

1

2

3

4

6

5

7

8

9

DATE:

LOCATION:

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CCB

STAFF MEMBERS:

THE VIRGINIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TO

THE U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

FACTFINDING MEETING AND COMMUNITY FORUM

March 6, 1997

City Council Chambers

22 Lincoln Street

Hampton, Virginia 23669

Mrs. Jessie M. Rattley, Chair

of Newport News

Dr. Azizah al-Hibri of Midlothian

Mr. Roger A. Galvin of Alexandria

Reverend Curtis W. Harris of Hopewell

Mr. Philip Y. Huang of Blacksburg

Mrs. Anece F. McCloud of Lexington

Mr. Richard E. Patrick of Alexandria

Ms. Naomi Zeavin of Falls Church

William Darden Marc Pentino



CCR 3 Meet.

286

v.1

FOX REPORTING

21 Michael's Woods Drive, Hampton, Virginia 23666 (804) 827-7843



1	I N D E X
2	Welcome address by George Wallace, 4
3	Assistant City Manager, City of Hampton
4	PANEL 1: "No Easy Answers," - An Overview of Problems Facing African Americans Under Virginia's
5	Criminal Justice System
6	De Downer Braggrant Garden Braggrand Braggrand
7	DR. DONALD FAGGIANI, Senior Research Analyst, Criminal Justice Services Department 37
8	DR. RICHARD P. KERN , Director, Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission 92
9	criminal sencencing commission 92
10	PANEL 2: Results from a Survey of Racial Attitudes
11	and Tensions in Virginia
12	
13	MS. TRACEY WATKINS, DANIELLE FERGUSON & KENYATTA
14	MCCLEOUD, Law students from T. C. Williams Law School, University of Richmond, Representing
15	the Black Law Students Associations 127
16	
17	PANEL 3: "Perspectives on the Administration of of Justice in Virginia: The Minority
18	Population Experience"
19	THE HONORABLE N. HENRY MAXWELL, Senator, Virginia
20	General Assembly, Chairperson, Commission on the Status of African American Males
21	MR. DAVID P. BAUGH, ESQUIRE, 164
22	PROFESSOR ROBERT E. SHEPHERD, JR., T. C. Williams Law School, University of Richmond, 17
23	
24	
25	

1	
2	I N D E X (Continued)
3	
4	PANEL 4: "The Hampton Four: An Update and Continuing Problems Facing African
5	Americans Under Virginia's Criminal Justice System"
6	
7	MR. JAMES ELLENSON, ESQUIRE 218
8	MS. SHAUN BROWN, Chairperson, Legal and Press Committee of the S.W.I.S. Legal Defense Fund 229
9	MS. PATRICIA FROMAL, Director, We the People 249
10	MS. JOYCE HOBSON, Former S.W.I.S. President and Spokesperson 255
12	MR. MURRAY STEINBERG, Director, Children First and Family Resolution Council 258
13	MR. ANDREW SHANNON, Neighborhood Council 24-34-A Inc.,
14	Civic Organization 264
15	PANEL 5: "Is Justice Equal for All?"
16	
17	MS. LINDA D. CURTIS, ESQUIRE 281 Commonwealth Attorney, City of Hampton
18	,
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

MS. RATTLEY: George Wallace,

Assistant City Manager for the City of Hampton will

be making the welcoming address for Mayor Eason.

Please tell Mayor Eason I never thought I'd get to

2.3

sit in his chair, and he really did miss a treat by not being here.

MR. WALLACE: I'm sure he knows he'll have a bigger chair to fill when he gets back.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is George Wallace, and I'm an assistant city
manager for the City of Hampton, and also Director of
the Department of Development. I've been asked to
bring a greeting to you from the Mayor and city
Council. On their behalf, I bring you sincere and a
most profound warm welcome. We hope that your
deliberations will be productive and you accomplish
all you set out to do. If I, or any member of our
staff, can be of any additional assistance to your
particular efforts, we stand ready to do so.

One of the reasons I was asked to speak to you this morning for the Mayor, who is in Washington, as you know, is to provide you with information on the Charter Review Commission and or the Citizen Review Commission, which is the same group with two different names because it has two

different missions.

Having served as a lead staff person for this 26-month effort, I was tapped as the most logical person to provide information on this citizens group.

If you first -- if you'll allow me,

I'd like to present some historical context as to how
these groups evolved, what it is, and where it stands
at present.

In October of 1964, the City Council simultaneously received two requests. One request came from a citizen group called Blue Ribbon Commission, and the second from a Youth Coalition Group that had been organized the prior year.

The community group asked the Council to examine the feasibility of a different election process because there existed a belief that in some segments of the community, that minorities did not have representation on the council equal to their proportional numbers in the community.

A second assumption was that the at-large election methods precluded proportional representation for minorities and/or the election of candidates of their choice.

On the other hand, the Youth

Coalition Group told City Council that they had been looking at some issues, and concluded that neither the coalition nor the City could reach their full potential unless and until an avenue was developed for the City and the citizens to address race and adversity.

The council, after some deliberation, decided both issues were urgent and both should be addressed immediately. In December of 1994, Council appointed a 56-member Citizen Charter Review Commission, that included student representatives, and gave the Commission two mandates or two charters. The first one -- the first was to establish a process that could possibly include an advisory board that would encourage appreciation and respect for diversity in all elements of community life.

The second was to propose an election process for a voting system that would ensure a fair and equitable representation. Council assigned staff to work with the Commission and requested they report back with them before the election process of the school board that was to take place in May of 1996.

The Commission began its deliberations in January 1995 and decided on weekly meetings. Since the deadline for the school board

election was first and fairly close, the Commission decided to focus its initial energy on the City election process.

The Commission received expert advice on the legal interpretation on the Voting Right Act of 1965 as it existed at that time; and in addition, they sought out, and received, information on various voting processes, systems and procedures from college professors from the University of Virginia, Norfolk State, and the Institute of Government.

The Commission conducted three public hearings to solicit public input into their deliberations. They reviewed over forty maps in conjunction with various issues in our election procedures. The Commission reported back to City Council on the first mandate in time for school elections and recommended a district or board election system that called for a six-two-one representative council.

Thus the Council will be divided into six single district or wards, three majority black, three majority white, with one person elected from each district. Three of the previously mentioned six districts will be combined to create two super districts, one majority black and one majority white,

with one person elected from each of the two super districts. The Mayors were to be elected at large by all voters, thus we have had a nine-member council.

After the election report was then given to Council, the Commission turned its attention to the second mandate given to them in May, diversity in community strength. Some of original members chose not to continue on the Commission and were replaced with new appointees.

The revised Commission's first order of business was to change its name to something more reflective of the second charter. It became known as the Citizens' Unity Commission.

The new group deliberated nine months and conducted a community forum, did research to ascertain what the community at large was doing as far as race relation, and finally sponsored a community telephone survey.

The telephone survey was structured to look at the citizens' concept of an ideal community, and compare Hampton with that ideal community.

The Commission was able to determine that race was the most pervasive of all the issues, and concentrated most of its initial attention in

that arena.

On October of 1996, the Citizens'
Unity Commission gave its final report to Council on
a process that would encourage appreciation and
respect for diversities in all elements of community
life.

In summary, the Citizens' Unity

Commission set out two broad goals for the community:

First, that every citizen in Hampton should feel that
this community or its community was one where
fairness, justice, and equality are exemplified.

Therefore, the community should see a closing of the
gap between what our citizens have identified as an
ideal community, and Hampton. This was to be
measured by an opportunity index in an annual survey.

Two, every citizen in Hampton should have more opportunity to come together with individuals of different cultures to build understanding and respect for each other. This was to be exemplified by increased opportunities to expand what we have existing in Hampton, what we call study circles, and to develop and create new cultural festivals and events.

The telephone survey identified issues which were most prominent in the minds of the

citizens. They were the judicial system, public safety, neighborhood services, the media, hiring practice and business opportunity, and the need for a sense of community cross-cultural opportunities and educational opportunities.

A two-pronged approach was recommended, emphasizing the need for both proactive and reactive responses to the issue of diversity.

First, the Citizens' Unity Commission recommended that a Citizens' Unity Commission that they called Number 2 be proposed and developed and created, with a paid staff that was to carry forth, or that is to carry forth the work of the original Citizens' Unity Commission.

Second, they recommended that an ad-hoc leadership group would be created, one that represents a cross-section of the community that would function as an informational conduit to react quickly to isolated racial-related events.

Council received the report and recommended and requested staff to develop an implementation process and give that to Council for action. That response of that implementation process was given to Council in January.

The following is what is to take

place and recommended in the implementation of the CUC's recommendations: One, the April 15 edition of Commission's newsletter, which is sent to all households in Hampton, will feature statements from all councilmen expressing their commitment to and assurance that diversities will be a community strength; that the Council will support staff and resources to make diversity a strengthening issue in Hampton. Target date for this edition is April 15.

Two, a continuity group called Citizens' Unity 2 will be appointed to continue the work started by CUC-1. The group will make initial appointments by the Council and be consummated by July 15th. Recommendations from neighborhood groups and volunteers will form the list that Council will choose from.

Three, an ad-hoc group of twelve will be appointed to respond to crisis issues in the community. Appointed by Council, its membership too will be citizens, citizen-group nominees. Target date for completion for this particular task is September 1st.

Four, develop a budget and identify office space for the new staff. April 15th is the target completion date. Staff voted exclusively to

CUC will be hired and actively begin by hiring new 1 The target date for that is July 1st. 2 staff. Ouestions? 3 MS. RATTLEY: Thank you very much, 4 Mr. Wallace. May we have a copy of your information? 5 MR. WALLACE: 6 Yes, ma'am. 7 MS. RATTLEY: Thank you so much for your warm welcome and the information. 8 9. Mr. Wallace, would you mind 10 responding to questions? 11 That's my track record. MR. WALLACE: 12 MS. RATTLEY: Are there any questions of Mr. Wallace? 13 14 MR. DARDEN: I have one. 15 MS. RATTLEY: Mr. Darden. 16 MR. DARDEN: I just made a couple of 17 This is not in any order of priority, but the notes. 18 last thing you mentioned was the budget. Do you have 19 a budget figure, how much resources are going to be 20 devoted to this? 21 MR. WALLACE: We have a number in 22 mind. We anticipate, in terms of the quality level 23 of the individual -- give you a parameter, we'll say 24 somewhere between \$75,000 and \$100,000. 25 Say that again. MR. DARDEN:

Seventy-five and --1 2 MR. WALLACE: A hundred thousand dollars. 3 MR. DARDEN: And how many staff would 4 5 that fund? MR. WALLACE: Minimum of two. 6 7 MR. DARDEN: Minimum of two? Okav. Seems like a lot -- you staff this out, are you going 8 9 to expect the staff would increase over time? 10 Well, it depends on MR. WALLACE: 11 what activities are developing, what programs are 12 developed by the CUC-2 group as they're created 13 formally. 14 One thing we contemplate is that that 15 group will be catalytic to get City departments to do 16 additional activities to address some of the concerns 17 that were raised by the citizens' survey, and on the basis of some of the other issues. 18 So we see the 19 staff as a catalytic agent as well as programmatic. 20 MR. DARDEN: I understand. That 21 clears that up for me. Just another -- you mentioned 22 the opportunity index? 23 MR. WALLACE: Yes, sir. 24 MR. DARDEN: And did you -- how many 25 of those have you actually completed now?

~

MR. WALLACE: We've been doing -- for 1 2 CUC, we only had one Opportunity Index Survey. 3 the City as a whole, we do a Citizen Satisfaction Survey annually in October. That's been done for 4 5 nine years. We have an employee bonus predicated on the degree of satisfaction of the citizens 6 exemplified on that survey. 7 8 MR. DARDEN: Okay. Is there a 9 summary of the index, something that we could have to 10 get a baseline for --11 MR. WALLACE: Yes, sir. 12 MR. DARDEN: -- comparisons in the 13 future? Could you provide that to us? 14 MR. WALLACE: Yes. 15 Thank you. MR. DARDEN: The last 16 thing, this is one of the first things you mentioned, that race was the most pervasive issue you had 17 18 identified earlier. Can you talk just a little bit 19 more about that? What is the character of the 20 community's view on race, and how has it changed even 21 over this short period? 22 MR. WALLACE: First, in the context 23 of adversity, there are a lot of other issues, age, 24 gender, all the other ethnicity-type of issues that

25

were identified as problems -- or not as problems,

but as issues that need to be faced, addressed in some type of direction or programs put towards those issues.

1.3

In terms of the one that was most pervasive, in terms of numbers and identification of issues that showed up in the community forum and on the surveys as the one that was foremost in people's minds. When I present you the information on the survey, you can see that in terms of numbers.

MR. DARDEN: So when you say foremost, they saw that as a problem, racial divide or racial tensions, as a problem?

MR. WALLACE: Well, problem, and also the lack of opportunity for people to come together and get to know each other and get cross-cultural, racial opportunities to meet and talk.

MR. DARDEN: So are you saying, then, that there is a perception, fairly widely held that race --

MR. WALLACE: I sense that the context you want to put it in is a problem. We don't see it as a problem. We see it as an opportunity.

That's what we're addressing.

MR. DARDEN: That's what I wanted to understand. Thank you.

1 MS. RATTLEY: Are there any other 2 questions of Mr. Wallace? Yes, I have a couple of 3 MS. MCCLOUD: As follow-up to the questions asked by 4 questions. 5 Mr. Darden, were these responses coming primarily 6 from the black community, or who received copies of 7 the questionnaire? Who participated in the 8 questioning? 9 MR. WALLACE: The questionnaire 10 process is a random process. It was structured to 11 ensure that the ethnic representation in the response 12 group was comparable to the proportional numbers in 13 the community. So in that context, we were assured 14 that we had at least 38 percent of the respondents to 15 the survey, participants in the survey, that were 16 from the minority community. 17 MS. MCCLOUD: Were you able to 18 determine a difference in the perception of whites, 19 as opposed to African Americans --20 MR. WALLACE: Some. 21 MS. MCCLOUD: -- in their response? 22 MR. WALLACE: There was some 23 differences, but there were a lot of surprising 24 similarities. Again, I can provide you copies of 25 that document. You can read it and come to your own

conclusion. 1 What's the title of the 2 MR. DARDEN: 3 survey? Community survey that MR. WALLACE: 5 was done, Ideal Community and How Hampton Compared 6 with the Ideal Community. MS. MCCLOUD: I have one other 7 question, please. You mentioned the implementation 8 9 which sounds as if, you know, it can be followed, 10 that it should produce some results. Do you have a means for evaluating the results, the outcome? 11 12 MR. WALLACE: One of the 13 methodologies that we see, we see how people's 14 attitudes change. That change will be measured, one, by continuation of that annual survey. 15 16 MS. MCCLOUD: Thank you. 17 MS. RATTLEY: Any other questions? 18 REVEREND HARRIS: Yes, I'd like to 19 ask a question. How -- when did this process dealing 20 with diversity begin in Hampton? 21 MR. WALLACE: Actually, it was 22 brought to our attention by the Youth Coalition. We 23 formulated a Youth Coalition in 1993 with a full-time staff, and they had several meetings, including 24 retreats and several other kinds of things, and they 25

felt that we old people brought a lot of baggage to the table, in terms of our relationships, which precluded them from doing -- maximizing their opportunity and benefit. They said, Old folks, you got to deal with this baggage that you have; and in that context, we can become a better community and we can better relate in terms of our particular programs and opportunities as young people in the community. So that's where the impetus came from.

REVEREND HARRIS: Was that an integrated group?

MR. WALLACE: Totally.

REVEREND HARRIS: Before that, was government interested or aware that there were any race problems in Hampton?

MR. WALLACE: There are race issues all over the country. I don't think we're any worse or any better than most communities. Certainly there is sensitivities to race in our community. We have sensitivities to issues of fairness and equity in our community long before it was brought to the attention by the Youth Coalition, but I think that was the impetus that gave us to do something extraordinary and special, which is what we perceive we're doing at this point in time.

REVEREND HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. GALVIN: I have one question for you. On your survey, if you would please, you said the survey has been done as a satisfaction survey for the past six years?

2.3

MR. WALLACE: That's for employment and delivery of services for the City of Hampton, yes.

MR. GALVIN: And could you tell me for the past six years how the rating of that survey -- has it been constantly improving, or has it had its up and downs, or has there been a particular trend over the six years if we were to track it?

MR. WALLACE: I would hate to say off the top of my head. I don't think there's ever been a year where there was less than 85 percent satisfaction, and as high as 96, I believe, in terms of satisfaction of delivery of service, Hampton as a community, or residency, those kinds of situations. We can get you copies of that, too.

As I indicated previously, we have a bonus we pay our employees, the rank and file employees, all the employees outside the executive base, which means the department heads, assistant managers, managers, we don't participate in that

bonus program, but everybody else does. That bonus is usually given around Christmas. It's predicated again on the survey we take every October on citizen satisfaction of their services. We measured the satisfaction of the library, the police department, the fire department, public works, streets, roads, a whole array of issues in terms of community satisfaction, citizen satisfaction.

MR. GALVIN: So you would say that the staff and employees of the City have a great interest to see that the survey is rated very highly?

MR. WALLACE: The bonus ranges from -- it's not a large amount of money. It's basically to raise employee consciousness that that particular factor does exist. We have an organization value associated with customer satisfaction, and the value of the best bang for the buck we can possibly give to the community. We have a mission statement in that regard. That's embossed on each paycheck they get. They're aware, in terms of what our mission, what our organizational value is. We try to reinforce that with a small bonus.

MR. GALVIN: And just as -- you said you provide this within six years. Can you say for the past six years it has been -- the results have

been constantly, steadily reported? 1 MR. WALLACE: 2 I would be comfortable in saying yes, the response has been stable. 3 So that whatever MR. GALVIN: 4 5 incentive program, or in fact, program, you had been able to maintain a certain level? 6 MR. WALLACE: 7 Yes. 8 MR. GALVIN: Thank you. 9 MS. RATTLEY: Any other questions? 10 MR. HUANG: I have two follow-up 11 questions on the survey. One concerns how you administer the survey. Was the survey done 12 13 internally or by an independent agency? 14 MR. WALLACE: Independent operation 15 that does surveys for all the communities in 16 southeast Tidewater, and we happen to be one of them. 17 It's outside of our parameters. We don't control it 18 at all. 19 MR. HUANG: About the report, do you 20 share the report with the ordinary citizen? 21 MR. WALLACE: Yes, we do. mentioned the document called The Issues, a 22 23 newsletter we publish on a quarterly basis that's 24 sent to every household in Hampton, results published 25 annually in that regard.

MR. HUANG: Thank you.

MR. WALLACE: And copies are made available in public libraries, all the branches.

MR. HUANG: Thank you.

MS. RATTLEY: Any other questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Wallace.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you.

MS. RATTLEY: At this point, we are about to go into fact-finding session, and I've been asked to make a few remarks.

First of all, I should like to read the Privacy Act of 1974, Information Collected by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is established as a fact-finding agency within the Executive Branch. It is authorized by statute. And this is in parentheses. The Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1994, if anybody would like to research it, Public Law 103-419, 108 Statute 4348, if you want references, and it is authorized by law to study and collect information concerning the legal developments constituting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the

administration of justice. This is a statutory authority for the collection of information on and about individuals.

Now, information supplied to the staff members of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, is on a voluntary basis. The Commissioners are authorized to hold hearings, to issue subpoenas, and to take testimony under oath. And this is found in Section 3, 3E, Public Law 103-419.

Information requested of individuals by the Commissioners, and the commission staff on behalf of the Commission, is collected and will be maintained in accordance with Notices of Systems, and records published in the Federal Register to meet the Privacy Act requirements. And you may want to check the Federal Register, September the 3rd, 1975, and October the 2nd, 1975.

Now, information obtained by interview or letter from you as part of the Commission project, may be used routinely as set out in the Systems Notice entitled Civil Rights

Commission, 004 Commission Project. Now, this system includes reports, hearings, statements, conferences, commentaries on legislation, and possible referral to other agencies.

Now, for further information regarding the Privacy Act and information collected by the Commission, you may contact the Office of the General Council, whose address is 624 Ninth Street, Northwest, in Room 620, Washington, D.C. 20425. And the phone number, area code 202 376-8351. That's our law.

Now, let me make just a few statements to try to clear the air as to why we are here and what this is all about. I've already gotten calls from some citizens and concerned citizens in the community questioning the timing of these fact-finding hearings, but I want to make it very clear to you that we started back in March of 1993, and that went on for the rest of that year. And at this time, you understand that the news media, the national news media, the weekly magazines, and everybody else provided public coverage to the Hampton Four case. And during this period of time, the committee members residing in the Hampton area became involved.

So as community leaders and the evolving drama of community meetings and protests and demonstrations here in the City of Hampton -- and we might as well say it was all about Iverson at that

time -- the staff people came to this city and met at one of the hotels -- and I came for two days -- took testimony from citizens of this great city, and it was very alarming some of the comments that we received.

The citizens of Hampton asked the Civil Rights Commission to please look into the situation here and all of the allegations. And as you know, certain organizations were formed, and we had help from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Eastern Regional Office of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights came in November of '93, and they conducted an investigation here, and the staff people interviewed the public officials, and the African American community, and anyone else who wanted to speak with them.

And we have then been trying to establish a forum, and all of this has to be approved by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. They have studied the reports, they have discussed it, and they feel that it is well worth the time, the money, the staff, to come into this area to find the facts and then to submit them to the Commission.

You know, one lady called, she was just all up in arms and said, You know, why don't you

just drop it; you know, let sleeping dogs lie. Don't stir it up, you know. People are a little afraid of stirring up the peace, but we don't have any peace in many instances, because they're coming to us from citizens in both communities on a daily basis, and that's not an exaggeration, but yet we like to feel that everything is fine, and as long as you keep your mouth closed and you don't rock the boat, that it's going to go away. We don't feel that way.

1.1

Some of the things that were told to the people who came down from Washington is really frightening. I would like to just share a few with you to give you some idea as to why we feel it is important to come to you and ask you to help us find the facts in the case so we can ask the appropriate department, be it Justice Department, or whatever, to look into it and to try to bring some resolution.

You know, we've had the vandalism at some of the local churches, we have had mysterious deaths, and we've had students to demonstrate, and community leaders, and the organizations are still dealing with this in several different ways. But one that we all got very concerned about is allegations pertaining to police abuse, and especially in the emergency services area. And there are certain

quotes here that may not be politically correct, but if the paramedics take the attitude that there is a call, an emergency call and someone needs attention, and while driving to the scene, one of the medics stated to his junior partner that if it's an "N" word, they aren't having a seizure, and I'll talk them out of a transport. I have to teach CPR in the morning and I'm sorry -- you know, "N" word -- I don't like to say it -- isn't keeping me up all night. And sure enough, they talked the patient out of it. They didn't pick him up.

16.

And we had other examples of not rushing to an accident depending on the color of the victim, and I think that disturbed all of us.

We have other allegations about beatings, allegations about hiring. And originally we really wanted to go into other areas. We wanted to go not only into the criminal justice system, but public schools, emergency services, and police-community relations.

So we are here now because of this background, and it would really sicken you if you had this document that we have, just giving some idea as to some of the things that we're told during this investigation.

Now, you know that the bureaucracy works in a very slow manner most times, but we are finally here, and we don't feel as though this is disturbing the peace. We're simply trying to get the facts. One lady called yesterday and she wanted — this was a Newport News citizen — to say that she was just totally opposed to all of this because she lives near Aquevista — not Aquevista — where is one up in Denbigh — Aqueduct, and that you should see how these people behave, your people, and they do this, and they do that, and they're to blame for all of your troubles. And I just asked her if she would please come to our hearing and make her statement publicly to the Commission, Committee members, the Advisory Committee members.

who have called. And even the article in the press made it appear as though this is an effort to stir up, but it isn't. It is just an effort to find the facts and to report them. I want that to be clear before we get the wrong signals as to what it is we're trying to do, and it is simply to do what you asked this Committee to do.

Now, the purpose of the proposed project is to get the pertinent information so that

the Committee can ascertain facts of the situation and make recommendations as appropriate. The information will be collected from this two-day fact-finding meeting here in Hampton, and then in Newport News tomorrow, supplemented by the pre and the post fact-finding meeting, interviews and research. The project will focus on the issue mainly of the criminal justice system, but we will hear from citizens on any subject in reference to discrimination, and we want to make that very clear.

The meeting is being designed to provide an opportunity for all concerned public people to identify problems and express concerns.

And for public officials to respond, the mayors and members of council and staff people and others. It is not a one-sided fact-finding effort.

Also, I would like to ask you to let your neighbors know that these meetings that are going on all day today and into the evening, and all day tomorrow are open to the public. Anybody can come. You don't have to have a special invitation, but we ask you to please sign in during the opening session and these forums; and if you wish to make a statement, let us know and we have staff -- which staff member is going to do that, Mr. Darden?

MR. DARDEN: Mr. Pentino, Marc Pentino and myself.

MS. RATTLEY: If you wish to speak, please see this gentleman, and he will permit you to sign in so you can be called at the proper time.

Now, if you have any questions, I will try to answer them at this time before we go into our first discussion. We're running a little late already, but we want to make sure we're all singing from the same page and we understand why we're here.

And may I also say we had some people who are concerned about speaking in public because they feel that they will receive some reprisal, and if that is a concern of yours, please make it known to the staff and we can try to accommodate you. Some have said that they have been threatened, and some said they have been followed, and some said that they have been having other problems, and we certainly don't want anyone to be hurt simply because you're exercising your God-given and Constitutional right of freedom of speech.

Do you have any questions?

MR. HILLSTOCK: Ms. Rattley, you said that this Advisory Committee started during the Allen

Iverson incident. 1 MS. RATTLEY: In this area. 2 MR. HILLSTOCK: Yeah. 3 MS. RATTLEY: Yeah, because they were 4 invited to come down to speak to people. That's when 5 we started to get to where we are today. 6 MR. HILLSTOCK: Okay. 7 MS. RATTLEY: It isn't something we 8 just thought of last week. We've been working on it 9 10 since the incident happened. MR. HILLSTOCK: Was that 1993? 11 It's '93, I believe. MS. RATTLEY: 12 13 MR. HILLSTOCK: Reverend Hillstock, 14 who is not afraid to speak. 15 Also, you know that we MS. RATTLEY: 16 have a stenographer here who is transcribing the 17 hearings, so therefore we would ask you to please 18 identify yourself, even if you speak ten times, give 19 us your name ten times so we'll know -- have a record 20 Any questions on that? who said what. 21 Yes, ma'am. 22 MS. BURGESS: Marilyn Jackson 23 Burgess, and I came this morning because I read about 24 the advisory panel being here this morning in 25 yesterday's paper, and I imagine that there are

probably others who would have liked to have come, but because it was in yesterday's paper -- why wasn't it publicized prior to?

MS. RATTLEY: I will let Mr. Darden address that particular issue because all of these releases must come from Washington.

MR. DARDEN: I recognize that the public is always interested in getting as much advance notice as possible. Our procedure requires publication of notice of our meetings at least 30 days ahead of time, which was done in this case, not only thirty days, but actually 90 days ahead of time, because we changed the date earlier from an earlier date. Those were noticed in the Federal Register, which is the publication of record for federal government activities.

In addition to that, we sent press releases to the media across the board, which was done in this case. We can't account for the media.

Just to give you a straight answer, though, I think the interpretation I have about how this works -- and I've done this a number of times -- the media covers news, and if they go activate, release a story or start writing about events too far ahead of the actual occurrence, it doesn't sound much like news,

and so you get -- no matter how early or how soon you 1 2 send the press release out, you usually don't see a story about it until just before the event, and that 3 is what happened in this case. 4 MS. RATTLEY: Other questions? 5 MS. SAUNDERS: My name is Bessie 6 Saunders and I live in the City of Hampton, and 7 Ms. Rattley, I understood you to say that you-all 8 9 first came in contact with this meeting because of 10 the Iverson case. Okay. That was three years ago. 11 At that same time, three years ago, I don't know if 12 you were familiar with another case that was going Why is it that the governor, or whoever, gave 13 14 him the waiver to be released from jail, even though 15 he was guilty? If there is a person that is not 16 guilty, why is it so hard for the City to recognize 17 that they made a mistake? 18 MS. RATTLEY: I'm afraid I cannot 19 speak for the former governor of Virginia. I don't 20 know, would be my answer to your question. 21 Mr. Langford? MR. LANGFORD: 22 How many minutes this 23 evening when the public hearings start at 6:15 --24 MS. RATTLEY: I'm sorry. I can't 25 hear you. Come up, please.

MR. LANGFORD: When the -- first, 1 2 good morning. MS. RATTLEY: Good morning. 3 How are you? 4 5 MR. LANGFORD: Fine. 6 MS. RATTLEY: Good to see you. 7 MR. LANGFORD: Good to see you, Ms. Rattley. How many minutes -- when public 8 hearings begin at 6:15 this evening as I understand, 9 10 how many minutes will each speaker be allowed? 11 if we're allowed a certain amount of minutes, can we then be allocated additional minutes if we want to 12 13 talk about another topic? 14 MS. RATTLEY: Mr. Langford, I believe 15 I read in some of this mountain of material sent down 16 by the Civil Rights Commission, I think it's seven minutes. 17 18 MR. DARDEN: That's correct. 19 MS. RATTLEY: I've said, depending on 20 the number of people who want to speak, we can always plan to speak longer. 21 22 MR. LANGFORD: I need about 51 23 minutes. 24 MS. RATTLEY: But the point is, if 25 you have a lot of people and everybody wants to

speak, then we have to try to afford them an opportunity. If we don't have a lot of people who want to speak, then certainly we can permit you to go beyond the seven minutes. I know it takes politicians longer than seven minutes to make statements.

MR. LANGFORD: Thank you,

Ms. Rattley.

2.2

MS. RATTLEY: Anyone else? All right then. I'm going to ask Mr. Darden if he would introduce our first panel for us.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you very much. We are going to start out with a panel that we've titled "No Easy Answers," an overview of problems facing African Americans under Virginia's criminal justice system.

The attention of titling the panel is just to give some introduction, some general idea of what the panel is supposed to pursue. You'll see after we get started that this -- the topic will be covered sometimes much more broadly than that and also sometimes in much more detail.

The way we're going to be proceeding with this, and the other panels, each one will have a moderator, one of the Advisory Committee members will

lead in the questioning. The staff will usher the panelists to the table, and I think Mr. Pentino may be ready.

The first panel is made up of

Dr. Donald Faggiani, who is the Senior Research

Analyst for the Criminal Justice Services Department,

Virginia Public Safety Secretariat. Is he here?

Would you please -- Marc, would you bring him to the table?

Also Dr. Richard P. Kern, who is Director of the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission. Bring him to the table.

Our third panelist, Mr. Robert

Baldwin, Executive Secretary, Office of the Executive

Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia, had an

unexpected conflict in his schedule and has submitted
a written statement, which we will read into the

record at some point in time for his presentation.

So at this point, I'd like to introduce our moderators, who has already introduced himself to you, Mr. Robert Galvin.

MR. GALVIN: Good morning. I ask the panelists, if you would for the record, to identify yourself, even though we've called you by name, and where are you from and your relationship to this

topic. 1 DR. FAGGIANI: I'm Dr. Donald 2 I'm the with Department of Criminal 3 Faggiani. Justice Services. I'm the senior research analyst. 4 5 MR. GALVIN: Would you use the microphone, please. 6 DR. FAGGIANI: Dr. Donald Faggiani --7 can you hear me? My name is Dr. Donald Faggiani. 8 9 I'm with the Department of Criminal Justice Services, 10 Criminal Justice Research Center. I'm a senior 11 research analyst. 12 MR. GALVIN: Thank you. My name is Richard Kern. 13 DR. KERN: 14 I'm the Executive Director of the Virginia Criminal 15 Sentencing Commission. We are a Judicial Branch 16 agency of the Virginia Supreme Court. 17 MR. GALVIN: And I understand you are here this morning, and have some statements and 18 19 testimony, you'd like to present before the Committee 20 on this topic? 21 Well, it was my DR. FAGGIANI: 22 understanding I'd just be presenting some 23 information. I have information on arrests in 24 Virginia, and I was just going to do a presentation 25 on that.

1 MR. GALVIN: If you would then, 2 please, sir. 3 MS. RATTLEY: Just a minute, sir, before you start. Could you hear him? 4 5 MR. DARDEN: Use the podium. Thank you. MS. RATTLEY: 6 DR. FAGGIANI: It might be a little 7 I have a lot of overheads I wanted to display 8 just to make the presentation a little bit easier, so 9 10 I'll try to talk as loud as I can. Just give me a 11 second to get set up here. 12 What I have is just some general information on arrest trends in Virginia over the 13 14 last ten years or so. What I'm going to start with 15 is just some basic information on Part I arrests --16 and I'll explain all this in a minute -- and violent arrests. And then I want to get into more specific 17 18 information on a report that was just finished on 19 Juvenile Murder in Virginia, and everybody should 20 have a copy of this on the Committee. There's some 21 extra copies that I'll pass around after I'm done 22 here. 23 What we've done in -- at the Criminal Justice Research Center is we tried to take a look at 24

various crime issues in Virginia. And, of course,

25

the first place that we have them identifying a crime is with arrests. It happens, but usually the data flow doesn't start until we have an arrest made. So what I'm dealing with is arrest information, and all this arrest information comes from the Virginia State Police.

To begin, what I have on this first slide is the total Part I arrests. Part I arrests are the arrests that are reported to the FBI. That includes murder, manslaughter, robbery, rape, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

You can see from this slide that the numbers are pretty high overall. This is statewide information, and we're beginning in 1986 and going through 1995 here. In 1991, we reached a peak of about 67,000 Part I offenses -- arrests for Part I offenses. Excuse me.

Part-one offenses are then broken down by violent and nonviolent offenses. I'm going to be focusing primarily on violent offenses, and you can see what I have here is the trend in violent -- Part I violent offenses. This includes just murder, manslaughter, robbery, rape, and aggravated assault. We can see we reach our peak for violent arrests in

1994. We had about 13,368 violent arrests in Virginia.

If we break that down by who's getting arrested, we can see that adults are far and away the majority of people getting arrested. And by "adult," I'm defining "adult" as anyone who is 18 years of age or older, and "juvenile" as anyone from 10 to 17.

We have very few juveniles who are under age ten who get arrested for violent offense.

There are some. We'll talk about that a little later.

You can see back in 1986, juveniles accounted for about 12.2 percent of all violent arrests in Virginia. By 1995, they accounted for almost 16 percent. So there's been a gradual upward trend in juvenile arrests in violent offenses.

If we break that down by race, we can see that -- and this slide here, the blacks are represented by the blue line, and whites are represented by the green line. There's an "other race" category that is not on this chart. It's a very small percentage of arrests for violent offenses in Virginia.

You can see the majority of the

1 arrests are generally black individuals, and that 2 pattern is held pretty constant throughout this 3 ten-year period. Would you put that back 4 MR. DARDEN: You're going a little fast here. 5 one more time. 6 DR. FAGGIANI: I'm sorry. I also 7 I don't think -- I've have a copy of these charts. given them out, but I don't have copies for 8 9 everybody. 10 MR. DARDEN: All right. 11 MR. GALVIN: In 1992 to '93 is where 12 there was a largest rated change difference between 13 the two, the disparity being -- in other words, up to in '92, if I read that right, it was about fifty 14 15 percent difference? 16 DR. FAGGIANI: Yeah. Looks that way. 17 I haven't figured out the percentage, but we could 18 easily do that. But, yeah, it looks like between '92 19 and '93 is where we have one of the largest raises. 20 We have a very large decrease in '94 and '95. 21 MR. GALVIN: But the ratio stays --22 is increased? 23 DR. FAGGIANI: Right. 24 As I said, violent offenses are 25 murder, manslaughter, robbery, rape, aggravated

What I'm going to do here is break them 1 assault. 2 down, give you an idea of where some of these patterns lie and what's going on with some of these 3 crimes. 4 On this chart, the three lines 5 represent -- red line represents the total number of 6 robbery arrests for this period, so in 1995, we had 7 2,785 arrests. 8 9 MR. DARDEN: You said you have these 10 charts that you're going to distribute to us. Could 11 you do that now so we can follow along? Some of 12 these numbers take a while to sink in, at least they do with me. 13 14 DR. AL-HIBRI: Somebody was asking, 15 in '94 it was -- the ratio was 1.7 and in '95, 1.5. 16 You can round it to 1.6. 17 MR. GALVIN: Thank you. So what you've given us 18 MR. DARDEN: 19 corresponds exactly to your overhead? These are not 20 numbered, but we'll follow the title. All right. 21 Figure 5? 22 DR. FAGGIANI: This is Figure 5, 23 right.

1995, as I said, over 2,785 arrests for robbery in

24

25

We can see, for example, that in

Virginia. 78.1 percent who were arrested were black, and we don't have a breakdown, unfortunately, by gender as well, so it's just black individuals. 21.6 percent were white individuals. And whatever is left from that, about .3 percent, or something like that, is the other category.

If you look at aggravated assault, which is, I believe Figure 6, we see a somewhat similar pattern. There was a peak for aggravated assaults in 1994 with about 9,492. About 60.7 percent were arrests for black individuals. I am including burglary here. Burglary is not a violent offense, although there are some burglaries that have been defined as violent offenses during the pro-aberration system, but most burglaries are not violent offenses.

An interesting pattern emerged here when we were looking at that, and that's why I'm showing this. We have quite a few burglaries in Virginia, but the pattern is most of the burglaries are committed by white -- or most of the arrests are white individuals, as opposed to black individuals. And, for example, in 1995, about 59 percent are white and 40.3 percent are black.

Then we have the most serious of the

FOX REPORTING

offenses, which is murder. And, I believe, in your 1 2 handout there, I think murder is probably Figure 4. They're a little bit out of order. 3 We can see that 1993 was the peak 4 year for murders in --5 Just a minute. 6 MR. DARDEN: I'm not 7 following you now. MS. RATTLEY: Figure 4. 8 DR. FAGGIANI: Back to 4. It's a 9 little bit out of order there. 10 MR. DARDEN: All right. Go ahead. 11 12 DR. FAGGIANI: In 1993 was the peak 13 year for murders in Virginia. We have 534 murder I can't remember the exact number of 14 I think there were somewhere around 570 15 victims. 16 victims during that year. About 74 percent of the 17 arrests for murder were black, and about 25.7 were 18 white in that year. That 74 percent is pretty high. 19 It's been averaging between the upper 50s, low 60s 20 before that. After that, you know, we reached the 21 peakest in 1993, and it looks like it's starting to go down a little bit. 22 What we're going to do now is we're 23 24 going to switch to this report. It provides a lot 25 more specific information, particularly about

juveniles who are arrested for murder in Virginia.

And the reason I'm using this is because we have some detailed information on what kind of arrest trend we've uncovered.

MR. DARDEN: I'm assuming you are going to allow us to go back and question you on some of these things when we're finished?

DR. FAGGIANI: Yes, very definitely.

This first figure is Figure 1.3, even though mine says 1.4. It's on Page 5 of the Juvenile Murder Report. For people in the audience, there's some murder reports up here. If you don't get one, my name is in there. Please let me know, and I.'ll be happy to send you a copy.

MR. DARDEN: Do you have another copy of this report for the record, for the court reporter? And also, would all the panelists, as you provide documents, provide a copy for the court reporter -- to the court reporter.

DR. FAGGIANI: When we began to look at juvenile murders in Virginia, one of the first things that we looked at was distribution of age.

And this figure shows the age distribution for murder and non-negligible manslaughter arrests in Virginia between 1984 and 1994. The blue line is 1984. The

red line is 1994.

You can see that in 1984 the peak age, the age where most people were arrested, was age 22. In 1994, that shifted down to age 19. This is a national trend. We've seen this throughout the country. This is not something new.

What we tried to do then, is figure out where, you know, what age groups the real problem is lying with murder and non-negligible manslaughter. You can see the dashed line that goes up is age 18, and the increase between the blue line and the red line is the increase in number of arrests for murder.

MR. DARDEN: Excuse me. Just for the record, would you identify the chart in the report so -- it's Figure 1.3, and that's Page 5 of your report entitled Juvenile Murder in Virginia.

DR. FAGGIANI: Right. Okay.

Once we looked at the age differentials and the differences, we decided to take a look at the weapons that are used, and we know that guns, you know, are pretty commonly used these days. Back in 19 -- the early 1980's, it wasn't as common. Between 1980, I think, and 1994, I think there was probably about 60 or 70 percent increase in the use of guns in murder.

Between 1980 and 1994, 81.5 percent 1 of all juvenile murders, juveniles arrested for 2 murder or non-negligible manslaughter in Virginia 3 involved the use of a firearm. Most of that 4 percentage is the latter years, probably 1990 to 5 6 1994. 7 MR. DARDEN: Now, was that chart in this? 8 9 DR. FAGGIANI: Yes. That's Page 4. 10 MR. DARDEN: Would you do that for 11 the record, tie your visual to the page and figure number in the document? 12 13 DR. FAGGIANI: Okay. 14 MR. DARDEN: Thank you. 15 Well, this one isn't DR. FAGGIANI: 16 in there, so what we did, though, is we broke down 17 the firearm use of juveniles, and we can see that the 18 majority of the firearms that were used were 19 handguns. This one isn't in the report for some 20 reason. 21 MR. DARDEN: Is it part of this other set? 22 23 DR. FAGGIANI: No. 24 MR. DARDEN: So all we have is your 25 visual?

DR. GALVIN: Is your visual -- Chart

2.5 on Page 12? While the years there are '86 to
'94, your visual is '80 to '94, would that not be the
same representation valid here for '86 to '94 for the
same point you're making?

DR. FAGGIANI: Right. The only

1.6

DR. FAGGIANI: Right. The only difference is this breaks down the firearm use itself. The previous chart was Figure 2.5. This is a subset.

MR. GALVIN: I see.

DR. FAGGIANI: What we're doing is just taking a look at what firearm is being used for murder in Virginia, and it overwhelming is a handgun.

MR. DARDEN: Now, since that wasn't -- would you give the percentages that you showed that are on the visual so we'll know what they are. Read the title as well.

DR. FAGGIANI: Okay. It's Firearm
Uses of Juveniles Arrested for Murder, Non-negligible
Manslaughter in Virginia, 1980 to 1994: 83.2 percent
used a handgun, 9.5 percent used a shotgun, 4.7
percent used a rifle, and 2.5 percent used some other
firearm.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Could we ask that he submit this as an exhibit for the record?

DR. FAGGIANI: I'll get a copy.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. FAGGIANI: This is Figure 2.7 on Page 13. Now, this isn't Figure 2.7. It's the wrong The percentages are different. The year is I have 1990 and 1994. In the book, it's different. 1986 to 1994. Let me explain that. We have general arrest information from 1980 to present, actually 1995. When we began the Juvenile Murder Report, we started looking at the general trend. Then we got more specific information, but we only had the specific information for a limited period, from 1986 to 1994, so that the graphs that went into the murder report include the more specific information, as opposed to the general information. So to be consistent for this report, we just used 1986 through 1994. A lot of these graphs are from a previous presentation, so they're -- but if you look at -- the pattern is the same. The percentages are slightly different, but the sex and race of juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible in Virginia, in the book I have, 86.5 percent were male, 13.5 percent were female. This one is slightly different. 92 and 8.

In the book for race, 68 percent are

black, 29.6 percent are white/Mexican Americans, and 1 2 2.4 percent are other. You can see the percentages here are also slightly different. 3 MR. GALVIN: Would you also read 4 5 those percentages from '80 to '94 in, please? 6 DR. FAGGIANI: Right. From 1980 to 7 1994, for Sex and race juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter in Virginia: 8 Male 9 arrests were 92 percent. Female arrests were 8 10 Black arrests were 80 percent. percent. 11 White/Mexican American were 18.7 percent. Asians and 12 Pacific Islanders were 1.4 percent. 13 MR. GALVIN: Thank you. Could we agree that 14 DR. AL-HIBRI: all the slides that are not in the books will be 15 attached as exhibits? 16 17 DR. FAGGIANI: Yes. Page 11. This 1.8 is the victim-offender relationship for juveniles 19 arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter 20 between 1980 and 1994. Again, the one in the book is 21 1986 to 1994. It's slightly different percentages, I 22 think. 23 MR. DARDEN: They look the same in 24 the book here. You mean Figure 2.3 on Page 11?

25

DR. FAGGIANI: Figure 2.3 on Page 11.

I understand.

MR. DARDEN: I'll have to read this transcript. I'll never figure out what you were saying.

DR. FAGGIANI:

MR. GALVIN: Would you also note in your figure that the 1980 is a typo and should be

Right.

DR. FAGGIANI: Right. The visual Figure 2.3 I have up here should be 1986 to 1994. All the rest of my graphs, by the way, should be correct. Because now we're starting to get into more specific information, and this information is only available from 1986 to 1994.

This is the Victim-offender
Relationship of Juveniles Arrested for Murder and
Non-negligible Manslaughter, 1986 to 1994. You can
see that the victim-offender relationship,
acquaintance was the most frequent, about 53.8
percent; family members were about 11.6, neighbors
2.5, dating 1.2, friends .9, strangers about 28.9,
and undetermined is about 1.4 percent.

I'm going to move into Chapter 3 of the book. That should be a little more consistent from this point on. This is Figure 3.1 in Chapter 3, Page 15. What we're doing here is we're trying to

take a look at juvenile murder trends and what we're calling syndromes. And I'll explain syndrome in a few minutes.

Figure 3.1 is juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter, and firearm involvement in 1986 to 1994. The red line represents firearms that are involved in the murder arrests, and the blue line is no firearms are involved. You can see that beginning around 1988, and especially between 1989 and 1990, there was a major increase in use of firearms in murder arrests for juveniles in Virginia. That percent, I believe between 1989 and 1990, was about 115 percent increase.

juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter and firearm involvement by gender. And in this case, we'll see that the pattern for firearm involvement, and the pattern for male involvement is very similar. The male arrests again began around 1989, actually about 1988, beginning an increase. That increase was dramatic between 1989 and 1990 and has stayed at a fairly high level from that point.

Figure 3.3, also on Page 16 of the report, is the race of juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter. And you can see the

same pattern holds for black arrests at about 1988, actually just slightly before that, around 1987; but between '87, '88, and '89, there was the beginning of an increase; between '89 and '90, there was a very large increase, and it stayed at that higher level for the remainder.

Figure 3.4, which is on Page 17 of the report, is the type of location where the crime was committed. And again these are juveniles arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter, 1986 to 1994. And as has been reported numerous times, it seems to be in the urban areas of the state. MSA's are statistical -- metropolitan statistical areas defined by the U.S. Bureau of Consensus. There are eight metropolitan statistical areas in Virginia, and basically what it involves is independent cities, suburban counties, and suburban cities.

You can see that even though the murder arrest rate increased slightly in the rural areas over this period, it still is below ten in 1994, ten arrests; whereas for metropolitan areas, it's increased dramatically again. 1989 to 1990 is the period where that increase was.

If we take a further look at the

metropolitan statistical areas and break that down, we can see that the majority of the arrests are happening in central cities, as opposed to suburban cities or suburban counties. In fact, suburban cities are pretty low. In 1992 to 1994, there was virtually zero. Suburban counties, there was a slight increase around 1989, 1990; but the major increase was in central cities. And this is Figure 3.5 on Page 17.

If we bring it all together, and we look at, you know, specific groupings of individuals arrested, Figure 3.6, which is on Page 18, is the juvenile black males arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter with a firearm in metropolitan statistical areas. That accounts for about 90 percent of all the arrests in this period in this category, in metropolitan areas.

You can see that black males arrested for murder with firearms increased again around 1988 when it started. 1989 through 1990, it was growing pretty rapidly and stayed at that higher level. All other juveniles arrested for murder rose a little bit in 1989 to 1990 but continues to decline since that period.

Figure 3.7, this is slightly

different than the Figure 3.7 in the book, but it's the exact same information. It just looks better on the overhead this way than what the two lines -- the one in the book has two lines, but it's the same information.

This is juvenile black males arrested for murder and non-negligible manslaughter with a firearm in metropolitan statistical areas versus all other juveniles arrested for murder. That includes males and females. And you can see that around 1986, juvenile black males represented only slightly over 30 percent. By around 1993, they were well over 80 percent and stayed there.

This is Table 3.1 on Page 19, and what we just -- this presents the numbers. In 1986, there were seven black males with a gun that were arrested. That represents 35 percent. Other males with a gun were four; black males without a gun, seven; other males without a gun, 2. You can see the changes in the 1994 column. Other males with a gun stayed at four; black males without a gun decreased to two; other males with a gun, there was zero; and black males with a gun, 46. That 46 represents a 557 percent increase in arrests of black males with a gun between that two-year period. Between 1986 and 1994,

all the others had either zero increases or decreases. The total increase was about 160 percent.

1.3

One of the things we were trying to do is figure out exactly the patterns that were developing in these murder arrests; and you know, one of the important issues, of course, is the victims. But we'll look at other things, like the motivating circumstances, and that kind of information as well.

Figure 3.8, which is on Page 20 of the report, is the distribution of victims of Virginia juvenile murders by the victim-offender relationship; and you can see the majority of them, almost 60 percent, were acquaintances. 16.4 percent were family members, and only 24.1 percent were strangers.

One of the things that is, I think, misunderstood about murder especially is that it's a random act of violence against unknowns and strangers. Well, the data doesn't support that so much. I mean, almost 25 percent is strangers. That's not something to be ignored, of course, but the overwhelming majority of murders are against people that the offender knows.

Figure 3.10 on Page 21 is distribution of Virginia juvenile murders by homicide

syndrome classification. There's a group of literature that talks about homicide as not simply one offense. Homicide is actually multiple offenses, and it's multiple offenses because they all start as some form of confrontation. If you can define that form of confrontation, you can probably identify the motivation for the offense.

There is essentially two primary types of motivation. One is expressive. The other is instrumental. Expressive is violence for the sake of violence. You know, there is an argument. They just take the argument too far. Instrumental is that the homicide or murder started as something other than an argument. It could have been a robbery. It could have been a drug transaction. It could have been a car accident. Could have been something else.

Then there is gangland and street gang murders, and rape and sex offense murders.

Those are a very small percentage of the murder in Virginia for juveniles.

What Figure 3.10 does is tries to break down the type of motivation by the type of victim-offender relationship. 34.3 percent are expressive acts of violence against known victims, 7.6 are expressive acts of violence against family

members, and only 6.2 percent are expressive acts of violence against strangers.

Instrumental represents about 48.6 percent of all the homicides by juveniles. I'll break that down shortly.

MR. DARDEN: What does that term mean, instrumental?

DR. FAGGIANI: Instrumental means it had some other motivation, like a robbery, a burglary, a drug transaction, or something along those lines as the motivation for the incident.

MR. GALVIN: So what you have there, approximately fifty percent of the homicides are by expressives -- I mean, the category expressive, and fifty percent by some other means other than a motive?

DR. FAGGIANI: Right, exactly. If we take a look at the homicide syndrome, or the murder syndrome -- this is Figure 3.12, and this is on Page 22 -- it's distribution of Virginia juvenile murder syndrome by race of arrestee, and the red bars on the chart are black. The blue bar is white. And you can see that there seems to be something of a pattern here. The other known, expressive, and instrumental seems to be primary syndromes for black, or blacks

1 represent the majority of those syndromes. 2 percent of other known expressives are committed by 3 black juveniles; 20 percent of other known 4 expressives are white juveniles. Family expressive, this was rather 6 It's 32 percent white. 3.1 percent are 7 black. Also, the other thing about family 8 expressive, there's a lot of females in that category, not that there were a lot of females 9 10 arrested for this, but most of the females that are 11 arrested are in that category. Stranger expressive, fairly even. 12 13 Instrumental, about 52 percent are black and 35.7 14 percent are white. Gangland street murder, majority are white, and rape, sex offenses, the majority are 15 16 white. 17 MR. DARDEN: Excuse me just a second. 18 Is your presentation going to move into the other 19 data beyond the murder data? 20 DR. FAGGIANI: Yeah. 21 MR. DARDEN: All right. 2.2 This is the last one DR. FAGGIANI: on the murder. 23

MR. DARDEN:

DR. FAGGIANI:

24

25

You're killing me.

This is the percentage

of drug arrests involving juveniles for sale and distribution of Schedule 1 or 2 drugs. Schedule 1 or 2 drugs are defined as opium, cocaine, and derivatives of cocaine, including crack cocaine. You can see that around 1987, it started to increase; and by 1990, there was a fairly significant increase in drug arrests of juveniles. In fact, for arrests for sale and distribution of Schedule 1 or 2 drugs, juveniles in 1991 represent 12 percent of all arrests for that offense. Since 1991, it looks like it's been declining gradually.

1.0

The next is the percentage of -- and this is Figure 12 in the handout, the percentage of drug arrests involving juveniles for sale and distribution of Schedule 1 and 2 drugs by race. As we saw with murder, by juvenile black offenders seems to be the ones where the increase was, particularly in the late 1980s and in to 1990. Now, it may be encouraging that the most recent numbers beginning in '94 and '95 are showing a slight decline.

The next one is Figure 13. It's percentage of drug arrests involving juveniles for sale and distribution of marijuana, and you can see that there's a fairly significant increase. This time the increase begins around 1992, and it's still

increasing in 1995. By 1995, juveniles represent 15 percent of all offenders arrested for this offense.

arrests involving juveniles for sale and distribution of marijuana by race -- this is Figure 14 -- there doesn't really seem to be a difference between black and white. One year the black might be higher. The next year white might be higher. It's hard to say. It fluctuates quite a bit throughout this whole period. However, there is continuing to be an increase.

The way that Figure 14 would be read is that in 1995, let's see, whites represent 7.9 percent of all arrests -- white juveniles -- I'm sorry -- represent 7.9 percent of all arrests for possession and sale and distribution of marijuana, and blacks represent 7.10.

I'm going to skip Figure 15, and just to speed this up a little bit. This is Figure 16.

It's the sale of narcotics arrests for juveniles in metropolitan statistical areas by race. And again, we'll see that this is all narcotics, including marijuana and Schedule 1 or 2 drugs.

Beginning in the late 1980s, there was a significant increase in the metropolitan areas

of -- for black juveniles being arrested for possession of drugs. If we superimpose this on violent crime increases and murder increases, the pattern will look very, very similar.

Finally, I'm going to talk just slightly -- a little bit about conviction information. The Department of Criminal Justice Services released a drug report in 1989. What we've done is we've updated some of the figures in that drug report to see if any of the patterns had changed. What we're finding is that they pretty much stayed the same throughout this period.

This is Figure 18, and this is
percentage of drug convictions involving -- this is
for possession of Schedule 1 or 2 drugs by race; and
you can see that back in 1986, percentage of whites
was not much higher than the percentage of blacks.
Around 1988, it started to change, '87, '88, it
started to change. And by 1995, about 72 percent of
the arrests are black and about 26 percent of the
arrests are white.

And again, just to go back to that figure, this is conviction information. This is, you know, for individuals who are convicted in circuit court for a drug offense or a narcotics offense,

narcotics felony offense. The previous one was possession.

This is Figure 18. This is for sale and distribution of a Schedule 1 or 2 drug; again, percentage of drug convictions involving white and blacks. We see the same pattern as we saw with the possession. Back in 1986, whites represented about 59 percent, blacks about 38 percent. It completely switched in the late '80s to a point where in 1995, 82 percent of the convictions for sale or distribution of Schedule 1 or 2 drugs are black offenders, and 15 percent are white offenders.

Again, this is conviction
information, percentage of drug convictions involving
whites and blacks for marijuana sales, the sale and
distribution of marijuana, again, convictions in
circuit court: 1986, whites represented about 70
percent; 1995, they represented about 79 percent.
The pattern didn't really change here. It pretty
much stayed the same. In fact, black convictions
might be going down somewhat for sale of marijuana.

I also have a request to just kind of summarize the breakdown in our state responsible population. These are people that are housed in the prisons and jails, and are state responsible, which

means they were convicted of a felony. During most of this period they had to have a sentence of two years or greater. For 1995 to the present, it was six months.

The pattern here is, you know, blacks represent about 63.7 percent in 1990, and about 67.2 percent of the confined Department of Corrections population through this period. Whites represent about 31 -- 35.7 in 1990, and 31.94 in 1996.

REVEREND HARRIS: Would you repeat that last one?

DR. FAGGIANI: Whites represent about 35.73 percent of the state responsible population in jails in 1990. By 1996, they represent about 31. -- almost 32 percent, and this is Figure 20 in the handout.

And the last chart I'm going to show is the Juvenile Correctional Center Admission, and this is Figure 24 in the handout. It's the last figure, and this shows the racial breakdown of juveniles who are committed to the Department of Youth and Family Services, now called the Juvenile Justice, Juvenile Correctional Centers in 1990, 1996. Blacks represented about 61 percent in 1990, and about 30 percent in 1990 were white. About two

percent were other. By 1996, blacks represented about 59 percent; whites, about 36 percent; and other, about five percent. Looking at this, there seems to be a slightly downward trend for blacks throughout the period 1992 to 1993 and through 1996.

And that's all the presentation I have. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

MR. GALVIN: Take the questions of the panel now, please.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I have a couple of questions. And correct me if I missed something. There have been quite a few figures. One thing I found very striking was on your figures, there was a sharp rise in the statistics relating to black individuals after 1987. And while I know you're collecting figures and drawing graphs, have you looked behind it? Have you asked why there is such a sudden change? It sounds like it's something environmental, something extraneous? What would that be?

DR. FAGGIANI: I haven't looked behind it. My intent in looking at these figures is to give information to people who can look behind it and come up with the answers.

One of the problems with crime data

is it's not very specific; and one of the things that's been happening, particularly in the last ten years or so, people have been making broad assumptions about patterns, without specific information. What I'm trying to do, particularly in the Juvenile Murder Report is say, Here is some more specific information.

We know that not all homicides are committed against strangers; in fact, only about 25 percent. We know there's a lot of blacks from metropolitan areas who are using a gun and being arrested for homicide. Why, I'm not sure. We know there seems to be a relationship with narcotics arrests during that same period.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I see. Okay. So I can conclude that in the data-collection process, no light was shed on this issue.

Let me ask you something else. Did you do a study in one of the figures -- I've been trying to see if I find the answer, but I couldn't. I hope I didn't miss it. In breaking down the various offenses, did you see how many of them were committed within the same race, and how many were cross-racial? I know you did family versus strangers, but that doesn't tell me much.

1 DR. FAGGIANI: We looked at it for 2 juvenile murder. Let me see if we actually reported it in here. 3 No, we didn't report it. We didn't 4 5 pursue the issue, not because we didn't want to. Ι 6 think it's just because we didn't really see any patterns there, although we know a lot of the 7 homicides are black and black. 8 9 DR. AL-HIBRI: As you said, there are 10 a lot of assumptions that go around, and I would 11 love, since you have the data, if you could put 12 together a chart on this issue in particular. 13 least we can try and figure out some lessons from 14 that. 15 DR. FAGGIANI: I'll do that. Sure. 16 DR. AL-HIBRI: Thank you. 17 MR. GALVIN: Other questions? 18 MS. MCCLOUD: Could you say a word, 19 please, about your methodology in collecting the 20 data? 21 DR. FAGGIANI: What we've done Okay. 22 is, for most of this, we just use the Virginia State 23 Police uniform crime reports, and especially for the

juvenile murders, we use the supplemental homicide

24

25

report.

The supplemental homicide reports are

whenever there's a homicide in Virginia, the arresting officer fills out a separate report from just the UCR report with specific information on the offenders, if an offender is arrested; the arrest information on the offender, such as race; motivation, if they know it; whether a weapon was used, and that kind of information.

Very little information is included on the victim. We do have sex and race information and acquaintance information, but outside of that, we don't have a lot of information on the victims. And basically we just -- this is just a descriptive analysis. We just put the numbers together. We try not to make any interpretation of the numbers. We try not to bias it in any way. This is just the State Police report.

MR. GALVIN: Have you done the same report, or summary, for adult crimes in the same categories and track that against that of juvenile crimes?

DR. FAGGIANI: We're working on that right now. We don't have that ready yet, but we're working on it.

MR. GALVIN: How far along are you on

it?

DR. FAGGIANI: We have the data ready. It's quite a bit of data actually. We're trying to -- what we're trying to do with the adult one is increase it, or expand it to 1996 data. We now have 1996 data. That's not ready yet, but we're getting there.

1.3

1.5

1.8

2.2

MR. GALVIN: Would you have it for the earlier years already done so there would be -- you could provide us with some tracking to see how the adult community and the juvenile community, through the same crime rates and ratios, compare?

DR. FAGGIANI: I haven't done any analysis as of yet, so I really don't have anything I could report at this time.

MR. GALVIN: Okay.

REVEREND HARRIS: Excuse me. Of the information that you have shared with us, who gets this information? Who commissioned your staff to make this report, and where does this report go?

Does it go to the General Assembly finally? And how can -- how can we expect that something will happen as a result of all of this work that you are reporting?

DR. FAGGIANI: That's a real good question. Anyone gets the report that wants it. We

began the report, we were working -- the Criminal Justice Research Center at Department of Criminal Justice Services was supporting the governor's Commission on Juvenile Justice Reform. We had collected a lot of information for that.

1.0

The information that we collected during that commission was reported to the commission when we got it. They did with it what they needed to, I guess, and you know, they made some changes to legislation.

After the commission disbanded, we just took this data and started working with it and trying to figure out what else we could extract from it.

So no one specifically commissioned this report. We just kind of took it on our own to do it. We felt it was something that needed to be done. We had the data to do it. We printed up about 2,000 copies. We sent copies to everyone we had addresses for, and everyone who wants a report will get a copy. We have about 700 left.

MR. GALVIN: Do you know at this time if there's any group, or activity of the group, or people that are involved in making some conclusion or analysis of this data?

DR. FAGGIANI: Not that I know of,

no.

1.8

MR. HARRIS: Is this -- are you commissioned by the State of Virginia, and who is paying the price? Is it the taxpayers paying the salaries? It's very important to find out whether you're just looking around and nothing is going to happen; and if I'm helping to pay for it, I'd like to know that kind of information.

DR. FAGGIANI: Well, the Commonwealth of Virginia pays my salary. I know that. The specific funding for this report outside of my salary came from a federal grant that we have. We have -- we've been getting a grant to look at various issues. One of the things we're also responsible for is forecasting the local jail population, the local inmate population. Part of that grant is to cover that. Part of the grant is also to cover the, you know, analysis of some juvenile justice data. That comes from the burned anti-drug abuse funds.

REVEREND HARRIS: In your report to us, for the record, the various places from which you receive funds, and for the record, so we can discover all monies dedicated for the project that you just described.

DR. FAGGIANI: As far as I know, that's the only outside funding source we have. Everything else is with the -- from the Commonwealth of Virginia. There is a Statistical Analysis Center grant, which is Statistical Analysis Center for Virginia, and that money comes from the Bureau of Justice Statistics. That money wasn't used for this particular project.

1.1

MS. MCCLOUD: I want to go back to your selection of data. I don't know if you can answer this or not, but in using police reports as your primary resource, have you been able to determine any differences in the way reports are given or written up?

DR. FAGGIANI: Well, we haven't seen the actual written report. What we're getting is the same information that is sent by the State Police to the FBI for their analysis, so we're just looking at data tapes. We're just getting data tapes. So we haven't seen any written reports.

I have compared the Virginia UCR data, and particularly the Virginia Supplemental Homicide Report data with other states, and the Virginia system seems to be more complete than the other states' homicide data, seems to be in better

1 | shape.

2 MS. MCCLOUD: How do you mean

3 | complete?

DR. FAGGIANI: There's more information. There's less missing information than we had expected. Most of the -- most of the murders that have an arrest made for, as far as we determined, are included, if not all of them. There may be one or two in that ten-year period we don't know about, but we've tried to look through newspapers accounts to see if we can find any discrepancies or anything like that, and we've been unable to find any major discrepancies with the supplemental homicide data in Virginia.

MS. MCCLOUD: Thank you.

MR. GALVIN: May I ask you one question, Doctor? In the course of doing your work and collection of the data and relating it to the commission on this study, have you found that there is additional studies that you would have found been useful if you had been commissioned to do, or for you to have this study done in greater depth because of research is someplace where you feel there is something missing by what the study is not showing?

DR. FAGGIANI: Yes.

MR. GALVIN: Could you state what you think those are?

DR. FAGGIANI: One of the things that -- well, there's actually a lot of things, but one of them we're working on right now is including adults and doing a comparison between juveniles and adults. That's something we wanted to do initially. We just didn't have the resources to do it. We had the data for juveniles, so we focused primarily on juveniles.

The other main issue for us anyway is not having any court information. We know what's happening at the front end of the system. We know what's happening at the back end of the system. We know very little about the middle of the system. And that's something that, you know, if we had access to that data, we'd love to analyze it.

MR. GALVIN: The data is available; you just don't have access to it?

DR. FAGGIANI: I'm not sure the data is available. I talked with several people, and it may be available, you know, to some extent, but not fully. It's always available on hard copies. If we had enough research assistants, we could go to every file and get it that way, but that would take years.

MR. GALVIN: Other members'

questions?

MR. HUANG: Your findings seem to indicate various unique patterns. Are those findings consistent with the national data?

DR. FAGGIANI: Pretty much. The -it depends on where you look in, you know, the
national scene. A lot of the urban areas, some of
the violence started a little bit earlier than it did
in Virginia. Crack cocaine started a lot earlier in
some of those areas. Virginia is just a few years
behind in that regard; but outside of that, it's a
pretty similar pattern.

I didn't display this, but in the report on Page 4, Figure 1.2, we compare Virginia with the United States for juvenile arrests for murder, and you can see that the pattern is very, very similar.

MR. GALVIN: Have you any plans to take this as well into the same study for cities?

You're comparing Virginia to the rest of the country.

How about cities within Virginia?

DR. FAGGIANI: That's something that

I'm also working on. I just reworked some of the

data to try to be able to do that. We do have

comparison of the cities in this report. If you look, I think it's Appendix A, basically gives the change in the four-year period between 1986 and 1989 as compared with 1991 and 1994, and it lists the difference for all 136 Virginia localities.

1.6

2.1

MR. GALVIN: Could you point out the localities here just for the record for Hampton and Newport News?

DR. FAGGIANI: Sure. For Hampton, let's see, Hampton City is, between 1986 and 1989, there were zero reported juvenile arrests for homicide. Between 1991 and 1994, there were 16 juvenile arrests for homicide. So it was a fairly significant increase.

Newport News is, between 1986 and 1989 -- I'm sorry -- yeah, Newport News, 1986 to 1989, there were 12. 1991 to 1994, it dropped to 10. So there was a decrease of two during those areas for that four-year period.

Also in here, just to give you kind of a visual representation, I believe it's on Page 9, there's two maps, Map 2-1, is the total amount of arrests for -- juvenile arrests for murder in Virginia localities for 1986 to 1994, and Map 2-2 represents that appendix visually.

MR. DARDEN: I have a question. And please forgive me, I was out of the room, so some of this you may have already -- but if I step back and think about what you've presented, I get a picture, a really sort of frightening one of really enormous increase in deaths among young black males in particular, and violent deaths, use of guns, and namely drug-related, among people who know one another.

My question is this: If that picture and these data by race were reversed, and instead of there being a huge increase in the percentage of minorities involved in dying, it were the reverse and they were nonminorities and whites, could you speculate for me what kind of reaction there might be within your department, and generally if that were the case, instead of the effect being on minority?

DR. FAGGIANI: I would assume if there was an increase of any crime by any category of arrestee, or individual, we'd want to look at it. Personally, I'm interested in looking at crime. You know, it doesn't make any difference who's committing it, or why it's being committed, I think it needs to be explained. I'm assuming that my agency feels the same way.

I

MR. DARDEN: I thought when I came back, I heard you say that even though these reports have been completed, the response to them has been very negligible. Did I mishear that? DR. FAGGIANI: I don't know of any response, but -- I don't know if it's been negligible. I don't know if anyone's been -- you know, doing anything with this information or not. know we've had a lot of requests. We've had a lot of requests by the State Police because they're interested in it. I mean, my expectation --MR. DARDEN: How many would be a lot? DR. FAGGIANI: Well, you know, 15 or 20.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DARDEN: 15 or 20?

DR. FAGGIANI: But we also sent out about 1,200 of these to people that were on our list, so this is over and above the ones we've sent out.

MR. DARDEN: I think you might get at the obvious part of my question is, I think a popular assumption that we have, a whole generation of black males that are being almost expendable in a sense, and not much attention is being paid to what can be some really desperate life situations, and I'm just trying to get a sense of what you see being part of

the -- you know, the administration.

1.0

Does this concern raise to the level of really causing alarm? Do bells go off so that people who are in authority say, We have a problem; we need to do something about this?

DR. FAGGIANI: I hope so. I mean, I don't know for a fact -- I'm not in direct communication with the governor's office, or the secretary's office, or anything like that. They've all received copies of it. I've had questions from the attorney general's office, as well as the governor's office on specific issues related to the report, but I have no idea at this point what they're doing. I don't know if any bells or whistles go off.

MR. DARDEN: Nothing has come to you as a priority to focus in on these issues --

DR. FAGGIANI: Right.

MR. DARDEN: -- and to report back on their development?

DR. FAGGIANI: Right. I also have to say that this report was only printed in October, so -- and it was sent out in -- just before Christmas, so there's a good chance that -- I mean, a lot of people haven't had time to read it. The session was just ended, so the response may not have

surfaced yet.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you.

MS. MCCLOUD: Do you have any idea -if I heard you correctly, you said that the report
had been -- you had given copies of the report to
police officials, and so forth, who had requested it.
Do you know what their purpose behind requesting it
was? Did they tell you why?

DR. FAGGIANI: No. I have no indication whatsoever.

MS. ZEAVIN: I'd like to ask about the drugs, since that's where the white -- and selling drugs -- are high. So why didn't that go any special place to be studied, because that's a -- I would think a big concern.

DR. FAGGIANI: We're -- I don't know if anyone else has taken a look at this right now. This is fairly new data that we've just begun to look at. You know, I think it was looked at the last time in depth, back in 1989 was when the report was released. It's our intent over the next year, to update the drug report very similar to this and to report that information to whoever wants it.

MR. GALVIN: Yes, please. Would you identify yourself?

MS. BRYANT: Yes. My name is Debbie And in your presentation, I think you've Lee Bryant. touched on it. Most of us in this audience are from Hampton and Newport News, and whereas your presentation was relevant to Virginia, it wasn't brought to Hampton, and whereas -- or Newport News, and whereas, you know, the different categories. Ιf we could have had a comparison in the different categories, because maybe if there was a national pattern, maybe if there was a pattern in Virginia, there may be some categories in Hampton where that pattern may not be the same. You see what I'm saying?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it would have helped us -- well, it would have helped me. I have to speak for Debbie Bryant. It would help Debbie if someone would have given me a comparison of how does that raw -- the raw statistics are wonderful, but if you don't have it to compare it to anything, it doesn't essentially mean anything if you don't have anything to compare it to.

MR. GALVIN: Yes, please.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I want to commend you for trying to give figures as a basis for people's conclusions in the future. I think it's an excellent first step, but as the audience and members of the

panel have mentioned, one needs to go beyond to stage two, and I'm sure you're planning on that.

I would suggest that since you do seem to have analysis -- analytical capacity, as you did with the juvenile murders, that your next step would be to look at things like why there was this very sharp increase after '87 in criminal activities, or criminalized activity.

And also, I would suggest if you feel you're highly extended, then perhaps one way of dealing with this is to draw on the community and build bridges so you can do a project together.

MS. RATTLEY: May I -- I recognize the presence of delegate Christian, who is here, and I see her hand up.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. I have a question in relation to the data and Figure 19 and Figure 20. And it's indicated by race, black is as low as 16 percent, whites 79 percent, to indicate that there are many, many more sales and convictions of whites than blacks; but on the next page, you find still that the jail population is almost twice as high for blacks as it is for whites, so somewhere between the time that, even though they are convicted and we saw stats on the arrests, the numbers of

arrests, the numbers that are convicted, but then the numbers of blacks in jail amount to almost 31 percent to 67 percent, so somewhere are there alternative modes of sentencing which are much different. Do you have data on how many whites or blacks get community service, or how many get incarceration, and so forth? Because there's a very disproportionate number of those convicted, twice as much, but yet twice as many land in jail. The jail population is double. Do you have any data on those that are convicted? Where are they?

1.7

DR. FAGGIANI: I need to point out that Figure 20 is all incarcerated individuals, not just individuals for drugs. This is every offense that incarcerated somebody in the State of Virginia; whereas, Figure 19 is strictly for the distribution of marijuana, which is actually fairly small, and most of these people probably don't go to prison.

Most of -- if anything, they're going to get jail time. We don't have that kind of data for the jail, but most of them aren't going to be in prison anyway.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Do you have data on

MS. CHRISTIAN: Do you have data on alternative modes of sentencing?

DR. FAGGIANI: Unfortunately not.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Numbers for whites

and blacks. How many we can see get community service, home incarceration, and so forth, and how many land in jail? Having visited in the jails and institution, it's about 85 percent are black in the jails, and yet you still see they're coming through courts, but they're not in jail.

So I think it would be helpful for us to see what the alternative modes are, how many black young people are sentenced into drug rehabilitation programs, how many are sentenced into community service programs, and then I think we can certainly see a more balanced picture of what the criminal justice system is doing with regards to race.

DR. FAGGIANI: I agree. We don't have a lot of data on that information.

Unfortunately it's not recorded anywhere that I know of. We've been looking for it for years, believe me. We do have several evaluation reports on specific programs, and they're generally commissioned by the General Assembly. And we have various evaluation reports. I'm not exactly sure what -- all the ones we have. I don't work in that section, but if you'd like, I can get you that information.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes, please.

MR. DARDEN: Can I just follow up?

It just seems incredible -- not incredible, but let me ask it this way. With the kind of problem or disparity that the delegate just described to you, and then your response is you don't -- you've been looking for that data for years, you don't have it; it doesn't sound like you're going to get it any time soon.

1.0

The question that I have is, you know, why is there such a blind eye in your department -- and yours is the only one I know that is primarily responsible for collecting and analyzing this data -- why is there a blind eye on the issue of race?

DR. FAGGIANI: I guess I don't have an answer for that. I'm not sure there is necessarily a blind eye. One of the problems in Virginia isn't just unique to Virginia, this is throughout the country, there is very little criminal justice data, and when new programs start up, the data systems aren't always put in place to try to track those programs, and that's one of the issues that we've been struggling with for years to try to overcome.

