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(On Tuesday July 30, 2013, the following proceedings occurred, beginning at 9 a.m.:)

THE COURT: Bruce.
MR. BEEMER: Good morning, Your Honor. Commonwealth calls Lisa Powers. LISA POWERS, called as a witness, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

MR. BEEMER: Just so the Court is aware, we're taking Ms. Powers out of order. So all the exhibits were pre-marked, so they're not going to be in sequential order, but we'11 get there eventually.

THE COURT: Thank you.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Good morning. Could you please state your name?

A Lisa Powers.
Q And, Ms. Powers, how are you employed?
A I am the director of public information
at Penn State University.
Q And how long have you been in that position?

A Since 2007.
Q And prior to that, did you work at Penn State?

A I did.
Q In what capacity?
A I was the speech writer for Graham Spanier for seven years.

Q And what kinds of things do you do in your current job?

A Well, it's the job of university relations to manage and protect the image of the university and to answer media queries and basically to put out positive stories about the university, its faculty, staff, students.

Q And prior to mid-November of 2011 when Graham Spanier was still president of Penn State, what was your chain of command with him?

A Above me is an associate vice president, above her is a vice president, and then above him was President Spanier.

Q Who were those people in that time frame, 2010, 2011?

A The associate vice president was Cindy Hall. The vice president was Bill Mahon.

Q Were there -- the job title that you held, were there ever times where the president would reach out to you directly or would it always go through that chain that you just described?

A No, he would reach out directly.
Q And obviously you knew him from your seven years working for him as a speech writer?

A Correct.
Q Did you get any sort of a handle on Mr. Spanier's management style during your time both as a speech writer and your current position?

A Sure, yeah.
Q Could you describe your observations of that?

A He was a very demanding employer. He was into the details. He, I guess, could be described as a micro-manager. That's probably about it. He was open to conversations, but generally things would happen the way he wanted them to happen.

Q Tell us about the relationship that your
department, and I mean your current department, has and had back in really from your time there with the athletic department.

A I mean, it was obviously a cordial relationship but they have no direct reporting line to us. They don't have a dotted $1 i n e$ to us. They have their own public information staff within athletics. They have their own marketing department within athletics, so they were pretty much self-contained. We didn't cross over a whole lot except if there was an issue.

Q Was that -- in your experience, was that a successful type of structure?

A My understanding is that it's pretty common in higher education, but $I$ think that more conversation and more communication is probably better.

Q Now, who was the head of the athletic department at that time back in 2010, 2011?

A Tim Curley.
Q And who did you understand that he reported to?

A The president.
Q Tell us about when you first remember becoming aware that there could be a -- there was
an issue with Jerry Sandusky.
A I believe that the president received an e-mail in September of 2010 from a reporter with the Patriot News who was asking a pretty vague question about whether he was aware of an investigation for criminal activity involving Jerry Sandusky.

MR. BEEMER: Judge, this is one you do not have.

THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q I'm going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 32 and ask you if you recognize that?

A I do.
Q What is that?
A It's the e-mail that came from Jan Murphy of the Patriot News and was blind copied to me and Bill Mahon from President Spanier.

Q Were you familiar with President Spanier's e-mail address?

A Oh, yeah.
Q And how would you in your experience, your time working as his speech writer and then in your current duties when you worked with him,
did you know him to use e-mail?
A Oh, yes, often.
Q How often would you describe that you communicated with him through e-mail?

A If not daily, at least four times a week.
Q Was he the type of person that -- did you often not get a response or was it ignored?

A No, he was very prompt in his responses. Generally within an hour.

Q And that could have been on any of a variety of matters or topics involving the university?

A Yes.
Q And is your e-mail address noted on this?
A Yes. Well, in the further conversation, not in the initial.

Q Right. Can you identify on this document where your e-mail address is? It's on the top.

A When I respond that I have not heard of anything either. It's at the very top.

Q What's the actual address?
A Lmr8@psu.edu.
Q Spanier's was what?
A GSpanier@psu.edu.
Q Did you know was this always the e-mail
address typically that you would have communicated with him on?

A Yes.
Q Do you have a specific recollection of this e-mail exchange happening back in 2010 ?

A Yes.
MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I would move for the admission of Commonwealth's 32.

MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
MR. FARRELL: No objection.
MS. ROBERTO: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.

## BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Now, there is an initial e-mail that sort of prompts more discussion within the university. And who did that e-mail come from?

A I'm not sure which part you're talking about.

Q Was there an e-mail that came in from a reporter?

A Right.
Q And who did that go to?
A It went to Graham Spanier.
Q And who was the e-mail from?
A Jan Murphy of the Patriot News.

Q And can you identify the question that she asked or the information that she provided to Spanier?

A Are you aware of any police investigation into Jerry Sandusky for suspected criminal activity that occurred while he was a Penn State employee? If so, can you elaborate on what you know?

Q And you were apparently copied in Mr. Spanier's response; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And he responded to her in what fashion?
A He said he had not heard this, can you tell me more.

Q Okay. Now, you were provided with this information at some point?

A In the blind copy?
Q Yes.
A Yes.
Q And who would have blind copied you?
A President Spanier.
Q As a result of getting the blind copy on that, what did you do?

A Sent it to a few people within our unit to see if they had heard anything, and one of
them was Cindy Hall and the other was Bill Mahon, and Bill had also been blind copied.

Q And were you able to find out anything?
A Cindy indicated that she had seen something on a blog about Jerry Sandusky touching boys. And then we had a short conversation about the title of his book, and I went and looked at this particular blog. It was a body building blog. But any comment related to Jerry Sandusky had been taken down within that half hour.

Q Did you receive any information from the president of the university about the existence of a '98 investigation?

A No.
Q Were you told to go to speak with anyone else in the university about the existence of a 1998 investigation?

A No.
Q Were you asked to speak to the senior vice president, Gary Schultz?

A No.
Q So what was to your knowledge Penn State's official response to this reporter about the existence of this 1998 investigation?

A Jan Murphy did not respond after

President Spanier asked her what she might know. So it just sort of went into a black hole. I contacted or forwarded it to Steve Shelow who at the time was the chief of police for Penn State and asked what he might know.

Q Did you ever get a response from Mr. Shelow?

A Steve said he didn't know anything but he would look into it, but then after that I didn't hear anything.

Q So you never heard anything about this until considerably later in 2011?

A That's correct.
Q Now, did you ever -- did you know who Jerry Sandusky was?

A Vaguely.
Q And did you ever do anything on your own to try to educate yourself about Mr. Sandusky?

A I did. I believe it was in February of 2011, I Googled him. I'm not from the state of Pennsylvania. I lived in Ohio, so I wasn't familiar with him except that he was a former employee and coach.

Q Did you become aware in February of 2011 that some reporters had reached out -- or someone
had reached out to the former police chief, Tom Harmon?

A Yes.
Q How did you become aware of that?
A I was having a conversation with Al Horvath, who at the time was the vice president for finance and business. And we were talking about the upcoming state budget and he mentioned, oh, by the way, a reporter had camped out at Tom Harmon's house asking about an investigation of Jerry Sandusky, former employee, who had been gone from the university for ten years and that investigation, she was asking about, was closed. There were no findings.

Just wanted you to know that there was a reporter outside of Tom Harmon's house.

Q And is that what prompted you to do further research?

A Yes, in part to find out exactly, you know, who Jerry Sandusky was in his previous life and also to see if there was anything out there in the news related to him that would give me a clue as to why there was a reporter camped outside of a former police officer's house.

Q I'm going to -- were you aware at the
time that there was an exchange between the president of the university and A1 Horvath about how to address the information as it related to you?

A No, I was not.
Q I'm going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 24. Do you recognize the e-mail address of Graham Spanier on there?

A Yes, um-hmm.
Q How about Al Horvath?
A Yes.
Q And what's the date on the e-mail?
A February 4th of 2011.
MR. FARRELL: Excuse me, I didn't hear the date, February 4 th of what year?

THE WITNESS: 2011.
MR. FARRELL: Thank you.

## BY MR. BEEMER:

Q And does this include the e-mail from Tom Harmon indicating -- I'm sorry, an e-mail from Steve Shelow to Al Horvath indicating that he had received communications from Tom Harmon?

A Yes.
Q And that was the incident that you were
referring to where the reporter showed up?
A Yes.
Q And does Horvath send an e-mail to the president of the university in response to this?

A I don't -- yes, he does. I'm sorry. It's an FYI. He just forwarded it.

Q And what does he tell the president?
A He doesn't say anything, but the president responds.

Q And what was the president's response?
A We probably need to brief Bill -- I'm sorry, that's from A1 Horvath, you're correct. We probably need to brief Bill and Lisa soon. Bill being Bill Mahon.

Q And on February 4th at what indicates to be 10:41 a.m., the president responds to A1 Horvath?

A Yes.
Q What does he tell him?
A I'll clue her in with just as much as she needs to know to field media inquiries and without exacerbating the situation.

Q And what were you clued in on, what were you told?

A That someone had camped outside of Tom

Harmon's house, that it was related to an employee who was ten years removed from the university and that the case, you know, that they were digging into had been closed and there were no criminal findings.

Q And who told you that?
A Al Horvath.
Q Did you have a conversation with the president about this?

A I did not.
MR. BEEMER: Move for the admission of 24, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objections to $24 ?$
MR. FARRELL: No.
MS. ROBERTO: No, Your Honor.
MS. AINSLIE: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So moved. BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Now, did you hear after that incident in February, did you hear anything more about this issue until the fall?

A Yes.
Q And when was that?
A March 28th in 2011, Sara Ganim, a reporter with the Patriot News, sent a note to
the athletics department which was then forwarded to me to respond to an inquiry about Jerry Sandusky.

Q And were you responsible for handling that?

A Yes.
Q And who did you deal with in formulating a response?

A I think I went off of what Al Horvath had originally told me, and $I$ believe the response was something along the lines of we don't know anything, which was absolutely true at that point. I didn't know anything. And that he was a former employee that had not been with the university for ten years.

Q And did you become aware at some point that a number of high ranking administration officials had been asked to testify in front of the grand jury?

A Only through the newspaper report that came out on the 31 st of March.

Q So that was the first you had heard of that occurring?

A Absolutely.
Q And were you the individual responsible
for preparing the response to Sara Ganim?
A Yes.
Q And did it deviate in any way from what you just indicated?

A No.
Q Now, did anymore news reports come out that you had to address?

A Not immediately. And in the interim I contacted Cynthia Baldwin, the general counsel for the university. And I was not aware of what a grand jury was. I only knew it as something that happened with the mafia. So I was asking her to basically explain to me what a grand jury was, what it meant, and why there were three administrators named as having testified.

And in my phone conversation with her, she said that this was the fourth time that the grand jury had convened, that they had found no evidence, that there was nothing to talk about because there was no presentment, that it was a fishing expedition. And that she explained the grand jury process to me and said we have nothing to say. There is nothing -- there are no findings yet.

Q Okay. And had the 1998 incident been out
in the news media at that time?
A I think right after that, like early
April, I recall mostly sports stories indicating that Joe Paterno would have to answer to this, that he would have to address the issue at some point.

And so mostly I considered it an athletics matter. I was still under the impression that this was a former employee who didn't have any relationship to Penn State as it was, although I was concerned that senior administrators were asked to testify.

Q And essentially the information you were working off and that you were given was that this was an issue involving Sandusky and not the university?

A Yes. And that the matter had been closed in 1998.

Q Were you ever told at that time about another incident that occurred in the early 2000s involving something that an employee had seen in one of the showers?

A No.
Q What are the president council meetings?
A President's council?

Q Yes.
A It's the senior leadership of the university, perhaps 15,12 to 15 vice presidents. I'm sorry, I don't know off the top of my head. But it's the senior leadership that leads all of the major units of the university.

Q Did you ever attend those?
A Yes.
Q During this period of time, we'11 say from early 2011 up through October, was the incident surrounding the grand jury investigation ever discussed at a president's council meeting?

A Not while I was in attendance.
Q Did you late in October, did you become aware of an issue of some importance involving this matter?

A Yes.
Q What happened?
A On October 28th in 2011, I was asked to attend a meeting with Graham Spanier and Cynthia Baldwin. And so Bill Mahon and I went to the meeting. And Cynthia Baldwin, Graham Spanier and Steve Garban were there, I believe.

And we were --
Q Let me ask you. At that time were you
informed of the fact that there may be a presentment that was going to be issued?

A Yes, on October 28th. Yes, they told us.
Q And how did the president of the university react at that meeting?

A The purpose of the meeting was to tell us that --

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, $I$ have no idea what he's asking. React to what? It's an extraordinarily general question. It's vague. I don't know how --

THE COURT: Mr. Beemer?

## BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Let me ask you this. Was there a discussion at the meeting about whether or not certain individuals associated with the university were going to be charged criminally?

A Yes. That was the purpose of the meeting.

Q And who was it your understanding at the meeting were going to be charged?

A Tim Curley and Gary Schultz.
Q And who provided that information?
A Both Graham Spanier and Cynthia Baldwin at various times.

Q And during the course of that discussion, did the president of the university -- what was -- what was he saying relative to those charges?

A He began by telling us that two senior leaders could be charged with lying and that he knew for a fact that this was wrong, that he knew with certainty that they had handled everything appropriately. He indicated he had never seen the 1998 report and neither had Tim Curley.

He said that when he was told about the 2001 incident that it was described to him as horseplay, that no one ever said the words sodomy or rape or child abuse, and that he felt this was just people targeting the university and his senior leadership, and that he wanted to put his unconditional support behind Gary and Tim.

Q Did he tell -- did he say in that meeting that he participated in the discussions in 2001?

A No, he did not.
Q Did you have any further meetings with the president prior to the charges actually being filed?

A Not that I recall.
Q What happened -- 1et's start with
Saturday, November 5th, what occurred?

A We were anticipating the charges to come out and I guess the presentment was leaked first and then charges were filed. So the president called together his senior leadership again, president's council plus a few other folks and with Cynthia Baldwin, and wanted to share the statement that he basically crafted with them.

Q Let me back you up. This was a meeting?
A Yes, um-hmm.
Q Who was present at that meeting?
A Most of PC, which is president's council, with the exception of Tim Curley, but Gary was there. And some other folks who might be associate vice presidents, a couple of them. I was there, Bill Mahon was there, Cynthia Baldwin.

Q Did he discuss at that meeting whether or not he had conducted any kind of inquiry himself or whether he had anyone within the university try to find out what had actually happened to the child in the shower in 2001?

MS. AINSLIE: Objection, leading.
THE COURT: I'm going to allow her to answer.

THE WITNESS: He did not.
BY MR. BEEMER:

Q What was your reaction sitting there during the presentation by the president?

A I'm not sure how to answer that. I mean, obviously we were all in shock. And I had previously asked him in the October 28th meeting why he wanted to throw his full support behind Gary and Tim.

And he had indicated that if you were doing your job in a leadership position and he knew you were doing it correctly, that wouldn't you want him to support you or your supervisor to support you.

Q Now, did -- were you one of the people responsible for helping to craft a release or a press statement?

A Yes and no.
Q Can you explain?
A When we went to the meeting on October 28th, the statement was already written. And it had been written by Graham himself. And he slid it across the table to both Bill Mahon and myself, and we looked at it.

And the first thing that Bill Mahon indicated was there was no line in there about the victims or about child abuse. So Graham took
the paper back and scribbled the very first two sentences of his statement, which indicate that it's appropriate to investigate and that children should be protected. And then the rest of it was his support for Gary and Tim.

Q I'm going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 25, ask you if you can identify that?

A Yes, it's the first statement that came out from the university.

Q And is this a - the statement that you're referencing that was changed on October 28th by the president?

A Yes.
Q And were you responsible for putting this out?

A Yes.
MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I move for the admission of Commonwealth's 25.

MR. FARRELL: No objection.
THE COURT: Ladies?
MS. AINSLIE: Just a moment. I haven't had a chance to look at all of it.

MS. ROBERTO: Just by point of clarification, is 25 the two pages that have the
statement by Penn State as well as the statement by myself and Mr. Farrell?

THE COURT: That's what I have.
MR. BEEMER: Yes.
MS. ROBERTO: All of the e-mail?
MR. BEEMER: Yes.
MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Now, I want to talk about the top part of the statement. Specifically, it indicates statement issued by Penn State President?

MS. AINSLIE: I'm sorry. Who is this from? Who is this e-mail from? I don't see any --

THE WITNESS: I believe it's from me. The last page.

MS. AINSLIE: On the normal e-mail line at the top, it doesn't have any from.

MR. BEEMER: It's a subject -BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Can you identify this as an e-mail that you would have sent?

A Yes, it would have been the final statement so that everyone could see it.

MS. AINSLIE: Thank you.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q It indicates statement issued by Penn State President. You referred to an October 28th meeting where there was -- Al Horvath had made a comment. What was the comment again?

A He wasn't in the October 28th meeting.
Q I'm sorry. Who was in the October 28th meeting?

A Cynthia Baldwin, Graham Spanier and Steve Garban.

Q And at some point did the statement get -- was it pushed over to you or handed to you?

A Yes.
Q And was there a change made?
A Yes. The top two sentences were added.
Q And how did that happen, why were they added?

A Because my supervisor, Bill Mahon, was reading the statement and there was no indication of empathy or any concern expressed and he felt that was lacking.

Q So did the statement as it was originally given to you on October 28th, was it as it is on that paper but for those first top two lines?

A Well, probably the second paragraph was altered to follow but, yeah, it was basically he was giving his unconditional support to Tim and Gary.

Q Now, the last line of the second paragraph says what?

