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Sacramento, California; Wednesday, December 19th, 2018 10:53 a.m.

BLAKE GRAHAM,
having been administered an oath, was examined and testified as follows:
(Whereupon Exhibit 95 was premarked for identification.)

EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADY
Q. Good morning, Mr. Graham.
A. Good morning.
Q. I believe you recall who $I$ am, but in case you don't, my name is Sean Brady. I am an attorney for the plaintiffs in the matter of Rupp $v$ Becerra, which you are here designated as an expert witness on behalf of the defendant, Attorney General Xavier Becerra.

Is that your understanding?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Good morning, by the way.
A. Good morning.
Q. I have marked as Exhibit 95 a document entitled Plaintiff's Amended Notice of Deposition of Defendant's Expert Witness Blake Graham.

Have you seen this document?
A. Let me look at the date.
(Pause on the record.)

THE WITNESS: I'm not sure if I've seen this before.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So if you turn to page 3, it says Attachment $A$, and there's a request for production.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you not seen this document before?
A. Honestly, I don't recall. I've -- there's been a lot of documents with multiple lawsuits over the last year or so, so $I$ don't remember this specific one.
Q. Did you -- do you recall producing any documents in response for this -- for this deposition?
A. Yeah. I don't recall, unless you want me to confer with the department's attorney.
Q. If you need to.
A. Yeah. I mean, is that --

MR. CHANG: Sean, everything that -- we're not withholding any documents on the basis of any objection to these requests. I think everything that -- as indicated in the previous e-mail, everything Agent Graham has that he relied on or cited in his report have either been produced or the internet link was provided for that material.
/ / /

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So if there's not an internet link in your report, then there is no document that you relied on for your report that was -- is that accurate?
A. So basically past experiences in my career, I rely upon those. I think I've provided a curriculum vitae to basically the -- the package. That would have been a document sort of responsive to this conversation. I believe we have an attachment -- possibly Attachment A -- that might have been attached to an expert report somewhere in this process. That was basically the assault weapon registration terms. I believe that was disclosed. There may have been footnotes in my expert report and possibly the rebuttal to the other experts.

So a footnote might be a reference to something that isn't necessarily an internet URL or link as you asked in the question.
Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that you have no documents that you relied on that are not cited in your report referring to a link of some sort?
A. Yeah. I mean, the Penal Code, obviously. I didn't -- I don't know if $I$ specifically called that out, but the Penal Code is part of this conversation. We have an assault weapons guide, and that's sort of in the back of my mind occasionally when dealing with assault
weapons. You know, matters like this. I've got various court criminal cases going forward that I'm an expert in, for example, that are not listed on my CV because I have not yet given expert testimony on; but $I$ plan to be unless the case settles. So those kinds of things are generally in my head.
Q. Okay. I appreciate that. I just want to know whether there was any documents that you might --
A. Not really, other than what we've given you. Would you like this back?
Q. No. She will be keeping that. If any of us remove that, we're in big trouble.

MR. CHANG: You can also keep it beside you if you need to refer to it.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll just keep it here in a pile if that's all right.

MR. BRADY: Okay. You mentioned your CV. I'd like to mark that as Exhibit 96.
(Whereupon Exhibit 96 was marked for identification.)

MR. BRADY: And while we're at it, we will also mark your report in this matter as Exhibit 97.
(Whereupon Exhibit 97 was marked for identification.)
/ / /

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. Do you have your Exhibit 96 , your CV, in front of you?
A. I can.
Q. You should probably keep Exhibit 97 handy for the duration. It's probably going to be the majority of what we're talking about today.
A. Understood.
Q. So starting out with Exhibit 97, your report, you list under "Background and Qualifications" a lot of -- your background and qualifications that you deem relevant for this -- this matter. Is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Under paragraph 5, you say as a special agent for DOJ, that you investigated violent crimes. And that was between 1999 and 2002; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. What sort of violent crimes did you investigate?
A. So as part of that unit, the Violence

Suppression Program, it was targeted at assisting local agencies with arrest of fugitives, which would include attempted murder, murderers. We did -- initiated a wiretap on the suspected murderer of a police officer. We have investigations on parolees that were in
possession of weapons. Those types of things.
Q. So you were dealing with real bad, violent guys?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Were assault weapons a common feature of those investigations? Did you come across them often in those investigations?
A. I would say they were present, but $I$ don't know if I've ever tried to -- you know, capture -- that was several years ago. If they had -- half of the guys that we arrested or investigated had them or -- I don't really know. I know that some of them did, but $I$ would probably have, I think, trouble putting down a number of, you know, five of these guys per year did or didn't have it or, you know, something like that.
Q. Okay. So you can't really say whether assault weapons were common in those investigations? Commonly come across in those investigations?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous as to "assault weapons" and as to timing. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. During your investigations between 1999 and 2002, would you say it was common for you to come across rifles defined as assault weapons in your investigations of violent crimes?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous as
to "common" and also as to the timing of the definition of "assault weapons."

THE WITNESS: I'm still allowed to answer, correct?

MR. CHANG: Please.

THE WITNESS: Just so I don't get ahead of myself. So after all that back and forth, can you repeat the question? Sorry.

MR. BRADY: Can you read it back?
(Whereupon the record was read back.)

MR. CHANG: Same objections.

THE WITNESS: Understood. Okay.

I can say that assault weapons were present to some degree. Firearms were -- the generic term of firearms would be the most common factor. Some of which -- some of those firearms would have met the definition of an assault weapon under 30510 because of the time in early '99, that would have been the only game in town as far as state law.

Later on in that period of time that you spoke of, we had the three -- what are now called the 30515 generic characteristics sort of standards. At the time, it was 12276 and 12276.1 in that window of time. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Would you say that rifles meeting the definition
of assault weapon under Penal Code Section 30515 now were -- commonly come across in your investigations of violent crime during the period of 1999 to 2002?
A. To some degree, yes.
Q. You also say as a special agent during that period, you worked on various violations occurring at California gun shows.

How many gun shows were you attending during that period?
A. Good question. Probably somewhere in the neighborhood of one a month. Maybe one every other month. I had a particular region, so that's why it's a little bit vague. I had from the San Jose area and then some of the Bay area -- I'm sorry, the North Bay. Depending on what gun shows were on calendar, it might vary.
Q. Were rifles that meet the definition of assault weapon prevalent at these gun shows?
A. In 1999, they would have been -- probably -actually, in '99, we wouldn't have been doing a ton of gun shows because the gun show stuff sort of picked up probably late 2000 or 2001 . So starting in 2000 , there was a registration window for the Category 3 or, at the time, the 12276.1 identified weapons. So they were controlled. There shouldn't have been a lot of them out
there unless somebody was selling something they shouldn't have been selling.

I'm aware of investigations that the department did that involved those happening at gun shows, and occasionally we would find somebody wandering around with an assault weapon basically trying to sell it to random, you know, gun show attendees.
Q. So were AR-15 platform rifles not prevalent at these gun shows during the period of 1999 to 2002?
A. So depending on the makeup of the weapon, there may have been some that were a . 22 caliber, let's say, that may not have triggered particular definitions in play at the time. That would have been very possible to have been present in the shows. There would have been gun stores that have dangerous weapons permits that were allowed to sell to police. They could have been selling their wares or something to sell the attendees of the shows that happened to be cops. Magazines, ammunition, that was very common. Normal handguns. Pump shotguns. Because of the Senate Bill 23 change in the law from 1999, by the time $I$ started going to the shows quite a bit, I would say that they were less common than before that, if that's responsive to you.
Q. So you're saying that the amount of $A R$ platform rifles increased later -- after this period of 1999 to 2002?
A. No. Not necessarily. I would say that the -that the $A R$ platform is a broad platform because you -depending on the caliber, it may or may not fall into an assault weapon status. Depending on various features, it may or may not fall into that status.
Q. Just to be clear, I'm not necessarily asking about an $A R$ platform rifle that would meet the assault weapon definition.
A. Okay.
Q. For example, during that time period, if an $A R$ platform rifle had a bullet button on it, it would be legal to sell, correct?
A. Hypothetically, absent any prohibited markings on the gun -- meaning a 30510 -identified weapon or something like that -- hypothetically, probably, yes. It would be legal for sale. But $I$ don't believe bullet buttons really came into play until maybe 2004 or 2005 .
Q. Okay. So that was my question. So 2004, 2005, whenever bullet buttons came into play, did you notice an increase in the prevalence of $A R$ platform rifles at these gun shows?
A. Yes. And just so I -- we're all on the same page, when you say "AR platform," I won't be assuming you're talking about assault weapons unless you tell me
you mean $A R$ assault weapons.
Q. I think that's fair. As a matter of fact, let's get some definitions squared away at the outset just so -- I think you and I will understand each other, but the normal human beings reading this probably will not -no offense to you -- but, you know, the nature of the game is such, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So Category 1 -- Cat 1 assault weapons, are those listed in California Penal Code Section 30510? Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is they are assault weapons based on their make and model, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then there are Cat 2 assault weapons, which are listed in the California Code of Regulations, which were subsequently added to be considered series assault weapons; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then Cat -- Category 3, Cat 3 assault weapons are those that meet the definition based on having certain features in California Penal Code Section 30515; is that correct?
A. Yes. Correct.
Q. Okay. Okay. So I will choose either one of those if I'm trying to be specific to one of those. If I say "AR platform rifle," I'll try to clarify that I'm not limiting it to those. But if I say that, I'm probably not limiting it to that. But, please, if you want clarification because it makes a difference, just say, "Can you please clarify?" because we do need clarity on that.
A. Thank you. I'll try to do the same if I'm speaking about a group of weapons and if I'm speaking about the group as a whole or the subset of assault weapons within that large group.
Q. Got it. Okay. So moving on to paragraph 6.

You say that from 2002 to the present, you've been a special agent and special agent supervisor for the DOJ's Bureau of Firearms; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that capacity, you've been assigned to recover firearms from prohibited individuals, monitor gun shows for illegal activities, conduct surveillance on gun dealers suspected of illegal activity, and investigate illegal trafficking of firearms, manufacturing of assault weapons, machine guns and illegal possession of various magazines and ammunition; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How many recoveries from prohibit -firearm recoveries from prohibited individuals have you participated in?
A. I'd say an attempted recovery -- that's how I'm going to answer your question -- we might go out on an APPS enforcement operation and have perhaps 10,12 people on the list that day, and not in every case would we actually find the person to talk to, and then also after finding the person, make a recovery, so I don't know.

Maybe -- I'm going to guess 20 percent of the time we actually go out looking for 10 people might we find somebody and then make a seizure of some kind.
Q. And when you say "APPS," you're referring to the Armed \& Prohibited Persons System?
A. Correct.
Q. And that is a program for the DOJ Bureau of Firearms whereby agents confirm that an individual has a firearm registered to them in the automated firearm system and that they are also a prohibited person and then go to determine whether that individual still possesses that firearm illegally?
A. In general terms, yes. The data that we have on the person is a registration of an assault weapon to that person and/or just generic ownership information, like a dealer record of sale or a voluntarily reported batch of
data on some guns. Maybe they moved here from out of state. They're required to tell DOJ about that. That information is in there, too.
Q. Okay. And of those recoveries, when the -- you said about 20 percent of the time you go attempt to recover firearms, you do indeed recover them.

What percentage, more or less of those, are assault weapons that you recover?
A. I'm going to guess that we recover between 3and 4,000 guns a year as a bureau, and I haven't looked at the stats lately to give you a real good answer, but perhaps -- I don't know. Over the last few years, maybe 10 percent of those are assault weapons. Some of which would be known to us being in the system and some of which would be unknown to us. They either failed to register, or they manufactured it clandestinely or -yeah, that pretty much covers the group.
Q. And when you say "assault weapons," would -would that 10 percent -- your estimated 10 percent change if you only were talking about rifles that meet the assault weapon definition?
A. Not a whole lot. Assault pistols and assault shotguns are, $I$ would say, a tiny fraction of the overall assault weapon numbers. The assault rifles within that group of three types is easily the lion's share.

Probably at least 80 percent would be assault rifles.
Q. So removing the non-rifle assault weapons from the mix of what you seize, you would still stick with the 10 percent of the firearms --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- that are generally assault rifles?
A. I'd say that's pretty fair. It's very rare that we get an assault pistol or an assault shotgun whether one is known or unknown to us. The most common type of assault weapon that we get is probably a Category 3 assault weapon of some kind. Rarely they'll have a Cat 1 or a Cat 2 marking on it, but generally the default is the Category 3 stuff.
Q. And when we say -- both you and I use the term "assault rifle," we're using that as shorthand for a rifle that meets the definition of an assault weapon under the AWCA; is that correct?
A. Yes. If I'm trying to speak about federal law, I'll try to call that out. And unless you ask me to go into that, I'm not going to bring it up here.
Q. Okay. So it says you also monitor gun shows for illegal activities.

How often do those illegal activities involve assault weapons?
A. Probably about 40 percent of the time that we
make an arrest that's sort of gun show related, the person is either a prohibited person or a non-prohibited person and they have bought something at the show that caused us to make a contact, maybe a traffic stop or do a later search warrant on them. And we will probably find an assault weapon of some kind involving -- in those events.

I would say more recently since 2012 to present, we're getting more people assembling guns because of the knowledge of how to do that with YouTube and other things. It's just more prevalent. And the home-built guns now, those are getting easier and easier for people to make again with, you know, social media if you include YouTube in there. The internet has various step-by-step guides. People can build stuff.
Q. So do you see the parts that are used to build AR platform rifles at gun shows fairly frequently?
A. Oh, yeah.
Q. And in California gun shows -- because you attend both California and Nevada gun shows, correct?
A. Mostly California. Maybe once or twice a year do we go to an out-of-state show.
Q. Okay.
A. And it's getting less and less common that we go to the out-of-state shows.
Q. Got it. Prior to the recent -- the most recent change to the assault weapon act -- the Assault Weapon Control Act, essentially making bullet-button rifles into assault weapons, were you -- were bullet-button AR-15 rifles fairly prevalent at these gun shows?
A. Yes.
Q. Would -- what percentage -- or rather than percentages, because that's kind of hard to do, I admit. If you were to rank the most common firearms at these gun shows going around looking at all the booths, you know, your hunting shotguns or your bolt-action rifles, handguns, AR platform rifles, what have you, what would you think if you had to -- based on your experience, what would you say is the most prevalent, most ubiquitous firearm at these gun shows?
A. My answer is going to be based on Northern California shows. I don't get to a lot of Southern California shows. I'd say the most common two groups that we would have seen since 2004 or '05 would have been a semiautomatic handgun or probably an AR platform of some kind.
Q. Okay.
A. And when $I$ say the platform, it might just be a lower receiver sitting there. Because you'll see sometimes dozens of those available for sale, and then at
the various accessories so somebody could build up their own, you know, version of whatever they want.
Q. Got it. And at the Nevada shows, same or different?
A. I'd say at the Nevada shows we see a lot more of the curio and relic antiques, lever-action, bolt-action, pump-action. There seems to be a big collector market. I know a lot of California residents will go up there and find stuff that they can't find here for whatever reason. I think part of it is because a lot of the gun show promoters are on a circuit, so they'll bring -- the vendors also are kind of on the same circuit. They'll bring weapons from other states.

And Reno, specifically where we work a lot or used to, that's sort of a hub for different guns to, you know, kind of get in one spot and people from various states can come to.
Q. Okay. So you were noticing that those shows were more focused on collectible guns or older guns more so than the modern stuff?
A. No, the modern stuff is present. But I'd say a -- if $I$ had to, like, put a percentage on it, there's definitely more tables for sure. The shows are bigger over there than in Northern California right now, and $I$ would say a higher percentage of non-assault weapons and
non-AR platforms over there.

See, it's kind of the same with the number of handguns at the Reno shows. There's certainly the older -- older technology, bolt-action, lever-action, etcetera, here at the California shows. But it's just a little bit different feel when you're at one of these shows.
Q. So it next says that you conduct surveillance of gun dealers suspected of illegal activity.

Do these -- obviously without divulging specifics about, you know, specific investigations or your tactics, how often do these -- this surveillance involve assault weapons?
A. Speaking broadly over the -- I guess the current part of my career within firearms, the most -- I would say the most common -- one of the two most common crimes we're investigating is possession or manufacturer of assault weapons when it applies to a dealer.

The other side of what we do with a dealer is if they're basically doing phoney paperwork, you know, not filling out the stuff correctly and fudging intentionally the data on this stuff, which then goes into the databases.

So it's sort of maybe like a half and half on the type of crime in general that we're looking at on the
dealer. The California dealer is what I'm speaking of. Not an out-of-state or something.
Q. When you say "half and half," it's half and half of that type of crime or half and half involved assault weapons?
A. I'd say, like, 50/50. It's the -- the guns specifically that we're seizing are more likely than not -- an unregistered assault weapon and a dealer doesn't have a dangerous weapons permit, so there's no way that they can legally be in possession of it. And then we have paperwork violations, which might involve perjury or something else on behalf of the dealer. That kind of thing.
Q. Are you inspecting gun stores generally? Not just those that are suspected of illegal activity, but going in and monitoring -- checking -- doing check-ups on gun stores?
A. I personally do not get involved in the day-to-day inspection process. There are times when the folks that do the inspections will say, "Hey. We think we have a problem at this store. Would you mind coming along?" In those cases, I will come out. But that's, I would say, very rare.
Q. Do you have a reason to go into gun stores throughout California or in your region for other
reasons? Do you find yourself in gun stores often?
A. For a noncriminal investigation, meaning; or what do you mean?
Q. In any capacity. Whether it's professional or personal, do you find yourself in gun stores frequently?
A. Yes. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. The same one or two, or various ones?
A. Various.
Q. Okay. And prior to this change in the law, change in the definition of assault weapon to include bullet-button rifles, at those gun stores that you frequented, were AR-15 platform rifles, non-assault weapons at that time, bullet-button rifles, prevalent at those gun stores?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you say it would be more likely than not that if you were to go into a random gun store, there would be AR platform rifles?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. At that time?

MR. CHANG: Same objection.

THE WITNESS: When you say "at that time" -BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Just so we're clear -- because I'm going to ask
you in a second -- maybe there's a not a distinction -or let me ask you now. Let me rephrase. Sorry.

The -- at that time, $I$ was referring to prior to the new law changing. So when bullet-button rifles could be sold with all the other features, okay?

Now, right, it's changed so that you have -- you have to have a bullet button and no features, right? Or -- or no bullet button and no features?
A. So -- yeah. After Senate Bill 880 or Assembly Bill 1135, as soon as that changed, there was a shift in the marketplace as far as what -- how weapons could be configured if it was an $A R$ platform and some of the other platforms, too.

There are still AR platform weapons being sold in California. I would say if you go to a corporate store -- Big 5 or maybe some of the other chains -you're less likely to see the AR platforms unless it's maybe like a . 22 version or something. Turners, which is down south, I think you're more likely to -- you're not more likely. But there's a greater chance than a Big 5 that you're going to see a centerfire version of some kind down there.

The -- I would say, like, the mom-and-pop kind of stuff where there's one or two dealerships owned by the same person or couple of people, that's where you're
going to find the prevalent -- the prevalence of the AR family, if you will.
Q. And that's still happening today post sB880 you're talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. And now, prior to SB880, were there more or less AR platform rifles than there are now in these gun stores you frequent?
A. I would say towards the end of 2016 , there was a huge surge. So $I$ don't know if that was a true -- or if you just notice, that's a spike. The numbers that -- of the guns in the stores now, I would say overall, all gun sales have dipped a little bit. I'm not sure by what percentage, but I'm just hearing people talk around the office. There's less DROSes happening right now -- maybe 10 percent less or something like that -- than before that spike. Late 2016.

So we might be back at a time where maybe we're mirroring the numbers from 2014, 2015 possibly, and I haven't done a -- any kind of analysis on, like, large-sale DROS numbers or anything like that, but typically we notice that handguns are about 50 percent of the sales and long guns are about 50 percent of the sales. AR platforms are typically rifles. And over a long period of time, those $50 / 50$ numbers have held true.

I don't know what's -- what we're on pace for this year, though, for example.
Q. Okay. But prior to SB880, is it fair to say that you would see $A R$ platform rifles at gun stores frequently?
A. Yes.
Q. Moving onto paragraph 8 of your report. So we already talked about gun shows. You said you've attended at least 40 .

Would it be less than 100?
A. Honestly, I stopped counting after about 40. No one really asks me, "Hey. How many have you been to?" At some point doing some mental math in my career, $I$ came up with, oh, at least 40 at some point, and then $I$ just didn't see any reason to keep counting after that.

As far as 100 or less, it could be close to the -- to that number, maybe. Close to 100.
Q. So let's -- actually, before we go on to your training, I want to ask you about back in paragraph 6, you talk about what you're doing today. You're investigating the illegal trafficking of firearms, manufacturing of assault weapons.

Do you do any investigation of the violent use of firearms?
A. Are you speaking about like do $I$ work involved
in murder cases right now, or...
Q. So, for example, it looks like these crimes that you are investigating are violations of the AWCA such as illegal possession, making, importing, of an assault weapon; is that right?
A. For the most part, yes. But also like 29800, which is felony possession. It doesn't necessarily just limit to the AWCA. There are other statutes in play.
Q. So -- but it's enforcement of illegal possession statutes, right?
A. Possession, manufacture, or trafficking, or sales. I don't typically get involved in -- me personally. Our bureau might have -- depending on the month, might have some involvement in a home invasion, or we might provide expertise about, you know, something to someone else's case.
Q. So you don't get involved in shooting crimes?
A. I personally do not. We have, overtime, gotten involved in someone that was making statements about wanting to shoot -- shoot up a school, that kind of thing.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. I -- and $I$ can say $I$ personally have been involved in two of those in the last year.
Q. Okay. Moving on, then, to your training.

And before $I$ move on, just so you know, whenever -- if you need a break or anything, or if Madam Court Reporter needs a break, all you have to do is just ask. And, you know, transitions like this are obviously good times.
A. Sure. I'm okay for now.
Q. Great.

All right. So paragraph 9, you talk about what you've been trained and qualified on to -- to -- the firearms you've been trained and qualified for to carry on duty.

Am $I$ wrong in saying that there are no assault rifles on there?
A. You are correct. These are either semiautomatic handguns or machine guns. We do have assault weapons that are seized guns that we use for training aids, but my duty use is pretty much here listed on this page.
Q. So paragraph 9 says, "I have been trained and qualified to carry several different types of firearms including" -- and it lists guns.

You have not been trained or qualified to carry an -- a rifle meeting the assault weapon definition?
A. No. My M4 is a machine gun, so it's not an assault weapon under the AWCA.
Q. And your M4 is an AR platform rifle that is
select fire, meaning a machine gun, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So it has a pistol grip?
A. Yes.
Q. It has a flash suppressor?
A. Yes.
Q. It has an adjustable stock?
A. Yes. Just to point out, the number nine, that's over the course of my career. So there's only two guns I'm currently qualified to use. This is a -- just sort of a historical paragraph, if that makes sense.
Q. Thank you. I was hoping you weren't carrying all these things, for your sake, at the same time.
A. No. No.
Q. Although, you know, you never know, right?
A. Yeah.
Q. So moving on to paragraph 10. You say, "Throughout my career, I've conducted training programs in the identification and handling of firearms. I have also trained other special agents of BOF on assault weapons and firearms identification."

What did that training involve?
A. Basically we will use the previously seized weapons that we've captured and, you know, retained for training purposes, and we will show them what those
various features on the various guns equate to.
Sometimes that's a pistol grip or, you know, grenade launcher or flare launcher. The various types of 30515 characteristics. It might be going through showing weapons that are identified in 30510 because of their make and mark -- make and model markings.
Q. Okay. So moving to Exhibit 96, which is your CV. Under "Training," the second item listed is -- says you completed a 32 -hour class in entry weapons. What exactly are entry weapons?
A. So the department -- when you complete this particular class, the department gives you a certificate, and the word "entry weapons" are -- is on that particular certificate.

The nuts and bolts version of that is it's a weapon that is a long gun that you're going to be used to deploy during a search warrant or probation search or parole search. Typically, it's going to be select-fire MP5 or an M4.

The -- the shotgun stuff, that could be factored in, but usually there's a dedicated shotgun class for, like, the people that are going to be doing that. So it's basically how to clear rooms with the additional length of weapons instead of just a handgun. So it factors that in. Weapon retention, weapon take-aways if
someone is trying to get your long gun from you, and just a lot of repetitive moving through buildings, how to use those select fire weapons within policy, etcetera.
Q. So you're -- you've been trained to enter building with long guns? With rifles?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Why -- what does this training say as to when it is appropriate to enter a building with a rifle?
A. Generally, you go to this --

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.

You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Generally, you would be assigned to go to this particular training class once you had worked for the department for a little bit, and -maybe a year or two -- and you're off probation, and you seem to be tactically sound with a handgun, then this was sort of a step up as far as the -- the weapons that the department felt you were ready to start carrying for other -- you know, for enforcement activities, and it's usually up to the supervisor on a particular team to designate which member is going to have what role in a search warrant, let's say.

Someone is going to have to be ready with the battering ram. Someone is going to do knock notice. Someone is going to be, you know, the No. 1, No. 2,
etcetera. They may say, "All right. We're going to alternate. You've got a long gun. The next person in line is a handgun," or they're going to say, "Everybody has got long guns." It's really up to the supervisor to sort of call out the need for a particular weapon system depending on the operation we're conducting. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So why would you enter a building with a rifle instead of a handgun?
A. If we were doing -- back in this period of time, I'll speak to it then. A lot of it was narcotics raids. So meth labs and marijuana grows. The trainings -- the very next entry down -- sorry. Three days later, you see on my list here the training. 3/19/2000.
Q. Yes.
A. Advanced tactical operations. So that sort of pulled in some of the stuff from above and just reiterated, again, and did some rural patrolling and -because there are marijuana grows out there we have to deal with -- or used to -- on a larger scale, and it tries to incorporate the things you learn in entry school and what your weapon system is good for.

An M4 has a greater range than an MP5, so you might be assigned -- if you just have an MP5, the supervisor may or may not have you use it for that
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particular mission. You might have to have some other function. You may be in charge of carrying a fire extinguisher in case there's pit bulls. You may have to just be that, and then you're going to have your handgun available to deal with it that way.
Q. During this training, is -- are the buildings that you're entering generally close quarters?
A. Yes.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Would you say that, generally, it's within handgun range? Every -- every -- wall to wall? Would you ever enter a building where the wall furthest away from you was beyond effective handgun range?
A. In -- during the training class or in reality?
Q. Let's start with the training class.
A. In the training classes, it would be rare for us to have access to a facility that would be some kind of a giant warehouse, let's say, where it's just a big shell and no smaller walls, you know, dividing up in between those exterior four walls. Maybe like -- I mean, I had to think about, like, what you -- what you meant like that, but I'm going to say like an airplane hanger where it's just a giant empty box.
Q. Sure.
A. Something like that, that might be a scenario in the real world where we have to go for some reason. Maybe there's a marijuana grow in the hanger. It's just a great place to grow weed. That might be a reality, but we probably wouldn't have a lot of access to something like that, but it might be a reality, but...
Q. I was just -- so -- but when they're training you, it is to do entry weapons training. Is it generally within walls that are confined to effective handgun range?
A. Typically, yes. But part of that same school is how do you approach the building first, which you might start a hundred yards down a dirt road, walk up to that facility that you're going to, in a sense, assault because of a search warrant, and the -- this training class usually incorporates the simulation of a breacher that's going to break the door, and then the first -- you know, basically all the team will flow in and conduct the search of those rooms inside the location.

So there are plenty of times where you have to get from your vehicles up to the building and there's long distances where a handgun would not be a great -- a great weapon if that's your only weapon.
Q. Did this course train you that when entering a house or a similar structure, when you're entering with a
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rifle, to continue with the rifle or to put the rifle away and retrieve a handgun?
A. If there was a malfunction of the long gun, we're trained to transition to our handgun. If there's a scenario in which the long gun is too -- too long, pardon the pun, but if it's too cumbersome to use in a tight space, we're trained to transition to a handgun. Sometimes on staircases, it's best to incorporate a handgun and a long gun. Sometimes going around corners, it's easier to use a handgun than a long gun in some instances. Going into an attic, for example.
Q. But entering a home necessarily does not mean transition to a handgun, right?
A. No. No.
Q. Two items down, you say on January 20th, 2002, you completed a 24 -hour class in assault rifle training.

Can you describe what that training was about?
A. Yeah. That was -- I believe that was at either Camp Roberts -- I'm trying to think here -- or Fort Hunter Liggit down in maybe like San Luis Obispo area off the Highway 101 , and that class was for those people that had an M4 issued to them.

It was about basically teaching long distance marksmanship to, like, say, like, 400 yards with iron sights. That kind of stuff. We have access to the
military targets, and we were, you know, laying prone, standing, kneeling, all the variations there. And I don't recall there being any full auto fire from any kind of distance. It was just about learning how to use your weapons at distance as opposed to close confines, like the entry school was up close and personal.
Q. So moving to the next page, and it will be the third item down on the second page. Third full item, right, because the last item on page 1 bleeds over. So you go one, two, three down.

It's September 13th, 2004 . It says you were part of a DOJ BOF ballistic texting -- sorry -- testing exercise.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe what that was -- what that involved?
A. Sure. Myself and probably four other agents and maybe one supervisor went to a shooting range in Grass Valley, and we'd been asked to test some ammunition to see how it performed against -- well, ballistic gelatin and a couple of car doors that had been acquired from, like, a wrecking yard and just to see what the projectiles looked like after going through the substances. The fragment.
Q. What type of ammunition were you using?
A. I believe it was all handgun ammunition. Either 9 or . 40 caliber, I think.
Q. And any more specifics than that as far as grains or --
A. No. I don't recall. Yeah, I was just -- I wasn't like the lead on it. So if I was the lead, I might have a little more memory; but $I$ participated in it.
Q. So somebody was just giving you ammo, telling you to shoot it, and you just recall you were using a 9 or a. 40 - -
A. Our supervisor had said that, "Hey, we're going to go up and do this and test it. Have you guys ever done this before," meaning shooting into ballistic gelatin or fire it into car doors to see how they -- you know, if they will penetrate or not; and none of us had done that sort of stuff. So that was -- it was basically an expertise building event.
Q. And I assume by your description of it being handgun ammunition that these were handguns?
A. Yes. I think we used either seized weapons or duty weapons. I don't recall at the time.
Q. Well, the next one down, it says you completed a 16-hour ArmaLite AR-15 rifle armorers course; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What did that involve?
A. That was two gentlemen from the ArmaLite corporation came -- I think it was at Folsom prison, and there were several of us in there, possibly 15 to 20 of us. And it was a armorers course, so the AR family of weapons. They brought sample guns that we were able to take apart, put back together many times back and forth, and they showed us ways to diagnose problems with that weapon system. They showed us common mistakes people made when reassembling guns, what to look for, things like that.
Q. And ArmaLite is part of the AR acronym; is that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they -- the instructors go over the history of the AR-15 in that course at all?
A. To a degree, yes.
Q. And do you recall what they discussed about the history of the $A R-15 ?$
A. They were -- from what I remember, they were fairly sort of proud that their weapon system was now broadly being used and there were other companies making versions of it. Copying them, basically.
Q. Did they discuss any of the original features of
the AR-15?
A. They discussed the features of the weapons in the class and on the various systems. I don't know when you say "original" what you mean by original, though.
Q. So is it your understanding that the ArmaLite AR-15 was the original AR platform rifle?
A. No. I mean, there were -- the $A R-15$ is a civilianized version of the M15, if you will, which is a select-fire variant.

They discussed lightly the $A R-10$ which is a different caliber version of this weapon system in that family. We didn't work on any of the AR-10s that $I$ recall. I think they may have had one in the class that they just had there for demo purposes to show us, "Hey, you're going to see a slightly different part. Don't try to install this part on this group of weapons. This one is beefier. It shouldn't fit. Don't try to make it fit." Things like that. They -- nomenclature about the different systems was discussed.

The AR-10 variants were typically chambered in, like a . 308 or a 7.62 cartridge, and then the $A R-15$ side of it was more of a 5.56 or .223 caliber round. That was -- back then, that was before a lot of these other calibers were getting widely used. And for our purposes, we cared about the 5.56 because that's what we were
seeing. And for the most part, at that point, either .223 or 5.56 is what a lot of the California residents had, and it's the most common sort of, like, law enforcement round that we were -- you know, we were issued that similar weapons except select-fire versions were cold.
Q. I believe you indicated that the ArmaLite folks were proud that others had ripped them off, if you will, for lack of a better term, right?
A. In a sense. It was a grudging, "Well, it's such a good weapon that other people are now, you know, copying our product."
Q. So they were the first, right, to make this weapon system?
A. I mean, Eugene Stoner I think devised it for the military. I don't remember all the backstory if he worked for ArmaLite and then that's where it sort of sprung from, but they -- there may have been submodels that didn't necessarily have the ArmaLite stamp on them. It's been a while. It's been since 2004 .
Q. Okay. Did they talk about whether that weapon system was designed for particular capacity magazines?
A. I believe the discussion about magazines dealt with us having the ability to diagnose problems with the magazines in the guns; meaning, "Hey, the shoulders of
the magazines are -- if they're alluminum and you drop them on concrete, it might bend the shoulder, and you may have malfunctions, you know, so look for that. If you have a bent magazine in that area, just throw it away. Destroy it. Don't let it get back out because it might cause a problem for one of your teammates." That kind of thing. So diagnosing problems with mags.

Discussion would have been dealing with 20- and $30-r o u n d$ magazines typically were what was discussed. If you're dealing with $A R-10, ~ I ~ b e l i e v e ~ t h e r e ~ w a s ~ s o m e ~$ discussion about 10 - and 20 -round magazines for that weapon system being the most ubiquitous, to use the word you used earlier.
Q. Got it. So moving down to May 11th, 2006. You completed a 24-hour firearms rifle instructor update class.

What type of rifles were involved in that particular event?
A. My weapon at that time and still is the same weapon, actually. It's a Colt M4. Other attendees at the class had variants of the AR. There may have been somebody there that had a Ruger Mini-14 possibly, as well.
Q. So people were bringing their own rifles to this event?
A. No. That was an issued weapon from his agency, if I recall. It was another agency that wasn't allowed to have assault weapons per the Penal Code, so that law enforcement agency had, I think, issued him a Mini-14, if I remember.
Q. Okay. But they -- every individual officer who was attending this was bringing their issued rifle?
A. Yes.
Q. And yours is a Colt M 4 as you indicated?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is a select-fire weapon?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 11 of your report, which is Exhibit 97, the first sentence -- it's on page 2 --
A. Thanks.
Q. -- says, "I have also completed as least 15 firearms training courses since 1994."

Are these training courses that you mention including the ones that we just talked about in your CV?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So other than the ones we just talked about, did any of these involve assault rifles? Any of these training courses?
A. Let me look at my CV. So that's going to be No. $96 . \quad$ Exhibit.

So on page 2 of my CV, September 18th, 2003, there was a 24-hour class on the Heckler \& Koch MP5 trigger group and USP pistols. There's a variant of the USP that has a threaded barrel, so that would be an assault pistol.
Q. What about if we could just limit to assault rifles?
A. Oh, I'm sorry.
Q. No, it's okay. I don't know if I was clear. I'm just clarifying.
A. Okay. Sure. So on 5/14/2004, there's an eight-hour class that $I$ attended that BTF has put on. And in this class, they had full auto AK-47s. They had semiauto $A K-47 s$, and then the $S K S s$ were a mixture of, if I remember right, the detached mag variants and the fixed ten-round mag versions. So some of those from both groups would have been assault weapons.

The ArmaLite class, those were semiauto. So those would have been assault weapons that we've already talked about. January 17th, 2007, there was another class put on involving a semiauto AK-47. 3/28/2007 was a tech -- oh. That's a pistol. Sorry. That SKS was a fixed mag version, so $I$ won't go down there.

So November 4th through -- sorry.
November 4th, 2013, through November 6, 2013, is the
bottom of that page I've just been talking about. This class had several different firearms that were modified from normal semiautomatic weapons up until full auto. So there was discussion about in that class, "Hey, if you see this part in the weapon, it's been modified to fire full auto." That type of thing. "And if it didn't have this part and it had the original part, it would be semiautomatic."

Some of those guns absent the full auto parts in them would have been machine guns -- or I'm sorry -semiautomatic assault weapons, so there was some discussion during the class about that.

On 9/11/2014, there was a trafficking class in Dublin, California. The trafficking techniques dealt with a variety of different weapons that would have been trafficked. It was sort of a mostly nationwide successful techniques that have been used to interdict trafficked guns.
Q. And in that specific event, were they focused on any particular types of firearms as being the most commonly trafficked?
A. I don't know. I mean, they were more like case studies, so they would basically talk about, "Hey, in New Orleans, this is what we saw. This kind of stuff was happening," and they would list off, you know, "These
were the weapons," and they would have slides showing that type of data about those specific people that got indicted for, you know, these guns.
Q. Do you recall whether assault rifles were of particular concern in that training or class?
A. So what $I$ recall is -- this was a Federal Task Force Officer training and some of just the federal ATF agents that were there. Federally, there is no assault weapon law anymore, so they were less concerned about trying to tie into California State Penal Code sections. But some of the weapons that were trafficked, based on my training and experience, were assault weapons based on speaking with the presenters after the classes, and -- but it wasn't in every single case that was demonstrated here.
Q. What I'm asking is was there a focus on -granted there's no -- as you said, these rifles would be defined as assault weapons under California law, not under federal law. Probably not under any of the other states that were involved, but they could still -- ATF or people from other states could still say, you know, "We're having a big problem with AR or AK platform rifles."

Do you recall that being part of this class?
A. I don't recall them calling out a specific
family of weapons. It was just more about -- because these presenters are from all over the United States. And there was less concern about a label placed on a gun as opposed to what they actually bought through an informant or they got on a search warrant and put a case on somebody.
Q. Got it. Moving down the page to -- on -- let's see. Page 3 of Exhibit 96. You have your expert testimony.
A. Yes.
Q. You say that you qualified as an expert witness. Can you explain what that means?
A. Yes. That means that the -- the judge in each of these cases deemed me to be an expert on the various categories of expertise. The categories are broken up by the commas. So assault weapon identification would be one. Registration is a separate sort of subsubject. Subsubject, that's not right. It's a different sort of sub --
Q. Category?
A. Category. Thank you.

And then there was a lot of questions in this particular case about the automated firearm system, so he made a fairly broad ruling in this case, the Fajardo case, I could speak to this, this, and this as depicted
here on this item.
Q. Did he do an evaluation of you to make -- the judge, did he make an evaluation of you to determine that you were an expert witness?
A. As $I$ recall -- again, this was 11 years ago. Each of the judges in the 15 or -- I guess 16 items in this long list of my expertise, they -- they did question me. Sometimes it was the defense attorney. Sometimes it was the prosecutor going through my curriculum vitae to verify that they were comfortable with the idea that $I$ had enough expertise to speak on a particular matter.
Q. So there is a process to qualify you as an expert witness?
A. Yes.
Q. Got it. And in the first entry under "Expert Testimony," it says that you were qualified as an expert witness on assault weapons identification, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you consider yourself an expert on assault weapons identification?
A. Yes.
Q. It says next that you were qualified as an expert on assault weapons registration.

Would you consider yourself an expert on assault weapons registration?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would that entail?
A. At the time in 2007 , it would be being able to competently explain to the jury what the process would have been for a person to lawfully register a weapon. That would include a civilian registering a particular weapon system by mailing in the proper form with a check, getting a response letter back from the department indicating that their registration was successful. Those types of things. That would be sort of outlined how a person should have done it.

Depending on the line of questioning, I would also speak to how peace officers can have an exemption to the normal process for a civilian. Civilians are usually locked down to a date range of a window based on legislation or something like that that they have to register in a certain time. Peace officers have a -- in a sense, they don't have a time limit. They just have to get a letter from their head of agency if they're working for a particular permitted group of agencies, and they can avoid that time frame sort of hurdle, and $I$ would be able to speak to that.

And how you check the system both through CLETS -- the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System -- and what you should expect to see if there's a
properly registered gun as opposed to what a dealer record of sale type of entry would show versus an evidence entry and all the various subentry types there within AFS.
Q. And AFS is Automated Firearms System, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also qualified as an expert witness for that, as well? AFS, correct?
A. Yes. In that case on that date.
Q. And do you still consider yourself an expert on the AFS?
A. Usually the expertise threshold is do I know more than the average person about the particular subject matter. I think I do. We -- we now have custodians of record that will typically -- one of their main jobs is to go to court and say, "Hey. This is the information we found in the system at the time." I -- because of the demands of subpoenas upon the department, they've sort of carved out niches, if you will, for custodians on specific subject matters.

I'm no longer, like, a custodian in that sense. So if someone asks for that on a current case, I'm going to say, "Hey. You need to subpoena this person over here" --
Q. Okay.
A. -- "if you want database specific stuff because I'm better at" -- you know, not better, "but my area is this." I keep in my lane, and we have other people that have specific functions to do.
Q. Does your lane involve AFS at all?
A. Yeah. I mean, I make entries to AFS. I review it as part of various investigations. I can definitely speak to it in court, and $I$ would say that $I$ definitely know more than most citizens, more than most cops. You know, I've -- I would say that $I$ can still speak to that. It just depends on what the purpose of the inquiry is about the data.
Q. And for assault weapon registration back in 2007, it was a different registration than is today, correct?
A. The current registration -- or the most recent, I would say, is the Senate Bill 880. It's a totally different process. The older process that I would have been speaking back to back in 2007 would have been basically involved a form. Did they attach a check? You know, those types of things. It was a much, I guess, simpler process. And I don't know. Hopefully that's responsive to you.
Q. Well, it is. But $I$ guess my follow-up question is, $I$ just wanted to confirm that there was indeed a
difference between the 2007 version of assault weapon registration versus a -- the registration today, which has been closed, as you indicated. There's a window that closes. The window on the most recent registration has closed, right?
A. Correct.
Q. But before it closed, that was a different registration scheme than what was in place in 2007 , right?
A. Yeah. There was really nothing in place in 2007 actively being registered unless you were a peace officer.
Q. Correct.
A. It would have really ended in 2000 for the Category 3 guns, and there was a little bit of bleed over, I think, for the Category $2 s$ that bled over into early 2001, I think.
Q. So would you still consider yourself an expert on the most recent assault weapon registration scheme?
A. Yes.
Q. And on assault weapon identification under the new definition, SB880?
A. Yes.

Is this a good transition time for a break? MR. BRADY: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Would that be okay?

MR. BRADY: Yes. Off the record.
(Recess from 12:13 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Going back on the record.

So coming back from a break, let's pick up with page 4 of your report, which is marked as Exhibit 97.
A. Okay.
Q. The very first complete sentence states, "While it is not legally necessary for a Category 1 or a Category 2 assault weapon to have certain features, they usually have one more of the features listed in Penal Code Section 30515 (Category 3 definition language)."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the Category 1 and Category 2 assault weapons as we previously discussed are those described in Penal Code Section 30510 and the California Code of Regulations, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And the California Code of Regulations -I'm sorry. Penal Code Section 30510 has been marked as Exhibit 2. I will let you look at it if you would like, but I'm sure you probably know the contents of it from your work, right?
A. Yeah. I'm familiar with the code, and...
Q. And then the Category 3 assault weapons referenced are those that are defined by their features as assault weapons under Penal Code Section 30515, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. 30515 has been marked as Exhibit No. 21, so in case you need to reference those. My question about the difference between Category 1 and Category 2 and Category 3 rifles -- is there any functional difference between a Category 1 or Category 2 rifle, meaning the definition of an assault weapon?
A. Do you mean "functional" as far as their nature? If they're semiautomatic? Both groups?
Q. Sure. So let's say -- for example, let's take the AR series rifles that are described expressly in 30510, right?
A. Okay.
Q. There are also AR platform rifles that are considered Category 2 assault weapons in the California Code of Regulations, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any functional difference between those two rifles, assuming they are your standard AR platform rifle?
A. Right. So when you say "standard," I'm going to infer that you mean semiautomatic. Both groups. Cat 1 and Cat 2 .
Q. Yes. Yes.
A. As to whether -- what other functions, I'm not sure what you're getting at. They're both going to -both groups of weapons should fire in a semiautomatic nature, but $I$ don't know where you want to go from there.
Q. Sure. So what I'm trying to get at is these guns that are listed in 30510 in the California Code of Regulations, Cat 1 and Cat 2 assault weapons are listed by make and model, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do those makes and models have any functional difference than a Category 3 assault rifle that has -that is semiautomatic centerfire with a detachable magazine and having the features that are restricted in 30515 ?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous.
THE WITNESS: Both groups -- all three groups -Cat 1, Cat 2, Cat 3 -- have to be on the very basic level semiautomatic. The rifles under 30515 have to also be semiautomatic -- I'm sorry -- centerfire.

There's no requirement under 30510 or the -basically, it's all 30510 for the Cats 1 and 2 s. There's
no requirement for a centerfire component to that, so technically you could have a . 22 -- I've never seen one for a Cat 1 and Cat 2. But if somebody made one that had the right make and model on it, it might be classified as a Category 1 or 2 but not a Category 3, so I want to make sure that's out there.

But for the most part, the ones that I've seen in my career, they're going to be semiautomatic centerfire, and there's probably going to be some common features, meaning physical characteristics between all three groups unless someone has taken something off. But there would be a few rare exceptions probably. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So, for example, in Exhibit 2 which is Penal Code Section 30510 , it says Colt AR-15 series, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. CHANG: And, Sean, do you have a copy for me?

MR. BRADY: I don't believe so.

MR. CHANG: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Can I put it between us and you can look at it that way?

