20 76/15 76/22 76/24 82/19 82/19 83/25 85/2 97/21 97/22 98/5 128/1 128/2 140/21 143/9 168/9 179/21 179/23 179/25 186/7 207/10 resume [2] 144/6 204/17 retail [1] 192/20 retired [4] 53/4 157/14 160/19 167/17 retraining [2] 90/3 90/8 return [2] 144/17 144/24 review [45] 10/3 17/15 19/13 19/17 19/19 19/20 19/21 19/23 32/19 37/11 37/13 41/15 41/16 41/17 60/12 75/19 78/24 82/20 82/23 83/3 92/25 95/17 99/24 102/2 135/5 138/11 138/19 164/16 165/4 168/24 170/6 170/18 170/24 228/1 228/19 232/3 232/5 232/6 232/16 233/9 233/15 238/2 243/24 243/24 246/16 reviewed [19] 9/21 10/9 69/7 69/14 69/22 75/19 75/23 75/24 76/1 78/14 94/24 131/3 169/20 169/23 170/1 228/8 228/8 228/14 245/23 reviewing [13] 11/1 11/1 18/5 79/15 94/4 94/5 94/11 94/12 136/22 170/15 170/16 227/1 245/25 reviews [2] 183/19 209/17 rewrite [1] 19/25 rewritten [1] 20/1 Richmond [6] 1/16 2/4 2/10 2/14 2/18 258/22 rid [1] 124/12 ridge [1] 111/22 riffed [3] 170/16 170/17 188/24 **rifling** [1] 66/19 right [171] 3/9 5/14 6/4 6/7 6/15 7/5 7/8 12/15 15/12 27/9 28/15 29/21 32/10 38/17 40/3 40/3 41/3 42/16 46/19 51/5 51/16 53/5 53/20 54/3 55/12 55/15 56/5 56/19 56/23 57/21 59/20 61/4 66/3 66/8 66/11 66/20 67/18 69/23 72/10 72/14 73/16 75/2 75/6 76/6 77/15 84/23 84/24 86/24 88/9 88/16 89/4 90/11 97/17 97/21 105/21 108/13 111/6 111/9 114/14 116/5 116/16 116/20 117/1

122/13 126/13 126/16 126/25 131/1

139/15 140/13 140/16 140/25 141/7 141/10 141/25 142/21 144/12 146/1

148/10 150/2 151/14 151/22 152/16

153/22 153/25 155/20 156/3 156/23

159/23 160/16 161/22 162/11 163/2

168/15 169/13 169/17 169/23 169/24

175/11 175/17 175/18 175/21 175/23

179/10 180/19 181/12 182/13 183/5

183/8 187/1 191/22 192/4 192/19

176/3 176/6 176/10 176/11 177/2 179/9

171/23 172/8 172/14 174/7 174/15

164/3 164/16 165/3 165/6 166/21 167/1

131/16 133/2 133/22 137/6 137/17

194/14 195/8 196/7 200/8 201/18 203/9 204/16 207/15 211/9 211/16 211/21 212/1 212/4 212/8 212/14 212/18 212/21 212/24 213/5 213/18 215/1 215/22 225/21 228/9 237/18 239/18 241/14 249/21 250/1 251/14 253/4 253/17 254/13 255/4 256/22 257/5 right-hand [3] 175/23 176/3 176/6 rigorous [3] 170/6 170/18 238/1 rigorously [1] 245/23 rim [2] 96/6 96/7 ring [1] 242/10 rinsed [4] 73/14 126/14 132/11 132/19 rinsing [1] 132/25 **Rios [5]** 145/24 146/3 146/8 151/16 172/16 risk [2] 164/15 252/8 Robert [2] 199/5 235/13 role [4] 167/15 206/19 216/23 243/12 room [5] 52/16 134/24 134/25 183/11 230/20 rounds [8] 47/14 47/25 48/1 48/2 48/3 48/14 48/15 48/15 Ruger [4] 16/16 18/2 18/3 32/4 rule [6] 6/23 6/23 184/13 184/21 241/3 243/17 rules [5] 10/1 183/2 183/24 192/2 222/11 ruling [1] 118/15 run [3] 44/14 197/25 207/18 runs [1] 54/24 rust [1] 115/17 rusted [1] 115/16 S S.W.3d [1] 8/6 sacrosanct [1] 242/15 safe [3] 25/19 26/17 26/18 safety [6] 18/24 50/5 61/2 70/2 70/13 70/13 said [65] 8/13 14/23 23/15 25/4 33/9 40/24 41/5 55/1 56/17 61/19 63/13 80/1 80/16 81/1 81/23 81/24 82/4 82/5 82/14 83/12 83/22 86/10 86/18 89/15 89/16 92/4 102/8 107/12 113/3 113/19 115/7

129/19 129/21 130/13 130/14 130/16 130/17 131/2 131/17 136/3 139/7 152/9 153/15 159/24 161/15 189/12 189/19 190/4 192/21 192/24 204/19 209/5 211/15 213/9 217/4 217/8 234/2 234/3 237/17 238/3 241/25 243/4 249/11 252/13 252/25 **salient [1]** 178/15 same [126] 14/1 18/1 24/6 24/8 24/9 24/9 24/17 27/2 27/11 27/17 28/3 28/11 28/23 29/8 31/2 31/6 31/17 32/11 32/11 32/12 32/12 32/13 34/5 35/4 35/6 35/10 39/18 39/19 48/5 56/4 56/7 56/12 56/14 56/16 56/25 56/25 57/1 57/1 66/3 66/7 66/18 75/17 77/11 77/11 80/8 81/11 81/16 81/19 81/19 81/19 81/20 83/17 85/18 85/23 91/1 91/12 92/5 92/19 92/25 93/1 96/18 96/20 97/2 97/5 98/18 101/21 102/25 104/13 105/18 105/22 105/24 106/6 110/23 114/1 114/2 114/2 114/3 114/4 114/5 114/5 114/6 114/6 114/17 116/24 117/15 121/22 124/1 126/1 126/1 126/7 137/15 137/21 137/22 140/15 140/15 140/20 156/9

156/11 166/5 166/14 170/2 170/23 179/21 181/8 186/9 189/13 190/19 191/20 192/2 195/4 195/4 197/20 197/25 212/8 213/11 214/18 214/19 215/21 215/25 216/1 216/15 216/18 226/21 228/8 231/15 235/17 sample [13] 37/25 38/1 175/25 176/1 188/4 188/4 188/19 188/21 188/22 190/19 197/25 208/5 208/12 samples [15] 24/15 26/20 37/8 39/10 39/11 39/12 39/13 73/20 88/5 137/19 137/20 187/15 188/4 199/4 208/4 samples' [1] 189/24 satisfied [1] 243/24 Saudi [1] 51/1 save [2] 124/14 234/24 saw [4] 115/19 121/25 156/7 193/20 say [129] 4/23 12/3 25/19 26/12 28/2 28/6 28/8 29/1 29/3 29/5 29/9 31/14 32/6 34/12 34/13 34/15 34/15 35/4 35/8 35/10 35/11 35/19 35/22 36/10 36/12 37/3 42/5 44/1 45/13 48/22 49/7 61/15 65/1 67/21 69/9 72/4 72/25 73/24 77/6 79/4 79/7 81/5 83/9 83/15 84/9 85/14 85/16 85/19 90/10 91/6 91/14 91/18 91/20 93/11 93/14 101/14 102/5 102/19 110/25 113/6 119/13 129/17 131/24 132/3 142/6 143/22 162/14 163/15 166/13 173/1 177/5 179/1 179/1 181/21 183/13 184/12 186/8 186/20 186/24 188/10 189/1 189/12 189/23 190/23 191/5 191/8 192/9 192/12 192/25 194/2 194/18 194/19 198/1 199/12 201/3 202/10 202/11 202/13 206/11 206/24 208/2 208/3 208/16 208/18 210/25 213/9 214/18 215/10 216/9 222/11 224/16 224/17 226/20 226/23 227/19 229/9 233/25 236/1 237/11 237/19 239/15 242/18 243/3 243/4 243/10 243/11 252/2 252/5 254/3 saying [30] 63/3 79/13 81/22 82/24 83/1 109/10 111/14 121/11 139/24 139/25 160/17 179/8 192/1 197/19 212/5 215/21 220/1 220/2 223/25 225/2 236/5 237/12 240/13 241/12 241/18 243/6 243/7 250/9 252/21 252/22 179/4 186/10 188/11 193/2 232/19 232/23 SBOT [5] 2/3 2/8 2/12 2/17 2/21

says [11] 17/18 36/20 73/7 76/6 149/22

scale [2] 46/3 160/24 Scardino [1] 2/20 scenarios [1] 208/11 scene [3] 13/25 36/15 188/10 scheme [1] 54/1