A I have complete confidence in how they have handled the allegations about a former university employee.

Q And there was something else included in the statement that wasn't just from the president of the university, correct?

A Not initially.
Q How did that happen?
A Initially we posted the president's statement and then, I believe, Bill Mahon received a request from the president to post the statements from Tim Curley's attorney and Gary Schultz's attorney.

So $I$ was not in the office at that time, but my assistant director then began to add those statements to our original statement.

Q And did you have any sort of reaction or say anything about that?

A I did. I indicated to both the assistant
director and Bill Mahon that I didn't think that that was appropriate, that it seemed to go a little bit further than we should. But both of them said we were told to do this so we're doing $i t$.

Q Now, in your position as --
A Director.
Q -- director, would you say there was a considerable amount of interest in the statement that was put out?

A I would characterize it as all hell broke loose.

Q And were you -- did you become aware of how that statement was reacted to internally by board members and others?

MS. AINSLIE: Objection, Your Honor; relevance, leading, any number of reasons.

MR. BEEMER: It's very relevant because it goes to the issue of putting out this statement and why it would be put out and --

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, I don't see how any of this is relevant to the charges that bring us here today.

THE COURT: I'm going to allow Mr. Beemer to explore this to some degree.

THE WITNESS: And the question was? BY MR. BEEMER:

Q In your dealings with the university, how would you say the board of trustees reacted or did you have any reaction from them?

A I did not get an initial reaction from them. I was not aware that they were angry until later, a day later probably.

Q Did another statement go out at some point?

A Yes, and that was supposed to have been crafted with the help of the board of trustees. I don't recall how it was crafted. I did not have a hand in it, but $I$ did post it.

Q I'm going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 26 and ask you if you recognize that?

A I do.
Q What is that?
A It's an e-mail from January of 2012 from Graham Spanier to me in which he's asking me for the final statement, because as I've since learned the trustees were questioning the -whether the statement had been changed or not. And they believed that President Spanier had
changed that statement.
Q Did you, in fact, provide that?
A No, because I don't know which statement was accurate.

Q Okay.
A I had two versions obviously.
Q Now, I'm also going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 27 and ask you if you can identify that?

A Yes. It's an e-mail from Graham Spanier on November 9th, 2011, in which he's telling me there's a new version of the statement that will be issued tonight after the board takes its action which, of course, was the termination of his presidency, and he asked us to hold it until then.

Q I'm sorry. I didn't give you the back part of that which is page 2. Was the statement attached?

A This is not the correct statement that was posted.

Q Okay. What is that?
A This is the statement that President Spanier wanted to be posted. It differs in one paragraph.

Q How does it differ?
A Well, the paragraph -- the trustees obviously did not want him to say, although I have always acted honorably and in the best interest of the university -- no, I'm sorry, that's not it.

This may be -- I'm sorry, this may be the correct statement. The incorrect statement included a line that said that Graham was stepping aside for the betterment of the university. On behalf of the university, he saw fit to no longer lead.

And on the night of November 9th, I received several calls from President Spanier asking me to post his version of the release. And I kept indicating that I needed to hear from John Surma. And he called me four times asking again had I heard from John Surma, indicating that John had said it was okay to post this release, but $I$ had never heard from John Surma.

So on the final call, he again asked if I had heard from any of the attorneys and was I going to post this particular version, and I said --

MS. ROBERTO: I'm going to object to any
of the attorneys. If she would get more specific. Was I included in that? I want her to be more specific if she can be.

THE COURT: Can you be specific about -you referenced attorneys, that you didn't hear from attorneys.

THE WITNESS: That would be the university's attorneys at the time, I'm sorry. But on the last call when he asked me once again to post it, I said, I'm sorry, I'm told I no longer work for you.

So I did not post his version, which included the 1 ine about him stepping aside voluntarily and --

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, move for the admission of 26 and 27 and offer for cross.

MS. AINSLIE: I object on the grounds of relevance, Your Honor, but I understand Your Honor has already, I guess, ruled on that.

THE COURT: Objections to the documents from other counsel?

MR. FARRELL: The same objection.
THE COURT: 26 and 27 are in. Offered for cross.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q Good morning, Ms. Powers.
A Hi.
Q I'm Elizabeth Ainslie. I'm Dr. Spanier's 1 awyer.

I have seen e-mails between you and your family and Dr. Spanier after his departure that indicated a certain degree of friendship. Is it fair to say that you were friendly with Dr. Spanier and your family was?

A I think you're referring to some November 11th e-mails?

Q I am.
A Correct.
Q And your daughter is well?
A Correct.
Q And in those e-mails it's referenced that it's been a tough week for both of you, both you and Dr. Spanier?

A That would be accurate.
Q And $I$ have also seen reference to something like 76 e-mails that went back and forth about this press release that Mr. Beemer's shown you a few e-mails about. Does that sound
about right?
A I honestly couldn't tell you. I don't know.

Q Okay. But it was a tough week and there was a great deal of back and forth among people at the university who were, as you said, in shock; is that fair to say?

A I wouldn't know that for certain.
Q Well, as between you and Bill Mahon and Cynthia Baldwin and President Spanier, all of you were scurrying to try to make sense of this situation; is that fair?

A I think after October 28th, we were just waiting. We were sort of in a holding pattern waiting for whatever was to come from the state.

Q Okay. But in the week, that's not the time period $I$ was talking about. It was really the time period of, you know, after there was at least some leak of a presentment and then it disappeared; isn't that right?

A I gather that it was up and it was down.
Q But you knew that something bad was coming with respect to Mr. Sandusky?

A Yes.
Q And probably also with respect to

Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley?
A Based on what $I$ was told, yes.
Q Right. And at the time you were drafting the release, you didn't have the full presentment in front of you; isn't that right?

A We did not.
Q So you didn't know that, you know, Mr. Sandusky had not only been accused of activities on Penn State but activities with other children in other places, and your job was to take care of Penn State, correct?

A Correct.
Q So you had to take care of Penn State in the absence of any real detail about what the charges were going to be about; fair?

A Fair.
Q Okay. One of the -- well, to go back to what you just finished talking about, Dr. Spanier called you about the release of his own statement?

A He did.
Q And, you know, you said he called you four times about it and was clearly anxious to get the statement out, correct?

A Correct.

Q And the statement was not purporting to be on anybody else's behalf but his own, true? This was his statement talking about his own decision or the circumstances of his stepping down?

A It was my understanding that any statements coming out needed to have the approval of the board of trustees.

Q Well, I understand that that was your understanding, but you can see from Dr. Spanier's point of view, this was his own statement and he was speaking from the heart about his departure from Penn State?

A It still required the approval of the board.

Q I'm just saying from Mr. -- I understand your position was you were in a tough place, you were -- you know, Dr. Spanier was saying this is -- I'm leaving the university I've served for 16 years and it's broken my heart, but I'm about to leave; and you were saying, yes, I understand but the trustees have said I can't do anything officially without their approval; is that fair?

A Correct.
Q Dr. Spanier says in this -- and I'm
talking about the second page of Exhibit 27-- I am heartbroken to think that any child may have been hurt and have deep convictions about the need to protect children and youth. My heartfelt sympathies go out to all those who may have been victimized.

I would never hesitate to report a crime if I had any suspicion that one had been committed. The acts of no one person should define this university. Penn State is defined by the traditions, loyalty and integrity of hundreds of thousands of students, alumni and employees, correct?

A Correct.
Q And this was -- Mr. Beemer, I think, took you through sometimes some statements early on that omitted or had relatively little reference to children, correct?

A Correct.
Q And that was when you hadn't seen the presentment, but this statement now that I've just read from, by that time the presentment had come out and people knew what Mr. Sandusky had been accused of, correct?

A It had been almost a week.

Q Okay. So, yes, I'm right?
A Correct.
Q Okay. So when the details came out, Dr. Spanier made strong efforts to express his sorrow and shock at the accusations involving children; isn't that right?

A After advice, yes.
Q And Mr. -- Dr. Spanier was someone who in your experience with him, had he ever shown any callousness toward children?

A No.
Q Had he, in fact, shown concern for children?

A Yes.
Q I thought I heard you say that, when Mr. Beemer was asking you questions, that Dr. Spanier in one of these meetings didn't say he had himself participated in the earlier incident in 2001?

A Correct.
Q But I thought immediately before that you had -- he had told you that what he had been told about that incident was that it was concerning because it was a man in a shower with a boy, but what was going on was only horseplay. Did I
mishear you?
A No, that's what Graham Spanier said.
Q Okay. So he was told about the 2001 incident and told you about the 2001 incident and said that as far as he knew it only involved horseplay, true?

A Correct.
Q Now, there were other questions from Mr. Beemer that implied that you were kept out of the loop as far as the investigation was concerned early on?

A Very much so.
Q And then when you talked to Cynthia Baldwin, she said it was no big deal?

A Correct.
Q It was a fishing expedition, no problem?
A There were no charges, don't worry about it, the only thing we had to say was we were aware.

Q And do you know whether she was telling other people that same thing?

A I do not.
Q But Cynthia Baldwin was the contact, the university's main contact with the investigation, true?

A I wouldn't know but I would gather.
Q Yeah. She's the general counse1, correct?

A Correct.
Q And she was a former Supreme Court Justice, am I right?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Did you at any time hear that there is an issue called grand jury secrecy?

A Yes.
Q How did you -- did you hear that from Dr. Spanier or from Cynthia Baldwin or some other place?

A I had only heard it after October 28th.
Q Okay.
A And my understanding is that the person who testified is able to talk about their testimony if they wish.

Q And how did you hear that?
A I believe Dr. Spanier and Cynthia Baldwin told the roomful of people at the meeting that that was the case.

Q Okay. And do you understand that an error -- a disclosure of things that go on in the grand jury, if one strays over that particular
line could be contempt, imprisonment, something like that?

MR. BEEMER: Objection to relevance of her knowledge of that.

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, there was an implication that she was -- there was some sinister reason.

THE COURT: I'11 let you ask the question. BY MS. AINSLIE:

Q So you understand that grand jury secrecy is taken very seriously by the courts, correct?

A Yes, for the content of the testimony.
Q Okay. If a person knows about an investigation, am I -- well, are people allowed to say to Sara Ganim or someone else, I hear there's a grand jury investigation, I was there, I was -- this is what they're talking about?

A Well, the only people --
MR. BEEMER: Objection. It's a vague question. Who is someone? BY MS. AINSLIE:

Q Okay. Are grand jury leaks of any concern to the public according to the courts to your knowledge?

MR. BEEMER: Objection to the relevance of her knowledge.

THE COURT: I just don't know that she would know that.

MS. AINSLIE: A11 right. I'11 go on. BY MS. AINSLIE:

Q Now, you were shown a bunch of e-mails about an inquiry from Jan Murphy, I believe it was?

A Yes.
Q And she was asking about had we heard anything about an investigation into a former employee, I guess she said?

A She said Jerry Sandusky.
Q She did. And immediately after that e-mail came in to Dr. Spanier, he replied and blind copied you; is that right?

A That's correct.
Q And is that in accordance with your normal procedures, that if Dr. Spanier saw something that might be of importance to the university's public image he would let you know?

A Yeah. That was standard protocol simply because not only for alerting people to issues but also because media tend to tap everybody.

Q Sure. So as soon as -- and I assume that in your job potential problems came to your attention fairly regularly?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So there was a standard procedure, and as soon as anybody in the organization saw a potential problem on the horizon, you expected them to blind copy or let you know somehow?

A It was not a formal procedure. It was based more on people's practices.

Q Right. Sure. But it was a need to know, heads up, alert kind of situation?

A Correct.
Q And so Dr. Spanier was not covering up this issue that had arisen, he was, in fact, alerting you and Bill Mahon and, I believe, others of this inquiry that had come in, correct?

A Correct.
Q This is a --
MS. AINSLIE: I apologize for the botched up copies, but may I approach the witness?

THE COURT: Yes, please.
BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q I'm showing you what I've marked GPS-5, and it purports to be an e-mail from you to

Dr. Spanier, Bill Mahon, and Cynthia Baldwin. And I draw your attention to this additional pages that $I$ think this e-mail is in response to. Do you recognize this?

A Yes.
Q So this is an --
THE COURT: Do you have a copy for me?
MS. AINSLIE: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I'11 give you this one. I think $I$ know it well enough.
(Document provided to the Court.)
BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q Is it fair to say that this is another of the e-mails, Mr. Beemer showed you some, and this is another of the e-mails that were done in the period between October 28 th and November 5th or whatever when all hell broke loose, as you said?

A Um-hmm, yes.
Q This is, again, talking about a potential statement if this comes to pass, this is what we want to have ready?

A Correct.
Q And I just draw your attention to your having said on October 28th, 2011, I also added in red a stronger dismissal of the claims against

Tim and Gary. It's not needed but just a more strongly worded version. Your choice.

And is that fairly typical of the sort of exchange that you and $\operatorname{Dr}$. Spanier went through in the course of this week?

A I would assume, yes.
MS. AINSLIE: May I have a moment, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
(Pause.)
MS. AINSLIE: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
MS. AINSLIE: Thank you.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FARRELL:
Q Good morning, Ms. Powers, I'm Tom Farre11.

A Good morning.
Q First, I want to correct something. I think Mr. Beemer made a misstatement in one of his first questions to you. He asked you about the September 2010 communications after there was some notice that there was an investigation. Do
you recall those questions?
A Yes, I recall the 2010 e-mail.
Q And he asked you if you talked to the senior vice president of finance and business in order to come up with a response or learn what it was about. Do you recall him asking that?

A I do.
Q And he said the senior vice president for finance and business, Gary Schultz. But Mr. Schultz was not the senior vice president for finance and business at the time, was he?

A You'll have to tell me because I don't recall the order. Gary was and then he wasn't.

MR. BEEMER: My recollection is I said A1 Horvath. If I did not, then it was a misstatement.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FARRELL: Okay. That's all I wanted, the correction, that Mr. Horvath was the senior vice president in September 2010.

THE WITNESS: Okay. BY MR. FARRELL:

Q All right. And, in fact, you did not communicate at all with Mr. Schultz in September 2010?

A No.
Q Mr. Schultz returned in a temporary role as senior VP for finance and business after Mr. Horvath left, right?

A Correct.
Q Which was about September of 2011, right?
A I'll have to believe you.
Q Okay. Thank you. During that time period from September 2010 to September 2011, we heard there were some communications you had about the investigation with Ms. Baldwin, for example, right?

A Correct.
Q And you tried to learn what the investigation was about?

A Correct.
Q In order to make a response to the media if one was deemed advisable?

A Correct.
Q You never communicated with Gary Schultz in that time period from September 2010 to September 2011 about the investigation, did you?

A No, I did not.
Q He was not in any of the phone calls you had about the investigation, was he?

A No.
Q Apparently you had a conversation with Ms. Baldwin after the March 31st, 2011 Sara Ganim article about the investigation?

A Correct.
Q That was a telephone conversation, not in person?

A Correct.
Q And the two of you were the only ones on the line?

A That's correct.
Q And that's the conversation in which she would characterize the investigation as a fishing expedition?

A That's correct.
Q One of the exhibits included was a statement by President Spanier, a press release, that included press releases from me and from Ms. Roberto. You recall that exhibit, of course?

A Yes.
Q You had a conversation with Bill Mahon about the inclusion of my statement and Ms. Roberto's statement; is that right?

A That's correct.
Q And he stated to you that we were told to
include my statement and Ms. Roberto's statement; is that right?

A Correct.
Q Did he clarify told by whom?
A The indication was by Graham Spanier.
Q All right. Not by anyone else?
A No.
MR. FARRELL: I have nothing else. Thank you.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. ROBERTO:
Q Good morning, Ms. Powers. My name is Caroline Roberto and I represent Mr. Curley. Can you hear me okay?

A Yes, I can.
Q Okay. Great. We've never met before?
A No.
Q We've never communicated by e-mail?
A I don't think so.
Q We've never communicated by telephone?
A No.
Q Okay. And when you say that you were given my statement regarding Mr. Curley and it was included in Commonwealth Exhibit 25, you
didn't help me write that statement, did you?
A I did not.
Q Okay. And you received that statement from?

A Bill Mahon.
Q From Bill Mahon?
A Um-hmm.
Q Okay. But you didn't meet with me regarding this statement?

A I did not.
Q And you didn't meet with Mr. Curley regarding this statement?

A I did not.
Q Okay. Now, you said that I think when Mr. Beemer was asking you a few questions that athletics, the athletic department at Penn State was generally self-contained?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. And would it be fair to say that if there was a sports matter dealing with the football program, for instance, they would often issue their own public statements?

A Depending.
Q Depending. And so in this particular case, you said that there was an e-mail that was
sent by Sara Ganim to the ath1etic department and it was forwarded to you?

A Um-hmm.
Q And would that -- that means yes?
A Yes, I'm sorry.
Q Was that e-mail forwarded to you by Mr. Curley or by someone else, do you recall?

A It was forwarded to a member of my staff who forwarded it to me, but it came from Jeff Ne1son.

Q Who is Jeff Nelson?
A He is the public information officer in athletics.

Q And do you know whether he works for Mr. Curley?

A Yes, he does.
Q Okay. And so at least in this particular situation, there was information flowing from the athletic department to administration?

A That was not unusual when there was a big problem.

Q Okay. And so we considered this or at least at this point it was considered a problem?

A I gather, yes, they sent it to me.
Q Okay. And so you said that you never met
with Mr. Curley regarding the statement that was included in this November 5th e-mail. Did you meet with Mr. Curley concerning any statement regarding the Sandusky matter?