As I said earlier, I mean, we have fairly decent information on the front end, and

fairly decent information on the back end. We don't have hardly anything in between that, and we searched pretty much every source that we could search to get that information without a massive data collection effort. That information just is not going to be readily available.

MR. DARDEN: Just one final question and then I am through. Within the structure at the Department of Criminal Services, do you have professionals who are involved in the -- at the level of decision-making, suggesting directions, suggesting thrusts for the deployment, for the use of resources, who might speak from the minority perspective, either because they happen to be minorities themselves or have a particular interest or connection with minority community or issues of civil rights?

I'm trying to understand if within your circle of decision-makers, you have input which would bring to the table some of the questions that we're interested in today?

DR. FAGGIANI: I'm not part of that circle, but it's my understanding that there are -there is a variety of individuals who make those kinds of decisions. I have no idea who they are.

I'm a researcher. I sit in the corner and crunch

numbers. I give my information to the people who want it, but I am not a decision-maker, and I have very little impact on those who are decision-makers.

MR. GALVIN: Yes, sir.

MR. HARRIS: It seems to me --

MR. GALVIN: Identify yourself,

please, sir.

MR. HARRIS: Marcellus Harris. It seems to me that what we have here is a scientist or an analyst who has given us just raw data, and my question would be -- first, am I right about that?

DR. FAGGIANI: Yes.

MR. HARRIS: My question would be, then, who are the persons responsible for the influence of this data and interpretation of this data? If it is predicated upon where this data goes and the inferences and the interpretations are left to folks like General Assembly folks and other folks, then the onus would be on them to -- or where do we fit in to try to get this data the attention we feel it ought to be leveled at it in the sense of some sense of alarm, some sense of crisis, because that's what it seems like to me in this audience; and I'm sure others in the audience, as the question was earlier asked; which seems to be the obvious thing,

about what's happening in the black community.

MR. GALVIN: I don't know if you have
an answer to, who should be here speaking other than

4 | you --

MR. DARDEN: Well, Mr. Morris would be one person, correct?

DR. FAGGIANI: And the Secretary of Public Safety and the Governor's office.

MR. GALVIN: You wanted to give those titles for the record who are the policy-makers in your division?

DR. FAGGIANI: Correct. The Director of the Department of Criminal Justice Services, Bruce Morris. He's the key policy-maker for the Department of Criminal Justice Services.

One thing I do want to mention is that they're in the process of developing a criminal justice plan that has very specific goals for the Department of Criminal Justice Services, and I believe that plan is going to be released next month or so. I think it might be April. I'm sure everyone can get a copy of that.

Bruce Morris is -- I assume reports
to the Secretary of Public Safety, Patricia West, and
she's one of the governor's secretariats, and she

reports to the governor's office.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DARDEN: Thank you.

MR. GALVIN: Dr. Faggiani, I want to thank you for coming here and providing us with this kind of information, and also the answering of the questions. It's been a longer time than I think you anticipated your presentation would take. However, I would like to ask you one last question.

In your opinion as a researcher doing this work, have you found that your expectations for the amount of response from your report coincides with your expectations? In other words, do you think this report should have caused, or should be causing more response than you have received so far?

Well, I want it to. DR. FAGGIANI: mean, that's one of the reasons we wrote it. I quess I feel that a lot of this information has been talked about for several years now. I mean, there really isn't anything new in the report. The only thing that's new about it is that it's specific to Virginia. We're trying to identify where the problem areas lie. I'm optimistic that someone is going to pick up on that and do something about it. I mean, that's why we do this kind of research, but I am just a scientist trying to figure out where the issues

lie.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GALVIN: And so for, what's also not new, like you say, giving this report, it's been picked up to have anything done with?

DR. FAGGIANI: Right.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I have one comment before you leave, if you don't mind. I understand you're a scientist gathering numbers. There have been quite a few studies about the fact that science is not a scientific objective to a student, and very often it is shaded with personal biases, et cetera. For that reason, I ask the group who's doing this study, is it ethnically diverse, sufficiently diverse so we will avoid the kind of blind spots that Mr. Darden was talking about? And if not, could you please convey our concern, or at least my concern, about that?

DR. FAGGIANI: Are you talking about the group that is doing the research?

DR. AL-HIBRI: Well, your group and whatever Mr. Morris is doing. I think it should be systematically all the way through that, in order to assure that there is no systematic bias, either in the data or in the interpretation, or even in describing setting up the project itself, there must

be an ethnic diverse group that would bring in all the concerns of the various parties.

MR. GALVIN: Thank you, Dr. Faggiani.

MR. HARRIS: He didn't answer the

question.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. FAGGIANI: I'll answer the It's my understanding that the Department question. of Criminal Justice Services is very ethnically diverse. I don't know the exact proportions, but I know that it's fairly diverse. As far as my research group, there's three people. There's me and two research assistants. One is a white male, and the other is a black female, and she's the key research assistant. As far as I'm concerned, I think my research section is fairly diverse, and we're committed to finding the issues without bias, if we That's our objective. That's always been my can. objective.

MS. RATTLEY: Thank you very much.

May I just say, sir, that our time is at a premium now. We're going to have to make some changes, but what we want to do is to hear from Dr. Kern, and we may have to push some items back later this afternoon, so we would like very much to be out if possible, sir -- I don't know how long your

presentation is -- by noon if possible.

1.7

2.1

We will not take a break -- where is Mr. Darden? He said maybe five minutes, but I think we better push forward and finish this panel.

DR. KERN: Can you hear me okay?

Does this work?

MS. RATTLEY: Yes.

DR. KERN: I work for a criminal justice agency, the Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission, which is an agency that has taken research information and data and put it to good use to address problems that have been identified by the type of data that you have just seen displayed by Dr. Faggiani. And to give you a good understanding of this, I'll try to be succinct and get you somewhat back on schedule.

The history of sentencing reform in Virginia began in 1982 when then-Governor Chuck Robb created a task force on sentencing to take a look at the sentencing of people convicted of felony offenses in Virginia; felony offenses being offenses that are considered more serious, and those of which you could receive a prison term; and see if there were unwarranted sentencing disparity in sentencing practices in Virginia. And by unwarranted -- it's

important to talk about that term, so oftentimes we hear the word sentence disparity.

Disparity, in essence, implies that there is some disproportionate representation of certain groups in society being sentenced to prison disparate from their proportional representation in our population. That does not necessarily mean, however, that there are unwarranted sentencing practices by judges and juries in Virginia. There's a big difference here.

when we talk about unwarranted sentence disparity, what we're saying, that is there empirical evidence, scientific evidence that all other things being equal, controlling for circumstances of the crime, the offender's prior criminal history, are there so-called extra legal considerations, things that are extraneous to the legal circumstances of the case before a judge, that play a role in how that particular criminal defendant is sanctioned by that Court?

And a good example of extra legal factors, extra legal considerations, would be the race of the defendant, their sex, their socioeconomic status, the type of legal representation they can afford, whether or not they were represented by

court-appointed counsel, public defender, or whether or not they could afford a private attorney, the judge who does the sentencing, and the particular location of the courtroom. For instance, was the offender sentenced to prison because he was sentenced in a courtroom in Southwest Virginia, as opposed to having been sentenced differently had that same case been heard in Northern Virginia or, say the Tidewater area.

So when we talk about unwarranted sentencing disparity, we're looking at that type of particular issue. Is there a lack of fairness, a lack of equity and how people are sanctioned in courtrooms once they are before a judge for sentencing.

Governor Robb's commission back in 1982 did a study of approximately 3,000 criminal sentencings throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia, and they did conclude that there was indeed strong evidence that there was unwarranted sentencing disparity in Virginia courtrooms. They then turned that evidence over to the General Assembly, which commissioned the Supreme Court of Virginia to take some action to address this particular problem identified by Governor Robb's commission.

The Supreme Court then set in motion a process of gathering information on a more exhaustive basis of felony sentencings in Virginia. In essence, they put into place a database that recorded a wealth of information on everybody being convicted in Virginia courtrooms of felonies.

They then took all of that information and developed what are known as sentencing guidelines. The sentencing guideline database, in essence, consists of over 200 unique pieces of information on every criminal defendant sentenced in Virginia courtrooms. All types of information, information about their employment history, their educational background, military history, if they had one; a lot of information about their personal background, whether or not they have a history of drug abuse, or alcohol abuse, and so on, as well as a wealth of information about their criminal history and their juvenile criminal history.

The judiciary essentially took all this information, and after identifying which of those factors that they gathered were relevant to the sentencing decision in a scientific study, they took out all the extra legal considerations. They indeed replicated the finding of Governor Robb's commission

that indeed there were unwarranted sentencing disparities in Virginia.

They then said we'll no longer want to consider any of these factors in our guidelines, and what was left were only the legal considerations of the case, the facts of the crime itself: For instance, was it a robbery? Was it an armed robbery with a firearm? Was there any victim injury? And prior criminal history, does the offender have any prior criminal convictions, and what is the nature of those prior criminal convictions?

And around those factors developed sentencing guidelines that reflected actual sentences imposed by Virginia judges in the previous five years of data that we looked at.

What we then did is, the Supreme

Court commissioned a study -- and I believe

Mr. Darden's been given a copy of this study -entitled Voluntary Sentencing Guidelines Pilot

Program Evaluation. The Supreme Court wanted to see
whether or not these sentencing guidelines could play
an effective role in reducing unwarranted sentencing
disparities in Virginia courtrooms.

So what the Supreme Court did is they commissioned a pilot test. They asked six circuit

courts in Virginia to take part in a year-long experiment using these sentencing guidelines. What we then did is, after that year, we compared sentencing practices in the six pilot circuits that utilized the sentencing guidelines to those circuits -- the other 25 judicial circuits -- there's 31 judicial circuits in Virginia -- so they compared the other 25 circuits that were not using sentencing guidelines, and we found dramatic differences.

1.0

We found that in the six circuits that were employing the sentencing guidelines, unwarranted sentencing disparity was significantly reduced, and in some cases, outright eliminated; whereas, in those 25 circuits that were not employing the sentencing guidelines, the sentencing disparity, the unwarranted sentencing disparity, continued unabated.

As a result of that evaluation study, the judiciary itself, all the circuit judges in Virginia, and the Supreme Court justices, voted unanimously to extend the Sentencing Guidelines Program statewide, and that happened in July 1st of 1991.

Now, since then, we've had several evolutions of sentencing reform in Virginia, most

recently culminating with the General Assembly abolition of parole and institution of a truth-in-sentencing system. And by "truth-in-sentencing," what I mean by that is that now if a felon is sentenced in a Virginia courtroom, they must serve 85 percent or more of whatever time is imposed by a judge or a jury.

In the past, prior to this new system, an offender would be eligible for parole, which in some cases would make them eligible for release after serving only a quarter of their sentence. As well, they were eligible for very generous good conduct reductions in their sentence. Under the old scheme, most felons received 25 days off for every 30 days they received for just not misbehaving in the institution.

When you combine the good conduct credit and the parole system under the old sentencing scheme, most felons only served about 20 to 25 percent of whatever the sentence was imposed in a Virginia courtroom. Now we have a new system where they will serve at least 85 percent or more.

And I brought along today -- and we have brochures in the back -- two brochures which address this new sentencing system. This particular

brochure here is entitled Virginia's New Criminal
Sentencing System, and this describes the new
sentencing system in a little more detail than what I
just provided for you.

The second brochure is a progress report on the new sentencing commission that was created as part of this new legislation that abolished parole. We still have today a sentencing guideline system. The sentencing guideline system is different than the old system. Rather than a system of guidelines that is calibrated on historical sentences imposed, the new sentencing guidelines are calibrated on actual historical time served for most felons.

The exception are those who are convicted of violent crimes. If a felon is convicted of a violent crime, the new sentencing guidelines call for enhancement that will extend their length of incarceration over what it would have been under the old sentencing system.

So before I move on to another topic, what I'd just like to say is, what we have here in Virginia -- and it reflects about 16 years of data collection and research -- is at least one example of a situation where research, scientific research did

identify a fairness problem, an unwarranted disparity problem in the criminal justice system, and action was taken to address that problem and a mechanism was put into place to correct that problem.

Now, that being said, you must understand that having in place a sentencing guideline system that corrects for unwarranted sentencing disparity that ensures more consistent and predictability -- consistency and predictability in sentencing, does not mean it eliminates outright disparity, unwarranted disparity in the criminal justice system because sentencing guidelines do not address disparate practices by police departments in their policing strategies and the use of police discretion in deciding whether or not to make an arrest or not in a particular situation.

The sentencing guidelines in no way, shape, or form deal with prosecutorial discretion and abuse of prosecutorial discretion.

One of the most hidden areas of the use of discretion in the criminal justice system is the decision by the prosecutor whether or not to charge the defendant at all with a crime; and if so, if the decision is made to charge, at what level do they charge. Do they charge him with a felony, and

what level of felony, or do they reduce the charge to a misdemeanor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And even if they do decide to charge the defendant with a felony, we know about plea bargaining practices, the fact that some defendants will get some concessions, in terms of charge reductions or negotiated sentence reduction. In return, sometimes we get cooperation in prosecuting others.

But nonetheless, we have tremendous discretion that is being exercised by other critical actors in a criminal justice system, prior to the point in time when a criminal defendant is convicted of a felony and before a judge for sentencing. oftentimes you pick up literature, like we have in the back of the room, that takes a look at disparity in imprisonment and disparity in sentencing. Part of the reason for that is that, for one, we do have good data on people once they're convicted and sentenced to imprisonment; and a lot of the studies that you find, focus on that decision only because it's the good data that's available. But in Virginia at least, I feel very confident, based on our own research, that we have addressed the issue of unwarranted sentencing disparity in Virginia, and we

have very sound evidence that judges are embracing these sentencing quidelines.

Our compliance rate is very high, 75 percent, and the law requires that if a judge departs from the sentencing guidelines, he must state in writing why he departs, and the commission then tracks that information and provides that to the public in our annual report. Anybody who wants a copy of our annual report can write to us, and it's -- the address is on the back of this brochure entitled 1996 Progress Report.

One last thing I'd like to touch on before taking any questions, if there are some, is that there was a question earlier about the dramatic sharp rise in drug arrests around 1986 and 1987, and of course, around that time we also saw a spike in the arrest rates for violent crimes. Most criminologists do put those two factors together and attribute the great increase in violent crime in the latter part of the '80s to the explosion, the widespread explosion and introduction of crack cocaine in our inner cities throughout America.

And there certainly is no question that the scientific data does reveal some disparity in terms of the treatment of people who are using

cocaine. Citizen surveys, surveys done of school children in high schools and in colleges seem to reveal that use of cocaine is about evenly split across the racial groups. About fifty percent of cocaine users are white; about fifty percent are black.

However, when you take a look at the arrest data, you see that when you focus on cocaine, about 80 percent of the arrests for cocaine are black defendants, and about twenty percent are white. And that particular disproportionate representation of the racial groups continues on about a parallel all the way through to conviction and then ultimately imprisonment.

So when you take a look at the imprisonment statistics for people who are caught selling cocaine, you see that 80 percent of the defendants are black and twenty percent are white, but what that really represents is the fact that judges are putting almost all of them in prison, a hundred percent.

Our sentencing guidelines call for them all to go to prison, and what the judge is seeing, four out of every five people before him for sentencing are black. But, again, this disparate

proportion of people begins at the point of arrest, not at the point of sentencing, and it's important to remember that.

One other thing I'd like to get on the record is that the Virginia Sentencing Commission is a separate and distinct animal from the U.S. Sentencing Commission. The U.S. Sentencing Commission that you may be aware, promulgates sentencing standards for the federal courts, offenders who are convicted of federal-level offenses and sentenced by federal judges.

In the past year, there's been a lot of attention focused on how the U.S. Sentencing Commission and Congress treats defendants convicted of cocaine offenses. If you're not aware of it, the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines call for a treatment of crack cocaine defendant, which is dramatically different than defendants who are convicted of powder cocaine offenses. The guidelines call for a mandatory five-year prison term for any defendant who is caught trafficking in five grams or more of crack cocaine.

But to receive the same five-year sentence recommendation for powder cocaine, defendants in the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, the

defendant must be caught with at least 500 grams of powder cocaine; so essentially there's a 100 to 1 ratio difference between how crack and powder cocaine are treated in those guidelines.

What's the significance of that?

Well, the significance of that is that their own data reveals that the great majority, about 80 percent, of the defendants convicted of crack cocaine offenses are black; however, the great majority of defendants in the federal court system convicted of offenses involving powder cocaine are white. So it's been viewed by some as a clear example of how disparity has been institutionalized into a sentencing system of quidelines.

In Virginia, we do not have that scenario. We treat powder and crack cocaine exactly the same in Virginia, so we do not institutionalize that type of disparity that we may be familiar with in the federal system, into the state system.

And I know you're way over schedule, so I'm going to confine my remarks to that.

MR. DARDEN: You're doing fine, and thank you very much. You brought it down very quickly.

Questions for the panel?

MS. RATTLEY: Yes. Could you just help me, please. I understand how the federal law came into being, the difference between crack and cocaine. What's behind that, because to me, that is a good illustration of discrimination, because, you know, I've heard the whole thing, I guess. Crack is cheaper. Crack is more attractive to poor people.

DR. KERN: Right.

MS. RATTLEY: So -- but you can get pure cocaine, and there is a disparity in the sentencing, plus you've got to have so much more of the real cocaine --

DR. KERN: Right.

MS. RATTLEY: -- than you do of the crack cocaine. Could you just look into the mind of those legislators who would pass such a law?

U.S. Sentencing Commission itself studied this and actually issued a report on this last year, and they did conclude, much as you do, that this was not fair, that this did institutionalize unwarranted treatment of African Americans, and they rebutted the contention.

The original contention, Madam Chairman, for the disparate treatment of crack

cocaine was that crack cocaine trafficking was more often associated with violent behavior on the part of those defendants involved in those criminal conspiracies where you have a drug-trafficking operation.

The argument was that where there is crack cocaine, there are guns. Where there is crack cocaine, there is violence and terror. And that while powdered cocaine is also a danger, powder cocaine trafficking is practiced in the suburbs, in office buildings, and doesn't involve weapons, doesn't involve violence. And through that type of analogy, the argument was made that we would indirectly be able to reduce violence by taking people trafficking in crack cocaine and getting them off the street; whereas, there would not be that urgency to get those trafficking in powder cocaine off the streets because the argument again would be it would not be averting that much violence.

Now, that particular argument was examined by the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and they concluded that at least as far as their data went, they didn't see any differences in the types of violent records of those who trafficked in powder and crack. They didn't find any empirical report for

that; but nonetheless, you might recall that when the U.S. Sentencing Commission publicized their report and recommended to Congress that this disparity be eliminated, there was large outcry in Congress, as well as from Attorney General Reno's office, and the U.S. Sentencing Commission, as I understand, was almost threatened with being abolished as a result of what was viewed as an outrageous recommendation to equate these, and Congress almost unanimously rejected the U.S. Sentencing Commission's recommendations and told them to go back to the drawing board and come up with better recommendations.

1.1

Now, I notice on your agenda tomorrow you have Congressman Scott appearing before you. Being that he is a member of Congress and was a member of Congress when this issue was being debated before Congress, he would probably be a better person than I to give you some insight onto what the thinking was of Congress in rejecting that. All of the information I'm providing to you here is basically what I was provided by secondhand.

MS. RATTLEY: Well, I guess that would then conclude that when we talk about discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex,

age, handicap, or national origin, in the administration of justice, we should add based on money, because that's what it's all about, the matter of crack versus pure cocaine.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Maybe the Constitution needs to be amended, because if the law makers continue to let that law stand, it's obvious that the whole country now is judged by how much money you have. You even get into the problem of money deciding who lives and who dies.

You didn't come for a lecture, but it just kind of rubs me the wrong way. When we talk about crack, in Los Angeles charges now currently that crack was deliberately carried into the depressed community, or the urban centers, or in black neighborhoods. So then you say that all black folks use crack, all whites folks use coke. We all know that's bull, because at one time they had the real coke, the crack, the pure coke in black communities. As the supply and demand, you know, didn't have enough money to buy the pure, so they can get a cheaper brand of the same thing, so they take maybe three times as much to get the same high, and then they become violent, may become violent to get the money to get all the crack they need. Maybe they wouldn't be so violent if they can get the cocaine.

I don't think they should have any of it, just
personally.

DR. KERN: Right.

MS. RATTLEY: But that, to me, is just a blatant disregard for justice in this system, and I don't mean to blow off on you. I know you didn't do it.

MR. DARDEN: Question, and this is a little bit out of your area, I'm sure, of expertise. You're a criminologist, and I'm thinking now about the kind of sociological issue that comes up in terms of stereotypes. And we have an historical stereotype of one of them, of black males as being dangerous in the sense of the stereotype of -- oh, let's see, there was a book years ago about stereotypes called "Bucks, Coons, Mulattos," and so there's this system, apparently, of characterizing black people into stereotypes.

And for young black males, there seems to be a growing stereotype that they are dangerous; and I think some of the data that we've shown, in terms of use of guns and violent crime, feeds into that. What I'm'trying to understand here now is whether this sensitivity -- or whether there

is some sensitivity in the law enforcement community to stereotype, and whether, you know, what we're seeing now is feeding that stereotype?

And it's important to me -- and I'll just stop right here, because I want to give an anecdote. On the way in, I stopped at the Norfolk airport and my sky cab, a fellow named Juan, and I were chatting, and he told me he and his buddies talked together about how things are changing. White people, in his words, don't even like to accept his sky cab services anymore. They'd rather get a cart and push it themselves than to be -- than to have them in their presence. And it just seemed to me another example, at least from his point of view, that there's a sense that young black people, young black males are threatening, just having them around can create a sense of menace.

So I wanted to get some sense of whether that is a -- in any way implicated in the criminal justice system looking at sentencing disparity.

DR. KERN: Well, it perhaps plays some role in what Congress did, I suppose, in making their decisions about how to treat cocaine cases, but I can tell you that that issue does not play a role

as far as the Judicial Sentencing Commission is concerned in promulgating sentencing guidelines.

The commission promulgates these guidelines with a goal of achieving consistency and fairness and greater equity on how people are sanctioned by the courts once they're convicted, and we make every effort to ensure that we keep an accurate track of how often judges comply with those guidelines and the documentation of what they cite for a reason for departure.

So for example, if you have a case where it's an armed robbery, and the guidelines call for a particular sentence and the judge goes above that and gives ten more years, we take a close look at what is the judge citing as the reason why he believes this offender should go to prison for ten more years than the guidelines call for. Again, we track all these things.

So there's a, if you will, a level of accountability there. And so I think that it is the only system really that's in place to guide discretion, when you think about it, in a criminal justice system. Again, there are many opportunities for discretionary decisions to be made in the criminal justice system, starting with the decision

to report an offense, the decision to make an arrest, the decision to prosecute and how to prosecute, and so on, and the sentencing guidelines are the only mechanism in place to provide a device to correct for the opportunity for disparate practices to take place. No other decision in the criminal justice system has guidelines of that sort or accountability of that nature.

1.8

MR. DARDEN: Pretty late in the process, but better late than never, I guess.

REVEREND HARRIS: As I understand it, your -- excuse me -- your responsibility deals with judges only?

DR. KERN: Well, sentencing -- yeah, judge sentencing. We actually have jury sentencing, but that makes up a very small percentage, about two percent of all the felony sentencing.

REVEREND HARRIS: What do you find out with the jury sentencing? What do you find out with, is there any disparity during sentencing?

DR. KERN: Well, jury sentencing is tremendously inconsistent from jury to jury, and you might expect that because in most cases, people only serve on a jury once in their lifetime, and it may be their only opportunity to punish someone, if you

will, once they have convicted them of a crime; and they don't have any benchmarks, other than maybe what they read in the newspaper, as to what a fair sentence might be in a particular case, so it's not surprising that from jury to jury across the Commonwealth, you do find great inconsistencies.

We also find when we look at jury sentencing, that a jury sentence is consistently harsher than judges. A typical jury sentence will be three to four times higher than what the judge would do, and I attribute that again to the fact of the novelty of serving on a jury and that being your only opportunity ever to sentence someone.

A judge, on the other hand, in a given year may sentence hundreds of people convicted of felonies, and he puts that all into a broader perspective and therefore sentences within that perspective, and has the guidelines, of course, to help him in sentencing.

Jury, on the other hand, does not get the sentencing guidelines, does not have that broader perspective, and therefore, they tend to whack it to people, if you will, much more so, because again, that's their only opportunity to ever punish someone for a particular crime.

1 REVEREND HARRIS: Do you have any 2 data on the selection process of juries? 3 DR. KERN: Of --REVEREND HARRIS: Of the juries? 4 5 DR. KERN: No. I'm sorry. There's 6 no data kept on the voir dire process in terms of the 7 background of people who are reviewed to serve on juries and who are excluded and who are retained. 8 9 None of that information is gathered by the courts. 10 MR. GALVIN: We have a gentleman 11 seated right here. 12 MR. GIBSON: My name is Vaughn 13 Gibson. I can appreciate the information that's 14 being given, and as a member of this generation that's already been counted out, I think we're 15 16 missing one fundamental thing here that relates to 17 disparity that's occurring here. Disparity is being 18 thrown around by everybody here, and at various 19 levels. 20 I think one of the main reasons we're 21 here is because of something very simple and a very 22 fundamental thing, and it's -- in my mind, it boils 2.3 down to a premise and a bias at a very base level. 24 In order to gather the information this gentleman from the Sentencing Commission gathered, you looked 25

at -- this gentleman looked at the arrest information that was brought in by the State Police. Okay.

The State Police paints a very bleak picture of the state of affairs in regard to young black men. What I contend is that, of course, the picture is going to be extremely bleak because these young black men, as result of this bias and this prejudice towards young black men, are going to be the initial targets. The arrest rates are going to be higher. The conviction rates are going to be higher. And subsequently we're going to get data that looks exactly like the data we have there because of the bias on the very base fundamental levels.

In order to get these men in the door, you have to address those who deal with them daily, who target these men.

MR. GALVIN: Do you have a question for Dr. Kern or -- observation about the collection of the data is what you're making?

MR. GIBSON: My question is this:

How does your office -- I understand the federal

level, and I understand that system is already

intact. How does your office address the base level,

the biases and the prejudices on the very fundamental

level, our precincts, our captains, our lieutenants, our patrol officers, and the ones who walk the streets? What is the system of checks and balances for them?

DR. KERN: We have -- the Sentencing Commission is a Judicial Branch agency of the Supreme Court of Virginia. We have no statutory charge to do anything other than focus on what judges do in the courtrooms; so while you point out that there is a valid need for that type of attention focused earlier in the system, we're probably not the agency for it since we're in the Judicial Branch and we deal with offenders long after they've been arrested.

MR. GALVIN: Please.

MR. HARRIS: Marcellus Harris again.

As I listened to Dr. Kern, one thing has become clear to me, and I hope to be cleared up with this little discussion perhaps. You stand factually by the system's guidelines, sentencing guidelines of Virginia, and you say to us that for certain -- whoever gets to a certain status in the system, they're going to go to jail because your sentencing guidelines put them in jail whether they're black or white. To that end, we still have to deal with so many blacks going into the jail versus whites.

I would submit to you, then, that the prosecutorial part of this, where the Commonwealth and others who deal with defendants and accuse, they know that, too. So perhaps we need to be looking at the prosecutorial side of this where they have so much discretion that the black defendants versus white defendants may not be sized up casewise prosecutorialy, that will get them to the status of the sentencing; and perhaps in the back of their mind, they know that, and a juvenile may be tried as an adult versus being tried as a juvenile make all the difference in the world in the system, color regardless, irregardless, because of the fact that that juvenile being charged with a felony as an adult.

Blacks would certainly fall into the sentencing guidelines and be engulfed by the sentencing guidelines; where a similar case of another color, or another race, may be -- maintain the juvenile status through that same charge and not be consequentially locked up in the sentencing guidelines.

So I see where the sentencing '
guidelines may be a blessing and a curse, because
those who know the sentencing quidelines know that

the only way to get this guy is to get him charged where the sentencing guidelines can kick in, vice versa.

So I'm kind of concerned -- I'm asking you what can we do to check the prosecutorial side of this, or get some data on the prosecutorial side of this, which may be the missing part of this puzzle, at least from my mind?

DR. KERN: That's a good question. I really don't -- I wish I had an answer for you. Plea bargaining is really the black hole of the criminal justice system. There really is no good information on what happens once the case comes to the attention of the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office, and then what happens to it when it gets out of there.

MR. DARDEN: Let me say in the interest of time, we will be hearing from both Commonwealth Attorneys from Hampton and Newport News, and we'll have a chance to put the question to them. We are trying to catch up. I want to thank you very much.

MR. GALVIN: Two questions that I wanted -- and Ms. McCloud had a question, please, if you would.

FOX REPORTING

MS. MCCLOUD: I'll make it as brief

as possible. I wanted to point out my understanding of the difference in the two studies. The first study seems to have been one more or less of quantitative, in other words, as some sociologists call it, number crunching. And the study that was conducted on behalf of Governor Robb was qualitative. DR. KERN: No, it was quantitative as well. MS. MCCLOUD: It was quantitative as well? DR. KERN: Right. Yes. MS. MCCLOUD: I thought I understood that you looked at the kinds of information that was collected, and from that you drew the conclusion as to whether or not some of those questions should not have been asked on that? Do you follow what I mean? DR. KERN: No, I really --18 DR. AL-HIBRI: At this point, I just want to make a final comment about the two studies, 20 just to make sure they are not misconstrued. 21 taken too simplistically, the studies would show there are lots of black males who cause a lot of 22 23 trouble, whether it is aggravated assault, or simple, 24 and that our judicial system treats them fairly 25 because we have guidelines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

19

What it doesn't show is that these numbers and these guidelines you're talking about are embedded in a very complex system where discrimination and the bias starts very early on. For example, if you have a profile of a black male as being dangerous -- somebody in the audience mentioned that -- then I think it would affect the policemen, your approach in determining whether you have probable cause in one situation or not. And if you're faced with a black kid, you're more likely to say I had probable cause than if you're faced with a white, and therefore, they arrest that person and statistics will be different.

So I would like to really emphasize that these numbers and these statements do not tell us even a significant part of the story, that it could be -- these studies could be misconstrued if somebody approached them too simplistically.

I'd like to know which agency do you think, or which party, again, the same question I asked Dr. Faggiani, one could turn to and say, Would you please give us some analysis, embed these facts, these results in a more complete picture so we know what is happening and therefore we can treat it.

DR. KERN: It would have to be done

1 i
2 J
3 G
4 D
5 D
6 A
7 0

in the Executive Branch of Government, not the Judicial Branch, because the Executive Branch of Government, you have the State Police, you have the Department of Criminal Justice Services, you have the Department of Corrections, you have the Commonwealth Attorneys Training Council, which is the umbrella organization that oversees our state's prosecutors, and so on.

So all the other facets of the criminal justice system are -- that come before us are in the Executive Branch of Government under the Governor and Secretary of Public Safety, so that would be the appropriate place to focus, to address the types of issues I think you've raised.

MR. GALVIN: Thank you, Dr. Kern, and thank you for being here. I want to -- just one thing I want to understand, you said you put a new system in which has extended the length of sentencing time to 85 percent?

DR. KERN: Right.

MR. GALVIN: And I'm going to make the assumption -- if I'm wrong, I'd ask you to correct me -- that the thought possibly behind this was that the goal here, why we want to increase the sentencing time toward the goal in this is the

deterrent to make our community safer, our streets safer?

DR. KERN: Well, there's two goals here of this new legislation. One was just to -- for the purpose of having a truthful system for the citizens of the Commonwealth so that if a victim of crime is sitting in the courtroom and they hear a sentence pronounced by the judge, they know with a high degree of certainty how long that offender is going to be locked up in prison.

Under the old scheme, a victim of crime had no idea when their assailant perhaps would be released from prison, so it was to enhance that predictability in everybody's mind. The second piece of this, which is -- which got the most attention in the media, but actually is the smallest piece, is longer sentences for violent crime, because we have found that only one in five felons receive an enhancement as a violent offender, so four out of five people are just being sentenced to historical time served, but under truth in sentencing.

So a good example of that -- see, under the old system, if someone sold one gram of crack cocaine, they would get a five-year prison sentence typically. They'd serve ten months of that

five years. Now that crack cocaine offender receives a one-year sentence and serves ten months, so the time served has not changed at all, but they're now serving almost of all of what they get, so everyone knows he's got a year and he's going to serve most of it, rather than getting five and only serving ten.

If you're a violent offender, however, that length of stay will be increased, but that's again only --

MR. GALVIN: I understand this, but what I'm really asking you is whether you have looked at the consequences of this action, given that there's a disparity in the prison. Given there's a disparity in incarceration, this goal has, for sure -- could have -- this policy could have reached the goal of incarcerating more blacks in prison. While I understand the explanation --

DR. KERN: Sure. I mean, if the judge has before him ten armed robbers and eight of them are black, all ten are going to prison. You might put a different twist on that and say that policy institutionalized the disparate treatment of blacks in terms of imprisonment, but from our perspective, it results in more consistency and predictability and fairness because all armed robbers

are going to prison.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But on that issue, somebody asked earlier about community corrections and alternatives to incarceration, and the commission is the agency now that does track the use of those options, so we are the agency that gathers that data, and I can tell you that effective July 1st, 1997, the commission is putting in place new sentencing guidelines that will greatly expand the use of alternatives to incarceration. Effective July 1st, if someone is convicted of trafficking in cocaine, whether it's crack or powder, one gram or less, and they have no felony record whatsoever, the quideline will now call for the Detention Center Program placement by a circuit court judge, and that is a new program established by the Virginia General Assembly.

It's a six-month long program that has mandated substance abuse treatment as a part of that program. It's a 20-week mandatory substance abuse component.

Because in the past, none of these drug offenders were getting any treatment, so as a result we saw very high recidivism rate. They were simply going to prison, they'd sit there for about ten months, or a year, and come right back out with

the same substance abuse problem and show up again in a few months as a recidivist.

So now we are going to put in place a mechanism to give judges guidelines that say for these people, we'd like to see these offenders placed into this treatment program to see if we can have some impact on recidivism.

How does that relate to the problem you're talking about? We've estimated that 85 percent of those that fit this criteria are African American, 85 percent; so 85 percent of the people convicted in our courtrooms of selling one gram or less of cocaine with no felony record are African American.

So presuming that judges comply with this recommendation at the rate that they've shown in our other guidelines, that will affect, in a very positive way, on the incarceration rate because we will see a significant core of black defendants who otherwise would have gone to prison, now going into this treatment program under our new guidelines.

MR. GALVIN: Thank you very much. Thank you for being here today, as well, with us.

Madam Chairman, do you want to take a

break at this time?

MS. RATTLEY: Thank you very much.

We want to move right into our next speaker if we could. It doesn't seem as though we're going to get any lunch either since I've been told we have to start the afternoon meeting exactly 1:10. But we are going to ask Mr. Darden to introduce our next panel.

MR. DARDEN: I'm going to expedite this and actually turn right over to our panel moderator, Dr. Azizah al-Hibri.

DR. AL-HIBRI: May I ask Ms. Tracey
Watkins to come to the table. Ms. Tracey Watkins is
a student at the University of Richmond Law School,
and she belongs to the Black Law Student Association.
She is going to share with us the results of the
survey that BLSA, the Black Law Student Association,
has conducted.

MS. WATKINS: Good afternoon.

MS. RATTLEY: Good afternoon.

MS. WATKINS: We feel really bad about speaking to you this afternoon when everyone is trying to get to lunch, but as Professor al-Hibri said, we are all students and we have to run back and get to class, so we're not going to take up a lot of your time this afternoon. As a matter of fact, we're

going to move fairly quickly.

2.2

DR. AL-HIBRI: Ms. Watkins, would you introduce the other people?

MS. WATKINS: I have a little presentation. On my left is the President of the Black Law Student Association, Ms. Danielle Ferguson, and she's going to say a few words at this time.

MS. FERGUSON: For those of you who are not familiar with the Black Law Students
Association, it's an association designed to meet the needs of the black law students, whether or not they go to a predominantly white law school or not, during our three-year legal education.

And what we have done is prepared a survey -- kind of pass these out so you can have a copy -- prepared a survey for -- that was answered by law students, as well as some of the custodial staff at the school, and what we did was we tallied out at the responses and kind of organized information for everyone.

MS. WATKINS: The surveys are being tallied up by Ms. Kenyatta McCleoud. Kenyatta is also a member of the Black Law Students Association. She worked really hard on the survey and will be talking with you about some of the comments that

we've received from the student body.

We apologize if we didn't bring enough copies. We weren't aware as to the number of participants by audience members.

When Professor al-Hibri approached the Black Law Students Association to put together a survey, our initial goal was to be able to come up with the survey tool that we could use to determine racial perceptions among people within the State of Virginia.

Now, as you can tell, that sounds like a very lengthy project and was not one we were able to completely go about conducting. But this survey, this tool that we used, will be used to go to other BLSA Chapters within the State of Virginia located not only in William and Mary, but George Mason, Washington and Lee, and University of Virginia to see about the types of responses they were able to receive.

We took a look at our law school community, because although we're sort of -- we're within the school system, we considered the law school community a good microcosm of the community at large. We thought it would be interesting to see the perceptions of students who will actually be

attorneys within the next year, within the next two to three years, to see what their perceptions were of the current situation in Virginia, and in a sense, globally.

We had a hundred surveys made available to the law school population, and we received a total of 54 responses. I'd like to put a disclaimer in. You've heard a lot of scientific data this morning. This is an unofficial survey. This is a citizen survey. We are not statisticians, we are not researchers, and we're not analysts. We are students who were interested in finding out what our fellow students wanted to know.

The survey tool is before you, and in the interest of time, we will be forwarding to Professor al-Hibri to give to you the actual breakdown of the age, the grade level, the race, the total income, and approximately where everyone was from so she can forward that to you for your analysis.

If you would take a look at the topic portion, the topical portions of the survey, you see that they're broken down into five topics. We have employment, law enforcement, government, education, and the judicial and the court system. In coming up

with the questions for each of the topics, we received some information from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and some information and data that we had on our own within our law school library system.

In compiling the questions, we tried to come up with questions that depicted either biases or general stereotypes that were a part of our community at large; and if you notice, each of the number six questions are completely and totally outrageous, as far as coming up with some sort of racial stereotype and bias. The number six questions were designed in order to see what types of responses we can get. And Ms. McCleoud is going to share with you some of the written comments we got on the surveys about it.

Just to sort of you give you, though, a racial breakdown on the composition, we had ten black responses, we had 41 white responses, we had two Asian and one Arab response. In the employment section, we were able to analyze from our data -- and I apologize that you don't have it in front of you -- that there is a general consensus that there are a lot of inequitable practices still going on in the workplace, that minorities are not receiving the same type of treatment as non-minorities.

We were real interested in looking at, quote, the other population within the law school, and that's our Arab response and our Asian response. And in looking overall, our Arab response was very close -- was very close to the other 6 minority responses. They were very close to the 7 typical black responses. They shared the same feelings of general discrimination and the practices 8 that the biases that were inherent in some of the 9 10 practices.

1

2

3

4

5

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With our Asian response that we got, the two responses that we had, one was closely aligned with sort of a minority response, and the other really was very neutral. They simply responded in general that they did not know and they did not put any comments, so we thought that was worth noticing to you.

In the law enforcement section, this was very -- we weren't surprised by some of the There was a general negative figures here. perception among the black responses about the police protection and police practices in the community. The white responses were interesting to us because they were also aware of what they considered unfair practices and the fact that they may or may not be

afforded more protection. So this made us feel that our students are aware of the racial problems and the problems that minorities have in the areas of law enforcement.

In Government -- and I don't know if this is typical cynical law students, but our students generally felt that the Government was out of touch with what was going on, that there was not diversity within the Government's practices. They were unsure as to legislative-type issues about district lines being drawn. I know there's a lot of stuff going on in Virginia about that. And that could be simply a reflection of the fact that we're in the school about 18 hours a day and don't read the paper.

For education, there was a general positive view across the board between minorities and non-minority responses. Within our school, we had a question that we weren't sure about if the responses reflected University of Richmond or the school system in which they came from as part of their undergraduate experience. We weren't able to quantify that as well. That's something we'll look at, but as far as the school body being integrated, there were an equal number of responses of people

feeling that the school body was integrated. They agreed with that response in that they felt it was not integrated. We thought that that was pretty interesting.

across-the-board negative view of courts in the treatment of minorities. The white responses were the same. We have two or three responses that felt that minorities received equal treatment. There seemed to be a lot of response concerning the question on whether or not there was impartiality among the decisions in the sentencing and whether or not your case depended on which judge was presiding.

So it was a very interesting survey for us to conduct. Ms. McCleoud is going to tell you about some of the comments we received. They were interesting.

MS. MCCLEOUD: As you can tell -good afternoon, first of all. As you can see from
looking at the survey that we distributed to the
panel and to the audience participating, the
questions, all you really had to do was circle the
level of agreement with the statements that had been
made.

Typical, I guess, of law students,

there were ample written-in responses. Some of them used the front and the back. Some of them wrote boldly across the side of the question that they were concerned about. Just as a general statement, before I read you some of the responses that were given to us, in accord with the survey, we -- I feel that as a general statement -- and I believe that my fellow BLSA members will agree with me -- University of Richmond is a predominantly white institution, and in this incoming class there were 152 students, and nine of us were African American. It makes for interesting classroom discussion, but I have noted, and I want you to note before I read you the statements, that as a general-type statement, the incoming class, the first-year class of law students are not extremely comfortable discussing racial So their statements, they attempted to qualify whatever they had circled. One response from a white female

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

says, I find myself troubled by this survey because it does seem biased and determined. While I do believe racism exists in our society, I find that most of the issues raised on this survey are not really the black-white racist issues that confront our society. I don't think that these issues come

down to skin color, but urban versus suburban, or other things. I guess I'm trying to say that there is more than one type of discrimination and it manifests itself in many ways, and this surveys tends to make all forms of discrimination a black-white issue."

In other words, her statement is kind of a general statement of what our responses were like. They wanted us to view these statements in terms of socioeconomic and various other factors so they wouldn't have to deal with the race issue. There was a white male response that says, "I feel race relations are the most pressing topic in our country."

And as I stated earlier, the other statements tend to try to qualify these issues in terms other than race. And one final statement that I'd like to read is from another white male. I have a hard time making generalizations. I don't really know what my district looks like. Basically as a white male, I don't know what the black experience is like in America. I now suspect it is different from mine, but to say that blacks have a harder time getting hired across the board, I don't feel like I can speak on the subject. I have heard, yes, it's a

lot tougher, and I've heard, well, I got hired because I was a minority or a woman. I think that both are true, so I'm not comfortable rating the above generalizations. To have my perception be represented by this all too easily qualifies that race by this all too easily quantifiable media is not the whole truth in my opinion. Of course, I thought we ought -- I think that you ought to perceive -- this statement is a little incorrect. Perhaps this is not the point. Perhaps what we ought to look at is not simply race but the cultural and socioeconomic influences and how they affect how we as humans treat one another.

So as a general statement, again I'd like to point out that there were respondents who avoided the racial issues at all costs, even though we specifically stated to them in filling out the survey that it was to measure racial relations. Thank you.

MS. WATKINS: At this time, we'll quickly take some questions. We know everyone's hungry, so --

MS. MCCLOUD: I just have one quick question about the comments.

MS. MCCLEOUD: Yes.

1 MS. MCCLOUD: The ones you stated seem to have been made by white students, were there 2 any made by --3 4 MS. MCCLEOUD: We received no statements from our ten black respondents. 5 6 MS. MCCLOUD: Okay. Thank you. 7 DR. AL-HIBRI: Did I understand you to say you're going to continue the survey on other 8 9 campuses? MS. WATKINS: We have initiated 10 11 contact with other BLSA chapters within the law schools here in the State of Virginia, and we'll be 12 sending them a copy of the tool and asking that they 13 14 utilize it within their law school community to see 15 the types of responses that they get, and we'll 16 certainly forward it to you, Professor al-Hibri. 17 DR. AL-HIBRI: I appreciate your 18 cooperation on such short notice. I'd also like to 19 suggest that although you're doing a lot of work, at 20 one point when the Virginia results are put together, 21 it might not be a bad idea to let other BLSA Chapters 22 in other states to know about this to get a profile 23 of Virginia versus other states. 24 MR. PATRICK: One question. Richard 25 Patrick. Do you find some of the comments you

received bore any correlation to the discussions that you had among your white law school students? I went to the University of Virginia Law School, and so I know somewhat of what you speak.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's interesting MS. MCCLEOUD: Yes. you bring that up because our survey happened to be distributed on Dred Scott and affirmative action week. Section one at the law school was dealing with Dred Scott and had a rather heated discussion about the way the Dred Scott case had been approached in the class. And section two had moved on to affirmative action issues; and in order to elicit responses and statements, and to spark discussion among students who were not willing to openly discuss their racial beliefs, the teachers have had to distribute questions and actually call on people in class, as opposed to allowing some type of free volunteering to go on.

So, yeah, I'm quite sure that it has everything to do with the things that go on in class.

MS. WATKINS: The class she's speaking about is constitutional law, and it involves a lot of judicial interpretation, and we had a professor, who will remain nameless, that Professor al-Hibri, they will remain nameless -- who was

discussing the case in every -- the Dred Scott case 1 in particular, in every type of legal principle but 2 the racial issue. We discussed full faith and 3 4 credit. We discussed diversity action and subject matter jurisdiction. We discussed a lot of legal 5 6 principles, but we did not discuss the factor that 7 race played. And for those of you that may be unfamiliar with Dred Scott, we know it's been 8 9 vilified, but it's also a case that decided the 10 citizenship question for black Americans at the time. 11 MR. HUANG: Two quick questions. 12 First of all, do you have any report that would be available soon? 13 I find your study very interesting. 14 MS. WATKINS: We're entering into 15 spring break starting five o'clock on Friday.

plan on getting it together for you at that time.

MS. WATKINS:

MR. HUANG: Can we get a copy?

Yes.

MR. HUANG: Do you have any plan to extend the study to other populations in the college; for example, the other minorities students who are

not studying in the law school? Are you going to

give their opinions as well?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FERGUSON: I think one of our plans for the Black Law Students Association is to try to go out into the community of Richmond, primarily, and find people who know nothing about the law. That way we would get an opinion that's maybe not so legal based. I think we're going to do that initially. This was a very short-term project for us, so we kind of worked with the crowd that we had initially, but it is our plan to go out into the community and get -- and have everyone fill out the survey so we won't just get kind of legal answers.

MR. HUANG: I know you don't have any

MR. HUANG: I know you don't have any data available. Do you expect the findings will be different if you go to the general population?

MS. FERGUSON: I do. I've lived in Richmond all my life, and yeah, it will be a lot different. I think even with the different areas of town, west end versus east end, northside versus southside Richmond, I think the answers will be greatly skewed, so I'm very interested to find out the answers as well.

DR. GALVIN: I would ask that you -as you expand and continue in your survey, that you
might look at including a question onto the freedom
of discussion of racial issues so that we have some
basis as well to document that -- the opinions or
feelings, that will be very useful to us.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I thought there was somebody --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WEBS: Hello. My name is Lewis Webs, and I'm an alumni of Cheyney University, oldest black college in the United States, and I stand and I commend you on just what you're doing right now, but my question is, have you encountered any opposition to what you're trying to do? And if you have not, when that does come, will you -- how far are you-all willing to go and what price are you willing to pay to bring the results, or bring this to the attention of the people who need to be addressed? How far are you willing to go, because most times, even in the academic community, you have to take into consideration that taking such a stand as this is going to bring a lot of attention to your situation, personal situation. I want to know how far you see yourself going with this issue.

MS. WATKINS: Our president probably could address that issue a little bit better, but we have received enough comments that we have found it necessary to draft a response that will be posted to our electronic notice board that we have, so that there's not a misinterpretation of the reasoning behind the survey.

There have been a lot of comments about the survey tool being useless, that it was to set part of the racial divide. There was just a general misinterpretation overall in some cases about why the survey was being done. And so as often happens, we have to explain what our purposes were.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But as far as how far we can go, we defer to our president on that one.

MS. FERGUSON: It's been a BLSA history, and I quess practice, that we pretty much never succumb to popular opinion. Black Law Students have been at the University of Richmond since approximately 1978, and the school is about 175 years old, so we've been making a lot of strides in the 20 to 25-year history that we've been in existence, and we would like -- we like the support of our community, but that's not our main purpose -- as far as our legal community, I mean -- but that's not our Our purpose is to get this information main purpose. out, and we're not -- don't get me wrong -- I don't want to seem like I'm being abrasive, but it's not our mission to ask the general public at the law school whether or not they like the findings, or we're just simply putting the information out there, and so far we've received only commentary

repercussions. I don't foresee BLSA receiving any sort of academic aggressive repercussions at all. don't see that happening.

But I mean, people have made comments like, you know, what you're doing is not really helping the situation. You're just furthering the racial divide and the black self-segregation, which to me is an interesting comment, because if I was a white woman sitting here with my white comrades, if I looked to my left or right, would that be segregation, or would it not be? It's just you notice us because our skin is darker, but I think --I mean, BLSA is willing to go as far as we need to put the information out into the community.

Also, for the record, MS. WATKINS: we have received support from our faculty and from our administration in a tremendous way. They attend our activities. They support our mission. We have found them to be much more understanding, and I'm not qoing to say it's a benefit of age and wisdom, but than our own peers. So for the record, the University of Richmond, our law school, has been very supportive of BLSA.

> DR. AL-HIBRI: Mr. Harris.

REVEREND HARRIS: You indicated that

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

you put out a survey and no African Americans responded.

MS. MCCLEOUD: The African Americans filled out the survey. What they did not do was initiate any written statement in addition to their circling their agreement -- level of agreement with the response. There were ten black respondents. They just did not have additional comments.

MR. DARDEN: Just in relation to those responses, remember about the doctor, he's always telling me a hit dog will holler, so when you're talking about racial mindfulness among whites, and you receive the kind of responses that you get, you should also remember that it happens very infrequently that people do test, but when they do test, they come back with very similar results as yours.

And I encourage you to keep up this sort of thing. We really need to have an open dialogue in society about white racism and how to bring it to the fore in a way that we can recognize it and hopefully begin to avert some of the effects. So long as we only talk about one side of the equation, the minority side, and what problems are there, without also talking about the majority side,

I don't think we're going to get very far.

But I did have a question and it's this: Earlier when we were hearing from some of the scientists about the gaps in the data and about their responses to the questions about the civil rights thrust in data gathering, one of the questions from, I think Dr. al-Hibri was if they might, in partnership with the academic community, use law students like yourself, for instance, to try and fill some of those gaps.

And I've seen that you've done it for us. What do you think is the likelihood that as a group, law students like yourself, or at your campus, or other campuses, can realistically begin to deliver themselves to assist in the providing, from a civil rights perspective, the kind of information that we all need to know? Can you fit that into your day?

MS. WATKINS: We are always open to collaboration, Mr. Darden, but as law students, time is crucial, and I cannot begin to tell you what an 18-hour day is. I'm sure you have it at your job, but the demands of being in law school and also with demands -- I'm a nontraditional student myself. I'm a bit older, and I have a child, so my study needs and habits are going to be very different from my

peers seated here, but we're always open to collaboration, and we can only hope that when we graduate, that incoming students will share the same enthusiasm that we had in putting this type of project together.

I wanted to make a quick comment about the 54 responses that we received out of the hundred we made available. I think we have approximately 350 students per class. No, we have 150 in our class.

Okay. Well, we have 35 black students total, so when you saw the fact that we only had 10 black responses, we felt that we needed to tell you -- you know, to tell you what the numbers were in that area.

MR. DARDEN: So if we were to consider recommendations that would make it easier for students like you, then we could talk to the administrations, whoever sets up the curriculum, and perhaps build into your 18-hour day, a structured way for you to contribute. Is that what you're suggesting?

DR. AL-HIBRI: Mr. Darden, let me comment on that. I am their protector around here. First of all, I think you will find out that as you

move up in the years in law school, you have a little bit more time on your hands, so hopefully you'll be able -- don't contest me on that, but hopefully you'll have more time to do some of this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It's always possible that,

Mr. Darden, if you want to do something like that,

I'd be more than happy, with BLSA's support, to take

it to the faculty and see what we can work out. I

think the idea is we're open, let's work on the

logistics later, and let's see what we can do. But

as students, they do have obligations on their

schedules, but the faculty might also be willing to

work with you.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Darden, I'd like to add, I'm in my third-year at University of Richmond. I only have two more months then I'm done forever, but they're first-years and the schedule for them is much more difficult, your first year in law school. But as a second-year and as a third-year student, there are what we call clinics available for credit, so should some fact-finding mission want to enlist the help of students in a law school, what would be an appropriate means of doing that would be to offer such assistance for like credit or something like that. That would even be more helpful.

1

2

_

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MCCLEOUD: One additional

comment. Even if you can't get it as far as an additional law clinic, which is where they will we -- we have two types of law clinics. One is an in-house. One is a placement law clinic. What you may be able to do, along the placement law clinic is, set it up so it's more of an internship-type of thing, and then we would be designated hours out of our day to assist in fact-finding missions, and then

we could get credit for it so that our academic side

wouldn't sacrifice for our willingness to help in

whatever the commission may need.

MS. RATTLEY: First of all, I should like to congratulate the young women for an excellent job in your presentation. But I just thought about the dichotomy. Earlier this morning, I made a very blunt statement in reference to our mission here Why are we here? And I shared with you some today. of the comments; that is, we should not be discussing these issues. Everything is all right. We have everything in place, and I think this is what has been happening, and I think I could have given you the results of your survey, because people don't want to talk about it. And they will deny it and then they will turn around and use it on you. They call

you crybabies. Are you looking for a reason, or it's somebody else's fault.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So they're saying they're not responsible simply because we know that it is the embedded racism over the years that got us to this point, but if you said, especially the young middle-class, upper-mobile citizens of our community today, you're beginning to be embarrassed by people who will just speak out against it and say it's there, because then others will try to embarrass you by saying, All you're doing is looking for an excuse. I think that's what the survey said. They say, Why talk about it? That was in the past. Why go back to Dred Scott? Why go back to the grandfather clause? Why go back to any of your history? Because you have all the opportunities now. You can go to the Richmond Law School and you're doing fine, so why do you put that on race? Why are you discussing race? Why would you have it on your survey?

Hear it every day. Nothing has changed. Nobody wants to talk about it. And I made a personal commitment to myself. I don't try to convince any person that racism exists in this country, because if they don't know it, I think it's something wrong with them. Not that I look for an

excuse, I try to take my own responsibilities.

But some people just don't want to discuss it, and this committee is being criticized as we speak for holding these fact-finding hearings because, of course, in this area of Virginia, we have no problems. We have no race problems in Hampton. We have no race problems in Newport News. So they ask why are you here? What do you hope to accomplish?

So I just thought it was a dichotomy for you to give us the results of your report, because we're undergoing the same thing right now, and as the press continues to write about it, if they do, it will come out as it did in last night's paper, Why are you here?

And when I disappeared and went outside, I had to speak to three reporters out there, that was the question. Ed was standing on the side. He heard me, you know. Isn't everything here? What are you planning to accomplish? What are you going to do with the facts you find?

So we've already had it today, so I just wanted to share that with you. And in my opinion, I say you're right on target.

MS. WATKINS: Thank you.

MS. MCCLOUD: I just wanted to make a comment. I think your efforts have been admirable.

I work at Washington and Lee University, and I do work with BLSA there, so if I can be of any assistance to you in making contact with them, I'd be very happy to.

The other thing I wanted to say in connection with Mr. Darden's request is that I know how busy law students are. Maybe we should look at those who have completed law school and try to get them involved in some of our efforts, because a lot of times when African Americans, and sometimes other minorities, have attained their goals, they are not that interested, for lack of a better word, in trying to assist those behind them, and I think this is something that we've lost since, for example, when some of the rest of us were younger.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Perhaps one way of remedying that is if we can involve our students early on in such projects, and when they graduate, like you, Danielle, will want to continue to some extent.

Thank you all very much. It was very informative, and thank you for all your efforts.

MS. RATTLEY: I'm going to assume

1 that since I have not been given any announcements, I 2 have no announcements to make, and we'll be at recess now for lunch until what time, Mr. Darden? 3 MR. DARDEN: One o'clock. Actually 4 1:10. 5 6 I just want to remind the committee 7 we do want to honor our commitment to particularly David Baugh, who has to get back up to court. 8 That's one reason we want to start quickly. 9 10 11 (Lunch break.) 12

MS. RATTLEY: Come to order. This is the second part of our meeting today, Fact-finding Committee Meeting of the Virginia State Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I should like to welcome our panelists here this afternoon, and we'd ask Mr. Darden, our staff person from the Commission office in Washington, to make the introductions. Mr. Darden.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you. As we begin -- resume in the second session, I'd just like to reiterate the announcements that were made in the beginning regarding the coverage of the Privacy Act.

We are prepared to accept individual statements, and we have Privacy Act statements which give the details. I'm going to skip over some of that in the interest of time.

Let's see. In addition to that,
we're supposed to make a note -- I'm thinking of our
requirements -- regarding statements about
individuals in a public session. If there should be
any statements that border on defamatory or degrading
characterizations of any individuals, the staff will
actually step in. We are prohibited from going that
far in a public setting.

That being the case, I'm going to dispense with all other formal notices and again reiterate that our setup here is for advisory committee members to monitor each one of the panels, and the moderator for this panel is Dr. Azizah Y. al-Hibri, and at this point, I'll turn the proceeding over to her.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Thank you. Welcome to the afternoon session. I would like to start the session entitled, Perspectives on the Administration of Justice in Virginia: The minority population experience.

We're very lucky to have some

1.5

distinguished speakers with us today, and I'd like to start by introducing the Honorable Henry Maxwell of the Virginia Assembly.

1.5

SENATOR MAXWELL: Thank you. Mayor Rattley and -- excuse me. Mayor Rattley and members of the committee, good afternoon.

MS. RATTLEY: Good afternoon.

inviting me to participate in this forum today. For those of you who do not know me, I'm State Senator W. Henry Maxwell, and I represent the second senatorial district composed of portions of Newport News and Hampton. I've been asked to participate in this panel discussion today, not simply because I am a state legislator, but because I'm also vice chairman of the State Joint Subcommittee studying the status and needs of African American males in Virginia. I deem this a worthwhile study and look forward to the implementation of its result.

Members of the Commission and

Committee, some of the statements of my presentation

may seem repetitive, but it only shows the importance

of this issue that we are faced with today. At this

point in my presentation, I would like to provide you

with a brief overview of our subcommittee.

__

This joint subcommittee was established by the General Assembly in 1996 for the express purpose of examining the issues and factors that contribute to the fight of the African American male, and to provide appropriate and feasible alternatives to assist this specific population in reaching their fullest potential.

There are five delegates and three senators who serve with me on this committee. We are all from different parts of our state, thereby enabling us to examine this situation with many different perspectives.

Pursuant to the enabling legislation

House Joint Resolution 167, our subcommittee has been directed to analyze demographic profiles of African American males in Virginia with regard to their representation in state and federal correctional facilities, as well as those under supervision of the judicial system but not currently incarcerated.

We have been charged to analyze the demographic profiles of African American males enrolled as in-state students at public and private institutions of higher education in the Commonwealth. Identify the prevailing health problems and issues of African American males in the Commonwealth. Analyze

African American male high school graduation rate relative to the total number of the African American male students enrolled in public and private schools in Virginia.

We have been charged also to analyze the representation of African American students in advance preparatory courses, as well as vocational and technical educational program, or special ed programs. We've also been directed to analyze the high school graduation and completion rate in juvenile and adult correctional facilities in Virginia. We have been charged with the task of examining employment statistics for African American males, including their job security and promotion rates for considering overall economic independence.

Examine the African American male's representation amid crime and family violence statistics as perpetrators and victims, and among substance abuse programs, both voluntary and involuntary. We've also been charged to recommend appropriate and feasible alternatives to facilitate, promote, and assist African American males in reaching their fullest potential.

Members of the committee, as you can see, this is a mammoth undertaking by our committee.

To date, we have held four meetings, each dealing with certain and different aspects of our study. At each meeting, we have received information from the public and professionals with expertise in particular areas.

1.0

Our last meeting for the 1996 portion of our study was held on January 10, 1997. At that meeting, we summed up all of the information we had received thus far and decided on what to report to the governor and what legislation would be introduced to the General Assembly.

The information that I will share with you today on the criminal justice aspect is based on information received in this area thus far. The information that we have compiled in this area today is as follows: One in three African American males between the ages of twenty and twenty-nine is in prison or under court supervision.

Nationally, between 1986 and 1991, the number of African American men and women in state prisons for drug offenses increased 828 percent. Law enforcement practices and prosecutorial policies in the war on drugs have resulted in disproportional arrests and conviction among African American males. Mandatory sentencing policies have contributed to the

disproportionate representation of African Americans, particularly male, in the correctional system.

Here in the Commonwealth of Virginia, among the conviction rate in fiscal year 1995 for crack cocaine, African Americans represent 91.6 percent of the convictions, as compared to 7.3 percent for whites.

In Virginia, among the conviction rate of fiscal year 1995, for powder cocaine, African Americans represent 83.3 percent of convictions, as compared to 14.7 percent for whites.

In Virginia, among the convictions rates for FY 1995 for other Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 drugs, African Americans represented 53.3 percent of conviction, as compared to 46.1 percent for whites.

Here in the Commonwealth of Virginia, there is an overrepresentation of African American males in the juvenile justice system, and such overrepresentation increases at each stage in the criminal justice system. Minorities comprise about 27 percent of the youth population in Virginia. However 77 percent of African Americans are committed to the correctional system for serious offenses.

FOX REPORTING

overrepresentation of African American youth in the

Factors which contribute to the

juvenile justice system include racism, unconscious biases among the criminal justice and prosecutorial official, desensitization to cultural difference, economic and social disadvantages, and differential enforcement policies.

African American youth have a higher incident of educational deficiencies, health problems, serious head injury, abuse and neglect. White youth are more likely to be treated through court diversion programs, whereas, minorities and poor youth are dealt with in governmental institutions. Lack of prevention and early intervention programs targeted to minority and low-income youth throughout the Commonwealth.

In Virginia, of the 245,000 persons who lost their right to vote due to a felony conviction, 145,000 were African American males.

Many disenfranchised persons who were convicted of lessor felonies, or were convicted and incarcerated for the crime for more than 25 years ago, have led productive and crime-free lives since their conviction. However, individuals do not seek restoration of their rights, or forsake the efforts because of the associated cause, delays in processing the applications, and perceived burdensome

administrative procedures.

As I stated earlier, members of the commission, this subcommittee began its work in 1996. We were charged to report our findings to the governor for the 1997 General Assembly session. Several recommendations in the area of criminal justice system and violence were made, and also several legislative initiatives came out of this committee.

The two initiatives that are directly related to this panel today is House Bill 2761, which deals with criminal statistics reporting, and House Joint Resolution 667 that encourages the prevention and intervention in state programs and service.

House Bill 2761 requires that the Departments of Corrections, Juvenile Justice, and Correctional Education to collect data pertaining to the demographic characteristics of certain prison population, including race and age and gender of such person, their educational level, and the learning disabilities and health-related problems prevalent among such persons.

Beginning in July 1997, the department must collect this data quarterly and report their findings annually to the governor and

1 th
2 re
3 So
4 He
5 Se
6 Co
7 em
8 st
9 cl

the General Assembly. House Joint Resolution 667 requires the Departments of Corrections, Education, Social Service, Health, Juvenile Justice, Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services, Medical Assistance Services, and Correctional Education are encouraged to focus on and emphasize appropriate prevention and intervention in state programs and in service to their respective clients to lessen the need for more costly social programs and services.

Other legislation came out of this first phase of this subcommittee. Other legislation came out of this first phase of the subcommittee that dealt with the aspects of our study, namely education, employment, social welfare and health. We also introduced a House Joint Resolution 583 which requested the continuation of joint subcommittee setting the standards and needs of African American males in Virginia through 1997.

I'm glad to say that these bills and resolutions have been passed by the 1997 General Assembly and all are now awaiting the governor's signature.

Members of the committee, in closing,
may I say -- I would like to say that the plight of

the African American male is a grave and serious problem. There are many variables that affect this problem. The failings of the criminal justice system to appropriately address this issue only mirrors the failings of many other agencies and institutions in our community, our cities and our state.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I personally believe that the breakdown of the African American family in their communities are the core of these problems. Also the failure of the respective support system, such as religious -- our religious, social, educational, economic, judicial and legislative institutions have all aided and abetted in the escalation of this It will take, and it's going to take, a massive, collaborative effort on all of the aforementioned fronts to attack and resolve this I hope that our joint subcommittee study at issue. the legislative level will be the catalyst for a great turnaround and about-face here in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Thank you kindly for your diligence.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Thank you, Senator

Maxwell. I think in the interest of efficiency, what
we'd like to do is have all three of you give your
statements, and then the panel will ask questions,

and the audience, from all three at once.

The next person I'd like to introduce is Mr. David Baugh, attorney at law from Richmond.

MR. BAUGH: Madam Chair, members of the committee, I am a criminal defense attorney, and I practice in the Virginia area across the state. Prior to my becoming a defense attorney, I was Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, and an Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia. I am also a parent. I have two teen-aged daughters.

The issues that bring this committee together are issues that are of significance to me, both as an attorney and as a parent and as an African American. The topic I was told we were going to discuss today was the perceptions of the criminal justice system.

I want to tell you that first, it is important that you start with perceptions. There is an old Buddhist expression that truth is but a perception. Whatever people believe to be the truth, they see; and because of that, many people see many different things. By analogy, I will tell you a story I tell to students. During the Simpson trial, which everyone watched, no one in the United States

the wall in Mr. Simpson's house out of concern for his safety, but all the police officers said that.

Everyone in the United States believed they were lying. Not only did the officers make false statements, but they said the same false statement. The judge acted as though it was the truth. Now, we know it wasn't. Most people do.

Many people perceive that as a manifestation of bigotry. Actually, it could be construed as a manifestation of this judge feeling that this person is so important that we ought to bend the rules in order to get a conviction, but his action would be perceived as racially bigoted because of to whom they were directed.

perceptions of the criminal justice system that you understand that, first, bigotry is alive, but it comes in different forms. If you read McClesky versus Kemp -- that's M-c-C-l-e-s-k-y -- Justice Powell's opinion -- there was a case in Georgia wherein the application of the death penalty was tested on statistical reasons, it was more often given to African American males.

In that opinion, Justice Powell, who

has since said maybe he was wrong on this, said that unless we could prove -- unless the defense bar could prove that the discrimination that was arising, or gave rise to these statistics was intentional, then there was no Constitutional wrong; that unless you could prove that the legislatures when they were writing this statute, sat back and said we're going to zap some African American males, that nothing could be done.

g

It has always been my opinion that the failing of that opinion by Justice Powell is a failure to recognize the bigotry that is born of ignorance, which is a greater impact than all other types. There are very few people who wake up and say, I'm going to do racially bigoted acts today. More often, bigotry and discrimination arises from ignorance, or ignorance of the facts, or ignorance about how people are perceived.

And probably the most graphic example of that -- and I talk about this with the enthusiasm of the more recently converted. In February of 1995, the United States Sentencing Commission prepared a special report to Congress on the disparity between the sentencing practices for crack cocaine and powdered cocaine. And it can be obtained from the

Sentencing Commission. I could not get enough copies. Just call the Sentencing Commission in Washington and say, We'd like a copy.

But when you read the report, you should not just read the racial aspect of it. One thing you will determine, if you really get into this report and read it, is that another perception problem we're having in this country, which manifests itself unfairly on African American males, deals with drugs. I was shocked to learn -- and have read it and have studied it -- what crack cocaine is. And I was amazed to find out more people do not know what it is.

I was also amazed to find out the disparity, not only in the number of people being convicted, broken down by race, but according to the United States Sentencing Commission, 52 percent of all crack users are white, while only four percent of those people being prosecuted are white. Now, where the police are going, I don't know, but I found it amazing because crack is perceived to be a drug that is peculiarly strong in African American neighborhoods, and according to the United States Sentencing Commission, that is not true.

Additionally, I find most frightening is that crack

is viewed as the most dangerous scourge to our neighborhoods. It is a plague.

Well, when reading the United States
Sentencing Commission report -- I don't know how many
of you have read it or not -- I was shocked to find
out that, one -- well, first, crack cocaine is
perceived to be one of the most addictive substances
there is. It is generally perceived to be targeted
towards youth by its low cost. It is generally
perceived to be pure cocaine, thereby justifying
greater punishment and greater allocation of law
enforcement resources. And, of course, there is the
manifestation of crack babies.

When you read the Sentencing

Commission report, you will find that, amazed to find
out there are, one, six addictive substances,
physically addictive substances. Now, a physically
addictive substance is a substance which, over a
period of time, the body gets used to, it creates a
chemical imbalance, and then when the substance is
withdrawn, you have withdrawal symptoms, cramping,
headaches, diarrhea.

Cocaine, in any form, is not physically addictive according to the United States Sentencing Commission report. It cannot be

physically addictive. According to the United States
Sentencing Commission report, no one can go through
withdrawal from denial of cocaine in any form.
Additionally, if you analyze the report, and you'll
notice it's obvious, the price of crack cocaine per
dose to powder cocaine is slightly greater.

While powdered cocaine is normally sold on the street in one-gram packages, that one-gram package represents ten to -- five to ten dosage units. It sells for -- the bottom line, it's about a hundred dollars a gram, which means it's about \$10 to \$20 per dose unit. Crack cocaine is sold in increments of a tenth to a fifth of a gram. It sells for about \$10 per dose unit, which is \$10 for a tenth of gram, or \$100 for a full gram.

Actually, what the Sentencing

Commission report says, the average price for

cocaine -- crack cocaine on the streets in the United

States is \$113, and the average price of powder

cocaine is \$100. Crack costs more. Now, how these

perceptions are allowed to go on, I don't know.

And I also find this interesting. If no mammal is capable of going through withdrawal from denial of cocaine in any form, even crack, then the story of the crack babies is a myth. If the only --

if no form of cocaine is physically addictive, then no one can go through withdrawal.

Now, of course, there is psychological addiction. But I think you'd have a hard time explaining how a newborn child could be psychologically addicted to something. And, of course, there are many people who say, Well, the reason we have to do this is because that psychological addiction is a horrible addiction.

There are many different types of psychological addiction. I mean, many noncontrolled substances are psychologically addictive. What I'm saying here is that it would appear, upon reading what the Sentencing Commission has written, that cocaine in its form is not as deadly as we would lead you to believe. It's not a good thing by any stretch of the imagination.

In fact, if you really want to get, for want of a better word, nerdy -- and I am -- cocaine is probably the most -- it is the scapegoat of all scapegoats. We have a tendency to believe that our neighborhoods were not in trouble before cocaine came along, and they were. We seem to believe that our schools were not deteriorating before cocaine came along, and they were.

Cocaine, as it comes out, according to the Sentencing Commission report -- believe me, I'm just telling you what I read, and it was a test, and really nerdy -- cocaine leaf, which has been chewed by indigenous South American people for 3,000 years, contains a cocaine alkaloid which carries the chemical makeup of C17H21NO4. That's it.

All right. And when people chew it -- and this is really tempting, and I hate to tempt you with it -- chewing cocaine leaf will provide a long-lasting, low-grade sense of euphoria. It increases a person's physical stamina. It increases the body's ability to efficiently utilize oxygen, and it's an appetite suppressant. Well, when you read that, the makers of Geritol are going to get scared because it certainly appears to do everything they say it will do.

What's difficult -- what's unique about the leaf -- and also in South America, they also converted it into a paste by removing the plant fiber from it and it leaves it like a putty. The active ingredient, the alkaloid in the leaf and the paste is the same, C17H21NO4. That's it. That's what gets you high.

In 1860, American scientists wanted

to make cocaine so they could use it as an anesthetic for eye surgery, but cocaine, as it comes out of the leaf, and cocaine paste, is not water-soluble. It will just sit there. It will just sit there as a little glob and not dissolve. So what American scientists came up with, and if you ever see a picture of a South American lab, you will find this. They take the cocaine alkaloid, C17H21NO4, and they treat it in a hydrochloric acid bath, and they mush it up and make this soup out of it, and with a little potassium formalganate and some other things, they strip all that off and the residue left is no longer C17H21NO4. It is C17H21NO4HCL, hydrochloride.

By adding that hydrochloride molecule -- by the way, I didn't do that well in chemistry at school. I find this amusing. By adding that hydrochloride molecule, you have, one, made the cocaine alkaloid water-soluble. It can now dissolve. You can also -- can't smoke it in that form. Cocaine leaf is smoked. Cocaine paste is smoked. Powdered cocaine will not, because cocaine hydrochloride, as you get it hot enough to vaporize, it will decompose and have no pharmacological effect.

Powdered cocaine is C17H21NO4HCL.

That's what people used in this country for years.

Up until 1916, it was legal.

Crack cocaine, and also free-basing cocaine, all you do is you take the C17H21NO4HCL, the hydrochloride, you treat it with a base and you strip the hydrochloride molecule off of it and put it back in its original form, and now it can be smoked. And why smoke? Well, another advantage of it being cocaine hydrochloride is you can dissolve it. You can shoot it in your arms if you want to, or you can sniff it up your nose.

Cocaine, what we call crack, which is really -- has no definition. The word "crack" cannot be found in any drug schedule, neither can "cocaine base". They don't exist in science. Cocaine base, or "crack" as we call it, is smoked. The reason it is smoked is, one, you don't have to stick yourself in the arm, but number two, the intensity of the high is determined by how fast the drug can get into your system.

If you snort cocaine in your nose, according to the Sentencing Commission report, how fast it gets in your system is determined by how big your nasal passages are, which we'll say -- and I don't know 21, 22 square inches. If you smoke it into your lungs -- if you take the average set of

human lungs and you cut off all the little alveoli and you stretch it out, it's approximately 36,000 square feet. It is amazing. Needless to say, the cocaine goes in faster through a 36,000-square-foot hole than it does through a 24-square-inch hole.

We have stopped addressing the problems of bigotry and racism in this country because we are now fighting a war on drugs. A war that we are using as a scapegoat to deprive ourselves of our Constitutional rights, and I believe, to avert attention from the real problem.

In 1984 when -- in 1986 when the limited hearings were being held on crack cocaine in Washington, there was a letter to the editor of the Washington Post -- it was printed in the Congressional record -- where a writer wrote in and said, If it were not for crack cocaine, we as citizens would probably realize the ineffectiveness of our government. If we didn't have crack cocaine to blame for our deteriorating cities and our deteriorating schools, Congress would probably have had to invent it to justify their reelection.

