# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

CIVIL ACTION NO. 13-cv-1300-MSK-MJW

JOHN B. COOKE, et al,

Plaintiffs,

Volume 1

Page 1 - 148

JOHN W. HICKENLOOPER, Governor of the State of Colorado,

Defendant.

**DEPOSITION OF:** 

GARY KLECK

TAKEN AT INSTANCE OF: The Defendant

DATE:

VS.

October 25, 2013

TIME:

Commenced at 8:07 a.m. Concluded at 11:46 a.m.

LOCATION:

2894 Remington Green Lane Tallahassee, Florida

REPORTED BY:

L. DANIELLE FREEZE Certified Realtime Reporter Lfreeze37@comcast.net

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC. 2894 REMINGTON GREEN LANE TALLAHASSEE, FL 32308 850.878.2221 asreporters@nettally.com

2

# APPEARANCES:

# REPRESENTING PLAINTIFFS:

MARC F. COLIN, ESQUIRE mcolin@brunolawyers.com BRUNO, COLIN, JEWELL & LOWE, P.C. Suite 3100, 1999 Broadway Denver, Colorado 80202 303.831.1099

# REPRESENTING DEFENDANT:

MATTHEW D. GROVE, ESQUIRE mat THEW D. GROVE, ESQUIRE matt.grove@state.co.us COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF LAW 1300 Broadway, 6th Floor Denver, Colorado 80203 720.508.6157

INDEX	3
WITNESS GARY KLECK Direct Examination by Mr. Grove	E 4 4
INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
(Exhibits are attached.)	
NO. Description PAGE	
1 Supplemented Expert Report of Gary Kle 2 Article entitled: Do criminals go to the	ck 17 31
hospital when they are shot? 3 Report entitled: Firearm Violence,	37
1993-2011 4 Article entitle: Trends in Nonfatal and Fatal Firearm-Related Injury Rates in the	40 United
States, 1985-1995 5 Article entitled: Policy Lessons from	62
Recent Gun Control Research 6 Article entitled: Impact of handgun types on gun assault outcomes: a comparison of assaults involving semiautomatic pistols ar	73 gun id
revolvers Article entitled: The Case for Enhanced Data Collection of Gun Type	80
8 Article entitled: Mass Shootings in the United States Involving High-Capacity An Magazines	100 nmunition
9 Spokane County Sheriff's Office Report of Investigation	f 105
10 Article on North Hollywood shootout 11 Article entitled: Victim Resistance and Offender Weapon Effects in Robbery	107 146
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	148

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

STIPULATIONS

The following deposition of GARY KLECK

4

was taken on oral examination, pursuant to notice, for purposes of discovery, and for use as evidence, and for other uses and purposes as may be permitted by the applicable and governing rules. Reading and signing is

9 THE COURT REPORTER: Do you swear or affirm 10 to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing 11 but the truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.

13 Thereupon,

not waived.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

15 16

18

19

20

21

14 was called as a witness, having been first duly sworn,

was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. GROVE:

> Q Good morning, Dr. Kleck. My name is Matthew Grove. I'm an assistant attorney general for the state of Colorado. I'm representing the governor in case No. 13-cv-1300, which is captioned Cook et al. v.

22 Hickenlooper.

23 You've submitted an expert report, a 24 supplemented expert report and a rebuttal expert report 25

in that case; correct?

Q I've always been fascinated by criminology, frankly, so this is going to be interesting. How would you describe the discipline?

A The scientific study of the causes and consequences of criminal behavior and the way society reacts to it.

 $\label{eq:Q_solution} Q \qquad \text{So it's fair to say that you study criminals}$  and what they do?

A Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Q How do you define what a criminal is?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

A It's a legalistic definition. Lots of things are disapproved of or immoral, but if it's a violation of criminal law, that's a crime and a person who does that is a criminal. More informally, though, we usually use the term "criminal" to refer to people who commit more serious crimes or commit crimes repetitively.

Q So when does somebody cross the line, to you, between being an ordinary citizen and a criminal?

A Again, technically, legally, the only crossing over point is when a person is convicted of a crime. But on the other hand, criminologists don't really focus on that legal distinction.

People don't have any one distinct point where they cross over; rather, they gradually become more criminal as they do more crimes, as it becomes more of a frequent activity.

Q So I'm just trying to tease out exactly what the line is or if there is a line at all. Someone who commits crimes and then stops for three or four months, is that person still a criminal in a criminologist's view?

A There is no clear cut yes or no answer to that. The more crimes you do, the more criminal you are.

Q Are there any papers that you can point me to in the criminological literature that discuss what a

criminal is, what a criminal isn't?

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

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A Yeah. Although, I'm not prepared to right now. I wasn't alerted that that would be a topic of the deposition. But yeah, given time, I certainly could.

 $\label{eq:Q} Q \qquad \text{There's nothing, there's no like seminal work?}$  I'm just curious.

A No, I don't think so.

Q Are most crimes -- would you say the majority of crimes are crimes of opportunity or are they crimes that are well-planned out?

MR. COLIN: Foundation. Go ahead.

A Well, it would, of course, depend on the type of crime you are talking about. White collar or business crime, for example, is almost invariably planned. It's as planned as noncriminal business behavior and business decisions.

Some violent behavior is planned. Mass killings are almost invariably planned and not only planned but often for very long periods of time. A great deal of other violence, more ordinary violence, with just a single victim, is impulsive and, therefore, unplanned. And that's probably more common. It would be the more numerous kind of violent crime.

Robbery, on the other hand, it's -- somebody may have a kind of predisposition to rob, but which

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

target they rob is a function of opportunity. You know, they come across a liquor store where they happen to be just a customer but they realize they're the only person in the store, it's late at night; there's only one clerk working there, there's lots of cash in the cash register and then it becomes a robbery.

It required both preexisting disposition plus

 $\label{eq:continuity} \textbf{It required both preexisting disposition plus opportunity for the crime to occur.}$ 

BY MR. GROVE:

Q Do people who engage in that sort of activity, an opportunistic crime where they walk into a liquor store or something like that, do they typically walk around with whatever weapon they're likely to use in order to effect that robbery?

MR. COLIN: Objection: Foundation, go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Could you rephrase the
question? I don't understand it as you stated it.
BY MR. GROVE:

Q Do people who are predisposed to committing armed robberies walk out the door with the weapon that they intend to use for that robbery?

A Sometimes they do, yeah. Sometimes they habitually carry a firearm primarily for reasons of self protection, and then when they come across an opportunity to commit a crime they hadn't planned when they went out

b

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

11

12

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

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

the door, in a sense, having the gun was planned because they did it every day. It was part of a habitual behavior, and the robbery wasn't planned.

In other cases, they have a target in mind. They're going out to commit a robbery in a particular place at a particular time, in which case they do bring the gun with them for that specific purpose.

You mentioned self protection. Are criminals more likely than ordinary citizens to need to carry a weapon for self protection?

- A Yes.
- Q Why is that?
- A They're victimized more often. And they're victimized more often because they are more likely to associate with dangerous people, more likely to live in dangerous neighborhoods, more likely to find themselves in dangerous situations like buying or selling illegal drugs.
- And are there any legal restrictions on people who are in that situation, whether they should or -should be owning a gun?
- A Yeah, it's illegal everywhere in the United States for a convicted felon to even possess a gun anywhere. And then on top of that, there's additional restrictions virtually everywhere in the United States,

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

10

with a few states excepted, to have a special permit for carrying in public places.

- Is -- do most felons have a criminal history?
- Well, all of them do, by definition. A
- That wasn't a very good question.

Do most people who are likely to go in and commit a violent robbery or a mugging, or something like that, do most of them have a criminal history?

MR. COLIN: Foundation, speculation.

Most are likely to have an arrest record, if that's what you mean by criminal history, yes. BY MR. GROVE:

> Q Have you done any studies on this?

- A
- Have any of the studies that you've written Q cited other studies that discuss that point?
  - On robbery, no; on homicide, yes.
  - Q What do the studies on homicide say?
- They indicate that something like 75 to 80 percent of people who are arrested for homicide had a

prior arrest record. And that's going to vary depending on how thorough the researchers were in looking for a record.

If you only look for a record in the same state, you're not going to find as many priors as if

vou looked for a record across the entire United

Is the mobility of people with criminal records from state to state, does that vary from the general population?

Yes, criminals are more mobile.

I'm not going to pull out your résumé because it's really long. But I do have a couple of questions about it.

As I was going through it, I noticed that there are some articles -- and forgive my ignorance -that you mentioned are in peer-reviewed journals and then other published articles. There are two different categories.

I've never fully understood the peer-review process. How does that work in your discipline?

An author who wants an article published will submit a paper to a professional journal, an academic journal, and the editor of that journal will select between two and four experts in the area to whom he sends the manuscript.

They read and evaluate that manuscript and make a recommendation to the editor. And they may recommend that it be rejected out of hand, that it be revised and resubmitted or they may accept it. And the

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

editor takes that as a recommendation. He can, if he likes, overturn it. But usually he'll accept a recommendation, at which point it's accepted for publication and it appears in the journal.

Do peer reviewers do things like, you know, check math errors, things like that, or are they more looking at the general concepts of the paper?

It would be rare they check for math errors, but they may recognize, based on what's in the manuscript, that there was some flaw in the statistical procedures, that somebody used the wrong procedures and failed to do something that's necessary in order for the procedures to work properly.

But they wouldn't have access to the data themselves. And so they wouldn't be in a position to know, for example, that somebody had hand calculated a number and the hand calculation was wrong because they wouldn't have access to the original data and wouldn't be able to do that computation themselves.

- Do peer reviewers make editing suggestions? Q
- Yeah, definitely.
- You've written a number of books and a number of book chapters. Are those typically peer-reviewed or are they -- is it more of an editing process?
  - That's less likely to be. There can be peer

18 19

20 21 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

In general, would you say that if an article is Q peer-reviewed, is it something that someone in the field should be able to rely on?

You're relatively more likely to be able to rely on it if it's been refereed than if it hasn't refereed. It's probably not a very strong relationship because a great deal of what is reviewed and refereed very -- supposedly very thoroughly is, nevertheless, poor work; and there's probably a fair amount of work that's excellent on technical grounds, but reviewers have recommended it not be published on non-scholarly bases.

What sort of non-scholarly bases would you Q have?

Α Ideology. In our field -- it's a very ideological field. And so if an author has arrived at a conclusion that a reviewer dislikes on ideological grounds, then they may be inclined to impose a higher set of technical standards as to whether the article ought to be published.

Have you had any submissions of manuscripts that have been rejected on ideological grounds?

Many. Α

Q Can you give me an example?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

I did an article that was an evaluation of the impact of gun control laws on crime and violence rates, and I probably submitted it to maybe five journals that rejected it before the sixth one -- maybe it was the fifth one -- accepted it.

And I think that took a period of like four or five years before it was finally published, from the time it was first completed and could have gone into print to the time it appeared in print.

> Q What article was that?

That's the Kleck and Patterson article in 1993 A that was published in the Journal of Quantitative Criminology.

How common is it for peer-reviewed articles to reach diametrically opposed positions on a particular topic?

A Very common.

So I know you've testified a number of times as an expert. Can you give me an estimate of how many times?

A Testified in court, you mean?

How about -- we can do both.

How about how many times have you been engaged as an expert in connection with a court case?

In my entire life, I would say something on the

order of 12 to 14 times, something like that.

Aside from -- I know some of those have been in liability cases; right?

A Correct.

And some of them have been constitutional 0 challenges?

A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Are there any other types of cases where you've 0 been engaged?

10 Yes. I'm currently engaged by the Canadian Department of Justice defending a decision they made or 11 the government made to repeal long gun registration 12 13 requirements. So I'm not sure what legal category that 14 falls into, but it's certainly not constitutional or 15 liability, whatever that's called.

What other cases are you currently involved in?

A I'm involved in -- I wouldn't be able to give you the names, but there are cases in Connecticut and Cook County concerning assault weapon bans. Washington, D.C. concerning registration requirements; Chicago, I guess there's a case that's still live in Chicago.

And that's different than the Cook County case?

Yes, that's a distinct case. That's about it A that I can think of right now.

Do any of those other cases involve large

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

16

capacity magazine bans?

The Connecticut case does, and I think the Cook County case does.

I think there's a Maryland case going on right now too. Are you involved in that?

Yes, I haven't done anything on that one. But that's another one I've been engaged on, I think. I'm not absolutely sure about that one. It runs together in my mind.

And in any of those cases, are you testifying on behalf of the government?

Α No.

So it's the -- just to make that a little bit clearer, it's the plaintiffs in each of those cases; right?

Yes, not the Canadian case, though -- then it's the other way around -- but other than the Canadian case.

Sure, I'm talking about the Connecticut, Maryland, DC, Cook County cases.

Yes, that's correct. Α

And in each of those cases, the plaintiffs are Q challenging gun laws?

A Yes.

Have you ever testified on behalf of a gun Q control measure? In favor of, let me clarify that.

12 13

14

15 16 17

18 19

20 21 22

23 24 25

17 1 No. Α 2 Q What were you asked to do in this case? 3 A I was asked to address the issue, the portion 4 of the law that concerns large capacity magazines and 5 what impact that has on violence. Who asked you to do it? 6 Q 7 David Kopel. A 8 (Exhibit No. 1 was marked for 9 identification.) 10 BY MR. GROVE: 11 The court reporter has handed you Exhibit 1. Q 12 A (Views document.) 13 Q Do you recognize this document? 14 A Yes. 15 Q What is it? 16 A It's a revised version of my expert report in 17 the Colorado case, and it differs from the previous 18 version in that I added eight more mass shootings that I 19 discovered after the original report had been submitted. 20 Did Mr. Kopel pose any specific questions for 21 you to answer in drafting this report? 22 Beyond what I've told you, no. 23 Did you have any assistance in gathering the Q 24 data for this report? 25 Yes, David Kopel provided me with the services

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

18

of a law student, I think, who took my specifications of what to look for and searched for media accounts of mass shootings, which I defined as involving more than six victims, either killed or wounded.

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

How did you come up with that definition?

A It was one I had used before in a book called Targeting Guns, studying an earlier set of mass shootings. And the reason it was more than six was because six was the number of rounds that an old fashioned six-shot revolver could fire, meaning you could, without reloading, shoot six different people with a six-shot revolver.

And so the sorts of shootings in which a large capacity magazine was most likely to matter would be those in which large numbers of victims were killed. And so the cutoff was more than what could be killed or injured with a revolver.

So do you think that a large capacity magazine can matter in a mass shooting?

Well, in one case, it probably did matter and -- during the later period that I studied and in one case in the earlier period I studied.

So in the most recent set that's covered in this supplementary expert report, there was one case out of 58 where it probably did matter in the sense

19 that it affected the number of victims killed or 1 2 injured. 3 And you reached that conclusion based on review Q 4 of media reports? 5 Correct. Α 6 We'll talk more about that later, I think. But Q 7 let's talk a little bit more about just the reports, this 8 report. 9 Did you speak to any of the plaintiffs in 10 this case about the factual allegations they've made in 11 the complaint? 12 A 13 0 Have you reviewed the complaint? 14 A 15 Have you reviewed the two bills that are being Q 16 challenged? 17 A One. I don't recall two but one, yes. 18 And that's -- was it House Bill 1224? 19 A I wouldn't know the number. 20 Yeah, I guess that's not fair. Q 21 Is it the bill on large capacity magazines 22 that you reviewed? 23 A Yes. 24 And I'm sorry, I know you answered this. 25 Did you or did you not review the complaint?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

1	A	Yes, once.	20		
2	Q	Yes, you did?			
3	A	I read it once, yes.			
4	Q	So in your tenure as a criminologist, have you			
5	had an op	portunity to become generally familiar with			
6	statistics a	associated with gun violence?			
7	A	Yes.			
8	Q	What sources do you find to be most reliable			
9	for that?				
10	A	It depends on the subject matter.			
1		If you want to make relative judgments of how	V		
12	much crime there is from place to place, the best				
13	source of information is the uniform crime reports of				
14	the FBI, which are police-based statistics.				
15		And if you want to know the total amount of			
16	6 crime in the United States, a better approximation is				
17	provided by the national crime victimization survey,				
18	which is conducted by the census bureau.				
19		If you want to know the characteristics of			
20	offenders, you only have a little bit of information				
21	from the victim surveys because all you really know is				
22	what the victim could perceive. So we know a great				
23	deal more from the characteristics of people who are				
24	arrested, so arrest statistics provide us data on that				
25	subject.				

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

1

7

8 9 10

15

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

I'm struggling to understand why. Do you know why? The principal reason is because, by definition,

the police can only count crimes that they're aware of, that are known to them, which, for the most part, are those that are reported by the victim. And those --

In some crimes, the victim is willing to tell a A surveyor from the census bureau about the incident, even though they, for whatever reason, did not report it to the police. So that results in an additional number in the NCVS.

I've seen the UCR and the NCVS, at least; and I

haven't dug into the data. But I've noticed that the

numbers that come out of those are pretty different.

Q So the UCR uses police-reported crimes?

A Crimes reported to the police or that otherwise become known to them. In some cases, police will discover crime on their own.

They might, for example, discover that, you know, in their patrol area, a store had been broken into, that sort of thing. But for the most part, it's crimes reported to the police that they count.

And then the police give it to the FBI as a central repository?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Eventually. They first report it to a state uniform crime reporting entity, which, in turn, passes it on to the FBI.

How does the NCVS work in terms of data Q collection?

It's a survey. The census bureau is basically always interviewing people. They select a representative sample of the U.S. households and in each household that's selected, they interview everybody age 12 and up.

And they'll ask them background questions, you know, age, sex, race and so on of the residents of the home and then they'll ask them general screener questions to determine whether or not they've been a victim of a crime in the previous six months. And if they say yes, they ask a whole series of detailed questions about what those crimes were.

Is that a snapshot in time or is it done over a 0 period?

It's being done continuously.

Every month they're doing an additional large number of interviews so that, at any one time, there are 60 to 80,000 individual persons who are interviewed about crime experiences. But it's a rotating panel design, meaning about 1/6 of the sample drops out and another 1/6 is -- comes into the sample to be replaced.

And people are interviewed -- any one individual from the standpoint of the respondent, they're interviewed every six months for a 3 1/2-year period before they're rotated out of the sample -- or I should say, actually, it's not any one person. They come back to the same housing unit every six months; and sometimes, you know, people have moved out and it's a different set of people.

So technically speaking, it's the residents of a given housing unit are interviewed every six months. And most of the interviewing is done by telephone except the first interview, which is done face-to-face in the person's home.

Survey results for the NCVS, are they anonymous?

A No. The -- obviously, if the interviewer is going to their home for the first interview or the census bureau knows exactly where the individual lives and when they contact them later by telephone, of course, they know their telephone number. And so yes, they may know who the people are.

Q But it sounds like they don't track you down if you move?

> A Correct.

Q Could they -- do they have information that

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

would allow them to do that? I don't know.

I guess I'm just curious as to if you're just going to -- if you're worried about housing units and not the people who are living there. I'm just wondering why the census bureau doesn't track them down. But if you don't know, you don't know.

It would be difficult. I mean, that's certainly the reason. It would be very difficult.

Do they take your name and address and all of that stuff? Obviously, they have your address. Do they have your name?

I think they do, and they do it partly so that they can tell if they are talking to the same people as last time. So then they can tell which are, you know, the individuals for whom they could compare the last interviews and see what changed as opposed to the people who are new to the sample -- new to that housing unit and they -- you know, the census bureau hasn't previously interviewed them.

Q If the surveyor finds out -- you know, if a surveyor comes and comes into the house and sees that you're dealing crack out of the house, for example, is the surveyor allowed to, then, report that to the police?

I have no idea.

22

24

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

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

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

There's an assurance of confidentiality. I'm not sure about anonym -- whatever that word was you just used. They assure confidentiality, which is a different thing. It means that even if the surveyors know the person's identity, they're not going to release the information in individual form, at least, that's what the respondents are assured of. Whether they believe it or not is a debatable matter, but that's the assurance that's given.

So any particular response of an individual couldn't be linked with that specific individual. That's the reality of it. And so the census bureau is honestly assuring people of that. But whether people accept that or not, given the fact that they're not anonymous, is a quite distinct matter.

Q Have you reviewed the script for NCVS surveyors?

A

Q And it contains that assurance that information that they provide won't be shared outside of the survey?

Q Have there been any trends in violent crime

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

26

over, say, I don't know, the past 30 years?

So you're talking about since 1983?

I just pulled that number out of a hat. If there are any significant breaking points before or after that.

Crime went up a lot from '85 to '91, then it went down a lot from '91 to 2000. And from 2000 to the present, it's generally been declining a little bit, very, very mildly.

Q So '91 was the peak?

Yes, correct.

It depends on which crime you're talking about. There was actually a peak in '91 for homicide and another peak in '93. But '91 is probably best described as the peak of crime overall.

> Q What about for gun violence?

A I think it was the same.

Q So it generally tracks violent crime?

Yes, the only difference is trends in gun violence tend to be more volatile, meaning when crime in general is going up, gun violence will go up more steeply; when crime in general and violence in general is going down, gun violence will go down more. So it's more variable; gun violence is more variable.

When we talk about violent crime, I guess we

should make sure we're both talking about the same thing.

Are there -- what constitutes a violent crime? Are there categories?

Yes. Mostly when we deal -- when we talk about violent crime, we're talking about the ones that we have data on, the ones that we have counts for. And so that is in effect what the uniform crime reports or the national crime victimization will count.

And the ones they count is -- well, the uniform crime reports will count as a violent crime: Murder and non-negligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, robbery and rape. And the NCVS will count all of those as violent crime except they don't count homicide or murder in non-negligent manslaughter.

Homicide is not counted as a violent crime for the NCVS?

A No, because it's based on survey data taken from victims; and obviously, they can't interview homicide victims.

That's a fair point. Although, I thought they did it on a household basis.

They do do it on a household basis; but once the households are selected, then they speak to individual persons and ask those individual persons about their prior victimization experiences. For crimes that

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

28

are kind of inherently household crimes, like having a burglary of a home, then there's a principal respondent, who is called the household respondent, and they respond on behalf of the household.

So it's usually, you know, head of household or some other adult who would be that respondent. And they would report on things like either break-ins in the home or household larcenies, thefts that aren't attached to a particular individual; but they were, in effect, crimes pertaining to the household. And I think the same is true of motor vehicle thefts, the household report -- respondent would report on that.

So I'm not going to ask you for exact figures because I'm sure there are a ton of numbers on this, but what's the most recent year that we have reliable data for on gunshot wounds and fatalities?

Let's see. We're probably about to get, this month or next month, the uniform crime reports out for 2012. 2011 is definitely out. 2012 might just be out. I'm not sure about that.

And do you think the UCR is a reliable indicator of the number of gunshot fatalities?

Yes, well, homicides, but other gunshot fatalities would include suicides and, of course, the FBI doesn't have anything to do with that.

1

11

23 24 25

14

24

25

0 Is there a reliable source that encompasses all gunshot wounds?

Yes, the National Center for Health Statistics gathers mortality data based on death certificates. And so they would count up homicides, suicides and fatal gun accidents. So they would be comprehensive in covering fatal violence involving guns.

What about nonfatal violence? 0

The NCVS does not gather that in any systematic way. There are alternative sources of information based on emergency room data, so probability samples of emergency rooms might be contacted for their accounts of nonfatal gunshot wounds that they treated; but that really isn't a comprehensive count of nonfatal gunshot woundings because they can only count the ones that are treated. And that's almost certainly far too low with respect to criminal nonfatal assault injuries.

Why is that?

Α Well, we know from studies of victims of violence that most victims are criminals. They have criminal records and medical personnel are required by law to report gunshot wound treatment to the police, which means if you are a criminal and you've been wounded -- let's say, you were trying to stick up a liquor store and the liquor store owner shot you -- if

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

you go to the local emergency room, then it will be -the police will be told that this individual is being treated for a gunshot wound. And if the liquor store owner, meanwhile, had reported that incident to the police, they'd know this is the guy who did it. There aren't that many people shot in any one day who fit a general description that would be provided of the suspect.

And so, in effect, that sort of victim of a nonfatal gunshot wound has a choice of either seeking professional medical care and then being handed over to the police for a possibly very severe legal penalty or self treating, which means for less serious gunshot injuries, the choice would be pretty clear.

It would be advisable to self treat or have, you know, a relative, friend, girlfriend or whatever do the treatment rather than go to a professional medical source.

Would you say a firearm injury, being shot, is a generally serious injury?

Yes. But some are less serious than others. And less than 10 percent of gunshot assault injuries are fatal.

So most of them could be treated in a nonprofessional way because mostly what physicians do,

even with the injuries that are reported to them, is they do the same kinds of things that an amateur could do; that is, they clean out the wound. They'll rinse it with something like Betadine. They'll put a sterile bandage on it. And they may or may not give the person some antibiotic pills.

And that's the way most gunshot injuries are treated. In other words, there's no surgery. There's no stitching up, even. In other words, it's the kind of treatment that an amateur or nonprofessional person could administer, which is why it's a realistic option to self treat on the less serious gunshot injury.

Have there been any studies on the number of people who self treat when they've been shot?

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

25

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

Q Have there been any studies, that you're aware of, on whether when a criminal is shot he goes to the hospital?

Yes, there was one rather dubious jail survey where inmates were asked if they had been shot and if they had been shot, did they seek medical treatment. I don't recall it asking about whether they self treated or not or what they did.

> Let's talk about that dubious jail survey. (Exhibit No. 2 was marked for

> > ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

30

identification.) BY MR. GROVE:

This has been marked as Exhibit 2. Is this Q said survey?

> A Yes.

Q What's dubious about it?

The context in which the respondents are interviewed. They're incarcerated; they're in jail.

In fact, it's even worse than if they were in prison because when you're in jail, the bulk of criminals there are awaiting trial, meaning it hasn't been established yet whether they'll be convicted and punished and yet that's something that's upcoming. And for most of them, they will be convicted and punished.

So it's still up in the air what kind of a sentence they'll receive, and so the last thing on earth a person in that position wants to do is to present themselves as even more criminal than the authorities already know them to be.

And if you're asked a question, you know: Did you receive a gunshot wound and if so, did you seek professional treatment, the obvious follow-up question for anybody who said: No, I didn't -- was foolish enough to say no -- would be why?

I mean, it's what any ordinary person would

1 2

9 10

11 12 13

14 15 16

21 22 23

24 25

1

12

17

18

24

25

want to know because from a purely medical standpoint, of course, the sensible thing is to seek medical treatment. Of course, the correct answer, the true answer is: I didn't want to go to the professional medical treatment personnel because it would result in me going to prison for whatever crime I was committing when I got shot.

Are you aware of any studies that contradict the findings in Exhibit 2?

A No.

Have you ever interviewed a jail or prison Q inmate about whether he -- whether when he was shot, he went to the hospital?

No.

Q If you were going to do a study like that, what would be important -- what do you think that --

What did the authors of the report in Exhibit 2 not do that they should have done?

What they should have done is interview people in a different context, not in a jail context. It would have been somewhat better even if they had just asked people in a prison setting.

Because in a prison setting, at least the penalty, the sentencing has already been done. It's

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

34 not up in the air how severely they'll be punished. Better still would be interviewing people who are not under any kind of incarceration conditions. And that would be a sample of unincarcerated criminals who would be interviewed, rather than people in jail or prison. That would be still better.

Anything else they should have done?

Well, of course, better still would be to kind of verify to the extent that people's responses can be verified.

If somebody says yes, I was treated, of course, you can ask: Well, where was that and check medical facilities to see if they were treated. If somebody says no, you can follow up -- I'm sorry, yeah, if somebody says no, you can follow up by asking: Why not?

I don't think they verified that when they said yes, I sought professional medical treatment, I don't think they verified with any medical personnel that were involved whether yes, that was true and certainly validating that kind of response, dubious as it is, subject to serious doubts, you'd certainly want to validate it.

So they could have asked them: Well, where was that treatment facility? And they could say:

Well, it was Tallahassee Memorial Regional Hospital. And then they could check to see if an individual of that name had been treated for a gunshot wound based on the medical files.

Is verification of that type of survey result Q important?

A Yes.

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

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

Why? Q

Because there are strong a priori reasons to doubt the validity of what respondents are saying.

Does that apply to these particular respondents in particular or just is that a general rule and survey technique?

These respondents in particular.

Q And why is that?

A Because of the context -- well, because of the character of the respondents as well as the context. They are criminals, No. 1, and No. 2, you are interviewing them in a jail.

So what's your best guess as to how many firearm injuries there were in 2011?

We really don't know. We only have the medically treated injuries; and as I've said, I'm very dubious about the validity of those numbers.

So in many years, it's been on the order of

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

100,000 people who underwent medical treatment for nonfatal gunshot injuries. The true number is almost certainly larger than that, but nobody really knows.

We do, however, know that a great deal of nonfatal gunshot injuries do go uncounted in, for example, the NCVS. That's probably the strongest evidence we have that victims of nonfatal gunshot injuries don't report those injuries.

Although, in that case, it's not reporting to the census bureau in the NCVS. And we know that just from comparing the number that were treated medically and the number that you would come up with if you used strictly the NCVS data, and that shows the NCVS data are way too low. So people are not telling the census bureau about their non-fatal gunshot injuries.

So you have at the low end, the NCVS estimates, then you have kind of, in some middle range, the data based on that probability sample of emergency rooms on medically treated injuries, and then there's some higher number but we don't know how much higher, the true total number of nonfatal gunshot injuries, the bulk of which are probably criminals nonfatally shot, but who did not go to seek medical treatment for the obvious reason that it would result in a prison sentence.

Q	Doe	s the NCVS would you expect it to
incorpora	te noi	ncrime-related gunshot injuries?
Α	No.	I'm just talking about nonfatal injur

A No. I'm just talking about nonfatal injuries in connection with violent crime.

(Exhibit No. 3 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. GROVE:

 $\label{eq:Q} \textbf{ This is Exhibit 3. Have you seen this document before?}$ 

A Yes.

Q What is it?

A It's a report from the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics on trends in firearm violence from 1993 to 2011.

Q And does this -- how reliable would you say this source is?

A Highly reliable in connection with firearm homicides, less reliable when you're talking about nonfatal violence.

Q I'm interested -- earlier you said that criminals are frequently victims of crime themselves; am I restating that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Are criminals excluded from the NCVS?

A No. The only ones who couldn't be covered

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

would be those that are institutionalized.

Q Why doesn't the NCVS cover them?

A Well, in a way, they're covered in other census bureau surveys. They periodically do surveys of prison inmates, federal and state prison inmates.

But also, it's just a matter of it doesn't really fit into the sampling design because the sample they choose is housing units and which would be, for the most part, either apartments or stand-alone homes. And so they -- they're not very good at covering institutionalized individuals.

And it's partly also a matter of access. If you selected a probability sample of individual persons who are scattered across many different prisons and jails, it would entail getting permission from every single prison and jail administration in which those selected individuals were housed in order to do the survey.

So, instead, the census bureau does a separate survey entirely devoted to first sampling a representative sample of institutions, and then sampling individuals within those institutions.

Q If a criminal who is not in prison or jail is randomly selected for the NCVS survey, do you have any reason to believe that they wouldn't report being shot? A Yes.

Q Why is that?

A Well, I really already mentioned the basis for that. When you come up -- well, let me back up. Do we know specifically about whether that particular kind of individual underreports nonfatal victimization by gunshot, no.

But do we know that people in general responding to the NCVS underreport it, yes. And it's based on that data I discussed previously; that is, the NCVS-based estimates don't even come up with a number as large as the number we know were medically treated based on the emergency room data.

Q How far off the mark are they on that?

A I don't recall. It was substantial, but this is based on research done by Phillip Cook in the mid '80s, so I don't even know if any similar work has been repeated since.

But we do have reason to believe that criminals would underreport to the victimization surveyors more than other people, even. And the reason for that is, again, they don't really know what the follow-up questions might be.

And it's quite reasonable to suppose they'd have the same fears that jail inmates would, that the

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

follow-up questions might be: Well, what were the circumstances of this? And a criminal would hardly want to admit that they had gotten shot at attempting a robbery or, for that matter, he wouldn't even want to report the fact that one of his crack-smoking friends had shot him in the course of consuming crack cocaine.

Q So in terms of gunshot wounds, I think you said that the trend had generally, I think we started at 1983. You said it peaked around the early 90's and then tailed off to about where it is today; is that right?

A Almost, except there's been a slight decline continuing since 2000 but only a very mild decline.

13 (Exhibit No. 4 was marked for identification.)

THE WITNESS: And I'm sorry. Did that question concern firearms homicide or homicide in general about the trends?

BY MR. GROVE:

 $\label{eq:Q_def} Q \qquad \text{Actually, people being shot, whether it's fatal} \\$  or nonfatal.

A In that case, I'm not so sure because what I was telling you is the trends in homicide.

Q This is Exhibit 4. Have you seen this paper before?

A (Views document.)

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 is?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The title is "Trends in Nonfatal and Fatal Firearm-related Injuries in the United States, 1985 to 1995." So let's look at page 3 of that at the table.

You mean page 53?

The third page, yes. And the table is: Annual Estimates of Numbers and Percentages of Persons. I won't read the rest of it.

(Views document.)

And this is nonfatal firearm-related injuries treated in the U.S. hospital emergency departments.

So from June 1992 to May 1993, which is a vear-long period, there were an estimated 99,000 people treated for gunshot wounds in emergency departments; am I reading that right?

> Α Yes.

Q How big -- you mention that this estimate is likely higher than the NCVS estimate?

Yes.

Q How much bigger?

A I don't know.

Q And you mention that it's probably too low because it excludes some subset of people who treat themselves?

A Yes.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Do you have an estimate of how many people that Q

A No.

> Just a ballpark figure? Q

A

Q Do you know if anybody has done any work on that?

> Not that I know of. Α

So you don't know what percentage of people who Q are shot while committing crimes treat themselves?

No, only that I assume that it's a very large A share.

Would you agree that -- I mean, we see a dropoff in the third column of that table from June '94 to May '95 of looks like about 13 percent, from 101,000 to 80,000 -- 88,000. And that trend, as I understand it, has generally continued.

Do you know why gunshot violence has -- gun violence in general has declined over the last 15 vears?

MR. COLIN: Foundation, objection.

It's probably a mistake to think of it as a firearm-related thing because crime in general was going down over that same period. It peaked in the early '90s and then it was already declining by the mid '90s, which

is what that third column refers to.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

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

So this is mostly a reflection of things improving in whatever factors affect crime in general and not necessarily firearm specific. But as I say, it's a general pattern that firearms violence will go up more proportionally than violence in general when crime is going up, and it will go down proportionally more when violence is generally going down. And so these figures kind of illustrate that. BY MR. GROVE:

Do you think that the number of untreated gunshot wounds generally would track the data that we have from emergency departments?

Probably, yeah, because the motive to not report it would remain constant, basically criminals would still not want to go to prison and would still continue to perceive the going to prison as a consequence of seeking professional medical care.

Q So it's not every person that gets shot while committing a crime that treats themselves; right? I mean, some of them have to go to the hospital, I would

Certainly the ones that would see their injuries as life threatening if they were not professionally treated, would -- if they were physically

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

44

capable of making that choice, would very likely seek medical treatment.

And in other cases, they wouldn't have the choice because they would be, let's say, unconscious or otherwise incapacitated and others would make that decision on their behalf, dial 911, summon an ambulance and so forth.

Do you know if there are surveys on whether and under what circumstances someone perceives a wound to be life threatening?

Well, there's certainly studies by medical personnel of that. They have classification schemes like, you know, a six class categorization where they rate the seriousness of the injuries on up to, you know, critical or life threatening.

And so that's partly the basis for my assertion that most nonfatal gunshot injuries are not life threatening because even those that are treated by medical personnel, which presumably are more serious than the ones that were self treated, even most of those are not rated by professional medical personnel as life threatening.

Is that based on -- are those surveys based on the perception of the person who has been shot or the --

No, that's the professional medical judgment.

20

21

22

2

3

4

24

25

So a physician would presumably classify the injury on that categorization scheme.

- So you're not aware of any work, then, in which somebody has talked to gunshot victims and said: You were shot in the leg. How serious did you perceive that to be?
  - No, I'm not aware of any such study. THE WITNESS: Can I get another water. MR. COLIN: Sure, I'll get you one. (Brief recess was taken.)

### BY MR. GROVE:

- Have medical techniques for treating gunshot wounds improved over the last 30 years?
- No, no, or, at least, there's no affirmative evidence of it. There's been improvements in medical treatment of other kinds of injuries like blood trauma injuries and prior to the last 30 years, in fact, prior to, let's say, the early 1960s, there was affirmative evidence that there was medical improvement in the ability to treat gunshot wounds.

But what happened by that point, let's say, early '60s or so, medical treatment of gunshot wounds had gotten so effective that survival rates were approaching 100 percent, which basically meant there was a ceiling effect. You couldn't get any better.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

I mean, medical personnel were basically saving everybody who reached medical treatment. And so there wasn't any room for further improvement after that point.

- Generally speaking, are there any types of gun control laws, in your view, that would be effective in reducing gun violence?
  - Α Yes.
- Let's go through a few of those. Q So we know that, you know, Heller v. District of Columbia, I'm sure you're familiar with that case; right?
- That took a ban on handguns completely off the table. So I won't even go there. That's not a possibility. But there is a history of banning certain types of guns at both the state and federal level. So let's talk about a couple of those.

In your view, would a ban on assault weapons, however that's defined, be effective in reducing gun violence?

- A No.
- Q Why not?
- A Two reasons: First of all, only a very, very tiny share of violence is committed with those kinds of

weapons.

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

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

Let me stop you right there. What do mean by tiny?

Well, probably on the order of 1 or 2 percent of violent crimes are committed with assault weapons.

Why so few?

I think criminals find them to be unsuitable A for their purposes because they tend to be larger and less concealable. That's one likely reason.

Another reason is they tend to be more expensive. And so since criminals are -- or violent criminals are predominantly low income, that's an issue too.

- Any other reasons that an assault weapon ban would not, in your view, be effective?
- The underlying premise or the rationale for banning them are generally wrong.

For example, it's described -- some advocates, anyway, will describe assault weapons as especially lethal; although, they are somewhat vague as what exactly they mean by that.

But I think experts in the area usually think of lethality as the likelihood that a given round fired from such a weapon would result in a death. And the bulk of assault weapons tend to be either no larger in

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

48

caliber or smaller in caliber than their non-assault weapon counterparts.

So, for example, assault rifles, so-called, will have smaller calibers, like .223, while hunting weapons that are left unbanned will have larger calibers and bigger bullets produce bigger holes in the victims and they're more lethal.

Or it's argued that assault weapons fire more rapidly; although, usually there isn't any distinction between a banned semiautomatic weapon and an unbanned semiautomatic weapon. But even the distinction between semiautomatic and, let's say, revolvers turns out to be inconsequential in crime simply because shooters never make use of the full capabilities of that rapid fire.

So semiautomatic weapons might be slightly faster firing than their non-assault weapon counterparts, but no criminal actually makes use of that higher rate of fire.

Even in mass shootings where large numbers of rounds are fired, the information we have on how many shots were fired in how long a time period indicate that shooters never fire guns at a rate higher than could be maintained by an ordinary six-shot revolver, including reloading time.

What studies are you referring to when you say

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

that?

2

1

15

24

25

16 17 18

15

19 20

21

22

23 24 25

Α Well, everything I've written on assault weapons, for starters. As to rate of fire, I've determined that myself.

I've fired revolvers as fast as I could, and I've fired semiautomatic pistols as fast as I could and an audio timer was used to nail down exactly how fast they fired.

And there are firearms reference works which will mention people firing six rounds from a revolver by people who have really practiced at it in under one second. I've never been able to do that, but you can do it -- I'm not an especially skilled shooter -- you can do it in two seconds.

So, you know, you can fire a revolver at a faster rate than has been known to ever been used in any mass shooting -- any gun that has been used in a mass shooting.

- So in your view, a mass shooter with a revolver would be just as effective as a mass shooter with an assault weapon?
- In almost all cases, except in the cases where he doesn't have another gun which is also loaded and there's somebody present who is willing to intervene to tackle the shooter and, therefore, stop his shooting,

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

50

then it would make a difference. And that kind of scenario is extraordinarily rare.

As I say, I discovered one such case in the earlier study that was published in Targeting Guns of that ten-year period; and there was one case in my updated study that covered the period since then so.

- What about victims escaping, is that likely to Q save lives?
- Well, I'm not sure how much of a difference it would make as to whether the person had an assault weapon with regard to that, but yes, victims escaping, obviously, would result in fewer deaths.
- I mean, say a shooter walks in with -- doesn't matter what sort of gun, a gun that has 50 rounds in it, in one magazine without reloading, versus a shooter that walks in with a revolver.

All things being equal, which scenario is going to have more people shot?

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

Which pair of scenarios are you comparing? You only mentioned one.