school [11] 51/19 51/23 52/5 52/6 62/11 62/15 157/6 159/15 159/22 217/15 246/11

Schwartz [1] 227/7 science [99] 8/8 8/13 9/22 10/9 13/4 13/8 13/21 14/7 14/20 14/21 25/21 29/20 51/13 51/22 53/7 53/19 54/6 56/1 56/19 68/19 80/14 85/9 95/7 108/17 108/18 111/5 117/23 120/9 120/10 120/16 142/9 142/11 146/11 148/16 148/20 148/25 149/4 156/21 157/1 157/3 157/24 158/3 165/7 168/24 169/9 177/4 182/9 182/9 182/11 185/24 185/25 186/2 203/20 204/10 213/7

```
231/19 251/3 252/8 257/6
                                                                                  shell [7] 26/12 39/15 83/24 124/24
                                         seeing [9] 43/19 76/20 93/20 101/21
                                                                                   137/2 152/21 189/14
science... [44] 213/12 213/15 213/19
                                         102/20 112/2 139/17 162/7 162/8
                                                                                  shells [1] 44/21
213/23 213/23 215/22 215/25 216/1
                                         seek [1] 163/6
                                                                                  shift [1] 206/6
216/6 216/7 217/7 217/9 217/13 218/10
                                         seem [1] 195/19
                                                                                  ship [4] 150/24 151/4 151/6 153/11
                                                                                  shipping [1] 151/9
218/13 219/9 222/15 224/23 225/2
                                         seen [19] 27/7 28/9 28/21 32/20 34/8
225/4 226/2 236/14 236/19 237/4 237/8
                                         34/8 34/18 92/24 102/23 103/1 103/23
                                                                                  shoe [1] 111/23
                                                                                  Shoemake [2] 1/15 149/3
237/13 240/10 241/17 241/18 241/19
                                         175/23 182/2 189/22 189/22 193/11
241/20 241/21 241/24 241/24 244/6
                                         193/16 205/18 209/3
                                                                                  shoes [4] 189/2 189/2 189/3 189/5
244/6 244/11 244/13 244/16 244/18
                                         select [2] 61/14 121/1
                                                                                  shoot [2] 74/18 217/25
                                                                                  shootings [1] 160/7
                                         selected [2] 29/7 193/5
244/23 245/6 245/19 253/3
                                         self [1] 186/4
sell [2] 39/1 66/10
                                                                                  short [4] 147/14 207/11 255/15 256/25
sciences [18] 7/15 12/1 14/9 50/10
51/10 54/8 63/23 63/24 64/3 64/4 64/6
                                                                                  shorten [1] 256/1
                                         semi [2] 74/4 95/25
111/20 112/5 141/19 180/1 180/4 180/7
                                                                                  shortly [2] 55/22 177/15
222/7
                                         semi-automatic [2] 74/4 95/25
                                                                                  shot [4] 44/21 49/5 88/7 210/11
scientific [73] 10/10 10/20 10/23 11/10
                                         seminal [3] 158/3 158/7 203/6
                                                                                  should [42] 8/8 9/25 23/14 38/5 53/22
                                         Senator [1] 188/7
11/13 11/15 21/14 54/9 54/17 63/1
                                                                                   53/24 54/1 54/12 72/4 74/5 90/3 100/13
                                         send [4] 32/18 38/14 38/15 46/18
sends [1] 38/4
sense [5] 30/16 43/18 148/9 170/2
63/16 63/19 79/13 80/1 80/2 80/18
                                                                                   127/10 128/14 128/14 128/16 173/1
141/16 142/1 158/4 160/21 163/11
                                                                                   177/5 197/22 215/10 215/14 220/3
                                                                                   223/19 224/7 237/10 237/13 237/14
165/15 167/18 170/5 170/10 171/6
171/11 171/12 171/13 171/16 177/8
                                                                                   239/14 240/16 240/24 240/25 242/1
                                         197/18
178/9 178/16 178/16 178/18 178/21
                                         sent [3] 83/24 84/4 170/13
                                                                                   242/18 242/25 243/3 243/4 243/8
179/15 179/21 180/3 183/4 185/20
                                         sentences [1] 237/5
                                                                                   243/11 243/20 243/20 246/14 252/25
186/23 186/24 187/8 187/19 189/7
                                         separate [6] 27/2 39/18 103/3 148/2
                                                                                  shouldn't [9] 72/1 72/17 72/18 121/25
189/17 191/18 191/21 197/5 200/22
                                         162/22 219/23
                                                                                   127/12 197/4 215/10 224/2 227/5
201/1 206/15 206/21 211/24 211/25
                                         separated [1] 13/19
                                                                                  show [23] 12/8 28/15 48/13 65/3 164/18
212/6 212/10 214/9 215/20 225/1 233/5
                                         separately [1] 77/6
                                                                                  173/10 173/12 173/18 179/6 190/8
233/20 233/21 236/9 236/10 236/16
                                         separates [1] 193/21
                                                                                   191/2 196/22 197/16 198/2 198/6
                                         September [6] 129/4 135/19 136/12
237/4 245/2 251/23 252/4 252/12 253/7
                                                                                   201/23 202/19 203/10 205/17 209/21
scientifically [17] 106/25 189/15 190/5
                                         136/14 136/15 167/5
                                                                                   232/13 237/25 253/23
                                         September 27th [2] 129/4 136/12 September 28th [3] 135/19 136/14
                                                                                  showed [1] 185/11 showing [8] 108/16 176/5 194/7 197/23
190/25 193/4 202/11 203/1 205/7 206/9
206/12 206/23 213/17 214/4 214/14
                                                                                   197/24 201/1 201/1 209/18
225/18 243/5 249/9
                                         136/15
                                         sequentially [1] 202/3
                                                                                  shown [5] 88/19 175/23 185/1 190/5
scientist [2] 8/10 202/12
scientists [14] 54/15 64/11 80/23 84/15
                                         Sergeant [1] 76/25
                                                                                   197/22
                                                                                  shows [6] 48/25 76/7 173/15 189/23
141/20 141/21 141/22 142/6 167/8
                                         serious [5] 11/11 55/16 202/4 203/21
170/9 225/21 225/22 246/14 253/10
                                         204/9
                                                                                   191/1 196/20
scientize [1] 20/4
                                         served [1] 159/10
                                                                                  side [14] 96/6 140/12 140/13 140/16
                                         service [1] 159/4
scope [7] 43/13 76/12 138/24 140/13
                                                                                   140/16 150/17 169/14 175/20 175/23
140/14 146/20 210/18
                                         Services [1] 37/22
                                                                                   175/25 176/1 176/3 176/6 192/20
scores [2] 186/21 186/21
                                         set [14] 22/10 22/11 26/19 76/12 90/15
                                                                                  sides [1] 5/15
                                         100/19 103/17 104/10 113/5 140/15
                                                                                  sign [2] 119/15 122/13
scouts [1] 4/24
scratching [1] 154/20
screen [9] 82/20 135/7 173/20 173/24
                                                                                  significance [3] 171/17 176/11 252/24 significant [10] 33/17 111/1 195/14
                                         140/16 143/21 143/24 186/14
                                         sets [3] 99/14 193/13 235/25
                                         setting [2] 101/2 190/9
175/24 193/21 193/24 195/12 203/23
                                                                                   196/10 205/10 211/18 238/15 238/20
                                         settled [4] 7/13 9/8 9/9 9/22
se [1] 221/3
                                                                                   238/21 249/2
sealed [1] 99/12
                                         seven [17] 13/10 43/1 101/20 101/21
                                                                                  similar [30] 28/23 30/8 34/3 34/5 34/7
search [1] 9/4
                                         113/9 113/10 113/16 113/17 113/18
                                                                                   39/13 45/5 45/6 45/14 45/20 46/14
                                         113/19 157/13 194/4 208/19 237/3
                                                                                   81/18 88/3 88/4 92/20 110/22 114/4
seated [1] 144/9
second [17] 31/1 75/8 75/15 98/6 98/19
                                         254/4 254/5 254/6
                                                                                   166/3 169/21 184/6 191/7 194/9 196/23
                                         seventeen [2] 194/6 218/1
                                                                                   202/4 204/22 207/25 232/5 238/12
99/21 100/15 120/1 165/13 165/19
165/19 166/7 168/4 168/8 173/15 192/5
                                         seventh [1] 52/5
                                                                                   239/16 248/16
                                         several [12] 32/20 50/5 50/7 64/23
                                                                                  similarities [7] 18/4 184/9 184/9 184/24
                                                                                   185/2 248/10 248/15
secondary [1] 51/19
                                         162/14 169/5 177/25 192/21 210/7
                                                                                  similarity [4] 28/13 28/16 92/17 196/22
seconds [1] 202/1
                                         211/3 211/13 239/2
section [14] 13/5 15/3 15/7 42/23 50/10
                                         Sexton [3] 8/6 8/9 8/24
                                                                                  simple [5] 190/18 191/16 193/18 199/16
                                         shadowed [1] 147/11
55/14 57/8 58/22 120/1 146/13 146/13
                                                                                  207/8
                                         shape [2] 27/22 66/6
148/15 149/5 219/24
                                                                                  simplest [3] 160/3 181/24 224/18
sections [2] 58/24 112/12
                                         shaping [1] 158/19
                                                                                  simply [2] 144/23 145/4
secure [1] 151/9
                                         sharpened [1] 67/16
                                                                                  since [15] 5/23 6/24 10/1 13/9 31/14
see [54] 5/7 17/21 17/24 18/4 27/2
                                         she [33] 39/15 121/9 121/22 124/8
                                                                                   59/7 69/19 71/1 80/16 102/15 142/24
28/12 28/13 28/22 28/25 33/4 34/2
                                         124/13 124/13 140/4 140/4 140/5 140/6
                                                                                   148/16 226/6 226/6 226/9
34/20 34/22 39/14 45/14 46/20 47/24
                                         140/11 140/14 140/17 140/18 147/4
                                                                                  single [7] 7/19 29/4 71/17 77/4 79/5
57/11 58/18 70/25 78/18 84/19 84/20
                                         154/2 174/15 174/16 192/24 193/2
                                                                                   184/13 184/20
84/22 88/12 88/13 89/16 92/21 93/18
                                         193/8 207/15 207/15 207/16 209/7
                                                                                  sir [14] 117/13 144/13 144/20 148/13
97/6 101/20 101/25 102/4 102/5 102/10
                                         213/9 213/11 213/12 213/25 224/14
                                                                                   155/18 180/13 189/15 214/23 215/12
102/21 109/7 148/21 162/7 162/8
                                                                                   232/9 232/12 239/19 253/19 255/2
                                         224/15 224/15 224/16
167/18 173/2 173/23 173/23 173/25
                                         she'll [1] 10/6
                                                                                  sit [3] 76/11 100/22 101/17
174/10 174/19 176/14 193/17 196/15
                                         she's [3] 92/12 189/14 192/20
                                                                                  sites [1] 50/8
```

```
250/2 250/4 257/3
                                                                                  spit [1] 197/10
                                         somebody [12] 39/7 39/16 44/18 62/14
                                                                                  split [3] 175/24 193/21 195/12
sitting [3] 76/6 81/5 101/16
                                         62/15 68/25 94/4 124/18 139/7 144/22
                                                                                  spot [1] 140/5
                                                                                  spread [2] 134/23 139/16
situation [5] 89/9 90/9 90/10 114/24
                                         150/17 203/2
                                         somehow [1] 46/6
208/1
                                                                                  spring [1] 228/18
                                                                                  stages [1] 26/25
Stahlin [1] 76/25
situations [1] 187/23
                                         someone [1] 50/20
                                         someone's [1] 119/5
six [19] 67/21 93/2 108/11 123/25
                                         something [52] 3/11 12/12 20/23 21/25
159/18 180/25 181/2 181/4 181/7
                                                                                  stain [1] 112/1
193/12 193/13 193/14 193/16 194/4
                                         22/4 31/9 31/10 31/11 57/22 67/3 69/18
                                                                                  stamped [1] 106/14
199/23 201/11 201/11 201/25 233/7
                                         70/22 72/7 86/17 97/15 100/2 100/4
                                                                                  stand [8] 116/6 142/10 144/15 144/15
                                                                                  217/4 219/16 235/22 254/9
sixteen [2] 163/8 194/6
                                         101/17 103/16 103/25 108/8 109/9
                                         114/16 114/17 122/7 124/3 126/18
sixteen-inch [1] 163/8
                                                                                  standard [23] 57/7 57/19 59/16 60/7
sixth [1] 52/5
sixty [1] 201/11
                                         128/9 129/4 144/19 147/1 166/16
                                                                                  69/23 75/6 75/20 90/23 91/1 91/3 99/10
                                         169/21 174/4 174/18 175/2 176/4
                                                                                  102/8 102/9 103/18 113/4 113/5 126/16
size [3] 66/5 66/18 66/20
                                         189/14 192/25 197/19 199/21 204/19
                                                                                  127/14 132/8 143/21 143/24 182/17
sizes [1] 198/24
                                         214/9 215/24 222/21 225/2 225/13
                                                                                  241/5
                                                                                  standards [18] 10/25 11/5 12/5 12/10
skepticism [1] 216/19
                                         229/6 237/9 237/14 242/25 244/5
skew [1] 128/2
                                         sometime [2] 149/2 255/19
                                                                                  57/24 59/16 101/24 103/19 103/24
skews [1] 42/7
                                         sometimes [18] 22/1 34/11 35/13 49/8
                                                                                  178/11 180/6 191/25 215/25 216/2
skills [1] 235/4
                                                                                  235/15 235/17 243/22 246/16
                                         67/14 67/15 67/17 71/1 76/9 83/11
skip [7] 134/19 174/1 186/16 186/18
                                         83/13 93/21 94/20 97/23 113/13 128/2
                                                                                  standing [1] 124/8
186/25 212/17 212/24
                                         139/13 139/14
                                                                                  standpoint [1] 45/7
slash [2] 7/14 238/13
                                         somewhat [2] 123/22 210/9
                                                                                  stands [2] 213/23 243/23
slide [22] 48/2 96/4 96/4 96/5 96/13
                                         somewhere [3] 46/11 56/21 89/23
                                                                                  start [9] 3/10 4/16 5/17 184/2 198/4
172/20 173/18 175/24 176/3 176/16
                                         SOP [4] 61/3 61/13 61/13 70/13
                                                                                  230/16 230/23 230/23 231/3
                                         SOP's [15] 57/14 58/4 58/8 58/12 58/14
                                                                                 started [10] 8/3 15/13 53/9 55/6 115/6
181/19 182/3 190/11 190/25 196/10
203/10 209/3 209/14 209/24 210/16
                                         58/19 60/19 60/24 61/10 61/17 72/1
                                                                                  131/5 131/7 136/14 152/5 159/13
                                         72/3 73/9 90/18 112/21
                                                                                  starting [1] 229/10
246/3 253/23
slides [7] 30/7 32/5 32/16 32/21 32/25
                                         sorry [28] 4/9 8/2 44/14 45/17 109/15
                                                                                  startled [1] 239/7
                                                                                  startling [1] 239/6
79/18 79/20
                                         117/3 127/5 157/17 161/21 169/16
                                                                                  starts [3] 5/11 110/11 178/2
state [29] 1/3 2/6 2/11 2/15 5/23 6/9 8/1
slightly [1] 143/25
                                         177/21 178/19 183/6 187/14 190/14
slow [4] 29/16 40/23 56/6 169/7
                                         202/2 213/21 216/17 218/2 218/19
small [1] 193/19
                                         234/15 236/23 237/11 238/16 239/15
                                                                                  8/2 8/6 8/17 9/10 9/11 49/20 73/9 117/1
smart [1] 160/23
                                         244/17 247/4 254/17
                                                                                  117/12 144/10 146/6 151/1 155/17
Smith [2] 16/16 65/17
                                         sort [20] 42/7 42/11 45/19 52/19 62/4
                                                                                  157/6 159/16 213/7 214/3 224/23
                                         70/7 76/19 97/18 107/11 109/25 119/18
                                                                                  224/24 241/2 258/1 258/4
smoldering [2] 169/7 169/7
smoothness [1] 66/6
                                         121/24 123/10 126/21 158/22 199/12
                                                                                  State's [4] 3/7 7/3 10/13 246/22
                                                                                  stated [4] 133/5 136/11 143/25 180/8
social [1] 101/2
                                         203/13 229/19 233/22 234/1
socialize [1] 101/3
                                         sorts [1] 127/18
                                                                                  statement [19] 4/1 6/5 6/17 6/20 10/17
societies [1] 157/21
                                         sound [2] 46/17 75/21
                                                                                  36/1 146/22 189/9 189/16 189/18 206/7
Society [3] 163/16 163/17 163/18
                                         sounded [1] 223/9
                                                                                  212/11 214/11 224/19 224/21 248/11
soft [4] 49/14 222/7 222/15 244/13
                                         sounds [1] 108/13
                                                                                  250/10 250/20 252/7
software [1] 123/15
                                         source [10] 109/10 165/25 166/6 186/10
                                                                                  statements [9] 206/1 206/10 206/12
solid [2] 12/8 86/5 solids [1] 160/4
                                         186/11 190/6 198/2 201/3 214/6 249/6
                                                                                  212/9 213/9 224/20 226/16 227/12
                                         sources [3] 110/20 209/18 212/7
                                                                                  256/8
                                         Southwest [1] 63/24
solution [7] 73/5 73/10 132/9 132/10
                                                                                  states [16] 8/21 9/14 54/15 73/9 73/15
132/17 134/3 134/11
                                         sp [3] 123/12 246/25 253/8
                                                                                  103/22 108/18 116/21 157/19 157/22
some [123] 4/3 4/10 7/22 8/24 10/6
                                         space [5] 139/19 157/11 192/11 192/14
                                                                                  172/8 172/9 172/10 222/8 240/22 241/9
11/11 15/13 16/7 26/5 28/11 28/13
                                                                                  stating [2] 204/8 213/25
                                         192/17
28/15 29/14 30/11 32/25 33/1 34/2
                                         speak [3] 87/2 89/6 171/4
                                                                                  statistical [2] 12/5 186/14
                                        speaking [1] 92/13 special [7] 157/14 157/15 162/10
                                                                                  statistically [3] 166/3 186/17 211/17
34/13 34/14 35/13 36/21 36/21 40/10
                                                                                  statistics [1] 83/8
44/4 45/14 47/3 51/19 55/15 57/2 57/3
                                         217/13 217/13 217/14 217/19
                                                                                  stay [7] 3/21 4/22 48/5 145/15 154/5
57/4 59/14 59/18 61/15 63/22 63/22
                                                                                  160/21 231/7
64/1 64/10 64/13 65/16 68/5 68/6 68/7
                                         specialist [2] 68/4 121/22
73/17 73/20 76/15 76/16 78/13 88/12
                                         specialized [2] 221/23 246/8
                                                                                  Ste [1] 2/21
                                         specific [25] 6/25 7/10 23/6 66/5 67/11
                                                                                  steel [3] 49/13 65/16 65/21
90/7 93/6 93/7 94/4 104/10 104/10
106/13 106/15 109/10 116/12 116/23
                                         84/5 85/11 85/11 93/5 97/25 106/11
                                                                                  steels [4] 199/13 199/14 199/15 199/20
                                         118/25 119/4 153/13 166/22 175/2
                                                                                  Stein [4] 52/24 53/3 99/20 119/10
119/18 121/24 122/4 122/23 122/23
123/15 124/24 126/21 126/23 133/18
                                         190/6 190/24 207/13 209/25 212/7
                                                                                  stenotype [1] 1/18
140/22 142/15 147/6 154/17 159/18
                                         219/10 219/12 222/19 249/6
                                                                                  Stephen [2] 2/17 51/7
                                         specifically [10] 12/1 20/14 31/22 72/3
                                                                                  Stephen's [1] 147/17
163/5 163/21 163/22 165/6 168/15
                                                                                 STI [1] 16/17
stick [2] 43/25 116/4
168/24 169/14 176/9 177/12 183/13
                                         73/9 78/9 104/19 111/13 120/20 149/21
186/4 187/24 191/18 194/13 194/17
                                         specified [2] 66/17 182/23
                                                                                  stickers [1] 193/9
198/9 200/25 201/15 203/18 204/12
                                         speck [1] 131/25
                                                                                  sticking [1] 41/24
                                        spectrum [1] 60/23
204/19 206/2 206/3 206/18 206/21
209/20 209/24 212/12 218/18 218/20
                                         speed [1] 145/7
                                                                                  still [27] 28/11 33/12 34/1 38/21 44/12
                                         spend [1] 219/7
                                                                                  46/25 48/7 53/2 56/4 56/7 68/18 68/25
218/24 219/1 222/11 227/24 229/12
                                        spent [1] 157/13
229/12 230/20 230/21 233/2 234/24
                                                                                  76/11 93/23 115/11 147/4 188/8 191/13
239/4 246/20 247/11 247/14 249/14
                                         spirit [2] 234/20 235/1
                                                                                  196/11 206/8 208/14 208/22 211/16
```