The ignorance, the most frightening thing about the Sentencing Commission report is that I realized at that time that I was ignorant, and I

was bigoted. I perceived things about people who used this substance that were not true; and as most people who are recently converted, I am now a fan. Ι believe that we are denying ourselves the truth. Because of the war on drugs, in 1984 there were approximately 880,000 people in United States prisons We now have 1.6 million. and jails. We now have more than Russia and South Africa. They used to be number one and two. We were three. We've now outstripped them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have spent billions of dollars trying to keep the street clean of drugs, and all we've done is jail an additional one million people at the cost of somewhere between \$20,000 and \$50,000 per year per person.

And if you were to go out -- I don't know what it is in Hampton, but I know in Richmond -- in Richmond about 1984, a gram of cocaine cost a hundred dollars. Right now a gram of cocaine cost a hundred dollars. The price of heroine has dropped a little bit, and the purity has increased. We have done nothing with our war on drugs, except take a significant percentage of a disenfranchised population and further disenfranchise them by taking from them their right to vote and their right ever to

participate in our government in any way, shape, or form.

Virginia is one of the thirteen states that when a person finishes their jail commitment, their rights are not restored. You have to go through the governor's office, and actually it is so complex, very few of them actually go through. I have participated -- I've had people who did that. I know how involved it is.

So I want to end by saying what I started off with earlier. We must realize that we're dealing with a perception. Whenever things occur that don't look right, whether it is a racist thing, or a thing of ignorance, is determined by how we view it. I think we ought to come to the realization that the problems that our children are having, the problems that our neighborhoods are having are caused by other factors that I believe you should investigate.

I would hope that you would not fall for this ploy that the war on drugs is the problem. That drugs are the problem. The drugs are the symptom of deeper problems, and for that reason, I want to thank you for inviting a lawyer to come down here and talk to you. Thank you.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Thank you. I'd like to introduce the last participant on this panel, Professor Robert Shepherd, my colleague from the T. C. Williams Law School.

MR. SHEPHERD: Thank you very much.

Madam Chair, Members of the Advisory Committee, it's always difficult following David. Unlike my colleague, Ron Basagle, who has the courage to invite David to be a guest lecturer from time to time, thus messing up the rest of the semester by embarrassment, I avoid that in the courses that I teach on juvenile law, and David has just given you a good example of why I do that.

But it is a pleasure to be here with you today, and to be on such a distinguished panel with Senator Maxwell and David Baugh. As my colleague, Dr. al-Hibri, has pointed out, I am a professor at the T. C. Williams School of Law, the University of Richmond. I am a former chair of the Virginia Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Committee appointed by the governor. I'm a former member of the Virginia Commission on Youth. I'm a past chair of the Juvenile Justice Committee of the American Bar Association, and I currently chair the Commission on the Needs of Children of the

Virginia Bar Association.

I am here really to focus briefly on the specific and significant issues presented by the handling of children of color in the juvenile justice system in Virginia. I have provided for you some written testimony, along with a couple of attachments, one of which is kind of a statistical flow chart of what has been happening with youth of color in the juvenile justice system over the past -- past nine years, and a copy of a column that I regularly write for Criminal Justice Magazine that the American Bar Association publishes that I did a couple of years ago about children of color in the juvenile justice system that addresses some of these issues in general.

But I would like to focus on

Virginia, and I'll try to avoid being repetitive of

the figures that Senator Maxwell has given you,

because I did testify before that joint subcommittee

earlier as well, and much of the data he has given

you is derived from data that I gave to that body.

Those of us that have been involved in the juvenile justice system in Virginia as lawyers, or other participants, over the years -- and for me it's been more than 35 years -- we have always

had a perception that minority kids -- and in Virginia, we're talking primarily about African American youth, although in Northern Virginia and other parts of the state, there are problems dealing with Hispanic and Southeast Asian youth.

There has been a perception that children of color are dealt with more severely within the juvenile justice system than majority youth are. And there has been a perception that that severe treatment tends to increase as the youth penetrates more deeply into the system. However, for most of us, that perception -- and as David has said, perceptions are very important -- has been largely anecdotal.

In 1988, what was then the National Coalition of State Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups met in Jackson, Mississippi, for their Spring conference. The focus of that conference was the overrepresentation of minorities in the juvenile justice system. The organization is kind of an umbrella group that has been established by Congress, comprised of the various state advisory groups, and as I mentioned, at the time I was chairing the Virginia Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. And these state groups

decided for the first time to look at the issue of minority youth.

Out of that conference and the presentations made, a recommendation was made by the National Coalition to Congress that the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act be amended to require the states to focus on the problems of minority youth in the juvenile justice system.

Now, there's a lot of debate going on right now about the reauthorization of that act.

It's reauthorized essentially every four years, 1988 and 1992, and it was to be reauthorized last year, but Congress really couldn't reach any closure, and the issue is still on the table. One of the issues that is being presented is that this is another example of the federal government telling the states how they ought to deal with state problems.

Well, let me point out to you that
the issue of minority representation, which in my
judgment is the most vulnerable aspect of that act,
the one that is receiving the most attack from
members of Congress, that minority overrepresentation
mandate, or focus, came from the states to the
federal government. It was essentially a grassroots

movement among many of us in the states that said that this is a problem that needs to be addressed, and the federal government has some of the resources to help us to address it.

1.1

So that in 1988, the act was amended to tell the states, as we had asked them to tell us, to start looking at the development of some statistics, some data about this overrepresentation. Is it more than anecdotal? Can we actually look at the population of kids within juvenile detention facilities, within juvenile correctional facilities, those juveniles that are transferred from the juvenile court to the adult court to be tried as adults, and do the data, in fact, manifest what many of us had known anecdotally, and can we then use some of the federal money that comes into Virginia through this act and the other states, to try and start addressing the problem if our anecdotal perceptions are accurate?

Well, Congress did that. Four years later in 1992, they, in fact, made it a mandate so that if a state is not addressing the problem, it would lose some of the federal funds under the act. You got the carrot of getting some money to help you address the problems, and there was the stick that

you would lose part of that money if you weren't addressing them.

Out of that 1988 amendment, five states were really designated to be pilot projects. Well, we didn't wait in Virginia to see what the pilot projects showed. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Committee in Virginia resolved that we were going to use some of the money that we were already getting and start looking at what Virginia's experience was; and if there was a problem, that we would start addressing it, not wait to see what the pilot project showed.

So we began in 1988 to start collecting data. And I think you heard maybe this morning from Bruce Morris with the Department of Criminal Justice Services, and Dr. Rick Kern, for many years accurate data about what goes on in the criminal justice system was sadly lacking. Those of us in academy, as opposed to David, like to have data to work with -- obviously David does as well with some of his comments regarding the Sentencing Commission and the war on drugs -- and we got our staff, we spent some money to commission institutions in the state, as well as the Department of Criminal Justice Services, to start looking at what the

experience was in Virginia.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And let me give you the raw percentages first, and then I will refer to this chart that you have that shows kind of an index, the indices of the representation of minority youth at each stage of the process, and data have not changed significantly since this was concerned, is that about 27 percent of the population under 18 in Virginia was comprised of minority youth, and that's overwhelmingly African American. The other states, the problem may be more Hispanic or Oriental, but in Virginia, it is primarily African American -- that these youths comprise 27 percent of the population. They constituted about 40 percent of the arrests for all acts of delinquency, and about 50 percent of all arrests for Part I offenses, the more serious offenses against the person.

Although somewhat paradoxically, the FBI uniform crime reports include car theft within Part I, and they do not include drug offenses, so the data is a little bit curious from the perception of policy makers at the state level that car thefts are in there and drug offenses are not, with all of the focus, as David has pointed out, on drug offenses.

What we also discovered is that

minority youth constituted forty-five percent of all of the youth placed in juvenile detention homes awaiting trial. Fifty-four percent of those youths committed to the then Department of Youth and Family Services, now Department of Juvenile Justice, for placement in a juvenile correctional center, and 60 percent of the juveniles transferred to circuit court for trial as adults, so our anecdotal perceptions were really reinforced by the data, that at each stage of the process, as the consequences became more severe and as the placement became more secure, minority youths were appearing at a higher representation rate.

represented 46 percent of all juvenile arrests, 53

percent of the Part I offenses. The detention of

minority youth had risen from 45 percent to 57

percent. The Department of Youth and Family Service

commitments had risen to 66 percent. In other words,

two-thirds of all the kids at Beaumont, Bon Air,

Hanover, Jenny Porter Barrett, Natural Bridge, Oak

Ridge were minority youths. And transfers to adult

courts had increased to 75 percent. Three-quarters

of all of the youths across the Commonwealth that

were transferred to be tried as adults, were minority

youths.

2.3

Now, around 1991 was when we started -- we said, you know, the data gathering is -- that system is well in place. We need to start assessing the problem. We did it in a variety of ways. We put together some focus groups and brought together public defenders and prosecutors and police officers and representatives of the various civil rights groups and all, and we started talking about why is this occurring.

We discovered that it was a mix of things, and I don't think there's any question but that racism plays a part, whether it's unconscious or conscious, but there were other reasons as well. One was, where are our resources focused? As David has pointed out, a lot of the enforcement is really focused on our large central cities. The crack data is even worse when it comes to other drugs.

The University of Michigan annual studies of self-report data by young people shows that far more white youths use drugs than African American or other minorities, and yet most of the arrests for drug offenses are of African American youths. That's because it's basically more efficient. You get more bang for your buck if you're picking up

people on the street corners than putting undercover cops in your suburban high school, so that the arrests are in a sense distorted by the way that

enforcement takes place.

Secondly, we discovered that in a lot of these localities, there were fewer alternative resources, alternatives to detention, alternatives to commitment. Quite often, the jurisdiction that's had the wider range of resources and alternatives were places like Virginia Beach and Fairfax County, Henrico County, and Chesterfield County and the like. People are always shocked when I tell them that there's a higher rate of Part I arrests in Chesterfield County, where I live, than there are in the City of Richmond.

What happens in the City of Richmond is that you have more arrests for homicide, and the public attention for juvenile crime is driven largely by homicide. And a lot higher rate in Virginia Beach and Chesterfield County for Part I offenses than there are in the City of Norfolk and the City of Richmond, and yet we would not know that from reading the news media.

I heard a reporter once say if it bleeds, it leads, so that our stories, our television

news are largely driven by things like homicide. We also discovered that, as Tip O'Neal once said, all politics is local. There's a wide disparity in the way these issues are dealt with. The highest overrepresentation of minority youth and detention facilities we found was along the Interstate 81 corridor where there were really fewer minorities, and there were no alternative services in many of those counties. So the black kids, primarily, are the ones that were getting locked up.

Maxwell has alluded to this, that a lot of the nonjustice risk factors were higher among minority groups, problems like learning disabilities, health problems, abuse and neglect. Other issues were concentrated. These kids were far more at risk, and the police were there when the risk became manifested.

Now, let me jump ahead to say that we had the data, we had engaged in some analysis of why this was true, and we decided that we needed to put some resources and attention to try to correct it.

And Virginia has a long ways to go. But if you look at this data, these data as they are recorded here, you will see that these data are really stated by

indices, and let me explain briefly what that means.

the factor of minority youth at that stage in the system, opposed to the percentage of minority youth in the population. So if you see, for example, in 1991, 2.45 for commitment to a juvenile correctional facility, that means that a minority youth is 2.45 times more likely to be found in a juvenile correctional center than in the population. So it's 2.45 times 27 percent, and you've got that 66 percent figure that I talked about.

Now, if you look at this, you will see that there indeed have been some reductions. If you look at secured detention, it went from 2.22 index to 1.96 between 1992 and 1994. There was a reduction of 2.25 in other types of secure youth facilities to 2.02. From 2.49 commitment to the Department of Juvenile Justice to 2.32.

Some of the other areas we don't have data yet for '95 and '96, the Part I arrests, but there was even a bit of a reduction in the percentage of arrests of minority youth. Now, that's minor changes, but it is a reflection of the fact that some conscious effort has been made to address that.

The Virginia Supreme Court has

recently gotten a state justice institute grant to continue training judges, clerks, and magistrates in cultural competency, and in trying to deal in race neutral decision-making. There's a lot of discretion in the juvenile justice system, and that's one of the problems.

And ironically, even when you try to eliminate the discretion -- we don't have the data yet -- the one area I'm really concerned about is transfer to adult court, because we enacted a statute last year where basically the offense drives whether the kid is going to be transferred to adult court rather than a hearing before the judge.

In the City of Richmond, for example, I'm aware that since July 1, 1996, the Commonwealth Attorney's Office is automatically giving notice of transfer for any kid who has committed an offense that is listed in 16.1-269.1(c) of the code, which are the serious offenses. Now, remember a kid may be charged with a serious offense and not be found quilty of that serious offense.

I mean, a kid who commits a homicide, for example, could be guilty of capital murder, but they could be guilty of involuntary manslaughter.

Also kids tend to commit offenses in groups more than

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

adults. Let me give you an example. About twenty-four percent of all the arrests for robbery in the United States are of juveniles, and yet juveniles are responsible for only 14 percent of those robberies that are cleared by an arrest. The disparity is that juveniles tend to do things in groups, more than adults do. An adult will commit a robbery perhaps as a lone wolf. Juveniles do that very rarely. So juveniles are overrepresented in arrest data vis-a-vis adults.

We've got a lot more we have to do. And I'm proud that during the time that I was on the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Committee, and during the time that I was on the Virginia Commission on Youth, and with the help of Senator Maxwell and others in the General Assembly, we were able to get enacted the Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act, which now, after this session of the General Assembly, will result in about 26 million dollars statewide to develop alternative community-based resources to keep kids out of detention homes and keep them out of the Department of Juvenile Justice. That's going to have a real impact in places like Richmond and Hampton and Newport News and Norfolk where the local resources

may not have been great enough in the past to develop these alternatives, as opposed to some of the more affluent communities.

Where I think we are falling short is on prevention. There are some excellent programs that are being piloted in Virginia and elsewhere. In fact, the City of Hampton was one of the pilots for Healthy Family Virginia, which shows tremendous promise in trying to prevent juvenile crime before it happens.

And as far as I'm concerned, it's like the old purilator in the television commercial, you can pay me now or pay me later. It's much more cost-effective to put the money into prevention, than it is to put this \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year into correctional facilities.

I'll conclude by saying we've got to keep working at this. I remember a Peanuts cartoon a number of years ago that showed Charlie Brown walking off the baseball field, and in the background the scoreboard says, Visitors 99, Home 0. And Charlie Brown is saying, How could it have happened when we were so sincere? It takes more than sincerity. It takes action. And I look forward to the recommendations that this body may be able to make,

and the attention you can bring to bear on some of 1 2 these problems for our youth and our young African American males in particular across the Commonwealth. 3 MS. RATTLEY: Quite interesting 4 Mr. Baugh, have you written that book yet? 5 panel. I need that information. 6 7 MR. BAUGH: On the book? MS. RATTLEY: No, on your 8 9 presentation, on the perception of crack and pure cocaine. 10 11 MR. BAUGH: I do have extra copies of 12 the Sentencing Commission Report, but I will take it 13 upon myself to call the United States Sentencing 14 Commission and get enough extra reports for the whole 15 panel if you'd like them. I can give them to Dr. 16 al-Hibri. 17 MS. RATTLEY: Yes. That kind of blows your mind. We talk about perceptions, and some 1.8 19 other thoughts we have through history, of plans that 20 are out there that we never recognized. 21 Senator Maxwell, may we have a copy 22 of your report, please? I was very concerned about 23 the restoration of voting rights. I think you said in the State of Virginia, we have 245,000 people who 24 25 have been denied their voting rights, and of that

number, 145,000 are black males basically. 1 2 SENATOR MAXWELL: That's a lot of 3 votes. MS. RATTLEY: That's a lot of votes. 4 5 And that could be connected to what Mr. Baugh said as 6 to the motive, in a sense, for having three out of Now you said we had one out of three. 7 four. SENATOR MAXWELL: One out of three. 8 MS. RATTLEY: Wasn't it kind of a 9 10 national thing that we had one out of four, and now it's one out of three? 11 One out of three. 12 SENATOR MAXWELL: 13 That's right. 14 MS. RATTLEY: What is the national 15 average, the same, or is it --16 SENATOR MAXWELL: National average --17 what is the national average? It's the same, one out 18 of three. National average is one out of four. Here in the Commonwealth, we found out it was one out of 19 20 three. 21 MS. RATTLEY: I think that is a point that must be made and emphasized. I was shocked when 22 23 you said that. We really need a copy, if you will, of your presentation, because you're getting into the 24 specifics of how we stack up in the State of 25

Virginia. 1 2 And I want to thank you, all of you, 3 for being here, and we have just a few minutes now left for questions. I know Mr. Baugh has to get back 4 5 to Richmond. MR. BAUGH: I canceled that 7 appointment. 8 MS. RATTLEY: Very good. You're 9 going to stay with us through the night? 10 MR. BAUGH: As my wife always tells 11 me, even love has its limits. 12 DR. AL-HIBRI: Let's take a few 13 questions from the panelists and the audience. 14 MS. MCCLOUD: I don't know, maybe I 15 haven't been listening very well, or maybe I'm 16 missing the point here, but we've heard a lot of data 17 We've heard a lot of statistics. today. We have 18 heard about a lot of different groups, et cetera, who 19 are trying to address the problem. I have not heard 20 any reference to the people who are really 21 responsible for bringing these youth in, for example, 22 the police officers, the people who are on the 23 streets with them. 24 Can you tell me, can you expect there 25 to be change unless there is some work done with

those people as well?

2.3

MR. BAUGH: Ma'am, if I might,
Mrs. McCloud, I'll start off from my perspective.
The problem is not just there. Actually, the thing
that scares me the most about it is that in order to
really address this problem, we have to have almost a
societal change in our perceptions.

I understand from my perspective as a criminal defense attorney that there is entirely too much testosterone involved in law enforcement, and that everyone seems to be thrilled with the idea of getting tough on crime, but no one seems to be really -- they don't seem to like the attitude of let's get intelligent about the resolution of crime. We are willing -- if a person's dog bites, you know that you don't beat the dog into stopping that behavior; only by caring and attention will that dog learn. We'll do the same thing to humans.

Our entire law enforcement perspective, from the president down, is if something is wrong, if you use enough force and we punish enough people, it will be fixed, and that is not true. We demand that our police make arrests. We demand that our police do undercover operations that get, as Robert said, the biggest bang for the buck,

but as we look at those numbers, no success.

entire attitude. When I say "we," I mean the entire nation. I believe we can do it. I believe Americans can do it. If we can put a man on the moon; we can cure disease; we can do anything if we put our mind to it. But I think right now we're going with the quick fix, and I don't know what it's going to take to make people serious about resolving this problem.

DR. AL-HIBRI: If I may interject here, once in a while I do give lectures to policemen and women, and part of the discussion at times revolves around this kind of issue, and what surprises me -- I didn't expect it -- is that some of these policemen have just told me that they're really afraid of teenage males when they meet them in the school yards, et cetera, and so they fall to the stereotype, for the stereotype we were talking about this morning, so when they approach the problem, they try to use the force that they think will make them safe.

I think we have to recognize that someone, as society, has these stereotypes. The police will be victims of them, as well as other members of society, and we really need an overhaul in

that particular area.

MR. SHEPHERD: I might mention,
Ms. McCloud, that one of the focus groups that we
held, the director of the police academy in Virginia
Beach very openly said that he thought one of the
biggest mistakes was this idea of the war on drugs,
that characterizing something as a war, made it an
"us versus them", a "good versus bad" sort of thing,
and that the idea of the war on drugs as a war, led
to more problems than it actually solved.

Coupled with that, I would mention that I think one of the most powerful advocates for prevention in the Commonwealth that I have met is Chief Melvin High of the Norfolk City Police Department. He served on the Commission on Youth Juvenile Justice System Task Force with me, and I kind of felt like he and I sat at two different ends of that group and kept saying prevention, prevention, prevention into the microphone; whereas, others were saying transfer, lockup.

And I think you'd find the police officers of the Commonwealth will be some of the strongest advocates for prevention. They just as soon not have to confront that angry male in the school yard; but if that angry male is given

something else to do with his testosterone, as well as the police officers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I will make one MR. BAUGH: suggestion, and I hate to say this because my living depends upon police doing excessive things, but if you really wanted to stop crime in the United States, and you wanted to do one thing in this Commonwealth, I would say that urban areas you should start off, one, every child above the age of three should be in some structured educational program; and number two, in those urban environments, no child should be in a class with more than nine classmates for the first three years of their education, and then and only then -- I'll never forget this. The reason I don't steal is not because I have a fear of getting caught. The reason I don't steal is not because I have fear of going to jail. The reason I don't steal is that Mrs. Freeman, my teacher, and my mother taught me it was wrong, and that's what prevents me from committing crime.

SENATOR MAXWELL: If I understand your question correctly, Mrs. McCloud, you know that there is a perception in our society today whereby that -- let me retract and come back to this point. When I was graduated from high school and people of

my generation, there was an attitude, say the less college, college was the main thrust of my attitude, and what have you.

Now, many times when kids graduate from high school or from school, they say money, money, money, money, money. And the attitudes have changed, so the thing about it is, what is out there in the environment that is more profitable and more acceptable than drugs?

The reason that police officers in certain areas have easier time and higher incarceration rate among blacks is because in certain areas of our city, they do it openly on the streets, and what have you; while in other areas, it's a little tougher because they go behind closed doors. There's more going on behind closed doors, but the street's what we concentrate on this effort here down in another section of our society.

I look at the crime, look at the violence. I look at the homicides, but I don't believe -- it may be in contradiction to what has been said. I still don't believe they are our main problem. Educational deficiencies and all these things, not our main -- our main problem is still drugs, whether we will admit to it or not, because

1 drugs are just like a thread that has rolled itself 2 into the very fabric of everything we do; and if we 3 don't get a handle on our drugs, we're about to lose a generation of young males, young people. 4 have already lost them. 5 We've declared war, but we haven't 6 7 engaged the act. We haven't commenced anything. We 8 say that we're going to declare war, but we really 9 haven't moved from lift feet to doing something about 10 our problem. 11 That's what I find existing today. REVEREND HARRIS: Mr -- Reverend 12 Maxwell? 13 14 SENATOR MAXWELL: Yes, sir. Senator. 15 REVEREND HARRIS: Brother Maxwell, 16 you talked about your subcommittee, and I'm familiar 17 with subcommittees, and committees in the General 18 Assembly --19 SENATOR MAXWELL: Yes, sir. 20 REVEREND HARRIS: -- that finally go 21 to the governor and so forth with the veto the bill 22 and so forth. 23 SENATOR MAXWELL: That's right. 24 REVEREND HARRIS: And based on 25 what -- your analysis and what you have discovered

with your subcommittee, how long do you think that before we can realize some relief from the kinds of things that you have shared with us today? How long is it going to take?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR MAXWELL: It's hard for me to have a measuring rod to say exactly how long, but we do hope in the immediate future. We are continuing our subcommittee, and in the continuation of our subcommittee, we are hopeful that many of the things, the resolution and resolve that come about in our subcommittee will be enacted into law and signed by our -- and signed by the governor. This is the -how long that would take, it is up to our legislative black caucus. We are going to police to see immediate implementation of these resolutions have béen made, but how long it will take, after he signs it to maybe have a fiscal impact statement may be prohibitive if we do -- most of the changes we see is a matter of just attitude changes and what have you.

REVEREND HARRIS: How can the citizens assist in this process? Is it now left to the hands of the committee or the subcommittee? Are we supposed to just sit and wait until we get a report? How -- what do you suggest that the general population --

SENATOR MAXWELL: We're in the same process you are, in the fact-finding position. 3 trying to put all the facts together to see what type of pictures are going to develop from those facts we 5 We would be glad to afford to the committee 6 the facts, and the report that we have received, and 7 we're going to legislate -- whatever we can do legislatively, that is what we will move forward to 8 do. 9

1

2

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GALVIN: Just two questions for One, do you have any study or survey on those that are granted voting rights back that were disenfranchised? Do we have any breakdown or statistics on the racial bias in those grantings?

SENATOR MAXWELL: The only thing we have to go by is the stats involved. I did have the resource person here who may have some of that data here for us today, but we're only going to talk about the conviction of felons and the restoration of their rights, back to their rights. It is -- right now, we don't know exactly -- we just made an amendment to our study to seek information as it relates to the very thing that you're talking about, so we will do that during our study meeting this year.

MR. GALVIN: Will you provide that to

1 us? 2 SENATOR MAXWELL: Yes, sir. I'll be 3 glad to. MR. GALVIN: My second question, I 4 5 think for Mr. Baugh or Mr. Shepherd, while I 6 understand prevention and some people talk about 7 treatment in there, and it's a little contradictory with your statements of not having an addiction. 8 Physical addiction. 9 MR. BAUGH: 10 MR. GALVIN: By treatment, 11 psychological treatment. But given that, and given 12 that that's one direction or possibility, I'd also 13 like to ask you in your opinion, how do you see the 14 disparity in judgment in the prosecutors? 15 heard testimony, or comments today in having 16 sentencing guidelines, and how sentencing has the 17 consequences of what's that produced. 18 Is there, though, a huge disparity in 19 the judgment that is issued by prosecutors in 20 deciding who goes to trial, how they're charged and 21 that what would your opinion be if there were 22 quidelines in this direction towards moving the 23 disparity imbalance further down the line? 24 MR. SHEPHERD: Well, I certainly see 25 that as being a major problem in the juvenile justice system, because the legislation that we adopted in 1996 governing transfers to adult court, we basically moved the discretion away from judges, whose judgments are subject to appeal, to prosecutors, whose decision making is basically totally immune.

I mean, we've got some recent cases before the United States Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, the case that came out of Norfolk in looking at prosecutorial decision-making. I think there's a significant disparity across the state and how prosecutors are using this new transfer statute.

In most of the state it's made no difference. Prosecutors are exercising their judgment essentially on the same criteria that judges did previously, and they're selecting the cases where a motion for transfer is to be made. You know, you can have four or five kids involved in a single offense, and the level of culpability is quite different, the previous record, the age.

But in some Commonwealth Attorneys'
offices, all of these kids are being moved for
transfer if they're 14 years of age or older. And as
far as I'm concerned, if you're familiar with Charles
Dickens' Oliver Twist, that means you're treating

Oliver Twist the same way you are the Artful Dodger and Fagan and Bill Sykes, and the degree of culpability is quite different among those.

MR. BAUGH: Before I answer, I think your court reporter wants to change her paper.

Mr. Galvin, I did want to answer. I am opposed to -- I'm opposed to sentencing guidelines. I think the sentencing guidelines are a violation of separation of powers, and I am one of the people who believe the Constitution is a great idea and you shouldn't mess with it.

The idea of trying to limit

prosecutorial discretion, I believe is a

Constitutional infraction of justice as well. I

believe that we should be about the business of

educating prosecutors and judges, and I think one

simple thing -- I know Dr. Kerns was here this

morning -- on the sentencing reporting documents that

they use, if they were to include race as a data

field, then much of the question we have today could

be resolved. All they have to do is include a

one-digit spot on their reporting documentation, and

their computer can sort it. I happen to know what

computer program they use for data sorting. I have a

pending lawsuit against Dr. Kerns for some

information, but all you have to do is add that and it would resolve the problem.

MR. GALVIN: Would you want to, for the record, say -- we have his report -- where you suggest that would be added since he has --

MR. BAUGH: There's a little blue form they use that's prepared by the sentencing judge that is a reporting form that is sent to the Sentencing Commission, has the defendant's name, the judge code, circuit code. If they were to add on there a box for the race of the defendant, that would give us -- and same for juveniles -- give us a tremendous amount of information. You could use it to objectively determine whether or not there is a perception of problem.

MR. GALVIN: So let me see if I understand then. Then do you believe the collection of the data in the middle channel is relatively easy to get by the addition of this box and it's not difficult to obtain?

MR. BAUGH: If Dr. -- I think I missed something. No, it is not easy -- it is not difficult at all. All it is, is put down, you know, one, or two, or three for whatever race you are, and believe me, and once that is declared a field, a

field for purpose of being sorted in the program, it is not difficult at all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GALVIN: Let me ask you this. What would you speculate could be a basis of why this hasn't been added, given that it's this easy and it doesn't look like it adds any additional cost?

MS. RATTLEY: Perception.

MR. BAUGH: No additional cost.

MR. GALVIN: What is your speculation of why this hasn't been added?

MR. BAUGH: It is my birthday. don't think -- I think that everyone in the system knows that it's skewed, but I believe that there is some solace that discrimination is tolerable as long as it's unintentional. I was -- this may impact on my credibility. I am not an Assistant United States Attorney any longer. As I once asked the federal judge while I was prosecutor, Why is it when I convict white people, they get probation, and when I convict black people, you put them in jail? why I'm no longer Assistant United States Attorney. In one of the discussions he and I had, he said, Well, Mr. Baugh, do you think I'm an intentional I don't care whether you're an intentional bigot or not. He said, Mr. Baugh, intention is

everything. Intention is the difference between manslaughter and murder. And I said, Not to a dead man. You are just as dead whether it was a whoopsie or by intention.

1.5

I think that a lot of people in the system -- I think everybody in the system knows it's skewed and nobody wants to see it because you're going to ask them why, and that's -- and you knew that answer was coming.

MR. GALVIN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MS. RATTLEY: Mr. Baugh or Senator

Maxwell, either one. I get so many questions about

restoration of rights. Would you briefly give me the

procedure to have rights restored to convicted

felons.

MR. BAUGH: Well, the procedure -believe me, I only know it from some employees
actually I did this with. Normally when people call
me, I say call the governor's office, tell them when
your conviction might have been. The governor's
office, I understand, does a pretty good job of
screening.

Namely, say for instance you received a twenty-year sentence with all but five years suspended. Well, that means you have five years in

jail, then you have 15 years of probation. At the end of the twenty years, you have to wait until all of your debt has been paid, either active incarceration or the probationary period.

At the end of all that, I believe it's three to five years after that, you can apply. The governor's office will screen -- at first, When were you convicted, what was your sentence, how much -- and if you don't qualify, they won't even send you the paperwork; but if you tell them -- I mean, because it doesn't make sense to fill out the paperwork if you haven't been off probation long enough -- if you tell know you do qualify and you show them, then they'll send you the paperwork.

The forms are pretty involved, and then also you have to fill out the form, Where were you convicted, what offense, what have you been doing, a lot of historical information, letters of recommendation, background information, and then go and turn it into the governor's office, get it investigated.

I have never seen one of these -- I think the quickest I've ever seen was ten months.

And that was pretty fast.

And then the governor -- it takes a

while, you have to fill out all these forms, have the background check done, and then get a phone call, and they tell you the paperwork is coming and you're restored.

2.1

MS. RATTLEY: That's if you're in a state prison, right?

MR. BAUGH: Yes.

MS. RATTLEY: How about federal, what do you do?

MR. BAUGH: There is a federal procedure for restoration. No, I think you have to get a pardon from the president. That's about it.

SENATOR MAXWELL: A pardon from the president, a pardon from the governor, in the State of -- Commonwealth of Virginia, I've written three times on behalf of citizens for restoration. The Governor has denied all three of them. One thing that I found out is that many of the minorities have been charged instead of being -- especially for the first offender, that does not go on the record, but by them not being charged under First Offender Act, they had to wait ten years. It was ten years before their restoration -- before the rights will be restored. I found that out in dealing with the government.

MR. BAUGH: I do want to point out that recently Richmond Times Dispatch, which I don't quote very often, had an interesting article indicating that only thirteen states in the United States do not have an automatic restoration of rights. I did not know that.

MR. DARDEN: Just a quick one. I had a several other questions, but back to Professor Shepherd, when you talk about the automatic transfer, and I understand that to mean into handling a juvenile as an adult in adult court and adult penalties, I've seen some studies in another state, in Delaware, indicating a correlation between that first incarceration and continuation in the criminal justice system, either in another incident or from the same one.

The gist of it was that if you can avoid, in a juvenile case, that first incarceration, it greatly enhances the likelihood of avoiding a long-time involvement with the criminal justice system; but conversely, that after that first incarceration, it greatly enhances it and we tend to see a lot of return.

So it makes that particular aspect very crucial because of its long-term impact. Now

1 you're telling me there's an automatic, almost mindless handling that sends these juveniles into 2 what might be a life of involvement with the criminal 3 4 justice system. And I'm trying to understand that if 5 any -- does anybody else see this as a problem? 6 MR. SHEPHERD: Well, yes, I did, and 7 I spent a good deal of time at the General Assembly last year arguing against the changes in the Virginia 8 9 Code that would make it more or less automatic, 10 partly for the reasons I stated, that you've got kids 11 with different levels of culpability, with different backgrounds, with a different prior history, and the 12 13 judges could make that determination with lawyers, 14 like David Baugh, representing these kids in court, 15 and frequently convincing the judge that transfer was 16 not appropriate in this case. 17 The other part of it is that even 18 from the standpoint --19 MR. DARDEN: What happened there, 20 when you were making this case in the General Assembly? 21 22 MR. SHEPHERD: They want to get 23 tough. They wanted to prove how hard they were 24 coming down on juvenile crime.

25

MR. DARDEN:

That means black youth?

MR. SHEPHERD: Well, that's the effect. I mean, there are some that say if you have an automatic system, you take the discretion out, there will be less racial disparity, but you never take out discretion because the prosecutors are making charging decisions.

MR. DARDEN: And they're in the same --

MR. BAUGH: And the police officers.

MR. SHEPHERD: And the police officers are making arrest decisions and charging decisions.

The thing that's so crazy about all of this, is that we do know in the states where studies have been made, that a juvenile who is sent to the adult system and tried and convicted as an adult, is five times more likely to be assaulted in the adult correctional system than in the juvenile system, either physically or sexually; that a juvenile who is tried and convicted as an adult and serving an adult sentence is more likely to recidivate upon release, recidivates earlier, and recidivates with a more serious offense, than the same youth who commits the same offense and is dealt with as a juvenile.

22

23

24

25

In addition, ironically, unless you're dealing with the really serious offenses like homicide, and maybe armed robbery and the like, the juvenile who's kept in the juvenile system ends up serving more time than the juvenile who is put into Because you've got adult judges the adult system. now, and they may look at a fourteen-year-old kid who's five-foot-two and weighs 130 pounds, and they say, I am not going to send that young man to an adult penitentiary because I know what's going to I'm going to put him on probation. happen to him. But if he were still in the juvenile system, he may very well go into a treatment program. He may very well be held accountable by being put in a juvenile facility because the risk of physical harm and the like is much less.

MR. DARDEN: So does this automatic action come from the Commonwealth Attorneys represent some sort of depersonalization? Do they just not see these cases now as individual cases that have to be considered, or --

MR. SHEPHERD: Well, again this gets back a little to Mr. Galvin's question is that it depends on what the practice is in a particular Commonwealth's Attorney's Office. I know there are

localities in Virginia where it's made no change whatsoever. The Commonwealth's Attorneys are still using criteria for determining whether to automatically file that are comparable to what the judges would have used previously. So you're not seeing any real change in transfers.

There are other jurisdictions where the Commonwealth's Attorneys are saying, or at least implicitly, saying, We're going to prove how tough we are on crime; we're going to send more of these kids into the adult system.

MR. DARDEN: So where is the standard of professional practice among the Commonwealth Attorneys that would bring about some sort of uniform --

MR. SHEPHERD: I have had, in fact, some conversations with the Commonwealth Attorneys Training Council, and I have provided them with some information from Florida, which unfortunately was kind of the originator and exporter of this approach, where they have -- they are mandated by law in Florida to develop written criteria, guidelines, protocols that are going to be used in the prosecutors' offices for making these decisions.

And I have secured from Florida these

FOX REPORTING

criteria, these guidelines that have been developed, 1 2 and have provided them to Professor Walter Felton at 3 William and Mary, who staffs the Commonwealth Attorneys Association and their training council, and 4 5 he's indicated that they really do want to do some 6 training about what sort of screening process they 7 should do. In some instances, they're not really 8 exercising discretion, they're just automatically 9 10 saying that if it's a Part II or Part I felony. 11 MR. DARDEN: And then finally, do you 12 know whether that practice is the case in either 13 Hampton or Newport News? 14 MR. SHEPHERD: I have no idea. I do 15 know some of the localities, but I won't mention at 16 this point. 17 MR. BAUGH: We have a Newport News or 18 Hampton attorney present? 19 MR. ELLENSON: About 15 years. What 20 specifically were you asking? 21 MR. BAUGH: The question whether or 22 not in Norfolk or Newport News do they automatically 23 transfer certain offenses. 24 MR. ELLENSON: No, they use the old 25 criteria.

DR. AL-HIBRI: He's on the next 1 panel, and his questions will be answered. 2 3 I want to thank all the participants in this panel. We learned a lot. Thank you very 4 much. 5 We'll take a MS. RATTLEY: 6 five-minute break. We're still running behind time, 7 so will the next panel come forward. 8 9 (Break) 10 11 12 MS. RATTLEY: We're coming back now 13 to discuss the topic of the Hampton Four, which is an 14 update on a continuing problem facing African 15 Americans under the Virginia criminal justice system. 16 And I wanted to now turn it over to Mr. Darden, to 17 introduce the moderator and the panelists. 18 MR. DARDEN: I'm going to turn it 19 immediately to the moderator, Mr. Patrick. 20 MR. PATRICK: Good evening. Thank 21 you, Chairman. Good evening. Welcome to this 22 afternoon session, which is titled, The Hampton Four 23 Update, and Continuing Problems Facing African American Under Virginia's Criminal Justice System. 24 25 We will go in this order. We'll have

1 Mr. James Ellenson, who's an attorney at law and the 2 former S.W.I.S. legal counsel, and S.W.I.S. is an acronym for the Hampton Four defendants. 3 4 Mr. Ellenson, we'll have Ms. Shaun Brown, then 5 Ms. Pat Fromal, Director of We The People, then Mr. Murray Steinberg, Director of Children First and 6 Family Resolution Council, and then we had Mr. Walter 7 Bingham, but he's having a problem with his voice, so 8 9 sitting in for him will be Mr. Andrew Shannon, and we 10 will hear all the panelists first and then we will 11 take questions, so we'll now hear from Mr. James 12 Ellenson. 13 MR. ELLENSON: My name is Jim 14 Ellenson. I'm an attorney and --15 Mr. Ellenson, take the MS. RATTLEY: 16 mike, please. 17 MR. ELLENSON: Okay. I'll stand. I'm used to speaking to juries and courts, so I think 18 19 everybody should be able to hear me. My name is Jim 20 Ellenson. I'm an attorney and I practice in Newport 21 My office is in Newport News, and I've been 22 practicing since 1981. One brief correction. 23 wasn't S.W.I.S.'s attorney, I was -- S.W.I.S. paid 24 the fee for both Melvin Stephens and Allen Iverson. 25 Those are two of the four that I actually represented in the case. They paid the fee, but I was not their, S.W.I.S.'s, lawyer. I was Mr. Stephens' lawyer at first, and then Mr. Iverson retained me.

So sort of to get a background so you'll understand how it all came to pass, I'll try to be brief and run through it. Melvin Stephens and his mother come to my office. Melvin Stephens is 17. This ties in nicely with your last topic with David Baugh and a transfer which shouldn't have been automatic, but -- I'm getting ahead of myself.

Stephens comes in the office. He's 17 years old. He knows who I am. I practice a lot in this area, so I'm sort of halfway decently known as a criminal defense lawyer in this area. They come in. Melvin says, Last Saturday night, I went with a couple of my friends to a bowling alley and we got into a fight.

Melvin, what happened?

Well, I was on one end of the alley with some of my friends, and on the other end of the alley, Allen Iverson -- who I didn't know, who was a classmate and a friend of Melvin's -- Allen and another fellow went down to the other end of the bowling alley to get a hamburger, and down there, there was just a whole lot of talking and commotion.

I don't really know what was going on, but they 1 2 started fighting down there, so I went down there to be with my buddy. I went down there to help out. 3 Everyone was throwing chairs. 4 were guys breaking glass. It was awful. 5 We all ran 6 out. We left. And now the police are after me. 7 They're going to arrest me. I said, All right, Melvin. Well, let 8 9 me ask you something. Did anybody get hurt? 10 He said, I don't really know. 11 understand that there was one guy who had a broken 12 arm, and I think a girl got some stitches. 13 Okay. Have you ever been in trouble before, Melvin? 14 15 Nope, I've never been in trouble a 16 day in my life. 17 How old are you? I'm 17. 18 19 And you're in 12th grade at Bethel 20 High School? 21 Yes. 22 And you're all set to graduate? 23 Yes. 24 And you'll graduate on time? 25 Yes.

Do you have any plans afterwards?

Yeah, I'm supposed to be going to a junior college out in Missouri.

I said, Well, no, Melvin, it doesn't sound like this is going to be a real serious case, so, you know, I'll quote you a fee and I'll come with you, and we'll go turn yourself in; and I would predict that you're looking at probation, maybe a male mentoring program, some community service, if there's any restitution involved. I would predict that's what's going to happen to you.

And I said this on the basis of about 15 years of experience.

Imagine my surprise when I get a transfer motion from the Commonwealth's Attorneys office. What is this? Why are you trying to transfer this kid? He's never been in trouble. We've got the report from the juvenile probation officer who says there were no guns involved in the fight, no knives. The kids didn't go there to fight. The kids went there to bowl. Of all the people that were involved in the fight, four black kids were the ones that got arrested. Nobody else got arrested. Nobody else has been charged.

Judge, the juvenile probation officer

FOX REPORTING

says, this case should not be certified to be tried as an adult. My recommendation is forty hours of community service work, pay restitution, and put the kid on probation. He's supposed to go to college in the Fall, and if everything works out, then, you know, he'll come back next summer, and we'll see if he's done well in school, then the case should be dropped and that will be the end of it.

The judge said, No, I'm not going to do that. This is a very serious case. The Commonwealth Attorney is in there ranting and raving. Send this case across the street to circuit court.

Our preliminary hearing for Melvin

Stephens was along with -- we had the same

preliminary hearing as Allen Iverson's case. The

exact same argument -- I was not Mr. Iverson's

attorney at the time. Herb Kelly was his lawyer at

the time. The same arguments were made on behalf of

Mr. Iverson, the same juvenile probation officer had

made the same recommendations for Mr. Iverson.

Nevertheless, the cases were both certified and sent over to circuit court. My immediate reaction when a juvenile's case is transferred over to circuit court, the juvenile's case can be had -- you can have a trial by jury.

When you have a trial by jury, the judge will sentence, but the jury decides if you're guilty or innocent.

This is a very important point because with adults it's different. In adults, the jury also sentences, so because of that, you're rather loath to take a jury trial if you have an adult as a defendant.

If I have a criminal defendant, and let's say he's guilty of possession of cocaine, a judge who has seen that case a hundred times is probably going to follow the guidelines, and if guidelines call for six months or a year, he'll probably do that. However, if it's a jury and you've got the prosecuting attorney saying, Drug people should be locked up, lock them away, you're looking at ten years, so you don't tend to take juries.

You're gambling a lot.

I'm sure Mr. Shepherd and Mr. Baugh, if they're still in the audience, know that. The law is crystal clear. You're entitled to a jury trial and the jury will not sentence you if you're a juvenile.

We get over to circuit court. I demand a jury trial. The case is set before Judge

Overton. Overton calls me the day before the trial and he says, Mr. Ellenson, if you insist on taking a jury trial, I'm going to let the jury sentence.

I say, Judge, you can't do that. The law is plain.

I'm sorry. That's what I'm going to

There were four kids that were ultimately charged. I was the only one that took a jury trial. The other three, Iverson, Simmons, and Wynn, opted for a judge trial. They did not take a jury. Despite Judge Overton's warnings to me, I nevertheless took the jury trial. That first jury, which consisted of six whites and six blacks, heard the evidence, which I essentially have said to you today. Who started the fight? That's a good question. If you listen to the whites, the fight started because Allen Iverson went over there and he was running off at the mouth.

If you listen to the blacks, the fight started because the white protagonist, who is a convicted felon -- he has a cocaine felony conviction at the time. He was 23 -- he and his brother started the fight. That's what the black kids say.

You know, that's -- I guess that's

1.4

why you have a jury case. That's why you go to court. You know, I wasn't there. None of you-all were there. Sort of who knows? But I've got all my kids and my witnesses who are saying it happened one way, and you have other folks that say it happened the other way. Well, the first jury trial ends up in a hung jury. They can't decide what to do.

They just -- Judge Overton wants to lock them in the jury room until ten o'clock. I'm not serving you guys dinner. I want a decision.

Judge, we can't.

You can hear them in the back screaming and yelling and carrying on, and they just couldn't make a decision. Jury ends up hung. The case is then reset for another jury trial.

In the interim, Judge Overton heard the evidence for the other three young men, and he's found all of them guilty. He's had no problem disbelieving every black kid and believing every white kid; and I suppose if you want to talk about what Mr. Baugh or the Professor Shepherd talked about, well, you have different kids who have different levels of culpability in any one sort of a crime.

Well, if you were going to say who

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was the most culpable, I think the argument could very well be that my client, Melvin Stephens, was the most culpable, because here on the other side of the bowling alley is Allen Iverson engaged in a fight, and there's about two black kids, and there's about five white kids on the other end of the bowling alley fighting, and what does Melvin Stephens do? of leads the charge and takes about three or four or five other kids with him down to the other end of the bowling alley. To use the basketball analogy, it's sort of the fight's going on at center court and Melvin Stephens jumps off the bench and runs down there and gets into it. That is essentially the evidence. Yet, a racially mixed jury the first time hearing that evidence, found Melvin -- they couldn't decide at all.

The second time the jury consisted of eight whites and four blacks, and they convicted him of an assault and battery. That's it. Simple assault and battery.

We appealed the case, and the Court of Appeals, by the way, ruled that Judge Overton was completely wrong, that it wasn't even close, that the jury should not have been allowed to sentence, and they sent the case back down for sentencing. That

sentencing finally occurred in January of this year.

That's how long the case took to sort of wind its way all around.

And the ultimate sentence for Melvin Stephens was six months, all suspended. And he's gone on and he's in college down in Shaw University, and he's doing just fine. He went out to Missouri to the junior college, and now he's over at Shaw. He's also got a bill of about \$9,000 because he took two jury trials; and even though he was, in the end, a simple assault and battery, the Commonwealth Attorney has decided that he nevertheless needs to pay all these court costs, and he's got \$8,997 that he's got to pay.

What happened in the meantime with the other three cases is that they all went up to the Court of Appeals, and the Court of Appeals threw out the convictions because they said you couldn't be found guilty of maiming by mob, because essentially the boys didn't go there to get into a fight. They went there to bowl, so there wasn't any sort of shared intent for a mob action. But what they said is that Hampton Commonwealth Attorney, you can feel free to go off, and if you want to prosecute for a simple maiming, for simple assault and battery, if

you feel strongly that you can prove beyond a reasonable doubt Allen Iverson hit this person, then go for it. You're allowed to do that.

Я

1.9

The Commonwealth Attorney chose not to reinstitute any litigation against those three and -- but Melvin was sort of stuck. On the other hand, Melvin didn't have to spend about four to five months in jail, which the other three guys did before Wilder gave -- let them out early basically. He didn't pardon them or anything. So I think that's pretty much the story now. That's the update.

I've got these -- I guess Shaun wants me to give the -- these are the actual -- this is the final sentencing order on Melvin Stephens, and he's got to pay the \$8,997.

I guess my involvement, just briefly how the thing with Iverson is, after he got -- how I got involved with Iverson, after he got the 15 years with ten suspended, then that's when he retained me for the appeal, and there was a rather tumultuous few months there in trying to get him out and everything else.

I would like to take this as a public opportunity to thank one attorney who did a great deal, and I think throughout the whole -- while this

thing was going on, he did it -- he was kind of behind the scenes. His name is Theophlise Twitty. He's a former Director of Peninsula Legal Aid. He was in Richmond at the time. He was doing something with Wilder. I think he was the Director of Public Safety, or something, and he was absolutely instrumental in hooking up a lot of these things, as far as how Allen actually got out of city farm.

I think that's about where I'm at. I have to leave fairly soon, so I don't know if you want to have more presentations.

MS. RATTLEY: We wanted to hear from everyone, Mr. Ellenson, and then we would have questions to the panel. We're operating on a very tight schedule.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Chairman. We're being -- fighting an ever-losing battle with time all day long. Being cognizant of that, Ms. Shaun Brown.

MS. BROWN: I'm going to try to make my remarks brief as well, because I think it's very important we get through the panel and ask questions because there are lots of details that I know you want to understand.

This morning we had an opportunity to

listen to the information regarding the sentencing, and I think one of your commissioners commented on the amount of information that you were given this morning; but I think beyond focusing on the questions about the inequality of the sentencing, if I can follow up on something that Reverend Marcellus Harris said earlier this morning, and that is, some of our concerns in tracking the policies of the Commonwealth Attorney's Office, and the concerns that we have in terms of addressing the Judicial Review Commission.

Attorney Ellenson gave a very brief version of a long ordeal that pretty much could have resulted in a major race riot in the City of Hampton and on the Peninsula. If it were not for many of the people sitting at this table, and some of the people in the audience, and thousands of people here in the City of Hampton, there would have been a race riot that would not even begin to address what happened in the '60's.

So I think it's important that you understand that your staff members came three years ago in 1993, and we were glad to see them, and we very much believe that that had a lot to do with Allen Iverson staying in the city farm and not going to the penitentiary, as daily calls were made to send

him there, as well as the other young men who were in the Hampton City Jail.

There is an inherent problem in the judicial system in Virginia, and the ability of the judiciary to remain impartial. In 1985, the law in Virginia changed to revoke the rights of the people of Virginia, and to establish instead a judicial inquiry and review commission. There are only seven members of the Judicial Review Commission, all of whom are political appointees.

Currently B. M. Milner of the

Judicial Review Commission is a member of the law

firm of Jones, Blechman, Woltz & Kelly. If you might

recall, Attorney Ellenson mentioned that Attorney

Kelly was Allen Iverson's first attorney; so as you

can see, we felt that we really had no recourse in

terms of the decision that Judge Overton had made.

There was no place to go. Here sitting on the

Judicial Review Commission in Richmond was a member

of the law partner who represented Allen Iverson, and

later that representation by Attorney Kelly lead to a

malpractice suit by Iverson, which was dropped.

One might say there was some intimidation there, but that is yet to be seen, and that's a discussion at another date. But the point

is, we had no place to go.

Our recourse, as I said, is and still -- still is and was limited at the time. It is the usual course of business for lawyers on the Peninsula to look to the community for help in keeping the playing ground and the court fair, especially if their clients are black, male, and young. Here on the Peninsula, lawyers will quickly say that all they want is a fair chance for their clients in court.

In this community, we found that the Hampton Four was no exception. Not only was it no exception, but many of the tactics and strategies to keep the playing ground fair were used and can be reflected in the cases of Stephens, Wynn, Iverson, and Simmons.

The influence of legal variables and the extra legal variables we heard the gentleman, Dr. Kern, talk about this morning, and the political motivation, determine the environment in which the lawyers and all of us as supporters had to operate in.

Before drawing any further conclusion, or even beginning to make some . suggestions that some of us on the panel would like

to make, I think it's important to note in the community we found three types of views of the criminal justice system. They can be quickly summarized as follows: The legal system here reflects the authority, control, and interest of those holding political power. Efforts are made to create a perception that those in authority represent the will of the masses.

As a result of this, extra legal variables, such as your level of poverty, the color of your skin, your age, your sex, your education, your ability to find a lawyer that will not be threatened, who is willing to go to court for you, are all attributes of offenders that may increase the severity of sentencing directly or indirectly here on the Peninsula.

The legal -- and those, of course, influence the legal variables and whether you take a plea, or trial, or prior record of criminal history. I would suggest that black American males on the Peninsula are viewed as terrorists. I would go far beyond the description of stereotypes that you talked about, Mr. Darden, this morning, or even some of the descriptions that Dr. Kern talked about the impact of the stereotypes on the legal system.

As one of many who sat in the courtroom with Judge Overton, the concern of the public safety and the issues of whether or not Iverson and Simmons and Wynn should be released for bond, were major issues and major points of discussion. They were a threat to society. And we

heard that time and time again.

One of the ways that the terrorists, as I say, in terms of perception are controlled and somewhat subdued is that efforts are made, I think, by the Commonwealth Attorney's Office to politicize the crime of the offenders in a way to try to openly publicize their motives.

There's another tactic that we saw -we see even in some of the cases today, and what we
saw back in '93, in terms of trying to use
traditional offenses to charge, in this case, the
students. The maiming by mob charge which Attorney
Ellenson talked about before is very interesting and
applies very much to your conversations this morning
about the Virginia sentencing guidelines.

Because as was discussed this morning, if the Commonwealth offers -- if they know what the sentences are going to be and what the guidelines are for judges, then they can maneuver and

manipulate the various sentences to make sure that the judges have no option but to sentence and to use certain sentencing procedures.

In the second view, the legal system here, it's reflected in terms of a shared society values and a consensus of moral solidarity. The prior -- the variables of prior record and criminal history are indicators of an offender's unwillingness to conform to society's moral standard. Where racism is ingrained, and of course we believe that truly is the case here, the sentencing is even more severe.

This is an important point in terms of the role of the Commonwealth Attorney's Office again, because just as we were involved in raising the level of consciousness and raising money to pay the legal fees, there was an opposing, and just as vigorous, campaign by people who could be seen as associated with the Commonwealth's office that they had to persuade the community that these fellows, in fact, had prior records, that they were a menace to society, and there was a constant effort to justify the public — to justify the maiming by mob charge. It's as if the Commonwealth's office would say, Charge them with maiming by mob and then go out in the court of public opinion to try to convince the

community that that is the case, and because of their prior records, which they had none, because of their criminal history, because of where they live, because of their parents, then they deserve to go to jail, in particular they deserve to go to the penitentiary.

2.3

Here it's important in this third view of what you see on the Peninsula, I believe it's a combination of all of these legal variables, and what I call the extra legal variables: The color of your skin; the level of your income; most importantly, as I mentioned to one of your Commissioners earlier this morning, we have a tremendous problem here in finding lawyers to go to court.

It is a problem where we can find attorneys, and given if they are white attorneys representing black people, we soon expect that the white attorneys are sanctioned or criticized in some form or fashion because they have black clients. I'm not a lawyer so I can say things that some of the legal minds at this table can't say, but I run into that all the time, and I see that it's not just a case of not being able to find a lawyer; but when you find a lawyer and if the lawyer is white and you are black, and if they defend you and they do a good job,

then the lawyers have problems for some time going before other judges.

I think that this last view of all of these kinds of variables coupled together best explains the environment that all of us had to operate. With little or no means of legal redress, meetings, marches, and rallies in a normal show of support and concern. In the 24-hour watchful eye of Lyn Simmons, who represented the other young men, and Ellenson, and a number of other legal minds, and I have to say these people will forever remain nameless because of fear of retaliation, these people were very much involved in creating an environment to keep track of things on an hourly and on a daily basis.

They did so in order to give some assistance and some hope again that Allen Iverson would not be moved from the city farm to the penitentiary, and Xavier Wynn and Michael Simmons would remain at the Hampton City Jail; and, of course, Melvin Stephens would remain in school.

With little or no legal redress, we were forced to come together, and as one of our flyers would point out, stay together. We have some of the various flyers. What we have here, the articles, newspaper articles that were in the various

newspapers, the magazines, as you might well imagine, with little or no legal redress, we had to resort to the environment on -- outside of the courtroom to try to keep, as we say, the playing ground in the courtroom fair. Tremendous amount of public support nationwide in order to try to keep an eye on what was going on here with these cases.

I think you're here because you understand, like us, that this is the tip of the iceberg. There are other people who will come later today. They had to be convinced to come because, again, of a concern of threats of what would happen if they came to all places, City Hall, City Council Chambers, to talk about their concerns. They are coming this evening and they are coming with more details on their situations.

This community had to put together a tremendous fight, raise a lot of money in order to get the results that we did get. Unfortunately, Melvin has a bill close to \$9,000, and that's something this community will have to help him address; but I think what's important for you to understand is that there are a number of people who are coming, and it is our hope that you will not come back three years from now, but you came three years

ago, and your staff, and took notes and had discussions, and there were some -- yes, as a result of your coming, that played a tremendous impact.

We're hoping now that your role will be one of seeking -- helping us to seek some justice in an environment in which we had to result to thousands of articles and flyers, and what have you, to keep things even to the point of being somewhat even.

The rest of the people of the panel are going to talk about the environment and some of their experiences. As Mr. Ellenson said, he has to leave, and we will try to make this short, but I think, again, it's important to understand we're only here because we seriously believe that you're going to try to do something to assist us in bringing in the right agencies in order to take a look at what's going on here on the Peninsula.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Ms. Brown.

And that's a reminder that is scheduled for 6:15 p.m.

this evening, we'll have an open session, so we'll

have time at that time for the questions.

We next go to Ms. Pat Fromal.

MR. DARDEN: Mr. Moderator, just one quick question. I wanted to find out is Mr. Ellenson

1 going to be able to stay for questions? 2 MS. RATTLEY: Yeah, we'll be finished 3 and come right back --4 MR. ELLENSON: I kind of had to leave around -- like real soon. 5 6 MR. PATRICK: Do you want to go ahead and ask him some questions? 7 Well, it's up to you. 8 MR. DARDEN: 9 You're moderating, but I think it's important --MR. PATRICK: 10 Yeah, I think it's 11 important then that since he has to leave, that we 12 ought to ask any questions now. 13 MR. ELLENSON: I know more specifics, 14 I think. I can just give you facts and maybe they 15 can give you more opinions as to how things played 16 off. 17 Well, does anybody else MR. PATRICK: 18 have a question for him? 19 MR. DARDEN: Mine was not really that 20 specific, but in terms of Ms. Brown's point a moment 21 ago that they've had difficulty -- "they" being the 22 community of people -- getting legal counsel to carry 23 on with the issues that they're concerned with, and 24 from the perspective of a lawyer, I just wanted to 25 get some insight into why that should be? What's the problem?

MR. ELLENSON: I'll give you a quick, easy example. After the Iverson case -- I mean, I have a wife and three kids. I've got to earn a living. I do court-appointed work. I had a judge call me in his office and say, You're not getting any more cases. I can't officially remove you from the list, but I'm not going to give you any more cases.

MR. DARDEN: And that's because you

represented --

MR. ELLENSON: Yeah, he straight-up said, Because you raised so much hell over there in Hampton with the circuit court judges, I'm not going to let you come over here and raise hell with our judges, and that was it.

MR. DARDEN: And that's generally understood through the bar, and people have decided not to --

MR. ELLENSON: Unless you know -there's David Baugh, and there's a few other lawyers
that really can make a living simply on retained
cases, and if you're doing a lot of criminal defense
work, but if you're going to keep your hand in it and
you want to go to court every day, you're going to
have some court-appointed cases; and if you get out

here and do some of these more controversial cases, 1 you're not going to get that kind of work. 2 And then also, on the retained cases, 3 you're going to get people telling -- saying now, you 4 know, that lawyer over there, he's no good, don't go 5 And sort of the word gets out like that. 6 7 MS. BROWN: I have been in court. Не has been threatened in court by the judges. 8 MR. DARDEN: Well, does that kind of 9 action coming from the bench constitute grounds for a 10 11 complaint? 12 MS. BROWN: To who? The Judicial --MR. DARDEN: 13 Commission of Judicial Review. 14 They're controlled. 15 MS. BROWN: No. MR. DARDEN: I want Mr. Ellenson --16 17 MR. ELLENSON: What good is it going 18 to do you? It's not going to do any good. 19 So you could complain, MR. DARDEN: 20 but you don't think it would do any good? 21 MR. ELLENSON: Correct. 22 MR. STEINBERG: The Judicial Inquiry 23 and Review Commission in the last 26 years has only 24 sanctioned five judges and taken two off the bench. 25 It's a system of foxes guarding the fox house.

MR. DARDEN: I want to be really clear about this, but it does seem there's a whole string of problems that emanate from the people who want counsel not being able to get it, through the attorneys who want to give it to them being barred from doing so, to the judges introducing bias to make sure that certain kinds of issues don't come to court. Is that what you're saying?

MR. ELLENSON: Yeah, I think that's what we're all saying.

MS. RATTLEY: I think traditionally it's known throughout the community that if you get into trouble, and your best bet is to go out of the city to have a lawyer, and if they can reach those lawyers outside of the city before you can get there, or if they're a little weak, they will not take the case either. We've lived with that for many years.

I think in the Iverson case, it all came to the surface. Embarrassment, one after the other, and they know that they will not be considered part of the game after taking a case in defiance of a particular judge or law firm, if you understand what I'm saying.

MR. DARDEN: I understand.

MS. RATTLEY: If I needed a lawyer, I

FOX REPORTING

would probably leave the city to go outside to get someone to represent me if the case involved a touchy political segment or issue.

MR. DARDEN: Yes. I have a follow-up that has just occurred to me in terms of what our procedures usually ask a staff. Considering the nature of your statement, could you give us a little more specific information so that we might be better able to track these actions even down to -- to where we might find the individuals who were involved in blocking you?

MR. ELLENSON: What do you mean, names of judges or cases or --

MR. DARDEN: I'm not asking you to do that, because we don't want that kind of individual identification, but we do need to at least be, I think, specific enough so that for our purposes we can try to pinpoint where the problem is. If you can do that, maybe the courts, the cities. Which city are you talking about?

MR. ELLENSON: I agree with them. I think it's pretty -- I think it's fairly widespread. I think the more that the judicial nominating and appointment process opens up, where you've got -- where you get more of a rainbow-type of judiciary,

that makes a difference, because you might have an old segregationist who's been on the bench for thirty years, who was on the bench prior to, you know, integration -- I mean, Overton, he went on the bench in 1965, and we all know Loving versus Virginia didn't happen until '67. So when he started practicing, when he started sitting on the bench, segregation was legal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But once you get judges -- you know, because judges kind of all hang around, too, and once the judges get other judges and then they sit and can talk with an African American judge, for example, or a woman judge, or -- and then they get sort of a different idea, and you started breaking up -- trying to break up places like James River Country Club and those kinds of things so that these old white males don't constantly just see other old white males that they're hanging around, so I think the answer sort of lies with opening up the judicial appointment You get more spectrum of judges. I think that opens it up. If I go in front of a judge who's not a certain -- then you've got more of a level playing field.

MR. DARDEN: Let me explain my line of questioning, and then I'll be done. I hear very

For

loud and clearly, as all of us do, the perception 1 that you had and want us to get of the problems and 2 the conditions that you have to operate under. 3 us to really move forward as an agency, and coming 4 out of this meeting into even conclusions and 5 recommendations that the committee, this committee 6 might wish to forward to the appropriate authorities, 7 the more information that you can give us, which will 8 9 be specific, will give us the basis for firm The more diffuse your statement is, 10 conclusions. then the less likely it is that it will be able to 11 draw the conclusion that you're suggesting. 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My example about MR. ELLENSON: Overton with the threats -- the only way you can get a fair trial in a lot of places is to take a jury, but if you take a jury and you lose, you're going to get hammered on sentencing, so that's -- so the only way -- a recommendation, if you really want to level out the playing field, don't let juries sentence in Virginia. We're one of the very few states that allow that. There's only a couple of states in the country that do that, and what that does is, as a practitioner, you don't want to take a jury because you're scared, but even though you think you got a pretty decent shot of getting the person off, and the

1 person's truly not guilty, you can't take a jury 2 because you can't risk it because the jury is also 3 going to sentence. 4 MR. GALVIN: I want to ask you one 5 more question before you leave, please. You made a general statement in terms of this, in terms of it's 6 What I'm looking for, and I believe 7 everywhere. 8 Mr. Darden is looking for, is if you could be a 9 little more specific of what you're calling 10 Are we talking about the entire State of everywhere. 11 Virginia, or are we talking about Hampton, Newport 12 Could you be a little more specific in a 13 geographic location? 14 MR. ELLENSON: 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The major places that I practice are Hampton, Norfolk, and Newport News. If I was going to rank them, I'd rank Hampton the worst, Norfolk after that, and then Newport News --Newport News is all right. It's getting there. It's getting there because --

> MS. RATTLEY: That's good to know.

You asked me -- that's MR. ELLENSON: my perception.

MR. GALVIN: That's what we're asking is a little bit more in specific for us to be able to take some action. I'm not asking specifically in

terms of what court and what judge.

MR. ELLENSON: Hampton certainly improved, though, because you don't have Judge Gray and you don't have Judge Overton, because Gray killed himself and Overton got promoted to the Court of Appeals. So then Chris Hutton gets his position because he gets promoted there.

REVEREND HARRIS: Let me ask a question before you leave. My name is Curtis Harris. In your opinion, will it be better for the majority of the citizens in this area, and for the State of Virginia, would it be better to have judges elected, or would you go for the -- keep it as it is, even though it's flawed?

MR. ELLENSON: Elected, because there would be more accountability. I think it would even things out.

MR. GALVIN: Would you like it recorded that there was a lot of sentiment from the audience on elected?

MS. RATTLEY: Mr. Ellenson, if you have anything in writing you wish to leave, I would --

MR. ELLENSON: I think Shaun's got

- 11

them.

1 MS. BROWN: We have copies. 2 MR. ELLENSON: Thank you. 3 MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Ellenson. 4 Next we hear from Ms. Pat Fromal. 5 Am I pronouncing your name correctly? 6 7 MS. FROMAL: Fromal. I'm one of the ones that Shaun had to 8 9 coerce into coming here today. MS. RATTLEY: They can't hear you. 10 I'm one of the ones that 11 MS. FROMAL: 12 Shaun had to coerce into coming here today. My life 13 has not been pleasant over the last five years, six 14 years, because I stood up to a judge in Hampton. 15 stood up to him for several reasons. For one thing, 16 .he called me in his chamber and asked me what I was 17 doing bringing these black people into his courtroom. 18 The reason I was bringing him into 19 his courtroom is because I filed a civil action to prevent the illegal foreclose of a young black 20 21 couple's property. 22 Now, we wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for the visibility of Allen Iverson. 23 24 bless this young man's heart, because I think the 25 Lord gave him a mission that he didn't know about,

because what's going on in Hampton and what went on in Hampton with the Iverson case, has been going on in Hampton for twenty years, maybe longer than that, but, you know, my age is only a certain span of memory.

1.8

Now, I grew up here. I practiced as a CPA here for twenty years before my son was killed in a Hampton street and I began to question the role of the Commonwealth Attorney's Office, so I read law and I passed the bar exam the first time I took it. I'm not very popular, maybe because I did that; maybe because I spoke out against police and judicial conspiracy in covering up the death of a six-year-old child; maybe because I objected to them building the Coliseum on private property instead of using government financing. Whatever the reason, it all culminated when I stood up to Judge Nelson Overton over Brenda Jones' property here in Hampton.

The bottom line is, if you want to start any place, just look at a few of the cases handled in Hampton.

You could almost start with any judge, but since we're here because of the Iverson case, why not start with Judge Overton? Why not ask the questions as to what his involvement was in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

David Murray case, because 400 people would have saved 42 million dollars if he had acted on what he knew was going on 15 years before the public knew it.

Ask why a six-year-old child was struck by a probable drunk driver, someone with a forty-year history, on his way to a court-ordered AA meeting on Kecoughtan Road in Hampton, Virginia, and the Commonwealth Attorney and Assistant Commonwealth Attorney came to the scene of the crime, sent the 67-year-old cataract, glass-eyed man home without a sobriety test, told the public the story the child came off the curb, and twenty years later when asked under oath, Mr. Boester said, Oh, he came from behind a parked car. I said, Mr. Boester, I lived on that street for thirty years. That's been a no-parking zone for thirty years. Did the car -- did the driver that parked the car there get a ticket? He himself looked at the accident report that's on file in Hampton Police Department -- and if it's not anymore, I still have a copy of it -- and said no decent prosecutor would have dismissed a case on this. Ι said, Mr. Boester, you did.

And then he went to work for the insurance company that was our carrier, that had the major liability, and they never let that insurance

company into court. Nelson Overton saw that case for 15 years and finally demanded a twenty-five thousand-dollar settlement that's sitting in the Hampton courthouse, except for the money he gave the attorneys. He was determined we would not even get the money to bury our son.

Just look at a couple of those kinds of cases and ask why. Why would a judge, an impartial judicial leader, do such a thing? A judge's wife told me about ten years ago to back off. They weren't going to let me in.

Let me tell you a secret, ladies and gentlemen, I don't want in. I want the law to work for everybody. I want Brenda Lee Jones to be able to enjoy her property just like you and I sometimes can enjoy our property if we're not under judicial tyranny. And I want a six-year-old child, when a six-year-old child dies, I want to know why. I want investigation of that accident.

When a lawyer in this town is stealing 42 million dollars from people, I want the legal community in this town to be held accountable when they know it and they're getting checks out of his trust account. I want those questions answered.

I want to know why a young man who's

never been in trouble, doesn't have a history -- and I worked in the juvenile courts in Newport News for three years every day. I represented hundreds of juvenile defendants.

I had one little boy steal 36 cars.

He was 12 years old, couldn't reach the accelerator.

I'm giving him a lecture in my office, and he said,

Ms. Fromal, now you know they ain't going to do

nothing to me. I'll go up there and get a pink shirt

or a red shirt. I didn't even know about pink shirts

and red shirts until that day.

If you stay three months, you get a pink shirt. If you stay six months, you're a bad boy and you get a red shirt and you stay six months. And he was kind of looking forward to it. They had a pool table.

Now, that's what normally happens in the juvenile court. It's very frustrating. You do not want to see these children go to jail, but you do want to see them rehabilitated. You do want to see them taken care of. You do want to see the system do a little better than giving them a pink shirt and a red shirt.

But what happened to Allen Iverson and these young men in that bowling alley was

disgraceful. But let me tell you something, I'll give you a group of papers, and I've been writing to Congressmen, to the Judicial Review Committee, since 1990. That was three years before Allen Iverson. It was probably '89 because it was two years before I represented Brenda Jones.

To what response? I got one letter from a subhead of a Civil Rights Commission in Washington saying that it was really a state matter. Well, I believe in state rights. My hero is Thomas Jefferson. I liked the fact he had red hair. But state rights does not give any state the right to ignore the Constitution of the United States. It doesn't give any state the right to take away human rights. That's what we're all about.

You know, we want to stop talking about black, white, and purple. We want to start talking about people and what's right for people.

And let me tell you what's happening in Virginia.

I've got a white Jewish friend of mine here today, and there's a young lady that you're not going to believe her story when you hear it tonight I brought in from Richmond.

It's not just happening here in Hampton, and it's not just happening to blacks; but

let me tell you something, when one of us, any one of us -- and I don't care how bad we are, how good we are -- when any one loses our Constitutional rights in any courtroom, whether it's the district court, whether it's the circuit court, whether it's the Supreme Court of the United States, when we start losing our rights in that courtroom, it affects everybody in this country. It doesn't just affect the person in that courtroom that day -- and whether white America believes it -- in every decision made by every judge in every court affects them personally. Personally.

б

Now, if white people can't get a fair hearing in this Good Old Boy state, what do you think is happening to black people? And I promised I wouldn't even go that far, so I'm going to stop there, and I'm going to give you lots of reading material.

MS. RATTLEY: Thank you. The staff will come and pick that up.

MR. PATRICK: Next we'll hear from Ms. Joyce Hobson.

MS. HOBSON: Members of the Civil
Rights Commission, first permit me to thank you for
giving the people of this community an opportunity to

share some of their judicial system experiences.

2.3

Secondly, permit me to ask, number one, what is your mission? Number two, what are your standard operating procedures? And, number three, when will you publish your findings? And, number four, how will the commission implement or effect changes that help people to have just, equitable, and fair treatment as they utilize the judicial system? Not that I want you to answer it today, but perhaps in writing in the near future.

In terms of the case of the Hampton
Four, let me say for the record, that the S.W.I.S.
Legal Defense Fund, which is now defunct, sent
letters ascertaining the support of local, state, and
national civil rights organizations and groups that
should have lent their support; namely, the Southern
Poverty Law Center, the Virginia Legislative Black
Caucus, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the Southern
Christian Leadership Conference, let me note and say
that this conference, this group -- it's a state
group -- did lend its support throughout. Had it not
been for that group, I don't think we could have had
the success we had with the Hampton Four case.

In addition to that, we notified and wrote to the National Association for the Advancement

of Colored People, the National Urban League, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change, Virginia State NAACP, the Hampton branch NAACP, and the Newport News branch NAACP.

I will submit to you letters of response at a later date, most of which denied involvement and/or seeked not to follow the S.W.I.S. legal defense fund, which was a local community support group, so that they could control the outcome that would best serve their organization with little regard about the outcome of the cases of these four young boys. They saw this as a golden opportunity to increase membership and increase PR visibility nationally.

As for my personal harassment as spokesperson of the S.W.I.S. legal defense fund, it came in the following forms: Verbal, written, wire tapping of my home telephone, searching of my school records in this chamber, being followed by officers of the law, a death threat. Mind you, that these tactics have not stopped. Just this week I was followed by a policeman.

The documentation of these instances of harassment will be filed with this commission, and again, I thank you.

MR. PATRICK:

gained from talking with other people.

Thank you, Ms. Hobson.

We next hear from Mr. Steinberg,

Director of Children First and Family Resolution

Council.

_

MR. STEINBERG: Thank you for this opportunity. I am a legal analyst, a family counselor, and a mediator. I'd say seven years ago I didn't know to spell "mediator" and now I are one. I do counsel about a thousand people a year. About half of those are African Americans. About two-thirds are fathers. I will share with you some of the experiences that I've had, plus those I've

It's easy to follow what has already been said. I'll get into the juvenile justice system in a minute, but primarily we're talking about the whole system of legal, what I call injustice. It is a court system and a legal system out of control.

Judges don't have to answer to anybody on this earth.

We've already indicated that. And if you try to get a grievance filed against a judge, they normally get dismissed summarily by the head of the Judicial Inquiry Review and it never gets to the commission.

If you file a grievance against a lawyer, it gets dismissed by the Director of the

Virginia State Bar, and there is no appellate process. You can't go any further than that. Most of these records are sealed, and I guess you have to get some act of Congress to break through that privacy. They cite confidentiality, and even when we cite freedom of information, they say they're exempt.

