## VOLUME 1

### STATE OF ALASKA

### IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AT ANCHORAGE

In the Matter of:

STATE OF ALASKA

١

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Case No. 3ANS89-7217

versus

Case No. 3ANS89-7218

JOSEPH J. HAZELWOOD

9

Anchorage, Alaska

November 27, 1989

The above-entitled matter came on for omnibus hearing before the Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, commencing at 8:35 a.m. on November 27, 1989. This transcript was prepared from tapes recorded by the Court.

#### **APPEARANCES:**

On behalf of the State:

LEONARD M. LINTON, JR., Esq.

On behalf of the Defendant:

RICHARD H. FRIEDMAN, Esq.

DICK L. MADSON, Esq.

22

23

24

25

PRO-TYPISTS, INC.

Professional Transcription Serice Resources (202) 347-5395Library & Information Services Anchorage Alaska

# C O N I E N I S

WITNESSES
-----------

STATE	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
Daniel Joseph Lawn	46	62	-	-
Michael J. Fox	68	91	-	-
Mark J. Delozier	118	149	166	175
	_	_	177	-

\_ \_ \_

# EXHIBITS

- 1		- V II T D T I D
2	STATE'S	<u>IDENTIFICATION</u> IN EVIDENCE
3	1	90 126
4	2	90 -
5	3	90 132
6	4	90 131
7	5	90 133
8	6	90 134
9	7	90 131
10	8	90 136
11	9	90 -
12	10	130 140
13	11	139 141
14	12	139 141
15	13	139 142
16	14	137 138
17		
18	<u>DEFENDANT'S</u>	
19	A	90 -
20		<b></b> -
21		
22		
22		

# PROCEEDINGS

(Tape No. C-3499)

THE CLERK: Good morning. My name is Scott

Purden. Today's date is November 27th, 1989. Judge Karl

S. Johnstone's Court is now in session.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You may be seated, thank you.

This time has been set for proceedings in State of Alaska versus Joseph J. Hazelwood, Cases 89-7217 and 7218, in Anchorage. Everybody is present.

Before we go into the substantive portion of this, I want to take care of some administrative matters. I don't know if we need to go on the record for this. I want to go through some media coverage guidelines and try to accommodate all of the parties involved. We can stay on the record or we can go off the record, as Counsel may preference.

MR. : (Inaudible.)

MR. LINTON: My preference is to stay on the record.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, we'll stay on the record. I've had numerous media requests and as a result of what I anticipate to be media interest, I've sequestered the media courtroom, Courtroom C, and for the duration of these hearings, we'll meet in Courtroom C.

Your media requests that you make today will

fulfill requirements for any media attendance throughout the duration of this hearing and trial, as well, so you don't need to do it twice. It will cover for the duration.

I understand all media requests, when signed, will have to be taken downstairs and you'll have to get a badge of some sort. That's an administrative policy which I do not set, but I concur in. So I will sign these media requests and if you have not filed a media request, during the first break we take, I'll have additional forms here you can fill out and take them downstairs for your badge.

We're in the media courtroom, but I went through the back room last week and I think it's wholly inadequate to give adequate coverage to any case. It was implemented back in the dinosaur days when we tried to avoid pictures of defendants and other persons involved. So I'm going to permit — and it cannot be altered without some drastic changes — so I'm going to permit some cameras in the jury box which can be pooled, to some extent, and the audio hookup can be made with the Gyre machine.

If you wish to go in the back room, you can hook your equipment up in the back room with the assistance of our technician. You'll see what cameras are available there and you can pool what resources you need back there, as well.

I intend in allowing only two video cameras in the

jury box and as far as still cameras, a couple of still cameras. I think you can pool that. Two ought to be sufficient in the jury box. If you think that's insufficient, you'll have a fairly high burden of showing me why. You can pool your video coverage from the jury box. I'm going to permit two cameras there. I don't know where your still cameras want to be, but if you want to put a couple of technicians in the jury box with still cameras, that would be adequate, as well. But I can't have a bunch of equipment in that jury box going off, whirring, clicking and clacking a lot. It will be somewhat distracting. But four I can tolerate.

I'm going to bar the first row there. We're going to put some tape on the first row of spectators, so nobody will be able to sit there. And the purpose is so you cannot overhear conferences between counsel and their parties. I don't want any recording of conferences between counsel, witnesses sitting at counsel table, representatives of the party or the party, himself. That's to effectively deter that.

If we run out of room in the Court, then we'll move counsel tables up a little bit and we'll fill up the first row, but it looks like we have some room now.

Now a few people came into my office this morning and filed media requests and I said that I would entertain

any suggestions or any specific complaints you have with the system we have here now. If you have a problem with what I've just said, two still cameras and two video cameras, and you think you can convince me why there should be some changes, you can raise your hand and tell me now, but you have a high burden to overcome. Is there any problem with what I've just set forth? Yes, sir, your name, please?

MR. WALSH: My name is Pat Walsh; I'm with
Channel 11. There are three television stations in town.
In fairness to all three of us, is there any way that all three of us could be in that box?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: That's not sufficient. We've always had three television stations in town and generally only allow one camera, Mr. Walsh, so that's not a good enough reason. Is there any other problem with what we've set forth here?

MR. JOHNSON: Your Honor, I'm just curious on what

-- I'm with \_\_\_\_\_ and my name is Walt Johnson. And

I'm foreseeing some media in the future, basically, if

there's more than two still cameras, what's going to

determine who gets in the jury box?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Well, you're going to need one person for each camera and you'll have to work that out.

Our media coverage guideline says you folks work that out.

If you can't work it out, they say you're to be excluded. So I don't want to take any drastic steps like that. I'm sure you all can work that kind of thing out with the cameras.

Now when we break, we don't have a security problem here, but we have some security personnel here just to make it look impressive, I suppose, but there's not a security problem. When we break, I don't want to have a bunch of interviews going on in Court. These folks have got more important things to do than interview in the courtroom. If you want to get some statements from the players, you can wait until they get out of the courtroom. I'm not going to permit any interviewing in the courtroom during the course of the hearings. And we'll take 15-, 20-minute breaks. I always say ten minutes, but it lasts a lot longer, so you'll have plenty of time to hook and unhook, so when we come back in, everybody will be in place.

MS. : (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Yes, I have some here. As soon as we take a break here, Mr. Purden will distribute those who haven't received one and take them down to me and I'll sign them as quickly as I can so you can go downstairs. And we'll wait until you all get geared up here. We'll give you an appropriate length of time, but then we're

going to start and we won't be moving cameras in and out during the course of the proceedings.

MS. : (Inaudible.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You can hook it up back there for radio. You don't need to come up here. We have many plug-ins back there. Do we have a technician here for the -- is our tech. here?