MR. BRADY: Yeah. Of course. Of course. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So it says Colt $A R-15$ series, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So does Colt make an $A R$ platform rifle that was sold as a Category 3 assault weapon?
A. There are Colts that have been sold since the Category 1 language became part of the Penal Code, but they were sort of submodels, if you will. They may have markings on them that say Colt Commando, Colt M4. Even though it says Colt $M 4$, it's really not the same as my M4 because of the select-fire nature.

So $I$ would say it's in that same family. It's part of the AR platform that we've discussed off and on today, but because of the factor -- from the factory, Colt makes probably, like, $70-\mathrm{plus}$ variants over the years. And depending on barrel length, the thickness of the barrel, they have different nomenclature changes sometimes stamped on the receiver.
Q. Okay. So is there any significant difference functionally from the Colt $A R-15$ listed in Penal Code Section 30510 and those Colt Category 3 rifles that were made subsequently and allowed to be sold in California?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous as to functional.

THE WITNESS: I would say the biggest change from the guns that were identified in 305- -- that are currently identified in 30510 would be how the magazine
was released from the weapon. The more recent ones -- up until the end of 2016 , it would have been the bullet-button guns or perhaps somebody had made a weapon that was a featureless weapon. So it still had a push-button style release, but it didn't have other features.

Those guns that were sold in California up until the end of 2016 -- to get some of those features legally, you had to have, effectively, the bullet button, which was -- I don't know. There were thousands of those sold. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Thousands? How many thousands do you think?
A. I don't know. I'm just guessing annually, there were probably thousands sold, but $I$ don't know what the numbers are. Our system isn't that sophisticated to tell us, like, the magazine style release. It doesn't ask the dealer to send that data to us. Like, I couldn't be accurate. All $I$ can say is about half the guns we sell are long guns, and about half are handguns. It would require a lot of detailed sort of data mining within our AFS system that I've never done.
Q. Okay. So -- but correct me if I'm wrong, but you indicated that there were Colt $A R$ platform rifles that met the Category 3 definition, correct? That were sold in California?
A. They meet the current version of it. They're basically post -- they're nonfixed mag versions, basically. The bullet-button style. So from maybe '04 until 2016, there were some Colt guns sold in California that didn't have, you know, the Colt AR-15 marking on it. They had some variant of it. Like a Commando model or some other spinoff.
Q. What year was Penal Code Section 30510 implemented?
A. That was of sort hatched around 2012. The predecessor to it was 12276. That came out in the Roberti-Roos Assault Weapons Control Act in 1989.
Q. 1989?
A. Yes.
Q. That's when the list of makes and models, Cat 1s, was created, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So -- but following 1989, if a rifle was not on the list in 30510 , it was not an assault weapon, correct?
A. Until the year 2000 .
Q. Correct.
A. Then Senate Bill 23 comes into play. And regardless of the markings, it may have been an assault weapon.
Q. Correct. So that's my question is: Those rifles on the list, are they functionally different than the rifles that became known as Category 3 assault weapons, assuming they're the same basic rifle? For example, AR or AK.

Is an AR that was restricted under 30510 significantly different than an AR that was restricted under 30515?
A. So a weapon -- let's say two weapons. One was a 1988 version, and then one's a 2015 or '16 version. Semiautomatic -- both are semiauto. They both have pistol grips. The functional difference in my mind would be how does the magazine drop?
Q. Okay. I get that, but I'm asking about Category 3. You're asking about bullet-button guns, or you're thinking about bullet-button guns.
A. Well, that's part of Category 3. Bullet-button guns are now part of Category 3, right?
Q. I don't think so, actually. That's an interesting point. I think that Category -- so let me -I guess now we need to make a Category 4, right? Because the way that Category 3, in my understanding, has always been discussed was the -- the guns that had to be registered by 2000 .

So let's use -- whether you agree with me or
not, just for purposes of this discussion, let's call Category 3 the -- the guns -- the assault weapons that had to be registered by 2000 , okay?
A. Okay. So push-button style release?
Q. Yes. Correct.
A. So we're on the same term. Okay.
Q. Yes. Exactly. And then the rifles that had to be registered under $S B 880$, the recent one, let's just call those bullet-button rifles or Category 4 assault weapons.
A. I'll try to keep my brain in that path.
Q. Okay. I was wondering what the disconnect was. Now I get it.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So between an AR rifle that's prohibited under Penal Code Section 30510 and one that would become prohibited under Penal Code Section 30515 in 1999 -- you had to register in 2000 -- is there any significant difference between those two rifles?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So it's merely those were the names of the rifles they knew at the time to restrict in 30510?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. So it's just the -- the writing on the receiver that is different between a Category 1 and a

Category 3 AR?
A. That's generally true, yes.
Q. Okay. And if a rifle listed in Penal Code Section 30510 has the features removed -- the features that Penal Code Section 30515 is concerned with -- in other words, if you were to take a Colt AR-15 series rifle in 30510 and remove its pistol grip, remove its adjustable stock, remove its flash suppressor or any other of the prohibited features in 30515 , would it still be considered an assault weapon?
A. Yes.
Q. What about a bare receiver without an upper on it? Without a stock? Just a bare receiver bearing those markings? And when $I$ say "those markings," the markings that are expressly stated as being prohibited in Penal Code Section 30510. Would that be -- would a bare receiver be considered an assault weapon?
A. No.
Q. Can you explain why not?
A. Sure. 30510 -- at the top of Exhibit 2 --
Q. Yes.
A. -- says, "The following designated semiautomatic firearms." A bare receiver is not semiautomatic. The action type is unknown because there's nothing attached. If you then slide down to $30510(a)$, all of the
following specified rifles. A bare receiver is not necessarily a rifle at that point. It's a firearm, but without a stock attached or a pistol buffer tube or something else to sort of tip the scales, maybe -- if you had a flowchart, for example, you're going to come to a multi-pronged point of that, and there's -- I don't know. The receiver has options to become built out or maybe never built out.
Q. Okay. Do you think that there's any argument that a bare receiver is an assault weapon under Penal Code Section 30510?
A. I don't understand.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Argumentative.
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Have you come across anybody in law enforcement who disagrees with your interpretation of 30510 that bare receivers are not assault weapons under 30510?
A. Not that $I$ know of.
Q. But you would think that that person would be wrong if they believe that a bare receiver would be -- is an assault -- can be an assault weapon under 30510?
A. I would ask them why they think that. I'm not going to assume that I'm right all the time. Maybe they have some knowledge about something as to why they think that. Maybe they've got video of the guy shooting it,
disassembling it, and they're trying to charge this person with a semiautomatic assault weapon based on a video that they then saw him take apart and they found a receiver.

That might be a scenario where that weapon does, in a sense, get charged as an assault weapon. So that's a -- it'd be an extreme example. But $I$ would go back to what $I$ just did with you and say semiautomatic and rifle, show me how this receiver is either of those, and please convince me.

If -- if an agency reached out to us and said, "Hey, we've recovered" -- you know -- "five weapons" -let's say -- "in various states of assembly, and there are a couple of receivers, couple are full working weapons," and I'm going to say, "Okay. These I don't believe are, and I think these over here are because you've got features. Have you guys test fired them? Have you made sure they're semiauto? Do you know that they're rim fire? Do you know that they're centerfire?" Various questions that $I$ would ask.
Q. But setting aside specific situations like the one you gave an example of where somebody assembled a lower, and then you were making the case about, you know, that particular individual, if we're talking about solely just the person only has a bare receiver, and it is
the -- the individual's view that a bare receiver -- a bare receiver in all circumstances having those markings indicated on Penal Code Section 30510 is an assault weapon, you would disagree with that person?
A. Yeah. Unless I had some new information that I don't have as $I$ sit here right now.
Q. So it's -- it's not your understanding that the legislature intended to consider those assault weapons just by being receivers?
A. I think if they had --

MR. CHANG: Objection. Lacks foundation.
THE WITNESS: They listed firearms that were in circulation or in California at that time or they felt that were. Right now, with all the changes that have gone on in the industry since 1989 , receivers are much more prolific. People build things that they never would have built years ago, so they -- I think they listed rifles, pistols, and shotguns, and then they put "semiautomatic" because that's the way things were back then.

Now, we have people that buy 10 lower receivers in one transaction, and they might built them up differently. You can buy a bolt action upper. There are pump action AR uppers. There's, you know, .22s. They might built out one different flavor, you know, or
different Cerakote job just because they want to have a different look. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So let's talk about the Cat 3 features.
A. Okay.
Q. Which, I guess, are now in Cat -- Cat 3 and Cat 4, right? Except for one is a detachable magazine. One is it has to be anything -- it can't be anything but a fixed magazine, right?
A. There are even fixed mag assault weapons under 30515(2), so it's a little bit of an asterisk on that notation.
Q. Okay. So $I$ believe in your report, you say that a pistol grip is probably the most popular -- I don't want to misquote you. I can't find the quote, but you basically say that the pistol grip is the most prominent feature of the features in 30515 on these rifles; is that fair to say?
A. I would say probably pistol grip is the most prevalent feature.
Q. Okay.
A. That if -- and I'm speaking about guns that I've either seen in stores for sale when I'm speaking about bullet-button guns, as well. Or I'm speaking about guns that we've seized over the years as evidence.

It just seems like the pistol grip is the most common feature across the board.
Q. Okay. And you define a pistol grip in paragraph 19, page 5 of your report, and it says, "A pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon is a grip that allows for a pistol-style grasp in which the web of the trigger hand between the thumb and index finger can be placed beneath or below the top of the exposed portion of the trigger while firing."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Where is that definition from?
A. I want to say it's part of the regulations -the Assault Weapon Registration Regulations. It was probably attached to my report as a -- here we go.
Q. It's, I believe, Exhibit 94.
A. So you've already got it in front of me. Exhibit A.
Q. Oh, great. I'll give it to --

MR. CHANG: Are you entering this as an --

MR. BRADY: It's already entered. Yeah. This
is Exhibit 94. I think this is what we did yesterday.

MR. CHANG: Okay.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So we will find --
A. So yeah. Within Exhibit A, page 5, letter Z.
Q. Okay. Got it. So that's where you got this?
A. Right.
Q. Now, going to -- back to the first page of Exhibit 94, which is California Code of Regulations Section 5471. At the top --

MR. CHANG: Are we sharing a copy of this?

MR. BRADY: I can give you another one. I'm sorry. I thought you had it for Exhibit A.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I just want to make sure if I'm going to -- that $I$ go to the right section.

MR. BRADY: Yeah, of course. Of course. There you go.

THE WITNESS: All right. Okay.

MR. CHANG: Let me give you this one so you know where -- this is Exhibit 94.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll trade you. Thanks. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So if you look at the very first sentence under the title, it says, "For purposes of Penal Code Section 30900 and Articles 2 and 3 of this chapter, the following definitions shall apply."
A. Uh-huh.
Q. What does that mean to you?
A. 30900 is the section that the legislature has
modified over the years that deals with DOJ having to register assault weapons that were submitted to the department.
Q. So these definitions apply for registration purposes, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Do they apply for enforcement of 30515 purposes?
A. Not at this time. I believe they're still pending -- $I$ don't know what you would call it -- final acceptance or approval from either our department or the Office of Administrative Law.
Q. So there currently are no regulatory definitions for the features -- assault weapon features in Penal Code Section 30515, right?
A. The way I understand it is when these regulation -- the registration regulations were pushed through, the department tried to do everything together as one package, but -- I don't know -- the Office of Administrative Law said it can only apply to registration. So the department did a second batch.

The same terms as you see for registration, as I understand it, are going to be -- I don't know -- rolled out or whatever you want to call it.
Q. So are there any definitions currently for the terms of features in Penal Code Section 30515?
A. To my knowledge, these are for registration purposes. And if somebody wanted to use them, they could. This is what $I$ would lean on.
Q. So you're basically assuming that the definitions in CCR Section 5471 are relevant for interpreting the -- the same terms in Penal Code Section 30515?
A. Yes, and here's why. The original regulations from roughly 2001 that the department did were at least with regards to a pistol grip, which is what we were just talking about. I believe it was possibly word for word. I'm going to look at the definition here.

I think the only thing that was added was that last sentence. "This definition includes pistol grips on bullpup firearm designs." I think the rest of that is all consistent with the terms that -- there were, I think, five terms that were, in a sense, in place from 2001, let's say, or whatever year it was that they created those and the old regs, so that was the one change.
Q. So when we're talking about pistol grips, regardless of what definition officially applies, you're talking about a grip that the shooter wraps their hand around underneath the stock; is that fair to say?
A. I mean, that's one -- it's a very broad way of
looking at it.
Q. I'm just trying to make -- you know, set parameters because have you read -- I assume you read Mr. Helsley's expert report?
A. Yes. It's been a while. But, yes, I read it.
Q. And you saw how he went through the litany of different pistol grips that are available on rifles?
A. Yes.
Q. But some of those -- while they are pistol grips, the shooter grasps the rifle -- the grip from above the rifle, right?
A. It -- you'd have to show me his report before I can really comment too much.
Q. Okay. But in any event, the pistol grips you're referring to are always the shooter's hand is underneath the stock grasping the grip, correct?
A. Underneath the action. That's I think the way the definition has always read. Usually the action is -I mean, the action is going to be typically above the -above the trigger and usually in line with the stock, if not on -- in fact, maybe even above the stock.
Q. But a shooter with a pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon as it is -- as the term is defined in 30515, that person would never be grasping the rifle from above the stock, above
the action; is that right?
A. I can't think of a scenario like that.
Q. So here it is. You say in your experience, this feature is the most prevalent feature of assault rifles prohibited under the AWCA. That's paragraph 19. Okay.

You say later in paragraph 19 that a pistol grip on an assault rifle enhances the ergonomics of the weapon. What do you mean by that?
A. So ergonomics would be comfort factors, if you will. If I've got to do various things with my weapon, I'm going to have to shoot it, I'm going to have to reload it, I'm going to have to aim with it, in my experience, a pistol grip is a key factor on this style of weapon that $I$ want or maybe even a thumbhole stock. If that's my -- if $I$ want extra weight, then maybe I'll have a thumbhole stock. But you get the same thing with a pistol grip, and you have a little bit less weight.

So ergonomically, I'm able to potentially stay up on target as I'm doing a mag exchange; whereas, if I'm holding it more of a traditional rifle-style stock -meaning like a normal Mini 14 , there's no pistol grip on it -- I'm going to have a different grip. And it may not be as comfortable or quick to do that mag change.
Q. Got it. You know, I think because you brought up the Mini 14 , $I$ think it might be helpful for us to
really quickly divert to page 9 of your report.
A. Okay.
Q. And those are two images of a Mini 14, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And for simplicity's sake, I'm going to refer to the rifle on top as Rifle A.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And the image of the rifle beneath that
is Rifle B. Okay?
A. Sure.
Q. Rifle A is an example of a Mini 14 that is not an assault weapon, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is because it lacks any of the features listed in Penal Code Section 30515 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Rifle B is an assault weapon under Penal Code Section 30515, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because it has at least an adjustable stock and a pistol grip, and it may or may not have a flash suppressor. We'll just say it does.
A. Sure.
Q. So when you were talking about a Mini 14 traditional, you were talking about the stock on the
image of Rifle $A$, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because you grasp the grip behind the action above the rifle rather than below, correct?
A. Below the exposed portion of the trigger.
Q. Okay. Other than the pistol grip, adjustable stock, and potential flash suppressor on Rifle B, these rifles are functionally identical, correct?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague and ambiguous. MR. BRADY: Let me ask you this. I'll strike that. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. These rifles shoot the same cartridge, correct?
A. Assuming it's a Mini 14, yes, because it's going to be probably a .223. If that, for some reason, was a picture of a Mini 30 --
Q. Yes.
A. -- it would be different.
Q. Let's assume that these are both Mini 14 s because you did, in fact, say Mini 14. That's why I assume they are . 223 .
A. Yes.
Q. So these both shoot .223?
A. Right.
Q. They're both semiautomatic?
A. Right.
Q. They both can potentially have the same magazine capacity, correct?
A. Yes. They will accept the same magazines.
Q. They will accept the same magazines?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So the fact that Rifle B has a larger magazine in the -- in the image is not -- does not mean that Rifle $B$ accepts larger magazines than Rifle $A$, correct?
A. Right. They should be interchangeable. Those mags from $A$ and $B$ should be interchangeable.
Q. Got it. Okay.

So going back to the discussion on pistol grips.

So you said that you like a pistol grip because it gives you control of the firearm. It's ergonomic. Is that what you --
A. Yes.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Mischaracterizes the witness's testimony. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Go ahead.
A. Okay. So it -- in my experience, it increases the ergonomics. It's one of the features that would increase ergonomics on the assault rifle. Because of the
reload, $I$ can keep sight picture. That's the aiming side of it during the reload, and $I$ just like the grip there as opposed to the traditional rifle-style grip when I'm shooting a centerfire semiautomatic rifle.
Q. So you find a pistol grip as defined in Penal Code Section 30515 as being helpful to you in operating a semiautomatic rifle?
A. Yeah. Specifically the $A R-15$ sort of family of weapons.
Q. Got it. The next line, you say, "A shooter using an assault rifle without a pistol grip may shoot less accurately if the shooter's trigger hand is in an awkward position for a significant amount of time."

What do you mean by that?
A. So there are certain weapons that are being sold in California now that are being marketed as featureless, and so they will put -- I don't know -- just nontraditional grips onto, let's say, an AR-15. Instead of your thumb being wrapped around a grip that protrudes down below the action, some of these grips make you sort of grip and your thumb is actually pointing up to the sky.

There are a few other ones out there, and it just dramatically changes your -- your, like, weapon retention. Maybe even just comfort when you're shooting
for long periods of time.
Q. Are you referring to grips like the MonsterMan grip?
A. That's one of the various products that's out there. Yes.
Q. And you're -- you're saying that those grips make it -- make it less controllable for the -- make the rifle less controllable for the shooter?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.

THE WITNESS: I'm saying it may. For me, I prefer the grip with a pistol grip. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. And those sorts of grips are attempts to bypass -- get around the assault weapon restrictions, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. They have no market in states where there is no assault weapon law to your knowledge, is there?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: Based on my sort of study of this area, there are often -- you know, I've seen them called New York and California style compliant grips or something like that. So those are -- you know, here and New York, we have assault weapon laws; and they wouldn't
have really much, $I$ guess, marketplace in the other 48 states unless maybe -- I don't know if Maryland, I think they might have a law now, as well. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. And that's because those grips are inferior to a traditional AR pistol grip, right?
A. I don't know about inferior. They're different, and people take a while to get used to a particular -maybe an ergonomic change like that.
Q. And it could potentially make the -- those grips can potentially make the shooter shoot less accurately is what you're saying?
A. I've experienced several of these grips as they come out. I don't find it comfortable to have my thumb pointing up in the sky when I'm trying to retain hold of the weapon.
Q. Okay. The next line, you state, "An assault rifle lacking a pistol grip would not necessarily be less accurate than an assault rifle with a pistol grip." What exactly do you mean there?
A. So what $I$ mean there is you could have a -- a weapon that does not have a pistol grip, but it has another feature somewhere on it that would trigger 30515 standards, too. Maybe it's a flash suppressor, maybe it's another -- a folding stock or something like that.

By in and of itself, you could probably -- with a lot of training, you could probably overcome like my -if I train a lot with one -- like you brought up the MonsterMan. If I trained a ton and that's all I used, I could probably get to the point where I'd be comfortable with it and it wouldn't affect my score if $I$ was shooting on a paper target.

But what I've used since -- I don't know -- the year 2000 is a pistol grip, so that's what I'm most comfortable with. I believe my score would drop if I had to use that only.
Q. Do you believe comfort when shooting is a positive thing?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Moving on to adjustable stocks.
A. Do you have a page?
Q. Sure. Let me -- so you state on page 8 in paragraph 27 that "folding or" -- "folding or telescoping stocks and a rifle with overall length under 30 inches aid in the concealability of the weapon;" is that right?
A. Could you give me the paragraph again?
Q. 27 .
A. "Folding or telescoping stock and a rifle with an overall length under 30 inches aid in the concealability."

Okay. I see what you're speaking of.
Q. Now, back on page 6, you discuss telescoping stocks.
A. Do you have a line?
Q. So paragraph 21. So you say, "Telescoping stock is a stock that is shortened or lengthened by allowing one section to telescope into another portion."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And on AR-15-style firearms, the buffer tube or receiver extension acts as the fixed part of the stock on which the telescoping butt stock slides or telescopes; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. On an AR-style rifle, how -- how much does it -a stock telescope generally in your experience?
A. Three or four inches.
Q. Three or four inches?
A. Yeah.
Q. So could -- are you familiar with short barrel rifle laws?
A. Somewhat.
Q. Do you know the definition of a short barrel rifle under California law?
A. I can give it a shot if you want me to.
Q. Sure. I can assist you if you want. I'm not trying to quiz you.
A. Sure. No. I've testified as an expert at least once on one of the cases --
Q. Okay. Go ahead while I look for it to confirm.
A. So generally on the short barrel rifle, the things you're going to evaluation: Is the barrel less than 16 inches? Is the overall length less than 26 inches?
Q. That's my understanding.
A. Yeah. So those are the rough parameters that state and federal law would kick in if something like that was found.
Q. And that's Penal Code Section 17170.
A. The definition, yes. The charging section is possibly 33210 .
Q. Okay.
A. Somewhere around there.
Q. Okay. So why couldn't somebody with an AR -- or strike that.

So an AR must have at least a 16-inch barrel in order to be legal, correct?
A. AR rifle.
Q. An AR rifle must have at least a 16-inch barrel, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So with a 16-inch barrel plus the length of the receiver, could you possibly make a short barrel rifle via the stock on an AR-style rifle?
A. I don't know. With an AR, it would be tough because of the length of the receiver. I don't know if I've done measurements on that specific question to be able to answer really well.
Q. So it would -- you believe it would be tough?
A. With a 16-inch barrel, it would be tough.

MR. BRADY: So let me mark as Exhibit 98.
(Whereupon Exhibit 98 was marked for
identification.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Turn to page 2 of Exhibit 98. There's a schematic of an image of an $A R-15$ rifle; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this rifle has what appears to be a 16-inch barrel, correct?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then from the barrel, the receiver is about 8.375 inches, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So between those two -- between the barrel and the receiver, you're at 24.75 inches, right?
A. Right.
Q. So in order to be a short barrel rifle, the stock -- there's only room for a one-inch stock, right?
A. Right.
Q. And behind the receiver, there's a buffer tube inside there that you said that the stock telescopes on, right?
A. Yes.
Q. How long is a buffer tube more or less? Because I don't think this schematic provides that.
A. Yeah. It's going to be probably -- let's see here. I don't know. It could be eight inches roughly on the carvings, and then the rifle versions would be slightly longer. And then a pistol buffer would be six inches, maybe, depending on the maker. Because sometimes you can have guys that will make them a little bit longer on the pistols.
Q. So then with a 16-inch barrel, assuming that the receiver is about 8-ish inches, as this indicates, do you have any reason to not agree that a receiver is about eight or so inches long?
A. No. That seems a good approximate.
Q. And then the buffer tube is another 6-ish inches as you indicated?
A. Yeah.
Q. So we're at 30 inches with a standard -- with a legal -- a non-short barrel rifle, AR platform rifle, right?
A. Yeah. Right around 30 inches would be the -sort of the -- the minimum, I guess, for an average AR if it's got a telescoping stock.
Q. And you can own a rifle that's down to 26 inches overall length, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So an $A R$ cannot be a short barrel rifle via the -- via the stock, right?
A. Well, so -- so far up to this point, we're sort of blending assault weapon, and we're talking about short barrel rifles. Assault weapons have to be semiautomatic. Short barrel rifles can be single shot. If somebody had created something, whether accidently or intentionally, that was capable of firing a single round, it might somehow classify -- they basically could cap off that buffer tube if they were able to just basically have a pullback bolt action rifle. You wouldn't necessarily need this style stock off the end or the buffer tube.

There are -- there's one or two weapon systems.
I think Olympic Arms, they made an AR pistol that didn't have a buffer tube at all. And there are some other newer technology AR-family weapons that are -- as opposed
to the delayed -- sorry -- the gas system that's on this -- depicted here. There might be a direct impingement scenario where they wouldn't necessarily need the buffer or whatever.

And if they're only going to fire it once and then manually manipulate it like a bolt, they might be able to get away with no buffer tube or receiver extension.
Q. But that would involve some pretty significant alterations to the standard semiautomatic AR platform, right?
A. Agreed. Yes.
Q. So your standard $A R$ is going to be a few inches over the short barrel rifle law, correct?
A. In most cases, I believe so.
Q. Okay. And so it would be legal for somebody to acquire an $A R$ with the stock in its shortest configuration as long as it's over 26 inches, right?
A. If -- if the weapon was measured in the -- I would say the shortest possible configuration in which it will fire, which would be, in this case as depicted in this picture, telescoped down, that should be fine. If you had a folding -- like an $A K$, it's more common in an AK will have a folding stock. Those weapons can get really close to 26 inches. In fact, some versions are
under 26, so the AKs are a little easier to slip into that short barrel rifle status --
Q. Sure.
A. -- than an AK would -- I'm sorry, than an AR would.
Q. That's okay. I just want to stick with the -the adjustable stock.
A. Okay.
Q. The telescoping. We'll get to folding in a second.
A. Okay.
Q. Because you indicate in your report, right, that telescoping stocks are an issue because they can be more easily concealed. They're more easily concealable than a rifle without a telescoping stock, right?
A. Yeah. If I have a -- a much larger -- like the picture here is a carbine, which is usually around a 16-inch barrel with a telescoping stock. There are rifle versions that might have maybe about a 20-inch barrels and then a fixed stock that would be potentially slightly longer than this, even when it was extended, perhaps. I would have to lay the two weapons out and see.

But you might have a scenario there that would be different. But, you know, this is a carving, so it 's -- obviously the law applies to not just AR-15s. It's a broad range of rifles.
Q. Yes. Understood. But here with respect to the feature of telescoping stocks on an $A R$, you could buy this carving in its shortest configuration, and it would -- you could -- assuming you could purchase it lawfully, right? It would not be a violation of the short barrel rifle law?
A. It would certainly be over 26 inches. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so you could get that rifle in its shortest configuration, so I'm asking how does a telescoping stock affect this rifle's concealability if you can buy it in its shortest configuration already?
A. Well, if it's -- if something's legal, it doesn't mean it's not concealable. If $I$ have a long 20-inch barrel rifle and then $I$ have a fixed stock, it might -- maybe it has an overall length of 35 inches or something, but then $I$ buy the one depicted here. Maybe it's 30 inches overall. So there's really a shrinkage of the weapon of about five inches because of the variant of the $A R$ platform -- or the -- between those two systems or weapons within that family of weapons.

So the smaller one as depicted here would be more concealable than the bigger sort of cousin with that longer barrel, etcetera.
Q. But my point is, you can buy it in its shortest
configuration, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So that's as concealable as that particular rifle gets in its shortest configuration, right?
A. Yes. That's a different question than you asked.
Q. Okay. I apologize if $I$ wasn't there.
A. That's okay.
Q. So that is -- in its shortest configuration, that's as concealable as it gets, correct?
A. Yes. Yeah. That would be right about 30 inches unless they made some potentially illegal modification to the barrel or some mechanical change perhaps to the buffer system or they bought a whole new upper or something.
Q. And so in that case, the adjustable stock -- the telescoping stock really only lengthens the rifle; is that fair to say? If you're buying it at a legal length -- here, 30 inches -- and that's its shortest configuration with the stock completely collapsed as much as possible and it's a legal length rifle, then the telescoping stock only serves to lengthen the rifle three to four inches; is that fair to say?
A. I don't know if I've ever -- it's sort of a reverse measurement than the way $I$ would normally do it.

Possibly. That's, I guess, my best answer for that.
Q. Let me just help you out.
A. Sure.
Q. So it's as concealable as it's going to get in its shortest configuration as you purchased it, right? 30 inches?
A. Right around 30 inches.
Q. So that's its shortest configuration.
A. Right.
Q. It has a telescoping stock, but then you said telescoping stocks on average change three to four inches. It's only growing three to four inches from its shortest configuration, which is legal -- or you could buy a fixed stock at 30 inches, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you wouldn't run afoul of the assault weapon law?
A. Sure. Right.
Q. So you can have a gun that is just as concealable as this gun at 30 inches, right?
A. Right. But when you speak about concealability like $I$ did in page 8, No. $27, i f$ I have the ability to shrink my weapon down, it aids in my concealability. If I'm going to conceal it under a long coat or in a bag or something -- like a backpack, and I can collapse it down
to right at 30 , whether it be a fixed or telescoping stock version, making something smaller, it makes it more versatile if I'm going to try to get it into a -- maybe a -- I don't know -- a school zone or something like that. It gives flexibility as far as the shooter. They can customize it to their body fit, as well.
Q. But my point is that you can buy with a fixed stock at 30 inches, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So it's already as concealable as it's going to get with the fixed stock or -- whether it has a fixed stock or an adjustable stock, at 30 inches, that's as concealable as it gets?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: So larger frame shooters may choose to have longer weapons because of their body type. They may seek a telescoping stock variant to -- when I say concealability, that might be because they have some bad intent to do. Get it into a building or something like that.

Granted, you can buy a weapon with a fixed stock, and it's locked in at 30 or 31 inches. Whatever it's going to be. But having the freedom to telescope it down and back it off so that it's longer to fit the shooter's needs, it's an advantage.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. You don't think that a change of three to four inches is fairly negligible when you're talking about concealment of a firearm?
A. No. I think it's kind of significant. The AR platforms come in various lengths. Barrel lengths are around 16 for the standard ones. And then if you go down to the short barrel rifle or machine gun versions, they're 14-and-a-half-inch barrel, and then a 10-or 11-inch barrel, too. Different stages of those upper receivers.

The smaller you get, the -- those chunks taken off the end of the barrel, as you're -- if you're clearing houses, like what $I$ do for a living sometimes, having the shorter barrel will aid you in not giving away your position if you're creeping around trying to clear a house. That is an advantage. I'm not going to give myself away by having a long barrel sticking out in front of me.
Q. So there are -- you have an adjustable stock on your rifle?
A. On my M4, yes.
Q. So they are of -- why do you have an adjustable stock on your rifle?
A. Why do I?
Q. Yes.
A. The department issued me that rifle, and it had it when I got it.
Q. Would you prefer a rifle that did not have an adjustable stock?
A. No. I'm happy with it having an adjustable one because $I$ have different levels of body armor, thickness levels. So between the heaviest armor that $I$ wear for search warrants, it's definitely thicker, and I have to put it on a different setting. Otherwise it causes me problems.
Q. Okay. And why -- why do you need different -different lengths of the rifle? Why do you need to change the stock to accommodate the body armor? Why can't it just be a fixed stock?
A. Ergonomics because sometimes I have a helmet on. Sometimes I have Level 4 body armor on with a rifle plate. I'm very -- my girth increases, if that makes sense. So I need to shorten the stock so I can have the same sight picture, the same eye relief, etcetera.

So if $I$ have a T-shirt on, I might change the position because $I$ don't have, you know, two or three inches of body armor on.
Q. So you're saying that the length of stock can affect your ability to -- to effectively use the firearm?
A. In an ergonomic sense, yeah. You're better off customizing the length of the stock to fit your body type. You might have somebody that has really short arms, and they may need to go as short as they legally can go. Somebody that's really long, over six-foot something, they're going to probably want that stock backed out because they're likely to have longer arms, and that's just what fits their body type better.
Q. So stock fit is important in being able to shoot properly?
A. Yes.
Q. And if a rifle does not have an -- an adjustable stock is meant to, like you just said, fit a particular shooter whether it be their standard arm length or if they have a heavy coat on versus a T-shirt, right?
A. Yeah. Those things would be factors.
Q. Or teaching a younger person who's smaller or teaching somebody else who's of a different size how to use a firearm. That might be a factor in wanting an adjustable stock?
A. Yeah. Versatility. Like I said, the department issues us these weapons. We all get the same weapon regardless of our height and weight and our length, so it's a practical reason.
Q. Without an adjustable stock, a person who wants
to have the proper stock fit, what would they do to find a rifle that has the proper stock fit?
A. They may try the one that came with it and see if it -- if it's too long or too short for them, they may add a pad to the end of their stock if their stock will accept different thickness pads. They may just go outside the box and buy a whole other company's stock that fits their rifle.

I'll use an example of a company that a lot of people use. MagPole. They make various stocks for the AR platform. There's probably -- I don't know -- five or six different variants of their stocks, and some of those versions have different thickness. Buffers -- I'm sorry. Not buffers, but pads for the end of the stock, and some of those are fixed stocks. Some of them are telescoping stocks.
Q. So you can change the length of your stock if you want whether it has a telescoping stock or not?
A. Generally, there's some variation -- some -there's a lot of options is what I'm trying to say, I guess, for a person. If you want a fixed stock or a telescoping stock, there are a ton of options out there in the marketplace.
Q. Well, people can't have telescoping stocks under the AWCA, so that's my question is: What are the
alternatives? And I think you just laid out some of them. People can figure out certain -- they can put a pad on or try to find a stock that fits them, buy a custom stock.

Wouldn't it just be a whole lot easier to have a stock that you can move around to adjust to your -- your shoulder length?
A. A whole lot easier in what sense?
Q. When you're -- to get the proper shoulder fit.
A. If that was allowed by law, which in some cases, it is. A . 22 rifle that didn't have Category 1 or 30510 markings, . 17 caliber, those are still allowed. But if it's a centerfire without a fixed mag, it might get classified as a 30515 or a Category 3 assault rifle.
Q. Because those three to four inches on an $A R$ are increasing its concealability.

Is that the sole reason that the telescoping stock is --

MR. CHANG: Objection. Lacks foundation. Calls for speculation.

MR. BRADY: Good objection, but I need to finish my question.

MR. CHANG: I just wanted -- it looks like -- it looked like the witness was about to answer, so $I$ was trying to thread the needle right there. Please finish.

MR. BRADY: I know. I appreciate it.

Can I have that read back?
(Whereupon the record was read back.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. -- is objectionable under -- in your -- in your analysis?
A. So your question is solely to the $A R-15$ platform?
Q. Sure. Let's start with that.
A. Okay. So the AR-15 platform -- because of its design as depicted in Exhibit 98 is somewhat limited in the -- the concealability, and the -- I guess the benefits of a telescoping stock on that platform. Other weapon systems that are, you know, not this one potentially, the telescoping stock might be more of a factor.

So this -- No. 27 on page 8 is a broad statement that's not strictly talking about the AR platform. So other weapon systems may be more than a three- to four-inch concealability factor.
Q. So you're talking about, for example, the, like, wire stocks that telescope into, like, the stop of an AK where it will collapse all the way to the receiver?
A. I don't know if I've seen the wire types on an AK, but the ones I'm thinking of are on some of the more
odd ball ones like a -- a Feather Industries -- they do have a wire, like the calicos. They have more like a double wire almost like a --
Q. And it collapses all the way to the action, right?
A. Yeah.
Q. And there's no buffer to it?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So would it be fair to say that those rifles are in a different category with respect to the significance of a telescoping stock than AR platform rifles?
A. Yeah. I would say the non-ARs are probably certainly more concealable because of their telescoping stocks and their overall mechanics of their design. The AR is the least benefitted by a telescoping stock under the majority of the builds out there.
Q. Are you aware of any incidents where a bad guy has utilized a telescoping stock to smuggle an assault rifle into a location where he should not have had it or where we don't want him to have it?
A. So I know there was a shooting at the LA airport. I don't know what the terms of him getting the weapon into the system were, but the incident happened right around the bag check or magnetometer area where the

TSA guys, you know, check things. That was -- that's an incident of something like that happening.

There have been various incidents that have happened at schools. The one I can think of was in Santa Monica, but the guy basically got out of a vehicle and then walked right into the campus and started shooting folks, so that wasn't necessarily like a smuggle in.

The Aurora, Colorado, scenario, he came in
through, I think, a back door in the theater with at least a shotgun, a pistol, and a rifle. I think the shotgun may have been in a duffel bag or something like that, but the $A R$ I think he had in his arms or on a sling.
Q. And the shotgun did not have an adjustable stock?
A. I don't remember the details on the shotgun.
Q. Okay.
A. I can probably look at my report. I may have mentioned some of the shootings. That might jog my memory. I'll flip through here. Okay. So I'm looking at page 11. So lines -- so page 12 , line 7 which is also E, that was the one $I$ mentioned there.
Q. Yeah.
A. Aurora, Colorado. I don't have a lot of details on the next one.

Zawahri, that's line 13, letter G. That's the one at Santa Monica. He walked in. The rest of these were, for the most part on page 12 , ones that happened, and I don't know the circumstances of how -- if they came in over with them or if they had them broken down or collapsed.
Q. Yes.
A. Those kinds of things.
Q. So "broken down," what do you mean by that?
A. Broken down would be like separating the upper and the lower on an $A R$ if that was the weapon that was involved. Whereas something that was collapsed or telescoped down would be still operational.
Q. It would not be operational if the upper was off the lower?
A. Right.
Q. How long does it take to put the upper back on the lower?
A. If you know what you're doing, a few seconds.
Q. How long does it take to adjust the stock to your proper shoulder fit?
A. You may not have to adjust it. It may already be set there if you've left it in the last comfortable position.

If for some reason you had to really close it
all the way down and then adjust it out, it -- you know, you might feel it as you're backing the stock back. One click, two clicks. You'll know if you have a certain setting that you always go to. So it might be a second or two for that.
Q. Okay. So there's a couple seconds difference in a -- between a telescoping stock and just separating the upper from the lower and putting it back on?
A. I mean, it might even be the same time depending on what's -- when you put that gun back together, you're going to have to charge it. You're probably going to have to have loaded the magazine. So the making it operational action versus just adjusting the stock. Getting it operational again when you factor in inserting the mag, charging the handle, and attaching, if it's an $A R$, the upper and the lower with the two pins, that's going to be more time than adjusting the stock.
Q. Okay. So you can't have a -- a magazine already in the mag well when the upper is off the lower for an AR?
A. You could, but people might experience issues when they're trying to mate the upper and the lower because of a malfunction. It would be cleanest, mechanically speaking, if you attach the upper and the lower, insert the mag, and then did the charge on the
bolt.
Q. And if an upper was off a lower, that would basically cut the size of an AR in half, right?
A. Pretty close to it because you could lay it on top of each other. You might be down to -- instead of 30 inches, you're going to be down to -- I don't know. You could shave off 12 inches, maybe, or something from the overall length and put it in a backpack or something.
Q. And when an upper is separated from the lower on an AR, it is not considered an assault weapon; is that correct?
A. Correct. For registration purposes right now.
Q. Well, if somebody was walking, you know -- for registration purposes, if somebody has an upper separated from the lower in their house, they are not in violation of the AWCA; is that correct? Assuming it's not a Cat 1 or a Cat 2.
A. Right. Well, if their upper and lower are separated, as I said earlier, the semiautomatic wouldn't apply, right? So separate upper and lower shouldn't be based on your receiver question. It's kind of the same thing.
Q. 30515 also requires it be a semiautomatic rifle, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah. So, yeah, separated upper and lower. I wouldn't advise anybody to arrest a non-prohibited person -- meaning an average citizen, gun store owner, whatever -- for a separated upper and lower if it's a 16-inch barrel. And then when those things get assembled, it's more than 26 inches; so there's no short barrel rifle issues or any of that stuff.

Sean, can we do a five-minute break?

MR. BRADY: Any time you want. Off the record.
(Recess from 2:14 p.m. to 2:22 p.m.)
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Go back on the record. We -- let's take a look at page 8 of your report, paragraph 28 .

You say, "Flash suppressor may increase efficiency while the shooter is firing since the shooter's vision is less likely to be impaired by excess flash in low light settings."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So is a flash suppressor only relevant -- the effect of a flash suppressor only relevant in low light conditions?
A. I would say it's most relevant because the -I'll call it the ball of fire at the end of the barrel is
most visible the darker things get.

And in terms of flash suppressor, the way the definition has always sort of been focused, it's about the shooter's vision being affected as opposed to someone other than the shooter being able to see the shooter. Like a muzzle blast from a distance. It's more about what can the shooter see or not see because of the device on the end of the barrel.
Q. So a flash suppressor under California law would not necessarily, anyway, affect the muzzle -- the visibility of the muzzle flash by people being shot at; is that right?
A. Could you rephrase that question?
Q. Sure. If you're downrange on the wrong end of the gun --
A. Okay.
Q. -- okay, a flash suppressor will not make the muzzle flash less visible to you, right?
A. Depending on your angle to the shooter, it may. If you're off to the side, you're probably going to be able to still see the shooter a bit. If you're dead on, it may be less of -- I don't know how to explain this. It may not matter if there's a device on the end of the barrel or not.
Q. Because it's dead on.
A. Well, there's that, too.
Q. You're on the wrong end of the gun.
A. Yeah. Let's just say in a scenario of sustained fire -- let's say law enforcement had to respond to a shooting. They might be able to see somebody easier in, let's say, dusk or something with no flash suppressor possibly. It depends on the mechanics of the device. The Penal Code and then our regs haven't really spoken to what the -- the victim potentially or outsiders could see on the -- it would be a more complicated definition to write, so I'm not sure. Maybe that's why they never went there.
Q. So the definition of flash suppressor, as you understand it under California law, is solely concerned with the shooter's field of vision; is that fair to say?
A. Yeah. For the most part. We get into a little bit more detail in the recent regulations about registration on -- if there's a hybrid-type device, etcetera. Yeah.
Q. And in paragraph 22 on page 7, the definition of flash suppressor that you're using is again from --
A. 5471 of --
Q. Yeah. I'm just trying to find the Exhibit number.
A. Yeah. Let me find it here.

MR. CHANG: Exhibit 94?
MR. BRADY: Exhibit 94, yes.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. It would be page 2, letter
$R$; and then it continues to page 3.
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. And so you state on page 7 at the end of paragraph 22 that the rifle with the flash suppressor should be easier to shoot in low light conditions because the shooter should have less problems aiming accurately; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a good thing or a bad thing?
A. Well, if you're -- if you are the shooter, you want to have less impediment or impedence to your vision, so you might -- like, my duty machine gun has a flash suppresser on it, as do most military guns issued by the United States, so that your vision isn't temporarily obscured or you don't get sort of a night blindness scenario where your eyes have to readjust.
Q. And so if a person were using a rifle in low light conditions for legitimate purposes, say self-defense in the home, would it be a good thing that they could shoot easier and more accurately in low light conditions?
A. A legitimate use of a rifle -- well, whether it
be legitimate or illegitimate, the shooter is going to have probably a better chance of hitting what they're shooting at. Regardless if it's a civilian -- you know, non-prohibited citizen or a criminal. There's an advantage to it at the end of the day.
Q. All right. So in paragraph 24 , you say that the challenge features described in Penal Code Section 30515 on assault rifles, and those features are the ones we just went through as far as the pistol grip, the adjustable stock, and the flash suppressor, right? And granted, there's others; but those are the three that we're mostly talking about here.
A. Right. You called it adjustable. I would call it telescoping stock.
Q. Correct. Well, there's telescoping and folding, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And those are two different animals, if you will, with respect to your -- well, I guess even telescoping can be broken into two categories as we already found: One that will allow the rifle to be shortened down to the receiver and then the $A R$ telescoping stock which cannot be as shortened. And so those are sort of two different types of concerns; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. So we're talking about those -- we're talking about those features when in paragraph 20 , you say that they may, quote, aid -- sorry. Let me rephrase that. That, quote, "May aid the shooters in being potentially more effective and efficient while shooting people."

Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So as we just went through, and I believe you said with respect to the -- all of those things -the flash suppressor in low light, the adjustable stock for proper shoulder fit, the pistol grip for the ergonomics and control -- those things would also aid a person shooting people legitimately in self-defense, right?
A. Potentially, yeah.
Q. You have these features on your rifle, right?
A. Right.
Q. And you are only shooting people in legitimate self-defense, right?
A. Yeah. It might be a dog or it might be a person that has a weapon. Something like that.
Q. You're only taking life if there is a legal, justified reason to do so, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And your department use of force policy is - is what? Can you explain?
A. Yeah. I'll give it a shot. I'm not the department's expert.
Q. What is your understanding of when you are able to use up to deadly force?
A. If you boil it down, it's basically to prevent serious bodily injury to myself, other law enforcement, or other members of the public that might be subject to an immediate attack. Somebody may be swinging a weapon or throwing a brick or shooting at one of us, and there's nothing else that can potentially stop that from happening. So you have to stop the threat by potentially using lethal force against the aggressor.
Q. Is that standard any different than for a non-law enforcement member of the public, to your knowledge?
A. There's -- there's a specific Penal Code that breaks down justified homicide, and there might be a separate exemption that is carved out for law enforcement versus civilian. I'm not an expert on that area, so I don't want to comment, but $I$ think there might be some differentiation, at least a separate exemption broken down there.
Q. Generally, you're only using lethal force to
protect a threat to life or great bodily injury; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever had to use lethal force?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever discharged your weapon in the line of duty towards a human being?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever pointed your gun at anybody in the line of duty?
A. Hundreds of times.
Q. Hundreds of times.

Why didn't you shoot in any of those hundreds of times?
A. I didn't feel a threat that would justify me pulling the trigger.
Q. Was that -- out of those hundreds of times, was it with your pistol or with your rifle or both?
A. Both.
Q. Do you notice a difference in the response from the suspects when you're pointing a pistol versus a rifle at them in their reaction to you?
A. No, not really. I would say in every occurrence that this has happened, I've usually had one or more partners with me also doing the same thing, and they may
have had a pistol or a rifle whereas $I$ had the opposite. Sometimes it was all of us had rifles. Sometimes all of us had pistols.