When you walk in any courthouse in this land, it is filled by most of the people that I counsel, and the decision's already made before we get there. If you walk into a courthouse in this state -- and it is over throughout the state. You asked what areas of the state, it's wholesale throughout. I deal with people all over the State of Virginia, and I don't see any entity that doesn't discriminate.

then he's hit twice. If you walk into a courthouse, it's like you're walking outside of the United States. The Constitution doesn't exist. We have no freedom. Freedom to raise our children free from interference from the state doesn't exist. In this state, there are over 400 court orders a day either restricting or terminating a father's rights.

Instead of telling these fathers that they should be fathers and be responsible fathers, they're telling

them stay out of the lives of the children, but don't forget to keep sending those paychecks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is no due process. I've said the "due" now is "do as I say" and "do you have any money?" Freedom and liberties has been replaced with injunctions, sanctions, and incarceration. And believe me, we still have debtor's prison. All you have to do is talk to any of the sheriffs. I have talked to two of the entities in Henrico County and Chesterfield County, and they told me that between 25 percent to a third of the people in their jails are in there for civil domestic matters largely related to child support. If a person's in jail for child support, they can't pay child support. They can't earn the money, they get further behind.

Courts now don't interpret law as the Constitution says. They make law. The legislature has now given discretion to the courts, and when you give discretion to the court, you say, Make the law and do what you want to with it. We don't go to court to get our rights anymore. We go to court to lose them. Courts restrict us.

And now the color associated with civil rights has widened to green. We have the best legal system that money can buy with liberty and

justice for all, those who can afford it. And in domestic law, a lawyer told me there were three P's in domestic law, politics, personality and perjury. I added one more, profit.

As far as the Constitution goes, again, it doesn't exist. Beyond due process, how many people have you ever heard in domestic law getting a trial by jury? Doesn't happen.

If you think you're entitled to an arraignment, or an indictment, it doesn't exist either. Judges have said, I don't know if this is right or wrong. This is what I'm going to do. If you don't like it, you can appeal it.

The appellate process not only costs money, but it takes from one to three years, and even if you win at the Court of Appeals level, you have three circuit court judges, or used to be circuit court judges, ruling on another circuit court judge. Even if you win, you don't win the decision to be overturned. It's simply sent right back to the same judge, and they tell that judge, Do it again.

Most of the decisions that I've been familiar with and have had contact with, practically 90 percent, the appellate court simply says lower court judge has not abused his discretion. Lower

court decision affirmed. And this is true not only at the state level but the federal level.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have known of federal cases that have been filed. Some didn't even make it to the clerk's hands so that they put a case number on it. The judges dismiss them summarily. No evidentiary hearing, no finding of facts, and on top of that, the judges, in order for you not to come back with this lawsuit, civil rights claim, under 42 USC 1983, they simply sanction you. I've been sanctioned \$2,500 just for bringing the case, and the judge in my case says, And I am thinking about telling you -- or having you come to me first before you file any more. I'm giving serious consideration to an injunction barring you from filing any more matters in this court without securing the advance permission of this court.

child, as I did -- I put my own daughter as next friend and natural father on one of my petitions. I was accused of practicing law, and I've now been enjoined from the continuation of practicing law.

I'm having to fight that in the Supreme Court of Virginia, but I've been told that last year there were 3,300 cases -- petitions before the Supreme

Court of Virginia, and only 11 were heard. So my chances of even getting heard are slim to none.

I was also told that in civil matters, the Assistant Attorney General says, Claims for civil relief need not be supported by the specific statutory provision. They don't even need laws.

There is a tie-in to all of this and the matter before you today. When fathers are taken out of the lives of their children -- and the previous panel talked about juvenile justice and building bigger programs. We don't need to build bigger programs, we need to get government and courts out of our lives when they're not wanted and needed.

There is no compelling state interest involved in most of these cases unless there is abuse or neglect. And what happens is that when fathers are out of the lives of their children, they are more susceptible to emotional health problems, physical health problems, making poor grades in school, teenage suicide, teenage drugs, crime, and the list goes on. We don't need to necessarily build bigger prisons if we just do the opposite, make sure that parents parent their children.

In short, I guess in closing, the

FOX REPORTING

system we now have is a system out of control, and I call it a system of the lawyers, by the lawyers, for the lawyers for profit. Judges become -- judges were lawyers, and it is a system full of cronyism. I hope that you can help us before it's too late.

you.

I have people that come to me that are talking about overthrowing the government, and I don't believe in that. I don't believe in violence.

But I surely understand it when I hear of someone walking in shooting up a courtroom or doing something bizarre. I can never condone it, but I can understand it. I hope you help correct the situation before it gets out of control even more.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Steinberg, thank

Our final panelist is Mr. Andrew Shannon, who is a member of the neighborhood council 24-34 A, Inc, which is a civic organization.
Mr. Shannon.

MR. SHANNON: Thank you. I'll use the podium. Good afternoon to the Chairperson, members of the committee, staff, panelists, and, of course, the audience.

Unfortunately the chairperson of 24-34 A, Mr. Walter Bingham -- he's present in the

audience -- he's unable to speak, but I'll try to do
my best to speak on his behalf, but I certainly
appreciate him giving me this opportunity to speak
and represent --

1.6

MS. RATTLEY: Could you ask him to stand?

MR. SHANNON: Would you stand, Mr. Bingham. Thank you.

I certainly appreciate Mr. Bingham giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the council. I'd like to continue on the theme, and update a continuing problem as a topic, subtopic, The Commerce of Justice when there is Wealth, or the Blindness of Justice.

Several years ago, I was asked, Are you a slave? This question was presented to me by a very prominent leader of civil rights in Newport News, a person who I admired greatly and has inspired me to fight for what is right. I observed conditions of inequality in the City of Newport News, towards the citizens of the southeast community. I observed public officials use public funds for their own personal gain. I observed, in the same community Allen Iverson grew up in, a community center that did not have adequate heat in the wintertime and no

air-conditioning in the summertime when other recreational facilities had these resources.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I was able to ascertain the reason the facility did not have the resources. I did not have the adequate funds because the funds in the African American community were only on paper.

In reality, it was a slush fund for city manager.

When I began to speak out on these issues, there was silence among the elected officials chosen to represent the people, silence from the local branch of the nation's oldest civil rights group, but, you know, I found encouragement through the community. In the midst of the hostile retaliatory environment that I was subjected to as an employee of the City of Newport News, because I cared about our youth and having resources for them, I found peace. I found support and encouragement. Ι found peace from a former African American female, mayor of Newport News, who lived in the City of Newport News, who is Mrs. Jessie Rattley.

I found peace from an active vocal
Baptist minister involved in civil rights in midtown
Newport News, Reverend Marcellus Harris. I found
hope from the president of the state chapter of the
Southern Christian Leadership Council all the way in

Hopewell, Virginia, Reverend Curtis Harris; and I found special guidance from my home church, First Baptist Church of Denbigh, and members.

But I also found encouragement from a local neighborhood council, 24-34 A, whose president I'm speaking on behalf of today, Mr. Walter Bingham. One of the faithful members of 24-34 A is Mr. O'Neil, who is the grandfather of Allen Iverson, one of the, quote, Hampton Four, and I've heard Mr. Bingham and others speak earlier today while you-all were in discussions, and he mentioned to me that Mr. O'Neil, said -- that's Allen's grandfather -- said all his grandson wanted to do was play basketball. That was his goal. Yet he had to endure all these obstacles. If you would like an update on the continuing problems, I am not here to sugar-coat the issue.

Before you complete your fact-finding meeting and community forum, you'll be presented with a well-oiled machine of money makers and justice takers. They are the members of an elitist organization, whoever the print media loves to quote. They tell you there is no problem. Everything is fine, always has been and always will be.

Justice is blind without grass-root organizations, and people who stand up and take a

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

stand when there is a need for street lights, neighborhood police precincts, and services available for the disenfranchised. So I submit to you today, yes, the problems are increasing because the suppression of people are continuing, and the climate is fertile for more problems unless we take a stand against the money makers and justice takers.

We must take a stand when we know we are right and not succumb to the pressure of a \$20,000 to \$30,000 job, or be invited to socials or being labeled a troublemaker. So I say no, I am not a slave to injustice because of economic threats or Presently I serve as the Director of social status. Youth Services working on prevention and early intervention programs in cooperation with the Virginia Community Crime Control Act and with the Department of Juvenile Justice working to reduce recidivism in our courts.

Also, I'm a co-owner of the Cultural Arts Center and Davis Performing Arts, which is located in Hampton at New Market Mall, and I also serve as the Executive Director of Project Reachful, which is a Peninsula district, not a Methodist outreach ministry.

We have money makers and justice

takers on some of our city councils, particularly in Newport News. We have influence peddlers where -- Hampton as well, but I have to speak on what I know, and I have others who can attest to what is going on in Hampton.

2.3

We have influence peddlers where a prominent CPA who was routinely -- who routinely conducts business with the City, also served on the council. As long as the needs of our youth go unserved, as long as the voices of members of 24-34 A, and other groups, are met with a deaf ear by City officials, because we have people who have crowned themselves the kings and queens of the people, and everything must go through them, justice will continue to be injustice in Hampton and Newport News.

I request your assistance to take an inventory, a comprehensive assessment of civil rights, particularly in Hampton and Newport News.

When attorney Ellenson spoke about retainers, I'm presently involved in a Title VII case that involves the City of Newport News, and I am concerned about the close connection of agencies, such as EEOC, with local officials involving cases.

Primarily they rule the cases inconclusive, which gives the plaintiffs the added

financial burden against a municipality when their resources are already limited. That results in the commerce of justice.

I endured three years of retaliatory threats and coercion during my tenure as a center director for Newport News, which was a lower-level City position, because I spoke out about conditions. I asked you if you are looking for the truth, please come to the grassroots organizations and people who are sincere. I was betrayed by the chairman of the Legal Redress Committee of a local NAACP branch for \$40,000 and a Lincoln Continental. I was followed, put under surveillance, and a case manufactured against me. Money makers and justice takers. Thank you.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

MS. RATTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Shannon.

Let me please add that Mr. Shannon is a prolific

poet, and I think that was reflected in his

presentation.

MR. SHANNON: Thank you.

MR. PATRICK: I'm looking at the clock on the wall. Are there any questions for the panelists?

MS. RATTLEY: May I go back here? As

this morning I explained, when we come back tonight, you will be given the right to speak. If you didn't say everything you wanted to say, you can have another shot, but please let the staff person know who you are. He's keeping a list of those who would like to speak tonight.

Yes, sir.

18.

MR. GALVIN: I have just one question. Ms. Hobson, maybe you could be, as we asked the other panelists, a little bit more specific as far as when you spoke about being followed by policemen this week.

MS. HOBSON: Yes.

MR. GALVIN: How do you make this assessment that it was a policeman who followed you?

Do you have an identification, or do you have a license number? Do you have something that would aid us in this matter?

MS. HOBSON: Oh, yes. Yes, I do. I have a police car number. I have the route that it took. I had the time. I have all of the details that I believe are necessary to prove that I was being followed.

MR. GALVIN: And would you make that available to us, please?

1 MS. HOBSON: Oh, sure. Yes. 2 MS. RATTLEY: Thank you. All right. 3 Thank you very much. Can I have a question? 4 MR. DARDEN: 5 MS. RATTLEY: Yes. One. 6 Actually, I have two. MR. DARDEN: 7 MS. RATTLEY: We're going to stop I invited them to dinner tonight at my home 8 here. 9 thinking that I would have an hour for lunch, I would 10 run home and put some food in the oven. 11 Later they decided they would give me tuna lunch. 12 fish salad, and I had to go in the back, chew it, and 13 turn my back here to try to eat the rest of it. 14 was getting sick. Now, if you don't let me go home 15 16 during the dinner hour to cook your dinner, you're 17 not going to get any dinner at eight o'clock. 18 REVEREND HARRIS: I make a motion to 19 go to dinner. 20 MR. DARDEN: All right. 21 MR. GALVIN: They use a lot of 22 authority --We're used to it. 23 MS. FROMAL: 24 MR. DARDEN: I just actually have two 25 quick questions, maybe getting -- real, real quick.

I know you will give us the 1 One for Ms. Hobson. 2 details about this harassment that you've had, and I just wondered if you could briefly tell us why you 3 think you are being harassed this way? 4 Quite frankly, I have 5 MS. HOBSON: 6 been a political activist in the community for some 7 twenty years. I have engineered a number of historic political firsts in terms of the African American 8 9 community, so it's nothing new for me quite frankly. It just intensified during the Allen Iverson case. 10 11 So it's been really a twenty-year ongoing situation 12 for me. Now, go back to your question. Now, what is it now --13 MR. DARDEN: 14 you say even as late as last week? 15 MS. HOBSON: This week. So I'm 16 MR. DARDEN: This week. 17 trying to get some sense of what's happening now that 18 would continue --19 MS. BROWN: The article in the paper. 20 MS. HOBSON: The announcement of your 21 arrival. 22 MR. DARDEN: In connection with this 23 meeting? 24 MS. HOBSON: The announcement of your 25 arrival. The very day that the article hit the

newspaper, I was followed. 1 2 MR. DARDEN: I'm sorry. My second 3 question I have goes back to Ms. Brown. You mentioned something about an attorney named Kelly and 4 malpractice. 5 6 MS. BROWN: I have a copy of the 7 malpractice suit here for you. I didn't understand what MR. DARDEN: 8 9 that was. Could you just briefly explain what that 10 was. 11 MS. BROWN: Attorney Ellenson 12 explained earlier that there were a number of 13 questions about how Attorney Kelly handled the Allen 14 Iverson case when he was a juvenile in court, and the 15 transfer over to circuit court, and the various procedures that Attorney Kelly did not follow to 16 17 question that decision-making process to transfer him to circuit court. That was the basis of a 18 19 malpractice suit for, I believe it was over a 20 hundred-million-dollar malpractice suit against 21 Attorney Kelly.

The reason why that is important is because Attorney Kelly's law partner served on the Judicial Review Commission.

MR. HARRIS: Hello.

FOX REPORTING

22

23

24

25

1 MS. BROWN: Therefore, we felt that 2 we had, yes, answered the question we can send our paperwork to Richmond, but you know, it's going to 3 fall in a black hole. 4 MR. HARRIS: Hello. 5 6 MR. DARDEN: Thank you. 7 MR. GALVIN: No paperwork was sent 8 in? 9 MS. BROWN: None was sent. 10 MS. MCCLOUD: This question is for 11 Mr. Steinberg. I think you were the one who made the 12 most comments about the extensiveness of what I would 13 consider, or what I would categorize as corruption in Are you seeing that per -- you 14 the judicial system. 15 said throughout Virginia? 16 MR. STEINBERG: Yes, ma'am. 17 MS. MCCLOUD: How do you think that 18 compares with other states? 19 MR. STEINBERG: I network with people 20 all around the country, and it's pretty much epidemic everywhere, but I'm more familiar with what's 21 22 happening in Virginia, and the statistics show -- I 23 mean, it's open record that Judicial Inquiry Review, 24 as I indicated earlier, has only sanctioned five 25 judges in 26 years and removed, or been responsible

for the removal of two.

Either we've got a heck of a good judiciary, or we got a heck of bad check and balance system.

MS. BROWN: I'd like to comment to that. Several years ago my family hired F. Lee Bailey as an attorney, and one of the reasons why he took the case in Virginia is because he was willing very much to state on the record that he believed of all the states in the United States, Virginia had the most corrupt system in terms of lawyers, and that is something that led to him getting involved in our case and led to him several years ago coming to a number of the law schools in the state to speak on behalf of the system here, particularly the type of review of judges and attorneys.

MR. STEINBERG: If one of them gets out of line, they're penalized. We know of certain attorneys who have lost their license when they tried to report corruption. We know of certain judges that have been forced off the bench when they try to do what's right.

MS. FROMAL: They use the disciplinary system in Virginia to hold attorneys in line.

MR. GALVIN: What do you think makes the difference that makes this area unique, or what system are they using outside of this area that doesn't have this happening?

MS. FROMAL: We have probably less public input than most other places. I'm not saying there's not other places that could be as bad. I can't imagine any place being worse than this, but we have no public input into either the lawyer disciplinary system, or into the review committee for judges, and what gives them such power is, our Supreme Court are not administrators of the law, they are the makers of the law, so if something doesn't go through the legislature, the Supreme Court simply writes a rule to say what they want it to.

Murray is a prime example in that he was practicing law without a license. Now, back to the Jones case, the judge's clerk closed a loan in the courthouse not giving information on a second mortgage. With no notice, they were doing a foreclosure sale. The judge's clerk in the courthouse, with the assistance of an attorney preparing a deed for a nonowner of a property. They do it every day. They do it so much they don't even know it's not right.

Well, Murray -- last year they went after real estate agents, and it's almost a necessity. Mortgage companies have gone to real estate agents to do loan closings, because real estate agents were doing them anyway, and lawyers were getting paid for them. So they've by-stepped that and said, Okay, you're doing all the paperwork; we're going to send you the paperwork, fill in the blanks.

Well, they went to the legislators and said -- the lawyers went to the legislators. The judiciary, the legal community started up the legislature and you have to look at what's the percentage of lawyers in the legislature now?

MR. STEINBERG: Certain key committees in the courts of justice committee, out of 20 it's 19.

MS. FROMAL: Well, they went through the legislature. They said, Okay, we're going to stop real estate people from closing loans. And it didn't pass because the bank got involved. The banks had an innate interest. That's our money. We want to know the loans are closed right. We want them done expediently. The lawyers aren't doing a good job. The legislature wouldn't touch it.

22

23

24

25

So what did the Virginia State Bar They had a secret meeting in Roanoke in August and went through the back door, and what they've come out with is, Okay, real estate agents can close loans, but they're now going to be under the discipline of the Virginia State Bar. What gives them that right? When those people have licensed as real estate agents, they didn't make any commitment to the Virginia State Bar. They don't pay dues to the Virginia State Bar. The Virginia State Bar is not even supposed to be a state agency. supposed to be financed by them. But what gives them the right to put in a little law that, Okay, we're just going to move this agency and we're going to make you disciplined. Because that's the way they control the pockets. That's the way they control who does the loan. That's the way they can tell people what to do, because if you don't do it, you're not going to do anything.

And most people when they confront them like that are not like me, and run and hide their head under a rock.

MR. STEINBERG: I was told they don't need law. I was told the Constitution doesn't matter. I raised the Constitution issues, and they

1 said, No, you didn't raise them within 21 days. They 2 said, You don't have Constitutional rights 21 days. 3 MS. MCCLOUD: Who told you that? MR. STEINBERG: Assistant 4 5 Commonwealth Attorney, and the judge backed it up. 6 MS. FROMAL: When Christian Compton 7 of the Supreme Court was questioned on Nelson Overton forcing a \$25,000 settlement, his remark in the 8 9 Supreme Court building on the bench, from the bench, 10 said, Do you mean to tell me that my judge does not 11 have the right to use his discretion in his 12 And I want you to know that it is not his courtroom? 13 The courtroom belongs to the people, and courtroom. 14 that is not Christian Compton's judge. And it's time 15 somebody told him that besides me. 16 MS. RATTLEY: Panel, thank you very 17 much. 18 MR. GALVIN: Thank you for not having 19 much passion. 20 MS. FROMAL: My greatest point is 21 that. That's exactly my point, that controlling 22 lawyers by using the disciplinary system and 23 particularly passionate lawyers, particularly 24 passionate about human rights. 25 This session is ended. MS. RATTLEY:

1 I should like to know if there's Attorney Linda 2 Curtis in the room, Commonwealth's Attorney. 3 I want all of you to know Attorney Linda Curtis, the Commonwealth Attorney, is to speak 4 in about five or ten minutes. She's out of sequence. 5 She was scheduled for tomorrow, but she wants to make 6 her presentation this afternoon. So those of you who 7 would like to hear her -- is that Linda? 8 9 Come right in. This is the 10 Commonwealth Attorney, the Honorable Linda D. Curtis. 11 We're ready to begin. Thank you, Mrs. Curtis. 12 13 I'm a panelist without a MS. CURTIS: 14 panel. Thank you. 15 I'm very glad to have an opportunity 16 to be here. I apologize for not being able to be 17 part of the panel that you had planned for tomorrow. 18 Unfortunately I have a case in court and I'm probably 19 going to be tied up all day, so it's been scheduled 20 for some time. 21 MS. RATTLEY: Would you please hold 22 the mike closer to your mouth? 23 MS. CURTIS: I'm definitely low-tech. 24 I apologize.

25

So as I say, I'm very glad that you

can hear me out of order, and I do apologize for not being able to be part of the panel tomorrow. I want to, I guess start by telling you that you may not be aware that last -- well, actually a couple years ago, our City Council appointed a unity commission, and the unity commission worked for a year on some other issues and then reconvened to look at the issues dealing with race relations in the city.

MS. RATTLEY: May I correct your program. Attorney Curtis is not from the City of

MS. RATTLEY: May I correct your program. Attorney Curtis is not from the City of Newport News. She's Commonwealth Attorney in the City of Hampton.

MS. CURTIS: That's correct.

MS. RATTLEY: You have that incorrect on that sheet for today, but it is correct on the sheet for tomorrow.

MS. CURTIS: When I won't be here.

The Unity Commission, among their functions, commissioned a study to look at how the folks in Hampton perceive the delivery of services in the city, including the justice system, the school system, and other kinds of city services.

When they came back with their report, a copy of that was shared with me, and I thought it was very interesting to see that while

citizens of Hampton across the board were satisfied with, for example, the school board and the way they dealt with racial issues, that the justice system came out in that study very poorly, and that, I'm sure doesn't surprise any of you; but what might have surprised you, and some others, was that that was across racial lines. That was not -- the sampling that they used was random and covered both African Americans and non African American community.

1.8

MS. RATTLEY: Is that the report Mr. Wallace gave us this morning? This was instituted by the City of Hampton?

MS. CURTIS: Yes. So I think that it's clearly -- clearly from my perspective, if the public doesn't have confidence in our justice system, then it doesn't work. If people don't feel that they will get a fair shake in the system, then crimes go unreported, then witnesses refuse to come to court and participate in that process, and the whole system doesn't work.

So when I got that report, I contacted the folks on the Unity Commission and told them that I was very interested in being a part of whatever solutions they felt they were going to be able to come up with, and continue to be very

```
interested.
1
2
                     MS. RATTLEY: Do you have a copy of
3
    that report?
                                   No, I didn't bring it
                     MS. CURTIS:
4
    with me.
5
                                   Do you know the title --
6
                      MR. DARDEN:
7
     we have something here. We want to see if it's the
     same.
8
9
                      MS. CURTIS:
                                   It was a study that was
10
     commissioned by the Unity Commission.
                                              It was a
11
     survey.
                                    Unity Commission?
12
                      MS. RATTLEY:
                                    Yes, the Hampton
13
                      MS. CURTIS:
     Citizens' Unity Commission.
14
                      MR. DARDEN:
15
                                   Would that be the
16
     Citizens' Perception Study?
17
                      MS. CURTIS:
                                    I believe so.
18
                      MR. DARDEN:
                                    Prepared by Jeanine
19
     Perry?
20
                      MS. CURTIS:
                                    Yes.
21
                      MR. DARDEN:
                                    Okay.
22
                                  Mr. Darden, when he
                      MS. CURTIS:
23
     called me, asked me to talk for a few minutes about
24
     the charging process, so I have come prepared to talk
25
     to you about that part of our system.
```

there are essentially four ways that charges can be initiated. The first way is that a citizen can go to a magistrate and make a complaint. And the magistrate has the job of determining whether there is probable cause to issue that warrant and whether the matter is, in fact, a criminal one; and the magistrate makes a determination of probable cause and then issues a warrant. That happens in many, many misdemeanor cases. It also happens in some types of felony cases, but that's fairly unusual.

The second way that a charge can be initiated is that a citizen can make a complaint to the police department. The police department then, either through a uniformed officer or through an investigator, makes a determination that a charge, or charges, are appropriate and then goes to the magistrate and again presents probable cause and gets warrants.

The third way would be police-initiated. That would be the sort of situation where a police officer is driving down the road and sees a car crossing the lines and pulls the car over and eventually goes to the magistrate and gets a DUI, or other kind of appropriate warrants,

where the police see some criminal activity and then initiates that warrant.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The fourth way is the initiation of the charge through the grand jury. In Hampton -- and that does involve directly the Commonwealth's Attorney's office. In Hampton, I would say less than five percent of our indictments are initiated that Normally, that sort of situation arises when the police department does some sort of undercover drug operation and they have an undercover operative who's out on the street, perhaps making drug buys. The police department obviously doesn't want to make an arrest right then and there because then the undercover operative wouldn't be able to continue to work, so they wait until the operation is finished and then they will compare police reports and bring those reports to the Commonwealth Attorney's Office where they will be reviewed and charges will be determined and indictments will be prepared. then we take those charges to the grand jury, which also serves to establish that there's probable cause, and then they issue an indictment, which in this instance, takes the place of a warrant.

Attorney's Office is -- as I say, less than five

In Hampton, the Commonwealth

percent of what we do involves initiating the charges through the grand jury. The vast majority of the charges that we get are initiated largely through police investigation, and secondarily, and much less, through citizen warrants, and our first knowledge of those charges is when the defendant has been arrested and has an initial appearance in the general district court.

1.7

At that point, we generally know only the defendant's name and what the charges are, and it's probably a week or ten days later that a police report comes over that gives us substantive information about the events as to how the offenses came about, what the investigation revealed, witness statements and all that sort of thing.

So the charging decision in Hampton largely is made at the police department level. Once it comes to our office, or if it comes to our office with a request to present indictments directly to the grand jury, then we obviously screen them and make some determination as to what charges should be, and obviously, as the case progresses along through the system, we will make determinations as to whether the evidence supports the charges that have been brought.

For example, the police officer may

charge based on an investigation, a possession of cocaine with intent to distribute charge, which is a more serious charge. Upon looking at the evidence in the case, we may make a determination that the best we can prove is possession, as opposed to the possession with intent. Then we'll make that adjustment and continue on through the life of the case. That determination will only be made, though, after we have received the reports and that sort of thing.

In terms of juveniles, the process is very similar, except that we don't have the ability to initiate charges at the grand jury level with juveniles.

When a charge against a juvenile is sought, whether it be from -- initiated by a citizen or being initiated by a police officer, then rather than going to the magistrates office and getting a warrant, as you would do with an adult, you would go to the juvenile court service unit and get a petition, which is the juvenile equivalent of a warrant. It's a charging document that tells the individual what they're charged with, what code sections, describes the offense, that sort of thing.

Again, the person at the in-take

office makes that same sort of probable cause determination; and again in juvenile court, you normally get the charges -- the first information that we have about charges is when they come in at that arraignment hearing. And again, we get a report on the -- and the same process takes place. And as I mentioned, we do not have the option with juveniles to initiate the charges at the grand jury level.

So that's largely how that process works. It is -- from my office's point of view, each case is looked at individually. The concern of this committee, and the concerns that I have heard expressed before from people in the Unity Commission study and elsewhere, involves the idea that charging is largely race-based, or that the fact there are many, many African Americans in the criminal justice system as it functions, somehow, either charging decisions, or that some other kind of racially based issue.

And I can only tell you that we review the cases on an individual basis, not on a class basis, not as a class of African American defendants versus non-African American defendants.

We don't make decisions based on the ethnicity, the national origin, the gender, the religion, or any of

the other Constitutionally protected classes.

The decisions that we make in individual cases as we're preparing them for trial are based on our view of whether the evidence meets the Constitutional requirements, meets the statutory requirements, and all of the other considerations that go in that vein, as opposed to other considerations which clearly do not pass any kind of muster and certainly are not proper.

MS. RATTLEY: You don't use perceptions when you get a young black, baggy pants --

MS. CURTIS: When that person comes to court, that person's -- whether that charge goes forward is based on what the evidence is against that person.

MS. RATTLEY: No, I'm talking about the process you just explained. You initiated a comment that you do it based on the information you have and nothing else.

MS. CURTIS: Right.

MS. RATTLEY: And since we had a panel earlier today talk about perceptions -- it was fascinating, and I just wondered if you had paid attention to that as far as images that we talked so

much about today. Here's a young kid. He's in your 1 2 office, and you're looking at the evidence given to you, proposed evidence, and you say all you base your 3 decision on as to whether or not he would be 4 5 prosecuted --6 MS. CURTIS: I don't see the defendant. 7 MS. RATTLEY: 8 Oh, okay. MS. CURTIS: I don't make the 9 10 decision based --11 You're talking about MS. RATTLEY: 12 those who do make it when you were saying that they 13 were charged based on the evidence? 14 MS. CURTIS: Well, I quess what I'm 15 trying to convey is that the charging decision is 16 made either by a magistrate, who the defendant is not 17 present at that point, based on a citizen's 18 complaint; or based on a police officer's investigation. 19 20 When we assess the evidence, we'll 21 have a warrant that says, Black male, five-eleven, 22 date of birth, Social Security number, or white male, 23 or whatever, but we don't have anything else. We may 24 have a criminal background history, but that doesn't

change what the evidence is in a case.

25

And our assessment of it in the 1 2 Commonwealth Attorney's Office is not based on seeing somebody who doesn't look like me and making a 3 determination, because I don't see anybody who Δ doesn't look like me. I'm looking at papers. I'm 5 6 looking at reports, and I may be talking to witnesses, but I've never seen the defendant. 7 I don't know the defendant, and I don't have the 8 opportunity to make a determination one way or the 9 10 other, based on anything like that, because I don't 11 have any contact with the defendant.

MR. DARDEN: I'm sorry. I just wanted to follow up on the Chairman's point, to clarify. I think you might not have understood what she was trying to get at.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We heard earlier on, as she was saying, about a number of things, but one of them, in terms of the common behavior in the Commonwealth Attorneys office was that there is a varying practice, particularly with regard to juvenile cases and transfer into the adult -- charging them as adults.

And the statement was that in some cases, some places, Commonwealth Attorneys are routinely, without very much individual

consideration, transferring 14-year-olds depending on the level of the crime -- I think the more serious crimes -- into adult charges. That seemed to suggest a very significant impact on African American population, and the juveniles certainly, but then also the introduction of them into the adult system at an early age has a long-term impact for them, both in terms of what might happen to them actually in incarceration at that age, as well as recidivism throughout their life.

So we're trying to get some sense of what you do in this charge -- the charging process.

MS. CURTIS: In terms of transfer.

MR. DARDEN: What kind of considerations come into play, and also whether in that process -- this is what the Chairman was getting at -- you have some awareness of racial factor since it seems to be a really inordinate impact for African American males?

MS. RATTLEY: May I add that I asked the question because it was from your own remarks when you made a point to say that these people then charge on one thing only, and that is the evidence that they have. That was the reason why I asked the question.

Let me address 1 MS. CURTIS: Okay. 2 the juvenile transfer issue, if I can. Let me also 3 say that I hope at some point in the process of your inquiry, that you also will be taking a look at the 4 disproportionate number of African American victims 5 of crime, because they are certainly victimized at a 6 rate that is significantly higher than their 7 proportion of the population. That's also a fact. 8 And it is in many cases largely African American 9 10 crime with African American victims. 11

MS. RATTLEY: Do you have those statistics?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CURTIS: For Hampton?

MS. RATTLEY: Because we have had some interesting panels on a lot of perceptions are not necessarily true, so do you have proof of that fact?

MS. CURTIS: I've seen police department statistics. We don't keep statistics by race. We keep them by numbers of crimes and felonies versus misdemeanors and that sort of thing. But I've seen the police department have those statistics, and I've seen those. That's where I make that statement from. That's not only true for Hampton. That's true nationwide.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Can I interject here? I'm a little bit frustrated by the conversation back and forth in the last two times because I feel that the comment -- the question is being raised and the answer is a non sequitur, and let me tell you what I For example, in the first sentence when you mean. were asked about the perceptions and whether the race does not influence the judgment of the person looking at the evidence. And you said, No, we do it on the I don't see the person. I don't see evidence. somebody and I don't say, therefore, that he is not like me, and yet you said it's in the record. mean, the distinction -- you said it says in the record he's a black male. You don't need to see him to know he's not like you, so the distinction you're drawing is a little too subtle for me in this case. MS. CURTIS: Well, the question was asked, baggy pants, plaited hair, and I don't have

that information.

DR. AL-HIBRI: We can work with stereotypes, and if you see black males and drugs, your reaction to the question, it is not going to be different if you had a stereotype from seeing a white Not you personally, but -male.

> I understand. MS. CURTIS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. AL-HIBRI: Because you are the person here, but you know, generally there are stereotypes, and all you need to trigger a stereotype is a symbolic word, black male, or you know, young black male is even more indicative, it seems from some of the things I have heard this morning.

MS. CURTIS: Every case in my office that is nolle prossed, or dropped, or where a plea agreement is entered into, or if there is a trial and the defendant is found not guilty, I have to have a written explanation for the action that was taken on that file. And if you want to ask about specific cases, or if you want to ask about cases in general, there are -- the answers that are given, the explanations that I am given by my staff, which is diverse, those explanations are that the evidence was not sufficient, and I can review the file then and say yes, I agree, this was a bad stop; or I can see from the record that these witnesses did not appear in this case, which made it impossible to go forward, or some other reason which is not race-based.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I don't disagree with you at all, but in that extreme, there are very easy calls to make about certain judgments. I think the question has to be in this area that are the gray

areas, and whether a certain predisposition on the part of the person looking at the evidence is not going to predispose them to come down one way or the other.

Now, I mean -- I can ask you that question, but I also know the answer, because I have said -- I've seen the literature about what perceptions do in terms of formulating judgment.

We've also heard this morning these perceptions are not necessarily conscious. We've seen this in very famous criminal cases in the U.S. The perception does not have to be conscious, you just have a certain presumption, which might be an unconscious or subconscious presumption, and it acts as your perception, and therefore things are clearly one way or the other, when for somebody else it doesn't.

I think these are sort of the things we're worried about, because if the stereotype is very prevalent in society where it becomes an everyday model, then you don't know the damage anymore. It's happening, and we think that it is the way things ought to be, or the way things are.

The other thing on the statistics, the question that Ms. Rattley asked, and we were concerned about impressions or perceptions about

statistics, as opposed to their reality. 1 I was very surprised this morning when we were faced with a lot 2 of statistics, but none of these broke down the data 3 in terms of intra versus interracial crimes, and I'm wondering why. I've asked, and hopefully we will get 5 6 those figures. But then when we came back to you, 7 you spoke about lack of evidence, hardly enough to generalize from it when you are such a careful 8 thinker in terms of the evidence, police reports I 9 think you said it. 10 11 MS. CURTIS: No, I didn't say police I believe the police department keeps data 12 reports. on not only the race of offenders who get arrested, 13 14 but also on the race of the victims. 15 DR. AL-HIBRI: But it has not been compiled, has it? 16 MS. CURTIS: I believe so, because 17 18 I've seen --19 DR. AL-HIBRI: I'm asking can we have access to this data? 20 21 MS. CURTIS: It's not my data. I 22 believe the police department keeps it. And I'm sure that --23 24 Do you know what it's MR. DARDEN:

called, what the data set is called?

25

No, I don't. 1 MS. CURTIS: I assume 2 it's victims, because the police department can 3 access --MR. DARDEN: Let me be clear then. 4 Is this something you think ought to exist, or is 5 this something you know does exist? 6 MS. CURTIS: I believe this is 7 I believe these are something that exists. 8 9 statistics that I've seen, and I've seen them both on 10 a local level and I've seen them on a national level. 11 DR. AL-HIBRI: Raw data or --12 MS. CURTIS: It's just number -- I mean, it's numbers. 13 14 MR. DARDEN: I quess what I'm trying to do here is to nail down some points of reference. 15 16 If you have seen data, then I'd like to know what that is. We'll ask the police department what they 17 18 have. They may not give the same data. 19 MS. CURTIS: I would be happy to go back and look. 20 21 Very well. MR. DARDEN: And as a 22 point of reference, I want to know if they're not the 23 same data, if you are getting what the police have. 24 MS. CURTIS: I would be glad to go 25 back and find what I have and provide that for you.

1 MR. DARDEN: Thank you. 2 MS. MCCLOUD: I have a question 3 concerning the data. Even if the data from the police department does show that there are more 4 5 African American victims than say Caucasian, or white 6 victims, could there not be some fallacy in the 7 reporting? I mean, for example, all cases involving whites reported to the same extent that cases 8 9 involving blacks are? 10 I can't tell you that. MS. CURTIS: 11 MS. MCCLOUD: Isn't that somewhat up to -- you mentioned the police doing the reporting or 12 13 another citizen, et cetera, so it could have some 14 impact? 15 Well, clearly citizen MS. CURTIS: 16 complaints that go, for example, directly to a 17 magistrate where a warrant is issued, that don't go 18 through the police department, those statistics 19 aren't gathered because those people don't call the 20 police department to get into the database, so that's 21 absolutely correct. 22 MR. DARDEN: You didn't answer the 23 question about the transfer. I haven't had a chance 24 MS. CURTIS: 25 to.

I won't let that go, but 1 MR. GALVIN: 2 I did want to ask this one. Are we talking about what class of crimes, because we heard data presented 3 today that in violent crimes, the victims turned out 4 5 to be 75 percent, I believe, were either 6 acquaintances or family members with 25 percent 7 without. 8 MR. CURTIS: Right. Then if, in fact, the 9 MR. GALVIN: 10 proportion of those committing those crimes are from 11 the black community, then you would expect the victims to also be in the black community if they're 12 13 acquaintances and family. So are you speaking in 14 drug-related now? 15 I'm just speaking in MS. CURTIS: 16 general terms. The African American population in 17 the criminal justice system on both sides of the 18 equation is disproportionate to the general 19 population. That's my only point. It's not just one 20 side of the equation. It's both sides of the 21 equation. 22 MR. GALVIN: But it's also the 23 incarceration is disproportionate. 24 MS. CURTIS: Undoubtedly. I don't

dispute that.

25

1 MR. GALVIN: And those people are 2 committing crimes against their own family, or acquaintances, you would expect that? 3 MS. CURTIS: That's right. 4 MR. GALVIN: I just wanted to make 5 sure I understood that. 6 7 DR. AL-HIBRI: Can I just clarify I don't want to make the -- correct me if 8 something? 9 I'm wrong -- the wrong assumptions, unwarranted 10 assumptions unnecessarily. Even if the number of 11 victims in the African American population is large, 12 we don't know the perpetrator until we see the 13 evidence, correct? 14 MS. CURTIS: Right. 15 Couple of just nuts and MR. PATRICK: 16 bolts questions, because it seems as though 17 statistics are looming large here, and from this 18 morning's panel, we begin to get a filter that the 19 issue lies in the charging process. As I listen to 20 you, what you're saying doesn't match those 21 statistics that we heard. But my nuts and bolts 22 questions are these: One, were you elected and when, 23 and what is the racial makeup of your staff? 24 MS. CURTIS: I was elected last year 25 in a special election.

1 MR. PATRICK: What's your term? 2 MS. CURTIS: I have to run again this 3 year, and this will be a normal election that will be for a four-year term. 4 The racial makeup of my staff -- I 5 6 became Commonwealth Attorney in 1995 -- late 1995. 7 have -- the racial makeup of my attorney staff is at 8 this point twenty-five percent minority. I have filled eight attorney positions since I have been 9 10 Commonwealth's Attorney. Three of them are 11 minorities and two of the positions that were filled 12 by non-minority applicants were offered to minority 13 applicants, but they received better offers elsewhere. 14 15 MR. PATRICK: How large is your 16 staff? 17 MS. CURTIS: I have 16 assistants. 1.8 MR. PATRICK: Sixteen. So four of 19 those, you're saying are minority? 20 MS. CURTIS: Minority and black or --21 three African American and one Filipino American. 22 MR. PATRICK: Thank you. 23 MS. CURTIS: Do you want me to answer 24 the transfer question? 25 MR. DARDEN: Yeah, then I have

1 another question after that. 2 MS. CURTIS: Maybe you can help me get back to where --3 MR. DARDEN: We understand that 4 transfer from juvenile into adult sometimes happens 5 automatically and without individual consideration 6 7 given the individual cases. MS. CURTIS: No. I would say that 8 our request to transfer is based on two things. 9 10 is the individual's record, prior record, whether 11 this person is going to be amenable to treatment within the criminal justice system and/or the 12 severity of the offense. 13 14 Now, we went through massive change 15 last year in the Virginia juvenile justice system. 16 The transfer provisions that you're talking about 17 went through a very radical change as an 1.8 acknowledgement of the fact that there were more and more juveniles committing more and more serious 19 20 crimes. 21 This is just here in the MR. DARDEN: 2.2 district? This is here in 23 MS. CURTIS: 24 Virginia. Statewide. 25 MR. DARDEN:

MS. CURTIS: Statewide. Up until July 1st of '96, transfers could be based on either amenability -- transfers could only be held in certain kinds of cases, and the procedure was that the Commonwealth would request transfer in a case, a report would be prepared, and then the judge would make a decision as to whether it was appropriate to transfer or not to transfer.

In 1996, the statutes changed giving prosecutors significantly more latitude. There are one or two offenses for which transfer is automatic. That would be capital murder and aggravated malicious wounding, which is an injury that causes serious and permanent disability.

MR. DARDEN: That's one of the new provisions?

MS. CURTIS: That's one of the new provisions. Then there is a second classification of crimes, which are generally violent felonies, where the prosecutor has the discretion to make that decision; and if the prosecutor makes that decision to request transfer, then the case will be transferred. Then there is the third category which is treated as all previous cases were, which is it is at the discretion of the Court.

Since that change occurred, we -- I mean, I have looked at -- because we now have a full calendar year's worth of cases to look at, we have not in Hampton transferred any more cases than we did before. We still look at the severity of the offense, and the age of the offender would be another circumstance to look at. If someone is very close to their 18th birthday and it's a serious offense, even though they may not have any prior record, that may . be a case where we might decide to transfer.

On the other hand, if a person has been -- has a significant juvenile record, then that may also be a circumstance under which we transfer; but each case is looked at individually, and after, you know, looking at the background of the individual that's involved.

There's no -- I mean, other than capital murder and aggravated maimings, which we don't have many of those things very much, we're not transferring at any higher rate than we were when we had to go before the Court and request the Court's permission to transfer.

MR. DARDEN: That's just happenstance, or is that the result of some -
MS. CURTIS: No, I think it's because

FOX REPORTING

we are continuing to look at these cases in the same way that we did prior to the statutory change, which is looking at the individual, looking at the individual offense, noting the degree of injury to the victim, those other factors, criminal records, so on and so forth.

1.0

MR. DARDEN: Well, do you consider any of the societal factors in your decision-making?

MS. CURTIS: No.

MR. DARDEN: So the data that we saw earlier about the sky-rocketing involvement of African American males in various kinds of crimes, you have a blind eye to that in terms of your approach to the discretionary area?

MS. CURTIS: Race is not a factor in making that decision, no.

MR. DARDEN: Okay. I had one more question. This goes to -- this is sort of a peculiar question, even for me. If harassment by a police officer, such as keeping an individual under surveillance who's not engaged in any criminal activity, if that were to occur, what is your -- what would be the remedy? What would the individual who is being so harassed -- what should they do in order to alleviate the problem and even initiate some

corrective action?

immediately to mind, and one would be to make a complaint to the police department. There is a mechanism within the police department -- and please be clear, I don't run the police department. That is a city agency, and I'm not a city employee. And the other I would suggest would be to retain an attorney to -- because that would clearly be some sort of, either a civil rights violation, or some other kind of violation which would have some civil remedy.

My office does not have any investigatory powers, staff. Frequently I get calls from citizens who are unhappy about something, whether -- not necessarily a racial issue, but sometimes it is, and I have no ability to prosecute or to take any action without an investigative report, which comes through a law enforcement agency.

MR. DARDEN: Just a moment. I thought earlier you said that of the four ways in which a complaint can be brought, one of them is through a grand jury?

MS. CURTIS: Right, but that's --

MR. DARDEN: Would you initiate the

process that would bring information before the grand

1 jury? 2 MS. CURTIS: Well, my office is involved in preparing the documents that go to the 3 4 grand jury. MR. DARDEN: Correct. 5 MS. CURTIS: But our grand jury is 6 7 very different from a federal grand jury. The state grand jury is -- makes a probable cause determination 8 9 on whether to send a case to the circuit court for It's not an investigative body in the same 10 11 way that the federal grand jury works. MR. DARDEN: I see. 12 MS. CURTÍS: If we initiate a case at 13 the grand jury, it's because the police department 14 15 has brought us a police report, as they would in a case that was initiated by warrant. 16 17 MR. DARDEN: I see. 18 MS. CURTIS: I don't have an 19 investigative staff. I simply have lawyers who go to 20 court. 21 MR. DARDEN: So it would be very 22 unlikely that if a case involved a police officer, 23 that you would receive any charges from the police 24 department?

MS. CURTIS:

25

Well, if someone were

1 complaining to me about the police department, I 2 would refer them to the state police, which is the 3 other law enforcement agency which could then --4 MR. DARDEN: Do the investigation. 5 MS. CURTIS: Right. Then if they 6 brought me something back, then I would prosecute that. 7 MR. DARDEN: Would you be available 8 for that kind of referral? 9 You would be available to 10 receive the complaint --11 MS. CURTIS: Yes. -- and make sure it got 12 MR. DARDEN: 13 processed properly? 14 MS. CURTIS: I would refer it to the 15 State Police, and that would be only other law 16 enforcement agency I'd have access to. If I got some 17 kind of complaint that the police department was unable to handle, for whatever reason, that's where I 18 would send it. 19 20 MS. MCCLOUD: I have a question. You 21 started out by talking about a group, which I don't 22 really -- I'm not really asking you to go into 23 details about that, the Unity Commission --24 MS. CURTIS: Yes. 25 MS. MCCLOUD: -- however, you did say that the justice system came out rather poorly?

MS. CURTIS: That's correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MCCLOUD: What is your impression of -- your personal impression of the Virginia judicial system, and where do you see that the problems lie, if you do see there are any?

MS. CURTIS: Well, the question always comes down to the selection of judges and the method for selection of judges, and our system is a political appointment. It is an appointment. doesn't really make any claims to be anything other than that. The General Assembly has a caucus that meets and makes some decisions with regard to that. Since the political makeup of the General Assembly has changed, that's changed the process somewhat, but it essentially is still a political appointment. There is no real ability for citizen input. There is no real process for -- there's no real input into the process, and in some situations -- I mean, I think it's probably fairly remarkable that we've done as well as we have. And clearly the perception is we haven't done well at all. There would certainly be instances I would agree with that. But it is a political process.

When you talk about electing judges,

25

that's also a political process. It's one where there is citizen input, but it's one that involves -and having just gone through one election, as someone who certainly never perceived myself to be particularly political, you know, the notion of raising money and from whom and how, is troublesome, so I don't have the answer there. I think if I had -- if I had my way, I would look at some process that was inclusive within a community that allowed people from -- you know, without regard to any of the things we've been talking about, political persuasion, economic status, all of those things, that would let people have a voice, but I'm not sure that -- I've been driven through states. My parents live in Florida, and I've driven through Florida and seen the billboards for "Elect John Jones Judge," and I can tell you that that makes my skin crawl because that's -- you know, that's just a process. really -- I mean, popular election of judges makes people do things for popular reasons, and sometimes judges have to make unpopular decisions that are consistent with the law and the evidence, but that doesn't fly with the public, so I don't think that's a very good idea either. That's just my personal opinion.

1 MS. MCCLOUD: Thank you very much. 2 REVEREND HARRIS: In your opinion, 3 when the police department asks the Commonwealth Attorney's opinion before a charge is filed, does 4 5 that ever happen in your case? MS. CURTIS: Occasionally. 6 7 REVEREND HARRIS: And if it happens, you have to talk about the individual that's going to 8 9 be charged, right? Is that true? 10 MS. CURTIS: Sometimes. Usually, 11 again, these are phone calls, these are the facts, is there a charge, and if so, what is it? 12 So -- but there's not usually at that point. You don't have a 13 14 document in front of you that gives you information about the individual. 15 16 REVEREND HARRIS: You have to respond 17 to the police officer? 18 MS. CURTIS: Right. 19 REVEREND HARRIS: And based on your 20 response, the police officer moves on to make the 21 arrest? 22 MS. CURTIS: Right. 23 REVEREND HARRIS: So you've been 24 involved with it from the beginning? I would say that happens 25 MS. CURTIS:

in a very small percentage of cases. The only cases where the police department has to call me and ask me are in homicide cases. And then the question is whether it's going to be capital, or first-degree, or second-degree, or whatever. And that, again, is going to be based on what the evidence is with regard to the crime, as opposed to who the person is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The vast majority of cases -- and I would say probably over 99 percent of the cases -our first knowledge of the case is when that individual comes into General District Courtroom B for arraignments, and we have the person's name and the warrant and the charges. I mean, that's all the information that we have. We are not routinely consulted prior to the placing of charges.

REVEREND HARRIS: In Richmond, there is a case, police claiming that they had the evidence before they made the arrest, a drug case. suggesting, then, that the Commonwealth Attorney's Office didn't know anything about it?

MS. CURTIS: I don't know the case that you're referring to.

> REVEREND HARRIS: It's Iverson.

MS. CURTIS: Probably not.

jurisdictions that I'm familiar with how they

operate -- I mean every city and county can operate 1 somewhat differently, but most of the jurisdictions 2 with which I'm familiar that's generally how it 3 occurs. We are not -- the Commonwealth's Attorney's 4 Office is not a part of routinely making decisions 5 before warrants are obtained. 6 7 REVEREND HARRIS: When you say routinely, but it can happen? 8 MS. CURTIS: Certainly. We get calls 9 about is this a civil case, is this a criminal case, 10 11 should I charge under this statute, should I charge 12 under that statute. Obviously we're there to give 1.3 that kind of advice, but that happens, as I say, in 14 probably less than one percent of thousands of cases that pass through my office in a year. 15 16 MR. DARDEN: I have one more 17 question. The Commonwealth Attorney, I guess in one sense is the victim's advocate, if you want to put it 18 19 that way? 20 MS. CURTIS: Well --21 MR. DARDEN: No? 22 MS. CURTIS: Well, in -- we are 23 usually, hopefully, pretty in sync with that side of 24 the case, but not always.

MR. DARDEN:

25

Not always.

Our role is to take a MS. CURTIS: step back. We do not represent victims. We have to make an independent assessment of evidence, and in most cases, as I say, that -- we're all working on the same side, but there are victims who want to drop charges, and we will sometimes tell them that they

And there are victims who want the death penalty in cases where it is not appropriate. I just tried one in a situation where the death penalty was not an appropriate sentence, and the victim's family wanted it very badly. I understood that, but I am bound by the law and the evidence, and I made the decision that it was not appropriate and didn't ask for it.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you for that clarification. I'm thinking back to your earlier comment that many of the -- well, vast majority of the victims of crime are also disproportionately from the African American community, and I'm also assuming that gives you some insight into the kind of -- the perspective of those victims, and so by extension, perspective African Americans?

> MS. CURTIS: Right.

MR. DARDEN: And the community that's

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

cannot do that.

25

2.3

being victimized primarily by crime. I wanted to get some sense of your experience there, of just what is it that the community wants. You know, what do you see? And I'm putting this in the context of a number of things we've heard in the past, the war on drugs as one of the influences, or one of the factors in this skyrocketing involvement of the young men in the system. Do you think that the community wants that outcome? Do you think -- did the community ask for the war on drugs? Who asked for the war on drugs? And now that we see what the outcome is, as a result of it, is it what the community wanted to see happen?

MS. CURTIS: I have spent -- I have gone to neighborhoods all over the city and my sense is that people from neighborhoods, regardless of whether they're predominantly African American, or predominantly white, or whatever, want the same thing. They want their children to be able to play in their yards. They want their kids to be able to walk home from school safely. They want to be able to enjoy their homes and their neighborhoods without being afraid.

The poorest neighborhoods in the city are the ones that are the most riddled by crime, and the decent hardworking people who live there have no

resources with which to move. And they are absolute prisoners, and they are frequently the ones who initiate the kinds of undercover operations that go into a neighborhood and try to clean it up, so that because those are -- I know that those folks want to be able to live in their neighborhood, and the drug dealers and the drug users and the vandalism and the violence most affects those people who have not got the resources to move to another block or another neighborhood where it's a little safer.

I honestly don't have a sense that the people that live in this community, regardless of the neighborhood, have a problem with significant and strong enforcement of drug laws, because those are the people who are making the neighborhoods unsafe. I went to a meeting right after I took office, in maybe October of '95, in the old Northampton neighborhood in our city. It is -- I believe it is now, or certainly did at that time, had the highest crime rate. It is a predominantly African American. It is predominantly economically depressed neighborhood with very few resources.

I don't know what I expected. I was new to being Commonwealth Attorney and I was a little nervous, but I had been invited to talk with their

civic association. I was there with a major from the police department, and the folks at this meeting didn't want less police involvement in their neighborhood, they wanted more. The police department had recently assigned a community police officer on a bicycle to patrol their neighborhood and they gave him an award that night but wanted to know when they were going to get another one.

I expected that I would be questioned about, you know, why do you enforce things this way. Why are you victimizing our community; and instead I got, Why are you letting those drug dealers out? Why are those people coming back? We get them out of our community, and five minutes later, they're back in the neighborhood, and what's the matter with you? Why can't you keep those people in? I understand that's not hard evidence, but I did not get any sense from the people from that community that they wanted -- that they had a problem with the strict enforcement approach to drugs, which is what my office uses.

MR. DARDEN: Just to round that out, one of our earlier panelists described the war on drugs and this hard enforcement as a kind of scapegoating so that the more fundamental and

long-term problems affecting neighborhoods like the one you described somehow get washed into the background as much more attention almost inordinately goes towards dealing with the drug trafficking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CURTIS: Well, there's no one solution, and if all of the effort is focused on drugs -- and truthfully, if all the attention is focused on enforcement, we're not going to get This is a much larger problem and the government, or the criminal justice system, or the criminal justice community, can't solve it. a problem that goes much deeper than that. There are lots of implications, and certainly we have to spend a lot of time worrying about getting young kids, keeping them safe, keeping them in school so they can learn, and all the things that we talk about so much in trying to make sure that those kids don't end up on a street corner with a needle in their arm, or worse, because those kids very often end up dead, and none of us wants that to happen.

I don't know -- we don't have -- my office has not -- we have a policy of not making any plea agreements in drug cases. We have not done that in probably ten years. Obviously that precedes my tenure in office. But you have to start somewhere,

and if we can get a person into a drug treatment program and they're ready -- and that's not -- that doesn't always happen, then we make a little bit of progress.

I don't think that's the answer.

Drugs are not -- drugs are only a part of the problem, and dealing with drugs is only a part of the solution.

MR. DARDEN: Just on that last point, you said that you don't -- you haven't made any plea agreements in drug cases, but then you talked about getting people into treatment programs. What is the connection there?

MS. CURTIS: Well, most -- if a person has no prior drug record in Virginia, then they qualify for a program called first offender status. We will tell the Court this person has no prior drug record, and they would qualify, and the Court will then put them into -- onto a status which gives them the opportunity and access to possibly making some progress with their problem. They may be placed on probation. They may then be put into the drug treatment program. We don't put them there. The Courts put them there. Probation officers put them there.

1 MR. DARDEN: You're required for 2 first offenders to give that information so that they can qualify? 3 MS. CURTIS: To give --4 MR. DARDEN: Their status as first 5 In other words, is it at all 6 offenders. discretionary on your part to provide the Court, so 7 the Court will know --8 9 MS. CURTIS: We provide it -- if a 10 person qualifies for first offender, we'll tell them 11 that because we have that information. 12 MR. DARDEN: Yeah. Are you required 13 to give it, or is it something you can decide to 14 withhold? If you thought this was a case where this 15 guy needs to go to jail, even though he's a first 16 offender, could you decide to --17 MS. CURTIS: We would always tell the Court they didn't have a record. We're going to give 18 19 the Court that information. We may then say, but we 20 think in this case there are circumstances you 21 shouldn't put him in, and tell the Court what we 22 think it is. And the defendant and his attorney will 23 also have that information presumably. 24 MR. DARDEN: Yeah.

25

MS. CURTIS: But we do the record

1 check, so we have that information at our disposal. 2 MR. DARDEN: If there were a case where that information would not come out in court, 3 that would be a mistake? 4 5 MS. CURTIS: I would say yes. 6 DR. AL-HIBRI: I don't want to go 7 home without asking you one more transfer question, if you don't mind. When we were asking you about 8 9 the -- essentially there are two kinds of things here 10 we're concerned about, procedural justice and 11 substantive justice, and we do have quite a few 12 procedures in place to ensure at least procedural 13 justice. When we asked you about transfers, you said 14 you have certain criteria and you started by speaking 15 about prior record, which absence, I guess, would 16 lean against a transfer, and then you said and/or, 17 and you went through another two sets of criteria. Ι 18 think both of them remain in the discretion of the 19 person making the judgment. 20 MS. CURTIS: Yes. 21 DR. AL-HIBRI: I would like to take 22 the end of the "or" part. 23 MS. CURTIS: Okay. 24 DR. AL-HIBRI: And that means, 25 regardless of whether there is a prior record or

not -- and let's assume there was not, then it's within the discretion of the person making the decision to go ahead and order a transfer.

Now, I want to first of all make it very clear that I think any system of procedural justice ought to have some flexibility, and the idea worked because when you have flexibility, then you can deal with things that might unfortunately get caught into the web that ought not to be.

But given the world we live in, which is not the ideal world, and what we've been hearing all day, issues of substantive justice, in other words where people's discretion is relied upon, we're not really so sure that judgment is not tainted by biases and prejudices. I'd like to ask you, how would you feel if we were to develop a set of criteria for transfers which leaves no discretion at all?

MS. CURTIS: I think that -- you sort of answered your own question, I think, when you started your question to me.

DR. AL-HIBRI: In the ideal -
MS. CURTIS: I have policies in my

office, not with regard to transfer, but I have

policies in my office that say this is what we will

do in this case, but I always have to leave open the person who doesn't fit the mold, the extraordinary case, and I think whenever you develop a system which leaves no discretion, then you are going to find examples of people who you never meant to catch in the web.

DR. AL-HIBRI: I guess I'm asking you to balance the evils. On the one hand, there is that point. On the other hand, there is the argument that discretion always ends up hitting one segment of the population. On the other hand, if you make it automatic, everybody in the population will bear an equal burden. Where do you come down on this?

MS. CURTIS: Well, you have to have confidence in the people who exercise discretion, and if you don't, then you have to replace them. I don't -- I think any system -- I mean, to say, for example, that for every person who commits murder, we will execute that person, comes down in a way that does not discriminate against anyone, but it discriminates against everyone because that's not the appropriate punishment in every case.

I don't think it's possible, given a human system, to ever -- to ever eliminate people who make bad decisions. But I think to take away the

ability to make decisions is perhaps worse. I don't think that's the right solution. I understand -- I think I understand what you're asking me, but I think that you would be less satisfied with the results in that case, generally, than you are now.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Actually, I'm not sure, but I also know what you're getting at.

Suppose I propose a third middle ground. I'm not sure it is a middle ground at all. I'm just entertaining a hypotheses. I think one sentence you said, which was very important, is that where you have discretion, and you'd like to have discretion, it really depends on the people who are given the discretion. If they're doing it wrong, you replace them.

really trying to discuss here. What sort of people misuse their discretion; and is it just some bad people, or is it some good people who are not aware of the misuse of their discretion, and if that is -- is there a filter that you propose that you can filter these kinds of people who use their discretion in matters of life and death for a significant part of this population -- is there a filter you propose to be put in place?

Certainly we've heard enough today that the results are not what they ought to be in terms of substantive justice.

MS. CURTIS: I don't know what the filter is, but the answer to your question is yes, I think it's both. I think there are people who make decisions who shouldn't be in a position to make those decisions; and I think there are people who are the right people, who may make decisions based on perhaps unconscious factors, the kinds of things you're talking about, who meanwhile -- who might need additional information, education.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Can you think of such a program that you would recommend?

MS. CURTIS: I'm sitting in the council chamber right now. No. I would like to try. I think it's -- I think when we talk about judges, clearly the practice, for example, has been that judges have six-year or eight-year terms, but it has been essentially the process where that has been continued on by a rubber stamp. There has been no real assessment of a person's performance done.

yes. And I would say that that probably should be done by a cross-section of the community who feels

the results of what that person does. But can I devise something right here, right now? I don't think so.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Let me ask you one last thing. As you know, as a lawyer, when we start talking about appointments to the Supreme Court by the Executive Branch, the Bar Association gives its own opinion, and it is not an official opinion, but it carries some weight. I'm wondering, if the judges of this state are appointed through political appointments, don't you think there ought to be somebody, which represents a cross-section of the population, which can give an opinion --

MS. CURTIS: Yes.

DR. AL-HIBRI: -- before the appointment as to whether this person would be acceptable from the kind of perspective you're discussing?

MS. CURTIS: Yes, I do. I think bar associations now typically have them put into that process. I believe without exception, I've been in Hampton for 15 years, and the Bar Association has always endorsed a candidate, and our legislative delegation has always gone along with the Bar Association's recommendation. But I'm not sure that

the Bar Association is necessarily the filter that 1 2 you're looking at. That's right. 3 DR. AL-HIBRI: MS. CURTIS: I would suggest it would 4 need to go further than that. 5 6 DR. AL-HIBRI: Thank you. I would like to follow 7 MR. DARDEN: The Commonwealth 8 up just a little bit on that. 9 Attorneys Association, I understand, is the one body 1.0 that deals with all Commonwealth Attorneys in the 11 state --12 MS. CURTIS: Right. -- and trains them? 13 MR. DARDEN: MS. CURTIS: 14 Right. 15 MR. DARDEN: I don't think there's 16 any other professional -- or any other group that 17 looks at professional standards or common practices 18 by Commonwealth Attorneys around the state; is that 19 correct? 20 MS. CURTIS: Well, the Commonwealth 21 Attorneys Association is in terms of training. 22 would say that yes, that's accurate. Although, for 23 example, I often send my attorneys to other kinds of 24 training besides that. MR. DARDEN: Other kinds of training. 25

As a body, do you look to the Commonwealth Attorneys
Association to be a monitor or a watch dog in any way
over the profession?

MS. CURTIS: I'm not sure that I would call that organization a monitor or a watch dog.

MR. DARDEN: Is there any organization that has that kind of role, sort of role?

MS. CURTIS: The State Bar.

MR. DARDEN: Just the State Bar. So if individuals were not pleased with a Commonwealth Attorney's performance and wanted to make a complaint, either about an individual case or about a pattern, would they file a complaint with the State Bar about the Commonwealth Attorney; and if that is the place that receives the complaints, how would they dispose of them?

with -- the State Bar certainly gets all sorts of complaints about all sorts of lawyers. I'm sure prosecutors are included in that. Their focus is on ethical. We have the canons that -- the canons of ethics and the disciplinary rules that go along with that. And there are special ones for prosecutors,

and the State Bar is responsible for enforcing that. 1 There has been a lot of controversy 2 3 in this part of the state recently with regard to efficacy of the State Bar handling those complaints. 4 5 MR. DARDEN: You're saying that they don't handle them well? 6 7 MS. CURTIS: I will say there's a general public perception, that is to say, a 8 9 nonlawyer perception, that the State Bar is not 10 terribly responsive in that area. 11 MR. DARDEN: What's your lawyer's 12 perception? I've never been involved 13 MS. CURTIS: in that process, so I really don't have any firsthand 14 I've been a lawyer for almost twenty 15 knowledge. 16 years. 17 MR. DARDEN: I'm unclear then. What 18 would a person do --19 MS. CURTIS: If a person wants to 20 make a complaint, they'll go to the State Bar. 21 happens to the complaints when it goes to the State 22 Bar, I can tell you theoretically how it's set up to work. 23 24 MR. DARDEN: Yes, okay. The complaint goes to a 25 MS. CURTIS:

bar investigator. The bar investigator does an initial determination to see if it's a matter that is within the purview of the bar; and if it is, then a 3 more formal investigation is initiated. The bar has on its staff, investigators who handle those kinds of 5 things. 6 And then a report is developed as a 7 result of that investigation, and it goes to a local 8 9 committee within the State Bar. Every district has a representative on the State Bar, and they're divided 10 up into sections of the state to hear the complaints. 11 And then I mean, the State Bar has the ability to 12 13 revoke someone's license, and as well as many --MR. DARDEN: 14 License to practice law? 15 MS. CURTIS: License to practice law. 16 Of course, you'd have to MR. DARDEN: 17 be a lawyer to be the Commonwealth Attorney. 18 MS. CURTIS: Right. 19 Go ahead. MR. DARDEN: 20 MS. CURTIS: I think I know what 21 you're asking, and in terms of --22 MR. DARDEN: We're trying to get 23 accountability here. If you had a complaint 24 MS. CURTIS:

1

2

4

25

about a pattern of behavior that did not necessarily

involve an ethical violation, or a disciplinary rule violation --

MR. DARDEN: Yes. For instance,
Mr. Patrick has explained that overall we have a lot
of the analysis about what's wrong with the system
seems to rest on complaints about actions in the
Commonwealth Attorney's Office, whether it's
automatic transfers, or other kinds of discretionary
actions. The question that I'm asking here is, from
the perspective of the public who may want to insist
on some sort of accountability from the Commonwealth
Attorney, where does that -- where does the public go
to make a complaint?

MS. CURTIS: Because of the structure of independent Constitutional officers, which is what all Commonwealth Attorneys are, if the complaint is not an ethical discipline rule violation, which the State Bar might handle, I think the answer is that there is nowhere.

MR. DARDEN: There would be nowhere.

Now, that being the case, do you see that as -
MS. CURTIS: There is no one over the

Commonwealth Attorney's head.

MR. DARDEN: Correct. That's what you're saying. So the Commonwealth Attorney is

1 almost invulnerable, except to election? 2 MS. CURTIS: I certainly don't feel invulnerable. 3 But that's the point I'm 4 MR. DARDEN: trying to get to. From the perspective of the public 5 6 7 MS. CURTIS: Right. There is no boss 8 to complain to. 9 MR. DARDEN: No boss to complain to, 10 Do you think that situation really serves the 11 public well? MS. CURTIS: I'm not a fan of the 12 13 political process, but I think that -- and I would 14 hope that the political process would work. Commonwealth Attorney, as every other elected 15 16 official, is a servant of the public and has to be 17 conscious of the public's perception of how he or she 18 is doing their job. The only mechanism that exists for that displeasure or pleasure to be, you know, 19 20 enunciated is through the election process, but I 21 certainly -- certainly public perception of how all 22 of us do our jobs is right on the table all of the 23 time. So I -- I don't know how else I can answer 24 that question.

25

I mean, I think that having a

four-year term, I mean you could suggest a shorter term if that were something that would satisfy -- you know, have a quicker ability to resolve a particular displeasure if that's what you're suggesting, but other than that, I can't think of any other mechanism to do that, because they're all independently -- all of the Constitutional offices, the Sheriff, the Commonwealth Attorney, they're all independently elected officials. I mean, we're answerable to the public. I certainly consider myself to be answerable to the public. I certainly hear from the public and make myself accessible to the public on these issues, and I'm always interested to hear what people have to I will answer and explain to any citizen anywhere at any time what has occurred in my office. I am happy, and if the person is not satisfied with it, then -- but at least I will give an explanation and hope that that satisfies their concern.

MR. DARDEN: Thank you.

REVEREND HARRIS: Excuse me. You later -- you had earlier indicated you have been to Florida and saw some billboards about election of judges.

MS. CURTIS: Right.

REVEREND HARRIS: And you indicated

il l

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that you didn't think that a selection -- or the election of judges would help us any regarding what we are discussing. Now, you say it would be so quick if judges were elected. Well, what about the Commonwealth Attorneys, are they political animals also --

MS. CURTIS: Certainly.

REVEREND HARRIS: -- or do they have already so much discretion, and so forth?

MS. CURTIS: (Witness nods head.)

REVEREND HARRIS: So would you -when you assess the impact of the selection of -election of judges versus elections of Commonwealth
Attorneys.

MS. CURTIS: Well, my concern about that is that, as I said, having just gone through one political campaign, my first, you know, it's real difficult in a justice system type of job to, you know, raise money in a way that is not compromising to what you do. And anybody who doesn't think that elections cost a lot of money, I mean they do. That's political reality, and to -- and my concern was not only the aspect of judges going out and raising money, and that being an issue that I was concerned with, it's also the notion that judges

1 sometimes have to make unpopular decisions, unpopular 2 with the people in a community, that are based on proper law and evidence, and I guess my concern is 3 4 that a popular election could lead to judges making decisions that are contrary to law and evidence 5 6 because it was a popular decision, and I would have 7 some concerns about that. REVEREND HARRIS: Could that happen 8 to the Commonwealth's Attorney? 9 Well, the Commonwealth 10 MS. CURTIS: Attorney doesn't ultimately -- certainly makes some 11 12 decisions in cases, but doesn't ultimately make the 13 final decision, and I mean, there are a lot of 14 Constitutional protections that are very unpopular 15 with certain parts of the population. 16 REVEREND HARRIS: As relates to the transfer --17 18 MS. CURTIS: Okay. 19 REVEREND HARRIS: -- law, the 20 Commonwealth Attorney has the discretion --21 MS. CURTIS: Right. 22 REVEREND HARRIS: -- to either put 23 somebody into the juvenile system or in the adult 24 system? 25 MS. CURTIS: Well, in every case

where a juvenile is tried as an adult, in every case, the Court, in sentencing, still has the option of sentencing that individual as a juvenile, so transferring a juvenile to the adult -- to be tried as an adult, does not guarantee that that person, if incarcerated, will end up in an adult facility. The judge can still choose to find the person guilty as an adult but sentence that person to a juvenile detention center, or sentence him as that person would be sentenced as a juvenile.

REVEREND HARRIS: Can you give me an illustration of -- you are the Commonwealth Attorney, you recommend that this child, this youth will be sentenced as an adult, and the judge says, No, I'm going to sentence him as a juvenile. Can you give me a scenario that could happen in Hampton?

MS. CURTIS: Well, we've had it happen in Hampton. We had an individual -- I can't remember. 'I'm sorry. I can't recall the circumstances of, or what the charges were, but the young man was tried in Judge Taylor's court, and Judge Taylor sentenced him as a juvenile. He was tried and convicted as an adult, so he has an assault criminal conviction, but it was a young man, was sentenced to one of the learning centers, was given a

disposition as though he had been tried in juvenile court. I can certainly find the name of the case for you if you want me to do that, but it has occurred.

pr. AL-HIBRI: Can I elaborate on your point a little bit? I'm a little concerned. My colleague here is concerned about the fact that Commonwealth Attorneys might also be subject to the same kinds of pressures that you were mentioning in terms of a judge running a campaign for election. Then you mentioned, in response to that, that not to worry, the judge has an option of sentencing the juvenile as a juvenile, even if the Commonwealth Attorney has sent the case to the court as an adult transfer case.

But now when we delve through the details, we find out even if the judge sentences the person, the juvenile, as a juvenile, on the record of that person is an adult conviction --

MS. CURTIS: That's correct.

DR. AL-HIBRI: -- and all that goes with it. So the back-up solution that you're pointing out is hardly a solution because we already know it's part of something, and I'm not going to deny it's not something, but the kid, his or her records have been ruined, right?

1 MS. CURTIS: Well, juvenile 2 convictions are no longer confidential. 3 DR. AL-HIBRI: I know that. 4 MS. CURTIS: Well, but even if a juvenile is convicted as a juvenile in juvenile court 5 of a felony, if that person is more than 15 years 6 old, that remains on his or her record. 7 That is not 8 expunded anymore as it used to be, so I don't see 9 there's a distinction. 10 DR. AL-HIBRI: Let me ask you what's 11 the difference between the two convictions as an 12 adult? 13 MS. CURTIS: It doesn't show on the 14 record any different. It shows a burglary 15 conviction, for example. It's not going to say 16 juvenile court or adult court. It's just going to 17 say burglary. 18 DR. AL-HIBRI: Up to 15. 19 MS. CURTIS: Over 15 -- I mean, 15 20 and over. 21 DR. AL-HIBRI: So if you're talking 22 about a 14-year-old, it does make a difference for 23 that person? 24 MS. CURTIS: I'm sorry. I misspoke. 25 14 and over --

1 DR. AL-HIBRI: 13-year-olds --2 MS. CURTIS: 13-year-olds can't be tried as adults. 3 4 DR. AL-HIBRI: All right. As far as this conviction charge showing on the record, I 5 already know that in some professions, if you have a 6 7 record like that, it's harder or impossible to get into that profession. Is there a difference in this 8 9 case between a juvenile conviction and an adult one? 10 MS. CURTIS: It won't show up any 11 \ differently. 12 DR. AL-HIBRI: Would it be given the same consideration? 13 MS. CURTIS: I can't answer that. 14 Ι 15 don't know that anyone would ever be able to tell 16 which it was. In other words, if a prospective 17 employer was running a record check on an individual, 18 the record is simply going to reveal 1997, Hampton, 19 Virginia, burglary. It's not going to say, you know, 20 slash juvenile or slash adult. 21 DR. AL-HIBRI: In other words, you're 22 saying there's absolutely no consequence to what the 23 Commonwealth Attorney does, in terms of these 24 choices, because it shows the same way on the record; 25 but as far sentencing, which is significant, the

judge can switch that. Is that a correct statement?

MS. CURTIS: Yes. Well, I'm not saying it's of no consequence. I'm simply saying that if -- that in this massive juvenile justice reform that our General Assembly did in 1996, one of the things that they removed was the confidentiality that existed that had held to juvenile records; and now if a juvenile is convicted of a felony, that information is on the record and is accessible as an adult.

The Commonwealth Attorney can ask for transfer and can get transfer in certain cases automatically, but the judge always has the option of sentencing that juvenile as a juvenile.

DR. AL-HIBRI: Let me try to simplify my question to pinpoint something. We might not be able to pinpoint it. I just want to know if there is a difference in terms of consequences between having it on your record as a juvenile or adult conviction?