MR. : In back, two of them.

what to hook up back there for -- you might look back there before you think that it's not adequate because there may be some portions of it that are adequate and you can hook up your camera equipment, your movie camera equipment, video camera and your sound tracks back there and you may find it just as easy back there. You can talk back there, to some extent. It's soundproof, to some extent. And you might be able to communicate among yourselves back there. So take a look at it and I'll leave it up to you what you want to do.

MS. : Sir, you said no interviewing in the courtroom. What about in the hallways?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Sure, in the hallway is fine, but not in this room here. What I plan to do is to take a break and let everybody get their requests in. And as I said, these requests are going to be good through the

\_

taken.)

duration of this proceeding involving this case, so you don't have to continue. And these rules in Courtroom C will apply throughout the proceedings, these hearings and any subsequent hearings that may become necessary.

Okay, we'll take a brief recess and we'll come back in when everybody gets set up. I'll leave that to Mr. Purden to get that arranged. Will you have anybody else at counsel table with you, Mr. Linton?

MR. LINTON: No, Your Honor, I don't expect to.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, we'll stand recessed.

THE CLERK: Please rise. Court stands at recess. (Whereupon, at 8:43 a.m., a brief recess is

THE CLERK: Please be seated, thank you.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: We're ready to resume. For Counsel's information, I have all day available, so I would plan on taking a normal lunch hour and coming back after a reasonable lunch hour and going until 4:30. Tomorrow, we'd only be able to go until about 1:30 and I think I have to cut things on the calendar Wednesday, too, but we'll see how it works out.

All right, I'll just address one of you, and since you're looking at me, Mr. Friedman, you'll be the person.

How would you like to proceed? Do you have several motions? I understand you like to take care of the

immunity issues first and how would you like to proceed on that? And then, Mr. Linton, you can give me your input on it.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, as I suggested in the brief, I think it would be helpful to both parties -- I don't know how the Court feels about this, but it would be helpful to both parties to present the legal arguments to the Court relating to independent source and inevitable discovery. If you're in a position to rule on that after the oral arguments, we may not need to take any testimony. Or on the other hand, if you're not in a position to rule, I think that it would be helpful to you in terms of crystallizing what you're interested in hearing in terms of testimony.

If you don't want to hear oral argument, as such, I would ask for maybe five minutes to give what would amount to a small opening statement, what we expect the facts to show and how they tie into the law.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: -- concur in legal arguments first or would you rather proceed with opening statements and get all the evidence under your belt and then do legal arguments at the conclusion?

MR. LINTON: It doesn't matter, Your Honor, and I state that because the question isn't purely a legal one, I don't believe. If Your Honor were to conclude, as a matter

of law, that the report of a grounding is independent of the report of a spill, but there's an independent duty, that still doesn't show that there would have been a similar response to that report, as opposed to the other — to the report of the oil spill. That is would, in fact, assuming it's an independent source, would the same response have occurred? That's a factual question, as opposed to a legal one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's some authority in the Ninth Circuit in the Croson case that you can decide those matters on affidavits and I have affidavits that I would be willing to submit to fill out that portion of the requirement of law that there be some factual basis to conclude that there would have, in fact, have been a response. But the defense might want to cross examine those witnesses and it seems to me we're going to be in a state where we're going to have -- we'll need to take testimony anyway. And since I would ask that we have a factual basis, as well as the legal one, on that score, on whether it's an independent source or not and the defense is going to want to cross examine and I think we're kind of at loggerheads. And I think the smarter way to go is to go ahead with the immunity question, both prongs of it, independent source and inevitable discovery, with witnesses and then argue the whole thing at the end.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Friedman, am I interpreting

in your remarks that there is no longer an issue on whether or not the scheme of immunity that would be afforded

Captain Hazelwood would be transactional versus use derivative use?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I guess my thought, Your Honor, is that the use derivative use is a cleaner legal area. The transactional immunity argument we made under the state constitution I'm not into that. I think it's well briefed. I think you're going to make your decision. I'm not sure you need a whole lot of argument on it. I guess I sort of assumed that if you were going to decide in our favor on transactional immunity, you probably have a pretty clear idea of that. And if you're going to decide against us, we need to then address use derivative use.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Do you wish argument on that issue or are you willing to present it on the briefs?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm willing to rely on the briefs, Your Honor.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Linton, are you willing to --

MR. LINTON: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, so I'm inclined to go along with Mr. Linton's request here to present evidence, do a brief opening statement if you need to. I know what the issues are here and if you need a brief opening

statement to outline how you're going to present it, that would be somewhat helpful, but as far as telling me what you're going to offer, I think I know what you're going to offer on both sides. It seems to me that the burden here is on the state, using a use derivative use immunity scheme.

I've pretty much made up my mind that the

Defendant is not entitled to a broad transactional immunity
under our legislation. I think under Kastiger and under
our statute and subsequent case that it's a use derivative
use. That's the way I'm feeling now. I don't think
there's much you can say to change my mind, but if during
the course of the proceedings something comes up, I'll
certainly entertain it, but that's the way I'm proceeding
at this time.

So why don't we go ahead? I think that the facts and the law are so interconnected here that for me to have a full understanding of the parties' positions, I'm going to need to hear evidence before I can make a final determination on the law to be applied. So why don't we proceed on that basis, Mr. Friedman, if you want to? Mr. Linton, you're going to present the evidence first. If you want to give me some summary on how you intend on proceeding, you may do so, or you can call your first witness.

MR. LINTON: I'd like to give a brief summary,
Judge. Judge, if we start with the proposition that both
federal and state law give the master of a vessel use
immunity for the report of an oil spill, there are two
doctrines of law under which the state may avoid that
immunity. One is what's referred to as an independent
source theory; the other is an inevitable discovery theory.

Briefly stated, an independent source theory is where there is some report which is received by the government which would cause the investigation to go forward in the form in which it did. In the common case, that's somebody else sees it and reports it, either before or simultaneous with, sometimes even after, but not substantially after the spiller makes his report.

The other is the doctrine of inevitable discovery. That is our position is that, at some point, the consequences of the spill become so great that persons would have become aware of it, even if there had been no report, in fact, even if the master of a vessel had exercised his Fifth Amendment rights, which he shouldn't really have, and simply remained silent. That is if a vessel had gone aground and Captain Hazelwood, in this case, had not made any report at all, would the spill have been found and when.

I'd like to give you a brief overview of the

testimony I expect to cover those two theories and then witnesses who will testify that the state was aware of this problem and took steps to segregate lawyers who might be exposed to materials which were immunized, properly immunized, from those which are not. I've got basically three groups of witnesses that I'll be calling.