subpoena [1] 147/4 **symbol [1]** 193/9 system [34] 36/21 37/11 37/15 44/10 subpoenaing [2] 144/16 144/22 still... [4] 238/13 238/15 238/19 248/25 subscribe [1] 236/4 44/22 45/3 46/9 57/6 81/2 81/7 81/9 stipulate [1] 195/21 subsequent [1] 226/11 81/10 81/12 81/14 81/21 82/4 82/8 stock [1] 97/7 subset [1] 184/23 82/12 82/17 83/3 83/19 87/8 123/2 stone [1] 199/1 **substance [1]** 176/19 123/9 123/11 123/13 123/23 123/24 substances [5] 111/22 120/24 143/19 stop [3] 5/4 122/18 190/16 124/16 124/17 197/10 198/8 232/8 stopped [2] 121/3 219/2 199/18 201/15 241/6 stops [1] 39/3 **substantive [1]** 130/2 Т **store [2]** 123/15 193/2 such [13] 7/23 9/8 11/17 54/1 80/19 **T-O-B-I-N [1]** 155/19 stores [1] 66/10 128/24 169/7 183/2 192/17 197/16 201/2 206/10 251/23 street [5] 2/4 2/9 2/13 2/18 192/20 **T-R-I-B-O-L-O-G-I-C-A-L [1]** 158/5 **suddenly [1]** 6/9 **sufficient [9]** 35/8 42/18 178/5 178/5 streets [1] 239/2 table [1] 251/6 **Taiwan [1]** 157/19 strength [1] 199/14 Strengthening [2] 108/17 226/2 178/6 178/12 178/12 179/4 179/7 take [46] 3/14 3/23 3/25 4/5 6/17 15/24 stresses [2] 200/2 200/6 sufficiently [2] 11/13 11/22 17/20 18/2 26/21 40/16 41/10 43/4 **suggested** [2] 53/22 142/8 44/20 45/9 45/21 45/23 46/21 56/18 **stria [1]** 193/14 striate [2] 113/12 113/12 **suggestions [1]** 170/14 61/13 66/9 66/14 71/12 74/17 86/13 striations [12] 91/9 113/25 114/1 115/20 suggests [1] 192/15 93/3 96/16 107/16 123/2 123/16 124/21 174/8 174/9 176/9 181/21 183/13 191/8 suitable [1] 69/11 125/2 134/2 137/18 139/7 140/17 145/5 summary [3] 108/6 174/12 233/2 192/25 204/13 215/24 229/4 229/5 192/12 192/14 strong [3] 93/10 93/18 253/12 super [1] 181/24 248/8 255/21 255/22 256/11 257/2 taken [7] 83/22 84/16 87/11 122/17 structure [2] 54/24 105/24 super-human [1] 181/24 superfluous [1] 130/7 strung [1] 160/7 stuck [3] 5/12 96/13 133/17 204/15 227/24 230/7 supervise [1] 68/8 takes [3] 41/12 46/6 143/22 taking [3] 4/4 136/1 218/23 student [1] 39/3 supervising [1] 68/6 studied [1] 205/3 supervision [1] 14/14 talismanic [2] 216/8 252/13 studies [52] 31/25 47/11 47/13 47/17 supervisor [12] 52/23 58/9 89/15 90/5 talk [22] 23/20 27/8 35/25 47/10 84/6 47/23 48/12 48/13 48/21 88/18 88/23 118/22 119/9 119/10 119/11 122/24 100/18 100/23 100/24 101/1 101/6 141/8 141/12 184/25 185/11 186/22 123/22 157/14 162/21 101/18 102/8 146/16 165/9 186/19 187/2 187/2 187/8 187/12 196/19 **supervisors [2]** 92/3 211/13 **supervisors' [1]** 122/24 194/3 196/7 209/4 209/14 216/25 230/2 202/16 202/16 202/19 202/23 202/25 239/25 203/3 204/20 204/21 205/1 205/5 205/8 supervisory [1] 68/7 talked [14] 53/5 103/21 112/20 127/7 205/11 205/16 205/18 206/14 206/22 169/19 182/13 190/15 200/8 202/15 Supp [1] 9/15 207/7 207/13 209/1 209/3 209/6 209/7 **Supplement [1]** 8/22 205/19 211/21 211/22 212/15 239/20 209/8 209/9 209/12 213/2 217/13 support [4] 116/18 147/4 213/13 213/24 talking [29] 3/12 11/5 30/5 41/6 43/13 supports [1] 196/20 supposed [7] 4/23 58/11 66/1 66/11 217/14 217/19 218/10 218/13 246/8 47/18 92/6 114/12 117/17 125/4 129/20 study [18] 40/17 110/12 110/17 158/6 130/4 130/5 163/14 181/16 185/18 75/8 211/15 221/8 185/5 196/25 198/9 198/10 198/11 186/8 192/9 195/22 196/17 198/8 supposedly [2] 92/4 253/2 207/16 207/17 207/18 211/22 211/22 199/10 205/10 207/19 213/18 228/3 213/5 254/14 254/23 254/25 suppression [2] 177/25 178/1 232/3 244/9 248/2 stuff [14] 11/11 14/21 52/18 61/1 61/9 sure [52] 22/3 22/6 26/16 40/23 48/21 tank [1] 143/20 66/23 78/20 78/25 97/18 107/7 210/21 50/17 60/7 60/17 60/20 60/25 61/5 61/7 tanks [1] 87/21 tantamount [1] 179/8 228/8 230/5 257/3 66/7 66/25 67/5 67/6 81/18 82/2 85/19 stunned [1] 167/25 tap [1] 96/17 89/17 89/18 101/4 106/16 126/8 126/10 tapes [1] 239/4 styled [1] 258/9 149/17 156/8 156/10 161/5 161/14 subatomic [1] 200/23 187/16 193/25 215/16 216/21 217/2 taught [2] 52/22 217/15 subclass [29] 29/21 29/25 30/2 30/24 221/24 223/13 224/1 225/10 229/15 teach [2] 51/15 52/4 31/3 31/23 33/3 93/20 104/5 104/6 229/18 239/21 244/4 244/24 247/20 teacher [3] 51/20 51/22 52/21 104/8 113/13 113/15 114/12 114/21 247/25 248/12 248/19 249/3 249/10 teaching [2] 51/24 52/1 249/20 251/14 115/21 174/18 174/20 174/22 175/4 team [1] 167/21 183/9 183/10 183/16 183/20 183/23 surely [1] 178/10 technical [8] 21/18 22/3 37/13 42/24 184/3 184/3 196/12 198/24 surface [4] 192/10 192/13 193/19 195/6 75/18 138/11 160/12 160/21 subject [12] 19/16 63/17 68/12 69/6 surprise [1] 197/4 technically [6] 69/14 69/21 75/21 75/23 surprised [7] 197/1 197/3 197/4 197/6 75/24 76/1 69/13 104/17 110/20 187/9 209/1 217/21 219/4 233/8 197/12 239/22 239/24 technician [2] 15/13 68/10 subjective [15] 12/4 12/10 12/10 43/23 suspect [1] 43/5 technique [2] 112/21 112/23 Sustained [5] 69/1 92/15 127/23 199/9 techniques [8] 16/25 34/6 77/21 77/24 43/24 91/15 91/16 91/17 94/2 94/8 105/7 143/25 179/12 182/6 182/10 78/5 78/10 112/20 209/21 203/16 subjectively [1] 194/20 swabbed [1] 107/7 technology [3] 157/3 198/15 198/19 **SWAFS** [1] 63/23 subjectivity [1] 47/7 telephone [8] 2/5 2/10 2/14 2/19 2/22 submission [1] 129/1 submit [3] 107/12 170/7 170/11 submitted [22] 19/25 26/21 27/13 73/21 swear [1] 144/24 SWGGUN [8] 21/8 21/10 21/11 21/12 21/14 21/17 22/2 22/5 144/19 144/24 258/23 television [1] 242/13 tell [54] 17/11 17/13 21/10 26/9 26/13 73/25 98/14 126/24 127/1 127/7 128/21 switch [1] 56/17 33/9 34/12 35/7 36/7 45/20 65/3 65/7 129/8 129/11 137/20 138/2 143/5 sword [1] 201/6 65/13 65/14 94/6 94/6 94/13 96/20 sworn [10] 12/17 12/22 117/6 117/10 102/8 106/7 122/5 126/3 133/9 133/24 164/12 169/22 170/8 170/18 171/1 221/8 221/10 145/3 145/3 145/25 146/4 155/13 134/1 134/5 135/3 135/10 135/12 submitting [2] 39/4 127/18 155/15 135/17 135/22 136/18 137/8 137/21

```
T
```