MS. CURTIS: I don't know that I can answer that. I can only tell you as far as I know, when a prospective employer, who is the person I assume would be looking at that information, gets it, it is not going to distinguish the record between an adult conviction or a juvenile conviction. What

1 impact that has on the employer, I can't answer. 2 MR. GALVIN: Just a follow-up. Would 3 you say that it's the exception that a judge sentences onto the juvenile side? 4 5 MS. CURTIS: Yes. That's an exception, so 6 MR. GALVIN: 7 that once it is tried as an adult, it appears, at 8 least by the -- that there's more of a propensity for the sentence to be an adult sentencing? 9 MS. CURTIS: Right. But the judge, 10 11 again, has the ability to look at all those factors 12 and make an independent decision. 13 MR. GALVIN: And do I understand, though, if it's tried as an adult, there also could 14 15 be a jury, which the jury does sentencing, which is not the case in --16 Juries don't sentence 17 MS. CURTIS: juveniles. 18 19 Right, but when a MR. GALVIN: 20 juvenile is sentenced as an adult --21 MS. CURTIS: They don't sentence 22 those young people. Judges sentence juveniles who are tried as adults. 23 24 MR. DARDEN: With Mrs. Rattley not 25 being here, I'm going to try to step in and thank you

Mrs. Curtis for being with us. 1 It's a fascinating 2 presentation. If there was any burning question from 3 the committee before she goes, she can answer in thirty seconds. 4 5 MS. MCCLOUD: I have one. MR. DARDEN: Yes. 6 7 MS. MCCLOUD: With regard to the record, you know, the offense being entered on the 8 record, whether it's as a juvenile or whether it's as 9 10 an adult, if it remains there, if, for example, the 11 person elected to go to law school and is asked --12 usually they ask that question, you know, have you been convicted of a felony, then it is going to have 13 14 an impact on that, is it not? 15 MS. CURTIS: Yes. Mr. Gwynn -- I 16 want to also tell you that Howard Gwynn, the 17 Commonwealth Attorney from Newport News, I think he's scheduled to be here tomorrow. 18 19 MR. DARDEN: Yes. 20 MS. CURTIS: He will also be able to 21 answer the same type of procedure questions because 22 he obviously does the same thing I do. 23 MR. DARDEN: Thank you very much for 24 being with us. 25 Now, at this time, I'd like to ask

the treasurer of the group if we take just a very short break and then come right back and start with our community forum, I think we can conclude by 7:00, but it's going to mean just moving ahead, if that's all right with you.

So for the audience, I think we're going to take just five minutes, really, and come back; and the committee will come back at 6:10 and we will begin at 6:15 as we had scheduled for the

As I said, we have eight people signed up. We're going to try to get every one of you in that 45-minute period, so please be prepared to be brief. All right.

Thank you very much.

community forum.

I, Anna M. Fox, Notary Public, certify the foregoing pages 1 through 346, constitute a true and correct copy of the original transcript of the Factfinding Advisory Committee on the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights meeting, commencing on March 6, 1997. I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Virginia that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated this 23rd day of March, 1997.

1916 173/1 300 262/25 \$ 1964 5/10 31 64/9, 64/14, 83/2, 97/7 1965 7/6, 245/5 59/6, 64/15, 188/18 \$10 169/12, 169/14 \$100 12/24, 169/15, 169/20 \$113 169/19 1974 22/12 34 3/14, 57/23, 264/18, 264/25, 267/5, 267/7, 1975 23/16, 23/17 269/10 1978 143/13 \$2 262/10 346 346/8 \$20 169/12, 175/14, 268/10 \$25 191/15, 280/8 1980 46/23, 47/1, 48/20, 49/8, 50/6, 50/20, 51/6 35 55/17, 59/13, 64/9, 64/13, 147/11, 178/25 1980's 46/22 350 147/9 \$30 1980s 60/18, 61/24 268/10 36 59/1, 65/2, 174/2, 174/4, 253/5 1981 218/22 368 40/1 270/12 1982 92/18, 94/17 \$50 175/14, 191/15 37 2/7 \$75 12/24 1983 262/9 376 24/6 1984 45/25, 46/2, 174/12, 175/5, 175/18 \$8 227/13, 228/15 38 16/14, 63/8 1985 231/5 \$9 227/9, 238/20 3E 23/9 1986 39/15, 40/13, 49/7, 49/12, 49/16, 50/21, 3rd 23/16 51/7, 51/9, 51/13, 51/16, 52/6, 53/11, 55/10, 55/15, 55/25, 62/16, 63/7, 63/17, 76/3, 76/10, 76/15, 76/16, & 76/24, 102/15, 158/19, 174/12 1987 53/2, 60/5, 65/15, 102/15 & 2/13, 231/13 4 2/2, 3/5, 44/2, 44/8, 44/9, 45/10, 47/9, 48/21, 1988 52/9, 52/20, 53/1, 54/19, 62/18, 179/15, 50/2, 50/12, 51/21, 53/7, 56/13, 75/15 180/12, 181/5, 182/3, 182/13 40 43/24, 183/14 1989 52/10, 52/12, 52/20, 52/21, 53/23, 54/7, 54/20, 54/23, 62/8, 76/3, 76/10, 76/16, 76/17, 80/20 1990 47/5, 49/6, 52/10, 52/13, 52/21, 53/23, 54/7, 400 251/1, 259/22 '60's 230/19 41 131/18 419 22/19, 23/9 **'67 245/6** '80 48/3, 50/5 54/20, 54/23, 60/6, 60/18, 64/6, 64/9, 64/14, 64/23, 54/20, 54/25, 554/4 64/24, 64/25, 254/4 1991 39/16, 60/9, 60/10, 76/4, 76/12, 76/17, 97/23, 158/19, 184/14, 185/2, 188/6 1992 41/11, 54/5, 60/25, 65/5, 180/13, 181/21, 42 251/2, 252/21, 262/9 '80s 63/9, 102/20 4348 22/19 '86 48/2, 48/4 '87 53/3, 62/18, 82/7 45 184/17, 188/6, 188/7, 188/10, 345/13 46 55/23, 159/15, 184/15 '88 *53/3*, *62/18* 48 58/3 '89 53/3, 53/4, 254/5 188/15 49 188/17 ²90 53/4 1993 17/23, 24/14, 31/11, 44/4, 44/12, 44/21, 492 43/10 '92 41/14, 41/18 55/12, 65/5, 230/22 1994 6/9, 22/18, 40/1, 43/10, 45/25, 46/1, 46/4, '93 25/13, 31/12, 41/11, 41/19, 234/16 ⁹⁴ 41/20, 42/15, 48/3, 48/4, 50/5, 60/20 46/23, 47/1, 47/6, 48/20, 49/6, 49/7, 49/13, 49/17, 50/7, 50/20, 50/21, 51/9, 51/13, 51/16, 52/6, 53/11 '95 41/20, 42/15, 60/20, 188/20, 318/17 3/16, 42/15, 42/21, 42/22, 45/10, 46/15, 47/1, '96 188/20, 305/2 53/22, 54/5, 55/20, 55/25, 76/4, 76/12, 76/17, 76/24, 48/2, 48/8, 48/21, 48/22, 49/22, 51/20, 54/9 's 218/23, 219/2 188/15 50 183/15 1995 6/24, 39/16, 40/15, 42/7, 42/25, 43/23, 49/9, 61/1, 61/13, 62/19, 63/9, 63/18, 64/3, 159/4, 159/9, 500 105/1, 262/10 50s 44/19 159/13, 166/21, 303/6 1996 6/22, 9/2, 64/9, 64/14, 64/23, 65/1, 65/5, 51 34/22 0 191/21 52 69/4, 69/5, 102/11, 156/2, 158/6, 161/3, 189/15, 204/2, 305/9, 342/5 1997 1/9, 125/7, 158/7, 161/5, 161/23, 162/19, 59/13, 167/17 53 51/18, 159/14, 184/15 000 12/24, 39/17, 70/19, 94/17, 160/15, 160/17, 534 44/13 171/5, 174/2, 174/4, 175/6, 175/14, 191/15, 192/24, 54 130/7, 147/7 193/1, 227/9, 238/20, 268/10, 270/12, 280/8 162/21, 341/18 557 55/23 1st 11/22, 12/2, 97/22, 125/7, 125/10, 305/2 004 23/22 56 6/10 02 188/17 57 184/17 570 44/15 583 162/16 2 2/10, 10/11, 11/11, 13/12, 40/14, 42/8, 42/25, 59 43/23, 63/8, 65/2 48/2, 48/8, 48/20, 48/22, 49/3, 49/4, 50/2, 50/24, 50/25, 51/9, 51/20, 52/14, 55/19, 58/1, 60/2, 60/3, 1 2/4, 11/12, 42/15, 42/16, 43/1, 45/9, 45/10, 46/15, 50/12, 51/20, 51/21, 51/24, 52/4, 55/14, 60/8, 60/15, 61/23, 62/15, 63/4, 63/11, 64/6, 70/19, 75/15, 76/22, 76/24, 159/13, 188/6, 188/7, 188/10, 56/14, 59/6, 60/2, 60/8, 60/15, 61/23, 62/15, 63/4, 6 63/11, 75/15, 76/22, 78/17, 105/2, 127/5, 153/5, 6 1/9, 33/23, 34/9, 42/16, 43/3, 43/8, 50/1, 51/19, 188/14, 188/16, 188/17, 188/18 20 56/9, 59/3, 64/15, 78/14, 78/15, 82/18, 83/13, 98/19, 125/19, 143/14, 278/17 159/13, 159/15, 175/7, 188/15, 189/15, 189/18, 346/8 54/12, 57/25, 58/1, 58/3, 159/5, 175/7, 239/20, 345/8, 345/9 10 40/8, 56/24, 57/21, 61/17, 76/17, 127/5, 147/13, 153/5, 158/7, 345/8 60 43/10, 46/24, 56/13, 184/6 200 78/17, 95/10 100 105/2 60s 44/19 202 24/6 103 22/19, 23/9 61 64/24 20425 24/5 108 22/19 620 24/5 21 43/3, 56/24, 173/24, 280/1, 280/2 11 50/17, 50/24, 50/25, 51/19, 263/1 624 24/4 115 52/13 63 64/6 22 1/10, 46/4, 58/20, 173/24, 188/14 12 40/14, 48/2, 58/19, 60/9, 60/13, 76/17, 253/6 66 184/19, 188/10 127 2/14 229 3/9 667 161/13, 162/1 23 224/23 12th 220/19 67 39/17, 64/6, 83/3, 251/10 23669 1/11 13 40/1, 49/4, 49/22, 60/21, 341/1, 341/2 68 49/25 24 3/14, 56/14, 64/19, 174/5, 237/8, 264/18, 130 214/8 264/25, 267/5, 267/7, 269/10 136 76/5 245 160/15, 192/24 249 3/10 14 61/5, 61/12, 159/11, 190/4, 204/23, 293/1, 340/22, 340/25 145 160/17, 193/1 15 11/2, 11/9, 33/23, 34/9, 51/25, 61/1, 61/18, 63/12, 78/13, 78/15, 209/1, 216/19, 221/13, 228/18, 239/20, 251/3, 252/2, 328/22, 340/6, 340/18, 340/19, 25 44/17, 56/20, 66/9, 97/6, 97/8, 97/14, 98/14, 42/15, 43/10, 44/17, 48/21, 49/3, 49/4, 50/11, 98/19, 143/15, 160/20, 188/16, 260/10, 301/6 54/25, 55/1, 57/25, 59/1, 59/13, 61/13, 61/15, 61/17, 64/6, 64/9, 159/6, 159/11, 345/3 258 3/13 70 46/24, 63/17 26 5/3, 62/20, 190/20, 242/23, 275/25 700 70/21 345/9 264 3/15 72 62/19 150 147/10 269 189/18 73 64/13 152 135/10 159/21, 183/8, 183/13, 188/10 44/16, 44/18 155 2/20 2761 161/11, 161/15 75 102/3, 184/23, 301/5 15th 11/14, 11/24 28 51/20 159/22 77 16 40/16, 52/14, 52/23, 56/13, 61/19, 76/12, 82/19, 281 3/18 78 43/1 99/23, 189/18, 303/17 29 50/1 785 42/8, 42/25 160 56/2 164 2/21 167 156/14 2nd 23/17 79 63/18, 82/19 40/8, 53/7, 54/9, 219/7, 219/12, 220/18 X 175 143/13 177 2/22 2/17, 23/9, 43/5, 43/24, 45/9, 46/15, 50/24 8 49/24, 50/9, 51/18, 56/9 18 40/6, 46/10, 50/11, 54/12, 62/13, 63/3, 133/14, 50/25, 51/9, 51/22, 51/24, 52/4, 52/14, 52/23, 53/7, 54/9, 54/12, 54/25, 55/1, 55/14, 56/9, 56/24, 57/21, 80 50/10, 55/12, 103/9, 103/17, 105/7 146/21, 147/20, 183/8 81 47/1, 187/6 1860 171/25 57/23, 58/19, 59/6, 94/17, 159/6, 159/10, 159/14, 82 63/10 18th 306/8 828 158/21 171/5, 262/25

30 32/10, 55/12, 64/25, 98/15

83 48/20, 159/10

19 46/4, 46/22, 55/14, 82/17, 83/16, 278/17

8351 24/6 85 19/16, 84/4, 98/6, 98/22, 122/19, 126/9, 126/11 86 49/22 880 175/6

9 43/10, 48/21, 51/20, 61/13, 61/15, 76/21 90 32/12, 54/16, 261/24 91 159/5

92 2/8, 49/24, 50/9

94 64/9

96 19/17, 188/15 99 191/21, 314/9 997 227/13, 228/15

A

AA 251/6 aberration 43/15 abetted 163/13 ability 171/13, 231/4, 233/12, 288/12, 308/16, 311/17, 326/1, 332/12, 335/3, 343/11 abolished 99/8, 108/7 abolition 98/2 abrasive 143/21 absence 323/15 absolute 318/1 abuse 26/24, 71/20, 95/17, 100/19, 125/18, 125/20, 126/1, 157/19, 160/8, 162/4, 187/15, 263/16 abused 261/25 academic 142/14, 144/2, 146/8, 149/10 academy 182/19, 197/4 accelerator 253/6 accept 111/10, 154/1 acceptable 199/9, 328/17 access 74/16, 74/19, 298/20, 299/3, 310/16, 321/20 accessible 335/12, 342/9 accident 27/13, 57/16, 251/18, 252/19 accommodate 30/16 accomplish 4/16, 151/9, 151/20 accord 135/6 account 32/19, 252/24 accountability 112/20, 113/7, 248/16, 332/23, 333/11 accountable 214/14, 252/22 accounted 40/14, 40/15 accounts 54/15, 73/11 accurate 112/8, 181/19, 182/17, 329/22 accuse _ 118/3 accused 262/21 achieving 112/4 acid 172/9 acknowledgement 304/18 acquaintance 51/18, 68/10 acquaintances 56/13, 301/6, 301/13, 302/3 acronym 218/3 actoryin 216/5 Act 7/5, 22/12, 22/18, 23/15, 24/2, 56/18, 153/25, 154/2, 180/6, 180/11, 180/21, 181/5, 181/17, 181/23, 190/18, 200/7, 210/21, 259/4, 268/16 acted 165/7, 251/2 action 10/23, 94/24, 100/2, 124/12, 139/7, 139/12, 140/4, 165/14, 191/24, 214/18, 227/22, 242/10, 247/25, 249/19, 296/11, 308/1, 308/17 actions 244/9, 333/6, 333/9 activate 32/23 active 171/22, 209/3, 266/21 actively 12/1 activist 273/6 activities 13/11, 13/16, 32/16, 82/7, 144/18 activity 70/23, 82/8, 286/1, 307/22 actors 101/12 acts 57/24, 57/25, 58/1, 166/15, 183/15, 297/14 add 109/2, 148/15, 206/1, 206/10, 270/18, 293/20 added 206/5, 207/5, 207/10, 261/4, 269/25 addicted 170/6 addiction 170/4, 170/9, 170/11, 203/8, 203/9 addictive 168/7, 168/16, 168/17, 168/18, 168/24, 169/1, 170/1, 170/12 adding 172/14, 172/16 address 2/2, 4/3, 6/5, 13/16, 24/4, 32/5, 92/12, 94/24, 98/25, 100/3, 100/13, 102/10, 116/16, 116/24, 122/13, 142/20, 163/4, 181/4, 181/25, 188/24, 194/19, 195/6, 230/18, 238/22, 294/1 addressed 6/9, 15/1, 101/24, 142/12, 181/2 addresses 70/20, 178/14 addressing 15/23, 174/6, 181/18, 181/22, 182/2, 182/11, 230/10 adds 207/6 adequate 265/25, 266/5 adjustment 288/7 administer 21/12

Administration 2/17, 23/1, 79/1, 109/2, 144/17, administrations 147/19 administrative 161/1 administrators 277/12 admirable 152/2 admired 265/18 Admission 64/18 admit 199/25 adopted 204/1 adult 40/6, 68/18, 69/3, 69/10, 118/11, 118/15, 157/11, 181/13, 184/22, 189/10, 189/12, 190/7, 204/2, 211/11, 213/16, 213/17, 213/18, 213/20, 213/21, 214/6, 214/10, 215/11, 222/2, 223/8, 285/1, 288/19, 292/21, 293/3, 293/6, 304/5, 337/23, 338/1, 338/4, 338/5, 338/6, 338/8, 338/14, 338/23, 339/13, 339/18, 340/12, 340/16, 341/9, 341/20, 342/10, 342/19, 342/25, 343/7, 343/9, 343/14, 343/20, 344/10 adults 40/4, 74/6, 74/7, 181/14, 184/8, 184/25 190/1, 190/7, 190/10, 223/5, 292/22, 341/3, 343/23 advance 32/9, 157/7, 262/16 Advancement 256/25 advantage 173/7 adversity 6/6, 14/23 advice 7/4, 315/13 ADVISORY 1/2, 6/14, 28/15, 30/25, 31/24, 35/25, 153/15, 154/15, 177/6, 177/21, 179/16, 179/22, 179/24, 182/7, 190/13, 346/10 advocate 315/18 advocates 197/12, 197/23 affairs 116/4 affect 121/7, 126/17, 137/12, 163/2, 255/8 affecting 320/1 affects 255/7, 255/11, 318/8 affirmative 139/7, 139/12 affirmed 262/1 affluent 191/3 afford 35/1, 93/25, 94/2, 202/5, 261/1 afforded 133/1 afraid 26/2, 31/14, 33/18, 196/16, 317/22 Africa 175/8 African 2/4, 2/20, 3/5, 16/19, 25/15, 35/15, 106/22, 126/10, 126/13, 135/11, 145/1, 145/3, 152/12, 155/17, 156/4, 156/15, 156/21, 156/25, 157/1, 157/2, 157/6, 157/13, 157/16, 157/22, 158/16, 158/20, 158/24, 159/1, 159/5, 159/9, 159/14, 159/17, 159/22, 159/25, 160/6, 160/17, 162/18, 163/1, 163/8, 164/14, 165/24, 166/8, 167/9, 167/22, 179/2, 183/10, 183/12, 185/21, 185/23, 192/2, 217/14, 217/23, 245/12, 258/10, 266/6, 266/18, 273/8, 283/8, 283/9, 289/16, 289/22, 289/23, 293/4, 293/18, 294/5, 294/9, 294/10, 300/5, 301/16, 302/11, 303/21, 307/12, 316/20, 316/23, 317/16, 318/20 afternoon 91/24, 127/5, 127/18, 127/19, 127/21, 127/25, 134/19, 153/18, 154/21, 155/6, 155/7, 217/22, 264/21, 281/7 afterwards 221/1 age 14/23, 22/25, 40/7, 40/10, 45/22, 45/23, 46/3, 46/4, 46/8, 46/10, 46/18, 109/1, 130/17, 144/20, 161/19, 198/9, 204/20, 204/23, 233/11, 250/4, 293/7, 293/9, 306/6 aged 164/11 agencies 23/25, 163/5, 239/17, 269/22 agency 21/13, 22/15, 37/16, 77/24, 92/9, 92/10, 117/6, 117/11, 121/19, 125/4, 125/6, 246/4, 279/11, 279/14, 308/7, 308/18, 310/3, 310/16 agenda 108/14 agent 13/19 agents 278/2, 278/4, 278/5, 279/4, 279/8 ages 158/17 aggravated 39/11, 39/24, 41/25, 43/7, 43/9, 120/23, 305/12, 306/18 aggressive 144/2 agree 50/14, 84/14, 135/8, 244/21, 296/18, 311/23 agreed 134/2 agreement 134/23, 145/6, 296/9 agreements 320/23, 321/11 Aid 229/3, 271/17 aided 163/13 air 24/9, 184/20, 266/1 airport 111/7 al 1/13, 127/10, 127/22, 129/5, 130/16, 138/16, 139/25, 154/18, 192/16 alarm 79/3, 87/22 alarming 25/4 alcohol 95/17 Alexandria 1/15, 1/21 aligned 132/13 alive 165/18 alkaloid 171/6, 171/22, 172/8, 172/18 allegations 25/8, 26/23, 27/15, 27/16 Allen 30/25, 218/24, 219/21, 219/22, 222/15, 224/18, 226/4, 228/2, 229/8, 230/24, 231/15, 231/20,

237/16, 249/23, 253/24, 254/4, 265/24, 267/8, 273/10, 274/13 Allen's 267/12 alleviate 307/25 alley 219/16, 219/19, 219/21, 219/24, 226/4, 226/6, 226/10, 253/25 allocated 34/12 allocation 168/11 allow 5/6, 45/6, 246/21 allowed 34/10, 34/11, 169/21, 226/24, 228/3, 312/9 allowing 139/17 alluded 187/12 alternative 83/3, 83/23, 84/8, 186/6, 187/8, 190/20 alternatives 125/3, 125/9, 156/6, 157/21, 186/7, 186/9, 191/2 alumni 142/4 alveoli 174/1 amazed 167/12, 167/14, 168/15 amazing 167/21, 174/3 amenability 305/3 amenable 304/11 amended 109/6, 180/7, 181/5 amendment 182/3, 202/21 Amendments 22/18 America 102/22, 136/22, 171/19, 255/10 American 2/20, 25/15, 50/11, 126/11, 126/14, 135/11, 155/17, 156/4, 156/16, 156/21, 156/25, 157/1, 157/2, 157/6, 157/13, 157/16, 157/22, 158/16, 158/20, 158/24, 159/17, 159/25, 160/6, 160/17, 162/18, 163/1, 163/8, 164/15, 165/24, 166/8, 167/9, 167/22, 171/5, 171/25, 172/5, 172/7, 177/24, 178/12, 179/3, 183/10, 183/12, 185/22, 185/23, 192/3, 217/24, 233/20, 245/12, 266/6, 266/18, 273/8, 283/9, 289/22, 289/23, 293/4, 293/19, 294/5, 294/9, 294/10, 300/5, 301/16, 302/11, 303/21, 307/12, 316/20, 317/16, 318/20 Americans 2/4, 3/6, 16/19, 35/15, 50/1, 106/22 140/10, 145/1, 145/3, 152/12, 159/1, 159/5, 159/10, 159/14, 159/22, 196/4, 217/15, 258/10, 283/9, 289/16, 316/23 amount 20/13, 34/11, 76/22, 83/2, 89/11, 206/13, 230/3, 238/5 ample 135/1 amusing 172/16 analogy 107/13, 164/23, 226/10 analysis 68/13, 69/13, 70/25, 71/19, 72/4, 72/5, 72/18, 82/4, 121/22, 130/20, 187/20, 200/25, 333/5 Analyst 2/6, 36/6, 37/4, 37/11, 87/10, 258/6 analysts 130/11 analytical 82/4 analyze 74/17, 131/20, 156/15, 156/20, 156/25, 157/5, 157/9, 169/4 analyzing 85/11 and\or 4/23 anecdotal 179/14, 181/9, 181/18, 184/8 anecdotally 181/15 anecdote 111/6 anesthetic 172/1 Angeles 109/13 angry 197/24, 197/25 animal 104/6 animals 336/5 Anna 346/7 announcement 273/20, 273/24 announcements 153/1, 153/2, 153/24 annual 9/15, 17/15, 102/8, 102/9, 185/19 annually 14/4, 21/25, 161/25 answer 30/7, 32/20, 33/20, 65/7, 66/20, 72/11, 85/15, 88/3, 91/4, 91/6, 119/10, 205/4, 205/6, 208/9, 245/18, 256/9, 258/19, 295/5, 297/6, 300/22, 303/23, 312/7, 321/5, 327/5, 333/18, 334/23, 335/14, 341/14, 342/21, 343/1, 344/3, 344/21 answerable 335/9, 335/10 answered 128/16, 217/2, 252/24, 275/2, 324/20 answering 89/5 Answers 2/4, 35/14, 65/24, 141/9, 141/17, 141/19, 296/14 anti 71/20 anticipate 12/22 anticipated 89/7 apologize 129/2, 131/21, 281/16, 281/24, 282/1 appeal 204/4, 228/20, 261/13 appealed 226/21 Appeals 204/8, 226/22, 227/17, 248/6, 261/16 appearance 287/7 appellate 259/1, 261/14, 261/24 Appendix 76/2, 76/25 appetite 171/14 applicants 303/12, 303/13 application 165/22 applications 160/25 applies 234/20 apply 209/6

appointed 6/10, 11/11, 11/18, 11/19, 94/1, 177/21, 241/5, 241/25, 282/5, 328/10 appointees 8/9, 231/10 appointment 194/7, 244/24, 245/19, 311/10. 311/16, 328/16 appointments 11/13, 328/6, 328/11 appreciate 115/13, 138/17, 265/3, 265/9 appreciation 6/15, 9/4 approach 10/6, 121/8, 196/19, 215/20, 307/14, approached 121/18, 129/5, 139/10 appropriate 26/15, 29/2, 122/13, 148/23, 156/5, 157/21, 162/7, 212/16, 246/7, 285/17, 285/25, 305/7, 316/9, 316/11, 316/14, 325/22 appropriately 163/4 approved 25/18 April 11/2, 11/9, 11/24, 88/21 Aqueduct 28/9 Aquevista 28/8 Arab 131/19, 132/3, 132/4 area 24/6, 24/20, 25/22, 26/25, 31/2, 94/9, 110/10, 147/15, 151/5, 158/14, 158/15, 161/6, 164/6, 189/9, 197/1, 219/13, 219/14, 248/11, 277/2, 277/3, 296/25, 307/14, 331/10 areas 27/17, 53/12, 53/14, 53/16, 53/21, 53/22 54/1, 54/15, 54/17, 55/8, 61/21, 61/25, 66/11, 75/8, 75/11, 76/18, 89/22, 100/20, 133/3, 141/15, 158/5, 188/19, 198/8, 199/11, 199/13, 199/14, 259/12, 297/1 arena 9/1 arguing 212/8 argument 57/11, 57/12, 57/14, 107/6, 107/13, 107/18, 107/20, 222/16, 226/1, 325/9 arguments 222/18 arises 166/16, 286/8 arising 166/3 arm 173/17, 220/12, 320/18 armed 96/7, 112/12, 124/19, 124/25, 214/3 arms 25/25, 173/9 arraignment 261/10, 289/5 arraignments 314/12 array 20/7 arrest 38/13, 39/3, 39/4, 39/5, 45/3, 49/8, 53/20, 68/4, 73/7, 100/16, 102/17, 103/8, 104/1, 113/1, 116/1, 116/9, 121/12, 190/5, 190/10, 213/11, 220/7, 286/13, 313/21, 314/18 arrested 40/4, 40/5, 40/10, 43/1, 45/1, 46/3, 47/2, 48/19, 49/20, 50/7, 50/19, 51/15, 52/4, 52/15, 52/24, 53/10, 54/12, 54/13, 54/18, 54/22, 55/6, 55/9, 55/17, 59/10, 59/11, 61/2, 62/1, 66/12, 68/4, 117/13, 221/23, 287/6, 298/13 arrestee 58/21, 77/20 arresting 68/2 arrests 37/23, 38/15, 38/17, 39/2, 39/8, 39/9, 39/17, 39/25, 40/1, 40/15, 40/17, 40/23, 41/1, 42/7, 42/8, 42/25, 43/11, 43/21, 44/14, 44/17, 45/24, 46/12, 50/9, 50/10, 52/7, 52/11, 52/19, 53/1, 53/22, 54/2, 54/16, 55/24, 56/5, 60/1, 60/7, 60/9, 60/14, 60/22, 61/4, 61/14, 61/15, 61/20, 62/20, 62/21, 66/14, 75/16, 76/11, 76/13, 76/23, 82/25, 83/1, 102/15, 103/9, 158/24, 183/14, 183/16, 184/14, 184/15, 185/23, 186/3, 186/13, 186/17, 188/20, 188/22, 190/2, 195/23 arrival 273/21, 273/25 arson 39/12 Artful 205/1 article 28/17, 211/3, 273/19, 273/25 articles 237/25, 239/7 Arts 268/20 ascertain 8/16, 29/1, 266/3 ascertaining 256/14 Asian 131/19, 132/3, 132/11, 179/5 Asians 50/11 aspect 158/13, 167/5, 180/21, 211/24, 336/23 aspects 158/2, 162/14 assailant 123/12 assault 39/11, 39/24, 42/1, 43/7, 120/23, 226/19, 226/20, 227/11, 227/25, 338/23 assaulted 213/17 assaults 43/10 Assembly 2/19, 69/20, 84/20, 87/18, 94/22, 98/1, 125/16, 155/3, 156/2, 158/11, 161/5, 162/1, 162/22, 190/16, 190/19, 200/18, 212/7, 212/21, 311/12, 311/14, 342/5 assess 291/20, 336/12 assessing 185/5 assessment 269/17, 271/15, 292/1, 316/3, 327/22 assigned 6/19, 319/5 assist 146/15, 149/9, 152/15, 156/6, 157/22,

201/21, 239/16

assistance 4/18, 148/24, 152/5, 162/5, 237/16,

Assistant 2/2, 4/2, 4/10, 19/24, 91/14, 164/8,

164/9, 207/16, 207/21, 251/8, 263/4, 280/4

assistants 74/24, 91/12, 303/17 associated 20/16, 107/2, 160/24, 235/18, 260/23 Association 127/14, 127/16, 128/6, 128/10, 128/23, 129/6, 140/25, 177/24, 178/1, 178/12, 216/4, 256/25, 319/1, 328/7, 328/22, 329/1, 329/9, 329/21, 330/2 Association's 328/25 Associations 2/14, 328/20 assumption 5/21, 78/21, 122/22 assumptions 66/4, 67/10, 302/9, 302/10 assurance 11/6 assure 90/23 assured 16/13 attached 50/16 attachments 178/7 attack 163/16, 180/22 attained 152/13 attempted 135/17 attend 144/17 attention 8/5, 8/25, 17/22, 18/21, 27/3, 35/17, 78/23, 87/20, 104/13, 117/10, 119/13, 123/15, 142/11, 142/16, 174/11, 186/18, 187/22, 192/1, 195/17, 290/25, 320/3, 320/7 attest 269/4 attitude 27/2, 195/13, 196/3, 199/1, 199/3, 201/19 Attifudes 2/10, 17/14, 199/6 Attorney 3/18, 79/11, 94/2, 108/5, 164/3, 164/5, 164/7, 164/8, 164/10, 164/14, 195/9, 207/17, 207/21, 216/18, 218/1, 218/14, 218/20, 218/23, 222/11, 216/18, 218/1, 218/14, 218/14, 218/20, 218/23, 222/11, 222/17, 223/15, 227/11, 227/23, 228/4, 228/24, 228/24, 230/11, 231/14, 231/15, 231/21, 234/18, 251/8, 251/9, 263/4, 269/19, 274/4, 274/11, 274/13, 274/16, 274/21, 274/23, 276/7, 277/22, 280/5, 281/1, 281/2, 281/3, 281/4, 281/10, 282/10, 282/11, 303/6, 303/7, 303/9, 303/10, 308/8, 315/17, 318/24, 322/22, 330/16, 332/17, 333/12, 333/25, 334/15, 335/8, 337/9, 337/11, 337/20, 338/12, 339/13, 341/23, 342/11, 344/17 342/11, 344/17 Attorney's 119/14, 189/16, 214/25, 230/9, 234/11, 235/13, 250/9, 286/6, 286/17, 286/25, 292/2, 313/4, 314/19, 315/4, 330/13, 333/7, 333/23 Attorneys 119/18, 122/6, 130/1, 214/18, 215/2, 215/8, 215/14, 215/17, 216/4, 221/15, 236/16, 236/18, 243/5, 252/5, 276/16, 276/19, 276/24, 292/19, 292/24, 329/9, 329/10, 329/18, 329/21, 329/23, 330/1, 333/16, 336/5, 336/14, 339/7 Attorneys' 204/21 attractive 106/7 attribute 102/19, 114/11 attributes 233/14 audience 45/11, 81/3, 81/25, 87/23, 87/24, 121/6, 129/4, 134/21, 164/1, 194/13, 223/20, 230/16, 248/20, 264/23, 265/1, 345/6 August 279/2 authorities 246/7 authority 23/2, 79/4, 233/5, 233/7, 272/22 authorized 22/16, 22/20, 23/7 automatic 211/5, 211/9, 212/1, 212/9, 213/3, . 214/17, 219/10, 305/11, 325/12, 333/8 automatically 189/16, 215/4, 216/9, 216/22, 304/6, 342/13 available 22/3, 51/13, 74/18, 74/21, 74/22, 74/23, 86/6, 101/22, 130/6, 140/13, 141/11, 147/8, 148/20, 268/2, 271/25, 310/8, 310/9 avenue 6/4 average 169/17, 169/19, 173/25, 193/15, 193/16, 193/17, 193/18 averaging 44/19 avert 145/22, 174/10 averting 107/19 avoid 90/14, 177/11, 178/17, 211/18 avoided 137/16 avoiding 211/19 awaiting 162/22, 184/3 award 319/7 awareness 293/17

В

babies 168/13, 169/25
backed 280/5
background 27/22, 95/14, 95/16, 115/7, 191/20, 209/19, 210/2, 219/4, 291/24, 306/15, 320/3
backgrounds 212/12
bad 127/20, 138/21, 196/2, 197/8, 253/13, 255/2, 276/3, 277/7, 296/18, 325/25, 326/18
baggage 18/1, 18/5
baggy 290/11, 295/18
Bailey 276/7
balance 276/3, 325/8
balanced 84/12
balances 117/3

Baldwin 36/14

bang 20/17, 185/25, 195/25 bank 278/21 banks Baptist 266/22, 267/3 bar 58/22, 166/2, 177/24, 178/1, 178/12, 241/17, 250/10, 259/1, 279/1, 279/6, 279/9, 279/10, 328/7, 328/19, 328/22, 328/24, 329/1, 330/10, 330/11, 330/16, 330/19, 330/20, 331/1, 331/4, 331/9, 331/20, 331/22, 332/1, 332/3, 332/4, 332/9, 332/10, 332/12, 333/18 bargaining 101/5, 119/11 barred 243/5 Barrett 184/21 barring 262/15 bars 58/21 Basagle 177/8 base 19/24, 115/23, 116/13, 116/24, 173/4, 173/14, baseball 191/20 based 101/23, 108/25, 109/2, 141/4, 158/14, 190/21, 200/24, 288/1, 289/15, 289/18, 289/24, 290/4, 290/15, 290/19, 291/10, 291/13, 291/17, 291/18, 292/2, 292/10, 296/21, 304/9, 305/2, 313/19, 314/6, 327/9, 337/2 baseline 14/10 basing 173/2 basis 13/18, 21/23, 23/6, 26/5, 81/23, 95/3, 141/24, 207/4, 221/12, 237/14, 246/9, 274/18, 289/21, 289/22 basketball 226/10, 267/13 bath 172/9 battery 226/19, 226/20, 227/11, 227/25 battle 229/17 BAUGH 2/21, 153/8, 164/3, 177/16, 212/14, 219/9, 241/20 Beach 186/10, 186/19, 197/5 bear 192/1, 325/12 beat 195/16 beatings 27/16 Beaumont 184/20 behave 28/10 behavior 107/2, 195/17, 292/18, 332/25 belief 5/17 beliefs 139/15 bells 79/3, 79/14 bench 226/12, 242/10, 242/24, 245/2, 245/3, 245/4, 245/7, 276/21, 280/9 benchmarks 114/2 bend 165/13 benefit 18/4, 144/20 Bessie 33/6 bet 243/13 Bethel 220/19 betrayed 270/10 bias 68/15, 90/23, 91/16, 115/23, 116/7, 116/13, 121/4, 131/11, 202/14, 243/6 biased 135/21 biases 90/11, 116/25, 131/6, 132/9, 160/2, 324/15 bicycle 319/6 big 80/15, 93/10, 173/22 bigger 4/8, 263/12, 263/13, 263/22 biggest 195/25, 197/6 bigot 207/24, 207/25 bigoted 165/14, 166/15, 175/1 Digoted 165/14, 166/15, 175/1
bigotry 165/10, 165/18, 166/12, 166/16, 174/7
Bill 161/11, 161/15, 200/21, 205/2, 227/9, 238/20
billboards 312/16, 335/22
billions 175/11
bills 162/20
Bingham 218/8, 264/25, 267/6
birth 291/22
birthday 207/11, 306/8 birthday 207/11, 306/8 bit 14/18, 38/9, 44/3, 44/10, 44/22, 54/22, 61/9, 61/19, 62/6, 69/2, 75/9, 110/10, 142/20, 146/24, 148/2, 175/21, 183/21, 188/21, 247/24, 271/10, 295/2, 321/3, 329/8, 339/5 bites 195/15 bizarre 264/11 Black 2/14, 7/21, 7/25, 16/6, 41/1, 43/1, 43/3, 43/11, 43/22, 43/24, 44/17, 50/1, 50/10, 53/1, 54/13, 54/18, 55/6, 55/11, 55/16, 55/18, 55/21, 55/23, 55/24, 58/22, 58/25, 59/2, 59/3, 59/7, 59/13, 60/16, 61/6, 6 61/7, 62/1, 62/20, 63/11, 63/20, 65/14, 67/8, 77/6, 78/21, 82/18, 84/4, 84/8, 88/1, 91/13, 103/6, 103/9, 103/18, 103/25, 105/9, 109/16, 109/19, 110/14, 110/18, 110/20, 111/15, 111/16, 116/5, 116/7, 116/8, 117/23, 118/6, 119/11, 120/22, 121/5, 121/10, 124/20, 126/19, 127/14, 127/16, 128/6, 128/9, 128/11, 128/23, 129/6, 131/18, 132/7, 132/21, 135/24, 136/5, 136/21, 138/5, 140/10, 140/25, 142/5, 143/11, 144/7, 145/7, 147/11, 147/13, 187/9, 193/1,

201/14, 207/20, 212/25, 221/22, 224/24, 225/19,

226/5, 232/7, 233/20, 236/17, 236/19, 236/25,

249/17, 249/20, 254/17, 255/15, 256/17, 259/16, 275/4, 290/11, 291/21, 295/14, 295/21, 296/4, 296/5, 301/11, 301/12, 303/20 blacks 40/19, 58/25, 61/17, 62/17, 63/6, 63/8, 63/15, 64/5, 64/24, 65/1, 65/4, 66/10, 82/21, 82/23, 83/2, 83/5, 84/1, 117/25, 118/16, 124/16, 124/23, 136/23, 199/12, 224/14, 224/20, 226/18, 254/25, 300/9 Blacksburg 1/18 blame 28/11, 174/20 blanks 278/9 blatant 110/6 bleak 116/3, 116/6 Blechman 231/13 bleeds 186/25 bless 249/24 blessing 118/24 blind 85/9, 85/12, 85/16, 90/14, 267/24, 307/13 Blindness 265/14 block 318/9 blocking 244/11 blow 192/18
BLSA 127/16, 129/15, 135/8, 138/11, 138/21, 143/9, 144/1, 144/13, 144/23, 152/4 BLSA's 148/7 Blue 5/12, 40/20, 45/25, 46/11, 52/8, 58/22, 206/6 blunt 149/17 board 6/14, 6/22, 6/25, 7/17, 32/18, 108/12, 133/17, 134/6, 136/24, 142/23, 283/1, 283/2 boat 26/8 body 129/1, 133/24, 134/1, 168/19, 178/21, 191/25, 309/10, 329/9, 330/1 body's 171/13 boils 115/22 boldly 135/3 bolts 302/16, 302/21 Bon 184/20 bond 234/5 bonus 14/5, 19/22, 20/1, 20/12, 20/22 book 49/6, 49/22, 49/25, 50/20, 50/24, 51/23, 55/1, 55/4, 110/16, 192/5, 192/7 books 50/15 border 154/9 bore 139/1 born 166/12 boss 334/7, 334/9 bottom 169/10, 250/19 bound 316/13 bowl 221/21, 227/21 bowling 219/16, 219/24, 226/4, 226/6, 226/10, 253/25 box 206/11, 206/19 boy 253/5, 253/13, 255/14 boys 227/20, 257/12 Branch 22/16, 37/15, 117/6, 117/12, 122/1, 122/2, 122/11, 257/3, 257/4, 266/11, 270/11, 328/7 branches 22/3 brand 109/22 break 40/3, 40/18, 42/1, 54/1, 57/22, 58/5, 92/2, 126/25, 140/15, 153/11, 217/7, 217/10, 245/15, 259/4, 345/2 breakdown 43/2, 63/23, 64/20, 130/17, 131/17, 163/8, 202/13 breaking 66/21, 220/5, 245/14 breaks 48/7 Brenda 250/18, 252/14, 254/6 Bridge 184/21 bridges 82/12 brief 119/25, 155/25, 218/22, 219/6, 229/21, 230/11, 345/14 bring 4/13, 4/14, 26/17, 36/9, 36/12, 54/10, 86/19, 91/1, 129/2, 139/6, 142/11, 142/16, 145/21, 164/12, 192/1, 215/14, 284/4, 286/16, 308/25 bringing 194/21, 239/16, 249/17, 249/18, 262/11 broad 9/8, 66/3 broader 114/16, 114/21 brochure 99/1, 99/5, 102/10 brochures 98/24 broke 47/16, 298/3 broken 39/19, 130/23, 167/16, 220/11 Brother 200/15, 224/23 brought 17/22, 18/1, 18/21, 81/6, 98/23, 105/23, 116/2, 185/6, 254/22, 287/24, 308/21, 309/15, 310/6 BROWN 3/9, 191/19, 191/22, 218/4, 229/19 Bruce 88/13, 88/23, 182/15 Bryant 81/2, 81/16 buck 20/18, 185/25, 195/25 Bucks 110/17 Buddhist 164/20 buddies 111/8 buddy 220/3

budget 11/23, 12/18, 12/19

build 9/18, 82/12, 147/20, 263/12, 263/22 building 250/14, 263/12, 280/9 buildings 107/11 bull 109/18 burden 270/1, 325/13 burdensome 160/25 Bureau 53/14, 72/6 bureaucracy 28/1 Burgess 31/23 burglaries 43/13, 43/15, 43/19, 43/20 burglary 39/11, 43/12, 58/10, 340/14, 340/17, 341/19 burned 71/20 burning 344/2 bury 252/6 business 8/11, 10/3, 205/15, 232/4, 269/8 busy 152/9 buy 109/21, 260/25 buys 286/11

C

C17H21NO4 171/7, 171/23, 172/8, 172/13 C17H21NO4HCL 172/24, 173/3 cab 111/7, 111/11 calendar 306/3 calibrated 99/11, 99/13 calibrated 99/11, 99/13
call 9/21, 27/3, 99/18, 103/22, 104/16, 104/19,
112/12, 112/17, 120/5, 125/13, 139/16, 148/20,
149/25, 167/2, 173/11, 173/15, 192/13, 208/18,
208/19, 210/2, 223/13, 236/9, 241/6, 258/17, 264/2,
300/19, 314/2, 330/5
calls 24/11, 224/1, 230/25, 296/24, 308/13, 313/11, 315/9 came 5/12, 18/9, 25/1, 25/2, 25/12, 26/11, 31/23, 33/9, 71/13, 78/1, 106/3, 133/21, 161/8, 162/11, 162/13, 170/23, 170/25, 172/6, 180/24, 204/9, 219/5, 230/21, 238/13, 238/25, 243/19, 251/9, 251/12, 251/13, 257/17, 282/23, 283/4, 287/14, 298/6, 311/1 campaign 235/17, 336/17, 339/9 campus 146/13 campuses 138/9, 146/14 canceled 194/6 candidate 328/23 candidates 5/24 canous 330/23 capacity 82/4 capital 189/23, 305/12, 306/18, 314/4 captains 117/1 car 57/16, 183/19, 183/22, 251/14, 251/16, 251/17, 271/20, 285/23, 285/24 care 207/24, 253/21, 255/2 cared 266/15 careful 298/8 caring 195/17 carried 109/14 carrier 251/24 carries 171/6, 328/9 carrot 181/24 carry 10/12, 10/13, 240/22 carrying 225/13 cars 253/5 cart 111/11 cartoon 191/18 case 24/19, 26/15, 32/11, 32/19, 33/4, 33/10, 33/12, 52/17, 77/17, 93/18, 94/7, 96/6, 112/11, 114/4, 118/18, 119/13, 134/13, 139/10, 140/1, 140/9, 154/13, 165/21, 204/8, 211/18, 212/16, 212/20, 216/12, 219/1, 221/5, 222/1, 222/7, 222/10, 222/12, 222/15, 222/23, 222/25, 223/11, 223/25, 225/1, 225/15, 226/21, 226/25, 227/2, 234/17, 235/11, 236/1, 236/23, 241/3, 243/17, 243/18, 243/21, 244/2, 250/2, 250/24, 251/1, 251/21, 252/1, 256/11, 256/23, 250/2, 250/24, 251/1, 251/21, 252/1, 256/11, 256/23, 262/5, 262/11, 269/20, 270/13, 273/10, 274/14, 276/8, 276/13, 277/18, 281/18, 287/22, 288/4, 288/8, 289/11, 291/25, 295/16, 296/7, 296/20, 305/5, 305/22, 306/10, 306/14, 309/9, 309/13, 309/16, 309/22, 313/5, 314/10, 314/17, 314/18, 314/21, 315/10, 315/24, 322/14, 322/20, 323/2, 325/1, 325/3, 325/22, 326/5, 330/14, 333/21, 337/25, 338/1, 339/2, 339/13, 339/14, 341/9, 343/16 cases 97/13, 98/10, 111/24, 113/23, 143/4, 204/6, 204/16, 214/20, 222/21, 227/16, 232/15, 234/15, 204/16, 214/20, 222/21, 227/16, 232/15, 234/15, 238/7, 241/7, 241/8, 241/22, 241/25, 242/1, 242/3, 244/13, 250/20, 252/8, 257/11, 262/3, 262/25, 263/16, 269/23, 269/24, 285/10, 285/11, 289/21, 290/3, 292/20, 292/24, 294/9, 296/13, 297/11, 300/7, 300/8, 304/7, 305/4, 305/24, 306/3, 306/4, 307/1, 314/1, 314/3, 314/8, 314/9, 315/14, 316/4, 316/9, 320/23, 321/11, 337/12, 342/12 cnsewise 118/7 casewise 118/7 catalyst 163/18 catalytic 13/15, 13/19

cataract 251/10 catch 119/20, 325/5 categories 68/19, 81/7, 81/9, 81/11 categorize 275/13 category 40/22, 43/6, 54/17, 58/14, 59/9, 59/11, 77/19, 305/23 Cancasian 300/5 caucus 201/14, 256/18, 311/12 caught 103/16, 104/21, 105/1, 198/15, 324/9 caused 89/13, 176/17 causes 305/13 causing 79/3, 89/13 Center 37/10, 38/24, 64/18, 70/2, 72/4, 72/5, 125/14, 184/6, 188/9, 226/11, 256/17, 257/2, 265/24, 268/20, 270/5, 338/9 Centers 64/23, 109/15, 338/25 central 54/3, 54/8, 185/17 certainty 123/9 certified 222/1, 222/22 certify 346/7 Chair 1/12, 4/5, 4/8, 164/4, 177/6, 177/19, 177/23, 177/24 chairing 179/23 Chairman 106/25, 126/24, 155/15, 217/21, 229/16, 270/10, 293/16 Chairman's 292/13 Chairperson 2/19, 3/9, 264/21, 264/24 **chairs** 220/4 chamber 249/16, 257/19, 327/16 Chambers 1/10, 238/14 chance 79/23, 119/19, 232/9, 300/24 chances 263/2 change 8/11, 17/14, 41/12, 62/18, 62/19, 63/19, 65/18, 76/3, 194/25, 195/7, 196/2, 205/5, 215/1, 215/6, 257/2, 291/25, 304/14, 304/17, 306/1, 307/2 changed 14/20, 32/13, 62/11, 124/3, 150/21, 183/6, 199/7, 231/6, 305/9, 311/15 changes 55/20, 70/9, 91/21, 188/23, 201/18, 201/19, 212/8, 256/7 changing 111/9 channel 206/18 Chapter 51/22, 51/24, 266/24 Chapters 129/15, 138/11, 138/21 character 14/19 characteristics 161/18 characterizations 154/10 characterizing 110/18, 197/7 charge 100/23, 100/24, 100/25, 101/1, 101/3, 101/6, 117/7, 118/20, 226/8, 234/17, 234/18, 235/22, 235/24, 285/12, 285/16, 286/4, 288/1, 288/2, 288/3, 288/15, 290/14, 293/12, 293/23, 313/4, 313/12, 315/11, 341/5 charged 118/14, 119/1, 156/20, 157/5, 157/12, 157/20, 161/4, 189/20, 203/20, 210/19, 210/21, 221/24, 224/9, 288/23, 291/13, 313/9 charges 109/13, 285/2, 285/17, 286/18, 286/20, 287/1, 287/3, 287/6, 287/10, 287/21, 287/24, 288/13, 289/3, 289/4, 289/8, 293/3, 309/23, 314/13, 314/15, 316/6, 338/20 charging 213/6, 213/11, 284/24, 287/16, 288/22, 289/14, 289/17, 291/15, 292/21, 293/12, 302/19 Charles 204/24 Charlie 191/19, 191/21 chart 40/22, 42/5, 46/14, 47/7, 48/1, 48/8, 58/22, 64/17, 67/12, 178/8, 183/4 Charter 4/23, 6/10, 8/12 charters 6/12 charts 41/7, 42/10 cuarts 41/1, 42/10 chatting 111/8 cheaper 106/7, 109/22 check 23/15, 119/5, 210/2, 276/3, 323/1, 341/17 checks 117/3, 252/23 chemical 168/20, 171/7 chemistry 172/15 chemistry 172/16 Chesterfield 186/11, 186/14, 186/20, 260/10 chew 171/8, 272/12 chewed 171/5 chewing 171/10 Cheyney 142/4 Chief 197/14 child 146/24, 170/5, 198/9, 198/11, 250/14, 251/4, 251/11, 252/17, 252/18, 260/13, 260/14, 262/19, Children 3/13, 103/2, 176/16, 177/25, 178/4, 178/13, 179/7, 184/14, 218/6, 253/19, 258/3, 259/20, 260/1, 263/10, 263/18, 263/24, 317/18 choice 5/24 choices 341/24 choose 11/16, 338/7 chose 8/8, 228/4 chosen 266/10 Chris 248/6 Christian 25/10, 82/14, 256/19, 266/25, 280/6,

280/14 Christmas 20/2, 79/23 Chuck 92/18 Church 1/23, 267/2, 267/3 churches 26/19 circle 86/18, 86/22, 134/22 circled 135/18 circles 9/22 circles 9/22
circles 9/22
circling 145/6
circuit 62/24, 63/17, 96/25, 97/19, 125/15, 184/7, 204/8, 206/10, 222/12, 222/22, 222/24, 223/24, 241/13, 255/5, 261/17, 261/18, 274/15, 274/18, 309/9
circuits 97/4, 97/6, 97/7, 97/8, 97/10, 97/14
circumstance 306/7, 306/13 circumstances 56/8, 93/15, 93/18, 322/20, 338/20 cite 112/9, 259/5, 259/6 cities 53/17, 53/18, 54/3, 54/4, 54/5, 54/8, 75/20, 75/22, 76/1, 102/22, 163/6, 174/20, 185/17, 244/19 citing 112/15 Citizen 4/24, 5/12, 6/10, 9/9, 9/16, 11/20, 14/3, 20/3, 20/8, 21/20, 28/6, 103/1, 130/10, 285/3, 285/13, 287/5, 288/16, 300/13, 300/15, 311/17, 312/2, 335/14 312/2, 335/14 citizen's 291/17 citizens 5/5, 6/5, 9/13, 10/1, 11/20, 14/6, 24/11, 25/3, 25/6, 26/5, 29/9, 123/6, 150/7, 174/18, 201/21, 210/16, 248/11, 265/21, 283/1, 308/14 Citizens' 8/13, 8/20, 9/2, 9/7, 10/9, 10/10, 10/13, 11/11, 13/17, 284/14, 284/16 citizensbin, 140/10 11/11, 13/17, 20-9149, 20-9149 citizenship 140/10 City 1/10, 2/2, 3/18, 4/2, 4/10, 4/11, 4/13, 5/10, 6/1, 6/3, 6/5, 7/2, 7/15, 13/15, 14/3, 19/7, 20/10, 24/24, 25/1, 25/3, 33/7, 33/16, 76/10, 186/15, 24/24, 25/1, 25/3, 33/7, 33/16, 76/10, 186/15, 186/16, 186/21, 189/14, 191/7, 197/14, 199/13, 229/8, 230/13, 230/17, 230/24, 231/2, 237/17, 237/19, 238/13, 243/14, 243/15, 244/1, 244/19, 265/20, 266/7, 266/15, 266/19, 269/1, 269/8, 269/11, 269/21, 270/7, 282/5, 282/8, 282/10, 282/12, 282/21, 282/22, 283/12, 308/7, 315/1, 317/14, 317/23, 318/18 Civic 31/5 264/18, 310/1 282/22, 283/12, 308/7, 315/1, 317/14, 317/23, 318/18 Civic 3/15, 264/18, 319/1 CIVIL 1/4, 22/13, 22/14, 22/17, 23/5, 23/21, 25/7, 25/12, 25/19, 34/16, 86/16, 131/2, 146/5, 146/15, 153/16, 185/8, 249/19, 254/8, 255/23, 256/15, 260/12, 260/24, 262/9, 263/3, 263/5, 265/17, 266/11, 266/22, 269/17, 308/10, 308/11, 315/10, 346/11 claim 262/9 claiming 314/17 Claims 263/4, 311/11 clarification 316/17 clarify 292/14, 302/7 class 127/24, 135/10, 135/15, 139/11, 139/17, 139/20, 139/21, 147/9, 147/10, 150/7, 198/12, 289/22, 301/3 classes 290/1 classification 57/1, 305/18 classmate 219/22 classmates 198/12 classroom 135/12 clause 150/14 clean 175/12, 318/4 clear 24/9, 24/14, 28/20, 29/10, 105/12, 117/16, 223/21, 243/2, 299/4, 308/6, 324/5 cleared 117/17, 190/5 clearly 246/1, 283/14, 290/8, 297/15, 300/15, 308/9, 311/21, 327/18 clears 13/21 clerk 277/18, 277/21 clerk's 262/5 clerks 189/2 client 226/2 clients 162/9, 232/7, 232/10, 236/19 climate 268/5 clinic 149/3, 149/5, 149/6 clinics 148/20, 149/4 clock 270/23 close 7/1, 112/14, 132/5, 132/6, 226/23, 238/20, 269/22, 279/4, 306/7 closed 26/8, 199/15, 199/16, 277/18, 278/23 closer 281/22 closing 9/12, 162/24, 263/25, 278/20 closings 278/4 closure 180/14 Club 245/15 Coalition 5/13, 6/1, 6/3, 17/22, 17/23, 18/22, 179/16, 180/5 coat 267/16 cocaine 60/3, 60/4, 75/10, 102/22, 103/1, 103/3, 103/5, 103/8, 103/9, 103/17, 104/15, 104/17, 104/19, 104/22, 104/24, 105/2, 105/3, 105/8, 105/11, 105/16, 106/4, 106/10, 106/12, 106/15, 107/1, 107/7, 107/8, 107/10, 107/9, 107/10, 107/15, 107/17, 109/4, 110/1, 111/24, 123/24, 124/1, 125/11, 126/13, 159/5, 159/9, 166/24,

166/25, 167/11, 168/6, 168/10, 168/23, 169/3, 169/5, 169/6, 169/7, 169/12, 169/18, 169/20, 169/24, 170/1, 170/15, 170/20, 170/23, 170/25, 171/1, 171/4, 171/6, 171/10, 172/1, 172/2, 172/3, 172/8, 172/18, 172/19, 172/20, 172/21, 172/24, 173/2, 173/3, 173/8, 173/11, 173/13, 173/14, 173/20, 174/4, 174/13, 174/17, 174/19, 175/18, 175/19, 192/10, 223/10, 224/22, code 24/6, 189/18, 206/10, 212/9, 288/23 coerce 249/9, 249/12 coercion 270/5 cognizant 229/18 coincides 89/11 coke 109/17, 109/19 Coliseum 250/15 collaboration 146/19, 147/2 collaborative 163/15 colleague 177/3, 177/8, 177/17, 339/6 collect 22/21, 161/17, 161/24 Collected 22/12, 23/12, 24/2, 29/3, 70/5, 70/6, 120/14 collecting 65/16, 67/19, 85/11, 182/14 collection 23/2, 66/16, 73/18, 86/4, 99/24, 116/19, 206/17 college 7/8, 140/20, 142/5, 199/2, 221/3, 222/4, 227/6, 227/8 22/10, 22/10 colleges 103/2 color 22/24, 27/13, 108/25, 118/12, 118/19, 136/1, 178/4, 178/9, 178/13, 179/7, 184/14, 233/10, 236/9, 260/23 Colored 257/1 column 55/20, 178/10 combination 236/8 combined 98/17 combined 7/24 comfortable 21/2, 135/16, 137/3 commenced 200/7 commencing 346/11 commend 81/22, 142/6 comment 90/6, 120/19, 144/8, 147/6, 147/24, 149/2, 152/2, 276/5, 290/19, 295/4, 316/18 143/2, 152/2, 270/15, 250/15, 250/15, 250/16 commentaries 23/24 commentary 143/25 commented 230/2 comments 25/4, 128/25, 131/14, 132/16, 134/16, 137/24, 138/25, 142/21, 143/1, 144/4, 145/8, 149/19, 182/21, 203/15, 275/12 Commerce 265/13, 270/3 commercial 191/12 COMMISSION 1/4, 1/12, 2/8, 2/19, 4/23, 4/24, 5/13, 6/11, 6/12, 6/20, 6/23, 7/1, 7/4, 7/11, 7/15, 5/13, 6/11, 6/12, 6/20, 6/23, 7/1, 7/4, 7/11, 7/15, 8/5, 8/8, 8/13, 8/23, 9/3, 9/8, 10/9, 10/10, 10/14, 22/13, 22/14, 22/17, 23/5, 23/11, 23/12, 23/20, 23/22, 24/3, 25/7, 25/12, 25/19, 25/23, 28/14, 34/16, 36/12, 37/15, 70/4, 70/7, 70/11, 73/19, 92/10, 94/16, 94/25, 95/25, 99/6, 102/6, 104/5, 104/7, 104/8, 104/14, 106/18, 107/21, 108/2, 108/6, 112/1, 112/3, 115/25, 117/6, 125/4, 125/7, 131/3, 149/12, 153/16, 153/19, 155/20, 161/3, 166/22, 167/1, 167/2, 167/17, 167/24, 168/4, 168/15, 168/25, 169/2, 169/17, 170/14, 171/2, 173/21, 174/24, 177/22, 177/25, 182/22, 182/23, 199/15, 192/12, 192/14, 197/15. 182/22, 182/23, 190/15, 192/12, 192/14, 197/15 206/9, 230/10, 231/8, 231/9, 231/12, 231/19, 242/14, 242/23, 254/8, 255/24, 256/6, 257/24, 258/2 274/24, 282/5, 282/6, 282/18, 283/22, 284/10, 284/12, 284/14, 289/13, 310/23, 346/11 Commission's 8/10, 11/3, 108/10 commissioned 69/18, 70/15, 71/4, 73/21, 84/19, 94/23, 96/17, 96/25, 282/19, 284/10 Commissioners 23/6, 23/11, 230/2, 236/12 commit 189/25, 190/7 commitment 11/5, 150/22, 153/7, 176/5, 186/8, 188/6, 188/17, 279/8 commitments 184/19 commits 189/22, 213/24, 325/18 committed 43/21, 53/9, 59/2, 64/21, 66/9, 66/23, 77/23, 91/16, 159/22, 184/4, 189/17 COMMITTEE 1/2, 3/9, 24/20, 28/14, 28/15, 28/23, 29/1, 30/25, 35/25, 37/19, 38/20, 151/3, 28/25, 25/15, 30/25, 35/15, 35/25, 151/5, 153/6, 153/6, 153/6, 155/15, 155/21, 156/9, 157/24, 157/25, 161/9, 162/24, 164/5, 164/12, 177/6, 177/21, 177/23, 182/7, 190/14, 201/22, 202/5, 246/6, 254/3, 264/22, 270/11, 277/10, 278/16, 289/12, 332/9, 344/3, 345/8, 346/10 committees 200/17, 278/16 committees 200/17, 278/16
committing 77/22, 198/20, 301/10, 302/2, 304/19
common 46/22, 292/18, 329/17
Commonwealth 3/18, 71/10, 72/3, 94/18, 114/6, 118/2, 119/18, 122/5, 123/6, 156/23, 156/25, 159/3, 159/16, 160/14, 163/20, 184/24, 189/15, 192/3, 193/19, 197/13, 197/22, 198/7, 204/21, 210/15, 14/18, 215/17, 215/17, 216/12, 227/11, 227/11 214/18, 215/13, 215/17, 216/3, 222/11, 227/11, 227/23, 228/4, 230/8, 234/11, 234/23, 235/13, 250/9,

251/8, 280/5, 281/4, 281/10, 282/11, 286/17, 286/24, 292/2, 292/18, 292/24, 303/6, 305/5, 313/3, 314/19, 315/17, 318/24, 329/8, 329/10, 329/18, 329/20, 330/1, 330/12, 330/16, 332/17, 333/7, 333/11, 333/16, 333/23, 333/25, 334/15, 335/8, 336/5, 336/13, 337/10, 337/20, 338/12, 339/7, 339/12, 241/2, 242/11, 242/17 341/23, 342/11, 344/17 Commonwealth's 119/14, 214/25, 215/2, 215/8, 221/15, 235/18, 235/23, 281/2, 286/5, 303/10, 315/4, commotion 219/25 communication 79/8 communities 18/18, 21/15, 26/5, 109/20, 163/9, COMMUNITY 1/5, 5/15, 5/18, 5/20, 6/16, 8/7, 8/15, 8/16, 8/18, 8/21, 8/22, 9/5, 9/8, 9/10, 9/12, 9/14, 10/4, 10/17, 11/6, 11/19, 15/6, 16/6, 16/13, 16/16, 17/4, 17/5, 17/6, 18/6, 18/8, 18/19, 18/21, 19/19, 20/7, 20/18, 24/12, 24/22, 24/23, 25/15, 26/21, 27/20, 69/10, 82/11, 83/5, 84/1, 84/10, 86/16, 88/1, 109/15, 111/1, 123/1, 125/3, 129/21, 129/23, 131/8, 132/22, 138/14, 141/1, 141/8, 142/14, 143/17, 143/18, 144/14, 146/8, 150/7, 163/6, 190/18, 190/21, 221/9, 222/3, 232/5, 232/11, 233/2, 235/19, 236/1, 238/21, 240/22, 243/12, 252/22, 255/25, 238/17, 238/21, 240/22, 243/12, 252/22, 255/25, 257/8, 265/21, 265/23, 265/24, 266/6, 266/13, 267/18, 268/16, 273/6, 273/9, 278/12, 283/9, 301/11, 301/12, 312/9, 316/20, 316/25, 317/3, 317/8, 317/9, 317/12, 318/12, 319/5, 319/11, 319/14, 319/18, 320/11, 327/25, 337/2, 345/3, 345/10 community's 14/20 companies 278/3 company 251/24, 252/1 comparable 16/12, 215/4 compare 8/21, 69/11, 75/15, 81/19, 81/20, 286/16 Compared 17/5, 72/21, 76/4, 97/3, 97/7, 159/6, 159/11, 159/15 compares 275/18 comparing 75/21 comparison 74/6, 76/1, 81/8, 81/17 comparisons 14/12 comparisons 14/12 compelling 263/15 competency 189/3 compiled 158/15, 298/16 compiling 131/5 complain 242/19, 334/8, 334/9 complain 242/19, 3348, 3349 complaining 310/1 complaint 242/11, 285/4, 285/13, 291/18, 308/4, 308/21, 310/10, 310/17, 330/14, 330/15, 331/20, 331/25, 332/24, 333/13, 333/16 complaints 300/16, 330/17, 330/21, 331/4, 331/21, 332/11, 333/6 complete 72/24, 73/3, 121/23, 267/17 completed 13/25, 78/3, 152/10 completion 11/21, 11/25, 157/10 complex 121/3, 176/7 compliance 102/3 comply 112/8, 126/15 component 125/20 composed 155/12 composition 131/17 comprehensive 269/17 comprise 159/20, 183/13 comprised 179/22, 183/9 compromising 336/19 Compton 280/6 Compton's 280/14 computer 205/23, 205/24 comrades 144/9 concentrate 199/17 concentrated 8/25, 187/16 concept 8/20 concern 30/15, 79/2, 80/15, 90/16, 165/2, 234/2, 237/8, 238/12, 289/11, 335/18, 336/15, 336/22, 337/3 concerned 24/11, 26/23, 29/12, 30/13, 91/14, 112/2, 119/4, 135/4, 183/7, 189/9, 191/11, 192/22, 204/24, 240/23, 269/21, 297/25, 323/10, 336/25, 339/5, 339/6 concerns 13/16, 21/11, 29/13, 91/2, 230/8, 230/9, 238/14, 289/12, 337/7 concessions 101/6 conclude 66/16, 94/19, 106/20, 108/24, 191/17, concluded 6/2, 107/22 conclusion 17/1, 70/24, 120/14, 232/24, 246/12 conclusions 81/24, 246/5, 246/10 conditioning 266/1 conditions 246/3, 265/19, 270/7 condone 264/11 conduct 98/13, 98/17, 134/15 conducted 7/11, 8/15, 25/13, 120/6, 127/17 conducting 129/13 conducts 269/8

conduit 10/18 Conference 25/11, 179/18, 180/3, 256/19, 256/20 conferences 23/23 confidence 283/15, 325/15 confident 101/23 confident 101/23 confidential 340/2 confidentiality 259/5, 342/6 confine 105/21 confined 64/7 conflict 36/16 conform 235/9 conform 235/9 .
confront 135/24, 197/24, 279/20 confrontation 57/5, 57/6 congratulate 149/14 Congress 104/14, 108/3, 108/4, 108/9, 108/16, 108/17, 108/18, 108/20, 111/23, 166/23, 174/21, 179/21, 180/5, 180/14, 180/23, 181/20, 259/4 Congressional 174/16 Congressman 108/15 Congressman 254/2 Congressman 108/15 Congressmen 254/3 conjunction 7/14 connected 193/5 connection 86/15, 152/8, 269/22, 273/22, 321/13 conscious 185/14, 188/24, 297/10, 297/12, 334/17 consciousness 20/14, 235/15 Consensus 53/15, 131/22, 235/6 Consequence 341/22, 342/3 consequences 124/12, 184/10, 203/17, 342/18 consideration 142/15, 262/14, 293/1, 304/6, considerations 93/17, 93/22, 93/24, 93/24, 290/8, 293/15
consistency 100/9, 112/4, 124/24
consistent 49/16, 51/23, 75/5, 100/8, 312/22
consistently 114/8
conspiracies 107/4
conspiracy 250/13
constant 41/2, 235/21
constitute 242/10, 346/8
constituted 183/14, 184/1
constituting 22/22 considerations 93/17, 93/22, 95/24, 96/5, 290/6, constituted 183/14, 184/1
constituting 22/22
Constitution 22/24, 109/5, 205/10, 254/13,
259/19, 260/17, 261/5, 279/24, 279/25
Constitutional 30/21, 139/22, 166/5, 174/10,
205/14, 255/3, 280/2, 290/5, 333/15, 335/7, 337/14
Constitutionally 290/1
construed 165/11
consulted 314/15
consummated 11/13
content 24/3 33/9 138/11 152/5 261/23 292/11 contact 24/3, 33/9, 138/11, 152/5, 261/23, 292/11 contacted 283/22 contacted 25/22 contains 171/6 contemplate 13/14 contend 116/5 contention 106/23, 106/24 content 108/3 106/24 content 108/3 106/24 content 108/3 content 108/3 context 5/7, 14/22, 15/21, 16/13, 18/6, 317/4 Continental 270/12 continuation 17/15, 162/17, 201/8, 211/14, 262/22 continue 8/8, 11/11, 109/6, 138/8, 141/21, 152/21, 189/2, 265/11, 269/15, 273/18, 283/25, 286/14, 288/7 Continued 3/3, 97/16, 327/21 continues 54/23, 103/12, 151/13 Continuing 3/5, 61/10, 201/7, 217/14, 217/23, 265/12, 267/15, 268/5, 307/1 continuity 11/10 contradiction 199/21 contradiction 199/21 contradictory 203/7 contribute 147/21, 156/4, 159/24 contributed 158/25 control 21/17, 190/18, 233/5, 257/9, 258/18, contributed 158/25 control 21/17, 190/18, 233/5, 257/9, 258/18, 264/1, 264/13, 268/16, 279/16 controlled 234/9, 242/15 controlling 93/14, 280/21 controversial 242/1 controversy 331/2 conversation 295/2 conversatious 215/17, 234/20 conversatious 215/17, 234/20 converted 166/21, 171/20, 175/3 convey 90/16, 291/15 convict 207/19, 207/20 convicted 62/24, 64/1, 82/24, 83/1, 83/8, 83/10, 92/20, 95/6, 99/16, 101/13, 101/19, 104/10, 104/14, 104/18, 105/8, 105/10, 112/6, 114/1, 114/15, 125/11, 126/12, 160/18, 160/19, 167/16, 208/14, 209/8, 209/17, 213/16, 213/20, 224/22, 226/18, 338/23, 340/5. 342/8, 344/13 209/17, 213/16, 213/20, 224/22, 226/18, 338/23, 340/5, 342/8, 344/13 conviction 62/6, 62/23, 63/13, 103/13, 116/10, 158/24, 159/4, 159/8, 159/15, 160/17, 160/22, 165/13, 202/19, 208/20, 224/22, 338/24, 339/18, 340/15, 341/5, 341/9, 342/19, 342/25 convictions 62/14, 63/5, 63/10, 63/14, 63/16,

63/20, 82/20, 96/10, 96/11, 159/6, 159/10, 159/12, cover 71/17, 71/18 227/18, 340/2, 340/11 convince 150/23, 235/25 convinced 238/11 convincing 212/15 cook 272/16 Coons 110/17 cooperation 101/8, 138/18, 268/15 copies 16/6, 16/24, 19/20, 22/2, 38/21, 41/8, 70/19, 74/23, 79/10, 80/5, 129/3, 167/2, 192/11, 249/1 cops 186/2 copy 12/5, 38/20, 41/7, 45/14, 45/15, 45/18, 49/1, 70/21, 88/22, 96/18, 102/9, 128/16, 138/13, 140/17, 167/3, 178/10, 192/21, 193/23, 251/20, 274/6, 282/24, 284/2, 346/9 core 126/19, 163/9 corner 86/25, 320/18 corners 186/1 COTRETS 186/1 COTRECT 27/1, 34/18, 51/11, 65/11, 88/6, 88/12, 100/4, 113/4, 122/23, 187/22, 242/21, 264/12, 282/9, 282/13, 282/15, 300/21, 302/8, 302/13, 309/5, 311/2, 329/19, 333/24, 339/19, 342/1, 346/9 525/15, 535/24, 535/15, 542/1, 540/5 correction 218/22 Correctional 64/18, 64/23, 156/17, 157/11, 159/2, 159/23, 161/16, 162/6, 181/11, 184/6, 188/6, 188/9, 191/16, 213/18 Corrections 64/7, 122/5, 125/3, 161/16, 162/2 corrective 308/1 correctly 80/4, 198/22, 249/6 corrects 100/7 correlation 139/1, 211/13 corresponds 42/19 corridor 187/7 corrupt 276/11 corruption 275/13, 276/20 cost 168/9, 175/14, 175/18, 175/19, 191/14, 207/6, 207/8, 336/21 costly 162/9 costy 162/9
costs 137/16, 169/20, 227/13, 261/14
Council 1/10, 3/13, 3/14, 4/14, 5/10, 5/15, 5/19, 6/1, 6/7, 6/9, 6/19, 7/16, 7/19, 7/20, 8/3, 8/5, 9/3, 10/20, 10/22, 10/24, 11/7, 11/13, 11/15, 11/19, 24/4, 29/15, 122/6, 215/18, 216/4, 218/7, 238/13, 258/4, 264/17, 265/11, 266/25, 267/5, 269/9, 282/5, 327/16 councilmen 11/5 councils 269/1 counsel 94/1, 218/2, 240/22, 243/4, 258/9, 259/9 counselor 258/7 counted 115/15 counties 53/17, 54/4, 54/6, 187/9 country 18/17, 46/6, 75/21, 85/18, 109/7, 136/14, 150/24, 167/8, 172/25, 174/7, 245/15, 246/22, 255/8, 275/20 County 186/10, 186/11, 186/14, 186/20, 260/9, County 186/10, 186/11, 186/14, 186/20, 260/9, 260/10, 315/1 couple 12/16, 16/3, 65/10, 178/6, 178/13, 219/16, 246/21, 252/7, 282/4, 302/15 couple's 249/21 Coupled 19/1/11, 237/4 courage 177/8 courage 177/8
course 28/16, 38/25, 56/6, 56/21, 73/17, 102/16,
114/18, 116/5, 137/7, 151/5, 168/12, 170/3, 170/7,
232/4, 233/17, 235/10, 237/20, 264/23, 332/16
courses 157/7, 177/11
Court 36/15, 37/16, 45/16, 45/18, 45/19, 62/25,
63/17, 74/12, 93/20, 94/1, 94/23, 95/1, 96/17, 96/20,
96/24, 97/20, 105/10, 117/7, 125/15, 130/25, 134/5,
153/8, 158/18, 160/10, 181/13, 184/7, 188/25,
189/10, 189/12, 204/2, 204/7, 204/8, 205/5, 211/11,
212/14, 222/12, 222/22, 222/24, 223/24, 225/2,
226/11, 226/21, 227/13, 227/17, 232/6, 232/10,
233/13, 235/25, 236/14, 241/5, 241/13, 241/24,
241/25, 242/7, 242/8, 243/8, 248/1, 248/5, 251/6, 241/25, 242/7, 242/8, 243/8, 248/1, 248/5, 251/6, 252/1, 253/18, 255/4, 255/5, 255/6, 255/11, 258/18, 259/22, 260/19, 260/21, 261/16, 261/17, 261/18, 259/22, 260/19, 260/21, 261/16, 261/17, 261/18, 261/24, 261/25, 262/1, 262/16, 262/17, 262/23, 263/1, 274/14, 274/15, 274/18, 277/12, 277/14, 280/7, 280/9, 281/18, 283/18, 287/8, 288/20, 289/2, 290/14, 305/25, 306/21, 309/9, 309/20, 321/17, 321/19, 322/7, 322/8, 322/18, 322/19, 322/21, 323/3, 328/6, 338/2, 338/21, 339/2, 339/13, 340/5, 340/16 Court's 306/21 courthouse 252/4, 259/7, 259/10, 259/17, 277/19, 277/22 courtroom 94/4, 94/6, 98/5, 98/21, 123/7, 234/2, 238/3, 238/5, 249/17, 249/19, 255/4, 255/7, 255/9, 264/10, 280/12, 280/13, 314/11 courtrooms 94/14, 94/21, 95/6, 95/12, 96/23,