So when you're in that moment, I've never
noticed someone all of a sudden their eyes get bigger than they already are if somebody with a rifle walks into the room and there's already a Glock or two pointed at them. I've never noticed that.
Q. Have you ever had a situation where a suspect was not complying because they didn't realize you had a gun out?
A. No.
Q. No?
A. Huh-uh.
(Pause on the record.)
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So we went through the features that are restricted on a semiautomatic centerfire rifle that does not have a fixed magazine as defined in California Penal Code Section 30515 that you describe in your report. I'll note that we did not go through thumbhole stocks because would you agree that those are essentially pistol grips?
A. Agreed.
Q. And forward pistol grips are essentially the
same as pistol grips?
A. Agreed.
Q. So that is why we did not discuss those, but they're implicit in the pistol grip analysis.

And in discussing those -- correct me if I'm wrong, but it is my understanding that you believe that each of those features is beneficial to the user of a firearm; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. But is it then your opinion that because those features are beneficial to bad guys as well as good guys, that that's why they should be restricted?
A. Well, it's not really up to -- sorry.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Lacks foundation.

THE WITNESS: It's not really up to me to say what is permissible, per se, under state law. The legislature sets that up. So I'm not sure if that's responsive to your question. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. I'm not asking your opinion on the law unless you want to give it. I was planning to not put you in that position because I'm friendlier than that, but I understand that you're dealing with the law that is in front of you, but you are making the -- the case for why each of these features in Penal Code Section 30515 is
problematic from the state's view. From a public safety perspective, right?
A. Yes. So I'm making the point that each of those features, in my eyes, has some kind of advantage that it gives to the shooter. It's not necessarily, you know -bad things can happen with guns.

We have the so -- on page 9, we have Rifle A and Rifle B. They both fire the same ammunition. They're both semiautomatic. The magazines are interchangeable. Rifle $B$ has some of the features. I wouldn't want to get shot by either Rifle $A$ or Rifle B. And depending on the skill level of my opponent, it may not make a difference. But the average person picking up Rifle A or Rifle B, I would probably prefer them to have Rifle A.
Q. Why?
A. Because they -- Rifle A lacks a few ergonomic features that $I$ would want myself, so doesn't have a flash suppressor. If this guy is shooting at me in a low light situation, $I$ do want him to be maybe -- his vision to be impaired probably because there's no flash suppressor there.

Maybe this person stole the weapon and maybe their arms are so short that they're having a hard time shooting or aiming this thing, so I don't necessarily want them to be able to collapse the stock down or to,
you know, make the weapon smaller or to conceal it or something like that.

The pistol grip, earlier $I$ gave examples of magazine exchange being slightly faster for me which could apply to another person. With that pistol grip, they can keep their gun on site, which might be aimed at me. I would want them to come off of target while they're trying to fumble to get their mag exchange and then come back up and find me to start shooting at me again.

So the Rifle B, to me, has tactical advantages over Rifle A. So that's my point in calling out those features as perhaps why the legislature called out certain features.

We didn't -- in California law, we never worried about bayonet lugs. The federal law did at one point. Rifle $B$-- the picture has a bayonet plug, but $I$ didn't it speak to it. I'm not aware of any people getting bayonetted, so -- but other things do happen. A lot of shootings happen with, you know, various weapons.

Rifle $A$ and B, there's a lot more Rifle As out there in the general population. They're still legal for sale just like that.
Q. And features on Rifle $B$ that make it easier for a bad guy to use would likewise make the rifle easier for
a good guy to use, right?
A. Potentially, yeah. It's a double-edged sword.
Q. And by taking away the features from Rifle B, that could potentially contribute to a better fit of firearm for a user. The state is basically saying that the general public should have less effective weapons than -- because the most effective ones could be misused by criminals, right?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Lacks foundation. Speculative. Argumentative.

THE WITNESS: Since 1989, the legislature has called out certain military-style weapons. Albeit, they've been semiautomatic ones. Most of the ones called out in 30510 have been ones that had one or more of the features on Rifle B. Some of them have multiple features like that.

The 30510 sort of scheme for registration and the control and lack of sales of those after that lawsuit was settled in 1991, I think, didn't quite work, so the legislature sort of reinvented the wheel and went down the path of what the federal government had done by calling out certain generic characteristics.

Probably neither of these is a perfect sort of fix to what they perceive is a problem. They obviously have evolved over time with the Senate Bill 880 being the
most recent version of the assault weapons changes over time. The weapons over time are changing, and the laws are slowly changing behind them, sometimes ten years or later after a significant change has occurred like the bullet button sort of change. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So you gave some examples of why you would prefer a bad guy shooting at you having Rifle A versus Rifle $B$ and that had to do with maybe they stole it, so, you know, the stock doesn't fit them right. That makes sense. You know, if it's in low light, it doesn't have a flash suppressor, they may lose their night vision and not be able to see you for the follow-up shot. Okay. But in a general daytime situation with an average -- average build person with Rifle A versus Rifle B, how much of a difference do these features really make for accuracy?
A. Could you discuss the range of which -- let's say two people squared off. One with Rifle A and one with Rifle B.

How far apart are they?
Q. Why don't you tell me what the difference would be.
A. If the shooters were -- I don't know -- 50 to 100 yards apart and shooting each other, the shooter with

Rifle $B$ would probably want to have the stock extended out like in the picture because they're going to want to have the best and most accurate shot. The longer -- with the stock extended like this, it's going to mimic the stock on Rifle A. The advantage that this weapon here will have is during the reload, they're going to have the pistol grip. They can keep the weapon up and roughly pointed at the target when the mag exchange happens --
Q. You can't do that with Rifle A?
A. You can. I find it troublesome with this specific weapon. I've fired both versions of this the department owns. And to me, it's just harder to reload this while keeping the weapon up.
Q. Have you ever done a side-by-side comparison of -- of Rifle A and Rifle B? Obviously not those specific rifles, but a -- a featureless rifle, which is Rifle $A$, and a featured assault rifle, which is Rifle B?
A. Yes.
Q. You've done a side-by-side comparison?
A. Yes. Folsom prison. We did it there with a bunch of other guns that we had laid out for a training day to get people accustomed to as we seize these, "Hey, you're going to find these weapons. And some will be loaded. Some will be not loaded." We've done it with AKs so that people are used to shooting and hearing the
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sounds of certain weapons if they're fired at you.
Submachine guns, machine guns, etcetera.
So our agents -- we try to train them so that they can safely -- when they recover weapons, they're making sure they're clearing the chamber, making sure we're not taking loaded guns home -- or back to the office for our evidence technicians to have an accidental discharge or things like that. So there's a good reason to have these out there and shoot various ones.

We have a -- one that looks a lot like Rifle B, and then there's a one that looks a lot like Rifle $A$, and I think there's one or two other variants that are sort of in between with, like, a flash suppressor attached, and then there's another version that has some other change to it. I think it might be stainless or something.
Q. And you shot those side by side on the same day at the same targets?
A. Yeah. Yeah.
Q. And what was the difference in your groupings?
A. It was -- I don't know that it was a groupings difference. It was my speed to which -- it wasn't a timed test, per se, but it was how quickly could I fire enough rounds to stop the threat. That type of thing. If $I$ was doing two rounds, mag change, put the
new mag in, charge it, and then two more rounds, it was three or four seconds slower with the rifle that was similar to Rifle A.
Q. Okay. So then your effective rate of fire was not as -- was slower than the actual rate of fire.

Is that fair to say with Rifle $A$ versus Rifle $B$ ?
A. Yes. Rifle A, I was a little bit slower. The distance in which we were shooting was seven yards.
Q. Okay.
A. So the distance -- it was negligible.
Q. So accuracy did not change between the two?
A. I didn't notice a much larger pattern.
Q. It was the magazine change that made the difference there?
A. Yeah. The speed in which I could reload and just do similar drills that we do with our M4s and stuff. We were just having the agents mimic that.
Q. And that was because of the pistol grip, right?
A. That's what -- yeah. I found that to be more similar to my M4 which I've used for many years, so it just seemed more natural.
Q. Okay. So between Rifle A and Rifle B, when you did a side-by-side comparison, you weren't really looking for accuracy because you were at short distances, right? But -- so accuracy was really -- couldn't be
distinguished at that...
A. Yeah. At that short range, seven yards, it's not going to make a difference.
Q. So on what do you base your opinion that the features on Rifle $B$ increase accuracy on a rifle?
A. So I was in a -- I was in a scenario which I didn't have people shooting back at me. I had -- I basically could go as fast as I felt comfortable going. I was at my own pace, in other words. So if I'm going to be in a stressful situation trying to shoot, reload, shoot again, and repeat that cycle as long as I needed to, Rifle B would be my choice. I might be 10 percent more effective because especially in low light with the flash suppressor change. And when $I$ say effective, I mean quicker and potentially more accurate.

Another factor with Rifle B -- it wouldn't come to play with a $50-$ to 100 -yard or longer -- but if I'm up close, say seven yards, I could probably even fire this thing with no stock, meaning it's been folded to collapse it down, and $I$ could still probably hit the target with all my rounds, and just coming up like this without actually a brace or a sling on there.

I'm going to -- I may lose a little bit of accuracy there, but the -- the difference being is $I$ would be sort of simulating coming out from maybe -- I
don't know -- a trench coat or some other -- maybe out of a bag, and I didn't see the need at that point to flip the stock out. I just wanted to start shooting. The concealability factor there would override the accuracy at a close range.

Does that make sense?
Q. Yeah. I believe so. It makes sense. I don't know if it was completely responsive to my question about why you think the features -- or what you base your opinion that the features make Rifle $B$ more accurate than Rifle $A$, because that is your opinion in your report, correct?
A. Right.
Q. So I'm just wondering, do you -- do you base that opinion that Rifle $B$ is going to be more accurate than Rifle $A$ on just your personal preference for these features or on testing that you've seen? That's what I'm trying to get at.
A. I would say, like, the only time I've done that side by side with weapons similar to Rifle A and Rifle B would be that one time. I've fired a weapon like Rifle A a few other times, but we didn't have the Rifle B clone out there, and it was sufficient. I was able to hit, you know, things on target, but $I$ just felt like $I$ was more -- when the stock would be extended, I was more
comfortable shooting Rifle B. And if $I$ had to shoot for some kind of a score between the two and a timed score, I think I'm going to do better with Rifle B.
Q. Okay. How much better, do you think?
A. Perhaps 10 percent. Something like that. Each of these features maybe is going to give you a few maybe percentage points of improvement. Small little things. The professional or semipro shooters out there, they do all kinds of things to their guns, whether it be handgun or long gun, from grip wraps so they get a perfect grip and different, you know, carvings on the wood stocks and all this other stuff.

So little ergonomic differences make a difference if you're really into having a high score if it's a, you know, paper target scenario where you're shooting metal plates and, you know, things like that at a competition.
Q. And accuracy is a good thing, right?
A. Yes.
Q. You train to be accurate, right?
A. Yeah. You want to have the highest score possible if you're shooting for a qualification, for example.
Q. And that's because -- well, also, you want to hit your target in the real world if you need to, right?
A. Uh-huh. Same thing would apply.
Q. And we would want somebody who is shooting somebody in self-defense to hit their target and not miss and hit something else, right?
A. Legitimate --
Q. Yeah, we're assuming legitimate.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. Bad guys coming down the hallway with the knife in hand. You want the homeowner to put two in his chest and not two over his shoulder into the neighbor, right?
A. Yeah. You want responsible gun owners to -and/or law enforcement, if that's what's going on in the shooting, to hit what they're shooting at and not have rounds flying around.
Q. And control of the firearm assists with being accurate, right?
A. I believe so.
Q. So you want a gun that fits well, right?
A. Yes.
Q. That's crucial for proper firearm -- safe firearm use, right?
A. Depending on how your -- what your needs are, you can get away with certain things that you -- some people have multiple weapons, and they're all slightly
configured different ways. Rifle A and Rifle B can both get the job done. But probably people with Rifle $B$, you're going to end up with -- if you have had a lot of training with an $A R$ specifically and had to transition to one of these two, I'm going to be most accurate, I believe, with Rifle B.
Q. All right. Got it. We're going to talk a little bit more about mass shootings in a second. But while we're on the subject of accuracy, I just want to ask what you think.

If a mass shooter -- because they're, by definition, merely trying to kill people, $I$ wouldn't say the average criminal would do this. But in a mass shooting situation, if a mass shooter hits somebody they're shooting at, what do you think would be their most likely response after they realize that they've hit their target?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: I think the response might be dependent upon what body part they hit on the victim, how much ammunition they have left, are they seeking to flee, or are they just going to stay and shoot it out until they're out of ammunition.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Let's say they're at the beginning of their --
they don't anticipate any resistance yet. They're there. They're just starting. Shot, they hit somebody, person goes down, what do you think their reaction is going to be?
A. They may move to another target unless they perceive the person on the ground to be a threat.
Q. And if they realize that they completely missed the person, what do you think their most likely reaction is going to be?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: Unless they have some threat approaching them or they get distracted, they may go back and fire again at that person that they apparently missed.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. And granted, this is a hypothetical and anything could happen. But I'm just asking what a reasonable result would be, and $I$ think that you provided your answer.
A. Yes.
Q. And so based on that, could it be possible that a less accurate weapon that a mass shooter is using could result in more rounds being fired?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. Incomplete hypothetical.

THE WITNESS: I'm going to say that a lot of it is going to depend on how much ammo they're carrying, sa to how many rounds they get off, the police response time, or if bystanders are able to disable the person, as well.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. I want to move to the next section of your report on page 9 titled, "Assault Rifles Have Higher Capacity for Firepower."

Can you define what "capacity for firepower" is in your understanding?
A. So I think it's 30 -- Penal Code Section 30505 is a -- sort of a general statement of intent by the legislature. I don't know that $I$ have it quoted in my report. But the beginning of the assault weapon control act, in other words, has some language in there that speaks to capacity for firepower that the legislature was seeking to rein in.
Q. So that's what you're using here?
A. Yeah. I attempted to sort of give my understanding of what that could have been based on the -- the guns called out in 30510 and then the other features that were pulled in under 30515 to look for a thread that -- a commonality between the two sections.
Q. Okay. When you say assault rifles have higher
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capacity for firepower, what are you meaning to say with capacity for firepower?
A. So semiautomatic would be the start of the conversation. Generally, a -- at this point, a nonfixed magazine would come into the conversation, as well. That's the newest language for 30515. Generally, you're going to have one or more of these features that might be a concealability -- strictly concealability or maybe some ergonomic benefit.

Flash suppressor -- I don't know if that's ergonomics necessarily, but it's more about the shooter's vision not being impaired. So I don't know if that's an ergonomic benefit, if you will. But a lot of it ties into can the magazine be quickly reloaded? Meaning a nonfixed mag. That's sort of a -- the basis of all that.
Q. So how does Rifle $B$ have a higher capacity for firepower than Rifle A in your opinion? Or does it? Setting aside the fact we're going to assume they have the same size magazine, right, because they both can accept the same magazines?
A. Right.
Q. Assuming they have the same size magazine in them, does Rifle $B$ have a higher capacity for firepower than Rifle A?
A. If you factor in the potential accuracy
increases the shooter might get in a low light situation with a flash suppressor, some potential accuracy increase from -- not accuracy. It would be the ergonomics of a quick mag exchange on Rifle B. The benefit would be, again, like I said earlier, you can keep your eyes on the target while you're doing that mag exchange. I would say that Rifle B would have a slightly higher capacity for firepower.
Q. Because you can get more magazines in it quicker?
A. That's part of it. Yeah.
Q. So speaking of magazines, you say on the next page, page 10 of your report, some LCMs -- and "LCM" stands for large-capacity magazines, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, "Some LCMs can hold 20, 30, 50, 75 or 100 rounds of ammunition at a time."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. They can also hold 12 or 15 , right?
A. If it's a pistol. Those are -- there are various pistols that would hold 12 or 15 . There's probably -- I'm thinking of like the M1 carving. There's a 15-round variant for that.
Q. Okay. So just -- you were talking about rifle

LCM -- LCMs that are usually used in rifles when you were giving these numbers?
A. For the most part, yeah. That's why I put "some LCMs." I didn't say all.
Q. Fair enough. So how many hundred-round LCMs have you come across in your career?
A. Quite a few coming back from Reno.
Q. Yeah.
A. There were -- sometimes the people would buy multiple of those, and they were usually gang members. They would have ammo that would match. Sometimes we got guns that matched. Sometimes we got -- they were in the car. Sometimes we would get guns subsequent with a search warrant that matched the weapon -- or sorry, matched the ammo and the magazines they were buying out of state. So that -- those are some definite scenarios.

We've also recovered them during APPS investigations, and the people were obviously acquiring them either as parts kits when that was still a thing or they got them from out of state and smuggled them in.
Q. Okay. Moving to paragraph 34 of your report. You state, "Assault rifles as defined in Penal Code Section 30515 are often used with rifle rounds that are associated with increased lethality."

Did I quote you accurately?
A. Yes.
Q. What does "increased lethality" mean?
A. So the United States Military has adopted, generally, for the most part, two rounds that they're consistently using in a lot of the weapon system. The 5.56 and the $7.62 \times 51$ round, those two calibers are found in a lot of AR-15, Springfield M1A, which are still used in the military now.

These rounds were created for mainly military use, and there's sort of a civilianized version of both of these rounds which would be the . 223 for the 5.56 military round and then the . 308 round which is a sort of civilianized version of the $7.62 \times 51$. There are other cartridges out there, but those are the easiest to...
Q. You're saying that those cartridges have increased lethality because they're used by the military?
A. Well, the military would not, let's say, use something that they felt was inadequate to arm their soldiers with. They go through lots of testing on which rounds will be accurate. Weapons -- sorry. Not weapons. But ammunition that will do the job at a certain distance because certain fire fights happen at certain distances.

So they factor all those things in when they choose a particular round to issue to the military members.
Q. Is the job of a soldier necessarily to be lethal in shooting somebody?
A. No. Not necessarily. Sometimes the job is to wound as many of the enemy as you can because you actually sometimes tie up more of the opponent's forces. If it's large-scale military actions, arguably if you can wound 100, it's better than killing 50.
Q. And are you aware that militaries are restricted on what ammunition they can use by The Hague Convention?
A. I was thinking Geneva Convention, but Hague sounds right.
Q. Is it? It could be. Some European convention.
A. Correct. My understanding, there are restrictions on those. But the rounds themselves, I think one of the general sort of key factors is 1 believe they have to be full-metal jackets, and it can't necessarily be, like, a hollow point, which is okay for civilian use.
Q. It is the Geneva Convention. You just jogged my memory.
A. All right. There you go.
Q. You got me. I owe you. Okay.

So then can you really say that those cartridges have increased lethality just because military use them? Based on what we just went through, that they're not
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necessarily trying to do the most harm?
A. Well -- so the military will -- wants to use weapons that are going to fire when cleaned by some 19-year-old recruit in poor conditions somewhat infrequently if they're out doing whatever mission they're on. If they arm all of their soldiers with . 22 caliber rimfires, we would be hampering our soldiers from potentially killing or wounding the enemy.

By putting $5.56,7.62$ and other rounds at the disposal of our soldiers, they're giving them a lethal round; but they're not going all the way to some of the civilian rounds that are out there now. Hollow points, etcetera, are arguably more effective. And if it's a handgun round, there are a few -- there are some hollow point and other expansion-type rounds that exist. But the military doesn't necessarily use those because what they issue to the troops is sufficient, and it's sufficiently lethal and deadly.
Q. So would you consider the 5.56 to be a particularly powerful round?
A. It's powerful enough for probably 98 percent of our military forces to use. I would say yes, it's powerful enough to do its job. I wouldn't want to shoot an elephant or a Grizzly bear with it. But to stop a man, it's adequate.
Q. And you say that some California assault rifles are capable of firing the same centerfire rounds as these military weapons; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But so can Rifle A, which is not an assault rifle, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So you don't necessarily need the features to be able to shoot the same rounds as these military weapons, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You go on in paragraph 34 to say, "These rounds will typically defeat normal bullet-resistant body armor used by law enforcement."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of a rifle caliber round other than a . 22 long rifle that would not penetrate the -- or defeat normal bullet-resistant body armor that law enforcement uses?
A. Even normal . 22 when fired from a rifle will probably penetrate most average law enforcement officer's soft body armor.
Q. Okay. So then is it fair to say that generally a round coming out of a rifle is going to penetrate body
armor?
A. Yes.
Q. So it doesn't matter whether it's these rounds coming out of an assault weapon or not. They're going to penetrate body armor?
A. A normal set of body armor without a rifle plate, probably it's going to go through.
Q. And if you have a rifle plate, would a 5.56 or .223 round penetrate the rifle plate?
A. Depends on how thick your plate is and what it's rated for. But there are different thicknesses. If it's ceramic, they can be two inches thick sometimes depending on what you're trying to stop. Sometimes they're thinner than some metal plates that have, like, a rubberized coating on them.

They also have a rating system, as well, and I've seen -- I'll call it armor. I don't know about body armor, but it's stuff that will stop even up to like a . 50 BMG round. But it's very thick. I saw that shot in Sacramento County at a range by a company trying to sell this to, you know, governmental agencies and stuff. So there's a whole range of stuff that could or could not be stopped depending on the thickness. If they're trying to outfit a vehicle versus, you know, a person in the thicker body armor, it will -- it may or
may not stop something.
Q. And do the features that make a rifle an assault weapon under Penal Code Section 30515 affect how a round reacts with body armor in any way? A pistol grip, an adjustable stock, a flash suppressor, would that effect how a round reacts to hitting body armor?
A. Should not.
Q. The last sentence of your paragraph 34, it -- is that -- the last line of page 10 , it starts, "The rifle," and then goes on to page 11.

It says, "The rifle barrel being at least three times longer than most semiautomatic handgun barrels leads to the bullet leaving the barrel at a higher rate of speed (or higher muzzle velocity)."

That's your -- you're just talking about rifle barrels generally versus handgun barrels, right? Not necessarily assault rifle barrels versus handgun barrels?
A. A legal length rifle barrel being 16 or more inches in length. Minimally, if an average pistol is, let's say, four and a half, five inches long, if you triple that, you're going to be about the same length as an average legal length, you know, 16-inch barrel. So five-inch, five-inch, five-inch, you're about 15 inches versus a 16 -inch rifle, so it's roughly comparable.
Q. So a rifle is going to have higher muzzle
velocity than a handgun just by virtue of the fact that it has a longer barrel, right?
A. Traditionally, if both weapons are shooting the same ammo out of the same box, it should produce higher muzzle velocity because there's -- the longer it stays in the barrel, generally the quicker it will leave the barrel and muzzle blasting --
Q. Got it. And none of the features in Penal Code Section 30515 that make a rifle an assault weapon affects muzzle velocity; is that fair to say?
A. I can't think of any that would.
Q. All right. Moving to page -- well, we're on page 11. Under the heading, "Use of Assault Weapons in Mass Shootings."
A. Okay.
Q. So on this page, you -- you list, starting in paragraph 40 , several incidents involving shootings where the perpetrator appears to have used what would qualify as an assault rifle under California law; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your definition of mass shooting that you used here?
A. Under No. 40?
Q. Well, the heading on page 11 is "Use of Assault Weapons in Mass Shootings."
A. Okay. I -- no, I understand. But on page 11, line -- sorry, paragraph 40?
Q. Yeah. So in paragraph 40 , you have subsection A, B, C, all the way through M.
A. Okay.
Q. And I assume that these are the mass shootings that you're referring to in your heading "Use of Assault Weapons in Mass Shootings" on page 11; is that right?
A. Right. So it says one or more persons, including peace officers, while using assault weapons. That's -- maybe the "mass" is the --
Q. Okay.
A. It's basically assault weapons used in shootings. Maybe that's a more accurate way, and I could have broken this list into two categories.
Q. Okay.
A. I see what your confusion is about the title.
Q. Thank you. Just because there is now three definitions that we're working with --
A. Understood.
Q. -- with mass shootings, so I just wanted to clarify.
A. Sorry about that.
Q. No, it's okay. I appreciate the clarification. So basically some of these are what you would consider
mass shootings. Others are just perhaps public shootings that would not be mass shootings but involved assault weapons; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So starting with the first one, A, the -the shooting in Stockton that started all of this type of regulation, the Assault Weapon Control Act. The shooter shot and killed five and wounded 32 with an AK-47-style rifle using large capacity magazines, right?
A. Right.
Q. What -- what details of that shooting do you have that help you attribute the use of that particular rifle to the amount of victims? In other words, how do we know -- what details of this shooting tell us that the use of that particular rifle was responsible for the number of victims versus just the evildoer wanting to shoot that many people?
A. I'm not sure if $I$ understand the question. He -- to my knowledge, he had an AK-47-style weapon. I don't recall if he had other weapons on him, but $I$ know he had that style.
Q. Do you know how far away he was from his victims?
A. I've read a report years ago that he moved around the schoolyard doing the shooting, so I imagine
the distances varied.
Q. And it was during school hours, so it was daytime, right?
A. Yes.
Q. So the flash suppressor probably wouldn't have helped that much?
A. Most AKs don't even have flash suppressors.
Q. Okay. And AKs often don't have adjustable stocks, right?
A. Yeah. Kind of like -- probably 60/40 that they don't. That they'll have just a fixed wooden or plastic stock.
Q. Do you recall whether his did or did not?
A. I don't remember. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Would you have any -- if it -- if it did not -- if the rifle did not have an adjustable stock, then he had a fixed-stock rifle, right?
A. Most likely would have had a fixed-stock weapon.
Q. So then the only -- and you said AKs do not generally have flash suppressors, so the only feature that would have likely made this firearm an assault weapon under Penal Code Section 30515 is the -- the pistol grip, right?
A. Could have been a thumbhole stock because there are Norinco, like, MAK90 types which are a subset of the

AK family. They -- go ahead. Sorry.

MR. CHANG: Make an objection that it lacks
foundation because there's no indication that this was a 30515 weapon.

THE WITNESS: So I forgot the last thing I said.
Is that okay if I ask --
MR. BRADY: Of course.
THE WITNESS: -- to repeat my last statement?
(Whereupon the record was read back.)

THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry. Norinco MAK90 types are sort of a subset of the AK family. Those will often have a thumbhole stock, which as we said earlier, sort of equates to a pistol grip.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Assumes facts not in evidence. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So are there any details from this shooting that you're aware of that suggest that he would not have been able to shoot just as many victims had he not had a pistol grip or any of the features that are identified in Penal Code Section 30515 on his rifle?
A. I don't know specifics other than a report that I read many years ago. It was a DOJ sort of -- I don't know -- after-action type report that existed written by an obviously now retired special agent way back in 1989.

Because there was no assault weapon law at the time, things that $I$ would call out now wouldn't have necessarily been called out in a report like that back then because 30510,30515 and their predecessors didn't exist.

All $I$ can tell you from the number of killed and wounded is that probably there was at least one mag exchange unless he had a larger than 30 -round magazine on him, but $I$ don't know specifically how many magazines he possessed that day.
Q. Okay. And let's assume that Rifle A from your report -- the gun we referred to as Rifle A is a Mini 30.
A. Okay.
Q. And a Mini 30 fires the same or similar round as an $A K-47$; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So it's essentially an AK-47 without a pistol grip for lack of a -- generally, would that be fair to describe it?
A. Sure.
Q. Okay. So -- and you testified earlier, I believe, that the difference in a magazine change for you between Rifle $A$ and Rifle $B$ due to the pistol grip would be a difference of a few seconds; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. So if this shooter had Rifle A instead of the AK-47 he had --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- his magazine change that you assumed happened -- and that's likely a safe assumption based on there being 37 people shot -- unless there was through and throughs and stuff like that -- but that the difference between his using the $A K-47$ with the pistol grip versus Rifle A would only have hindered him a few seconds; would that be fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. So based on that, is there any way to attribute the features present in Penal Code Section 30515 that make a rifle an assault weapon to the victim count in the Stockton shooting?
A. I would say that in the chaos of what $I$ can imagine happened that day -- kids scattering everywhere, adults potentially scattering everywhere, and he's trying to shoot as many as people as possible, and he has to be interrupted by a mag exchange, if his mag exchange takes longer because he has no pistol grip and he's fumbling around for an extra three or four seconds, that's three or four seconds that those kids could have gotten farther away, maybe rounded a corner. Gone out of his view. Perhaps something like that. Maybe a few more seconds
for the police to show up to engage him.

So it could have made a difference. Less
wounded. Maybe less death if his reload was slightly slower.
Q. And if I asked you the same set of questions for each of these shootings where there was multiple people -- because some there's only one, and I'll ask you about those.

But for all the shootings where there's multiple people, would you essentially have the same -- what if there was no magazine change needed? Would it make a difference whether it was an $A K-47$ or Rifle $A ?$
A. If there was no mag exchange or change of any kind -- let me review the list here.
Q. Maybe the Santa Monica Community College shooting. I forget how many people were shot there, and your report doesn't indicate it, but...
A. Yeah. It was, comparatively speaking, to some of these others, it was a more modest, you know, bad event.
Q. What about the -- the Texas event? The Dallas -- it's J. Towards the bottom.
A. J. So I've seen a picture of that weapon. It was an Izhmash Saiga variant that had been AK-ized. It had a pistol grip and an adjustable stock, 30-round mag.

But $I$ don't know how many times he did his reloads because there were a lot of shots that he fired.
Q. Oh. So he did do reloads?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry. I thought I saw five killed, but it was actually 14 killed.
A. Fourteen.
Q. It was five cops. Okay.
A. Yeah. Five cops. And actually, he --
Q. Oh. Wounded nine others.
A. -- wounded nine others, some of which, I think, were peace officers, some of which were civilians that were just caught, you know, in the middle of it.
Q. Okay. I just am trying to avoid us having to go through each of these and talk about the specifics to determine, you know, the impact of the features --
A. Sure.
Q. -- on these shootings.

So I guess would it be safe to say that -- that, in your opinion, the only difference between an assault rifle being used in a mass shooting versus Rifle A would be the -- the quickness of a magazine change?
A. If -- if the pistol grip was the only factor, that's a fair answer. Some of these shootings happened in dim light, so a flash suppressor would potentially
come into play.
Q. Like which ones?
A. The January 9, 2005. The June 15th, 2008.
Q. Okay. So the -- the January 9, 2005,
incident --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- involved the shooting and killing of a single individual, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how many rounds were fired?
A. I don't recall how many were fired. I remember Sergeant Stevenson was killed, and then a second officer, I believe, maybe had caught some ricochetted rounds. I think the two of them were the only ones shot. There were quite a few rounds fired, though. I remember from the video. When this happened, I interviewed a responding Modesto officer that went to the scene regarding the weapon. It was an SKS with a detachable magazine.
Q. And it had a flash suppressor?
A. No. In this particular case, it did haven't a flash suppressor to my knowledge.
Q. Okay.
A. But this was a nighttime thing, so a flash suppressor might or might not have made a difference on
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this.
The June 15 th case, that was a gang member that killed Deputy Diaz. About 17 rounds were fired, and it was definitely nighttime. I believe there was just one magazine in play.

July 20th, 2012, that was in a dark movie
theater, so a flash suppressor would have been a factor there.
Q. And he killed 12 people in that incident, right?
A. And then wounded about 70 others.
Q. And do you know how many of those victims were shot by the assault rifle?
A. To my knowledge, the majority of them were from the assault weapon. If he deployed the shotgun, I don't have a specific recollection if he did. It may have been strictly the rifle that he had.

So June 12, 2016, that was in a nightclub. I don't know what the lighting conditions were, but $I$ can imagine parts of the inside of the building had more or less light than others if it was a dance club.
Q. And in that shooting, the -- in the nightclub, he killed 49 people and wounded 53 others, right?
A. That's my understanding from what $I$ was able to gather.
Q. So he would have had to have made multiple
magazine changes, right?
A. Unless he had one very large capacity double drum mag. There are some that are -- well, yeah. I don't know of a 120-round drum. So, yeah, probably multiple exchanges were done.
Q. Assuming he had 30 -round magazines in his rifle and, you know, whatever he had in his pistol -- I don't know how many people he shot with that or whatever.

But assuming he had 30 -round magazines in his rifle, he would have had to have made multiple magazine changes to get those figures, right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And to your knowledge, did you look at the details of that --
A. When it happened, I studied it at the time. As these things happen -- because I eventually sometimes might get asked, like in this setting, about various shootings and what went on -- I'll try to gather data about particular events.
Q. Do you recall how that one ended?
A. I believe the SWAT team eventually made entry, and I think there was an exchange of gunfire. But I don't remember if the final result was that he killed himself or if the rounds from the SWAT team killed him.
Q. But it was law enforcement intervention that
ended it?
A. I believe so.
Q. No civilian stopped him?
A. Correct. I don't think so on that one.
Q. Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry. If you wanted to bring others up.
A. No. That's fine. So moving to page 13, the Steven Patock incident in Las Vegas. It was an evening concert. He's at an elevated position. He had broken out the windows to the hotel room. A lot of things in play with that one. Many firearms he had added the slide fire solutions-type bump stocks to around 12 , $I$ think, of his long guns. And he had lots and lots of and lots of large-cap mags ready to go, and there's some video that $I$ saw early -- like, within a day or so -- it was probably on the news or something, but $I$ wasn't able to really pick out what windows the shooting was happening from until they did some, like, still frames, and they had little arrows pointing. I wasn't able to tell just from that cell phone video or whatever they had gotten from citizens that day.

I imagine the same scenario if you're looking with the naked eye, looking to see where these bullets are coming from, you're going to have difficulty as well with a music concert going on with lights and probably
stage effects and things, too.
Q. He -- he -- in that particular case, accuracy was not really necessary to inflict the type of damage he did, right?
A. Yeah. He just had to be generally accurate enough to get --
Q. He's shooting at a crowd of thousands of people, right?
A. Yeah. Yeah. He didn't have to be super precise. Just put a lot of bullets in a small -relatively small area, and he was going to hit something.
Q. He probably could have inflicted the same amount of damage with a blindfold on; fair to say?
A. Other than having difficulty reloading his guns, or $I$ think after the $--I$ mean, the -- even blindfolded --
Q. Granted -- okay. Because he was probably grabbing different rifles as they heated up and changing the magazines --
A. Yes.
Q. -- which would be hard with -- but the -- just the shooting part, he could have done it with his eyes closed, right, and inflicted what he did?
A. I don't know about that. The -- there's a lot of people obviously that were injured there and killed.
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I definitely don't want to sort of trivialize that.
He -- he set himself up for success. I'll put it that way. And very little things that he did was going to hurt his quest for infamy.

That's about all I think I have as far as the -the list of shootings there, Sean.
Q. So would it be fair to say, Mr. Graham, that you would not be able to definitively say that any of the features in Penal Code Section 30515 that define a rifle as assault weapon contributed to the number of victims in any of the shootings that you've identified in paragraph 40 of your report?
A. I would say -- I guess between all these different shootings, it's too hard for me to generalize and say if a particular weapon or shooter was aided by a particular feature on their weapons.
Q. Well, let me ask you: Is there any shooting on that list where you can say definitively that you know or believe that the features made a difference based on specific facts? Not just the general, like you said, with the -- with the Stockton shooting. You know, the pistol grip potentially could have helped him. Granted, it could have. It may have, may not have made a difference.

What I'm asking is, can you definitively say in
any of these whether the features made a difference?
A. Because I wasn't the overall investigating officer on any one of these, I have -- I have a hard time picking out a particular feature that would have aided the shooter. But, in general, if their weapons did have one or more of those features, it probably did help them in some level.

The Topete case at the top of page 12 , $I$ testified in that case for the Yolo DA's office, and I fired the murder weapon at the request of the DA's office and saw the magazine and whatnot. So that was an AR-15-style weapon that was used to kill the deputy.
Q. Granted, and -- assault weapons were used in each of these shootings, right?
A. Yes.
Q. My question is: Is there anything in any of these cases that you can point to that would definitively say that had the shooters used Rifle $A$, that they wouldn't have inflicted the identical casualty rate?
A. I don't know that $I$ can say that either way. The -- in all these cases, they used assault weapons. I -- typically, when $I$ hear about a scenario like this where it's cops getting killed, sometimes there's assault weapons. Sometimes it's a handgun. Sometimes the officer was disarmed and killed with his own handgun,
unfortunately. But there are more and more of these anti-law-enforcement shootings using assault weapons now, and there are a lot more of these mass shootings which involve multiple victims that are happening, it appears, just with a lot greater frequency that are using these weapons that if they were weapons that were found in California, we would call them an assault weapon. If they're in Louisiana or Texas, they don't call them assault weapons there. They're just weapons in those, you know, states.
Q. So it's your understanding that there's an increase in mass shooting incidents?
A. It's a perceived increase on my part.
Q. Okay. You haven't done any research or studies to confirm whether there is an increase or not?
A. No. I don't have time for that.
Q. I hear you.
(Pause on the record.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. And so would it be fair to say also that you wouldn't know whether more mass shootings are perpetrated with non-assault weapons versus assault weapons?
A. My perception is -- I don't know if it's an equal number, but the ones where there's many casualties -- I'll say five or more people, let's say --
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typically, there's an assault weapon or something we would call an assault weapon in California -- that's been involved. There are a few instances where a handgun maybe with a large-capacity magazine is involved.

There was a recent shooting in Thousand Oaks. That individual had, I believe, one handgun with multiple large-cap mags, and he shot people there. And I think the Gabby Giffords shooting, that was a Glock with a large-capacity magazine. Yeah. During his mag exchange, that's when the crowd sort of jumped him. Grabbed it.
Q. So mass shooting with non-assault weapons happen, right?
A. They do.
Q. And it's your perception that more mass shootings occur with assault weapons than non-assault weapons, though?
A. I would say that at least that maybe the media is picking up on it more and publicizing it. Maybe it's always been happening, but it seems to me that -- because I pay attention to this stuff, but like I said, I don't do formal studies. I'm not a researcher on, like, a scientific level. But in the course of my career, it seems like it's happening more often, and probably at least $50 / 50$ if it's an assault weapon or not.
Q. Understood. So moving to page 13 of your
report. The title, "Assault Rifles are Suitable for Law Enforcement Use."
A. Yes.
Q. So assault rifles have a legitimate use, then; is that fair to say?
A. So in California, there's been a carve-out in the Penal Code by the legislature to allow law enforcement agencies and the sworn members of certain law enforcement agencies to purchase and register them if -if they've had to make sort of a personal purchase of them. Some agencies will just issue the weapons out. Some agencies don't have the money to do that, so the individual police officers or deputies can make a purchase with agency letterhead.
Q. But the policy choice to allow that exception for police officers to acquire assault rifles for duty use suggests that those rifles have a useful, legitimate law enforcement purpose; is that fair to say?
A. Sure. Yeah.
Q. And that is because they are effective for defending against criminals; is that fair to say?
A. Yes.
Q. And while, granted, police officers come into contact with criminals, as an individual, I'd have much more -- much more common daily rate than would your
normal, everyday citizen. When a citizen does face a criminal, it is the same criminal as those that law enforcement face; isn't that fair to say?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague.

THE WITNESS: There might be certain scenarios that a civilian might encounter a person with a weapon or some other threatening object.

An extreme example might be like some kind of a home invasion whether it be they meant to go to that house and try to rob them because there's a marijuana grow in that house or maybe it's a mistaken identity. They thought that was the marijuana grow's house, but it's actually next door. Things like that can sort of happen where there's a group of individuals that try to take over a house. But for the most part, law enforcement is in a unique spot with sometimes daily contact with armed criminals. Some of these armed criminals have acquired -- through usually illegitimate methods -- handguns, shotguns, rifles, assault rifles, etcetera.

The average citizen probably is not going to go through life having a criminal point of weapon at them. It does happen, but -- excuse me -- law enforcement is much more likely, in my opinion, to encounter armed resistance or gunfire.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Sure. I think I conceded that they're more likely to.
A. Yeah.
Q. My question is, once the -- once it happens -because obviously at least some average citizens face criminals, right? There's a thousands of murders every year. There's thousands of robberies, thousands of rapes, thousands of all sorts of terrible crimes on non-peace officers, right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. So the public does come into contact with these dangerous people, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in those instances, once defense is called for, what is the difference between a law enforcement officer and a civilian in using deadly force when it's called for? They both want to end the threat, right? What's the goal of using deadly force?
A. Yeah. End the threat. That might be by making him run away or it might result in gunfire.
Q. Yeah. And the goal is to -- at least for the civilian, to make the bad guy go -- whether it's run away or -- or -- or drop dead, that's the goal of the civilian; whereas, the police officer may need to
detain -- doesn't want the bad guy necessarily to run away because then he could be a danger to others, right?
A. Generally, yeah.
Q. So there is -- so a peace officer does have more -- slightly more -- well, significantly more reason to -has more responsibility when there's an encounter like this. But in order to just simply defend, they're in the same shoes, right? A police officer and a civilian, they're in the same shoes as far as wanting to put down the threat, right, or stop the threat?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical.
THE WITNESS: It's a lot more complicated for law enforcement. Law enforcement has to deal with policies and procedures and the Penal Code and the various exemptions that may or may not exist given the situation. A civilian also might have a justifiable reason to pull a weapon on somebody or, you know, shoot somebody. Each group could have a basic fear of death or great bodily injury. Something like that. And both groups might have a need to stop the threat with a firearm. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Have you ever had a gun pointed at you by a bad guy?
A. Not that $I$ know of.
Q. That's -- that's kind of spooky.
A. Yeah. I've had a lot of people talk to me through partially closed doors.
Q. Yeah. And you don't know what they had behind the door?
A. Yeah. Or through a security screen with very tight mesh that you can't see other than an outline. I can say that I've found loaded weapons in rooms where there was a person there that would have had the ability to set guns down. I found weapons on people when I've arrested them, like down the front of their pants, for example, stuff like that.

But to your point, $I$ don't think I've had a weapon pointed at me. I can think of definitely people being armed with guns on their person, and we found them after the search of the person.
Q. Are you aware if any of your fellow -- how many fellow DOJ special agents are there?
A. I don't know. Maybe statewide and across all of our bureaus -- firearms is just one bureau -- maybe there's 300 to 350.
Q. Are you aware of any of them who have had firearms pointed at them by bad guys?
A. I'm trying to think of -- I can say a few of the retired people. I don't know about active people, but I
know that there have been exchanges of gunfire between agents and bad guys. Multiple agents that $I$ know of have been shot.
Q. Mr. Helsley being one of them?
A. He's one of the -- yeah -- the people that come to mind.
Q. So would you say it's rare for a DOJ special agent to get in a gunfight with a criminal?
A. I think it's rare for law enforcement to probably get in a gunfight. I would include DOJ agents in that group. Sometimes it's about where you're working and who you're targeting with that particular investigation. If you're doing white collar crime and that's your thing or welfare fraud, you may not get into a whole lot of gun fights. But if you're out contacting street criminals or chasing murderers, then the likelihood goes up.
Q. I don't know if I'd execute a warrant on Martha Stewart, but I'll defer to you as the expert on that.
A. Okay.
Q. So you say on page 13 and paragraph 43, "Law enforcement personnel undergo regular specialized training to safely and effectively use assault weapons." Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What type of training is that?
A. So California has a thing called the Peace Officer Standards and Training or POST. There's a POST mandated class that you have to go to for basically rifles, and that's sort of a minimal level of training. Generally, each agency will have some kind of qualification requirements. DOJ, we do it typically four times a year. I think the POST minimum is a couple times a year. We do it a little bit more than the minimum mandatory because of cost. Some agencies don't end up doing more than two. Some agencies have 7,000 peace officers, so they are constantly qualifying people nearly 365 days a year. That's not the case for my agency, though.
Q. What's the case for your agency?
A. We go quarterly. Each office would get everybody done and then go back to normal business routine.
Q. Okay. It says you're trained to consider the backdrop, which is the area behind whatever is being aimed at, to make sure persons or property are not needlessly injured or damaged, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't that true for all firearms, that you should be concerned about the backdrop? I mean, is that
a problem that's unique to assault weapons?
A. No. It's a statement that could be applied to any firearm.

MR. BRADY: Okay. So I can tell you that I'm about to ask some questions on the final paragraph of your report, which will then lead me into another subject that that relates to. So if anybody wants to take a break, now might be a good time. Otherwise, I can try to --

THE WITNESS: Let's just do a five-minute. MR. BRADY: Sure.
(Recess from 3:55 p.m. to 4:02 p.m.) BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Back on the record. Going to the last page of your report, page 14, paragraph 45. You conclude your report by saying, "It is my opinion that the provisions of California Assault Weapons Control Act challenged by plaintiffs in this case enhances public safety by limiting prohibited weapons that are unreasonably dangerous for unrestricted civilian use and are often used by those who intend on committing crimes such as mass shootings."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So what makes those weapons unreasonably
dangerous for civilians to use?
A. Well, if the various features enhance, you know, whether it be ergonomically or whatever, it enhances the shooter's ability to, in a sense, hit what they're shooting at because of generally the -- if there's a detachable magazine or a nonfixed magazine in play, the volume of fire coming out of these is often more than a non-assault weapon. And I'm saying there it's unrestricted civilian use. They've chosen to allow registration of certain -- over certain period of times.
Q. Okay. That's actually an interesting point. So when you -- I was going to ask you about the word "unrestricted." So you're -- when you say "unrestricted," you're basing -- are you saying that those who do not register them?
A. Yeah. There's sort of two factors in play. You've got a group of people that choose to not register for whatever reason. If you go to, at some point, try to sell your weapon and you ignored the law or whatever the deal is, the gun store shouldn't accept your unregistered assault weapon because they would be putting their license and permit in jeopardy.

A person that did register their weapon can take it to that store for repair or sales legitimately, and the store can accept it and not be in fear of losing
their license or permits. So that's one aspect of it.

Registered assault weapon use and transportation is limited. There's a Penal Code section -- there's a specific Penal Code that says what you can do. Basically to and from your residence to a location which you're going to use the weapon in basically target practice. That kind of a general thing. That's a permitted use of a generally restricted weapon. But if it's registered, you're allowed to do $X, Y$, and $Z$ with it.