tell... [20] 137/24 139/10 139/13 149/21 156/23 156/25 157/25 158/14 165/6 177/2 178/11 181/17 182/15 224/6 245/14 248/3 250/21 252/15 252/18 252/22

telling [4] 85/22 111/5 123/25 145/3 tells [3] 80/3 90/18 182/17 temper [1] 215/14

temporarily [1] 119/25

ten [28] 31/6 31/17 32/4 32/5 32/23 32/24 48/2 48/14 55/20 67/15 73/5 73/10 132/8 132/9 132/10 172/12 191/11 191/12 194/4 197/10 198/3 198/6 204/14 207/16 207/17 207/18 208/25 249/8

ten percent [3] 73/5 73/10 132/8 ten-gun [3] 207/16 207/17 207/18 ten-minute [1] 204/14 tendency [1] 10/21 tens [1] 43/12

term [11] 8/12 30/11 44/5 57/21 160/25 171/7 178/8 185/25 219/19 222/14 242/2

terminated [4] 118/3 118/4 118/19 118/20

termination [1] 118/12 terms [4] 89/21 160/1 160/3 177/11 test [106] 17/19 17/20 18/1 18/2 18/6 26/18 27/11 28/22 28/22 29/4 32/15 32/18 33/18 34/9 34/23 37/9 37/10 37/14 37/20 37/25 38/1 38/1 38/4 38/20 39/4 39/6 39/10 40/18 69/12 69/13 69/15 69/16 70/10 70/11 71/3 73/19 79/5 85/2 85/8 86/7 86/14 86/23 86/25 86/25 87/1 87/5 87/9 87/10 87/12 87/15 88/4 89/12 89/19 94/24 95/3 95/9 95/16 95/17 96/12 96/14 97/23 97/24 98/6 98/7 98/11 98/11 98/12 98/15 98/15 98/17 98/17 98/19 98/20 98/21 98/22 98/25 99/7 99/8 99/9 99/11 99/15 99/21 99/21 100/14 100/15 100/19 102/14 102/25 104/16 105/3 134/24 136/6 137/3 137/4 137/5 137/9 137/10 137/12 137/13 137/14 137/25 143/3 143/6 188/19 190/22 197/7

test-fire [17] 26/18 70/11 71/3 95/3 95/9 97/23 97/24 98/7 98/20 98/21 99/21 100/15 104/16 105/3 137/9 137/10

test-fired [16] 29/4 69/16 70/10 73/19 79/5 88/4 94/24 95/16 95/17 96/12 96/14 98/6 98/15 98/19 100/14 137/3 test-fires [34] 17/20 18/1 18/2 18/6 27/11 28/22 28/22 32/15 33/18 34/9 34/23 38/4 98/11 98/11 98/12 98/15 98/17 98/17 98/22 98/25 99/7 99/8 99/9 99/11 99/15 99/21 100/19 102/14 102/25 137/4 137/5 137/12 137/13 137/14

test-firing [7] 17/19 69/12 69/13 69/15 134/24 136/6 137/25

testability [1] 243/23

tested [8] 10/9 38/19 38/22 87/11 87/17 94/23 238/1 245/22

testified [28] 12/22 22/23 23/8 25/4 25/14 43/2 82/14 114/23 117/10 117/20 146/4 155/15 169/22 172/1 172/11

220/16 226/6 227/11 235/11 237/8 237/12 237/14 238/11 239/14 239/16 240/22 241/9 241/25

testify [14] 6/11 95/4 144/17 146/15 147/1 166/13 205/23 215/1 220/24 223/20 224/7 235/5 235/9 253/2 testifying [7] 23/12 166/12 206/4 215/6 225/8 239/12 246/21

testimonies [2] 188/2 216/4

testimony [42] 7/1 7/21 7/23 8/4 8/10 8/20 8/24 9/3 9/4 10/6 26/2 53/6 68/23 85/10 119/7 169/14 172/16 172/16 215/7 216/11 216/16 216/20 223/8 223/11 224/12 226/19 227/3 227/24 228/15 239/8 241/1 245/7 247/12 247/16 250/12 250/14 251/1 251/2 251/21 252/25 255/18 256/1

testing [14] 36/25 37/2 37/6 37/7 37/13 37/21 39/3 41/12 41/14 107/11 143/9 143/18 163/18 164/21

tests [19] 9/23 37/18 38/24 39/1 39/16 40/1 40/11 40/17 41/18 86/11 86/18 86/21 87/23 88/3 88/19 142/24 143/8 209/22 213/3

TEXAS [41] 1/3 1/4 1/17 2/4 2/6 2/10 2/11 2/14 2/15 2/18 2/22 8/2 8/16 8/25 9/11 9/11 14/6 18/23 25/24 49/24 50/4 51/9 56/8 172/10 172/11 172/11 172/12 172/13 190/12 190/12 191/1 221/22 222/9 222/10 238/5 244/5 258/1 258/5 258/20 258/21 258/22

text [2] 173/14 233/3

than [40] 4/14 5/8 10/22 28/14 37/25 39/16 42/2 43/5 51/12 59/5 59/7 59/16 67/19 72/24 77/18 88/21 96/23 98/2 103/13 107/2 113/19 115/18 116/7 125/19 125/20 130/2 131/3 136/4 144/21 145/13 152/2 178/10 185/2 189/20 196/23 218/6 222/22 224/21 229/5 251/10

thank [15] 12/20 116/5 116/9 117/1 125/16 144/8 154/3 154/7 161/20 177/6 194/16 231/23 254/9 254/12 257/5 that [1521]

that's [163] 3/22 4/4 7/3 7/16 8/17 9/1 9/7 9/13 13/15 14/3 14/19 20/23 23/5 23/14 24/18 24/18 27/21 30/22 31/1 31/1 31/2 31/3 33/7 34/18 35/22 36/18 38/13 39/12 40/14 41/25 48/16 48/21 48/22 51/21 52/17 55/4 55/19 57/16 58/15 61/3 61/12 61/18 69/12 69/18 70/12 73/14 73/15 80/1 80/20 81/13 81/23 82/6 85/14 85/25 86/20 87/6 91/19 94/2 94/16 97/19 99/4 101/5 101/21 102/7 104/2 106/23 108/15 109/5 127/14 128/6 128/7 128/9 129/11 139/16 147/3 148/8 154/13 154/16 154/22 156/24 158/7 158/20 163/15 163/21 165/3 168/14 169/17 172/24 173/17 175/17 175/22 179/11 180/5 180/9 182/20 185/19 186/12 186/13 187/9 188/12 188/15 189/6 190/3 190/7 194/21 195/23 202/4 204/11 205/21 207/5 208/13 210/15 211/19 211/19 212/3 212/4 214/10 215/13 215/24 216/13 218/1 219/19 220/4 221/8 221/14 221/24 222/23 223/14 223/22 224/22 225/21 225/25 226/13 230/17 231/13 231/17 232/22 233/7 233/24

234/1 235/12 236/4 236/6 236/15 236/19 238/4 239/8 240/21 241/5 241/23 242/17 243/6 243/11 244/14 248/18 249/11 250/23 252/5 252/18 252/20 253/23 254/3 256/22 their [74] 3/21 5/23 5/24 5/24 5/25 6/9 6/10 6/10 6/11 7/18 11/20 16/21 32/17 39/1 39/10 49/20 50/18 50/20 63/20 63/21 64/15 66/4 66/12 66/13 66/24 77/21 78/17 87/23 88/5 101/14 103/24 106/17 107/9 114/9 114/9 117/25 123/7 123/8 141/20 154/20 162/21 170/11 170/11 171/18 176/18 176/21 179/20 182/2 183/24 184/8 185/8 186/6 186/20 187/1 191/12 203/18 204/6 204/23 206/17 206/20 209/7 215/11 215/14 216/3 216/4 216/4 216/23 219/24 220/23 221/4 226/19 229/7 233/20

theirs [1] 170/23

241/6

them [64] 6/10 17/2 19/13 26/23 35/14 38/4 38/14 41/2 42/10 46/7 58/9 59/1 61/15 64/13 67/18 67/21 71/12 71/13 71/13 71/13 79/24 82/13 84/8 84/8 84/18 87/20 87/20 94/13 94/18 98/9 99/22 105/3 105/4 115/25 116/18 137/13 139/10 139/13 162/18 168/12 168/21 175/21 185/16 193/5 193/10 194/23 205/5 210/4 211/1 216/19 221/6 223/12 224/3 229/7 230/20 230/22 230/22 236/8 237/23 242/20 242/20 246/14 248/9 256/24

themselves [6] 85/7 91/18 140/8 141/19 186/6 194/20

then [129] 6/15 6/24 8/5 14/10 15/14 16/1 20/1 24/7 24/13 24/18 26/17 26/20 27/12 28/2 28/5 28/19 28/25 30/18 31/5 31/14 32/13 32/15 34/7 37/5 38/2 38/13 38/16 41/4 46/6 46/25 51/18 52/4 59/2 61/25 62/17 67/8 70/14 70/24 73/6 73/19 74/6 74/9 76/16 79/22 79/23 83/6 85/16 93/18 94/23 94/24 95/16 96/3 96/8 96/13 97/24 98/23 105/23 106/15 110/17 113/16 115/16 122/5 122/19 123/4 132/11 132/17 132/19 132/22 132/25 133/1 133/18 133/23 137/18 138/16 138/25 139/6 140/14 140/21 141/11 147/20 148/1 148/2 152/8 152/11 152/11 154/19 157/13 158/24 159/12 163/25 166/4 170/12 170/13 173/13 174/10 174/18 175/8 179/4 179/5 180/19 182/24 183/1 184/18 185/9 185/9 187/18 188/5 192/22 193/10 197/9 208/18 218/9 222/24 223/10 226/6 226/18 230/3 230/22 231/2 233/1 234/10 237/19 241/16 241/18 249/4 250/2 252/1 254/25 256/7 theory [17] 17/15 57/15 80/4 80/8 142/10 176/17 176/18 177/3 177/10 177/13 178/16 178/18 178/21 178/22 179/3 179/12 182/14

there [210] 4/19 9/2 9/3 9/5 9/12 11/24 13/20 16/14 16/19 19/4 20/2 22/18 25/7 25/8 27/20 28/4 29/1 29/5 32/25 33/17 33/23 34/11 34/13 34/14 34/24 35/12 35/19 36/21 39/23 39/25 41/15 42/17 44/3 44/11 45/14 46/14 46/20 49/2 49/4 49/9 49/9 49/23 50/1 50/6 52/8 53/2 55/9 55/11 55/15 55/23 57/2 57/12