BY MR. GROVE:

- Fifty-round magazine versus revolver. Q
- A Versus a revolver. Okav.

I don't know. I don't have any empirical

foundation for that because usually we don't have any information about people escaping from the scene. We have information on how many people ended up getting shot, but we don't have any information on how many were present and could have been shot but weren't. So there's really no way to tell.

Q So it's your testimony that if a mass shooter walks into a room with 100 people with a revolver and another mass shooter walks into the same room of 100 people with a gun that has a 50-round magazine that you wouldn't be able to tell -- you wouldn't have a prediction as to which incident would result in more people being shot?

I'd only make a prediction with regard to the situation where there was somebody present willing to tackle them while they tried to reload. And then, of course, there would be fewer dead in the scenario where the shooter had only a six-shot revolver.

In any other scenario, which would cover virtually all the cases of which I'm aware, it wouldn't make any difference because the individual would be free to reload. And in mass shootings, we know they either do actually reload or there was nothing to stop them from doing that.

And you don't think people would run away?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Yes, in both cases people could and would, if it was possible to do so, if they weren't panicked and paralyzed by fear, yes, indeed. Indeed, there's, at least, anecdotal evidence that some people do precisely that. The question, though, is whether it would be any different between the two scenarios you've laid out.

Q How long does it take to empty, say, a 50-round magazine?

If somebody would actually fire at the full capability of a semiautomatic weapon, they could probably do it in -- I don't know, with some practice, they could probably do it in 25 seconds.

How long would it take to shoot 50 bullets from a six-shot revolver? Let's assume you have a speed loader.

Yeah, unfortunately, I didn't come prepared to answer that kind of question. Once upon a time, I would have been able to give you a very precise answer because there are firearms competitions in which people do that.

I mean, they are timed as to how fast they can go through a particular course of fire, which may involve something like two dozen rounds or whatever. So I couldn't really tell you. I could tell you that you could fire the initial six easily in two seconds and then the reloading would take a couple of seconds

25

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

with a speed loader.

But as to exactly how many, I wouldn't be able to tell.

Q Would it take longer than the 25 seconds you cited earlier?

- I don't know. Α
- Do mass shooters typically -- do they take part 0 in shooting competitions?

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

A I don't know.

BY MR. GROVE:

Do they train in quickly changing magazines? MR. COLIN: Speculation and foundation.

I don't know.

BY MR. GROVE:

- Q Have you done any research on that?
- A
- Okay. We were talking about gun control Q measures that might or might not be effective. So we're talking about types of guns and in particular guns that, at least, some people perceive to be more popularly used in crime.

Have you heard the term "Saturday night special"?

A Yes.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

54

- What's a Saturday night special? Q
- A It's a cheap, small-sized handgun.
- Is it a revolver, a pistol? Does it matter? Q
- A Could be either.
- What capacity does a -- I'm just going to call Q this NS -- SNS; is that okay?
  - Sure. A
- 0 What capacity does a revolver that's an SNS typically have?
  - A Six.
  - Q What about a pistol?
- A Could -- it's a function not of the pistol per se but the size of the magazine. And usually there are magazines that range anywhere from six rounds on up to 32 rounds and with particularly unusual weapons, even larger than that.
- Does a -- are you aware of any Saturday night specials that have a capacity of less than six rounds? I'm sorry. Let me withdraw that.

Obviously, revolvers might have a five or six round capacity; right?

- Yes.
- So what about semiautomatics, what's the 0 smallest magazine size that come --
  - Semiautomatics that are Saturday night

would probably be around the smallest. So the average of a semiautomatic, whether it's

specials? I really don't know. I mean, I'm guessing six

- a Saturday night special or something else, is going to be larger than six rounds?
  - Yes, yes, definitely.
- Do any states -- I want to say Maryland does -but that would be answering the question for you, have any states tried to ban Saturday night specials?
- Yes, Maryland has, but other states have as well. Something like a half dozen; although, I couldn't name them right now.
  - Have those bans been effective? Q
  - No. A

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

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

- Q Why not, in your view?
- Α Well, the principal reason is that they leave a very large number of other alternative weapons including most brands of handgun still available and so that there's no difficulty in offender simply using a different type of handgun.

And whatever benefits there might have been from keeping at least a few criminals from having those handguns are canceled out by the fact that if you've eliminated the least lethal types of handguns, which is what Saturday night specials are, almost by definition,

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

56

any substitute weapon would have to be more lethal.

So it's either a larger caliber handgun or, worse still, a long gun, like a sawed-off shotgun. So, in effect, any benefits there might be are canceled out by substitution of more lethal firearms.

- Why are Saturday night specials less lethal?
- First of all, they're small caliber. Small size tends to go along with small caliber so that the bullets they fire punch smaller holes in the targets, in human beings that are injured.

Secondly, they tend to have shorter barrels, and shorter barrels make the firearms less accurate so that the shooter is less likely to hit the target in the first place.

And third, Saturday night specials, by being cheap, they also tend to be less reliable. They're not all unreliable. Some are actually surprisingly reliable; but on average, cheap means less reliable, which means if it's -- if the shooter pulls the trigger, it's less likely to actually discharge as designed. And so no injury can occur if the gun didn't discharge in the first place.

That reminds me, I meant to go back to this. You mentioned earlier that assault weapons typically use .223; is that right?

14

1

2

15 16 17

13

14

18 19

20 21 22

24

25

23

Α

That's one very common caliber certainly. And that's a -- and Saturday night specials, is

Q a .22 often used in those?

They're not usually defined by caliber; but on average, any gun that's smaller tends to be also smaller in caliber. So the most common small calibers would be .22, .25 and .32. All of those would be regarded as relatively low caliber.

So .223 ammunition that assault weapons use, that's on the small end of ammunition; right?

A

Q So does bullet velocity have anything to do with lethality of rounds?

Up to a point, only up to a point. It's a curvilinear relationship; that is, as muzzle velocity goes up, up to roughly the sound of -- the speed of sound, which is around 1,100 feet per second, greater muzzle velocity means greater penetration of the round so that the wound cavity is longer so that a round is more likely to go all the way through the victim's body, creating a longer wound cavity.

But after that point, additional muzzle velocity actually doesn't produce a larger wound cavity because the bullet travels so fast, it doesn't have time to deform or expand out, which means the wound

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

58

cavity is narrower.

And so it turns out that the most lethal velocities are kind of middle velocities because the bullet has time to expand so it creates a wider cavity, wound cavity. And also, it goes completely through the victim as if there's no obstruction, like bone or extremely heavy clothing.

Have you heard of the concept of cavitation? Q

Α

Q What is that? What is cavitation?

Well, actually, back up. No, I should say no, A I don't know. I'm not confident enough to answer that.

Okay. How about -- let me go back to gun control measures that might or might not have an effect.

How about limiting the number of guns that any one individual can purchase?

I don't think we have any empirical evidence on that, so all I could give you is a guess, really. I can't give you an empirically based assessment.

Well, let me give you a more concrete example.

I know that -- I don't know if there are any laws in effect that do this. But I know that one proposal I've seen is limiting people to buying one gun per month or one gun per year.

Do you know if -- are there any laws like

that that are in effect?

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Are they effective or do you think they would 0 be likely to be effective?

I don't recall the research on the subject.

I mean, my inclination is to say no because they seem to be based on the rationale that it's traffickers or traffickers' representatives who are buying these multiple guns.

But the indirectly relevant research -- not a direct test of the laws per se -- but the indirectly relevant evidence concerns whether or not guns purchased in a multiple handgun incident are more likely to later on be recovered by police in connection with a crime.

So that seems to be the underlying premise, that multiple purchases are likely to be purchases by traffickers or their confederates, like straw purchases and, therefore, more likely to be later on transferred to criminals who would use them in crime. And that's not supported by the evidence.

They're, in fact, no more likely to be end up being recovered by the police than handguns that are purchased one at a time.

Do you think that putting in place tougher

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

60

criminal penalties for violating gun laws would be

effective?

A No.

Q Why not? Because my research indicates it has no impact, and a broader array of research concerning other kinds of laws indicates that adding additional penalties, making penalties more severe, has no impact on crime.

And what research have you done on that?

A The Kleck and Patterson article I cited before.

That's 1993? Q

Yes. But I'd also base it on many studies done A by others that were reviewed in Targeting Guns.

And Targeting Guns is your 1997 book?

Yes. Α

What about shifting the focus from specific types of guns and the penalties and things like that to who can possess them.

If a law could make it more difficult for high-risk individuals to acquire firearms, is that likely to reduce gun violence?

A Yes.

> Q Where do criminals typically get their guns?

There are three common sources: They either purchase them from people, individuals they know, family,

Let's go back to Exhibit 3. And that's Firearm Violence, 1993 to 2011. On page 13, let's look at Table 14.

- (Views document.)
- Q Take a look at that, and tell me when you've digested it.
  - A Yes.

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

- Q So as I read this table, it says that about 80 percent of state prison inmates in both 1997 to 2004, which are the two snapshots of this survey, did not buy the gun from a source that would have required a background check; is that right?
  - A Yes.
- Q And is -- are those dated, to your knowledge,
- accurate? A On that point, I believe they are. Not to the exact percentage point, necessarily, but certainly they're accurate with respect to the main point that most guns acquired by criminals would not be purchased from the kind of place

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

1	that would require a background check.
2	(Exhibit No. 5 was marked for
3	identification.)
4	BY MR. GROVE:
5	Q This is Exhibit 5.
6	A (Views document.)
7	Q I've printed this out from the Internet so the
8	format may be a bit different than what you've seen
9	before, but do you recognize this article?
10	A I do.
11	Q And are you the Gary Kleck that wrote it?
12	A I am. It's an outstanding article, wonderful.
13	Q Let's look at page 15
14	A (Views document.)
15	Q under the subheading "How Do Criminals
16	Acquire Guns?" And in the last paragraph of that, you
17	rely on a study by James Wright and Peter Rossi,
18	R-O-S-S-I, that concluded that, quote: Criminals acquire
19	their guns predominantly through private secondhand
20	transfers.
21	I know this article was written in 1986.
22	Have things changed since then?
23	A Not to my knowledge.
24	Q Would it be fair to say that most criminal gun
25	acquisitions fall outside of federal background check

1	requirements?	63		
2	A Yes.			
3	Q And those federal requirements are s	et forth by		
4	the Brady Act; is that right?			
5	A Yes.			
6	Q When was Brady passed?			
7	A 1993, and I think the effective date wa	as early		
8	'94.			
9	Q Would it be fair to say that the Brady	Act is		
10	an example of an effort to prohibit prevent pro	hibited		
11	persons from acquiring firearms?			
12	A Yes.			
13	Q How did Brady change the law surro	unding		
14	firearm acquisition?			
15	A Well, it made it a national requirement	nt that a		
16	person had to go through a background check, w	vhereas		
17	previously there was no such federal requiremen	ıt.		
18	Individual states had those kinds of requirement	s, but		
19	many of them did not.			
20	Q Was there a central for the states th	nat had		
21	those requirements, was there a centralized data	base that		
22	they checked?			
23	A Yes. They could check with an FBI d	atabase or		
24	they could check with some state version of that.			

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

So that was -- the FBI database, was that a

25

		64			
1	precursor to NICS?				
2	A Yes well, yes, I guess.				
3	Q Did that become more formalized with Brady?				
4	A I don't know what that means.				
5	Q Did it get better after Brady? Did NICS becom	e			
6	more comprehensive?				
7	A I wouldn't be qualified to say.				
8	Q Does Brady apply to private transfers of guns?				
9	A No.				
10	Q In your opinion, would it be complicated or				
11	unfeasible to infeasible to extend a background check				
12	requirement like Brady to cover private transfers of				
13	guns?				
14	A There would be difficulties, yes.				
15	Q What would those difficulties be?				
16	A Well, one difficulty would be that you'd have				
17	to arrange it so that it was a practical matter for				
18	people to get the background check done.				
19	So you would have to have something that made	e			
20	firearms dealers willing to do this background check,				
21	for example, offering them the opportunity to have				
22	fairly generous brokerage fees for performing that				
23	service.				
24	So, you know, if people wanted to acquire a				
25	gun and they had to go through the background check for				

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

68

6

16

12

19 20 21

18

22 23

24

25

a private transfer, they would have to be able to find a willing gun dealer who would do the background check or some other source.

Let's flip to page 17 of this article, which is -- we're still on Exhibit 5.

And then the last paragraph of this that starts with: And states which have permits to purchase.

You wrote that: Undoubtedly many private persons under a private transfer scheme would still illegally transfer guns directly to ineligible persons either because they owned so few assets that they would stand to lose very little if sued or because they did not think that the gun could be traced back to them if it were subsequently involved in an injury or damage.

Do you still agree with that statement?

- A
- And then the next sentence says: Nevertheless, even partial compliance could reduce the availability of guns to criminals enough to justify the costs of the added caseload in civil courts and the additional inconvenience to dealers and private sellers of guns; do you think that's still accurate?
  - Yes. A
  - Q And you laid out a sort of a proposal, I guess,

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

66

might be the best way to say this, for how this would work. And I think it's the Kennedy-Rodino, R-O-D-I-N-O, approach.

How would that work, in general?

A For private -- for background checks on private transfers?

Well, broadly speaking, the prospective buyer and seller would go to a willing licensed firearm dealer, federal firearms licensee, who, of course, is capable of performing background checks. But in this case, they would perform the background check on behalf of these two individuals, the prospective buyer and seller.

And if the background check was clear, if there was no indication that the prospective recipient was unqualified, then the transfer would go through. And the dealer would be entitled to charge some modest brokerage fee in order to -- you know, for his trouble. And if, of course, it was denied, then the sale -- the transfer would be illegal if he, the prospective recipient, didn't pass the background check.

- What sort of modest brokerage fee would be reasonable?
- A Well, I didn't really get into it at the time, you know. It would really have to be determined by the

perceptions of licensed gun dealers as to what's worth their time and trouble and any other difficulties they might face.

For example, at the time, I had not really considered issues of liability for the dealer, you know. If something went wrong and there was a failure of the background check, would he in any way be liable? It was an issue I hadn't even addressed at that time. I don't really know if it was then or is now an issue but certainly it's been discussed.

- If something goes wrong under Brady with a background check, does the dealer have liability?
  - I don't know. I'm not qualified to say.
- Are you aware of any dealer, as you sit here today, who has ever been held liable, in some fashion, for a problem with a background check that he performed under Brady?
  - No, I'm not aware of any such case. A
- In your view, would it be realistic to expect universal compliance with a private background check requirement?
  - It would be very unreasonable to expect.
- Would it be realistic to expect that no one would comply with a background check?
  - That would be also unrealistic. There would be

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

some compliance.

2 Would implementation of a universal background 3 check, in your view, make it more difficult for some 4 prohibited individuals to acquire firearms?

A

In 2012, you published an article in the Fordham Urban Law Journal; correct?

A

And I don't have that one printed out, but I Q was reading it last night. It's a good article.

Thank you.

In that article, you said that -- and this is a quote -- since background checks on dealer transfers appear to be beneficial, extending them to cover private transfers of guns is a reasonable next step; do you still believe that to be true?

A Yes.

I understand it's not the focus of your expert report in this case, but I think you mentioned that you hadn't reviewed Colorado's background check provision; you have or haven't?

If I did, I've forgotten it. So I'm not qualified today to speak on it.

> Okay. Then I won't ask any questions about it. I will ask you this: If it generally

A That would be a problem. It would call for additional measures that I hadn't anticipated in 1986.

Is there a problem under the federal law in getting FFLs to participate in the background check system?

> MR. COLIN: Form. I'm not aware of any. MR. COLIN: Private transfers or in general? MR. GROVE: No, under Brady. Under the federal law.

BY MR. GROVE:

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

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

Q You're not aware of any?

A (Witness shakes head.)

Is it sort of a condition of participation as Q an FFL that you do that?

I don't know. I would have guessed yes, but I

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

70

69

don't know for sure.

Let's go back to Exhibit 1, which is your 0 report.

> A (Views document.)

Is this the only report you've written in this Q particular case?

Well, I wrote an earlier version of this same report, which didn't have that additional eight mass shootings. But other than that, the previous report was the same.

And you wrote a rebuttal report after this; Q right?

A Yes. I think it was a rebuttal to a guy name Zacks.

Let's talk about -- we'll talk about that later. So let's focus on Exhibit 1 for now.

Were there any prior drafts of this report, aside from the one that I know about?

Nothing that was submitted to the attorneys. I mean, I obviously worked on it incrementally so, in that sense, there were earlier drafts. But there's just the two versions that I submitted to the attorneys.

Aside from the attorneys, did you submit the draft form of this report to anyone else?

No. Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Q And did any of your -- the opinions and conclusions expressed in Exhibit 1 change from the early versions to what we see as the final product now?

Α

So you're welcome to look at the report as you answer this question, but what are your conclusions?

(Views document.)

The overall conclusion was that Colorado's ban on large capacity magazines would be more likely to harm the safety of Colorado citizens than to improve

I'm going to make you go through each one of these. So maybe we should just do that one by one. That would be the easiest way.

So on page 3, what is your first conclusion?

17 (Views document.) A

> And actually let me back up just a second. Do you have any expert opinions in this case that are not encompassed in this report?

I'm not sure I understand the question. I mean, I thought by definition, my only expert opinions were the ones in this report. Is there some other legal meaning to this that I'm not picking up on?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Q No.

Okay. This is it. A

Q Okay.

> That's -- they're all in the report. A

I just wanted to make sure of that.

What we try to do in depositions is make sure there's not a freight train coming from the side that we don't see.

> A Okay.

So the first opinion is at page 3, and it is No. 1. And it says: Criminals rarely fire very large numbers of rounds in any given crime incident.

Why does that matter?

Because the larger the number of rounds that are fired, the more likely it is that a large capacity magazine would influence the number of people killed or injured.

Whereas if somebody is only going to fire one or two rounds, they could have fired that with or without a large capacity magazine. And usually offenders don't even fire as many rounds as you could have in an old-fashioned six-shot revolver, nevermind fire dozens of rounds.

Would you say that the chances of injury are related in any way to the number of rounds that are

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

72.

71

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

10

11 12 13

14 15 16

17

22 23

24 25

12

13

It's a complex relationship.

It's -- if somebody is fire -- if the reason why somebody is firing a large number of rounds is because they're firing very rapidly, the rapidity of firing reduces the likelihood they'll hit the target that they're aiming at.

On the other hand, if they're carefully aiming at individual targets, taking their time and shooting large numbers of rounds, then the large number of rounds will lead to more people being hurt.

- Generally speaking, if someone was shooting at you, would you rather that they shoot two bullets or ten?
  - A
- Q And is that because you're less likely to be hit by two than ten?
- If the shooter continues trying to make an attempt to shoot me, he's more likely to eventually succeed with larger numbers of attempts.
  - This cites a Reedy and Koper study from 2003. (Exhibit No. 6 was marked for identification.)
  - (Views document.) Α
- BY MR. GROVE:
  - Q Is this the study that you cited?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

74

A

Q Let's discuss some of the findings in that study.

First, I think you testified earlier that, on average, semiautomatics hold more cartridges than a revolver; is that right?

- A Yes.
- And tell me if I'm wrong, but I think the point that you're making in opinion 1 of your expert report is that limiting magazine capacity won't advance public safety when it comes to criminal shootings because criminals don't fire that many shots to begin with; is that right?
- Well, I'm making a much narrower point that merely says that it's unusual that criminals fire large numbers of rounds. It still, at that point, remains possible that there could be some improvement in public safety nevertheless; but point No. 1 just establishes that criminals rarely fire more than a handful of rounds.
- So one of the findings that Koper made in this article that he reported are that more shots are fired during assaults with semiautomatics than during assaults that use revolvers; do you agree that that's one of the findings?
  - Yeah, it's marginally higher but still low and

that's the point. There's no important difference between, let's say, three rounds being fired and two rounds being fired if you're talking about banning magazines that hold more than 15 rounds because, obviously, with either a revolver or a semiautomatic pistol with or without a large capacity magazine, under that definition, the criminals could have fired all the rounds they fired.

So the fact that those using semiautomatic pistols fired more rounds, it's not a reflection of magazine capacity because neither the revolver shooters nor the semiautomatic pistol shooters came anywhere near using the full capacity of their respective weapons.

Instead presumably, it was a matter of their intentions or circumstances. They wanted to shoot more rounds or circumstances called for shooting more rounds, and that happened to be the case more frequently with semiautomatic pistols than with those using revolvers.

- Would you agree that there's a correlation here between magazine size and the number of shots fired in a particular incident?
  - Yes. A
  - Q And what is that correlation?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

It's a positive correlation -- well, depending

on how you coded semiautomatic. If semiautomatic is the larger -- gets the larger value, then it would be a

positive correlation.

And let's look at Table 1, which is on Q page 154.

Let's look at the minimum estimates, for example, which the first left-hand column is in that table. There are very few incidents, would you agree, in which someone who was firing with a revolver fired more than the capacity of a revolver?

(Views document.)

And would you agree that there are more incidents -- nevermind. So I withdraw that question.

Koper also found that -- in this study that more victims are wounded during assaults with semiautomatics than during assaults that use revolvers; do you agree with that?

Well, first of all, do you agree that he found that?

- A Could you repeat the question, please?
- Koper found that more victims, more victims are wounded during assaults with semiautomatics than during assaults with revolvers?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

A	Yes.	There	was	a slight	difference	of	1.15
ersus 1.0	for re	volvers	i.				

- Q And that's in Table 2; correct?
- A Correct.
- Q And do you have any basis to question that finding?
- A No, as a bare statistical finding, I don't have any reason to doubt it.
- Q What about as a non -- what do you mean by as a bare statistical finding?
- A Well, the interpretation that some people would be likely to make would be that it was because a semiautomatic pistol was involved that there were more victims wounded than in revolver cases; whereas, it could, in fact, be that the intentions of the shooter were what determined the number of victims shot and that those who are planning on shooting more victims or anticipate the possibility of that happening would choose a semiautomatic pistol over a revolver.

So it wasn't the weapon that mattered; it was the shooter's intentions or circumstances that mattered.

Q If I intended to shoot more people, why would I choose a semiautomatic than a revolver -- over a revolver, excuse me.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

- A Because you would be able to shoot more rounds without reloading.
- Q Koper also found that, in this study, more pistol victims received multiple wounds than revolver victims; do you have any basis to disagree with that finding?
  - A Could you repeat that one as well?
- Q Yeah, this one is a little bit more nuanced. It's at page 153 in the right-hand column, third full paragraph just above "discussion."
  - A (Views document.)
  - Q Did you have a chance to read that paragraph?
  - A You were going to rephrase the question.
- Q I'm sorry. I was giving you a chance to read the paragraph.

Did you read it and do you understand what it says?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So about halfway through that paragraph, Koper says: Although a higher percentage of pistol victims sustain multiple wounds -- and then in parentheses, it says: 24.3 percent to 20 percent for pistol and revolver victims respectively -- the average number of wounds for pistol victim was actually lower than that for revolver victims.

So my question is, as I read this: Koper found that a pistol victim was more likely to receive multiple wounds than a revolver victim.

A (Views document.)

That's true. Even though the average was lower for pistol cases, the percent who got two or more wounds was higher for pistols.

- Q Right. I'm guessing there must have been a couple big outliers for revolvers or something. But --
- A You can see all the data in Table 2. Let's see. Number of wounds is -- there's only one that's seven in the revolver case; one that's six in the pistol case. So really it's not a matter of outliers.

So they don't list anywhere, you know, somebody got 14 wounds or ten or whatever. There really aren't any outliers. There's always got to be a maximum, of course, but there are no outliers.

- Q Would you agree that, in general, the more times a victim is shot the less likely his chances of survival?
- A Other things being equal, that's probably true.

  But often if the reason why somebody got shot multiple times was because the shooter was firing more rapidly and, therefore, less accurately, it's possible that the multiple wounds would be in less vulnerable

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

areas, less vital areas of the body as a result of the inaccurate shooting produced by rapid firing.

But other things being equal, let's say, you had two wounds in vital areas versus one wound in a vital area, yes, the victim would be more likely to die in that scenario, with two wounds rather than one.

Q I think we're on 6.

MR. COLIN: Seven.

MR. GROVE: Seven?

(Exhibit No. 7 was marked for

11 identification.)

12 BY MR. GROVE:

 $\boldsymbol{Q}$  — This is a study from the Journal of Trauma titled "The Case for Enhanced Data Collection of Gun Type."

MR. COLIN: Extra copy.

MR. GROVE: Didn't I give you one?

MR. COLIN: Not yet. I can share his. It's all right.

MR. GROVE: Did I give you two?

21 THE COURT REPORTER: I don't think so.

MR. GROVE: Okay. Sorry.

23 BY MR. GROVE:

Q Have you seen this study before?

A No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'll represent to you that they did something fairly similar to the Reedy and Koper study in 2003. This study analyzed -- actually, do you want to take a couple minutes to skim through this?

Yes.

(Views document.)

MR. GROVE: Can we go off.

(Brief recess was taken.)

BY MR. GROVE:

Did you have a chance to review Exhibit 7? Q

A Yes, very briefly.

Q Would you agree that this study attempted to do something fairly similar to what Reedy and Koper did?

And it analyzed about 400-odd homicide victims Q and the guns that killed them; right?

And it found that the use of a pistol by the Q shooter resulted in more entry wounds than when a revolver was used?

> A Yes.

Q Let's look at page 1358, which is the third page of the exhibit.

Figure 1 shows that they're about 4 1/2 mean wounds inflicted by pistols and about two wounds on

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

82

average inflicted by revolvers on these homicide victims; correct?

> A Yes.

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

In fact, on page 4, which I think is page 1359, Q actually, if you look at the first full paragraph, it says: Pistols were associated with more than twice as many wounds per gun than revolvers and largely accounted for the differences found between handguns and long guns.

And the next sentence -- well, first of all, do you have any reason to dispute that statement?

With respect to this particular sample, yeah, that's -- as far as I can tell, that's accurate.

Are you aware of any other studies or any other research that you've done that would refute that statement?

A Well, yeah, the Koper study, the Reedy and Koper study.

This was a larger sample size than Reedy and Koper; correct?

Yeah, but the sample size really isn't the issue. The issue is the nature of the sample. This other study done by whoever, Richmond et al., it's a study only of homicide.

So it's kind of a censored sample of violent incidents, which means you only get the ones that ended

up with the worst possible outcome, which is homicide; whereas, the Koper study was better because it kind of studied the whole violent process from being in a crime incident, an assault incident, getting shot and then whether the gunshot wound results in death.

And so some of the differences in the studies, I think, are attributable to that. And it's the nature of the sample. And some of it is attributable to just local differences; although, they don't specify where this study was done, where the Richmond et al. study was done.

And then the next sentence after the one that I just read said: Pistols also had the strongest association between wounds per gun and the number of body regions injured; do you have any reason to dispute that statement?

A Well, I don't understand the statement, so I can't really dispute it. I don't really know what that means.

Q Fair enough. It's not the best sentence I've ever seen.

It sounds like it's virtually a tautology as far as I can tell. That sentence doesn't compare pistols with revolvers or any pair of gun type, but it's saying -- I guess it's saying that when somebody is

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

1

wounded multiple times, they're likely to be wounded in multiple places, which is probably true, kind of trivial but probably true, I assume.

And the point of this study, to me, seems to be in the last two sentences of this, it says: These findings suggest the extent of wounding from pistols is significantly different from that of other gun types and that pistol wounds may thus present distinct clinical challenges which require treating physicians to do different things.

I suppose that wasn't really a question. It was just a statement.

Going on from there, though, it does say that -- at the beginning of the next paragraph, it says: One reason pistols produce more wounds per gun than revolvers may be because the magazine capacity of pistols typically exceeds the number of chambers in most revolvers, often allowing more shots to be fired; do you disagree with that statement?

Well, given that it's stated as a speculation, it's certainly one reasonable speculation among others.

So it would be reasonable to conclude that that's true?

> That the speculation is true? A Let me state what I think and you can tell me

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

It may, as I previously said, simply be a reflection of the fact that people who are either intending to or willing to inflict more wounds are also the people who select pistols. And they would have fired just as many rounds and inflicted just as many wounds, even if they had a revolver, because it was their intentions that were different.

- Q Would you agree in this study that there was a correlation, correlation between gun capacity and the number of wounds inflicted?
  - A Well, between pistols versus revolvers, yes.
- Q And so, in general, guns that had higher capacity inflicted more wounds?
- A Well, strictly speaking, I don't think they broke it down that way. I don't think they ever showed number of rounds by capacity. They only made the distinction between revolvers and pistols unless I missed something.
  - Q That's accurate.

But I thought that we'd established earlier that, on average, pistols have higher capacities than revolvers.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

A Yeah, on average, but the problem is, in some cases, these pistols had small magazine capacities that were no larger than revolvers and, of course, some revolvers have capacities up to eight or nine rounds. And so you can't just tell by these data alone whether that statement you just made is correct.

All you can say is: Pistols, on average, produce more wounds than revolvers. And, on average, pistols have larger magazine capacities than revolvers. But you can't conclude what you stated, which is that

Q How common are revolvers that hold eight or nine rounds?

- A I don't know.
- Q Have you ever seen one?
- A Yes
- Q Have you ever seen one used in a crime?
- A No. That doesn't mean they don't occur. I just have never seen one.
  - Q Are they more collector's items?
  - A I have no idea. I don't know.
- $\label{eq:Q} \mbox{ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \ \ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \ \ \ } \mbox{ \ \ \$
- A A revolver with eight or nine rounds? Trace data wouldn't tell you that one way or the another.

Q It wouldn't tell what type of gun is being traced?

A It would tell you whether it's a revolver. It wouldn't tell you whether it's an eight-round revolver or a nine-round revolver or any other number of rounds.

Q I just asked because I had no idea that such weapons existed. I thought the capacity was typically six.

- A It is most commonly six.
- Q So you don't have a guess as to the percentage of revolvers that hold more than six rounds that are in current circulation?
  - A No.

- Q But we're still sticking with -- you still agree that the mean capacity of a pistol exceeds the mean capacity of a revolver?
  - A Yes.
- Q But you think this sample size of 400 deaths would not be large enough to demonstrate that; you don't think it necessarily would be consistent with that?
- A No, the problem isn't sample size. Sample size is a trivial issue. It's the character of the sample, the fact that it was limited just to the incidents that had a particular outcome, in this case, that resulted in the death of the victim, whereas you had a broader array

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

of incidents covered in the Koper study, covering both

fatal and nonfatal assaults.

Q I guess I'm not clear how outcome would make a difference when you're talking about -- when you're talking about the results, at least with respect to the size of the capacity of the gun that was used to inflict the wounds.

Can you clarify that?

A Well, I can only note the contrast in findings between these two studies, and that's the biggest thing that distinguishes the two studies. They come to different conclusions, and one study involved homicides only. And the other involved the full array of violent assaults, gunshot assault.

Q Let's move on to the second conclusion.

MR. COLIN: I'm sorry, this second conclusion or in this document?

MR. GROVE: We're back to Exhibit 1. MR. COLIN: Okay, thank you.

20 BY MR. GROVE:

Q So as I read this, you say that -- let's unpack this because there's several things.

First of all, you say -- you reference:

Extremely rare mass shootings in which large numbers of victims are shot.

10 11 12

18

25

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

3

Well, I was able to identify a grand total of 58 cases over a 20-year period. So that's roughly three shootings per year. And the number of both fatal and nonfatal assaults in each year is certainly in the tens of thousands, so it's certainly well under 1 percent. It's probably under 1,000. So extremely rare in this case would mean less than 1,000.

What do you mean by large numbers of victims?

What do you mean by extremely rare, first of

I defined it as more than six killed or wounded A for the purposes of this particular study because I was interested in the issue of large capacity magazines and the consequences their use had for how many people got killed or injured.

And my reasoning was that this would be a set of shootings in which it was especially likely that large capacity magazines would make a difference if they ever made a difference.

And then after the comment, it says: The shooters virtually never needed large capacity magazines to injure or kill as many victims as they did.

How do you infer what particular mass shooters needed?

Well, because if you had multiple guns that

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

allowed you to continue firing without reloading, then it means that there's no opportunity for anyone to intervene and stop them from firing.

The same is true of having multiple magazines except then there's perhaps a two-second interval where the shooter would have to drop an expended magazine and insert a new one in a semiautomatic weapon, again, providing virtually no opportunity for someone to intervene.

Because, of course, if no one intervenes, then there's nothing to stop the shooter from continuing to shoot as long as they want to. Or in other cases, we know they didn't need a large capacity magazine simply because they could, instead, reload. And we know they could reload because they, in fact, did reload.

So, in some of these incidents, we know they didn't need the large capacity magazine because they had multiple guns and others because they had multiple magazines and other cases because regardless of whether they had multiple guns or multiple magazines, they did, in fact, reload.

So that boils it down to basically cases where they might have needed large capacity magazines to hurt as many people as they did because they had

neither multiple guns nor multiple magazines. And there's no indication that they had opportunity to reload.

So what these mass shooters needed, you based that on your view of the newspaper articles?

That's the information I based my judgments on.

91

Did you interview any of the mass shooters? Q

A

Q Did you interview any of the investigators?

A

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Q Did you interview victims?

No. Α

> Q Witnesses?

A

Q Did you review any police reports?

16 Α In a couple of cases, yes.

> Q Which ones?

Let's see.

For the earlier study -- well, actually, I wouldn't be prepared to tell you now because it's been a long time. But I think I reviewed a couple of police reports just because they happened to be available.

But it really didn't have any significant impact on the conclusions because I was almost invariably relying entirely on media accounts.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Did the materials you review say anything about

the physical layout of the location where the shooting

happened?

A In some cases, yes. So --

Q You take that --

A -- for example, you would often know whether it occurred in an indoor location or an outdoor location.

Did you take that into consideration when determining what a mass shooter needed?

A

Q Did the materials you reviewed in any of the shootings reveal anything about the rate of fire?

In some cases, they did; because in some cases, the media accounts included both number of rounds fired and the span of time from beginning to end of the shooting.

Does that really tell us what the rate of fire was?

Well, it tells us an overall rate of fire, an average rate of fire over the span during the shooting; but it doesn't tell us rates of fire maintained during any short interval.

Are you aware of any reports that do address Q that question?

Occasionally they would, very, very rarely, but

it's probably not reliable information because nobody is standing there with a stopwatch or anything.

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

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

So you're depending on eyewitness testimony among people who are almost certainly extremely fearful, and they're making guesses about time. And so, you know, you may have very accurate information about numbers of rounds fired, especially when a semiautomatic weapon is involved because the police can recover expended shells.

But the time intervals depend entirely, almost entirely, on eyewitness testimony, which is probably not reliable about an exact time interval.

So just a hypothetical situation. Say we have one mass shooting in which it's reported in the media that it was all over in ten minutes, and the shooter fired 60 rounds.

As I understand what you are saying here, you would say that it's pretty easy to fire 60 rounds in ten minutes and so for that reason, the shooter would not have needed a mass -- sorry, the shooter would not have needed a large capacity magazine in that situation to discharge that many rounds; is that right?

You are going to have to repeat the question. That's a pretty complicated question.

What I'm trying to get to is this: If a

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

94

shooting event takes ten minutes, a large portion of the expenditure of the rounds could be compressed into a very small part of that ten minutes; correct?

- A Yes.
- So, for example, the shooter could walk into a room, shoot everybody in the room in a matter of 20 seconds and then go hide in the bathroom for ten minutes and shoot himself when the police arrive?
- Yeah, certainly that's possible. We can speculate that could be the case.
- And so some of these media reports say this was all over in ten minutes; right?
  - (Witness nods head.)
- But they don't say -- at least, I haven't seen anything that says something like the scenario that I just outlined, that actually says the active shooting part of this incident took X number of minutes, and the rest of it was spent hiding from the police or running or anything like that?
- That's correct. The media accounts wouldn't really have any reliable information on that because they, in turn, are relying on the eyewitness testimony, which, as I say, is probably not reliable.
- So it's fair to say we actually don't know anything about the rate of fire in most of these

incidents?

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

No, we do know an average rate of fire over the span of time when shooting was going on; and we know that for a minority of mass shooting incidents.

Okay. Which ones?

Well, I mean, you can go through my appendix; and every time it lists the span of time of the shooting plus the number of rounds fired, then that would be an example of where we did know the average rate of fire.

So it is a minority of the incidents, but it's not none of the incidents. There are some cases where the media account provided both pieces of information needed to calculate an average rate of fire.

Sure. And I guess my point is that: Do those media reports actually discuss the length of time of the event as a whole or the length of time that the shooter took to expend the rounds that he expended?

No, this pertains to the latter.

It's the span of time when firing was going on, so it's basically the estimated time from first shot to last shot.

Okay. So let's look at page 20 of your report. And it starts on page 19, actually. It's Time Magazine: Terror in the Sanctuary.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

96

(Views document.) 1 2 Page 20?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLIN: Nineteen, it starts. THE WITNESS: Oh, 19, okay.

BY MR. GROVE:

Bottom of page 19, top of 20.

A All right. Got you.

So on 20, there are notes and it says: The Houston Press article states that the 9-millimeter gun was a Ruger and that the event lasted ten minutes. And according to the official Wedgewood Baptist Church website, the gunman fired over 100 rounds.

So based on the press report, is it your understanding that this gunman walked in, fired his first shot at second 1 and then fired his last shot at minute 10?

We don't know.

I mean, that's why earlier in that synopsis, it says: Time from start to end is unknown. The fact that it didn't say it lasted ten minutes is an indication that that later comment, based on the Houston Press article, is ambiguous. It may be the incident in some sense, the event in some sense lasted ten minutes; but it's not necessarily the span of time from first shot to last.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

And that's my question. Is do we know in any of these incidents what the time was from first shot to last?

Yes. I believe there are a few. Not a very large set of cases, but there are a few.

> Q If you could --

Mass shootings in 2001. This is page 23. It starts out ABC News, ex-employee kills four. It has both information on time of shooting from start to end and number of rounds fired. The next incident after that --

Well, let's stop right there.

What does -- how do we know from where it says time from start to end, how do we know what the, I guess, density of shots during any given minute of that was? How do we know --

A We don't.

Okay. And --Q

Α As I say, it's just an average rate of fire over the entire span in which firing was going on.

And so it looks like he had an SKS semiautomatic rifle; and according to the news report, we don't know what type of magazines were used.

(Views document.)

Q And so my question is this: Do we know --

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

break this thing down into 30-second chunks.

Do we know during any particular 30-second or one-minute chunk how many shots were fired during that period?

Α Not unless the entire span of time was 30 seconds or one minute or whatever.

And here it was eight to 15 minutes?

Right. So, in this case, we wouldn't know for any one minute or 30-second span what the rate of fire

So it's possible, based on this report that you reviewed, that the ex-employee walked in, shot four people in 15 seconds, went into the bathroom until the police came and then shot himself 15 minutes later?

Yes, we might speculate that; but it is only speculation. It's not really evidence or solid information. And in my view, what really matters is the average.

The average is much more important because it basically conveys how rapidly the shooter had to shoot in order to kill as many or injure as many people as he did. How often he fired in any 10- or 30-second interval is relatively minor.

I guess I'm not sure I understand that because if -- I mean, if I walk in and I've got -- I could walk

in with a musket, a front loading musket, and reload it and shoot it four times in 15 minutes; right?

Yes. A

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so if you were in this office and I walked in with a front-loading musket and I shot the first person, would you wait around or would you run?

I would run.

And so if I walked in with a Tec-9 with 0 52-round magazine, do you think that your chances would be better or worse than if I ran in -- walked in with a musket?

A Worse.

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

14 BY MR. GROVE:

> Do we have any other incidents in which we know what the actual rate of fire during the active shooting portion was?

Yes. In these incidents where they have both the span of time in which shooting occurred, which I guess I would refer to as the active shooting period and where they showed the number of rounds fired.

Let's talk about Columbine. That might be a good way to start this. And that's going to be at page 18.

A (Views document.)

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

So let's mark this.

100

identification.)

4 BY MR. GROVE:

> Have you seen this document before? Q

(Exhibit No. 8 was marked for

A

Q Do you recognize the picture on the first page?

Yes. Α

What is that picture? Q

> A It's a picture of the two shooters in the

11 Columbine High School shootings.

> Do you recognize the weapon that the shooter on the right of the picture is holding?

It looks in general like a Tec-9.

And is that an extended magazine? Q

Yes, I believe it is; although, it's hard to say exactly how extended. It might be in the vicinity of 15 to 20 rounds, maybe, hard to tell.

If I told you it was 32, would you have any reason to disagree with that?

Well, that one doesn't look like it's 32. It doesn't look long enough for that, but he may have had multiple magazines and, in fact, probably did. But that one doesn't look like it's 32. Could be. I mean, you know, it's hard to tell.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

**17** 

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

104

0

more than 15 rounds?

5

6 7 8

9 10 11

25

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

Probably, yeah. A And so on page 18 of Exhibit 1, where you say capacity of magazines, do you agree or disagree that the Columbine shooters possessed high capacity magazines under Colorado's definition?