The first are a group of witnesses who made decisions about whether to go out to the Exxon Valdez. They are Commander Steve McCall, who is head of the Coast Guard unit; number two, Lieutenant Commander Thomas Falkenstein, who was second in command of the Coast Guard unit in Valdez; and Warrant Officer Mark Delozier, who is an investigator who went along with Commander Falkenstein to the Exxon Valdez that morning.

I have two other witnesses. One would be Dan

Lawn, an employee in the Alaska Department of Environmental

Conservation and, finally, Michael Fox, an officer of the

Fish and Wildlife Protection Division of the Alaska State

Troopers.

In terms of the gist of the testimony that I expect to elicit from these people is this. Given their knowledge of Prince William Sound and of the kind of vessel involved here, had they learned simply that the vessel was fetched up hard aground on some rocks in Prince William Sound, they would have gone to that location and done an

investigation, even if there had been no report of an oil spill.

Now, Judge, I have Dan Lawn and Michael Fox here this morning and I'm prepared to go with them here this morning. Commander Falkenstein and Mark Delozier are coming in this afternoon. Commander Falkenstein couldn't get away this week and wouldn't be available until next Monday and the same is true with Commander McCall and I may even have to request the Court that he permitted to testify telephonically at some point here this week. But those are the five witnesses I expect to call on the question of an independent source.

Then, Judge, I've got a group of witnesses who will address themselves to the inevitable discovery theory and they are in three separate groups. First, to some extent, Commander Falkenstein will cover that, but, more importantly, the captain of the Chevron California will cover that.

Judge, referring to a chart of Chart Number 16700 of Prince William Sound, the Exxon Valdez was on the rocks at roughly, give or take ten minutes, at this location (inaudible). The vessel was outbound from Valdez Harbor. There is a vessel traffic separation which is actually portrayed on this 16700 chart. It's this blue area here. There is a northbound inbound lane, the traffic area

starting at Hinchinbrook entrance to Prince William Sound. There is an inbound northbound lane on the east side of the zone laid out on the map. There is a southbound chart -- there's a southbound lane on the west side, portrayed here and, in between, a separation zone, which is denominated as such on the chart.

Now the Chevron California was here at
Hinchinbrook entrance at about 12:00 o'clock, maybe quarter
after 12:00. It was inbound and was going to be going
directly into Valdez Harbor. There are times when ships
back up at the entrance, trying to get into the dock, to
the terminal, and they'll actually wait in an anchorage
area located off Loan's Head here and they'll sit and wait
their turn to come in to load up before they head south.

On this occasion, on the night of March 23d, 24th, there were no other vessels waiting to get into the dock, into the terminal, so that the Chevron California could come straight in to its position here.

As the Exxon Valdez had been outbound, reports had been heard that there was ice in the traffic lanes. The Columbia Glacier sits right here and ice breaks off of the Columbia Glacier, comes out Columbia Bay and then slides, moves into the traffic lanes from time to time. And on this particular evening, a vessel that had gone ahead of the Exxon Valdez had encountered ice and had reported that

to the Coast Guard station in downtown Valdez and they, in turn, had reported it to the Exxon Valdez as they were leaving, so that as the master and pilot on board came out of the Port of Valdez, they had been told that there was ice in lanes which they should be alerted for.

about ice in those lanes because it was going to have to be making a transfer shortly thereafter. And if there were radio communications between the Coast Guard station in Valdez and the Chevron California as it was coming in, saying, "We've had reports of ice in the traffic lanes, so you might want to talk to the Exxon Valdez when the two of you start coming closer together," that is after the Exxon Valdez had gotten out of, through the ice and probably passed by \_\_\_\_\_\_ and points further south, "... and you would be inbound, then you can talk to him and get up-to-date reports of ice conditions." The Chevron California was -- anxious is too strong a word, but interested in talking to the Exxon Valdez to find out what the ice conditions were.

Now the channel that's used by vessels to communicate with -- (unintelligible) with the Valdez Coast Guard station is the same channel that ships use to talk to Prince William Sound or from bridge to bridge, so that the communications from the Coast Guard station to the Valdez

may be overheard, assuming that there's no interference with the transmission, may be overheard by other vessels in the system and vice versa. That is if they're talking to the Coast Guard, other vessels can also hear that conversation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The testimony, then, will proceed under the theory that the state is advancing, that the Exxon Valdez, to give the captain the benefit, absolute benefit of his Fifth Amendment right -- let's assume he never reported being aground or spilling oil. He then would have been sitting at this location, having said absolutely nothing to anyone about the situation. Had that been the case, given the normal speed with which it travels (inaudible), the Chevron California would have been at a position at Bligh Reef at roughly 3:00 to 3:30 in the morning. It has radar on it, two sets of radar, actually, which carry 12- and 24-mile ranges of radar (inaudible). The scale on this chart, this is the ten nautical miles. So at the point it reached its position in the inbound lanes off of Bligh Reef, it would have been within two or three miles, five at the outside -that's ten -- two, three, four miles from the Exxon Valdez, would have seen it on its radar, could distinguish this little bell which would have shown up on its radar from a ship a thousand feet long, 900 feet long, and would have been in a position to say to the Coast Guard, "Hey, I've

1 been looking for the Exxon Valdez. I didn't pass it. would have seen it on my radar if I passed it and I didn't 2 3 see it. And I've gotten up here and now I find there's something on Bligh Reef on my radar that's big enough to be a ship." Likely, they could see the lights on the ship. And the Coast Guard station -- as of 3:30, I'm telling you that the Exxon Valdez is aground on Bligh Reef. So that as of roughly 3:30 in the morning, the location of the vessel and the fact of it being aground would have inevitably been discovered.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Actually, Judge, there's the other route by which you get to that, a fellow I expect to have testify next Monday, a fellow named Bruce Blandford who works in the Coast Guard station. One of the means of operating this system is to have reports made to the Coast Guard, that is before you come to the Hinchinbrook entrance, you're supposed to report when you're going to arrive so they'll know how much traffic is coming in. You report when you arrive here so they'll know where people are.

And then there's another reporting station off of Naked Island, this position up here, Naked Island. That's an intermediate point where the Coast Guard can make sure they know where you are and you report to them where you are and whether you're transit outbound or you're transit inbound. And there's actually a regulation which requires a report at that position when you are traveling in this traffic separation coming and going from Valdez.

Before he went aground, Captain Hazelwood called the Coast Guard station and estimated that it would abeam Naked Island at 1:00 a.m., 0100. He did say that as he was making his diversion out of the traffic lanes to go around ice that he might have to update that report, he might have to amend it because of the additional time needed to travel outside the lanes and do whatever he could to avoid the ice. But by 1:00 o'clock, the Coast Guard station was expecting some kind of report from the Exxon Valdez. It might have had some \_\_\_\_\_\_ factor for the fact that he had to take a little longer going around ice, but roughly at that time, it would expect some kind of report.