Т

there... [158] 58/20 59/20 62/7 62/24 63/3 63/16 63/19 64/1 64/10 64/11 64/13 64/14 65/2 66/9 67/16 72/20 76/6 76/14 76/16 76/18 77/24 78/13 80/19 80/23 80/25 81/1 81/9 83/19 83/20 83/22 85/3 85/4 86/5 87/9 93/24 93/25 94/13 94/14 97/9 101/9 103/12 103/23 105/20 113/3 113/4 113/5 114/1 115/12 115/12 116/18 116/19 120/17 122/22 124/3 124/8 126/9 127/25 129/10 129/10 129/15 130/20 131/11 131/23 132/24 133/18 138/2 140/25 141/5 141/5 141/15 141/18 141/21 141/22 141/24 142/6 142/6 143/2 143/21 143/24 150/11 150/23 150/23 151/2 152/2 159/17 163/3 169/14 172/11 172/23 173/14 173/16 173/17 176/11 177/9 182/9 182/11 182/16 182/22 182/23 182/25 183/1 183/18 184/11 187/10 187/17 187/18 189/20 190/4 191/4 191/6 191/8 191/13 191/17 192/10 192/16 194/12 195/6 195/6 198/6 200/3 201/1 201/12 202/7 202/15 203/7 203/20 204/19 204/25 206/9 206/25 207/20 208/6 208/8 208/25 209/2 209/5 209/9 209/12 210/6 215/2 220/7 220/8 220/9 221/1 224/20 225/11 225/17 231/20 231/20 233/2 233/3 237/3 241/10 242/5 242/5 244/1 244/9 246/4

there's [79] 5/4 10/8 11/15 14/18 27/9 28/1 28/11 35/1 36/15 40/17 43/25 44/11 45/14 47/3 48/16 49/5 49/8 50/6 50/7 50/7 57/13 63/9 65/2 71/18 80/10 80/11 80/17 81/7 81/25 83/23 87/7 90/17 90/22 90/23 91/1 91/3 93/10 93/11 93/21 96/9 97/14 97/16 97/17 105/15 106/1 106/25 113/14 126/7 129/6 129/13 131/21 142/11 175/13 175/24 176/23 177/24 182/14 190/2 190/24 192/1 192/13 196/11 202/19 203/14 203/18 204/20 206/11 206/25 207/1 211/25 220/1 221/1 225/7 234/20 250/7 252/8 253/12 256/24 256/24 therefore [5] 25/21 104/15 166/5 188/22

thereof [1] 240/10

192/15

these [56] 3/13 10/7 10/25 11/19 16/8 17/8 28/3 29/8 30/24 32/9 35/5 37/18 38/23 43/25 67/20 79/8 80/15 100/24 101/7 103/21 105/6 106/11 114/11 114/17 114/24 177/7 181/20 185/7 186/21 189/13 189/13 192/7 194/13 194/23 195/10 195/15 195/17 195/17 198/21 199/11 200/8 200/14 206/22 207/6 208/25 209/3 209/16 209/17 209/20 209/22 212/14 212/15 212/24 222/1 243/15 251/22

they [345]

they'll [7] 38/13 38/16 154/20 199/13 229/8 230/19 230/19

they're [71] 5/25 12/9 22/3 27/5 33/1 38/19 38/25 54/16 54/22 55/4 58/24 58/25 60/3 65/15 65/16 65/20 65/21 65/24 66/1 66/6 66/10 66/11 66/25 77/21 78/22 81/18 84/15 86/12 86/22 87/13 87/13 87/14 87/14 87/24 88/6

88/6 89/3 114/1 114/15 114/16 116/18 128/1 133/20 171/14 171/14 174/24 176/1 176/14 182/3 183/2 184/23 186/6 187/13 187/14 187/15 201/22 205/3 205/16 206/22 208/23 211/1 211/1 212/5 212/16 216/5 228/7 233/18 233/20 235/20 241/6 244/12 they've [4] 3/20 36/21 99/12 189/4 thick [1] 181/9 thin [1] 194/11 thing [17] 23/18 26/15 47/10 52/19 61/12 80/19 85/23 100/14 107/17 108/5 124/1 190/19 195/4 212/8 230/11 233/22 252/17 things [22] 4/2 11/19 22/13 27/18 34/8 38/11 43/19 60/20 60/25 65/6 65/13 67/17 76/14 85/7 107/25 114/8 127/19 142/24 169/22 197/24 227/25 251/4 think [79] 4/2 12/12 36/24 43/15 47/12 50/18 50/19 51/1 54/11 63/13 64/24 76/7 78/4 81/6 82/22 85/25 85/25 86/1 86/5 86/6 89/21 91/5 91/23 93/23 100/14 101/24 103/19 116/22 130/14 130/21 145/18 147/10 173/19 181/16 181/22 182/4 184/6 190/11 190/15 190/25 196/9 201/20 203/5 203/9 204/18 205/9 205/15 207/15 207/20 211/4 214/1 219/14 221/1 221/11 221/14 223/10 227/17 228/24 229/4 229/20 230/15 231/20 232/7 232/18 233/17 234/23 237/1 237/3 237/20 238/10 242/1 242/5 242/14 246/5 252/6 255/20 256/4 256/5 256/10 thinking [3] 5/9 186/3 231/14 third [4] 31/1 74/2 74/7 205/20 thirteen [3] 172/5 194/5 226/11 thirty [7] 185/12 218/1 229/5 230/12 230/12 231/16 231/21 thirty-five [1] 230/12 thirty-one [2] 185/12 218/1 this [330] Thompson [1] 210/1 thorough [1] 251/13 those [118] 3/19 4/2 4/18 10/7 10/24 11/6 11/6 14/22 15/6 16/17 17/2 17/20 17/23 18/3 18/3 19/10 19/16 22/13 23/24 24/5 24/11 26/21 27/4 28/18 32/15 32/19 33/2 33/2 33/5 33/18 35/2 38/11 39/12 39/16 40/10 41/16 41/16 41/18 42/3 46/8 47/16 47/22 48/8 48/11 48/13 48/14 57/11 57/24 60/9 60/9 60/20 63/20 63/22 64/12 64/22 66/15 69/20 75/14 79/7 79/23 82/21 83/8 86/10 86/18 97/3 102/19 111/20 112/1 112/5 112/14 113/12 113/17 115/23 116/13 122/17 130/4 133/11 134/23 134/25 137/14 137/18 137/19 140/15 140/21 141/12 142/24 143/1 143/7 150/21 162/9 168/9 176/12 183/14 184/16 185/9 189/23 191/6 191/10 191/14 196/23 199/17 199/23 203/2 204/25 206/12 207/12 214/15 214/16 216/1 218/1 222/12 224/20 225/16 227/12 236/16 239/3 242/21 242/22

though [4] 29/16 42/16 202/13 243/8

119/22 130/9 134/1 165/21 207/16

thousand [10] 48/2 48/3 48/14 67/15

216/15 254/17 254/18

thought [12] 94/8 94/14 116/23 119/17

67/15 160/24 191/4 191/6 234/11 249/8 thousands [8] 18/6 43/12 43/12 47/16 182/1 199/3 199/3 234/22 thread [2] 165/16 175/9 three [42] 17/20 17/21 25/11 31/6 34/25 39/15 59/8 61/24 61/25 74/18 74/21 108/8 131/1 133/25 137/4 137/5 137/12 138/2 143/3 143/6 143/7 159/9 159/21 163/13 166/22 170/9 185/14 189/2 191/14 193/12 193/16 194/2 200/3 208/16 208/18 217/24 223/14 237/5 238/14 238/19 246/5 249/1 three-barrel [2] 143/3 143/6 threes [1] 193/14 through [40] 3/15 3/15 26/14 27/1 37/12 40/19 41/11 41/17 41/19 47/25 49/6 49/15 60/2 60/4 60/16 64/25 89/13 90/3 90/7 124/15 138/10 138/11 140/22 140/23 151/9 156/24 158/10 158/11 180/25 181/1 181/4 196/14 203/13 210/4 212/24 215/4 216/5 242/22 244/2 throughout [4] 49/20 50/21 134/23 157/19 throwing [1] 113/18 thrown [1] 124/11 tie [1] 122/8 till [5] 5/7 155/1 229/10 230/8 230/11 time [74] 3/19 4/5 5/16 19/1 24/9 25/13 27/2 37/23 37/24 37/24 38/6 43/15 43/16 59/11 59/20 65/23 65/25 67/13 71/15 74/17 83/4 83/6 83/10 98/6 98/20 100/16 116/4 118/5 122/11 124/7 124/9 125/10 125/17 126/1 126/5 126/7 129/1 131/5 134/19 139/3 140/18 144/6 145/5 145/5 145/6 148/2 151/5 151/17 152/5 159/21 162/3 162/9 166/19 186/19 197/3 198/1 198/4 198/17 201/14 205/9 219/14 225/9 226/20 227/11 229/7 230/4 230/20 231/15 234/24 242/6 243/19 251/16 255/15 256/11 times [20] 4/17 11/17 23/3 24/7 25/4 43/3 74/19 74/21 83/9 131/1 131/9 131/12 162/14 172/4 172/5 172/12 211/13 225/20 226/7 226/7 timing [1] 255/6 tiny [3] 9/1 192/10 192/17 **tip [1]** 72/16 tire [1] 111/23 title [6] 146/9 160/20 219/18 219/21 232/20 232/23 titled [1] 1/14 to read [1] 247/22 Tobacco [3] 15/19 44/15 44/15 **Tobin [12**] 155/11 155/14 155/19 156/19 204/18 214/25 219/10 229/21 231/6 232/2 246/21 255/23 today [25] 3/16 4/15 4/21 6/18 7/24 9/19 23/12 117/17 144/16 145/3 146/16 147/1 163/14 169/14 201/10 205/9 213/7 213/24 214/3 224/9 224/11 229/21 248/3 249/12 255/1 together [13] 15/24 70/17 70/18 70/19 71/11 100/23 101/17 126/13 133/6 133/17 133/23 135/2 139/14 told [13] 65/9 87/14 99/5 99/13 121/19 122/17 126/22 127/18 128/4 128/9 174/14 182/4 188/7 tolerance [4] 67/4 67/6 67/10 67/17