Would you agree that magazine is likely to hold

Probably, although, it's -- you know, if you're going to rely on just this videotape evidence, it's not really very clear. You certainly can't tell what the capacity is. You could probably say, in all likelihood, it's over 15 rounds and that's about it. So that's why that was coded as capacity of magazines unknown. Really didn't know.

We'll get back to that later but, the page is replete with that sort of evidence.

How did you treat in this study -- because the vast majority of these I know are the capacity of magazines is unknown. How did you treat them when you were doing your analysis?

Well, the analysis didn't entail -- didn't use that information at all because it wasn't necessary to reach the conclusions I reached because it was basically on the basis of whether they had multiple magazines, multiple guns or had an opportunity to reload so...

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

102

So you didn't deem --Q

A Yeah, it might have turned out to be additional information I needed, but you can essentially rule out the significance of large capacity magazines solely on the basis of those other factors without addressing the issue of the capacity of the magazines.

Do you disagree with Dr. Zacks's conclusion that there is a correlation between the use of large capacity magazines in mass shootings and the number of injuries inflicted?

I don't have an opinion on that one way or another, I don't think, although I might have commented on, you know, his methods about arriving at that conclusion. But I don't recall expressing an opinion on that particular issue.

Do you generally agree that mass shootings that involve the use of a high capacity magazine by a mass shooter result in more injuries, more gunshot wounds among the victims than mass shooting events that do not involve the use of high capacity magazines?

Yes, I think that's true; but it's a function of people having an intention to kill a lot more people and, therefore, they bring weapons and magazines that they believe are consistent with that intention.

And so, again, you're faced with the

difficulty of inferring whether or not it was really the magazines or gun types that produced the number of victims rather than just the fact that some people want to kill and injure a lot more people than other

It sounds to me, then, like a shooter who wants to kill and injure a lot of victims would bring a large capacity magazine with him for that purpose?

Yes. It would be more likely to do that simply because it's their belief they can more easily achieve their goal of hurting a lot of people.

And do you believe that that -- withdraw that. Do you have any reason to disagree with that conclusion that a mass shooter would reach?

I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

That's because it was a terrible question. Do you agree if someone wanted to go and kill a lot of people that a large capacity magazine would be

a more efficient tool for doing so? In that case, I honestly don't know what efficient would mean. I would believe that, for whatever

reason, a person intending to kill a lot -- or injure a lot of people would be more likely to bring such a magazine.

I'm not sure what exactly efficiency would

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

have to do with it, but just that he would be able to accomplish it if he could fire more rounds without reloading. So I suspect that's what he would see as an advantage.

"Efficiency" was probably a bad word. Do you think you would be more likely to succeed in your goal of killing a lot of people if you had a large capacity magazine versus a smaller capacity magazine?

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

Well, it turns out -- all I can say on that A that I'm confident about is it turns out it's not necessary except in the most extraordinarily rare incidents to have a large capacity magazine in order to kill or injure large numbers of people.

16 BY MR. GROVE:

> And you base that on your conclusion about, one, having multiple handguns and, two, the length of the incident?

> > A Multiple guns of some type.

Q I'm sorry, yeah; and two, the length of the incident?

Well, not just those factors but also having large numbers of magazines independent of whether they are large or small capacity and also whether or not

there's anyone present willing to intervene and stop the shooter because if there's not such a person who was willing and able to intervene and do so, for example, when the shooter is attempting to reload, then, it doesn't matter what the magazine capacity was, so the person can take their time.

Q I didn't have time to go through all of these because there were a lot.

(Exhibit No. 9 was marked for

BY MR. GROVE:

identification.)

Q This is Exhibit 9.

A (Views document.)

Q And I'll direct you to page 13, the *New York Times* article, that's -- this is the police report from that incident.

Have you reviewed this report as part of your analysis in this case?

A So you're referring to the gunman kills two and hurts 19 on Air Force base --

Q Correct.

A -- case?

And did I review the sheriff's department report? No, I did not.

Q And so we say -- the report says that an

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

AK-style rifle was used and that the capacity of the magazine was unknown in that case; correct?

- A In my summary?
- Q Yes.
- A Yeah.
- Q And I'm on page -- this is page 2 of the report. It's the first page with text on it. Fourth and fifth line down, it says: Mellberg was armed with a Norinco Mac 90 7.62 X 39 caliber semiautomatic rifle, and the rifle had attached to it a 75-round drum magazine. That's not something that you analyzed or even had available to you; correct?
- $\label{eq:A-Yeah.} A \qquad \mbox{Yeah. If it wasn't in the news media account,}$  then we wouldn't know it.
- $\label{eq:Q} \mbox{$\bf Q$} \mbox{ \ \ \, And you weren't able to find this report on the } \\ \mbox{Internet?}$
- $\label{eq:A.1.1} A \qquad \text{No. Well, I shouldn't say we weren't able to.}$  We made no effort to.
  - Q Why didn't you make an effort to?
- A We didn't believe that it was necessary. And believe me, we were under a pressure of time, so that would have also entailed additional time.
- Q Did you think the information in this report would have been useful to your conclusions in this case?
  - Well, it would be useful, but if you mean would

it modify my conclusions, I can't say because, obviously, I haven't seen this kind of information. And so I don't know whether it would.

By the way, I should point out, on my particular synopsis on that incident, if you read the notes, it does mention the shooter purchasing a 70-round magazine. It just doesn't establish that that was the one he was using in the shooting. So it's kind of partial information that...

- Q Would you agree that the police report established that it was a 75-round drum magazine that was used?
- A I have no reason to doubt that. Other than the fact that, you know, another news report said it was 70 rounds rather than 75. But between the two sources, I would be more inclined to believe the sheriff's department report.
- Q That was my question. Thank you. I feel your pain on sourcing some of this stuff, by the way.

(Exhibit No. 10 was marked for identification.)

22 BY MR. GROVE:

Q So this is the North Hollywood bank robbery shootout. It's referenced at page 14 to the top of page 15 of your report.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

-----

1 A (Views document.)

Q And here again, it says: The capacity of the magazines were unknown. If we look at page -- these don't have page numbers on it. The fourth page that says: Aftermath and controversy in bold.

A (Views document.)

MR. COLIN: Maybe I'm missing something.
Is this the reference that you're talking about?

MR. GROVE: Yeah, it's under the bottom of page 14 and the top of page 15.

MR. COLIN: Well, then, I'll object to the form of the question. That inaccurately states. BY MR. GROVE:

Q So the title is five gunfights that change law enforcement. And I'm on -- I'm now looking at Exhibit 10 and I'm trying to compare these two.

So on Exhibit 1 at the bottom of page 14, it says: Capacity of magazines unknown; correct?

MR. COLIN: Well, I'll object to the form. Part of what it says.

A It says that the shooters were in possession of at least 3,300 rounds of ammunition in both box and drum magazines. And so unless they had an enormous number of magazines, it sort of does imply the magazines they had

target, basically.

Let's go back to Exhibit 8.

relied on. It's a little bit hard to match some of

these up, but I think we can do it for most of them.

to ask about this Long Island Railroad shooting while

semiautomatic pistol and multiple magazines. It was --

He started shooting, emptied his first

magazine, quickly changed another magazine without any

bystanders interfering with him, then according to some

we're on the topic. What do you know about that

it occurred on a Long Island commuter train.

eyewitnesses, he changed into a third magazine.

some eyewitnesses, he was trying to hand load a

one. And then at one point or another, according to

magazine and that's when bystanders jumped him and

Well, not exactly. Apparently, at least

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

compare what we have in Exhibit 8 with data that you

And I just want to go through these and

So your start in 1994, and actually I do want

A guy named Colin Ferguson had a 9-millimeter

Others say no, he only switched into a second

So he was tackled or somehow interfered with as

stopped the shooting.

he was changing magazines?

shooting?

were large capacity. But it doesn't actually nail it down and certainly doesn't nail down exactly how large the capacities were.

BY MR. GROVE:

Q So let's look at Exhibit 10, again. And we're on page 4. This says: Aftermath and controversy. And it says that: The shooters had an AR-15 converted to fire automatically with two 100-round beta magazines, a semiautomatic HKA-91 rifle with several 30-round magazines and then a Beretta that we don't know the capacity for and then three different AK-47s that were fully automatic with several 75- to 100-round drum magazines as well as some more 30-round box magazines.

So would you agree that the capacity of the magazines in this situation was unknown?

- A It was unknown on the basis of the news report.

  Known on the basis of the Wikipedia article.
- Q Do you have any reason to doubt this Wikipedia article?
- A Yeah, plenty. Not this one in particular, just the fact that it's Wikipedia, which is frequently wrong. I wouldn't rely on Wikipedia unless I absolutely had nothing else to rely on.
- Q Do you have any reason to believe that the two shooters in the North Hollywood shootout did not have

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

magazines that held more than 15 rounds?

A Not exactly except, as I say, I wouldn't rely on Wikipedia because anybody can contribute to Wikipedia, whether they know what they are talking about or not and so it's not a good source to rely on, whereas professional journalists have more of a commitment to having a sound foundation for what they put into their accounts, the news account.

And so I have that general reason to doubt it, but not this particular fact any more than any other alleged fact.

- Q Do you think it's realistic to assume that these shooters would have equipped a fully automatic AK-47 with a magazine that held 15 or fewer rounds?
  - A Please say again.
- Q If you had a fully automatic AK-47, one that had been altered to do that, would you have equipped with a magazine that held 15 or fewer rounds?
  - A No.
  - Q Why not?
- A Because a fully automatic weapon will fire anywhere from 800 to 1,200 rounds a minute, which means you would have expended 15 rounds in like a second.

So, you know, it's -- a second's worth of firing would be -- would allow you to shoot once at one

according to some eyewitnesses, he had used up his magazines and now he was trying to hand reload one of them.

So you wouldn't call it changing magazines exactly; but, you know, it's apparently he had run out of loaded magazines and so the only way he could continue shooting people was to attempt to hand load the rounds into a magazine.

- Q And at the point that he had run out of bullets, someone was able to interfere?
- A Well, at the time he had run out of loaded magazines. He still had cartridges, the ones he was trying to reload into an expended magazine but...
- Q Did he -- was he finished or did he intend to continue shooting people?
- A It looked like he was intending to shoot some more people.
- Q Okay. So we covered the Fairchild Air Force base. That's a *New York Times* article on page 13 that's referenced.

And then these don't all match up, unfortunately.

It's interesting how -- just shows you some of the unreliability of the media sources that not everybody can agree what is a mass shooting and what is

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

116

not. It's just an editorial comment.

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

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

Let's go to page 16 of your report and then we're going to compare it to the middle of page 4 on Exhibit 8, which is the Caltrans maintenance yard.

So the page 16 on Exhibit 1 is the New York Times article. It says: Dismissed worker kills four and then is slain.

This is the Caltrans maintenance yard shooting; correct?

- A Yes.
- And your report indicates that the capacity of Q the magazines was unknown. And the Violence Policy Center report indicates that the shooter had five 30-round magazines.

Do you have any reason to dispute that?

- No. They presumably were using additional sources beyond the ones that my assistant was using.
- And then you don't have in this, the next one up the page, on Exhibit 8 on page 4, which is the Connecticut State Lottery headquarters, as best I can tell.
  - A What page was that?
- I'm still on the same page, which is page 4 of Q Exhibit 8, just above the Caltrans maintenance yard shooting?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

114

A Right.

Q It's the Connecticut State Lottery Headquarters.

- A
- Q Is that one you took into account?
- A Let's see. No, because it's not a mass shooting, according to my definition.
  - Oh, because there were only five dead? Q
- Well, in fact, four because we weren't counting the shooter. So it's really not even borderline. It's four rather than seven plus.
  - Okay. Move on.

So Westside Middle School, Jonesboro, Arkansas. Again, we're on page 4 of the Violence Policy Center exhibit.

Is that one that made it into here, into your expert report?

- Yes. It would be on page 17 of my report, starting out New York Times from Wild Talk to Friendship.
  - Okay. Q
- And it's dated March 24th. The incident A occurred March 24th.
- Here you do have a 30-round capacity magazine; although, interestingly the Violence Policy Center report says 15.

know for a fact that it was the New York Times that was wrong and Violence Policy Center was right. **Evidently Violence Policy Center used some** 

never quite know why they said what they said. I don't

other source of information, but they don't state what

- Which do you think he had, a 30 or a 15? Q
- Well, I'd rather rely on a source that I know.

Well, they don't report their sources, so I

In this case, it's the New York Times. That doesn't make them infallible. They may be the newspaper of record; they can make mistakes too.

But in the case of the Violence Policy Center, you don't have any source cited at all. There's no way to tell where that 15-round magazine claim came from.

Let's look at Thurston High School, which is the next one up the page. This is the Springfield, Oregon shooting. And I think that this is the one that you mentioned that there actually was interference by a bystander --

A

-- at reloading. Tell me what you know about Q that incident.

Actually, there's eyewitness conflict on this

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

one as well, but, you know, what some accounts say is 1

2 he's firing the 50-round magazine out of a rifle, a

3 .22 caliber storm Ruger rifle, semiautomatic rifle,

4 expends that magazine, and according to some people, he

5 was either attempting to reload or he was just switching guns and firing another shot. And then he got tackled by

6 7

two brothers. And then some other individuals also 8

joined in once the first two had done so, and they

9 stopped him from firing.

> Would you agree that changing guns, you have to pause in order to change guns?

> > MR. COLIN: Foundation.

Very, very briefly. So briefly that I couldn't imagine that would be a reason why somebody would in that instant decide that yes, I'm willing to tackle them.

These guys were willing to tackle him, at least according to some eyewitness accounts, even though he was still firing. So some versions of it, he was beginning to shoot with another gun.

So these were very, very unusual bystanders in that they may not -- based on some eyewitness accounts, they may not have even had to wait for the shooter attempting to reload. And, in fact, I think one of the people who tackled him, the first one, actually had already been shot.

So it was even more extraordinary. He was a wounded individual who was willing to attack a shooter who either was attempting to reload or was just continuing to fire with a second gun.

O Okay. So we're on page 18 of Exhibit 1 pow.

Q Okay. So we're on page 18 of Exhibit 1 now.

Three are killed and five hurt in shootout in
Utah City. I haven't been able to find anything about this one.

Do you remember any details of this shooting?

A The Utah City one we're talking about, on page 18?

Q Yes.

A Not really. This was -- as mass shootings go, this was not a particularly celebrated one or well covered in the media. So no, I don't recall much of that.

In fact, it's somewhat surprising that that one even made it into the *New York Times* because normally they wouldn't cover incidents with three killed unless it was a local story.

Q Let's move on to page 24 of your report.

A (Views document.)

Q So you've got -- I'm at Mass Shootings in 2004, which is the Wisconsin hunting camp shooting.

And your sources say ten rounds and mine,

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

which is the Violence Policy Center report, says a 20-round magazine on the SKS assault rifle.

Do you have any reason to doubt this was a 20 round instead of, in fact --

A Well, again, my response would be the same as in the previous case where there was a conflict. I don't know what the sources were for the Violence Policy Center, where at least I know the sources for the media accounts. And so I would have a generic doubt about unsourced claims, know more for this than the other; but the point is the Violence Policy Center just didn't cite sources so.

Q So on page 25, your note says: Some accounts claim that the shooter had a 20-round magazine, however, the AP reports states: The prosecutors displayed a 10-round magazine in court and claimed that he'd shot at least 20 rounds.

A Right. And so what may account for this discrepancy is that the Violence Policy Center relied on one of those accounts that mentioned a 20-round magazine, but I have no reason to doubt AP would be inaccurate about what prosecutors showed as the shooter's magazine in court.

Q Are SKS rifles often equipped with 10-round magazines?

A I don't know.

Q Does Wisconsin have limits on the number of rounds the hunter can carry?

A I don't know.

 $\label{eq:Q} Q \qquad \text{So would it be fair to say that -- I'm not} \\ \text{going to go through the rest of these.}$ 

Would it be fair to say that, in your view, the magazine capacity was not relevant to the analysis that you were doing here?

 $\label{eq:A} \textbf{A} \qquad \textbf{Are you referring to this particular case} \\ \textbf{or...?}$ 

Q In Exhibit 1, the analysis that you did that underlies your conclusion 2, you did not -- you didn't take into consideration magazine capacity in reaching the conclusion about what mass shooters need?

A Well, I took it into account in the sense that I concluded that it was irrelevant --

Q Well, let's talk about --

A -- to how many people got killed or injured.

Q Let's talk about the Aurora Theater shooting.

That's summarized at page 38 of your report; what do you know about that event?

A Well, there was a single shooter who entered a theater with three guns. He had a semiautomatic rifle, a semiautomatic handgun and a tactical shotgun. And he

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

fired very large numbers of rounds; although, in this case, not known exactly how many. It's just that, universally, people said large numbers of rounds.

 $\label{thm:condition} The shooting lasted roughly six minutes, and he ended up killing 12 people and wounding 58.$ 

Q So let's go back to the -- let's go back to this idea of time and the activity of a mass shooter during the time span of an incident.

This estimates that the time from start to end was six minutes; is that right?

A Yes. And start to end of the shooting.

Q Right. And so in your analysis, let's say the shooter fired 100 rounds. That makes it easy to divide.

Does that mean that under your analysis, you would assume that the shooter fired 15 and a half rounds per minute during that six minute --

A That would be the average rate of fire, yes.

Q And is that the reason -- and it's pretty easy to shoot 15 1/2 rounds a minute; right?

A Yes.

21 Q And so, in your view, did the fact that the 22 shooter in that case had a 100-round drum magazine make 23 any difference in the number of people that he was able 24 to shoot?

A No, because in this case, no one was willing to

 $\label{eq:Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q_Q} \ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}} \ \ \, \mbox{ Do you know if anybody was able to escape the theater?}$ 

A Almost certainly, yes, because while 70 (sic) were killed, there were a lot more people in the theater. So there must have been many who escaped the theater.

Q And do you think it's possible that anybody could have escaped while he was changing magazines?

MR. COLIN: Foundation, speculation.

A I don't know. I just don't know one way or another. There wasn't that kind of detail provided in media accounts.

### BY MR. GROVE:

Q If the shooter had walked in with -- he had an AR-15 -- actually, he had a Smith and Wesson M&P -- but if he had started shooting that and he had a 15-round magazine versus the 100-round magazine that he did have, do you think more or fewer people would have been shot?

A It wouldn't have made any difference. Best judgment is it wouldn't have made any difference because this particular individual had both additional guns and additional magazines.

Q And you base that on your review of the media report?

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

- A That's correct.
- Q Any other sources?
- A No.
- Q And you don't know anything about the actual rate of fire aside from an estimate, aside from dividing the number of bullets by the total time; is that correct?
- A Right. And in this case, we don't really even know the number of rounds fired. So in this case, we don't really know rate of fire.

You can say what it was at minimum because you can -- just to make the simplifying assumption that each of the 70 individuals was shot with one round in which case there were at least 70 rounds fired, but whether there were additional rounds above and beyond that, we don't know. And the media accounts, in any case, didn't provide that additional information.

- $\,\,Q\,\,\,\,\,\,$  What do you know about Tucson in 2000 -- was it late 2011?
  - A (Views document.)
  - Q Page 35.

A That's best known as the incident in which Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords was shot. She was shot nonfatally, but the event involved six people being killed and 13 wounded nonfatally including Congresswoman Giffords. The shooter in that particular case had four magazines with him, and the media accounts did say what the capacity of the magazines were. Two would be defined under Colorado law as large capacity because they had 33 rounds, and two would not because they had

Q Which ones did he use?

A Well, witness accounts differed on that. So according to some witness accounts, he had used as many as three of the magazines and then on the fourth one, it jammed. A spring failed, apparently, so the magazine wouldn't feed rounds anymore.

And there's differing eyewitness accounts as to what he did in reaction to that. Some say he was still attempting to make the gun work -- make the magazine work and others say he responded to that by trying to leave the scene. And at that point, he was tackled.

So he was either tackled while he was attempting to make the magazine function or he was tackled while he was already finished shooting and leaving the scene.

Q This says: Time from start to end, five minutes. So we know that 19 people were shot; correct?

A Yes.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

Do we know that -- where does the five-minute

figure come from? How long -- do we know from news reports?

A Almost always the news reports base it on eyewitness accounts and sometimes the eyewitness accounts, even they conflict with one another.

Sometimes they're getting -- the news media accounts are getting it indirectly from the police who, in turn, got it from eyewitness accounts except for the incidents where there were law enforcement officers who happened to be present from the beginning to the end.

And I have no reason to believe that was the case here. So, as usual, you've got an eyewitness estimate, basically.

Q My understanding of this shooting was that basically the shooter walked up to the front of the line -- and there was a line waiting to see the congresswoman -- and that he walked down the line firing at people; do you find -- is that consistent with what your understanding is?

A Except for the last part. I'm not sure about the last part, whether he was firing as he went down the line or he had gotten to the end of the line and then started firing. That, I don't recall.

Q But you would agree that the victims were lined

u	l

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

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

A Certainly, some of them were. I don't know that all of them were waiting to, you know, meet the congresswoman.

> And this was in an outdoor setting? 0

Α

Q Do you find it plausible that it took five minutes in order to expend enough bullets to kill -- or to kill or wound 19 people?

It's perfectly plausible since many other mass shootings with similar number of victims took similar amounts of time. In effect, you know, the individual who is the shooter is in control of how fast he wants to fire. And in this case, yes, he might have fired for five minutes.

Q Do you think --

A But as I say, all of these time estimates have to be taken with a big grain salt because they depend on eyewitnesses who were in a terrified frame of mind in many cases. And there's conflict even between eyewitnesses.

So each of them may be unreliable and those unreliable accounts even can conflict with one another. And so basically we're just going with what we have of however much reliability it may have.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

In an outdoor setting, do you think it's plausible that 13 -- or 19 people would have stood around

long enough in order for him to shoot all of them? Some people are paralyzed by fear, and so yeah, it's possible. And again, in other outdoor shootings, apparently the shootings did last that long and so there must have been victims still remaining for the shooter to shoot at.

Which ones are you talking about? Q

A I couldn't tell you offhand, but there are others that occurred in outdoor locations. It's possible the one just above it might be an outdoor location, the one, the Hialeah one.

Let's look at page 36.

Actually, do know the time for this one. And I'm sorry, I'm on the second one, which is CNN gunman kills three, wounds others at Nevada IHOP.

So we know from this report that the shooter used large capacity magazines under the Colorado definition; correct?

Q And that he fired 60-plus shots in 85 seconds; is that right?

A

Would it be realistic for someone to fire that

127 many rounds in 85 seconds with a magazine that held 15 or fewer rounds?

A Easily.

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

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

Q Do you know of any mass shootings in which that's been done?

I couldn't tell you offhand. I can just tell you from shooting experience that it's easy to accurately fire that many rounds in 85 seconds because that's over one second a round, which in shooting, is an enormous amount of time.

Q It's easy to aim if you are shooting that rapidly?

It's less easy but sufficiently easy, especially at the close ranges that most mass shootings occur at. It's not at all difficult to accurately shoot 60 rounds in 85 seconds.

So it's your position -- I just want to be clear -- that the size of the magazine did not make a difference in the Tucson shooting?

Yes, accord -- it -- depending on which eyewitness accounts you believe, because there's conflict on the issue of whether or not the shooting was disrupted by bystanders.

So if you believe the New York Times account, which said that the shooter was already attempting to

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

126

leave the scene at the point where he was tackled by bystanders, then no, the large capacity magazine didn't make a difference.

On the other hand, if he was trying to reload and that's when -- and he intended to shoot, continued shooting and that's when bystanders tackled him, then it's possible a large capacity magazine would have made a difference.

So that's an ambiguous case along with the Kinkel Oregon case, where it's a lot clearer it did make a experience.

And do you know whether the size of the magazine affected the rate of fire in Tucson?

I have no idea one way or the another on that.

And it's your position that the size of the magazine, the 100-round drum that the shooter used in Aurora, didn't make a difference in the number of people that were shot?

A That's correct, yes.

And that the 100-round drum, use of the 100-round drum, did not affect rate of fire?

Well, it could have affected the rate of fire while he was firing that 100 rounds because he didn't have to reload as he would have with a smaller capacity magazine. But it didn't make a difference to how many

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

**17** 

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

may have engaged in?

131

people were killed.

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

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

That was just a function of when he decided to stop shooting because nobody caused him to stop. He didn't run out of ammunition. He simply, for whatever reason, was satisfied with the number of rounds he had fired and the number of people he had hurt.

- You're not aware of whether the theater was empty by the time he stopped shooting?
  - I'm not aware one way or the other on that.
- Your report indicates that the time from start to end was six minutes. Do you think -- and I'm talking about Aurora again.

Is it realistic that a theater could empty in six minutes in that kind of situation?

It's possible. What happens when people try to exit, though, is the exits get jammed. There's a limited number of exits, and people are crowding through and some people get trampled and some people fall down.

And so it's not a matter of like how many people could exit during a, you know, fire exercise or fire alarm exercise because people are panicked and other things can happen that prevent a rapid exit, but is it possible. Certainly, it's possible.

- Do you know if there was a pile-up at the door?
- A I don't know one way or the other.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

130

- Do you know anything about the layout of the Q Aurora theater?
- No, except that I assume it's like other theaters, but I don't know for sure.
- Are there fire codes that allow for quick exits Q from theaters generally?
- Certainly fire codes would mandate a certain number of exits, given the capacity of the room.
- Do you have any reason to believe that the Aurora Theater was not in compliance with those codes?
- I have no reason to believe one thing or another on that issue.
- Q What about Newtown? What do you know about that shooting?
  - (View document.) A
  - Q Page 39 of your report.
- A single shooter used three guns and was carrying at least 12 magazines and at least one of -- at least ten of them were 30-round magazines, and there were others of unknown capacity. He fired at least 154 shots in approximately a five-minute span, and he ended up killing 26 people besides his mother, which he had killed in a separate incident.
- Do we know how much -- what his rate of fire aside from dividing 154 into five minutes was?

No. In my view, that would be less relevant to the event of whether -- to the issue of whether a large capacity magazine would make any difference.

Not based on these news accounts, no.

So we don't know anything about bursts that he

The point is how much time did he have an opportunity to fire as many rounds as he fired and the case -- the fact in virtually every single case is that the shooters had ample time, even without large capacity magazines, to fire as many rounds as they did.

Are you aware of any -- of whether any victims or any children in the classroom or classrooms that were attacked were able to escape while he was changing magazines?

A Can I back up just a little bit to complete my answer?

Q Sure.

A About these time spans, these are the spans where the news media accounts said they were actually shooting, but it's not the time span when they could have

The time span when they could have shot, when they had an opportunity to continue firing, if they chose to do so, could be much longer than that so --

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

132

and that may well actually be the relevant issue. 1 2

If you had a very long time to continue shooting, then the possession of a large capacity magazine would be even less relevant or, likewise, the possession of a rapidly firing gun would be even less relevant because you had more time when you could have been shooting.

So I want to stress: These are only the times they actually did shoot.

- And how do we know that?
- How do we know the time spans when they were A shooting?
- Q

A Well, we know it usually from eyewitness accounts, which are, in turn, transmitted to police which are, in turn, transmitted to news media outlets.

And do we know -- and my question is more about the rate of fire. So we know that the shooter in the Newtown shooting fired, from this -- and I'm on page 39 of Exhibit 1 -- 154 shots in approximately five minutes.

And so your assumption from this is that he fired 30 rounds per minute during that time; right?

Right, about two seconds per round. And news media accounts indicate it was at very close range. He was shooting children who were no more than a few feet

away from him.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

And so when you do this analysis, do you assume that that was a steady rate of fire over the course of that five minute?

Don't make any assumption about how steady it was at all because I think that's essentially irrelevant to the issue of how many people will be hurt.

Do you think it's realistic to have a steady rate of fire in a situation like this?

Certainly realistic to expect it to be possible, but I have no basis one way or another for knowing in this particular incident how steady the fire was -- rate of fire was.

Would it would surprise you to hear that --0 withdrawn.

So just to be clear, your conclusion here is that a magazine with a capacity of over 15 rounds arguably affected the number of persons killed or wounded in just one of the 58 mass shootings occurring in the U.S. from 1994 to 2013?

That's correct, and the Kip Kinkel incident in A Oregon.

Let's move on to conclusion 3.

You say that: Limits on magazine capacity are likely to impair the ability of citizens to engage

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

134

in lawful self-defense in those crime incidents necessitating that the victim fire many rounds in order to stop the aggressive actions of offenders.

Are you aware, as you sit here today, of any incident in which a victim has had to fire 15 or more rounds in order to stop the aggressive actions of offenders?

A

And let me clarify that. That would be Q civilian. I know there are plenty of times with a SWAT team. But that would be -- you're not aware of any incident in which a civilian has had to fire 15 or more rounds?

A I'm not aware of whether there are or are not any given number of those incidents.

> Q As you sit here today, you can't name any?

We talked earlier about whether ordinary everyday crimes are typically crimes of opportunity. And we know the mass shootings are well thought out, typically, or at least planned for.

Your second sentence here, you say: In contrast to mass shooters, victims of crimes generally cannot plan for or anticipate crimes to occur at a specific time and place; why is that?

Because they're not in control of the event.

And the aggressor is the person who is in control of the event. They determine that a crime will be attempted in a particular time and place and the victim is not alerted in advance so that they can make preparations for it.

So is it your position that it's not possible to prepare for a home invasion?

No, you can prepare for it. You just can't prepare for particular times and places, for particular incidents to occur at a particular time. So your preparations have to be generic, in a way.

You know, you just have to do what you can that's feasible in planning for a wide variety of possible victimization events. But you can't plan as a mass shooter plans, which is planning to commit a particular crime at a particular place at a particular time.

You can prepare to defend yourself in a particular place, though; correct?

Yes, in a very generic way.

But, for example, you know, there are very few people who would be willing to routinely carry three guns for self protection; in fact, I've never heard of anybody willing to do that. Two maybe and

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

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

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

probably much more commonly one, but for victims to carry as many guns routinely -- not in anticipation of a specific event happening at a particular time and place -- but the only way they could prepare would be in a routine, generic way.

And it's just highly implausible they would routinely, on a daily basis, be carrying three guns in public places for the purpose of a possible victimization event occurring.

How about two? Is it common for people to carry a backup gun?

I don't know. I know that's common among police officers, but among civilians, we don't really have any data on it. I suspect it's rare, but I don't know that for a fact.

Is there anything in Colorado's law that you're aware of that would discourage someone from carrying more than one gun on them?

I'm not aware of it one way or the other.

Is there anything in Colorado's law that would prevent or prohibit someone from carrying multiple magazines with them?

I'm not aware of it one way or another. I'm not sufficiently familiar with Colorado law.

Would you agree that the need for self-defense

A That's correct.

19 20 21

22 23 24

25

BY MR. GROVE:

is most acute in the home?

A No, I would not.

Q So you disagree with Justice Scalia on that?

A I have no idea what Justice Scalia said on it, but he's not really qualified to make a judgment. He knows the Constitution, federal law quite well; but he is not expert on crime or self-defense.

Q Where is the need for self-defense most acute?

A It's probably most acute in public places because that's where the victimization rate is highest.

Q What percentage of everyday violence offenders carry multiple guns with them?

A I have no idea. I'm not aware of any relevant data sources on that. We only know that about mass shooters because there's a special interest in it and because they're especially heavily covered in the news media. But for ordinary kinds of violence and ordinary kinds of offenders, I'm not aware of any information that bears on that issue.

Q So at the top of page 6, you say:

Consequently, if a potential victim's one gun or
magazine's capacity was limited to 15 or fewer rounds,
this means they would unable to implement the alternative
tactics available to criminal aggressors planning to have
multiple guns and magazines ready for their use.

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

I'm not sure how -- can you explain how the second part of that sentence follows from the first?

A Well, the substitute that would be -- the possible alternative courses of action to having a single magazine that carried large numbers of rounds would be, for example, carrying either multiple magazines or multiple guns. And yet that's impractical for most people because it's obviously more cumbersome to have multiple guns than just one gun or multiple magazines, rather than just one. It's just not as easy for people to routinely do that.

If people were anticipating a particular need for self-defense at a particular time and a particular place, then, of course, they could prepare by carrying multiple guns or multiple magazines; but if they don't know an event is going to occur at a particular time and place that they can plan for, then the only way they could have guns and magazines available is if they were sort of routinely carried without advance knowledge of a particular victimization incident occurring.

Q What are the alternative tactics available to criminal aggressors that you are referencing in this sentence?

A Well, the alternative tactics for shooting

large numbers of rounds, having the capacity to shoot large numbers of rounds is carrying multiple guns into the situation where they're going to shoot or carrying multiple magazines or both.

Q And so earlier, you said that you have no data or no knowledge of what sort of equipment an everyday violent criminal carries with him. So I'm not understanding where the criminal aggressors are actually engaging in these alternative tactics.

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

A Well, you're referring to the wrong contrast.

The contrast here is between mass shooters and ordinary and civilians. And the reason the focus is on mass shooters is because it's mass shootings where a large capacity magazine is most likely to make a difference. And so that's the contrast here, not ordinary criminal aggressors. So you've got to take this in context. It's in the context of opinion No. 2, which was all about mass shooters.

Q So let's broaden the focus a bit and just talk about everyday ordinary violent criminals.

I think you agreed earlier that, based on the Reedy and Koper study, there was a correlation between the number of shots discharged in an incident and the

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

size of the magazine, the capacity of the firearm used; is that right?

A (Views document.)

Actually, no, I didn't know that. I think I responded to that question before. The response was that Koper only contrasted pistol versus revolver. And so we know, on average, pistols have more rounds; but there was no direct correlation between number of rounds and either number of wounds inflicted or number of victims. So we don't know one way or the other, in other words.

Q Let's look at the results. And I'm back on exhibit -- I can't remember what exhibit this was.

A It's 6 if you mean Reedy and Koper.

Q Yeah. Back on Exhibit 6.

And so under the results, it says: More shots were fired in attacks with pistols than attacks with revolvers. And I think we're on the same page, that pistols on average have a higher capacity than revolvers; correct?

A Yes

Q And so I guess I'm not clear, taking this out of the mass shooting context, whether this alternative tactics available to criminal aggressors, whether your average everyday violent felon sticks up a liquor store

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

24

25

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

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

MR. COLIN: Foundation.

Well, he wouldn't need to. I mean, because he's not planning on shooting large numbers of rounds, unlike a very non-ordinary mass shooter.

So he's -- typically wouldn't have any reason to carry either multiple guns or multiple magazines. Because, as I pointed out before, when we're talking about ordinary violence involving ordinary criminals, actually, the most common number of rounds fired in gun crimes is zero because they're usually just assaults in the sense of a threat.

And then the most common is one and then the next most common is two, and the average is extremely low, so something in the order of two. BY MR. GROVE:

Okay. Q

Α So why would they need multiple guns or multiple magazines if they're only going to fire zero, one or two rounds?

Q So back to the top of page 6 here in Exhibit 1, why does a limitation on magazine capacity mean that an ordinary person who was trying to defend himself would be unable to plan to have multiple guns and magazines ready

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

142

# for use?

Well, because if you have that limitation, then the only way you can be prepared to fire more than 15 rounds in self-defense is if you had multiple magazines or multiple guns.

And the only way you could do that, given in a situation where you couldn't have anticipated that event occurring at a particular time and place, is if you routinely carried multiple guns and/or multiple magazines.

And does Colorado's law prohibit you from planning to have multiple guns and magazines ready for use?

I don't know of any of such restriction. The real limitation would be that it's just really difficult, inconvenient. A gun is heavy enough just to carry one around on your person; and magazines are heavy too, the ammunition in them to be precise. The ammunition in the magazines is also very heavy.

So to double or even triple that burden is just something very few people would be willing to do. So that's the kind of commonsensical underlying assumption I'm making. I admit it's an assumption, but it seems kind of self-evident.

So unable to implement is a matter of

would be a more precise way of saying it, given human nature and people not wanting to carry around 5 pounds of gun or, you know, 3 pounds of ammunition loaded up in

Well, not likely to happen, actually, probably

convenience? What do you mean by unable?

magazines.

But you're not aware of any legal or physical bar to carrying multiple guns and magazines ready for use?

Well, I'm not aware of a legal obstacle, but I'm aware of the physical reality that it would be a lot more difficult to carry multiple guns or multiple magazines. And it would be a physical difficulty because it entails a lot of weight and a lot of bulging in your clothing if you're going to carry them underneath your clothing.

> How much does a sub compact weigh? MR. COLIN: Foundation.

A What do you mean by a sub compact? BY MR. GROVE:

> Say, a baby Glock. 0

I don't know. I mean, I think it's probably in the vicinity of 3 or 4 pounds, but I don't know and more leaded, but I'm guessing. I only know that whatever it is, it's double when you have two of them than when you

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

144

have one of them and triple when you have three of them rather than one.

Well, a sub compact weighs less than a full frame handgun; right?

> A Yes.

So it wouldn't really be double, would it, if you have one full frame and one sub compact?

Well, no, but I was talking about a different comparison: If you had two compacts versus one, then that's twice as much weight and twice as much bulging in your clothing and so on.

People do carry backup handguns; correct? MR. COLIN: Foundation.

I know that police officers do. I don't know whether that's common among civilians. I suspect that very likely some do but also suspect that's quite unusual among civilians.

18 BY MR. GROVE:

> And, but that's their choice; correct? MR. COLIN: Foundation.

21 I don't quite understand the question. In what 22 sense do you mean it's their choice?

23 BY MR. GROVE:

> I'm just hung up on the unable to implement. It seems to me that ...?

Oh, I see what you mean. Well, is it a matter of free will, yeah, it's a matter of free will; certainly it's not a matter of being mandated by law or forbidden by law if that's what you are getting at. At the end of this section, it says: Supporting evidence: These points are self-evident followed logically from widely-accepted empirical facts, therefore, they do not need further empirical support. What widely accepted empirical facts did you rely on here? A Well, that last sentence, which you haven't addressed in that same paragraph that immediately precedes that assertion is perhaps the most self-evident one because it's true by definition. Persons who are law abiding would be unable to adapt the -- adopt the adaptation of getting an illegal banned large capacity magazine like from out of state or from a criminal source or whatever because --and it's true by definition because if they did so, they wouldn't be law abiding. And the empirical reality would be that people you would characterize as noncriminal do crime less than people you would characterize as criminals. That would certainly be widely accepted and

ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.

(Brief recess was taken.)

(Lunch recess was taken.)

self-evident.

1 2

Q Does this last sentence refer to more than just the immediately preceding sentence?

A Well, the assertion that if I had elaborated, as I have here, on that issue of unable to implement as to what I meant, I think it would have been self-evident to virtually everyone that people would find it harder to carry two or three guns or multiple magazines than carrying just one.

And so certainly at the margin, there's bound to be some people who would decide: I'm not willing to do that. And in my personal opinion, it would be lots and lots of people. But it seems indisputable that there would be at least some unwilling to carry two guns or multiple magazines rather than just one.

Q How often do gun fights occur among -- in violent crime incidents?

A Rarely. Most violent incidents that involve guns involve only one party using the gun. And so it tends to be one sided, whether it's the victim using the gun or the offender using the gun. But only a small fraction of violent -- gun-related violent account -- events involve both parties shooting.

(Exhibit No. 11 was marked for identification.)