Had the Exxon Valdez been aground here, they would have tried to contact him, "Where are you, Exxon Valdez," "How far have you gotten," "Have you gotten to Naked Island, yet," "Did it take longer or not take longer than you estimated," "Where are you now because we've got the Chevron California coming in?" Had they started looking at that time, the Coast Guard would have been able to actually see the vessel on its radar. That is as it was, when the vessel went aground and reported it, the Coast Guard station was able to make out the position of the vessel on the reef. They had not been tracking it as it went out,

but at the time it was called to their attention, they could see the position of the vessel on the reef. So that as of roughly 1:00 o'clock time, had the Coast Guard started looking, they might have been able to see it on the reef. (Unintelligible sentence.) Those are two witnesses that will be called.

Judge, there are then four other witnesses. Three of them are residents of a town called Alamar, which is right here, on the mainland. It's not really a town; it's just a collection of houses. And a man named Dave Lindennow lives there and he lives there in a position where he has a view between the islands of Bligh Island here and this is Busby Island over the north, where he can see between those islands and see out to the position of Bligh Reef.

He got up at roughly 6:00 or 7:00 that morning, looked out his window and saw the Exxon Valdez aground on the reef. He turned on his radio and then began hearing all this press coverage of radio and television which had already started up at that hour that he saw it. But he then, himself, went out to the vessel, went around it to the south and saw that it was leaking oil. In fact, the boat slowed down as it came into the oil, it was so thick. So as of roughly 7:00 to 8:00, he has not only perceived it, but he is out there at the vessel, itself, seeing the

oil on the ground. He's been in maritime businesses for about 20 years and is prepared to say that, "Had I not turned on the radio or when I turned on the radio, had I not heard that there was — that everybody knew about this thing already, then I would have told somebody this vessel was in distress. But as it was, it seemed apparent that everybody knew that already, so I (unintelligible)."

There are two other people from the Heston family,

James and Lucinda Heston. They live in Alamar, too, and

they could see the vessel on the rocks. And, actually,

James Heston went out and (unintelligible) the same

time every morning, go out to the Valdez, go out to look at

it.

There was another person, a resident of the village of Tinkipling, just a little further south of Alamar, who heard reports on the radio and hoping he could find work, went out to the vessel and saw the vessel at 8:00 o'clock in the morning.

A little later in the day, there was a fellow named Gary Graham who was a pilot who worked for \_\_\_\_\_\_ flew a route which went from Cordova to the village of Tinkipling. He was on a flight at approximately 9:00, 9:30 that morning and his route was taking him to Tinkipling, from which position he would have been (unintelligible phrase) islands, 1,600 feet high, so at that altitude

\*

that he was flying, he would have been able to see everything, the Exxon Valdez. Had he done -- when he did that -- in fact, he had heard about it on the radio earlier and had flown out in a private plane just to look the situation over and gone back and gotten the mail flight. But he would have seen it, had he not been on the mail flight.

Judge, with those witnesses, we ask the Court to find that, to roughly sum up, the Exxon Valdez would have been found aground -- Chevron California probably places it closer to 3:30, really. But even most conservatively, at the time these other people are seeing it, it would have been discovered, particularly Dave Lindennow. That means that if you add to that the travel time for someone to get the report and get on the boat in Valdez to go out there and see it themselves, the investigation would have begun. I would place that at roughly 8:30 in the morning.

Judge, as you listen to the testimony, we ask that you focus on some of these times because it makes a difference. The two theories that the state has do not lead to the same result. That is if indeed the report of the ground \_\_\_\_\_\_ that's part of the same conversation, but nonetheless an independent duty on the part of the captain, if that is an independent source, then actually all of the evidence gathered would be admissible against

Captain Hazelwood. However, if only the independent -excuse me, only the inevitable discovery theory applies,
then one must find the time when that would have occurred
because that time, then, serves to define what observations
which (unintelligible) for it would not be admissible
evidence and which observations thereafter would be
admissible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

For example, this is approximately 12:04, grounding; 12:28, the report. The Coast Guard arrives at approximately 3:30. Dan Lawn, Department of Conservation, on board. It's roughly 3:30 that the Chevron California would have come by and it's roughly 1:00 o'clock that the Naked Island report would have been made. It's roughly 7:00 o'clock that the Alamar people get to the vessel. The Coast Guard people actually left about 1:30 and traveled another two hours. The Coast Guard people called Michael Fox at roughly 4:00. He left at roughly 5:00 and got there at 6:15, traveling an hour and 15 minutes. But then, once he arrives there, things happen on the vessel. There is an interview by Mr. Delozier with Trooper Fox sitting in with Kagan, the helmsman on the Exxon Valdez, at roughly 7:45. Thereafter, Mr. Cousins is interviewed, the second -- the third mate.

At roughly 10:00 a.m., blood samples, blood and urine samples are taken from members of the crew, including

1

5

6

7

**8** 9

11

12

10

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

Captain Hazelwood. At roughly 1:00 p.m., Captain Hazelwood is interviewed by Mr. Delozier and Trooper Fox is sitting in.

So that if you find, for example, that the evidence that we present doesn't show it would have been found until 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon, then things which fell before then would not be admissible in evidence. And that means that those things, the samples of blood and urine, would not be admissible and the Hazelwood statement would not be admissible under the inevitable discovery doctrine. As we said, under the independent source doctrine, everything from the report on down would be admitted. And if you found (unintelligible) the time, as the state suggests, roughly 8:30, then what would be properly suppressed would be things which occurred before that, like the observations of Dan Lawn when he first arrived there, the observations of the Coast Guard people when they first got there. Everything that fell in between the report and that time would be properly suppressed.

Now with that, I'd like to talk about the third group of witnesses that I propose to call because the third group of witnesses goes to this point. Judge, the state anticipated that this might be a problem in the prosecution and as early as March 27th, roughly four days after the grounding, began to talk about the problem and how to

handle it. We recognized that inevitable discovery, an inevitable discovery doctrine might be one of the exceptions to the reporting requirement. We also knew that it would be improper to use the report, itself, in that fashion. The problem was defining when, at what point these things would inevitably have been discovered.

It was a path, we decided, that required two sets of prosecutors and investigators. That is one set would go ahead and learn everything it could about all these circumstances, all the way down, and would learn about everything. The other set would not get information which would not be admissible under this inevitable discovery. That is they were not going to be given anything in this prohibitive area; they could get none of that to work from.