So the unrestricted civilian use, at this point, is sort of also over the years various types, Category 1, 2, 3, and now, as you said earlier, the bullet button guns, those are all sort of -- they've been restricted sort of like different bites of the apple. Something that met the definition of 30515 can no longer be sold since 1/1/17.

Other weapons that shoot the same ammunition that are also semiautomatic, they can be sold, or they have a fixed magazine that has less than ten-round capacity in it. It may have similar features to some of the prohibited weapons.

So there are restrictions put on some of these that in a sense kind of one way or the other, there's some -- $I$ don't know if you call it "mitigation." By fixing the magazine down to ten rounds, let's say, the
reload is much slower.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any registered assault rifles that have been used in violent crimes?
A. That's a good question. Possession, yes. But possession is not a violent crime. I don't know -- I don't know if $I$ have a specific example.
Q. Would it be fair to say that violent crime by registered assault weapon owners is probably low?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. I mean -- let me strike that.

Have you -- you can't think of an example of a registered assault weapon owner committing a violent crime with the assault weapon, right?
A. Right. But the problem with sort of my answer is there's no reporting mechanism for what you're asking for. There are various things that the state legislature has made law enforcement do over the years. We have sort of like traffic stop reporting. We have use of force reporting.

I'm not aware of a mandate that says police, sheriffs, etcetera, must report up to DOJ every time a registered or unregistered assault weapon is in use in a crime, whether it be a possession crime or a violent act. Something like that $I$ could -- maybe I could reference a
report that we would put out, you know, but we don't have that. There's nothing like that that's out there.
Q. Got it. Would your opinion in paragraph 45 change at all if it was restricted civilian use of these weapons whereby you -- the public could still acquire them, but they would always have to register them in the manner that they did when registration periods are open, and they were limited to the use of them in the way that you describe the Penal Code currently limits the use of assault weapons?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: You said would I be opposed? Is that what your question was? BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Yeah. Would it change your opinion in paragraph 45?
A. I guess I would have to see if there was a bill proposed by a member of the legislature. I would have to see that and digest what kind of language that carried because just about with any law that comes through, we have to think on multiple levels. Does it touch a database that we already have? Does it have an implication to the courts? To the DA's offices? To local law enforcement? Kind of all these different groups.

Right now, we deny about one and a half percent of the people that try to buy a gun. I don't know what our -- our rate of putting someone into APPS is, for example. I don't think we have that knowledge or data in our systems. Let's say there's three million to six million gun owners, you know, amongst our databases. I don't know at what point -- like, what percentage of them fail now and if they are already a registered assault weapon owner or are they just a handgun owner and those types of things.

So it's hard for me to make a broad statement, which $I$ think it would be a very broad statement to answer you question on would $I$ be in favor of -- it sounds like it's kind of like an enhanced firearm ownership status for certain people that could pass -are you talking like an enhanced background check or something?
Q. Well, what $I$ was suggesting is basically after SB880, everybody had -- acquired -- there was a year and a half, right, to acquire more bullet button rifles, and then you had to register them by July 1st, 2017, right? Or '18? I forget what --
A. No. So the acquisition window closed December 31st of '16. That law was signed in somewhere after July of '16. So at the most, it was five, six months.
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Q. So all I'm saying is, would your opinion in paragraph 45 of your report change if the acquisition window never closed but people still had to register every assault weapon they acquired and they were still restricted in their use to the -- the uses that you indicated the Penal Code already restricts them to?
A. I mean, we already have DROSes -- dealer records of sale -- which is not the same as a registration. An assault weapon status carries -- I don't know if it's a burden, per se, but there are limited uses, but there's also restrictions placed on who you can transfer them to. Things like that. If your survivors come across the weapon after you pass on, they only have 90 days to get rid of that weapon lawfully, etcetera. A normally DROS'd, let's say, long gun of some kind that isn't an assault weapon, there's freedom to transfer it and so forth.

I don't know. I would have to see the language in a bill like that before $I$ could really offer anything useful.
Q. Do you normally review language of bills being proposed by the legislature that affect firearms laws?
A. Yes.
Q. Would it be odd if you were not consulted for a proposed piece of legislation affecting firearm laws?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague.
THE WITNESS: It would be odd for the Bureau of
Firearms to not be made aware of something like that. Because usually in those kinds of bills, we're given some task or more than one task sometimes. Registration or tinker with this database or do this or do that. Create some program that doesn't exist.

If we're told to do something, I would hope that we would be consulted on is this implementable, or is it -- you know, is this going to break the bank? Does it cost too much? Or whatever.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So did the legislature consult the Bureau of Firearms and you by extension when it was considering SB880?
A. Yes.
Q. Has the legislature proposed any other changes or run any other proposed legislative changes by the Bureau of Firearms and, by extension, you for new legislation concerning assault weapons since SB880?
A. Not that I'm aware of. I've only seen two bills that are gun related so far this year, and they didn't have anything to do with assault weapons that $I$ recall.
Q. And none in the other previous two years or whatever?
A. Yeah. And I think 880 was -- we've been still trying to basically accomplish that heavy lift, and I don't remember any other assault weapon related either clean up or fresh stuff that was being thrown our way for consideration.

MR. BRADY: All right. Let's mark as Exhibit 99 your rebuttal report in this matter.
(Whereupon Exhibit 99 was marked for
identification.)
(Discussion off the record.)
THE WITNESS: So I have No. 99 now.

MR. BRADY: 99. Right. Okay. So we are now talking about Exhibit 99, which is your rebuttal report.
(Pause on the record.)
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So going to the end of your report, page 6, your response to --
A. The rebuttal?
Q. I'm sorry?
A. The rebuttal page?
Q. Yes. Your Response to Plaintiff's Expert, William English.
A. Okay.
Q. And you note that Mr. English estimated there are around 15 million $A R-s t y l e ~ r i f l e s ~ i n ~ c i r c u l a t i o n ~ b y ~$
the end of 2018, and you take issue with his analysis in reaching that number because it looks like your concern is he did not account for $A R$ rifles that may not meet the definition of an assault weapon under California, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that those rifles that would not meet the definition would either be featureless like Rifle $A$, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Or rimfire rifles, meaning they don't shoot centerfire cartridges, right?
A. Yeah. If it was a 30515 consideration, rimfire would be thrown out the door.
Q. Or they don't qualify under Penal Code Section 30515 because they have a fixed magazine with less than a ten-round capacity, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I think we discussed earlier whether MonsterMan grips and those sort of grips are -- exist outside of California, and $I$ believe you said to your understanding other than in states where there might also have assault weapons laws, there's no market for those types of grips; is that right?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Mischaracterizes the witness's testimony.

THE WITNESS: I would say that it's a minimal, if any, kind of a market. There could be some. But, I mean, if a California residence moved to some other state and they just have what they had here and haven't changed it out for whatever reason or -- you know, it's not a hundred percent impossible that they exist in all 50 states, but it's just less likely to be in large numbers. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Would -- what reason would somebody have to make an AR-platform rifle featureless other than to comply with California's assault weapon law?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. Lacks foundation.

THE WITNESS: If they were -- if they've never been in one of the states that requires certain gun controls like maybe New York and California on this area of law, I can't see many reasons why a person would change out a pistol grip for a MonsterMan or some other off shoot. BY MR. BRADY:
Q. So There's no practical reason that you're aware of to remove the AR-15 standard features like pistol grips, adjustable stocks, and flash suppressors, right?
A. Yeah. Not since the federal ban has gone away. You know, basically from 2004 to present in most states,
you can just walk in and buy a traditional AR-15 like the one in the exhibit earlier when we were dealing with all the measurements. That's just normal in some states.
Q. But even that the federal law was the reason people had -- had or did not have certain features was to comply with the law, right? It wasn't because of practicality; is that fair to say?
A. Right. It was a compliance thing.
Q. So but for the law, there would be no practical reason for somebody to remove the features that California identifies in 30515 from an AR-platform, rifle, right?
A. Not the average citizen. You might have somebody that's a -- maybe a shooter and they shoot a particular weapon in different competitions and perhaps a weapon would have to be configured a certain way to get into a certain class, but that would be a really extreme scenario.
Q. Got it. And the same with fixing a magazine, right? There would be no practical reason to fix a magazine on an $A R-p l a t f o r m$ rifle if it came with a detachable magazine, right?
A. Generally, yeah. That's not a common practice, I believe, outside of California. Maybe some of the other states they're restricted.
Q. As far as rimfire AR-platform rifles, how prevalent are those, in your experience?
A. I would say -- let's say our department seizes 1,000 ARs in a year. I would say 50 to 100 of those might be . 22 ARs of some kind. The rest would be centerfire variant. And I'm speaking about full, working weapons. I'm not talking about lower receivers and anything -- anything that's not functional.
Q. We'll talk about lower receivers in a second. But as far as fully operational configured . 22 rimfire rifles, so you're -- in your experience, if what you see in your line of work is reflective of the broader trend of AR ownership, you would say that the rimfire variant of an AR-platform rifle is five-ish, ten-ish percent?
A. Possibly 5 to 10 percent. I -- I've never poked around and inside the AFS or DROS systems to study up on that.
Q. Would you be able to determine that from AFS or at least a better number?
A. I couldn't do it. We might have to ask a programmer to dive into something like write code. I don't know that our systems are that capable as they sit there.
Q. So speaking of lower receivers, those can be sold bare, stripped, right, just the receiver?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is a common practice, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And they are probably sold by the tens of thousands in California prior to the latest ban?
A. Yeah. That's fair.
Q. And would you say the most common configuration of those lowers is into a -- a semiautomatic centerfire rifle?
A. If they ever get built up, the most common, I guess, build would be probably semiauto centerfire. Most likely 5.56 would be the -- if I had to pick one caliber cartridge, that would probably be the most common.
Q. If they ever get built up. Does that mean you have experience that lots of people don't build them up?
A. Yeah. They'll lose interest. They'll go through life changes. Divorce.
Q. Get yelled at by their wife?
A. Sometimes. Yeah, that happens.
Q. Just saying I heard it happen before.
A. Right. Agreed. Agreed.
Q. And there are also unfinished lower receivers called 80 percenters, correct?
A. Yeah. Unfinished receivers is a very common thing in California since about the early part of 2013.
Q. And --
A. We've seen sort of an explosion of them -pardon the pun -- since early 2013.
Q. And by "explosion," you mean they're sold by the, what, thousands? Tens of thousands?
A. Probably in the tens of thousands.
Q. Okay. So they're fairly common relative to the gun world?
A. Yeah. My line of work is $I$ see $--I$ see bad guys that end up with them because they want to avoid a background check, etcetera, and we will recover weapons that are sometimes assault weapons that are made from an 80 percenter, as you said, unfinished receiver. But I know that a lot of normal people buy them and build them into weapons, and there's even a serial number acquisition process now for legitimate hobbyists to make their own weapon, get a number from DOJ, and they just can't build an assault weapon. They can build anything but pretty much.
Q. Prior to SB880 taking effect, would you say that the most common result of an 80 percent lower, assuming it gets built and the wife doesn't yell at the guy, would you say the most common result is a -- would have been a semiautomatic centerfire rifle with a bullet button and the features?
A. And this -- you're speaking of a lower receiver with normal FFL markings on it, or are you talking about 80 percenters?
Q. 80 percenters. I'd actually like to ask you about both. Lowers -- a manufactured lower that has to be DROS'd, right, with the markings, you know, the eight -- federal markings. A serial number. All that.

Would it be fair to say -- I believe you already said that it's fair to say the most common would be a semiautomatic centerfire rifle out of those, right?
A. Yeah. I would imagine the vast majority of all the lowers that were sold to civilians through a normal gun store transaction which caused a dealer record of sale, if it was a serialized lower, you can buy as many as you want at this point of those. Sometimes guys will buy ten, and then there would be no more activity with that person unless they started selling guns off because of a life change or whatever.

So there -- most common scenario for those weapons is semiautomatic centerfire, 5.56 , pink, purple, green, black, blue. One of everything. Sometimes you open a safe, and you're like, "Wow. Okay. This guy's colorful with all of his builds," and there's really no difference between all of them. There's a color change, and that's about it.
Q. Got to match, right?
A. Yeah. You've got to match your shoes and belt, I guess.
Q. Could the same be said for 80 percent lowers?
A. I'd say the majority is still.
Q. Prior to $\operatorname{SB880}$ when it was still legal to do so.
A. Right. I'd say the -- the home built guns -I'll go towards the 50 percent, maybe slightly 50 to 60 percent of those were legitimate builds in the sense that they had a bullet button on them. They were trying to comply with the 2000 era law as opposed to the, you know, 880 law.

But $I$ would say as you got into those home built guns, there's more likelihood that you're going to find somebody, in my line of work, that was building it with a push button release, and they were just saying, "Screw it. I don't care. It's got no serial number. I'm putting a push button on here, and I've got all the features," and then they would have all their legitimate stuff in their safe, too. That was definitely more common with those. We didn't see it as much with the serialized lowers.
Q. But they were making semiautomatic centerfire rifles, not rimfires, right?
A. Yeah. Rarely would you ever see an 80 percent
build or unfinished-receiver-type build go up into a . 22 caliber or some other rimfire.
Q. Got it. So if Professor English did not include lowers -- whether they be finished lowers or 80 percenters -- in his numbers, in his figures estimating
 consider those -- those -- those firearms in his count, would he be -- would he have been omitting potentially a significant number of $A R$ rifles that are out in the general public?
A. If he -- if you're -- I think what your question is is that, if he claimed only finished weapons in his numbers, there is a possibility of more guns out there that are not mentioned in his report.
Q. That is my question. Thank you. You said it more clearly than I.
A. Okay. I'm trying to get to the bottom of that. I don't know what -- at the end of the day, I don't know what was really in his pool of guns.
Q. Yeah. I'm asking you to assume that he omitted guns that were built up from lowers.
A. Okay. Yeah. So -- yeah. Possibly there are more out there that are unknown to the government. There's never been tax paid on them. You know, the 80 percents, for example -- or just there was tax paid
because it's got a serial number from Colt or some other maker out there. I just don't know, you know -- is he assuming a lower receiver is automatically an $A R-15$, or could it be for some other --
Q. Let's assume he did not account for lower receivers at all. And we know that lower receivers can be built up into a semiautomatic centerfire rifle with all the features, right?
A. Right.
Q. Or it can be built up into a rimfire nonassault weapon, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Or it can be built up into a featureless rifle, right?
A. Or fixed.
Q. Or fixed.
A. Yes.
Q. Right. But $I$ believe you indicated that the majority of those receivers are built up into semiautomatic centerfire rifles with features, right?
A. But it's a big if. If they actually get built.
Q. Sure.
A. We find, in my line of work, if the guy has ten guns in his safe, there's probably -- maybe it's just indicative of the people that end up in APPS. I don't
know. But there's going to be two or three maybe ARs with bullet buttons on them, and then there's going to be probably an equal amount of unfinished guns that they just didn't get time to build or whatever happened.

You know, our accounts, when we report what we seize, we count those as long guns because that's typically what ends up happening with the lower receivers. That's the way they're DROS'd as well when there's DROS activity.
Q. But if Professor English is omitting all guns built up from lowers, then he is potentially leaving out a significant number of potentially tens of thousands of rifles from his count, right?
A. Possibly.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Asked and answered.
(Pause on the record.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Speaking of numbers of AR platform rifles in the hands of the public, are you familiar with how many AR-platform rifles are owned by Californians and when -harkening back to the beginning of this wonderful day when we started the deposition, we had the exchange about AR-platform rifles, what it means.

What it means here, just to be clear, is whether it's an assault weapon or not an assault weapon, if it's
compliant with the law. How many people have acquired or possess AR-15 platform rifles in California?
A. And we're talking legally registered in the sense of assault weapons, or are we talking about lawfully registered assault weapons, DROS'd AR-platform guns, some of which we will have DROSes for after 2014. But you have to acknowledge there's potentially -- I don't know -- thousands that we don't know about because we weren't allowed to track the long gun sales before that.
Q. Correct.
A. I don't know. I'm going to say -- are we including lower receivers that have not been built into anything in your question?
Q. If you feel comfortable assigning a general percentage of how many of those you think actually get built up because I will, you know -- actually, no. I think we should include lowers because while, you know, building up the lower might have got cut off the honey-do list for whatever reason, that individual likely acquired that lower with the intent of eventually owning one of these rifles, right? Likely. Most likely.
A. Yeah, likely.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation to the original question.

THE WITNESS: I don't know that we've ever done a crunch on the numbers for something like this department-wide whether it be for PRA or, you know, whatever purpose or in response to another lawsuit or something. I would think since the beginning of time, there are probably a few hundred thousand, but I don't know in what configurations. I don't know if all of those would be lawfully possessed or even in legal configurations as we speak right now. It's an ugly population of good, bad, things that aren't yet built. Things like that.

MR. BRADY: Can we go off the record for a second?
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. We can go back on. Thank you.

Okay. So you don't feel comfortable giving an estimate of the number of $A R-p l a t f o r m$ rifles that you think the California public owns?
A. Yeah. We don't have a -- in a sense, a search engine that tells us if something is AR versus Heckler \& Koch or $A K$ or whatever. You'd have to do a lot of filters on the data, and our programers are very busy doing legislatively-mandated things. While that would be a nice to know batch of data, our people are in lockdown
as far as getting certain things done in a timely manner.
All of the registered assault weapons in

California right now are not necessarily AR-15s or their, you know, derivatives, so you're going to have assault pistols in there. You're go to have assault shotguns in there and all the other non-ARs blended into that number.
Q. Do you know how many assault weapons were registered under the $5 B 880$ registration last year, or was it this year?
A. So --
Q. July 1st of this year, right?
A. Yeah. It ended June 30th, so we were already processing applications as -- pretty much as they came in after August of '17. And the staff processed some, and people were getting their letters as they passed the background check, etcetera. I don't know. That's not my function.

At some point, I'm sure they're going to push out a number of either a press release or whatever they're going to do. But $I$ don't know what that number is. Even now, some people are failing the background check. That person's gun will not count as a registered assault weapon because they're now in APPS, so I don't know if that's sort of relevant to the overall conversation, too.
Q. So is it fair to say that you don't know how many individuals registered under $\mathrm{SB880}$, like, had completed registrations as of June 30th?
A. I don't know. Maybe someone on our -- what I would call our program side. I would be on the enforcement side. The program side would be the civilian staff that do the background checks, etcetera.
Q. Got it. Do you know how many people's applications that were filed before June 30 th or on June $30 t h$ are still pending or were still pending post June 30 th?
A. I don't know. I don't know that number.
Q. Okay. Okay. Do you believe that the number of registered assault weapons reflects the number of $A R-15 s$ that are owned by the general public -- AR-platform rifles, assault weapons, nonassault weapons that are owned by the California public?
A. So my best answer for that is some of the registered assault weapons in our database are AR-platform weapons, but $I$ would say there are potentially whatever that number is -- and I don't know because we don't have a search engine to tell us. But there's probably a decent likelihood that the -- the non-AR weapons that are out there that have been built up into featureless, fixed, . 22, bolt action, pump action,
those little subgroups, that might equal or maybe slightly exceed the number of registered ARs we have in California right now.
Q. Okay. So to be clear, the -- the regulations that are Exhibit 94, Section 5471, allows the owner of a Category 4 assault weapon -- what you and I have agreed is a Category 4 assault rifle, which is a rifle with a bullet button, right?
A. Okay.
Q. So those regulations allowed an individual with a Category 4 assault rifle to remove it from the assault weapon definition by removing features, correct?
A. Let me look at this document real quick.
Q. I think there's a definition for your -- just to help you out, that says "featureless," I believe. I could be wrong.
A. Yeah. It's page 2 of Exhibit 94. So Letter O, I guess.
Q. Yeah. Yeah.
A. So --
Q. And I believe these regulations somewhere -- and I'll try to find it -- say you cannot register a featureless rifle, right?
A. Yeah. But it's not going to be in this document. This is a section of the overall
regulations --
Q. Oh, okay.
A. -- that you've presented me with. So this is maybe one of four sections.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding, though, that if you go -- if you have a featureless rifle, meaning an AR-platform rifle, that you take the pistol grip, adjustable stock, flash suppressor off of that you do not have to register -- you cannot register that rifle as an assault weapon, right?
A. Right. The department can only register firearms that match 30515 characteristics. A featureless one as defined in 5471, Letter O, which is the featureless definition, doesn't match up with 30515 .

So we spelled it out in that fashion so that if people got a rejection letter, "Sorry. We can't register your weapon because it doesn't meet the classification," people -- you know, I don't know what the number has, but I know there's been a few rejections where people try to send in an application for a disassembled gun, meaning just a lower. People sent in . 22, which is rimfire, which is -- we'd have to fail them.

Some of the rejections would be because the weapon had no features, per se, like listed in Letter O.
Q. And so people with a Category 4 assault weapon
had the option of going featureless rather than registering, right?
A. That is -- that's the way things ended up, yes. They can go featureless. They can go fixed.
Q. When you say "they can go fixed," what does that mean?
A. Meaning there are -- we call them compliance products out there that change the magazine release from a bullet-button style release to a scenario where you have to disassemble on an $A R$, partially interrupt the action by -- you can remove the rear take down pin. The weapon would hinge up just a bit. And then at that point, the -- it's a protrusion basically that sticks up and normally touches the upper receiver. But when there's a gap there, that protrusion will then fall in the gap in between the two -- the upper and the lower, and the mag will drop at that point.

So that's an example of one of the variants of a fixed mag that I've seen.
Q. And if you have that product on your rifle, you lawfully avoid registering it as an assault weapon, right?
A. Generally unless you put a 20 -round or a $30-r o u n d$ mag in there, then you've created a fixed mag assault weapon.
Q. Yeah. Sure. Let's leave the magazine out. Just the rifle. If you put that product on it and it requires that you pop the upper off the lower in order to pop out the magazine, then you don't have to register that rifle, right?
A. Correct.
Q. How quick can you change -- how quickly can you change a magazine with one of those products that require you to disassemble the action?
A. So there's different versions of it. There are some that have a captive magazine in there, so you actually have to top load. That's -- that scenario is going to be much slower to do a reload. Obviously you have to put between one -- one and ten rounds in there, close it back up, put the pin in, charge the handle up, and then you can fire.

There are versions of a fixed mag out there that the rear take down pin -- they've got almost like a lobster claw scenario where you just hit these paddles, the lobster claws will retract, the weapon will hinge up, and they've even built in sort of like an auto drop feature into the mag well. So as soon as that -- it senses that there's no spring tension right over there near the mag well, it drops the mag regardless if you want it to or not. There's all these little variants
that have sprung up since then.
So it could be -- I don't know -- five seconds, you know, on some of them, and some of them would be much longer.
Q. Have you shot a rifle with that feature on it? With the -- with the rear take down pin that allows you to remove the magazine?
A. One, I think.
Q. Okay. Have you shot an AR-platform rifle with a bullet button?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you changed magazines on both rifles?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you say which one was faster?
A. Personally, $I$ was slower with the fixed mag version than $I$ was with the bullet button version, and I -- when $I$ was experimenting with the various bullet button tools that were out there, some of them -- those were even faster than others. So just like in the bullet button side of things, there are faster variants. And just like in the fixed magazine conversation, there are faster versions. And some accessories you can buy will speed up your reload, and people are coming out with those now.
Q. How much of a difference between the bullet
button and the rear take down pin for you are we talking about?
A. Three to five seconds, maybe. If I really get after it and practice, that might be the difference.
Q. So three- to five-second difference?
A. Possibly. For me with my experience and with the weapons that I've experimented with.
Q. Okay. And is my understanding correct that if you -- like we discussed earlier, if you simply remove the upper from the lower and leave it in that state, then you do not have to register it as an assault weapon as long as you do not reassemble it?
A. That's correct.
Q. Are you aware of any notice that owners of Category 4 assault weapons were given to reregister their rifles as assault weapons when $S B 880$ passed?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Vague as to
"reregister."
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. Let me strike reregister. To register. Let me clarify the -- the law here, right?

When people purchase their Category 4 assault weapons, they were not assault weapons, right?
A. Right.
Q. And so they were not -- if they were prior to

2014, they did not have to be registered, right?
A. We did not have data in the system on their ownership, meaning a DROS entry, because we weren't allowed to keep it.
Q. Okay. So regardless of when somebody bought a Cat 4 assault weapon during the period that it was lawful, they did not have to -- they had to go and register -- take an affirmative step to register it under SB880 with the California Department of Justice, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so they had to know -- in order to do that, they had to know that they had to do that, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware of any notice that owners of those rifles were given to go and register their Category 4 assault weapons under SB880?
A. I believe I'll know of some, but $I$ may not know all that the department took. That was something that our program site did, which, again, is not my function. I'm aware that the department updated our website, which amongst all of the Attorney General's web pages, it gets either the No. 1 or the No. 2 number of hits annually. Sometimes it's Megan's Law, or it's that, the firearms page. So that page was updated to reflect sort of a notice to owners of these weapons. "Hey. Go
here to this special page. Figure out if you have one of these. Here's how you register."

That was done. There was a countdown clock on the top of the page. There were posters that were sent to the gun show promoters, and the promoters were asked to put those at the shows that they were producing throughout the course of the window of registration. Fliers, to my knowledge, were created which mimicked the larger posters. Those were sent to the gun stores in the State of California. Around roughly 2,000 stores, they would have received a number of fliers based on what we thought their volume was. So a home dealer that sells five guns a year is not going to get 10,000 copies because of cost and whatnot. People that had a higher volume store would get more forms to hand out to their customers.

There were press releases through the AG's press office. At least one, maybe two. Probably within the last month or two of the registration window before it expired, there was an announcement then. I'm trying to think what else.

We don't have a -- in a sense a central e-mail address or physical address list for all gun owners in California. There's -- AFS has DROS data on particular addresses for people the day that they bought their gun.

They might move the next day, and that address is stale. So we don't have a minute-by-minute perfect address system that we could, you know, send a letter to everybody with all of their addresses over the course of time.
Q. So then is it accurate to say that the DOJ put general information out into the public about the need to register assault weapons but did not directly contact any owners -- directly contact any of the owners of these rifles to tell them that they had to register them?
A. Yes. We did a public education campaign, but we don't have a perfect method to get word to every single Californian that might own one or have a friend that has one of these, etcetera.
Q. So is it reasonable to assume that there are individuals who did not know that they had to register the assault weapons that they acquired lawfully?
A. It's possible.
Q. And that would affect the number of people who actually registered, and it would lower that number, right?
A. Sure. They could still have an AR-platform weapon, so to that larger conversation. But as to whether they decided to actually register via our website or later convert it to featureless or fixed or
disassemble it, $I$ have no idea.
Q. Yeah. I know you don't -- I wouldn't assume you would have an idea of the specific numbers of people who did that. Just that that would -- those options would affect the -- potentially affect the number of actual registrants, right?
A. The options to --
Q. To alter.
A. -- to do something else other than -- yeah. Yeah. Sure.
Q. And in your -- do you have any feelings or impressions on how common it has been for the gun owning public to -- to do an alternative to registration such as going featureless?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. You may answer if you know.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. All I can say is that there are a number of products that purport to be compliance products, whether it be featureless or fixed, that have sprung up in the last couple years. Presumably they wouldn't be making these unless there was a market. Because you can still -- even to this day, you can buy something off the shelf at a store here that is supposedly featureless or fixed.

So I don't know how much of that marketplace is
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going to guns sold after 2017 or for the products -- or how often those products would have been applied and attached to a gun pre 1/1/17.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Understood. But you don't necessarily need those products to avoid registration legally, right? Like you said, you can take the upper off the lower. You can just remove the features rather than get a compliance product, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And would it be reasonable to assume that people were dissuaded from acquiring $A R-p l a t f o r m ~ r i f l e s ~ i n ~ l i g h t ~$ of the AWCA?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation.
THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't know if I -- are you speaking about the most recent change, Senate Bill 880 where they were -BY MR. BRADY:
Q. We can limit it to that, but I'm talking about generally since 1989 since the, you know, original Assault Weapon Control Act, there's been laws directed at AR-platform rifles and similar type rifles.

Would it be reasonable to believe that people who would have otherwise bought such a rifle said, "I'm not going to go near those things because of California's
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laws"?
MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't know. I mean, I
know of a lot of people who have bought some legal variants, so I don't think I've ever had a conversation with somebody that said, "Well, I only bought this because of the laws on the books, but I'm going to buy all these other things." Typically people will buy what they can find in a store. That's in my experience. Whether it be law enforcement friends or, you know, my neighbors or whoever, they're going to buy what they see in front of them. If they see a featureless or a fixed mag gun on the wall and that's what they can buy, they're probably going to buy some.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Are you familiar with the Firearms Policy Coalition?
A. Yes. I've heard of that group.
Q. Do you look at their materials on the internet that they put up on their website?
A. I've been to their website, and I don't know how many times. Maybe -- I don't know -- a handful of times. If we are either sued by them, I might go to their site or if we are PRA'd by them. Maybe that causes me to go to the site. But there's been instances where I've gone
there for a particular reason.
Q. Have you reviewed the page of their site that talks about what they claim to be key facts and stats about California's bullet button assault weapon registration?
A. If I have, I don't recall right now.
Q. So do you have any thoughts on their claim that only 3 percent of assault rifle owners registered their rifles under the SB880 law?
A. I don't know where they would get their numbers from to do that, and $I$ would struggle as I've had today to figure out what numbers might apply. So I'm not sure where they got their numbers.
Q. Do you know whether their claim that 52,443 applications for firearm registrations were still pending as of June 30th?
A. 52,000 you said?
Q. $52,000--$ yes -- assault weapon registrations were still -- applications for registrations were still pending.

MR. CHANG: What's the question?
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Yeah. Are you -- have you seen that number that they're claiming that there's 52,000 -ish assault weapon applications that are still pending review since

June 30th?
A. No. That's news to me. I don't know where they got the numbers. Maybe it came from the department.

Maybe it's some math they did on their own from estimates. I really don't know.
Q. Are there still people whose assault weapon applications are still pending?
A. Yes.
Q. You just don't know the number?
A. Right.
Q. Could it be 52,000?
A. It could be.

MR. CHANG: Objection. Calls for speculation.

THE WITNESS: It could be. Or it could be more or less, too. I don't know.

MR. BRADY: Can we go off the record really quick, please?
(Discussion off the record.)

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. All right. Let's go back on the record, please. We are back on the record after a quite long and loud fire drill.

So, Mr. Graham, can you still hear me?
A. Sort of.
Q. If -- if you need me to repeat a question or you
don't hear or understand me, please ask me to repeat it, okay?
A. I will try.
Q. Thank you. So going to Exhibit 99, which is your rebuttal report. You state in paragraph 5 that you did agree with several opinions reached by Mr. Boone in his report.

Can you explain what your disagreements with Mr. Boone's opinions are?
A. So he's -- he's speaking in his report about the AR-15 being an appropriate weapon for civilians in general. FBI agents, if they're issued an $A R-15$, have a certain level of training that they're going to have. In general, any firearm ideally is going to have some training associated with it. An $A R-15$ is very close to an issued weapon to our military, and certain people may have enough training to handle it -- handle a weapon like that. The average person -- it probably goes for most firearms. It would be better if they had some marksmanship training for -- in the case of errants rounds or something like that. So that was one thing. He was making a broad statement about "AR-15s are fine." The military issues these weapons and they -they have marksmanship training. Law enforcement issues weapons like this. We have training. I don't know that
there's any training standards here in California or elsewhere that are similar to what either members of the military or members of law enforcement have to do to maintain proficiency with these things.
Q. So is it fair to say that you do not disagree with Mr. Boone's opinion that $A R-p l a t f o r m$ rifles are good weapons for self-defense; you take issue that you have to have a certain level of training for it to be a good home defense weapon.

Is that fair to say?
A. Any weapon would be better off in the hands of a trained user. Could it be the most appropriate weapon in some scenarios? Maybe. In all scenarios? Probably not.
Q. Does Mr. Boone opine that it is the best home defense weapon in all scenarios in his report to your recollection?
A. The way $I$ took his report, it was sort of a blanket approval for -- regardless if they lived in a homeless encampment or they lived in a cabin on top of a hill miles from anybody else. It sort of seemed like a blanket, in a sense, approval from him solely because, well, FBI uses it, so everybody else should be able to use it for the same purposes. But there's a lot of different reasons an $A R-15$ might be used by law enforcement or the military than the average citizen as
we discussed earlier. The average citizen is not going to encounter armed criminals as often as law enforcement does day-to-day.
Q. So if I'm hearing you right, an AR-platform rifle can be good for home defense but is not necessarily in all situations?
A. Right. Absent appropriate training or absent -if you're at the ATM getting money out, it's probably inappropriate to have an $A R-15$ around yourself. If you're -- if you have a concealed weapons permit and you have a handgun, that's probably the most appropriate weapon for that specific type of self-defense.

If you're living in a rural environment and you might have large animals, you might find a rifle of some use. That's potentially more appropriate for that setting. If you're in an apartment building or close proximity to other houses and you shoot and let some rounds off and they get -- either go through the person, they can continue on and hurt neighbors, etcetera.
Q. I am putting in front of you Exhibit 13 which has been previously marked as such, and it is a series of slides prepared by the ATF.

Have you seen this document before?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. So in responding to Mr. Boone's report, which he
referenced this ATF report in, you did not look at the report that he relied on?

MR. CHANG: Objection. Mischaracterizes the facts. That's not what he relied on. That's not what Mr. Boone relied on.

MR. BRADY: The ATF document is not what

Mr. Boone relied on?

MR. CHANG: The test that Mr. Graham is
referring to -- and I'm assuming you're talking about paragraph 7 of Mr. Graham's rebuttal report -- Mr. Boone did not rely on that particular set of slides for the portion of the -- of Mr. Boone's report that Mr. Graham was rebutting in paragraph 7. If you want to provide Mr. Graham a copy of Mr. Boone's report, you may get more specific answers.

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So in paragraph 6 of your rebuttal report, you object to Mr. Boone's opinion that handgun rounds underperform regardless of circumstance; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your issue with that? With his opinion on it?

MR. CHANG: Go ahead. If you need to see a copy of Mr. Boone's report --

MR. BRADY: No. I'm referencing -- I mean, here. Here's Mr. Boone's report, if you want it. It's Exhibit 22. But I'm asking you about your rebuttal report, paragraph 6.

THE WITNESS: Right.
BY MR. BRADY:
Q. You say that you disagree with Mr. Boone's opinion that handgun rounds underperform regardless of circumstance.

Why is that?
A. I felt it was a broad -- too broad of a statement for him to make. The test, as you see -- I think it's line 24 within paragraph 6. It's based on a test conducted during his time during the -- with the BRF, which is the group he was part of. And he talks about a particular round, and $I$ didn't see any data to say how long the barrel was, and it gets into page 2.
Q. Okay. So I believe I gave you a copy of Mr. Boone's report.
A. Okay.
Q. If you -- can $I$ see it really briefly, please? Because I don't think I grabbed enough of these for me.
A. Sure.
(Pause on the record.)
///

BY MR. BRADY:
Q. Okay. So this is what I'm going to be referring to.

First off, in your paragraph 6 of your rebuttal report, the -- part of the reason you take issue with his opinion that handgun rounds underperform regardless of circumstance is that you say that it was based on a test conducted during his time with the BRF that showed a particular 115-grain plus $P$ plus 9 millimeter bullet, presumably fired out of an unarm-type of handgun penetrated approximately 11 inches in a bare tissue stimulant.

What is your issue with him referencing that bullet?
A. So I get into my reasons in paragraph 7 and paragraph 8.
Q. Okay.
A. Can we go to that?
Q. Sure.
A. It's on page 2. So how the projectile performs will really depend on the type of projectile itself. Is there a full metal jacket? There are hollow points and various other types of bullets which are projectiles. He said one particular type, but $I$ didn't understand from his statement here. He says "bullet," but he doesn't say
if it's a full metal jacket. He doesn't say if it's hollow point that $I$ can tell, anyway.

I would have been potentially more inclined to maybe agree or not have an objection if he had identified the bullet type that was going to travel through, you know, the substance. Maybe it was an omission or whatever, but $I$ wanted more information about the bullet type. That's -- that's my issue with No. 7.
Q. Okay.
A. No. 8. Let's see. The main part of -- well, another part of his report, he's talking about the likelihood of a 9 millimeter being a good round -- it was not a good round basically to use. But since that time, there's been an $F B I$ report that says the ballistics for 9 millimeter have improved because of changes in technology with the ammunition manufacturers. That was a $--I$ don't know. It was like a 2014, I think, FBI report.
Q. Do you know -- so you referenced in your -you're familiar with an $F B I$ report that said that -- that you believe contradicts Mr. Boone; is that correct?
A. Yeah. I mention it on page 3, top of -- so paragraph 9, and $I$ think it's -- it's referenced -there's a footnote to the bottom of page 3 about that, $I$ guess, source, if you will. That 2014 report. FBI report.
Q. Okay. So what relevance does this have that -in nine -- what relevance does it have that the FBI went back to 9 millimeter for handguns?
A. So he's making a statement that when he did this test in the past, $I$ think it was possibly page 6 -- the over penetration thing here with a particular bullet out of a particular cartridge was inappropriate. I don't know if he factored in this -- I believe he retired in 2012. This is about two years after he retired. He may have access to this. I don't know. But if he had access to this, $I$ wonder if he would have had the same statement, $I$ guess, on the bottom of his page 6. That was a difference that $I$ had with him over that.

At the end of the day, he may agree ultimately that $I$ felt that this modern -- well, 2014 FBI report says some things that may be at odds with his statement at the bottom of page 6 .
Q. Okay. Was that report comparing handgun rounds? Ammunition for handguns -- the 40 Smith \& Wesson, the . 45 auto, and the 9 millimeter -- or was it also comparing ammunition for handguns with rifles?
A. I recall it being a handgun-based sort of report that rolled out. I don't have a copy of it in front of me, and it's been probably a month and a half since I've looked at the thing, so...
Q. Is this footnote on the bottom of page 3, is that the $F B I$ report that you --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But so assuming it's only comparing handgun rounds and not comparing the ammo that they're using in handguns with rifles, then isn't that report apples and oranges with Mr. Boone's report that was comparing . 223 rounds out of a rifle with handgun rounds?
A. His statement to me sort of leads the reader to -- down a path that doesn't bring into the fact of a more recent report by his own former agency. Maybe that was an oversight or maybe it was his intention. I don't know. I've never met the man. I didn't have a way to ask him that.

But $I$ was concerned that he didn't factor in this -- it's been a fairly big news that the FBI has gone to the 9 mil, and a lot of agencies are switching back to it because of the improvement in the 9 millimeter round over the last few years.

So I don't know if he's still going to have the same opinion that the 9 millimeter is inadequate or it's going to overpenetrate those types of things.
Q. And in your paragraph 8, you indicate that since 2007, the terminal effectiveness of projectiles has dramatically increased; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Where -- on what do you base that?
A. I based it on the statement from within the 2014 FBI report. A series of bullets -- pardon the pun, but literally it's bulleted out. Various findings. And one of them is that sentence.
Q. Okay. Do you have any -- in that report, did it say whether the $F B I$ ballistic research facility, the BRF had any -- any contribution to making projectiles more effective?
A. I don't remember reading anything to that effect.
Q. So you're saying since 2007 -- that report says, "Since 2007, the terminal effectiveness of projectiles has dramatically increased," right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know who had daily oversight over the FBI's BRF from 2007 to late 2012?
A. I would think it would have been Mr. Boone.
Q. Mr. Boone.
A. Yes. The author of the report in 2014 wasn't Mr. Boone, from what $I$ could tell, so the statements from that may or may not have had -- he may not have had total knowledge of everything that came out in that 2014 report. So that's why $I$ was like, "I don't know about
this," so I wanted to bring that up.
Q. Okay. So in other words, this basically raises questions in your mind about the accuracy of Mr. Boone's report; it doesn't necessarily contradict it?
A. Yes. He may have -- his statement may still be accurate, but $I$ see something here that makes me question it, and I don't -- I don't know why the FBI two years after he retired would -- there's no benefit for them putting out false info or whatever.

I don't think it was his intention to put out false info in his report, either. I know that over time, new information comes available. And if you don't know about a particular new bit of information, you may -- you may not answer the question the same way.
Q. So I just want to focus in on what exactly that FBI says that causes issues with what Mr. Boone is saying in your -- in your opinion.
A. Okay. So on his page 6, the bottom of it, it has the overpenetration paragraph. I take some information from the 2014 FBI report on page 3, paragraph 9. There's mention here about halfway down line 6 or so.
"The report concludes that with modern, properly designed, expanding handgun bullets, the objective of penetrating 12 to $16 "--" 12$ to 18 inches, depending on
the size of the individual and the angle of the bullet path, is realized." In his page 6, he's talking about approximately 11 inch in bare tissue stimulant, and then there's a change in what might happen after going through the plywood.

So I don't know if this is totally -- I'm not sure how to say this. But the -- the data in the 2014 FBI report caused me to question that area of his report.
Q. Okay. Question but not necessarily contradict, right?
A. I think the -- I've not been able to ask Mr. Boone that particular question.
Q. What question would you ask him if you could?
A. "When you wrote this paragraph starting with overpenetration, did you have knowledge of this 2014 FBI report? And does -- if so, how does this statement within the report regarding the 12 to 18 inches compare with your statement talking about 11 inches in bare tissue?"
Q. Okay. And to be clear, the 2014 report did not talk about . 223 ammunition at all, right?
A. I don't recall that it did.
Q. And was it talking about the difference in penetration when hitting an -- an intermediate barrier?
A. I don't know if this had intermediate barrier
language in it. I believe the -- his page 6 comments deal with hitting plywood and then the effects of it after that. I don't remember if this was an exact apple-for-apple test.
Q. Do you disagree with Mr. Boone about the penetration effects of .223 versus the 9 millimeter and 40 Smith \& Wesson rounds he was comparing in his report?
A. He is a ballistics expert. I am not. My role here is, in a sense, to review his report and point out things that cause me concern. I don't have a -- the credentials to question his ballistics statements.
Q. Got it. So there is potentially -- he could potentially answer the question you raised in a way that would alleviate your concerns about -- that you raised about his report is that --
A. Possibly. Yeah. It might be a very simple answer to one sentence or -- I don't know, you know.

MR. BRADY: Okay. So in sum -- strike that. I think I'm done.

EXAMINATION BY MR. CHANG
Q. Okay. I have a few redirect questions while you have the reports in front of you. You're looking at Mr. Boone's report, Exhibit 22.
A. Okay.
Q. Actually, look at your rebuttal report,
paragraph 6 .
A. This is No. 99, page 6.
Q. Correct. Or paragraph 6, page 1.
A. Paragraph 6. Okay.
Q. So according to paragraph 6, his -- Mr. Boone's report -- he opined that a test result -- excuse me.

His opinion that handgun rounds underperform, regardless of circumstance, is based on a test conducted during his time with the BRF, correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And it's your understanding he retired from the $B R F$ in 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Boone's report on page 6, as you pointed out earlier, stated that in a test he conducted, the handgun round penetrated 11 inches in bare tissue stimulant, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the 2014 report, $F B I$ report that you also discussed in your report, the 2014 FBI report reported that the handgun round -- 9 millimeter handgun round that they tested penetrated 12 to 18 inches, correct?
A. Yes.

MR. BRADY: Objection. Asked and answered.
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BY MR. CHANG:
Q. So based on the timing of the data, when the report was released, does this -- does this suggest to you that Mr. Boone relied on outdated data in his expert report?

MR. BRADY: Objection. Calls for speculation. Beyond the scope of the witness's expertise.

THE WITNESS: The dates on the various batches of data are what appears to be. It's entirely possible he did factor in the 2014 report, but it's not clear in his document. That's why I questioned it. I'd love to know the answer, but $I$ don't know at this time. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Well, in the report, the part that you rebutted, he referenced that it was a test he conducted. He relied on the test he conducted at $B R F$, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in a different matter, I think you were previously asked whether the -- in the number of -if $I$ mischaracterize anything, please let me know. Please clarify the record.

You were previously asked in the number of AR-15s that you have seized or the Department of Justice has seized, how common are rimfires -- rimfire AR-15-platform rifles, and $I$ think -- I think you had
said five to ten percent, correct?
MR. BRADY: Objection. Asked and answered.
THE WITNESS: I believe out of 1,000, I think I said 50 to 100 possibly, which $I$ think if you did the math would be five to ten percent. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. And I believe -- and this is just a set up for the question. And I believe you were also asked whether that number you think is reflective of the percentage of rimfire $A R-15 s$ versus centerfire $A R-15 s$ in California overall.

MR. BRADY: Objection. Misstates the -BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Do you recall your answer to that question? MR. BRADY: Objection. Misstates the question. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Do you recall that question being asked?
A. I vaguely recall the question. I don't necessarily recall my answer.
Q. I'll just ask you, then.

Do you know what the -- in California, do you know what the percentage of $A R-15 s$ are rimfire $A R-15 s$ versus centerfire $A R-15 s ?$

MR. BRADY: Objection. Beyond the scope of what the expert was called to testify about. Asked and
answered, and beyond the scope of appropriate redirect.

THE WITNESS: My -- my answer at the time to Mr. Brady was dealing with weapons that the bureau agents have seized. As I said, some of our databases can capture certain data, and some are incapable of doing that. I don't have access, you know, at this time to pull the data for specific .22 versus non-. 22 at this time.

BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Okay. Previously, we had talked about the definition of flash suppressors, and you were asked about the -- the definition of flash suppressors in the regulations. And $I$ think at the end of your questioning, you said something about there's -- the definition of flash suppressors was virtually the same as it was before SB880 except there was a new regulation included hybrid devices.