13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	ACCURATE STENOTYPE REPORTERS, INC.	
		148
1		140
1	CEDTIEICATE OF DEDODTED	140
2	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	140
2 3	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	140
2 3 4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	140
2 3 4 5		140
2 3 4 5 6	STATE OF FLORIDA )	140
2 3 4 5 6 7		140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes. I further certify that I am not a relative,	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.  I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties,	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.  I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.  I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I	140
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	STATE OF FLORIDA ) COUNTY OF LEON )  I, LISA D. FREEZE, Notary Public, certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the proceedings herein, and that the transcript is a true and complete record of my stenographic notes.  I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties'	140

LISA D. I

,	1993 [6] 14/11 37/13 41/12 60/11 61/7 63/7	75 [3] 10/19 107/15 109/12
	1993-2011 [1] 3/10	75-round [2] 106/10 107/11
'60s [1] 45/22	1994 [2] 111/7 133/20	8
'80s [1] 39/17 '85 [1] 26/6	1995 [2]   3/11 41/4   1997 [2]   60/14 61/14	80 percent [2] 10/20 61/14
'85 to [1] 26/6	1999 [1] 2/6	80,000 [2] 22/22 42/16
'90s [2] 42/24 42/25	2	800 [1] 110/22
'91 [5] 26/6 26/7 26/10 26/13 26/14		80202 [1] 2/6
'91 is [1] 26/14	2 percent [1] 47/4	80203 [1] 2/12
'91 to [1] 26/7	20 [8] 94/6 95/23 96/2 96/6 96/8 100/18 118/3 118/17	85 [4] 126/22 127/1 127/8 127/16
'91 was [1] 26/10 '93 [1] 26/14	116/17   20 percent [1]   78/22	850-878-2221 [1] 148/23 850.878.2221 [1] 1/21
93 [1] 20/14   94 [2] 42/14 63/8	20-round [3] 118/2 118/14 118/20	88,000 [1] 42/16
'95 [1] 42/15	20-year [1] 89/4	8:07 [1] 1/14
	2000 [4] 26/7 26/7 40/12 122/17	9
00 503 88 0 88 8 44 / 10	2001 [1] 97/7	
.22 [3] 57/3 57/7 116/3	2003 [2] 73/20 81/2	9-millimeter [2] 96/9 111/11
.22 caliber [1] 116/3 .223 [3] 48/4 56/25 57/9	2004 [2]   61/14 117/23     2011 [6]   3/10 28/19 35/21 37/14 61/7 122/18	90 [1] 106/9 90's [1] 40/9
.25 [1] 57/7	2011 [6] 5/10 28/19 55/21 5//14 61// 122/18 2012 [4] 28/19 28/19 68/6 69/2	91 [1] 109/9
.32 [1] 57/7	2013 [3] 1/13 133/20 148/19	911 [1] 44/6
1	2221 [1] 148/23	99,000 [1] 41/13
	23 [1] 97/7	A
1 percent [1] 89/7	24 [1] 117/21	
1,000 [2] 89/8 89/9 1,100 feet [1] 57/17	24.3 percent [1] 78/22	a.m [2] 1/14 1/15 ARC [1] 97/8
1,100 feet [1] 5//1/ 1,200 [1] 110/22	24th   2    114/21   114/22     25   4    1/13   52/12   53/4   118/13	ABC [1] 97/8 abiding [2] 145/16 145/21
1.0 [1] 77/2	[25 [4] 1/13 52/12 53/4 118/13 [26 [1] 130/22	ability [4] 5/7 5/11 45/20 133/25
1.15 [1] 77/1	2894 [3] 1/16 1/21 148/22	able [20] 12/19 13/5 13/6 15/17 49/12 51/11
1/2 [2] 81/24 120/19	3	52/18 53/3 65/1 78/1 89/3 104/1 105/3 106/15
1/2-year [1] 23/3		106/17 112/10 117/7 120/23 121/3 131/14
1/6 is [1] 22/25	3 pounds [1] 143/5	about [107] 5/4 7/13 11/9 14/22 14/23 15/23
1/6 of [1] 22/24 10 [5] 96/16 98/22 107/20 108/16 109/5	3,300 [1] 108/23	16/8 16/18 19/6 19/7 19/10 21/12 22/16 22/23 22/24 24/4 25/5 26/2 26/13 26/16 26/25 27/1
10 [5] 96/16 98/22 10//20 108/16 109/5 10 percent [1] 30/22	30 [6] 26/1 45/13 45/17 98/5 115/8 132/22 30-round [5] 109/9 109/13 113/14 114/23	27/4 27/5 27/24 28/17 28/20 29/8 31/22 31/24
10-round [2] 118/16 118/24	130/19	32/6 33/12 35/24 36/15 37/3 37/18 39/5 40/10
100 [5] 51/8 51/9 96/12 120/13 128/23	30-second [4] 98/1 98/2 98/9 98/22	40/17 42/15 46/18 50/7 51/2 53/18 53/20
100 percent [1] 45/24	303.831.1099 [1] 2/7	54/11 54/23 58/13 58/15 60/16 61/13 68/24
100,000 [1] 36/1	3100 [1] 2/6	70/15 70/15 70/18 75/3 77/9 78/19 81/15
100-round [7] 109/8 109/12 120/22 121/18	32 [4] 54/14 100/19 100/21 100/24	81/24 81/25 88/4 88/5 92/1 92/12 93/5 93/7
128/16 128/20 128/21	32308 [2] 1/21 148/22	93/12 94/25 99/22 101/12 102/13 104/12
101,000 [1] 42/15 11 [1] 146/24	33 [1]   123/5   35 [1]   122/20	104/17 108/9 110/4 111/8 111/9 115/23 117/7 117/10 118/9 118/22 119/15 119/18 119/20
11:46 [1] 1/15	36 [1] 126/14	119/22 122/4 122/17 124/21 126/9 129/12
12 [4] 15/1 22/9 120/5 130/18	38 [1] 119/21	130/1 130/13 130/13 131/2 131/19 132/17
1224 [1] 19/18	39 [3] 106/9 130/16 132/19	132/23 133/5 134/18 136/10 137/14 139/19
13 [5] 61/8 105/14 112/19 122/24 126/2	4	139/22 141/10 144/8
13 percent [1] 42/15		above [4] 78/10 113/24 122/14 126/12
13-cv-1300-MSK-MJW [1]   1/3   1300 [2]   2/12 4/21	4 pounds [1] 143/23 400 [1] 87/18	absolutely [2] 16/8 109/22 academic [1] 11/18
1300 [2] 2/12 4/21 1358 [1] 81/22	400 [1]   87/18  400-odd [1]   81/15	accept [3] 11/25 12/2 25/17
1356 [1] 81/22 1359 [1] 82/4	400-000 [1]   81/13     47 [2]   110/14 110/16	accepted [5] 12/3 14/5 145/8 145/10 145/25
14 [6] 15/1 61/8 79/15 107/24 108/11 108/18	47s [1] 109/11	access [3] 12/14 12/18 38/12
148 [1] 1/5	5	accidents [1] 29/6
15 [29] 42/19 62/13 75/4 98/7 98/13 98/14		accomplish [1] 104/2
99/2 100/18 101/2 101/12 107/25 108/11	5 pounds [1] 143/4	accord [1] 127/20
109/7 110/1 110/14 110/18 110/23 114/25	50 [2] 50/14 52/13 50-round [3] 51/10 52/7 116/2	according [9] 96/11 97/22 111/16 111/19 112/1 114/7 116/4 116/17 123/9
115/8 120/15 120/19 121/16 123/6 127/1   133/17 134/5 134/12 137/22 142/3	50-round [3]   51/10 52/7 110/2     52-round [1]   99/9	account [8] 95/12 106/13 110/8 114/5 118/18
15-round [2] 115/15 121/17	53 [1] 41/5	119/16 127/24 146/22
153 [1] 78/9	58 [4] 18/25 89/4 120/5 133/19	accounted [1] 82/7
154 [4] 76/6 130/20 130/25 132/20	5th [1] 148/18	accounts [28] 18/2 29/12 91/25 92/14 94/20
16 [2] 113/2 113/5	6	110/8 116/1 116/17 116/22 118/9 118/13
17 [2] 65/4 114/18		118/20 121/13 122/15 123/2 123/8 123/9
18 [4] 99/24 101/4 117/5 117/11 19 [7] 95/24 96/4 96/6 105/20 123/24 125/9	60 [4] 22/22 93/16 93/18 127/16 60-plus [1] 126/22	123/13 124/5 124/6 124/8 124/9 125/23 127/21 131/1 131/20 132/15 132/24
19 [7] 95/24 96/4 96/6 105/20 123/24 125/9 126/2	6th [1] 2/12	accurate [8] 1/20 56/12 61/20 61/23 65/23
1960s [1] 45/18	7	82/12 85/22 93/6
1983 [2] 26/2 40/8		accurately [3] 79/24 127/7 127/15
1985 [1] 41/3	7.62 [1] 106/9	achieve [1] 103/10
1985-1995 [1] 3/11	70 [4] 107/14 121/5 122/12 122/13	acquaintances [1] 61/1
1986 [4] 62/21 69/2 69/4 69/11	70-round [1] 107/7 720.508.6157 [1] 2/13	acquire [5] 60/20 62/16 62/18 64/24 68/4
1992 [1] 41/12	/ 20.300.013 / [1]   2/13	acquired [1] 61/24
	<u> </u>	<u>I</u>

acquiring [1] 63/11 acquisition [1] 63/14 acquisitions [1] 62/25 across [4] 8/2 8/24 11/1 38/14 Act [2] 63/4 63/9 action [4] 1/3 138/4 148/16 148/17 actions [2] 134/3 134/6 active [3] 94/16 99/16 99/20 activity [3] 6/16 8/10 120/7 actual [2] 99/16 122/4 actually [33] 23/5 26/13 40/19 48/17 51/23 52/9 56/17 56/20 57/23 58/11 71/18 78/24 81/3 82/5 91/19 94/16 94/24 95/16 95/24 109/1 111/7 115/20 115/25 116/25 121/16 126/15 131/20 132/1 132/9 139/8 140/4 141/11 143/2 acute [3] 137/1 137/8 137/9 adapt [1] 145/17 adaptation [1] 145/17 added [2] 17/18 65/21 adding [1] 60/7 additional [15] 9/24 21/14 22/20 57/22 60/7 65/21 69/11 70/8 102/2 106/22 113/16 121/22 121/23 122/14 122/16 address [4] 17/3 24/10 24/11 92/23 addressed [2] 67/8 145/13 addressing [1] 102/5 administer [1] 31/11 administration [1] 38/16 admit [2] 40/3 142/23 adopt [1] 145/17 adult [1] 28/6 advance [3] 74/10 135/5 138/19 advantage [2] 104/4 141/1 advisable [1] 30/15 advocates [1] 47/19 affect [4] 5/7 5/11 43/3 128/21 affected [4] 19/1 128/13 128/22 133/18 affirm [1] 4/9 affirmative [2] 45/14 45/18 after [9] 17/19 26/5 46/3 57/22 64/5 70/11 83/12 89/20 97/11 Aftermath [2] 108/5 109/6 again [11] 6/9 39/22 90/7 102/25 108/2 109/5 110/15 114/14 118/5 126/5 129/12 age [2] 22/9 22/11 aggravated [1] 27/11 aggressive [2] 134/3 134/6 aggressor [1] 135/2 aggressors [5] 137/24 138/23 139/8 139/17 140/24 agree [22] 42/13 65/16 74/23 75/21 76/9 76/14 76/19 76/20 79/18 81/12 85/11 87/15 101/1 101/5 102/16 103/17 107/10 109/14 112/25 116/10 124/25 136/25 agreed [1] 139/23 ahead [2] 7/11 8/15 aim [1] 127/11 aiming [2] 73/7 73/9 air [4] 32/15 34/1 105/20 112/18 AK [4] 106/1 109/11 110/14 110/16 AK-47 [2] 110/14 110/16 AK-47s [1] 109/11 AK-style [1] 106/1 al [4] 1/4 4/21 82/22 83/11 alarm [1] 129/21 alerted [2] 7/3 135/5 all [39] 6/18 10/4 20/21 24/10 27/12 29/1 46/24 49/22 50/17 51/20 56/7 56/17 57/7 57/20 58/18 72/4 75/7 76/20 79/10 80/19 82/9 86/7 88/23 89/2 93/15 94/12 96/7 101/11

101/22 104/11 105/7 112/21 115/14 125/3 125/17 126/3 127/15 133/6 139/19 allegations [1] 19/10 alleged [1] 110/11 allow [3] 24/1 110/25 130/5 allowed [2] 24/24 90/1 allowing [1] 84/18 almost [12] 7/14 7/18 29/16 36/2 40/11 49/22 55/25 91/24 93/4 93/11 121/5 124/4 alone [2] 38/9 86/5 along [2] 56/8 128/9 already [7] 32/19 33/25 39/3 42/25 116/25 123/21 127/25 also [18] 38/6 38/12 49/23 56/16 57/5 58/5 60/12 67/25 76/16 78/3 83/13 85/6 104/23 104/25 106/22 116/7 142/19 144/16 altered [1] 110/17 alternative [9] 29/10 55/17 137/23 138/4 138/22 138/25 139/9 140/23 141/2 although [13] 7/2 27/20 36/9 47/20 48/9 55/11 78/20 83/9 100/16 101/8 102/12 114/24 120/1 always [4] 5/16 22/7 79/16 124/4 am [6] 37/21 41/14 62/12 148/13 148/15 148/16 amateur [2] 31/2 31/10 ambiguous [2] 96/22 128/9 ambulance [1] 44/6 ammunition [9] 3/16 57/9 57/10 108/23 121/1 129/4 142/18 142/18 143/5 among [8] 84/21 93/4 102/19 136/12 136/13 144/15 144/17 146/16 amount [3] 13/11 20/15 127/10 amounts [1] 125/12 ample [1] 131/10 analysis [8] 101/20 101/21 105/18 119/8 119/12 120/12 120/14 133/2 analyzed [4] 81/3 81/15 86/22 106/11 and/or [1] 142/9 anecdotal [1] 52/4 Annual [1] 41/6 anonym [1] 25/5 anonymized [1] 25/3 anonymous [2] 23/15 25/18 another [21] 16/7 22/25 26/14 45/8 47/10 49/23 51/9 86/25 102/12 107/14 111/15 111/19 116/6 116/19 121/12 124/6 125/23 128/14 130/12 133/11 136/23 answer [11] 5/8 5/11 6/22 17/21 33/3 33/4 52/17 52/18 58/12 71/7 131/17 answered [2] 19/24 85/1 answering [1] 55/8 antibiotic [1] 31/6 anticipate [2] 77/18 134/24 anticipated [2] 69/11 142/7 anticipating [1] 138/12 anticipation [1] 136/2 any [130] 5/4 5/7 5/10 6/13 6/24 9/19 10/13 10/15 13/22 15/8 15/25 16/10 17/20 17/23 19/9 22/21 23/1 23/5 25/1 25/13 25/25 26/4 29/9 30/6 31/13 31/16 32/25 33/8 34/3 34/19 38/24 39/17 42/6 45/3 45/7 45/25 46/3 46/5 47/14 48/9 49/17 49/17 50/25 51/1 51/4 51/19 51/21 52/5 53/16 54/17 55/7 55/9 56/1 56/4 57/5 58/16 58/17 58/21 58/25 67/2 67/7 67/14 67/18 68/24 69/16 69/21 70/17 71/2 71/19 72/12 72/25 77/5 77/8 78/5 79/16 82/10 82/13 82/13 83/15 83/24 87/5 91/7 91/9 91/15 91/23 92/11 92/22 92/23 94/21 97/1 97/15 98/2 98/9 98/22 99/15 100/19 103/13 109/18 109/24 110/10 110/10 111/15 113/15 115/14 117/9 118/3 120/23 121/20 121/21 122/2 122/15

133/5 134/4 134/11 134/15 134/16 136/14 137/13 137/18 141/7 142/14 143/7 148/14 anybody [6] 32/23 42/6 110/3 121/3 121/8 135/25 anymore [1] 123/12 anyone [3] 70/25 90/2 105/1 anything [16] 16/6 28/25 34/7 57/12 92/1 92/12 93/2 94/15 94/19 94/25 117/7 122/4 130/1 131/2 136/16 136/20 anyway [1] 47/19 anywhere [5] 9/24 54/14 75/12 79/14 110/22 AP [2] 118/15 118/21 apartments [1] 38/9 apparently [4] 111/25 112/5 123/11 126/6 appear [1] 68/14 APPEARANCES [1] 2/1 appeared [1] 14/9 appears [1] 12/4 appendix [1] 95/6 applicable [1] 4/6 apply [2] 35/11 64/8 approach [1] 66/3 approaching [1] 45/24 approximately [2] 130/21 132/20 approximation [1] 20/16 AR [2] 109/7 121/16 AR-15 [2] 109/7 121/16 are [194] area [4] 11/20 21/21 47/22 80/5 areas [3] 80/1 80/1 80/4 aren't [3] 28/8 30/6 79/16 arguably [1] 133/18 argued [1] 48/8 Arkansas [1] 114/14 armed [2] 8/20 106/8 around [9] 8/13 16/17 40/9 55/2 57/17 99/6 126/2 142/17 143/4 arrange [1] 64/17 array [3] 60/6 87/25 88/13 arrest [3] 10/10 10/21 20/24 arrested [2] 10/20 20/24 arrive [1] 94/8 arrived [1] 13/17 arriving [1] 102/13 article [30] 3/8 3/10 3/12 3/13 3/15 3/16 3/18 3/19 11/17 13/3 13/20 14/1 14/10 14/11 60/10 62/9 62/12 62/21 65/4 68/6 68/10 68/12 74/21 96/9 96/22 105/15 109/17 109/19 112/19 113/6 articles [4] 11/11 11/13 14/14 91/5 as [138] 4/4 4/5 4/14 4/15 6/15 6/15 7/15 7/15 8/17 10/25 10/25 11/10 12/1 13/20 14/18 14/24 18/3 20/4 21/24 24/3 24/14 24/17 26/15 27/10 27/13 27/15 32/3 32/18 34/21 35/17 35/17 35/20 35/23 39/12 39/12 42/16 42/22 43/4 43/17 43/24 44/22 47/19 47/20 47/23 49/3 49/5 49/5 49/6 49/6 49/20 49/20 50/3 50/10 51/12 52/20 53/2 55/10 56/20 57/7 57/15 58/6 61/13 67/1 67/14 69/23 71/4 71/6 72/21 72/21 77/7 77/9 77/9 78/7 79/1 80/1 82/6 82/12 82/12 83/22 83/23 84/20 85/4 85/8 85/8 87/10 88/21 89/11 89/22 89/22 90/12 90/12 90/25 90/25 93/17 94/23 95/17 97/19 98/21 98/21 98/21 99/20 101/13 104/3 105/17 109/13 109/13 110/2 111/23 113/20 116/1 117/13 118/5 118/22 122/21 123/4 123/9 123/10 123/13 124/13 124/22 125/17 128/24 131/8 131/8 131/11 131/11 134/4 134/16 135/15 136/2 138/10 141/9 144/10 144/10 145/23 145/24 146/5 146/5

127/4 130/9 131/6 131/12 131/12 131/13

A	120/6 131/16 140/12 140/15 141/22	68/16 69/3 97/4 100/16 102/24 103/12 103/21
	background [25] 22/10 61/17 62/1 62/25	106/20 106/21 107/16 109/24 124/12 127/21
aside [6] 15/2 70/18 70/24 122/5 122/5 130/25 ask [9] 22/10 22/12 22/15 27/24 28/13 34/12	63/16 64/11 64/18 64/20 64/25 65/2 66/5 66/10 66/11 66/14 66/21 67/7 67/12 67/16	127/24 130/9 130/11   beneficial [1] 68/14
68/24 68/25 111/8	67/20 67/24 68/2 68/13 68/20 69/8 69/13	benefits [2] 55/21 56/4
asked [8] 17/2 17/3 17/6 31/20 32/20 33/22	backup [2] 136/11 144/12	Beretta [1] 109/10
34/24 87/6	bad [1] 104/5	besides [1] 130/22
asking [2] 31/22 34/15	ballpark [1] 42/4	best [8] 20/12 26/14 35/20 66/1 83/20 113/20
asreporters [1] 1/22	ban [5] 46/14 46/19 47/14 55/9 71/10	121/20 122/21
assault [22] 3/13 15/19 27/12 29/17 30/22 46/19 47/5 47/14 47/19 47/25 48/1 48/3 48/8	bandage [1] 31/5 bank [1] 107/23	beta [1] 109/8 Betadine [1] 31/4
48/16 49/2 49/21 50/10 56/24 57/9 83/4 88/14	banned [2] 48/10 145/18	better [9] 20/16 33/22 34/2 34/6 34/8 45/25
118/2	banning [3] 46/16 47/17 75/3	64/5 83/2 99/10
assaults [11] 3/14 74/22 74/22 76/17 76/18	bans [3] 15/19 16/1 55/13	between [19] 6/8 11/20 48/10 48/11 52/6 75/2
76/24 76/25 88/2 88/14 89/6 141/12	Baptist [1] 96/11	75/22 82/8 83/14 85/12 85/14 85/20 88/10
assertion [3] 44/17 145/14 146/4 assessment [1] 58/19	bar [1] 143/8	102/8 107/15 125/20 139/12 139/24 140/8
assets [1] 65/12	bare [2] 77/7 77/10 barrels [2] 56/11 56/12	beyond [3] 17/22 113/17 122/14 big [3] 41/17 79/9 125/18
assistance [1] 17/23	base [6] 60/12 104/17 105/20 112/19 121/24	bigger [3] 41/20 48/6 48/6
assistant [2] 4/19 113/17	124/4	biggest [1] 88/10
associate [1] 9/15	based [24] 12/9 19/3 20/14 27/17 29/4 29/10	bill [2] 19/18 19/21
associated [2] 20/6 82/6	35/3 36/18 39/10 39/11 39/13 39/16 44/23	bills [1] 19/15
association [1] 83/14 assume [7] 42/11 52/14 84/3 110/12 120/15	44/23 58/19 59/7 91/4 91/6 96/13 96/21 98/11   116/21 131/1 139/23	bit [9] 16/13 19/7 20/20 26/8 62/8 78/8 111/5 131/16 139/21
130/3 133/2	bases [2] 13/13 13/14	131/16 139/21   blood [1] 45/16
assumption [5] 122/11 132/21 133/5 142/23	basically [12] 22/6 43/15 45/24 46/1 90/23	body [3] 57/20 80/1 83/14
142/23	95/21 98/20 101/23 111/1 124/14 124/16	boils [1] 90/23
assurance [3] 25/4 25/11 25/22	125/24	bold [1] 108/5
assurances [1] 25/1 assure [1] 25/6	basis [12] 27/21 27/22 39/3 44/16 77/5 78/5 101/24 102/5 109/16 109/17 133/11 136/7	bone [1] 58/6 book [3] 12/23 18/6 60/14
assure [1] 25/0 assured [1] 25/10	bathroom [2] 94/7 98/13	books [1] 12/22
assuring [1] 25/16	be [213]	borderline [1] 114/10
attached [3] 3/6 28/9 106/10	bears [1] 137/19	both [16] 8/7 14/22 27/1 46/17 52/1 61/14
attack [1] 117/2	because [112] 9/1 9/14 11/7 12/17 13/9 18/9	88/1 89/5 92/14 95/12 97/9 99/18 108/23
attacked [1] 131/14	20/21 21/6 27/17 28/14 29/15 30/25 32/10	121/22 139/4 146/23
attacks [2] 140/17 140/17 attempt [2] 73/18 112/7	33/1 33/5 33/24 35/9 35/16 35/16 38/7 40/21 41/23 42/23 43/14 44/4 44/18 47/8 48/13 51/1	bottom [3] 96/6 108/10 108/18 bound [1] 146/10
attempted [2] 81/12 135/4	51/21 52/18 57/24 58/3 59/6 60/5 61/3 65/12	box [2] 108/23 109/13
attempting [8] 40/3 105/4 116/5 116/23 117/3	65/13 72/14 73/5 73/15 74/11 75/4 75/11	Brady [11] 63/4 63/6 63/9 63/13 64/3 64/5
123/15 123/20 127/25	77/12 78/1 79/23 83/2 84/16 85/9 87/6 88/22	64/8 64/12 67/11 67/17 69/18
attempts [1] 73/19	89/12 89/25 90/10 90/14 90/15 90/18 90/19	brands [1] 55/18
attorney [3] 4/19 148/14 148/16 attorneys [3] 70/19 70/23 70/24	90/20 90/25 91/20 91/22 91/24 92/13 93/1 93/8 94/21 98/19 98/24 101/17 101/22 101/23	break [2] 28/7 98/1 break-ins [1] 28/7
attributable [2] 83/7 83/9	103/10 103/16 105/2 105/8 107/1 110/3	breaking [1] 26/4
attributes [1] 61/5		Brief [3] 45/10 81/8 147/1
audio [1] 49/7	121/5 121/21 122/10 123/4 123/5 125/18	briefly [3] 81/11 116/13 116/13
Aurora [5] 119/20 128/17 129/12 130/2	127/8 127/21 128/23 129/3 129/21 132/6	bring [4] 9/6 102/23 103/7 103/23
130/10   author [2]   11/17 13/17	133/6 135/1 137/10 137/15 137/16 138/8   139/14 141/4 141/9 141/12 142/2 143/13	broaden [1] 139/21 broader [2] 60/6 87/25
authorities [1] 32/19	145/15 145/19 145/20	broadly [1] 66/7
authorized [1] 148/10	become [5] 6/14 20/5 21/18 64/3 64/5	Broadway [2] 2/6 2/12
authors [1] 33/18	becomes [2] 6/15 8/6	broke [1] 85/18
automatic [4] 109/12 110/13 110/16 110/21	been [53] 4/14 5/2 5/16 13/7 13/23 14/23 15/2	broken [1] 21/21
automatically [1] 109/8 availability [1] 65/19	15/5 15/9 16/7 17/19 21/21 22/13 25/25 26/8 29/23 31/13 31/14 31/16 31/20 31/21 32/3	brokerage [3] 64/22 66/18 66/22 brothers [1] 116/7
available [7] 55/18 91/22 106/12 137/24	32/12 33/22 33/25 35/3 35/25 39/17 40/11	BRUNO [1] 2/5
138/18 138/22 140/24	44/24 45/15 49/12 49/16 49/16 49/17 51/5	brunolawyers.com [1] 2/5
average [23] 55/3 56/18 57/5 74/5 78/23 79/5	52/18 55/13 55/21 67/10 67/15 79/8 91/20	bulging [2] 143/14 144/10
82/1 85/24 86/1 86/7 86/8 92/20 95/2 95/9	106/24 110/17 116/25 117/7 121/7 121/19	bulk [3] 32/10 36/22 47/25
95/13 97/19 98/18 98/19 120/17 140/7 140/19 140/25 141/15	126/7 127/5 132/7 146/6   before [14]   5/2 14/4 14/7 18/6 23/4 26/5 37/9	bullet [3] 57/12 57/24 58/4 bullets [7] 48/6 52/13 56/9 73/13 112/10
awaiting [1] 32/11	40/24 60/10 62/9 80/24 100/5 140/5 141/9	122/6 125/8
aware [27] 21/7 31/16 33/8 45/3 45/7 51/20	begin [1] 74/12	burden [1] 142/20
54/17 67/14 67/18 69/16 69/21 82/13 92/23	beginning [4] 84/14 92/15 116/19 124/11	bureau [12] 20/18 21/12 22/6 23/18 24/6
129/7 129/9 131/12 134/4 134/11 134/14	behalf [5] 16/11 16/24 28/4 44/6 66/11	24/19 25/15 36/10 36/15 37/12 38/4 38/19
136/17 136/19 136/23 137/13 137/18 143/7	behavior [4] 5/20 7/15 7/17 9/3	burglary [1] 28/2   burgts [1] 131/2
away [2] 51/25 133/1	being [21] 6/8 19/15 22/19 30/2 30/11 30/19 38/25 40/19 50/17 51/13 56/15 59/23 73/11	bursts [1] 131/2 business [3] 7/13 7/15 7/15
B	75/2 75/3 79/21 80/3 83/3 87/1 122/23 145/4	buy [2] 61/2 61/15
	beings [1] 56/10	buyer [2] 66/7 66/12
baby [1] 143/21	belief [1] 103/10	buying [3] 9/17 58/23 59/9
back [18] 23/6 39/4 56/23 58/11 58/13 61/6 65/14 70/2 71/18 88/18 101/15 111/2 120/6	believe [21] 25/10 38/25 39/19 41/1 61/21	bystander [1] 115/21
05/14 /0/2 /1/10 00/10 101/15 111/2 120/0		

claimed [1] 118/16 B cash [2] 8/5 8/6 claims [1] 118/10 bystanders [6] 111/16 111/21 116/20 127/23 clarify [3] 16/25 88/8 134/9 categories [2] 11/14 27/3 128/2 128/6 categorization [2] 44/13 45/2 class [1] 44/13 classification [1] 44/12 category [1] 15/13 caused [2] 85/3 129/3 classify [1] 45/1 calculate [1] 95/13 causes [1] 5/19 classroom [1] 131/13 calculated [1] 12/16 cavitation [2] 58/8 58/10 classrooms [1] 131/13 calculation [1] 12/17 cavity [6] 57/19 57/21 57/23 58/1 58/4 58/5 clean [1] 31/3 caliber [11] 48/1 48/1 56/2 56/7 56/8 57/1 ceiling [1] 45/25 clear [8] 6/22 30/14 66/14 88/3 101/10 127/18 57/4 57/6 57/8 106/9 116/3 celebrated [1] 117/14 133/16 140/22 calibers [3] 48/4 48/6 57/6 censored [1] 82/24 clearer [2] 16/14 128/10 call [3] 54/5 69/10 112/4 census [11] 20/18 21/12 22/6 23/17 24/6 clerk [1] 8/5 24/19 25/15 36/10 36/14 38/3 38/19 called [6] 4/14 15/15 18/6 28/3 48/3 75/17 clinical [1] 84/8 Caltrans [3] 113/4 113/8 113/24 Center [11] 29/3 113/13 114/15 114/24 115/4 close [2] 127/14 132/24 came [3] 75/12 98/14 115/16 115/5 115/14 118/1 118/8 118/11 118/19 clothing [4] 58/7 143/15 143/16 144/11 camp [1] 117/24 central [2] 21/25 63/20 CNN [1] 126/16 can [59] 6/24 12/1 12/25 13/25 14/19 14/22 centralized [1] 63/21 cocaine [1] 40/6 15/24 18/19 21/7 24/14 24/15 29/15 34/9 coded [2] 76/2 101/13 certain [2] 46/16 130/7 34/12 34/14 34/15 45/8 49/12 49/14 49/15 certainly [27] 7/4 15/14 24/9 29/16 34/21 codes [3] 130/5 130/7 130/10 52/21 56/21 58/16 60/18 79/10 80/18 81/7 34/22 36/3 43/23 44/11 57/1 61/23 67/10 COLIN [3] 2/4 2/5 111/11 82/12 83/23 84/25 86/7 88/8 88/9 93/8 94/9 84/21 89/6 89/7 93/4 94/9 101/10 109/2 121/5 collar [1] 7/13 95/6 102/3 103/10 104/11 105/6 110/3 111/6 125/2 129/23 130/7 133/10 145/3 145/25 collection [3] 3/15 22/5 80/14 112/25 113/20 115/12 119/3 122/10 122/11 146/10 collector's [1] 86/20 125/23 127/6 129/22 131/16 135/5 135/9 CERTIFICATE [1] 148/2 COLORADO [11] 1/1 1/7 2/6 2/11 2/12 4/20 135/13 135/19 138/1 138/17 142/3 certificates [1] 29/4 17/17 71/11 123/4 126/19 136/24 can't [12] 27/18 58/19 83/18 85/1 86/5 86/10 **Certified** [1] 1/19 Colorado's [7] 68/20 69/3 71/9 101/7 136/16 101/10 107/1 134/16 135/9 135/15 140/13 136/20 142/11 certify [2] 148/9 148/13 Canadian [3] 15/10 16/16 16/17 challenged [1] 19/16 Columbia [1] 46/11 canceled [2] 55/23 56/4 challenges [2] 15/6 84/9 Columbine [3] 99/22 100/11 101/6 cannot [1] 134/24 challenging [1] 16/22 column [4] 42/14 43/1 76/8 78/9 capabilities [1] 48/14 chambers [1] 84/17 chance [3] 78/12 78/14 81/10 comcast.net [1] 1/19 capability [1] 52/10 come [12] 8/2 8/24 18/5 21/3 23/6 36/12 39/4 capable [2] 44/1 66/10 chances [3] 72/24 79/19 99/9 39/11 52/16 54/24 88/11 124/2 capacities [5] 85/24 86/2 86/4 86/9 109/3 change [5] 63/13 71/3 108/15 116/11 121/2 comes [4] 22/25 24/22 24/22 74/11 capacity [80] 3/16 16/1 17/4 18/14 18/18 changed [4] 24/17 62/22 111/15 111/17 coming [1] 72/7 19/21 54/5 54/8 54/18 54/21 71/10 72/15 changing [6] 53/12 111/24 112/4 116/10 Commenced [1] 1/14 72/20 74/10 75/6 75/11 75/13 76/11 84/16 121/9 131/14 comment [3] 89/20 96/21 113/1 85/12 85/16 85/19 87/7 87/15 87/16 88/6 chapters [1] 12/23 commented [1] 102/12 89/13 89/18 89/21 90/13 90/18 90/24 93/21 character [2] 35/17 87/22 commit [6] 6/5 6/6 8/25 9/5 10/7 135/16 101/5 101/6 101/11 101/13 101/18 102/4 commitment [1] 110/6 characteristics [2] 20/19 20/23 102/6 102/9 102/17 102/20 103/8 103/18 characterize [2] 145/23 145/24 commits [1] 6/19 104/8 104/8 104/14 104/25 105/5 106/1 108/2 committed [2] 46/25 47/5 charge [1] 66/17 108/19 109/1 109/11 109/14 113/11 114/23 cheap [3] 54/2 56/16 56/18 committing [4] 8/19 33/6 42/10 43/20 119/8 119/14 123/3 123/4 126/19 128/2 128/7 common [13] 7/22 14/14 14/17 57/1 57/6 check [26] 12/6 12/8 34/12 35/2 61/17 62/1 128/24 130/8 130/20 131/6 131/11 132/3 62/25 63/16 63/23 63/24 64/11 64/18 64/20 60/24 86/12 136/10 136/12 141/11 141/14 133/17 133/24 137/22 139/1 139/15 140/1 64/25 65/2 66/11 66/14 66/21 67/7 67/12 141/15 144/15 140/19 141/23 145/18 67/16 67/20 67/24 68/3 68/20 69/13 commonly [2] 87/9 136/1 captioned [1] 4/21 checked [1] 63/22 commonsensical [1] 142/22 care [2] 30/11 43/18 checks [4] 66/5 66/10 68/13 69/8 commuter [1] 111/13 carefully [1] 73/8 Chicago [2] 15/20 15/21 compact [4] 143/17 143/19 144/3 144/7 carried [3] 138/5 138/19 142/9 children [2] 131/13 132/25 compacts [1] 144/9 carries [1] 139/7 choice [6] 30/10 30/14 44/1 44/4 144/19 compare [5] 24/16 83/23 108/17 111/4 113/3 carry [15] 8/23 9/9 119/3 135/23 136/2 144/22 comparing [2] 36/11 50/20 136/11 137/12 141/8 142/16 143/4 143/12 choose [3] 38/8 77/18 77/24 comparison [2] 3/13 144/9 143/15 144/12 146/8 146/14 chose [1] 131/25 competitions [2] 52/19 53/8 carrying [11] 10/2 130/18 136/7 136/17 chunk [1] 98/3 complaint [3] 19/11 19/13 19/25 136/21 138/6 138/14 139/2 139/3 143/8 146/9 chunks [1] 98/1 complete [2] 131/16 148/12 cartridges [2] 74/5 112/12 Church [1] 96/11 completed [1] 14/8 case [60] 3/15 4/20 4/25 9/6 14/24 15/21 completely [3] 46/14 58/5 61/3 circulation [1] 87/12 15/22 15/23 16/2 16/3 16/4 16/16 16/17 17/2 circumstances [5] 40/2 44/9 75/16 75/17 complex [1] 73/2 17/17 18/20 18/22 18/24 19/10 36/9 40/21 77/21 compliance [4] 65/19 67/20 68/1 130/10 46/11 50/3 50/5 66/11 67/18 68/19 70/6 71/19 cite [1] 118/11 complicated [2] 64/10 93/24 75/18 79/12 79/13 80/14 87/24 89/9 94/10 cited [5] 10/16 53/5 60/10 73/25 115/14 comply [1] 67/24 98/8 103/20 105/18 105/22 106/2 106/24 comprehensive [3] 29/6 29/14 64/6 cites [1] 73/20 115/10 115/13 118/6 119/10 120/2 120/22 citizen [1] 6/8 compressed [1] 94/2 120/25 122/7 122/8 122/13 122/16 123/1 citizens [3] 9/9 71/11 133/25 computation [1] 12/19 124/13 125/14 128/9 128/10 131/9 131/9 City [2] 117/7 117/10 concealable [1] 47/9 caseload [1] 65/21 civil [2] 1/3 65/21 concept [1] 58/8 cases [30] 9/4 15/3 15/8 15/16 15/18 15/25 civilian [2] 134/10 134/12 concepts [1] 12/7 16/10 16/14 16/19 16/21 21/18 44/3 49/22 civilians [4] 136/13 139/13 144/15 144/17 concern [1] 40/16 49/22 51/20 52/1 77/14 79/6 86/2 89/4 90/13 concerning [3] 15/19 15/20 60/6 claim [2] 115/16 118/14 90/20 90/23 91/16 92/4 92/13 92/13 95/11

97/5 125/20

concerns [2] 17/4 59/12 conclude [2] 84/22 86/10 concluded [3] 1/15 62/18 119/17 conclusion [14] 13/18 19/3 71/9 71/16 88/15 88/16 102/7 102/14 103/14 104/17 119/13 119/15 133/16 133/23 conclusions [7] 71/3 71/7 88/12 91/24 101/23 106/24 107/1 concrete [1] 58/20 condition [1] 69/23 conditions [2] 5/10 34/3 conducted [1] 20/18 confederates [1] 59/18 confident [2] 58/12 104/12 confidentiality [2] 25/4 25/6 conflict [6] 115/25 118/6 124/6 125/20 125/23 127/21 congresswoman [4] 122/22 122/24 124/18 125/4 connected [1] 148/16 Connecticut [5] 15/18 16/2 16/18 113/20 connection [4] 14/24 37/4 37/17 59/14 consequence [1] 43/17 consequences [2] 5/20 89/14 Consequently [1] 137/21 consideration [2] 92/8 119/14 considered [1] 67/5 consistent [3] 87/20 102/24 124/19 constant [1] 43/15 constitutes [1] 27/2 Constitution [1] 137/6 constitutional [2] 15/5 15/14 consuming [1] 40/6 contact [1] 23/19 contacted [1] 29/12 contains [1] 25/22 context [8] 32/7 33/21 33/21 35/16 35/17 139/18 139/18 140/23 continue [6] 43/17 90/1 112/7 112/15 131/24 132/2 continued [2] 42/17 128/5 continues [1] 73/17 continuing [3] 40/12 90/12 117/4 continuously [1] 22/19 contradict [1] 33/8 contrast [5] 88/9 134/23 139/11 139/12 139/16 contrasted [1] 140/6 contribute [1] 110/3 control [9] 3/12 14/2 16/25 46/6 53/18 58/14 125/13 135/1 135/3 controversy [2] 108/5 109/6 convenience [1] 143/1 converted [1] 109/7 conveys [1] 98/20 convicted [4] 6/10 9/23 32/12 32/14 conviction [1] 61/4 Cook [6] 4/21 15/19 15/22 16/2 16/19 39/16 COOKE [1] 1/4 cooperation [2] 69/7 69/9 copy [1] 80/16 correct [31] 4/25 15/4 16/20 19/5 23/24 26/11 33/3 68/7 77/3 77/4 82/2 82/19 86/6 94/3 94/20 105/21 106/2 106/12 108/19 113/9 122/1 122/6 123/24 126/20 128/19 133/21 134/17 135/20 140/20 144/12 144/19 correctly [1] 37/22 correlation [9] 75/21 75/25 76/1 76/4 85/12 85/12 102/8 139/24 140/8 costs [1] 65/20

20/22 23/25 24/16 30/24 31/2 31/11 34/24 34/25 35/2 48/23 49/5 49/6 51/5 52/1 52/10 52/11 52/23 52/24 54/4 54/12 58/18 60/19 63/23 63/24 65/14 65/19 69/7 72/19 72/21 74/17 75/7 76/22 77/15 78/7 90/14 90/15 94/2 94/5 94/10 97/6 98/25 100/24 101/11 104/2 112/6 121/9 128/22 129/13 129/20 131/21 131/23 131/25 132/6 136/4 138/14 138/18 142/6 couldn't [10] 25/14 37/25 45/25 52/23 55/11 69/9 116/13 126/10 127/6 142/7 counsel [2] 148/14 148/16 count [10] 21/7 21/23 27/8 27/9 27/10 27/12 27/13 29/5 29/14 29/15 counted [1] 27/15 counterparts [2] 48/2 48/17 counting [1] 114/9 counts [1] 27/6 County [6] 3/17 15/19 15/22 16/3 16/19 148/7 couple [7] 11/8 46/18 52/25 79/9 81/4 91/16 course [17] 7/12 23/19 28/24 33/2 33/3 34/8 34/12 40/6 51/17 52/21 66/9 66/19 79/17 86/3 90/10 133/3 138/14 courses [1] 138/4 court [6] 1/1 14/21 14/24 17/11 118/16 118/23 courts [1] 65/21 cover [5] 38/2 51/19 64/12 68/14 117/19 covered [8] 18/23 37/25 38/3 50/6 88/1 112/18 117/15 137/16 covering [3] 29/6 38/10 88/1 crack [3] 24/23 40/5 40/6 crack-smoking [1] 40/5 creates [1] 58/4 creating [1] 57/21 crime [55] 6/3 6/10 7/13 7/14 7/23 8/8 8/11 8/25 14/2 20/12 20/13 20/16 20/17 21/19 22/2 22/14 22/23 25/25 26/6 26/12 26/15 26/18 26/20 26/22 26/25 27/3 27/5 27/7 27/8 27/10 27/10 27/13 27/15 28/18 33/6 37/4 37/21 42/23 43/3 43/7 43/20 48/13 53/22 59/15 59/20 60/8 72/12 83/3 86/17 134/1 135/3 135/17 137/7 145/23 146/17 crimes [25] 6/6 6/6 6/15 6/19 6/23 7/8 7/9 7/9 7/9 21/7 21/11 21/16 21/17 21/23 22/16 27/25 28/1 28/10 42/10 47/5 134/19 134/19 134/23 134/24 141/12 criminal [35] 5/20 5/25 6/3 6/4 6/5 6/8 6/15 6/20 6/23 7/1 7/1 10/3 10/8 10/11 11/3 29/17 29/21 29/23 31/17 32/18 38/23 40/2 48/17 60/1 61/2 61/4 62/24 74/11 137/24 138/23 139/7 139/8 139/17 140/24 145/19 criminals [31] 3/8 5/22 9/8 11/6 29/20 32/11 34/4 35/18 36/22 37/21 37/24 39/20 43/15 47/7 47/11 47/12 55/22 59/20 60/23 61/25 62/15 62/18 65/20 72/11 74/12 74/15 74/19 75/7 139/22 141/10 145/24 criminological [1] 6/25 criminologist [1] 20/4 criminologist's [1] 6/20 criminologists [1] 6/11 criminology [3] 5/15 5/16 14/13 critical [1] 44/15 cross [2] 6/7 6/14 crossing [1] 6/9 crowding [1] 129/17 CRR [1] 148/21 cumbersome [1] 138/8 curious [2] 7/6 24/3 current [1] 87/12

could [63] 7/4 8/16 14/8 18/10 18/11 18/16

currently [2] 15/10 15/16 curvilinear [1] 57/15 customer [1] 8/3 cut [1] 6/22 cutoff [1] 18/16 cv [2] 1/3 4/21