Even as late as April, mid-April, that line wasn't a clear line. That is we didn't know when, on the 29th, we could show a judge in your position that this spill would inevitably have been discovered and an investigation started. So from roughly mid-April, we set up a second set of prosecutors and investigators on a team. Since I had gone to Valdez on the 26th and been there since then and knew some things that fell on both sides of the line, it was decided that I would be a person to be on the team that knew everything and the set of investigators who had gone with me, who all gathered in Valdez to work on the case

initially, they would be on this team who would do the entire investigation.

It was then my job to separate stuff out and give it to a new set of prosecutors who had not been involved in the case earlier. They were Mary Ann Henry, initially, Brent Cole joined me later and, at a later date, Sam Adams joined that team. Similarly, they got their own investigators.

At that point, the captain had not been charged by the Grand Jury. An \_\_\_\_\_\_ charging only misdemeanors had been filed in Valdez, but the Grand Jury had not yet convened on the case. And so prior to the Grand Jury, I began screening materials and giving them to the prosecution team. The criterion that I used was this. Because it's not clear when this line -- when Your Honor might, if ever, find that that line was drawn, whether it would be here at 8:30, or back here at 3:30 or back here at 1:00 o'clock or somewhere thereafter, I said to myself, "Let's let me be careful and exclude anything that occurred on March 24th, 1989, from the time of the report all the way through the end of the day, to midnight, 12:00 p.m."

So the material then that Mary Ann Henry and Brent Cole were given to present to the Grand Jury did not include, for example, the evidence of alcohol, blood alcohol test results. It did not include the statement by

Captain to Mr. Delozier and

They got a tape -- in one exhibit, for example, that they played, they played a tape recording of the communications between the vessel, the Exxon Valdez, and the Coast Guard station, starting from about the time that Captain Hazelwood takes over from the pilot. And that tape that they played before the Grand Jury ran up to the time of the report, but did not include the report, so that the tape that the Grand Jury heard of the communications between the ship and the Coast Guard station did not include the conversation in which Captain Hazelwood first says fetched up hard aground, (unintelligible) with some oil. That was not given to the prosecution team, nor to the Grand Jury in preparation for just this kind of a day, Judge.

So the third group of witnesses are people who can say that we played by those rules, Judge, and as to the way we did it. They would include Alaska State Troopers, on the initial team, Sergeant John McGhee, Trooper Julia Grimes, Trooper Paul Burke, Trooper Chris Stockard and includes an investigator — includes Trooper Fox, includes an investigator for the Department of Law in the Office of Special Prosecutions and Appeals, Gale Savage. It then includes a trooper who was on the prosecuting team, James Stogsdill, S-t-o-g-s-d-i-l-l. And it includes the

1

4

3

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

lawyers, Mary Ann Henry, Brent Cole and me.

Judge, just a comment about the "me" part of Judge, ordinarily, a lawyer is not permitted to be that. both a witness and to argue a case. In this instance, I had such great exposure to both the facts, in terms of being able to present the case to the Court, but that same exposure made me an ideal witness, as well, that I ask permission of Mr. Friedman whether I could do that if I did not do what the canon of ethics prohibits and that is a lawyer argue his own credibility. So with that caveat, with that understanding, we are proceeding with this posture. I am expected to be the last witness in this series of witnesses. We will have another lawyer come in for that to do whatever direct or cross examination or redirect examination there may be of me. If the Court still feels that's appropriate, at the end of -- if that procedure is appropriate, then I will argue the case without arguing my credibility, one way or the other. we hope it doesn't come to that, but if Your Honor wishes to insist that we have somebody else prepared to argue the motion, we can make those arrangements, but we prefer not to.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Can we resolve that right now? Do you object to that?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, not at all, Your Honor.

 with the agreement of counsel on this. Unless I can find some good reason not to, you can expect to argue this.

MR. LINTON: Very well, Your Honor.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I assume we'll probably go along

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You did not mention Mr. Adams' name as one of the lawyers. Was that your intention?

MR. LINTON: That's correct. He got into it so far down the road that I didn't expect to call him. If it became apparent that it would be important to do that, I'm prepared to do that, but had not planned on it, Judge. And that's how I expect to proceed.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I've been told by Mr. Purden we're having a hard time getting an audio pickup, so be sure and pull the microphone closer to you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, Mr. Linton has candidly admitted that what they're trying to do here is avoid Mr. Hazelwood's congressionally granted immunity and the state's problem in doing that stems from the inherent facts of this case. Ordinarily, an investigation is started, a body is discovered, a phone call is made, something takes place that starts an investigation. And as the authorities investigate, they cast an ever widening net of information.

Sometimes, they decide that a particular witness has evidence that they need and they need it so badly that they're willing to grant that witness use derivative use

immunity. And I'm sure the Court has read the cases now and is familiar. Over and over again, that is the posture in which these immunity cases are decided. A prosecutor grants a witness immunity. And then, of course, from that witness' testimony, a variety of other information is obtained.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If the prosecutors, at that point, decide that they want to prosecute this witness, everyone agrees that they cannot use this evidence, that is evidence that they only would have been led to by this witness' testimony. But if they can prove an independent source for this evidence, they can use it against this witness. And a way the prosecutors' offices, particularly federal prosecutors' offices try to deal with that issue is when the immunized testimony is presented, when this witness is examined in the Grand Jury or whatever, a totally different prosecutor, not the one conducting this investigation, but the one conducting this -- a separate one is brought in to question this witness. So this prosecutor can honestly say, "I haven't been exposed to this witness' testimony," and we were led to all of this stuff by our own leads, we had nothing to do with this. And as you read the case as they talk about the Kastiger hearings, that's often what they're fighting about, were the prosecutors led to this information by the immunized testimony or did they have

independent sources.

Now here, the entire investigation began right here. There were no independent sources. There was nothing else that triggered the investigation. The immunized testimony, itself, triggered the very investigation that \_\_\_\_\_ will use here. And that's the inherent problem. They're trying to use, the state is trying to use techniques that were developed for this situation, trying to use those techniques where they have this situation and that's why they don't work and I'll show you why in a moment.

Now one of the state's arguments, and they will be presenting evidence on this, is that there's an independent source here that when Captain Hazelwood said, "We're hard aground, leaking oil," the "hard aground" is separate from the "leaking oil." I would ask you to keep in mind as you hear comments about independent source the Kastiger language, which is "wholly independent source." They have to prove, to prove an independent source, that whatever they're claiming is the independent source was wholly independent of the immunized testimony. And I will argue this at the end of the hearing, the legal standard. But for present purposes, I would point out to the Court, I'd ask you, as you hear the testimony, to keep in mind that if you take the state's position that only the words "leaking

oil" are immunized and everything around them is not immunized, then there is no immunity. If Captain Hazelwood, if the only way he could get immunity is to call up and say, "Hi, I'm leaking oil, but I'm not going to tell you where I am, who I am or how it happened," if that's what Congress wanted him to do to get immunity, then the statute doesn't make any sense. And we're going to be asking the Court at the end of the hearing for a common sense interpretation of the statute and we have some authorities to cite to you in support of that common sense interpretation.