transcript [2] 227/17 247/22 transcription [1] 258/6 tolerances [3] 66/5 66/17 67/1 transcripts [3] 216/5 227/2 228/14 Tom [1] 152/11 transfer [3] 175/7 175/9 201/13 tomorrow [6] 4/20 5/7 230/16 230/18 transferred [5] 15/6 30/19 30/25 174/23 255/14 255/19 175/1 transition [1] 149/1 tonight [4] 230/15 254/25 255/25 transitioned [1] 148/19 256/13 transportation [1] 151/10 too [3] 172/11 244/11 257/4 took [28] 51/19 98/23 123/7 125/19 traumatic [1] 160/6 travel [1] 4/17 126/12 131/2 132/14 133/22 134/10 134/15 135/1 135/9 135/14 135/20 Travis [1] 56/8 135/22 135/24 136/4 136/10 136/12 treat [2] 41/18 99/10 treatises [1] 10/4 136/18 137/4 140/2 194/23 218/18 trend [1] 199/15 trends [1] 245/4 218/20 219/1 220/10 246/7 tool [30] 24/2 24/4 24/9 30/3 30/7 30/10 31/2 31/5 31/8 46/17 46/25 67/7 67/9 trial [8] 4/20 144/18 144/25 173/1 67/14 79/21 81/16 104/7 104/9 104/11 173/15 247/2 247/4 255/13 104/13 158/18 158/18 167/12 168/12 tribological [2] 158/4 198/21 tribology [2] 158/6 209/2 tried [4] 59/5 87/5 119/23 167/19 175/7 199/3 199/19 199/24 201/19 238/23 tooling [1] 202/1 trier [1] 222/17 toolmark [43] 7/2 7/16 8/7 12/2 15/18 triers [1] 216/10 tries [1] 44/25 troop [1] 4/24 17/17 18/10 18/13 19/6 20/9 20/14 30/14 51/10 51/16 52/22 62/10 62/16 Trotter [2] 210/10 210/16 63/9 63/17 64/11 67/24 68/2 86/4 108/12 108/25 115/13 158/1 161/23 trouble [2] 73/22 73/24 162/1 162/16 163/23 164/9 175/3 troubleshoot [1] 15/23 true [12] 11/8 51/21 82/13 158/3 170/5 176/22 180/16 187/3 233/12 234/15 234/23 234/24 235/9 235/16 248/25 170/9 185/19 226/13 233/21 233/24 toolmarks [27] 81/8 84/7 84/11 86/19 248/11 258/6 truly [3] 110/5 237/8 258/13 110/16 110/19 110/21 133/13 162/4 truth [2] 205/22 215/16 162/5 163/7 163/25 164/22 172/6 184/19 185/21 190/10 206/20 209/10 try [40] 3/25 16/4 21/18 36/22 38/20 215/18 220/13 228/13 235/7 235/11 39/10 39/13 39/20 41/18 59/1 66/1 67/8 235/23 238/13 238/18 77/22 100/12 111/17 139/12 145/12 175/21 176/23 178/23 181/20 181/25 tools [19] 24/3 32/12 65/7 65/9 65/13 190/22 198/18 202/25 204/22 209/6 67/12 67/16 67/18 80/5 80/6 104/13 198/19 198/21 199/11 199/23 223/15 215/25 219/10 219/11 219/13 231/5 238/14 238/20 249/1 245/2 247/14 251/3 251/4 251/5 251/13 top [13] 96/4 163/13 163/13 197/10 253/8 255/18 197/17 198/2 198/3 198/6 205/19 217/3 trying [28] 7/24 47/4 65/21 66/2 66/8 238/14 238/19 249/1 98/3 104/18 110/18 111/15 128/2 136/3 **topics** [1] 63/20 **total** [3] 13/11 52/3 258/15 136/5 146/16 147/8 148/4 148/6 159/22 174/4 191/2 198/20 216/9 218/22 totally [2] 115/23 193/6 235/12 238/22 244/10 251/9 252/15 touch [2] 107/14 194/14 252/18 tough [1] 234/17 tubing [1] 158/24 tour [6] 16/19 16/22 16/23 16/24 17/4 tungsten [2] 199/16 199/20 turn [3] 82/13 82/25 163/6 77/17 toured [3] 16/18 77/10 77/13 turned [5] 106/15 152/25 169/8 193/9 tours [4] 64/7 64/12 64/22 67/20 234/9 toward [2] 160/10 199/15 turns [2] 6/9 160/23 towards [2] 210/22 246/8 **TV [1]** 189/23 toxicology [1] 120/20 **TWA [1]** 219/5 trace [1] 120/25 tracks [6] 44/12 44/12 44/19 44/19 twelve [5] 13/11 14/23 194/5 217/17 217/18 twenty [13] 23/4 25/4 42/9 42/10 43/3 44/22 111/23 tracts [1] 222/10 43/6 157/13 161/25 195/24 205/10 trade [3] 62/19 62/25 63/3 211/10 211/10 221/12 twenty-five [7] 23/4 25/4 42/9 42/10 train [1] 160/8 trained [2] 58/23 114/8 43/3 43/6 211/10 twenty-four [3] 161/25 195/24 221/12 trainees [1] 25/12 twenty-seven [1] 157/13 trainer [2] 52/23 90/5 training [29] 14/13 15/10 15/12 15/14 twenty-two [1] 211/10 15/16 15/17 15/20 16/2 16/6 16/7 17/14 twice [2] 130/25 234/9 17/15 17/18 34/7 52/24 57/16 57/17 twist [1] 27/24 two [86] 4/14 14/12 15/10 15/14 25/11 57/17 57/24 57/25 58/2 58/5 58/7 89/13 102/2 102/11 113/22 144/1 182/10 26/24 26/25 27/2 28/3 28/14 31/10

34/10 34/20 35/5 42/2 43/13 46/15 49/7 52/17 59/7 68/8 68/10 74/21 75/10 81/17 82/17 83/5 83/8 85/6 91/20 92/3 95/18 95/19 97/3 99/7 99/14 103/2 103/2 121/18 122/15 122/24 124/8 124/24 125/4 145/8 145/10 159/11 160/19 163/25 171/20 176/12 179/14 180/2 181/1 181/4 183/3 183/10 193/5 193/13 193/21 194/2 195/10 195/13 196/3 199/2 199/17 199/18 201/21 202/2 202/8 205/19 206/25 211/10 214/15 214/16 215/7 217/23 218/7 219/15 219/23 225/23 225/23 233/1 237/4 237/19 256/24 two feet [1] 124/8 two percent [2] 42/2 83/5 two-year [1] 14/12 type [18] 8/4 8/20 9/2 9/7 10/2 15/13 32/13 44/4 49/13 63/7 77/11 97/5 97/23 97/24 160/6 185/14 189/17 232/8 typed [1] 124/14 types [10] 10/3 17/1 28/23 77/23 79/8 97/25 192/7 199/11 200/6 206/25 typical [2] 90/12 91/5 typically [25] 38/18 49/6 58/24 64/19 100/10 107/10 114/13 174/23 175/7 175/22 178/20 187/15 193/11 205/16 205/22 206/1 210/7 225/22 **U.S [2]** 226/3 247/9 **UCC [1]** 218/5 uh [3] 51/24 131/15 234/17 249/5 253/5 **ultimately [3]** 8/12 9/21 55/24 **Um [3]** 109/2 226/10 237/2 Um-hum [3] 109/2 226/10 237/2 unacceptable [3] 42/14 89/21 189/16 unarticulated [1] 12/4 uncommon [3] 185/1 196/21 216/22 under [21] 14/13 26/23 44/13 59/15 59/17 72/1 138/23 139/3 139/4 140/9 140/15 145/3 184/7 193/7 193/13 193/20 203/8 221/6 233/2 237/18 246/10 undergraduate [1] 159/6 underlying [5] 164/21 167/22 176/20 178/3 202/5 underpinning [1] 10/24 118/7 118/17 130/6 130/8 131/17 139/21 144/20 145/1 154/16 223/12 231/8 238/4 240/8 244/14 251/19 understandable [1] 207/22

65/16 69/7 70/24 84/3 87/2 87/10 93/9 ultimate [6] 54/24 158/12 224/12 240/24 understand [19] 29/14 40/24 85/21 86/2 understanding [9] 5/17 7/3 108/20 152/24 181/17 222/12 245/13 245/15 252/9 understands [2] 251/15 251/20 understood [2] 128/10 149/17 undertook [1] 167/20 unfounded [2] 213/17 249/9 uninterpretable [1] 239/10 unique [23] 24/7 24/11 29/8 30/3 30/4 31/15 79/22 79/23 80/15 97/15 102/20 104/7 104/8 104/15 106/4 106/7 106/8 113/20 114/25 115/2 116/1 175/14 175/15

used [44] 13/18 33/21 49/11 67/8 78/13

93/4 95/15 96/22 97/7 97/8 97/18 98/13

103/13 111/14 112/21 124/18 140/12

uniqueness [31] 80/19 84/10 84/19 84/24 103/9 108/24 110/15 141/16 141/19 141/23 142/7 164/22 178/3 178/4 190/23 200/9 200/12 200/13 200/15 200/17 200/19 200/20 200/23 200/25 201/2 202/8 202/9 202/10 203/1 203/5 203/6 unit [6] 13/25 162/5 162/5 220/12 221/3 221/5 United [9] 8/21 9/14 54/15 103/22 108/18 116/21 157/19 157/22 246/21 units [1] 162/22 University [11] 14/6 120/10 157/6 157/7 157/7 159/16 217/11 217/19 218/11 218/16 219/2 **unknowingly [1]** 205/13 **unknown [8]** 16/5 24/15 26/20 34/13 73/20 98/13 137/19 184/5 unknowns [2] 27/12 27/14 unless [2] 97/14 147/4 unlikely [1] 35/11 unnecessary [2] 100/20 100/20 unpublished [1] 8/15 unquote [4] 10/23 11/10 107/17 166/3 unrelated [1] 193/6 unreliable [1] 239/10 unsigned [1] 152/10 unsuitable [5] 35/10 35/12 35/15 35/18 until [7] 4/13 82/17 107/14 131/19 147/25 148/19 226/22 untrue [1] 237/6 unusual [3] 8/9 23/18 73/1 unusually [1] 101/2 up [50] 3/23 3/25 4/5 4/13 5/2 5/3 29/15 36/1 39/9 43/23 44/25 55/13 76/12 81/4 88/20 93/22 111/2 111/7 122/8 140/15 140/16 142/2 144/9 150/14 154/18 160/25 163/6 169/20 170/13 176/7 185/11 192/19 195/20 197/16 197/22 197/23 197/24 198/2 198/6 210/23 214/18 226/21 229/10 230/9 230/17 230/21 242/14 252/6 253/5 255/17 UPC [2] 192/21 193/9 UPC's [2] 193/6 193/21 upon [5] 10/20 22/2 115/22 199/3 234/22 **upper [1]** 176/6 **upset [2]** 234/7 234/10 **upside** [1] 193/10 urge [1] 118/11 urged [1] 4/13 us [23] 44/20 63/22 65/9 65/13 71/19 99/13 107/12 121/19 137/8 137/24 144/2 145/20 149/21 156/23 156/25 157/25 158/14 163/13 173/18 245/14 254/25 256/3 256/11 use [48] 10/25 11/6 21/21 30/11 65/7 67/12 67/18 77/20 81/3 87/18 87/19 89/22 97/5 97/7 98/4 100/10 134/18 137/9 137/10 149/7 149/15 150/12 158/12 170/5 171/5 173/13 173/21 176/23 177/14 184/20 185/10 188/5 188/8 188/22 189/6 189/25 191/16

192/14 199/11 199/12 199/13 207/22

207/22 207/24 215/10 235/12 235/16

245/1

140/13 148/17 149/25 158/19 166/23 167/1 168/7 168/12 168/24 170/17 171/5 176/20 179/14 184/13 187/20 188/6 188/18 188/25 190/9 198/12 199/25 201/16 201/25 223/15 232/7 233/20 238/10 useful [1] 248/5 user [1] 123/11 uses [4] 65/17 177/13 189/20 211/24 using [18] 32/12 33/6 34/5 39/25 47/5 57/21 78/6 83/12 95/14 96/22 123/16 124/17 132/8 176/15 195/5 233/19 245/3 245/20 **USSI [1]** 163/5 usually [4] 35/12 49/5 87/5 101/3 usurp [3] 216/23 223/23 252/2 usurping [1] 243/12 vacuous [4] 177/12 189/16 191/18 206/8 vague [2] 177/11 179/12 valid [7] 10/11 82/25 84/24 141/17 167/23 212/6 215/13 validate [1] 204/22 validated [2] 47/5 225/13 validation [15] 186/22 187/1 187/2 187/8 187/12 191/18 204/20 204/21 205/4 206/14 206/14 206/22 207/7 207/12 213/2 validity [13] 84/6 84/10 108/24 110/14 206/24 206/25 207/1 207/2 207/3 207/5 207/6 207/9 252/24 valuable [1] 224/4 value [13] 26/5 46/4 113/21 167/9 167/24 167/24 168/4 168/6 206/23 238/15 238/20 238/24 249/2 values [2] 46/6 46/8 Vance [2] 199/6 235/13 variabilities [2] 97/16 97/17 variability [1] 110/20 variable [2] 46/17 200/4 varies [1] 67/14 various [7] 32/3 187/3 209/18 209/18 243/18 246/4 251/24 vary [3] 48/21 143/25 178/6 vehicle [3] 188/10 188/12 188/16 velocity [1] 66/22 venue [2] 240/21 241/11 verbal [1] 76/22 verbatim [1] 249/14 verification [11] 37/12 37/17 69/7 69/11 69/13 91/19 91/21 138/10 138/16 138/21 140/2 verifications [1] 76/17 verified [8] 69/6 69/10 69/18 69/20 69/21 75/14 76/3 83/25 verify [7] 69/13 69/15 75/11 139/1 139/8 140/6 253/22 versa [2] 178/8 211/11 version [2] 173/13 173/21 versus [13] 8/22 9/15 29/23 49/14 103/25 116/21 136/19 183/9 183/10 186/10 211/5 213/22 238/23