# D

D.C [1] 15/20 daily [1] 136/7 damage [1] 65/15 dangerous [3] 9/15 9/16 9/17 DANIELLE [1] 1/18 data [28] 3/15 12/14 12/18 17/24 20/24 21/2 22/4 27/6 27/17 28/15 29/4 29/11 36/13 36/13 36/18 39/10 39/13 43/12 79/10 80/14 85/2 86/5 86/22 86/25 111/4 136/14 137/14 139/5 database [3] 63/21 63/23 63/25 date [2] 1/13 63/7 dated [2] 61/19 114/21 David [2] 17/7 17/25 day [3] 9/2 30/6 148/19 DC [1] 16/19 dead [2] 51/17 114/8 deal [5] 7/20 13/9 20/23 27/4 36/4 dealer [7] 65/2 66/9 66/17 67/5 67/12 67/14 68/13 dealers [4] 64/20 65/22 67/1 69/7 dealing [1] 24/23 death [4] 29/4 47/24 83/5 87/25 deaths [2] 50/12 87/18 debatable [1] 25/11 decide [2] 116/15 146/11 decided [1] 129/2 decision [2] 15/11 44/6 decisions [1] 7/16 decline [2] 40/11 40/12 declined [1] 42/19 declining [2] 26/8 42/25 deem [1] 102/1 defend [2] 135/19 141/24 Defendant [3] 1/8 1/11 2/9 defending [1] 15/11 defense [6] 134/1 136/25 137/7 137/8 138/13 142/4 define [1] 5/25 defined [5] 18/3 46/20 57/4 89/11 123/4 definitely [3] 12/21 28/19 55/6 definition [12] 6/1 10/4 18/5 21/6 55/25 71/22 75/7 101/7 114/7 126/20 145/15 145/20 deform [1] 57/25 demonstrate [1] 87/19 denied [1] 66/19 density [1] 97/15 Denver [2] 2/6 2/12 department [4] 2/11 15/11 105/23 107/17 departments [3] 41/11 41/14 43/13 depend [3] 7/12 93/10 125/18 depending [4] 10/21 76/1 93/3 127/20 depends [2] 20/10 26/12 deposed [1] 5/2 deposition [3] 1/9 4/2 7/4 depositions [1] 72/6 describe [2] 5/18 47/19 described [2] 26/15 47/18 description [2] 3/7 30/7 design [2] 22/24 38/7 designed [1] 56/21 detail [1] 121/12 detailed [1] 22/15 details [1] 117/9 determine [2] 22/13 135/3 determined [3] 49/4 66/25 77/16

	D
	determining [1] 92/9 devoted [1] 38/20
	dial [1] 44/6
ı	diametrically [1] 14/15
	did [78] 9/2 14/1 17/20 17/23 18/5 18/20 18/25 19/9 19/25 19/25 20/2 21/13 27/21 30/5
	31/21 31/23 32/21 32/21 33/18 36/23 40/15
	45/5 61/15 63/13 63/19 64/3 64/5 64/5 65/13 68/22 70/24 71/2 78/12 78/16 80/20 81/1
	81/10 81/13 89/22 90/16 90/21 90/25 91/7
	91/9 91/11 91/15 92/1 92/8 92/11 92/13 95/9
	98/22 100/23 101/17 101/19 105/23 105/24 106/23 109/25 112/14 112/14 119/12 119/13
	120/21 121/18 123/2 123/7 123/14 126/6
	127/18 128/10 128/21 131/7 131/11 132/9
	145/10 145/20 148/10 didn't [28] 32/23 33/4 52/16 56/21 66/21
	66/24 70/8 80/17 90/13 90/18 91/23 96/20
	101/14 101/21 101/21 102/1 105/7 106/19 106/20 118/11 119/13 122/16 128/2 128/17
	128/23 128/25 129/4 140/4
	didn't make [1] 128/25
	die [1] 80/5 differed [1] 123/8
	difference [19] 26/19 50/1 50/9 51/21 75/1
	77/1 88/4 89/18 89/19 120/23 121/20 121/21
	127/19 128/3 128/8 128/17 128/25 131/6 139/16
	differences [3] 82/8 83/6 83/9
	different [17] 11/13 15/22 18/11 21/3 23/8 25/6 33/21 38/14 52/6 55/20 62/8 84/7 84/10
	85/10 88/12 109/11 144/8
	differing [1] 123/13
	differs [1]  17/17 difficult [7]  24/8 24/9 60/19 68/3 127/15
	142/15 143/12
	difficulties [3] 64/14 64/15 67/2 difficulty [4] 55/19 64/16 103/1 143/13
	digested [1] 61/11
	direct [4] 4/16 59/11 105/14 140/8 directly [1] 65/11
	disagree [7] 78/5 84/19 100/20 101/5 102/7
	103/13 137/3 disapproved [1] 6/2
	discharge [3] 56/20 56/22 93/22
	discharged [1] 139/25
	discipline [2] 5/18 11/16 discourage [1] 136/17
	discover [2] 21/19 21/20
	discovered [2] 17/19 50/3 discovery [1] 4/4
	discovery [1] 4/4 discrepancy [1] 118/19
	discuss [4] 6/25 10/16 74/2 95/16
	discussed [2] 39/10 67/10 discussion [1] 78/10
	dislikes [1] 13/18
	Dismissed [1] 113/6
	displayed [1] 118/15 disposition [1] 8/7
	dispute [4] 82/10 83/15 83/18 113/15
	disqualifying [1] 61/4 disrupted [1] 127/22
	distinct [4] 6/13 15/23 25/18 84/8
	distinction [4] 6/12 48/9 48/11 85/20
	distinguishes [1] 88/11 DISTRICT [3] 1/1 1/1 46/10
	divide [1] 120/13
	dividing [2] 122/5 130/25 do [190]
	document [28] 17/12 17/13 37/8 40/25 41/9
	61/9 62/6 62/14 70/4 71/8 71/17 73/23 76/12

78/11 79/4 81/6 88/17 96/1 97/24 99/25 100/5 105/13 108/1 108/6 117/22 122/19 130/15 140/3 does [34] 6/3 6/7 11/4 11/16 16/2 16/3 22/4 29/9 35/11 37/1 37/15 38/19 52/7 54/3 54/5 54/8 54/17 55/7 57/12 64/8 67/12 72/13 84/13 92/17 97/13 107/6 108/25 119/2 120/14 124/1 141/23 142/11 143/17 146/2 doesn't [19] 24/6 28/25 38/2 38/6 49/23 50/13 57/23 57/24 83/23 86/18 92/21 100/21 100/22 100/24 105/5 107/7 109/1 109/2 115/11 doing [5] 22/20 51/24 101/20 103/19 119/9 don't [106] 6/11 6/13 7/7 8/17 19/17 23/22 24/2 24/7 24/7 26/1 27/13 31/22 34/17 34/19 35/22 36/8 36/20 39/11 39/15 39/17 39/22 41/21 42/9 50/25 50/25 51/1 51/4 51/25 52/11 53/6 53/10 53/14 55/1 58/12 58/17 58/21 59/5 61/2 61/4 64/4 67/9 67/13 68/9 69/25 70/1 72/8 72/21 74/12 77/7 79/14 80/21 83/10 83/17 83/18 85/17 85/18 86/14 86/18 86/21 87/10 87/19 94/14 94/24 96/17 97/17 97/23 102/11 102/12 102/14 103/15 103/20 107/2 108/4 109/10 112/21 113/18 115/1 115/2 115/6 115/14 117/15 118/6 119/1 119/4 121/11 121/11 122/4 122/7 122/9 122/15 124/24 125/2 129/25 130/4 131/2 133/5 136/12 136/13 136/14 138/15 140/10 142/14 143/22 143/23 144/14 144/21 done [22] 10/13 16/6 22/17 22/19 23/11 23/12 33/19 33/20 33/25 34/7 39/16 42/6 53/16 60/9 60/12 64/18 82/14 82/22 83/10 83/11 116/8 127/5 door [3] 8/20 9/1 129/24 double [3] 142/20 143/25 144/6 doubt [8] 35/10 77/8 107/13 109/18 110/9 118/3 118/9 118/21 doubts [1] 34/22 down [18] 23/22 24/6 26/7 26/23 26/23 42/24 43/7 43/8 49/7 85/18 90/23 98/1 106/8 109/2 109/2 124/18 124/22 129/18 dozen [2] 52/22 55/11 dozens [1] 72/23 Dr. [2] 4/18 102/7 Dr. Kleck [1] 4/18 Dr. Zacks's [1] 102/7 draft [1] 70/25 drafting [1] 17/21 drafts [2] 70/17 70/22 drop [1] 90/6 dropoff [1] 42/14 drops [1] 22/24 drugs [1] 9/18 drum [8] 106/10 107/11 108/23 109/12 120/22 128/16 128/20 128/21 dubious [5] 31/19 31/24 32/6 34/21 35/24 dug [1] 21/2 duly [1] 4/14 during [17] 18/21 74/22 74/22 76/17 76/18 76/24 76/24 92/20 92/21 97/15 98/2 98/3 99/16 120/8 120/16 129/20 132/22 each [7] 16/14 16/21 22/8 71/13 89/6 122/12 125/22 earlier [15] 18/7 18/22 37/20 50/4 53/5 56/24 70/7 70/21 74/4 85/23 91/19 96/18 134/18

each [7] 16/14 16/21 22/8 71/13 89/6 122/12 125/22 earlier [15] 18/7 18/22 37/20 50/4 53/5 56/2 70/7 70/21 74/4 85/23 91/19 96/18 134/18 139/5 139/23 early [6] 40/9 42/24 45/18 45/22 63/7 71/3 earth [1] 32/17 easiest [1] 71/15 easily [3] 52/24 103/10 127/3 easy [8] 93/18 120/13 120/18 127/7 127/11 127/13 127/13 138/10

125/17

editor [3] 11/19 11/23 12/1 editorial [1] 113/1 effect [10] 8/14 27/7 28/10 30/9 45/25 56/4 58/14 58/22 59/1 125/12 effective [11] 45/23 46/6 46/20 47/15 49/20 53/19 55/13 59/3 59/4 60/2 63/7 Effects [1] 3/19 efficiency [2] 103/25 104/5 efficient [2] 103/19 103/21 effort [3] 63/10 106/18 106/19 eight [7] 17/18 70/8 86/4 86/12 86/24 87/4 eight-round [1] 87/4 either [18] 18/4 28/7 30/10 38/9 47/25 51/23 54/4 56/2 60/24 65/12 75/5 85/5 116/5 117/3 123/19 138/6 140/9 141/8 elaborated [1] 146/4 eliminated [1] 55/24 else [4] 34/7 55/4 70/25 109/23 emergency [8] 29/11 29/12 30/1 36/18 39/13 41/11 41/14 43/13 empirical [6] 50/25 58/17 145/8 145/9 145/10 145/22 empirically [1] 58/19 employee [4] 97/8 98/12 148/14 148/15 emptied [1] 111/14 empty [3] 52/7 129/8 129/13 encompassed [1] 71/20 encompasses [1] 29/1 end [14] 36/16 57/10 59/22 92/15 96/19 97/10 97/14 120/10 120/11 123/23 124/11 124/23 129/11 145/6 ended [4] 51/3 82/25 120/5 130/21 enforcement [2] 108/16 124/10 engage [2] 8/10 133/25 engaged [5] 14/24 15/9 15/10 16/7 131/3 engaging [1] 139/9 Enhanced [2] 3/15 80/14 enormous [2] 108/24 127/9 enough [9] 32/24 58/12 65/20 83/20 87/19 100/22 125/8 126/3 142/16 entail [2] 38/15 101/21 entailed [1] 106/22 entails [1] 143/14 entered [1] 119/23 entire [4] 11/1 14/25 97/20 98/5 entirely [4] 38/20 91/25 93/10 93/11 entitle [1] 3/10 entitled [8] 3/8 3/9 3/12 3/13 3/15 3/16 3/19 66/17 entity [1] 22/2 entry [1] 81/19 equal [3] 50/17 79/21 80/3 equipment [1] 139/6 equipped [3] 110/13 110/17 118/24 errors [2] 12/6 12/8 escape [2] 121/3 131/14 escaped [2] 121/7 121/9 escaping [3] 50/7 50/11 51/2 especially [6] 47/20 49/13 89/17 93/7 127/14 137/16 ESQUIRE [2] 2/4 2/10 essentially [2] 102/3 133/6 establish [1] 107/7 established [3] 32/12 85/23 107/11 establishes [1] 74/18 estimate [6] 14/19 41/17 41/18 42/1 122/5 124/14 estimated [2] 41/13 95/21 estimates [6] 36/17 39/11 41/7 76/7 120/9

editing [2] 12/20 12/24

E	expand [2] 57/25 58/4	fee [2] 66/18 66/22
E	expect [5] 37/1 67/19 67/22 67/23 133/10	feed [1] 123/12
et [4] 1/4 4/21 82/22 83/11	expend [2] 95/18 125/8	feel [1] 107/18
evaluate [1] 11/22 evaluation [1] 14/1	expended [5] 90/6 93/9 95/18 110/23 112/13 expenditure [1] 94/2	fees [1] 64/22 feet [2] 57/17 132/25
even [37] 9/23 21/12 25/7 31/1 31/9 32/9	expenditure [1] 94/2 expends [1] 116/4	felon [2] 9/23 140/25
32/18 33/22 39/11 39/17 39/21 40/4 44/18	expensive [1] 47/11	felons [1] 10/3
44/20 46/15 48/11 48/19 54/15 65/19 67/8	experience [2] 127/7 128/11	Ferguson [1] 111/11
72/21 79/5 85/9 106/11 114/10 116/17 116/22	experiences [2] 22/23 27/25	few [11] 10/1 46/9 47/6 55/22 65/12 76/9 97/4
117/1 117/18 122/7 124/6 125/20 125/23	expert [14] 3/8 4/23 4/24 4/24 14/19 14/24	97/5 132/25 135/23 142/21
131/10 132/4 132/5 142/20 event [13] 94/1 95/17 96/10 96/23 119/22	17/16 18/24 68/18 71/19 71/23 74/9 114/17 137/7	fewer [7] 50/12 51/17 110/14 110/18 121/19 127/2 137/22
122/23 131/5 135/1 135/3 136/3 136/9 138/16	13///   expertise [1] 5/14	FFL [1] 69/24
142/8	experts [2] 11/20 47/22	FFLs [1] 69/24
events [3] 102/19 135/15 146/23	explain [1] 138/1	field [4] 5/14 13/4 13/16 13/17
eventually [2] 22/1 73/18	expressed [1] 71/3	fifth [2] 14/5 106/8
ever [10] 16/24 33/11 49/16 67/15 83/21	expressing [1] 102/14	fifth line [1] 106/8
85/18 86/15 86/17 86/22 89/19 every [9] 9/2 22/20 23/3 23/6 23/10 38/15	extend [1] 64/11 extended [2] 100/15 100/17	Fifty [1] 50/23 Fifty-round [1] 50/23
43/19 95/7 131/9	extended [2] 100/13 100/17 extending [1] 68/14	fights [1] 146/16
everybody [4] 22/9 46/2 94/6 112/25	extent [2] 34/9 84/6	figure [3] 42/4 81/24 124/2
everyday [5] 134/19 137/11 139/6 139/22	Extra [1] 80/16	Figure 1 [1] 81/24
140/25	extraordinarily [2] 50/2 104/13	figures [2] 28/13 43/9
everyone [1] 146/7	extraordinary [1] 117/1	files [1] 35/4
everything [1] 49/2 everywhere [2] 9/22 9/25	extremely [6] 58/7 88/24 89/1 89/8 93/4 141/15	final [1] 71/4 finally [1] 14/7
evidence [12] 4/4 36/7 45/15 45/19 52/4 58/17	eyewitness [13] 93/3 93/11 94/22 115/25	financially [1] 148/17
59/12 59/21 98/16 101/9 101/16 145/7	116/17 116/21 123/13 124/5 124/5 124/9	find [10] 9/16 10/25 20/8 47/7 65/1 106/15
evident [5] 142/24 145/7 145/14 146/1 146/6	124/13 127/21 132/14	117/7 124/19 125/7 146/7
Evidently [1] 115/5	eyewitnesses [5] 111/17 111/20 112/1 125/19	finding [4] 77/6 77/7 77/10 78/6
ex [2] 97/8 98/12	125/21	findings [6] 33/9 74/2 74/20 74/24 84/6 88/9
ex-employee [2] 97/8 98/12 exact [3] 28/13 61/22 93/12	$\mathbf{F}$	finds [1] 24/21 finished [2] 112/14 123/21
exact [5] 26/13 01/22 93/12 exactly [12] 6/17 23/18 47/21 49/7 53/2	face [3] 23/13 23/13 67/3	fire [62] 18/10 48/8 48/14 48/18 48/22 49/3
100/17 103/25 109/2 110/2 111/25 112/5	face-to-face [1] 23/13	49/15 52/9 52/21 52/24 56/9 72/11 72/18
120/2	faced [1] 102/25	72/21 72/23 73/3 74/12 74/15 74/19 92/12
examination [2] 4/3 4/16	facilities [1] 34/13	92/17 92/19 92/20 92/21 93/18 94/25 95/2
examined [1] 4/15	facility [1] 34/25 fact [30] 25/17 32/9 40/5 45/17 55/23 59/22	95/9 95/14 97/19 98/9 99/16 104/2 109/8 110/21 117/4 120/17 122/5 122/9 125/14
example [19] 7/14 12/16 13/25 21/20 24/23 36/6 47/18 48/3 58/20 63/10 64/21 67/4 76/8	75/9 77/15 82/4 85/2 85/5 87/23 90/15 90/22	126/25 127/8 128/13 128/21 128/22 129/20
92/6 94/5 95/9 105/3 135/22 138/6	96/19 100/23 103/3 107/14 109/21 110/10	129/21 130/5 130/7 130/24 131/8 131/11
exceeds [2] 84/17 87/15	110/11 114/9 115/3 116/23 117/17 118/4	132/18 133/3 133/9 133/12 133/13 134/2
excellent [1] 13/12	120/21 131/9 135/24 136/15	134/5 134/12 141/20 142/3
except [10] 23/12 27/13 40/11 49/22 90/5	factors [3] 43/3 102/5 104/23	firearm [15] 3/9 3/11 8/23 30/19 35/21 37/13
104/13 110/2 124/9 124/21 130/3 excepted [1] 10/1	facts [2] 145/8 145/10 factual [1] 19/10	37/17 41/3 41/10 42/23 43/4 61/7 63/14 66/8   140/1
exception [1] 13/1	failed [2] 12/12 123/11	firearm-related [4] 3/11 41/3 41/10 42/23
excluded [1] 37/24	failure [1] 67/6	firearms [11] 40/16 43/5 49/9 52/19 56/5
excludes [1] 41/23	fair [10] 5/22 13/11 19/20 27/20 62/24 63/9	56/12 60/20 63/11 64/20 66/9 68/4
excuse [1] 77/25	83/20 94/24 119/5 119/7	fired [44] 47/23 48/20 48/21 49/5 49/6 49/8
exercise [2] 129/20 129/21 exhibit [45] 17/8 17/11 31/25 32/3 33/9 33/19	Fairchild [1] 112/18 fairly [3] 64/22 81/2 81/13	72/15 72/19 73/1 74/21 75/2 75/3 75/7 75/8
37/5 37/8 40/13 40/23 61/6 62/2 62/5 65/5	fall [2] 62/25 129/18	75/10 75/22 76/10 84/18 85/8 92/14 93/7 93/16 95/8 96/12 96/14 96/15 97/10 98/3
70/2 70/16 71/3 73/21 80/10 81/10 81/23	falls [1] 15/14	98/22 99/21 120/1 120/13 120/15 122/8
88/18 100/2 101/4 105/9 105/12 107/20	familiar [3] 20/5 46/11 136/24	122/13 125/14 126/22 129/6 130/20 131/8
108/16 108/18 109/5 111/2 111/4 113/4 113/5	family [1] 60/25	132/19 132/22 140/17 141/11
113/19 113/24 114/15 117/5 119/12 132/20	far [4] 29/16 39/14 82/12 83/23	firing [23] 48/16 49/10 73/4 73/5 73/6 76/10
140/13 140/13 140/15 141/22 146/24 Exhibit 1 [11] 17/11 70/2 70/16 71/3 101/4	fascinated [1] 5/16 fashion [1] 67/15	79/23 80/2 90/1 90/3 95/20 97/20 110/25 116/2 116/6 116/9 116/18 124/18 124/22
108/18 113/5 117/5 119/12 132/20 141/22	fashioned [2] 18/10 72/22	110/2 110/6 110/9 110/18 124/18 124/22 124/24 128/23 131/24 132/5
Exhibit 10 [2] 108/16 109/5	fast [6] 49/5 49/6 49/7 52/20 57/24 125/13	first [30] 4/14 14/8 22/1 23/12 23/17 38/20
Exhibit 2 [3] 32/3 33/9 33/19	faster [2] 48/16 49/16	46/24 56/7 56/14 56/22 71/16 72/10 74/4 76/8
Exhibit 3 [2] 37/8 61/6	fatal [9] 3/11 29/5 29/7 30/23 36/15 40/19	76/20 82/5 82/9 88/23 89/1 95/21 96/15 96/25
Exhibit 4 [1] 40/23	41/2 88/2 89/5	97/2 99/5 100/7 106/7 111/14 116/8 116/24
Exhibit 5 [2] 62/5 65/5 Exhibit 7 [1] 81/10	fatalities [3] 28/16 28/22 28/24 favor [1] 16/25	138/2  fit [2]   30/6 38/7
Exhibit 8 [5] 111/2 111/4 113/4 113/19	FBI [6] 20/14 21/24 22/3 28/24 63/23 63/25	five [15] 14/3 14/7 54/20 108/15 113/13 114/8
113/24	fear [2] 52/3 126/4	117/6 123/23 124/1 125/7 125/15 130/21
Exhibit 9 [1] 105/12	fearful [1] 93/5	130/25 132/20 133/4
EXHIBITS [2] 3/5 3/6	fears [1] 39/25	five-minute [2] 124/1 130/21
existed [1] 87/7	feasible [1] 135/14 feadows [0] 38/5 46/17 62/25 63/3 63/17 66/0	FL [2] 1/21 148/22
exit [3] 129/16 129/20 129/22 exits [4] 129/16 129/17 130/5 130/8	federal [9] 38/5 46/17 62/25 63/3 63/17 66/9 69/12 69/19 137/6	flaw [1] 12/10
CARS [4] 125/10 125/17 130/3 130/6	03/12 03/13 13//0	

F	gi 5
flip [1] 65/4	gi
Floor [1] 2/12	8
Florida [2] 1/17 148/6	gi
focus [6] 6/11 60/16 68/18 70/16 139/13	Ğ
139/21	go
follow [5] 32/22 34/14 34/15 39/23 40/1	3
follow-up [3] 32/22 39/23 40/1	4
followed [3] 69/1 69/6 145/8	6
following [1] 4/2	9.
follows [2] 4/15 138/2	1
foolish [1] 32/23 forbidden [1] 145/4	go
Force [2] 105/20 112/18	go
Fordham [2] 68/7 69/3	go 1
forgive [1] 11/11	3
forgotten [1] 68/22	7
form [5] 25/9 69/15 70/25 108/13 108/20	9
formalized [1] 64/3	1
format [1] 62/8	go
forth [3] 44/7 63/3 69/2	go
found [7] 76/16 76/21 76/23 78/3 79/2 81/18	go
82/8   foundation [18] 7/11 8/15 10/9 42/21 50/19	9
51/1 53/9 53/13 99/13 104/10 110/7 116/12	1
121/10 139/10 141/3 143/18 144/13 144/20	go
four [10] 6/19 11/20 14/6 97/9 98/12 99/2	go
113/6 114/9 114/11 123/1	go
fourth [3] 106/7 108/4 123/10	gr
fraction [1] 146/22	gr
frame [3] 125/19 144/4 144/7	gr
frankly [1] 5/17	gr
free [3] 51/22 145/2 145/3	gr
FREEZE [3] 1/18 148/9 148/21	G
freight [1] 72/7	gr
frequent [1] 6/16	G
frequently [3] 37/21 75/19 109/21	gı
friend [1] 30/16	5
friends [2] 40/5 61/1 Friendship [1] 114/19	_
front [3] 99/1 99/5 124/16	gı gı
front-loading [1] 99/5	gı
full [8] 48/14 52/9 75/13 78/9 82/5 88/13	gı
144/3 144/7	1
fully [5] 11/15 109/12 110/13 110/16 110/21	2
function [5] 8/1 54/12 102/21 123/20 129/2	4
further [3] 46/3 145/9 148/13	5
G	6 8
Gabrielle [1] 122/22	9
gain [2] 69/7 69/9	1
GARY [4] 1/9 3/8 4/2 62/11	1
gather [1] 29/9	gı
gathering [1] 17/23	gı
gathers [1] 29/4	آسا

gathers [1] 29/4 general [23] 4/19 11/4 12/7 13/3 22/12 26/21 26/22 26/22 30/7 35/12 39/8 40/17 42/19 42/23 43/3 43/5 43/6 66/4 69/17 79/18 85/15 100/14 110/9 generally [16] 20/5 25/2 26/8 26/18 30/20 40/8 42/17 43/8 43/12 46/5 47/17 68/25 73/12 102/16 130/6 134/23 generic [4] 118/9 135/12 135/21 136/5 generous [1] 64/22 get [13] 28/17 45/8 45/9 45/25 60/23 64/5 64/18 66/24 82/25 93/25 101/15 129/16 129/18 gets [2] 43/19 76/3 getting [8] 38/15 51/3 69/13 83/4 124/7 124/8 145/5 145/17 Giffords [2] 122/22 122/25 girlfriend [1] 30/16

ive [11] 13/25 14/19 15/17 21/24 31/5 52/18 58/18 58/19 58/20 80/17 80/20 iven [12] 7/4 23/10 25/12 25/17 47/23 72/12 34/20 97/15 130/8 134/15 142/6 143/3 iving [1] 78/14 Hock [1] 143/21 o [41] 3/8 7/11 8/15 10/6 26/21 26/23 30/1 30/17 33/4 36/5 36/23 43/5 43/7 43/16 43/21 16/9 46/15 52/21 56/8 56/23 57/20 58/13 61/6 63/16 64/25 66/8 66/16 70/2 71/13 81/7 94/7 05/6 103/17 105/7 111/2 111/3 113/2 117/13 19/6 120/6 120/6 oal [2] 103/11 104/7 oes [4] 31/17 57/16 58/5 67/11 oing [39] 5/17 9/5 10/21 10/25 11/7 11/10 6/4 23/17 24/4 25/8 26/21 26/23 28/13 33/6 33/15 42/23 43/7 43/8 43/17 50/18 54/5 55/4 1/13 72/18 78/13 84/13 93/23 95/3 95/20 07/20 99/23 101/9 113/3 119/6 125/24 138/16 39/3 141/20 143/15 one [1] 14/8 ood [6] 4/18 10/5 38/10 68/10 99/23 110/5 ot [14] 33/7 79/6 79/15 79/16 79/22 89/14 06/7 98/25 116/6 117/23 119/19 124/9 124/13 otten [3] 40/3 45/23 124/23 overning [1] 4/6 overnment [2] 15/12 16/11 overnor [2] 1/6 4/20 radually [1] 6/14 rain [1] 125/18 rand [1] 89/3 reat [4] 7/20 13/9 20/22 36/4 reater [2] 57/17 57/18 Freen [3] 1/16 1/21 148/22 rounds [3] 13/12 13/19 13/23 ROVE [3] 2/10 3/3 4/19 uess [16] 15/21 19/20 24/3 26/25 35/20 58/18 64/2 65/25 83/25 87/10 88/3 95/15 07/15 98/24 99/20 140/22 uessed [1] 69/25 uesses [1] 93/5 uessing [3] 55/1 79/8 143/24 un [72] 3/12 3/13 3/13 3/15 9/1 9/7 9/21 9/23 4/2 15/12 16/22 16/24 20/6 26/16 26/19 26/21 26/23 26/24 29/5 42/18 46/5 46/7 46/20 19/17 49/23 50/14 50/14 51/10 53/18 56/3 56/21 57/5 58/13 58/23 58/24 60/1 60/21 61/2 61/16 62/24 64/25 65/2 65/14 67/1 80/14 82/7 33/14 83/24 84/7 84/15 85/12 86/22 87/1 88/6 06/9 103/2 116/19 117/4 123/15 132/5 136/11 36/18 137/21 138/9 141/11 142/16 143/5 46/16 146/19 146/21 146/21 146/22 un-related [1] 146/22 unfights [1] 108/15 gunman [4] 96/12 96/14 105/19 126/16 guns [59] 18/7 29/7 46/17 48/22 50/4 53/20 53/20 58/15 59/9 59/12 60/13 60/14 60/17 60/23 61/24 62/16 62/19 64/8 64/13 65/11 65/20 65/22 68/15 81/16 82/8 85/15 89/25 90/19 90/21 91/1 101/25 104/20 116/6 116/10 116/11 119/24 121/22 130/17 135/24 136/2 136/7 137/12 137/25 138/7 138/9 138/15 138/18 139/2 141/8 141/19 141/25 142/5 142/9 142/12 143/8 143/12 146/8 146/15 146/19 gunshot [34] 28/16 28/22 28/23 29/2 29/13 29/14 29/22 30/3 30/10 30/13 30/22 31/7 31/12 32/21 35/3 36/2 36/5 36/7 36/15 36/21 37/2 39/7 40/7 41/14 42/18 43/12 44/17 45/4 45/12 45/20 45/22 83/5 88/14 102/18

guy [3] 30/5 70/13 111/11

guys [1] 116/16

Н habitual [1] 9/2 habitually [1] 8/23 had [90] 10/20 12/16 13/22 17/19 18/6 20/5 21/21 30/4 31/20 31/21 33/22 35/3 40/3 40/6 40/8 45/23 50/10 51/18 63/16 63/18 63/20 64/25 67/4 80/4 83/13 85/9 85/15 86/2 87/6 87/24 87/25 89/14 89/25 90/19 90/19 90/21 90/25 91/2 97/21 98/20 100/22 101/24 101/25 104/8 106/10 106/11 108/24 108/25 109/7 109/22 110/16 110/17 111/11 112/1 112/5 112/9 112/11 112/12 113/13 115/8 116/8 116/22 116/25 118/14 119/24 120/22 121/2 121/15 121/15 121/16 121/17 121/17 121/22 123/1 123/5 123/5 123/9 124/23 129/5 129/6 130/22 131/10 131/24 132/2 132/6 134/5 134/12 142/4 144/9 146/4 hadn't [4] 8/25 67/8 68/20 69/11 half [2] 55/11 120/15 halfway [1] 78/19 hand [13] 6/11 7/24 11/24 12/16 12/17 73/8 76/8 78/9 111/20 112/2 112/7 128/4 148/18 handed [2] 17/11 30/11 handful [1] 74/19 handgun [8] 3/13 54/2 55/18 55/20 56/2 59/13 119/25 144/4 handguns [7] 46/14 55/23 55/24 59/23 82/8 104/18 144/12 happen [3] 8/2 129/22 143/2 happened [5] 45/21 75/18 91/22 92/3 124/11 happening [2] 77/18 136/3 happens [1] 129/15 hard [4] 100/16 100/18 100/25 111/5 harder [1] 146/7 hardly [1] 40/2 harm [1] 71/11 has [25] 13/17 17/5 17/11 30/10 32/3 33/25 39/17 42/6 42/17 42/18 42/19 44/24 45/4 49/16 49/17 50/14 51/10 55/10 58/4 60/5 60/8 67/15 97/9 134/5 134/12 hasn't [3] 13/7 24/19 32/11 hat [1] 26/3 have [227] haven't [7] 16/6 21/2 68/21 94/14 107/2 117/7 145/12 having [11] 4/14 9/1 28/1 55/22 90/4 102/22 104/18 104/23 110/7 138/4 139/1 he [100] 11/20 12/1 12/1 31/17 33/12 33/12 33/12 40/4 49/23 66/20 67/7 67/16 74/21 76/20 95/18 97/21 98/21 98/22 100/22 104/1 104/2 104/3 107/8 111/14 111/17 111/18 111/20 111/23 111/24 112/1 112/2 112/5 112/6 112/9 112/11 112/12 112/12 112/14 112/14 112/14 112/16 115/8 116/4 116/5 116/6 116/18 116/18 117/1 119/24 119/25 120/5 120/23 121/1 121/9 121/15 121/16 121/17 121/17 121/18 123/7 123/9 123/14 123/14 123/16 123/17 123/19 123/19 123/20 123/21 124/18 124/22 124/22 124/23 125/13 125/14 126/22 128/1 128/4 128/5 128/23 128/23 128/24 129/2 129/3 129/4 129/5 129/6 129/8 130/20 130/21 130/22 131/2 131/7 131/8 131/14 132/21 132/24 137/5 137/6 141/4 he'd [1] 118/16 he'll [1] 12/2 he's [5] 73/18 116/2 137/5 141/5 141/7 head [3] 28/5 69/22 94/13 headquarters [2] 113/20 114/3 Health [1] 29/3

hear [1] 133/14

TT	hypothetical [1] 93/13	income [1] 47/12
H	T	inconsequential [1] 48/13
heard [3] 53/23 58/8 135/25	TIA [4] 12/1 51/14 40/12 115/0	inconvenience [1] 65/22
heavily [1] 137/16 heavy [4] 58/7 142/16 142/17 142/19	I'd [4] 13/1 51/14 60/12 115/9 I'll [5] 45/9 81/1 105/14 108/12 108/20	inconvenient [1] 142/16 incorporate [1] 37/2
held [5] 67/15 110/1 110/14 110/18 127/1	I'm [84] 4/19 4/20 6/17 7/2 7/6 11/7 15/10	incrementally [1] 70/21
Heller [1] 46/10	15/13 15/17 16/7 16/18 19/24 21/4 24/3 24/5	indeed [2] 52/3 52/3
here [18] 67/14 75/21 93/17 98/7 108/2 114/16 114/23 119/9 124/13 133/16 134/4	25/4 28/13 28/14 28/20 34/14 35/23 37/3 37/20 40/15 40/21 45/7 46/11 49/13 50/9	independent [1] 104/24 INDEX [2] 3/1 3/5
134/16 134/22 139/12 139/16 141/22 145/11	51/20 54/5 54/19 55/1 58/12 67/13 67/18	indicate [3] 10/19 48/21 132/24
146/5	68/22 69/16 71/13 71/21 71/24 74/8 74/14	indicates [5] 60/5 60/7 113/11 113/13 129/10
herein [1] 148/11 Hialeah [1] 126/13	78/14 79/8 88/3 88/16 93/25 98/24 103/15 103/25 104/12 104/21 106/6 108/7 108/16	indication [3] 66/15 91/2 96/21
HICKENLOOPER [2] 1/6 4/22	108/16 108/17 113/23 116/15 117/23 119/5	indicator [1] 28/22 indirectly [3] 59/10 59/11 124/8
hide [1] 94/7	124/21 126/16 126/16 129/9 129/11 132/19	indisputable [1] 146/13
hiding [1] 94/18	134/14 136/19 136/23 136/23 137/13 137/18	individual [20] 22/22 23/2 23/18 25/9 25/13
high [7] 3/16 60/20 100/11 101/6 102/17 102/20 115/17	138/1 139/7 140/12 140/22 142/23 143/10 143/11 143/24 144/24 146/11	25/14 27/24 27/24 28/9 30/2 35/2 38/13 39/6 51/21 58/16 63/18 73/9 117/2 121/22 125/12
High-Capacity [1] 3/16	I've [19] 5/16 11/15 16/7 17/22 21/1 21/2	individuals [10] 24/16 38/11 38/17 38/22
high-risk [1] 60/20	35/23 49/2 49/3 49/5 49/6 49/12 58/23 62/7	60/20 60/25 66/12 68/4 116/7 122/12
higher [12] 13/19 36/20 36/20 41/18 48/18 48/22 74/25 78/20 79/7 85/15 85/24 140/19	68/22 83/20 85/1 98/25 135/24 idea [7] 24/25 86/21 87/6 120/7 128/14 137/4	indoor [1] 92/7
48/22 /4/25 /8/20 /9// 85/15 85/24 140/19   highest [1]   137/10	137/13	ineligible [1] 65/11 infallible [1] 115/11
highly [2] 37/17 136/6	identification [11] 17/9 32/1 37/6 40/14 62/3	infeasible [1] 64/11
him [14] 40/6 103/8 111/16 111/21 116/9	73/22 80/11 100/3 105/10 107/21 146/25	infer [2] 85/1 89/23
116/16 116/24 121/1 123/2 126/3 128/6 129/3   133/1 139/7	identify [1] 89/3 identity [1] 25/8	inferring [1] 103/1 inflict [2] 85/6 88/6
himself [3] 94/8 98/14 141/24	ideological [3] 13/17 13/18 13/23	inflicted [8] 81/25 82/1 85/3 85/8 85/13 85/16
his [12] 40/5 49/25 66/18 79/19 80/18 96/14	Ideology [1] 13/16	102/10 140/9
96/15 102/13 111/14 112/1 130/22 130/24 history [4] 10/3 10/8 10/11 46/16	ignorance [1] 11/11 IHOP [1] 126/17	influence [1] 72/16
hit [3] 56/13 73/6 73/16	illegal [4] 9/17 9/22 66/20 145/18	informally [1] 6/4 information [26] 20/13 20/20 23/25 25/2 25/9
HKA [1] 109/9	illegally [1] 65/11	25/22 29/10 48/20 51/2 51/3 51/4 91/6 93/1
HKA-91 [1] 109/9	illustrate [1] 43/9	93/6 94/21 95/13 97/9 98/17 101/22 102/3
hold [5] 74/5 75/4 86/12 87/11 101/1 holding [1] 100/13	imagine [1] 116/14 immediately [2] 145/13 146/3	106/23 107/2 107/9 115/6 122/16 137/18 inherently [1] 28/1
holes [2] 48/6 56/9	immoral [1] 6/2	initial [1] 52/24
Hollywood [3] 3/18 107/23 109/25	impact [6] 3/13 14/2 17/5 60/5 60/8 91/24	injure [6] 89/22 98/21 103/4 103/7 103/22
home [7] 22/12 23/13 23/17 28/2 28/8 135/8 137/1	impacts [1] 69/4 impair [1] 133/25	104/15   injured [7]   18/17 19/2 56/10 72/17 83/15
	implausible [1] 136/6	89/15 119/19
homicide [14] 10/17 10/18 10/20 26/13 27/14	implement [4] 137/23 142/25 144/24 146/5	injuries [25] 29/17 30/14 30/22 31/1 31/7
27/15 27/19 40/16 40/16 40/22 81/15 82/1 82/23 83/1	implementation [1] 68/2	35/21 35/23 36/2 36/5 36/8 36/8 36/15 36/19
homicides [4] 28/23 29/5 37/18 88/12	imply [1] 108/25 important [4] 33/16 35/6 75/1 98/19	36/21 37/2 37/3 41/3 41/10 43/24 44/14 44/17 45/16 45/17 102/10 102/18
honestly [2] 25/16 103/20	impose [1] 13/19	injury [8] 3/11 30/19 30/20 31/12 45/2 56/21
	impractical [1] 138/7	65/15 72/24
house [3] 19/18 24/22 24/23 housed [1] 38/17	improve [1] 71/11 improved [1] 45/13	inmate [1] 33/12 inmates [5] 31/20 38/5 38/5 39/25 61/14
household [10] 22/8 27/21 27/22 28/1 28/3	improvement [3] 45/19 46/3 74/17	ins [1] 28/7
28/4 28/5 28/8 28/10 28/12	improvements [1] 45/15	insert [1] 90/7
households [2] 22/8 27/23 housing [5] 23/6 23/10 24/4 24/18 38/8	improving [1] 43/3 impulsive [1] 7/21	INSTANCE [1] 1/11 instant [1] 116/15
Houston [2] 96/9 96/22	inaccurate [2] 80/2 118/21	instead [4] 38/19 75/15 90/14 118/4
how [72] 5/4 5/18 5/25 10/22 11/16 14/14	inaccurately [1] 108/13	institutionalized [2] 38/1 38/11
14/19 14/22 14/23 14/23 18/5 20/11 22/4 34/1	INC [1] 1/20	institutions [2] 38/21 38/22
35/20 36/20 37/15 39/14 41/17 41/20 42/1   45/5 48/20 48/21 49/7 50/9 51/3 51/4 52/7	incapacitated [1] 44/5 incarcerated [1] 32/8	intend [2] 8/21 112/14 intended [2] 77/23 128/5
52/13 52/20 53/2 58/13 58/15 62/15 63/13	incarceration [1] 34/3	intending [3] 85/6 103/22 112/16
66/1 66/4 76/2 86/12 88/3 89/14 89/23 97/13	incident [26] 21/12 30/4 51/12 59/13 72/12	intention [2] 102/22 102/24
97/14 97/16 98/3 98/20 98/22 100/17 101/17	75/23 83/4 83/4 94/17 96/23 97/11 104/19 104/22 105/16 107/5 114/21 115/24 120/8	intentions [4] 75/16 77/15 77/21 85/10 interest [1] 137/15
125/13 128/25 129/19 130/24 131/7 132/10	122/21 130/23 133/12 133/21 134/5 134/12	interest [1] 137/13 interested [3] 37/20 89/13 148/17
132/11 133/5 133/7 133/12 136/10 138/1	138/20 139/25	interesting [2] 5/17 112/23
138/1 143/17 146/16   however [4]   36/4 46/20 118/14 125/25	incidents [21] 76/9 76/15 82/25 87/23 88/1 90/17 95/1 95/4 95/10 95/11 97/2 99/15 99/18	interestingly [1] 114/24 interfere [1] 112/10
human [2] 56/10 143/3	104/14 117/19 124/10 134/1 134/15 135/11	interfered [1] 111/23
hung [1] 144/24	146/17 146/18	interference [1] 115/20
hunter [1] 119/3	inclination [1] 59/6	interfering [1] 111/16
hunting [2] 48/4 117/24 hurt [5] 73/11 90/25 117/6 129/6 133/7	inclined [2] 13/19 107/16 include [1] 28/24	Internet [2] 62/7 106/16 interpretation [1] 77/11
hurting [1] 103/11	included [1] 92/14	interval [4] 90/5 92/22 93/12 98/23
hurts [1] 105/20	including [3] 48/24 55/17 122/24	
I .		Ī