Your Honor, Mr. Linton spent a long time this morning and will spend a long time during the next couple of weeks, explaining or arguing to you what might have happened, what could have happened, what should have happened. This chart was designed to show you what did happen and it's very important because it will illustrate some of the problems with the state's case. And, later, I'll ask to mark it as an exhibit. You'll hear me asking questions, somewhat out of context to build the foundation for this and we'll be moving to move it into evidence at the end of the hearing.

When Captain Hazelwood first made his radio calls, he reported he was aground, leaking oil, that there had been a problem with the third mate and that he was trying

to get the ship off the reef. When Investigator Delozier first came aboard in response to this radio call -- Investigator Delozier and several others went out to the ship as quickly as they could. When they got there at approximately 3:35 a.m., Investigator Delozier will tell you that he immediately smelled what he believed was alcohol on Captain Hazelwood's breath, he says within moments. So as of 3:35 a.m., what's happened is we have radio calls and the investigators respond immediately and immediately smell alcohol.

As of 3:35 a.m., they have three what Kastiger calls investigatory leads or, as Kastiger says, focuses of the investigation. Captain Hazelwood has focused the investigation for them and we have three theories, three leads to follow up on. One, was he properly getting off the reef? Two, was alcohol involved in the accident? And, three, was there some sort of problem with the third mate?

Now when we cross examine Mr. Cole, I expect that he will say that the case he intends to present to the jury, the allegations that he's going to make, actual assertions he's going to make a trial are, one, that Captain Hazelwood somehow responded improperly to the grounding, either that trying to get off the reef was improper or that the way he got off -- his failure to try to get off the reef was improper. He's going to tell us

that he has witnesses to say Captain Hazelwood smelled like alcohol, to say that he smelled like he had alcohol on his breath.

By the way, Your Honor, there are lots of witnesses to contradict all of this, but, obviously, at this hearing, we're not arguing the merits of the criminal case. We're trying to recreate the state's case. So the state has some witnesses who say he had alcohol on his breath, a witness who believes he exhibited guilty type behavior at the scene, some witnesses who saw him in bars that day, a witness who thinks he had red eyes, one who thinks he had a sway in his step, one who thinks he has a different mood. There was a blood alcohol test which the state will argue was elevated to prove that, at the time of the accident, he had an elevated blood alcohol. Those all relate to the alcohol.

I think Mr. Cole will also say that the final portion of the state's case, that he gave the conn, that's the bridge, he turned it over to an unqualified officer, that he, himself, was not on the conn in required waters, and that he did not give specific instructions to the people he left in charge of the conn and that's the basis for their recklessness charges, the felony charges.

What you see then is the very things that they have, the investigative leads that they had as of 3:35.

What is that, about two hours, two and a half hours after his calls? They wind up with the exact same theory of the case he gave them at that time.

The question, of course, is do they use this.

Well, again, in this situation, his calls clearly

precipitated everything that came after it. We're going to

be looking at -- by the way, Your Honor, I hope to have a

smaller version of this to give to you at some point for

your own use during the hearing.

This does not represent everything that was done in the investigation, but it shows you the main threads of the investigation. And what you'll see, as an example, from the smell of alcohol, Mr. Delozier begins to suspect that Captain Hazelwood is exhibiting guilty behavior. He makes efforts to get someone out to the ship to test blood alcohol. A corpsman named Conner is in town, but is actually on his way to the airport. He's flagged down on the way to the airport. He has to come out. He arrives on the ship, collects blood alcohol and gets an elevated blood alcohol.

I won't go through all of these now, but there are several points that are illustrated by this chart that are going to be important to the Court's decision. Our position, as you know from the briefs, is that the inevitable discovery doctrine doesn't apply in this case,

1 that, legally, it makes no sense. It has a totally 2 different trial basis and, in fact, the language of 3 inevitable discovery smashes right into a brick wall when it hits the language of Kastiger saying you can't use his 4 5 call as investigatory leads to focus the investigation. 6 That's just inconsistent with the concept of inevitable 7 discovery. Kastiger focuses on what actually happened, not what might have happened.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But if you decide that you're going to go for some sort of inevitable discovery theory, in theory, you find that it could be applied, this chart will help illustrate for us the impossibility in this case of the state meeting its burden in that respect.

I should emphasize that nobody is denying that inevitably, the ship and the oil would have been discovered. But that's not the state's case. The state's case is not there's a ship aground, leaking oil. Therefore, you're guilty. This is the state's case and the question is would the facts supporting this case have inevitably been discovered. So the state first has to prove to you when the ship, itself, would have been discovered. And, in essence, what the state is arguing is we would have found this all, that we would have found the ship and we would have gotten out here -- I guess from listening to Mr. Linton, he's saying, "At least by 8:30, we

there's an important difference which he's either not recognizing or not owning up to, which is had Captain Hazelwood not called, had he remained silent, when they walked on the boat at 3:30, they would not have the investigatory lead of getting off the reef. They wouldn't have smelled alcohol because there are witnesses who said, at that point, there was no smell of alcohol on him, and they wouldn't have had the indication that there had been a problem with the third mate. So rather than just moving all this down to 8:30, which is what they're suggesting that you do, they're walking on board at 8:30 knowing nothing other than there's a ship aground, leaking oil. And, again, you have to assume that Captain Hazelwood would not have spoken to them.

would have walked onto the boat, instead of 3:30."

And so the question is and what they have to prove to you is that all of this would have happened later on if they had started with a clean slate.

Now what they're prepared to do, of course, is bring investigators on who now, with the help of 20/20 hindsight, now that they have in fact used all of this stuff, now that they have in fact put their case together, they're now prepared to work backwards and say, "Well, we would have found all of this anyway. We would have done a careful investigation. We would have found everything

anyway."

I would remind the Court that what Kastiger and the subsequent cases say is the state has to prove, has to present the Court with each piece of evidence it plans to use at trial and show an independent source or a non-Kastiger team for each piece of evidence. If you're going to somehow try to graft the inevitable discovery doctrine onto Kastiger, you're going to have to find that each piece of evidence they want to use at trial would have been inevitably discovered and that is a task that I'm not sure anybody would ever be up to. They're asking you to, in essence, make a leap of faith and say, "When we walked on board knowing nothing, we still would have been able to recreate all of this."