A No.
Q All right. And in fact, Mr. Curley, I think you said, at the president's council meeting on November 5th, he was not present?

A That's correct.
MS. ROBERTO: I have no other questions.
Thank you.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, just one brief point. I think I overlooked formally moving in GPS-5. I would do that at this time.

THE COURT: Any objections?
MR. FARRELL: No.
MR. BEEMER: No.
THE COURT: So moved. Any other questions, Mr. Beemer?

MR. BEEMER: I just have a follow-up.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Ms. Ainslie asked you if you were all
scrambling during that period of time. Were you scrambling more because leadership had not given you any information to address this issue?

MS. AINSLIE: Objection. That's totally speculative and totally irrelevant.

THE COURT: Overruled. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: That would be a large portion of it. Our office had no idea what -- we did not anticipate the presentment, we did not anticipate the fallout, and we were inundated with media from everywhere.

And I didn't answer my phones and I couldn't answer e-mails. There were just too many of them.

Q And you don't know what information President Spanier had been told during his appearance at the grand jury or any materials, do you?

MS. AINSLIE: Objection. What she doesn't know is clearly not relevant.

MR. BEEMER: Ms. Ainslie went out of her way to make the point, Your Honor, that nobody had seen the presentment. I think it's a fair question as to --

THE COURT: I'11 allow her to answer.

THE WITNESS: Could you repeat?
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Sure. You were not made aware of any of the information, materials or knowledge that Dr. Spanier had in his possession about Jerry Sandusky and his contact with children?

MS. AINSLIE: Objection, Your Honor. Again, that implies that he had any. I think --

MR. BEEMER: I think we've already introduced evidence that he had some, Your Honor, so I think it's a fair question.

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, as of 2000 -well, we can argue this later. I'll withdraw the objection.

THE COURT: Thank you. You can answer.
THE WITNESS: From the September 2010 e-mail up until October, I was not told that anyone was appearing before the grand jury. I was not told any additional information.

MR. BEEMER: That's all I have.
MS. ROBERTO: I just have one brief question.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

## RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. ROBERTO:
Q Ms. Powers, were you aware that as early as February 2010, Judge Feudale of the grand jury issued a nondisclosure order to Penn State regarding the investigation?

A I was not aware of the investigation so I was not aware of that.

MS. ROBERTO: Thank you.
MR. BEEMER: I don't have anything further.

MR. FARRELL: I would. I'm sorry.

## RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FARRELL:
Q In your conversations with Ms. Baldwin, did she make you aware that she had appeared in the grand jury with Mr. Schultz, Mr. Curley, Mr. Spanier?

A Later in April, she did tell me that we had received a subpoena for all of our records, but I was never told that she appeared or -- I only read it in the newspaper and then questioned her.

Q And then you questioned her?

A I questioned her after I read that Tom Harmon, Gary Schultz and one other, it may have been Tim Curley, I don't know, had appeared.

Q And what did you ask her?
A I said what is this about, and she indicated again that it was a past complaint. It was a fishing expedition, no charges had been filed. It was an employee who had not been there for ten years.

Q Did she tell you that she had represented Mr. Curley, Mr. Schultz in the grand jury?

A No.
Q Did she tell you whether or not she was in the grand jury?

A No.
Q The April subpoena you referred to, did she describe what that was for?

A It was for records dating back to, I believe, 1997.

Q Did she ask for your assistance in finding records?

A No.
Q Did she tell you what, if any, search had been done for records?

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I'm going to
object. This is beyond the scope of redirect.
THE COURT: How many more questions, Mr. Farrell, but we're definitely behind the scope.

MR. FARRELL: Could I just get an answer to that last one?

THE COURT: Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No.
MR. FARRELL: Thank you.
MR. BEEMER: Nothing further.
THE COURT: You're dismissed. Thank you very much.
(Witness excused.)

## BRADEN COOK,

called as a witness, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Could you please state your name?
A Braden Cook.
Q And, Mr. Cook, how are you employed?
A I am the senior supervisory special agent with the Office of Attorney General, Computer Forensics Unit.

Q And can you describe briefly your -- one moment.

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, we have a stipulation from counsel that Mr. Cook is an expert in the area of computer forensics and analysis.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. BEEMER: I'11 briefly go through that.

BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Mr. Cook, can you describe what your duties are as the Senior Supervisory Special Agent?

A My day-to-day duties include managing all of the agents and labs within the Office of Attorney General Computer Forensic Unit. We have presently two labs, one in Harrisburg/Lemoyne area, and one in the North Huntingdon/Pittsburgh area.

Additionally, I supervise the intake and analysis of all computer equipment that is done, and $I$ also participate in the examination. I carry a full caseload as well as all the agents under me, in the intake process of evidence, the processing of evidence, and the production of
reports related to the cases that we do.
Q And you've been qualified and testified in courts in Pennsylvania previously?

A Yes, I have.
Q And how long have you been with the office?

A I've been with the Attorney General's Office for about eight and a half years, and prior for four years with the Pennsylvania State Police as a civilian examiner as well.

Q Now, when did you first become involved in this particular investigation?

A Mid-November 2011, I was contacted by the supervisory staff of this case and directed to attend a meeting at Penn State to talk about the production of evidence related to subpoenas that were issued.

Q Okay. Prior -- just to give us a time frame, was this -- would this have been after charges were filed against Jerry Sandusky, Gary Schultz and Tim Curley?

A I believe the Jerry Sandusky charges were done in the beginning of November 2011. And this would have been subsequent to that.

Q Had you been asked prior to that to
review or forensically examine any items of information that had been turned over by Penn State relevant to this investigation?

A I had not.
Q So in mid-November, that was your first initial contact?

A Correct.
Q Now, did you ultimately work with members of the forensics department at Penn State University to collect evidence potentially relevant to this inquiry?

A Yes. During the meeting in November of 2011, I met with Mr. John Corro of the security operations and services unit from Penn State, at which point we talked about the process we were going to go through to collect the evidence that was necessary.

And then I worked directly with him from beginning -- from November 2011 through December 2012 in the collection and processing of the evidence.

Q And how much -- can you give us an idea of how much evidence was collected? I don't want you to go through it specifically, but how much evidence was collected in this case?

A We identified 108 items that were collected relative to approximately 60 individuals. That included desk top computers, laptop computers, cell phones, handheld devices such as I-pads and also server backups, mail, and network file share, files for every individual.

Q Okay. Now, once you obtained these items what's your method of examination, what do you do?

A The process that was involved in this one, we obtained the original hard drives in the presence of Mr. Corro with the security operations group, and we duplicated the hard drives with Mr. Corro. The duplicate hard drive was returned back to Penn State, and we maintained the original hard drive.

After maintaining the original hard drive, we took it to our lab, did a forensic image of each of the hard drives that we could work on with our forensic software, and then the original hard drives were placed into our evidence room.

That same process was done with the server results that we got for keyword searching. We, again, imaged all of the hard drives and
worked off our forensic images.
In relation to the cell phones and the I-pads, they were all imaged with a software called Cellebrite. And the results were then produced back to the investigators.

Q And who would give you the direction as to what kinds of information you were looking for given the volume of what you had?

A There was a process that we went through with each and every device. The first process was we ran approximately 60 keywords for a search for privileged or confidential material related to attorneys and counsel for either individuals or the University in particular.

After that keyword search was completed, those results were turned over to Dwayne Morris in a sealed envelope for them to review for any privileged or confidential information.

Q Duane Morris was counsel for Penn State University?

A Correct.
Q Now, what was the next step?
A The next step was to take the items that were not identified under the keyword search. And that would be all of the active files and
e-mails. Those were produced over to our investigators for them to keyword search.

Additionally, I ran 39 keywords myself on those items relative to the investigation, and that was to identify any information that may be in the unallocated space, which would be deleted files and those kinds of things, and also relative to the e-mails in the files that were not considered for the privilege review.

Q Okay. And were -- I want to talk specifically about some of your results that are considered relevant to this matter and this investigation. Did you locate relevant e-mails in a file relating to Gary Schultz, and if you could describe how that occurred?

A Yeah. We were reviewing the information that was received. And in March of 2011, we identified that an item that we supposedly had received had not been accounted for. We contacted security operations, and they provided us with a disk of Gary Schultz's network file share files.

The network file share is basically when a computer network, you can store files on a server, which is basically the main hub computer
for the entire network. And many corporations set up an individual location for each user to store files. That way it's not on their local machine. It's on a place where they can access them from any machine on that network, either from a different office, a conference room, something like that.

We received those in March of 2011. And in that was a file called Gary's archived.PST. That file is a mail archive file created using Microsoft Outlook. Inside of that identified several e-mails that were relevant to the matters under investigation.

Q And would that have been -- did you become aware of the fact that there was a change that occurred in the mid 2000s that would have necessitated this type of thing to occur in order to preserve earlier e-mails?

A Yeah. During the course of the investigation, it was identified that in 2005, the e-mail system went from what was the Eudora, E-u-d-o-r-a, Eudora e-mail system to Microsoft Exchange.

At that process, it was identified that Mr. Gary Schultz had a voluminous amount of
e-mails and the exchange system would not be able to maintain those e-mails and allow him to move forward with new e-mails.

So what was created was this PST archive that could be accessed later using Microsoft Outlook, and then the e-mail system began from there with the Outlook in 2005. And that is how that archive was created.

Q Now, you indicated that your review of that particular area located some particularly relevant e-mails?

A Yes, it did.
Q And what do you do with those once you find them?

A When I identified those e-mails, I contacted the review staff with our AG's Office, identified where those were at, and allowed them to identify them. And those e-mails were archived and printed out for use later on.

Q And how do -- did some of these e-mails contain communications only between the three Defendants that are here in court today?

A Yes, they relate to all three of them.
Q Can you describe to the Court how you go about the process of, say, forensically
authenticating those e-mails?
A To authenticate the e-mails is kind of a twofold process. The first one is to authenticate if the e-mails are true and accurate and unchanged. The process that we took in this case was to look at those e-mails and identify if any changes had been made from the time the archive was created.

In this case, the archive was actually supplied to us on a DVD, so we were unable to look at any dates related to the written access dates of the physical PST file. However, every e-mail within that PST file had been unchanged since May of 2005. They were all within the same time frame, actually within seconds of each other being put into the archive, which was consistent with the archive being created in 2005. So those e-mails were unchanged at that point.

Additionally, we look at whether or not the e-mail addresses are valid e-mail addresses that would have been able to send and receive e-mails from those. In this case, all of the e-mail addresses were identified as having multiple e-mails sent to and from the e-mail addresses, which identified that they were valid
e-mail addresses on the psu.edu network.
I should say also that additionally these e-mails were authenticated back to the year 2000. There was an additional item that was received on July 2nd, 2011-- or 2012, and this was an administration end of year backup that was created in 2007.

On that backup were actually the original Eudora e-mail boxes related to Mr. Gary Schultz. And we were able to authenticate the e-mails back to January of 2000 when those Eudora e-mail boxes were actually last accessed.

Q Okay. I'm going to show you what I've marked for identification as Commonwealth's 19 and ask you if you recognize that document?

A Yes, I do.
Q What is it?
A This is an e-mail that was sent from Gary Schultz to Mr. Tim Curley and cc'd to Mr. Graham Spanier.

Q And what was the date on the e-mail?
A The e-mail was sent on May 6th, 1999, at 2:06 p.m.

Q Check the year again, please.
A Sorry, 1998. I apologize.

Q And was this one of the e-mails that was recovered in the fashion that you've just described for the Court?

A Yes, it was.
Q Those particular e-mail addresses, did you do anything to go about verifying or authenticating the e-mail addresses and who they relate to?

A I did. The e-mail address, gcs2@psu.edu, it was verified as being the e-mail address of Mr. Gary Schultz. In this case, the to and the cc do not contain e-mail addresses. They are just names. The name for the two is Tim Curley. The cc is Spanier-Graham (GBS).

In order to identify those, I went back to look to see if there was other e-mails within the e-mail system that was sending and receiving e-mail with these identifiers. The name Tim Curley was gone back to and looked at, and it came up as tmc3@psu.edu as being the address associated with Mr. Tim Curley.

And the address for Spanier-Graham (GBS) was identified being GSpanier@psu.edu. And the name Spanier-Graham only occurs in the e-mail box for Mr. Gary Schultz. It's a moniker that is
identified through the system. It does not show up in any other e-mail boxes in that fashion.

MR. BEEMER: Okay. Your Honor, I would move for the admission of Commonwealth's 19.

MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
MR. FARRELL: No objection.
MS. ROBERTO: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved. BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Now, the header is what you were just referring to; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q Now, there's time indicated that the e-mail was sent?

A Correct.
Q And can you give us an understanding is that -- do you know that to be correct, the time?

A There's no way for me to accurately account for the time because the e-mail system that was used was no longer in service. So this was on a server and the time would be generated from that mail server.

Without being able to go back and look physically to the original mail server, there's no way accurately to translate that time.

Q How about the date?
A The date is consistent with all the other e-mails. The dates and times were consistent with all the other e-mails within that archive and within the vast majority of e-mails that I looked at.

Q And this particular e-mail, as many others, have subject headers?

A Yes, they do.
Q The subject header here is what?
A Re: Joe Paterno.
Q Is there an original or other e-mail that was indicated that it was sent on this particular document?

A Yeah, this is actually a reply to an original e-mail that would have had the subject Joe Paterno, and the original e-mail is located at the bottom of this portion where you see the little caret that comes in on the side. And that would be the one that appears to have been sent from Mr. Tim Curley on May 5th, 1998.

Q How about that time that's contained in that?

A The time on there is 5:24 p.m. with a minus four offset from universal time code.

Q What does that mean?
A The universal time code is the standard by which all time is calculated, and that is from the Greenwich Mean Time. This is a minus four hours which would put that at Eastern Standard Time.

Q And the text reads what?
A The text reads, I have touched base with the coach. Keep us posted. Thanks. Tim Curley, tmc3@psu.edu.

Q This is the e-mail that Mr. Schultz replies to?

A Correct.
Q And he replies what?
A He replies: Will do. Since we talked tonight I've learned that the Public Welfare people will interview the individual Thursday.

Q Describe for the Court when somebody as in this case is cc'd, what happened?

A When somebody is cc'd on an e-mail, it would be sent to the e-mail address of that individual. It could be delivered to one of possibly two places, the inbox or a spam box location.

In this case, considering that the e-mail
address was on the same network psu.edu and was given a moniker, which means it's a commonly used e-mail address, this would go to the actual inbox of the individual.

Q I'11 show you Commonwealth's 20. Is that another e-mail?

A Yes, this is another e-mail that was obtained from the Gary Schultz archive.

Q Okay. And I'm going to actually run through these three very quickly, Commonwealth's 21 and 22. Are they all referenced e-mails around the same time?

A Yes, they do. They are all an actual e-mail from an e-mail string, and that would be a conversation back and forth between individuals.

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I move for the admission of 20 through 22 collectively.

THE WITNESS: The individuals on --
MR. BEEMER: Hold on one second.
MS. ROBERTO: No objection.
MR. FARRELL: No objection.
MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q Go ahead.

A The individuals on No. 20, it was from Gary Schultz to Tim Curley.

Q No. 20, is this also a response e-mail?
A Yes, this is a response e-mail. The original e-mail was from Mr. Tim Curley.

Q What was the text of that?
A The original or the response?
Q The original.
A The original e-mail was sent from Mr. Curley on May 13th, 1998 at 2:21 p.m. And the text is: Anything new in this department? Coach is anxious to know where it stands.

Q And the reply?
A The reply from Mr. Schultz to Mr. Curley was: Tim, I understand that a DPW person was here last week; don't know for sure if they talked with Jerry. They decided to have a child psychologist talk to the boys sometime over the next week. We won't know anything before then.

Q Now, is it possible for -- I mean, someone could take this, for example, in this case Mr. Schultz, could send an e-mail to someone else and forward the text of this so that someone would know what the context is?

A It is possible to forward the e-mail,
yes. In those cases, it would actually come up with a subject 1 ine generally of forward represented by an FW or an FWD.

Q And No. 21?
A No. 21 is, again, from Mr. Gary Schultz to Tim Curley. And this is a response back as wel1.

Q And what is that response?
A There's actually three responses on there. The first is the original e-mail that was sent on May 13th, 1998 that was represented in Exhibit No. 20. And the response as well, that was represented in No. 20.

Q So is it fair to say that -- well, let me ask you. Is it likely that Mr. Curley on May 18th, 1998 just replied to the original -- to Mr. Schultz's reply of his original e-mail?

A Yes. There was -- Mr. Curley sent the original e-mail. Mr. Schultz replied to it. Mr. Curley then sent another reply back, and this is a response back from that third reply.

And Mr. Curley replied to Mr. Schultz on May 18th, 1998 at 9:37 p.m.: Any update?

Q And what was the reply?
A And Mr. Schultz then replies back: No,
but I don't expect we'11 hear anything prior to the end of this week. And that was sent on May 19th, 1998 at 1:47 p.m.

Q And 22?
A 22 is a continuation of this e-mail string with a response from Tim Curley to Exhibit No. 21 on May 30th, 1998 at 10:27 a.m. And the text is: Any further update?

And then Mr. Schultz responds back to Mr. Curley on June 9th, 1998 at 2 a.m.: Tim, I don't have an update at this point. Just before I left for vac, Tom told me that the DPW and university police services were planning to meet with him. I'll see if this has happened and get back to you.

Q Okay. Now I want to show you -- did you also recover -- and there have been a number of other e-mails from 1998 that have already been introduced. But did you recover any e-mails that were relevant to the investigation in February of 2001?