I	103/17 103/22 104/15 125/8 125/9	143/7 143/10
	killed [16] 18/4 18/15 18/16 19/1 72/16 81/16	legalistic [1] 6/1
intervals [1] 93/10 intervene [5] 49/24 90/2 90/9 105/1 105/3	89/11 89/15 117/6 117/20 119/19 121/6	legally [1] 6/9
intervenes [1] 90/10	122/24 129/1 130/22 133/18   killing [3] 104/7 120/5 130/22	length [4] 95/16 95/17 104/18 104/21 LEON [1] 148/7
interview [8] 22/9 23/12 23/17 27/18 33/20	killings [1] 7/18	less [26] 12/25 30/13 30/21 30/22 31/12 37/18
91/7 91/9 91/11	kills [4] 97/8 105/19 113/6 126/17	47/9 54/18 56/6 56/12 56/13 56/16 56/18
interviewed [8] 22/22 23/1 23/3 23/10 24/20	kind [24] 7/23 7/25 28/1 31/9 32/15 34/3 34/8	56/20 73/15 79/19 79/24 79/25 80/1 89/9
32/8 33/11 34/5	34/21 36/17 39/5 43/9 50/1 52/17 58/3 61/25	127/13 131/4 132/4 132/5 144/3 145/24
interviewer [1] 23/16	82/24 83/2 84/2 107/2 107/8 121/12 129/14	Lessons [1] 3/12
interviewing [4] 22/7 23/11 34/2 35/19	142/22 142/24	let [9] 16/25 39/4 47/2 54/19 58/13 58/20
interviews [2] 22/21 24/17	kinds [7] 31/2 45/16 46/25 60/6 63/18 137/17	71/18 84/25 134/9
invariably [3] 7/14 7/18 91/25	137/18	let's [48] 19/7 28/17 29/24 31/24 41/4 44/4
invasion [1] 135/8 Investigation [1] 3/18	Kinkel [2] 128/10 133/21 Kip [1] 133/21	45/18 45/21 46/9 46/18 48/12 52/14 61/6 61/8 62/13 65/4 70/2 70/15 70/16 74/2 75/2 76/5
investigators [1] 91/9	KLECK [7] 1/9 3/8 4/2 4/18 14/11 60/10	76/7 79/10 80/3 81/22 88/15 88/21 91/18
involve [7] 15/25 52/22 102/17 102/20 146/18	62/11	95/23 97/12 99/22 100/1 109/5 111/2 113/2
146/19 146/23	know [174]	114/6 115/17 117/21 119/18 119/20 120/6
involved [10] 15/16 15/17 16/5 34/20 65/15	knowing [1] 133/12	120/6 120/12 126/14 133/23 139/21 140/12
77/13 88/12 88/13 93/8 122/23	knowledge [4] 61/19 62/23 138/20 139/6	lethal [7] 47/20 48/7 55/24 56/1 56/5 56/6
involving [5] 3/14 3/16 18/3 29/7 141/10	known [6] 21/8 21/18 49/16 109/17 120/2	58/2
irrelevant [2] 119/17 133/6	122/21	lethality [2] 47/23 57/13
is [300]	knows [3] 23/18 36/3 137/6	level [1] 46/17
Island [2] 111/8 111/13 isn't [5] 7/1 29/14 48/9 82/20 87/21	Kopel [3] 17/7 17/20 17/25	Lfreeze37 [1] 1/19
issue [17] 17/3 47/12 67/8 67/9 82/21 82/21	Koper [17] 73/20 74/20 76/16 76/23 78/3 78/20 79/1 81/2 81/13 82/16 82/17 82/19 83/2	liability [4] 15/3 15/15 67/5 67/12 liable [2] 67/7 67/15
87/22 89/13 102/6 102/15 127/22 130/12	78/20 79/1 81/2 81/13 82/16 82/17 82/19 83/2   88/1 139/24 140/6 140/14	licensed [3] 66/8 67/1 69/7
131/5 132/1 133/7 137/19 146/5		licensee [1] 66/9
issues [1] 67/5	L	life [6] 14/25 43/24 44/10 44/15 44/18 44/22
it [333]	laid [2] 52/6 65/25	like [41] 7/5 8/12 9/17 10/8 10/19 12/5 12/6
it's [171]	Lane [3] 1/16 1/21 148/22	14/6 15/1 23/22 28/1 28/7 31/4 33/15 42/15
items [1] 86/20	larcenies [1] 28/8	44/13 45/16 48/4 52/22 55/11 56/3 58/6 58/25
$\mathbf{J}$	large [58] 15/25 17/4 18/14 18/15 18/18 19/21	59/18 60/17 64/12 83/22 94/15 94/19 97/21
	22/20 39/12 42/11 48/19 55/17 71/10 72/11	100/14 100/21 100/24 103/6 110/23 112/16
jail [11] 31/19 31/24 32/8 32/10 33/11 33/21 34/5 35/19 38/16 38/23 39/25	72/15 72/20 73/4 73/10 73/10 74/15 75/6 87/19 88/24 89/10 89/13 89/18 89/21 90/13	129/19 130/3 133/9 141/1 145/18
jails [1] 38/15	90/18 90/24 93/21 94/1 97/5 102/4 102/8	likelihood [3] 47/23 73/6 101/11 likely [41] 8/13 9/9 9/14 9/15 9/16 10/6 10/10
James [1] 62/17	103/7 103/18 104/8 104/14 104/15 104/24	12/25 13/6 18/14 41/18 44/1 47/9 50/7 56/13
jammed [2] 123/11 129/16	104/25 109/1 109/2 120/1 120/3 123/4 126/19	56/20 57/20 59/4 59/14 59/17 59/19 59/22
JEWELL [1] 2/5	128/2 128/7 131/5 131/10 132/3 138/5 139/1	60/21 71/10 72/15 73/15 73/18 77/12 79/2
JOHN [2] 1/4 1/6	139/2 139/15 141/5 145/18	79/19 80/5 84/1 89/17 101/1 103/9 103/23
joined [1] 116/8	largely [1] 82/7	104/6 133/25 139/15 143/2 144/16
Jonesboro [1] 114/13	larger [15] 36/3 47/8 47/25 48/5 54/15 55/5	likes [1] 12/2
journal [7] 11/18 11/19 11/19 12/4 14/12 68/7	56/2 57/23 72/14 73/19 76/3 76/3 82/18 86/3	likewise [1] 132/4
80/13   journalists [1]   110/6	86/9	limitation [3] 141/23 142/2 142/15
journalsts [1] 110/0 journals [2] 11/12 14/3	last [19] 24/15 24/16 32/16 42/19 45/13 45/17 62/16 65/6 68/10 84/5 95/22 96/15 96/25 97/3	limited [3] 87/23 129/16 137/22 limiting [3] 58/15 58/23 74/10
judgment [3] 44/25 121/21 137/5	124/21 124/22 126/6 145/12 146/2	limits [2] 119/2 133/24
judgments [2] 20/11 91/6	lasted [4] 96/10 96/20 96/23 120/4	line [9] 6/7 6/18 6/18 106/8 124/17 124/17
jumped [1] 111/21	late [2] 8/4 122/18	124/18 124/23 124/23
June [2] 41/12 42/14	later [9] 18/21 19/6 23/19 59/14 59/19 70/16	lined [1] 124/25
June '94 [1] 42/14	96/21 98/14 101/15	linked [1] 25/14
June 1992 [1] 41/12	latter [1] 95/19	liquor [6] 8/2 8/11 29/25 29/25 30/3 140/25
just [80] 5/6 6/17 7/6 7/21 8/3 16/13 19/7 24/3	law [23] 2/11 6/3 17/4 18/1 29/22 60/19 63/13	LISA [2] 148/9 148/21
24/3 24/5 25/5 26/3 28/19 33/22 35/12 36/10	68/7 69/3 69/12 69/19 108/15 123/4 124/10	list [1] 79/14
37/3 38/6 42/4 49/20 54/5 70/22 71/14 71/18 72/5 74/18 78/10 83/9 83/13 84/12 85/8 85/8	136/16 136/20 136/24 137/6 142/11 145/4   145/4 145/16 145/21	lists [1] 95/7 literature [1] 6/25
86/5 86/6 86/19 87/6 87/23 91/22 93/13 94/16	lawful [1] 134/1	little [8] 16/13 19/7 20/20 26/8 65/13 78/8
97/19 101/9 103/3 104/1 104/23 107/7 109/20	laws [8] 14/2 16/22 46/6 58/22 58/25 59/11	111/5 131/16
111/3 112/23 113/1 113/24 116/5 117/3	60/1 60/7	live [2] 9/15 15/21
118/11 120/2 121/11 122/11 125/24 126/12	layout [2] 92/2 130/1	lives [2] 23/18 50/8
127/6 127/17 129/2 131/16 133/16 133/19	lead [1] 73/11	living [1] 24/5
135/9 135/13 136/6 138/9 138/10 138/10	leaded [1] 143/24	load [2] 111/20 112/7
139/21 141/12 142/15 142/16 142/21 144/24	least [22] 21/1 25/9 33/24 45/14 52/4 53/21	loaded [4] 49/23 112/6 112/11 143/5
146/2 146/9 146/15	55/22 55/24 88/5 94/14 108/23 111/25 116/17	loader [2] 52/15 53/1
Justice [4] 15/11 37/12 137/3 137/4 justify [1] 65/20	118/8 118/17 122/13 130/18 130/18 130/19	loading [2] 99/1 99/5
	130/20 134/21 146/14  leave [3]   55/16 123/17 128/1	local [3] 30/1 83/9 117/20 location [5] 1/16 92/2 92/7 92/7 126/12
K	leaving [1] 123/22	locations [1] 126/11
keeping [1] 55/22	left [2] 48/5 76/8	logically [1] 145/8
Kennedy [1] 66/2	left-hand [1] 76/8	long [18] 7/19 11/8 15/12 41/13 48/21 52/7
Kennedy-Rodino [1] 66/2	leg [1] 45/5	52/13 56/3 82/8 90/12 91/21 100/22 111/8
kill [10] 89/22 98/21 102/22 103/4 103/7		
KIII [10] 07/22 70/21 102/22 103/4 103/7	legal [8] 6/12 9/19 15/13 30/12 61/3 71/24	

## long... [5] 111/13 124/2 126/3 126/6 132/2 longer [4] 53/4 57/19 57/21 131/25 look [20] 10/24 18/2 41/4 61/8 61/10 62/13 71/6 76/5 76/7 81/22 82/5 95/23 100/21 100/22 100/24 108/3 109/5 115/17 126/14 140/12 looked [2] 11/1 112/16 looking [3] 10/22 12/7 108/16 looks [3] 42/15 97/21 100/14 lose [1] 65/13 lot [16] 26/6 26/7 102/22 103/4 103/7 103/11 103/18 103/22 103/23 104/7 105/8 121/6 128/10 143/11 143/14 143/14 lots [4] 6/1 8/5 146/12 146/13 Lottery [2] 113/20 114/2 low [8] 29/16 36/14 36/16 41/22 47/12 57/8 74/25 141/16 LOWE [1] 2/5 lower [2] 78/24 79/6 Lunch [1] 147/2 M

Mac [1] 106/9 made [15] 15/11 15/12 19/10 63/15 64/19 74/20 85/19 86/6 89/19 106/18 114/16 117/18 121/20 121/21 128/7 magazine [79] 16/1 18/14 18/18 50/15 50/23 51/10 52/8 54/13 54/24 72/16 72/20 74/10 75/6 75/11 75/22 84/16 86/2 86/9 90/6 90/14 90/18 93/21 95/24 99/9 100/15 101/1 102/17 103/8 103/18 103/24 104/8 104/9 104/14 105/5 106/2 106/10 107/7 107/11 110/14 110/18 111/15 111/15 111/17 111/21 112/8 112/13 114/23 115/15 116/2 116/4 118/2 118/14 118/16 118/20 118/22 119/8 119/14 120/22 121/18 121/18 123/11 123/16 123/20 127/1 127/18 128/2 128/7 128/13 128/16 128/25 131/6 132/4 133/17 133/24 138/5 139/15 140/1 141/23 145/18 magazine's [1] 137/22 magazines [80] 3/17 17/4 19/21 53/12 54/14 71/10 75/4 89/13 89/18 89/21 90/4 90/20 90/21 90/24 91/1 97/23 100/23 101/5 101/6 101/13 101/19 101/24 102/4 102/6 102/9 102/20 102/23 103/2 104/24 108/3 108/19 108/24 108/25 108/25 109/8 109/10 109/13 109/13 109/15 110/1 111/12 111/24 112/2 112/4 112/6 112/12 113/12 113/14 118/25 121/2 121/9 121/23 123/2 123/3 123/10 126/19 130/18 130/19 131/11 131/15 136/22 137/25 138/6 138/9 138/15 138/18 139/4 141/8 141/20 141/25 142/4 142/10 142/12 142/17 142/19 143/6 143/8 143/13 146/8 146/15 main [1] 61/24 maintained [2] 48/23 92/21 maintenance [3] 113/4 113/8 113/24 majority [2] 7/8 101/18 make [40] 5/6 11/23 12/20 16/13 20/11 27/1 44/5 48/14 50/1 50/10 51/14 51/21 56/12 60/19 68/3 71/13 72/5 72/6 73/17 77/12 88/3 89/18 106/19 115/11 115/12 120/22 122/11 123/15 123/15 123/20 127/18 128/3 128/11 128/17 128/25 131/6 133/5 135/5 137/5 139/15 makes [2] 48/17 120/13 making [6] 44/1 60/7 74/9 74/14 93/5 142/23 mandate [1] 130/7 mandated [1] 145/4 manslaughter [2] 27/11 27/14 manuscript [3] 11/21 11/22 12/10

manuscripts [1] 13/22 many [43] 10/25 13/24 14/19 14/23 30/6 35/20 35/25 38/14 42/1 48/20 51/3 51/4 53/2 60/12 63/19 65/9 72/21 74/12 82/7 85/8 85/8 89/14 89/22 90/25 93/22 98/3 98/21 98/21 119/19 120/2 121/7 123/9 125/10 125/20 127/1 127/8 128/25 129/19 131/8 131/11 133/7 134/2 136/2 MARC [1] 2/4 March [2] 114/21 114/22 March 24th [2] 114/21 114/22 margin [1] 146/10 marginally [1] 74/25 mark [2] 39/14 100/1 marked [12] 17/8 31/25 32/3 37/5 40/13 62/2 73/21 80/10 100/2 105/9 107/20 146/24 Maryland [4] 16/4 16/19 55/7 55/10 mass [50] 3/16 7/17 17/18 18/2 18/7 18/19 48/19 49/17 49/18 49/19 49/20 51/7 51/9 51/22 53/7 70/8 88/24 89/23 91/4 91/7 92/9 93/14 93/20 95/4 97/7 102/9 102/16 102/17 102/19 103/14 112/25 114/6 117/13 117/23 119/15 120/7 125/10 127/4 127/14 133/19 134/20 134/23 135/16 137/14 139/12 139/14 139/14 139/19 140/23 141/6 match [2] 111/5 112/21 materials [2] 92/1 92/11 math [2] 12/6 12/8 matt.grove [1] 2/11 matter [23] 18/14 18/19 18/20 18/25 20/10 25/11 25/18 38/6 38/12 40/4 50/14 54/3 64/17 72/13 75/15 79/13 94/6 105/5 129/19 142/25 145/2 145/3 145/3 mattered [2] 77/20 77/22 matters [1] 98/17 MATTHEW [2] 2/10 4/18 maximum [1] 79/17 may [27] 4/5 7/25 11/23 11/25 12/9 13/19 23/20 31/5 31/5 41/12 42/15 52/21 62/8 84/8 84/16 85/4 93/6 96/22 100/22 115/11 116/21 116/22 118/18 125/22 125/25 131/3 132/1 May '95 [1] 42/15 May 1993 [1] 41/12 maybe [6] 14/3 14/4 71/14 100/18 108/7 135/25 mcolin [1] 2/5 me [25] 6/24 13/25 14/19 16/25 17/25 33/6 39/4 47/2 54/19 56/23 58/13 58/20 61/10 71/18 73/18 74/8 77/25 84/4 84/25 84/25 103/6 106/21 115/23 134/9 144/25 mean [39] 10/11 14/21 24/8 32/25 41/5 42/13 43/21 46/1 47/3 47/21 50/13 52/20 55/1 59/6 70/20 71/22 77/9 81/24 86/18 87/15 87/15 89/1 89/9 89/10 95/6 96/18 98/25 100/24 103/21 106/25 120/14 140/14 141/4 141/23 143/1 143/19 143/22 144/22 145/1 meaning [5] 18/10 22/24 26/20 32/11 71/24 means [13] 25/7 29/23 30/13 56/18 56/19 57/18 57/25 64/4 82/25 83/19 90/2 110/22 137/23 meant [3] 45/24 56/23 146/6 meanwhile [1] 30/4 measure [1] 16/25 measures [3] 53/19 58/14 69/11 media [22] 18/2 19/4 91/25 92/14 93/14 94/11 94/20 95/12 95/16 106/13 112/24 117/15 118/8 121/13 121/24 122/15 123/2 124/7 131/20 132/16 132/24 137/17 medical [26] 5/10 29/21 30/11 30/17 31/21 33/1 33/2 33/5 34/13 34/18 34/19 35/4 36/1 36/23 43/18 44/2 44/11 44/19 44/21 44/25 45/12 45/15 45/19 45/22 46/1 46/2

medically [4] 35/23 36/11 36/19 39/12 medications [1] 5/7 meet [1] 125/3 Mellberg [1] 106/8 Memorial [1] 35/1 mention [4] 41/17 41/22 49/10 107/6 mentioned [8] 9/8 11/12 39/3 50/21 56/24 68/19 115/20 118/20 merely [1] 74/15 methods [1] 102/13 mid [2] 39/16 42/25 middle [4] 36/17 58/3 113/3 114/13 might [23] 21/20 28/19 29/12 39/23 40/1 48/15 53/19 53/19 54/20 55/21 56/4 58/14 58/14 66/1 67/3 90/24 98/15 99/22 100/17 102/2 102/12 125/14 126/12 mild [1] 40/12 mildly [1] 26/9 millimeter [2] 96/9 111/11 mind [3] 9/4 16/9 125/19 mine [1] 117/25 minimum [2] 76/7 122/10 minor [1] 98/23 minority [2] 95/4 95/10 minute [13] 96/16 97/15 98/3 98/6 98/9 110/22 120/16 120/16 120/19 124/1 130/21 132/22 133/4 minutes [23] 81/4 93/15 93/19 94/1 94/3 94/7 94/12 94/17 96/10 96/20 96/24 98/7 98/14 99/2 120/4 120/10 123/24 125/8 125/15 129/11 129/14 130/25 132/20 missed [1] 85/20 missing [1] 108/7 mistake [1] 42/22 mistakes [1] 115/12 MJW [1] 1/3 mobile [1] 11/6 mobility [1] 11/3 modest [2] 66/17 66/22 modify [1] 107/1 month [4] 22/20 28/18 28/18 58/24 months [5] 6/19 22/14 23/3 23/6 23/11 more [132] 6/4 6/5 6/15 6/15 6/16 6/23 6/23 7/20 7/22 7/23 9/9 9/13 9/14 9/14 9/15 9/16 11/6 12/6 12/24 13/1 13/6 17/18 18/3 18/8 18/16 19/6 19/7 20/23 26/20 26/21 26/23 26/23 26/24 32/18 39/21 43/6 43/8 44/19 47/10 48/7 48/8 50/18 51/12 53/21 56/1 56/5 57/19 58/20 59/13 59/19 59/22 60/8 60/19 64/3 64/6 68/3 71/10 72/15 73/11 73/18 74/5 74/19 74/21 75/4 75/10 75/16 75/17 75/18 76/11 76/14 76/17 76/23 76/23 77/13 77/17 77/23 78/1 78/3 78/8 79/2 79/6 79/18 79/23 80/5 81/19 82/6 84/15 84/18 85/3 85/6 85/16 86/8 86/20 87/11 89/11 98/19 101/2 102/18 102/18 102/22 103/4 103/9 103/10 103/19 103/23 104/2 104/6 107/16 109/13 110/1 110/6 110/10 112/17 117/1 118/10 121/6 121/19 132/6 132/17 132/25 134/5 134/12 136/1 136/17 138/8 140/7 140/16 142/3 143/3 143/12 143/23 146/2 morning [1] 4/18 mortality [1] 29/4 most [40] 7/8 10/3 10/6 10/8 10/10 18/14 18/23 20/8 21/8 21/22 23/11 28/15 29/20 30/24 31/7 32/14 38/9 44/17 44/20 55/18 57/6 58/2 61/24 62/24 84/18 87/9 94/25 104/13 111/6 127/14 137/1 137/8 137/9 138/7 139/15 141/11 141/14 141/15 145/14 146/18 mostly [3] 27/4 30/25 43/2 mother [1] 130/22 motive [1] 43/14

### M motor [1] 28/11 move [5] 23/23 88/15 114/12 117/21 133/23 moved [1] 23/7 Mr [1] 3/3 Mr. [1] 17/20 Mr. Kopel [1] 17/20 MSK [1] 1/3 much [15] 20/12 36/20 41/20 50/9 74/14 98/19 117/15 125/25 130/24 131/7 131/25 136/1 143/17 144/10 144/10 mugging [1] 10/7 multiple [50] 59/9 59/13 59/17 78/4 78/21 79/3 79/23 79/25 84/1 84/2 89/25 90/4 90/19 90/19 90/21 90/21 91/1 91/1 100/23 101/24 101/25 104/18 104/20 111/12 136/21 137/12 137/25 138/6 138/7 138/9 138/9 138/15 138/15 139/2 139/4 141/8 141/8 141/19 141/20 141/25 142/4 142/5 142/9 142/9 142/12 143/8 143/12 143/12 146/8 146/15 murder [2] 27/11 27/14 musket [4] 99/1 99/1 99/5 99/11 must [3] 79/8 121/7 126/7 muzzle [3] 57/15 57/18 57/22 my [36] 4/18 5/8 11/11 14/25 16/9 17/16 18/1 44/16 50/5 59/6 60/5 62/23 71/22 79/1 89/16 91/6 95/6 95/15 97/1 97/25 98/17 106/3 107/1 107/4 107/18 113/17 114/7 114/18 118/5 124/15 131/4 131/16 132/17 146/12 148/12 148/18

### N.T

myself [1] 49/4

nail [3] 49/7 109/1 109/2 name [7] 4/18 24/10 24/12 35/3 55/12 70/13 134/16 named [1] 111/11 names [1] 15/18 narrower [2] 58/1 74/14 national [4] 20/17 27/8 29/3 63/15 nature [3] 82/21 83/8 143/4 NCVS [20] 21/1 21/15 22/4 23/14 25/19 27/12 27/16 29/9 36/6 36/10 36/13 36/13 36/16 37/1 37/24 38/2 38/24 39/9 39/11 41/18 NCVS-based [1] 39/11 near [1] 75/13 necessarily [4] 43/4 61/23 87/20 96/24 necessary [4] 12/12 101/22 104/13 106/20 necessitating [1] 134/2 need [11] 5/6 9/9 90/13 90/18 119/15 136/25 137/8 138/12 141/4 141/19 145/9 needed [9] 89/21 89/24 90/24 91/4 92/9 93/20 93/21 95/13 102/3 negligent [2] 27/11 27/14 neighborhoods [1] 9/16 neither [2] 75/11 91/1 nettally.com [1] 1/22 Nevada [1] 126/17 never [8] 11/15 48/13 48/22 49/12 86/19 89/21 115/2 135/24 nevermind [2] 72/22 76/15 nevertheless [3] 13/10 65/18 74/18 new [11] 24/18 24/18 90/7 105/14 112/19 113/5 114/19 115/3 115/10 117/18 127/24 news [14] 97/8 97/22 106/13 107/14 109/16 110/8 124/2 124/4 124/7 131/1 131/20 132/16 132/23 137/16 newspaper [2] 91/5 115/12 Newtown [2] 130/13 132/19 next [10] 28/18 65/18 68/15 82/9 83/12 84/14 97/10 113/18 115/18 141/15 NICS [2] 64/1 64/5

night [12] 8/4 53/23 54/1 54/17 54/25 55/4 55/9 55/25 56/6 56/15 57/2 68/10 nine [4] 86/4 86/13 86/24 87/5 nine-round [1] 87/5 Nineteen [1] 96/3 no [131] 1/3 3/7 5/5 5/9 5/13 6/22 6/22 7/5 7/7 10/14 10/17 16/12 17/1 17/8 17/22 19/12 23/16 24/25 27/17 31/8 31/9 31/15 31/25 32/23 32/24 33/10 33/14 34/14 34/15 35/18 37/3 37/5 37/25 39/7 40/13 42/3 42/5 42/11 44/25 45/7 45/14 45/14 45/14 46/22 47/25 48/17 51/6 53/17 55/14 55/19 56/21 58/6 58/11 58/11 59/6 59/22 60/3 60/5 60/8 62/2 63/17 64/9 66/15 67/18 67/23 69/18 71/1 71/5 72/1 73/21 74/18 75/1 77/7 79/17 80/10 80/25 86/3 86/18 86/21 87/6 87/13 87/21 90/2 90/8 90/10 91/2 91/8 91/10 91/12 91/14 92/10 95/2 95/19 100/2 105/9 105/24 106/17 106/18 107/13 107/20 110/19 111/18 113/16 114/6 115/15 117/15 118/21 120/25 120/25 122/3 124/12 128/2 128/14 130/3 130/11 131/1 131/4 132/25 133/11 134/8 135/9 137/2 137/4 137/13 139/5 139/6 139/18 140/4 140/8 144/8 146/24 No. [3] 4/21 35/18 72/11 No. 1 [1] 72/11 No. 13-cv-1300 [1] 4/21 No. 2 [1] 35/18 nobody [3] 36/3 93/1 129/3 nods [1] 94/13 non [9] 13/13 13/14 27/11 27/14 36/15 48/1 48/16 77/9 141/6 non-assault [2] 48/1 48/16 non-fatal [1] 36/15 non-negligent [2] 27/11 27/14 non-ordinary [1] 141/6 non-scholarly [2] 13/13 13/14 noncrime [1] 37/2 noncrime-related [1] 37/2 noncriminal [2] 7/15 145/23 none [1] 95/11 nonfatal [19] 3/10 29/8 29/13 29/14 29/17 30/10 36/2 36/5 36/7 36/21 37/3 37/19 39/6 40/20 41/2 41/10 44/17 88/2 89/6 nonfatally [3] 36/22 122/23 122/24 nonprofessional [2] 30/25 31/10 Norinco [1] 106/9 normally [1] 117/19 North [3] 3/18 107/23 109/25 not [171] Notary [2] 148/9 148/21 note [2] 88/9 118/13 notes [3] 96/8 107/6 148/12 nothing [6] 4/10 7/5 51/23 70/19 90/11 109/23 notice [1] 4/3 noticed [2] 11/10 21/2 November [1] 148/19 now [11] 7/2 15/24 16/5 55/12 67/9 70/16 71/4 91/20 108/16 112/2 117/5 NS [1] 54/6 nuanced [1] 78/8 number [63] 12/17 12/22 12/22 14/18 18/9 19/1 19/19 21/14 22/21 23/20 26/3 28/22 31/13 36/2 36/11 36/12 36/20 36/21 39/11 39/12 43/11 55/17 58/15 72/14 72/16 72/25 73/4 73/10 75/22 77/16 78/24 79/11 83/14 84/17 85/13 85/19 87/5 89/5 92/14 94/17 95/8 97/10 99/21 102/9 103/2 108/24 119/2 120/23 122/6 122/8 125/11 128/17 129/5 129/6 129/17 130/8 133/18 134/15 139/25 140/8

140/9 140/9 141/11

numbers [22] 18/15 21/3 28/14 35/24 41/7 48/19 72/12 73/10 73/19 74/16 88/24 89/10 93/7 104/15 104/24 108/4 120/1 120/3 138/5 139/1 139/2 141/5 numerous [1] 7/23

## 0

object [2] 108/12 108/20 objection [2] 8/15 42/21 obstacle [1] 143/10 obstruction [1] 58/6 obvious [2] 32/22 36/24 obviously [9] 23/16 24/11 27/18 50/12 54/20 70/20 75/5 107/1 138/8 Occasionally [1] 92/25 occur [8] 8/8 56/21 86/18 127/15 134/24 135/11 138/16 146/16 occurred [5] 92/7 99/19 111/13 114/22 126/11 occurring [4] 133/19 136/9 138/21 142/8 October [1] 1/13 odd [1] 81/15 off [5] 39/14 40/10 46/14 56/3 81/7 offender [3] 3/19 55/19 146/21 offenders [6] 20/20 72/21 134/3 134/7 137/11 137/18 offering [1] 64/21 offhand [2] 126/10 127/6 office [2] 3/17 99/4 officers [3] 124/10 136/13 144/14 official [2] 96/11 148/18 often [10] 7/19 9/13 9/14 57/3 79/22 84/18 92/6 98/22 118/24 146/16 Oh [3] 96/4 114/8 145/1 okay [21] 50/24 53/18 54/6 58/13 68/24 72/2 72/3 72/9 78/19 80/22 88/19 95/5 95/23 96/4 97/18 112/18 114/4 114/12 114/20 117/5 141/18 old [2] 18/9 72/22 old-fashioned [1] 72/22 once [6] 20/1 20/3 27/22 52/17 110/25 116/8 one [128] 6/13 8/5 14/4 14/5 16/6 16/7 16/8 18/6 18/20 18/21 18/24 19/17 19/17 22/21 23/1 23/5 30/6 31/19 40/5 45/9 47/9 49/11 50/3 50/5 50/15 50/21 57/1 58/16 58/22 58/23 58/24 59/24 64/16 67/23 68/9 70/18 71/13 71/14 71/14 72/18 74/20 74/23 78/7 78/8 79/11 79/12 80/4 80/6 80/17 83/12 84/15 84/21 86/15 86/17 86/19 86/23 86/25 88/12 90/7 90/10 93/14 98/3 98/6 98/9 100/21 100/24 102/11 104/18 107/8 109/20 110/16 110/25 111/19 111/19 112/2 113/18 114/5 114/16 115/18 115/19 116/1 116/24 116/24 117/8 117/10 117/14 117/18 118/20 120/25 121/11 122/12 123/10 124/6 125/23 126/12 126/13 126/13 126/15 126/16 127/9 128/14 129/9 129/25 130/11 130/18 133/11 133/19 136/1 136/18 136/19 136/23 137/21 138/9 138/10 140/10 141/14 141/21 142/16 144/1 144/2 144/7 144/7 144/9 145/15 146/9 146/15 146/19 146/20 one-minute [1] 98/3 ones [15] 27/5 27/6 27/9 29/15 37/25 43/23 44/20 71/23 82/25 91/17 95/5 112/12 113/17 123/7 126/9 only [42] 6/9 7/18 8/3 8/4 10/24 20/20 21/7 26/19 29/15 35/22 37/25 40/12 42/11 46/24 50/21 51/14 51/18 57/14 70/5 71/22 72/18 79/11 82/23 82/25 85/19 88/9 88/13 98/15 111/18 112/6 114/8 132/8 136/4 137/14 138/17 140/6 141/20 142/3 142/6 143/24 146/19 146/21

opinion [7] 64/10 72/10 74/9 102/11 102/14

O	page 1358 [1] 81/22	52/1 52/4 52/19 53/21 58/23 60/25 64/18
opinion [2] 139/18 146/12	page 1359 [1] 82/4 page 14 [3] 107/24 108/11 108/18	64/24 72/16 73/11 77/11 77/23 85/5 85/7 89/14 90/25 93/4 98/13 98/21 102/22 102/22
opinions [3] 71/2 71/19 71/23	page 15 [3] 62/13 107/25 108/11	103/3 103/4 103/11 103/18 103/23 104/7
opportunistic [1] 8/11	page 153 [1] 78/9	104/15 112/7 112/15 112/17 116/4 116/24
opportunity [13] 7/9 8/1 8/8 8/24 20/5 64/21	page 154 [1] 76/6	119/19 120/3 120/5 120/23 121/6 121/19
90/2 90/8 91/2 101/25 131/8 131/24 134/19	page 16 [2] 113/2 113/5	122/23 123/24 124/19 125/9 126/2 126/4
opposed [2] 14/15 24/17	page 17 [2] 65/4 114/18	128/17 129/1 129/6 129/15 129/17 129/18
option [1] 31/11	page 18 [3] 99/24 101/4 117/5	129/18 129/20 129/21 130/22 133/7 135/23
oral [1] 4/3 order [15] 8/14 12/12 15/1 35/25 38/17 47/4	page 19 [2] 95/24 96/6 page 2 [1] 106/6	136/10 138/8 138/10 138/12 142/21 143/4 144/12 145/23 145/24 146/7 146/11 146/13
66/18 98/21 104/14 116/11 125/8 126/3 134/2	page 20 [2] 95/23 96/2	people's [1] 34/9
134/6 141/16	page 23 [1] 97/7	per [12] 54/12 57/17 58/24 58/24 59/11 82/7
ordinary [15] 6/8 7/20 9/9 32/25 48/23	page 24 [1] 117/21	83/14 84/15 89/5 120/16 132/22 132/23
134/18 137/17 137/17 139/13 139/17 139/22	page 25 [1] 118/13	perceive [4] 20/22 43/17 45/5 53/21
141/6 141/10 141/10 141/24	page 3 [3] 41/4 71/16 72/10	perceives [1] 44/9
Oregon [3] 115/19 128/10 133/22	Page 35 [1] 122/20	percent [10] 10/20 30/22 42/15 45/24 47/4
original [2] 12/18 17/19 other [60] 4/5 6/11 7/20 7/24 9/4 10/16 11/13	page 36 [1] 126/14 page 38 [1] 119/21	61/14 78/22 78/22 79/6 89/7 percentage [5] 42/9 61/22 78/20 87/10 137/11
15/8 15/16 15/25 16/17 16/17 28/6 28/23 31/8	page 39 [2] 130/16 132/19	Percentage [3] 42/7 01/22 70/20 07/10 137/11
31/9 38/3 39/21 44/3 45/16 47/14 51/19 55/10	page 4 [5] 82/4 109/6 113/3 113/19 114/14	perception [1] 44/24
55/17 60/6 61/4 65/3 67/2 70/9 71/24 73/8	page 53 [1] 41/5	perceptions [1] 67/1
79/21 80/3 82/13 82/13 82/22 84/7 87/5 88/13	pain [1] 107/19	perfectly [1] 125/10
90/13 90/20 99/15 102/5 103/4 107/13 110/11	pair [2] 50/20 83/24	perform [1] 66/11
115/6 116/7 118/10 122/2 125/10 126/5 128/4 129/9 129/22 129/25 130/3 136/19 140/10	panel [1] 22/23 panicked [2] 52/2 129/21	performed [1] 67/16 performing [2] 64/22 66/10
140/11	panicked [2]   52/2 129/21 paper [5]   11/18 12/7 40/24 69/3 69/5	performing [2] 04/22 00/10 perhaps [2] 90/5 145/14
others [10] 30/21 44/5 60/13 84/21 90/19	paper [3] 11/10 12/7 40/24 03/3 03/3	period [13] 14/6 18/21 18/22 22/18 23/4
111/18 123/16 126/11 126/17 130/20	paragraph [9] 62/16 65/6 78/10 78/12 78/15	41/13 42/24 48/21 50/5 50/6 89/4 98/4 99/20
otherwise [2] 21/17 44/5	78/19 82/5 84/14 145/13	periodically [1] 38/4
ought [1] 13/20	paralyzed [2] 52/3 126/4	periods [1] 7/19
our [1] 13/16	parentheses [1] 78/22	permission [1] 38/15
out [45] 6/17 7/10 8/20 8/25 9/5 11/7 11/24 18/25 21/3 22/24 23/4 23/7 24/21 24/23 26/3	part [12] 9/2 21/8 21/22 38/9 53/7 94/3 94/17 105/17 108/21 124/21 124/22 138/2	permit [1] 10/1 permits [1] 65/7
28/18 28/19 28/19 31/3 48/12 52/6 55/23 56/4	partial [2] 65/19 107/9	permits [1] 4/5
57/25 58/2 62/7 65/25 68/9 97/8 102/2 102/3	participate [1] 69/13	person [20] 6/3 6/10 6/20 8/4 23/5 31/5 31/10
104/11 104/12 107/4 112/5 112/9 112/11	participation [1] 69/23	32/17 32/25 43/19 44/24 50/10 63/16 99/6
114/19 116/2 121/1 129/4 134/20 140/22	particular [41] 9/5 9/6 14/15 25/13 28/9	103/22 105/2 105/6 135/2 141/24 142/17
141/9 145/18 outcome [3] 83/1 87/24 88/3	35/11 35/12 35/14 39/5 52/21 53/20 70/6 75/23 82/11 87/24 89/12 89/23 98/2 102/15	person's [2] 23/13 25/8
outcome [5] 83/18//24 88/3	107/5 109/20 110/10 119/10 121/22 123/1	personal [1] 146/12 personnel [7] 29/21 33/5 34/19 44/12 44/19
outdoor [6] 92/7 125/5 126/1 126/5 126/11	133/12 135/4 135/10 135/10 135/11 135/17	44/21 46/1
126/12	135/17 135/17 135/20 136/3 138/12 138/13	persons [10] 22/22 27/24 27/24 38/13 41/7
outlets [1] 132/16	138/13 138/16 138/20 142/8	63/11 65/10 65/11 133/18 145/16
outliers [4] 79/9 79/13 79/16 79/17	particularly [2] 54/15 117/14	pertaining [1] 28/10
outlined [2] 69/2 94/16 outlines [2] 69/1 69/6	parties [2] 146/23 148/14 parties' [1] 148/15	pertains [1] 95/19 Peter [1] 62/17
outside [2] 25/23 62/25	parties [1] 146/13 partly [3] 24/13 38/12 44/16	Phillip [1] 39/16
outstanding [1] 62/12	party [1] 146/19	physical [4] 92/2 143/7 143/11 143/13
over [21] 6/10 6/14 22/17 26/1 30/11 42/19	pass [1] 66/21	physically [1] 43/25
42/24 45/13 77/19 77/24 89/4 92/20 93/15	passed [1] 63/6	physician [1] 45/1
94/12 95/2 96/12 97/20 101/12 127/8 133/3 133/17	passes [1] 22/2	physicians [2] 30/25 84/9
overall [3] 26/15 71/9 92/19	past [1] 26/1 patrol [1] 21/21	picking [1] 71/24 picture [4] 100/7 100/9 100/10 100/13
overturn [1] 12/2	pattern [1] 43/5	pieces [1] 95/12
own [1] 21/19	Patterson [2] 14/11 60/10	pile [1] 129/24
owned [1] 65/12	pause [1] 116/11	pile-up [1] 129/24
owner [2] 29/25 30/4	peak [4] 26/10 26/13 26/14 26/15	pills [1] 31/6
owning [1] 9/21	peaked [2] 40/9 42/24	pistol [20] 54/3 54/11 54/12 75/6 75/12 77/13
P	peer [8] 11/12 11/15 12/5 12/20 12/23 12/25 13/4 14/14	77/19 78/4 78/20 78/23 78/24 79/2 79/6 79/12 81/18 84/8 85/2 87/15 111/12 140/6
P.C [1] 2/5	peer-review [1] 11/15	pistols [22] 3/14 49/6 75/10 75/19 79/7 81/25
page [63] 1/5 3/2 3/7 41/4 41/5 41/6 61/8	peer-reviewed [4] 11/12 12/23 13/4 14/14	82/6 83/13 83/23 84/6 84/15 84/17 85/7 85/14
62/13 65/4 71/16 72/10 76/6 78/9 81/22 81/23	penalties [4] 60/1 60/7 60/8 60/17	85/20 85/24 86/2 86/7 86/9 140/7 140/17
82/4 82/4 95/23 95/24 96/2 96/6 97/7 99/24	penalty [2] 30/12 33/25	140/19
100/7 101/4 101/15 105/14 106/6 106/6 106/7 107/24 107/25 108/3 108/4 108/4 108/11	penetration [1] 57/18	place [15] 9/6 20/12 20/12 56/14 56/22 59/25
108/11 108/18 109/6 112/19 113/2 113/3	people [114] 6/5 6/13 8/10 8/19 9/15 9/19 10/6 10/20 11/3 18/11 20/23 22/7 23/1 23/7	61/25 134/25 135/4 135/17 135/20 136/4 138/14 138/17 142/8
113/5 113/19 113/19 113/22 113/23 113/23	23/8 23/21 24/5 24/14 24/17 25/16 25/16 30/6	places [5] 10/2 84/2 135/10 136/8 137/9
114/14 114/18 115/18 117/5 117/10 117/21	31/14 33/20 33/23 34/2 34/5 36/1 36/14 39/8	plaintiffs [5] 1/5 2/3 16/14 16/21 19/9
118/13 119/21 122/20 126/14 130/16 132/19	39/21 40/19 41/13 41/23 42/1 42/9 49/10	plan [4] 134/24 135/15 138/17 141/25
137/20 140/18 141/22	49/11 50/18 51/2 51/3 51/8 51/10 51/13 51/25	planned [10] 7/10 7/14 7/15 7/17 7/18 7/19
page 13 [3] 61/8 105/14 112/19		
		•