There are some things we'll be able to prove to Your Honor that they did not, they could not. For example, the blood test that I mentioned before. Had they walked on board at 8:30 and started their efforts to get someone to test the blood alcohol, at that point, Conners would have been on his airplane, flying to Anchorage. They wouldn't have gotten blood/urine tests at 10:00 or 10:50, somewhere in that range. It would have been hours later, if at all, we can show you. And for a fact, they couldn't have inevitably wound up with that, they would not have.

On many of the other things, we're going to have

to rely upon their inability to prove inevitable discovery because all we are is in this never never land, trying to determine what could have happened, what might have happened, what should have happened.

A final point I would ask the Court to be alert to as we go on, if I understood Mr. Linton correctly, he told us that it was in mid-April that the state decided that they'd better do something about this immunity problem and so they're setting up a separate set of investigators, a separate set of prosecutors that are going to try to somehow try to separate from this information, only give them this information. I guess I should talk about that for just a second.

Remember, Kastiger says you can't use it as an investigatory lead and anything your immunized testimony leads you to also gets thrown out. Their argument is that if you draw a line across here somewhere, wherever that line might be drawn -- it's probably a line like this, I suppose -- that if you only let the prosecutor see this stuff, you've done your job under Kastiger. But Kastiger says no, you can't use this stuff if you were led to it by the immunized testimony.

So their efforts with regards to separating prosecutors from the top of the pyramid doesn't help them under Kastiger because they still get the benefits of all

that investigation down here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And in that regard, I'd like to point out to the Court -- and I think we will be asking questions that will elicit this testimony from various of the state's witnesses. We don't intend to call any witnesses ourselves or, at most, one or two. We'll try to make our points through their witnesses. What I think we can show, that before the state took any efforts to immunize their prosecutors or investigators, they had interviewed more than 46 people. They compiled approximately a hundred pages of police summaries, that blood and urine samples were taken, of course. Two experts were hired; they received reports from various sources. Two search warrant hearings were conducted, two search warrants issued, two searches conducted. Experts were given the benefit of materials seized in those searches. The experts, themselves, went out to the scene, reviewed documents, worked with the prosecutors and information, criminal information was sworn out, charging three misdemeanors. probable cause statement supporting the information -- and by the way, that probable cause statement incorporated all this information that they're now, if not conceding, almost conceding is immunized. An arrest warrant was issued. Captain Hazelwood was arrested. All of that happened before they took their efforts to unring the bell, if you

will.

After that time period, virtually nothing was done. They have this investigator, Stogsdill who is their immunized or sanitized (unintelligible). Other than going to the scene to take some pictures, try to help put their inevitable discovery arguments together, Mr. Stogsdill hasn't done much. And the point is this, that the entire investigation was completed, virtually the entire investigation was completed before they took any actions to protect Captain Hazelwood under this immunity claim.

What that means is that they really are trying to unring the bell. All of this was put together before they even addressed the immunity issue. When they finally addressed the issue, they are trying to cut this off, get the benefits of everything, all his statements, everything that they were led to from his statements, without paying the price that Congress and, in our case, in the state, the state regulatory agencies expected.

The final thing, Your Honor, which I think is inclusive in what I've said so far is if you adopt the concept that inevitable discovery applies, the legal concept can apply, what you're going to need to do as this hearing goes on is try to figure out not just which of those strands, for simplicity's sake, we put on a diagram would have inevitably been discovered, but every fact they

want to present at trial, you're going to have to decide and make a ruling that it inevitably would have been discovered. Whether that burden is clear and convincing, as we've argued in the brief, or more probably than not, the preponderance of the evidence obviously hasn't been decided yet, but whichever standard it is, they're going to be unable to meet it as to any significant fact. And that's all I want to present at this time. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Let's get started here. MR. LINTON: Call Dan Lawn, Your Honor. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Do we have other witnesses in the Court and is there any reason to exclude them or not exclude them? MR. FRIEDMAN: I ask that witnesses be excluded, Your Honor. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, if there are any witnesses

that expect to be called, they'll have to remain outside.

MR. LINTON: He's outside now, Judge. I'm going to have to watch to see when he comes in, it's going to be a little hard to do. He's feeding a meter.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I wonder if we could have that thing taken down.

: Sir, you'll find a microphone MR. there (unintelligible).

25

Whereupon,

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

having been called as a witness by Counsel for the State, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

DANIEL JOSEPH LAWN

THE CLERK: Sir, would you state your full name and spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: Daniel Joseph Lawn, L-a-w-n.

THE CLERK: Mailing address?

THE WITNESS: Post Office Box 1483, Valdez, Alaska 99686.

THE CLERK: Your current occupation, sir?

THE WITNESS: I'm an environmental engineer for the Department of Environmental Conservation in Valdez.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Let's plan on taking a break around quarter of and keep an eye on the clock.

MR. LINTON: Yes, sir.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LINTON:

- How long have you worked for the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, sir?
  - Approximately 12 years. Α
  - And what are your responsibilities for them? Q
- I deal with various forms of investigation enforcement for the Department of Environmental

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Conservation having to do with oil, water, sewage, all the regulatory elements the Department deals with.

Q Do your investigations result in both civil actions and criminal actions?

A Yes.

Q How long have you been in the Valdez office of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation?

A All the entire length of my employment with the Department.

Q How long has that been, compared to the time that the TransAlaska Pipeline has been operating and ships have been coming and going from Valdez?

A Just about the entire time. I believe I joined the Department about a month after the first shipment of oil.

Q Some time in the early morning hours of

March 24th, 1989, did you receive word about a problem with
the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes, I got a call around 1:00 a.m. from Alyeska OCC, that's the Operation Control Center. They advised me that the Exxon Valdez, outbound to avoid ice, had been out of shipping lanes and had run aground on Bligh Reef and may be leaking some oil. I tried to question them some more and they really had no additional information.

Q What did you do next?

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20 21

22

23

24

25

I immediately told my wife that we had a major problem here and then I immediately called the Coast Guard.

Who did you talk to?

Well, the phone was answered by someone there in their vessel traffic system and I announced who I was and, immediately, the phone was taken away by Commander McCall. Commander McCall and I discussed the report that I had just received from Alyeska in more detail. At that time, I told him and had known intuitively that we had a major problem and the potential for a catastrophic spill.

We discussed a plan of action which included the use of dispersants, included mobilizing the Coast Guard forces and DEC forces, that the Coast Guard would be sending some people out there. He asked me if I wanted to I told him of course and I told him I'd be down there as soon as I could. He told me that the boat would be coming in soon.