Do you recall --

MR. BRADY: Objection. Mischaracterizes the testimony. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. -- that line of questioning?
A. I vaguely remember talking about flash suppressors. As to what was new versus the old definition, $I$ don't know that $I$ spoke in a whole lot of
detail about -- I did say the word "hybrid" at some point today, and it's in the -- it's in the registration definition.
Q. Let me ask you, then. What is the difference between a hybrid device versus a flash suppressor as it was defined under the previous regulation?

MR. BRADY: Objection. Beyond the scope of redirect. It was not discussed in the deposition.

THE WITNESS: The -- the hybrid devices that I've seen advertised sometimes purport to be a flash suppressor. Sometimes they purport to do one or more other functions such as act as a muzzle break. Things like that. So the -- the regulation speaks to the reader in the sense that if there are advertised, I guess, features of the muzzle device that have a flash suppressing component and other components, it would be deemed to be a flash suppressor. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Okay. If you could turn to your report, page 9. I think there is -- some time was spent on discussing Rifles $A$ and $B$.
A. Just a second.
Q. Sure. This is Exhibit --
A. 97 ?
Q. $\quad 97$.
A. Okay. Let me find those pages. Okay. So I'm on page 9 of my report.
Q. Right. Correct. And we had discussed Rifles A and $B$ with Rifle $A$ being the top rifle, one that is -that is not -- it's considered featureless in terms of Penal Code Section 30515, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Rifle B has the 30515 features?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You had talked about -- there was some discussion about the accuracy.

Does the rifle grip -- or does the pistol grip affect the accuracy of firing Rifle $B$ versus Rifle A? MR. BRADY: Objection. Is there a question? BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Yes. Does it affect the accuracy of the shooter?

MR. BRADY: Then, objection. Asked and answered. Beyond the scope of proper redirect.

THE WITNESS: Depending on the shooter, there may be some benefit to accuracy. It may not apply to every single shooter. Hopefully that's responsive. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Does it -- is the accuracy of Rifle A versus Rifle B, does it affect -- is it affected -- or does the
number of rounds fired or the rate of fire affect the accuracy in -- in -- of having a pistol grip in Rifle B versus no pistol grip in Rifle A?
A. I think I need a different -- that question
is --
Q. Sure. I'll rephrase.
A. Thank you.
Q. So if someone has Rifle B and -- you know, you have two shooters, one with Rifle $A$ and one with Rifle $B$.
A. Okay.
Q. And they're each asked to make, you know, two shots with, you know, two seconds in between each shot.
A. Okay.
Q. Would the pistol grip rifle be -- make the shooter be more likely to be accurate than the shooter holding Rifle A?

MR. BRADY: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Beyond the scope of appropriate redirect. Vague.

THE WITNESS: Depending on the shooter, it may or may not. If there's that much time allowed between shots, you're going to have more time to aim, etcetera. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. What about then -- you mentioned the time between shots.

What if the shots -- the timing between shots is
reduced? Let's say in another hypothetical, two shooters, one with Rifle $A$, one with Rifle $B$, and they're both asked to shoot as quickly as they can at a specific target. Would the shooter holding Rifle B with the pistol grip be more or less likely to be accurate than the shooter holding Rifle A?

MR. BRADY: Objection. I'm going to make an objection to all this line of questioning on the record, Peter, because I've been trying to drop hints that this line of questioning is inappropriate, but you didn't want to take me up on it. We're not here to redepose Mr. Graham. He has provided answers to virtually all of these questions. You may not have liked the answers. You're welcome to take those answers in briefing from his deposition transcript and explain whether he -- what he said was or was not how you interpret it. But to redepose Mr. Graham is simply not appropriate.

MR. CHANG: You may answer.

THE WITNESS: I'm going to -- can she read the question back? With all that, I lost track.

MR. CHANG: Yes.
(Whereupon the record was read back.)

MR. BRADY: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for speculation. Vague. Confusing. THE WITNESS: So I can say that I'm likely going
to be more -- more accurate with Rifle B. The average shooter -- I don't know the answer to every shooter out there in the world, but $I$ believe $I$ would be more accurate with this Rifle B because it's most closely in characteristics to my duty weapon. Duty long gun. BY MR. CHANG:
Q. Okay. You were previously asked whether you can definitively say -- and this was within the context of discussing paragraph 40 -- the incidents you listed in paragraph 40.

You were previously asked whether you can definitively say whether the shootings listed in paragraph 40 , whether the fact that -- whether you can definitively say that the fact they used an AR-15 type of weapon did not contribute to the -- the -- the outcome of those shootings.

In your expert opinion, is it more likely than not that the fact that these shooters used an AR-15 type of weapons with, you know -- with the features, if they used the features -- in your expert opinion, is it more likely than not that the fact that they used those assault rifles contributed to the -- the lethality or the damage that was done by those shooters?

MR. BRADY: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Calls for speculation. Vague. Confusing.

THE WITNESS: Assuming these weapons had a pistol grip and one or more of the other features or just a different feature, the pistol grip, in my experience, aids me in being more accurate, quicker to reload, etcetera. I would think these shooters would have the same benefit from a pistol grip if there was a reloading that happened during their particular shootings. Those reloads probably happened slightly faster than a weapon without a pistol grip.

MR. CHANG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Graham. That's all I have.

COURT REPORTER: Counsel, would you like a transcript?

```
MR. BRADY: Yes, please.
```

MR. CHANG: Yes.
(Deposition concluded at 5:57 p.m.)
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| \& | 223:16 | 200:24 201:9 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& 3:3 17:14 45:2 } \\ & \text { 182:21 206:19 } \\ & \text { 211:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lc} \mathbf{1 1 0 0 0} & 3: 9 \\ \mathbf{1 1 3 5} & 26: 10 \\ \mathbf{1 1 5} & 204: 9 \end{array}$ | 213:25 220:14,18 <br> 15s 87:25 183:3 184:14 199:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \quad 15: 16 \text { 19:12 } \\ & \text { 33:25 44:14 45:1 } \\ & \text { 54:11,16,23 55:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0 | 11th 17.699 | 214:1 | 55:11,20 56:3,11 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{0 0 7 4 6} & 1: 7 \\ \mathbf{0 4} & 60: 8 \\ \mathbf{0 5} & 21: 19 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 100:3 102:7 128:20,22 146:9 146:17 148:12 | 15th 145:3 146:2 <br> 16 39:24 49:6 <br> 61:10 82:8,21,24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:21 57:3,5,14 } \\ & \text { 63:20 67:11 69:21 } \\ & \text { 83:15 102:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 151:8 209:25,25 | 83:2,10,18 84:18 | 185:17 191:2 |
| 1 1:25 15:9,9 | 210:17 212:22 | 87:18 92:7 103:6 | 203:17 204:20 |
| 19:11 33:25 38:9 | 120 147:4 | 135:18,22,24 | 2,000 192:10 |
| 54:10,16 55:9,11 | 12276 11:23 60:11 | 166:24,25 209:25 | 20 17:10 18:5 40:5 |
| 56:2,11,21,25 57:3 | 12276.1 11:23 | 169 4:12 | 43:8,11 87:19 |
| 57:5 58:5 62:25 | 12:24 | 17 96:12 146:3 | 88:15 108:3 |
| 96:11 102:16 | 12:13 54:3 | 183:14 | 128:16 187:23 |
| 163:11 191:22 | 13 100:1 148:7 | 17170 82:14 | 222:8 |
| 212:3 | 153:25 159:21 | 17th 45:20 | 200 3:4 |
| 1,000 173:4 214:3 | 201:20 | 18 166:22 209:25 | 2000 12:22,22 |
| 1/1/17 163:16 | 1300 2:18 | 210:17 212:22 | 53:14 60:21 61:24 |
| 195:3 | 13th 38:11 | 180 3:4 | 62:3,18 80:9 |
| 10 17:6,11 18:13 | 14 43:22 44:4 | 18154 223:1 | 177:11 |
| 18:19,19 19:4 | 73:21,25 74:3,11 | 18th 45:1 | 2001 12:22 53:17 |
| 27:16 31:17 41:10 | 74:24 75:14,20 | 19 1:17 2:20 68:4 | 71:9,18 |
| 41:20 43:10,11 | 92:9 144:6 161:15 | 73:5,6 132:4 | 2002 9:17 10:22 |
| 66:21 92:9 120:12 | 14170 1:23 2:21 | 1988 61:10 | 12:3 13:9 14:1 |
| 122:5 128:13 | 223:20 | 1989 60:12,13,18 | 16:14 37:15 |
| 135:9 173:15 | 14s 75:19 | 66:15 115:11 | 2003 45:1 |
| 10,000 192:13 | 15 13:8 21:4 25:12 | 140:25 195:20 | 2004 14:18,19 |
| 100 28:10,16,17 | 39:24 40:5,17,20 | 1991 115:19 | 21:19 38:11 42:20 |
| 116:25 120:17 | 41:1,6,7,21 44:16 | 1994 44:17 | 171:25 |
| 128:16 131:7 | 49:6 57:15,25 | 1999 9:17 10:21 | 2005 14:18,19 |
| 173:4 214:4 | 58:18 60:5 63:6 | 12:3,19 13:9,21,25 | 145:3,4 |
| 101 37:21 | 77:8,18 81:10 | 62:17 | 2006 43:14 |
| 10:53 2:19 5:2 | 83:16 97:7,10 | 19th 5:1 | 2007 45:20 50:3 |
| 10s 41:12 | 128:20,22,24 | 1:00 54:3 | 52:14,19 53:1,8,10 |
| 11 44:13 49:5 | 130:7 135:23 | 1s 60:16 | 207:24 208:13,14 |
| 92:10 99:21 | 151:12 169:25 | 1st 166:21 183:11 | 208:18 |
| 135:10 136:13,24 | 171:22 172:1 |  | 2008145 |
| 137:1,8 204:11 | 179:3 181:2 |  | 2012 20:8 60:10 |
| 210:3,18 212:16 | 199:11,12,15 |  | 146:6 206:9 |
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| 208:18 212:12 | 27 80:18,22 90:22 | 64:11,16,17,21 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 45:25,25 | 97:17 | 66:3 96:11 115:14 | 4 54:7 61:21 62:9 |
| 174:25 175:3 | 28 103:14 | 115:17 126:22 | 67:7 93:17 185 |
| 2014 27:19 181:6 | 29800 29:6 | 141:4 | 185:7,11 186:25 |
| 191:1 205:17,24 | 2:14 103:11 | 30515 11:21 12:1 | 190:15,22 191:6 |
| 206:15 208:3,21 | 2:22 103:11 | 15:24 32:3 54:13 | 191:15 |
| 208:24 209:20 | 2s 53:16 56:25 | 55:4,7 56:18,22 | 4,000 18:10 |
| 210:7,15,20 | 3 | 61:8 62:17 63:5,9 | 40 19:25 28:9,11 |
| 212:19,20 213:1 | 3 6:4 12:23 | 7:11,17 70:7,14 | 28:14 39:2,11 |
| 2015 27:19 61:10 | $315: 21 ~ 18: 9 ~ 19: 10 ~$ | 70:25 71:7 72:24 | 136:17,23 137:2,3 |
| 2016 27:9,17 59:2 | 19:13 48:8 53:15 | 74:15,18 77:6 | 150:12 206:19 |
| 59:8 60:4 146:17 | :13 55:2,10 | 79:23 96:1 | 211:7 220:9,10,13 |
| 2017 166:21 195:1 | .13 55.2,10 | 102:23 107:7 | 400 37:24 |
| 2018 1:17 2:20 5:1 | 58:3,19 59:24 | 111:20 11 | 415 3:10 |
| 170:1 | $61: 3,15,17,18,22$ | 126:23 127:6 | 43 159:21 |
| 2019 223: | 62:2 63:1 67:4,6 | 129:23 135:3 | 45 161:15 165:3,16 |
| 20th 37:15 14 | 69:21 96:14 106:4 | 136:9 139:22 | 167:2 206:19 |
| 21 55:7 81:5 | 163:12 197:8 | 140:4,21 141:4 | 455 3:9 |
| 211 4:3 | $05: 21,23207$ | 142:13 150:9 | 47 45:21 138:8,19 |
| 216-4444 3:5 | 209:20 | 163:15 170:12,15 | 141:15,17 142:2,8 |
| 22 13:11 26:18 | 3/19/2000 $34: 14$ | 172:11 186:12,14 | 143:12 |
| 57:2 96:11 105:20 | $\begin{array}{ll}\mathbf{3} / \mathbf{2 8} / \mathbf{2 0 0 7} & 45: 21\end{array}$ | 217:6,8 | 47s 45:13,14 |
| 106:7 132:6 | 30 43:9 75:16 | 308 41:21 130:12 | $48 \quad 79: 1$ |
| 133:18,21 173:5 | 80:19,24 85:1, | 30900 69:21,25 | $49 \quad 146: 22$ |
| 173:10 178:1 | $88: 18 \text { 89:11,19 }$ | 30th 183:12 184:3 | 4:02 $161: 12$ |
| 184:25 186:21 | $90: 6,7,14,2091: 1$ | 184:9,10,11 | 4th 45:24,25 |
| 203:3 211:23 | 91:8,12,22 102:6 | 197:16 198: | 5 |
| 215:7,7 $223 \quad 1.25$ | 126:12 128:16 | $31 \text { 91:22 }$ | 5 4:2,7 9:15 26:16 |
| $42: 275: 15,21,23$ | 141:8,12,14 | $\text { 31st } \quad 166: 24$ | 26:20 68:4 69:1 |
| 130:11 134:9 | 143:25 147:6,9 | 32 32:9 138 | 173:15 199:5 |
| 207:8 210:21 | :24 | 33210 82:16 | 5.56 41:22,25 42:2 |
| 211:6 | $300158: 21$ | 34 129:21 133:12 | 130:6,11 132:9,19 |
| 22s 66:24 | 30 | 135:8 | 134:8 174:12 |
| 23 13:20 60:23 | 30505 | 35 88:16 | 176:20 |
| 24 37:16 43:15 | 30510 11:17 14:15 | $350 \quad 158: 21$ | 5/14/2004 45:11 |
| 45:2 107:6 203:13 | 15:10 32:5 54 | $365160: 13$ | $50 \quad 27: 22,23116: 24$ |
| 24.75 83:25 | 54:22 55:17 56:10 56:24 25 57.15 | $37142: 6$ | 120:17 128:16 |
| 26 82:8 85:7 86:18 | 56:24,25 57:15 | 3:55 161:12 | 131:7 134:19 |
| 86:25 87:1 88:8 | 58:19,25 60:8,19 |  | 171:6 173:4 177:8 |
| 103:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 662: 16,22 \\ & 63: 4,7,16,20,25 \end{aligned}$ |  | 177:8 214:4 |
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline /50 24:6 27:25 \& 8.375 83:22 \& a \& 217:24 218:2 \\
\hline \(3: 24\) \& \(80 \quad 19: 1174: 23\) \& 2: \& accurate 7:4 59:18 \\
\hline 0-3776 3:10 \& 75:13,21 176:3,4 \& ability 42:24 90:22 \& 79:19 117:3 \\
\hline 52,000 197:17,18 \& 177:4,25 178:4,24 \& 93:25 158:9 162:4 \& 120:15 121:10,15 \\
\hline 197:24 198:11 \& 83 4:11 \& able 40:7 50:3,22 \& 122:20 123:17 \\
\hline 52,443 197:14 \& 880 26:9 52:17 \& 73:18 83:8 85:19 \& 124:5 125:2 \\
\hline 53 146:22 \& 62:8 115:25 169:1 \& 86:7 94:9 104:5 \& 130:20 137:14 \\
\hline 5471 69:6 71:5 \& 177:12 195:17 \& 104:21 105:5 \& 149:5 193:6 209:6 \\
\hline :22 \& 8:17 1:72: \& 109:5 113:25 \& 218:15 219:5 \\
\hline \%:13 \& 9 \& 6:13 121:23 \& 20:1,4 221:4 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{5 6 2} \& 3: 5 \\
\mathbf{5 : 5 7} \& 2: 19
\end{array}
\] \& \& 126:4 133:9 \& 223:9 \\
\hline 6 \& 4:1 113:7 126:8 \& 140:19 146:23 \& 79:11 106:9,23 \\
\hline 6 16:13 28:19 \& \[
205: 12,14,22
\] \& 173:18 200:22 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{129:25
accustomed} \\
\hline :25 81:2 84:23 \& 206:3,20 207:17 \& 210:11 \& \\
\hline 9:17 202:17 \& 207:18,21 209:21 \& absent 14:14 46:9 \& 117:22 \\
\hline 3:4,13 204:4 \& 211:6 212:21 \& 201:7,7 \& acknowledge \\
\hline 6:5,12,17 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{216:19 217:2
9/11/2014 46:13} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{accept 76:4,5 95:6
127:20 162:20,25} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
181:7 \\
acquire 86:17
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 9:18,22 21 \& \& \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { acquire 86:17 } \\
154: 16 \text { 165:5 }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 1:1 212:1,2,3,4 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(90 \quad 167: 13\) \\
90802 3:4
\end{tabular}} \& acceptance 70:10 \& \[
166: 20
\] \\
\hline 212:5,14 \& \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
accepts 76:9 \\
access 35:18 36:5
\end{tabular}} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{acquired 38:21} \\
\hline 60 177:9 \& \[
94 \text { 68:16,22 69:5 }
\] \& \& \\
\hline 60/40 139:10 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { 69:16 106:1,2 } \\
\& \text { 185:5,17 }
\end{aligned}
\]} \& 37:25 206:10,10 \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { 155:18 166:19 } \\
\& 167: 4 \text { 181:1,20 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 7 \& \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{accessories 22:1} \& 193:17

cating
129:18 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline 7 \text { 99:21 105:20 } \\
\text { 106:6 202:10,13 }
\end{array}
$$ \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathbf{9 5} & 4: 7 \text { 5:6,20 } \\
\mathbf{9 6} & 4: 98: 18,19 \\
9: 2
\end{array}
$$

\]} \& \& \[

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { acquiring } \\
195: 12
\end{gathered}
$$
\] <br>

\hline 204:15 205:8 \& \& 189:22 accidental 118:7 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{acquisition 166:23} <br>

\hline 7,000 160:11 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
964: 98: 18,199: 2 \\
32: 744: 2548: 8
\end{gathered}
$$ \& accidently 85:16 \& <br>

\hline 7.62 41:21 132:9 \& $$
\begin{array}{cc}
97 & 4: 108: 22,23 \\
9: 5,944: 1454: 7
\end{array}
$$ \& accommodate \& acronym 40:13 <br>

\hline 7.62x51 130:6 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
216: 24,25
$$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{accomplish 169:2} \& act 21:2,3 60:12 <br>

\hline 7.62x51. 130:13 \& \& \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{126:16 138:7 161:17 164:24 195:21 216:12} <br>

\hline 70 58:13 146:10 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& 98 \text { 4:11 83:11,12 } \\
& \text { 83:15 97:11 } \\
& 132: 21
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { account } & 170: 3 \\
\text { 179:5 } \\
\text { accounts } & 180: 5
\end{array}
$$
\]} \& <br>

\hline 75 128:16 \& \& \& <br>

\hline 8 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
$$
\begin{aligned}
& 99 \text { 4:12 11:18 } \\
& 12: 20 \quad 169: 6,8,11
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{| accuracy 116:17 |
| :--- |
| 119:11,24,25 |} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\text { action 21:11 22:6 } \\
22: 6,7 & 23: 4,4
\end{array}
$$
\]} <br>

\hline 8 4:9,10 28:7 \& \& \& <br>

\hline 80:17 84:19 \& \multirow[t]{5}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 169:12,13 199:4 } \\
& 212: 2
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 120: 5,24 \text { 121:4 } \\
& \text { 122:18 124:9 } \\
& \text { 127:25 128:2,3 } \\
& \text { 149:2 209:3 } \\
& 217: 11,13,16,21
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 63:24 66:23,24 } \\
& 68: 572: 17,18,19 \\
& 72: 2373: 175: 4 \\
& 77: 20 ~ 85: 20 ~ 98: 4 \\
& 101: 13 ~ 140: 24
\end{aligned}
$$
\]} <br>

\hline 17 103:14 \& \& \& <br>
\hline 204:16 205:10 \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& <br>
\hline \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}
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[action - answer]

| 184:25,25 187:11 | advanced 34:16 | agree 61:25 84:20 | allowing 81:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 188:9 223:11 | advantage 91:25 | 111:22 199:6 | allows 68:6 185:5 |
| actions 131:6 | 92:17 107:5 113:4 | 205:4 206:14 | 189:6 |
| active 158:25 | 117:5 | agreed 86:12 | alluminum 43:1 |
| actively 53:11 | advantages 114:11 | 111:24 112:2 | alter 194:8 |
| activities 16:20 | advertised 216:10 | 174:21,21 185:6 | alterations 86:10 |
| 19:22,23 33:19 | 216:14 | ahead 11:6 76:22 | alternate 34:2 |
| activity 16:21 23:9 | advise 103:3 | 82:5 140:1 148:5 | alternative 194:13 |
| 24:15 176:16 | affect 80:6 88:11 | 202:24 | alternatives 96:1 |
| 180:9 | 93:25 104:10 | aid 80:20,24 92:15 | ambiguous 10:18 |
| acts 81:11 | 135:3 167:22 | 108:4,5,13 | 10:25 33:10 35:9 |
| actual 119:5 194:5 | 193:19 194:5,5 | aided 150:15 | 56:19 58:21 75:9 |
| add 95:5 | 217:13,16,25 | 151:4 | amended 4:7 5:21 |
| added 15:18 71:13 | 218:1 | aids 30:16 90:23 | ammo 39:9 126:2 |
| 148:11 | affirmative 191:8 | 221:4 | 129:11,15 136:4 |
| additional 32:23 | afoul 90:16 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { a i m }}$ 73:12 218:21 | 207:5 |
| address 192:23,23 | afs 51:4,5,8,11 | aimed 114:6 | ammunition 13:18 |
| 193:1,2 | 52:5,6 59:21 | 160:21 | 16:24 38:19,25 |
| addresses 192:25 | 173:16,18 192:24 | aiming 77:1 106:9 | 39:1,20 113:8 |
| 193:4 | ag's 192:17 | 113:24 | 124:21,23 128:17 |
| adequate 132:25 | agencies 9:22 | airplane 35:23 | 130:21 131:9 |
| adjust 96:6 100:20 | 50:20 134:21 | airport 98:23 | 163:17 205:16 |
| 100:22 101:1 | 154:8,9,11,12 | ak 45:13,14,21 | 206:19,21 210:21 |
| adjustable 31:7 | 160:10,11 207:17 | 47:22 61:5 86:23 | amount 13:24 |
| 63:8 74:20 75:6 | agency 44:1,2,4 | 86:24 87:4 97:22 | 77:13 138:13 |
| 80:15 87:7 89:16 | 50:19 65:11 | 97:25 138:8,19 | 149:12 180:3 |
| 91:12 92:20,23 | 154:14 160:6,13 | 140:1,11 141:15 | analysis 27:20 |
| 93:5,6 94:12,20,25 | 160:15 207:11 | 141:17 142:2,8 | 97:6 112:4 170:1 |
| 99:14 107:10,13 | agent 6:21 9:15 | 143:12,24 182:22 | angle 104:19 |
| 108:11 135:5 | 12:5 16:15,15 | aks 87:1117:25 | 210:1 |
| 139:8,16 143:25 | 140:25 159:8 | 139:7,8,19 | animals 107:18 |
| 171:23 186:8 | agents 17:17 31:20 | al $1: 42: 5$ | 201:14 |
| adjusting 101:13 | 38:17 47:8 118:3 | albeit 115:12 | announcement |
| 101:17 | 119:17 158:18 | alleviate 211:14 | 192:20 |
| administered 5:4 | 159:2,2,10 199:12 | allow 107:21 | annually 59:13 |
| administrative | 215:3 | 154:7,15 162:9 | 191:23 |
| 70:11,19 | aggressor 109:14 | allowed 11:3 | answer 11:3 17:5 |
| admit 21:8 | ago 10:9 49:5 | 13:16 44:2 58:20 | 18:11 21:16 33:11 |
| adopted 130:3 | 66:17 138:24 | 96:10,12 163:9 | 83:8 90:1 96:24 |
| adults 142:18 | 140:23 | 181:9 185:10 | 125:19 144:24 |
|  |  | 191:4 218:20 | 164:15 166:13 |

[answer - assault]

| 184:18 194:16 | applies 23:18 | 82:24 83:4,5,16 | 42:17,19 45:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 209:14 211:13,17 | 71:22 87:25 | 85:2,5,10,23,25 | armed 17:14 |
| 213:12 214:14,19 | apply 69:22 70:4,7 | 86:10,13,17 87:4 | 155:17,17,24 |
| 215:2 219:18 | 70:19 102:20 | 87:25 88:3,20 | 158:15 201:2 |
| 220:2 | 114:5 123:1 | 92:5 95:11 96:15 | armor 93:7,8,14 |
| answered 91:14 | 197:12 217:21 | 97:7,10,18 98:11 | 93:17,23 133:13 |
| 0:15 212:25 | appreciate 8:7 | 98:16 99:12 | 133:19,23 134:1,5 |
| 214:2 215:1 | 97:1 137:24 | 100:11 101:16,20 | 134:6,17,18,25 |
| 217:19 | approach 36:12 | 102:3,10 107:22 | 135:4,6 |
| answers 202:15 | approaching | 124:4 130:7 | armorers 39:24 |
| 219:12,13,14 | 125:12 | 151:12 169:25 | 40:6 |
| anti 152:2 | appropriate | 170:3 171:10,22 | arms 85:23 94:4,7 |
| anticipate 125 | 199:11 200:12 | 172:1,11,21 173:1 | 99:12 113:23 |
| antiques 22:6 | 201:7,11,15 215:1 | 173:13,14 178:6,9 | arrest 9:22 20:1 |
| anybody 64:15 | 218:18 219:17 | 179:3 180:18,20 | 103:3 |
| 103:3 110:9 161:7 | approval 70:10 | 180:23 181:2,5 | arrested 10:10 |
| 200:20 | 200:18,21 | 182:18,21 183:3 | 158:11 |
| anymore 47:9 | approxim | 184:14,15,20,24 | arrows 148:19 |
| anyway 104:10 | 84:22 | 186:7 187:10 | ars 98:13 173:4,5 |
| 205:2 | approximately | 189:9 193:22 | 180:1 183:6 185:2 |
| apart 40:8 65:3 | 204:11 210:3 | 195:12,22 199:11 | articles 69:21 |
| 116:21,25 | apps 17:6,13 | 199:12,15,22 | aside 65:21 127:18 |
| apartment 201:16 | 129:17 166:3 | 200:6,24 201:4,9 | asked 7:17 38:19 |
| apologize 89:7 | 179:25 183:23 | 213:23,25 214:10 | 89:6 91:14 143:5 |
| apparently 125:13 | ar 13:8,24 14:3,8 | 214:10,22,22,23 | 147:17 180:15 |
| appear 222:3 | 14:11,21,24 15:1 | 220:14,18 | 192:5 212:25 |
| appearances 3:1 | 16:3 20:17 21:4 | area 12:13,14 | 213:19,22 214:2,8 |
| appears 83:18 | 21:12,20 23:1 | 37:20 43:4 52:2 | 214:17,25 215:11 |
| 136:18 152:4 | 25:12,18 26:12,14 | 78:22 98:25 | 217:18 218:11 |
| 213:9 | 26:17 27:1,7,24 | 109:21 149:1 | 219:3 220:7,11 |
| apple 163:14 | 28:4 30:25 39:24 | 160:20 171:16 | asking 14:7 47:16 |
| 211:4,4 | 40:6,13,17,20 41:1 | 210:8 | 61:14,15 88:10 |
| apples 207:7 | 41:6,6,7,10,12,20 | arguably 131:6 | 112:20 125:17 |
| application 186:20 | 41:21 43:10,21 | 132:13 | 150:25 164:16 |
| applications | 47:22 55:16,19,24 | argument 64:9 | 178:20 203:3 |
| 183:13 184:9 | 57:15,25 58:2,11 | argumentative | asks 28:12 51:22 |
| 197:15,19,25 | 58:18 59:23 60:5 | 64:13 115:10 | aspect 163:1 |
| 198:7 | 61:5,6,7 62:15 | arm 94:14 130:18 | assault 7:12,24,25 |
| applied 161:2 | 63:1,6 66:24 77:8 | 132:6 | 10:4,15,19,23 11:2 |
| 195:2 | 77:18 79:6 81:10 | armalite 39:24 | 11:13,17 12:1,17 |
|  | 81:15 82:19,21,23 | 40:3,13 41:5 42:7 | 13:6 14:5,8,25 |

[assault - awkward]

| 15:1,9,13,16,19,21 | 153:11,15,15,24 | 195:11 | 223:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:11,22 17:23 | 154:1,4,16 155:19 | assumed 142:4 | attribute 138:12 |
| 18:8,13,18,21,22 | 159:23 161:1,17 | assumes 140:14 | 142:12 |
| 18:22,24,24 19:1,2 | 162:8,21 163:2 | assuming 14:24 | august 183:14 |
| 19:6,8,8,10,11,15 | 164:2,8,13,14,23 | 55:24 61:4 71:4 | aurora 99:8,24 |
| 19:16,24 20:6 | 165:10 166:8 | 75:14 84:18 88:5 | author 208:21 |
| 21:2,2,4 22:25 | 167:4,9,16 168:20 | 102:16 123:6 | auto 38:3 45:13 |
| 23:13,18 24:4,8 | 168:23 169:3 | 127:22 147:6,9 | 46:3,6,9 188:21 |
| 25:10,12 28:22 | 170:4,22 171:11 | 175:21 179:3 | 206:20 |
| 29:4 30:12,15,22 | 175:12,18 180:25 | 202:9 207:4 221:1 | automated 17:18 |
| 30:24 31:20 36:14 | 180:25 181:4,5 | assumption 142:5 | 48:23 51:5 |
| 37:16 44:3,22 | 183:2,4,5,7,23 | asterisk 67:11 | automatically |
| 45:5,6,17,19 46:11 | 184:14,16,19 | atf 47:7,20 201:22 | 179:3 |
| 47:4,8,12,18 48:16 | 185:6,7,11,11 | 202:1,6 | available 21:25 |
| 49:17,19,23,24 | 186:10,25 187:21 | atm 201:8 | 35:5 72:7 209:12 |
| 52:13 53:1,19,21 | 187:25 190:11,15 | attach 52:20 | avenue 3:9 |
| 54:11,16 55:2,4,12 | 190:16,22,23 | 101:24 | average 51:13 |
| 55:20 56:11,15 | 191:6,16 193:8,17 | attached 7:10 | 85:5 90:11 103:4 |
| 58:3 60:12,19,24 | 195:21 197:4,8,18 | 63:24 64:3 68:15 | 113:13 116:15,15 |
| 61:3 62:2,9 63:10 | 197:24 198:6 | 118:13 195:3 | 124:13 133:22 |
| 63:17 64:10,17,21 | 220:22 | 222:4 | 135:19,22 155:21 |
| 64:21 65:2,6 66:3 | assembled 65:22 | attaching 101:15 | 156:6 172:13 |
| 66:8 67:10 68:14 | 103:7 | attachment 6:5 | 199:18 200:25 |
| 70:2,13 73:4,7 | assembling 20:9 | 7:9,9 | 201:1 220:1 |
| 74:12,17 76:25 | assembly 26:9 | attack 109:10 | avoid 50:21 |
| 77:11 78:15,19,25 | 65:13 | attempt 18:5 | 144:14 175:10 |
| 79:17,19 85:13,14 | assigned 16:18 | attempted 9:23 | 187:21 195:6 |
| 90:16 96:14 98:19 | 33:13 34:24 | 17:4 126:20 | aware 13:3 98:18 |
| 102:10 107:8 | assigning 181:15 | attempts 78:14 | 114:18 131:8 |
| 116:1 117:17 | assist 82:1 | attend 20:20 | 133:17 140:18 |
| 126:8,15,25 | assisting 9:21 | attended 28:8 | 158:17,22 164:2 |
| 129:22 133:1,5 | assists 123:16 | 45:12 | 164:21 168:3,21 |
| 134:4 135:2,17 | associated 129:24 | attendees 13:7,17 | 171:21 190:14 |
| 136:9,13,19,24 | 199:15 | 43:20 | 191:14,20 |
| 137:7,10,13 138:2 | associates 3:3 | attending 12:8 | aways 32:25 |
| 138:7 139:21 | assume 39:19 | 44:7 | awca 19:17 29:3,8 |
| 141:1 142:14 | 64:23 72:3 75:19 | attention 153:20 | 30:24 73:5 95:25 |
| 144:20 146:12,14 | 75:21 127:18 | attic 37:11 | 102:16 195:13 |
| 150:10 151:13,21 | 137:6 141:11 | attorney 1:8 2:9 | awkward 77:13 |
| 151:23 152:2,7,9 | 178:20 179:5 | 3:8 5:12,15 6:15 |  |
| 152:22,22 153:1,2 | 193:15 194:2 | 49:8 191:21 |  |
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## [b - beneficial]

| b | background $9: 10$ | $135: 11,13,18,22$ | bayonetted $114: 19$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b $1: 232: 2074: 9$ | $9: 11166: 16$ | $136: 2,6,7203: 17$ | beach $3: 4$ |
| $74: 1775: 776: 7,9$ | $175: 11183: 16,21$ | barrels $87: 19$ | bear $132: 24$ |
| $76: 12113: 8,10,11$ | backing $101: 2$ | $135: 12,16,16,17$ | bearing $63: 13$ |
| $113: 13114: 11,17$ | backpack $90: 25$ | barrier $210: 24,25$ | becerra $1: 72: 8$ |
| $114: 21,24115: 3$ | $102: 8$ | base $120: 41213,15$ |  |
| $115: 15116: 9,16$ | backstory $42: 16$ | $121: 14208: 2$ | beefier $41: 17$ |
| $116: 20117: 1,15$ | beginning $2: 19$ |  |  |
| $117: 17118: 10$ | bad $10: 291: 19$ | based $15: 13,22$ | $124: 25126: 15$ |
| $119: 6,22120: 5,12$ | $98: 18106: 12$ | $21: 13,1647: 12,13$ | $180: 21182: 5$ |
| $120: 16121: 10,15$ | $112: 11113: 6$ | $50: 1565: 278: 21$ | behalf $2: 175: 14$ |
| $121: 20,22122: 1,3$ | $114: 25116: 8$ | $102: 21125: 21$ | $24: 12$ |
| $124: 1,2,6127: 16$ | $123: 8143: 19$ | $126: 21131: 25$ | beings $15: 5$ |
| $127: 23128: 4,7$ | $156: 23157: 1,23$ | $142: 5,12150: 19$ | believe $5: 117: 9,12$ |
| $137: 4141: 23$ | $158: 23159: 2$ | $192: 11203: 13$ | $14: 1737: 1839: 1$ |
| $216: 21217: 4,8,13$ | $175: 9182: 10$ | $204: 7206: 22$ | $42: 7,2343: 10$ |
| $217: 25218: 2,8,9$ | bag $90: 2498: 25$ | $208: 3212: 8213: 2$ | $57: 1964: 2065: 16$ |
| $219: 2,4220: 1,4$ | $99: 11121: 2$ | basic $56: 2161: 4$ | $67: 1368: 1670: 8$ |
| $223: 19$ | ball $98: 1103: 25$ | $157: 18$ | $71: 1180: 10,12$ |
| back $7: 248: 10$ | ballistic $38: 12,20$ | basically $7: 5,7,11$ | $83: 986: 15108: 9$ |
| $11: 7,9,1027: 18$ | $39: 14208: 8$ | $13: 623: 2031: 23$ | $112: 6121: 7$ |
| $28: 1934: 1040: 8$ | ballistics $205: 14$ | $32: 2336: 1837: 23$ | $123: 18124: 6$ |
| $40: 841: 2343: 5$ | $211: 8,11$ | $39: 1740: 2446: 23$ | $131: 15141: 22$ |
| $50: 852: 13,19,19$ | ban $171: 24174: 5$ | $52: 2056: 2560: 2$ | $144: 4145: 13$ |
| $54: 5,665: 766: 19$ | bank $168: 10$ | $60: 367: 1671: 4$ | $146: 4147: 21$ |
| $69: 476: 1481: 2$ | bare $63: 12,13,16$ | $85: 18,1999: 5$ | $148: 2150: 19$ |
| $91: 2497: 2,399: 9$ | $63: 2364: 1,10,16$ | $102: 3109: 7115: 5$ | $153: 6170: 20$ |
| $100: 17101: 2,8,10$ | $64: 2065: 2566: 1$ | $120: 8137: 13,25$ | $172: 24176: 8$ |
| $103: 13114: 9$ | $66: 2173: 25$ | $160: 4163: 4,6$ | $179: 18184: 13$ |
| $118: 6120: 7$ | $204: 11210: 3,18$ | $166: 18169: 2$ | $185: 15,21191: 17$ |
| $125: 12129: 7$ | $212: 16$ | $171: 25187: 13$ | $195: 23201: 24$ |
| $140: 9,25141: 3$ | barrel $45: 458: 14$ | $205: 13209: 2$ | $203: 18205: 20$ |
| $160: 17161: 14$ | $58: 1581: 20,23$ | basing $162: 14$ | $206: 8211: 1214: 3$ |
| $180: 21182: 16$ | $82: 6,7,21,2483: 2$ | basis $6: 19127: 15$ | $214: 7,8220: 3$ |
| $188: 15198: 20,21$ | $83: 3,10,19,21,24$ | batch $17: 2570: 20$ | belt $177: 2$ |
| $206: 3207: 17$ | $84: 2,1885: 2,10,14$ | $182: 25$ | bend $43: 2$ |
| $219: 20,22$ | $85: 1586: 1487: 2$ | batches $213: 8$ | beneath $68: 5,8$ |
| backdrop $160: 20$ | $87: 1888: 7,15,24$ | battering $33: 24$ | $72: 2374: 8$ |
| $160: 25$ | $89: 1392: 6,8,9,10$ | bay $12: 14,14$ | beneficial $112: 7$ |
| backed $94: 7$ | $92: 13,15,18103: 6$ | bayonet $114: 16,17$ | $112: 11$ |
|  | $103: 8,25104: 8,24$ |  |  |

## [benefit - brought]

| benefit 127:9,13 | black 176:21 | 202:12,14,18,25 | 196:15 197:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 128:5 209:8 | blake 1:15 2:17 | 203:2,7,19 207:7 | 198:16,19 202:6 |
| 217:21 221:6 | 4:8,10,13 5:3,22 | 209:3 211:23 | 202:16 203:1,6 |
| benefits 97:13 | 222:1,14 | 212:5,14 | 204:1 211:18 |
| benefitted 98:16 | blanket 200:18,21 | booths 21:10 | 212:25 213:6 |
| bent 43:4 | blast 104:6 | bottom 46:1 | 214:2,12,15,24 |
| best 37:8 90:1 | blasting 136:7 | 143:22 178:17 | 215:3,19 216:7 |
| 117:3 184:18 | bled 53:16 | 205:23 206:12,17 | 217:14,18 218:17 |
| 200:14 | bleed 53:15 | 207:1 209:18 | 219:7,23 220:24 |
| better 42:9 52:2,2 | bleeds 38:9 | bought 20:3 48:4 | 221:14 |
| 94:1,8 107:2 | blended 183:6 | 89:14 191:5 | brain 62:11 |
| 115:4 122:3,4 | blending 85:13 | 192:25 195:24 | breacher 36 |
| 131:7 173:19 | blindfold 149:13 | 196:4,6 | break 30:2,3 36:17 |
| 199:19 200:11 | blindfolded | boulevar | 53:24 54:6 103:9 |
| beyond 35:14 | 149:16 | box 35:24 95:7 | 161:8 168:10 |
| 213:7 214:24 | blindness 106 | 136:4 | 216:12 |
| 215:1 216:7 | 176:21 | brac | breaks 109: |
| 217:19 218:18 | bmg 134:19 | brady 3:3 4:2 5:8 | brf 203:15 204:8 |
| big 8:12 $22: 7$ | board 68:2 | 5:12 6:3 7:1 8:17 | 208:8,18 212:9,12 |
| 26:16,20 35:19 | bodily 109:8 110:1 | 8:21 9:1 10:20 | 213:16 |
| 47:22 179:21 | 157:19 | 11:9,24 25:20,24 | brick 109:11 |
| 207:16 | body 91:6,16 93:7 | 34:7 35:10 53:25 | briefing 219:14 |
| bigger 22:23 88:23 | 93:14,17,23 94:2,8 | 54:2,4 57:13,19,23 | briefly 203:21 |
| 111:5 | 124:20 133:13,19 | 57:24 59:11 64:14 | bring 19:20 22:11 |
| biggest 58:23 | 133:23,25 134:5,6 | 67:3 68:21,24 | 22:13 148:6 |
| bill 13:20 26:9,10 | 134:17,25 135:4,6 | 69:8,12,18 75:10 | 207:10 209:1 |
| 52:17 60:23 | bof 31:20 38:12 | 75:12 76:21 78:13 | bringing 43:24 |
| 115:25 165:17 | boil 109:7 | 79:4 83:11,14 | 44:7 |
| 167:19 195:17 | bolt 21:11 22:6 | 92:1 96:21 97:1,4 | broad 14:3 48:24 |
| bills 167:21 168:4 | 23:4 66:23 85:20 | 103:10,12 106:2,5 | 71:25 88:1 97:17 |
| 168:21 | 86:6 102:1 184:25 | 111:16 112:19 | 166:11,12 199:22 |
| bit 12:13 13:22 | bolts 32:15 | 116:6 124:24 | 203:11,11 |
| 23:6 27:13 33:14 | books 196:7 | 125:15 126:6 | broader 173:12 |
| 53:15 67:11 73:17 | boone 199:6 | 140:7,16 152:19 | broadly 23:14 |
| 84:16 104:21 | 200:14 202:5,7,10 | 156:1 157:22 | 40:23 |
| 105:17 119:7 | 205:20 208:19,20 | 161:4,11,13 | broken 48:15 |
| 120:23 124:8 | 208:22 209:16 | 164:10 165:14 | 100:5,9,10 107:20 |
| 160:9 187:12 | 210:12 211:5 | 168:12 169:6,12 | 109:23 137:15 |
| 209:13 | 21 | 169:15 171:8,20 | 148:9 |
| bites 163:14 | boone's 199:9 | 180:17 182:12,15 | brought 40:7 |
|  | 200:6 201:25 | 190:19 195:4,18 | 73:24 80:3 |
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## [btf - capacity]

| btf 45:12 | bulleted 208:5 | bystanders 126:4 | californian 193:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| buffer 64:3 81:10 | bullets 148:23 | c | californian |
| 84:5,9,14,23 85:19 | 149:10 204:23 | c $137: 4$ | 180:20 |
| 85:21,24 86:4,7 | 208:4 209:24 | $\text { ca } 3: 4,9$ | call 19:1934:5 |
| 89:14 98:7 | bullpup 71:15 | cabin 200:19 | 62:1,9 70:9,23 |
| buffers 95:13,14 | bulls 35:3 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { calendar } & 12: 15\end{array}$ | 103:25 107:13 |
| build 20:15,16 | bump 148:12 | caliber $13: 1114: 4$ | 134:17 141:2 |
| 22:1 66:16 116:15 | bunch 117:21 | caliber 13.11 14.4 $39 \cdot 241: 11,22$ | 152:7,8 153:2 |
| 174:11,15 175:14 | burden 167:10 | 96:12 132:7 | 163:24 184:5 |
| 175:18,18 178:1,1 | bureau 16:16 | 133:17 174:12 | 187:7 |
| 180:4 | 17:16 18:10 29:13 | 178:2 | called 7:22 1 |
| building 33:5,8 | 158:20 168:2,13 | calibers 41:2 | 78:22 107:13 |
| 34:8 35:13 36:12 | 168:19 215:3 | calibers 130:6 | 114:13 115:12,13 |
| 36:21 39:18 91:19 | bureaus 158:20 | calicos 98:2 | 126:22 141:3 |
| 146:19 177:15 | business 160:17 | california | 156:15,18 160:2 |
| 181:19 201:16 | busy 182:23 | $2: 2,9,18 \quad 3: 85: 1$ | 174:23 214:25 |
| buildings 33:2 | butt 81:12 | 12:7 15:10,17,23 | calling 47:25 |
| 35:6 | button 14:12 21:3 | $20: 19,20,2121: 17$ | 114:12 115:22 |
| builds 98:17 | 21:4 25:11,13 | $21: 18 \text { 22:8,24 }$ | calls 25:19 78:20 |
| 176:23 177:9 | 26:4,7,8 59:3,5,9 | 21.18 22.5 $24.1,25$ | 96:19 124:18 |
| built 20:11 64:7,8 | 60:3 61:15,16,17 | $26: 1542: 24$ | 125:10,24 164:9 |
| 66:17,22,25 | 62:4,9 67:24 | $47 \cdot 10,1850:$ | 165:11 171:12 |
| 174:10,14 175:22 | 116:5 163:12 |  | 181:24 194:15 |
| 177:7,13 178:21 | 166:20 175:24 |  | 195:14 196:2 |
| 179:7,10,13,19,21 | 177:10,16,18 | 59:25 60:4 66:13 | 198:13 213:6 |
| 180:11 181:13,17 | 185:8 187:9 | 69:5 77:16 78:23 | 219:24 220:25 |
| 182:10 184:24 | 189:10,16,18,20 | $\begin{aligned} & 09: 5 / 1: 101 \\ & 81: 24104: 9 \end{aligned}$ | camp 37:19 |
| 188:21 | 190:1 197:4 | 105:14 111:19 | campaign 193:11 |
| bullet 14:12,17,20 | buttons 14:18,20 | 114:15 133:1 | campus 99:6 |
| 21:3,4 25:11,13 | 180:2 | 136:19 152:7 | cap 85:18 148:14 |
| 26:4,7,8 59:3,9 | buy 66:21,23 88:3 | 153:2 154:6 160:2 | 153:7 |
| 60:3 61:15,16,17 | 88:12,17,25 90:14 | 161:17 170: | capable 85:17 |
| 62:9 67:24 116:5 | 91:7,21 95:7 96:3 | $171: 3,1$ | 133:2 173:22 |
| 133:13,19 135:13 | 129:9 166:2 172:1 | 172:24 174:5,25 | capacity 1:8 $2: 9$ |
| 163:12 166:20 | 175:14 176:14,16 | 181:2 182:19 | 16:18 25:4 42:22 |
| 175:24 177:10 | 189:22 194:22 | $183: 3184: 17$ | 76:3 126:9,10,17 |
| 180:2 185:8 187:9 | 196:7,8,11,13,14 | 185:3 191:9 | 127:1,2,16,23 |
| 189:10,16,17,19 | buying 89:18 | $192: 10$ | 128:8,14 138:9 |
| 189:25 197:4 | 129:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 10,24 \\ & 214: 10,21 \end{aligned}$ | 147:2 153:4,9 |
| 204:9,14,25 205:5 | bypass 78:15 | california's 171:11 | 163:20 170:16 |
| 205:7 206:6 210:1 |  | 195:25 197:4 |  |