117/9, 126/12

courts 84/6, 97/1, 104/9, 112/6, 115/9, 134/6, 184/23, 218/18, 244/19, 253/2, 260/16, 260/18, 260/22, 263/13, 268/18, 278/16, 321/24

coverage 24/18, 153/25 covered 35/21, 283/8 covering 250/13 covers 32/22 CPA 250/7, 269/7 CPR 27/7 CPR 27/7
crack 60/4, 75/10, 102/21, 104/17, 104/21, 105/3, 105/8, 105/16, 106/3, 106/6, 106/7, 106/15, 106/25, 107/1, 107/7, 107/15, 107/25, 109/4, 109/13, 109/14, 109/17, 109/19, 109/25, 123/24, 124/1, 125/12, 159/5, 166/24, 167/11, 167/18, 167/21, 167/25, 168/6, 168/13, 169/5, 169/12, 169/18, 169/20, 169/24, 169/25, 173/2, 173/11, 173/12, 173/15, 174/13, 174/17, 174/19, 185/17, 192/9
cramping 168/21 cramping 168/21 crawl 312/17 crazy 213/13 create 7/24, 9/22, 111/17, 233/7 created 10/11, 10/16, 13/12, 92/19, 99/7 creates 168/19 creating 237/13 credibility 207/16 credibility 207/16 credit 98/18, 140/4, 148/21, 148/24, 149/10 crime 38/25, 39/1, 53/8, 62/3, 65/25, 67/23, 69/11, 77/19, 77/21, 93/15, 96/6, 99/17, 100/23, 102/19, 110/23, 114/1, 114/25, 123/7, 123/12, 123/17, 157/17, 160/20, 160/21, 183/19, 186/18, 190/18, 191/9, 195/12, 195/14, 198/6, 198/20, 190/18, 191/9, 195/12, 195/14, 198/6, 198/20, 199/19, 212/24, 215/10, 225/24, 234/12, 251/9, 263/21, 268/16, 293/2, 294/6, 294/10, 314/7, 316/19, 317/1, 317/24, 318/20 crimes 42/4, 68/18, 68/20, 99/16, 102/17, 283/17, 293/3, 294/20, 298/4, 301/3, 301/4, 301/10, 302/2, 304/20, 305/19, 307/12 304/20, 305/19, 307/12
Criminal 2/5, 2/7, 2/8, 3/6, 27/18, 29/8, 35/15, 36/6, 36/11, 37/3, 37/9, 37/10, 37/14, 38/23, 62/7, 70/1, 70/2, 82/7, 84/12, 85/18, 86/9, 88/13, 88/15, 88/17, 88/19, 91/8, 92/8, 92/9, 93/16, 93/19, 94/17, 95/11, 95/19, 96/9, 96/10, 96/11, 99/1, 100/2, 100/11, 100/21, 101/12, 101/13, 107/3, 111/20, 112/22, 112/25, 113/6, 119/11, 122/4, 122/10, 158/13, 159/20, 160/2, 161/6, 161/12, 163/3, 164/5, 164/16, 165/17, 178/11, 182/16, 182/18, 182/24, 195/9, 211/14, 211/20, 212/3, 217/15, 217/24, 219/14, 223/9, 233/3, 233/19, 235/7, 236/3, 241/22, 285/7, 286/1, 289/16, 291/24, 297/11, 301/17, 304/12, 307/5, 307/21, 315/10, 320/10, 320/11, 338/24 338/24 criminalized 82/8 criminalized 82/8
criminologist 110/11
criminologists 102/18
crisis 11/18, 87/22
criteria 126/10, 204/15, 215/3, 215/22, 216/1, 216/25, 323/14, 323/17, 324/17
critical 101/11 criticized 151/3, 236/18 cronyism 264/4 cross 10/4, 10/17, 15/15, 66/24, 327/25, 328/12 crossing 285/23 crowd 141/6 crowned 269/12 crucial 146/20, 211/25 crunch 86/25 crunching 120/5 crybabies 150/1 crystal 223/21 CUC 11/12, 12/1, 13/12, 14/2 CUC's 11/2 culminated 250/17 culminating 98/1 culpability 204/19, 205/3, 212/11, 225/23 culpable 226/1, 226/3 cultural 9/22, 10/4, 15/15, 137/11, 160/3, 189/3, 268/19 cultures 9/18 curb 251/12 cure 196/6 curious 183/21 currently 109/13, 156/19, 177/24, 231/11 curriculum 147/19 curse 118/24 Curtis 1/16, 3/18, 248/9, 267/1, 281/2, 281/4, 281/10, 282/10 custodial 128/17 customer 20/16 cut 174/1 cynical 133/6

daily 26/5, 116/17, 230/25, 237/14 damage 297/20 danger 107/9 dangerous 110/14, 110/22, 121/6, 168/1 DANIELLE 2/13, 152/21 Darden 1/24 darker 144/12 dashed 46/10 data 39/2, 56/19, 59/19, 65/25, 66/16, 67/11, 67/20, 69/1, 69/2, 69/4, 69/5, 70/12, 70/18, 70/25, 71/19, 72/10, 72/19, 72/22, 72/23, 72/25, 73/14, 73/18, 74/9, 74/17, 74/18, 74/20, 75/5, 75/25, 77/11, 80/18, 82/17, 83/5, 83/10, 83/20, 83/22, 84/15, 85/5, 85/12, 85/19, 85/20, 86/4, 87/10, 87/15, 87/16, 87/20, 90/24, 92/11, 92/13, 96/15, 99/23, 101/19, 87/20, 90/24, 92/11, 92/13, 96/15, 99/23, 101/19, 101/22, 102/24, 103/8, 105/6, 107/22, 110/22, 115/2, 115/6, 116/11, 116/12, 116/20, 119/6, 125/6, 130/8, 131/3, 131/20, 141/11, 146/4, 146/6, 161/17, 161/24, 178/20, 178/21, 181/8, 181/14, 182/14, 182/17, 182/19, 183/6, 183/21, 184/9, 185/3, 185/17, 185/20, 187/20, 187/24, 187/25, 188/20, 189/8, 190/10, 194/16, 202/17, 205/19, 205/24, 206/18, 298/3, 298/12, 298/20, 298/21, 298/25, 299/11, 299/16, 299/18, 299/23, 300/3, 301/3, 307/10 database 95/4, 95/10, 300/20 DATE 1/9, 11/9, 11/21, 11/25, 12/2, 32/13, 32/14, 158/1, 231/25, 257/6, 291/22 dating 51/20 daughter 262/19 daughter 262/19 daughters 164/11 David 153/8, 177/7, 177/9, 177/12, 177/16, 179/12, 182/19, 182/20, 183/24, 185/15, 212/14, 219/8, 241/20, 251/1 Davis 268/20 day 29/3, 29/19, 29/20, 133/14, 146/17, 146/21, 147/20, 149/9, 150/20, 220/16, 224/1, 229/18, 241/24, 253/3, 253/11, 255/9, 259/22, 273/25, 277/24, 281/19, 324/12 days 25/2, 32/11, 32/12, 46/21, 98/14, 98/15, 280/1, 280/2, 287/11 dead 208/2, 208/3, 320/19 deadline 6/25 deadly 170/15 deaf 269/11 deal 18/5, 100/18, 116/16, 117/12, 117/24, 118/3, 136/11, 180/18, 189/3, 212/7, 228/25, 259/13, 324/8 dealers 318/7, 319/12 dealing 17/19, 26/22, 39/4, 82/11, 139/8, 158/1, 176/12, 179/4, 210/24, 214/2, 282/8, 320/4, 321/7 deals 113/12, 161/12, 167/9, 329/10, 330/19 dealt 160/11, 162/14, 179/7, 187/4, 213/24, 283/3 death 165/22, 250/13, 257/20, 316/9, 316/10, 326/23 deaths 26/20, 77/6, 77/7 debate 180/10 debated 108/17 Debbie 81/1, 81/15, 81/16 debt 209/3 debtor's 260/7 December 6/9 decent 85/25, 86/1, 246/25, 251/20, 317/25 decently 219/13 decide 101/3, 225/7, 226/16, 306/10, 322/13, 322/16 decided 6/8, 6/24, 7/2, 46/19, 140/9, 158/9, 180/1, 187/21, 227/12, 241/17, 272/11 decides 223/2 decides 223/2 deciding 100/15, 109/9, 203/20 decision 86/11, 86/18, 87/2, 87/3, 95/23, 100/22, 100/24, 101/21, 112/25, 113/1, 113/2, 113/6, 189/4, 204/5, 204/10, 225/10, 225/14, 231/17, 255/10, 261/19, 262/1, 274/17, 287/16, 291/4, 291/10, 291/15, 305/7, 305/21, 307/8, 307/16, 316/14, 324/3, 337/6, 337/13, 343/12 decision's 250/0 decision's 259/9 decisions 86/24, 111/24, 112/24, 134/12, 213/6, decisions 80/25, 111125, 11227, 12712, 213/11, 213/12, 215/24, 261/22, 289/18, 289/24, 290/2, 311/13, 312/21, 315/5, 325/25, 326/1, 327/7, 327/8, 327/9, 337/1, 337/5, 337/12 declare 200/8 declared 200/6, 206/25 decline 54/23, 60/20 declining 60/11 decompose 172/22 decrease 41/20, 76/18 decreased 55/21 decreases 56/2 dedicated 71/24 deed 277/23 deeper 176/23, 320/12 defamatory 154/9

defend 236/25 defendant 93/19, 93/23, 95/11, 100/23, 101/4, 101/13, 104/17, 104/20, 105/1, 206/11, 223/8, 223/9, 287/6, 291/7, 291/16, 292/7, 292/8, 292/11, 296/10, defendant's 206/9, 287/10 defendants 101/5, 103/10, 103/18, 104/14, 104/18, 104/25, 105/8, 105/9, 107/3, 118/3, 118/6, 118/7, 126/19, 218/3, 253/4, 285/1, 289/23 defender 94/1 defenders 185/7 Defense 3/9, 164/5, 164/7, 166/2, 195/9, 219/14, 241/22, 256/13, 256/18, 257/8, 257/16 defer 143/8 defiance 243/21 deficiencies 160/7, 199/23 define 57/5 defined 43/14, 53/14, 60/3 defining 40/6 definition 173/12 defunct 256/13 degrading 154/9 degree 14/6, 123/9, 205/2, 307/4, 314/4, 314/5 Delaware 211/13 delays 160/24 delegate 82/14, 85/3 delegates 156/8 delegation 328/24 deliberated 8/14 deliberately 109/14 deliberation 6/7 deliberations 4/16, 6/24, 7/13 Delinquency 177/20, 179/25, 180/6, 182/7, 183/15, 190/13 deliver 146/14 delivery 19/7, 19/18, 282/20 delve 339/15 demand 109/20, 195/23, 195/24, 223/25 demanded 252/2 demands 146/22, 146/23 demographic 156/15, 156/21, 161/18 demonstrate 26/20 demonstrations 24/24 Denbigh 28/9, 267/3 denial 169/3, 169/24 denials 22/22 denied 192/25, 210/17, 257/6 deny 149/24, 339/24 denying 175/4 Department 2/7, 4/12, 19/24, 20/5, 20/6, 26/16, 36/6, 37/3, 37/9, 62/7, 64/7, 64/21, 70/2, 77/16, 85/10, 86/9, 88/13, 88/14, 88/19, 91/7, 122/4, 122/5, 161/24, 182/15, 182/24, 184/4, 184/5, 184/18, 188/18, 190/22, 197/15, 251/19, 268/17, 285/14, 286/9, 286/12, 287/17, 294/19, 294/22, 298/12, 298/22, 299/2, 299/17, 300/4, 300/18, 300/20, 308/4, 308/5, 308/6, 309/14, 309/24, 310/1, 310/17, 313/3, 308/18, 308/18, 308/18 314/2, 319/2, 319/5 departments 13/15, 100/13, 161/15, 162/2 departs 102/4, 102/6 departure 112/10 depended 134/13 depends 13/10, 75/7, 198/5, 214/24, 326/13 depersonalization 214/19 depicted 131/6 deployment 86/12 depressed 109/15, 318/21 deprive 174/9 depth 73/22, 80/20 derivatives 60/4 derived 178/21 described 71/25, 85/3, 319/23, 320/2 describes 99/2, 288/24 describing 90/25 description 233/22 descriptions 233/24 descriptive 68/12 desensitization 160/3 deserve 236/4, 236/5 designated 149/8, 182/4 designed 29/11, 128/10, 131/12 desperate 78/24 detail 35/22, 99/3 detailed 45/3 details 154/3, 229/23, 238/16, 271/21, 273/2, 310/23, 339/16 Detention 125/14, 181/10, 184/2, 184/16, 186/7, 187/5, 188/14, 190/22, 338/9 deteriorating 170/24, 174/20, 174/21 determination 212/13, 285/8, 285/16, 287/21, 288/4, 288/8, 289/2, 292/4, 292/9, 309/8, 332/2 determinations 287/23 determine 8/23, 16/18, 72/13, 129/8, 167/6,

206/14, 232/20 determined 73/8, 135/21, 173/18, 173/22, 176/14, 252/5, 286/19 determining 121/8, 215/3, 285/5 deterrent 123/1 develop 9/22, 10/21, 11/23, 190/20, 191/1, 202/4, 215/22, 324/16, 325/3 developed 6/4, 10/11, 13/12, 95/8, 96/12, 216/1, developing 13/11, 56/5, 88/17 Development 4/12, 79/19, 181/7 developments 22/22 device 113/4 devise 328/2 devoted 12/20 dialogue 145/20 diarrhea 168/22 dichotomy 149/16, 151/10 Dickens' 204/25 dies 109/10, 252/18 difference 16/18, 41/12, 41/15, 48/7, 61/6, 76/5, 77/22, 93/10, 105/3, 106/3, 118/12, 120/2, 160/3, 204/14, 208/1, 245/1, 277/2, 340/11, 340/22, 341/8, differences 16/23, 46/19, 72/13, 97/9, 107/23 differential 160/4 differentials 46/19 difficult 148/18, 171/18, 177/7, 206/20, 206/23, 207/2, 336/18 difficulty 240/21 diffuse 246/10 digit 205/22 diligence 163/21 dinner 225/10, 272/8, 272/16, 272/17, 272/19 dire 115/6 direct 79/7 directed 156/15, 157/9, 165/15 direction 15/2, 203/12, 203/22 directions 86/11 Director 2/8, 3/10, 3/13, 4/11, 36/11, 37/14, 88/12, 197/4, 218/5, 218/6, 229/3, 229/5, 258/3, 258/25, 268/13, 268/22, 270/6 disabilities 161/21, 187/14 disability 305/14 disadvantages 160/4 disagree 296/22 disappeared 151/16 disbanded 70/11 disbelieving 225/19 disciplinary 276/24, 277/10, 280/22, 330/24, 333/1 discipline 279/6, 333/17 disciplined 279/15 disclaimer 130/8 discover 71/23 discovered 183/25, 185/11, 186/5, 187/2, 187/11, discrepancies 73/12, 73/13 discretion 100/15, 100/18, 100/19, 100/21, 101/11, 112/22, 118/6, 189/4, 189/8, 204/3, 205/13, 213/3, 213/5, 216/9, 260/18, 260/19, 261/25, 280/11, 305/20, 305/25, 323/18, 324/2, 324/13, 324/17, 325/4, 325/10, 325/15, 326/12, 326/14, 326/18, 326/20, 326/22, 336/9, 337/20 discretionary 112/24, 307/14, 322/7, 333/8 discriminate 259/15, 325/20 discriminates 325/21 discrimination 22/22, 29/10, 106/5, 108/25, 121/4, 132/8, 136/3, 136/5, 166/3, 166/16, 207/14 discuss 139/14, 140/6, 151/3, 164/16, 217/13, discussed 25/20, 140/3, 140/4, 140/5, 234/22 discussing 135/16, 140/1, 149/19, 150/18, 165/16, 328/18, 336/3 discussion 30/8, 117/18, 135/12, 139/9, 139/13, 141/23, 155/14, 196/12, 231/25, 234/6 discussions 139/1, 207/22, 239/2, 267/11 disease 196/6 disenfranchise 175/24 disenfranchised 160/18, 175/23, 202/13, 268/3 disgraceful 254/1 dismiss 262/6 dismissed 251/21, 258/22, 258/25 disparate 93/6, 100/13, 103/25, 106/25, 113/5, disparities 96/2, 96/23 disparity 41/13, 85/3, 92/24, 93/2, 93/3, 93/12, 94/11, 94/21, 97/12, 97/15, 97/16, 100/1, 100/8, 100/11, 101/16, 101/17, 101/25, 102/24, 105/12, 105/ 105/18, 106/10, 108/3, 111/21, 113/20, 115/17, 124/13, 124/14, 166/23, 167/15, 187/3, 190/6, 203/14, 203/18, 203/23, 204/11, 213/4 Dispatch 211/2 dispense 154/14

display 38/8, 75/14 displayed 92/13 displeasure 334/19, 335/4 disposal 323/1 dispose 330/18 disposition 339/1 disproportional 158/23 disproportionate 83/7, 93/4, 103/11, 159/1, 294/5, 301/18, 301/23 disproportionately 316/19 dispnte 301/25 disregard 110/6 dissolve 172/5, 172/18, 173/8 distinction 295/13, 295/15, 340/9 distinguish 342/24 distinguished 155/1, 177/15 distorted 186/3 distribute 42/10, 139/16, 288/2 distributed 134/20, 139/7 distribution 45/22, 45/23, 56/10, 56/25, 58/20, 60/2, 60/8, 60/15, 60/23, 61/4, 61/16, 63/4, 63/11, 63/16, 83/16 district 7/17, 7/21, 7/23, 133/11, 136/20, 155/12, 164/9, 164/10, 255/4, 268/23, 287/7, 304/22, 314/11, districts 7/24, 7/25, 8/2 disturbed 27/14 disturbing 28/4 diversion 160/10 diversities 9/5, 11/6 diversity 6/16, 8/6, 10/8, 11/8, 17/20, 133/9, 140/4 divide 15/11, 143/3, 144/7 divided 7/20, 332/10 division 88/11 Doctor 73/17, 145/10 document 16/25, 21/22, 27/23, 47/12, 141/24, 288/22, 313/14 documentation 112/9, 205/22, 257/23 documents 45/18, 205/18, 309/3 Dodger 205/1 doesn't 32/25, 39/3, 56/19, 61/6, 66/25, 77/22 81/19, 85/6, 107/11, 107/12, 121/1, 127/3, 207/6, 209/11, 221/4, 253/1, 254/14, 255/8, 259/14, 259/19, 259/21, 261/6, 261/8, 261/10, 277/4, 277/13, 279/24, 283/5, 283/15, 283/16, 283/20, 286/12, 291/24, 292/3, 292/5, 297/16, 302/20, 311/11, 312/23, 321/3, 325/2, 336/20, 337/11, 337/12, 340/13 dog 145/11, 195/15, 195/16, 195/17, 330/2, 330/6 dogs 26/1 dollar 252/3, 274/20 dollars 13/3, 169/11, 175/11, 175/19, 175/20, 190/20, 251/2, 252/21 domestic 260/12, 261/2, 261/3, 261/7 door 116/16, 279/3 doors 199/15, 199/16 dosage 169/10 dose 169/6, 169/12, 169/14 double 83/9 doubt 228/2 downs 19/12 Dr. - I 206/21 DR. AL 42/14, 48/24, 50/14, 65/10, 66/15, 67/9, 67/16, 81/22, 90/6, 90/20, 120/18, 127/11, 128/2, 138/7, 138/17, 142/1, 144/24, 146/7, 147/23, 152/18, 154/20, 163/22, 177/1, 177/17, 194/12, 196/10, 217/1, 295/1, 295/20, 296/1, 296/22, 298/15, 298/19, 299/11, 302/7, 323/6, 323/21, 323/24, 324/22, 325/7, 326/6, 327/13, 328/4, 328/15, 329/3, 329/6, 339/4, 339/20, 340/3, 340/10, 340/18, 340/21, 341/1, 341/4, 341/12, 341/21, 342/15 Dr. Azizah 1/13, 127/10, 154/17 DR. DONALD 2/6, 36/5, 37/2, 37/7, 37/8 DR. FAGGIANI 37/2, 37/7, 37/21, 38/7, 41/6, 41/16, 41/23, 42/22, 44/9, 44/12, 45/8, 45/20, 46/17, 47/9, 47/13, 47/15, 47/23, 48/6, 48/11, 48/18, 49/1, 49/3, 50/6, 50/17, 50/25, 51/4, 51/8, 58/8, 58/17, 59/20, 59/22, 59/25, 64/12, 65/21, 67/1, 67/15, 67/21, 68/21, 69/1, 69/12, 69/24, 71/1, 71/10, 72/1, 72/15, 73/4, 73/25, 74/3, 74/20, 75/6, 75/23, 76/9, 77/18, 78/5, 78/13, 78/16, 79/6, 79/17, 79/20, 80/9, 80/16, 83/12, 83/24, 84/14, 85/14, 86/21, 87/12, 88/7, 88/12, 89/3, 89/15, 90/5, 90/18, 91/3, 91/6, 92/14, 121/21 92/14, 121/21
DR. GALVIN 48/1, 141/20
DR. KERN 37/13, 91/22, 92/5, 92/8, 106/8, 106/13, 106/17, 110/4, 1111/22, 113/14, 113/21, 115/3, 115/5, 116/19, 117/5, 117/16, 119/9, 120/7, 120/11, 120/17, 121/25, 122/15, 122/20, 123/3, 124/18, 232/19, 233/24
Dr. Kerns 205/17, 205/25
DR. RICHARD 2/8, 36/10
Dr. Dick 187/16 Dr. Rick 182/16

draft 142/22

drama 24/23 dramatic 52/21, 97/9, 102/14 dramatically 53/23, 104/17 draw 82/11, 246/12 drawing 65/16, 108/12, 232/23, 295/16 drawn 133/11 Dred 139/7, 139/9, 139/10, 140/1, 140/8, 150/14 drew 120/14 driven 186/18, 187/1, 312/14, 312/15 driver 251/5, 251/16 drives 189/11 driving 27/4, 285/22 drop 26/1, 316/5 drop 26/1, 316/5
dropped 76/17, 175/20, 222/8, 231/22, 296/8
drug 57/15, 58/10, 60/1, 60/7, 60/14, 60/22, 61/3, 62/8, 62/10, 62/14, 62/25, 63/4, 63/5, 63/14, 71/20, 77/8, 80/22, 84/9, 95/17, 102/15, 107/4, 125/22, 158/21, 167/21, 173/13, 173/18, 183/20, 183/23, 183/24, 185/23, 223/15, 286/10, 286/11, 301/14, 314/18, 318/6, 318/7, 318/14, 319/12, 320/4, 320/23, 321/1, 321/11, 321/15, 321/18, 321/23 62/2, 62/15 drugs 60/2, 60/3, 60/8, 60/15, 61/23, 62/2, 62/15, 63/11, 80/12, 80/13, 83/14, 158/23, 159/14, 167/10, 174/8, 175/5, 175/12, 175/22, 176/21, 176/22, 182/22, 185/18, 185/21, 197/6, 197/9, 199/9, 199/25, 200/1, 200/3, 263/21, 295/21, 317/5, 317/10, 319/20, 319/24, 320/7, 321/6, 321/7 drunk 251/5 dnes 279/9 DUI 285/25 during 24/19, 27/24, 29/22, 30/25, 43/14, 44/16, 64/1, 66/14, 70/7, 76/18, 113/20, 128/12, 164/24, 190/12, 190/14, 202/24, 270/5, 272/16, 273/10 dying 77/13

E

ear 269/11 earn 241/4, 260/15 earth 258/19 easier 38/9, 147/17, 199/11 easily 41/18, 137/5, 137/6 Eason 4/3, 4/4 east 141/16 Eastern 25/11, 164/8, 164/10 Easy 2/4, 35/14, 206/18, 206/22, 207/5, 241/3, 258/14, 296/23 eat 272/13 economic 157/15, 160/4, 163/12, 268/12, 312/12 economically 318/21 Ed 151/18, 157/8 edition 11/2, 11/9 editor 174/14 educating 205/16 education 128/13, 130/24, 133/16, 156/23, 161/17, 162/2, 162/6, 162/15, 198/13, 233/11, 327/12 educational 10/5, 95/14, 157/8, 160/7, 161/20, 163/11, 198/10, 199/23 EEOĆ 269/22 effect 77/17, 172/23, 213/2, 256/6 effective 96/22, 125/7, 125/10, 191/14 effects 145/22 efficacy 331/4 efficiency 163/23 efficient 185/24 efficiently 171/13 effort 5/3, 28/18, 28/19, 29/16, 86/5, 112/7, 163/15, 188/24, 199/17, 235/21, 320/6 efforts 4/19, 152/2, 152/11, 152/24, 160/23, 233/6, 234/10 eight 53/15, 124/19, 226/18, 272/17, 303/9, 327/19, 345/11 elaborate 339/4 Elect 312/16 elected 7/22, 8/1, 8/2, 248/12, 248/15, 248/20, 266/9, 302/22, 302/24, 334/15, 335/9, 336/4, 344/11 electing 311/25 election 5/16, 5/22, 5/23, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/3, 7/14, 7/18, 8/4, 302/25, 303/3, 312/3, 312/19, 334/1, 334/20, 335/22, 336/2, 336/13, 337/4, 339/9 elections 7/17, 336/13, 336/21 electronic 142/23 elements 6/16, 9/5 eleven 291/21 elicit 139/12 eligible 98/9, 98/10, 98/12 eliminate 189/8, 325/24 eliminated 97/13, 108/4 eliminates 100/10 elitist 267/20 ELLENSON 3/8, 218/1, 218/12, 218/14, 218/20, 230/11, 231/14, 234/19, 237/10, 269/19, 274/11 emanate 243/3

embarrass 150/10 embarrassed 150/8 embarrassment 177/10, 243/19 embed 121/22 embedded 121/3, 150/5 embossed 20/19 embracing 102/1 emerged 43/17 emergency 26/25, 27/3, 27/19 emotional 263/19 emphasize 121/14, 162/7 emphasized 193/22 emphasized 193/22 emphasizing 10/7 empirical 93/13, 107/25 employee 14/5, 20/14, 266/15, 308/7 employees 19/22, 19/23, 20/10, 208/17 employer 341/17, 342/22, 343/1 employing 97/11, 97/14 employment 19/6, 95/13, 130/24, 131/19, 157/13, enacted 189/10, 190/17, 201/11 encountered 142/7 encourage 6/15, 9/4, 145/18 encouraged 162/6 encouragement 266/12, 266/17, 267/4 encourages 161/13 encouraging 60/19 end 74/13, 74/14, 85/25, 86/1, 117/24, 141/16, 176/10, 209/2, 209/5, 219/19, 219/20, 219/23, 222/8, 226/6, 226/9, 227/10, 320/17, 320/19, 323/22, 338/6 ended 79/25, 280/25 endorsed 328/23 ends 197/17, 214/4, 225/6, 225/14, 325/10 endure 267/14 endured 270/4 energy 7/2 enforce 319/10 enforcement 111/1, 130/24, 132/18, 133/4, 158/22, 160/5, 168/12, 185/16, 186/4, 195/10, 195/19, 308/18, 310/3, 310/16, 318/14, 319/20, 319/24, 320/8 enforcing 331/1 engaged 187/20, 200/7, 226/4, 307/21 engineered 273/7 engulfed 118/17 enĥance 123/13 enhancement 99/18, 123/19 enhances 211/19, 211/22 enjoined 262/22 enjoy 252/15, 252/16, 317/21 enlist 148/22 enrolled 156/22, 157/3 ensure 6/18, 16/11, 112/7, 323/12 ensures 100/8 entered 296/9, 344/8 entering 140/14 entertaining 326/10 enthusiasm 147/4, 166/20 entities 260/9 entitled 23/21, 46/16, 96/19, 99/1, 102/11, 154/22, 223/21, 261/9 entity 259/14 enunciated 334/20 environment 199/8, 232/20, 237/5, 237/13, 238/3, 239/6, 239/11, 266/14 environmental 65/19 environments 198/11 epidemic 275/20 Eqnal 3/16, 5/19, 22/23, 93/14, 133/25, 134/9, equality 9/11 equate 108/9 equation 145/24, 301/18, 301/20, 301/21 equitable 6/19, 256/7 equity 18/20, 94/13, 112/5 equivalent 288/21 escalation 163/13 ESQUIRE 2/21, 3/8, 3/18 essence 93/3, 95/4, 95/10 establish 6/13, 25/18, 231/7, 286/21 established 22/15, 125/16, 156/2, 179/21 estate 278/2, 278/4, 278/5, 278/20, 279/4, 279/8 estimated 126/9 ethical 330/23, 333/1, 333/17 ethics 330/24 ethnic 16/11, 91/1 ethnically 90/13, 91/8 ethnicity 14/24, 289/24 euphoria 171/11 evaluating 17/11 evaluation 84/18, 84/20, 96/20, 97/18 evening 29/19, 33/23, 34/9, 217/20, 217/21, 238/15, 239/21

event 33/3 events 9/23, 10/19, 32/24, 287/13 evidence 93/13, 94/20, 94/22, 102/1, 224/15, 225/17, 226/14, 226/15, 287/24, 288/3, 290/4, 229/15, 2291/2, 291/3, 291/13, 291/20, 291/25, 291/25, 291/2, 291/3, 291/20, 291/25, 293/23, 295/9, 295/10, 296/16, 297/2, 298/7, 298/9, 302/13, 312/22, 314/6, 314/17, 316/3, 316/13, 319/17, 337/3, 337/5 evidentiary evils 325/8 evolutions 97/25 evolved 5/8 evolving 24/23 exaggeration 26/6 exam 250/10 examine 5/16, 156/11, 157/16 examined 107/21 examining 156/3, 157/13 exception 99/15, 232/12, 232/13, 328/21, 343/3, excessive 198/5 excluded 115/8 Excuse 39/18, 46/13, 59/17, 69/16, 113/12, 150/11, 151/1, 155/5, 335/20 execute 325/19 executive 19/23, 22/16, 36/14, 37/14, 122/1, 122/2, 122/11, 268/22, 328/7 exemplified 9/11, 9/20, 14/7 exempt 259/6 exercise 325/15 exercised 101/11 exercising 30/21, 204/14, 216/9 exhaustive 95/3 exhibit 48/25 exhibits 50/16 exist 20/15, 173/14, 259/19, 259/21, 261/6, 261/10, 299/5, 299/6 existed 5/17, 7/6, 342/7 existence 143/15 existing 9/21, 200/11 exists 135/22, 150/23, 299/8, 334/18 expand 9/21, 69/4, 125/9, 141/21 expect 13/9, 69/21, 113/23, 141/11, 194/24, 196/14, 236/17, 301/11, 302/3 expectation 78/11 expectations 89/10, 89/12 expected 73/6, 318/23, 319/9 expediently 278/24 expedite 127/8 expendable 78/22 Experience 2/18, 133/22, 136/21, 154/24, 182/10, 210, 135/22, 136/21, 1 183/1, 221/13, 317/2 experiences 239/12, 256/1, 258/12 experiment 97/2 expert 7/4 expertise 110/10, 158/4 explanation 124/17, 296/11, 335/17 explanations 296/15, 296/16 explosion 102/20, 102/21 exporter 215/20 express 29/13, 156/3 expressed 289/13 expressing 11/5 expression 164/20 expression 164/20 expressive 57/9, 57/10, 57/24, 57/25, 58/1, 58/14, 58/24, 59/5, 59/8, 59/12 expressives 58/14, 59/2, 59/4 expressives 58/14, 59/2, 59/4 extend 97/21, 99/18, 140/20 extended 82/10, 122/18 extension 316/22 extensiveness 275/12 extract 70/13 extraordinary 18/23, 325/2 extreme 296/23 eye 85/9, 85/12, 85/16, 172/2, 237/8, 238/6, 307/13 eyed 251/10 extraneous 65/19, 93/17

F

fabric 200/2
face 163/19
faced 15/1, 121/10, 121/11, 155/23, 298/2
facets 122/9
facilitate 157/21
facilities 156/18, 157/11, 181/11, 187/6, 188/17, 191/16, 266/2
facility 188/7, 214/15, 266/4, 338/6
Facing 2/4, 3/5, 35/14, 217/14, 217/23
fact 21/5, 22/9, 22/15, 24/13, 29/4, 29/6, 29/16, 54/4, 60/7, 63/20, 66/9, 79/7, 90/9, 101/5, 103/19, 114/11, 118/13, 127/25, 132/25, 133/13, 147/12,

148/21, 149/9, 151/4, 153/14, 170/18, 181/14, 181/21, 188/23, 191/7, 202/2, 215/16, 235/20, 254/11, 267/17, 285/7, 289/15, 294/8, 294/17, 301/9, 304/18, 339/6 FACTFINDING 1/5, 346/10 factor 20/15, 140/6, 188/3, 293/17, 307/15 factors 93/22, 95/22, 96/4, 96/12, 102/18, 136/10, 156/3, 159/24, 176/18, 187/13, 307/5, 307/8, 317/6, 327/10, 343/11 facts 25/22, 26/15, 28/5, 28/20, 29/1, 96/6, 121/22, 151/21, 166/17, 202/3, 202/4, 202/6, 240/14, 262/7, 313/11 factually 117/18 faculty 144/16, 148/8, 148/12 Fagan 205/2 FAGGIANI 2/6, 36/5, 37/3, 37/7, 37/8 failing 166/11 failings 163/3, 163/5 failure 163/10, 166/12 fair 6/18, 106/20, 114/3, 232/6, 232/9, 232/14, 238/5, 246/15, 255/13, 256/8, 283/17 Fairfax 186/10 fairness 9/11, 18/20, 94/12, 100/1, 112/5, 124/25 faith 140/3 faithful 267/7 fall 118/16, 176/20, 196/17, 222/5, 275/4 fallacy 300/6 falling 191/4 Falls 1/23 false 165/5, 165/6 Family 3/13, 51/19, 56/14, 57/25, 59/5, 59/7, 64/22, 66/24, 157/17, 163/8, 184/4, 184/18, 191/8, 218/7, 258/3, 258/6, 276/6, 301/6, 301/13, 302/2, 316/12 famous 297/11 fam 175/3, 334/12 farm 229/8, 230/24, 237/17 fascinating 290/24, 344/1 fashion 236/19 fast 41/5, 173/18, 173/22, 209/24 faster 174/4 father 262/20 father's 259/23 fathers 258/11, 259/24, 259/25, 263/9, 263/17 fault 150/2 FBI 39/9, 72/18, 183/19 fear 198/15, 198/16, 237/12 feasibility 5/16 feasible 156/5, 157/21 feature 11/4 February 166/21 Federal 23/14, 23/16, 32/14, 32/15, 71/13, 104/9, 104/10, 104/11, 105/10, 105/19, 106/2, 116/22, 156/17, 180/5, 180/17, 180/25, 181/3, 181/16, 181/23, 207/17, 210/8, 210/10, 262/2, 262/3, 309/7, 309/11 fee 218/24, 219/1, 221/6 feeding 111/3 feeds 110/24 feelings 132/8, 141/25 fees 235/16 feet 174/3, 200/9 fellow 111/7, 130/13, 135/7, 219/23 fellows 235/19 felon 98/5, 99/16, 224/22 felonies 95/6, 114/16, 160/19, 294/20, 305/19 felonies 98/14, 98/19, 99/14, 123/18, 202/19, 208/15 felony 63/1, 64/1, 92/20, 92/21, 95/3, 100/25, 101/1, 101/4, 101/14, 113/17, 118/14, 125/13, 126/13, 160/16, 216/10, 224/22, 285/11, 340/6, 342/8, 344/13 Felton 216/2 female 49/23, 50/9, 91/13, 135/19, 266/18 females 55/10, 59/8, 59/9, 59/10 FERGUSON 2/13, 128/6 fertile 268/6 festivals 9/23 fiber 171/21 field 191/20, 205/20, 206/25, 207/1, 245/23, 246/19 fifth 169/13 fifty 41/14, 58/13, 58/15, 103/4, 103/5, 184/3 fight 156/4, 219/17, 221/20, 221/22, 224/16, 224/17, 224/21, 224/24, 226/4, 227/20, 238/18, 262/23, 265/19 fight's 226/11 fighting 174/8, 220/2, 226/7, 229/17 figure 12/19, 42/21, 42/22, 43/8, 44/2, 44/8, 45/9, 45/23, 46/7, 46/15, 47/11, 48/8, 49/3, 49/4, 50/24, 50/25, 51/2, 51/6, 51/9, 51/24, 52/4, 52/14, 52/23, 53/7, 54/8, 54/12, 54/25, 55/1, 56/4, 56/9, 56/24, 57/21, 58/19, 60/13, 60/21, 61/5, 61/12, 61/18, 61/19, 62/13, 62/23, 63/3, 64/15, 64/19, 64/20, 67/13, 70/13, 75/15, 82/17, 82/18, 83/13, 83/16,

89/25, 188/11 figures 62/9, 65/12, 65/13, 65/16, 65/22, 66/19, 81/23, 132/20, 178/18, 298/6 file 19/22, 74/25, 215/4, 251/18, 258/24, 262/13, 296/12, 296/17, 330/15 filed 249/19, 257/24, 258/21, 262/4, 313/4 filing 262/15 Filipino 303/21 Filipino 303/21 fili 4/8, 141/8, 146/9, 209/11, 209/16, 210/1, 278/8 filled 145/4, 259/8, 303/9, 303/11 filling 137/17 fills 68/2 filter 302/18, 326/21, 326/22, 326/24, 327/5, 329/1 financed 279/12 financial 270/1 financing 250/16 find 25/22, 26/14, 28/19, 66/20, 71/6, 73/11, 73/13, 82/21, 101/21, 107/25, 113/18, 113/19, 114/6, 114/7, 135/20, 135/22, 138/25, 140/13, 141/2, 141/18, 147/25, 151/21, 167/12, 167/14, 167/25, 168/5, 168/15, 169/22, 172/7, 172/16, 197/21, 100/11, 233/12, 236/15, 236/23, 236/24, 239/25, 244/10, 299/25, 325/4, 338/1, 339/2, 339/16 finding 22/9, 22/15, 24/13, 29/4, 29/6, 29/16, 62/11, 91/16, 95/25, 130/12, 148/21, 149/9, 151/4, 153/14, 202/2, 236/13, 262/7, 267/17 findings 75/3, 75/4, 141/11, 143/23, 161/4, 161/25, 256/5 fine 26/7, 34/5, 105/22, 150/17, 227/7, 267/23 finish 92/4 finished 38/18, 45/7, 240/2, 286/15 finishes 176/4 fire 20/6 fire 2016 firearm 47/4, 47/17, 48/7, 48/12, 48/18, 48/23, 52/5, 52/16, 52/17, 54/14, 55/8, 96/8 firearms 47/18, 52/7, 52/8, 52/11, 54/19 firm 231/13, 243/22, 246/9 firsts 273/8 fiscal 159/4, 159/9, 201/17 fish 272/12 fit 87/20, 126/10, 146/17, 325/2 five 13/1, 65/3, 92/3, 96/14, 103/24, 104/20, 104/21, 104/23, 123/18, 123/20, 123/24, 124/1, 124/6, 130/23, 140/15, 155/8, 169/9, 182/3, 184/1, 204/18, 208/24, 208/25, 209/6, 213/17, 214/8, 217/7, 226/6, 226/9, 228/7, 242/24, 249/13, 252/2, 275/24, 281/5, 286/7, 286/25, 291/21, 303/8, 319/14, 345/7 281/5, 286/7, 286/25, 291/21, 303/8, 319/14, 345/7 fix 196/8 fixed 195/22 flawed 248/14 flexibility 324/6, 324/7 Florida 215/19, 215/22, 215/25, 312/15, 335/22 flow 39/3, 178/8 fluctuates 61/9 fly 312/23 flyers 237/23, 237/24, 239/7 focus 7/2, 29/7, 79/16, 101/21, 103/8, 117/8, 122/13, 162/6, 178/2, 178/16, 179/18, 180/7, 180/24, 183/24, 185/6, 197/3, 330/22 focused 74/9, 104/13, 117/10, 185/15, 185/17, 320/6, 320/8 focusing 39/21, 230/4 folks 18/4, 87/18, 109/17, 225/5, 282/20, 283/22, 318/5, 319/2 follow 16/4, 21/10, 42/11, 42/20, 84/25, 120/16, 223/12, 230/6, 244/4, 257/7, 258/14, 274/16, 292/13, 329/7, 343/2 followed 17/9, 30/18, 257/19, 257/22, 270/12, 271/11, 271/15, 271/23, 274/1 follows 158/16, 233/4 food 272/10 foot 174/4, 214/8 force 92/19, 195/21, 196/20, 197/16 forced 237/22, 276/21 forcing 280/8 forecasting 71/16 foreclose 249/20 foreclosure 277/21 foremost 15/7, 15/11 foresee 144/1 forgive 77/2 form 11/15, 57/5, 57/6, 100/18, 168/23, 169/3, 169/24, 170/1, 170/15, 172/19, 173/6, 176/2, 206/7, 206/8, 209/16, 236/19 formal 154/14, 332/4 formalganate 172/11 formally 13/13 formed 25/9 forms 136/5, 165/19, 209/15, 210/1, 257/17 formulated 17/23 formulating 297/8 forsake 160/23 forty 7/13, 184/1, 222/2, 251/6

FORUM 1/5, 8/15, 15/6, 25/18, 155/9, 267/18, 345/3, 345/10 forums 29/23 forwarding 130/15 found 23/8, 65/13, 73/19, 73/20, 89/10, 97/9, 97/10, 123/18, 142/21, 144/19, 167/20, 173/13, 187/6, 188/8, 189/20, 193/19, 210/18, 210/24, 225/18, 226/15, 227/19, 232/11, 233/2, 266/12, 266/17, 266/18, 266/21, 266/23, 267/2, 267/4, 296/10 Four 3/5, 11/23, 24/19, 55/18, 55/21, 76/3, 76/19, 103/24, 114/10, 123/19, 158/1, 167/18, 180/12, 181/20, 184/3, 190/2, 193/7, 193/10, 193/18, 204/18, 217/13, 217/22, 218/3, 218/25, 221/22, 224/8, 226/8, 226/18, 228/7, 232/12, 256/6, 256/12, 256/23, 257/11, 267/9, 285/2, 303/4, 303/18, 308/20, 335/1 fourteen 214/7 Fourth 204/8, 286/3 fox 242/25, 346/7 foxes 242/25 free 139/17, 160/21, 173/2, 227/24, 259/20 freedom 30/22, 141/22, 259/6, 259/20, 260/5 frequent 51/18 frequently 212/15, 308/13, 318/2 Friday 140/15 friend 219/22, 254/20, 262/20 friends 51/20, 219/16, 219/20 frightening 26/12, 77/5, 167/25, 174/23 FROMAL 3/10, 218/5, 239/23, 249/5, 249/7 front 74/13, 85/25, 131/21, 135/2, 245/21, 313/14 fronts 163/16 frustrated 295/2 frustrating 253/18 fullest 156/7, 157/23 function 10/18 functions 282/19, 289/17 Fund 3/9, 13/5, 256/13, 256/18, 257/8, 257/16, 266/7 fundamental 115/16, 115/22, 116/13, 116/25, 319/25 funding 71/12, 72/2 funds 71/20, 71/23, 181/23, 265/22, 266/5 furthering 144/6 future 14/13, 81/24, 201/7, 256/10 FY 159/13

æ

gain 265/23 gainėd 258/13 Galvin 1/15, 36/21 gambling 223/18 game 243/21 gang 57/18 gangland 57/17, 59/14 gap 9/13 gaps 146/4, 146/10 gather 115/24 gathered 95/22, 115/9, 115/25, 300/19 gatheren 95/22, 115/3, 115/25, 500/19 gathering 90/8, 95/2, 146/6, 185/3 gathers 125/6 gender 14/24, 43/3, 52/16, 161/19, 289/25 general's 79/11 generalizations 136/19, 137/4 generalize 298/8 generation 78/21, 115/14, 199/1, 200/4 generous 98/13 gentleman 30/4, 115/10, 115/24, 116/1, 232/18 gentlemen 4/9, 252/13 geographic 247/13 George 2/2, 4/1, 4/10, 129/16 Georgia 165/21 Geritol 171/15 Gibson 115/13 girl 220/12 gist 211/17 glad 162/20, 202/5, 203/3, 230/22, 281/15, 281/25, 299/24 glass 220/5, 251/10 glob 172/5 globally 130/4 goal 112/4, 122/24, 122/25, 124/14, 124/16, 129/7, goals 9/8, 88/18, 123/3, 152/13 God 30/21 golden 257/12 governing 204/2 Government 7/10, 18/14, 32/16, 122/1, 122/3, 122/11, 130/24, 133/5, 133/7, 174/19, 176/1, 180/17, 180/25, 181/3, 210/25, 250/16, 263/13, 264/7, 320/10 Government's 133/9 governmental 160/11 governor 33/13, 33/19, 92/18, 94/16, 94/25, 95/25, 120/6, 122/12, 158/10, 161/5, 161/25, 177/21,

200/21, 201/12, 209/25, 210/14, 210/17 governor's 70/3, 79/8, 79/12, 88/8, 88/25, 89/1, 162/22, 176/6, 208/19, 208/20, 209/7, 209/20 grade 130/17, 171/11, 220/19 grades 263/20 gradual 40/16 gradually 60/11 graduate 147/3, 152/20, 199/4, 220/22, 220/24 graduated 198/25 graduation 157/1, 157/10 gram 123/23, 125/12, 126/12, 169/8, 169/9, 169/11, 169/13, 169/15, 175/18, 175/19 grams 104/21, 105/1 grand 286/4, 286/20, 287/2, 287/20, 288/13, 289/8, 308/22, 308/25, 309/4, 309/6, 309/7, 309/8, 309/11, 309/14 grandfather 150/14, 267/8, 267/12 grandson 267/13 grant 71/13, 71/14, 71/17, 71/18, 72/5, 189/1 granted 202/12 grantings 202/14 graphic 166/19 graphs 49/13, 49/17, 51/10, 65/16 grass 267/24 grassroots 180/25, 270/9 grave 163/1 Gray 248/3, 248/4, 296/25 greater 64/3, 73/22, 112/5, 166/13, 168/11, 169/6 greatest 280/20 green 40/21, 260/24 greeting 4/13 grew 250/6, 265/24 grievance 258/21, 258/24 ground 232/6, 232/14, 238/4, 326/8, 326/9 grounds 242/10 ground 4/25, 5/5, 5/12, 5/14, 5/15, 6/1, 8/14, 10/16, 11/10, 11/12, 11/17, 11/20, 13/12, 13/15, 16/12, 18/11, 57/1, 70/23, 90/12, 90/19, 90/20, 91/1, 91/11, 146/13, 179/21, 179/24, 197/18, 254/2, 12/19, 25/12, 310/1 256/20, 256/21, 256/22, 257/9, 266/12, 310/21, 329/16, 345/1 groupings 54/11 groups 5/8, 11/14, 46/8, 93/5, 103/4, 103/12, 179/16, 179/22, 179/25, 185/6, 185/9, 187/14, 189/25, 190/7, 194/18, 197/3, 256/15, 269/11 growing 54/20, 110/21 guarantee 338/5 guarding 242/25 guess 70/9, 85/14, 89/16, 106/6, 108/23, 113/10, 134/25, 136/2, 143/10, 224/25, 228/12, 228/16, 259/3, 263/25, 282/3, 291/14, 299/14, 315/17, 323/15, 325/7, 337/3 guest 177/9 guidance 267/2 guide 112/21 guideline 95/9, 99/9, 100/7, 125/13 guidelines 95/9, 96/4, 96/13, 96/19, 96/21, 97/2, 97/5, 97/9, 97/11, 97/15, 97/21, 99/11, 99/12, 99/17, 97/5, 97/9, 97/11, 97/15, 97/21, 99/11, 99/12, 99/17, 100/12, 100/17, 102/2, 102/5, 103/22, 104/16, 104/19, 104/25, 105/4, 105/14, 112/2, 112/4, 112/9, 112/12, 112/17, 113/3, 113/7, 114/18, 114/21, 117/19, 117/23, 118/17, 118/18, 118/22, 118/24, 118/25, 119/2, 120/25, 121/2, 125/8, 126/4, 126/17, 126/21, 203/16, 203/22, 205/8, 215/22, 216/1, 223/12, 223/13, 234/21, 234/25 guiliy 33/15, 33/16, 189/21, 189/23, 189/24, 223/2, 223/10, 225/18, 227/19, 247/1, 296/10, 338/7 gun 55/16, 55/18, 55/19, 55/20, 55/21, 55/22, gun 55/16, 55/18, 55/19, 55/20, 55/21, 55/22, 55/23, 55/24, 66/11 55/25, 55/24, 60/11 guns 46/21, 46/25, 77/7, 107/7, 110/23, 221/19 guy 119/1, 220/11, 322/15 guys 220/5, 225/10, 228/8 Gwynn 344/16

H

habits 146/25
hair 254/11, 295/18
half 258/10
Hall 238/13
hamburger 219/24
hammered 246/17
Hampton 1/11, 2/2, 3/5, 3/18, 4/2, 4/11, 8/21,
9/9, 9/14, 9/16, 9/21, 11/4, 11/9, 17/5, 17/20, 18/15,
19/7, 19/18, 21/24, 24/19, 24/20, 24/24, 25/6, 29/4,
33/7, 76/7, 76/9, 76/10, 81/4, 81/6, 81/11, 119/18,
151/6, 155/13, 175/17, 190/24, 191/7, 216/13,
216/18, 217/13, 217/22, 218/3, 227/23, 230/13,
230/17, 231/2, 232/12, 237/19, 241/13, 247/11,
247/15, 247/16, 248/2, 249/14, 250/1, 250/2, 250/3,
250/8, 250/18, 250/21, 251/7, 251/19, 252/4, 254/25,
256/11, 256/23, 257/3, 267/9, 268/21, 269/3, 269/5,
269/15, 269/18, 282/12, 282/20, 283/1, 283/12,

284/13, 286/4, 286/6, 286/24, 287/16, 294/13, 294/24, 306/4, 328/22, 338/16, 338/18, 341/18 hand 5/25, 82/15, 114/14, 114/20, 228/7, 241/23, 306/11, 325/8, 325/9, 325/11 handgun 48/13, 48/21 handguns 47/19 handguns 47/19
handleap 22/25, 109/1
handle 200/3, 310/18, 331/6, 332/5, 333/18
handled 250/21, 274/13
handling 178/4, 211/10, 212/2, 331/4
handout 44/2, 60/13, 64/16, 64/19
hands 148/2, 201/22, 262/5
hang 245/10
hanging 245/18
Hanover 184/21
hannerstance 306/24 happenstance 306/24 happy 45/14, 65/7, 148/7, 152/6, 299/19, 335/16 harassed 273/4, 307/24 harassment 257/15, 257/24, 273/2, 307/19 hard 33/16, 61/8, 74/23, 128/24, 136/19, 170/5, 201/5, 212/23, 319/17, 319/24 harder 136/23, 341/7 hardly 86/2, 298/7, 339/22 hardworking 317/25 harm 214/15 Harris 1/16, 17/18, 18/10, 18/13, 19/1, 64/10, 69/16, 71/21, 87/8, 113/11, 113/18, 115/1, 115/4, 117/15, 144/25, 200/12, 200/15, 200/20, 200/24, 201/20, 230/6, 248/8, 248/9, 266/23, 267/1, 272/18, 313/2, 313/7, 313/16, 313/19, 313/23, 314/16, 314/23, 315/7, 335/20, 335/25, 336/8, 336/11, 337/8, 337/16, 337/19, 337/22, 338/11 harsher 114/9 hate 19/14, 171/9, 198/4 head 19/15, 160/8, 258/22, 279/22, 333/23, 336/10 heads 19/24 health 156/24, 160/7, 161/21, 162/3, 162/4, 162/15, 187/14, 263/19, 263/20 Healthy 191/8 hearings 7/12, 23/7, 23/23, 24/13, 31/17, 33/23, 34/9, 151/4, 174/13 heart 249/24 heat 265/25 heated 139/9 held 15/18, 41/2, 158/1, 158/7, 174/13, 197/4, 214/14, 252/22, 305/3, 342/7 hell 241/12, 241/14 heli 241/12, 241/14 Hello 142/3, 274/25, 275/5 help 25/10, 26/14, 81/16, 106/2, 114/19, 148/22, 149/11, 181/4, 181/24, 190/15, 220/3, 232/5, 238/21, 256/7, 264/5, 264/12, 304/2, 336/2 helped 81/14, 81/15 helpful 84/7, 148/25 helping 71/8, 144/6, 239/5 Henrico 186/11, 260/9 Henrico 186/11, 260/9 HENRY 2/19, 155/2, 155/11 Herb 222/17 hero 254/10 heroine 175/20 herome 175/20 Hibri 1/13, 42/14, 48/24, 50/14, 65/10, 66/15, 67/9, 67/16, 81/22, 90/6, 90/20, 120/18, 127/10, 127/11, 127/22, 128/2, 129/5, 130/16, 138/7, 138/16, 138/17, 139/25, 142/1, 144/24, 146/7, 147/23, 152/18, 154/18, 154/20, 163/22, 177/1, 177/17, 102/14, 104/12, 106/10, 217/1, 295/1, 295/20, 296/1, 192/16, 194/12, 196/10, 217/1, 295/1, 295/20, 296/1, 296/22, 298/15, 298/19, 299/11, 302/7, 323/6, 236/22, 236/13, 236/13, 239/11, 302/1, 323/6, 323/21, 323/24, 324/22, 325/7, 326/6, 327/13, 328/4, 328/15, 329/3, 329/6, 339/4, 339/20, 340/3, 340/10, 340/18, 340/21, 341/1, 341/4, 341/12, 341/21, 342/15 hidden 100/20 hidden 100/20 hide 279/21 high 19/17, 39/14, 44/18, 52/22, 80/13, 82/23, 102/3, 103/2, 109/23, 123/9, 125/23, 157/1, 157/10, 171/24, 173/17, 186/2, 197/14, 198/25, 199/5, 220/20 higher 53/5, 54/21, 61/7, 61/8, 62/17, 114/10, 116/10, 116/11, 156/23, 160/6, 184/12, 186/13, 186/19, 187/13, 199/11, 294/7, 306/20 highest 187/4, 318/19 Hillstock 31/13 hired 12/1, 136/24, 137/1, 276/6 hiring 10/2, 12/1, 27/16 Hispanic 179/5, 183/11 historic 273/7 historical 5/7, 99/11, 99/13, 110/13, 123/20, 209/18 history 92/17, 93/16, 95/14, 95/15, 95/17, 95/19, 96/9, 143/10, 143/15, 150/15, 192/19, 212/12, 233/19, 235/8, 236/3, 251/6, 253/1, 291/24 hit 145/11, 228/2, 259/17, 273/25 hitting 325/10 HOBSON 3/11, 255/22 hold 23/7, 276/24, 281/21

holding 151/4, 233/6 holds 53/1 hole 119/11, 174/5, 275/4 holler 145/11 home 84/2, 191/21, 251/10, 257/18, 267/2, 272/8, 272/10, 272/15, 317/20, 323/7 homes 184/2, 190/22, 317/21 homicide 56/25, 57/2, 57/3, 57/13, 58/18, 66/12, 67/24, 67/25, 68/1, 72/23, 72/25, 73/14, 76/12, 76/13, 186/17, 186/19, 187/1, 189/22, 214/3, 314/3 homicides 58/4, 58/13, 66/8, 67/8, 199/20 honestly 318/11 honor 153/7 HONORABLE 2/19, 155/2, 281/10 hooking 229/7 hope 4/15, 66/21, 79/6, 117/17, 147/2, 151/8, 163/17, 176/20, 201/7, 237/16, 238/24, 264/4, 264/12, 266/24, 294/3, 334/14, 335/18 hopeful 201/9 Hopewell 1/17, 267/1 hoping 239/4 horrible 170/9 hostile 266/13 hot 172/22 hotels 25/2 hour 146/21, 147/20, 237/8, 272/9, 272/16 hourly 237/14 hours 133/14, 149/8, 222/2 house 149/5, 156/14, 161/11, 161/12, 161/15, 162/1, 162/16, 165/2, 242/25 housed 63/24 household 21/24 households 11/4 Howard 344/16
Huang 1/18
huge 77/12, 203/18
human 174/1, 254/14, 280/24, 325/24
humans 127/12, 105/12 numan 174/1, 254/14, 280/24, 325/24 humans 137/12, 195/18 hundred 13/2, 103/21, 130/5, 147/8, 169/11, 175/19, 175/20, 223/11, 274/20 hundreds 114/15, 253/3 hung 225/7, 225/14 hungry 137/22 hurt 30/20, 220/9 Hutton 248/6 hydrochioric 172/9 hydrochloride 172/13, 172/14, 172/17, 172/21, 173/4, 173/5, 173/8 hypotheses 326/10

1 iceberg 238/10
idea 26/13, 27/23, 35/18, 42/2, 79/13, 80/3, 86/24, 123/12, 138/21, 148/9, 195/11, 197/6, 197/9, 205/11, 205/12, 216/14, 245/14, 289/14, 312/24, 324/6
ideal 8/20, 8/21, 9/14, 17/5, 17/6, 324/11, 324/22
identification 15/5, 244/16, 271/16
identified 9/13, 9/24, 14/18, 14/25, 92/12, 94/25
identify 11/23, 29/13, 31/18, 36/23, 46/14, 57/6, 20/25, 27/6, 80/21, 100/1, 156/24 inentity 11/23, 29/13, 31/18, 36/23, 46/14, 80/25, 87/6, 89/21, 100/1, 156/24 identifying 39/1, 95/21 ignorance 166/13, 166/17, 174/23, 176/14 ignorant 174/25 ignore 254/13 ignored 56/21 II 216/10 illegal 249/20 illustration 106/5, 338/12 images 290/25 imagination 170/17 imagine 31/25, 221/14, 238/1, 277/8 imbalance 168/20, 203/23 immediate 201/7, 201/15, 222/23 immune 204/5 impact 87/3, 126/7, 166/13, 190/24, 201/17, 207/15, 211/25, 233/24, 239/3, 293/4, 293/7, 293/18, 300/14, 336/12, 343/1, 344/14 impartial 231/5, 252/9 impartiality 134/11 impetus 18/9, 18/23 implement 256/6 implementation 10/22, 10/23, 11/1, 17/8, 155/19, 201/15 implicated 111/19 implications 320/13 implicitly 215/9 implies 93/3 importance 155/22 imposed 96/14, 98/7, 98/20, 99/12 impossible 296/20, 341/7 impression 311/3, 311/4 impressions 297/25

imprisonment 101/17, 101/20, 103/14, 103/16, 124/23 improved 248/3 improving 19/11 incarcerated 83/13, 83/15, 156/19, 160/19, 338/6 incarcerating 124/16 incarceration 83/6, 84/2, 99/19, 124/14, 125/4, 125/10, 126/18, 199/12, 209/4, 211/14, 211/18, 211/22, 260/6, 293/9, 301/23 incentive 21/5 inch 174/5 inches 173/24 incident 31/1, 31/10, 58/11, 160/7, 211/15 income 130/18, 160/14, 236/10 incoming 135/10, 135/15, 147/3 inconclusive 269/25 inconsistencies 114/6 inconsistent 113/22 incorrect 137/9, 282/14
increase 13/9, 46/11, 46/12, 46/24, 52/10, 52/13, 52/20, 52/21, 53/4, 53/5, 53/24, 54/7, 54/8, 55/24, 56/2, 60/5, 60/6, 60/17, 60/24, 60/25, 61/11, 61/25, 69/4, 76/14, 77/6, 77/12, 77/19, 82/7, 102/19, 122/24, 179/10, 233/14, 257/13
increased 9/20, 41/22, 53/20, 53/23, 54/19, 124/8, 158/21, 175/21, 184/23
increases 56/1, 62/3, 159/19, 171/12, 171/13
increasing 61/1, 268/4
incredible 85/1
increments 160/13 incorrect 137/9, 282/14 increments 169/13 independence 157/15 independent 21/13, 21/14, 53/17, 316/3, 333/15, 343/12 independently 335/6, 335/8 index 9/15, 13/22, 14/2, 14/9, 183/4, 188/15 indicate 75/4, 82/19 indicated 19/21, 82/18, 144/25, 216/5, 258/20, 275/24, 335/21, 335/25 indicating 211/4, 211/13 indication 80/10 indicative 296/5 indicators 235/8 indices 183/5, 188/1 indictment 261/10, 286/22 indictments 286/7, 286/19, 287/19 indigenous 171/5 ineffectiveness 174/18 inequality 230/5, 265/20 inequitable 131/23 inferences 87/17 influence 87/15, 232/17, 233/18, 269/2, 269/6, influences 137/12, 317/6 influences 137/12, 317/6
information 4/23, 5/4, 7/7, 12/5, 12/8, 15/8, 22/12, 22/21, 23/2, 23/4, 23/10, 23/18, 24/1, 24/2, 28/25, 29/3, 37/23, 38/13, 38/15, 38/18, 39/4, 39/5, 39/15, 44/25, 45/3, 49/8, 49/11, 49/12, 49/14, 49/15, 51/12, 55/2, 55/5, 56/8, 62/7, 62/23, 63/14, 65/23, 66/5, 66/7, 68/3, 68/5, 68/7, 68/8, 68/9, 68/10, 68/11, 69/17, 69/18, 70/5, 70/6, 71/9, 72/17, 73/5, 74/12, 78/8, 80/23, 84/15, 84/23, 85/25, 86/1, 86/4, 86/5, 87/1, 89/5, 89/17, 92/11, 95/2, 95/5, 95/8, 95/11, 95/13, 95/15, 95/18, 95/11, 102/7, 108/21, 115/9, 115/13, 115/24, 116/1, 119/12, 120/13. 7511, 7515, 7515, 7516, 230/1, 230/3, 244/8, 246/8, 259/6, 277/19, 287/13, 289/3, 290/19, 295/19, 308/25, 313/14, 314/14, 322/2, 322/11, 322/19, 322/23, 323/1, 323/3, 327/12, 342/9, 342/23 informational 10/18 informative 152/24 infraction 205/14 ingrained 235/10 ingredient 171/22 inherent 132/9, 231/3 initial 7/2, 8/25, 11/12, 116/9, 129/7, 287/7, 332/2 initiate 145/5, 288/13, 289/8, 307/25, 308/24, 309/13, 318/3 initiated 138/10, 285/3, 285/13, 285/21, 286/7, 287/3, 288/16, 288/17, 290/18, 309/16, 332/4 initiates 286/2 initiating 287/1 initiation 286/3 initiatives 161/8, 161/10 injunction 262/14 injury 96/8, 160/8, 305/13, 307/4 injustice 258/17, 268/12, 269/15 inmate 71/17 injunctions 260/6 innate 278/22 inner 102/22

innocent 223/3 inordinate 293/18 input 7/12, 86/18, 277/6, 277/9, 311/17, 311/18, inquiry 231/8, 242/22, 258/23, 275/23, 294/4 insight 108/19, 240/25, 316/21 inspired 265/18 Institute 7/10, 189/1 Instituted 283/12 instituted 283/12 institution 84/4, 98/2, 98/16, 135/9 institutionalize 105/17, 106/21 institutionalized 105/13, 124/22 institutions 156/23, 160/12, 163/5, 163/12, 182/23 instrumental 57/10, 57/12, 58/3, 58/7, 58/8, 58/24, 59/13, 229/7 insurance 251/24, 251/25 intact 116/24 integrated 18/11, 133/24, 134/1, 134/3 integration 245/4 intelligent 195/14 intensified 273/10 intensity 173/17 intent 65/22, 80/21, 227/22, 288/2, 288/6 intention 207/25, 208/1, 208/4 intentional 166/4, 207/23, 207/24 interest 20/11, 86/15, 119/17, 130/15, 154/4, 163/23, 233/5, 263/15, 278/22 interference 259/21 interim 225/16 interject 196/10, 295/1 internally 21/13 internship 149/7 interpret 260/16 interpretation 7/5, 32/21, 68/14, 87/15, 90/24, 139/23 interpretations 87/17 interracial 298/4 Interstate 187/6 intervention 160/13, 161/14, 162/7, 268/15 interview 23/19 interviewed 25/14 interviews 29/6 intimidation 231/24 intra 298/4 introduce 35/11, 36/20, 127/6, 128/3, 164/2, 177/2, 217/17 introduced 36/20, 158/10, 162/16 introducing 155/2, 243/6 introduction 35/18, 102/21, 293/6 introductions 153/20 invent 174/22 inventory 269/17 investigate 176/19 investigate 176/19
investigated 209/21
investigation 25/13, 27/25, 252/19, 287/4, 287/14, 288/1, 291/19, 310/4, 332/4, 332/8
investigative 308/17, 309/10, 309/19
investigator 285/16, 332/1
investigators 332/5
investigatory 308/13
invitation 29/21
invitation 29/21 invitation 29/21 invite 177/8 invited 31/5, 268/10, 272/8, 318/25 inviting 155/9, 176/24 involuntary 157/20, 189/24 involvement 52/6, 52/16, 52/18, 211/20, 212/3, 228/16, 250/25, 257/7, 307/11, 317/7, 319/3 invulnerable 334/1, 334/3 ironically 189/7, 214/1 Islanders 50/12 isolated 10/19 isolated 10/19 issue 10/8, 11/8, 14/17, 23/7, 29/7, 32/5, 66/17, 67/5, 67/12, 74/11, 85/12, 94/12, 101/24, 108/17 110/12, 111/25, 125/2, 136/6, 136/11, 140/3, 142/18, 142/20, 155/23, 163/4, 163/17, 180/1, 180/15, 180/20, 196/13, 244/3, 267/16, 285/6, 286/22, 289/19, 294/2, 302/19, 308/15, 326/16, 336/24 issued 106/19, 203/19, 300/17 issues 6/2, 6/8, 7/14, 8/24, 9/25, 11/18, 13/18, 14/23, 14/24, 15/1, 15/3, 15/6, 18/16, 18/20, 20/7, 21/22, 38/25, 56/6, 71/14, 79/12, 79/16, 85/21, 86/16, 89/25, 91/16, 122/14, 133/10, 135/17, 135/23, 135/24, 135/25, 136/16, 137/16, 139/12, 141/23, 149/20, 156/3, 156/24, 164/12, 164/13, 178/3, 178/15, 180/15, 187/4, 187/15, 234/3, 234/5, 240/23, 243/7, 266/9, 279/25, 282/7, 283/3, 285/9, 324/12, 335/12 items 91/23 ttems 91723 Iverson 24/25, 31/1, 33/10, 218/24, 219/21, 224/10, 224/18, 226/4, 228/2, 228/17, 228/18, 230/24, 231/20, 231/22, 232/15, 234/4, 237/16, 241/3, 243/18, 249/23, 250/2, 250/23, 253/24, 254/4, 265/24, 267/8, 273/10, 274/14, 314/23 J

Jackson 31/22, 179/17 jail 33/14, 71/16, 82/22, 83/2, 83/9, 83/19, 83/20, 84/3, 84/6, 117/22, 117/23, 117/25, 175/13, 176/4, 198/17, 207/20, 209/1, 228/8, 231/2, 236/4, 237/19, 253/19, 260/13, 322/15 jails 63/25, 64/14, 84/3, 84/5, 175/7, 260/11 James 245/15 January 6/24, 10/24, 158/7, 227/1 Jeanine 284/18 Jefferson 254/11 Jenny 184/21 Jewish 254/20 Jim 218/13, 218/19 job 146/21, 149/15, 157/14, 208/21, 236/25, 268/10, 278/25, 285/5, 334/18, 336/18 jobs 334/22 John 312/16 Joint 155/16, 156/1, 156/14, 161/13, 162/1, 162/16, 162/17, 163/17, 178/19 Jones 231/13, 252/14, 254/6, 277/18, 312/16 Jones' 250/18 Juan 111/7 judge 93/18, 94/3, 94/14, 98/7, 101/14, 102/4, 103/23, 112/13, 112/15, 113/15, 114/10, 114/14, 123/8, 124/19, 125/15, 134/13, 165/7, 165/11, 189/13, 206/7, 206/10, 207/18, 212/15, 221/25, 222/9, 223/1, 223/11, 223/25, 224/4, 224/11, 224/12, 225/8, 225/11, 225/16, 226/22, 231/17, 234/2, 241/5, 243/22, 245/12, 245/13, 245/21, 248/1, 248/3, 248/4, 249/14, 250/17, 250/23, 250/24, 252/8, 255/11, 258/21, 261/18, 261/21, 261/25, 262/11, 280/5, 280/10, 280/14, 305/6, 312/16, 338/7, 338/14, 338/21, 338/22, 339/9, 339/11, 339/16, 342/1, 342/13, 343/3, 343/10 judge's 252/10, 277/18, 277/21 judges 93/9, 96/14, 97/19, 102/1, 103/20, 104/11, Judges 53-7, 5614, 9715, 1021, 10322, 10211, 128, 113/13, 114/9, 117/8, 126/4, 126/15, 189/2, 204/3, 204/15, 205/16, 212/13, 214/6, 215/5, 234/25, 235/2, 237/2, 241/13, 241/15, 242/8, 242/24, 243/6, 244/13, 245/9, 245/10, 245/11, 245/20, 248/12, 258/19, 261/11, 261/17, 261/18, 262/6, 262/8, 264/3, 275/25, 276/16, 276/20, 277/11, 311/8, 311/9, 311/25, 312/19, 312/21, 327/17, 327/19, 328/9 335/23, 336/2, 336/4, 336/13, 336/23, 336/25, 337/4, 343/22 judgment 180/21, 203/14, 203/19, 204/15, 295/8, 297/8, 323/19, 324/14 judgments 204/4, 296/24 judicial 10/1, 37/15, 97/6, 97/7, 112/1, 117/6, 117/12, 120/24, 122/2, 130/25, 134/5, 139/23, 156/19, 163/12, 230/10, 231/4, 231/7, 231/9, 231/12, 231/19, 242/13, 242/14, 242/22, 244/23, 245/19, 250/12, 252/9, 252/16, 254/3, 256/1, 256/8, 258/22, 274/24, 275/14, 275/23, 311/5 judiciary 95/20, 97/19, 231/5, 244/25, 276/3, 278/12 July 11/14, 12/2, 97/22, 125/7, 125/10, 161/23, 189/15, 305/2 jump 187/19 jumps 226/12 junior 27/5, 221/3, 227/8 juries 93/9, 115/2, 115/4, 115/8, 218/18, 223/17, 246/19, 343/17 jurisdiction 140/5, 186/8 jurisdictions 215/7, 314/25, 315/2 jury 98/7, 113/15, 113/19, 113/21, 113/22, 113/24, 114/5, 114/7, 114/8, 114/9, 114/12, 114/20, 222/25, 223/1, 223/2, 223/6, 223/7, 223/14, 223/21, 223/22, 223/25, 224/3, 224/10, 224/12, 224/13, 225/1, 225/6, 225/7, 225/9, 225/14, 225/15, 226/14, 226/17, 226/24, 227/10, 246/15, 246/16, 246/23, 247/1, 247/2, 261/8, 286/4, 286/20, 287/2, 287/20, 288/13, 289/8, 308/22, 309/1, 309/4, 309/6, 309/7, 309/8, 309/11, 309/14, 343/15 Justice 2/5, 2/7, 2/17, 3/6, 3/16, 9/11, 23/1, 26/16, 27/18, 29/8, 35/15, 36/6, 37/4, 37/9, 37/10, 38/24, 62/7, 64/23, 70/2, 70/3, 70/4, 71/19, 72/7, 84/13, 85/19, 88/13, 88/15, 88/18, 88/19, 91/8, 92/9, 84/13, 85/19, 88/13, 88/15, 88/18, 88/19, 91/8, 92/9, 100/2, 100/12, 100/12, 101/12, 109/2, 110/6, 111/20, 112/23, 112/25, 113/6, 119/12, 122/4, 122/10, 154/23, 158/13, 159/18, 159/20, 160/1, 160/2, 161/7, 161/16, 162/3, 163/3, 164/17, 165/17, 165/20, 165/25, 166/11, 177/20, 177/23, 178/4, 178/9, 178/11, 178/14, 178/23, 179/8, 179/16, 179/20, 179/24, 180/6, 180/8, 182/6, 182/16, 182/18, 182/25, 184/5, 188/18, 189/1, 189/5, 190/13, 190/23, 197/16, 203/25, 205/14, 211/15, 211/20, 212/4, 217/15, 217/24, 233/3, 239/5, 258/15, 261/1, 263/11, 265/13, 265/14, 267/19, 267/24, 268/7, 268/17, 268/25, 269/14, 270/3, 270/14, 278/16, 282/21, 283/3, 283/15, 289/16, 301/17, 304/12, 304/15, 311/1, 320/10, 320/11, 323/10, 323/11, 323/13, 324/6, 324/12, 327/3, 336/18, 342/4 justices 97/20 justify 174/22, 235/21, 235/22 justifying 168/10 Juvenile 38/19, 40/7, 40/17, 45/10, 45/21, 46/16, 47/2, 49/9, 52/1, 54/13, 55/6, 55/11, 56/11, 56/25, 58/20, 60/16, 64/18, 64/22, 64/23, 66/6, 67/2, 67/24, 68/19, 69/10, 70/4, 71/19, 75/16, 76/11, 76/13, 76/23, 82/5, 95/19, 118/10, 118/11, 118/14, 118/20, 157/11, 159/18, 160/1, 161/16, 162/3, 177/11, 177/20, 177/23, 178/4, 178/9, 178/14, 178/23, 179/8, 179/16, 179/19, 179/24, 180/6, 180/8, 181/10, 181/11, 181/13, 182/6, 184/2, 184/5, 184/6, 184/15, 186/18, 188/6, 188/8, 188/18, 189/5, 190/13, 190/17, 190/23, 191/9, 197/16, 203/25, 211/11, 211/18, 212/24, 213/15, 213/18, 213/20, 213/25, 214/4, 214/5, 214/12, 214/14, 221/18, 221/25, 222/19, 223/23, 253/2, 253/4, 253/18, 258/15, 263/11, 268/17, 274/14, 288/15, 288/20, 288/21, 289/2, 292/20, 294/2, 304/5, 304/15, 306/12, 337/23, 338/1, 338/3, 338/4, 338/8, 338/10, 338/15, 338/22, 339/1, 339/12, 339/17, 340/1, 340/5, 340/16, 341/9, 341/20, 342/4, 342/7, 342/8, 342/14, 342/19, 342/25, 343/4, 343/20, 344/9 juvenile's 222/23, 222/24 juveniles 40/9, 40/13, 45/1, 47/2, 47/17, 48/19, 49/20, 50/7, 50/18, 51/15, 52/4, 52/11, 52/15, 52/24, 53/9, 54/22, 55/9, 57/20, 58/4, 59/3, 59/4, 60/1, 50/7, 60/9, 60/14, 60/22, 61/1, 61/4, 61/14, 61/10, 62/1, 64/21, 74/6, 74/9, 74/10, 181/12, 184/7, 190/3, 190/6, 190/8, 190/9, 206/12, 212/2, 288/11, 288/14, 289/7, 293/5, 304/19, 343/18, 343/22