A Yes, I did.
Q And did you recover them in the same way?
A Yes, they were actually from the same archive. Within the archive of Gary 's
archive.PST, there were folders that were 1abelled 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, and they were recovered the same way from the exact same location, $I$ believe.

Q I'm going to show you a document I marked for identification as Commonwealth's 23 and ask you if you can identify that?

A This is an e-mail that $I$ did recover, yes.

Q And what is it?
A This is an e-mail from Gary Schultz to Graham Spanier and Tim Curley. And this is actually a conversation between the three of the individuals.

Q Now, is it fair to say most of these e-mails that you were recovering were e-mails that were -- where the original was sent by Gary Schultz?

A Correct.
Q Why is that?
A Because they were found in his archive, and these are the e-mails that were sent from him to other individuals.

Q These particular items were -- were these e-mails you're identifying as Gary Schultz, Tim

Curley, Graham Spanier, were these -- you were able to identify these particular e-mail boxes?

A I was. Unfortunately, we weren't able to find any of the other e-mails in either Mr. Curley's e-mail boxes or Mr. Spanier's e-mail boxes.

MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, I move for the admission of Commonwealth's 23.

MR. FARRELL: No objection.
MS. AINSLIE: No objection.
THE COURT: So moved.
BY MR. BEEMER:
Q On Commonwealth's 23, I want to start at the bottom text from Tim Curley. If you could identify that information?

A The information from Mr. Curley was sent February 27th, 2001 at 8:10 p.m. And the text as well?

Q Yes.
A The text reads -- and you'11 see right at the very beginning where it says block quote type, that is actually formatting that is put in there from a web page. So that wasn't part of the actual e-mail. That was just some formatting that's in there.

Q Okay.
A The text starts: I had scheduled a meeting with you this afternoon about the subject we discussed on Sunday. After giving it more thought and talking it over with Joe yesterday, I am uncomfortable with what we agreed were the next steps. I am having trouble with going to everyone but the person involved. I think I would be more comfortable meeting with the person and tell him about the information we received.

I would plan to tell him we are aware of the first situation. I would indicate we feel there is a problem and we need to assist the individual to get professional help. Also, we feel a responsibility at some point soon to inform his organization and and maybe the other one about the situation.

If he is cooperative, we would work with him to handle informing the organization. If not, we do not have a choice and will inform the two groups. Additionally, I will let him know that his guests are not permitted to use our facilities.

Q And was there a response to that e-mail?
A Actually, there's another line to that
e-mail.
Q I'm sorry.
A I need some help on this one. What do you think about the approach?

Q And was there a response to that?
A It looks like there was another comment made to that subsequent at 10:18 p.m. by Mr. Graham Spanier.

Q Could you read the text of that, please?
A The text is: Tim, this approach is acceptable to me. It requires you to go a step further and means that your conversation will be all the more difficult, but I admire your willingness to do that and $I$ am supportive.

The only downside for us is if the message isn't heard and acted upon, and we then become vulnerable for not having reported it. But that can be assessed down the road. The approach you outline is humane and a reasonable way to proceed.

Q And the final reply from Mr. Schultz?
A The final reply is: Tim and Graham, this is a more humane and upfront way to handle this. I can support this approach with the understanding that we will inform his
organization with or without his cooperation. I think that's what Tim proposed. We can play it by ear to decide about the other organization.

Q Now, did you do a review of the information that was obtained relevant to Graham Spanier?

A Yes, I did.
Q Could you describe that for the Court?
A On the initial information that we received for Graham Spanier, which would have been the desk top computer and several other items, I reviewed both the files and the e-mail that was contained on those systems. It was noted that the e-mail box that was received contained no e-mails.

Additionally, we reviewed items that were contained on the archive from 2007. And several e-mail boxes for Mr. Spanier were identified under two different e-mail addresses. One was president@psu.edu and one was GSpanier@psu.edu. Both those e-mail boxes did contain e-mails. The e-mails on that system ranged from 1995 through 2007.

Q There were e-mails as far back as 1995 ?
A Contained on that system, yes, and those
were in the Eudora e-mail boxes.
Q Were any of the e-mails that $I$ just showed to you, specifically Commonwealth's 23 and Commonwealth's 19, were either of those e-mails contained in that system?

A They were not.
Q I'm also going to -- I'm going to show you what's been previously admitted as Commonwealth's 8 and ask you if you can tell me whether this particular e-mail was located within that system?

MS. AINSLIE: I'm sorry, what number is $i t ?$

MR. BEEMER: No. 8.
THE WITNESS: No, these were not identified in his e-mail boxes either. BY MR. BEEMER:

Q Now, one of the people on Commonwealth's Exhibit 8 who was copied was the chief of police at the time, Tom Harmon. If Mr. Harmon would have received that e-mail in the cc, can you describe for us what relevance that might have to anybody else that's contained on the e-mail?

A The way the cc is set up, you'll see both individuals that were cc'd on this were
identified by what is considered a moniker or an identifying name related to an e-mail address.

In this case the moniker for Mr. Harmon is Harmon-Thomas (TRH). And this would have been related to Mr. Harmon's psu.edu e-mail address. It is set up in the same fashion as the other e-mail Spanier-Graham (GBS) and would also have been a moniker for Mr. Spanier's e-mail address on the psu.edu system, which would have been the GSpanier@psu.edu e-mail.

Considering that the e-mail address was a valid e-mail address and was being used at the time, it would be -- it would have been delivered to his e-mail box. So both individuals would have received that e-mail.

Q I believe you talked about this earlier, but there's one of two ways it can come in, either in the inbox or the spam box?

A In an inbox or a spam box. Generally a spam box is used for e-mails that could possibly be outside of the e-mail network, in this case psu.edu, or for e-mails that are used for advertisements or the such.

Considering this was within the psu.edu system and that it was a commonly used e-mail
address that was used to converse back and forth, it would have been delivered to the inbox and not a spam box. I identified that because there was other e-mails between the individuals that were present that were using the same e-mail address.

Q Can you give the Court an idea of when you say there were e-mails located as far back as 1995 in Mr. Spanier's box, is that something that he had -- would he have had to have done something during the changeover to make that happen; and by changeover I mean when they changed systems?

A The e-mails that were identified back in 1995 and prior to 2005 were in the old Eudora e-mail system. Those e-mail boxes are separate from what the changeover system was, Microsoft Exchange.

During the process, the e-mails would have been imported from Eudora into the Microsoft exchange system. So any e-mails prior to 2005 would not have been acted upon, deleted or changed in the migration.

So any e-mails that were there were retained by the owner of the e-mail box. Any e-mails that were deleted would have been
selectively deleted by that individual as well.
Q Suffice it to say the relevant
information that you have discussed today and that was presented came exclusively or almost exclusively from one location?

A Correct.
Q And that was where?
A That was from the Gary Schultz e-mail, either from the archive or they're actually identified in the original Eudora e-mail boxes as wel 1.

Q And the decision that he would have made to do that would have occurred when; in other words, to keep those?

A After the e-mail was received.
Q But, I mean, when would that change -when would that have occurred during the changeover?

A Actually, the e-mails were retained back when they were originally received because they were still located in the original Eudora mail boxes. When the e-mail system was changed, those e-mail boxes were imported into the exchange system and would have been retained as well.

So the decision to keep them would have
been back in 1998 and those years subsequent to that.

MR. BEEMER: That's all I have.
THE COURT: Can we take a recess?
MS. AINSLIE: Of course.
THE COURT: We'11 adjourn until 10 after 11. Thank you.
(Court was held in recess at 10:48 a.m.)
(Recess.)
(The following proceedings occurred, beginning at 11:07 a.m.:)

MR. BEEMER: Can we approach for one second?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BEEMER: It can be off.
(A discussion was held off the record at sidebar.)

THE COURT: Welcome back. I believe we were ready for cross.

MR. BEEMER: Yes.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. AINSLIE:
Q Good morning, Mr. Cook.
A Good morning.

Q I'm Elizabeth Ainslie. I'm here representing Graham Spanier.

I am a complete novice at computers, so please bear with me.

A No problem.
Q Now, I have been laboring under the impression that Penn State gave me that there were no e-mails retrievable from before 2004 or 2005. Am I hearing you right that you say that's wrong?

A In the original e-mail box that was collected, which would be the present up to the time that it was collected. In the present e-mail system, there were no e-mails in that e-mail box.

Q Okay.
A However, there was a backup that we received on July 2nd, 2012.

Q Who gave you that if I can ask?
A That was from Penn State. It was a taped backup system that was identified, I believe, in a closet was the information $I$ had. It was then sent out to a company called Reclamere and they restored that to a hard drive.

We received that from Penn State on July

2nd, 2012, and that was a year end backup from 2007 for the administration. And there were e-mail boxes on there that contained e-mail from 2007 and prior.

Q You know nothing more about the providence of this additional collection of e-mails than that you've got it from Penn State?

A They turned it over subsequent to the subpoenas.

Q Okay.
A That's all I know.
Q Okay. Have you talked to the IT people at Penn State about what happened in this transition?

A You would have to ask them how that was done. They didn't relay any information except that they identified it, sent it to a company to be restored, and then I received the encrypted restored information.

Q So you just got it -- you haven't talked to any of the IT people at Penn State about how this phenomenon came about?

A As far as how it was received?
Q No. As far as, I mean, it sounds like a relatively strange phenomenon whereby you saw
some e-mails from earlier than 2004 and some not?
A It's not a strange phenomenon in the fact that the e-mails in the present system could have been deleted by the user prior to the collection of the data.

Q Right.
A The e-mails --
Q In fact, aren't we encouraged to do that by IT people, delete things as soon as we deal with them?

A I don't know if you are or not. I'm not. I keep e-mails that are relevant to information that $I$ may be dealing with in cases for several years.

Q Oh, yes. But then when you don't need it anymore, you delete it; am I right?

A If I decide that it's not relevant or something that $I$ don't need to have, I will delete my e-mails, yes.

Q And are you aware that people often are, especially people who get large quantities of e-mail, encouraged by their IT people to delete unnecessary e-mails from storage; isn't that right?

A It may be that some IT departments do
that.
Q Okay. Now, one of the things that you said, I think, was you were asked by Mr. Beemer about certain e-mails; for instance, Commonwealth Exhibit 19. Do you have that in front of you?

A Yes, I do.
Q And that's one of two e-mails that you have talked about that actually have Graham Spanier's name on, correct?

A Yes, and they're both in a cc format.
Q Right. The one that we're looking at now, Commonwealth 19, he's cc'd on an e-mail exchange between Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley and the RE line is Joe Paterno, right?

A Correct.
Q Is Jerry Sandusky's name anywhere in this e-mail exchange?

A I don't see it in there, no.
Q And basically the only thing this e-mail says is: Since we talked last night I've learned that the Public Welfare people will interview the individual Thursday, right?

A That is what it says, correct.
Q So for all that the world knows, they could be interviewing Joe Paterno about
something, isn't that?
A I'm not familiar with what the context is.

Q And, likewise, the other e-mail that you were asked to look at -- well, go back to another -- sorry, there were three e-mails. I misstated that. Exhibit 8, do you have that in front of you?

A Yes, I do.
Q And, again, Dr. Spanier is just copied on that e-mail?

A His is a cc on this, correct.
Q Okay. And it says they met with Jerry. It doesn't say Sandusky but just says Jerry; am I right?

A It does say Jerry, correct.
Q And concluded there was no criminal behavior. I think the matter has been appropriately investigated and I hope it is now behind us. Am I reading that correctly?

A You actually skipped one of the sentences in there.

Q Correct.
A I related to you --
Q He was a little emotional and expressed
concern as to how this might have adversely affected the child. And then it goes on and says: I think this matter has been appropriately investigated and I hope it is now behind us?

A That is what it says.
Q So there's nothing more to be done with this issue, is that the way you interpret that?

A That's just the conversation that they had.

Q Okay. And, finally, with respect to Commonwealth 23, there is an e-mail actually from Dr. Spanier in the middle of this page?

A It would appear that the information from Mr. Spanier occurred in between the conversation of the other two.

Q Okay. So it's a conversation?
A Correct.
Q At one point Dr. Spanier is talking about seeing to it that a message is received by the individual? Do you see that? The only downside for us is if the message isn't heard and acted upon?

A Yes.
Q Do you know what message he was talking about?

A I only know what's in the e-mail.
Q So you don't know what Dr. Spanier was told about this issue, it doesn't appear on the face of the e-mail, does it?

A The only thing I can say as to what he was told was what was written by Mr. Curley as to what he would be told.

Q Okay. So you can't add anything to the surface of these e-mails?

A I wouldn't add anything to the e-mail that would change the --

Q Okay. Now, in the course of your work on the e-mail files at Penn State, is it fair to say that on an average basis Dr. Spanier received hundreds of e-mails or at least a hundred daily?

A I wouldn't know that because the e-mail system that was present had no e-mails in it, so I wouldn't be able to tell you how many he received or did not.

Q Did you look into the deleted e-mails, into the outbox?

A I looked in all aspects of his e-mail system. His e-mail box was actually quite large, but there were no e-mails in the inbox or outbox. It was all deleted.

Q And do you know -- when did you receive this?

A I received the information related to his e-mail box, I believe it was on December 22nd or December 28th, 2011.

Q So he had already been gone for eight weeks by then?

A I don't know when Mr. Spanier left the university.

Q You don't know when he left?
A No.
Q Did you ask anyone at the IT facility again, Mr. Neeper, Mr. Corro, any of the people at Penn State, why there were no e-mails that you could see in that box?

A Actually, I did ask because it was kind of an interesting point.

Q Yeah.
A And they related that he received multiple e-mails and actually maintained multiple e-mails on a regular basis, and they couldn't explain why he had deleted all the e-mails out of his e-mail box because he regularly maintained a large volume of e-mail.

Q Okay. So it's a mystery?

A To them, they just explained that he deleted everything.

Q Okay.
A That was what was expressed to me.
MS. AINSLIE: Okay. Thank you. We'11 ask Mr. Neeper if we see him. Thank you.
(Pause.)
MS. AINSLIE: I'm sorry. May I ask one more question?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, of course. BY MS. AINSLIE:

Q Mr. Cook, I'11 still puzzled, I'm sorry. A witness from Penn State testified a few days ago saying that there were something like 84,000 e-mails in Graham Spanier's outbox. Can you explain that?

A I wasn't here for his testimony. I'm not sure as to what he would be referring to.

MS. AINSLIE: Okay. Thank you.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MS. ROBERTO:
Q Good morning.
A Good morning.
Q My name is Caroline Roberto and I
represent Mr. Curley, who is a former athletic director at Penn State. And I want to ask you a couple questions. Okay?

A Sure.
Q I think you said when you were talking about the e-mails related to the 1999 -- I'm sorry, 1998 e-mail thread and then the February 2001 e-mail, that you hadn't found any of those e-mails in Mr. Curley's e-mail account; is that right?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Now, when you were working with Penn State in gathering these e-mails in November and December and forward after that, did you attempt to access athletic department e-mails prior to 2004?

A We had requested from the athletic department. The way Penn State has their information set up, the athletic department has their own network --

Q Sure.
A -- and e-mail servers. We requested from them any and all backups that they maintained. The information that was relayed back to us is that there were no backups that were retained
prior to that time frame. And we were going off the subpoenas, so that's the information that we had.

Q Okay. And so there were no backups because was it your understanding that in late 2003, 2004, that time frame, the ath1etic department changed e-mail servers?

A I don't remember how they -- how their e-mail system works. I know that the university as far as the administration changed from the Eudora system to the exchange system. I assume that the e-mail system had changed also with the ath1etic department, but they just maintained that there were no backups that were maintained.

Q Did you ever attempt to further investigate whether there were indeed any backups from -- prior to 2004 in the athletic department?

A Again, we made requests to the athletic department, to the administrator of the network for that through Mr. Corro. Again, we were working on subpoenas to produce any and all backups, and the information that they returned to us is that there were none.

Q Okay. So do you have any evidence that there were backups from the athletic department
pre2004 e-mail system?
A Again, they didn't supply anything to us, so unless they were withholding stuff that they didn't inform us of, we have no backups.

Q Do you have any evidence that they were withholding?

A Again, we have nothing from them. They said there were no backups. They didn't supply us with any.

Q And did they supply you with everything that they did have in the way of backups from the administrative offices?

A Again, we requested it. They supplied us with what they supplied us. Unless they were withholding stuff that we didn't know about, I would assume that we received everything.

Q Okay. You would assume that you received everything. Do you know whether there was other agency, any other agency, law enforcement or internal investigation, that attempted to reconstruct the ath1etic department pre2004 e-mail backup?

A I don't know that they did that.
Q So when you say that there were no pre2004 e-mails from Mr. Curley, there were no
pre2004 e-mails for anybody in the athletic department?

A Only what we received in their active e-mail system. I would have to review all of the e-mail boxes we received from them to identify if there was any e-mails contained in those prior to 2004.

Q Okay. So you're not willing to say here today -- well, let me ask you this. Do you have any e-mails from Mike McQueary related to this 2001 incident?

A We have e-mails from Mike McQueary. I don't know if -- the evidence that $I$ have in front of me doesn't have anything from his e-mail box.

Q From 2001?
A Not that I know of. I believe there were e-mails from him but I don't -- I can't say that with certainty.

Q But it's true that when you went and began working with the Penn State University IT Department, you asked for the e-mails, all e-mails from Paterno, McQueary, Curley, Bradley, Federino, Ganter, Caldwel1, and Dieh1?

A There was approximately 60 individuals
from Penn State within the athletic department, administration, police services and physical plant that we requested. The individuals that you just stated were a small portion of the individuals from the athletic department that we requested.