## [captive - changes]

| captive 188:11 | cases 8:2 24:22 | 65:19 77:4 96:13 | 64:13 66:11 68:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| capture 10:8 | 29:1 48:14 82:4 | 111:18 133:2 | 68:23 69:7,15 |
| 215:5 | 86:15 96:10 | 170:11 173:6 | 75:9 76:19 78:9 |
| captured 31:24 | 151:17,21 | 174:8,11 175:24 | 78:20 91:14 96:19 |
| car 38:21 39:15 | casualties 152:25 | 176:10,20 177:23 | 96:23 106:1 |
| 129:13 | casualty 151:19 | 179:7,20 214:10 | 112:14 115:9 |
| carbine 87:17 | cat 15:9,16,21,21 | 214:23 | 124:18 125:10,24 |
| care 177:17 | 19:11,12 56:2,3,11 | central 1:2 2:2 | 140:2,14 155:4 |
| cared 41:25 | 56:11,21,21,21 | 192:22 | 157:11 164:9 |
| career 7:5 23:15 | 57:3,3 60:15 67:4 | cerakote 67:1 | 165:11 168:1 |
| 28:13 31:9,18 | 67:6,6,6 102:16,17 | ceramic 134:12 | 170:24 171:12 |
| 57:8 129:6 153:22 | 191:6 | certain 15:23 | 180:15 181:24 |
| carried 165:19 | categories 48:15 | 50:17 54:11 77:15 | 190:17 194:15 |
| carries 167:9 | 48:15 107:20 | 96:2 101:3 114:14 | 195:14 196:2 |
| carry 30:10,19,21 | 137:15 | 115:12,22 118:1 | 197:21 198:13 |
| carrying 31:12 | category 12:23 | 123:24 130:21,22 | 202:3,8,24 211:20 |
| 33:18 35:2 126:2 | 15:9,21 19:10,13 | 130:22 154:8 | 213:1,13 214:6,13 |
| cartridge 41:21 | 48:20,21 53:15,16 | 155:5 162:10,10 | 214:16 215:9,21 |
| 75:13 174:13 | 54:10,11,13,16,16 | 166:15 171:15 | 216:18 217:15,23 |
| 206:7 | 55:2,9,9,10, 11, 11 | 172:5,16,17 183:1 | 218:22 219:18,21 |
| cartridges 130:14 | 55:20 56:15 57:5 | 199:13,16 200:8 | 220:6 221:10,15 |
| 130:15 131:23 | 57:5 58:3,5,19 | 215:5 | change 13:20 |
| 170:11 | 59:24 61:3,15,17 | certainly 23:3 | 18:19 21:2 25:9 |
| carve 154:6 | 61:18,20,21,22 | 88:8 98:14 | 25:10 58:23 71:20 |
| carved 51:19 | 62:2,9,25 63:1 | certificate 32:12 | 73:23 79:9 89:13 |
| 109:20 | 96:11,14 98:10 | 32:14 | 90:11 92:2 93:14 |
| carving 87:24 88:4 | 163:11 185:6,7,11 | certified 2:21 | 93:21 95:17 116:4 |
| 128:23 | 186:25 190:15,22 | 223:1 | 116:5 118:15,25 |
| carvings 84:13 | 191:15 | certify 223:2,10 | 119:11,13 120:14 |
| 122:11 | cats 56:25 | chains 26:16 | 141:22 142:4 |
| case 1:7 2:7 5:11 | caught 144:13 | challenge 107:7 | 143:11,13 144:22 |
| 8:5 17:7 29:16 | 145:13 | challenged 161:17 | 165:4,15 167:2 |
| 35:3 46:22 47:14 | cause 43:6 211:10 | chamber 118:5 | 171:18 176:18,24 |
| 48:5,23,24,25 51:9 | caused 20:4 | chambered 41:20 | 187:8 188:7,8 |
| 51:22 55:8 65:23 | 176:13 210:8 | chance 26:20 | 195:16 210:4 |
| 86:21 89:16 | causes 93:10 | 107:2 | changed 26:6,10 |
| 112:24 145:21 | 196:24 209:16 | chang 3:8 4:3 6:18 | 171:4 189:12 |
| 146:2 149:2 151:8 | ccr 71:5 | 8:13 10:18,25 | changes 58:15 |
| 151:9 160:13,15 | cell 148:20 | 11:5,11 25:19,22 | 66:14 77:24 116:1 |
| 161:18 199:20 | centerfire 26:21 | 33:10 35:9 56:19 | 147:1,11 168:17 |
|  | 56:16,23 57:1,9 | 57:17,20 58:21 | 168:18 174:17 |
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[changes - come]

| 205:15 | 201:1 | classified 57:4 | 58:18 60:8 62:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| changing 26:4 | citizens 52:9 | 96:14 | 62:17 63:3,5,16 |
| 116:2,3 149:18 | 148:21 156:6 | classify 85:18 | 64:11 66:3 69:5 |
| chaos 142:16 | city $222: 9$ | claw 188:19 | 69:20 70:13,25 |
| chapter 69:21 | civilian 50:6,14 | claws 188:20 | 71:674:15,18 |
| characteristics | 107:3 109:21 | clean 169:4 | 77:6 82:14 105:8 |
| 11:22 32:4 57:10 | 131:18 132:12 | cleaned 132:3 | 107:7 109:18 |
| 115:22 186:12 | 148:3 155:6 | cleanest 101:23 | 111:20 112:25 |
| 220:5 | 156:17,23,25 | clear 14:7 25:25 | 126:12 129:22 |
| charge 35:2 65:1 | 157:8,16 161:20 | 32:23 45:9 92:16 | 135:3 136:8 |
| 101:11,25 119:1 | 162:9 163:10 | 180:24 185:4 | 139:22 140:21 |
| 188:15 | 165:4 184:6 | 210:20 213:10 | 142:13 150:9 |
| charged 65:6 | civilianized 41:8 | clearing 92:14 | 154:7 157:14 |
| charging 82:15 | 130:10,13 | 118:5 | 163:3,4 165:9 |
| 101:15 | civilians 50:14 | clearly 178:16 | 167:6 170:14 |
| chasing 159:16 | 144:12 162:1 | clets 50:23 | 173:21 217:6 |
| check 24:16 50:7 | 176:12 199:11 | click 101:3 | cold 42:6 |
| 50:23 52:20 98:25 | claim 197:3,7,14 | clicks 101:3 | collapse 90:25 |
| 99:1 166:16 | claimed 178:12 | clock 192:3 | 97:23 113:25 |
| 175:11 183:16,22 | claiming 197:24 | clone 121:22 | 120:19 |
| checking 24:16 | clandestinely | close 28:16,17 | collapsed 89:20 |
| checks 184:7 | 18:16 | 35:7 38:5,6 86:25 | 100:6,12 |
| chest 123:10 | clarification 16:6 | 100:25 102:4 | collapses 98:4 |
| choice 120:12 | 137:24 | 120:18 121:5 | collar 159:13 |
| 154:15 | clarify 16:3,7 | 188:15 199:15 | collectible 22:19 |
| choose 16:1 91:16 | 137:22 190:21 | 201:16 | collector 22:7 |
| 130:24 162:17 | 213:21 | closed 53:3,5,7 | college 143:15 |
| chosen 162:9 | clarifying 45:10 | 149:23 158:3 | color 4:11 176:24 |
| chunks 92:12 | clarity 16:7 | 166:23 167:3 | colorado 99:8,24 |
| circuit 22:11,12 | class 32:9,12,21 | closely 220:4 | colorful 176:23 |
| circulation 66:13 | 33:13 35:15,16 | closes 53:4 | colt 43:20 44:9 |
| 169:25 | 36:16 37:16,21 | club 146:20 | 57:15,25 58:2,7,7 |
| circumstance | 41:3,13 43:16,21 | coalition 196:17 | 58:8,13,18,19 |
| 202:19 203:9 | 45:2,12,13,18,21 | coat 90:24 94:15 | 59:23 60:4,5 63:6 |
| 204:7 212:8 | 46:2,4,12,13 47:5 | 121:1 | 179:1 |
| circumstances | 47:24 160:4 | coating 134:15 | colts 58:4 |
| 66:2 100:4 | 172:17 | code 7:21,23 12:1 | come 10:5,17,22 |
| cited 6:22 7:19 | classes 35:17 | 15:10,17,23 44:3 | 12:2 22:17 24:22 |
| citizen 103:4 | 47:13 | 47:10 54:13,18,18 | 64:5,15 79:14 |
| 107:4 155:1,1,21 | classification | 54:21,22 55:1,4,21 | 92:6 114:7,9 |
| 172:13 200:25 | 186:17 | 56:10 57:15 58:5 | 120:16 127:5 |

[come - contacting]

| 129:6 145:1 | community | components | confer 6:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 154:23 156:12 | 43:15 | 216:16 | configuration |
| 159:5 167:12 | companies 40:23 | conceal 90:24 | 86:18,20 88:4,10 |
| comes 60:23 | company 95:9 | 14:1 | 88:12 89:1,4,9,20 |
| 165:20 209:12 | 134:20 | concealability | 90:5,8,13 174:7 |
| comfort 73:9 | company's 95:7 | 80:20,25 88:11 | configurations |
| 77:25 80:12 | comparable | 90:21,23 91:18 | 182:7,9 |
| comfortable 49:10 | 135:24 | 96:16 97:12,20 | configured 26:12 |
| 73:23 79:14 80:5 | comparatively | 121:4 127:8,8 | 124:1 172:16 |
| 80:10 100:23 | 143:18 | concealable 87:14 | 73:10 |
| 120:8 122:1 | compare 210:17 | 88:14,23 89:3,10 | confined 36:9 |
| 181:15 182:17 | comparing 206:18 | 90:4,20 91:10,13 | confines 38:5 |
| coming 24:21 54:6 | 206:20 207:4,5,8 | 98:14 | confirm 17:17 |
| 120:21,25 123:8 | 211:7 | concealed 87:14 | 52:25 82:5 152:15 |
| 129:7 133:25 | comparison | 201:10 | confusing 219:24 |
| 134:4 148:24 | 117:14,19 119:23 | concealment 92:4 | 220:25 |
| 162:7 189:23 | competently 50:4 | conceded 156:2 | confusion 137:17 |
| commando 58:7 | competition | concern 47:5 48:3 | consider 49:19,24 |
| 60:6 | 122:17 | 170:2 211:10 | 51:10 53:18 66:8 |
| commas 48:16 | competitions | concerned 47:9 | 132:19 137:25 |
| comment 72:13 | 72:15 | 3:5 105:14 | 160:19 178:7 |
| 109:22 | complete 32:11 | 160:25 207:15 | consideration |
| comments 211:1 | 54:9 | concerning 168:20 | 169:5 170:12 |
| committing | completed 32:9 | concerns 107:24 | considered 15:18 |
| 161:21 164:13 | 37:16 39:23 43:15 | 211:14 | 55:20 63:10,17 |
| common 10:4,16 | 44:16 184:3 | concert 148:9,25 | 102:10 217:5 |
| 10:22 11:1,15 | completely 89:20 | conclude 161:15 | considering |
| 13:19,22 19:9 | 121:8 125:7 | concluded 221:16 | 168:14 |
| 20:24 21:9,18 | compliance 172:8 | concludes 209:23 | consistent 71:16 |
| 23:16,16 40:10 | 187:7 194:18 | concrete 43:2 | consistently 130:5 |
| 42:3 57:9 68:2 | 195:8 | conditions 103:23 | conspicuously |
| 86:23 154:25 | compliant 78:23 | 106:8,21,24 132:4 | 68:5 72:23 |
| 172:23 174:2,7,10 | 81:1 | 146:18 | constantly 160:12 |
| 174:13,24 175:7 | complicated | conduct 16:20 | consult 168:13 |
| 175:21,23 176:9 | 105:10 157:12 | 23:8 36:18 | consulted 167:24 |
| 176:19 177:21 | comply 171:10 | conducted 31:18 | 68 |
| 194:12 213:24 | 172:6 177:11 | 23:14 204:8 | contact 20:4 |
| commonality | complying 111:10 | 12:8,15 213:15 | 154:24 155:17 |
| 126:24 | component 57:1 | 213:16 | 156:12 193:8,9 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { commonly } 10: 16 \\ 12: 246: 21 \end{gathered}$ | 216:16 | conducting 34:6 | contacting 159:15 |

[contained - dangerous]

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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[dark - designated]

| dark 146:6 darker 104:1 | dealers 16:21 23:9 dealerships 26:24 | definite 129:16 definitely 22:23 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 213:23 } \\ \text { department's } & 6: 15 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| data 17:22 18:1 | dealing 7:25 10:2 | 52:7,8 93:9 146:4 | 109:4 |
| 23:22 47:2 52:12 | 43:8,10 112:23 | 150:1 158:14 | depend 126:2 |
| 59:17,20 147:18 | 172:2 215:3 | 177:20 | 204:21 |
| 166:4 182:23,25 | deals 70:1 | definition 11:1,16 | dependent 124:20 |
| 191:2 192:24 | dealt 42:23 46:14 | 11:25 12:17 14:9 | depending 12:15 |
| 203:16 210:7 | death 143:3 | 15:22 18:21 19:16 | 13:10 14:4,5 |
| 213:2,4,9 215:5 | 157:18 | 25:10 30:22 53:22 | 29:13 34:6 50:12 |
| database 52:1 | december 1:17 | 54:13 55:12 59:24 | 58:14 84:15 101:9 |
| 165:22 168:6 | 2:20 5:1 166:23 | 68:12 71:12,14,22 | 104:19 113:11 |
| 184:19 | decent 184:23 | 72:18 81:23 82:15 | 123:23 134:12,23 |
| databases 23:23 | decided 193:24 | 104:3 105:10,13 | 209:25 217:20 |
| 166:6215 | declaration 4:10 | 105:20 124:12 | 218:19 |
| date 5:24 50:15 | 4:13 | 136:21 163:15 | depends 52:11 |
| 51:9 223:13 | declare 222:1 | 170:4,7 185:12,14 | 105:7 134:10 |
| dated 223:16 | dedicated 32:2 | 186:14 215:11,12 | depicted 48:25 |
| dates 213:8 | deem 9:11 | 215:14,25 216:3 | 86:2,21 88:17,22 |
| day 17:724:19,19 | deemed 48:14 | definitions 13:12 | 97:11 |
| 107:5 117:22 | 216:17 | 15:3 69:22 70:4 | deploy 32:17 |
| 118:17 141:10 | default | 70:12,24 71:5 | deployed 146:14 |
| 142:17 148:15,21 | defeat 133:13,19 | 137:19 | deposition 1:15 |
| 178:18 180:21 | defend 157:7 | definitively 150:8 | 2:17 4:7 5:21 6:13 |
| 192:25 193:1 | defendant 1:10 | 150:18,25 151:17 | 180:22 216:8 |
| 194:22 201:3,3 | 2:10 3:7 5:15 | 220:8,12,14 | 219:15 221:16 |
| 206:14 222:8 | defendant's 4:7 | degree 11:14 12:4 | deputies 154:13 |
| days 34:13 160:13 | 5:21 | 40:18 | deputy 146:3 |
| 167:13 | defending 15 | delayed 86:1 | 151:12 |
| daytime 116:14 | defense 49:8 | demands 51:18 | derivatives 183:4 |
| 139:3 | 106:22 108:14,20 | demo 41:14 | describe 37:17 |
| dead 104:21,25 | 123:3 156:15 | demonstrated | 38:15 111:20 |
| 156:24 | 200:7,9,15 20 | 47:15 | 141:19 165:9 |
| deadly 109:6 | 201:12 | deny 166:1 | described 54:17 |
| 132:18 156:17,19 | defer | department 13:3 | 55:16 107:7 |
| deal 34:20 35:5 | define 68:3 126:10 | 32:11,12 33:14,18 | description 4:6 |
| 157:13 162:20 | 150:9 | 50:8 51:18 70:3 | 39:19 |
| 211:2 | defined 10 | 70:10,17,20 71:9 | design 97:11 98:15 |
| dealer 17:25 23:18 | 47:18 55:3 72:24 | 93:2 94:21 109:1 | designate 33:21 |
| 23:19 24:1,1,8,12 | 77:5 111:19 | 117:12 173:3 | designated 5:14 |
| 51:1 59:17 167:7 | 129:22 186:13 | 182:3 186:11 | 63:22 |
| 176:13 192:12 | 216:6 | 191:9,18,20 198:3 |  |
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[designed - dramatically]

| designed 42:22 | 210:23 216:4 | disarmed 151:25 | dive 173:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 209:24 | differences 122:13 | disassemble | divert 74:1 |
| designs 71:15 | different 22:4,15 | 187:10 188:9 | dividing 35:20 |
| destroy 43:5 | 23:6 30:19 41:11 | 194:1 | division 1:3 2:3 |
| detachable 56:16 | 41:15,19 46:2,15 | disassembled | divorce 174:17 |
| 67:7 145:18 162:6 | 48:18 52:14,18 | 186:20 | divulging 23:10 |
| 172:22 | 53:7 58:15 61:2,7 | disassembling | document 5:20,23 |
| detached 45:15 | 62:25 66:25 67:1 | 65:1 | 6:8 7:3,8 185:13 |
| detail 105:17 | 67:2 72:7 73:22 | discharge 118:8 | 185:25 201:23 |
| 216:1 | 75:18 79:7 87:24 | discharged 110:6 | 202:6 213:11 |
| detailed 59:20 | 89:5 92:10 93:7 | disclosed 7:13 | documents 6:10 |
| details 99:16,24 | 93:10,12,13 94:18 | disconnect 62:12 | 6:12,19 7:19 8:8 |
| 138:11,14 140:17 | 95:6,12,13 98:10 | discuss 40:25 81:2 | dog 108:21 |
| 147:14 | 107:18,24 109:15 | 112:3 116:18 | doing 12:20 23:20 |
| detain 157:1 | 122:11 124:1 | discussed 40:19 | 24:16 28:13,20 |
| determine 17:20 | 134:11 149:18 | 41:2,10,19 43:9 | 32:22 34:10 73:19 |
| 49:3 144:16 | 150:14 163:14 | 54:17 58:11 61:23 | 100:19 110:25 |
| 173:18 | 165:24 172:15 | 170:18 190:9 | 118:25 128:6 |
| device 104:7,23 | 188:10 200:24 | 201:1 212:20 | 132:5 138:25 |
| 105:7,18 216:5,15 | 213:18 218:4 | 216:8 217:3 | 159:13 160:11 |
| devices 215:17 | 221:3 | discussing 112:5 | 182:24 215:5 |
| 216:9 | differentiation | 216:20 220:9 | doj 9:16 17:16 |
| devised 42:15 | 109:23 | discussion 42:23 | 18:2 38:12 70:1 |
| diagnose 40:9 | differently 66:23 | 43:8,11 46:4,12 | 140:23 158:18 |
| 42:24 | difficulty 148:24 | 62:1 76:14 169:10 | 159:7,10 160:7 |
| diagnosing 43:7 | 149:14 | 182:14 198:18 | 164:22 175:17 |
| diaz 146:3 | digest 165:19 | 217:11 | 193:6 |
| difference 16:6 | dim 144:25 | disposal 132:10 | doj's 16:16 |
| 53:1 55:9,10,23 | dipped 27:13 | dissuaded 195:12 | doj.ca.gov 3:10 |
| 56:15 58:17 61:12 | direct 86:2 | distance 37:23 | door 36:17 99:9 |
| 62:19 101:6 | directed 195:21 | 38:4,5 104:6 | 155:13 158:5 |
| 110:20 113:12 | direction 223:8 | 119:8,10 130:21 | 170:13 |
| 116:16,22 118:20 | directly 193:8,9 | distances 36:22 | doors 38:21 39:15 |
| 118:22 119:14 | dirt 36:13 | 119:24 130:22 | 158:3 |
| 120:3,24 122:14 | disable 126:4 | 139:1 | double 98:3 115:2 |
| 141:22,24 142:7 | disagree 66:4 | distinction 26:1 | 147:2 |
| 143:2,12 144:20 | 200:5 203:7 211:5 | distinguished | downrange |
| 145:25 150:19,24 | disagreements | 120:1 | 104:14 |
| 151:1 156:16 | 199:8 | distracted 125:12 | dozens 21:25 |
| 176:24 189:25 | disagrees 64:16 | district 1:1,2 2:1,2 | dramatical |
| 190:4,5 206:13 |  |  | $77: 24 \text { 207:25 }$ |

## [dramatically - etcetera]

| 208:15 | 105:5 106:8,23 | empty 35:24 | entering 35:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| drill 198:22 | 4:24,25 | encampment | 36:24,25 37:12 |
| drills 119:16 | easiest 130:14 | 200:19 | 8:20 |
| drop 43:161:13 | easily 18:25 87:14 | encounter 155:6 | entirely 213:9 |
| 80:10 156:24 | 87:14 | 155:24 157:6 | entitled 5:20 |
| 187:17 188:21 | east 3 | 201:2 | entries 52:6 |
| 19: | edged 115:2 | ended 53: | entry $32: 9,10,1$ |
| drops 188: | education 193:1 | 47:20 148:1 | 34:13,21 36:8 |
| dros 27:21 173:16 | effect 103:22 | 183:12 187:3 | 38:6 49:15 51:2,3 |
| 180:9 191:3 | 135:5 175:20 | ends 180:7 | 147:21 191:3 |
| 192:24 | 208:12 | enemy 131:4 | environment |
| dros'd 167:15 | effective 35 | 132:8 | 201:13 |
| 176:6 180:8 18 | 36:9 108:6 115:6 | enforcement 17:6 | equal 152:24 |
| droses 27:15 167:7 | 115:7 119:4 | 29:9 33:19 42:4 | 180:3 185:1 |
| 181:6 | 120:13,14 132:13 | 44:4 50:24 64:15 | equate $32: 1$ |
| drum 1 | 154:20 208:10 | 70:7 105:4 109:8 | equates 140:13 |
| dublin 46:14 | effectively 59:9 | 109:16,20 123:13 | era 177:11 |
| due 141:23 | 93:25 159:23 | 133:14,20,22 | ergonomic 76: |
| duffel 99:11 | effectiveness | 147:25 152:2 | 79:9 94:1 113:16 |
| duly 223:6 | 207:24 208:14 | 154:2,8,9,18 155:3 | 122:13 127:9,13 |
| duration 9:6 | effects 149:1 211:2 | 155:16,23 156:16 | ergonomically |
| dusk 105:6 | 211:6 | 157:13,13 159:9 | 73:18 162:3 |
| duty 30:11,17 | efficiency 103:16 | 159:22 164:18 | ergonomics 73:7,9 |
| 39:22 106:15 | efficient 108:6 | 165:24 184:6 | 76:24,25 93:16 |
| 110:7,10 154:16 | eight 45:12 84:12 | 96:10 199:24 | 108:13 127:11 |
| 220:5,5 | 84:21 176:6 | 200:3,25 201:2 | 128:4 |
| e | either | engage 143:1 | errants 199:20 |
| e 6:2199 | 18:15 20:2 30:14 | engine 182:21 | especially 120:1 |
| 192:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18 ~ 39: 1,21 \\ & 42: 165: 967: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 184:22 <br> english | esq 3:3,8 <br> essentially $21: 3$ |
| earlier 43:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 10 \quad 113: 1 \\ & 0: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 178:3 180:10 | $111: 22,25141$ |
| 102:19 114:3 | $\begin{aligned} & : 1015: 1 \\ & 29: 19151 \end{aligned}$ | enhance 162 | $143: 10$ |
| 128:5 140:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 19151 \\ & 69: 3170: 7 \end{aligned}$ | enhanced 166: | estimate 182: |
| 141:21 163:12 |  | $166: 16$ | estimated 18 |
| 170:18 172:2 | 196:23 200:2 | enhances 73:7 | $169: 24$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 190: 9201: 1 \\ & 212: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 201:18 209:11 | $161: 18 \text { 162:3 }$ | estimates 198:5 |
| early 11:18 53:17 | elephant 132:24 | entail 50:2 | estimating 178:5 |
| 148:15 174:25 | elevated 148 | enter 33:4,8 $34:$ | et 1:4 2:5 |
| 175:3 | el | 35:13 | etcetera 23:5 33:3 |
| easier 20:12,12 | employee 223:11 | entered 68:21 | 34:1 88:24 93:20 |
| 37:10 87:1 96:5,8 |  |  | 105:19 118:2 |
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[etcetera - facts]

| 132:13 155:20 | 166:4 178:25 | exist 132:15 141:5 | expressly 55:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 164:22 167:14 | 187:18 | 157:15 168:7 | 63:15 |
| 175:11 183:16 | examples 114:3 | 170:19 171:6 | extended 87:21 |
| 184:7 193:14 | 116:7 | existed 140:24 | 117:1,4 121:25 |
| 201:19 218:21 | exceed 185:2 | expanding 209:24 | extension 81:11 |
| 221:5 | exception 154:15 | expansion 132:15 | 86:8 168:14,19 |
| eugene 42:15 | exceptions 57:12 | expect 50:25 | exterior 35:21 |
| european 131:12 | excess 103:17 | experience 21:13 | extinguisher 35 |
| evaluation 49:2,3 | exchange 73:19 | 47:12 73:3,13 | extra 73:15 142:22 |
| 82:7 | 114:4,8 117:8 | 76:23 81:16 | extreme 65:7 |
| evening 148:8 | 128:4,7 141:8 | 101:21 173:2,11 | 155:8 172:17 |
| event 39:18 43:18 | 142:20,20 143:13 | 174:15 190:6 | eye 93:20 148:23 |
| 43:25 46:19 72:14 | 147:22 153:9 | 196:9 221:3 | eyes 106:19 111:5 |
| 143:20,21 | 180:22 | experienced 79:13 | 113:4 128:6 |
| events 20:7 147:19 | exchanges 147:5 | experiences 7:5 | 149:22 |
| eventually 147:16 | 159:1 | experimented | f |
| 147:21 181:21 | excuse 155:2 | 190:7 | face 155:1,3 156:6 |
| everybody $34: 3$ $160: 17166: 19$ | :6 | experimenting | facility 35:18 |
| 160:17 166:19 | execute 159:18 | 89:17 | 36:14 208:8 |
| 193:4 200:22 | executed 222:8 | expert 4:7,10,12 | fact 15:2 $72: 21$ |
| everyday 155:1 | exemption 50:13 | 5:14,22 7:10,13 | 75:20 76:7 86:25 |
| evidence 51:3 | 109:20,23 | 8:2,4 48:8,11,14 | 1 |
| 67:25 118:7 | exemptions | 49:4,13,15,16,19 |  |
| 140:15 | 157:15 | 49:23,24 51:7,10 | 220:18,21 |
| evildoer 138:16 | exercise 38:13 | 53:18 72:4 82:3 | factor 11:15 58:12 |
| evolved 115:25 | exhibit 4:7,9,10,11 | 109:4,21 159:19 | 73:13 94:19 97:16 |
| exact 211:3 | 4:12 5:6,20 8:18 | 169:21 211:8 | $97: 20101: 14$ |
| exactly 32:10 62:7 | 8:19,22,23 9:2,5,9 | 213:4 214:25 |  |
| 79:20 209:15 | 32:7 44:14,25 | 220:17,20 |  |
| examination 5:8 | 48:8 54:7,23 55:7 | expertise 29:15 |  |
| 211:20 | 57:14 63:20 68:16 | 39:18 48:15 49:7 |  |
| examinations 4:1 | 68:18,22 69:1,5,9 | 49:11 51:12 213:7 |  |
| 4:2 | 69:16 83:11,12,15 | experts 7:14 | factored $\quad 32: 20$ |
| examined 5:4 | 97:11 105:23 | expired 192:20 |  |
| example 8:3 14:11 | 106:1,2 169:6,8,13 | explain 48:12 50:4 |  |
| 28:2 29:2 37:11 | 172:2 185:5,17 | 63:19 104:22 | 162:16 |
| 55:15 57:14 61:5 | 199:4 201:20 | 09:2 199:8 | factory 58:12 |
| 64:5 65:7,22 | 203:3 211:23 | 219:15 | facts 140:14 |
| 74:11 95:9 97:21 | 216:23 | explosion 175:2,4 | 150:20 197:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:23 155:8 } \\ & \text { 158:12 164:6,12 } \end{aligned}$ | exhibits 4:5 | exposed 68:9 75:5 | 202:4 |
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[fail - firearm]

| fail 166:8 186:22 | fast 120:8 | 113:10,17 114:13 | filed 184:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| failed 18:15 | faster 114:4 | 114:14,24 115:3 | filling 23:21 |
| failing 183:21 | 189:14,19,20,22 | 115:15,15 116:16 | filters 182:23 |
| fair 7:18 9:13 15:2 | 221:8 | 120:5 121:9,10,17 | final 70:9 147:23 |
| 15:19 19:7 28:3 | favor 166:13 | 122:6 126:23 | 161:5 |
| 67:18 71:24 89:18 | fbi 199:12 200:22 | 127:7 133:8 135:2 | financially 223:10 |
| 89:23 98:9 105:15 | 205:14,17,19,24 | 136:8 140:20 | find 13:5 17:8,12 |
| 107:25 110:2 | 206:2,15 207:2,16 | 142:13 144:16 | 20:5 22:9,9 25:1,5 |
| 112:8 119:6 129:5 | 208:4,8 209:7,16 | 150:9,19 151:1,6 | 27:1 67:15 68:25 |
| 133:24 136:10 | 209:20 210:8,15 | 162:2 163:20 | 77:5 79:14 95:1 |
| 138:3 141:19,24 | 212:19,20 | 171:22 172:5,10 | 96:3 105:23,25 |
| 142:10 144:24 | fbi's 208:18 | 175:25 177:19 | 114:9 117:10,23 |
| 149:13 150:7 | fear 157:18 162:25 | 179:8,20 185:12 | 177:14 179:23 |
| 152:20 154:5,18 | feather 98:1 | 186:24 195:8 | 185:22 196:9 |
| 154:21 155:3 | feature 10:4 67:17 | 216:15 217:8 | 201:14 217:1 |
| 164:7 172:7 174:6 | 67:20 68:2 73:4,4 | 220:19,20 221:2 | finding 17:9 |
| 176:8,9 184:1 | 79:23 88:3 139:20 | federal 19:18 47:6 | findings 208:5 |
| 200:5,10 | 150:16 151:4 | 47:7,19 82:12 | fine 86:22 148:7 |
| fairly 20:17 21:5 | 188:22 189:5 | 114:16 115:21 | 199:23 |
| 40:22 48:24 92:3 | 221:3 | 171:24 172:4 | finger 68:8 |
| 175:7 207:16 | featured 117:17 | 176:7 | finish 96:21,25 |
| fajardo 48:24 | featureless 59:4 | federally 47:8 | finished 178:4,12 |
| fall 14:4,6 187:15 | 77:16 117:16 | feel 23:6 101:2 | fire 31:1 $32: 19$ |
| false 209:9,11 | 170:7 171:10 | 110:15 181:15 | 33:3 35:2 38:3 |
| familiar 55:1 | 179:13 184:25 | 182:17 | 39:15 41:9 42:5 |
| 81:20 180:19 | 185:15,23 186:6 | feelings 194:11 | 44:11 46:5 56:7 |
| 196:16 205:19 | 186:12,14 187:1,4 | fellow 158:17,18 | 58:9 65:19 86:5 |
| family 27:2 40:6 | 193:25 194:14,19 | felony 29:7 | 86:21 103:25 |
| 41:12 48:1 58:10 | 194:24 196:12 | felt 33:18 66:13 | 105:4 113:8 |
| 77:8 85:25 88:21 | 217:5 | 120:8 121:24 | 118:23 119:4,5 |
| 140:1,11 | features 14:5 | 130:18 203:11 | 120:18 125:13 |
| far 11:19 26:11 | 15:23 26:5,7,8 | 206:15 | 130:22 132:3 |
| 28:16 33:17 39:3 | 32:1 40:25 41:2 | ffl 176:2 | 148:12 162:7 |
| 55:13 85:12 91:5 | 54:11,12 55:3 | field 105:15 | 188:16 198:22 |
| 107:9 116:21 | 56:17 57:10 59:6 | fights 130:22 | 218:1 |
| 138:22 150:5 | 59:8 63:4,4,9 | 159:15 | firearm 17:2,18,18 |
| 157:9 168:22 | 65:17 67:4,17 | figure 96:2 192:1 | 17:21 21:15 48:23 |
| 173:1,10 183:1 | 70:13,13,25 74:14 | 197:12 | 64:2 71:15 76:16 |
| farther 142:23 | 76:24 107:7,8 | figures 147:11 | 92:4 93:25 94:19 |
| fashion 186:15 | 108:3,17 111:17 | 178:5 | 112:8 115:5 |
|  | 112:7,11,25 113:4 |  | 123:16,21,22 |
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| 139:21 157:21 | fits 94:8 95:8 96:3 | 186:8 215:11,12 | forgot 140:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161:3 166:14 | 123:19 | 215:15,23 216:5 | form 50:7 52:20 |
| 167:25 197:15 | five 10:13 65:12 | 216:10,15,17 | formal 153:21 |
| 199:14 | 71:17 88:19 95:11 | flavor 66:25 | former 207:11 |
| firearms 11:14,15 | 103:9 135:20,23 | flee 124:21 | forms 192:15 |
| 11:16 16:16,19,22 | 135:23,23 138:8 | flexibility 91:5 | fort 37:19 |
| 17:17 18:6 19:4 | 144:5,8,9 152:25 | fliers 192:8,11 | forth 11:7 40:8 |
| 21:9 23:15 28:21 | 161:10 166:25 | flip 99:20 121:2 | 167:17 223:4 |
| 28:24 30:10,19 | 173:14 189:2 | flow 36:18 | forward 8:2 |
| 31:19,21 43:15 | 190:3,5 192:13 | flowchart 64:5 | 111:25 |
| 44:17 46:2,20 | 214:1,5 | flying 123:15 | found 51:17 65:3 |
| 51:5 63:23 66:12 | fix 115:24 172:20 | focus 47:16 209:15 | 82:13 107:21 |
| 81:10 148:11 | fixed 45:15,23 | focused 22:19 | 119:19 130:6 |
| 158:20,23 160:24 | 67:9,10 81:11 | 46:19 104:3 | 152:6 158:8,10,15 |
| 167:22 168:3,14 | 87:20 88:15 90:14 | folded 120:19 | foundation 66:11 |
| 168:19 178:7 | 91:1,7,11,11,21 | folding 79:25 | 96:19 112:14 |
| 186:12 191:24 | 93:15 95:15,21 | 80:18,18,23 86:23 | 115:9 140:3 |
| 196:16 199:19 | 96:13 111:19 | 86:24 87:9 107:15 | 171:13 |
| fired 65:17 117:11 | 139:11,17,18 | folks 24:20 42:7 | four 35:21 38:17 |
| 118:1 121:21 | 163:19 170:15 | 99:7 | 81:17,18 89:23 |
| 125:23 133:21 | 179:15,16 184:25 | follow 52:24 | 90:12,12 92:2 |
| 144:2 145:10,11 | 187:4,5,19,24 | 116:13 | 96:15 97:20 119:2 |
| 145:15 146:3 | 188:17 189:15,21 | following 60:18 | 135:20 142:22,23 |
| 151:10 204:10 | 193:25 194:19,24 | 63:22 64:1 69:22 | 160:7 186:4 |
| 218:1 | 196:12 | follows 5:5 | fourteen 144:7 |
| firepower 126:9 | fixing 163:25 | folsom 40:4 | fraction 18:23 |
| 126:10,17 127:1,2 | 172:19 | 117:20 | fragment 38:24 |
| 127:17,23 128:8 | flare 32:3 | foot 94:5 | frame 50:21 91:15 |
| fires 141:14 | flash 31:5 63:8 | footnote 7:15 | frames 148:18 |
| firing 68:9 85:17 | 74:22 75:7 79:24 | 205:23 207:1 | francisco 3:9 |
| 103:16 133:2 | 103:15,18,21,22 | footnotes 7:13 | fraud 159:14 |
| 217:13 | 104:2,9,11,17,18 | force 47:7 109:1,6 | freedom 91:23 |
| first 36:12,17 | 105:6,13,21 106:7 | 109:14,25 110:4 | 167:16 |
| 42:13 44:14 49:15 | 106:15 107:10 | 156:17,19 164:19 | frequency 152:5 |
| 54:9 69:4,19 | 108:11 113:18,20 | forces 131:5 | frequent 27:8 |
| 138:5 204:4 | 116:12 118:13 | 132:22 | frequented 25:12 |
| fit 41:17,18 91:6 | 120:14 127:10 | foregoing 222:2 | frequently 20:17 |
| 91:24 94:2,9,13 | 128:2 135:5 139:5 | 223:3,5,8 | 25:5 28:5 |
| 95:1,2 96:9 | 139:7,20 144:25 | forget 143:16 | fresh 169:4 |
| 100:21 108:12 | 145:20,22,24 | 166:22 | friend 193:13 |
| 115:4 116:10 | 146:7 171:23 |  |  |

[friendlier - going]

| friendlier 112:22 | 114:22 115:6 | gives 32:12 76:15 | 32:16,18,22 33:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| friends 196:10 | 116:14 126:13 | 91:5 113:5 | 33:23,24,25 34:1,3 |
| front 9:3 68:17 | 131:15 150:20 | giving 39:9 92:15 | 35:4,23 36:14,17 |
| 92:18 112:24 | 151:5 163:7 | 129:2 132:10 | 37:9,11 38:23 |
| 158:11 196:12 | 178:10 181:15 | 182:17 | 39:12 41:15 44:24 |
| 201:20 206:23 | 184:15 193:7 | glock 111:7 153:8 | 49:9 51:22 54:5 |
| 211:22 | 199:12,14 | go $17: 5,11,2018: 5$ | 56:1,6 57:8,9 64:5 |
| fudging 23:21 | general's 191:21 | 19:19 20:22,24 | 64:23 65:15 69:4 |
| fugitives 9:22 | generalize 150:14 | 22:8 24:24 25:17 | 69:11 70:22 71:12 |
| full 38:3,8 45:13 | generally 8:6 19:6 | 26:15 28:18 33:9 | 72:19 73:11,11,12 |
| 46:3,6,9 65:14 | 19:12 24:14 33:9 | 33:13 36:2 38:10 | 73:22 74:5 75:14 |
| 131:16 173:6 | 33:12 35:7,11 | 39:13 40:16 45:23 | 76:14 82:7 84:11 |
| 204:22 205:1 | 36:8 63:2 81:16 | 51:16 56:8 65:7 | 86:5,13 90:4,24 |
| fully $173: 10$ | 82:6 95:19 109:25 | 68:15 69:11,13 | 91:3,10,23 92:17 |
| fumble 114:8 | 127:4,6 130:4 | 76:22 82:5 92:7 | 94:6 101:11,11,17 |
| fumbling 142:21 | 133:24 135:16 | 94:4,5 95:6 101:4 | 102:6 104:20 |
| function 35:2 | 136:6 139:20 | 103:13 111:21 | 107:1 117:2,4,6,23 |
| 183:17 191:19 | 141:18 149:5 | 120:8 125:12 | 120:3,8,9,23 |
| functional 55:10 | 157:3 160:6 162:5 | 130:19 131:21 | 121:15 122:3,6 |
| 55:13,23 56:14 | 163:8 172:23 | 133:12 134:7 | 123:13 124:3,5,7 |
| 58:22 61:12 173:8 | 187:23 195:20 | 140:1 144:14 | 124:22 125:3,9 |
| functionally 58:18 | generic 11:14,22 | 148:5,14 155:9,21 | 126:1,2 127:7,18 |
| 61:2 75:8 | 17:24 115:22 | 156:23 160:4,16 | 132:3,11 133:25 |
| functions 52:4 | geneva 131:10,19 | 160:17 162:18 | 134:4,7 135:21,25 |
| 56:5 216:12 | gentlemen 40:3 | 174:16 177:8 | 148:24,25 149:11 |
| further 223:10 | getting 20:9,12,24 | 178:1 182:12,16 | 150:3 155:21 |
| furthest 35:13 | 41:24 50:8 56:6 | 183:5 186:6 187:4 | 161:14 162:12 |
| g | 98:23 | 187:4,5 191:7,15 | 163:6 168 |
|  | 114:18 151:23 | 191:25 195:25 | 169:16 177:14 |
| $\mathbf{g}$ | 183:1,15 201:8 | 196:23,24 198:16 | 180:1,2 181: |
| game | giant 35:19,24 | 198:20 201:18 | 183:4,18,20 |
| gang 129:10 146:2 | giffords 153: | 202:24 204:18 | 185:24 187:1 |
| gap $187: 15,16$ | girth 93:18 | goal 156:19,22,24 | 188:13 192:1 |
| gas 86:1 | give 18:11 68 | goes 23:22 125:3 | 194:14 195:1,25 |
| gate | 69:8,15 80:21 | 135:10 159:1 | 196:7,11,14 199:4 |
| gather | 81:25 92:17 109:3 | 199:18 | 199:13,14 201:1 |
| 147:18 | 112:21 122:6 | going 8:2 9: | 204:2 205:5 |
| gelatin 38:21 | 126:20 | 13:21 17:5,10 | 207:20,22 210:4 |
| 39:15 | given 8:4,9 157:15 | 18:9 19:20 21:10 | 218:21 219:7,19 |
| general 1:8 2:9 3:8 | 168:4 190:15 | 21:16 24:16 25:25 | 219:25 |
| 5:15 17:22 23:25 | 191:15 | 26:21 27:1 32:4 |  |