K

Kecoughtan 251/7 Kelly 222/17, 231/13, 231/15, 231/21, 274/4, 274/13, 274/16, 274/21 Kelly's 274/23 Kemp 165/20 KENYATTA 2/13, 128/22 KERN 2/8, 36/10, 37/13, 182/16 key 88/14, 91/13, 278/15 kick 119/2 kid 121/10, 189/12, 189/17, 189/19, 189/22, 214/7, 221/17, 222/4, 225/19, 225/20, 291/1, 339/24 kids 179/1, 181/10, 184/20, 187/9, 187/16, 189/25, 190/21, 199/4, 204/18, 204/22, 212/10, 212/14, 215/10, 221/20, 221/21, 221/22, 224/8, 224/24 225/4, 225/22, 226/5, 226/6, 226/9, 241/4, 317/19, 320/14, 320/17, 320/19 killed 248/4, 250/7 killing 59/24 kindly 163/20 King 257/2 kings 269/13 knives 221/20 knowledge 287/5, 314/10, 331/15 known 8/12, 30/15, 57/24, 58/24, 59/2, 59/3, 95/8, 181/15, 219/13, 243/12, 262/3 knows 4/7, 56/23, 124/5, 207/13, 208/6, 219/12, 225/3

L

lab 172/7

labeled 268/11

lack 15/14, 94/12, 94/13, 152/14, 160/12, 298/7 lacking 182/18 ladies 4/9, 252/12 lady 25/24, 28/5, 254/21 land 83/9, 84/3, 259/8 larceny 39/11 large 5/22, 8/2, 8/16, 20/13, 41/20, 53/5, 108/4, 129/24, 131/8, 185/17, 302/11, 302/17, 303/15 larger 320/9 largest 41/12, 41/19 lasting 171/11 later 40/12, 91/23, 148/10, 181/21, 191/13, 231/21, 238/10, 251/12, 257/6, 272/11, 287/11, 319/14, 335/21 latitude 305/10 Law 2/13, 2/14, 2/22, 22/19, 22/20, 23/9, 24/7, 102/4, 106/2, 106/16, 109/6, 109/7, 111/1, 127/13, 127/14, 127/16, 128/6, 128/9, 128/11, 128/12, 128/17, 128/23, 129/6, 129/20, 129/22, 130/6, 130/24, 131/4, 132/2, 132/18, 133/3, 133/6, 134/25, 135/15, 138/11, 138/14, 139/2, 139/3, 139/8, 139/22, 140/22, 140/25, 141/3, 143/11, 143/22, 144/22,

146/8, 146/13, 146/19, 146/22, 148/1, 148/18, 148/22, 149/3, 149/4, 149/5, 149/6, 150/17, 152/9, 152/10, 158/21, 164/3, 168/11, 177/4, 177/12, 177/18, 195/10, 195/19, 201/11, 215/21, 218/1, 223/20, 224/5, 231/5, 231/12, 231/20, 243/22, 250/9, 252/13, 256/17, 257/20, 260/16, 260/17, 260/19, 261/2, 261/3, 261/7, 262/21, 262/22, 274/23, 276/14, 277/12, 277/13, 277/17, 279/13, 279/24, 308/18, 310/3, 310/15, 312/22, 316/13, 332/14, 332/15, 337/3, 337/5, 337/19, 344/11 laws 22/23, 263/7, 318/14 lawsuit 205/25, 262/9 lawyer 176/24, 219/2, 219/14, 222/17, 233/12, 236/20, 236/23, 236/24, 240/24, 242/5, 243/14, 243/25, 252/20, 258/25, 261/2, 277/9, 328/5, 331/15, 332/17 lawyer's 331/11 lawyers 178/24, 212/13, 232/4, 232/8, 232/21, 236/13, 237/1, 241/20, 243/15, 264/2, 264/3, 264/4, 276/11, 278/5, 278/11, 278/14, 278/24, 280/22, 280/23, 309/19, 330/21 lead 5/2, 36/1, 170/15, 231/21, 337/4 leader 252/9, 265/17 leaders 24/22, 26/21 leadership 10/16, 25/10, 256/19, 266/25 leads 186/25, 226/8 leaf 171/4, 171/10, 171/19, 171/22, 172/3, 172/20 League 257/1 lean 323/16 learn 167/10, 195/18, 320/16 learned 217/4 learning 161/20, 187/14, 338/25 leave 90/7, 229/10, 239/13, 240/4, 240/11, 244/1, 247/5, 248/9, 248/22, 325/1 leaves 171/21, 324/17, 325/4 lecture 109/11, 253/7 lecturer 177/9 lectures 196/11 led 160/20, 197/9, 276/12, 276/13 Lee 81/2, 129/17, 152/3, 252/14, 276/6 left 43/4, 70/21, 87/17, 96/5, 128/5, 144/10, 172/12, 194/4, 201/21, 220/6 Legal 3/9, 7/5, 22/21, 93/16, 93/18, 93/21, 93/22, 93/24, 95/24, 96/5, 128/13, 140/2, 140/5, 141/4, 141/9, 143/18, 173/1, 218/2, 229/3, 232/17, 232/18, 233/4, 233/9, 233/17, 233/18, 233/25, 235/4, 235/16, 236/8, 236/9, 236/21, 237/6, 237/10, 237/21, 238/2, 240/22, 245/8, 252/22, 256/13, 256/18, 257/8 257/16, 258/6, 258/17, 258/18, 260/25, 270/11, 278/12 legislate 202/7 legislation 23/24, 70/10, 99/7, 123/4, 156/13, 158/10, 162/11, 162/12, 204/1 legislative 133/10, 161/8, 163/12, 163/18, 201/13, 256/17, 328/23 legislatively 202/8 legislator 155/15 legislators 106/16, 278/10, 278/11 legislature 260/17, 277/14, 278/13, 278/14, 278/19, 278/25 legislatures 166/6 lend 256/21 length 99/18, 122/18, 124/8 lengthy 129/12 lent 256/16 lessen 162/9 lessons 67/13 lessor 160/19 letter 23/19, 174/14, 254/7 letters 209/18, 256/14, 257/5 level 12/22, 21/6, 52/22, 53/5, 54/21, 79/2, 86/10, 100/24, 101/1, 104/10, 112/19, 115/23, 116/23, 116/24, 117/1, 130/17, 134/23, 145/6, 161/20, 163/18, 183/22, 204/19, 233/10, 235/15, 236/10, 245/22, 246/18, 261/16, 262/2, 270/6, 287/17, 288/13, 289/8, 293/2, 299/10 leveled 87/21 levels 115/19, 116/14, 212/11, 225/23 Lewis 142/3 Lexington 1/20 liability 251/25 liberties 260/5 liberty 260/25 libraries 22/3 library 20/5, 131/4 license 271/17, 276/19, 277/17, 332/13, 332/14, 332/15 licensed 279/7 lie 26/1, 42/3, 89/22, 90/1, 311/6 lies 245/19, 302/19 lieutenants 117/1 life 6/16, 9/6, 78/24, 141/14, 212/3, 220/16, 249/12, 288/7, 293/10, 326/23

lifetime 113/24 lift 200/9 light 66/17 lights 268/1 likelihood 146/12, 211/19 limit 205/12 limited 49/12, 174/13, 232/3, 270/2 limits 194/11 Lincoln 1/10, 270/12 Linda 281/1, 281/4, 281/8, 281/10 line 40/20, 40/21, 42/6, 45/25, 46/1, 46/10, 46/11, 46/12, 52/6, 52/8, 169/10, 203/23, 245/24, 250/19, 276/18, 276/25 lines 42/5, 55/3, 55/4, 58/11, 133/11, 283/7, 285/23 list 11/15, 78/17, 241/8, 263/21, 271/5 listed 189/18 listen 224/17, 224/20, 230/1, 302/19 listened 117/16 listening 194/15 lists 76/4 literature 57/2, 101/15, 297/7 litigation 228/5 little 14/18, 26/2, 30/8, 38/7, 38/9, 40/11, 41/5, 44/3, 44/10, 44/22, 51/23, 54/22, 61/19, 62/6, 68/8, 74/15, 75/9, 85/18, 87/3, 99/3, 110/10, 117/17, 128/4, 137/9, 142/20, 148/1, 172/5, 172/10, 174/1 175/21, 183/21, 199/15, 203/7, 206/6, 214/23, 237/6, 237/21, 238/2, 243/16, 244/7, 247/9, 247/12, 247/24, 253/5, 253/22, 257/10, 271/10, 279/13, 295/2, 295/16, 318/10, 318/24, 321/3, 329/8, 339/5 live 33/7, 186/14, 236/3, 312/15, 317/25, 318/6, 318/12, 324/10 lived 141/13, 243/17, 251/14, 266/19 lives 28/8, 109/9, 160/21, 260/1, 263/10, 263/14, living 198/4, 241/5, 241/21 loan 277/18, 278/4, 279/17 loans 278/20, 278/23, 279/5 loath 223/7 local 26/19, 71/16, 187/3, 190/25, 256/14, 257/8, 266/11, 267/5, 269/23, 270/11, 299/10, 332/8 localities 76/5, 76/7, 76/24, 186/6, 215/1, 216/15 located 129/16, 268/21 LOCATION 1/10, 53/8, 94/4, 247/13 lock 223/16, 225/9 locked 118/21, 123/10, 187/10, 223/16 lockup 197/20 logical 5/4 logistics 148/10 lone 190/8 looming 302/17 Lord 249/25 Los 109/13 lose 181/23, 182/1, 200/3, 246/16, 260/22 loses 255/3 losing 229/17, 255/7 lost 152/16, 160/16, 200/5, 276/19 loud 38/10, 246/1 love 67/11, 74/17, 194/11 loves 267/21 Loving 245/5 low 44/19, 54/5, 82/19, 160/14, 168/9, 171/11, 281/23 lower 261/24, 261/25, 270/6 154/25 lunch 127/4, 127/22, 153/3, 153/11, 272/9, 272/11 lungs 173/25, 174/1 Luther 257/2

М

lying 46/9, 165/5 Lyn 237/9

machine 267/19 Madam 106/24, 126/24, 164/4, 177/6 Magazine 178/11 magazines 24/17, 238/1 magistrate 285/4, 285/5, 285/8, 285/18, 285/24, 291/16, 300/17 magistrates 189/2, 288/18 maiming 227/19, 227/25, 234/18, 235/22, 235/24 mainings 306/18 main 74/11, 115/20, 143/17, 143/19, 199/2, 199/22, 199/24 maintain 21/6, 118/19 maintained 23/13 major 52/10, 54/7, 73/13, 203/25, 230/13, 234/5, 247/14, 251/25, 319/1 majority 7/21, 7/22, 7/25, 40/5, 40/25, 47/18, 54/2, 56/12, 56/22, 59/1, 59/14, 59/15, 105/7, 105/9, 145/25, 179/8, 248/10, 287/2, 314/8, 316/18 maker 87/2, 88/14 makers 86/18, 87/3, 88/10, 109/6, 171/15, 183/22, 267/19, 268/7, 268/25, 270/14, 277/13
makeup 171/7, 302/23, 303/5, 303/7, 311/14
male 49/22, 50/8, 52/18, 52/19, 91/12, 121/5, 136/12, 136/18, 136/21, 156/5, 157/1, 157/3, 159/2, 163/1, 197/24, 197/25, 221/9, 232/7, 259/16, 291/21, 291/22, 295/14, 295/24, 296/4, 296/5 male's 157/16 Males 2/20, 54/13, 54/18, 55/6, 55/10, 55/11, 55/16, 55/17, 55/18, 55/19, 55/20, 55/21, 55/22 55/23, 55/24, 77/6, 78/22, 110/14, 110/20, 111/16, 120/22, 155/17, 156/16, 156/21, 156/25, 157/14, 157/22, 158/17, 158/24, 159/18, 160/17, 162/19, 165/24, 166/8, 167/9, 192/3, 193/1, 196/16, 200/4, 233/20, 245/16, 245/17, 293/19, 295/21, 307/12 malicious 305/12 Mall 268/21 malpractice 231/22, 274/5, 274/7, 274/19, 274/20 mammal 169/23 mammoth 157/25 man 196/5, 208/3, 214/9, 251/10, 252/25, 338/21, 338/24 man's 249/24 Manager 2/2, 4/2, 4/11, 266/7 managers 19/25 mandate 7/16, 8/6, 180/24, 181/21 mandated 125/18, 215/21 mandates 6/12 mandatory 104/20, 125/19, 158/25 maneuver 234/25 manifest 181/14 manifestation 165/10, 165/11, 168/13 manifested 187/18 manifests 136/4, 167/8 manipulate 235/1 manslaughter 39/10, 39/24, 41/25, 45/24, 46/9, 47/3, 48/20, 50/8, 50/19, 51/16, 52/5, 52/16, 52/25, 53/10, 54/14, 55/7, 189/24, 208/2 manufactured 270/13 Map 76/22, 76/24 maps 7/13, 76/22 Marc 1/24, 30/1, 36/8 Marcellus 87/8, 117/15, 230/6, 266/23 March 1/9, 24/14 marches 237/7 marijuana 60/23, 61/5, 61/16, 61/23, 63/15, 63/16, 63/21, 83/17 Marilyn 31/22 Market 268/21 Martin 257/2 Mary 129/16, 216/3 Mason 129/17 masses 233/8 massive 86/4, 163/15, 304/14, 342/4 match 302/20 material 34/15, 255/18 matter 33/1, 109/3, 127/25, 140/5, 201/19, 254/9, 263/9, 271/18, 279/25, 285/7, 319/15, 332/2 matters 260/12, 262/15, 263/4, 326/23 maximizing 18/3 MAXWELL 2/19, 155/2, 155/4, 155/8, 155/11, 163/23, 177/16, 178/18, 187/12, 190/16, 192/21, 193/2, 193/8, 193/12, 193/16, 198/21, 200/13, 200/14, 200/15, 200/19, 200/23, 201/5, 202/1, 202/15, 203/2, 208/12, 210/13 Mayor 4/3, 4/4, 4/13, 4/21, 155/4, 155/5, 266/19 Mayors 8/2, 29/14 MCCLEOUD 2/13, 128/22 McClesky 165/19 McCloud 1/19 measure 137/18 measured 9/15, 17/14, 20/4 measuring 201/6 mechanism 100/3, 113/4, 126/4, 308/5, 334/18, 335/5 media 10/2, 24/16, 24/17, 32/18, 32/19, 32/22, 123/16, 137/6, 186/23, 267/21 mediator 258/7, 258/8 Medical 162/5 medics 27/4 meet 15/16, 23/14, 128/10, 196/16 MEETING 1/5, 29/4, 29/6, 29/11, 33/9, 127/5, 153/14, 153/15, 158/3, 158/6, 158/8, 202/24, 246/5, 251/7, 267/18, 273/23, 279/2, 318/16, 319/2, 346/11 meetings 6/25, 17/24, 24/23, 29/18, 32/10, 158/1, 237/7 meets 290/4, 290/5, 311/13 Melvin 197/14, 218/24, 219/6, 219/7, 219/15, 219/18, 220/8, 220/14, 221/4, 222/13, 226/2, 226/7, 226/12, 226/15, 227/4, 228/6, 228/7, 228/14, 237/20, 238/20 Melvin's 219/22 member 4/17, 6/10, 8/3, 29/25, 108/16, 108/17,

115/14, 128/23, 177/22, 231/12, 231/19, 264/17 MEMBERS 1/12, 1/24, 8/7, 23/5, 24/20, 28/14, 28/15, 29/15, 35/25, 51/19, 56/14, 58/1, 81/25, 129/4, 135/8, 154/16, 155/5, 155/20, 157/24, 161/2, 162/24, 164/4, 177/6, 180/23, 196/25, 230/21, 231/9, 255/23, 264/22, 267/3, 267/7, 267/20, 269/10, 301/6 members' 75/1 membership 11/19, 257/13 memory 250/5 men 116/5, 116/7, 116/8, 116/15, 116/17, 158/20, 225/17, 231/1, 237/9, 253/25, 317/7 menace 111/17, 235/20 Mental 162/3, 162/4 mention 88/16, 197/2, 197/11, 216/15 mentioned 7/23, 12/18, 13/21, 14/16, 17/8, 21/22, 82/1, 121/6, 179/23, 231/14, 236/11, 267/11, 274/4, 289/7, 300/12, 339/10 mentioning 339/8 mentoring 221/9 mess 205/11 messing 177/10 met 25/1, 179/17, 197/13, 269/11 method 311/9 Methodist 268/23 methodologies 17/13 methodology 67/19 methods 5/22 metropolitan 53/13, 53/15, 53/22, 54/1, 54/15, 54/17, 55/8, 61/21, 61/25, 66/11 Mexican 50/1, 50/11 Michael 237/18 Michigan 185/19 microcosm 129/23 microphone 37/6, 197/19 middle 74/15, 150/7, 206/18, 326/8, 326/9 Midlothian 1/14 midtown 266/22 mike 218/16, 281/22 military 95/14 million 175/7, 175/13, 190/20, 251/2, 252/21, 274/20 Milner 231/11 mind 12/9, 12/22, 90/7, 106/15, 115/22, 118/10, 119/8, 123/14, 192/18, 196/6, 257/20, 308/3, 323/8 mindfulness 145/12 mindless 212/2 minds 9/25, 15/8, 236/21, 237/10 Minimum 13/6, 13/7 minister 266/22 ministry 268/24 minor 188/22 minor 188/22 minorities 5/18, 5/23, 77/13, 86/14, 131/24, 131/25, 133/3, 133/17, 134/7, 134/9, 140/21, 152/13, 159/20, 160/10, 179/19, 185/22, 187/7, 210/18, Minority 2/17, 16/16, 77/17, 86/13, 86/16, 132/6, 132/13, 133/18, 137/2, 145/24, 154/23, 160/13, 179/1, 180/2, 180/8, 180/20, 180/23, 183/5, 183/9, 184/1, 184/12, 184/17, 184/22, 184/25, 187/5, 187/13, 188/3, 188/4, 188/7, 188/22, 303/8, 303/12, 303/19, 303/20 minute 38/3, 38/16, 44/6, 217/7, 258/16, 345/13 minutes 33/22, 34/8, 34/10, 34/11, 34/12, 34/17, 34/23, 35/4, 35/5, 52/3, 92/3, 194/3, 281/5, 284/23, 319/14, 345/7 mirrors 163/4 misbehaving 98/16 misconstrued 120/20, 121/17 misdemeanor 101/2, 285/10 misdemeanors 294/21 mishear 78/4 misinterpretation 142/24, 143/4 miss a 4/5 miss it 66/21 missed 65/11, 206/22 missing 73/5, 73/24, 115/16, 119/7, 194/16 mission 20/19, 20/21, 143/22, 144/18, 148/21, 149/17, 249/25, 256/3 missions 5/1, 149/9 Mississippi 179/17 Missouri 221/3, 227/7 misspoke 340/24 mistake 33/17, 323/4 mistakes 197/6 misunderstood 56/17 misuse 326/18, 326/20 mix 185/11 mixed 226/14 mob 227/19, 227/22, 234/18, 235/22, 235/24 mobile 150/7 model 297/20 moderating 240/9 moderator 35/25, 127/10, 154/17, 217/17, 217/19 moderators 36/20 modes 83/4, 83/23, 84/8 mold 325/2 molecule 172/15, 172/17, 173/5 moment 240/20, 308/19 money 20/13, 25/21, 72/6, 72/7, 109/3, 109/8, 109/9, 109/21, 109/25, 181/16, 181/24, 182/1, 182/8, 182/23, 191/14, 199/5, 199/6, 235/15, 238/18, 252/4, 252/6, 260/5, 260/15, 260/25, 261/15, 267/19, 268/7, 268/25, 270/14, 278/22, 312/6, 336/19, 336/21, monies 71/24 monitor 154/16, 330/2, 330/5 month 5/3, 88/20, 125/17 months 8/14, 64/4, 123/25, 124/2, 125/25, 126/2, 148/16, 209/23, 223/13, 227/5, 228/8, 228/21, 253/12, 253/13, 253/14 moon 196/5 moral 235/6, 235/9 morning 4/9, 4/21, 27/8, 31/23, 31/24, 34/2, 34/3, 36/22, 37/18, 130/9, 149/16, 182/15, 196/19, 205/18, 229/25, 230/4, 230/7, 232/19, 233/23, 234/20, 234/23, 236/12, 271/1, 283/11, 296/6, 297/9, 298/2 morning's 302/18 Morris 88/14, 88/23, 182/15 mortgage 277/20, 278/3 mother 198/18, 219/7 motion 95/1, 204/17, 221/15, 272/18 motivating 56/7 motivation 57/7, 57/9, 57/22, 58/9, 58/11, 68/6, 232/20 motive 58/16, 193/6 motives 234/13 motor 39/11 mountain 34/15 mouth 26/8, 224/19, 281/22 move 51/22, 59/18, 99/21, 127/2, 128/1, 148/1, 202/8, 246/4, 279/14, 318/1, 318/9 moved 139/11, 200/9, 204/3, 204/22, 237/17 movement 181/1 moves 313/20 moving 203/22, 345/4 Mr - Reverend 200/12 MR. ANDREW 3/14, 218/9, 264/16 MR. BAUGH 164/4, 192/5, 192/7, 192/11 193/5, 194/4, 194/6, 194/10, 195/2, 198/3, 203/5, 203/9, 205/4, 206/6, 206/21, 207/8, 207/11, 207/23 207/25, 208/11, 208/16, 210/7, 210/10, 211/1, 213/9, 216/17, 216/21, 223/19, 225/21 Mr. Bingham 265/8, 265/9, 267/9 Mr. Boester 251/13, 251/14, 251/22 MR. CURTIS 301/8 MR. DARDEN 12/14, 12/15, 12/16, 12/25, 13/4, 13/7, 13/20, 13/24, 14/8, 14/12, 14/15, 15/10, 15/17, 15/24, 16/5, 17/2, 29/25, 30/1, 32/4, 32/7, 34/18, 35/10, 35/12, 38/5, 41/4, 41/10, 42/9, 42/18, 44/6, 44/11, 45/5, 45/15, 46/13, 47/7, 47/10, 47/14, 47/21, 47/124, 48/14, 49/2, 50/23, 51/1, 58/6, 59/17, 59/21, 59/24, 77/1, 78/1, 78/12, 78/15, 78/19, 79/15, 79/18, 80/2, 84/25, 86/7, 88/5, 89/2, 90/15, 92/3, 105/22, 110/9, 113/9, 119/16, 127/6, 127/8, 145/9, 146/19, 147/16, 147/23, 148/6, 148/14, 153/3, 153/4, 153/19, 153/21, 153/22, 211/7, 212/19, 212/25, 213/7, 214/17, 215/12, 216/11, 217/16, 217/18, 233/23, 239/24, 240/8, 240/19, 241/9, 241/16, 242/9, 242/13, 242/16, 242/19, 243/1, 243/24, 244/4, 244/14, 245/24, 247/8, 272/4, 272/6, 272/20, 272/24, 273/13, 273/16, 273/22, 274/2, 274/8, 275/6, 284/6, 284/15, 284/18, 284/21, 284/22, 292/12, 293/14, 298/24, 299/4, 299/14, 299/21, 300/1, 300/22, 303/25, 304/4, 304/21, 304/25, 305/15, 306/23, 307/7, 307/10, 307/17, 308/19, 308/24, 309/5, 309/12, 309/17, 309/21, 310/4, 310/8, 310/12, 315/16, 315/21, 315/25, 316/16, 316/25, 319/22, 321/9, 322/1, 322/5, 322/12, 322/24, 323/2, 329/7, 329/13, 329/15, 329/25, 330/7, 330/11, 331/5, 331/11, 331/17, 331/24, 332/14, 332/16, 332/19, 332/22, 333/3, 333/20, 333/24, 334/4, 334/9, 335/19, 343/24, 344/6, 344/19, 344/23 Mr. Darden's 96/18, 152/8 MR. DAVID 2/21, 164/3 MR. ELLENSON 216/19, 216/24, 218/4, 218/13, 218/15, 218/17, 224/2, 229/13, 239/12, 239/25, 240/4, 240/13, 241/2, 241/11, 241/19, 242/16, 242/17, 242/21, 243/9, 244/12, 244/21, 246/13, 247/14, 247/21, 248/2, 248/15, 248/21, 248/24, MR. FERGUSON 148/14 MR. GALVIN 19/2, 19/9, 20/9, 20/23, 21/4, 21/8, 36/22, 37/5, 37/12, 37/17, 38/1, 41/11, 41/21, 42/17, 48/10, 50/4, 50/13, 51/5, 58/12, 65/8, 67/17, 68/17, 68/24, 69/7, 69/15, 70/22, 73/16, 74/1, 74/18, 75/1, 75/19, 76/6, 80/24, 81/21, 87/4, 87/6, 88/2,

119/22, 122/15, 122/21, 124/10, 126/22, 202/10, 202/25, 203/4, 203/10, 205/6, 206/3, 206/16, 207/3, 207/9, 208/10, 247/4, 247/23, 248/18, 271/8, 271/14, 271/24, 272/21, 275/7, 277/1, 280/18, 301/1, 301/9, 301/22, 302/1, 302/5, 343/2, 343/6, 343/13, 343/19 Mr. Galvin's 214/23 MR. GIBSON 115/12, 116/21 Mr. Gwynn 344/15 MR. HARRIS 71/3, 87/5, 87/8, 87/13, 91/4, 117/15, 144/24, 274/25, 275/5 MR. HILLSTOCK 30/24, 31/3, 31/7, 31/11, MR. HUANG 21/10, 21/19, 22/1, 22/4, 75/3, 140/11, 140/17, 140/19, 141/10 Mr. Iverson 219/3, 222/19, 222/20 Mr. Iverson's 222/16 MR. JAMES 3/8, 218/1, 218/11 Mr. Langford 33/21, 33/22, 34/1, 34/5, 34/7, 34/14, 34/22, 35/7 Mr. Moderator 239/24 Mr. Morris 88/5, 90/21 Mr. MURRAY 3/13, 218/6 Mr. O'Neil 267/7, 267/11 MR. PATRICK 138/24, 217/19, 217/20, 229/16, 239/19, 240/6, 240/10, 240/17, 249/3, 255/21, 258/1, 264/14, 270/16, 270/22, 302/15, 303/1, 303/15, 303/18, 303/22, 333/4 Mr. Pentino 30/1, 36/2 Mr. Philip 1/18 Mr. Richard 1/21 Mr. Robert 36/13, 36/21 Mr. Roger 1/15 Mr. Shannon 264/19, 264/20, 265/7, 270/17, 270/18, 270/21 MR. SHEPHERD 177/5, 197/2, 203/5, 203/24, 212/6, 212/22, 213/1, 213/10, 214/22, 215/16, 216/14, 223/19 Mr. Simpson's 165/2 MR. STEINBERG 242/22, 258/2, 258/5, 264/14, 275/11, 275/16, 275/19, 276/17, 278/15, 279/23, 280/4 Mr. Stephens' 219/2 MR. WALLACE 4/7, 12/5, 12/6, 12/9, 12/11, 12/13, 12/21, 13/2, 13/6, 13/10, 13/23, 14/1, 14/11, 14/14, 14/22, 15/13, 15/20, 16/2, 16/9, 16/20, 16/22, 17/4, 17/12, 17/21, 18/12, 18/16, 19/6, 19/14, 20/12, 21/2, 21/7, 21/14, 21/21, 22/2, 22/6, 22/7, 283/11 Mr. Walter 218/7, 264/25, 267/6 MR. WEBS 142/3 Mrs. Anece 1/19 Mrs. Curtis 281/12, 344/1 Mrs. Freeman 198/18 Mrs. Jessie 1/12, 266/20 Mrs. McCloud 195/3, 198/22 Mrs. Ratiley 343/24 MS. BROWN 229/20, 239/19, 242/7, 242/12, 242/15, 249/1, 273/19, 274/3, 274/6, 274/11, 275/1, 275/9, 276/5 MS. Brown's 240/20 MS. BRYANT 81/1 MS. BURGESS 31/22 MS. CHRISTIAN 82/16, 83/22, 83/25, 84/24 MS. CURTIS 281/13, 281/23, 282/13, 282/17, 282/1 283/13, 284/4, 284/9, 284/13, 284/17, 284/20, 284/22, 290/13, 290/21, 291/6, 291/9, 291/14, 293/13, 294/1, 294/13, 294/18, 295/17, 295/25, 296/7, 298/11, 298/17, 298/21, 299/1, 299/7, 299/12, 299/19, 299/24, 300/10, 300/15, 300/24, 301/15, 301/24, 302/4, 302/14, 302/24, 303/2, 303/17, 303/20, 303/23, 304/2, 304/8, 304/23, 305/1, 305/17, 306/25, 307/9, 307/15, 308/2, 308/23, 309/2, 309/6, 309/13, 309/18, 309/25, 310/5, 310/11, 310/14, 310/24, 311/2, 311/7, 313/6, 313/10, 313/18, 313/22, 313/25, 314/21, 314/24, 315/9, 315/20, 315/22, 316/1, 316/24, 317/13, 320/5, 321/14, 322/4, 322/9, 322/17, 322/25, 323/5, 323/20, 323/23, 324/19, 324/23, 325/14, 327/4, 327/15, 328/14, 328/19, 329/4, 329/12, 329/14, 329/20, 330/4, 330/10, 330/19, 331/7, 331/13, 331/19, 331/25, 332/15, 332/18, 332/20, 332/24, 333/14, 333/22, 334/2, 334/7, 334/12, 335/24, 336/7, 336/10, 336/15, 337/10, 337/18, 337/21, 337/25, 338/17, 339/19 340/1, 340/4, 340/13, 340/19, 340/24, 341/2, 341/10, 341/14, 342/2, 342/20, 343/5, 343/10, 343/17, 343/21, 344/15, 344/20 Ms. Danielle 128/6 MS. FERGUSON 128/8, 140/24, 141/13, 143/9 MS. FROMAL 249/7, 249/11, 253/8, 272/23, 276/23, 277/5, 278/18, 280/6, 280/20 MS. HOBSON 255/23, 258/1, 271/9, 271/13, 271/19, 272/1, 273/1, 273/5, 273/15, 273/20, 273/24 MS. JOYCE 3/11, 255/22

88/9, 89/3, 90/2, 91/3, 115/10, 116/18, 117/14,

Ms. Kenyatta 128/22 MS. LINDA 3/18 MS. LINDA 3/18
Ms. McCleoud 131/13, 134/15, 134/18, 137/25, 138/4, 139/5, 145/3, 149/1
MS. MCCLOUD 16/3, 16/17, 16/21, 17/7, 17/16, 67/18, 72/9, 73/2, 73/15, 80/3, 119/23, 119/25, 120/9, 120/12, 137/23, 138/1, 138/6, 152/1, 194/14, 197/3, 275/10, 275/17, 280/3, 300/2, 300/11, 310/20, 310/25, 311/3, 313/1, 344/5, 344/7
Ms. Naomi 1/22
Ms. Pot. 218/5, 220/23, 249/5 Ms. Pat 218/5, 239/23, 249/5
Ms. Pat RICLA 3/10
Ms. RATTLEY 4/1, 12/4, 12/7, 12/12, 12/15, 16/1, 17/17, 21/9, 22/5, 22/8, 30/3, 30/24, 31/2, 31/4, 31/8, 31/12, 31/15, 32/4, 33/5, 33/8, 33/18, 33/24, 34/3, 34/6, 34/8, 34/14, 34/19, 34/24, 35/8, 35/9, 38/3, 38/6, 44/8, 82/13, 91/19, 92/7, 106/1, 35/9, 38/5, 38/6, 44/8, 82/15, 9/11/9, 92/7, 1001, 106/9, 106/14, 108/23, 110/5, 127/1, 127/19, 149/13, 152/25, 153/13, 155/7, 192/4, 192/8, 192/17, 193/4, 193/9, 193/14, 193/21, 194/8, 207/7, 208/11, 210/5, 210/8, 217/6, 217/12, 218/15, 229/12, 240/2, 243/11, 243/25, 247/20, 248/21, 249/10, 255/19, 265/5 270/17, 270/25, 272/2, 272/5, 272/7, 280/16, 280/25, 281/21, 282/9, 282/14, 283/10, 284/2, 284/12, 290/10, 290/17, 290/22, 291/8, 291/11, 293/20, 294/11, 294/14, 297/24 MS. SAUNDERS 33/6 MS. SHAUN 3/9, 218/4 MS. TRACEY 2/13, 127/11, 127/12 MS. WATKINS 127/18, 127/20, 128/2, 128/4, 128/21, 137/20, 138/10, 139/21, 140/14, 140/18, 142/19, 144/15, 146/18, 151/25 MS. ZEAVIN 80/11 MSA's 53/13 Mulattos 110/17 multiple 57/3, 57/4 municipality 270/1 Murder 38/19, 39/10, 39/23, 41/25, 44/1, 44/2, 44/13, 44/17, 45/1, 45/11, 45/12, 45/23, 46/9, 46/12, 46/16, 46/25, 47/3, 48/13, 48/19, 49/9, 49/13, 49/21, 50/7, 50/19, 51/15, 52/1, 52/5, 52/7, 52/11, 52/15, 52/24, 53/10, 53/20, 54/13, 54/19, 54/22, 55/7, 55/9, 56/5, 56/17, 57/13, 57/19, 58/18, 58/20, 59/14, 59/19, 59/23, 60/16, 62/3, 66/6, 67/2, 75/17, 76/23, 189/23, 208/2, 305/12, 306/18, 325/18 murders 44/5, 44/13, 45/21, 47/2, 56/11, 56/22, 56/25, 57/18, 67/24, 73/6, 82/5 Murray 251/1, 277/16, 278/1 mush 172/9 muster 290/9 mysterious 26/19 myth 169/25

N

NAACP 256/18, 257/3, 257/4, 270/11 nail 299/15 name 4/10, 8/11, 31/19, 33/6, 36/24, 37/8, 37/13, 45/13, 81/1, 115/12, 142/3, 206/9, 218/13, 218/19, 229/2, 248/9, 249/6, 287/10, 314/12, 339/2 named 111/7, 274/4 nameless 139/24, 139/25, 237/11 names 4/25, 244/13 narcotics 61/20, 61/22, 62/25, 63/1, 66/13 nasal 173/23 nation 196/4 nation's 266/11 national 22/25, 24/17, 46/5, 75/5, 75/8, 81/9, 109/1, 179/15, 180/5, 193/10, 193/14, 193/16, 193/17, 193/18, 256/15, 256/25, 257/1, 289/25, 299/10 Nationally 158/19, 257/14 nationwide 238/6, 294/25 Natural 184/21, 262/20 nature 96/10, 113/8, 244/7 necessary 142/22, 271/22 necessity 278/3 need 10/3, 10/7, 15/1, 34/22, 79/5, 83/12, 109/25, 117/10, 118/4, 142/12, 144/13, 145/19, 146/17, 149/12, 162/9, 185/4, 192/6, 193/23, 196/25, 244/16, 263/5, 263/6, 263/12, 263/13, 263/22, 268/1, 279/24, 295/14, 296/3, 327/11, 329/5 needed 70/8, 70/17, 147/13, 187/21, 243/25, 263/14 needle 320/18 Needless 174/3 needs 27/3, 77/23, 82/1, 109/5, 128/11, 146/24, 155/17, 162/18, 177/25, 181/2, 227/12, 269/9, 322/15 negative 132/20, 134/6 neglect 160/8, 187/15, 263/17 negotiated 101/7 Neighborhood 3/14, 10/2, 11/14, 264/17, 267/5, 268/2, 318/4, 318/6, 318/10, 318/13, 318/18, 318/22, 319/4, 319/6, 319/15

neighborhoods 109/16, 167/23, 168/2, 170/22, 176/17, 317/14, 317/15, 317/21, 317/23, 318/15, 320/1 neighbors 29/18, 51/19 neither 6/2, 173/13 Nelson 250/17, 252/1, 280/7 nerdy 170/19, 171/4 nervous 318/25 network 275/19 network 2/5/19
neutral 132/14, 189/4
new 8/9, 8/14, 9/22, 11/24, 12/1, 46/6, 80/18, 85/19, 89/19, 89/20, 90/3, 98/8, 98/21, 98/25, 99/1, 99/2, 99/6, 99/7, 99/12, 99/17, 122/17, 123/4, 125/8, 125/15, 126/21, 204/12, 268/21, 273/9, 305/15, 305/17, 318/24 305/17, 318/24
newborn 170/5
Newport 1/12, 28/6, 29/5, 76/8, 76/15, 76/16,
81/4, 81/6, 119/18, 151/7, 155/12, 190/25, 216/13,
216/17, 216/22, 218/20, 218/21, 247/11, 247/15,
247/17, 247/18, 253/2, 257/4, 265/17, 265/20,
266/15, 266/19, 266/20, 266/23, 269/2, 269/15,
269/18, 269/21, 270/6, 282/11, 344/17
News 1/12, 24/16, 24/17, 28/6, 29/5, 32/23, 32/25,
76/8, 76/15, 76/16, 81/4, 81/6, 119/18, 151/7,
155/12, 186/23, 187/1, 190/25, 216/13, 216/17,
216/22, 218/21, 247/12, 247/15, 247/17, 247/18,
253/2, 257/4, 265/18, 265/20, 266/15, 266/19,
266/20, 266/23, 269/2, 269/15, 269/18, 269/21,
270/6, 282/11, 344/17
newsletter 11/3, 21/23 2700, 28211, 34417 newsletter 11/3, 21/23 newspaper 114/3, 237/25, 274/1 newspapers 73/11, 238/1 night 27/10, 194/9, 219/15, 319/7 night's 151/14 nine 8/3, 8/14, 14/5, 135/10, 158/17, 178/10, 198/12 Ninth 24/4 nods 336/10 nolle 296/8 nominating 244/23 nominees 11/20 noncontrolled 170/11 nonetheless 101/10, 108/1 nonjustice 187/13 nonlawyer 331/9 nonminorities 77/14 nonowner 277/23 nontraditional 146/23 nonviolent 39/20 noon 92/1 Norfolk 7/9, 111/6, 186/21, 190/25, 197/14, 204/9, 216/22, 247/15, 247/17 normal 237/7, 303/3 normally 169/7, 208/18, 253/17, 258/21, 286/8, Northampton 318/17 Northern 94/8, 179/3 northside 141/16 Northwest 24/5 nose 173/10, 173/20 Notary 346/7 note 51/5, 135/13, 154/6, 233/1, 256/19 notes 12/17, 239/1 Notice 23/21, 32/9, 32/10, 108/14, 131/8, 138/18, 142/23, 144/12, 169/5, 189/16, 277/20 Notices 23/13, 154/14 notified 256/24 notion 312/5, 336/25 novelty 114/12 November 25/12 November 25/12 Number 10/11, 12/21, 24/6, 32/22, 34/20, 42/6, 44/14, 46/12, 47/12, 83/7, 120/5, 129/3, 131/9, 131/11, 133/25, 157/2, 158/20, 167/15, 173/17, 175/9, 191/19, 193/1, 198/10, 237/10, 238/23, 256/2, 256/3, 256/4, 256/5, 262/5, 271/17, 271/20, 273/7, 274/12, 276/14, 291/22, 292/17, 294/5, 299/12, 302/10, 317/4 numbered 42/20 numbers 5/20, 15/5, 15/9, 16/12, 39/14, 42/12, 55/15, 60/19, 68/13, 68/14, 82/25, 83/1, 83/2, 83/25, 87/1, 90/8, 121/2, 121/15, 147/14, 188/2, 196/1, 294/20, 299/13 nuts 302/15, 302/21

O

O'Neal 187/2
Oak 184/21
oath 23/8, 251/13
objected 250/14
objective 90/10, 91/17, 91/18
objectively 206/14
obligations 148/11

observation 116/19 observed 265/19, 265/21, 265/23 obstacles 267/14 obtain 206/20 obtained 23/18, 166/25, 315/6 occurrence 32/25 occurring 115/17, 185/10 October 5/10, 9/2, 14/4, 20/3, 23/17, 79/21, 318/17 offender 50/18, 51/14, 51/17, 56/11, 56/23, 57/23, 68/4, 68/5, 94/5, 96/9, 98/9, 112/16, 123/9, 123/19, 124/1, 124/7, 210/20, 210/21, 306/6, 321/16, 322/10, 322/16 offender's 93/15, 235/8 offenders 60/16, 61/2, 63/12, 68/4, 104/10, 117/13, 125/22, 126/5, 233/14, 234/12, 298/13. 322/2, 322/6 32212, 32216
offense 40/10, 43/13, 57/3, 57/7, 57/18, 60/10, 61/2, 62/25, 63/1, 83/14, 113/1, 189/11, 189/17, 189/20, 189/21, 204/19, 209/17, 213/23, 213/24, 288/24, 304/13, 306/6, 306/8, 307/4, 344/8 288/24, 304/13, 306/6, 306/8, 307/4, 344/8
offenses 39/17, 39/18, 39/19, 39/20, 39/21, 39/23,
40/17, 40/23, 41/24, 43/14, 43/16, 44/1, 57/3, 57/4,
59/15, 66/22, 92/20, 92/21, 104/10, 104/15, 104/19,
105/8, 105/10, 158/21, 159/23, 183/16, 183/17,
183/20, 183/23, 183/24, 184/16, 185/23, 186/20,
189/19, 189/25, 214/2, 216/23, 234/17, 287/13,
205/14 305/11 offer 148/24 oner 148/24 offered 303/12 offers 234/23, 303/13 office 11/24, 24/3, 25/11, 36/14, 79/8, 79/9, 79/11, 79/12, 88/8, 89/1, 107/11, 108/5, 116/22, 116/24, 79/12, 88/8, 89/1, 107/11, 108/5, 116/22, 116/24, 119/14, 153/20, 176/6, 189/16, 208/19, 208/21, 209/7, 209/20, 214/25, 218/21, 219/7, 219/11, 221/16, 230/9, 234/11, 235/13, 235/18, 235/23, 241/6, 250/9, 253/7, 286/6, 286/17, 286/25, 287/18, 288/18, 289/1, 291/2, 292/2, 292/19, 296/7, 308/12, 309/2, 314/20, 315/5, 315/15, 318/16, 319/21, 2008/2, 314/20, 315/5, 315/15, 318/16, 319/21, 2008/2, 314/20, 315/2, 315/2, 315/2, 315/21, 318/26, 319/21 320/22, 320/25, 324/24, 324/25, 333/7, 335/15 office's 289/10 officer 68/2, 221/19, 221/25, 222/19, 285/15, 285/22, 287/25, 288/17, 307/20, 309/22, 313/17, 313/20, 319/6 officer's 291/18 officers 117/2, 165/1, 165/3, 165/5, 185/8, 194/22, 197/22, 198/2, 199/10, 213/9, 213/11, 257/19, 321/24, 333/15 offices 204/22, 215/24, 335/7 official 160/3, 328/8, 334/16 officially 241/7 officials 25/14, 29/14, 80/6, 265/22, 266/9, 269/12, 269/23, 335/9 oiled 267/19 olled 267/19
old 18/1, 18/4, 98/14, 98/18, 99/10, 99/20, 123/11, 123/23, 143/14, 164/20, 191/12, 214/7, 216/24, 219/12, 220/17, 245/2, 245/16, 245/17, 250/13, 251/4, 251/10, 252/17, 252/18, 253/6, 255/14, 318/17, 340/7, 340/22
older 40/7, 146/24, 204/23 oldest 142/4, 266/11 olds 293/1, 341/1, 341/2 Oliver 204/25, 205/1 onus 87/19 open 29/20, 145/19, 146/18, 147/1, 148/9, 239/21, 275/23, 325/1 275/23, 325/1
opening 29/22, 245/19
openly 139/14, 197/5, 199/13, 234/12
opens 244/24, 245/21
operate 232/21, 237/6, 246/3, 315/1
operating 229/14, 256/4
operation 21/14, 107/5, 286/10, 286/15
operations 195/24, 318/3
operative 286/10, 286/14
openation 20/2 14/12, 14/2/11, 151 opinion 89/9, 137/7, 141/3, 143/11, 151/24, 05/11, 165/25, 166/10, 166/11, 203/13, 203/21, 235/25, 248/10, 312/25, 313/2, 313/4, 328/8, 328/13 opinions 140/23, 141/24, 240/15 opinm 60/3 opportunities 9/20, 10/4, 10/5, 15/16, 18/8, 112/23, 150/16 opportunity 9/15, 9/17, 10/3, 13/22, 14/2, 15/14, 15/22, 18/4, 29/12, 35/2, 113/5, 113/25, 114/13, 114/24, 228/24, 229/25, 255/25, 257/12, 258/6, 265/3, 265/10, 281/15, 292/9, 321/20 opposed 16/19, 28/7, 43/22, 49/15, 54/3, 94/6, 139/17, 182/19, 188/4, 191/2, 205/7, 288/5, 290/7, 298/1, 314/7 opposing 235/16 opposite 263/23 opposition 142/7 opted 224/11 optimistic 89/22

option 235/2, 289/7, 338/2, 339/11, 342/13 options 125/5 ordeal 230/12 order 8/10, 12/17, 44/3, 44/10, 90/22, 115/24, 116/15, 131/12, 139/12, 153/13, 165/13, 195/5, 217/25, 228/14, 237/15, 238/6, 238/18, 239/17, 262/8, 282/1, 307/24, 324/3 ordered 251/6 orders 259/22 Organization 3/15, 20/16, 122/7, 179/20, 257/10, 264/18, 267/21, 330/5, 330/8 organizational 20/21 organizations 25/9, 26/21, 256/15, 267/25, 270/9 organized 5/14, 128/19 Oriental 183/11 origin 22/25, 109/1, 289/25 original 8/7, 10/13, 106/24, 173/6, 346/9 originally 27/16 originator 215/20 outcome 17/11, 257/9, 257/11, 317/9, 317/11 outcry 108/4 outrageous 108/8, 131/10 outreach 268/24 outstripped 175/10 oven 272/10 overcome 85/23 overhaul 196/25 overhead 42/19, 55/3 overheads 38/8 overrepresentation 159/17, 159/19, 159/25, 179/19, 180/23, 181/8, 187/5 overrepresented 190/9 oversees 122/7 overthrowing 264/7 Overton 224/1, 225/8, 225/16, 226/22, 231/17, 234/2, 245/4, 246/14, 248/4, 248/5, 250/17, 250/24, 252/1, 280/7 Overton's 224/12 overturned 261/20 Overview 2/4, 35/14, 155/25 overwhelming 48/13, 56/22 owner 268/19 oxygen 171/14

P

P's 261/2 Pacific 50/12 package 169/9 packages 169/8 pages 346/8 paid 10/12, 78/23, 209/3, 218/23, 219/1, 278/6, 290/24 paints 116/3 PANEL 2/4, 2/10, 2/17, 3/5, 3/16, 31/24, 35/11, 35/13, 35/17, 35/19, 36/4, 65/9, 82/1, 92/4, 105/25, 127/7, 127/9, 134/21, 154/17, 155/14, 161/11, 163/25, 177/2, 177/15, 192/5, 192/15, 217/2, 217/4, 217/8, 229/14, 229/22, 232/25, 239/10, 263/11, 280/16, 281/14, 281/17, 282/2, 290/23, 302/18 panelist 36/13, 264/16, 281/13 panelists 36/2, 36/23, 45/17, 153/18, 194/13, 217/17, 218/10, 264/22, 270/24, 271/10, 319/23 panels 35/24, 154/16, 294/15 pants 290/12, 295/18 paper 31/25, 32/2, 133/15, 151/14, 205/5, 266/6, 273/19 papers 254/2, 292/5 paperwork 209/10, 209/12, 209/14, 210/3, 275/3, 275/7, 278/7, 278/8 paradoxically 183/18 parallel 103/12 paramedics 27/2 parameter 12/23 parameters 21/17 pardon 210/12, 210/13, 210/14, 228/10 parent 164/11, 164/14, 263/24 parentheses 22/17 parents 236/4, 263/24, 312/14 parked 251/14, 251/17 parked 251/14, 251/17
parking 251/15
parole 98/2, 98/9, 98/18, 99/8
part 23/19, 38/15, 39/8, 39/17, 39/19, 39/23,
47/21, 71/17, 71/18, 78/20, 78/25, 86/21, 97/1, 99/7,
101/17, 102/20, 107/2, 118/2, 119/7, 121/16, 125/18,
131/7, 133/21, 143/3, 153/14, 182/1, 183/16, 183/20,
184/16, 185/13, 186/13, 186/20, 188/20, 196/12,
212/17, 216/10, 243/21, 281/17, 282/2, 283/23,
284/25, 297/2, 315/5, 321/6, 321/7, 322/7, 323/22. 284/25, 297/2, 315/5, 321/6, 321/7, 322/7, 323/22, 326/23, 331/3, 339/23 participant 177/2 participants 16/15, 129/4, 178/24, 217/3 participate 19/25, 155/9, 155/13, 176/1, 283/19

participated 16/7, 176/8 participating 134/21 parties 91/2 partner 27/5, 231/20, 274/23 partnership 146/8 parts 156/10, 179/4, 337/15 party 121/20 pass 38/21, 106/16, 128/15, 219/5, 278/21, 290/8, 315/15 passages 173/23 passed 162/21, 250/10 passion 280/19 passionate 280/23, 280/24 paste 171/20, 171/23, 172/3, 172/20 patient 27/10 Patricia 88/24 Patrick 1/21, 138/25 patrol 117/2, 319/6 pattern 41/2, 43/9, 43/17, 43/20, 49/19, 52/17, 52/18, 53/1, 58/23, 62/4, 63/6, 63/19, 64/5, 75/13, 75/17, 81/10, 81/12, 330/15, 332/25 patterns 42/3, 56/4, 62/10, 66/4, 67/7, 75/4 pay 19/22, 71/8, 142/10, 191/13, 222/3, 227/12, 227/14, 228/15, 235/15, 260/14, 279/9 paycheck 20/20 paychecks 260/2 paying 71/5 pays 71/11 peace 26/3, 28/4, 266/17, 266/18, 266/21 peak 39/16, 39/25, 43/9, 44/4, 44/12, 46/2 peakest 44/21 Peanuts 191/18 peddlers 269/2, 269/6 peers 144/21, 147/1 penalized 276/18 penalties 211/12 penalty 165/22, 316/9, 316/11 pending 205/25 penetrates 179/10 Peninsula 229/3, 230/14, 232/5, 232/8, 233/16, 233/21, 236/7, 239/18, 268/23 penitentiary 214/10, 230/25, 236/5, 237/18 Pentino 1/24, 30/2 perceive 18/24, 137/8, 165/9, 282/20 perceived 160/25, 165/14, 166/18, 167/21, 168/7, 168/8, 168/10, 175/1, 312/4 percentage 40/23, 41/17, 47/5, 57/19, 59/25, 60/12, 60/13, 60/22, 61/3, 62/14, 62/16, 62/17, 63/5, 63/14, 77/12, 113/16, 175/23, 188/4, 188/21, 278/14, 314/1 percentages 48/15, 49/5, 49/19, 50/2, 50/5, 50/21, 183/3 perception 15/18, 16/18, 132/21, 137/4, 164/21, 167/7, 176/12, 179/1, 179/6, 179/9, 179/12, 183/21, 192/9, 198/23, 206/15, 207/7, 233/7, 234/9, 246/1, 247/22, 284/16, 297/11, 297/15, 311/21, 331/8, 331/9, 331/12, 334/17, 334/21 perceptions 129/9, 129/25, 130/2, 164/16, 164/19, 165/17, 169/21, 179/13, 181/18, 184/8, 192/18, 195/7, 290/11, 290/23, 294/15, 295/7, 297/8, 297/9, 297/25 performance 327/22, 330/13
Performing 268/20
period 14/21, 24/19, 41/3, 42/7, 49/12, 53/21, 53/24, 54/16, 54/24, 55/25, 61/10, 62/12, 64/2, 64/8, 65/5, 66/14, 73/9, 76/3, 76/19, 168/19, 209/4, 345/13 perjury 261/3 permanent 305/14 permission 262/16, 306/22 permit 30/4, 35/3, 255/24, 256/2 perpetrator 302/12 perpetrators 157/18 Perry 284/19 personal 90/11, 95/16, 142/17, 150/22, 257/15, 265/23, 311/4, 312/24 personality 261/3
Personality 77/21, 110/3, 163/7, 255/12, 295/24
perspective 86/13, 114/17, 114/18, 114/22,
124/24, 146/16, 195/3, 195/8, 195/20, 240/24, 283/14, 316/22, 316/23, 328/17, 333/10, 334/5 Perspectives 2/17, 154/22, 156/12 persuasion 312/12 pervasive 8/24, 14/17, 15/5 petition 288/21 petitions 262/20, 262/25 pharmacological 172/23 phase 162/12, 162/13 phone 24/6, 210/2, 313/11 physical 171/12, 203/9, 214/15, 263/19 physically 168/17, 168/24, 169/1, 170/1, 213/19 pick 27/11, 89/23, 101/15, 255/20 picked 90/4

picking 185/25 picture 77/4, 77/10, 84/12, 116/4, 116/6, 121/23, 172/7 pictures 202/4 piece 123/14, 123/16 pieces 95/11 Pilot 96/19, 96/25, 97/4, 182/4, 182/6, 182/12 piloted 191/6 pilots 191/7 pink 253/9, 253/10, 253/13, 253/22 pinpoint 244/18, 342/16, 342/17 place 6/22, 11/1, 39/1, 80/14, 85/20, 95/4, 100/4, piace 6/22, 11/1, 39/1, 80/14, 85/20, 95/4, 100/4, 100/6, 112/21, 113/4, 113/6, 122/13, 125/8, 126/3, 149/21, 185/4, 186/4, 231/18, 232/1, 250/20, 277/8, 286/23, 289/6, 323/12, 326/25, 330/17 placed 126/5, 184/2, 321/22 placement 125/14, 149/5, 149/6, 184/6, 184/11 places 71/22, 186/10, 190/24, 238/13, 245/15, 246/15, 247/14, 277/6, 277/7, 292/24 placing 314/15 placing 314/15 plague 168/2 plaintiffs 269/25 plaited 295/18 plan 34/21, 88/18, 88/20, 140/16, 140/19, 141/7 planned 281/17 planning 82/2, 151/20 plans 75/19, 140/25, 192/19, 221/1 plant 171/20 play 93/19, 96/21, 111/25, 267/13, 293/15, 317/18 played 140/7, 239/3, 240/15 playing 232/6, 232/14, 238/4, 245/23, 246/19 plays 111/22, 185/13 plea 101/4, 119/10, 233/19, 296/8, 320/23, 321/10 pleasant 249/13 pleasure 177/14, 334/19 plight 162/25 ploy 176/21 plus 106/11, 258/12 pockets 279/16 podium 38/5, 264/21 poet 270/19 point 18/25, 22/8, 34/24, 36/18, 36/19, 48/5, 51/24, 52/22, 63/9, 76/6, 79/13, 83/12, 101/13, 104/1, 104/2, 111/14, 117/9, 120/1, 120/18, 137/10, 137/15, 138/20, 150/6, 154/18, 155/24, 180/19, 193/21, 194/16, 198/24, 211/1, 216/16, 223/4, 231/25, 235/12, 237/23, 239/8, 240/20, 280/20, 280/21, 287/9, 289/10, 291/17, 292/13, 293/22, 294/3, 299/22, 301/19, 303/8, 313/13, 321/9, 325/9, 334/4, 339/5 pointed 177/17, 183/24, 185/16 pointed 17/17, 183/24, 185/16
pointing 339/22
points 234/5, 299/15
police 20/5, 26/24, 27/20, 39/6, 67/23, 68/16,
72/11, 72/17, 78/10, 80/6, 100/13, 100/14, 116/2,
116/3, 122/3, 132/21, 132/22, 165/1, 165/3, 167/20,
185/7, 187/17, 194/22, 195/23, 195/24, 196/24,
197/4, 197/14, 197/21, 198/2, 198/5, 199/10, 201/14,
213/9, 213/10, 220/6, 250/12, 251/19, 268/2, 271/20,
285/14, 285/21, 285/22, 286/1, 286/9, 286/12, 285/14, 285/21, 285/22, 286/1, 286/9, 286/12, 286/16, 287/4, 287/11, 287/17, 287/25, 288/17, 291/18, 294/18, 294/22, 298/9, 298/11, 298/12, 298/22, 299/2, 299/17, 299/23, 300/4, 300/12, 300/18, 300/20, 307/19, 308/4, 308/5, 308/6, 309/14, 309/15, 309/22, 309/23, 310/1, 310/2, 310/15, 310/17, 313/3, 313/17, 313/20, 314/2, 314/17, 319/2, 319/3, 319/4, 319/5 policeman 257/22, 271/15 policemen 121/7, 196/11, 196/15, 271/12 policies 158/22, 158/25, 160/5, 230/8, 324/23, 324/25 policing 100/14 policy 88/10, 88/14, 124/15, 124/22, 183/22, 320/22 political 231/10, 232/19, 233/6, 244/3, 273/6, 244/3, 273/8, 311/10, 311/14, 311/16, 311/24, 312/1, 312/5, 312/11, 328/10, 334/13, 334/14, 336/5, 336/17, 336/22 politically 27/1 politicians 35/5 politicize '234/11 politics 187/3, 261/3 pool 253/16 poor 106/7, 160/11, 263/20 poorest 317/23 popular 78/20, 143/11, 250/11, 312/19, 312/20, 337/4, 337/6 Population 2/18, 63/24, 64/8, 64/13, 71/16, 71/17, 82/22, 83/9, 93/7, 130/6, 132/2, 141/12, 154/23, 156/6, 159/21, 161/19, 175/24, 181/10, 183/8, 183/13, 188/5, 188/9, 201/25, 293/5, 294/8, 301/16, 301/19, 302/11, 325/11, 325/12, 326/24, 328/13, 337/15

populations 140/20

Porter 184/21 portion 130/22, 158/6 portions 130/22, 155/12 position 202/2, 248/6, 270/7, 327/7 positions 303/9, 303/11 positive 126/18, 133/17 possession 61/16, 62/2, 62/15, 63/2, 63/7, 223/10, 288/1, 288/5, 288/6 possibility 203/12 possible 23/24, 32/9, 91/25, 92/1, 120/1, 148/5, 325/23 post 29/6, 174/15 posted 142/22 potassium 172/11 potential 6/4, 156/7, 157/23 pounds 214/8 poverty 233/10, 256/17 powder 104/18, 104/24, 105/2, 105/3, 105/11, 105/16, 107/9, 107/17, 107/24, 125/12, 159/9, 169/6, powdered 107/9, 166/25, 169/7, 172/20, 172/24 Powell 165/25, 166/11 Powell's 165/21 power 233/6, 277/11 powerful 197/12 powers 205/9, 308/13 PR 257/13 practice 10/3, 143/10, 164/6, 214/24, 215/13, 216/12, 218/20, 219/12, 247/15, 292/20, 327/18, 332/14, 332/15 practiced 107/10, 250/6 practices 92/25, 93/9, 97/4, 100/13, 101/5, 113/5, 131/23, 132/8, 132/10, 132/22, 132/25, 133/9, 158/22, 166/24, 329/17 practicing 218/22, 245/7, 262/21, 262/22, 277/17 practitioner 246/23 pre 29/5 precedes 320/24 precincts 117/1, 268/2 precluded 5/22, 18/3 predicated 14/5, 20/2, 87/16 predict 221/8, 221/10 predictability 100/9, 123/14, 124/25 predispose 297/3 predisposition 297/1 predominantly 128/12, 135/9, 317/16, 317/17, 318/20, 318/21 prejudice 116/8 prejudices 116/25, 324/15 preliminary 222/13, 222/15 premise 115/23 premium 91/20 preparatory 157/7
prepared 128/14, 128/16, 154/1, 166/22, 206/7,
284/18, 284/24, 286/19, 305/6, 345/13
preparing 277/23, 290/3, 309/3
presence 82/14, 111/13 presentation 36/18, 37/24, 38/9, 49/18, 59/18, 65/6, 81/2, 81/5, 89/7, 92/1, 128/5, 149/15, 155/21, 155/24, 192/9, 193/24, 270/20, 281/7, 344/2 presentations 180/4, 229/11 presented 77/4, 178/3, 180/16, 265/16, 267/18, 301*[*3 presenting 37/22 presents 55/15, 285/18 President 3/11, 128/5, 142/19, 143/8, 195/20, 210/12, 210/14, 266/24, 267/5 presiding 134/13 Press 3/9, 28/17, 32/17, 33/2, 151/13 pressing 136/13 pressure 268/9 pressures 339/8 presuming 126/15 presuming 126/15
presumption 297/13, 297/14
pretty 39/14, 41/2, 44/18, 46/21, 54/5, 54/21,
62/11, 63/19, 75/6, 75/13, 86/3, 113/9, 134/3,
143/10, 208/21, 209/15, 209/24, 228/11, 230/12,
244/22, 246/25, 275/20, 315/23
prevailing 156/24
prevent 191/9, 249/20
prevention 160/12, 161/13, 162/7, 177/20,
179/25, 180/6, 182/7, 190/13, 191/5, 191/14, 197/13,
197/18, 197/19, 197/23, 203/6, 268/14
prevents 108/19 prevents 198/19 price 71/5, 142/10, 169/5, 169/17, 169/19, 175/20 primary 57/8, 58/25, 72/12 prime 277/16 principle 140/2 principles 140/6 print 267/21 printed 70/18, 79/21, 174/15 priority 12/17, 79/16 prison 83/18, 83/21, 92/23, 93/5, 94/5, 103/20,

103/23, 104/20, 112/16, 123/10, 123/13, 123/24, 124/13, 124/16, 124/20, 125/1, 125/24, 126/20, 158/18, 161/18, 210/6, 260/7 prisoners 318/2 prisons 63/25, 158/21, 175/6, 263/23 Privacy 22/12, 23/15, 24/2, 153/25, 154/2, 259/5 private 94/2, 156/22, 157/3, 250/15 pro 43/15 proactive 10/7 probation 207/19, 209/1, 209/12, 214/11, 221/8, 221/18, 221/25, 222/4, 222/19, 321/22, 321/24 probationary 209/4 problem 15/11, 15/12, 15/13, 15/21, 15/22, 46/8, 79/4, 85/2, 89/21, 94/24, 100/1, 100/2, 100/3, 100/4, 109/9, 126/1, 126/8, 163/2, 163/3, 163/14, 167/8, 174/11, 176/21, 176/22, 181/2, 181/18, 181/22, 182/11, 183/11, 185/5, 194/19, 195/4, 195/6, 196/9, 196/19, 199/23, 199/24, 200/10, 203/25, 206/2, 206/15, 212/5, 217/14, 218/8, 225/18, 231/3, 236/13, 236/15, 241/1, 244/18, 265/12, 267/22, 307/25, 318/13, 319/19, 320/9, 320/12, 321/7, 321/21 Problems 2/4, 3/5, 14/25, 18/15, 29/13, 30/19, 35/14, 65/25, 85/16, 92/12, 133/2, 133/3, 145/24, 151/6, 151/7, 156/24, 160/8, 161/21, 163/9, 174/7, 176/16, 176/17, 176/23, 179/4, 180/8, 180/18, 181/25, 187/14, 187/15, 189/6, 192/2, 197/10, 217/23, 237/1, 243/3, 246/2, 263/19, 263/20, 267/16, 268/4, 268/6, 311/6, 320/1 procedural 323/10, 323/12, 324/5 procedure 32/9, 208/14, 208/16, 210/11, 305/4, 344/21 procedures 7/8, 7/15, 161/1, 235/3, 244/6, 256/4, 274/16, 323/12 proceeding 35/23, 154/18 process 5/17, 6/13, 6/18, 6/21, 7/3, 9/4, 10/22, 10/23, 16/10, 17/19, 66/16, 88/17, 95/2, 113/10, 115/2, 115/6, 183/6, 184/10, 201/21, 202/2, 216/6 244/24, 245/20, 259/2, 260/3, 261/6, 261/14, 274/17, 283/19, 284/24, 288/11, 289/6, 289/9, 290/18, 293/12, 293/16, 294/3, 302/19, 308/25, 311/15, 311/18, 311/19, 311/24, 312/1, 312/8, 312/18, 327/20, 328/21, 331/14, 334/13, 334/14, 334/20 processed 310/13 processes 7/8 processing 160/24 produce 17/10 produced 203/17 productive 4/16, 160/21 profession 330/3, 341/8 professional 215/13, 329/16, 329/17 professionals 86/10, 158/4 professions 341/6 PROFESSOR 2/22, 127/22, 129/5, 130/16, 138/16, 139/24, 177/3, 177/18, 211/8, 216/2, 225/21 professors 7/9 profile 121/5, 138/22 profiles 156/15, 156/21 profit 261/4, 264/3 profitable 199/8 program 20/1, 21/5, 96/20, 97/22, 125/14, 125/15, 125/17, 125/19, 126/6, 126/21, 157/8, 198/10, 205/24, 207/1, 214/13, 221/9, 282/10, 321/2, 321/16, 321/23, 327/14 programmatic 13/19 programs 13/11, 15/2, 18/7, 84/10, 84/11, 84/19, 85/19, 85/21, 157/9, 157/19, 160/10, 160/13, 161/14, 162/8, 162/10, 191/5, 263/12, 263/13, 268/15, 321/12 progress 99/5, 102/11, 321/4, 321/21 progresses 287/22 prohibited 154/11 prohibitive 201/18 project 23/20, 23/22, 28/25, 29/7, 71/24, 72/8, 82/12, 90/25, 129/12, 141/5, 147/5, 182/12, 268/22 projects 152/20, 182/4, 182/6 prominent 9/25, 265/17, 269/7 promise 191/9 promised 255/15 promote 157/22 promoted 248/5, 248/7 promotion 157/14 promulgates 104/8, 112/3 promulgating 112/2 pronged 10/6 pronounced 123/8 pronouncing 249/6 proof 294/16 propensity 343/8 property 249/21, 250/15, 250/18, 252/15, 252/16, proportion 104/1, 294/8, 301/10 proportional 5/20, 5/22, 16/12, 93/6

proportions 91/9

propose 6/17, 326/8, 326/21, 326/24

proposed 10/11, 28/24, 291/3 prosecute 113/2, 227/24, 308/16, 310/6 prosecuted 167/19, 291/5 prosecuting 101/8, 223/15 prosecutor 100/22, 207/18, 251/21, 305/20, 305/21 prosecutorial 100/18, 100/19, 118/2, 118/5, 119/5, 119/6, 158/22, 160/2, 204/9, 205/13 prosecutorialy 118/8 prosecutors 122/7, 185/7, 203/14, 203/19, 204/4, 204/11, 204/14, 205/16, 213/5, 305/10, 330/22, 330/25 prosecutors' 215/24 prossed 296/8 protagonist 224/21 protected 290/1 protection 22/23, 132/22, 133/1 protections 337/14 protector 147/24 protests 24/23 protocols 215/23 proud 190/12 prove 166/2, 166/3, 166/6, 212/23, 215/9, 228/1, 271/22, 288/5 provide 4/22, 5/4, 14/13, 16/24, 20/24, 29/12, 45/18, 69/9, 113/4, 155/24, 156/5, 171/11, 202/25, 299/25, 322/7, 322/9 provides 44/24, 102/7 provision 263/6 provisions 304/16, 305/16, 305/18 psychological 170/4, 170/9, 170/11, 203/11 psychologically 170/6, 170/12 public 7/11, 7/12, 10/1, 20/6, 22/3, 22/19, 23/9, 24/18, 25/14, 27/19, 29/12, 29/14, 29/20, 30/13, 32/8, 33/23, 34/8, 36/7, 88/8, 88/24, 94/1, 102/8, 122/12, 143/22, 154/8, 154/12, 156/22, 157/3, 158/4, 185/7, 186/18, 228/23, 229/5, 234/3, 235/22, 235/25, 238/5, 251/3, 251/11, 265/22, 277/6, 277/9, 283/15, 312/23, 331/8, 333/10, 333/12, 334/5, 334/11, 334/16, 334/21, 335/10, 335/11, 335/12, 346/7 public's 334/17 publication 32/10, 32/15 publicize 234/13 publicized 32/3, 108/2 publicly 28/14 publish 21/23, 256/5 published 21/24, 23/14 publishes 178/12 pulls 285/23 punish 113/25, 114/24, 195/21 punishment 168/11, 325/22 pure 106/10, 109/4, 109/19, 109/21, 168/10, 192/9 purilator 191/12 purity 175/21 purple 254/17 purpose 28/24, 80/7, 123/5, 143/17, 143/19, 156/3, 207/1 purposes 143/6, 244/17 pursue 35/19, 67/5 purview 332/3 push 91/23, 92/4, 111/12 put 15/2, 15/21, 41/4, 67/11, 68/13, 85/20, 92/11, 95/4, 100/4, 102/18, 117/23, 119/19, 122/17, 124/21, 126/3, 129/6, 130/7, 132/16, 138/20, 144/14, 145/1, 150/18, 173/5, 185/6, 187/21, 191/14, 191/15, 196/5, 196/6, 202/3, 206/23, 207/20, 214/5, 214/11, 214/14, 222/3, 238/17, 262/5, 262/19, 270/13, 272/10, 279/13, 315/18, 321/19, 321/22, 321/23, 321/24, 322/21, 326/25, 328/20, 337/22 pnts 114/16 putting 103/20, 125/8, 143/24, 147/4, 186/1, 317/4 putty 171/21 puzzle 119/8

o

qualifies 137/5, 322/10
qualify 135/18, 136/16, 209/9, 209/13, 321/16, 321/18, 322/3
qualitative 120/6
quality 12/22
quantifiable 137/6
quantify 133/23
quantitative 120/4, 120/7, 120/9
quarter 98/11
quarterly 21/23, 161/24
quarterly 21/23, 161/24
quarters 184/23
queens 269/13
question 17/8, 17/19, 19/2, 33/20, 45/6, 69/25, 73/17, 77/1, 77/10, 78/20, 82/17, 85/8, 86/7, 87/11, 87/13, 87/24, 89/8, 91/5, 91/7, 102/14, 102/23, 110/9, 116/18, 116/21, 119/9, 119/9, 119/23, 121/20, 133/19, 134/11, 135/3, 137/24, 138/24, 140/10, 141/22, 142/7, 146/2, 151/18, 185/12,

198/22, 203/4, 205/20, 214/23, 216/21, 224/17, 239/25, 240/18, 247/5, 248/9, 250/8, 265/16, 271/9, 272/4, 273/12, 274/3, 274/17, 275/2, 275/10, 293/21, 293/25, 295/4, 295/17, 295/22, 296/25, 297/6, 297/24, 300/2, 300/23, 303/24, 304/1, 307/18, 307/19, 310/20, 311/7, 314/3, 315/17, 323/7, 324/20, 324/21, 327/5, 333/9, 334/24, 342/16, 344/2, 344/12 questioned 280/7, 319/9 questioning 16/8, 24/12, 36/1, 245/25 questionmaire 16/7, 16/9 Questions 12/3, 12/10, 12/12, 16/2, 16/4, 17/17, 21/9, 21/11, 22/5, 30/6, 30/23, 31/20, 33/5, 65/7, 65/8, 65/11, 67/17, 75/2, 79/10, 86/19, 89/6, 102/13, 105/25, 119/22, 120/15, 131/1, 131/5, 131/6, 131/9, 131/11, 134/22, 137/21, 139/16, 140/11, 146/5, 146/6, 163/25, 194/4, 194/13, 202/10, 208/12, 211/8, 217/2, 218/11, 229/14, 229/22, 230/4, 239/22, 240/1, 240/12, 250/25, 252/24, 270/23, 272/25, 274/13, 302/16, 302/22, 344/21 quick 137/23, 140/11, 147/6, 196/8, 211/7, 239/25, 241/2, 272/25, 336/3 quicker 335/3 quickers 209/23 quote 132/2, 211/3, 221/6, 267/9, 267/21 quotes 27/1