Q Okay. And so you would have requested all e-mails from those persons as well?

A Yes, they were subpoenaed to supply any and all e-mails and files and computers related to those individuals.

Q Okay. Did you ever speak with a systems administrator by the name of Rand Allison who worked at the ath1etic department?

A Not personally I did not, no.
Q But you know who he is?
A I do not.
Q So your only contact person was Braden Cook -- you're Braden Cook. Your only contact person was John Corro?

A Our contact person was John Corro. Within the university in response to the subpoenas, he would contact the administrators that were relative to that. I did actually sit in on an interview and conduct an interview with

Mr. Neeper. That was the only administrator that I interviewed.

Q So when you found out, when you gained the information that there were no backups, pre2004 e-mails in the ath1etic department, did you receive that information from Mr. John Corro?

A I believe that's who it would have been through.

Q Okay. I'm going to show you what's been marked as Commonwealth Exhibit 21 and I want you to compare it with Commonwealth Exhibit 8.

A I do have those in front of me.
Q Okay. Take a look at Commonwealth Exhibit 21.

A Yes.
Q It's from Gary Schultz to Tim Curley. The time on there is 1:47 p.m.; is that right?

A And you're looking at 21?
Q I am looking at 21.
A Up at the top, correct.
Q Yes. Now, if you could look at Commonwealth Exhibit 8.

A Okay.
Q This is an e-mail thread that contains the same e-mail. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q In the middle of the page it says: You wrote; and before that it has the time 9:46 a.m.?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Could you explain the time difference?

A I'm not positive on this. Again, I don't have the servers in front of me. One of the possibilities is the server that -- the e-mail server that the administration would be using and the e-mail server that the athletic department would be using are separate and individual servers.

So without having those servers, I cannot verify the dates and times, the time that was set on that server.

Q So are you saying that one of them would have had the wrong time or could have had the wrong time?

A It could be a different time. It also could be a translation of the time. As you see, one of them says 1:47 p.m. The other one says 9:46 a.m. minus four hours, which would be approximately the exact same time if you add the four hours.

So one of them could be related in universal time code and one could be in Eastern Standard Time.

MS. ROBERTO: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

MS. AINSLIE: Your Honor, I do have one more question but if Mr . Beemer has redirect --

THE COURT: Mr. Beemer, can Ms. Ainslie ask another question? Are you ready for redirect?

MR. FARRELL: Your Honor, we have some questions.

THE COURT: All right. Please.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. MATANGOS:
Q Is it Agent Cook?
A Yes, it is.
Q Agent Cook, my name is George Matangos. I'm co-counsel for Gary Schultz. I have a few questions for you.

A Sure.
Q If you don't understand my question, please ask me so I can clarify it so we're on the same page. Okay?

A Not a problem.
Q You said in answer to Mr. Beemer's question that you were asked to become involved in November of 2011. Who were you asked by?

A I was asked by the attorneys and supervisory staff within our office who were doing the investigation to attend a meeting in November.

Q Was that Attorney Fina?
A He was one of them, correct.
Q Ms. Eshbach?
A She was part of the team.
Q Was Agent Sassano part of that discussion?

A He was the original investigating attorney -- or investigating agent.

Q Okay. You indicated in your direct examination that you got this network share file, Gary Schultz's network share file?

A Correct.
Q In March of 2011?
A We received that in, I believe it was, March 23rd, 2011.

Q So that was prior to your actual involvement, right?

A I'm sorry, March 23rd, 2012. I apologize.

Q I assumed. I didn't want to put it into your mouth. It was 2012 actually?

A Yes, I'm sorry. I apologize.
Q And who provided that to you?
A That was provided to me by John Corro.
Q John Corro testified yesterday about recovering some 30 terror bytes of information from the Penn State system.

A That is correct.
Q Was that all provided to the Office of the Attorney General?

A Yes, it was.
Q Do you know if that material was provided to anyone else?

A I don't know. That would have to be asked by -- asked of Penn State. We did not provide anything to anybody else.

Q You did not provide anything to any other investigating agencies or to the Freeh group or to Duane Morris or anyone?

A To Duane Morris, we did provide them with the information to privilege review. All other items if it was produced, it was produced by Penn

State. We didn't produce anything.
Q Mr. Corro said there are only two of them in the Penn State IT forensic unit, himself and another gentleman. Was it Mr. Corro that you worked with directly?

A Mr. Corro was the main person I worked with. There was another individual, Dan, I believe his last name was Ehrlich, but I'm not completely positive on that. He did assist Mr. Corro, but I dealt directly with Mr. Corro on almost everything.

Q Mr. Corro testified about he was asked by Mr. Beemer about wiping data off hard drives. Can you just briefly in your own words describe what you understand wiping data to mean?

A Wiping data can mean deleting items and then overwriting them one or multiple times to erase all data.

Q Where does that get erased from?
A That gets erased from the hard drive or server that the data resides on.

Q So, in fact, you could from your computer if your computer storage is on the network server, you could delete material from that network server on your own computer?

A You can delete it. It would depend on the program that you were using whether or not it would allow you to wipe. Generally, you can only wipe it on the machine that you're running the program on.

Q Mr. Corro mentioned something called auto delete as well. What's that?

A I don't know what he was referring to.
Q He was asked questions about e-mails and about taking specific information, putting it into a trash bin or recycling bin. And then there's a physical way to empty that trash bin, correct?

A Yes, you can empty your trash bin.
Q Is there also such a thing as an auto delete that will empty a trash bin at certain time frames or certain quantities of product are in it, is there anything like that?

A I don't know what program he's referring to or how it would be set up.

Q Can it be set up?
A It would depend on the product you're talking about.

Q Have you ever known such a thing to exist?

A I have seen trash bins can be set up to delete but, again, it would depend on the program that was being used.

Q This 30 terror bytes of information, is it my understanding, and please correct me if I'm wrong, that the search that was done on the 30 terror bytes was done with search words or specific -- asking for specific words to be sought out in the material?

A Yes. It was a string of text that was used to identify anything that might be relevant. Additionally, a majority of the e-mails that were identified, we then went through and identified one by one all of the e-mails and reviewed all the e-mails in that same time frame to identify if there was anything else that didn't contain those key words.

Q So the string of words, was that -No. 1, was that created in conjunction with the other investigators or were you asked to provide relevant information for that string or how did that work?

A I had some keywords that were obviously relevant, anything like Jerry or Sandusky. But other keywords were provided to me by the case
investigators, and then additional keywords were identified through e-mails that may be relevant to find out if there was any other string of text that might -- or e-mail strings that might be relevant with that string.

Q Okay. So besides the string, you also went back then and looked for specific information that contained e-mail addresses that you were able to pull from the material, correct?

A I'm sorry. Repeat that question one more time.

Q Did you use e-mail addresses as well to search?

A We didn't use e-mail addresses because the e-mail addresses would be identified over a broad spectrum. We actually used terms that were contained within e-mails that we identified. We did look at all the e-mail addresses.

The way the system was done, each individual when I did the forensic examinations, I examined each individual's hard drives separately from all the other individuals, each individual's e-mail separately from all other individuals.

So each thing was done in a separate
examination. So I had approximately two to three hundred different examinations that were performed. So it wasn't all the information together.

Q Right. Are these -- when you say these active searches, I'm assuming for a forensic examiner this is kind of common practice, correct?

A Yes.
Q Is it the standard of practice for searching this type of material?

A We do it through keyword searches. We do it through file extensions if we're looking at documents or e-mails. We also do it on a one by one, look at the text and review it manually.

Q It goes without saying it would be impossible to physically review each and every one of the entries as a physical document since there were 30 terror bytes of information; is that fair to say?

A There's a lot of information to go through, yes.

Q We were told yesterday that one terror byte would be almost equivalent to all of the paper product within the Library of Congress.

A That would be about accurate, yes.
Q In your review, as I understand your testimony, everything we've seen regarding e-mails came from Gary Schultz's network server file prior to 2005, correct?

A I believe all the ones that I've seen today were from that, correct.

Q And anything prior to 2005 would have had to have come from that, correct?

A Actually, all of these e-mails were from prior to 2005, but they were identified in both the 2005 archive that was created and in the original Eudora mailboxes. And those would have been from the '98 to 2001 time frame.

Q You said something in your direct testimony about only being able to confirm them back to 2000. What did that mean?

A The e-mail box, especially for the 1998 ones, there was a 1998, I believe it was titled 1998 DLF was the title of the Eudora mailbox.

The last written date on that mailbox was January of 2000. So e-mails could have been added up to that time frame, but those e-mails were contained in that e-mail box.

Q Is there any way to tell in your forensic
review whether you have every single e-mail from that time frame within the material that you were given by Penn State?

A There's no way for me to identify that as -- obviously, we don't have every e-mail because e-mails had been deleted as we can see the chains weren't there, so there were e-mails that were deleted from that time frame.

Q Is there any way to tell if there were other deletions or changes in that old system?

A It would be able to identify if changes were made. The system that was in place, it was a tape archive backup. The tape backup itself cannot be accessed or changed in any way from when that tape was created.

Additionally, the created date on the e-mail box, anything that was in there, if you changed a letter $A$ to a letter $B$, and any e-mail contained in that e-mail box would change the entire e-mail box created date. So there could be no changes that were made after the 2000 time frame.

Q The problem with that is you can't confirm that those dates on those e-mails are accurate; isn't that true? The 1998 e-mails, you
can't confirm that the dates and times are accurate?

A The times, no.
Q You can only say they're consistent and seem to be consistent with the e-mails you've recovered, correct?

A All of the e-mails on that system were the exact same dates and times as far as the span of them.

Q Right. But you can't confirm that the date and time are actually accurate?

A I don't know what the server date and time was.

Q In fact, you can only tell if anything happened prior to the tape backup being created? I mean, that's kind of a deadline, correct, so if something happened prior to the tape backup's creation, then that would be the deadline or cut off for you to see if there was something done, correct?

A Yes, if there was anything done to that system. So like the 2000 date, anything prior to that 2000 date. But after 2000, there was no changes that were made to anything within that system.

Q Do you know, yesterday we were told by Mr. Corro that, in fact, there was an extra process required by the Penn State IT Department in order for Mr. Schultz to preserve the old material when the switchover occurred to the Microsoft exchange. Are you aware, did you talk to Mr. Corro about how that actually occurred?

A I'm not -- I'm not sure exactly how it occurred.

Q It's not as simple as simply importing old e-mails; isn't that true?

A I don't know the system that they employed.

Q Okay. Did you ask him at any point exactly how the old network server information, how he got that, where it was, how it was created, who asked him back at the time to create that stuff?

A I asked -- it wasn't Mr. Corro that created it. It would have been the IT person at the time. And the information that was relayed to me was that the -- at the time Mr. Schultz had a large volume of e-mail that he didn't want to lose and wanted to be able to have access to it further down the road.

Therefore, they asked him what he wanted to do with them. He requested that an archive be created or that somehow they be preserved. They said we can create this archive by importing it. That was the information.

Q When you say they, that's the Penn State IT Department you're talking about?

A Yes.
Q And they made it clear to you that was al1 done at Mr. Schultz's request because he had asked to preserve the old system?

A In a discussion with them, that's what was determined.

Q Now, my understanding again with that preservation, that system is hard fixed at the date that, for instance, the tape backup, is that the 2000 tape backup that was done or is that the 2005 tape backup that you were speaking of earlier?

A I'm not sure what your --
Q When the system is backed up --
A Yes.
Q -- you said you can tell if there are any changes to any of the e-mails.

A With the archive or with the tape system?

Q With the archive, first let's do that.
A With the archive, the archive would be imported into our system. Indicates the created date for each of the e-mails within that system. Each of the e-mails within that system were in a sequential time frame on the date in 2005. So all of the e-mails were added the exact same time. So back to that 2000 time frame, anything that was changed after that would change that created date.

Q And then the tape, similarly anything prior to?

A The tape system cannot be accessed. And any changes made because it is a tape system, they would actually have to create a new tape system if they tried to change anything. And the reason for that is you have to restore the tape.

It's kind of like a VHS tape. You have to restore that back to computer hardware. You have to change something and then you would have to re-backup that system which would then change the backup date of the whole process.

Q So obviously you can tell from looking at the 2005 and 2000 whether it's the tape or the archive, you can tell that as of those dates,
those fixed dates, there were no changes, correct?

A Correct.
MR. MATANGOS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Liz, did you --
MS. AINSLIE: Yes.

## FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MS. AINSLIE:

Q Mr. Cook, I'11 try not to belabor the point but I'm still puzzled. You talked, I think you said, to Mr. Corro from time to time about the Penn State data?

A Mr. Corro was our contact.
Q Okay. You didn't talk to Steve Neeper, the boss of IT at Penn State?

A I did interview Steve Neeper. He was the network administer for the administration network.

Q Did he tell you that in November of 2011, Graham Spanier's hard drive and all of his e-mail servers were imaged by Penn State?

A I would assume that that's when the information was gathered.

Q Okay. And it was then -- was that the

84,000 , did Mr. Corro tell you about the 84,000 e-mails in the outbox?

A I don't know where that number comes from.

Q Okay. The person in charge of collecting the data at Penn State was ultimately the general counsel, Cynthia Baldwin; is that right?

A I don't know who. I would assume that's who received the subpoenas, but I don't know because I didn't serve them.

Q Okay. And you did no independent investigation, you just took what Penn State gave you; and your analysis, all of your analysis here today is based on what Penn State gave you?

A Yes, their response to whatever subpoenas were issued.

MS. AINSLIE: Thank you. I have nothing further.

MR. BEEMER: Nothing further.
THE COURT: You can step down. Thank you very much, sir.
(Witness excused.)
MR. BEEMER: Your Honor, at this time I believe we have a stipulation to the following: I've marked for identification and admission

Commonwealth's 29, which is the Apri1 13th, 2011 grand jury testimony of Graham Spanier; Commonwealth's 30 , which is the January 12th, 2011 testimony of Tim Curley; and Commonwealth's 31 which is the January 12th, 2011 testimony of Gary Schultz.

In as much as in a prior proceeding in front of Your Honor, Commonwealth's 30 and 31 have been previously read into the record, I propose admitting them just in document form. And at this time move for the admission of 29,30 and 31.

I believe we have a stipulation that if Shannon Manderbach, the court reporter, who took all three of those testimonies would certify that these are true and accurate copies of her recording of the questions and answers that were given on those days.

At this time I think it might actually work out well to put in Commonwealth's 29 into the record at this point. Jim Barker from our office has graciously agreed to read the answer portion and $I$ will do the question portion of Commonwealth's 29.

THE COURT: Counse1, are you okay with

MR. FARRELL: Yes, we're fine.
MS. AINSLIE: Yes, Your Honor.
MS. ROBERTO: Yes, Your Honor.
MR. BEEMER: The contents of
Commonwealth's 29: Witness: Graham Spanier. The date: April 13th, 2011, 9:53 a.m. Location: Strawberry Square, Verizon Tower, Eighth Floor.

Graham Spanier was called as a witness, was previously sworn, testified as follows: By Mr. Fina: (Reading)

Q Sir, could you give your name for the record, please?

A Graham Spanier.
Q Sir, you're represented by counsel today?
A Yes.
Q Could you just identify counsel?
A Cynthia Baldwin sitting behind me.
Q Thank you, sir. Could you start out with giving us your current title and then work in reverse chronology as to your history, your professional history, sir?

A I am currently the president of the Pennsylvania State University. I've been in that position since 1995, sixteen years. Before that,

I was the chancellor at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. I was in that position since 1991. From 1986 to 1991, I was the provost and vice president for academic affairs at Oregon State University. From 1982 to 1986, I was the vice provost for undergraduate studies at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

From 1973 until 1982, I was professor of human development family studies, professor of sociology, professor of demography and professor of family and community medicine at Pennsylvania State University; and in three successive administrative positions as professor in charge of the undergraduate program and individual and family studies as divisional professor in charge of that academic unit and then as associate dean of what is now called the College of Health and Community Development.

Q Sir, your education, can you go through your formal education?

A I have a bachelor's degree in sociology from Iowa State University, a master's degree in sociology from Iowa State University and a Ph.D. in sociology from Northwestern University.

Q Your degree in sociology, was there any
primary focus within that broad study?
A My focus is on marriage and family relations. I'm a marriage and family therapist by training, in addition, and demographer.

Q Outside of your academic work and your many academic professional positions, have you ever done any clinical or hands-on family therapeutic work?

A Yes. For 13 years earlier in my career, I did marriage and family therapy and other areas of therapeutic activity related to marriages, families, adolescent development.

Q Did you do that here in Pennsylvania, sir?

A Yes, in part, in Pennsylvania.
Q Was it in the Penn State area?
A Nine years of that time was during that period when $I$ was on faculty at Penn State.

Q Jumping now back to the present time, sir, can you give us the broad outlines of your current responsibilities?

A Well, I oversee one of the largest and complex universities in the United States. We have 96,000 students, 47,000 paychecks that we issue each month. We operate at 141 different
locations. I have 1700 buildings, tens of thousands of acres of 1and. I oversee a budget of about $\$ 4.3$ billion a year. I'm responsible for academic programs, physical plant, business and finance, university relations, research programs, one of the largest academic medical centers in the country. Those are a few of the different variables.

Q Can you tell us, sir, who Mr. Tim Curley is and who he has been in relation to Penn State?

A Tim Curley is one of the people who reports directly to me. He's the director of ath1etics.

Q Does he have anybody else in his chain of command or is he a direct report to you?

A He reports directly to me on the organizational chart. He would also work closely with other senior members of the university administration.

Q Can you tell us who those other senior members would be by title and name?