very [55] 6/22 9/5 9/11 9/17 16/24 39/12

45/5 46/17 46/23 49/14 60/23 61/10

65/16 65/20 65/21 73/3 89/5 89/13 97/15 115/6 115/10 115/16 115/19 116/5 116/24 125/2 125/3 139/14 139/18 141/3 144/12 145/14 163/24 170/25 178/8 184/5 184/6 186/17 188/24 192/9 193/19 195/16 195/25 198/17 217/3 219/7 219/10 219/11 224/3 239/16 248/9 254/8 254/9 256/21 256/25 **via [1]** 111/18 vice [2] 178/7 211/10 Vietnam [1] 159/10 view [3] 176/7 187/8 252/22 viewing [1] 139/6 violated [1] 150/4 violence [1] 160/7 Virginia [4] 157/7 218/11 218/16 219/3 virtually [2] 182/6 207/12 visit [1] 78/2 visited [3] 16/16 77/9 157/17 visiting [1] 16/10 visual [1] 46/1 visually [1] 114/20 vitae [3] 156/2 217/1 218/9 vital [1] 78/15 volatile [1] 110/22 volume [3] 1/2 233/1 258/9 **VOLUMES [1]** 1/2 volunteered [2] 139/3 143/6 vulnerabilities [1] 188/25 vulnerability [1] 190/8 W wait [2] 147/25 148/1 waited [1] 155/1

waive [2] 118/6 118/15 Wal [2] 192/25 193/1 Wal-Mart [2] 192/25 193/1 walking [1] 64/25 want [50] 3/18 4/11 37/3 39/11 45/21 45/22 47/10 47/24 66/17 66/18 66/19 67/1 70/11 72/11 88/2 88/4 107/11 107/13 107/15 111/7 116/12 118/11 118/15 121/17 125/11 130/3 135/16 144/15 154/4 154/17 154/19 156/8 156/10 156/24 163/7 169/13 173/20 178/22 190/12 190/13 192/5 216/25 223/22 227/19 229/11 229/24 231/21 247/23 252/6 252/19 wanted [16] 3/11 64/16 72/10 99/12 100/17 119/18 121/1 122/6 146/21 147/1 154/13 160/21 197/11 246/13 256/14 256/22 wants [1] 250/25 warn [1] 3/18 warned [1] 3/20 was [385] wash [1] 73/10 washed [1] 73/5 Washington [4] 157/7 217/11 217/19 227/14 wasn't [19] 55/6 69/6 76/21 81/22 130/11 133/8 133/8 160/23 161/12 166/19 166/23 168/21 186/13 197/23 210/13 218/22 226/20 250/8 256/16 waste [1] 100/16 watching [1] 242/13 water [3] 87/21 132/11 143/20

way [59] 17/8 20/3 22/3 27/19 33/23

W

way... [54] 35/9 36/15 36/21 40/6 40/7 42/7 44/19 46/2 47/17 49/16 49/19 65/19 66/10 71/11 87/4 89/5 99/4 105/20 106/4 106/6 106/25 115/1 126/7 126/9 126/23 127/4 127/6 133/3 133/13 136/9 137/11 145/17 145/20 145/21 147/23 148/8 158/9 160/17 170/23 171/14 174/16 203/8 205/6 224/15 228/8 230/21 239/13 239/16 240/12 240/14 240/21 250/2 250/21 251/17 ways [3] 75/10 112/13 225/17 **WC [1]** 199/16 we [275] we'll [22] 3/16 5/3 5/5 5/7 11/5 20/11 27/8 144/6 145/10 145/12 148/1 148/2 194/3 195/21 204/14 229/25 230/3 230/3 230/15 230/20 230/23 231/18 we're [44] 3/8 3/14 3/23 4/5 4/15 4/16 4/19 5/17 6/13 12/14 16/22 22/4 30/5 36/19 38/22 59/14 59/17 60/17 60/21 60/22 87/11 87/16 99/13 99/14 140/21 147/15 147/18 147/19 148/11 154/21 154/25 163/14 179/2 192/9 194/7 216/9 216/14 229/20 230/8 230/23 244/9 248/2 255/17 255/25 we've [16] 4/16 59/17 114/11 117/17 202/7 202/15 203/9 203/13 205/3 205/18 205/19 211/3 212/16 212/20 215/4 255/7 weapon [11] 47/15 61/8 71/21 81/19 90/14 90/21 91/6 176/24 176/25 210/11 214/19 weapons [2] 103/3 199/2 wear [3] 158/7 198/21 198/23 wearing [2] 198/19 201/19 web [1] 171/9 week [7] 149/2 150/13 151/19 152/9 153/19 153/20 199/22 weekends [1] 191/12 weeks [1] 4/14 weight [1] 113/21 welcome [1] 231/16 well [127] 4/7 4/22 5/2 5/10 5/19 5/22 6/2 7/13 9/8 9/8 9/17 9/22 10/9 11/16 13/24 15/19 19/23 26/21 27/6 27/13 31/13 36/24 37/5 38/9 45/6 47/24 49/5 50/21 52/3 55/5 55/24 60/10 60/24 71/15 72/7 79/18 80/4 81/9 82/16 83/18 86/16 89/5 89/23 91/21 93/9 93/11 93/14 94/13 101/5 105/14 113/8 127/12 127/24 128/8 130/21 133/24 136/3 136/16 137/2 142/3 144/13 145/14 147/8 147/22 148/17 156/7 161/17 165/9 171/14 173/10 173/22 175/5 177/24 178/5 178/10 186/12 189/3 189/4 189/11 195/5 196/5 196/6 199/10 199/13 202/10 209/11 210/24 211/3 211/7 212/22 215/3 216/21 220/4 222/14 222/23 223/1 223/22 225/16 225/17 225/22 228/12 230/10 231/4 234/9 234/16 234/20 235/3 237/16 238/16 240/21 241/5 241/23 242/4 243/18 243/20 244/2 244/22 245/15 245/25 245/25 246/3 249/23 250/6 250/7 252/20 254/15 254/20

went [14] 13/16 14/6 52/4 52/11 55/19

55/21 67/20 67/21 124/15 138/10 159/7

159/15 159/16 159/22 were [176] 3/24 13/24 16/3 16/5 17/22 27/11 28/3 28/10 28/12 32/10 32/10 33/12 33/12 33/18 34/1 34/4 34/10 35/6 35/9 35/9 48/9 52/8 52/15 55/9 55/11 55/13 55/15 56/5 57/4 59/8 59/20 59/24 61/16 63/3 64/10 64/13 64/14 71/11 72/25 73/18 73/18 73/20 76/4 76/16 77/8 92/5 94/9 94/14 97/12 98/12 98/14 98/16 98/17 99/8 102/24 103/3 103/5 105/13 105/23 106/13 106/22 106/23 107/1 107/3 107/4 108/14 115/19 115/23 115/24 117/19 118/4 118/19 118/21 118/23 119/13 119/14 119/17 120/17 120/18 120/18 120/25 122/6 122/8 122/9 122/10 122/23 123/10 123/11 123/18 123/21 124/9 125/23 128/10 128/17 132/9 132/11 132/11 135/3 137/21 137/22 138/2 138/14 143/10 145/3 148/21 152/21 158/15 158/24 159/4 159/8 160/1 160/16 161/8 161/9 161/23 162/6 162/7 162/17 162/21 162/22 162/24 166/2 166/11 166/24 167/6 167/24 168/23 184/14 184/17 185/9 188/9 188/9 191/15 191/20 193/6 195/11 196/3 196/23 197/1 197/3 197/6 197/9 197/9 197/12 197/14 197/15 197/24 206/4 210/8 211/15 217/17 219/15 219/16 220/20 220/21 220/23 226/11 226/11 226/15 226/16 227/25 232/3 233/25 235/1 239/5 240/20 242/2 242/5 242/22 243/1 246/4 249/18 250/9 254/18 254/18 258/11 weren't [5] 69/11 162/8 234/1 234/7 250/11 Wesson [2] 16/17 65/17 West [1] 193/12 Westlaw [1] 8/17 what [358] what's [28] 35/17 75/18 79/13 104/4 144/21 164/6 168/6 170/5 177/25 178/12 178/17 178/22 181/6 183/8 185/23 186/14 187/1 187/7 190/18 192/2 192/3 194/9 195/8 198/14 199/16 204/25 217/4 224/10 whatever [14] 32/6 32/16 63/7 66/2 66/6 83/16 122/12 134/4 135/17 154/4 171/24 208/7 245/4 245/24 when [161] 8/3 11/10 12/18 15/9 22/2 24/1 24/10 26/9 26/10 26/14 27/1 28/5 28/21 28/24 30/4 30/12 30/12 30/18 32/6 32/22 32/23 33/22 34/15 34/20 34/22 35/19 36/12 36/14 40/16 41/6 41/10 41/11 42/4 43/12 47/24 52/11 53/13 56/17 59/25 60/1 60/12 61/7 62/3 66/21 67/3 68/21 69/25 70/1 70/3 70/18 70/20 71/4 71/5 74/15 75/2 75/3 75/5 75/23 76/5 82/12 83/3 83/12 88/19 89/7 89/24 91/18 93/6 95/16 95/17 95/17 95/25 96/11 96/14 96/18 97/10 98/6 98/14 98/19 100/13 102/20 104/11 104/13 105/16 105/17 106/22 106/23 107/1 115/13 117/25 120/3 120/13 122/5 124/10 124/20 126/11 126/18 129/17 133/4 133/8 133/9 133/15 133/22 133/22 134/10 134/15 135/1 135/9 138/14 138/17 143/19 144/2 146/2 150/13 151/16 151/19 152/4

162/9 164/11 170/7 174/3 176/23 184/14 186/8 188/18 190/9 193/5 195/18 196/1 196/5 197/9 197/9 198/4 199/4 201/23 211/21 219/15 223/8 226/15 227/4 227/11 229/25 230/3 230/8 230/23 237/17 238/3 238/10 239/1 240/17 241/25 242/24 245/17 247/17 249/14 251/4 253/8 **When's [1]** 59/11 whenever [2] 75/7 162/24 where [76] 3/22 8/5 8/23 14/5 14/6 16/8 34/11 34/13 35/3 36/10 41/15 53/21 59/3 62/24 63/25 64/16 65/1 65/2 71/20 72/4 75/19 78/2 81/3 82/22 84/9 87/19 87/21 89/23 89/25 91/25 97/2 103/2 103/5 104/9 106/16 122/23 123/2 123/15 124/17 124/23 128/1 129/25 130/19 133/16 137/15 137/15 149/21 152/22 162/12 163/4 163/5 164/14 164/24 166/10 166/11 175/24 176/3 187/23 188/3 189/23 192/11 197/14 209/14 209/15 209/25 210/2 211/9 217/10 221/7 234/23 235/13 239/3 239/4 240/22 241/2 251/3 wherein [1] 165/16 whether [68] 9/25 10/4 11/2 11/12 11/13 12/11 24/15 24/17 36/16 37/14 38/9 38/16 39/7 39/8 50/16 57/12 57/22 58/19 59/24 72/15 72/16 73/17 75/13 77/25 78/6 80/18 80/24 84/23 85/1 93/19 103/12 103/16 109/22 118/10 127/7 128/9 129/2 129/7 129/13 129/23 130/15 130/22 130/23 131/24 131/25 133/12 133/20 135/3 136/18 141/1 141/16 142/1 142/14 143/22 152/6 169/6 174/5 185/12 194/21 200/17 200/19 200/20 202/25 230/15 233/15 240/15 242/10 252/7 which [78] 5/20 5/25 7/19 7/22 8/16 8/17 8/22 8/25 9/5 9/18 10/8 16/3 28/8 29/13 29/13 36/3 38/10 38/10 42/7 44/13 44/17 46/12 47/14 51/13 58/5 59/17 70/5 70/22 74/3 82/1 86/7 96/6 98/18 105/23 106/11 115/20 115/25 116/14 122/16 122/20 123/7 123/23 140/12 141/12 149/15 157/2 158/5 158/6 158/17 159/20 170/6 171/11 173/7 179/19 180/15 181/22 182/5 184/3 185/9 186/3 193/2 198/10 198/10 198/12 206/8 207/3 207/6 209/7 212/9 212/20 226/14 233/6 235/15 239/9 243/19 248/4 256/14 258/10 whichever [1] 208/7 while [15] 9/3 32/25 39/2 76/11 110/12 115/8 117/19 118/14 125/22 159/4 161/23 162/17 220/20 223/9 230/2 whisper [1] 196/14 who [47] 16/24 18/22 25/12 44/18 50/18 52/21 54/24 54/24 58/8 58/23 60/8 60/13 60/14 64/15 68/16 76/23 84/15 92/3 99/19 111/12 117/15 118/21 119/8 121/6 121/18 124/6 124/9 126/23 127/1 127/7 128/21 129/8 134/8 134/13 141/21 141/22 143/6 143/10 153/2 169/23 170/21 170/21 187/2 203/24 220/9 233/8 255/13 whoever [3] 32/14 139/2 166/12 whole [10] 10/19 37/15 100/14 120/25