[golden - guy]

| golden 3:9 | 157:19 | 203:15 | 106:15 110:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { g o o d }} 5: 9,10,18,19$ | greater 26:20 | groupings 118:20 | 111:11 114:6 |
| 12:10 18:11 30:5 | 34:23 152:5 | 118:21 | 122:10 123:12,19 |
| 34:22 42:11 53:24 | green 176:21 | groups 21:18 | 141:12 157:23 |
| 84:22 96:21 | grenade 32:2 | 45:17 55:14 56:2 | 159:15 162:20 |
| 106:12,22 112:11 | grip 31:3 32:2 | 56:7,20,20 57:11 | 166:2,6 167:15 |
| 115:1 118:8 | 63:7 67:14,16,19 | 157:20 165:25 | 168:22 171:15 |
| 122:18 161:8 | 68:1,3,4,6 71:10 | grow 36:3,4 | 175:8 176:13 |
| 164:4 182:10 | 71:23 72:10,16,22 | 155:11 | 81:9 183:22 |
| 200:6,8 201:5 | 73:6,13,17,21,22 | grow's 155:12 | 186:20 192:5,9,23 |
| 205:12,13 | 74:21 75:3,6 | growing 90:12 | 192:25 194:12 |
| gotten 29:18 | 76:15 77:2,3,5,11 | grows 34:12,19 | 195:3 196:13 |
| 142:23 148:20 | 77:19,21 78:3,12 | grudging 42:10 | 220:5 |
| government | 78:12 79:6,18,19 | guess 17:10 18:9 | gunfight 159:8,10 |
| 115:21 178:23 | 79:22 80:9 107:9 | 23:14 49:6 52:21 | gunfire 147:22 |
| governmental | 108:12 112:4 | 52:24 61:21 67:6 | 155:25 156:21 |
| 134:21 | 114:3,5 117:7 | 79:1 85:5 90:1 | 159:1 |
| grabbed 153:10 | 119:18 122:10,10 | 5:21 97:12 | guns 16:23 18:1,10 |
| 203:22 | 135:4 139:23 | 107:19 144:19 | 20:9,12 22:15,19 |
| grabbing 149:18 | 140:13,20 141:18 | 150:13 165:17 | 22:19 24:6 27:12 |
| graham 1:15 2:17 | 141:23 142:8,21 | 74:11 177:3 | 7:23 30:15,16,20 |
| 4:8,10,13 5:3,9,22 | 143:25 144:23 | 185:18 205:24 | 31:9 32:1 33:5 |
| 6:21 150:7 198:23 | 150:22 171:18 | 206:12 216:14 | 34:4 40:7,11 |
| 202:8,12,14 | 186:7 217:12,12 | guessing 59:13 | 42:25 46:9,10,18 |
| 219:12,17 221:10 | 218:2,3,14 219:5 | guide 7:24 | 47:3 53:15 56:10 |
| 222:1,14 | 221:2,3,6,9 | guides 20:15 | 58:24 59:3,7,18,19 |
| graham's 202: | grips 61:12 71:14 | gun 12:7,8,15,18 | 60:4 61:15,16,18 |
| grain 204:9 | 71:21 72:7,10,14 | 12:21,21 13:4,7,9 | 61:23 62:2 67:22 |
| grains 39:4 | 76:14 77:18,20 | 13:15 14:15,22 | 7:24,24 106:16 |
| granted 47:17 | 78:2,6,14,23 79:5 | 16:19,20 19:21 | 113:6 117:21 |
| 91:21 107:11 | 79:10,13 111:23 | 20:1,17,19,20 21:5 | 118:2,2,6 122:9 |
| 125:16 149:17 | 111:25 112:1 | 21:9,15 22:10 | 126:22 129:12,13 |
| 150:22 151:13 | 170:19,19,23 | 23:9 24:14,17,24 | 148:13 149:14 |
| 154:23 | 171:23 | 25:1,5,11,14,17 | 58:10,15 163:13 |
| raphs 4:11 | grizzly 132:24 | 27:7,12 28:4,8 | 176:17 177:7, |
| grasp 68:675:3 | ground 125:6 | 30:23 31:1 32:16 | 178:13,19,21 |
| grasping 72:16,25 | group 16:10,11,12 | 33:1 34:2 37:3,5,9 | 179:24 180:3,6,10 |
| grasps 72:10 | 18:17,25 41:16 | 37:10 48:3 51:1 | 181:6 192:13 |
| grass 38:19 | 45:3 50:20 155:14 | 90:19,20 92:8 | 195:1 |
| great 30:7 36:4,22 | 157:18 159:11 | 101:10 103:4 | guy 64:25 98:1 |
| 36:23 68:19 110:1 | 162:17 196:18 | 104:15 105:2 | 99:5 113:18 |
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| 114:25 115: | S | hear | hints 219:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:8 156:23 | 21:12 23:3 27:22 | 198:2 | toric |
| 7:1,24 175:22 | :15 39:20 59:19 | 99 | tory 40:16,2 |
| 9:23 | 155:19 206:3,19 | heard 174:20 | it 120:20 121:23 |
| uy's 1 | 206:21 207:6 | 196:18 | 14 |
| guys 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { handle } \text { 101:15 } \\ & \text { 188:15 199:17,17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { hearing } \\ \text { 117:25 201:14 } \end{array}$ | 124:16,20 125:2 |
| 39:13 65:17 84 |  |  | 149:11 162:4 |
| $2: 1$ | handling 31:19 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { heated 149:18 } \\ \text { heaviest } & 93.8\end{array}$ | 188:19 |
| 12 | hands 180:19 200:11 |  | hits 124:14 191:23 |
| 159 |  | heaviest 93:8 <br> heavy 94:15 169:2 | hiting |
| 176:15 | handy 9:5 <br> hanger $35.2336 \cdot 3$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { heckler } 45: 2 \\ 182: 21 \end{gathered}$ | 135:6 210:24 |
|  |  |  |  |
| h 3:8 <br> hague 131:9,10 <br> half 10:9 23:24,24 | 114:19,20 | height 94:23 | hobbyists 175:16 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 19,20125: 17 \\ & 130: 22 \text { 147:16 } \end{aligned}$ | held 27:25 | hold 79:15 128:16 |
|  |  | help 90:2 138:12 | 128:20,22 |
| half 10.9 23:24,24 | $153: 12155: 14,23$ |  | holding 73:20 |
| :18,19 | 174:20 210:4 | 151:6 185:15 | 218:16 219:4,6 |
| 2:3 | happened 13:18 98:24 99:4 100:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { helped 139:6 } \\ & 150: 22 \end{aligned}$ | hollow 131:17 |
| 66:1,20 |  |  | 2:12,14 204: |
| halfway | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 24 \text { 99:4 100:3 } \\ & 110: 24142: 4,17 \end{aligned}$ | helpful 73:25 77:6 | 205:2 |
| hallway 1 | 144:24 145:16 | helsley 159:4 | 20.11 29 |
| hampering | $147: 15180: 4$ $221: 7,8$ | helsley's 72:4 hereto $222: 4$ | 18:6 155:9 177:7 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { hand } 68: 771 \\ 72: 1577: 12 \end{array}$ | happening 13:4 | hey $24: 2028$ : | 77:13 192:12 |
| 192:15 | 27:3,15 46:25 | $39: 12 \text { 41:14 42:25 }$ | 200:8,14 201:5 |
| ful | 99:2 109:13 | 6:4,23 51:16,23 | homeless 200:19 |
|  | 148:17 152: | 65:12 117:22 | homeowner 123:9 |
| $2433: 16$ | 153:19,23 | 191:2 | homicide 109:19 |
| + | happens 117:8 | his | honestly 6:9 28:11 |
| 36:9,22 37 | 156:5 174:19 | higher 22:25 | honey 181:19 |
| 37:10,13 | happy 93:6 <br> hard 21:8 113:23 | 26:8,25 127:16 | hope 168:8 <br> hopefully $52: 22$ |
| 122:9 132:1 |  | 27:23 128: |  |
| 135:12,16,17 | 149:21 150:14 | 35:13,14,25 | hopefully $52: 22$ 217:22 |
| $136: 1151: 24,25$ | 151:3 166:11 | 36:4 192: | hoping 31:12 hotel 148:10 |
| 153:3,6 | harder 117:12 <br> harkening 180:21 | highway $37: 21$ |  |
| $201: 112$ |  |  | hour 32:9 37:16 |
|  | harm 132:1 | hill 200:20 | 39:24 43:15 45:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 205: 8 ~ \angle U 4 \\ & 206: 18,22 \end{aligned}$ | hatched 60:10 | hindered 142:9 | 45:1 |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { hinge } 187: 12 \\ 188: 20 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { hours } 139: 2 \\ \text { house } 36: 2592: 17 \\ 102: 15155: 10,11 \end{gathered}$ |
| 212:21,21 | heading 136:13,24 |  |  |
|  | 137: |  |  |
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| 155:12,15 | identifies 172:11 | inappropriate | incomplete 125:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| houses 92:14 | identity 155:11 | 201:9 206:7 | 157:11 218:17 |
| 201:17 | ignored 162:19 | 19:10 | 219:23 220:24 |
| houston 1:23 2:20 | illegal 16:20,21,22 | incapable 215:5 | incorporate 34:21 |
| 223:19 | 16:23 19:22,23 | inch 82:21,24 83:2 | 37:8 |
| hub 22:15 | 23:9 24:15 28:21 | 83:10,18 84:3,18 | incorporates |
| huge 27:10 | 29:4,9 89:12 | 87:18,19 88:15 | 36:16 |
| huh 29:22 49:18 | illegally 17:21 | 92:9,10 97:20 | increase 14:2 |
| 69:23 83:20,23 | illegitimate 107:1 | 103:6 135:22,23 | 76:25 103:15 |
| 111:14 123:1 | 155:18 | 135:23,23,24 | 120:5 128:3 |
| 142:3 145:6 | image 4:1174:8 | 210:3 | 152:12,13,15 |
| human 15:5 110:7 | 75:1 76:8 83:16 | inches 80:19,24 | increased 13:25 |
| hundred 36:13 | images 74:3 | 81:17,18 82:8,9 | 129:24 130:2,16 |
| 129:5 171:6 182:6 | imagine 138:25 | 83:22,25 84:12,15 | 131:24 207:25 |
| hundreds 110:11 | 142:17 146:19 | 84:19,21,23 85:1,4 | 208:15 |
| 110:12,13,17 | 148:22 176:11 | 85:7 86:13,18,25 | increases 76:23 |
| hunter 37:20 | immediate 109:10 | 88:8,16,18,19 | 93:18 128:1 |
| hunting 21:11 | impact 144:16 | 89:11,19,23 90:6,7 | increasing 96:16 |
| hurdle 50:21 | impaired 103:17 | 90:12,12,14,20 | index 4:1,5 68:8 |
| hurt 150:4 201:19 | 13:20 127:12 | 91:8,12,22 92:3 | indicate 87:12 |
| hybrid 105:18 | impedence 106:14 | 93:23 96:15 102:6 | 143:17 207:23 |
| 215:16 216:1,5,9 | impediment | 102:7 103:7 | indicated 6:21 |
| hypothetical | 106:14 | 134:12 135:19,20 | 2:7 44:9 53:3 |
| 125:16,25 157:11 | impingement 86:3 | 135:23 204:11 | 59:23 66:3 84:2 |
| 218:17 219:1,23 | implementable | 209:25 210:17,18 | 167:6 179:18 |
| 220:24 | 168:9 | 212:16,22 | indicates 84:19 |
| hypothetically | implemented 60:9 | incident 98:24 | indicating 50:9 |
| 14:14,16 | lication | 145:5 146 | indication 140:3 |
| i | 5:23 | 48:8 | indicative 179:25 |
| ea 49:10 194:1,3 | implicit 112:4 | incidents 98:18 | indicted 47:3 |
| 199:14 | important 94:9 | 136:17 | individual 17:17 |
| entical 75:8 | importing 29:4 | 52:12 220:9 | 7:20 44:6 65:2 |
| 151:19 | impossible 171:6 | lined | 53:6 |
| identification 5:7 | impressions | include 9:22 20:13 | 54:13,24 181:20 |
| 8:20,24 31:19,21 | 94:12 | 25:10 50:6 159:10 | 185:10 210:1 |
| 48:16 49:17,20 | improved 205: | 78:3 181:18 | individual's 66 |
| 53:21 83:13 169:9 | improvement | included 215:16 | individuals 16:19 |
| identified 12:24 | 122:7 207:18 | includes 71:14 | 7:2 155:14 184:2 |
| 14:15 32:5 58:24 | inadequate 130:18 | including 30:20 | 193: |
| 58:25 140:21 | 207:21 | 44:19 137:10 | industries 98:1 |
| 150:11 205:4 |  | 181:13 |  |
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| industry 66:15 | intention 207:12 | 129:18 | 223:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| infamy 150:4 | 09:10 | involve 19:23 | jde 1:7 2:8 |
| infer 56:2 | intentionally | 23:13 24:11 31:22 | jeopardy 162:2 |
| inferior 79:5,7 | 23:21 85:16 | 40:2 44:22 52:5 | jls 1:7 2:8 |
| inflict 149:3 | interchangeabl | 86:9 152:4 | job 1:24 67:1 |
| inflicted 149:12,23 | 76:11,12 113:9 | involved 13:4 24:4 | 124:2 130:21 |
| 151:19 | nterdict 46:17 | 24:18 28:25 29:12 | 131:1,3 132:23 |
| info 209:9,11 | interest 174:16 | 29:17,19,24 38:16 | jobs 51:15 |
| informant 48:5 | interested 223:1 | 43:17 47:20 52:20 | jog 99:19 |
| information 17:24 | interesting 61:20 | 100:12 138:2 | jogged 131:19 |
| 18:3 51:16 66:5 | 162:11 | 145:7 153:3,4 | jose 12:13 |
| 193:7 205:7 | termediat | involvement 29:14 | judge 48:13 |
| 209:12,13,20 | 210:24,25 | involving 20:6 | judges 49:6 |
| infrequently | internet 6:23 7:2 | 45:21 136:17 | july 146:6 166 |
| 132:5 | 7:16 20:14 196:19 | iron 37:24 | 166:24 183:11 |
| initialed 222:4 | erpret 219:16 | ish 84:19,23 | jumped 153:10 |
| initiated 9:23 | interpretati | 173:14,14 197:24 | june 145:3 146 |
| injured 149:25 | 64:16 | issue 87:13 130:24 | 146:17 183:12 |
| 160:22 | interpreting 71:6 | 132:17 154:11 | 184:3,9,9,11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { injury 109:8 110:1 } \\ & \text { 157:19 } \end{aligned}$ | interrupt 187:10 | 170:1 200:7 | 197:16 198:1 |
|  | interrupted | 202:22 204:5,13 | jury 50:4 |
| ink 222:3 <br> inquiry 52:11 <br> insert 101:25 <br> inserting 101:14 | 142:20 | 205:8 | justice 191:9 |
|  | intervention | issued 37:22 42:5 | 213:23 |
|  | 147:25 | 44:1,4,7 93:2 | justifiable 157:16 |
|  | interviewed | 106:16 199:12,16 | justified 108:24 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { inside } 36: 1984: 6 \\ 146: 19 \quad 173: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 145:16 | issues 94:22 | 109:19 |
|  | invasion 29:14 | 101:21 103:8 | justify 110:15 |
| inspecting 24:14 | 155:9 | 199:23,24 209:16 | k |
| inspection 24:19 inspections 24:20 | investigate 9:19 16:21 | it'd 65:7 <br> item 32 : | kaitlyn 1 |
|  | investig |  | 223:19 |
| install 41:16 instances 37:1 | $10: 10$ | items 37:15 49: | keep 8:13,15 9:5 |
| 153:3 156:15 | investigatin | ized 143:24 | 8:15 52:3 62:11 |
|  | 23:17 28:21 29:3 | izhmash 143:24 | 77:1 114:6 117:7 |
| 196:25 <br> instructor 43:15 | 151:2 | $\mathbf{j}$ | keeping 8: |
| instructors 40:16 | investigation 25:2 | j 143:22,23 | 117:13 |
| intend 161:21 intended 66:8 | 28:23 159:13 | jacket 204:2 | key 73:13 131: |
|  | investigations | 205:1 | 197:3 |
| intent 91:19 | 9:25 10:5,6,16,17 | jackets 131:16 | kick 82:12 |
| 126:13 181:21 | 10:21,23 12:2 | january 37:15 | kids 142:17,23 |
|  | 13:3 23:11 52:7 | - 45:20 145:3,4 |  |
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| kill 124:12 151:12 | 51:12 52:2,9,10,21 | 181:17,18 182:1,3 | 113:16 115:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| killed 138:8 141:6 | 52:22 54:24 56:8 | 182:7,7,25 183:4,7 | 140:2 171:13 |
| 144:5,6 145:12 | 59:10,13,14 60:5 | 183:16,20,24 | laid 96:1 117:21 |
| 146:3,9,22 147:23 | 64:6,18 65:12,18 | 184:1,4,8,12,12,21 | lane 52:3,5 |
| 147:24 149:25 | 65:19,23 66:24,25 | 186:18,18,19 | language 54:13 |
| 151:23,25 | 69:15 70:9,18,22 | 189:2,3 191:11,12 | 58:5 126:16 127:6 |
| killing 131:7 132:8 | 72:2 73:24 77:17 | 191:17,17 193:3 | 165:19 167:18,21 |
| 145:7 | 78:22,24 79:2,7 | 193:16 194:2,16 | 211:1 |
| kind 17:12 19:11 | 80:8 81:23 83:5,6 | 194:25 195:15,15 | large 16:12 27:21 |
| 20:6 21:8,21 | 84:12 87:24 89:24 | 195:20 196:3,4,10 | 128:14 131:6 |
| 22:12,16 23:2 | 91:4 93:22 95:11 | 196:21,22 197:10 | 138:9 147:2 |
| 24:12 26:22,23 | 97:1,14,24 98:22 | 197:14 198:2,5,9 | 148:14 153:4,7,9 |
| 27:20 29:20 35:18 | 98:23 99:1 100:4 | 198:15 199:25 | 171:7 201:14 |
| 37:25 38:3 43:6 | 100:19 101:1,3 | 205:6,17,18 206:8 | larger 34:20 76:7 |
| 46:24 92:5 102:21 | 102:6,13 104:22 | 206:10 207:13,20 | 76:9 87:16 91:15 |
| 113:4 122:2 | 107:3 113:5 114:1 | 208:17,25 209:7 | 119:12 141:8 |
| 139:10 143:14 | 114:20 116:10,11 | 209:11,12 210:6 | 192:9 193:23 |
| 155:8 158:1 160:6 | 116:24 118:21 | 210:25 211:17,17 | las 148:8 |
| 163:7,23 165:19 | 121:1,8,24 122:11 | 213:12,12,20 | late 12:22 27:17 |
| 165:24 166:14 | 122:15,16 126:14 | 214:21,22 215:6 | 208:18 |
| 167:15 171:2 | 127:10,12 134:17 | 215:25 218:8,11 | lately 18:11 |
| 173:5 | 134:21,24 135:22 | 218:12 220:2,19 | latest 174:5 |
| kinds 8:5 100:8 | 138:14,20,22 | knowledge 20:10 | launcher 32:3,3 |
| 122:9 168:4 | 140:22,24 141:9 | 64:24 71:1 78:19 | law 11:19 13:20 |
| kits 129:19 | 143:19 144:1,13 | 109:17 138:19 | 19:18 25:9 26:4 |
| kneeling 38:2 | 144:16 145:10 | 145:22 146:13 | 42:3 44:3 47:9,18 |
| knew 62:22 | 146:11,18 147:4,7 | 147:13 166:4 | 47:19 50:24 64:15 |
| knife 123:9 | 147:8 149:24 | 192:8 208:24 | 70:11,19 78:19 |
| knock 33:24 | 150:18,21 151:20 | 210:15 | 79:3 81:24 82:12 |
| know 7:22 8:1,7 | 152:10,21,23 | known 18:14 19:9 | 86:14 87:25 88:7 |
| 10:7,8,11,11,13,14 | 157:17,25 158:4 | 61:3 | 90:17 96:10 104:9 |
| 13:7 15:6 17:9 | 158:19,25 159:1,2 | koch 45:2 182:22 | 105:4,14 109:8,16 |
| 18:12 20:13 21:10 | 159:18 162:2 | 1 | 109:20 112:16,20 |
| 22:2,8,16 23:11,20 | 163:24 164:5,6 |  | 112:23 114:15,16 |
| 27:10 28:1 29:15 | 165:1 166:2,6,7 | label 48 | 123:13 133:14,19 |
| 30:1,4 31:15,15,24 | 167:9,18 168:10 | $\text { labs } 34: 12$ | 133:22 136:19 |
| 32:2 33:19,25 | 171:5,25 173:22 | lack 42:9 115:18 | 141:1 147:25 |
| 35:20 36:18 38:1 | 175:14 176:6 |  | 152:2 154:1,7,8,18 |
| 39:16 41:3 42:4 | 177:12 178:18,18 |  | 155:2,15,23 |
| 42:11 43:3 45:9 | 178:24 179:2,2,6 |  | 156:16 157:13,13 |
| 46:22,25 47:3,21 | 180:1,5 181:8,8,12 | 96:19 112:14 | 159:9,21 162:19 |
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[law - load]

| 164:18 165:20,24 | legally 24:10 | 185:17 186:13,16 | line 34:3 50:12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 166:24 171:11,17 | 54:10 59:8 94:4 | 186:24 193:3 | 72:20 77:10 79:17 |
| 172:4,6,9 177:11 | 181:3 195:6 | letterhead 154:14 | 81:4 99:21 100:1 |
| 177:12 181:1 | legislation 50:16 | letters 183:15 | 110:6,10 135:9 |
| 190:21 191:23 | 167:25 168:20 | level 56:21 93:17 | 137:2 173:12 |
| 196:10 197:9 | legislative 168:18 | 113:12 151:7 | 175:9 177:15 |
| 199:24 200:3,24 | legislatively | 153:22 160:5 | 179:23 203:13 |
| 201:2 | 182:24 | 199:13 200:8 | 209:22 215:22 |
| lawful 191:7 | legislature 66:8 | levels 93:7,8 | 219:8,10 |
| lawfully 50:5 88:6 | 69:25 112:17 | 165:21 | lines 99:21 |
| 167:14 181:5 | 114:13 115:11,20 | lever 22:6 23:4 | link 6:23 7:2,16,20 |
| 182:8 187:21 | 126:14,17 154:7 | license 162:22 | lion's 18:25 |
| 193:17 | 164:17 165:18 | 163:1 | list 9:10 17:7 |
| laws 78:25 81:21 | 167:22 168:13,17 | life 108:23 110:1 | 34:14 46:25 49:7 |
| 116:2 167:22,25 | legitimate 106:21 | 155:22 174:17 | 60:15,19 61:2 |
| 170:22 195:21 | 106:25 107:1 | 176:18 | 136:16 137:15 |
| 196:1,7 | 108:19 123:5,6 | lift 169:2 | 143:14 150:6,18 |
| lawsuit 115:18 | 154:4,17 175:16 | liggit 37:20 | 181:20 192:23 |
| 182:4 | 177:9,19 | light 103:18,22 | listed 8:3 15:10,17 |
| lawsuits 6:10 | legitimately | 106:8,21,23 | 30:17 32:8 54:12 |
| lay 87:22 102:4 | 108:14 162:24 | 108:11 113:19 | 56:10,11 58:18 |
| laying 38:1 | length 32:24 58:14 | 116:11 120:13 | 63:3 66:12,17 |
| lcm 128:14 129:1 | 80:19,24 82:8 | 128:1 144:25 | 74:15 186:24 |
| lcms 128:13,16 | 83:2,6 85:8 88:16 | 146:20 195:12 | 220:9,12 |
| 129:1,4,5 | 89:19,21 93:24 | lighting 146:18 | lists 30:20 |
| lead 39:6,6 161:6 | 94:2,14,23 95:17 | lightly 41:10 | litany 72:6 |
| leads 135:13 207:9 | 96:7 102:8 135:18 | lights 148:25 | literally 208:5 |
| lean 71:3 | 135:19,21,22 | liked 219:13 | little 12:13 23:6 |
| learn 34:21 | lengthen 89:22 | likelihood 159:17 | 27:13 33:14 39:7 |
| learning 38:4 | lengthened 81:6 | 177:14 184:23 | 53:15 67:11 73:17 |
| leave 136:6 188:1 | lengthens 89:17 | 205:12 | 84:16 87:1 105:16 |
| 190:10 | lengths 92:6,6 | likewise 114:25 | 119:7 120:23 |
| leaving 135:13 | 93:13 | limit 29:8 45:6 | 122:7,13 124:8 |
| 180:11 | lethal 109:14,25 | 50:18 195:19 | 148:19 150:3 |
| left 100:23 124:21 | 110:4 131:1 | limited 97:11 | 160:9 185:1 |
| legal 14:13,17 | 132:10,18 | 163:3 165:8 | 188:25 |
| 82:22 85:2 86:16 | lethality 129:24 | 167:10 | lived 200:18,19 |
| 88:13 89:18,21 | 130:2,16 131:24 | limiting 16:4,5 | living 92:14 |
| 90:13 108:23 | 220:22 | 161:19 | 201:13 |
| 114:22 135:18,22 | letter 50:8,19 69:1 | limits 165:9 | load 188:12 |
| 177:6 182:8 196:4 | 100:1 106:3 |  |  |

[loaded - mak90]

| loaded 101:12 | 206:25 | 101:19,22,25 | 187:24,24 188:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 117:24,24 118:6 | looking 17:11 | 102:2,9,15,18,20 | 188:22,24,24 |
| 158:8 | 21:10 23:25 72:1 | 103:2,5 173:7,9,24 | 189:15 196:13 |
| lobster 188:19,20 | 99:20 119:23 | 174:22 175:21 | magazine 43:4 |
| local 9:21 165:24 | 148:22,23 211:22 | 176:1,5,14 179:3,5 | 56:17 58:25 59:16 |
| location 36:19 | looks 29:2 96:23 | 179:6 180:7 | 61:13 67:7, 76 |
| 98:20 163:5 | 118:10,11 170:2 | 181:13,19,21 | 76:8 101:12,18 |
| lockdown 182:25 | lose 116:12 120:23 | 186:21 187:16 | 111:19 114:4 |
| locked 50:15 | 174:16 | 188:3 190:10 | 119:13 127:5,14 |
| 91:22 | losing 162:25 | 193:20 195:7 | 127:19,22 141:8 |
| long 3:4 27:23,25 | lost 219:20 | lowers 174:8 | 141:22 142:4 |
| 32:16 33:1,5 34:2 | lot 6:10 9:10 12:25 | 176:5,12 177:4,22 | 143:11 144:22 |
| 34:4 36:22 37:3,5 | 18:22 21:17 22:5 | 178:4,4,21 180:11 | 145:19 146:5 |
| 37:5,9,10,23 49:7 | 22:8,10,14 33:2 | 181:18 | 147:1,10 151:11 |
| 59:19 78:1 84:9 | 34:11 36:5 41:23 | lugs 114:16 | 153:4,9 162:6,6 |
| 84:21 86:18 88:14 | 42:2 48:22 59:20 | luis 37:20 | 163:19,25 170:15 |
| 90:24 92:18 94:5 | 80:2,3 95:9,20 | m | 172:19,21,22 |
| 95:4 100:17,20 | 96:5,8 99:24 | m 137:4 | 187:8 188:1,4,8,11 |
| 120:11 122:10 | 114:19,21 118:10 | $\text { m1 } \quad 128: 23$ | 189:7,21 |
| 133:18 135:20 | 118:11 124:3 |  | magazines 13:18 |
| 148:13 167:15 | 126:1 127:13 | m1a m1a 130:7 | 16:24 42:22,23,25 |
| 180:6 181:9 | 130:5,7 144:2 | m4 30:23,25 32:19 | 43:1,9,11 76:4,5,9 |
| 190:12 198:21 | 148:10 149:10,24 | 34:23 37:22 43:20 | 113:9 127:20 |
| 203:17 220:5 | 152:3,5 157:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23 \text { 3/:22 } 43 \\ & 44: 958: 7,8,8 \end{aligned}$ | 128:9,12,14 |
| longer 51:21 84:14 | 158:2 159:15 |  | 129:15 138:9 |
| 84:16 87:21 88:24 | 175:14 182:22 | m4s $119 \cdot 16$ | 141:9 147:6,9 |
| 91:16,24 94:7 | 196:4 200:23 |  | 149:19 189:12 |
| 117:3 120:17 | 207:17 215:25 |  | magnetometer |
| 135:12 136:2,5 | lots 130:19 148:13 | 46:10 92:8 106.15 | 98:25 |
| 142:21 163:15 | 148:13,13 174:15 | 118:2 $223 \cdot 7$ | magpole 95:10 |
| 189:4 | loud 198:21 | madam 30:2 | mags 43:7 76:12 |
| look 5:24 40:11 | louisiana 152:8 | mag 45:15.16,23 | 148:14 153:7 |
| 43:3 44:24 54:23 | love 213:11 |  | mail 6:21 192:22 |
| 57:22 67:2 69:19 | low 103:18,22 | $73: 23 \text { 96:13 }$ | mailing 50:7 |
| 71:12 82:5 99:18 | 106:8,20,23 | 101:15,19,25 | main 51:15 205:10 |
| 103:13 126:23 | 108:11 113:18 | 101.15,19,25 | maintain 200:4 |
| 147:13 185:13 | 116:11 120:13 | $118: 25119: 1$ | majority 9:6 98:17 |
| 196:19 202:1 | 128:1 164:8 |  | 146:13 176:11 |
| 211:25 | lower 21:24 65:23 | 127:15 128:4,6 | 177:5 179:19 |
| looked 18:10 | 66:21 100:11,15 |  | mak90 139:25 |
| 38:23 96:24 | 100:18 101:8,16 | $153: 9187: 17,19$ | 140:10 |
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## [maker - military]

| maker 84:15 | 83:12 169:8 | matters 8:151:20 | meet 12:17 14:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 179:2 | 201:21 | mean 6:17 7:21 | 15:22 18:20 60:1 |
| makeup 13:10 | market 22:7 78:18 | 15:1 25:3 35:21 | 170:3,6 186:17 |
| making 21:3 29:4 | 170:22 171:2 | 37:12 41:4,7 | meeting 11:25 |
| 29:19 40:23 65:23 | 194:21 | 42:15 46:22 52:6 | 30:22 |
| 91:2 101:12 | marketed 77:16 | 55:13 56:2 69:24 | meets 19:16 |
| 112:24 113:3 | marketplace | 71:25 72:19 73:8 | megan's 191:23 |
| 118:5,5 156:20 | 26:11 79:1 95:23 | 76:8 77:14 79:20 | member 33:21 |
| 177:23 194:21 | 194:25 | 79:21 88:14 100:9 | 109:16 146:2 |
| 199:22 206:4 | marking 19:12 | 101:9 120:15 | 165:18 |
| 208:9 | 60:5 | 130:2 149:15 | members 109:9 |
| malfunction 37:3 | markings 14:14 | 160:25 164:11 | 129:10 130:25 |
| 101:23 | 32:6 58:7 60:24 | 167:7 171:3 | 154:8 200:2,3 |
| malfunctions 43:3 | 63:14,14,14 66:2 | 174:14 175:4 | memory 39:7 |
| man 132:25 | 96:12 176:2,6,7 | 187:6 196:3 203:1 | 99:20 131:20 |
| 207:13 | marksmanship | meaning 14:15 | mental 28:13 |
| mandate 164:21 | 37:24 199:20,24 | 25:2 31:1 39:14 | mention 44:18 |
| mandated 160:4 | martha 159:18 | 42:25 55:11 57:10 | 205:21 209:21 |
| 182:24 | maryland 79:2 | 73:21 103:4 | mentioned 8:17 |
| mandatory 160:10 | mass 124:8,11,13 | 120:19 127:1,14 | 99:19,22 178:14 |
| manipulate 86:6 | 124:14 125:22 | 170:10 186:6,20 | 218:23 |
| manner 165:7 | 136:14,21,25 | 187:7 191:3 | merely 62:21 |
| 183:1 | 137:6,8,11,21 | means 48:12,13 | 124:12 |
| manually 86:6 | 138:1,2 144:21 | 180:23,24 | mesh 158:7 |
| manufacture | 152:3,12,21 | meant 35:22 94:13 | met 11:16 59:24 |
| 29:11 | 153:11,14 161:22 | 155:9 | 163:15 207:13 |
| manufactured | match 129:11 | measured 86:19 | metal 122:16 |
| 18:16 176:5 | 177:1,2 186:12,14 | measurement | 131:16 134:14 |
| manufacturer | matched 129:12 | 89:25 | 204:22 205:1 |
| 23:17 | 129:14,15 | measurements | meth 34:12 |
| manufacturers | mate 101:22 | 83:7 172:3 | method 193:12 |
| 205:16 | material 6:24 | mechanical 89:13 | methods 155:19 |
| manufacturing | materials 196:19 | mechanically | michel 3:3 |
| 16:22 28:22 | math 28:13 198:4 | 101:24 | michellawyers.c... |
| marijuana 34:12 | 214:5 | mechanics 98:15 | 3:5 |
| 34:19 36:3 155:10 | matter 5:13 8:22 | 105:7 | middle 144:13 |
| 155:12 | 9:12 15:2 49:11 | mechanism | mil 207:17 |
| mark 8:18,22 32:6 | 51:14 104:23 | 164:16 | miles 200:20 |
| 83:11 169:6 | 134:3 169:7 | media 20:13 | militaries 131:8 |
| marked 5:20 8:19 | 213:18 | 153:17 | military 38:1 |
| 8:23 54:7,22 55:7 |  |  | 42:16 106:16 |

[military - never]

| :3,8,9 | mistaken 155:11 | movie 146:6 | 2:19 64:2 79:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12,16,17,24 | mistakes 40:10 | moving 16:13 28:7 | 8:20 86:3 99:7 |
| 131:6,24 132:2,16 | misused 115:7 | 29:25 31:17 32:7 | 104:10 113:5,24 |
| 132:22 133:3,9 | mitigation 163:24 | 33:2 38:7 43:14 | 127:11 131:1,3,17 |
| 199:16,23 200:3 | mix 19:3 | 48:7 80:15 129:21 | 132:1,16 133:8 |
| 200:25 | mixture | 136:12 148:7 | 135:17 141:3 |
| millimeter 204:9 | model | 153:25 | 57:1 183:3 195:5 |
| 205:12,15 206:3 | 56:12 57:4 60:6 | mp5 32:19 34:23 | 201:5 209:4 210:9 |
| 206:20 207:18,21 | models 56:14 | 34:24 45:2 | 214:19 |
| 211:6 212:21 | 60:15 | multi 64:6 | necessary 54:10 |
| million 166:5,6 | modern 22:20,21 | multiple 6:10 | 149:3 |
| 99:25 | 6:15 209 | 115:15 123:25 | need 6:16 8:14 |
| mimic 1 | modest 143:19 | 29:10 143:6,9 | 16:7 30:2 34:5 |
| 119:17 | modesto 145:1 | 146:25 147:5,10 | 51:23 55:8 61:21 |
| mimicked 192:9 | modification | 152:4 153:6 159:2 | 85:21 86:3 93:12 |
| mind 7:25 24:21 | 89:1 | 165:21 | 93:13,19 94:4 |
| 61:12 159:6 209:3 | modified 46:2,5 | murder | 96:21 121:2 |
| mini 43:22 44 | 70:1 | 151:10 | 122:25 133:8 |
| 73:21,25 74:3,11 | mom 26:23 | murderer | 156:25 157:20 |
| 74:24 75:14,16,19 | moment 111: | murderers 9:23 | 193:7 195:5 |
| 75:20 141:12,14 | money 154 | 159:16 | 198:25 202:24 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} \text { 201:8 } & \\ \text { monica } & 99: 5 \quad 100: 2 \end{aligned}$ | murders | 218:4 |
|  |  | music 148:2 | needed 120:11 |
| minimally $135: 19$ | 143:15 | muzzle 104:6,10 | 43:11 |
| minimum 85:5 | monitor 16:19 | 104:11,18 135:14 | needle 96:25 |
|  |  | 135:25 136:5,7,10 | needlessly 160:22 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { mining } & 59: 20 \\ \text { minute } & 103: 9 \end{array}$ | monitoring 24:16 <br> monsterman 78:2 | 216:12,15 | needs 30:3 91:25 |
|  |  |  | 123:23 |
| 161:10 193:2,2 | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 4 \text { 170:19 } \\ & 171: 18 \end{aligned}$ | naked | negligible 92:3 |
| mirroring 27:19 |  | name 5:12 223:14 | 19:10 |
| mischaracterize | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { month } 12: 11,12 \\ 29: 14 & 192: 19 \end{array}$ | names 62:21 | neighbor 123:10 |
|  |  | narcotics $34: 1$ | neighborhood |
| mischaracterizes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:24 } \\ & \text { months } 166: 25 \end{aligned}$ | nationwide $46 \cdot 1$ | 12:11 |
| 76:19 78:9 170:24 |  |  | neighbors 196:11 |
| 202:3 215:19 | morning 5:9,10,18 | nature 15.655 .13 | 201:19 |
| misquote 67:15 | $\begin{gathered} 5: 19 \\ \text { move } 30: 196: 6 \\ 125: 5 \quad 126: 7 \quad 193: 1 \end{gathered}$ | nature 56.858 .9 | neither 115:23 |
| missed 125:7,14 |  | near 188.2 | 223:10 |
| $\text { mission } 35: 1132: 5$ |  | $195: 25$ | nevada 20:20 22:3 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { moved } 18: 1 \\ 138: 24171: 3 \end{gathered}$ |  | 22:5 |
| 214:15 |  | necessarily 7:16 | never 31:15 57:2 |
|  |  | necessarily 7:16 | 59:21 64:8 66:16 |

[never - official]

| 72:25 105:11 | nontraditional | 193:19,20 194:5 | 218:17 219:7,8,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 111:4,8 114:15 | 77:18 | 194:18 197:23 | 220:24 |
| 167:3 171:14 | norinco 139:25 | 198:9 213:19,22 | objectionable 97:5 |
| 173:15 178:24 | 140:10 | 214:9 218:1 | objections 11:11 |
| 207:13 | normal 13:19 15:5 | numbers 18:24 | objective 209:24 |
| new 26:4 46:24 | 46:3 50:14 73:21 | 27:11,19,21,25 | obscured 106:18 |
| 53:22 66:5 78:23 | 133:13,19,21 | 59:15 129:2 171:7 | obviously 7:21 |
| 78:25 89:14 119:1 | 134:6 155:1 | 178:5,13 180:18 | 23:10 30:4 87:25 |
| 168:19 171:16 | 160:17 172:3 | 182:2 194:3 | 115:24 117:15 |
| 209:12,13 215:16 | 175:14 176:2,12 | 197:10,12,13 | 129:18 140:25 |
| 215:24 | normally $89: 25$ | 198:3 | 149:25 156:6 |
| newer 85:25 | 167:14,21 187:14 | nuts 32:15 | 188:13 |
| newest 127:6 | no | 0 | occasionally 7:25 |
| news 148:16 198:2 207:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { northern } 21: 16 \\ & 22: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { o } 185: 17 \text { 186:13,24 }$ | $\begin{array}{rr}13: 5 \\ \text { occur } & 153: 15\end{array}$ |
| nice 182:25 | notation 67:12 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { oono } \\ \text { oaks } & 153.5\end{array}$ | curred |
| niches 51:19 | note 111:21 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { oaks } & 15 \\ \text { oath } & \text { 5:4 }\end{array}$ | occurrence 110:23 |
| night 106:18 | 169:24 | obispo $37: 20$ | occurring 12:6 |
| 116:12 | noted 222:3 | $\text { object } 155: 7$ | ocean 3:4 |
| nightclub 146:17 | notice 4:7 5:21 | $202 \cdot 18$ | odd 98:1 167:24 |
| 146:21 | 14:20 27:11,22 |  | 168:2 |
| nighttime 145:24 | 33:24 110:20 |  | odds 206:16 |
| 146:4 | 119:12 190:14 | $25 \text { 25:1 }$ | offense 15:6 |
| nine 31:8 144:10 | 1:14,25 |  | offer 167:19 |
| 144:11 206:2 | noticed 111:5,8 | 75:9 76:1978:9 | office 27:15 70:11 |
| nomenclature | noticing 22:18 | 78:20 91:14 96:19 | 70:18 118:7 151:9 |
| 41:18 58:15 | november 45:24 | 96:21 112:14 | 151:10 160:16 |
| non 19:2 20:2 | 45:25,25 | 115:9 124:18 | 192:18 |
| 22:25 23:1 25:12 | number 4:6 10:12 | 125:10,24 140:2 | officer 9:24 44:6 |
| 85:2 98:13 103:3 | 23:2 28:17 31:8 | 125.10,24 140.2 | 47:7 53:12 145:12 |
| 107:4 109:16 | 105:24 138:16 |  | 145:17 151:3,25 |
| 152:22 153:11,15 | 141:6 150:10 |  | 156:17,25 157:4,8 |
| 156:10 162:8 | 152:24 170:2 |  | 160:3 |
| 183:6 184:24 | 173:19 175:15,17 |  | officer's 133:22 |
| 215:7 | 176:7 177:17 | 18 | officers 50:13,17 |
| nonassault 179:10 | 178:6,9 179:1 |  | 137:10 144:12 |
| 184:16 | 180:12 182:18 |  | 154:13,16,23 |
| noncriminal 25:2 | 183:6,19,20 |  | 156:10 160:12 |
| nonfixed 60:2 | 184:12,13,14,21 | 205:4 212:25 | offices 165:23 |
| 127:4,15 162:6 | 185:2 186: | 213:6 214:2,12,15 | official 1:7 2:8 |
|  | 191:22 192:11 | 214:24 215:19 |  |
|  |  | 216:7 217:14,18 |  |

## [officially - ownership]

| officially 71:22 | 141:11,13,17,21 | 115:13,13,14 | 181:25 195:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| oh 20:18 28:14 | 144:5,8,14 145:4 | 118:9 145:2,14 | orleans 46:24 |
| 45:8,22 68:19 | 145:23 147:13 | 152:24 | utcome 220:15 |
| 144:3,10 186:2 | 148:5 149:17 | о00 4:4,14 221:17 | outdated 213:4 |
| okay 6:4 7:2,18 | 152:14 159:20 | open 165:7 176:22 | outfit 134:24 |
| 8:7,15,17 9:2 10:4 | 160:19 161:4 | operating 77:6 | outline 158:7 |
| 10:15 11:12 14:10 | 162:11 164:2 | operation 17:6 | outlined 50:10 |
| 14:19 15:16,21 | 169:12,16,23 | 34:6 | utset 15:3 |
| 16:1,1,13 17:1 | 170:18 175:7 | operational | outside 95:7 |
| 18:4 19:21 20:23 | 176:22 178:17,22 | 100:13,14 101:13 | 170:20 172:24 |
| 21:22 22:18 25:7 | 182:17 184:13,13 | 101:14 173:10 | outsiders 105:9 |
| 25:9 26:5 28:3 | 185:4,9 186:2,5 | operations 34:16 | overall 18:23 |
| 29:25 30:6 32:7 | 189:9 190:8,20 | opine 200:14 | 27:12 80:19,24 |
| 33:7,12 42:21 | 191:5 199:2 | opined 212:6 | 82:8 85:8 88:16 |
| 44:6,21 45:9,11 | 202:17 203:18,20 | opinion 112:10,20 | 88:18 98:15 102:8 |
| 51:25 54:1,8,21 | 204:2,17 205:9 | 120:4 121:10,11 | 151:2 183:24 |
| 55:18 57:20 58:17 | 206:1,18 207:4 | 121:15 127:17 | 185:25 214:11 |
| 59:22 60:18 61:14 | 208:7 209:2,18 | 144:20 155:24 | overcome 80:2 |
| 62:3,4,6,12,15,21 | 210:9,20 211:18 | 161:16 165:3,15 | overpenetrate |
| 62:24 63:3 64:9 | 211:21,24 212:4 | 167:1 200:6 | 207:22 |
| 65:15 67:4,5,13,21 | 213:18 215:10 | 202:18,23 203:8 | overpenetration |
| 68:3,23 69:2,14,17 | 216:19 217:1,1,10 | 204:6 207:21 | 209:19 210:15 |
| 72:14 73:5 74:2,7 | 218:10,13 220:7 | 209:17 212:7 | override 121:4 |
| 74:8,9 75:6 76:7 | 221:10 | 220:17,20 | oversight 207:12 |
| 76:13,23 78:14 | old 71:19 132:4 | opinions 199:6,9 | 208:17 |
| 79:17 80:15 81:1 | 215:24 | opponent 113:12 | overtime 29:18 |
| 82:5,17,19 86:16 | older 22:19 23:4,4 | opponent's 131:5 | owe 131:22 |
| 87:6,8,11 88:9 | 52:18 | opposed 38:5 48:4 | owned 26:24 |
| 89:7,8 93:12 | olympic 85:23 | 51:177:3 85:25 | 180:20 184:15,17 |
| 97:10 98:9 99:17 | omission 205:6 | 104:4 165:12 | owner 103:4 |
| 99:20 101:6,18 | omitted 178:20 | 177:11 | 164:13 166:9,9 |
| 103:1 104:16,17 | omitting 178:8 | opposite 111:1 | 185:5 |
| 106:6 108:9 | 180:10 | option 187:1 | owners 123:12 |
| 111:17 116:13 | once 20:21 33:13 | options 64:7 95:20 | 164:8 166:6 |
| 119:4,9,22 122:4 | 82:4 86:5 156:5,5 | 95:22 194:4,7 | 190:14 191:14,25 |
| 126:7,25 128:25 | 156:15 | oranges 207:7 | 192:23 193:9,9 |
| 129:21 131:17,22 | one's 61:10 | order 82:22 84:2 | 197:8 |
| 133:24 136:15 | ones 25:744:19,21 | 157:7 188:3 | ownership 17:24 |
| 137:1,5,12,16,24 | 57:7 59:177:23 | 191:11 | 166:15 173:13 |
| 138:5 139:8,15 | 92:7 97:25 98:1 | original $40: 25$ | 191:3 |
| 140:6,10,17 | 100:3 107:8 115:7 | 41:4,4,6 46:7 71:8 |  |