R

race 6/5, 8/17, 8/24, 14/17, 14/20, 15/19, 18/15, 18/16, 18/19, 22/24, 40/18, 40/22, 49/20, 49/25, 50/7, 52/24, 58/21, 60/15, 61/5, 61/21, 62/15, 66/23, 68/5, 68/9, 77/11, 82/18, 84/13, 85/13, 93/23, 108/25, 118/19, 130/17, 136/11, 136/13, 136/17 137/6, 137/11, 140/7, 150/18, 151/6, 151/7, 161/19, 167/16, 189/3, 205/19, 206/11, 206/24, 230/13, 230/17, 282/8, 289/15, 294/20, 295/7, 296/21, 298/13, 298/14, 307/15 Racial 2/10, 10/19, 15/11, 15/12, 15/16, 64/20, 66/24, 103/4, 103/12, 129/9, 131/11, 131/17, 133/2, 135/16, 137/16, 137/18, 139/15, 140/3, 141/23, 143/3, 144/7, 145/12, 167/5, 202/14, 213/4, 283/3, 283/7, 293/17, 302/23, 303/5, 303/7, 308/15 racially 165/14, 166/15, 226/14, 289/18 racism 135/22, 145/20, 150/5, 150/23, 160/1, 174/7, 185/13, 235/9 racist 135/24, 176/13 radical 304/17 rainbow 244/25 raise 20/14, 79/2, 238/18, 241/14, 259/20, 280/1, 336/19 raised 13/17, 122/14, 135/23, 241/12, 279/25, 295/4 raises 41/19 raising 235/14, 235/15, 312/6, 336/24 railles 237/7 ran 220/5 range 186/9 ranges 20/12 rank 19/22, 247/16 ranting 222/11 rape 39/10, 39/24, 41/25, 57/18, 59/15
rate 53/20, 102/3, 125/23, 126/16, 126/18, 157/1, 157/10, 159/4, 159/9, 184/13, 186/13, 186/19, 199/12, 294/7, 306/20, 318/20 rated 20/11, 41/12 rates 69/11, 102/17, 116/9, 116/10, 157/15, 159/13 rating 19/10, 137/3 ratio 41/21, 42/15, 105/3 ratios 69/11 Ratiley 1/12, 155/5, 266/20 raving 222/11 raw 81/17, 87/10, 183/2, 299/11 reach 6/3, 39/25, 180/14, 243/14, 253/6 reached 39/16, 44/20, 124/15 Reachful 268/22 reaching 156/7, 157/23 react 10/18 reaction 77/15, 222/23, 295/22 reactive 10/8 read 16/25, 22/11, 31/23, 34/15, 36/17, 41/14, 48/17, 50/4, 51/1, 61/12, 79/24, 114/3, 133/14, 135/5, 135/13, 136/18, 165/19, 167/4, 167/5, 167/7, 167/10, 168/5, 168/14, 171/3, 171/15, 250/9 reading 168/3, 170/13, 186/22, 255/17 reality 266/7, 298/1, 336/22 realization 176/15 reason 45/2, 47/20, 90/12, 101/18, 112/10, 112/15, 150/1, 153/9, 170/8, 173/15, 176/23, 198/14, 198/16, 198/17, 199/10, 249/18, 250/16, 266/4, 274/22, 293/24, 296/21, 310/18 reasonable 228/2

reasoning 142/24

reasons 4/20, 89/16, 115/20, 165/23, 185/14,

212/10, 249/15, 276/7, 312/20 reauthorization 180/11 reauthorized 180/12, 180/13 rebutted 106/22 rebutted 106/22
recall 108/1, 231/14, 338/19
receive 30/14, 71/23, 92/23, 104/23, 123/18,
129/19, 145/13, 202/5, 309/23, 310/10
received 5/11, 7/4, 7/7, 10/20, 16/6, 25/5, 79/10,
89/14, 98/14, 98/15, 129/1, 130/7, 131/2, 134/9,
134/16, 138/4, 139/1, 142/21, 143/25, 144/16, 147/7,
158/3, 158/9, 158/14, 202/6, 208/23, 288/9, 303/13
receives 124/1, 330/17 receives 124/1, 330/17 receiving 131/24, 144/1, 180/22 recess 153/2 recidivate 213/22 recidivates 213/23 recidivism 125/23, 126/7, 268/18, 293/9 recidivist 126/2 recommend 157/20, 327/14, 338/13 recommendation 104/24, 108/8, 126/16, 180/4, 209/19, 222/2, 246/18, 328/25 recommendations 11/2, 11/14, 29/2, 108/11, 108/13, 147/17, 161/6, 191/25, 222/20, 246/6 recommended 7/17, 10/7, 10/9, 10/15, 10/21, 11/1, 108/3 reconvened 282/7 record 12/11, 31/19, 32/15, 36/18, 36/23, 45/16, 46/14, 47/11, 48/25, 71/22, 71/23, 76/7, 88/10, 104/5, 125/13, 126/13, 144/15, 144/21, 174/16, 204/20, 206/4, 210/20, 233/19, 235/7, 256/12, 275/23, 276/9, 295/12, 295/14, 296/19, 304/10, 306/9, 306/12, 321/15, 321/18, 322/18, 322/25, 323/15, 323/25, 339/17, 340/7, 340/14, 341/5, 341/7, 341/17, 341/18, 341/24, 342/9, 342/19, 342/24, 344/8, 344/9 recorded 84/16, 95/5, 187/24, 248/19 records 23/14, 107/24, 235/20, 236/2, 257/19, 259/3, 307/5, 339/25, 342/7 recourse 231/16, 232/2 recreational 266/2 red 42/6, 46/1, 46/11, 52/6, 58/21, 253/10, 253/11, 253/14, 253/23, 254/11 redress 237/6, 237/21, 238/2, 270/11 reduce 101/1, 107/14, 268/17 reduced 97/13 reducing 96/22 reduction 101/7, 188/16, 188/21 reductions 98/13, 101/7, 188/13 reelection 174/22 reference 29/9, 149/17, 194/20, 299/15, 299/22 references 22/20 referral 23/24, 310/9 reflected 96/13, 133/20, 232/15, 235/5, 270/19 reflection 133/13, 188/23 reflective 8/12 reflects 99/23, 233/5 Reform 70/4, 92/17, 97/25, 342/5 refuse 283/18 Regional 25/11 Register 23/14, 23/16, 32/14 rehabilitated 253/20 rehabilitation 84/9 reinforce 20/22 reinforced 184/9 reinstitute 228/5 rejected 108/10 rejecting 108/20 relate 18/7, 126/8 related 10/19, 77/8, 79/12, 161/11, 161/21, 260/12, 301/14 relates 115/16, 202/22, 337/16 relation 8/17, 82/17, 145/9 relations 27/20, 136/13, 137/18, 282/8 relationship 36/25, 50/18, 51/15, 51/17, 56/12, 57/23, 66/13 relationships 18/2 relative 157/2 release 32/23, 33/2, 98/11, 213/22 released 33/14, 62/8, 80/21, 88/20, 123/13, 234/4 releases 32/6, 32/18 relied 324/13 relief 201/2, 263/5 religion 22/24, 108/25, 289/25 religious 163/11 remain 139/24, 139/25, 231/5, 237/11, 237/19, 237/20, 323/18 remainder 53/6 remains 340/7, 344/10 remark 280/8 remarks 22/10, 105/21, 229/21, 293/21 remedy 307/23, 308/11 remedying 152/19 remember 44/14, 104/3, 145/10, 145/14, 189/19,

191/18, 338/19 remind 153/6 reminder 239/20 removal 276/1 remove 241/7 removed 275/25, 342/6 removing 171/20 Reno's 108/5 repeat 64/10 repercussions 144/1, 144/2 repetitive 155/22, 178/17 replace 325/16, 326/14 replaced 8/9, 260/5 replicated 95/25 report 6/20, 8/4, 9/3, 10/20, 21/19, 21/20, 28/20, 38/18, 44/24, 45/11, 45/16, 46/14, 46/15, 47/19, 49/9, 49/14, 49/16, 52/24, 53/8, 56/10, 62/8, 62/10, 66/6, 67/4, 67/25, 68/2, 68/3, 68/16, 68/18, 69/14, 00/0, 07/4, 07/12, 00/2, 00/3, 00/10, 00/10, 07/17, 09/19, 69/19, 69/25, 70/1, 70/16, 70/20, 71/12, 71/21, 72/16, 72/23, 75/15, 76/1, 79/13, 79/18, 79/21, 80/4, 80/5, 80/20, 80/22, 80/23, 89/11, 89/13, 89/19, 90/3, 99/6, 102/8, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 102/11, 106/19, 107/25, 108/2, 102/9, 1 113/1, 140/12, 151/11, 158/9, 161/4, 161/25, 166/23, 167/4, 167/7, 168/4, 168/15, 168/25, 169/2, 169/4, 169/17, 171/2, 173/21, 174/24, 185/20, 192/12, 192/22, 201/24, 202/6, 206/4, 221/18, 251/18, 276/20, 282/24, 283/10, 283/21, 284/3, 287/12, 289/5, 305/6, 308/18, 309/15, 332/7 reported 7/15, 21/1, 39/9, 53/11, 67/2, 70/7, 76/11, 300/8 reporter 45/17, 45/19, 186/24, 205/5 reporters 151/17 reporting 69/23, 161/12, 205/18, 205/22, 206/8, 300/7, 300/12 reports 23/23, 25/20, 45/12, 67/23, 67/25, 72/11, 72/13, 72/20, 78/2, 84/18, 84/21, 88/23, 89/1, 183/19, 192/14, 286/16, 286/17, 288/9, 292/6, 298/9, represent 42/6, 59/1, 60/9, 61/1, 61/13, 61/15, 61/17, 64/6, 64/8, 64/12, 64/14, 155/11, 159/5, 159/10, 214/18, 233/7, 244/2, 262/18, 265/4, 266/10, representation 5/19, 5/23, 6/19, 16/11, 48/4, 76/21, 93/4, 93/6, 93/24, 103/11, 156/17, 157/6, 157/17, 159/1, 180/20, 183/5, 184/13, 231/21 representative 7/19, 332/10 representatives 6/11, 185/8 represented 40/20, 40/21, 55/11, 63/7, 63/17, 63/18, 64/24, 65/1, 93/25, 137/5, 159/14, 184/15, 218/25, 231/20, 237/9, 241/10, 253/3, 254/6 Representing 2/14, 212/14, 236/17 represents 10/17, 42/6, 52/6, 55/17, 55/23, 58/3, 76/25, 103/19, 169/9, 328/12 reprisal 30/14 request 5/11, 63/22, 152/8, 269/16, 287/19, 304/9, 305/5, 305/22, 306/21 requested 6/20, 10/21, 23/10, 80/6, 162/17 requesting 80/7 requests 5/11, 78/9, 78/10 require 180/7 required 322/1, 322/12 requirements 23/15, 154/7, 290/5, 290/6 requires 32/9, 102/4, 161/15, 162/2 Research 2/6, 8/15, 22/19, 29/7, 36/5, 37/4, 37/10, 37/11, 38/24, 70/2, 73/23, 74/24, 89/24, 90/19, 91/10, 91/12, 91/13, 91/15, 92/11, 99/24, 99/25, 101/24 researcher 86/25, 89/9 researchers 130/11 reset 225/15 residency 19/19 residing 24/20 residue 172/12 Resolution 3/13, 26/17, 156/14, 161/13, 162/1, 162/16, 195/14, 201/10, 218/7, 258/3 resolutions 162/21, 201/15 resolve 163/16, 201/10, 206/2, 335/3 resolved 182/8, 205/21 resolving 196/9 resort 238/2 resource 72/12, 202/17 resources 11/8, 12/19, 74/8, 86/12, 168/12, 181/3, 185/15, 186/7, 186/9, 187/22, 190/21, 190/25, 266/2, 266/4, 266/16, 270/2, 318/1, 318/9, 318/22 respect 6/15, 9/5, 9/19 respond 11/18, 29/14, 313/16 responded 132/14, 145/2 respondents 16/14, 137/15, 138/5, 145/7 responding 12/10 responding 1210 response 10/23, 16/11, 16/21, 21/3, 78/3, 78/6, 79/25, 85/4, 89/11, 89/14, 131/19, 132/3, 132/4, 132/11, 132/13, 134/2, 134/10, 135/19, 136/12, 142/22, 145/7, 254/7, 257/6, 313/20, 339/10

responses 10/8, 16/5, 128/19, 129/18, 130/7, 131/12, 131/18, 132/6, 132/7, 132/12, 132/21, 132/23, 133/18, 133/19, 133/25, 134/7, 134/8, 135/1, 135/5, 136/8, 138/15, 139/13, 145/10, 145/13, 146/5, 147/7, 147/13 147/1, 147/13
responsibilities 151/1
responsibility 113/12
responsible 63/23, 63/25, 64/13, 71/15, 85/11, 87/14, 150/4, 190/4, 194/21, 259/25, 275/25, 331/1
responsive 331/10
rest 24/15, 51/10, 75/21, 152/17, 177/10, 239/10, 272/13, 333/6 restitution 221/10, 222/3 restoration 160/23, 192/23, 202/19, 208/13, 210/11, 210/16, 210/23, 211/5 restored 176/5, 208/14, 210/4, 210/24 restrict 260/22 restricting 259/23 result 69/22, 97/18, 108/7, 116/7, 125/23, 155/19, 190/19, 233/9, 239/2, 239/6, 306/24, 317/11, 332/8 Results 2/10, 17/10, 17/11, 20/25, 21/24, 121/23, 124/24, 127/15, 138/20, 142/11, 145/16, 149/23, 151/11, 238/19, 270/2, 326/4, 327/2, 328/1 resume 153/23 retain 308/8 retained 115/8, 219/3, 228/19, 241/21, 242/3 retainers 269/19 retaliation 237/12 retaliatory 266/14, 270/4 Retardation 162/4 retract 198/24 retreats 17/25 return 101/8, 211/23 reveal 102/24, 103/3, 341/18 revealed 287/14 reveals 105/7 Reverend 1/16, 17/18, 18/10, 18/13, 19/1, 31/13, 64/10, 69/16, 71/21, 113/11, 113/18, 115/1, 115/4, 144/25, 200/12, 200/15, 200/20, 200/24, 201/20, 230/6, 248/8, 266/23, 267/1, 272/18, 313/2, 313/7, 313/16, 313/19, 313/23, 314/16, 314/23, 315/7, 335/20, 335/25, 336/8, 336/11, 337/8, 337/16, 337/19, 337/22, 338/11 reverse 77/13 reversed 77/11 Review 4/23, 4/24, 6/10, 230/10, 231/8, 231/9, 231/12, 231/19, 242/14, 242/23, 254/3, 258/23, 274/24, 275/23, 276/16, 277/10, 289/21, 296/17 reviewed 7/13, 115/7, 286/18 revised 8/10 revoke 231/6, 332/13 revolves 196/13 reworked 75/24 Ribbon 5/12 Richard 37/13, 138/24 Richmond 2/14, 2/22, 127/13, 133/20, 135/9, 141/1, 141/14, 141/17, 143/12, 144/22, 148/16, 150/17, 164/3, 175/17, 175/18, 177/19, 186/15, 186/16, 186/22, 189/14, 190/24, 194/5, 211/2, 229/4, 231/19, 254/23, 275/3, 314/16 riddled 317/24 Ridge 184/22 rifle 48/22 RIGHTS 1/4, 22/13, 22/14, 22/17, 23/5, 23/21, 25/7, 25/12, 25/19, 34/16, 86/16, 131/2, 146/5, 146/16, 153/16, 160/23, 174/10, 176/5, 185/9, 192/23, 192/25, 202/12, 202/20, 208/13, 208/14, 210/23, 211/6, 231/6, 254/8, 254/10, 254/12, 254/15, 255/3, 255/7, 255/24, 256/15, 259/23, 260/21, 260/24, 262/9, 265/17, 266/11, 266/22, 269/18, 280/2, 280/24, 308/10, 346/11 riot 230/13, 230/17 rise 65/14, 102/15, 166/4 risen 184/17, 184/19 risk 187/13, 187/16, 187/17, 214/15, 247/2 River 245/15 Road 251/7, 285/23 roads 20/6 Roanoke 279/2 Robb 92/18, 120/6 Robb's 94/16, 94/25, 95/25 robberies 190/5 robbers 124/19, 124/25 robbery 39/10, 39/24, 41/25, 42/7, 42/25, 57/14, 58/9, 96/7, 112/12, 190/2, 190/8, 214/3 ROBERT 2/22, 177/3, 195/25 rock 26/8, 279/22 rocketing 307/11 rod 201/6 role 93/19, 96/22, 111/23, 111/25, 235/13, 239/4, 250/8, 316/1, 330/8, 330/9 rolled 200/1 Ron 177/8

Room 24/5, 77/2, 101/16, 225/9, 281/2 root 267/24 rose 54/22 round 42/16, 319/22 route 271/20 routinely 23/20, 269/7, 292/25, 314/14, 315/5, 315/8 rubber 327/21 rubs 109/12 ruined 339/25 rule 269/24, 277/15, 333/1, 333/17 ruled 226/22 rules 165/13, 330/24 ruling 261/18 run 127/23, 219/6, 236/21, 272/10, 279/21, 303/2, running 30/8, 217/7, 224/19, 339/9, 341/17 runs 226/12 rural 53/20 rushing 27/13 Russia 175/8

S

sacrifice 149/11 safe 196/21, 320/15 safely 317/20 safer 123/1, 123/2, 318/10 safety 10/2, 36/7, 88/8, 88/24, 122/12, 165/3, 229/6, 234/3 salad 272/12 salaries 71/6 salary 71/11, 71/12 sale 60/1, 60/8, 60/14, 60/23, 61/4, 61/16, 61/20, 63/3, 63/10, 63/15, 63/21, 277/21 sales 63/15, 82/20 sampling 283/7 sanction 262/10 sanctioned 93/20, 94/13, 112/6, 236/18, 242/24, 262/10, 275/24 sanctions 260/6 sat 166/7, 197/17, 234/1 Satisfaction 14/3, 14/6, 19/4, 19/17, 19/18, 20/4, 20/5, 20/8, 20/17 satisfied 283/1, 326/4, 335/16 satisfies 335/18 satisfy 335/2 Saturday 219/15 Saunders 33/7 saved 251/2 saw 15/11, 60/16, 63/6, 82/25, 102/16, 125/23, 147/12, 234/14, 234/16, 252/1, 257/12, 307/10, scapegoat 170/20, 174/9 scapegoating 319/25 scapegoats 170/21 scared 171/16, 246/24 scares 195/5 scenario 105/16, 338/16 scene 27/4, 75/8, 251/9 scenes 229/2 schedule 36/16, 60/2, 60/8, 60/15, 61/23, 62/15, 63/4, 63/11, 92/16, 105/20, 148/17, 159/13, 173/13, 229/15 scheduled 239/20, 281/6, 281/19, 344/18, 345/9 schedules 148/12 scheme 98/14, 98/19, 123/11 School 2/14, 2/22, 6/25, 6/25, 7/16, 103/1, 127/13, 128/12, 128/18, 129/20, 129/22, 129/23, 130/6, 131/4, 132/3, 133/14, 133/18, 133/20, 133/24, 134/1, 138/14, 139/2, 139/3, 139/8, 140/22, 143/13, 134/23, 144/22, 146/22, 148/1, 148/19, 148/22, 150/17, 152/10, 157/1, 157/10, 172/16, 177/4, 177/18, 186/2, 196/17, 197/25, 198/25, 199/5, 220/20, 222/7, 237/20, 257/18, 263/20, 282/21, 283/2, 317/20, 320/15, 344/11 schools 27/19, 103/2, 138/12, 157/3, 170/24, 174/21, 276/14 science 90/9, 173/14 scientific 90/10, 93/13, 95/23, 99/25, 102/24, 130/8 scientist 87/9, 89/25, 90/8 scientists 146/4, 171/25, 172/6 scoreboard 191/21 Scott 108/15, 139/7, 139/9, 139/10, 140/1, 140/8, 150/14 scourge 168/1 screaming 225/13 screen 209/7, 287/20 screening 208/22, 216/6 sealed 259/3 search 86/3 searched 86/2

searching 257/18

seated 115/11, 147/1 second 5/13, 5/21, 6/17, 8/6, 8/12, 10/15, 38/11, 59/17, 99/5, 123/14, 148/19, 153/14, 153/23, 155/11, 203/4, 226/17, 235/4, 274/2, 277/19, 285/12, 305/18, 314/5 secondhand 108/22 seconds 344/4 secret 252/12, 279/2 Secretariat 36/7 secretariats 88/25 Secretary 36/14, 36/15, 88/7, 88/24, 122/12 secretary's 79/9 section 10/17, 23/9, 84/22, 91/15, 131/20, 132/18, 139/8, 139/11, 199/18, 327/25, 328/12 sections 288/24, 332/11 secure 184/11, 188/16 secured 188/14, 215/25 securing 262/16 security 157/14, 291/22 seek 160/22, 202/22, 239/5 seeked 257/7 seeking 239/5 segment 244/3, 325/10 segments 5/18 segregation 144/7, 144/11, 245/8 segregationist 245/2 seizure 27/6 selecting 204/16 selection 72/10, 115/2, 311/8, 311/9, 336/1, 336/12 self 144/7, 185/20 selling 80/13, 103/17, 126/12 sells 169/10, 169/14 semester 177/10 Senator 2/19, 155/4, 155/8, 155/10, 163/22, 177/16, 178/18, 187/11, 190/16, 192/21, 193/2, 193/8, 193/12, 193/16, 198/21, 200/14, 200/19, 200/23, 201/5, 202/1, 202/15, 203/2, 208/11, 210/13 senatorial 155/11 senators 156/9 send 33/2, 45/14, 209/10, 209/14, 214/9, 215/10, 222/12, 230/25, 275/2, 278/8, 309/9, 310/19, 329/23 sending 138/13, 260/2 sends 212/2 Senior 2/6, 36/5, 37/4, 37/10 sense 10/4, 15/20, 78/22, 78/25, 87/21, 87/22, 110/15, 111/15, 111/17, 111/18, 130/3, 171/11, 186/3, 193/6, 209/11, 273/17, 293/11, 315/18, 317/2, 317/14, 318/11, 319/17 sensitivities 18/19, 18/20 sensitivity 110/25, 111/1 sent 11/3, 21/24, 32/17, 34/15, 70/19, 72/17, 78/16, 78/18, 79/22, 206/8, 213/15, 222/22, 226/25, 251/9, 256/13, 261/20, 275/7, 275/9, 339/13 2519, 256/13, 261/20, 275/7, 275/9, 339/13 sentence 64/2, 93/2, 93/12, 98/12, 98/13, 98/20, 101/7, 104/24, 112/13, 114/4, 114/8, 114/9, 114/13, 114/15, 123/8, 123/25, 124/2, 208/24, 209/8, 213/21, 223/2, 223/22, 224/3, 226/24, 227/4, 235/2, 246/19, 247/3, 295/6, 316/11, 326/10, 338/8, 338/9, 338/15, 343/9, 343/17, 343/21, 343/22 sentenced 84/9, 84/10, 93/5, 94/5, 94/7, 95/12, 98/5, 101/19, 104/11, 123/20, 338/10, 338/14, 338/22, 338/25, 343/20 sentences 96/13, 39/12, 114/17, 123/17, 223/6, 234/24, 235/1, 339/16, 343/4
Sentencing 2/8, 36/11, 37/15, 83/4, 83/23, 92/9, 92/17, 92/19, 92/20, 92/24, 93/8, 94/3, 94/11, 94/15, 94/20, 95/9, 95/23, 96/1, 96/13, 96/19, 96/21, 96/22, 97/2, 97/4, 97/5, 97/8, 97/11, 97/12, 97/15, 97/16, 97/21, 97/25, 98/3, 98/4, 98/18, 98/25, 99/2, 99/3 99/6, 99/8, 99/9, 99/12, 99/17, 99/20, 100/6, 100/8, 100/10, 100/12, 100/17, 101/14, 101/17, 101/25, 102/2, 102/5, 103/22, 103/25, 104/2, 104/5, 104/7, 104/9, 104/13, 104/16, 104/25, 105/13, 106/11, 106/18, 107/21, 108/2, 108/6, 108/10, 111/20, 112/1, 112/2, 113/3, 113/14, 113/15, 113/17, 113/19, 113/20, 113/21, 114/8, 114/19, 114/21, 115/25, 117/5, 117/19, 117/22, 118/9, 118/17, 118/18, 118/21, 118/23, 118/25, 119/2, 122/18, 122/25, 123/21, 125/8, 134/12, 158/25, 166/22, 166/24, 167/1, 167/2, 167/17, 167/24, 168/4, 168/14, 168/25, 169/2, 169/16, 170/14, 171/2, 173/21, 174/24, 182/21, 192/12, 192/13, 203/16, 205/7, 205/8, 205/18, 206/7, 206/9, 226/25, 227/1, 228/14, 230/1, 230/5, 233/15, 234/21, 235/3, 235/11, 246/17, 338/2, 338/3, 339/11, 341/25, 342/14, 343/9, 343/15 sentencings 94/18, 95/3 sentiment 248/19 separate 68/2, 104/6 separation 205/9 September 11/22, 23/16 sequence 281/5 sequitur 295/5 serious 43/25, 92/22, 159/23, 160/8, 163/1,

183/16, 189/19, 189/20, 189/21, 196/9, 213/23, 214/2, 221/5, 222/10, 262/14, 288/3, 293/2, 304/19, 305/13, 306/8 servant 334/16 serve 98/6, 98/22, 113/24, 115/7, 123/25, 124/5, 156/9, 257/10, 268/13, 268/22 served 5/2, 98/19, 99/13, 123/21, 124/3, 197/15, 269/8, 274/23 serves 124/2, 286/21, 334/10 service 19/18, 83/6, 84/2, 84/11, 161/14, 162/3, 162/8, 184/18, 221/9, 222/3, 288/20 Services 2/7, 10/2, 19/7, 20/4, 26/25, 27/19, 36/6, 37/4, 37/9, 62/8, 64/22, 70/3, 86/9, 88/13, 88/15, 88/19, 91/8, 111/11, 122/4, 162/5, 162/10, 182/16, 182/25, 184/5, 187/8, 268/2, 268/14, 282/20, 282/22 serving 98/11, 114/12, 124/4, 124/6, 213/21, 214/5, 225/10 session 22/9, 29/23, 79/25, 153/23, 154/8, 154/21, 154/22, 161/5, 190/19, 217/22, 239/21, 280/25 set 4/17, 9/8, 23/20, 38/11, 47/22, 95/1, 143/3, 149/7, 173/25, 220/22, 223/25, 298/25, 324/16, 331/22 sets 147/19, 323/17 setting 90/25, 154/12, 162/18 settlement 252/3, 280/8 setup 154/15 seven 34/16, 35/4, 35/5, 55/16, 55/19, 231/8, 258/7 Seventy 13/1 severe 179/9, 184/11, 235/11 severity 233/15, 304/13, 306/5 sex 22/24, 49/20, 50/7, 57/18, 59/15, 68/9, 93/23, 108/25, 233/11 sexually 213/19 shaded 90/11 shake 283/17 SHANNON 3/14, 218/9, 264/17 shape 73/1, 100/18, 176/1 share 21/20, 26/12, 127/15, 131/13, 147/3, 151/23, 158/12, 256/1, 258/11 shared 69/17, 132/7, 149/18, 201/3, 227/22, 235/5, 282/24 sharp 65/14, 82/7, 102/15 Shaun 228/12, 229/19, 249/8, 249/12 Shann's 248/24 Shaw 227/6, 227/8 shed 66/17 sheet 282/15, 282/16 SHEPHERD 2/22, 177/3, 211/9, 225/21 Sheriff 335/7 sheriffs 260/8 shifted 46/4 shirt 253/9, 253/10, 253/13, 253/14, 253/22, 253/23 shirts 253/10, 253/11 shocked 167/10, 168/5, 186/12, 193/22 shoot 173/9 shooting 264/10 short 14/21, 138/18, 141/5, 191/4, 239/13, 263/25, 345/2 shorter 335/1 shot 246/25, 271/4 shotgun 48/21 show 64/17, 120/21, 121/1, 126/1, 209/14, 237/7, 275/22, 300/4, 340/13, 341/10 shows 45/23, 64/20, 155/22, 183/4, 185/20, 191/8, 340/14, 341/24 sick 272/14 sicken 27/22 side 118/5, 119/6, 119/7, 135/3, 145/23, 145/24, 145/25, 149/10, 151/18, 226/3, 301/20, 315/23, 316/5, 343/4 sided 29/16 sides 301/17, 301/20 sign 29/22, 30/5 signals 28/21 signature 162/23 signed 201/11, 201/12, 345/12 significance 105/5, 105/6, 164/13 signs 201/16 silence 266/9, 266/10 similarities 16/24 Simmons 224/10, 232/16, 234/4, 237/9, 237/18 simple 115/21, 120/23, 205/17, 226/19, 227/11, 227/25 simplify 342/15 simplistically 120/21, 121/18 Simpson 164/24 sincere 4/14, 191/23, 270/10 sincerity 191/23 singing 30/10 single 7/21, 204/18 sink 42/12 sit 4/5, 86/25, 125/24, 172/4, 201/23, 245/11 sitting 123/7, 144/9, 218/9, 230/15, 231/18, 245/7,

252/3, 327/15 situation 25/8, 29/1, 99/25, 100/16, 121/9, 130/3, 142/16, 142/17, 144/6, 156/11, 264/12, 273/11, 285/22, 286/8, 316/10, 334/10 situations 19/19, 78/24, 238/16, 311/19 six 7/18, 7/21, 7/23, 19/5, 19/10, 19/13, 20/24, 20/25, 64/4, 96/25, 97/4, 97/10, 125/17, 131/9, 131/11, 168/16, 223/13, 224/14, 227/5, 249/13, 250/13, 251/4, 252/17, 252/18, 253/13, 253/14, 327/19 Sixteen 303/18 sized 118/7 skewed 141/18, 207/13, 208/7 skin 136/1, 144/12, 233/11, 236/10, 312/17 skip 61/18, 154/3 sky 111/7, 111/11, 307/11 skyrocketing 317/7 slash 341/20 slave 265/16, 268/12 sleeping 26/1 slide 39/8, 39/13, 40/19 slides 50/15 slim 263/2 slow 28/2 slush 266/7 small 20/22, 40/23, 57/19, 83/17, 113/16, 314/1 smallest 123/16 smoke 172/19, 173/7, 173/24 smoked 172/20, 173/6, 173/15, 173/16 sniff 173/10 snort 173/20 sobriety 251/11 social 160/4, 162/3, 162/9, 162/15, 163/11, 257/2, 268/13, 291/22 socials 268/10 societal 195/7, 307/8 society 93/5, 135/22, 135/25, 145/20, 196/23, 196/25, 198/23, 199/18, 234/6, 235/5, 235/21, 297/19 society's 235/9 socioeconomic 93/23, 136/10, 137/11 sociological 110/12 sociologists 120/4 solace 207/14 sold 123/23, 169/8, 169/13 solicit 7/12 solidarity 235/6 soluble 172/3, 172/18 solution 320/6, 321/8, 326/2, 339/21, 339/22 solutions 283/24 solve 320/11 solved 197/10 someplace 73/23 son 250/7, 252/6 sort 77/5, 113/7, 129/21, 131/10, 131/16, 132/13, 144/2, 145/19, 197/8, 205/23, 214/19, 215/14, 216/6, 219/4, 219/13, 225/3, 225/23, 226/7, 226/11, 227/2, 227/21, 228/6, 242/6, 245/13, 245/18, 285/21, 286/8, 286/9, 287/15, 288/9, 288/24, 289/1, 294/21, 297/17, 307/18, 308/9, 324/19, 326/17, 330/8, 333/11 sorted 207/1 sorting 205/24 sought 7/7, 288/16 sound 32/25, 85/6, 102/1, 221/5 sounds 17/9, 65/18, 129/11 soup 172/10 source 72/2, 86/3 South 171/5, 171/19, 172/7, 175/8 southeast 21/16, 179/5, 265/21 Southern 25/10, 256/16, 256/18, 266/25 southside 141/17 Southwest 94/6 space 11/24 span 250/4 spark 139/13 speaker 34/10, 127/3 speakers 155/1 spectrum 245/20 speculate 77/15, 207/4 speculation 207/9 speech 30/22 speed 61/19 spell 258/8 spend 228/7, 320/13 spent 175/11, 182/23, 212/7, 317/13 spike 102/16 split 103/3
Spokesperson 3/12, 257/16
sponsored 8/17
spot 205/22 spots 90/14 spring 140/15, 179/17 square 173/24, 174/3, 174/4, 174/5 stable 21/3

stack 193/25 STAFF 1/24, 4/18, 5/2, 6/19, 10/12, 10/21, 11/7, 11/24, 11/25, 12/2, 13/4, 13/8, 13/9, 13/19, 17/24, 20/10, 23/5, 23/11, 25/1, 25/14, 25/22, 29/15, 29/24, 29/25, 30/16, 36/1, 69/18, 128/17, 153/19, 154/10, 182/23, 230/21, 239/1, 244/6, 255/19, 264/22, 271/4, 296/15, 302/23, 303/5, 303/7, 303/16, 308/13, 309/19, 332/5 staffs 216/3 stage 82/1, 159/19, 183/6, 184/10, 188/3 stamina 171/12 stamp 327/21 stand 4/19, 109/7, 117/18, 142/5, 142/15, 218/17, 265/6, 265/7, 267/25, 268/1, 268/6, 268/8 standard 215/12, 235/9, 256/4 standards 104/9, 162/18, 329/17 standing 151/18 standpoint 212/18 stands 5/8 start 32/24, 33/23, 35/13, 38/4, 38/14, 39/3, 57/4, 85/19, 127/5, 153/9, 154/21, 155/2, 164/19, 181/7, 181/17, 182/9, 182/11, 182/13, 182/25, 185/4, 195/3, 198/8, 250/20, 250/22, 250/24, 254/17, 255/6, 282/3, 230/5, 230/5 320/25, 328/5, 345/2 started 11/12, 24/14, 30/25, 31/6, 35/20, 49/10, 54/20, 57/13, 60/5, 62/18, 62/19, 70/12, 75/9, 75/10, 176/11, 185/3, 185/9, 220/2, 224/16, 224/18, 224/21, 224/23, 245/6, 245/7, 245/14, 278/12, 310/21, 323/14, 324/21 starting 44/21, 51/11, 112/25, 140/15 starts 121/4 starts 121/4
State 7/10, 39/5, 53/13, 63/23, 63/25, 64/13, 67/22, 68/16, 71/4, 72/17, 74/1, 78/10, 83/15, 102/5, 105/19, 116/2, 116/3, 116/4, 122/3, 129/9, 129/15, 138/12, 153/15, 155/10, 155/15, 155/16, 156/10, 156/17, 156/22, 158/20, 161/14, 162/8, 163/6, 164/6, 179/4, 179/16, 179/22, 179/25, 180/18, 181/22, 182/24, 183/22, 189/1, 192/24, 193/25, 204/11, 204/13, 210/6, 210/14, 211/12, 247/10, 248/11, 254/9, 254/10, 254/12, 259/11, 259/12, 259/13, 259/12, 259/13, 259/12, 259/13, 259/22, 263/2, 263/15, 266/24, 276/9. 250/20, 25/13, 259/11, 259/11, 259/12, 259/13, 259/21, 259/22, 262/2, 263/15, 266/24, 276/9, 276/14, 279/1, 279/6, 279/9, 279/10, 279/11, 309/7, 310/2, 310/15, 328/10, 329/11, 329/18, 330/10, 330/11, 330/15, 330/19, 330/20, 331/1, 331/3, 331/4, 331/9, 331/20, 331/21, 332/9, 332/10, 332/11, 332/12, 333/18 state's 122/7 statement 20/19, 28/13, 29/24, 36/17, 135/4, 135/7, 135/14, 136/7, 136/8, 136/17, 137/9, 137/14, 145/5, 149/17, 165/6, 201/17, 244/7, 246/10, 247/6, 292/23, 294/23, 342/1 statements 11/4, 23/23, 24/9, 35/6, 37/18, 121/15, 134/23, 135/14, 135/17, 136/9, 136/16, 138/5, 139/13, 154/1, 154/2, 154/7, 154/9, 155/21, 163/25, 165/6, 203/8, 287/15 states 72/23, 75/16, 138/22, 138/23, 142/5, 164/8, 164/9, 164/25, 165/4, 166/22, 167/17, 167/23, 168/3, 168/24, 169/1, 169/19, 175/6, 176/4, 180/7, 180/17, 180/24, 181/1, 181/6, 181/17, 182/4, 183/10, 190/3, 192/13, 198/6, 204/7, 207/16, 207/21, 211/4, 211/5, 213/14, 246/20, 246/21, 254/13, 255/6, 259/19, 275/18, 276/10, 312/14 states' 72/25 statewide 39/14, 97/22, 190/20, 304/25, 305/1 statistical 53/13, 53/14, 53/15, 54/1, 54/15, 55/8, 61/21, 72/4, 72/5, 165/23, 178/7 statisticians 130/10 statisticia 65/14, 72/7, 81/18, 103/16, 121/13, 157/13, 157/18, 161/12, 166/4, 181/8, 194/17, 202/14, 275/22, 294/12, 294/19, 294/22, 297/23, 298/1, 298/3, 299/9, 300/18, 302/17, 302/21 stats 82/25, 202/16 Status 2/20, 93/24, 117/21, 118/8, 118/20, 155/16, 268/13, 312/12, 321/17, 321/19, 322/5 statute 22/16, 22/19, 166/7, 189/10, 204/12, 315/11, 315/12 statutes 305/9 statutory 23/1, 117/7, 263/6, 290/5, 307/2 stay 124/8, 194/9, 237/23, 240/1, 253/12, 253/13, 253/14, 260/1 stayed 52/22, 53/5, 54/21, 55/13, 55/21, 62/12, 63/20 staying 230/24 stays 41/21 steal 198/15, 198/16, 198/17, 253/5 stealing 252/21 STEINBERG 3/13, 218/6 stenographer 31/16 stenographer 31/10 step 77/3, 81/25, 82/5, 154/11, 316/2, 343/25 Stephens 218/24, 219/6, 219/7, 219/11, 222/14 226, 226, 226, 226, 227, 227, 228, 14, 232, 15, 237, 20 stepped 278/6

stereotype 110/13, 110/15, 110/21, 111/2, 111/3, 131/11, 196/18, 295/23, 296/3, 297/18 stereotypes 110/13, 110/16, 110/19, 131/7, 196/23, 233/22, 233/25, 295/21, 296/3 stick 173/16, 181/25 stir 26/2, 28/18 stirring 26/2 stirring 26/3 stitches 220/12 stood 249/14, 249/15, 250/17 stop 111/5, 198/6, 254/16, 255/16, 272/7, 278/20, stopped 111/6, 174/6, 257/21 stopping 195/16 stories 186/25 story 32/23, 33/3, 121/16, 164/24, 169/25, 228/11, 251/11, 254/22 straight 32/20, 241/11 strange 59/6 Stranger 59/12 strangers 51/20, 56/15, 56/19, 56/20, 58/2, 66/9, 66/25 strategies 100/14, 232/13 Street 1/10, 24/4, 57/17, 59/14, 107/16, 169/8, 175/12, 186/1, 222/12, 250/8, 251/15, 268/1, 286/11, 320/18 street's 199/17 streets 20/6, 107/18, 117/3, 123/1, 169/18, 194/23, 199/13 strength 8/7, 11/7 strengthening 11/8 stretch 170/16, 174/2 strict 319/19 strides 143/14 strikes 143/14 striking 65/13 string 243/3 strip 172/12, 173/4 strong 94/19, 167/22, 318/14 strongest 197/23 struck 251/5 structure 86/8, 333/14 structured 8/19, 16/10, 147/20, 198/10 struggling 85/22 stuck 228/6 student 6/11, 90/10, 127/13, 127/14, 127/16, 128/6, 129/1, 146/23, 148/20 128/6, 129/1, 146/23, 148/20 students 2/13, 2/14, 26/20, 127/23, 128/9, 128/11, 128/17, 128/23, 129/6, 129/25, 130/12, 130/13, 133/2, 133/6, 133/7, 134/25, 135/10, 135/15, 138/2, 139/2, 139/14, 140/21, 140/25, 143/11, 146/9, 146/13, 146/19, 147/3, 147/9, 147/12, 147/18, 148/11, 148/22, 152/9, 152/19, 156/22, 157/3, 157/6, 164/24, 234/18 studied 25/20, 80/14, 106/18, 167/11 studies 73/20, 90/9, 101/20, 120/2, 120/19, 120/21, 121/17, 185/20, 211/12, 213/15 120/21, 121/17, 185/20, 211/12, 213/15 study 9/22, 22/21, 66/19, 73/19, 73/22, 73/24, 75/20, 90/13, 94/17, 95/23, 96/17, 96/18, 97/18, 120/3, 120/5, 140/13, 140/20, 146/24, 155/18, 158/2, 158/7, 162/14, 163/17, 202/11, 202/22, 202/24, 282/19, 283/4, 284/9, 284/16, 289/14 studying 140/22, 155/16 stuff 133/12 Suhcommittee 155/16, 155/25, 156/1, 156/14, 161/3, 162/12, 162/13, 162/17, 163/17, 178/19, 200/16, 201/1, 201/8, 201/9, 201/11, 201/22 subcommittees 200/17 subconscious 297/14 subdued 234/10 subhead 254/8 subject 29/9, 136/25, 140/4, 204/4, 339/7 subjected 266/14 submit 25/23, 48/25, 118/1, 257/5, 268/3 submitted 36/16 subpoenas 23/7 subset 48/9 substance 125/18, 125/19, 126/1, 157/19, 162/4, 168/18, 168/20, 175/2 substances 168/7, 168/16, 168/17, 170/12 substantive 287/12, 323/11, 324/12, 327/3 subtle 295/16 subtopic 265/12 suburban 53/17, 54/3, 54/4, 54/6, 136/1, 186/2 suburbs 107/10 success 196/1, 256/23 succinct 92/15 succumb 143/11, 268/9 sufficient 296/17 sufficiently 90/13 sugar 267/16 suggestion 198/4 suggestions 232/25 suicide 263/21 suit 231/22, 274/7, 274/19, 274/20

summarize 63/23 summarized 233/4 summary 9/7, 14/9, 68/18 summed 158/8 summer 222/6 summertime 266/1 super 7/24, 8/1 superimpose 62/2 supervision 156/18, 158/18 supplemental 67/24, 67/25, 72/22, 73/14 supplemented 29/5 supplied 23/4 supplied 23/4
supply 109/20
support 11/7, 56/19, 143/16, 144/16, 144/18,
148/7, 163/10, 237/8, 238/5, 256/14, 256/16, 256/21,
257/9, 260/13, 260/14, 266/17
supported 263/5
supporters 232/21
supporting 70/3
supportive 144/23
supports 287/24
suppressant 171/14 suppressant 171/14 suppression 268/5 Suppression 208/5 Supreme 36/15, 37/16, 94/23, 95/1, 96/16, 96/20, 96/24, 97/20, 117/6, 188/25, 204/7, 255/6, 262/23, 262/25, 277/12, 277/14, 280/7, 280/9, 328/6 surface 243/19 surfaced 80/1 surgery 172/2 surprise 221/14, 283/5 surprises 196/14 surveillance 270/13, 307/21 Survey 2/10, 8/18, 8/19, 9/15, 9/24, 13/17, 14/2, 14/4, 14/7, 15/9, 16/15, 17/3, 17/4, 17/15, 19/3, 19/4, 19/11, 20/3, 20/11, 21/11, 21/12, 127/16, 128/15, 128/16, 128/24, 129/7, 129/8, 129/14, 130/9, 130/10, 130/14, 130/22, 134/14, 134/20, 135/6, 135/20, 135/23, 137/18, 138/8, 139/6, 141/9, 141/21, 142/25, 143/2, 143/5, 145/1, 145/4, 149/23, 150/12, 150/19, 202/11, 284/11 surprises 196/14 150/19, 202/11, 284/11 surveys 15/7, 21/15, 103/1, 128/21, 130/5, 131/15, susceptible 263/19 suspect 136/22 suspended 208/25, 227/5, 228/19 switch 44/24, 342/1 switched 63/9 Sykes 205/2 symbolic 296/4 symptom 176/23 symptoms 168/21 sync 315/23 syndrome 52/2, 57/1, 58/18, 58/19, 58/21 Syntrome 52/2, 57/1, 53/15, 53/15, 53/21 System 2/5, 3/6, 6/18, 7/18, 10/1, 23/22, 27/18, 29/8, 35/16, 43/15, 72/24, 74/13, 74/14, 74/15, 84/13, 98/3, 98/9, 98/18, 98/21, 98/25, 99/2, 99/3, 84/13, 98/3, 98/9, 98/18, 98/21, 98/25, 99/2, 99/3, 99/9, 99/10, 99/20, 100/2, 100/7, 100/12, 100/21, 101/12, 105/10, 105/13, 105/19, 110/6, 110/17, 111/20, 112/21, 112/23, 112/25, 113/7, 116/23, 117/3, 117/11, 118/12, 119/12, 120/24, 121/3, 122/10, 122/18, 123/5, 123/23, 129/22, 130/25, 131/4, 133/20, 134/5, 156/19, 159/2, 159/18, 159/20, 159/23, 160/1, 161/7, 163/3, 163/10, 164/17, 165/17, 173/19, 173/22, 178/5, 178/9, 178/14, 178/23, 179/8, 179/11, 179/20, 180/9, 182/18, 185/4, 188/4, 189/5, 197/16, 204/1, 207/12, 208/6, 211/15, 211/21, 212/4, 213/3, 213/16, 213/18, 213/19, 214/4, 214/6, 214/12, 215/11, 217/15, 217/24, 23/14, 233/3, 233/4, 233/25, 235/4, 242/25, 253/21, 256/1, 256/8, 258/15, 258/15, 258/17, 258/18, 260/25, 264/1, 264/2, 264/4, 275/14, 276/4, 276/11, 276/15, 276/24, 277/3, 275/14, 276/4, 276/11, 276/15, 276/24, 277/3, 277/10, 280/22, 282/21, 282/22, 283/3, 283/15, 283/17, 283/19, 284/25, 287/23, 289/17, 293/6, 301/17, 304/12, 304/15, 311/1, 311/5, 311/9, 317/8, 320/10, 324/5, 325/3, 325/17, 325/24, 333/5, 336/18, 337/23, 337/24 system's 117/19 systematic 90/23 systematically 90/22 systems 7/8, 23/13, 23/21, 85/20

T

table 18/2, 36/2, 36/9, 36/12, 55/14, 86/19, 127/12, 180/15, 230/15, 236/21, 253/16, 334/22 tactic 234/14 tactics 232/13, 257/21 tainted 324/14 takers 267/20, 268/7, 269/1, 270/14 talk 14/18, 15/16, 27/6, 34/13, 38/10, 40/11, 62/5, 93/1, 93/11, 94/10, 108/24, 109/12, 145/23, 147/18, 149/24, 150/13, 150/21, 166/20, 176/25, 192/18,

202/18, 203/6, 211/9, 225/20, 232/19, 238/14, 239/11, 245/12, 260/8, 284/23, 284/24, 285/1, 290/23, 311/25, 313/8, 318/25, 320/16, 327/17 talked 27/10, 74/21, 89/17, 111/9, 188/11, 200/16, 225/21, 233/22, 233/24, 234/19, 260/9, 263/11, 290/25, 321/11 talking 90/15, 90/18, 121/2, 126/9, 128/25, 145/12, 145/25, 179/2, 185/9, 196/18, 202/23 219/25, 244/20, 247/10, 247/11, 254/16, 254/18, 258/13, 258/16, 264/7, 290/17, 291/11, 292/6, 301/2, 304/16, 310/21, 312/11, 327/11, 328/6, 340/21 talks 57/2 tallied 128/18, 128/22 tapes 72/19 tapped 5/3 tapping 257/18 Target 11/9, 11/20, 11/25, 12/2, 116/17, 151/24 targeted 160/13, 168/8 targets 116/9 task 11/21, 92/19, 157/12, 197/16 taught 198/18 taxpayers 71/5
Taylor 338/22
Taylor's 338/21
teach 27/7, 177/11 teacher 198/18 teachers 139/15 tech 281/23 technical 157/8 teen 164/11 teenage 196/16, 263/21 telephone 8/18, 8/19, 9/24, 257/18 television 186/25, 191/12 television 186/25, 191/12 tempt 171/10 tempting 171/9 ten 31/18, 31/19, 38/14, 40/10, 41/3, 53/21, 53/22, 66/2, 73/9, 112/14, 112/16, 123/25, 124/2, 124/6, 124/19, 124/20, 125/25, 131/17, 138/5, 145/7, 169/9, 209/23, 210/22, 223/17, 225/9, 228/19, 252/10, 281/5, 287/11, 320/24 tend 114/22, 136/16, 189/25, 190/6, 211/22, 223/17 tend 114/22, 136/16, 189/25, 190/6, 211/22, 22: tendency 170/21 tends 136/4, 179/10 Tensions 2/11, 15/12 tenth 169/13, 169/15 tenure 270/5, 320/25 term 58/6, 92/23, 93/1, 104/20, 141/5, 211/25, 293/7, 303/1, 303/4, 320/1, 335/1, 335/2 termingting 259/23 terminating 259/23 terms 12/22, 15/4, 15/5, 15/9, 18/2, 18/7, 19/17, 20/7, 20/20, 101/6, 102/25, 110/12, 110/23, 115/6, 2017, 20120, 101/6, 102/25, 110/12, 110/23, 115/6, 124/23, 136/10, 136/17, 230/10, 231/17, 234/9, 234/16, 235/5, 235/12, 240/20, 244/5, 247/6, 248/1, 256/11, 273/8, 276/11, 288/11, 292/18, 293/8, 293/13, 297/8, 298/4, 298/9, 301/16, 307/13, 327/3, 327/19, 329/21, 332/21, 339/9, 341/23, 342/18 terror 107/8 terrorists 233/21, 234/8 test 96/25, 145/15, 145/16, 171/3, 251/11 tested 165/23 testify 178/19 testimony 23/8, 25/3, 37/19, 178/6, 203/15 testosterone 195/10, 198/1 testosterone 195/10, 198/1
Texas 164/9
Thank 12/4, 12/7, 14/15, 15/25, 17/16, 19/1, 21/8, 22/1, 22/4, 22/6, 22/7, 35/7, 35/12, 37/12, 38/6, 42/17, 47/14, 49/2, 50/13, 67/16, 73/15, 80/2, 82/16, 89/2, 89/4, 91/3, 91/19, 105/23, 119/20, 122/15, 122/16, 126/22, 126/23, 127/1, 137/19, 138/6, 151/25, 152/23, 152/24, 153/22, 154/20, 155/4, 155/8, 163/20, 163/22, 176/24, 176/25, 177/1, 177/5, 194/2, 208/10, 21/3, 217/4, 217/20, 228/24, 229/16, 239/19, 249/2, 249/3, 255/19, 255/24, 229/16, 239/19, 249/2, 249/3, 255/19, 255/24, 257/25, 258/1, 258/5, 264/14, 264/20, 265/8, 270/14, 270/16, 270/17, 270/21, 272/2, 272/3, 275/6, 280/16, 280/18, 281/11, 281/14, 300/1, 303/22, 313/1, 316/16, 329/6, 335/19, 343/25, 344/23, 345/15 theft 39/12, 183/19 thefts 183/22 theme 265/11 Theophlise 229/2 theoretically 331/22 They've 79/9, 117/13, 126/16, 240/21, 278/6, 279/3 thinker 298/9 third 36/13, 148/15, 148/19, 236/6, 260/11, 285/20, 305/23, 326/8 thirds 184/20, 258/11 thirteen 176/3, 211/4 thirty 32/12, 245/2, 251/15, 251/16, 344/4 Thomas 254/10 thousand 13/2, 252/3, 258/9

thousands 230/16, 239/7, 315/14

thread 200/1

threat 234/6, 257/20 threatened 30/17, 108/7, 233/13, 242/8 threatened 30/17, 108/7, 233/13, 242/8 threatening 111/16 threats 238/12, 246/14, 268/12, 270/5 three 7/11, 7/21, 7/22, 7/23, 11/17, 33/10, 33/11, 42/5, 91/11, 109/23, 114/10, 128/13, 130/2, 134/8, 151/17, 156/8, 158/16, 163/24, 164/1, 175/9, 184/23, 193/6, 193/7, 193/8, 193/11, 193/12, 193/18, 193/20, 198/9, 198/13, 206/24, 209/6, 210/15, 210/17, 224/10, 225/17, 226/8, 227/16, 228/5, 228/8, 230/21, 233/2, 238/25, 241/4, 253/3, 253/12, 254/4, 256/4, 261/2, 261/15, 261/17, 270/4, 303/10, 303/21 threw 227/17 threw 227/17 thrilled 195/11 throwing 220/4 thrown 115/18 thrust 146/6, 199/2 thrusts 86/12 ticket 251/17 Tidewater 21/16, 94/8 tie 47/11, 263/8 tied 281/19 ties 219/8 tight 229/15 time 7/6, 7/16, 13/9, 17/23, 18/25, 24/16, 24/19, 25/1, 25/21, 30/5, 30/7, 32/11, 32/12, 33/11, 36/18, 41/5, 60/25, 69/14, 70/22, 79/24, 80/19, 82/24, 83/20, 85/6, 89/6, 91/20, 98/6, 99/13, 101/13, 102/16, 109/18, 119/17, 122/19, 122/25, 123/21, 124/3, 126/25, 127/25, 128/7, 130/15, 136/19, 136/23, 137/20, 140/10, 140/16, 146/19, 148/2, 130123, 137120, 140110, 140115, 140115, 14812, 14814, 153/3, 15414, 168/19, 170/5, 174/25, 177/9, 179/23, 180/1, 190/12, 190/14, 199/11, 211/20, 212/7, 214/5, 217/7, 220/24, 222/17, 222/18, 224/23, 226/14, 226/17, 229/4, 229/18, 232/3, 234/7, 236/22, 237/1, 239/22, 250/10, 271/21, 280/14, 281/20, 318/19, 320/14, 334/23, 335/15, 344/25 times 28/2, 31/18, 31/19, 32/22, 53/12, 109/23, 114/10, 142/13, 152/12, 188/8, 188/10, 196/12, 199/4, 210/16, 211/2, 213/17, 223/11, 295/3 timing 24/12 Tip 187/2, 238/9 title 17/2, 42/20, 48/17, 269/20, 284/6 titled 35/13, 217/22 titles 88/10 titling 35/17 tolerable 207/14 tool 129/8, 129/14, 130/14, 138/13, 143/2 top 19/15, 262/7 topic 34/13, 35/20, 37/1, 37/20, 99/21, 130/21, 136/13, 164/15, 217/13, 219/8, 265/12 topical 130/22 topics 130/23, 131/1 touch 10/212, 133/8, 278/25 touched 81/3 touchy 244/2 tough 38/8, 195/12, 212/23, 215/9 tougher 137/1, 199/15 town 141/16, 252/20, 252/22 track 12/11, 19/13, 68/19, 85/21, 112/8, 112/18, 125/5, 237/14, 244/9 tracking 69/9, 230/8 tracks 102/7 traditional 234/17 traditionally 243/11 trafficked 107/24 trafficking 104/21, 107/1, 107/4, 107/10, 107/15, 107/17, 125/11, 320/4 Training 122/6, 189/2, 215/18, 216/4, 216/6, 329/21, 329/24, 329/25 trains 329/13 transaction 57/15, 58/10 transcribing 31/16 transcript 51/2, 346/9 transfer 189/10, 189/17, 197/20, 204/12, 204/17, 204/23, 211/9, 212/15, 216/23, 219/9, 221/15, 221/17, 274/15, 274/17, 292/21, 293/13, 294/2, 300/23, 303/24, 304/5, 304/9, 304/16, 305/5, 305/8, 305/11, 305/22, 306/10, 306/13, 306/22, 323/7, 323/16, 324/3, 324/24, 337/17, 339/14, 342/12 transferred 181/12, 184/7, 184/25, 189/12, 222/24, 305/23, 306/4 transferring 293/1, 306/20, 338/4 transfers 184/22, 204/2, 215/6, 305/2, 305/3, 323/13, 324/17, 333/8 transport 27/7 treasurer 345/1 treat 4/5, 105/16, 111/24, 121/24, 137/12, 172/9, 173/4 treated 105/4, 160/9, 305/24 treating 204/25 treatment 102/25, 104/16, 106/21, 106/25, 124/22, 125/18, 125/22, 126/6, 126/21, 131/25,

134/7, 134/9, 179/10, 203/7, 203/10, 203/11, 214/13, 256/8, 304/11, 321/1, 321/12, 321/23 treats 104/14, 120/24 trend 19/13, 39/22, 40/17, 45/3, 46/5, 49/10, 65/4 trends 38/13, 52/1 trial 164/24, 184/3, 184/8, 203/20, 222/25, 223/1, 223/7, 223/21, 223/25, 224/1, 224/3, 224/10, 224/11, 224/13, 225/6, 225/15, 233/19, 246/15, 261/8, 290/3, 296/9, 309/10 trials 227/10 trigger 296/3 trouble 120/23, 170/22, 220/13, 220/15, 221/17, 243/13, 253/1 troubled 135/20 troublemaker 268/11 troubles 28/12 troublesome 312/6 true 137/3, 167/24, 175/2, 187/21, 195/23, 262/1, 294/16, 294/24, 313/9, 346/8 trust 252/24 truth 98/3, 98/4, 123/21, 137/7, 164/20, 164/21, 165/7, 175/4, 270/8 truthful 123/5 truthfully 320/7 tumultuous 228/20 tuna 272/11 turn 121/21, 127/9, 149/25, 154/18, 209/20, 217/16, 217/18, 221/7, 272/13 turnaround 163/19 turned 8/5, 94/21, 301/4 twelve 11/17 twenty 103/10, 103/18, 158/17, 190/2, 208/24, 209/2, 250/3, 250/7, 251/12, 252/2, 273/7, 273/11, 303/8, 331/15 twist 124/21, 204/25, 205/1 Twitty 229/2 two 4/25, 5/11, 6/12, 7/18, 7/24, 8/1, 9/8, 9/16, 10/6, 11/10, 13/6, 13/7, 21/10, 25/2, 29/3, 41/13, 55/3, 55/4, 55/22, 55/25, 57/8, 64/2, 64/25, 73/9, 76/18, 76/22, 82/2, 91/11, 98/24, 102/18, 113/16, 119/22, 120/2, 120/19, 123/3, 130/1, 131/19, 132/12, 134/8, 139/11, 140/11, 148/16, 149/4, 161/10, 164/11, 173/17, 175/9, 184/20, 197/17, 198/10, 202/10, 206/24, 214/8, 218/25, 226/5, 227/9, 242/24, 254/5, 256/3, 258/11, 260/9, 272/6, 272/24, 276/1, 295/3, 303/11, 304/9, 305/11, 308/2, 323/9, 323/17, type 14/24, 15/2, 53/8, 57/22, 92/13, 93/24, 94/11, 105/18, 107/12, 117/10, 131/25, 133/10, 135/14, 136/3, 139/17, 140/2, 147/4, 149/7, 202/3, 244/25, 276/15, 336/18, 344/21 types 57/9, 95/12, 107/23, 122/14, 129/18, 131/12, 138/15, 149/4, 166/14, 170/10, 188/16, 233/2, 285/11 typo 51/6 tyranny 252/17

U UCR 68/3, 72/21 umbrella 122/6, 179/21 unabated 97/17 unanimously 97/21, 108/9 unclear 331/17 unconscious 160/1, 185/13, 297/13, 327/10 uncovered 45/4 undercover 186/1, 195/24, 286/9, 286/10, 286/14, 318/3 undergraduate 133/22 undetermined 51/21 unexpected 36/16 unfair 132/24 unfairly 167/9 unhappy 308/14 uniform 67/23, 183/19, 215/15 uniformed 285/15 unintentional 207/15 unit 169/12, 169/14, 288/20 United 75/16, 142/5, 164/8, 164/9, 164/25, 165/4, 166/22, 167/17, 167/23, 168/3, 168/24, 169/1, 169/18, 175/6, 190/3, 192/13, 198/6, 204/7, 207/16, 207/21, 211/4, 254/13, 255/6, 259/18, 276/10 units 169/10 Unity 8/13, 9/3, 9/7, 10/9, 10/10, 10/13, 11/11, 282/5, 282/6, 282/18, 283/22, 284/10, 284/12, 284/14, 289/13, 310/23 University 2/14, 2/22, 7/9, 127/13, 129/17, 133/20, 135/8, 139/3, 142/4, 143/12, 144/22, 148/15, 152/3, 177/19, 185/19, 227/6 unknowns 56/18 Unlike 177/7 unofficial 130/9 unpopular 312/21, 337/1, 337/14 unreported 283/18

unsafe 318/15 unserved 269/10 unsure 133/10 unwarranted 92/24, 92/25, 93/8, 93/11, 94/10, 94/20, 96/1, 96/22, 97/12, 97/16, 100/1, 100/7, 100/11, 101/25, 106/21, 302/9 unwillingness 235/8 Update 3/5, 80/22, 217/14, 217/23, 228/11, 265/12, 267/15 updated 62/9 upper 44/19, 150/7 urban 53/12, 75/8, 109/15, 136/1, 198/8, 198/11, 257/1 urgency 107/17 urgent 6/8 USC 262/9 useful 73/21, 141/25 useless 143/2 users 103/5, 167/18, 318/7 usher 36/1 utilize 138/14, 171/13, 256/8 utilized 97/5

v

valid 48/4, 117/10

values 235/6

value 20/16, 20/17, 20/21

vandalism 26/18, 318/7 vaporize 172/22 variables 163/2, 232/17, 232/18, 233/10, 233/18, variables 163/2, 232/17, 2 235/7, 236/8, 236/9, 237/4 variety 86/23, 185/5 varying 292/19 vast 287/2, 314/8, 316/18 Vaughn 115/12 vehicle 39/11 vein 290/7 Verbal 257/17 versa 119/3 version 230/12 veto 200/21 vete 200/21 vice 119/2, 155/15 victim 27/14, 50/18, 51/14, 51/17, 56/11, 57/23, 68/9, 96/8, 123/6, 123/11, 307/5 victim's 315/18, 316/12 victimized 294/6, 317/1 victimizing 319/11 victims 44/15, 44/16, 56/6, 56/10, 57/24, 68/11, 157/18, 196/24, 294/5, 294/10, 298/14, 299/2, 300/5, 301/4, 301/12, 302/11, 316/2, 316/5, 316/8, 316/19, 316/22 view 14/20, 111/14, 133/17, 134/6, 136/9, 176/14, 235/4, 236/7, 237/3, 289/10, 290/4 viewed 105/12, 108/8, 168/1, 233/21 views 233/2 vigorous 235/17 VII 269/20 vilified 140/9 violation 205/9, 308/10, 308/11, 333/1, 333/2, violence 56/18, 57/10, 57/11, 57/24, 57/25, 58/2, 75/9, 107/8, 107/12, 107/14, 107/19, 157/17, 161/7, 199/20, 264/8, 318/8 199/20, 264/8, 318/8
violent 38/16, 39/20, 39/21, 39/22, 39/23, 39/25, 40/1, 40/10, 40/14, 40/17, 40/23, 41/24, 43/12, 43/14, 43/16, 62/3, 77/7, 99/16, 99/17, 102/17, 102/19, 107/2, 107/24, 109/24, 110/1, 110/23, 123/17, 123/19, 124/7, 301/4, 305/19
VIRGINIA 1/2, 1/11, 2/8, 2/11, 2/17, 2/19, 7/9, 33/19, 36/7, 36/11, 36/15, 37/14, 37/16, 37/24, 38/13, 38/19, 38/25, 39/5, 40/2, 40/15, 40/24, 43/1, 43/20, 44/13, 45/1, 45/21, 45/24, 46/16, 47/3, 48/13, 48/20, 49/21, 50/8, 52/12, 53/16, 56/11, 56/25, 57/20, 58/20, 67/22, 68/1, 71/4, 71/11, 72/4, 72/6, 72/21, 72/22, 72/24, 73/14, 75/10, 75/11, 75/15, 75/21, 75/22, 76/5, 76/24, 81/5, 81/10, 83/15, 85/17, 89/21, 92/9, 92/18, 92/21, 92/25, 93/9, 94/6, 94/8, 94/18, 94/21, 94/23, 95/3, 95/6, 95/12, 96/2, 96/14, 96/23, 97/1, 97/7, 97/20, 97/25, 98/5, 98/21, 99/23, 101/22, 101/25, 104/5, 105/15, 105/17, 11777, 13/2/10 12/24, 12/16, 12/17, 12/17, 13/2/6, 12/17, 13/2/6, 12/17, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 105/17, 117/7, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 105/17, 117/7, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 13/2/6, 105/17, 117/7, 13/2/6, 13/ 101/22, 101/25, 104/5, 105/15, 105/17, 117/7, 117/20, 125/16, 129/10, 129/15, 129/17, 130/3, 133/12, 138/12, 138/20, 138/23, 139/3, 151/5, 153/15, 154/23, 155/3, 155/17, 156/16, 157/4, 157/12, 159/3, 159/8, 159/12, 159/16, 159/21, 160/15, 162/19, 163/20, 164/6, 164/10, 176/3, 177/20, 177/22, 178/1, 178/3, 178/17, 178/23, 179/2, 179/3, 179/24, 181/16, 182/5, 182/7, 183/1, 183/8, 183/12, 186/10, 186/19, 187/23, 188/25, 190/15, 190/17, 191/6, 191/8, 192/24, 194/1, 197/4, 210/15, 212/8, 215/1, 217/15, 231/4, 231/6, 231/7, 234/21, 245/5, 246/20, 247/11, 248/12, 251/7, 254/19, 256/17, 257/3, 259/1, 259/14, 262/24, 263/1, 267/1,

268/16, 275/15, 275/22, 276/8, 276/10, 276/24, 279/1, 279/6, 279/9, 279/10, 304/15, 304/24, 311/4, 321/15, 341/19 Virginia's 2/4, 3/6, 35/15, 99/1, 182/10, 217/24 vis 190/10 visibility 249/23, 257/13 visited 84/3 Visitors 191/21 visual 47/11, 47/25, 48/1, 48/3, 48/16, 51/8, 76/21 visually 76/25 vocal 266/21 vocational 157/7 voice 218/8, 312/13 voices 269/10 voir 115/6 voluntary 23/6, 96/19, 157/19 volunteering 139/18 volunteers 11/15 vote 160/16, 175/25 voted 11/25, 97/20 voters 8/3 votes 193/3, 193/4 voting 6/18, 7/5, 7/8, 192/23, 192/25, 202/12 vulnerable 180/21

W

wait 182/5, 182/11, 201/23, 209/2, 210/22, 286/15 waiver 33/14 wake 166/14 walk 100/14 walk 117/2, 259/7, 259/10, 259/17, 317/20 walking 191/19, 259/18, 264/10 wall 165/2, 270/23 Wallace 2/2, 4/1, 4/10 war 158/23, 174/8, 175/5, 175/22, 176/21, 182/22, 197/6, 197/7, 197/9, 200/6, 200/8, 317/5, 317/10, 319/23 wards 7/21 warm 4/15, 12/8 warnings 224/12 warrant 285/6, 285/9, 286/2, 286/23, 288/19, 288/22, 291/21, 300/17, 309/16, 314/13 warrants 285/19, 285/25, 287/5, 315/6 washed 320/2 Washington 4/22, 24/5, 26/11, 32/6, 129/17, 152/3, 153/20, 167/3, 174/14, 174/15, 254/9 watch 330/2, 330/5 watched 164/25 watchful 237/8 water 172/3, 172/18 WATKINS 2/13, 127/12 weak 243/16 wealth 95/5, 95/18, 265/13 weapon 68/6 weapons 46/20, 107/11 web 324/9, 325/6 Webs 142/4

Week 31/9, 125/19, 139/8, 257/21, 271/12, 273/14, 273/15, 273/16, 287/11 weekly 6/24, 24/17 weighs 214/8 weight 328/9 Welcome 2/2, 4/15, 12/8, 153/17, 154/20, 217/21 welcoming 4/3 welfare 162/15 West 88/24, 141/16 whack 114/22 whack 114/22
whistles 79/14
white 7/22, 7/25, 43/4, 43/21, 43/22, 43/23, 44/18, 50/1, 50/11, 58/22, 59/4, 59/6, 59/14, 59/15, 59/16, 61/7, 61/8, 61/14, 62/21, 63/5, 63/12, 64/25, 80/12, 91/12, 103/5, 103/10, 103/18, 105/11, 111/9, 117/24, 118/7, 121/12, 128/12, 131/18, 132/23, 134/7, 135/9, 135/19, 135/24, 136/5, 136/12, 136/18, 136/21, 138/2, 139/2, 144/9, 145/20, 160/9, 167/18, 167/19, 185/21, 207/19, 24/21, 25/59, 226/6, 236/16 188/21, 207/19, 224/21, 225/20, 226/6, 236/16, 236/18, 236/24, 245/16, 245/17, 254/17, 254/20, 255/10, 255/13, 291/22, 295/23, 300/5, 317/17 whites 16/18, 40/20, 61/13, 62/16, 63/7, 63/15, 24/18, 40/20, 61/13, 62/16, 63/7, 63/15, 24/18, 40/20, 61/13, 62/16, 63/7, 63/15, 24/18, 40/20, 61/18, 40/20, 61/13, 62/16, 63/7, 63/15, 24/18, 40/20, 61/18, 40/20 63/17, 64/8, 64/12, 65/2, 77/14, 82/19, 82/21, 82/23, 83/5, 83/25, 109/17, 117/25, 145/12, 159/7, 159/11, 159/15, 224/14, 224/17, 226/18, 300/8 wholesale 259/12 whoopsie 208/3 wide 187/3 widened 260/24 wider 186/9 wife 194/10, 241/4, 252/10 Wilder 228/9, 229/5 William 1/24, 129/16, 216/3 Williams 2/13, 2/22, 177/4, 177/18

willing 139/14, 142/10, 142/13, 144/13, 148/12,

195/15, 233/13, 276/8 willingness 149/11 win 261/16, 261/19 wind 227/2 wintertime 265/25 wire 257/17 wisdom 144/20 wish 29/23, 30/3, 119/10, 246/7, 248/22 withdrawal 168/21, 169/3, 169/23, 170/2 withdrawn 168/21 withhold 322/14 witness 287/14, 336/10 witnesses 225/4, 283/18, 292/7, 296/19 wolf 190/8 Woltz 231/13 woman 137/2, 144/9, 245/13 women 149/14, 158/20, 196/12 wondered 273/3, 290/24 wondering 298/5, 328/9 word 27/6, 27/8, 67/18, 93/2, 152/14, 170/19, 173/12, 242/6, 296/4 words 41/13, 89/12, 111/10, 120/4, 128/7, 136/7, 184/19, 322/6, 324/13, 341/16, 341/21 work 6/20, 10/13, 11/12, 69/22, 73/17, 84/22, 89/10, 92/6, 92/8, 138/19, 148/8, 148/9, 148/13 152/3, 152/4, 161/3, 182/20, 194/25, 222/3, 241/5, 241/23, 242/2, 251/23, 252/13, 283/16, 283/20, 286/15, 295/20, 331/23, 334/14 worked 128/24, 141/6, 253/2, 282/6, 324/7 working 31/9, 68/21, 68/23, 70/1, 70/12, 74/5, 75/24, 191/18, 268/14, 268/17, 316/4 workplace 131/24 works 20/6, 28/2, 32/21, 222/5, 289/10, 309/11 world 118/12, 324/10, 324/11 worried 297/18 worry 339/11 worrying 320/14 worth 25/21, 132/16, 306/3 worthwhile 155/18 wounding 305/13 write 102/9, 151/13, 178/11 writer 174/16 writes 277/15 writing 32/24, 102/6, 166/7, 248/22, 254/2, 256/10 written 36/17, 72/14, 72/16, 72/20, 131/14, 135/1, 145/5, 170/14, 178/6, 192/5, 210/15, 215/22, 257/17, wrong 28/21, 49/4, 109/12, 122/22, 143/20, 150/25, 166/1, 166/5, 195/21, 198/19, 226/23, 261/12, 302/9, 326/14, 333/5 wrote 89/16, 135/2, 174/16, 256/25

X

Wynn 224/11, 232/15, 234/4, 237/18

X 2/1, 3/3 Xavier 237/18

v

yard 197/25 yards 196/17, 317/19 year 5/14, 19/16, 24/15, 41/3, 44/5, 44/13, 44/16, 44/18, 49/5, 55/25, 61/7, 61/8, 73/9, 76/3, 76/19, 80/21, 97/1, 97/3, 104/12, 104/20, 104/23, 106/19, 114/15, 123/24, 124/2, 124/5, 125/25, 128/13, 130/1, 135/15, 143/15, 148/15, 148/18, 148/19, 159/4, 159/9, 175/15, 180/13, 189/11, 191/15, 202/24, 208/24, 212/8, 214/7, 223/13, 227/1, 250/13, 251/4, 251/6, 251/10, 252/17, 252/18, 258/9, 262/24, 273/11, 278/1, 282/6, 293/1, 302/24, 303/3, 303/4, 304/15, 315/15, 327/19, 335/1, 340/22, 341/1, 341/2 year's 306/3 year's 306/3
years 14/5, 19/5, 19/10, 19/13, 20/24, 20/25,
33/10, 33/11, 38/14, 40/7, 47/5, 48/2, 64/3, 66/3,
69/8, 74/25, 75/11, 84/17, 85/5, 85/22, 89/18, 96/14,
99/23, 110/16, 112/14, 112/17, 124/1, 130/2, 143/13,
148/17, 150/5, 160/20, 171/6, 172/25, 178/10,
178/13, 178/24, 178/25, 180/12, 181/20, 182/17,
191/19, 198/13, 208/24, 208/24, 208/25, 209/1 178113, 178724, 178725, 180112, 181720, 18217, 191/19, 198/13, 204/23, 208/24, 208/25, 209/1, 209/2, 209/6, 210/22, 216/19, 219/12, 221/13, 223/17, 228/18, 230/21, 238/25, 242/23, 243/17, 245/3, 249/13, 249/14, 250/3, 250/7, 251/3, 251/12, 251/15, 251/16, 252/2, 252/10, 253/3, 253/6, 254/4, 254/5, 258/7, 261/15, 265/15, 270/4, 273/7, 275/25, 276/2, 2 276/6, 276/13, 282/4, 320/24, 328/22, 331/16, 340/6 yelling 225/13 young 18/8, 77/6, 84/9, 110/20, 111/15, 116/4, 116/7, 116/8, 149/14, 150/6, 185/20, 192/2, 200/4 214/9, 225/17, 231/1, 232/8, 237/9, 249/20, 249/24, 252/25, 253/25, 254/21, 257/12, 290/11, 291/1, 296/4, 317/7, 320/14, 338/21, 338/24, 343/22

younger 152/17 Youth 5/13, 5/25, 17/22, 17/23, 18/22, 64/22, 159/21, 159/25, 160/6, 160/5, 166/11, 160/14, 168/9, 177/22, 178/8, 179/3, 179/5, 179/8, 179/10, 180/2, 180/8, 183/5, 183/9, 184/1, 184/2, 184/4, 184/17, 184/18, 187/5, 188/3, 188/4, 188/7, 188/16, 188/22, 190/15, 192/2, 194/21, 197/15, 212/25, 213/24, 266/16, 268/14, 269/9, 338/13 youths 183/13, 184/3, 184/12, 184/22, 184/24, 185/1, 185/21, 185/24

Z

zap 166/8 Zeavin 1/22 zero 54/6, 55/22, 56/1, 76/11 zone 251/16