A Most prominently, he would also relate to the senior vice president for finance and business, who currently is Al Horvath.

Q How long has Mr. Horvath held that

A Approximately three years, give or take.
Q Prior to Mr. Horvath, who held that position?

A Gary Schultz.
Q How long did Mr. Schultz hold that position?

A I think he began in that position in 1993 or 1994.

Q Has Mr. Curley been there for all the years that you have been the president?

A Yes.
Q The vice president for finance, can you describe the duties and responsibilities of that individual?

A He's the chief financial and business officer of the university, oversees financial expenditures and a broad range of operational areas of the university, auxiliary enterprises, housing, food services, environmental health and safety, public safety, physical plant, transportation, internal audit, controller's office, university budgeting and a number of other areas.

Q It sounds like it's a very prominent
position?
A Yes.
Q When you stated public safety in reference to one of the areas that the vice president of finance supervises, is it accurate to state that that would include any police services that the Penn State University controls or supervises?

A Yes, it would include our police services, public safety operations.

Q Is it accurate that the Penn State University in State College has a police force that has trained police officers that are employed by the university?

A Yes. We have a very large police force. We are in some ways like a city in our own right. We have different components of it. We have sworn police officers who are trained like any other State Police or municipal police officer in Pennsylvania. I don't know the exact number, but it's probably 50 or 60 sworn police officers. We then have, I would say, roughly an equivalent number of public safety officers. Those who would not be armed -- excuse me, these would not be armed officers trained in the same
way, but people who have public safety and security responsibilities. We also have an auxiliary core of dozens of students who are hired to assist our police operations in security areas. So it's a pretty good size operation like you would find maybe in a medium-sized city.

Q And it would be your understanding, sir --

Ms. Baldwin: Excuse me, Mr. Fina, just a moment.

Mr. Fina: Yes.
The Witness: Justice Baldwin was pointing out that maybe I should clarify one thing for you because you used the term State College. What I was referring to was the Penn State University police force. There is a separate police department in the Borough of State College which has, I would say, an equivalent number of sworn police officers. By Mr. Fina:

Q Thank you, sir. And the police department -- I made that distinction, sir, just because you said you have 141, I believe, different locations?

A Yes.

Q We're just going to focus today on the State College area.

Ms. Baldwin: Just for a point of clarification, I'm sorry, Mr. Fina, it's University Park. That's why I made the distinction. Actually, it's called University Park.

Mr. Fina: Okay. I'11 use that term. By Mr. Fina:

Q And excuse me. I'm not associated with the university or well-versed in its nomenclature. The University Park police -- is it okay if I describe them in that way?

A Yeah. Sure.
Q They have full police powers, right, like any other police department, like the State College Police Department? They can investigate crimes and arrest people. They are just like any other cops, right?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q Sir, as the president of the university, can you describe for us the circumstances in a normal situation under which you would be informed of an allegation of criminal conduct being investigated by the University Park Police?

A It would be very rare that $I$ would be informed because we are so large and, like I said, something like a city. We allow the police department to work rather independently and my contact with them would be limited.

I would never and have never interfered in any of their activities and typically only informed when there's something of very substantial consequence that might affect the day-to-day operations of the university or a case of a death where $I$ might be in a position to need to inform a family member or communicate with them at least about the situation. I don't really have much contact and certainly no day-to-day contact.

Because of the numbers I mentioned earlier, we have a certain amount of crime in our community and a lot of incidents, most of them, thankfully, not of any great consequence. So I don't read the police logs or get informed about the typical day-to-day activities.

Q Understood. Who would be the person responsible for informing you of anything noteworthy or that rose to the level of importance that they felt they should tell you
about in relation to alleged crimes?
A Generally speaking, if $I$ were to be informed about something, it would come from the senior vice president for finance and business because, in that circumstance, the chief of police would have informed that individual as supervisor who would have thought it was important enough to merit my attention.

Occasionally, I could learn about it through the grapevine. For example, if it was a matter involving a student, the police chief might inform our office of judicial affairs because it's a student conduct matter. Therefore, our vice president for student affairs would learn about that and perhaps occasionally think it's something $I$ should be aware of.

Q Sir, if you could give us a flavor, say, take the past 24 months and tell us without specifics, no names or anything like that, the types of criminal allegations or activities that have been brought to you, revealed to you in that time period, if any.

A I would say no criminal activities have been brought to me in the last 24 months. We had one student death that, of course, the police are
called to the scene. So in the case of that student who was apparently intoxicated and fell out of a stairwell, I would have learned about that.

Because of my work with the FBI, I was informed by the FBI and by our public safety officers of a brewing episode involving a student at another one of our campuses. Those are the only two that $I$ can think of where $I$ was directly notified within a 24 -month period.

Q Again, as you stated, it is a rare event?
A Yes.
Q During your tenure as president of Penn State University, was there an occasion where officials came to you with information about Jerry Sandusky?

A There was never a time when the university police approached me with any issue concerning Jerry Sandusky. There was one time when our athletic director and senior vice president, the two individuals you mentioned earlier, came to seek my advice on a matter relating to Jerry Sandusky.

Q So Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley?
A Yes.

Q Again, to the best that you can recollect, approximately when was this that they came to you?

A In about 2002.
Q You do not remember anything beyond that in terms of the timing, correct?

A I can't give you a specific date or month. I don't recall specifically it was 2002, but approximately in that time frame because I remember it being about three years after Mr. Sandusky had retired from Penn State.

Q What is it that they informed you and if you could tell me, again, if you recollect, who was it among those two gentlemen who spoke to you and relayed the information?

A They asked if they could come over to my office to see me because the athletic director, Mr . Curley, had been approached by a member of his staff saying that he was somewhat uncomfortable because Jerry Sandusky in the football building locker room area in the shower was with a younger child and that they were horsing around in the shower. I believe that was the language that was used.

I don't remember specifically whether it
was Tim Curley or Gary Schultz who actually made that statement, but that was essentially the entirety of their statement. They said that the individual thought he saw -- and I think the characterization was that he thought he saw them horsing around in the shower and he was a little uncomfortable with it, so he brought it to Mr . Curley's attention.

Q Did Mr. Curley identify who it was who witnessed this alleged event?

A No, he did not.
Q Did you ever become aware of who the individual was that witnessed Sandusky in the shower with the child?

A No.
Q To this day, do you know who --
A I didn't ask.
Q To this day, you still don't know who the witness was?

A I don't know.
Q Did they, either Mr. Curley or Mr. Schultz, explain why they were bringing this information to you?

A Well, they felt it was an awkward situation and just wanted to know what my advice
was. So I gave them my advice.
Q What was your advice?
A I said that, you know, it's a university and we do -- at Penn State we're very open in allowing members of the community to use our facilities. We're not like a lot of universities where only employees or only students can use the facilities. We're pretty open. Local high school kids come and use our recreational facilities all the time and we feel that's a community service. So there wasn't any policy prohibiting it. It happens.

But we just thought it -- I thought and I told them that something like that could be misconstrued and probably we wanted to discourage people bringing younger kids into our facilities. So my advice was that they should do two things; that they should inform Mr. Sandusky that it was not a good practice to bring people under 18 into our locker room facilities and we'd like to ask him not to do that going forward.

Secondly, we thought that -- we thought since he was no longer employed by the university and we really didn't have any responsibility for him at that point in time, that we should also,
as a matter of prudence, contact the chair of the board of the Second Mile to simply inform that individual that we were concerned about Second Mile children being brought into Penn State locker facilities and that we were going to ask that that not occur. I think that call was made by Tim Curley. Those are my two pieces of advice on that.

Q Was your advice adopted and conducted by Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley? Do you know?

A I believe Mr. Curley at a later time mentioned that he had done both of those things, he had both of these conversations. That was very shortly after and that was the last time I heard of the matter until a few months ago.

Q This initial meeting that you had with Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley, can you estimate how long this whole discussion took?

A Probably not less than 10 minutes, nor more than 15 minutes.

Q Was it relayed to you as an aside to a larger meeting addressing other issues or was the meeting set up with you specifically for this sole purpose, to inform you of this and discuss this with you?

A It was almost a decade ago. I can't remember very precisely whether we might have also touched on another topic, but it seemed that was the main topic of that brief discussion.

Q Did either Mr. Schultz or Mr. Curley tell you when this had occurred, whether it had been a week prior or a couple days prior or anything 1ike that?

A I don't recall. They may have said but I don't remember. I had the impression that it was a fairly timely meeting, that it was sometime fairly recent.

Q Did they inform you whether Joe Paterno had been informed and was in any way involved in the relay of information?

A His name was never mentioned to the best of my recollection.

Q Did they say anything to you about how they came in possession of this information and I mean the timing of it, whether they were informed immediately, within hours, within days, anything like that?

A No, I don't remember, just that a member of the staff had thought he had seen that horsing around and had mentioned it to the athletic director.

Q Did they relay that the horsing around that was allegedly seen was after hours, that it was after normal business hours?

A I don't recall mention of the timing.
Q Did you have any impression that this had occurred at night or during the day or in the morning or anything like that?

A No, no impression.
Q Did either Mr. Schultz or Mr. Curley inform you that the young person in question, the child in question, was a Second Mile child?

A I recall that it was a Second Mile child or if it wasn't specifically told to me, I at least made that assumption. I can't state with certainty now that $I$ knew one way or the other, but that's my impression.

It may, indeed, have been stated to me pretty explicitly. But since neither Mr. Schultz nor Mr. Curley witnessed anything themselves, they may have been making the same assumption or perhaps the staff member that observed it knew. So all I can say is that it was my impression or assumption without actually any direct knowledge.

Q Was any description of the child
provided, either physical description or estimate of age?

A Not to my recollection. I don't actually know the child's age, but $I$ believe it was someone under 18. I believe it was a male child because they were in a male locker room.

Q So the individual is described as a child, is that correct, and no further description?

A I don't even know if the word child was used. It might have been a kid or a Second Mile kid.

Q Some statement reflecting a child?
A Yes.
Q Was any identification of the child made or presented to you?

A No.
Q Did anyone in this discussion discuss identifying the child or making any kind of effort to identify the child?

A No.
Q In the discussion about talking to Sandusky in regards to his use of the Penn State facilities with minors, was there any discussion of asking him the identity of the child?

A I'm sorry. Say that again.
Q Did you or Mr. Curley or Mr. Schultz ever discuss asking Mr. Sandusky who the child was?

A I never had any discussion with Mr. Sandusky.

Q Understood. But in reference to your recommendations to Mr . Curley to talk with Mr. Sandusky about not using the facilities with minors, was there any suggestion that he should identify who the child was?

A I don't know.
Q You didn't make any such suggestion?
A No, I did not.
Q Was there any discussion about reporting the matter to the police or Children and Youth or any other type of public agency?

A No.
Q Was there any impression by you that had been done -- that that had been done by either Mr. Schultz or Mr. Curley?

A No.
Q Was there any impression by you that that had not been done by Mr. Schultz or Mr. Curley?

A No.
Q Was there any discussion or information
provided to you about any prior allegations against Mr. Sandusky involving children?

A No.
Q Were you ever informed before 2011 that there had been an allegation in 1998 that Mr. Sandusky was in one of the Penn State University showers with two young men and that contact had occurred?

A No.
Q Were you ever informed in any way, shape or form, again, prior to 2011 that the Penn State University Police had investigated allegations of potential sexual misconduct by Mr. Sandusky?

A No.
Q When Mr. Curly reported back to you in regards to your recommendations, do you remember what it is he stated?

A No, and I'm pretty sure we didn't have a follow-up meeting, only that when I saw him next he mentioned that he had had both of those conversations and that they had gone well. That was the extent of it.

Q Did you ever have any discussion with Mr. Curley or Mr. Schultz about how Mr. Sandusky was accessing the Penn State facilities? And I
mean how in a very mechanical way, whether he had either a key or an electronic access card or anything like that.

A No.
Q Was there any discussions with Mr. Curley or Mr. Schultz about how the university would enforce the directive to Mr. Sandusky that he not bring minors into the locker rooms or the showers?

A No, I'm not aware of any discussions.
Q Was anyone else present during your conversation with Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz on this topic?

A I don't believe so.
Q Was there any discussion between yourself and Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz when discussing Mr. Sandusky and this horseplay that occurred about any potential adverse consequences to the image of Penn State University?

A I don't recall that we talked about it in those terms. I think as I recall back in telling them what I thought we ought to do to be responsible and follow-up, it was in my mind that we wouldn't feel comfortable with that practice. So I would have to fairly say that $I$ was thinking
it, but I don't think we actually discussed it in those terms.

Q Sir, can you describe to the grand jury who Mr. Sandusky is and why this is not just an average employee of Penn State University, if that is the case?

A Well, I'm not sure any of my employees that I've been associated with over the years would want me to describe them as just average.

Q I more than understand that. Is Mr. Sandusky an employee of notoriety than many of the employees?

A Well, at Penn State, anybody who's associated with the football program has a certain degree of notoriety. Jerry Sandusky was a well-known and very revered member of our football program for most of his life until he retired. He had a position of responsibility as defensive coordinator and was considered one of the best people in that position ever. He was a long-time member of Joe Paterno's staff. But he was probably equally known and revered for starting and nurturing the Second Mile program which has served thousands of young people and made such a contribution.

Certainly, he is a well-known figure and has been widely respected and admired. I actually had very little contact with him over the years. Most of my contact with members of the football staff is with the head coach who I see more regularly.

Q Again, I understand this is an opinion, sir, but within that hierarchy of notoriety related to the football program of Penn State University, where would you place Mr. Sandusky? Would he be at the very top or would he be somewhere below the very top?

A Well, he would be among the more visible people.

Q He may not be a Joe Paterno, but he would be up there in the --

A He would be in the next group I would say, yes.

Q In your discussions with Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz in those moments that they came to you and told you of this horseplay, was there any indication that the horseplay could have been sexual in nature?

A No.
Q Did it ever occur to you that that was a possibility at the time?

A No, it didn't, because what was reported was not a report of any activity that was sexual in nature. I know better than to jump to conclusions about things like that.

Q Did you ask Mr. Curley or Mr. Schultz whether they had made inquiry of the eye witness as to whether or not there was anything sexual in nature?

A All I recall is that it was reported to me in roughly the way $I$ described and it was on that basis that $I$ processed and responded.

Q Were you aware of any other occurrences where Mr. Sandusky had brought children into the locker room or the showers of Penn State University?

A No.
Q In the course of your discussions with Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz about this incident, did they ever express that Mr. Sandusky had a habit or had previously brought children into the locker room or the showers at Penn State University?

A No.
Q After this meeting you had with

Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley which you said was approximately 2002, from that point up until 2011, had you received any information from any source regarding allegations of potential sexual misconduct by Mr. Sandusky?

A No, nothing whatsoever, although your use of the year 2011, it was probably more late 2010.

Q Fair enough. Just for the record, you became aware of this investigation or an investigation in late 2010?

A Yes.
Q Where did you get that information from?
A First $I$ heard was an inquiry from a reporter, Jan Murphy, who is -- I think her title is chief of the Capitol News Bureau at the Harrisburg Patriot News. I believe the first I heard was an e-mail from her asking if I knew anything about this and wanted to comment on it. I wrote her back and said no.

Q The retirement of Mr. Sandusky, do you recollect, again, when that was, approximately?

A It was approximately in 1999.
Q Are you aware of any relationship between that retirement and any allegations of misconduct made against Mr. Sandusky?

A No, nothing whatsoever.
Q What is your understanding of why Mr. Sandusky chose to retire at that time?

A Well, Joe Paterno and Tim Curley and I meet from time to time to assess the football program. We meet at least yearly to discuss that subject, sometimes more often. My recollection in the late '90s was that Joe Paterno was not feeling that our defense was clicking on all cylinders and that Jerry Sandusky probably would not be in the best position to succeed him as head coach.

You have to understand that Joe Paterno's been on the verge of retirement for all of my 16 years there. So this topic is always on the table. And here we are in 2011 and he's still head coach. He's always been talking about getting the program to the point where he wants before he eventually retires.

My best recollection of what transpired at that time was that the coach probably had some degree of disenchantment with Jerry's coaching or if not that, if I'm overstating that, it just may have been he was not likely in a position to succeed him. It turns out Joe was not obviously
ready to retire in 1999.
So some of the people who were possibly in the line of succession were now getting to the age where there wouldn't be enough years for them to be head coach. So that discussion, as it unfolded, was really all about Jerry's future with the program. I never spoke to Jerry Sandusky about that. It was Coach Paterno who had a discussion with Jerry and the consequence of that was Jerry coming forward and saying that he would be retiring.

Q In relationship to Mr. Sandusky and the Second Mile, did that impact in any way on Penn State or involve Penn State University?

A Certainly in no official way. It's a completely separate organization with no actual connection to the university. There's no financial tie, no organizational tie. Most of the people involved in that $I$ believe are community leaders and philanthropists. I would say that indirectly it was thought to reflect well on the university because a prominent employee was so involved but there was no direct connection.

Q The meeting that you had with Mr. Curley
and Mr. Schultz, were there any writings that resulted from that meeting? Did anybody prepare a memo or an e-mail or handwritten notes as far as you're aware?

A I did not take any notes or prepare anything, nor did $I$ receive anything that anyone else had written. So I think the answer is no.

Q The feedback that you received from Mr. Curley after that meeting regarding his fulfillment of the recommendations, do you recollect if that was in writing in any way, shape or form?

A Not to my knowledge.
Q Just returning to what Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz informed you of regarding Mr. Sandusky in the shower, was it clear to you that Mr . Sandusky was in the shower naked with a child or a kid?