P
planned [4] 8/25 9/1 9/3 134/21
planning [6] 77/17 135/14 135/16 137/24 141/5 142/12
plans [1] 135/16
plausible [3] 125/7 125/10 126/2 please [2] 76/22 110/15
plenty [2] 109/20 134/10 plus [4] 8/7 95/8 114/11 126/22
point [28] 6/10 6/13 6/24 10/16 12/3 27/20
45/21 46/4 57/14 57/14 57/22 61/21 61/22 61/24 74/8 74/14 74/16 74/18 75/1 84/4 95/15
107/4 111/19 112/9 118/11 123/17 128/1
131/7 pointed [1] 141/9
points [2] 26/4 145/7
police [27] 20/14 21/7 21/14 21/16 21/17 21/18 21/23 21/24 24/24 29/22 30/2 30/5
30/12 59/14 59/23 91/15 91/21 93/8 94/8
94/18 98/14 105/15 107/10 124/8 132/15 136/13 144/14
police-based [1] 20/14 police-reported [1] 21/16
Policy [11] 3/12 113/12 114/15 114/24 115/4
115/5 115/13 118/1 118/7 118/11 118/19 poor [1] 13/10
popularly [1] 53/21
population [1] 11/5 portion [3] 17/3 94/1 99/17
pose [1] 17/20
position [5] 12/15 32/17 127/17 128/15 135/7 positions [1] 14/15
positive [2] 76/1 76/4
possess [2] 9/23 60/18 possessed [1] 101/6
possession [3] 108/22 132/3 132/5 possibility [2] 46/16 77/18
possibility [2] 40/10 77/18 possible [18] 52/2 74/17 79/24 83/1 94/9
98/11 121/8 126/5 126/11 128/7 129/15 129/23 129/23 133/11 135/7 135/15 136/8
138/4
possibly [1] 30/12 potential [1] 137/21
pounds [3] 143/4 143/5 143/23
practical [1] 64/17 practice [1] 52/11
practiced [1] 49/11 precedes [1] 145/14
preceding [1] 146/3
precise [3] 52/18 142/18 143/3 precisely [1] 52/4
precursor [1] 64/1
predicted [1] 69/4 prediction [2] 51/12 51/14
predisposed [1] 8/19
predisposition [1] 7/25 predominantly [2] 47/12 62/19
preexisting [1] 8/7
premise [2] 47/16 59/16 preparations [2] 135/6 135/12
prepare [6] 135/8 135/9 135/10 135/19 136/4 138/14
prepared [4] 7/2 52/16 91/20 142/3
present [8] 26/8 32/18 49/24 51/5 51/15 84/8 105/1 124/11
press [3] 96/9 96/13 96/22
pressure [1] 106/21 presumably [4] 44/19 45/1 75/15 113/16
pretty [5] 21/3 30/14 93/18 93/24 120/18
prevent [3] 63/10 129/22 136/21 previous [4] 17/17 22/14 70/9 118/6
previously [4] 24/19 39/10 63/17 85/4

primarily [1] 8/23 principal [3] 21/6 28/2 55/16 print [2] 14/9 14/9 printed [2] 62/7 68/9 prior [5] 10/21 27/25 45/17 45/17 70/17 priori [1] 35/9 priors [1] 10/25 prison [14] 32/10 33/6 33/11 33/23 33/24 34/5 36/24 38/4 38/5 38/16 38/23 43/16 43/17 prisons [1] 38/14 private [12] 62/19 64/8 64/12 65/1 65/9 65/10 65/22 66/5 66/5 67/20 68/14 69/17 probability [3] 29/11 36/18 38/13 probably [33] 7/22 13/8 13/11 14/3 18/20 18/25 26/14 28/17 36/6 36/22 41/22 42/22 43/14 47/4 52/10 52/12 55/2 79/21 84/2 84/3 89/8 93/1 93/12 94/23 100/23 101/3 101/8 101/11 104/5 136/1 137/9 143/2 143/22 problem [5] 67/16 69/10 69/12 86/1 87/21 procedures [3] 12/11 12/11 12/13 proceedings [1] 148/11 process [3] 11/16 12/24 83/3 produce [4] 48/6 57/23 84/15 86/8 produced [2] 80/2 103/2 product [1] 71/4 professional [10] 11/18 30/11 30/17 32/22 33/4 34/18 43/18 44/21 44/25 110/6 professionally [1] 43/25 prohibit [3] 63/10 136/21 142/11 prohibited [2] 63/10 68/4 properly [1] 12/13 proportionally [2] 43/6 43/7 proposal [3] 58/23 65/25 69/1 prosecutors [2] 118/15 118/22 prospective [4] 66/7 66/12 66/15 66/20 protection [4] 8/24 9/8 9/10 135/24 provide [3] 20/24 25/23 122/16 provided [6] 17/25 20/17 25/2 30/7 95/12 121/12 providing [1] 90/8 provision [1] 68/20 public [7] 10/2 74/10 74/17 136/8 137/9 148/9 148/21 publication [1] 12/4 published [8] 11/13 11/17 13/13 13/21 14/7 14/12 50/4 68/6 pull [1] 11/7 pulled [1] 26/3 pulls [1] 56/19 punch [1] 56/9 punished [3] 32/13 32/14 34/1 purchase [4] 58/16 60/25 61/3 65/8 purchased [3] 59/13 59/24 61/25 purchases [3] 59/17 59/17 59/18 purchasing [1] 107/6 purely [1] 33/1 purpose [3] 9/7 103/8 136/8 purposes [4] 4/4 4/5 47/8 89/12 pursuant [1] 4/3 put [3] 31/4 69/1 110/7 putting [1] 59/25

qualified [4] 64/7 67/13 68/23 137/5 Quantitative [1] 14/12 question [29] 8/17 10/5 32/20 32/22 40/16 52/5 52/17 55/8 71/7 71/21 76/15 76/22 77/5 78/13 79/1 84/11 85/1 92/24 93/23 93/24 97/1 97/25 103/15 103/16 107/18 108/13 132/17 140/5 144/21 questions [11] 5/4 5/8 5/12 11/8 17/20 22/10 22/13 22/16 39/23 40/1 68/24

quick [1] 130/5 quickly [2] 53/12 111/15 quite [6] 25/18 39/24 115/2 137/6 144/16 144/21 quote [2] 62/18 68/13

R-O-D-I-N-O [1] 66/2 R-O-S-S-I [1] 62/18 race [1] 22/11 Railroad [1] 111/8 ran [2] 99/10 121/1 randomly [1] 38/24 range [3] 36/17 54/14 132/24 ranges [1] 127/14 rape [1] 27/12 rapid [3] 48/14 80/2 129/22 rapidity [1] 73/5 rapidly [6] 48/9 73/5 79/24 98/20 127/12 132/5 rare [7] 12/8 50/2 88/24 89/1 89/8 104/13 136/14 rarely [4] 72/11 74/19 92/25 146/18 rate [28] 44/14 48/18 48/22 49/3 49/16 92/12 92/17 92/19 92/20 94/25 95/2 95/9 95/13 97/19 98/9 99/16 120/17 122/5 122/9 128/13 128/21 128/22 130/24 132/18 133/3 133/9 133/13 137/10 rated [1] 44/21 rates [4] 3/11 14/2 45/23 92/21 rather [13] 6/14 30/17 31/19 34/5 73/13 80/6 103/3 107/15 114/11 115/9 138/10 144/2 146/15 rationale [2] 47/16 59/7 reach [3] 14/15 101/23 103/14 reached [3] 19/3 46/2 101/23 reaching [1] 119/14 reaction [1] 123/14 reacts [1] 5/21 read [11] 11/22 20/3 41/8 61/13 78/12 78/14 78/16 79/1 83/13 88/21 107/5 reading [3] 4/6 41/15 68/10 ready [4] 137/25 141/25 142/12 143/8 real [1] 142/15 realistic [8] 31/11 67/19 67/23 110/12 126/25 129/13 133/8 133/10 reality [3] 25/15 143/11 145/22 realize [1] 8/3 really [40] 6/11 11/8 20/21 29/14 35/22 36/3 38/7 39/3 39/22 49/11 51/6 52/23 55/1 58/18 66/24 66/25 67/4 67/9 79/13 79/16 82/20 83/18 83/18 84/11 91/23 92/17 94/21 98/16 98/17 101/10 101/13 103/1 114/10 117/13 122/7 122/9 136/13 137/5 142/15 144/6 **Realtime** [1] 1/19 reason [36] 18/8 21/6 21/13 24/9 36/24 38/25 39/19 39/21 47/9 47/10 55/16 73/3 77/8 79/22 82/10 83/15 84/15 93/19 100/20 103/13 103/22 107/13 109/18 109/24 110/9 113/15 116/14 118/3 118/21 120/18 124/12 129/5 130/9 130/11 139/13 141/7 reasonable [5] 39/24 66/23 68/15 84/21 84/22 reasoning [1] 89/16 reasons [4] 8/23 35/9 46/24 47/14 rebuttal [3] 4/24 70/11 70/13 recall [7] 19/17 31/22 39/15 59/5 102/14 117/15 124/24 receive [3] 32/16 32/21 79/2 received [1] 78/4 recent [3] 3/12 18/23 28/15 recess [4] 45/10 81/8 147/1 147/2 recipient [2] 66/15 66/21

recognize [5] 12/9 17/13 62/9 100/7 100/12

R recommend [1] 11/24 recommendation [3] 11/23 12/1 12/3 recommended [1] 13/13 record [8] 10/10 10/21 10/23 10/24 11/1 61/2 115/12 148/12 records [2] 11/3 29/21 recover [1] 93/9 recovered [2] 59/14 59/23 reduce [2] 60/21 65/19 reduces [1] 73/6 reducing [2] 46/7 46/20 Reedy [7] 73/20 81/2 81/13 82/16 82/18 139/24 140/14 refer [3] 6/5 99/20 146/2 refereed [3] 13/7 13/8 13/9 reference [3] 49/9 88/23 108/8 referenced [2] 107/24 112/20 referencing [1] 138/23 referring [4] 48/25 105/19 119/10 139/11 refers [1] 43/1 reflection [3] 43/2 75/10 85/5 refute [1] 82/14 regard [2] 50/11 51/14 regarded [1] 57/7 regardless [2] 90/20 121/1 Regional [1] 35/1 regions [1] 83/15 register [1] 8/6 registration [2] 15/12 15/20 rejected [3] 11/24 13/23 14/4 related [7] 3/11 37/2 41/3 41/10 42/23 72/25 146/22 relationship [3] 13/8 57/15 73/2 relative [4] 20/11 30/16 148/13 148/15 relatively [3] 13/6 57/8 98/23 release [1] 25/8 relevant [8] 59/10 59/12 119/8 131/4 132/1 132/4 132/6 137/13 reliability [1] 125/25 reliable [14] 20/8 28/15 28/21 29/1 37/15 37/17 37/18 56/16 56/18 56/18 93/1 93/12 94/21 94/23 relied [2] 111/5 118/19 reload [18] 51/16 51/22 51/23 90/14 90/15 90/16 90/22 91/3 99/1 101/25 105/4 112/2 112/13 116/5 116/23 117/3 128/4 128/24 reloading [8] 18/11 48/24 50/15 52/25 78/2 90/1 104/3 115/23 rely [10] 13/5 13/7 62/17 101/9 109/22 109/23 110/2 110/5 115/9 145/11 relying [2] 91/25 94/22 remain [1] 43/15 remaining [1] 126/7 remains [1] 74/16 remember [2] 117/9 140/13 reminds [1] 56/23 Remington [3] 1/16 1/21 148/22 repeal [1] 15/12 repeat [3] 76/22 78/7 93/23 repeated [1] 39/18 repetitively [1] 6/6 rephrase [2] 8/16 78/13 replaced [1] 22/25 replete [1] 101/16 report [69] 3/8 3/9 3/17 4/23 4/24 4/24 17/16 17/19 17/21 17/24 18/24 19/8 21/13 22/1 24/24 28/7 28/12 28/12 29/22 33/18 36/8 37/12 38/25 40/5 43/15 68/19 70/3 70/5 70/8 70/9 70/11 70/17 70/25 71/6 71/20 71/23 72/4 74/9 95/23 96/13 97/22 98/11 105/15 105/17 105/24 105/25 106/7 106/15 106/23 107/10

107/14 107/17 107/25 109/16 113/2 113/11 113/13 114/17 114/18 114/24 115/1 117/21 118/1 119/21 121/25 126/18 129/10 130/16 reported [9] 1/18 21/9 21/16 21/17 21/23 30/4 31/1 74/21 93/14 reporter [3] 1/19 17/11 148/2 **REPORTERS [1] 1/20** reporting [2] 22/2 36/9 reports [14] 19/4 19/7 20/13 27/7 27/10 28/18 91/15 91/22 92/23 94/11 95/16 118/15 124/3 repository [1] 21/25 represent [1] 81/1 representative [2] 22/7 38/21 representatives [1] 59/8 representing [3] 2/3 2/9 4/20 require [2] 62/1 84/9 required [3] 8/7 29/21 61/16 requirement [4] 63/15 63/17 64/12 67/21 requirements [6] 15/13 15/20 63/1 63/3 63/18 63/21 research [9] 3/12 39/16 53/16 59/5 59/10 60/5 60/6 60/9 82/14 researchers [1] 10/22 residents [2] 22/11 23/9 Resistance [1] 3/19 respect [4] 29/17 61/24 82/11 88/5 respective [1] 75/13 respectively [1] 78/23 respond [1] 28/3 responded [2] 123/16 140/5 respondent [5] 23/2 28/2 28/3 28/6 28/12 respondents [6] 25/10 32/7 35/10 35/11 35/14 35/17 responding [1] 39/9 response [4] 25/13 34/21 118/5 140/5 responses [1] 34/9 rest [3] 41/8 94/18 119/6 restating [1] 37/22 restriction [1] 142/14 restrictions [2] 9/19 9/25 resubmitted [1] 11/25 result [8] 33/5 35/5 36/24 47/24 50/12 51/12 80/1 102/18 resulted [2] 81/19 87/24 results [6] 21/14 23/14 83/5 88/5 140/12 140/16 reveal [1] 92/12 review [9] 11/15 13/1 19/3 19/25 81/10 91/15 92/1 105/23 121/24 reviewed [15] 11/12 12/23 13/4 13/9 14/14 19/13 19/15 19/22 25/19 60/13 68/20 91/21 92/11 98/12 105/17 reviewer [1] 13/18 reviewers [3] 12/5 12/20 13/12 revised [2] 11/25 17/16 revolver [38] 18/10 18/12 18/17 48/23 49/10 49/15 49/19 50/16 50/23 50/24 51/8 51/18 52/14 54/3 54/8 72/22 74/6 75/5 75/11 76/10 76/11 77/14 77/19 77/24 77/25 78/4 78/23 78/25 79/3 79/12 81/20 85/9 86/24 87/3 87/4 87/5 87/16 140/6 revolvers [26] 3/14 48/12 49/5 54/20 74/23 75/20 76/18 76/25 77/2 79/9 82/1 82/7 83/24 84/16 84/18 85/14 85/20 85/25 86/3 86/4 86/8 86/9 86/12 87/11 140/18 140/20 Richmond [2] 82/22 83/11 rifle [10] 97/22 106/1 106/9 106/10 109/9 116/2 116/3 116/3 118/2 119/24 rifles [2] 48/3 118/24 right [43] 5/2 7/2 15/3 15/24 16/4 16/15 40/10

41/15 43/20 46/12 47/2 54/21 55/12 56/25 57/10 61/17 63/4 70/12 74/6 74/13 78/9 79/8 80/19 81/16 93/22 94/12 96/7 97/12 98/8 99/2 100/13 114/1 115/4 118/18 120/10 120/12 120/19 122/7 126/23 132/22 132/23 140/2 144/4 right-hand [1] 78/9 rinse [1] 31/3 risk [1] 60/20 rob [2] 7/25 8/1 robberies [1] 8/20 robbery [12] 3/19 7/24 8/6 8/14 8/21 9/3 9/5 10/7 10/17 27/12 40/4 107/23 Rodino [1] 66/2 room [9] 29/11 30/1 39/13 46/3 51/8 51/9 94/6 94/6 130/8 rooms [2] 29/12 36/19 Rossi [1] 62/17 rotated [1] 23/4 rotating [1] 22/23 roughly [3] 57/16 89/4 120/4 round [37] 47/23 50/23 51/10 52/7 54/21 57/18 57/19 87/4 87/5 99/9 106/10 107/7 107/11 109/8 109/9 109/12 109/13 113/14 114/23 115/15 116/2 118/2 118/4 118/14 118/16 118/20 118/24 120/22 121/17 121/18 122/12 127/9 128/16 128/20 128/21 130/19 132/23 rounds [96] 18/9 48/20 49/10 50/14 52/22 54/14 54/15 54/18 55/5 57/13 72/12 72/14 72/19 72/21 72/23 72/25 73/4 73/10 73/11 74/16 74/19 75/2 75/3 75/4 75/8 75/10 75/17 75/18 78/1 85/8 85/19 86/4 86/13 86/24 87/5 87/11 92/14 93/7 93/16 93/18 93/22 94/2 95/8 95/18 96/12 97/10 99/21 100/18 101/2 101/12 104/2 107/15 108/23 110/1 110/14 110/18 110/22 110/23 112/8 117/25 118/17 119/3 120/1 120/3 120/13 120/16 120/19 122/8 122/13 122/14 123/5 123/6 123/12 127/1 127/2 127/8 127/16 128/23 129/5 131/8 131/11 132/22 133/17 134/2 134/6 134/13 137/22 138/5 139/1 139/2 140/7 140/9 141/5 141/11 141/21 142/4 routine [1] 136/5 routinely [6] 135/23 136/2 136/7 138/11 138/19 142/9 Ruger [2] 96/10 116/3 rule [3] 13/2 35/12 102/3 rules [1] 4/6 run [7] 51/25 99/6 99/7 112/5 112/9 112/11 129/4 running [1] 94/18 runs [1] 16/8 résumé [1] 11/7

safety [3] 71/11 74/11 74/18 said [19] 32/4 32/23 34/18 35/23 37/20 40/7 40/9 45/4 68/12 83/13 85/4 107/14 115/2 115/2 120/3 127/25 131/20 137/4 139/5 sale [1] 66/19 salt [1] 125/18 same [18] 10/24 23/6 24/14 26/17 27/1 28/11 31/2 39/25 42/24 51/9 69/6 70/7 70/10 90/4 113/23 118/5 140/18 145/13 sample [20] 22/8 22/24 22/25 23/4 24/18 34/4 36/18 38/7 38/13 38/21 82/11 82/18 82/20 82/21 82/24 83/8 87/18 87/21 87/21 87/22 samples [1] 29/11 sampling [3] 38/7 38/20 38/22 Sanctuary [1] 95/25 satisfied [1] 129/5 Saturday [10] 53/23 54/1 54/17 54/25 55/4

short [1] 92/22 selling [1] 9/17 semiautomatic [26] 3/14 48/10 48/11 48/12 shorter [2] 56/11 56/12 Saturday... [5] 55/9 55/25 56/6 56/15 57/2 48/15 49/6 52/10 55/3 75/5 75/9 75/12 75/19 shot [54] 3/9 18/10 18/12 29/25 30/6 30/19 save [1] 50/8 76/2 76/2 77/13 77/19 77/24 90/7 93/8 97/22 31/14 31/17 31/20 31/21 33/7 33/12 36/22 106/9 109/9 111/12 116/3 119/24 119/25 saving [1] 46/2 38/25 40/3 40/6 40/19 42/10 43/19 44/24 45/5 sawed [1] 56/3 semiautomatics [6] 54/23 54/25 74/5 74/22 48/23 50/18 51/4 51/5 51/13 51/18 52/14 sawed-off [1] 56/3 76/18 76/24 72/22 77/16 79/19 79/22 83/4 88/25 95/22 say [71] 5/22 7/8 10/18 13/1 13/3 14/25 22/15 seminal [1] 7/5 95/22 96/15 96/15 96/25 97/2 98/12 98/14 23/5 26/1 29/24 30/19 32/24 34/25 37/15 43/4 sends [1] 11/20 99/5 116/6 116/25 118/16 121/19 122/12 44/4 45/18 45/21 48/12 48/25 50/3 50/13 52/7 sense [8] 9/1 18/25 70/21 96/23 96/23 119/16 122/22 122/22 123/24 128/18 131/22 131/23 55/7 58/11 59/6 62/24 63/9 64/7 66/1 67/13 141/13 144/22 shotgun [2] 56/3 119/25 72/24 75/2 80/3 84/13 86/7 88/21 88/23 92/1 sensible [1] 33/2 shots [12] 48/21 74/12 74/21 75/22 84/18 93/13 93/18 94/11 94/14 94/23 94/24 96/20 sentence [13] 32/16 36/25 65/18 82/9 83/12 97/15 98/3 126/22 130/20 132/20 139/25 97/19 100/17 101/4 101/11 104/11 105/25 83/20 83/23 134/22 138/2 138/24 145/12 140/17 106/17 107/1 110/2 110/15 111/18 116/1 146/2 146/3 should [11] 9/20 9/21 13/5 23/5 27/1 33/19 117/25 119/5 119/7 120/12 122/10 123/2 sentences [1] 84/5 33/20 34/7 58/11 71/14 107/4 123/14 123/16 125/17 133/24 134/22 137/20 sentencing [1] 33/25 shouldn't [1] 106/17 143/21 showed [3] 85/18 99/21 118/22 separate [2] 38/20 130/23 saying [5] 35/10 83/25 83/25 93/17 143/3 series [1] 22/15 shows [3] 36/13 81/24 112/23 serious [8] 6/6 30/13 30/20 30/21 31/12 34/22 says [35] 34/11 34/14 34/15 61/13 65/18 sic [1] 121/5 72/11 74/15 78/17 78/20 78/22 82/6 84/5 44/19 45/5 side [1] 72/7 84/15 89/20 94/15 94/16 96/8 96/19 97/14 seriousness [1] 44/14 sided [1] 146/20 105/25 106/8 108/2 108/5 108/19 108/21 service [1] 64/23 significance [1] 102/4 108/22 109/6 109/7 113/6 114/25 118/1 services [1] 17/25 significant [2] 26/4 91/23 118/13 123/23 140/16 145/6 set [7] 13/19 18/7 18/23 23/8 63/3 89/16 97/5 significantly [1] 84/7 Scalia [2] 137/3 137/4 setting [4] 33/23 33/24 125/5 126/1 signing [1] 4/6 scattered [1] 38/14 seven [4] 79/12 80/8 80/9 114/11 similar [6] 39/17 69/4 81/2 81/13 125/11 scenario [6] 50/2 50/17 51/17 51/19 80/6 several [3] 88/22 109/9 109/12 125/11 severe [2] 30/12 60/8 94/15 simplifying [1] 122/11 scenarios [2] 50/20 52/6 severely [1] 34/1 simply [6] 48/13 55/19 85/4 90/14 103/9 scene [4] 51/2 123/17 123/22 128/1 sex [1] 22/11 scheme [2] 45/2 65/10 since [8] 26/2 39/18 40/12 47/11 50/6 62/22 shakes [1] 69/22 schemes [1] 44/12 share [3] 42/12 46/25 80/18 68/13 125/10 scholarly [2] 13/13 13/14 shared [1] 25/23 single [6] 7/21 38/16 119/23 130/17 131/9 School [3] 100/11 114/13 115/17 She [1] 122/22 138/4 scientific [1] 5/19 shells [1] 93/9 sit [3] 67/14 134/4 134/16 situation [9] 9/20 51/15 93/13 93/21 109/15 screener [1] 22/12 sheriff's [3] 3/17 105/23 107/16 129/14 133/9 139/3 142/7 script [1] 25/19 shifting [1] 60/16 se [2] 54/13 59/11 shoot [24] 18/11 52/13 73/13 73/18 75/16 situations [1] 9/17 seal [1] 148/18 77/23 78/1 90/12 94/6 94/8 98/20 99/2 110/25 six [34] 18/3 18/8 18/9 18/10 18/11 18/12 searched [1] 18/2 112/16 116/19 120/19 120/24 126/3 126/8 22/14 23/3 23/6 23/10 44/13 48/23 49/10 second [18] 49/12 57/17 71/18 88/15 88/16 127/15 128/5 132/9 139/1 139/3 51/18 52/14 52/24 54/10 54/14 54/18 54/20 90/5 96/15 98/1 98/2 98/9 98/22 110/23 shooter [53] 49/13 49/19 49/20 49/25 50/13 55/1 55/5 72/22 79/12 87/8 87/9 87/11 89/11 111/18 117/4 126/16 127/9 134/22 138/2 50/15 51/7 51/9 51/18 56/13 56/19 73/17 120/4 120/10 120/16 122/23 129/11 129/14 second's [1] 110/24 77/15 79/23 81/19 90/6 90/11 92/9 93/15 six-shot [6] 18/10 18/12 48/23 51/18 52/14 secondhand [1] 62/19 93/19 93/20 94/5 95/17 98/20 100/12 102/18 72/22 sixth [1] 14/4 Secondly [1] 56/11 103/6 103/14 105/2 105/4 107/6 113/13 seconds [13] 49/14 52/12 52/24 52/25 53/4 114/10 116/23 117/2 118/14 119/23 120/7 sixth one [1] 14/4 94/7 98/6 98/13 126/22 127/1 127/8 127/16 size [14] 54/13 54/24 56/8 75/22 82/18 82/20 120/13 120/15 120/22 121/15 123/1 124/16 132/23 125/13 126/7 126/18 127/25 128/16 130/17 87/18 87/21 87/21 88/6 127/18 128/12 128/15 section [1] 145/6 132/18 135/16 141/6 140/1 see [15] 24/17 28/17 34/13 35/2 42/13 43/23 shooter's [2] 77/21 118/22 sized [1] 54/2 71/4 72/8 79/10 79/11 91/18 104/3 114/6 shooters [23] 48/13 48/22 53/7 75/11 75/12 skilled [1] 49/13 124/17 145/1 89/21 89/24 91/4 91/7 100/10 101/6 103/5 skim [1] 81/4 seek [5] 31/21 32/21 33/2 36/23 44/1 108/22 109/7 109/25 110/13 119/15 131/10 SKS [3] 97/21 118/2 118/24 seeking [2] 30/10 43/18 134/23 137/15 139/12 139/14 139/19 slain [1] 113/7 slight [2] 40/11 77/1 seem [1] 59/7 shooting [63] 18/19 49/17 49/18 49/25 53/8 seems [5] 59/16 84/4 142/24 144/25 146/13 slightly [1] 48/15 73/10 73/12 75/17 77/17 80/2 92/2 92/16 seen [13] 21/1 37/8 40/24 58/23 62/8 80/24 92/20 93/14 94/1 94/16 95/3 95/4 95/7 97/9 small [10] 54/2 56/7 56/7 56/8 57/6 57/10 83/21 86/15 86/17 86/19 94/14 100/5 107/2 99/16 99/19 99/20 102/19 107/8 111/8 111/10 86/2 94/3 104/25 146/21 sees [1] 24/22 111/14 111/22 112/7 112/15 112/25 113/9 small-sized [1] 54/2 select [3] 11/19 22/7 85/7 113/25 114/7 115/19 117/9 117/24 119/20 smaller [7] 48/1 48/4 56/9 57/5 57/5 104/8 selected [5] 22/9 27/23 38/13 38/17 38/24 120/4 120/11 121/17 123/21 124/15 127/7 128/24 self [21] 8/23 9/8 9/10 30/13 30/15 31/12 127/9 127/11 127/19 127/22 128/6 129/3 smallest [2] 54/24 55/2 31/14 31/22 44/20 134/1 135/24 136/25 137/7 129/8 130/14 131/21 132/3 132/7 132/12 Smith [1] 121/16 137/8 138/13 142/4 142/24 145/7 145/14 132/19 132/25 138/25 140/23 141/5 146/23 smoking [1] 40/5 146/1 146/6 shootings [27] 3/16 17/18 18/3 18/8 18/13 snapshot [1] 22/17 self-defense [6] 134/1 136/25 137/7 137/8 48/19 51/22 70/9 74/11 88/24 89/5 89/17 snapshots [1] 61/15 138/13 142/4 92/12 97/7 100/11 102/9 102/16 117/13 SNS [2] 54/6 54/8 self-evident [5] 142/24 145/7 145/14 146/1 117/23 125/11 126/5 126/6 127/4 127/14 so [256] 146/6 133/19 134/20 139/14 so-called [1] 48/3 seller [2] 66/8 66/13 shootout [4] 3/18 107/24 109/25 117/6 society [1] 5/20 sellers [1] 65/22

starts [4] 65/7 95/24 96/3 97/8 state [16] 1/7 4/19 10/25 11/4 11/4 22/1 38/5 solely [1] 102/4 46/17 61/14 63/24 84/25 113/20 114/2 115/6 solid [1] 98/16 145/19 148/6 some [68] 7/17 11/11 12/10 15/2 15/5 21/11 state.co.us [1] 2/11 21/18 28/6 30/21 31/6 36/17 36/20 41/23 stated [3] 8/17 84/20 86/10 43/21 47/18 52/4 52/11 53/21 56/17 63/24 statement [8] 65/16 82/10 82/15 83/16 83/17 65/3 66/17 67/15 68/1 68/3 71/24 74/2 74/17 84/12 84/19 86/6 77/11 83/6 83/8 86/1 86/3 90/17 92/4 92/13 states [18] 1/1 3/11 3/16 9/23 9/25 10/1 11/2 92/13 94/11 95/11 96/23 96/23 103/3 104/20 20/16 41/3 55/7 55/9 55/10 63/18 63/20 65/7 107/19 109/13 111/5 111/16 111/20 112/1 96/9 108/13 118/15 112/16 112/23 115/5 116/1 116/4 116/7 statistical [3] 12/10 77/7 77/10 116/17 116/18 116/21 118/13 123/9 123/14 statistics [5] 20/6 20/14 20/24 29/3 37/13 125/2 126/4 129/17 129/18 144/16 146/11 steady [4] 133/3 133/5 133/8 133/12 steal [1] 61/1 somebody [18] 6/7 7/24 12/11 12/16 34/11 steeply [1] 26/22 34/14 34/15 45/4 49/24 51/15 52/9 72/18 73/3 stenographic [1] 148/12 73/4 79/15 79/22 83/25 116/14 stenographically [1] 148/10 somehow [1] 111/23 STENOTYPE [1] 1/20 someone [11] 6/18 13/4 44/9 73/12 76/10 90/8 step [1] 68/15 103/17 112/10 126/25 136/17 136/21 sterile [1] 31/4 something [25] 8/12 10/7 10/19 12/12 13/4 stick [1] 29/24 14/25 15/1 31/4 32/13 52/22 55/4 55/11 64/19 sticking [1] 87/14 67/6 67/11 79/9 81/1 81/13 85/21 94/15 sticks [1] 140/25 106/11 108/7 141/1 141/16 142/21 still [24] 6/20 15/21 32/15 34/2 34/6 34/8 sometimes [5] 8/22 8/22 23/7 124/5 124/7 43/16 43/16 55/18 56/3 65/5 65/10 65/16 somewhat [3] 33/22 47/20 117/17 65/23 68/15 74/16 74/25 87/14 87/14 112/12 sorry [11] 19/24 34/14 40/15 54/19 78/14 113/23 116/18 123/15 126/7 80/22 88/16 93/20 103/15 104/21 126/16 STIPULATIONS [1] 4/1 sort [12] 8/10 13/14 21/22 30/9 50/14 65/25 stitching [1] 31/9 66/22 69/23 101/16 108/25 138/19 139/6 stood [1] 126/2 sorts [1] 18/13 stop [12] 47/2 49/25 51/23 90/3 90/11 97/12 sought [1] 34/18 105/1 121/1 129/3 129/3 134/3 134/6 sound [3] 57/16 57/17 110/7 stopped [3] 111/22 116/9 129/8 sounds [3] 23/22 83/22 103/6 stops [1] 6/19 source [11] 20/13 29/1 30/18 37/16 61/16 stopwatch [1] 93/2 65/3 110/5 115/6 115/9 115/14 145/19 store [8] 8/2 8/4 8/12 21/21 29/25 29/25 30/3 sources [13] 20/8 29/10 60/24 107/15 112/24 140/25 stores [1] 61/3 113/17 115/1 117/25 118/7 118/8 118/12 122/2 137/14 storm [1] 116/3 story [1] 117/20 sourcing [1] 107/19 span [14] 92/15 92/20 95/3 95/7 95/20 96/24 straw [1] 59/18 97/20 98/5 98/9 99/19 120/8 130/21 131/21 stress [1] 132/8 131/23 strictly [2] 36/13 85/17 spans [3] 131/19 131/19 132/11 strong [2] 13/8 35/9 speak [3] 19/9 27/23 68/23 strongest [2] 36/6 83/13 speaking [5] 23/9 46/5 66/7 73/12 85/17 struggling [1] 21/4 special [5] 10/1 53/24 54/1 55/4 137/15 student [1] 18/1 specials [7] 54/18 55/1 55/9 55/25 56/6 56/15 studied [3] 18/21 18/22 83/3 studies [15] 10/13 10/15 10/16 10/18 29/19 specific [7] 9/7 17/20 25/14 43/4 60/16 134/25 31/13 31/16 33/8 44/11 48/25 60/12 82/13 136/3 83/7 88/10 88/11 specifically [1] 39/5 study [32] 5/19 5/22 33/15 45/7 50/4 50/6 specifications [1] 18/1 62/17 73/20 73/25 74/3 76/16 78/3 80/13 specify [1] 83/10 80/24 81/2 81/3 81/12 82/16 82/17 82/22 speculate [2] 94/10 98/15 82/23 83/2 83/10 83/11 84/4 85/11 88/1 88/12 speculation [7] 10/9 53/13 84/20 84/21 84/24 89/12 91/19 101/17 139/24 98/16 121/10 studying [1] 18/7 speed [3] 52/14 53/1 57/16 stuff [2] 24/11 107/19 spent [1] 94/18 style [1] 106/1 Spokane [1] 3/17 sub [4] 143/17 143/19 144/3 144/7 spring [1] 123/11 subheading [1] 62/15 Springfield [1] 115/18 subject [4] 20/10 20/25 34/22 59/5 stand [2] 38/9 65/13 submissions [1] 13/22 stand-alone [1] 38/9 submit [2] 11/18 70/24 standards [1] 13/20 submitted [5] 4/23 14/3 17/19 70/19 70/23 standing [1] 93/2 subsequently [1] 65/15 standpoint [2] 23/2 33/1 subset [1] 41/23 start [9] 96/19 97/10 97/14 99/23 111/7 120/9 substantial [1] 39/15 120/11 123/23 129/10 substitute [2] 56/1 138/3 started [4] 40/8 111/14 121/17 124/24 substitution [1] 56/5 succeed [2] 73/19 104/7 starters [1] 49/3 starting [1] 114/19

such [9] 45/7 47/24 50/3 63/17 67/18 87/6 103/23 105/2 142/14 sued [1] 65/13 suffering [1] 5/10 sufficiently [2] 127/13 136/24 suggest [1] 84/6 suggestions [1] 12/20 suicides [2] 28/24 29/5 Suite [1] 2/6 summarized [1] 119/21 summary [1] 106/3 summon [1] 44/6 supplementary [1] 18/24 supplemented [2] 3/8 4/24 support [1] 145/9 supported [1] 59/21 Supporting [1] 145/7 suppose [2] 39/24 84/11 supposedly [1] 13/10 sure [24] 5/6 15/13 16/8 16/18 25/5 27/1 28/14 28/20 40/21 45/9 46/11 50/9 54/7 70/1 71/21 72/5 72/6 95/15 98/24 103/25 124/21 130/4 131/18 138/1 surgery [1] 31/8 surprise [1] 133/14 surprising [1] 117/17 surprisingly [1] 56/17 surrounding [1] 63/13 survey [14] 20/17 22/6 23/14 25/23 27/17 31/19 31/24 32/4 35/5 35/12 38/18 38/20 38/24 61/15 surveyor [4] 21/12 24/21 24/22 24/24 surveyors [4] 25/1 25/7 25/20 39/21 surveys [5] 20/21 38/4 38/4 44/8 44/23 survival [2] 45/23 79/20 suspect [5] 30/8 104/3 136/14 144/15 144/16 sustain [1] 78/21 SWAT [1] 134/10 swear [1] 4/9 switched [1] 111/18 switching [1] 116/5 sworn [1] 4/14 synopsis [2] 96/18 107/5 system [1] 69/14 systematic [1] 29/9

table [10] 41/4 41/6 42/14 46/15 61/8 61/13 76/5 76/9 77/3 79/10 Table 1 [1] 76/5 Table 14 [1] 61/8 Table 2 [2] 77/3 79/10 tackle [4] 49/25 51/16 116/15 116/16 tackled [8] 111/23 116/6 116/24 123/18 123/19 123/21 128/1 128/6 tactical [1] 119/25 tactics [6] 137/24 138/22 138/25 139/9 140/24 141/2 tailed [1] 40/9 take [13] 24/10 52/7 52/13 52/25 53/4 53/7 61/10 81/3 92/5 92/8 105/6 119/14 139/17 taken [8] 1/11 4/3 27/17 45/10 81/8 125/18 147/1 147/2 takes [3] 12/1 94/1 141/1 taking [3] 5/7 73/9 140/22 talk [13] 19/6 19/7 26/25 27/4 31/24 46/18 70/15 70/15 99/22 114/19 119/18 119/20 139/21 talk about [1] 119/18 talked [2] 45/4 134/18 talking [21] 7/13 16/18 24/14 26/2 26/12 27/1 27/5 37/3 37/18 53/18 53/20 75/3 88/4 88/5 108/8 110/4 117/10 126/9 129/11 141/9 144/8