159/12 159/13 159/19 160/18 162/4

184/23 185/13 194/12 197/7 199/1

232/6

writing [3] 61/16 246/15 258/8

W

whole... [6] 134/2 134/3 134/18 136/4 231/7 233/22 whom [2] 218/24 225/24 whoops [1] 194/2 why [61] 38/24 53/20 54/2 65/19 67/6 68/25 69/15 70/15 71/12 71/13 77/17 77/18 85/14 90/6 91/14 91/16 91/19 92/9 93/22 93/22 93/24 93/24 93/24 94/8 95/2 96/25 97/5 100/9 113/7 118/2 118/4 118/19 121/12 121/13 121/14 126/20 127/24 133/24 134/1 134/6 134/18 146/22 149/13 154/16 155/1 162/6 162/7 167/4 170/4 170/4 174/19 178/25 182/8 202/10 202/12 206/11 215/5 215/24 234/19 236/16 240/20 wide [3] 20/16 65/12 77/22 width [2] 27/24 114/2 wife [1] 192/18 Wildlife [2] 14/9 51/9 will [45] 4/23 7/9 17/1 27/12 29/5 30/11 30/13 30/19 32/8 32/14 32/17 37/24 39/1 45/12 66/15 76/11 79/6 79/22 79/23 81/4 81/25 82/2 137/18 144/18 147/14 149/25 173/15 175/7 175/9 193/15 196/21 201/10 205/22 206/1 224/23 224/23 225/23 239/13 240/15 248/15 252/23 253/22 255/9 255/20 258/17 **William [3]** 155/10 155/14 155/19 Williams [2] 91/25 211/5 Williams' [1] 91/24 Winchester [1] 97/8 Windows [1] 123/2 wiped [2] 72/22 72/23 wiping [1] 134/3 wire [1] 158/24 wish [5] 145/15 145/16 154/5 154/6 231/16 wishful [1] 186/3 with the [1] 223/3 within [20] 17/20 21/19 22/4 23/13 24/6 27/10 32/17 34/22 57/5 66/17 66/25 67/10 67/17 80/7 106/1 122/8 135/24 202/1 206/17 224/16 without [12] 29/3 101/16 114/21 123/24 123/25 126/3 134/14 144/16 145/6 191/20 205/6 212/10 witness [32] 6/10 10/13 12/16 12/17 51/4 92/11 107/18 107/21 116/2 116/10 117/6 144/4 144/9 144/24 145/23 145/25 147/18 147/21 148/7 152/14 155/13 214/21 230/24 232/10 246/17 247/19 253/16 254/16 254/19 255/4 255/12 255/20 witnesses [6] 3/13 3/20 4/17 4/18 5/23 116/12 witnesses' [1] 10/6 woke [1] 242/14 **woman [1]** 81/7 **won [1]** 130/5 won't [4] 210/4 230/16 231/22 255/22 wondering [1] 154/20 wooden [2] 96/16 96/17 Woolsey [3] 258/3 258/18 258/19 word [2] 93/10 207/8 words [22] 102/8 166/1 168/5 171/16

174/24 178/4 179/24 182/25 183/8

205/13 213/10 221/4 233/19 237/4 238/17 248/13 249/6 work [70] 25/11 38/21 39/14 39/24 41/18 42/24 42/24 47/5 47/17 50/19 50/20 52/12 53/6 60/8 66/10 66/11 69/5 69/12 69/14 73/22 73/25 75/4 75/5 75/9 75/10 75/19 75/24 88/10 88/11 88/12 88/14 91/21 93/1 99/25 100/23 100/24 101/8 107/9 119/15 119/19 119/23 122/6 122/9 122/12 122/20 124/1 125/22 136/16 138/8 138/9 138/17 139/1 139/14 159/23 160/22 168/15 169/2 175/1 187/13 193/11 200/6 205/20 205/21 208/10 208/23 210/2 210/3 220/3 221/5 255/25 worked [11] 15/2 53/13 159/24 162/16 162/18 165/7 221/6 226/15 228/12 239/2 252/10 working [20] 21/15 24/4 37/16 42/21 52/16 53/11 62/9 62/12 63/8 122/18 125/23 159/13 161/23 172/20 192/8 192/10 196/11 199/5 203/2 239/2 works [7] 24/3 37/17 50/25 123/1 123/14 192/18 201/23 world [17] 40/2 79/2 79/4 80/10 85/12 85/15 88/6 88/21 103/23 187/12 187/13 208/11 208/13 208/14 208/15 208/15 216/1 worn [1] 189/4 worth [1] 124/1 would [177] 5/23 6/1 9/24 12/24 20/1 25/11 26/4 26/15 26/16 26/18 26/21 28/9 29/7 30/2 33/4 36/10 37/8 37/16 39/14 42/12 42/13 43/11 57/17 67/7 67/9 70/9 70/9 72/21 72/22 72/23 73/2 73/10 75/24 76/22 78/4 79/8 81/12 83/9 84/20 84/22 84/25 87/6 87/8 90/12 90/16 90/16 90/19 91/5 91/6 92/21 93/25 95/4 100/2 100/11 102/5 103/9 105/22 107/13 107/16 109/8 109/11 109/23 111/17 113/17 113/18 116/4 126/21 126/22 131/11 132/24 132/25 134/13 136/1 138/16 138/23 138/24 139/3 139/5 139/6 140/6 140/11 140/14 140/16 140/17 141/3 144/16 144/17 145/19 147/20 149/11 150/23 150/23 153/11 153/19 162/1 162/11 162/14 163/4 163/5 163/13 163/15 164/1 164/2 165/22 165/24 166/3 166/4 166/13 172/5 174/11 174/19 175/3 175/4 175/15 176/7 176/13 179/8 180/11 182/21 184/18 185/8 186/20 188/3 190/7 190/16 192/16 194/8 195/16 196/10 197/6 197/7 197/10 198/1 198/2 200/12 203/5 203/14 206/24 207/8 207/20 208/6 208/21 209/19 213/16 213/24 214/1 214/8 214/14 215/24 216/13 218/17 218/21 222/17 224/13 225/17 226/20 226/23 227/15 227/18 229/9 231/3 231/4 234/11 235/7 237/11 237/19 237/20 240/18 241/10 242/12 242/22 243/1 243/5 245/1 245/5 254/13 254/22 wouldn't [19] 57/14 70/9 71/12 71/14 72/9 72/10 73/24 74/21 74/24 75/17 87/9 100/9 107/8 122/10 126/3 127/19 197/4 216/15 216/18 write [6] 61/7 61/10 61/14 193/23 221/4

written [7] 9/17 19/5 77/6 78/19 78/20 164/8 182/17 wrong [11] 12/9 33/10 41/2 92/1 92/5 128/19 141/7 187/1 187/7 193/8 204/25 wrongly [1] 210/8 wrote [6] 58/8 58/9 111/12 111/13 138/8 246/12 y'all [19] 5/11 58/18 59/24 76/8 82/7 83/22 83/24 100/5 101/6 105/3 107/8 121/24 122/1 151/4 152/18 229/12 230/2 230/17 257/6 y'all's [2] 91/25 103/14 yeah [17] 45/17 64/24 77/11 81/5 92/4 131/15 162/19 190/14 210/6 210/14 221/11 222/1 231/1 231/2 249/3 256/10 256/20 year [11] 13/9 14/12 51/24 58/21 59/9 62/2 142/19 162/15 168/11 227/18 246/11 years [40] 4/13 6/24 11/17 13/10 13/11 14/23 15/8 15/10 15/15 42/25 43/1 47/8 51/23 52/14 52/17 55/20 59/2 61/25 62/2 80/10 91/25 120/7 124/17 133/25 134/1 157/13 159/9 159/11 160/10 161/18 161/25 191/12 195/24 196/14 201/11 201/12 201/25 203/19 218/1 221/12 yes [310] yesterday [2] 6/25 7/7 yet [6] 84/12 109/1 110/16 142/13 201/25 212/23 you [992] you'd [1] 87/22 you'll [3] 11/24 38/14 243/25 you're [105] 11/11 12/18 14/11 20/13 22/19 25/15 26/11 33/23 34/2 36/14 36/24 41/6 43/13 47/11 47/18 56/4 56/18 58/19 61/19 61/24 62/12 63/8 63/13 66/2 68/5 68/6 71/4 71/7 71/9 71/10 72/8 77/14 82/18 83/15 85/21 85/22 88/15 89/20 92/6 98/1 98/3 108/3 111/8 113/11 115/13 121/11 139/24 142/17 144/13 145/15 146/2 148/24 150/2 152/6 168/18 192/9 195/3 197/19 198/8 207/18 213/1 215/21 220/2 221/7 221/17 222/25 223/1 223/6 223/10 223/18 224/2 225/1 225/2 228/4 228/24 231/15 234/23 236/1 236/5 237/12 238/6 239/12 239/12 239/17 241/12 241/18 243/3 243/7 244/2 244/12 245/11 245/13 248/3 250/1 251/1 251/9 252/15 252/20 252/20 252/21 252/22 252/23 256/4 256/5 256/15 you've [35] 14/1 14/22 20/23 26/8 33/10 42/21 43/2 43/5 43/15 68/4 88/7 103/16 108/5 130/25 172/14 180/8 183/7 190/15 191/22 200/8 209/3 209/24 211/19 211/22 212/15 214/25 218/7 225/5 225/25 226/6 240/2 242/12 243/16 252/25 255/20 younger [1] 52/4 your [224] 3/7 12/20 14/2 14/4 16/6 17/9 17/12 17/12 17/13 18/17 18/18 19/13 19/14 20/21 20/25 21/4 22/9 22/19 23/5 23/15 23/21 25/8 26/2 31/21 31/21 36/4

your... [198] 37/4 39/24 42/9 47/12 49/16 51/3 51/9 52/14 52/21 53/6 54/10 54/23 54/25 56/18 56/19 58/11 58/14 58/15 58/19 61/10 61/13 61/13 64/7 64/7 68/22 72/1 72/2 72/15 72/18 78/20 78/24 78/24 79/13 80/1 80/2 83/25 88/8 90/4 90/5 90/18 92/11 92/25 94/7 94/15 98/7 98/20 99/16 99/19 99/24 100/15 100/23 100/24 101/24 102/7 104/18 104/21 104/22 107/19 107/22 108/20 112/18 112/22 113/22 114/25 116/2 117/3 117/12 118/5 118/17 119/8 119/18 119/23 120/8 120/15 122/6 124/22 127/14 129/6 131/19 133/25 134/11 136/8 136/22 137/4 137/5 137/23 138/8 138/8 138/9 139/10 141/2 145/19 146/6 146/9 146/12 149/7 149/10 150/3 150/4 151/18 152/14 153/8 153/24 155/17 155/21 156/4 156/14 156/18 156/24 156/25 158/13 158/14 159/3 159/4 159/23 160/1 163/10 163/12 167/15 173/17 177/2 178/23 181/10 181/17 185/10 192/22 192/23 193/24 198/14 199/7 203/12 209/24 212/4 212/17 213/5 213/6 213/15 214/22 215/8 215/8 216/16 216/20 216/25 217/5 217/10 218/9 219/12 219/14 222/12 223/8 224/5 227/4 227/24 228/7 228/8 228/24 229/24 232/4 232/11 232/14 233/14 235/16 236/7 238/6 238/15 239/22 240/8 240/13 240/15 242/24 245/7 245/8 245/13 245/17 246/7 246/8 246/18 247/12 247/15 247/16 247/17 247/18 248/6 248/6 249/15 249/16 249/17 250/10 250/12 250/20 251/1 251/10 251/15 251/20 252/15 253/22 253/23 254/10 Yours [1] 128/12 yourself [4] 12/25 86/10 247/23 247/24 zero [2] 46/5 211/1