A That was my impression. For those of you who don't know, I think virtually all of our showers in our athletic facilities across the university are what we call gang showers. We don't have private showers. They are all big and in the open. In the locker room I use in rec hall, it's the same thing, one big open shower
with lots of shower heads. There could be one person in there or there could be ten people in there at any given time. So that's the physical configuration of a typical shower or locker room at a university.

Q Does the university either now or in the past have any regulations or limitations on who can enter the showers with the understanding that they are gender specific?

A Yes, they are gender specific. But beyond that, as I said, we're pretty open with our facilities. We have a lot of movement in and out of people in the community, students, faculty members, staff members. So we don't have a lot of rules about those things.

Q So there are no age limitations, for example?

A I don't believe that we have any such age 1imitations.

Q So there would be nothing that would prohibit a 65-year-old, a 43-year-old, a 22-year-old and a 9-year-old from all showering in the group shower together?

A Well, I wouldn't want to say there would be nothing prohibiting it. You know, we have
twenty-some thousand minor children every summer in for sports camps. We host almost the entire array of PIA Pennsylvania high school sports championships at the university. You have to understand we have a tremendous number of youth, tens of thousands per year, in and out of our athletic facilities and locker rooms.

Of course, what's most typical is if you have high school girls basketball going on, they're showering with each other. If you're having boys swimming at the Natatorium, they're showering with each other and they would have adults around, their coaches and staff.

There's going to be a certain amount of mingling and certainly a very broad presence of youth on campus. I'm not sure we have any specific rules that say who can be in a particular shower with whom at what time. But when I gave my reaction to that report, it was based more on a sense of an impression and what I would have felt comfortable with.

Q Again, sir, focusing on my question, the answer, as $I$ understand it, is that there's not any limitation. As you've said, there are a great many young people who use the facilities
and it could certainly happen without any impropriety that a swim team of 9 -year-olds would shower with their coach. That would not be prohibited, nor improper, correct?

A I don't know specifically that that happens. We have in many sports separate locker rooms where coaches can change. There are such provisions in some facilities. In others there may be not. I can't say I'm close enough to the day-to-day operations of any particular facility and its showers to give you a better answer than that.

Q Well, not to belabor this, sir, but you mentioned that you use some facility, you work out at Penn State or something, right?

A Yes.
Q I mean, you've been in the showers. You've seen people of a variety of ages in there including minors?

A Well, not in the shower facility I use because I'm in a locker room that is designated for faculty and staff.

Q Are you aware of, in the football facilities, whether there are any limitations based upon age on the use of the locker rooms or
the showers?
A I'm not aware of their rules there.
Q The football facilities, again, if you know, would contain locker rooms and showers and that would be the Lasch Building and Holuba, Holuba Hall?

A Yes. The Lasch Building is the principal -- it's where the offices of the football facility is, their weight room, their exercise equipment. Holuba Hall is a big, let's say, barn-like structure. It's an indoor football field under cover. I don't frankly know whether there are locker room or shower facilities in Holuba. I believe they use principally the Lasch Building facilities.

Q Sir, you were the president of Penn State in 1998 as well as in 2002, correct?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any information or insight you can give us as to why allegations against Mr. Sandusky in 1998 were handled differently than those which occurred in 2002?

A I'm not aware of allegations against Mr. Sandusky in 1998, nor am I, therefore, aware of how they were handled if there were such
allegations.
Q If, again, there had been allegations of a very similar nature from 1998 involving Mr. Sandusky, you wouldn't know why Mr. Schultz and Mr. Curley would not have informed you of those as they did in 2002?

A I have no information that Mr. Schultz or Mr. Curley had any knowledge in 1998. I don't know if they did or they did not. If they did, they would have brought it to my attention, I think, if they felt that there was something of merit or consequence.

I think we have a good enough working relationship and understanding that if something happened that they were concerned about, that they would have probably come and spoken to me which, as we discussed, happened once. I have no idea what, if anything, happened in 1998. I know when we met earlier you asked me the same set of questions and, you know, I don't know any more now than I did at that time.

Q Understood. We still, I hope you understand, need to get this stuff on the record. Now, not to be repetitious, but I assume your answer would be the same in regards to why in

1998 there was a police inquiry by the University Park Police into the allegations involving Mr. Sandusky in the shower with minors and then why there was not a similar investigation in 2002?

A I'm reasonably confident that if there was a police inquiry and they would have found something, that that would have come to my attention in a situation like that probably through our senior vice president for finance and administration. Because it would have been a police matter, it would not even necessarily have come to the athletic director. If something did occur then and it was brought to the attention of the police, I would make the assumption that they did not find something at that time. I certainly did not have anything brought to my attention.

Q In 2002, when the matter was reported to you by Mr. Curley and Mr. Schultz, did they indicate in any way that they had disclosed the matter to either law enforcement authorities or other public entities?

A No.
Mr. Fina: Sir, I have no further
questions. If you and Ms. Baldwin could step out
and return to that room which you were in, I'11 see if the grand jurors have any questions and I may have you back in. Thank you.

By Mr. Fina:
Q Sir, we have a few questions. They're more along the 1 ine of physical plant questions I'm not sure you will know, but let me ask you these things. You mentioned that where you use shower facilities at the university in relation to working out or whatever you're involved with, that they are primarily for faculty and staff members?

A Well, I do my exercise at rec hall, Recreation Hall. We have athletic facilities spread all over the campus. In rec hall where I exercise, there are 10 , maybe 15 different locker rooms. So people who have lockers are assigned to different locker rooms. There are also some very open general locker rooms, public. So there's a male and a female, wide open huge public locker rooms.

The one $I$ use is for faculty and staff. It's a lot of our retired faculty members, retired staff members and some current ones. No students as far as $I$ know in -- I'm in probably
one of the smallest of the locker rooms. There might be 40 lockers in there, 40 , possibly 50. In that locker room, there's one shower room with, I would say, eight to ten shower heads and one bathroom. That's probably the smallest one in that facility.

Q So retired faculty and staff still can use these facilities?

A Yes.
Q For example, Mr. Sandusky could have used that facility as well?

A Yes.
Q Is there a locker room hierarchy? Are there some locker rooms that are more sought after where people want to get their lockers in there as opposed to someplace else or anything like that?

A Probably.
Q Everybody wants a locker by yours?
A They just gave me this one 16 years ago and I've never asked about the others or systematically surveyed them. Partly it's which building you want to be in. I mean, if you're associated with the football program, you're going to be in the football building.

We have the intramural building. We have rec hal1. We have the Natatorium. We have other facilities. You know, people ask, what do you do as university president? Well, I'm sort of the complaint department and I must say I've never got any complaints about what $I$ wanted that locker room and got that one. So it's probably not a hot issue.

Q But a retired faculty member like Mr. Sandusky, he could have requested a locker in a particular location, right, not that he would have automatically gotten it, but he could have requested it?

A I suppose. But I think everyone who is in or has been in the football program -- no, I shouldn't say everyone. Most everyone probably would use the Lasch Building facilities.

Q You mentioned the public having access and I think in your earlier testimony you used the word community members. Can the public just walk in or do they have to pay a fee or join a club membership? How does that work?

A In the intramural building, which is a big large recreational facility just across the street from Beaver Stadium and next to our
largest residence hall complex, East Halls, that's completely wide open. Rec hall, which is more in the heart of campus, is pretty much wide open except for one part of it which is a fitness center where students pay an extra fee to use.

Other facilities are a little more restricted and are used by people who have a membership or they're buying time, so to speak, so they can use the swimming pool during recreation hours. There are some facilities where it's fee based and you need a card to get in and then there are others where they are completely wide open.

Q Is the Lasch Building a more restricted building or is that one that's open to the public?

A I would say the Lasch Building is more restricted in the sense that -- of course, anybody can walk in and that's true of virtually all buildings on campus. I mean, I can perhaps describe it a little more fully. I have 1700 buildings under my jurisdiction. And at the University Park Campus, we probably have 800 or 900 buildings, round number. Virtually all of them are wide open in the sense that there's no
security at the door.
We are a university. Our buildings have been built historically with money from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not so much lately, but we see them as quasi-public buildings. The environment of a college campus is intended to be as open as possible.

Now, Penn State has a few buildings, because of work we do in the national security arena where we do classified research, that are completely restricted and you can't get through the front door without a security clearance.

Then we have, as I said, some athletic facilities where the building may be open but to get into a particular exercise facility, it may be membership based. The Lasch Building would be more typical of that latter category. It is a building for the football program.

While people are in and out all the time, you might be in the reception area. You might be there for an appointment. You might be there for a tour. But you're not going to wander into a locker room unless you're escorted by someone who has something to do with the football program.

Q There is some access point that requires
a key or some permission?
A Well, not necessarily.
Q In the Lasch Building?
A I don't know the specific protocol in the Lasch Building. Most buildings on campus are open working hours. Many of our buildings are open 24 hours a day. Some are locked at certain hours and then when they are locked, you would need a key or a key card to get into the building.

Q Do you know when the Lasch Building was opened? Is that a fairly new building?

A It was built a few years after I became president. It was somewhat early in my tenure there, but $I$ frankly don't remember the date. I don't know if it was late '90s or within a couple years after 2000. We could get you that information, but it's now been open a number of years. I just don't remember exactly when. It was one of the earlier buildings that I know that I authorized after we got a lead gift for it.

Mr. Fina: Thank you, sir. We dismiss you. Thanks.

Testimony concluded at 11:12 a.m.
(Reading concluded.)