T
Tallahassee [4] 1/17 1/21 35/1 148/22
target [5] 8/1 9/4 56/13 73/6 111/1
Targeting [4] 18/7 50/4 60/13 60/14 targets [2] 56/9 73/9
tautology [1] 83/22
team [1] 134/11
tease [1] 6/17 Tec [2] 99/8 100/14
Tec-9 [2] 99/8 100/14
technical [2] 13/12 13/20
technically [2] 6/9 23/9 technique [1] 35/13
techniques [1] 45/12
telephone [3] 23/12 23/19 23/20 tell [31] 4/10 21/11 24/14 24/15 51/6 51/11
52/23 52/23 53/3 61/10 74/8 82/12 83/23
84/25 86/5 86/25 87/1 87/3 87/4 91/20 92/17
92/21 100/18 100/25 101/10 113/21 115/15
115/23 126/10 127/6 127/6 telling [2] 36/14 40/22
tells [1] 92/19
ten [15] 50/5 73/13 73/16 79/15 93/15 93/19
94/1 94/3 94/7 94/12 96/10 96/20 96/24 117/25 130/19
ten-year [1] 50/5
tend [6] 26/20 47/8 47/10 47/25 56/11 56/16
tends [3] 56/8 57/5 146/20 tens [1] 89/6
tenure [1] 20/4
term [2] 6/5 53/23
terms [2] 22/4 40/7 terrible [1] 103/16
terrified [1] 125/19
Terror [1] 95/25
test [1] 59/11 testified [5] 4/15 14/18 14/21 16/24 74/4
testifying [1] 16/10
testimony [4] 51/7 93/3 93/11 94/22
text [1] 106/7 than [84] 9/9 13/1 13/7 15/22 16/17 18/3 18/8
18/16 30/17 30/21 30/22 32/9 32/18 34/5 36/3
39/21 41/18 43/6 44/20 48/1 48/16 48/22 49/16 53/4 54/16 54/18 55/5 59/23 62/8 79/9
49/16 53/4 54/16 54/18 55/5 59/23 62/8 70/9 71/11 73/16 74/5 74/19 74/22 75/4 75/19
76/11 76/18 76/24 77/14 77/24 78/4 78/25
79/3 80/6 81/19 82/6 82/7 82/18 84/16 85/24
86/3 86/8 86/9 87/11 89/9 89/11 99/10 101/2 102/19 103/3 103/4 107/13 107/15 110/1
110/10 114/11 118/10 131/25 132/25 136/18
138/9 138/10 140/17 140/19 142/3 143/25
144/2 144/3 145/24 146/2 146/8 146/15 thank [3] 68/11 88/19 107/18
that [783]
that's [100] 6/3 7/22 10/11 10/21 12/12 12/25
13/1 13/11 14/11 15/15 15/21 15/22 15/23
25/9 25/11 25/12 25/15 27/20 29/16 31/7
32/13 32/13 36/6 44/16 44/25 46/15 46/20
47/9 47/12 54/8 57/1 57/2 57/5 57/10 59/20 60/11 61/7 65/23 72/4 74/23 75/1 77/3 79/5
79/11 79/12 79/21 82/12 82/12 84/23 85/22
88/10 89/4 91/6 93/24 94/9 94/20 96/18 97/1
99/23 101/12 101/12 102/21 103/16 104/3 105/15 106/11 111/21 112/19 112/19 119/21
122/1 122/21 127/5 127/8 128/5 128/6 128/9
128/19 133/6 133/21 134/17 135/14 136/12
137/10 138/7 139/16 142/22 144/10 144/15 144/16 144/19 145/4
the going [1] 43/17
theoton [0] 110/20 110/24 121/4 121/6 121/7

theater [9] 119/20 119/24 121/4 121/6 121/7

129/7 129/13 130/2 130/10

```
theaters [2] 130/4 130/6
thefts [2] 28/8 28/11
their [30] 21/19 21/21 23/17 23/20 27/25
29/12 36/15 43/23 44/6 47/8 48/1 48/16 59/18
60/23 62/19 67/2 69/9 73/9 75/13 75/15 85/10
89/14 103/10 103/11 105/6 110/7 115/1
137/25 144/19 144/22
them [55] 9/7 10/4 10/8 15/5 21/8 21/18 22/10
22/12 23/19 24/1 24/6 24/20 25/2 30/24 31/1
32/14 32/19 34/24 35/19 38/2 43/21 47/7
47/17 51/16 51/24 55/12 59/20 60/18 60/25
61/1 61/2 63/19 64/21 65/14 68/14 81/16 90/3
101/19 111/6 112/3 115/11 116/15 125/2
125/3 125/22 126/3 130/19 136/18 136/22
137/12 142/18 143/15 143/25 144/1 144/1
themselves [8] 9/16 12/15 12/19 32/18 37/21
41/24 42/10 43/20
then [73] 6/19 8/6 8/24 9/24 11/13 13/19
16/16 21/24 22/12 24/15 24/24 26/6 27/23
28/2 30/1 30/11 35/2 36/17 36/19 38/21 40/9
42/25 45/3 50/1 50/6 51/16 52/25 62/22 65/6
65/18 66/16 66/19 67/9 68/24 69/8 73/10 76/3
78/21 83/4 83/12 89/20 90/1 90/5 90/11 94/7
95/8 96/15 98/14 103/6 105/4 106/14 108/12
109/10 109/11 111/16 111/19 112/21 113/2
113/7 113/18 116/6 116/7 123/10 124/23
128/2 128/6 132/3 138/14 138/17 141/14
141/14 142/2 144/9
there [107] 6/18 6/22 6/24 8/5 9/19 11/11
11/13 12/10 12/25 15/8 15/18 18/24 20/12
22/21 24/5 25/1 25/25 26/4 26/13 27/2 27/3
28/14 29/1 29/10 30/5 31/13 31/16 31/19
32/11 35/9 35/21 41/13 44/8 45/18 45/19
45/24 46/3 46/5 46/15 46/16 47/2 48/9 49/9
50/5 51/15 51/17 51/23 52/19 54/13 55/21
56/4 58/21 58/25 60/24 63/17 63/20 63/21
64/14 66/15 67/6 67/25 69/12 70/17 70/21
71/23 74/17 76/9 76/14 77/1 77/13 79/8 79/15
79/17 84/13 85/11 93/2 95/11 96/8 97/4 97/5
97/12 102/8 105/8 114/8 115/20 118/6 119/23
121/6 121/7 121/12 122/13 122/14 124/10
124/17 126/6 126/10 129/24 130/5 130/19
134/10 134/14 135/22 136/16 136/20 139/24
there's [43] 7/5 7/5 8/4 8/5 9/24 13/11 15/21
16/4 25/4 28/2 31/8 31/8 36/19 40/11 44/11
45/14 45/15 49/24 51/6 52/3 55/19 58/6 70/22
72/7 75/1 75/21 79/11 79/16 88/22 90/2 90/5
90/11 91/2 105/1 105/2 115/15 115/25 123/13
125/20 127/21 129/16 137/15 146/10
therefore [6] 7/21 49/25 59/19 79/24 102/23
145/9
Thereupon [1] 4/13
these [37] 35/11 35/14 43/9 59/9 66/12 71/14
82/1 84/5 85/2 86/2 86/5 88/10 90/17 91/4
94/11 94/25 97/2 99/18 101/18 105/7 108/3
108/17 110/13 111/3 111/6 112/21 116/16
116/20 119/6 125/17 131/1 131/19 131/19
132/8 139/9 141/1 145/7
they [238]
thev'd [2] 30/5 39/24
they'll [8] 22/10 22/12 31/3 31/4 32/12 32/16
34/1 73/6
they're [34] 8/3 8/13 9/5 9/13 9/13 21/7 22/20
23/3 23/4 25/8 25/17 32/8 32/8 38/3 38/10
48/7 56/7 56/16 57/4 59/22 61/23 72/4 73/5
73/7 73/8 81/24 84/1 93/5 124/7 135/1 137/16
139/3 141/12 141/20
they've [3] 19/10 22/13 31/14
thing [9] 21/22 25/7 27/1 32/16 33/2 42/23
88/10 98/1 130/11
things [14] 6/1 12/5 12/6 28/7 31/2 43/2 50/17
```

```
60/17 62/22 79/21 80/3 84/10 88/22 129/22
think [68] 7/7 14/6 15/24 16/2 16/4 16/7 18/1
18/18 19/6 24/13 26/17 28/11 28/21 33/16
34/17 34/19 40/7 40/8 42/22 43/11 43/22 47/7
47/22 47/22 51/25 58/17 59/3 59/25 63/7
65/14 65/23 66/2 68/19 70/13 74/4 74/8 80/7
80/21 82/4 83/7 84/25 85/17 85/18 87/18
87/20 91/21 99/9 102/12 102/21 104/6 106/23
110/12 111/6 115/8 115/19 116/23 121/8
121/19 125/16 126/1 129/11 133/6 133/8
139/23 140/4 140/18 143/22 146/6
third [7] 41/6 42/14 43/1 56/15 78/9 81/22
111/17
this [160]
thorough [1] 10/22
thoroughly [1] 13/10
those [46] 12/23 15/2 15/25 16/10 16/14 16/21
18/15 21/3 21/9 21/10 22/16 27/13 27/24
35/24 36/8 38/1 38/16 38/22 44/18 44/21
44/23 46/9 46/18 46/25 55/13 55/22 57/3 57/7
61/19 63/3 63/18 63/21 64/15 69/6 69/8 75/9
75/19 77/17 95/15 102/5 104/23 118/20
125/22 130/10 134/1 134/15
though [9] 6/4 16/16 21/13 52/5 79/5 84/13
116/18 129/16 135/20
thought [5] 27/20 71/22 85/23 87/7 134/20
thousands [1] 89/7
threat [1] 141/13
threatening [5] 43/24 44/10 44/15 44/18
44/22
three [15] 6/19 60/24 75/2 89/4 109/11 117/6
117/19 119/24 123/10 126/17 130/17 135/24
136/7 144/1 146/8
through [17] 11/10 46/9 52/21 57/20 58/5
62/19 63/16 64/25 66/16 71/13 78/19 81/4
95/6 105/7 111/3 119/6 129/17
Thurston [1] 115/17
thus [1] 84/8
time [73] 1/14 7/4 7/19 9/6 14/8 14/9 22/17
22/21 24/15 48/21 48/24 52/17 57/25 58/4
59/24 66/24 67/2 67/4 67/8 73/9 91/21 92/15
93/5 93/10 93/12 95/3 95/7 95/7 95/16 95/17
95/20 95/21 95/24 96/19 96/24 97/2 97/9
97/14 98/5 99/19 105/6 105/7 106/21 106/22
112/11 120/7 120/8 120/9 122/6 123/23
125/12 125/17 126/15 127/10 129/8 129/10
131/7 131/10 131/19 131/21 131/23 132/2
132/6 132/11 132/22 134/25 135/4 135/11
135/18 136/3 138/13 138/16 142/8
timed [1] 52/20
timer [1] 49/7
times [19] 14/18 14/20 14/23 15/1 79/19
79/23 84/1 99/2 105/15 112/19 113/6 114/19
115/3 115/10 117/18 127/24 132/9 134/10
135/10
tiny [2] 46/25 47/3
title [2] 41/2 108/15
titled [1] 80/14
today [6] 5/8 40/10 67/15 68/23 134/4 134/16
together [1] 16/8
told [3] 17/22 30/2 100/19
ton [1] 28/14
too [7] 16/5 29/16 36/14 41/22 47/13 115/12
142/17
took [9] 14/6 18/1 46/14 94/17 95/18 114/5
119/16 125/7 125/11
tool [1] 103/19
top [6] 9/24 96/6 107/24 108/11 137/20
141/22
topic [3] 7/3 14/16 111/9
total [4] 20/15 36/21 89/3 122/6
tougher [1] 59/25
```

T	under [20] 34/3 44/9 49/11 62/15 67/17 69/12 69/18 69/18 75/6 89/
trace [2] 86/22 86/24	106/21 108/10 120/14 123/4 126/
traced [3] 65/14 86/23 87/2	underlies [1] 119/13
track [3] 23/22 24/6 43/12	underlying [3] 47/16 59/16 142/2
tracks [1] 26/18	underneath [1] 143/15
traffickers [2] 59/8 59/18	underreport [2] 39/9 39/20
traffickers' [1] 59/8	underreports [1] 39/6
train [3] 53/12 72/7 111/13	understand [13] 5/8 5/11 8/17 2
trampled [1] 129/18	68/18 71/21 78/16 83/17 93/17 98
transcript [1] 148/11	144/21
transfer [5] 65/1 65/10 65/11 66/16 66/20	understanding [4] 96/14 124/15
transferred [1] 59/19 transfers [7] 62/20 64/8 64/12 66/6 68/13	understood [1] 11/15   underwent [1] 36/1
68/15 69/17	Undoubtedly [1] 65/9
transmitted [2] 132/15 132/16	unfeasible [1] 64/11
trauma [2] 45/16 80/13	unfortunately [2] 52/16 112/22
travels [1] 57/24	uniform [5] 20/13 22/2 27/7 27/1
treat [8] 30/15 31/12 31/14 41/23 42/10 45/20	unincarcerated [1] 34/4
101/17 101/19	unit [3] 23/6 23/10 24/18
treated [18] 29/13 29/16 30/3 30/24 31/8	UNITED [8] 1/1 3/11 3/16 9/22
31/22 34/11 34/13 35/3 35/23 36/11 36/19	20/16 41/3
39/12 41/11 41/14 43/25 44/18 44/20	units [2] 24/4 38/8
treating [3] 30/13 45/12 84/9	universal [2] 67/20 68/2
treatment [15] 29/22 30/17 31/10 31/21 32/22	universally [1] 120/3
33/3 33/5 34/18 34/25 36/1 36/23 44/2 45/16	unknown [10] 96/19 101/13 101
45/22 46/2	108/3 108/19 109/15 109/16 113/
treats [1] 43/20	unless [5] 85/20 98/5 108/24 109
trend [2] 40/8 42/16	unlike [1] 141/6
trends [7] 3/10 25/25 26/19 37/13 40/17 40/22 41/2	unpack [1] 88/21
trial [1] 32/11	unplanned [1] 7/22 unqualified [1] 66/16
tried [2] 51/16 55/9	unrealistic [1] 67/25
trigger [1] 56/20	unreasonable [1] 67/22
triple [2] 142/20 144/1	unreliability [1] 112/24
trivial [2] 84/2 87/22	unreliable [3] 56/17 125/22 125/
trouble [2] 66/18 67/2	unsourced [1] 118/10
true [17] 28/11 33/3 34/20 36/2 36/21 68/16	unsuitable [1] 47/7
79/5 79/21 84/2 84/3 84/23 84/24 90/4 102/21	until [1] 98/13
145/15 145/20 148/12	untreated [1] 43/11
truth [3] 4/10 4/10 4/11	unusual [4] 54/15 74/15 116/20
try [2] 72/6 129/15	unwilling [1] 146/14
trying [11] 6/17 29/24 73/17 93/25 108/17	up [48] 18/5 22/9 26/6 26/21 26/2
111/20 112/2 112/13 123/17 128/4 141/24 Tucson [3] 122/17 127/19 128/13	31/9 32/15 32/22 34/1 34/14 34/1
turn [5] 22/2 94/22 124/9 132/15 132/16	39/4 39/11 39/23 40/1 43/6 43/7 4   54/14 57/14 57/14 57/16 57/16 58
turned [1] 102/2	71/18 71/25 83/1 86/4 111/6 112/
turns [4] 48/12 58/2 104/11 104/12	113/19 115/18 120/5 124/16 125/
twice [3] 82/6 144/10 144/10	130/21 131/16 140/25 143/5 144/
two [48] 11/13 11/20 19/15 19/17 46/24 49/14	upcoming [1] 32/13
52/6 52/22 52/24 61/15 66/12 70/22 72/19	updated [1] 50/6
73/13 73/14 73/16 75/2 79/6 80/4 80/6 80/20	upon [1] 52/17
81/25 84/5 88/10 88/11 90/5 100/10 104/18	Urban [1] 68/7
104/21 105/19 107/15 108/17 109/8 109/24	us [4] 20/24 92/17 92/19 92/21
116/7 116/8 123/3 123/5 132/23 135/25	use [23] 4/4 6/4 8/13 8/21 48/14
136/10 141/15 141/16 141/21 143/25 144/9	57/9 59/20 74/23 76/18 81/18 89/
146/8 146/14	102/8 102/17 102/20 123/7 128/2
two-second [1] 90/5	142/1 142/13 143/9
type [9] 3/15 7/12 35/5 55/20 80/15 83/24	used [22] 12/11 18/6 25/6 36/12
87/1 97/23 104/20	49/17 53/21 57/3 81/20 86/17 88/
types [9] 3/13 15/8 46/5 46/17 53/20 55/24	106/1 107/12 112/1 115/5 123/9 1
60/17 84/7 103/2 typically [11] 8/12 12/23 53/7 54/9 56/25	128/16 130/17 140/1
typically [11] 8/12 12/23 53/7 54/9 56/25	useful [2] 106/24 106/25
60/23 84/17 87/7 134/19 134/21 141/7	uses [2] 4/5 21/16 using [10] 55/19 75/9 75/13 75/2
$\mathbf{U}$	using [10]   55/19 /5/9 /5/13 /5/2   113/16 113/17 146/19 146/20 146
U.S [4] 22/8 37/12 41/11 133/20	usual [1] 124/13
UCR [3] 21/1 21/16 28/21	usually [11] 6/4 12/2 28/5 47/22
unable [7] 137/23 141/25 142/25 143/1	54/13 57/4 72/20 132/14 141/12
144/24 145/16 146/5	Htob [2] 117/7 117/10

unable |7| 137/23 141/25 142/25 143/1 144/24 145/16 146/5 unbanned [2] 48/5 48/10 unconscious [1] 44/4 uncounted [1] 36/5

nder [20] 34/3 44/9 49/11 62/15 65/10 67/11 7/17 69/12 69/18 69/18 75/6 89/7 89/8 101/7 06/21 108/10 120/14 123/4 126/19 140/16 nderlies [1] 119/13 nderlying [3] 47/16 59/16 142/22 nderneath [1] 143/15 nderreport [2] 39/9 39/20 nderreports [1] 39/6 nderstand [13] 5/8 5/11 8/17 21/4 42/16 8/18 71/21 78/16 83/17 93/17 98/24 103/15 nderstanding [4] 96/14 124/15 124/20 139/8 nderstood [1] 11/15 nderwent [1] 36/1 ndoubtedly [1] 65/9 nfeasible [1] 64/11 fortunately [2] 52/16 112/22 niform [5] 20/13 22/2 27/7 27/10 28/18 nincarcerated [1] 34/4 nit [3] 23/6 23/10 24/18 NITED [8] 1/1 3/11 3/16 9/22 9/25 11/1 0/16 41/3 nits [2] 24/4 38/8 niversal [2] 67/20 68/2 niversally [1] 120/3 nknown [10] 96/19 101/13 101/19 106/2 08/3 108/19 109/15 109/16 113/12 130/20 nless [5] 85/20 98/5 108/24 109/22 117/20 nlike [1] 141/6 npack [1] 88/21 planned [1] 7/22 nqualified [1] 66/16 realistic [1] 67/25 reasonable [1] 67/22 reliability [1] 112/24 rreliable [3] 56/17 125/22 125/23 nsourced [1] 118/10 nsuitable [1] 47/7 ntil [1] 98/13 ntreated [1] 43/11 nusual [4] 54/15 74/15 116/20 144/16 nwilling [1] 146/14 0 [48] 18/5 22/9 26/6 26/21 26/21 29/5 29/24 1/9 32/15 32/22 34/1 34/14 34/15 36/12 39/4 9/4 39/11 39/23 40/1 43/6 43/7 44/14 51/3 4/14 57/14 57/14 57/16 57/16 58/11 59/22 1/18 71/25 83/1 86/4 111/6 112/1 112/21 13/19 115/18 120/5 124/16 125/1 129/24 30/21 131/16 140/25 143/5 144/24 ocoming [1] 32/13 odated [1] 50/6 on [1] 52/17 rban [1] 68/7 [4] 20/24 92/17 92/19 92/21 se [23] 4/4 6/4 8/13 8/21 48/14 48/17 56/25 7/9 59/20 74/23 76/18 81/18 89/14 101/21 02/8 102/17 102/20 123/7 128/20 137/25 42/1 142/13 143/9 sed [22] 12/11 18/6 25/6 36/12 49/7 49/16 9/17 53/21 57/3 81/20 86/17 88/6 97/23 06/1 107/12 112/1 115/5 123/9 126/19 28/16 130/17 140/1 seful [2] 106/24 106/25 ses [2] 4/5 21/16 sing [10] 55/19 75/9 75/13 75/20 107/8 13/16 113/17 146/19 146/20 146/21 sual [1] 124/13 sually [11] 6/4 12/2 28/5 47/22 48/9 51/1

vague [1] 47/20

Utah [2] 117/7 117/10

validate [1] 34/23 validating [1] 34/21 validity [2] 35/10 35/24 value [1] 76/3 variable [2] 26/24 26/24 variety [1] 135/14 vary [2] 10/21 11/4 vast [1] 101/18 vehicle [1] 28/11 velocities [2] 58/3 58/3 velocity [4] 57/12 57/15 57/18 57/23 verification [1] 35/5 verified [3] 34/10 34/17 34/19 verify [1] 34/9 version [4] 17/16 17/18 63/24 70/7 versions [3] 70/22 71/4 116/18 versus [10] 50/15 50/23 50/24 77/2 80/4 85/14 104/8 121/18 140/6 144/9 very [46] 7/19 10/5 13/8 13/10 13/10 13/16 14/17 24/9 26/9 26/9 30/12 35/23 38/10 40/12 42/11 44/1 46/24 46/24 52/18 55/17 57/1 65/13 67/22 72/11 73/5 76/9 81/11 92/25 92/25 93/6 94/2 97/4 101/10 116/13 116/13 116/20 116/20 120/1 132/2 132/24 135/21 135/22 141/6 142/19 142/21 144/16 vicinity [2] 100/17 143/23 victim [19] 3/19 7/21 20/21 20/22 21/9 21/11 22/14 30/9 58/6 78/24 79/2 79/3 79/19 80/5 87/25 134/2 134/5 135/5 146/20 victim's [2] 57/20 137/21 victimization [9] 20/17 27/8 27/25 39/6 39/20 135/15 136/9 137/10 138/20 victimized [2] 9/13 9/14 victims [40] 18/4 18/15 19/1 27/18 27/19 29/19 29/20 36/7 37/21 45/4 48/7 50/7 50/11 76/17 76/23 76/23 77/14 77/16 77/17 78/4 78/5 78/21 78/23 78/25 81/15 82/2 88/25 89/10 89/22 91/11 102/19 103/3 103/7 124/25 125/11 126/7 131/12 134/23 136/1 140/10 videotape [1] 101/9 view [14] 6/21 46/6 46/19 47/15 49/19 55/15 67/19 68/3 91/5 98/17 119/7 120/21 130/15 131/4 Views [23] 17/12 40/25 41/9 61/9 62/6 62/14 70/4 71/8 71/17 73/23 76/12 78/11 79/4 81/6 96/1 97/24 99/25 105/13 108/1 108/6 117/22 122/19 140/3 violating [1] 60/1 violation [1] 6/2 violence [40] 3/9 7/20 7/20 14/2 17/5 20/6 26/16 26/20 26/21 26/22 26/23 26/24 29/7 29/8 29/20 37/13 37/19 42/18 42/19 43/5 43/6 43/8 46/7 46/21 46/25 60/21 61/7 113/12 114/14 114/24 115/4 115/5 115/13 118/1 118/7 118/11 118/19 137/11 137/17 141/10 violent [24] 7/17 7/23 10/7 25/25 26/18 26/25 27/2 27/5 27/10 27/13 27/15 37/4 47/5 47/11 82/24 83/3 88/13 139/7 139/22 140/25 146/17 146/18 146/22 146/22 virtually [7] 9/25 51/20 83/22 89/21 90/8 131/9 146/7 vital [3] 80/1 80/4 80/5 volatile [1] 26/20

### W

Volume [1] 1/5

vulnerable [1] 79/25

wait [2] 99/6 116/22 waiting [2] 124/17 125/3 waived [1] 4/7 walk [6] 8/11 8/12 8/20 94/5 98/25 98/25 walked [8] 96/14 98/12 99/4 99/8 99/10 121/15 124/16 124/18

W walks [4] 50/13 50/16 51/8 51/9 want [17] 20/11 20/15 20/19 33/1 33/4 34/22 40/3 40/4 43/16 55/7 81/3 90/12 103/3 111/3 111/7 127/17 132/8 wanted [4] 64/24 72/5 75/16 103/17 wanting [1] 143/4 wants [4] 11/17 32/17 103/6 125/13 was [237] **Washington** [1] 15/19 wasn't [9] 7/3 9/3 10/5 46/3 77/20 84/11 101/22 106/13 121/12 water [1] 45/8 way [37] 5/20 16/17 29/10 30/25 31/7 36/14 38/3 51/6 57/20 66/1 67/7 71/15 72/25 85/18 86/25 99/23 102/11 107/4 107/19 112/6 115/15 121/11 128/14 129/9 129/25 133/11 135/12 135/21 136/4 136/5 136/19 136/23 138/17 140/10 142/3 142/6 143/3 we [92] 6/4 14/22 20/22 26/25 26/25 27/4 27/4 27/5 27/6 28/15 29/19 35/22 35/22 36/4 36/7 36/10 36/20 39/4 39/8 39/12 39/19 40/8 42/13 43/12 46/10 48/20 51/1 51/2 51/4 51/22 53/18 58/17 71/4 71/14 72/6 72/8 81/7 90/13 90/15 90/17 93/13 94/9 94/24 95/2 95/3 95/9 96/17 97/1 97/13 97/14 97/16 97/17 97/22 97/25 98/2 98/8 98/15 99/15 99/15 105/25 106/14 106/17 106/18 106/20 106/21 108/3 109/10 111/4 111/6 112/18 114/9 122/7 122/8 122/15 123/24 124/1 124/2 125/24 126/18 130/24 131/2 132/10 132/11 132/14 132/17 132/18 134/18 134/20 136/13 137/14 140/7 140/10 we'd [1] 85/23 we'll [3] 19/6 70/15 101/15 we're [17] 27/1 27/5 28/17 53/19 65/5 80/7 87/14 88/18 109/5 111/9 113/3 114/14 117/5 117/10 125/24 140/18 141/9 weapon [20] 3/19 8/13 8/20 9/10 15/19 47/14 47/24 48/2 48/10 48/11 48/16 49/21 50/10 52/10 56/1 77/20 90/7 93/8 100/12 110/21 weapons [16] 46/19 47/1 47/5 47/19 47/25 48/5 48/8 48/15 49/3 54/15 55/17 56/24 57/9 75/14 87/7 102/23 website [1] 96/12 Wedgewood [1] 96/11 weigh [1] 143/17 weighs [1] 144/3 weight [2] 143/14 144/10 welcome [1] 71/6 well [88] 7/10 7/12 10/4 18/20 27/9 28/23 29/19 34/8 34/12 34/24 35/1 35/16 35/17 38/3 39/3 39/4 40/1 44/11 47/4 49/2 50/9 55/11 55/16 58/11 58/20 63/15 64/2 64/16 66/7 66/24 70/7 74/14 76/1 76/20 77/11 78/7 82/9 82/16 83/17 84/20 85/14 85/17 88/9 89/3 89/7 89/25 91/19 92/19 95/6 97/12 100/21 101/21 104/11 104/23 106/17 106/25 108/12 108/20 109/13 111/25 112/11 114/9 115/1 115/9 116/1 117/14 118/5 119/16 119/18 119/23 123/8 128/22 132/1 132/14 134/20 137/6 138/3 138/25 139/11 141/4 142/2 143/2 143/10 144/3 144/8 145/2 145/12 146/4 well-planned [1] 7/10 went [7] 8/25 26/6 26/7 33/13 67/6 98/13 124/22 were [77] 10/22 17/2 18/15 22/16 28/9 29/24 31/20 32/9 33/15 34/13 34/20 35/21 36/11 38/17 39/12 40/1 41/13 43/24 43/25 44/20 45/5 45/23 46/1 48/21 51/5 53/18 60/13 65/15 70/17 70/21 71/23 77/13 77/16 78/13 82/6

85/10 86/3 97/23 98/3 99/4 101/20 105/8

106/21 108/3 108/22 109/1 109/3 109/11

113/16 114/8 116/16 116/20 118/7 119/9 121/6 121/6 122/13 122/14 123/3 123/24 124/10 124/25 125/2 125/3 125/19 128/18 129/1 130/19 130/19 131/13 131/14 131/20 132/11 132/25 138/12 138/19 140/17 weren't [5] 51/5 52/2 106/15 106/17 114/9 Wesson [1] 121/16 Westside [1] 114/13 what [139] 5/23 5/25 6/17 6/25 7/1 10/11 10/18 13/9 13/14 14/10 15/13 15/16 17/2 17/5 17/15 17/22 18/2 18/16 20/8 20/22 22/16 24/17 25/9 26/16 27/2 27/7 29/8 30/25 31/23 32/15 32/25 33/15 33/16 33/18 33/20 35/10 37/11 39/22 40/1 40/21 42/9 43/1 44/9 45/21 47/3 47/21 48/25 50/7 50/14 54/5 54/8 54/11 54/23 55/25 58/10 58/10 60/9 60/16 62/8 64/4 64/15 66/22 69/4 69/9 71/4 71/7 71/16 72/6 75/25 77/9 77/9 77/16 78/16 81/13 83/18 84/25 86/10 87/1 89/1 89/10 89/23 91/4 92/9 92/17 93/17 93/25 97/2 97/13 97/14 97/23 98/9 98/17 99/16 100/9 101/10 103/20 103/25 104/3 105/5 108/21 110/4 110/7 111/4 111/9 112/25 112/25 113/22 115/2 115/6 115/23 116/1 118/7 118/18 118/22 119/15 119/22 122/10 122/17 123/2 123/14 124/19 125/24 129/15 130/13 130/13 130/24 135/13 137/4 137/11 138/22 139/6 140/13 143/1 143/19 144/21 145/1 145/5 145/10 146/6 what's [8] 5/14 12/9 28/15 32/6 35/20 54/1 54/23 67/1 whatever [15] 8/13 15/15 21/13 25/5 30/16 33/6 43/3 52/22 55/21 79/15 98/6 103/21 129/4 143/24 145/19 when [52] 3/9 6/7 6/10 8/24 8/25 23/18 26/20 26/22 26/25 27/4 27/4 31/14 31/17 32/10 33/7 33/12 34/17 37/18 39/4 43/6 43/8 48/25 61/10 63/6 74/11 81/19 83/25 88/4 88/4 92/8 93/7 94/8 95/3 95/20 101/19 105/4 111/21 121/1 128/5 128/6 129/2 129/15 131/21 131/23 131/23 132/6 132/11 133/2 141/9 143/25 143/25 144/1 where [41] 6/14 8/2 8/11 15/8 18/25 23/18 31/20 34/12 34/24 40/10 44/13 48/19 49/22 51/15 51/17 60/23 83/10 83/10 90/5 90/24 92/2 95/9 95/12 97/13 99/18 99/21 101/4 115/15 118/6 118/8 124/1 124/10 128/1 128/10 131/20 137/8 137/10 139/3 139/8 139/15 142/7 whereas [6] 63/16 72/18 77/14 83/2 87/25 110/5 whether [44] 9/20 13/20 22/13 25/10 25/16 31/17 31/22 32/12 33/12 33/12 34/20 39/5 40/19 44/8 50/10 52/5 55/3 59/12 83/5 86/5 87/3 87/4 90/20 92/6 101/24 103/1 104/24 104/25 107/3 110/4 122/14 124/22 127/22 128/12 129/7 131/5 131/5 131/12 134/14 134/18 140/23 140/24 144/15 146/20 which [93] 4/21 7/25 9/6 12/3 18/3 18/13 18/15 20/14 20/18 21/8 22/2 23/12 24/15 25/6 26/12 29/23 30/13 31/11 32/7 36/22 38/8 38/16 41/12 42/25 44/19 45/3 45/24 49/9 49/23 50/17 50/20 51/12 51/19 51/20 52/19 52/21 55/24 56/19 57/17 57/25 61/15 65/4 65/7 70/2 70/8 76/5 76/8 76/10 81/22 82/4 82/25 83/1 84/2 84/9 86/10 86/22 88/24 89/17 91/17 93/11 93/14 94/23 95/5 97/20 99/15 99/19 99/19 109/21 110/22 113/4 113/19 113/23 115/8 115/17 117/24 118/1 122/13 122/21 123/7 126/9 126/16 127/4 127/9 127/20 127/25 130/22 132/15 132/15 134/5 134/12 135/16 139/19 145/12 while [11] 42/10 43/19 48/4 51/16 111/8

121/5 121/9 123/19 123/21 128/23 131/14 White [1] 7/13 who [64] 6/3 6/5 6/18 8/10 8/19 9/20 10/6 10/20 11/17 17/6 18/1 20/23 22/22 23/21 24/5 24/18 28/3 28/6 30/5 30/6 31/14 32/23 34/2 34/4 36/1 36/23 37/25 38/14 38/23 41/23 42/9 44/24 46/2 49/11 49/24 59/8 59/20 60/18 65/2 66/9 67/15 76/10 77/17 79/6 85/5 85/7 93/4 103/6 105/2 116/24 117/2 117/3 119/23 121/7 124/8 124/10 125/12 125/19 132/25 135/2 135/23 141/24 145/16 146/11 whoever [1] 82/22 whole [4] 4/10 22/15 83/3 95/17 whom [2] 11/20 24/16 why [31] 9/12 21/4 21/5 24/5 29/18 31/11 32/24 34/15 35/8 35/15 38/2 39/2 42/18 46/23 47/6 55/15 56/6 60/4 72/13 73/4 77/23 79/22 96/18 101/12 106/19 110/20 115/2 116/14 134/25 141/19 141/23 wide [1] 135/14 widely [3] 145/8 145/10 145/25 widely-accepted [1] 145/8 wider [1] 58/4 Wikipedia [6] 109/17 109/18 109/21 109/22 110/3 110/3 Wild [1] 114/19 will [25] 11/17 11/19 21/18 25/2 26/21 26/23 27/8 27/10 27/12 30/1 30/2 32/14 43/5 43/7 47/19 48/4 48/5 49/10 68/25 73/11 110/21 133/7 135/3 145/2 145/3 willing [17] 21/11 49/24 51/15 64/20 65/2 66/8 85/6 105/1 105/3 116/15 116/16 117/2 120/25 135/23 135/25 142/21 146/11 Wisconsin [2] 117/24 119/2 withdraw [3] 54/19 76/15 103/12 withdrawn [2] 33/17 133/15 within [1] 38/22 without [11] 18/11 50/15 72/20 75/6 78/2 90/1 102/5 104/2 111/15 131/10 138/19 witness [7] 3/2 4/14 69/22 94/13 123/8 123/9 148/18 Witnesses [1] 91/13 won't [5] 25/23 41/7 46/15 68/24 74/10 wonderful [1] 62/12 wondering [1] 24/5 word [2] 25/5 104/5 words [3] 31/8 31/9 140/11 work [13] 7/5 11/16 12/13 13/11 13/11 22/4 39/17 42/6 45/3 66/2 66/4 123/15 123/16 worked [1] 70/20 worker [1] 113/6 working [1] 8/5 works [2] 5/4 49/9 worried [1] 24/4 worse [4] 32/9 56/3 99/10 99/12 worst [1] 83/1 worth [2] 67/1 110/24 would [244] would make [1] 89/18 wouldn't [32] 12/14 12/15 12/18 12/18 15/17 19/19 38/25 40/4 44/3 51/11 51/11 51/20 53/2 64/7 86/25 87/1 87/4 91/20 94/20 98/8 106/14 109/22 110/2 112/4 117/19 121/20 121/21 123/12 141/4 141/7 144/6 145/21 wound [15] 29/22 30/3 30/10 31/3 32/21 35/3 44/9 57/19 57/21 57/23 57/25 58/5 80/4 83/5 125/9 wounded [11] 18/4 29/24 76/17 76/24 77/14 84/1 84/1 89/11 117/2 122/24 133/19 wounding [2] 84/6 120/5 woundings [1] 29/15

wounds [36] 28/16 29/2 29/13 40/7 41/14

## W

wounds... [31] 43/12 45/13 45/20 45/22 78/4 78/21 78/24 79/3 79/7 79/11 79/15 79/25 80/4 80/6 81/19 81/25 81/25 82/7 83/14 84/8 84/15 85/3 85/6 85/9 85/13 85/16 86/8 88/7 102/18 126/17 140/9
Wright [1] 62/17
written [5] 10/15 12/22 49/2 62/21 70/5 wrong [9] 12/11 12/17 47/17 67/6 67/11 74/8 109/21 115/4 139/11

wrote [4] 62/11 65/9 70/7 70/11

### Y

vard [3] 113/4 113/8 113/24 yeah [26] 7/2 7/4 8/22 9/22 12/21 19/20 34/14 43/14 52/16 74/25 78/8 82/11 82/16 82/20 86/1 94/9 101/3 102/2 104/21 106/5 106/13 108/10 109/20 126/4 140/15 145/2 vear [8] 23/3 28/15 41/13 50/5 58/24 89/4 89/5 89/6 year-long [1] 41/13 years [6] 14/7 26/1 35/25 42/20 45/13 45/17 ves [130] 5/1 5/3 5/24 6/22 9/11 10/11 10/17 11/6 15/7 15/10 15/23 16/6 16/16 16/20 16/23 17/14 17/25 19/14 19/17 19/23 20/1 20/2 20/3 20/7 22/15 23/20 25/21 25/24 26/11 26/19 27/4 28/23 29/3 30/21 31/19 32/5 34/11 34/18 34/20 35/7 37/10 37/23 39/1 39/9 41/6 41/16 41/19 41/25 46/8 46/13 50/11 52/1 52/3 53/25 54/22 55/6 55/6 55/10 57/11 58/9 59/2 60/12 60/15 60/22 61/12 61/18 63/2 63/5 63/12 63/23 64/2 64/2 64/14 65/17 65/24 68/5 68/8 68/17 69/8 69/25 70/13 74/1 74/7 75/24 76/13 77/1 78/18 80/5 81/5 81/11 81/14 81/17 81/21 82/3 85/14 86/16 87/17 91/16 92/4 94/4 97/4 98/15 99/3 99/18 100/6 100/8 100/16 102/21 103/9 106/4 113/10 114/18 115/22 116/15 117/12 120/11 120/17 120/20 121/5 123/25 125/6 125/14 126/21 126/24 127/20 128/19 132/13 135/21 140/21 144/5 vet [4] 32/12 32/13 80/18 138/7 York [8] 105/14 112/19 113/5 114/19 115/3 115/10 117/18 127/24 you [440] you'd [2] 34/22 64/16 you're [32] 5/6 10/25 13/6 24/3 24/4 24/23 26/2 26/12 31/16 32/10 32/20 37/18 45/3 46/11 69/21 71/6 73/15 74/9 75/3 88/4 88/4 93/3 101/8 102/25 105/19 108/8 129/7 134/11 136/16 139/11 143/7 143/15 you've [16] 4/23 5/2 10/15 12/22 14/18 15/8 29/23 52/6 55/23 61/10 62/8 70/5 82/14 117/23 124/13 139/17 your [69] 5/7 5/11 5/14 11/7 11/16 20/4 24/10 24/11 24/12 35/20 46/6 46/19 47/15 49/19 51/7 55/15 60/14 61/19 64/10 67/19 68/3 68/18 69/2 70/2 71/2 71/7 71/16 74/9 85/1 91/5 95/23 96/13 99/9 101/20 104/7 104/17 105/17 106/24 107/18 107/25 111/7 113/2 113/11 114/16 117/21 117/25 118/13 119/7 119/13 119/21 120/12 120/14 120/21 121/24 124/20 127/17 128/15 129/10 130/16 132/21 133/16 134/22 135/7 135/11 140/24 142/17 143/14 143/15 144/11 yourself [1] 135/19

### $\mathbf{Z}$

Zacks [1] 70/14 Zacks's [1] 102/7 zero [2] 141/12 141/20