## [owning - penetration]

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { owning } 181: 21 \\ & \text { 194:12 } \\ & \text { owns 117:12 } \\ & 182: 19 \end{aligned}$ | paid $178: 24,25$ <br> pants $158: 11$ <br> paper $80: 7$ <br> paperwork $122: 15$ <br> 23:20  | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 13 \text { 155:15 } \\ & \text { 174:25 203:15 } \\ & 204: 5 \text { 205:10,11 } \\ & 213: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { pause } 5: 25111: 15 \\ 152: 18169: 14 \\ 180: 16203: 24 \\ \text { pay } 153: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p | 24:11 | partially 158:3 | peace $50: 13,17$ |
| p | paragraph 9:15 | 87:10 | $53: 11 \quad 137: 10$ |
| p.c. | 16:13 28:7,19 | participated 17:3 | 144:12 156:10 |
|  | 30:8,18 31:11,17 | 39:7 | 157:4 160:2,11 |
| 103:11,11 161:12 | 44:13 68:3 73:5,6 | particular 12:12 | penal 7:21,23 12:1 |
| 1:12 221:16 | 80:18,21 81:5 | 13:12 32:12,13 | 15:10,23 44:3 |
| pace 28:1 120:9 | 103:14 105:20 | 33:13,20 34: | 7:10 54:12,18,22 |
| package 7:7 70: | 106:7 107:6 108:3 | 35:1 42:22 43:18 | 55:4 57:14 58:5 |
| pad 95.596 .3 | 129:21 133:12 | 46:20 47:5 48:23 | 58:18 60:8 62:16 |
| ddles | 135:8 136:17 | 49:11 50:6,20 | 62:17 63:3,5,15 |
| ds $95: 6,14$ | 137:2,3 150:12 | 51:13 65:24 79:8 | 64:10 66:3 69:20 |
|  | 159:21 161:5,15 | 89:3 94:13 130:24 | 70:13,25 71:6 |
|  | 165:3,16 167:2 | 138:12,15 145:21 | 74:15,17 77:5 |
|  | 199:5 202:10,13 | 147:19 149:2 | 82:14 105:8 107:7 |
|  | 202:17 203:4,13 | 150:15,16 151:4 | 109:18 111:19 |
| 1 | 204:4,15,16 | 159:12 172:15 | 12:25 126:12 |
| 80: | 205:22 207:23 | 192:24 197:1 | 129:22 135:3 |
| $83: 15$ | 209:19,21 210:14 | 202:11 203:16 | 136:8 139:22 |
| 99:21,21 100:3 | 212:1,3,4,5 220:9 | 204:9,24 206:6,7 | 40:21 142:13 |
| 103:14 105:20 | 220:10,13 | 209:13 210:12 | 50:9 154:7 |
| 106:3,4,6 113:7 | parameters 72:3 | 221: | 57:14 163:3 |
| 126:8 128:13,13 | 82:11 | particular | 165:9 167:6 |
| 135:9,10 136:12 | pardon 37:5 175 | : | 170:14 217:6 |
| 136:13,16,24 | 208:4 | parties 223:12 | penalty 222:1 |
| 137:1,8 148:7 | parole 3 | partners 110:2 | pending 70:9 |
| $151: 8 \text { 153:25 }$ | parolees 9:25 | parts 20:16 46:9 | 184:10,10 197:15 |
| 159:21 161:14 | part 7:23 9:20 | 129:19 146:19 | 197:20,25 198:7 |
| 169:16,20 185:17 | 22:10 23:15 29:6 | pass 166:1 | penetrate 39:16 |
| 191:24,24 192:1,4 | 36:11 38:12 40:13 | 67:13 | 33:18,22,25 |
| 197:2 203:17 | 41:15,16 42:1 | passed 183:1 | 134:5,9 |
| $204: 20 \text { 205:21,23 }$ | 46:5,7,7 47:24 | 90:1 | penetrated 204:11 |
| 206:5,12,17 207:1 | 52:7 57:7 58:5,11 | path 62:11 115:21 | 212:16,22 |
| 209:18,20 210:2 | 61:17,18 68:13 | 207:10 210:2 | penetrating |
| 211:1 212:2,3,14 | 81:11 100:3 | patock 148:8 | 209:25 |
| 216:19 217:2 | 105:16 124:20 | patrolling 34:18 | penetration 206:6 |
| pages 1:25 191:22 | 128:11 129:3 | pattern 119:12 | 210:24 211:6 |
| 217:1 | 130:4 149:22 |  |  |
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## [people - plaintiffs]

| people 17:6,11 | 175:21 177:4,8,9 | 64:19 65:2,25 | 190:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20:9,12,15 22:16 | 177:25 197:8 | 66:4 72:24 94:17 | pink 176:20 |
| 26:25 27:14 32:22 | 214:1,5 | 94:25 95:21 103:4 | pins 101:16 |
| 37:21 40:10 42:11 | percentage 18:7 | 106:20 108:14,21 | pistol 19:8 31:3 |
| 43:24 47:2,21 | 21:7 22:22,25 | 113:13,22 114:5 | 32:2 45:5,22 |
| 52:3 66:16,21 | 27:14 122:7 166:7 | 116:15 125:2,6,8 | 61:12 63:7 64:3 |
| 79:8 95:10,24 | 181:16 214:9,22 | 125:13 126:4 | 67:14,16,19 68:1,3 |
| 96:2 101:21 | percentages 21:8 | 134:25 155:6 | 68:4,6 71:10,14,21 |
| 104:11 108:6,14 | percenter 175:13 | 158:9,15,16 | 72:7,9,14,22 73:6 |
| 108:19 114:18 | percenters 174:23 | 162:23 171:17 | 73:13,17,21 74:21 |
| 116:19 117:22,25 | 176:3,4 178:5 | 176:17 199:18 | 75:6 76:14,15 |
| 120:7 123:25 | percents 178:25 | 201:18 | 77:5,11 78:12 |
| 124:2,12 129:9,18 | perception 152:23 | person's 183:22 | 79:6,18,19,22 80:9 |
| 138:17 142:6,19 | 153:14 | personal 25:5 38:6 | 84:14 85:23 99:10 |
| 143:6,10,16 146:9 | perfect 115:23 | 121:16 154:10 | 107:9 108:12 |
| 146:22 147:8 | 122:10 193:2,12 | personally 24:18 | 110:18,21 111:1 |
| 149:7,25 152:25 | performed 38:20 | 29:13,18,23 | 111:22,25 112:1,4 |
| 153:7 156:13 | performs 204:20 | 189:15 | 114:3,5 117:7 |
| 158:2,10,14,25,25 | period 11:20 12:3 | personnel 159:22 | 119:18 128:21 |
| 159:5 160:12 | 12:6,9 13:9,25 | persons 17:14 | 135:4,19 139:23 |
| 162:17 166:2,15 | 14:11 27:25 34:10 | 137:9 160:21 | 140:13,20 141:18 |
| 167:3 172:5 | 162:10 191:6 | perspective 113:2 | 141:23 142:8,21 |
| 174:15 175:14 | periods 78:1 165:7 | peter 3:8 219:9 | 143:25 144:23 |
| 179:25 181:1 | perjury 24:11 | peter.chang 3:10 | 147:7 150:22 |
| 182:25 183:15,21 | 222:2 | phone 148:20 | 171:18,22 186:7 |
| 186:16,18,19,21 | permissibl | phoney 23:20 | 217:12 218:2,3,14 |
| 186:25 189:23 | 112:16 | physical 57:10 | 219:5 221:2,3,6,9 |
| 190:22 192:14,25 | permit 24:9 | 192:23 | pistols 18:22 45:3 |
| 193:19 194:3 | 162:22 201:10 | pick 54:6 148:17 | 66:18 84:17 111:3 |
| 195:11,23 196:4,8 | permits 13:15 | 174:12 | 128:22 183:5 |
| 198:6 199:16 | 163:1 | pi | 3:3 |
| people's 184:8 | permitted 50:20 | picking 113:13 | place 36:4 53:8,10 |
| perceive 115:24 | 163:7 | 151:4 153:18 | 71:17 223:4 |
| 125:6 | perpetrated | picture 75:16 77:1 | placed 48:3 68:8 |
| perceived 152:13 | 152:21 | 86:22 87:17 93:20 | 167:11 |
| percent 17:10 18:5 | perpetrator | 114:17 117:2 | plaintiff's 4:7 5:21 |
| 18:13,19,19 19:1,4 | 136:18 | 143:23 | 169:21 |
| 19:25 27:16,22,23 | person 17:8,9,19 | piece 167:25 | plaintiffs 1:5 2:6 |
| 120:12 122:5 | 17:23,24 20:2,2,3 | pile 8:16 | 2:18 3:2 5:13 |
| 132:21 166:1 | 26:25 34:2 50:5 | pin 187:11 188:15 | 161:18 |
| 171:6 173:14,15 | 50:11 51:13,23 | 188:18 189:6 |  |
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## [plan - prevalence]

| plan | plug 114:17 | portion 68:9 75:5 | 180:11,12 181:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| planning 112:21 | plus 58:13 83:2 | 81:7 202:12 | 184:21 194:5 |
| plastic 139:11 | 204:9,9 | position 77:13 | 201:15 205:3 |
| plate 93:18 134:7 | plywood 210:5 | 92:16 93:22 | 211:12,13 |
| 134:8,9,10 | 211:2 | 100:24 112:22 | powerful 132:20 |
| plates 122:16 | point 28:13,14 | 148:9 | 132:21,23 |
| 134:14 | 31:8 42:1 61:20 | positive 80:13 | pra 182:3 |
| platform 13:8,24 | 64:2,6 80:5 85:12 | possess 181:2 | pra'd 196:24 |
| 14:3,3,8,12,21,24 | 88:25 91:7 113:3 | possessed 141:10 | practical 94:24 |
| 16:3 20:17 21:12 | 114:12,16 121:2 | 182:8 | 171:21 172:9,20 |
| 21:20,23 25:12,18 | 127:4 131:17 | possesses 17:21 | practicality 172:7 |
| 26:12,14 27:7 | 132:15 151:17 | possession 10:1 | practice 163:6 |
| 28:4 30:25 41:6 | 155:22 158:13 | 16:23 23:17 24:10 | 172:23 174:2 |
| 47:22 55:19,24 | 162:11,18 163:10 | 29:4,7,9,11 164:4 | 190:4 |
| 58:2,11 59:23 | 166:7 176:15 | 164:5,24 | pre 195:3 |
| 85:2 86:10 88:20 | 183:18 187:13,17 | possibility 178:13 | precise 149:10 |
| 95:11 97:8,10,13 | 205:2 211:9 216:1 | possible 13:13 | predecessor 60:11 |
| 97:18 98:11 | pointed 110:9 | 86:20 89:21 | predecessors |
| 171:10 172:11,21 | 111:7 117:8 | 122:22 125:21 | 141:4 |
| 173:1,14 180:18 | 157:23 158:14,23 | 142:19 193:18 | prefer 78:12 93:4 |
| 180:20,23 181:2,5 | 212:14 | 213:9 | 113:14 116:8 |
| 182:18 184:15,20 | pointing 77:21 | possibly 7:9,14 | preference 121:16 |
| 186:7 189:9 | 79:15 110:21 | 27:19 40:5 43:22 | premarked 5:6 |
| 193:22 195:12,22 | 148:19 | 71:11 82:16 83:3 | prepared 201:22 |
| 200:6 201:4 | points 122:7 | 90:1 105:7 173:15 | present 10:7 11:13 |
| 213:25 | 132:12 204:22 | 178:22 180:14 | 13:14 16:14 20:8 |
| platforms 23:1 | poked 173:15 | 190:6 206:5 | 22:21 142:13 |
| 26:13,17 27:24 | police 9:24 13:16 | 211:16 214:4 | 171:25 |
| 92:6 | 126:3 143:1 | post 27:3 60:2 | presented 186:3 |
| play 13:13 14:18 | 154:13,16,23 | 160:3,3,8 184:10 | presenters 47:13 |
| 14:20 29:8 60:23 | 156:25 157:8 | posters 192:4,9 | 48:2 |
| 120:17 145:1 | 164:21 | potential 75:7 | press 183:19 |
| 146:5 148:11 | policies 157:14 | 127:25 128:2 | 192:17,17 |
| 162:6,16 | policy 33:3 109:1 | potentially $73: 18$ | presumably |
| please 11:5 16:5,7 | 154:15 196:16 | 76:2 79:10,11 | 194:20 204:10 |
| 65:9 96:25 198:17 | pool 178:19 | 87:20 89:12 97:15 | pretty 18:17 19:7 |
| 198:20 199:1 | poor 132:4 | 105:9 108:5,16 | 30:17 86:9 102:4 |
| 203:21 213:20,21 | pop 26:23 188:3,4 | 109:12,13 115:2,4 | 175:19 183:13 |
| 221:14 | popular 67:14 | 120:15 132:8 | prevalence 14:21 |
| plenty 36:20 | population 114:22 | 2:18 144:25 | 27:1 |
|  | 182:10 | 150:22 178:8 |  |

[prevalent - purposes]

| prevalent 12:18 | 182:6 184:23 | program 9:21 | protrusion 187:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13:8 20:11 21:5 | 192:18 196:14 | 17:16 168:7 184:5 | 187:15 |
| 21:14 25:13 27:1 | 199:18 200:13 | 184:6 191:19 | proud 40:22 42:8 |
| 67:20 73:4 173:2 | 201:8,11 206:24 | programers | provide 29:15 |
| prevent 109:7 | 221:8 | 182:23 | 202:13 |
| previous 6:21 | probation 32:17 | programmer | provided 6:23 7:6 |
| 168:24 216:6 | 33:15 | 173:21 | 125:18 219:12 |
| previously 31:23 | problem 24:21 | programs 31:18 | provides 84:10 |
| 54:17 201:21 | 43:6 47:22 115:24 | prohibit 17:1 | provisions 161:16 |
| 213:19,22 215:10 | 161:1 164:15 | prohibited 14:14 | proximity 201:17 |
| 220:7,11 | problematic 113:1 | 16:19 17:2,14,19 | public 109:9,16 |
| prior 21:1 25:9 | problems 40:9 | 20:2,2 62:15,17 | 113:1 115:6 138:1 |
| 26:3 27:6 28:3 | 42:24 43:7 93:11 | 63:9,15 73:5 | 156:12 161:18 |
| 174:5 175:20 | 106:9 | 103:3 107:4 | 165:5 178:10 |
| 177:6 190:25 | procedures 157:14 | 161:19 163:21 | 180:19 182:19 |
| 223:5 | proceedings 223:3 | projectile 204:20 | 184:15,17 193:7 |
| prison 40:4 117:20 | 223:5,6 | 204:21 | 193:11 194:13 |
| probably 9:5,6 | process 7:11 24:19 | projectiles 38:23 | publicizing 153:18 |
| 10:11 12:10,19,22 | 49:12 50:4,14 | 204:23 207:24 | pull 157:17 215:7 |
| 14:16 15:5 16:4 | 52:18,18,22 | 208:9,14 | pullback 85:20 |
| 19:1,10,25 20:5 | 175:16 | prolific 66:16 | pulled 34:17 |
| 21:20 36:5 38:17 | processed 183:14 | prominent 67:16 | 126:23 |
| 47:19 54:24 57:9 | processing 183:13 | promoters 22:11 | pulling 110:16 |
| 57:12 58:13 59:14 | produce 136:4 | 192:5,5 | pump 13:19 22:7 |
| 67:14,19 68:15 | produced 6:23 | prone | 66:24 184:25 |
| 75:15 80:1,2,5 | producing 6:12 | pronged 64:6 | pun 37:6 175:3 |
| 84:11 94:6 95:11 | 192:6 | proper 50:7 95:1,2 | 208:4 |
| 98:13 99:18 | product 42:12 | 96:9 100:21 | purchase 88:5 |
| 101:11 104:20 | 187:20 188:2 | 108:12 123:21 | 154:9,10,14 |
| 107:2 113:14,20 | 195:9 | 217:19 | 190:22 |
| 115:23 117:1 | production 6:5 | properly 51:1 | purchased 90:5 |
| 120:18,20 124:2 | products 78:4 | 94:10 209:23 | purple 176:20 |
| 128:23 132:21 | 187:8 188:8 | property 160:21 | purport 194:18 |
| 133:22 134:7 | 194:18,19 195:1,2 | proposed 165:18 | 216:10,11 |
| 139:5,10 141:7 | 195:6 | 167:22,25 168:17 | purpose 52:11 |
| 147:4 148:15,25 | professional 25:4 | 168:18 | 154:18 182:4 |
| 149:12,17 151:6 | 22: | prosecutor 49:9 | purposes 31:25 |
| 153:23 155:21 | professor 178:3 | protect 110:1 | 41:14,24 62:1 |
| 159:10 164:8 | 180:10 | protrudes 68:5 | 69:20 70:5,7 71:2 |
| 174:4,11,13 175:6 | proficiency 200:4 | 72:22 77:19 | 102:12,14 106:21 |
| 179:24 180:3 |  |  | 200:23 |
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## [push - reasonable]

| push 59:5 62:4 | 95:25 96:22 97:7 | r | readjust 106:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $77: 16,18183: 18$ | 102:21 104:13 | r 106:4 | ready $33: 18,23$ |
| pushed 70:16 | 12:18 121:8 | $\text { raids } 34: 1$ | 148:14 |
| put 22:22 37:1 | 138:18 151:16 | raised 211:13,14 | real 10:2 18:11 |
| 40:8 45:12,21 | 156:5 164:4 | raises 209:2 | 36:2 122:25 |
| 48:5 57:21 66:18 | 165:13 166:13 | ram 33:24 | 185:13 |
| 77:17 93:10 96:2 | 178:11,15 181:14 | random 13:6 | reality $35: 1536: 4$ |
| 100:17 101:10 | 181:25 197:21 | $25: 17$ | 36:6 |
| 102:8 112:21 | 198:25 209:6,14 |  | realize 111:10 |
| 118:25 123:9 | 210:8,9,12,13 | $35: 1436: 1038: 18$ | 124:16 125:7 |
| 129:3 149:10 | 211:11,13 214:8 | $50: 1588: 1116: 18$ | realized 210:2 |
| 150:2 157:9 | 214:14,15,17,18 | 120:2 121:5 | really $8: 910: 10,15$ |
| 163:22 165:1 | 217:14 218:4 | 34:20,22 | 14:18 28:12 34:4 |
| 187:23 188:2,14 | 219:20 | rank 21:9 | 53:10,14 58:8 |
| 188:15 192:6 | questioned 213:11 | rapes 156:9 | 72:13 74:1 79:1 |
| 193:6 196:20 | questioning 50:12 | rare 19:7 24:23 | 83:8 86:25 88:18 |
| 209:10 | 215:13,22 219:8 | 35:17 57:12 159:7 | 89:17 94:3,5 |
| putting 10:12 | 219:10 | 159:9 | 100:25 105:8 |
| 101:8 132:9 | questions | rarely | 110:23 112:13,15 |
| 162:21 166:3 | 65:20 143:5 161:5 | $177: 25$ | 116:17 119:23,25 |
| 177:18 201:20 | 209:3 211:21 | rate 119:4,5 | 122:14 131:23 |
| 209:9 | 219:13 | $135:$ | 148:16 149:3 |
| q | quick 73:23 128:4 | 154:25 166:3 | 167:19 172:17 |
| qualification |  | 218:1 | 176:23 178:19 |
| 122:22 160:7 | quicker | rated 134:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 190: 3198: 5,16 \\ & 203: 21 \text { 204:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| qualifications 9:10 | $\begin{array}{rr} \text { quicker } & 120: 1 \\ 128: 10 & 136: 6 \end{array}$ | rating $134: 16$ reached 65:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 203: 21204: 21 \\ & \text { rear } 187: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| ualified | 221:4 | 199: | 188:18 189:6 |
| $30: 19,2131: 10$ | quickly $74: 1$ | reaching 170 | 190:1 |
| 48:11 49:16,22 | 118:23 127:14 | reaction 110:22 | reason 22:9 24:24 |
| 51:7 | 188:7 219:3 | $125: 3,8$ | 28:15 36:2 75:15 |
| qualify 49:12 | quickness 144:22 | reacts | 84:20 94:24 96:17 |
| 136:18 170:14 | quite 13:21 115:19 | read 11:9,10 72:3 | 100:25 108:24 |
| qualifying 160:12 | 129:7 145:15 | 72:3,5,18 97:2,3 | 18:8 157:5,17 |
| quarterly 160:16 |  | 138:24 140:9,23 | $\begin{aligned} & 162: 18 ~ 171: 5,9,2 \\ & 172: 4,10,20 \end{aligned}$ |
| quarters 35:7 | quote 67:15 108:4 | 219:19,22 222:2 | 181:20 197:1 |
| quest 150:4 | 108:5 129:25 | reader 207:9 | 204:5 |
| question 7:17 11:8 |  | 216:13 | reasonable 125:17 |
| 12:10 14:19 17:5 | quoted 126.14 | reading 15:5 | 193:15 195:11,23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:7 52:24 55:8 } \\ & \text { 61:1 83:7 89:5 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 193.15 195.11,23 |
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## [reasons - release]

| reasons 25:1 | recess 54:3 103:11 | referring 7:20 | 49:23,25 50:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 171:17 200:24 | 161:12 | 17:13 26:3 72:15 | 52:13,14,16 53:2,2 |
| 204:15 | recollection | 78:2 137:7 202:9 | 53:4,8,19 68:14 |
| reassemble 190:12 | 146:15 200:16 | 204:2 | 70:4,16,20,21 71:1 |
| reassembling | record 5:25 11:10 | reflect 191:24 | 102:12,14 105:18 |
| 40:11 | 17:25 51:2,15 | reflective 173:12 | 115:17 162:10 |
| rebuttal 4:12 7:14 | 54:2,5 97:3 | 214:9 | 165:7 167:8 168:5 |
| 169:7,13,18,20 | 103:10,13 111:15 | reflects 184:14 | 183:8 192:7,19 |
| 199:5 202:10,17 | 140:9 152:18 | regarding 145:18 | 194:13 195:6 |
| 203:3 204:4 | 161:14 169:10,14 | 210:17 | 197:5 216:2 |
| 211:25 | 176:13 180:16 | regardless 60:24 | registrations |
| rebutted 213:14 | 182:12,14 198:16 | 71:22 94:23 107:3 | 184:3 197:15,18 |
| rebutting 202:13 | 198:18,20,21 | 188:24 191:5 | 197:19 |
| recall 5:11 6:9,12 | 203:24 213:21 | 200:18 202:19 | regs 71:19 105:8 |
| 6:14 38:3 39:5,10 | 219:8,22 223:6 | 203:8 204:6 212:8 | regular 159:22 |
| 39:22 40:19 41:13 | records 167:7 | regards 71:10 | regulation 70:15 |
| 44:2 47:4,6,24,25 | recover 16:19 18:6 | region 12:12 24:25 | 138:7 215:16 |
| 49:5 138:20 | 18:6,8,9 118:4 | register 18:16 | 216:6,13 |
| 139:13 145:11 | 175:11 | 50:5,17 62:18 | regulations 15:17 |
| 147:20 168:23 | recovered 65:12 | 70:2 154:9 162:15 | 54:19,21 55:21 |
| 197:6 206:22 | 129:17 | 162:17,23 165:6 | 56:11 68:13,14 |
| 210:22 214:14,17 | recoveries 17:1,2 | 166:21 167:3 | 69:5 70:16 71:8 |
| 214:18,19 215:18 | 18:4 | 185:22 186:9,9,11 | 105:17 185:4,10 |
| received 192:11 | recovery 17:4,9 | 186:16 188:4 | 185:21 186:1 |
| receiver 21:24 | recruit 132:4 | 190:11,20 191:8,8 | 215:13 |
| 58:16 62:25 63:12 | redepose 219:11 | 191:15 192:2 | regulatory 70:12 |
| 63:13,17,23 64:1,7 | 219:17 | 193:8,10,16,24 | rein 126:18 |
| 64:10,20 65:4,9,25 | redirect 211:21 | registered 17:18 | reinvented 115:20 |
| 66:1,2 81:11 83:3 | 215:1 216:8 | 51:1 53:11 61:24 | reiterated 34:18 |
| 83:6,21,25 84:5,19 | 217:19 218:18 | 62:3,8 163:2,8 | rejection 186:16 |
| 84:20 86:7 97:23 | reduced 219:1 | 164:2,8,13,23 | rejections 186:19 |
| 102:21 107:22 | refer 8:14 74:5 | 166:8 181:3,5 | 186:23 |
| 173:25 175:13 | reference 7:15 | 183:2,8,22 184:2 | related 20:1 |
| 176:1 178:1 179:3 | 55:8 164:25 | 184:14,19 185:2 | 168:22 169:3 |
| 187:14 | referenced 55:3 | 191:1 193:20 | relates 161:7 |
| receivers 64:17 | 202:1 205:18,22 | 197:8 | relative 175:7 |
| 65:14 66:9,15,21 | 213:15 | registering 50:6 | 223:11 |
| 92:11 173:7,9,24 | referencing 203:1 | 187:2,21 | relatively 149:11 |
| 174:22,24 179:6,6 | 204:13 | registrants 194:6 | release 59:5,16 |
| 179:19 180:8 | referred 141:12 | registration 7:12 | 62:4 177:16 |
| 181:13 |  | 12:23 17:23 48:17 | 183:19 187:8,9 |

[released - rifle]

| released 59:1 | $\text { repair } 162: 24$ | reported 1:22 | responsibility |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213:3 | repeat 11:7 120:11 | 17:25 212:21 | 157:6 |
| releases 192:17 | 140:8 198:25 | reporter 2:21 30:3 | responsible |
| relevance 206:1,2 | 199:1 | 221:12 223:2 | 123:12 138:15 |
| relevant 9:1271:5 | repetitive 33:2 | reporting 164:16 | responsive 7:8 |
| 103:21,22,24 | rephrase 26:2 | 164:19,20 | 13:23 52:23 |
| 183:24 | 104:13 108:4 | reports 211:22 | 112:18 121:8 |
| relic 22:6 | 218:6 | request 6:5 151:10 | 217:22 |
| relied 6:22 7:3,19 | report 4:10,12 | requests 6:20 | rest 71:15 100:2 |
| 202:2,4,5,7 213:4 | 6:22 7:3,4,10,14 | require 59:20 | 173:5 |
| 213:15 | 7:20 8:22 9:9 28:7 | 188:8 | restrict 62:22 |
| relief 93:20 | 44:13 54:7 67:13 | required 18:2 | restricted 56:17 |
| reload 73:12 77:1 | 68:4,15 72:4,12 | requirement | 61:6,7 111:18 |
| 77:2 117:6,12 | 74:1 87:12 99:18 | 56:24 57:1 | 112:12 131:8 |
| 119:15 120:10 | 103:14 111:20 | requirements | 163:8,13 165:4 |
| 143:3 164:1 | 121:11 126:8,15 | 160:7 | 167:5 172:25 |
| 188:13 189:23 | 128:13 129:21 | requires 102:23 | restrictions 78:15 |
| 221:4 | 138:24 140:22,24 | 171:15 188:3 | 131:14 163:22 |
| reloaded 127:14 | 141:3,12 143:17 | reregister 190:15 | 167:11 |
| reloading 149:14 | 150:12 154:1 | 190:18,20 | restricts 167:6 |
| 221:6 | 161:6,15,16 | research 152:14 | result 125:18,23 |
| reloads 144:1,3 | 164:22 165:1 | 208:8 | 147:23 156:21 |
| 221:8 | 167:2 169:7,13,16 | researcher 153:21 | 175:21,23 212:6 |
| rely 7:6 202:11 | 178:14 180:5 | residence 163:5 | retain 79:15 |
| remember 6:11 | 199:5,7,10 200:15 | 171:3 | retained 31:24 |
| 40:21 42:16 44:5 | 200:17 201:25 | residents 22:8 | retention 32:25 |
| 45:15 99:16 | 202:1,2,10,12,14 | 42:2 | 77:25 |
| 139:14 145:11,15 | 202:18,25 203:2,4 | resistance 125:1 | retired 140:25 |
| 147:23 169:3 | 203:19 204:5 | 155:25 | 158:25 206:8,9 |
| 208:11 211:3 | 205:11,14,17,19 | resistant 133:13 | 209:8 212:11 |
| 215:23 | 205:24,25 206:15 | 133:19 | retract 188:20 |
| remove 8:12 63:7 | 206:18,22 207:2,6 | respect 88:2 98:10 | retrieve 37:2 |
| 63:7,8 171:22 | 207:7,11 208:4,7 | 107:19 108:10 | reverse 89:25 |
| 172:10 185:11 | 208:13,21,25 | respond 105:4 | review 52:6 |
| 187:11 189:7 | 209:4,11,20,23 | responding 145:17 | 143:14 167:21 |
| 190:9 195:8 | 210:8,8,16,17,20 | 201:25 | 197:25 211:9 |
| removed 63:4 | 211:7,9,15,23,25 | response 6:13 50:8 | reviewed 197:2 |
| removing 19:2 | 212:6,14,19,19,20 | 110:20 124:16,19 | ricochetted 145:13 |
| 185:12 | 212:20 213:3,5,10 | 126:3 169:17,21 | rid 167:14 |
| reno 22:14 23:3 | 213:14 216:19 | 182:4 | rifle 4:11 14:8,12 |
| 129:7 | 217:2 |  | 16:3 19:2,15,16 |

## [rifle - right]

| $30: 22,2533: 8$ | $122: 1,3124: 1,1,2$ | $55: 16,19,2456: 22$ | $76: 1,1179: 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $34: 837: 1,1,1,16$ | $124: 6127: 16,17$ | $58: 1959: 2361: 2$ | $80: 2081: 8,13$ |
| $39: 2441: 643: 15$ | $127: 23,24128: 4,7$ | $61: 362: 7,9,19,22$ | $83: 16,22,2584: 1,3$ |
| $44: 755: 11,25$ | $128: 25129: 23$ | $64: 166: 1867: 17$ | $84: 4,785: 3,4,8,11$ |
| $56: 1558: 260: 18$ | $133: 5,6,17,18,21$ | $72: 773: 475: 8,13$ | $86: 11,1887: 12,15$ |
| $61: 462: 1563: 3,7$ | $133: 25134: 6,8,9$ | $85: 14,1588: 1$ | $88: 689: 1,4,11$ |
| $64: 265: 872: 10$ | $135: 2,9,11,15,17$ | $98: 10,12107: 8$ | $90: 5,7,9,14,18,20$ |
| $72: 11,2573: 7,20$ | $135: 18,24,25$ | $111: 2117: 16$ | $90: 2191: 1,8$ |
| $74: 6,6,8,9,11,17$ | $136: 9,19138: 9,13$ | $126: 8,25129: 1,22$ | $94: 1596: 2598: 5$ |
| $75: 1,4,776: 7,9,9$ | $138: 15139: 16,17$ | $133: 1149: 18$ | $98: 2599: 6100: 16$ |
| $76: 2577: 3,4,7,11$ | $140: 21141: 11,12$ | $154: 1,4,16,17$ | $102: 3,12,18,20,24$ |
| $78: 879: 18,19$ | $141: 23,23142: 1,9$ | $155: 19,19160: 5$ | $103: 19104: 12,18$ |
| $80: 19,2381: 15,21$ | $142: 14143: 12$ | $164: 3166: 20$ | $106: 10107: 6,10$ |
| $81: 2482: 6,23,24$ | $144: 21,21146: 12$ | $169: 25170: 3,6,10$ | $107: 13,16108: 15$ |
| $83: 3,4,16,1884: 2$ | $146: 16147: 6,10$ | $173: 1,11177: 24$ | $108: 17,18,20,24$ |
| $84: 1385: 2,2,7,10$ | $150: 9151: 18$ | $178: 6,9179: 20$ | $113: 2115: 1,8$ |
| $85: 2086: 1487: 2$ | $170: 7171: 10$ | $180: 13,18,20,23$ | $116: 10119: 18,24$ |
| $87: 15,1888: 7,9,15$ | $172: 12,21173: 14$ | $181: 2,22182: 18$ | $121: 13122: 18,20$ |
| $89: 4,17,21,2292: 8$ | $174: 9175: 24$ | $184: 16189: 12$ | $122: 25123: 4,11$ |
| $92: 21,2493: 2,4,13$ | $176: 10179: 7,13$ | $190: 16191: 15$ | $123: 17,19,22$ |
| $93: 1794: 1295: 2$ | $185: 7,7,11,23$ | $193: 10195: 12,22$ | $124: 7127: 19,21$ |
| $95: 896: 11,14$ | $186: 6,7,9187: 20$ | $195: 22197: 9$ | $128: 18,20131: 11$ |
| $98: 2099: 10$ | $188: 2,5189: 5,9$ | $200: 6206: 21$ | $131: 21133: 3,6,10$ |
| $102: 23103: 8$ | $195: 24197: 8$ | $207: 6213: 25$ | $133: 15135: 16$ |
| $106: 7,20,25$ | $201: 5,14207: 8$ | $216: 21217: 3$ | $136: 2,12,19137: 8$ |
| $107: 21108: 17$ | $217: 4,4,8,12,13,13$ | $220: 22$ | $137: 9138: 9,10$ |
| $110: 18,21111: 1,6$ | $217: 24,25218: 2,3$ | right $8: 169: 17$ | $139: 3,9,17,23$ |
| $111: 18113: 7,8,10$ | $218: 8,9,9,14,16$ | $15: 7,1116: 24$ | $145: 8146: 9,22$ |
| $113: 11,11,13,13$ | $219: 2,2,4,6220: 1$ | $22: 2426: 6,7$ | $147: 1,11,12149: 4$ |
| $113: 14,16114: 11$ | $220: 4$ | $27: 1529: 1,5,10$ | $149: 8,23151: 14$ |
| $114: 12,17,21,21$ | rifle's $88: 11$ | $30: 831: 1534: 1$ | $153: 12156: 7,10$ |
| $114: 24,25115: 3$ | rifles $10: 2311: 25$ | $37: 1338: 939: 25$ | $156: 13,18157: 2,8$ |
| $115: 15116: 8,9,15$ | $12: 1713: 8,25$ | $42: 9,1345: 15$ | $157: 10159: 24$ |
| $116: 16,19,20$ | $14: 2118: 20,24$ | $48: 1849: 1751: 5$ | $160: 22161: 23$ |
| $117: 1,5,9,15,15,16$ | $19: 1,620: 1721: 3$ | $53: 5,954: 14,25$ | $164: 14,15166: 1$ |
| $117: 17,17,17$ | $21: 5,11,1225: 11$ | $55: 1756: 1,12$ | $166: 20,21169: 6$ |
| $118: 10,11119: 2,3$ | $25: 12,13,1826: 4$ | $57: 461: 18,21$ | $169: 12170: 4,8,11$ |
| $119: 6,6,7,22,22$ | $27: 7,2428: 4$ | $64: 2366: 6,14$ | $170: 16,23171: 23$ |
| $120: 5,5,12,16$ | $30: 1333: 543: 17$ | $67: 7,968: 1069: 3$ | $172: 6,8,12,20,22$ |
| $121: 10,11,15,16$ | $43: 2444: 2245: 7$ | $69: 11,1470: 5,14$ | $173: 25174: 2,21$ |
| $121: 20,20,21,22$ | $47: 4,17,2355: 10$ | $72: 1173: 175: 24$ | $176: 6,10177: 1,7$ |
|  |  |  |  |

[right - scientific]

[scope - setting]

| scope 213:7 | 136:9 139:22 | 213:23,24 215:4 | 65:6 71:17 93:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 214:24 215:1 | 140:21 142:13 | seizes 173:3 | 94:1 96:8 116:11 |
| 216:7 217:19 | 150:9 163:3 | seizing 24:7 | 121:6,7 162:4 |
| 218:18 | 170:15 185:5,25 | seizure 17:12 | 163:23 177:9 |
| score 80:6,10 | 217:6 | select 31:1 32:19 | 181:4 182:20 |
| 122:2,2,14,21 | sections 47:10 | 33:3 41:9 42:5 | 192:22 200:21 |
| screen 158:6 | 126:24 186:4 | 44:11 58:9 | 211:9 216:14 |
| screw 177:16 | security 158:6 | self 106:22 108:14 | senses 188:23 |
| se 112:16 118:23 | see 6:6 20:16 | 108:20 123:3 | sent 186:21 192:4 |
| 167:10 186:24 | 21:24 22:5 23:2 | 200:7 201:12 | 192:9 |
| sean 3:3 5:12 6:18 | 26:17,21 28:4,15 | sell 13:6,16,17 | sentence 44:14 |
| 57:17 103:9 150:6 | 34:13 38:20,22 | 14:13 59:18 | 54:9 69:19 71:14 |
| search 20:5 32:17 | 39:15 41:15 46:5 | 134:20 162:19 | 135:8 208:6 |
| 32:17,18 33:22 | 48:8 50:25 70:21 | selling 13:1,2,16 | 211:17 |
| 36:15,19 48:5 | 81:1 84:11 87:22 | 176:17 | separate 48:17 |
| 93:9 129:14 | 95:3 104:5,7,7,21 | sells 192:13 | 102:20 109:20,23 |
| 158:16 182:20 | 105:5,9 116:13 | semiauto 45:14,18 | separated 102:9 |
| 184:22 | 121:2 137:17 | 45:21 61:11 65:18 | 102:14,19 103:2,5 |
| second 26:1 32:8 | 148:23 158:7 | 174:11 | separating 100:10 |
| 38:8 70:20 87:10 | 165:17,19 167:18 | semiautomatic | 101:7 |
| 101:4 124:8 | 171:17 173:11 | 21:20 30:14 46:3 | september 38:11 |
| 145:12 173:9 | 175:9,9 177:21,25 | 46:8,11 55:14 | 45:1 |
| 182:13 190:5 | 196:11,12 202:24 | 56:2,7,16,22,23 | sergeant 145:12 |
| 216:22 | 203:12,16,21 | 57:8 61:11 63:22 | serial 175:15 |
| seconds 100:19 | 205:10 209:6 | 63:23 65:2,8 | 176:7 177:17 |
| 101:6 119:2 | seeing 42:1 | 66:19 75:25 77:4 | 179:1 |
| 141:24 142:9,22 | seek 91:17 | 77:7 85:14 86:10 | serialized 176:14 |
| 142:23,25 189:2 | seeking 124:21 | 102:19,23 111:18 | 177:22 |
| 190:3 218:12 | 126:18 | 113:9 115:13 | series 15:18 55:16 |
| section 12:1 15:10 | seen 5:23 6:1,8 | 127:3 135:12 | 57:15,25 63:6 |
| 15:24 54:13,18,22 | 21:19 57:2,7 | 163:18 174:8 | 201:21 208:4 |
| 55:4 57:15 58:19 | 67:23 78:22 97:24 | 175:24 176:10,20 | serious 109:8 |
| 60:8 62:16,17 | 121:17 134:17 | 177:23 179:7,20 | serves 89:22 |
| 63:4,5,16 64:11 | 143:23 168:21 | semipro 122:8 | set 72:2 100:23 |
| 66:3 69:6,11,21,25 | 175:2 187:19 | senate 13:20 26:9 | 134:6 143:5 150:2 |
| 70:14,25 71:5,7 | 197:23 201:23 | 52:17 60:23 | 158:10 202:11 |
| 74:15,18 77:6 | 216:10 | 115:25 195:17 | 214:7 223:4 |
| 81:7 82:14,15 | seize 19:3 117:22 | send 59:17 186:20 | sets 112:17 |
| 107:7 111:20 | 180:6 | 193:3 | setting 65:21 |
| 112:25 126:7,12 | seized 30:16 31:23 | sense 31:11 36:14 | 93:10 101:4 |
| 129:23 135:3 | 39:21 67:25 | 42:10 50:18 51:21 | 127:18 147:17 |

[setting - simpler]

| 201:16 | 218:19 219:4,6 | 220:12,16 221:7 | 31:25 41:14 51:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| settings 103:18 | 220:2,2 | short 81:20,23 | 65:9 72:12 143:1 |
| settled 115:19 | shooter's 72:15 | 82:6 83:3 84:2 | 92:5 |
| settles 8:5 | 77:12 91:25 | 85:2,10,13,15 | showed 40:9,10 |
| seven 119:8 120:2 | 103:17 104:4 | 86:14 87:2 88:7 | 204:8 |
| 120:18 | 105:15 127:11 | 92:8 94:3,4 95:4 | showing 32:4 47:1 |
| S | 162:4 | 103:7 113:23 | shows 12:7,8,15 |
| sharing 6 | shooters 91:15 | 119:24 120:2 | 12:18,21 13:4,9,14 |
| shave 102:7 | 108:5 116:24 | shorten 93:19 | 13:18,21 14:22 |
| shelf 194:23 | 122:8 151:18 | shortened 81:6 | 16:20 19:21 20:17 |
| shell 35:19 | 218:9 219:2 | 107:22,23 | 20:19,20,25 21:5 |
| sh | 220:18,23 2 | shorter 92:15 | 21:10,15,17,18 |
| shift 26:10 | shooting 29:1 | shortest 86:17,20 | $2: 3,5,18,23$ 23:3 |
| shirt 93:219 | 38:18 39:14 64:25 | 88:4,10,12,25 89:4 | 23:5,7 28:8 192:6 |
| shoes 157:8,9 | 77:4,25 80:6,12 | 89:9,19 90:5,8,13 | shrink 90:23 |
| 177:2 | 98:22 99:6 105:5 | shorthand 2:21 | shrinkage 88:19 |
| shoot 29:20,20 | 107:3 108:6,14,19 | 19:15 223:1,7 | side 23:19 41:21 |
| 39:10 73:11 75:13 | 109:11 113:18,24 | shot 81:25 85: | 77:1 104:20 |
| 75:23 77:11 79:11 | 114:9 116:8,25 | 104:11 109:3 | 117:14,14,19,19 |
| 94:9 106:8,23 | 117:25 119:8 | 113:11 116:13 | 118:17,17 119:23 |
| 110:13 118:9 | 120:7 121:3 122:1 | 117:3 118:17 | 119:23 121:20,20 |
| 120:10,11 122:1 | 122:16,22 123:2 | 125:2 134:19 | 184:5,6,6 189:20 |
| 124:22 132:23 | 123:14,14 124:14 | 138:8 142:6 | sight 77:193:20 |
| 133:9 138:17 | 124:15 131:2 | 143:16 145:14 | sights 37:25 |
| 140:19 142:19 | 136:3,21 138:6,11 | 146:12 147:8 | signature 223:19 |
| 157:17 163:17 | 138:14,25 140:18 | 153:7 159:3 189:5 | signed 166:24 |
| 170:10 171:19 | 142:15 143:16 | 189:9 218:12 | significance 98:11 |
| 172:14 201:17 | 144:21 145:7 | shotgun 19:8 | significant 58:17 |
| 219:3 | 146:21 148:17 | 32:20,21 99:10,11 | 62:18 77:13 86:9 |
| shooter 71:23 | 149:7,22 150:17 | 99:14,16 146:14 | 92:5 116:4 178:9 |
| 72:10,22 77:10 | 150:21 152:12 | shotguns 13:19 | 180:12 |
| 78:8 79:11 91:5 | 153:5,8,11 162:5 | 18:23 21:11 66:18 | significantly 61:7 |
| 94:14 103:16 | shootings 99:19 | 155:19 183:5 | 157:5 |
| 104:5,5,7,19,21 | 114:20 124:8 | shots 144:2 218:12 | similar 36:25 42:5 |
| 106:9,13 107:1 | 136:14,17,25 | 218:21,24,25,25 | 119:3,16,20 |
| 113:5 116:25 | 137:6,8,14,21 | shoulder 43:2 96:7 | 121:20 141:14 |
| 124:11,14 125:22 | 138:1,1,2 143:6,9 | 96:9 100:21 | 163:20 195:22 |
| 128:1 138:7 142:1 | 144:18,24 147:18 | 108:12 123:10 | 200:2 |
| 150:15 151:5 | 150:6,11,14 | shoulders 42:25 | simple 211:16 |
| 172:14 217:17,20 | 151:14 152:2,3,21 | show 12:21 13:7 | simpler 52:22 |
| 217:22 218:15,15 | 153:15 161:22 | 20:1,3,22 22:10 |  |
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## [simplicity's - specifically]

| simplicity's 74:5 | slowly 116:3 | somewhat 81:22 | 206:22 207:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| simply $157: 7$ | small 122:7 | 97:11 132:4 | sorts 78:14 156:9 |
| 190:9 219:17 | 49:10,11 | soon 26:10 188:22 | sound 33:16 |
| simulating 120:25 | smaller 35:20 | sophisticated | sounds 118:1 |
| simulation 36:16 | 88:22 91:2 92:12 | 59:15 | 131:11 166:14 |
| single 47:14 85:15 | 94:17 114:1 | sorry 11:8 12:14 | source 205:24 |
| 85:17 145:7 | smith 206:19 | 26:2 34:13 38:12 | south 26:19 |
| 193:12 217:22 | 211:7 | 45:8,22,24 46:10 | southern 1:3 2:3 |
| sir 5:17 | smuggle 98:19 | 54:22 56:23 69:9 | 21:17 |
| sit 66:6 173:22 | 99:7 | 86:1 87:4 95:13 | space 37:7 |
| site 114:6191:19 | smuggled 129:20 | 108:4 112:13 | speak 19:18 34:11 |
| 96:23,25 197:2 | social 20:13 | 129:14 130:20 | 48:25 49:11 50:13 |
| sitting 21:24 | soft 133:23 | 137:2,23 140:1,10 | 50:22 52:8,10 |
| situation 111:9 | sold 26:5,14 58:3,4 | 144:5 148:5 | 90:21 114:18 |
| 113:19 116:14 | 58:20 59:7,10,14 | 169:19 186:16 | 182:9 |
| 120:10 124:14 | 59:25 60:4 77:15 | sort 7:8,20,24 9:19 | speaking 16:10,10 |
| 128:1 157:16 | 163:15,18 173:25 | 11:22 12:21 20:1 | 23:14 24:1 28:25 |
| situations 65:21 | 174:4 175:4 | 22:15 23:24 31:10 | 47:13 52:19 67:22 |
| 201:6 | 176:12 195:1 | 33:17 34:5,16 | 67:23,24 81:1 |
| six 84:14 94:5 | soldier 131:1 | 39:17 40:22 42:3 | 101:24 128:12 |
| 95:12 166:5,25 | soldiers 130:19 | 42:17 46:16 48:17 | 143:18 173:6,24 |
| size 94:18 102:3 | 132:6,7,10 | 48:18 50:10,21 | 176:1 180:18 |
| 127:19,22 210:1 | sole 96:17 | 51:18 58:6 59:20 | 195:16 199:10 |
| skill 113:12 | solely 65:24 97:7 | 60:10 64:4 77:8 | speaks 126:17 |
| sks 45:22 145:18 | 105:14 200:21 | 77:20 78:21 85:5 | 216:13 |
| skss 45:14 | solutions 148:12 | 85:12 88:23 89:24 | special 9:15 12:5 |
| sky 77:22 79:15 | somebody 13:1,5 | 104:3 106:18 | 16:15,15 31:20 |
| slide 63:25 148:11 | 17:12 22:1 39:9 | 107:24 115:17,20 | 140:25 158:18 |
| slides 47:1 81:12 | 43:22 48:6 57:3 | 115:23 116:5 | 159:7 192:1 |
| 201:22 202:11 | 59:3 65:22 71:2 | 118:12 120:25 | specialized 159:22 |
| slightly 41:15 | 82:19 85:15 86:16 | 126:13,20 127:15 | specific 6:11 16:2 |
| 84:14 87:20 114:4 | 94:3,5,18 102:13 | 130:10,12 131:15 | 23:11 46:19 47:2 |
| 123:25 128:7 | 102:14 105:5 | 140:11,12,23 | 47:25 51:20 52:1 |
| 143:3 157:5 177:8 | 109:10 111:6 | 150:1 153:10 | 52:4 65:21 83:7 |
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