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Barker.
Anything else from the Commonwealth?
MR. BEEMER: We have one more witness.
THE COURT: We'11 take a break.
MR. BEEMER: Take a break?
THE COURT: Yes. We're going to adjourn for lunch. Come back at 1:30, please.
(Court was held in recess at 12:26 p.m.)
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| ```97:22, 105:16, 119:9 byte [1] - 112:24 bytes [4] - 107:9, 110:4, 110:7, 112:19 C calculated [1] - 74:3 Caldwell [1] - 101:24 callousness [1] - 41:10 camped [3] - 15:9, 15:23, 17:25 camps [1] - 151:2 Campus [1]-159:23 campus [6] - 151:16, 156:15, 159:3, 159:20, 160:6, 161:5 campuses [1] - 132:8 cannot [3]-104:14, 114:14, 118:13 capacity [1]-6:8 Capitol [1] - 146:15 card [3] - 142:2, 159:11, 161:9 care [2]-38:11, 38:13 career [1] - 124:9 caret [1] - 73:19 Caroline [2] - 52:14, 97:25 CAROLINE [1] - 2:8 carry [1]-61:23 case[18] - 18:3, 43:22, 53:25, 62:14, 63:25, 69:6, 69:9, 69:22, 71:11, 74:19, 74:25, 76:22, 85:3, 85:21, 110:25, 130:10, 132:1, 143:6 caseload [1] -61:23 cases [3] - 62:1, 77:1, 91:13 category [1] - 160:17 cc [6]-71:12, 71:14, 84:21, 84:24, 92:10, 93:12 cc'd [5] - 70:19, 74:19, 74:20, 84:25, 92:12 cell [2] - 64:4, 65:2 Cellebrite [1] - 65:4 center [1] - 159:5 centers [1]-125:7 certain [10]-23:16, 36:9, 37:8, 92:4, 109:16, 109:17, 130:17, 143:15,``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:14, 161:7 } \\ & \text { certainly [6]- } \\ & \text { 130:14, 144:1, } \\ & \text { 148:15, 151:15, } \\ & \text { 152:1, 155:16 } \\ & \text { certainty }[3]-24: 7, \\ & \text { 101:19, 138:16 } \\ & \text { CERTIFICATION }[1] \\ & \text { - 163:5 } \\ & \text { certify }[2]-121: 15, \\ & 163: 8 \\ & \text { chain }[3]-6: 20,7: 6, \\ & 125: 14 \\ & \text { chains }[1]-114: 6 \\ & \text { chair }[1]-136: 1 \\ & \text { championships }[1]- \\ & 151: 4 \\ & \text { chance }[1]-27: 23 \\ & \text { chancellor }[1]- \\ & 123: 1 \\ & \text { change }[10]-29: 15, \\ & 67: 15,87: 16,95: 11, \\ & 114: 19,118: 9, \\ & 118: 16,118: 20, \\ & 118: 21,152: 7 \\ & \text { changed }[12]- \\ & 27: 12,32: 24,33: 1, \\ & 86: 12,86: 22,87: 22, \\ & 99: 7,99: 10,99: 12, \\ & 114: 14,114: 18,118: 9 \\ & \text { changeover }[4]- \\ & 86: 10,86: 11,86: 16, \\ & 87: 18 \\ & \text { changes }[8]-69: 7, \\ & 114: 10,114: 11, \\ & 114: 21,115: 24, \\ & 117: 24,118: 14,119: 1 \\ & \text { characterization }[1] \\ & -134: 5 \\ & \text { characterize }[2]- \\ & 31: 11,51: 13 \\ & \text { charge }[3]-120: 5, \\ & 123: 13,123: 15 \\ & \text { charged }[3]-23: 17, \\ & 23: 21,24: 5 \\ & \text { charges }[10]-24: 3, \\ & 24: 21,25: 1,25: 3, \\ & 31: 22,38: 15,42: 17, \\ & 59: 7,62: 20,62: 22 \\ & \text { CHARLES }[1]-1: 9 \\ & \text { chart }[1]-125: 17 \\ & \text { check }[1]-70: 24 \\ & \text { chief }[7]-14: 4,15: 1, \\ & 84: 19,126: 16,131: 5, \\ & 131: 11,146: 15 \\ & \text { child }[23]-24: 13, \\ & 25: 20,26: 25,40: 2, \\ & 76: 17,94: 2,133: 22, \\ & 134: 14,138: 12, \\ & 138: 13,138: 25, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | ```-16:23, 48:24, 50:10, 68:21 community [7] - 123:11, 130:18, 135:5, 135:11, 148:20, 150:13, 158:20 Community [1] - 123:18 company [2] - 89:23, 90:17 compare [1] - 103:11 complaint [2]-59:6, 158:5 complaints [1] - 158:6 complete [2] - 30:7, 89:3 completed [1] - 65:15 completely [5] - 108:9, 148:16, 159:2, 159:13, 160:11 complex [2] - 124:23, 159:1 components [1] - 127:17 Computer [2] - 60:24, 61:16 computer [9] - 61:5, 61:21, 66:24, 66:25, 83:11, 108:22, 108:23, 108:25, 118:19 computers [4] - 64:3, 64:4, 89:3, 102:10 concern [4]-29:21, 41:12, 44:24, 94:1 concerned [4] - 21:11, 42:10, 136:3, 154:15 concerning [3] - 41:23, 55:3, 132:19 concluded [3] - 93:17, 161:24, 161:25 conclusions [1] - 145:5 conduct [3] - 102:25, 129:24, 131:13 conducted [2] - 25:17, 136:9 conference [1] - 67:6 confidence [1] - 30:7 confident [1] - 155:6 confidential [2] - 65:12, 65:18 configuration [1] - 150:4 confirm [4]-113:16,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```114:24, 115:1, 115:10 Congress [1] - 112:25 conjunction [1] - 110:19 connection [2] - 148:17, 148:24 consequence [4] - 130:9, 130:19, 148:9, 154:12 consequences [1] - 142:18 considerable [1] - 31:9 considerably [1] - 14:12 considered [7] - 21:7, 54:22, 54:23, 66:9, 66:12, 85:1, 143:19 considering [3] - 74:25, 85:11, 85:24 consistent [5] - 69:16, 73:2, 73:3, 115:4, 115:5 contact [16] - 42:23, 42:24, 57:6, 63:6, 102:18, 102:19, 102:21, 102:23, 119:14, 130:5, 130:14, 130:15, 136:1, 141:8, 144:3, 144:4 contacted [5] - 14:3, 20:9, 62:13, 66:20, 68:16 contain [5] - 68:21, 71:12, 83:21, 110:16, 153:4 contained [16] - 8:10, 53:17, 73:22, 83:13, 83:15, 83:17, 83:25, 84:5, 84:23, 90:3, 101:6, 111:8, 111:17, 113:24, 114:19, 163:9 contains [1] - 103:24 contempt [1] - 44:1 content [1] - 44:13 contents [1]-122:5 context [2]-76:24, 93:2 continuation [1] - 78:5 contribution [1] - 143:25 controller's [1] - 126:22 controls [1] - 127:7 convened [1] - 20:18``` |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:10, 79:12, 80:1, } \\ & \text { 80:14, 80:16, 92:13, } \\ & 95: 6,98: 1,100: 25, \\ & \text { 101:23, 103:16, } \\ & \text { 121:4, 125:9, 125:11, } \\ & \text { 126:10, 132:24, } \\ & \text { 133:18, 134:1, 134:9, } \\ & \text { 134:21, 136:7, } \\ & \text { 136:10, 136:11, } \\ & \text { 136:17, 137:5, } \\ & \text { 138:10, 138:20, } \\ & \text { 140:2, 140:7, 140:20, } \\ & \text { 140:23, 141:24, } \\ & \text { 142:5, 142:12, } \\ & \text { 142:16, 144:19, } \\ & \text { 145:6, 145:19, 146:1, } \\ & \text { 147:4, 148:25, 149:9, } \\ & \text { 149:14, 154:5, 154:8, } \\ & \text { 155:19 } \\ & \text { Curley's [4] - 30:18, } \\ & \text { 80:5, 98:9, 134:8 } \\ & \text { Curly }[1]-141: 15 \\ & \text { current }[7]-6: 12, \\ & 7: 14,8: 1,9: 25, \\ & \text { 122:20, 124:21, } \\ & \text { 156:24 } \\ & \text { cut }[1]-115: 18 \\ & \text { cylinders [1] - } \\ & \text { 147:10 } \\ & \text { Cynthia [15]-20:9, } \\ & 22: 20,22: 22,23: 24, \\ & 25: 6,25: 15,29: 10, \\ & 37: 10,42: 13,42: 23, \\ & 43: 12,43: 20,47: 1, \\ & 120: 7,122: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| 11:10, 16:15, 16:18, | 126:13, 127:5, 131:4, |  | Ganim [5] - 18:24 | 6:19, 11:23, 16:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:14, 27:20, 35:22, | 155 | [3] - 121:10, | 20:1, 44:16, 51 | $22: 20,22: 22,23$ |
| 2:8, 55:17, 58:12 | 6, 126:1 | rmal [2] - 46: | Ganter [1] - 101:24 | 32:21, 33:10, 34:9 |
| 8:15, 60:4, 60:8, | 148:18 | 123:20 | ban [2]-22:23 | 2:2, 52:5, 70 |
| 72:6, 75:21, 80:9, | findings [3] - 15:14 | formally [1] - 55:14 | 29: | 71:22, 71:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:11, 122:2 } \\ & \text { Farrell }[4]-3: 7,28: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 18:5, $20: 24$ fine $[1]-122: 2$ | mat ${ }_{[1]}$ - 92:10 | Y [1] - 1:9 | 9:12, 80:1, 82:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:19, 60:3 } \\ & \text { fashion }[4]-12: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { finished }[1]-38: 18 \\ & \text { first }[18]-8: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:22, 80:24 } \\ & \text { former }[10]-14: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:22, 24:16, 25:12, } \\ & 26: 7,27: 5,30: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 7,89: 2,92: 8, \\ & 97: 15,119: 21,121: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 71: 2,72: 2,85: 6 \\ & \text { FBI }{ }_{[2]}-132: 5,132: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:22, 25:2, 26:23, } \\ & 27: 1,27: 9,29: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $15: 1,15: 11,15: 24$19:14, 21:9, 30:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 18,48: 1,49: 9 \\ & 49: 13,50: 20,59: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 122:6, 122:9, 122:14 <br> GRAHAM [1] - 1:14 |
|  |  |  | 49:13, 50:20, 59:2, <br> 62:20, 66:14, 66:21, |  |
| , | 63:5, 65:10, 69:3, | formulating [1] - | $67: 25,70: 9,70: 18$ | grand [20]-19:19, |
| 16:16, 17:15, 18:20 | 77:10, 81:12, 118: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:7 } \\ & \text { forth }[4]-36: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $71: 11,71: 25,75: 8,$ <br> 76:2, 77:5, 78:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 22,22: 11,43: 9 \\ & 43: 25,44: 11,44: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 58:4, 78:20, $80: 17$, 98.7 | 146:13, 146:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 2,77: 5,78: 25, \\ & 79: 11,79: 17,79: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 25,44: 11,44: 17, \\ & 44: 23,56: 17,57: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| 98:7 <br> Federino [1] - 101:24 fee [3]-158:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fishing }[4]-20: 21 \\ & 42: 16,51: 13,59: 7 \\ & \text { fit }[1]-34: 12 \end{aligned}$ | forward [7]-68:3, | 87:8, 103:16, 105:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 4,58: 18,59: 11 \\ & 59: 14,121: 2,143: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:5, 159:11 } \\ & \text { feedback [1] - 149:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fitness [1] - 159:4 } \\ & \text { fixed [2] - 117:15, } \end{aligned}$ | forwarded [7] - 14:3, | Gary's [1] - 67:9 <br> gather [3]-37:21 | grapevine [1] - |
| felt [6] - 24:13, | vor [1] - 131:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 6,19: 1,54: 2,54: 6, \\ & 54: 8,54: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { gather [3] - } \\ 43: 1,54: 24 \end{array}$ gathered [1] - 119:24 | 131:10 great [4] - 37:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 21,130: 25, \\ & 134: 24,151: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Floor [1] - 122:8 <br> flowing [1] - 54: | four [8]-10:5, 34:17, | gathered [1] - 119:24 <br> gathering [1] - 98:13 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 52:17, 130:19, 151:25 } \\ \text { Greenwich [1] - 74:4 } \end{array}$ |
| 154:11 | cus [3] - 12 | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 23,62: 9,73: 25, \\ & 74: 4,104: 23,104: 25 \end{aligned}$ | gathering [1]-98:13 $\text { GBS }_{[2]}-71: 22,85: 7$ | grounds [1] - 35:17 |
| male [1] - 156:20 | 124:2, 129: | $\begin{gathered} \text { 74:4, 104:23, 104:25 } \\ \text { fourth }[1]-20: 17 \end{gathered}$ | GBS) [1] - 71:14 <br> gcs2@psu.edu [1] - | group [4]-64:13, |
| Feudale [1] - $58: 4$ <br> few [11] - 12:24, | focusing [1] - 151:22 <br> folders [1]-79:1 | frame [14]-6:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gcs2@psu.edu }[1] \text { - } \\ & 71: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:21, 144:17, } \\ & \text { 150:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 25:5, 36:25, 53:15, | [2]-25:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:19, 69:15, 99:1, } \\ & 99: 6,110: 15,113: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 71:9 gender [2]-150:9, | groups [1] - 81:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 97: 13,105: 20,125: 7, \\ & 136: 15,156: 5,160: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 25:13 | 113:23, 114:2, 114:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:10 } \\ & \text { general }[5]-20: 9, \end{aligned}$ | gSpanier@psu.edu [1] - 10:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:13 } \\ & \text { field [2] - 17:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 55:21, 141:19, 142:23 <br> follow-up [3]-55:21, | 114:22, 118:6, 118:8, 133:9 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { general [5]-20:9, } \\ \text { 23:10, 43:2, 120:6, } \end{array}$ | GSpanier@psu. <br> edu [3]-71:23, 83:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:12 } \\ & \text { figure }{ }_{[1]}-144: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 141:19, 142:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { frankly }[2]-153: 12 \text {, } \\ & \text { 161:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { General }[3]-60: 24, \\ & 61: 16,107: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 85:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { file }[13]-64: 6,66: 14, \\ & 66: 21,66: 23,67: 9 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $88: 10,120: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:15 } \\ & \text { Freeh }[1]-107: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 61:16, 107:13 <br> GENERAL [1] - 2:6 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 25:2, 35:19, 45:13 } \\ \text { guests [1] - 81:22 } \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:10, 69:12, 69:13, } \\ & \text { 106:18, 106:19, } \end{aligned}$ | ```food [1] - 126:20 football [16] - 53:21, 133:21, 143:14,``` | friendly [1] - 36:10 friendship [1] - 36:9 front $[9]$ - 19:18, | General's [1] - 62:7 generally $[7]-7: 23$, | guests [1]-81:22 |
| $112: 13,113: 5$ |  | $38: 5,92: 5,93: 7,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85:19, 109:3, 131:2 } \\ & \text { generated }[1]-72: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| filed [4]-24:22, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:14, 103:12, } \\ & \text { 104:8, 121:8, 160:12 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 25: 3,59: 8,62: 20 \\ \text { files }[10]-64: 6, \end{gathered}$ | 143:17, 144:5, 144:9, <br> $147 \cdot 5,152 \cdot 23,153 \cdot 3$, | 104:8, 121:8, 160:12 $\text { fulfillment }{ }_{11]}$ | gentleman [1] - | habit [1] - 145:21 <br> half $[2]-13: 10,62: 8$ |
| 65:25, 66:7, 66:8, | 153:9, 153:12 |  | 108:4 | hall [6] - 149:25, |
| 66:22, 66:24, 67:3, | $157: 24,157: 2$ | full [4] - 26:6, 38: | 133:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:13, 156:15, } \\ & \text { 158:2, 159:1, } 159: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 12,95: 13,102: 10 \\ & \text { fina }[1]-129: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:15, 160:18, } \\ & 160: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $61: 23,129: 15$ | GEORGE [1]-2:11 <br> George [1]-105:19 | Hall [5] - 7:2, 13:1, |
| Fina [10]-106:9, | FOR [3] - 3:3, 4:3 | 163:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { George }[1]-105: \\ & \text { gift }[1]-161: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Halls [1] - 159:1 hand [1] - 32:14 handed [1] - 29:13 |
| 122:11, 128:9, 128:11, 128:20, | 4:20 | FURTHER [1] - 119:8 | girls [1]-151:9 <br> given [9]-21:14, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 128: 11,128: 20, \\ & 129: 4,129: 9,155: 24, \end{aligned}$ | force [3]-127:12 127:15, 128:16 | $[1] \text { - }$ | given [9]-21:14 |  |
| 156:4, 161:22 | nsic [7] - 64: | FWD [1] - 77:3 | $65: 8,75: 2,114: 3,$$121: 18,150: 3$ | handheld [1] - 64:4 |
| final [5]-28:24 | $64$ | $\mathrm{FYI}_{[1]}-17: 6$ |  | 81:19, 82:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:22 } \\ & \text { finally }[1]-94: 10 \end{aligned}$ | Forensic [1]-61:16 | G | GPS-5 [2]-46:24, | $\begin{gathered} \text { handled [4]-24:7, } \\ 30: 8,153: 21,153: 25 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { finance }[11]-15: 7, \\ & 49: 4,49: 9,49: 11, \\ & 50: 3,125: 5,125: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 63:1, 68:25 <br> Forensics [1] - 60:25 <br> forensics [2]-61:5, | gained [1] - 103:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { graciously [1] - } \\ & \text { 121:22 } \\ & \text { Graham [34]-6:9, } \end{aligned}$ | hands [1]-124:7 <br> hands-on [1] - 124:7 |




| ```10:22 local [2] - 67:3, 135:8 locate [1]-66:13 located [5] - 68:10, 73:17, 84:10, 86:7, 87:21 Location [1]-122:7 location [5] - 67:2, 74:24, 79:4, 87:5, 158:11 locations [2] - 125:1, 128:24 locked [2] - 161:7, 161:8 locker [27]-133:21, 135:20, 136:5, 139:6, 142:8, 145:15, 145:22, 149:24, 150:4, 151:7, 152:6, 152:21, 152:25, 153:4, 153:13, 156:16, 156:18, 156:19, 156:21, 157:1, 157:3, 157:13, 157:14, 157:19, 158:7, 158:10, 160:23 lockers [3]-156:17, 157:2, 157:15 logs [1] - 130:20 long-time [1] - 143:21 look [13]-14:9, 27:23, 69:6, 69:11, 69:19, 71:16, 72:23, 93:5, 95:20, 103:13, 103:21, 111:18, 112:15 looked [6] - 13:7, 26:22, 71:19, 73:6, 95:22, 111:7 looking [6] - 65:7, 92:11, 103:18, 103:19, 112:13, 118:23 looks [1] - 82:6 loop [1] - 42:10 loose [2]-31:12, 47:17 lose [1] - 116:24 loyalty [1]-40:11 lunch [1]-162:7 lying [1] - 24:5``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mafia [1] - 20:12 } \\ & \text { MAGISTERIAL [1] - } \\ & \text { 1:21 } \\ & \text { Mahon [17] - 7:2, } \\ & \text { 9:19, 13:1, 17:14, } \\ & \text { 22:21, 25:15, 26:21, } \\ & \text { 26:23, 29:19, 30:16, } \\ & 31: 1,37: 9,46: 16, \\ & \text { 47:1, 51:21, 53:5, } \\ & \text { 53:6 } \\ & \text { mail [181]- } 9: 3,9: 17, \\ & 9: 21,10: 1,10: 4, \\ & 10: 14,10: 18,10: 25, \\ & 11: 5,11: 14,11: 16, \\ & 11: 19,11: 24,16: 8, \\ & 16: 13,16: 20,16: 21, \\ & 17: 3,28: 5,28: 14, \\ & 28: 18,28: 22,32: 20, \\ & 33: 10,45: 16,46: 25, \\ & 47: 3,49: 2,52: 19, \\ & 53: 25,54: 6,55: 2, \\ & \text { 57:17, 64:5, } 67: 10, \\ & 67: 21,67: 22,68: 6, \\ & 69: 13,69: 20,69: 23, \\ & 69: 24,70: 1,70: 9, \\ & 70: 11,70: 18,70: 21, \\ & 70: 22,71: 5,71: 7, \\ & 71: 9,71: 10,71: 12, \\ & 71: 17,71: 18,71: 24, \\ & 72: 2,72: 14,72: 19, \\ & 72: 22,72: 24,73: 7, \\ & 73: 12,73: 16,73: 17, \\ & 74: 11,74: 20,74: 21, \\ & 74: 25,75: 3,75: 6, \\ & 75: 7,75: 14,76: 3, \\ & 76: 4,76: 5,76: 9, \\ & 76: 22,76: 25,77: 10, \\ & 77: 17,77: 19,78: 5, \\ & 79: 8,79: 11,80: 2, \\ & 80: 5,80: 24,81: 24, \\ & 82: 1,83: 12,83: 14, \\ & 83: 18,83: 19,83: 21, \\ & 84: 1,84: 10,84: 16, \\ & 84: 21,84: 23,85: 2, \\ & 85: 5,85: 7,85: 8, \\ & 85: 10,85: 11,85: 12, \\ & 85: 14,85: 15,85: 21, \\ & 85: 25,86: 5,86: 15, \\ & 86: 24,87: 8,87: 10, \\ & 87: 15,87: 21,87: 22, \\ & 87: 23,89: 11,89: 14, \\ & 89: 15,90: 3,91: 22, \\ & 92: 12,92: 17,92: 19, \\ & 93: 4,93: 11,94: 11, \\ & 95: 1,95: 4,95: 10, \\ & 95: 13,95: 16,95: 22, \\ & 95: 23,96: 4,96: 23, \\ & 96: 24,98: 7,98: 8, \\ & 98: 9,98: 22,99: 7, \\ & 99: 9,99: 12,100: 1, \\ & 100: 22,101: 4,101: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  | ```maintain [1]-68:2 maintained [6] - 64:16, 96:20, 96:23, 98:23, 99:13, 99:14 maintaining [1] - 64:17 major [1]- 22:6 majority [2] - 73:5, 110:12 male [3] - 139:5, 139:6, 156:20 man[1]-41:24 manage [1]-6:14 management [1] - 7:13 manager [1] - 7:21 managing [1] - 61:14 Manderbach [1] - 121:14 manually [1] - 112:15 March [8] - 18:24, 19:21, 51:3, 66:17, 67:8,106:21, 106:23, 107:1 MARK [1] - 1:4 marked [11]-5:14, 9:12, 16:6, 27:6, 32:15, 33:8, 46:24, 70:14, 79:5, 103:10, 120:25 marketing[1]-8:8 marriage [3] - 124:2, 124:3, 124:10 marriages [1] - 124:11 master's [1] - 123:22 MATANGOS [3] - 2:11, 105:16, 119:4 Matangos [2] - 3:12, 105:19 material [8] -65:12, 107:15, 108:24, 110:9, 111:9, 112:11, 114:2, 116:5 materials [2] - 56:17, 57:4 matter [17] - 21:8, 21:17, 22:16, 53:20, 55:4, 66:12, 93:18, 94:3, 131:11, 131:13, 132:22, 136:1, 136:15, 140:15, 155:12, 155:18, 155:21 matters [2]-10:11, 67:12 McQueary [3] - 101:10, 101:12, 101:23``` | ```mean [17]-8:1, 8:4, 26:3, 74:1, 76:20, 86:11, 87:16, 90:24, 108:15, 108:16, 113:17, 115:16, 137:20, 142:1, 152:17, 157:23, 159:20 Mean [1] - 74:4 means [3] - 54:4, 75:2, 82:12 meant [1] - 20:14 mechanical [1] - 142:1 media [6] - 6:15, 17:21, 21:1, 45:25, 50:17, 56:11 medical [1] - 125:6 medicine [1] - 123:11 medium [1] - 128:6 medium-sized [1] - 128:6 meet [6] - 53:8, 53:11, 55:3, 78:13, 147:5, 147:6 meeting[33] - 22:12, 22:20, 22:22, 23:5, 23:6, 23:15, 23:19, 23:21, 24:17, 25:8, 25:10, 25:16, 26:5, 26:18, 29:5, 29:7, 29:9, 43:21, 55:8, 62:15, 63:12, 81:3, 81:9, 106:7, 136:16, 136:22, 136:23, 137:11, 141:19, 145:25, 148:25, 149:2, 149:9 meetings [3]-21:24, 24:20, 41:17 member [8] - 54:8, 130:12, 133:18, 137:23, 138:22, 143:16, 143:21, 158:9 members [12] - 31:15, 63:8, 125:18, 125:21, 135:5, 144:4, 150:14, 156:12, 156:23, 156:24, 158:20 membership [3] - 158:22, 159:8, 160:16 memo [1] - 149:3 men [1]-141:7 mention [1] - 138:5 mentioned [11]- 15:8, 109:6, 130:16, 132:21, 136:12, 137:16, 137:25,``` |
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| 144:20 <br> money [1] - 160:3 <br> moniker [5]-71:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MS [59] - 11:9, 11:11, } \\ & \text { 18:15, 18:16, 23:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 154:23, 159:11, 161:9 needed [3]-34:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:24 } \\ & \text { nothing [15] - 20:19, } \\ & \text { 20:22, 20:23, 48:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 136: 6,144: 25,155: 14 \\ \text { occurred }[18]-5: 2, \\ \text { 12:6, 21:20, 24:25, } \end{gathered}$ |
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