Did he tell you anything more specific about what the problem was on board the vessel?

Just we had probably had the discussion of the reason the ship was over there, that it was trying to avoid ice and it had run aground. I can't say at the initial phone conversation that we discussed it in any more detail, but --

When you talked -- it was during that conversation Q

that you talked with him about dispersants? Correct. What are dispersants? Dispersants are a chemical additive you put on oil to combat an oil spill, to make it break up so that the environment can handle it in a more ready fashion. Q Why was it important to talk about those at that point? Well, I knew intuitively when I was told that the Α ship ran aground that we had a major catastrophic spill. And you need all of the weapons at your command and dispersants are one of those weapons. You said you talked about other resources of both Q your agency and his being called in. What did you talk about? Yes. We talked about the strike teams, Coast Α Guard strike teams. Q What are they? They are groups of oil spill response experts the Α Coast Guard has located around the United States. Where is the nearest one? Q I think they're in the San Francisco area. Α At least not in the State of Alaska. 23 Q

No, there's none, normally, in Alaska.

What happened next?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Α

Q

(Tape changed to C-3500.)

A I called my boss, Bill Lameraux, in Anchorage and gave him the limited information I had and it was still very limited. I told him that I had been notified by OCC; they didn't have much information. I called the Coast Guard and talked to McCall; he gave me a little bit more. In essence, the Exxon Valdez, outbound from the terminal, to avoid ice, had left the ship outbound lanes and ran aground and Naked Island -- excuse me, at Bligh Reef. And I indicated to him that this was -- we had minimal reports of the ship leaking oil, but I did tell him that this was the nightmare that I had been dreading, that we all had been dreading, and that I didn't need to go look at the ship to know that we had a major catastrophic event and that I wanted certain people in the Department headed this way right away. I asked him to notify those people.

He questioned me as to whether or not it could wait until morning. I told him no, that you don't run a ship aground in Prince William Sound without it being a major event and you can always turn the people around if you do not need them.

I told him that I would call one individual when I got to the office and asked him to call the rest of them.

I also discussed with him the fact that we would be using dispersants, so the RT would need to be notified and that I

9 10

11

12 13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

would continue to have conversations with him throughout the night and the morning, as I went out to the ship.

Where were the people you were asking him to gather?

Α Well, they were scattered throughout the state. Two individuals that are normally in the Valdez office were in Anchorage for training and I didn't know where they were staying, so I had to track them down. And I wanted Joe LeBeau, who was in Wasilla, and I wanted John Jansen, who was in Fairbanks, Al Kegler in Juneau, several of our immediate first response people. I knew intuitively we would need a good handful, a half dozen to a dozen people immediately. I also discussed with him getting our oil spill experts informed, including the AG's office.

Q How long did that telephone conversation take?

Oh, I expect the initial conversation took five or ten minutes. I had subsequent conversations with both McCall and Lameraux within the next few minutes. I went to the office and called John Jansen, apprised him of the situation and asked him to get mobilized.

Who is he? Q

He's the DEC oil spill expert in Fairbanks and I had advised him that \_\_\_\_\_ would be making some contacts with him, also.

How long did you stay at the office?

5 6

7

8 9

11 12

10

14 15

13

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

Α Oh, I suspect I was at the office ten or 15 minutes, maybe 20. I had to kind of look around for some gear. My normal response gear, most of it was in my vehicle which happened to be in the state DOT shop overnight and I couldn't get access to it, so I was trying to find some other gear.

And then from there, I went to the Coast Guard and met with McCall and Falkenstein and Delozier. I was there, in and out. They were scurrying around, trying to get some gear together, also.

How long did you stay at the Coast Guard station before you boarded the boat to go to the Exxon Valdez?

I would expect we were there a half hour, 45 minutes. During that period of time, we discussed various options and various notifications and the fact that Alyeska personnel had stopped by the Coast Guard station on their way to the terminal. They were going to dispatch equipment from the terminal.

We discussed that apparently Captain Hazelwood and Commander McCall had a discussion about rocking the ship back and forth at high water to remove the ship from the reef. As I recall, that would happen some time while we were on our way to the ship.

We were waiting there for the pilot boat to come in and pick us up. It was apparently the fastest boat, the

1

4

6

5

8 9

7

10

11

12

13

15

14

17

16

18

20 21

22

2324

25

closest one available, so we had to wait until it got into the dock. Again, we discussed with McCall the use of dispersants and notification of the federal -- the Coast Guard strike teams.

Q What time did you actually get on the pilot boat and actually leave the harbor at Valdez?

A I don't know the exact time. I expect it was around 3:00, between 2:45 and 3:00 o'clock, maybe a little before then.

Q What time did you get to the ship?

Well, as we were approaching the ship, I took some video footage of that and when we first saw it, it seems to me that it was about 3:15 a.m. and we were up alongside or fairly close at about 3:35 or so. The pilot ladder apparently was not in a position where it could be easily accessed, so while the pilot ladder was being moved, we, in the pilot boat, trying to stay out of the oil, went around the back side of the vessel, the stern of the vessel to the south side and just took a look at what we could see and saw oil in the water and just waited for the ladder to be Shortly thereafter, we were told that the ladder moved. had been moved and we transferred from the smaller pilot boat to a larger one to use as a -- it was a little higher off the water and made it easier to get aboard the pilot ladder.

As I was stepping off of the pilot boat and ahold of the ladder, as I went up, I noticed that the oil surface next to the ship was elevated from the surface of the liquid just a foot or two out from the ship. My recollection is I could see a good foot of difference. In other words, there was oil moving up alongside the ship, welling up and -- this sticks in my mind, as I climbed the pilot ladder -- after the --

Q Excuse me. You mean the oil was a foot away from the side of the vessel?

A The oil alongside the vessel was higher than the liquid surface immediately say a foot or two away from the vessel. And I can't say it was higher than the waters, though, because we were in oil, so I don't know where the water was in relationship to the oil. But as the oil left the ship, it came up alongside, a rolling boil, if you will, and so there was a difference in elevation in the two liquids.

Anyway, I climbed the pilot ladder carrying my video camera and the other gear I had with me and when all three of us, the two Coast Guard personnel and I, were together, we went to the bridge of the vessel.

Q Would you explain to the judge, then, what you did -- how long did you remain on board the vessel?

A Oh, I don't recall what time I got off, but it was

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in the neighborhood of 6:30 or 7:00 p.m.

Q On March 24th?

A Correct.

Q What did you do in the space of time that you were on board the vessel?

Α Well, when I got on the bridge, I saw Captain Hazelwood standing on what would be the port side, up near the window, very quiet, pensive, stroking his beard. I introduced myself and the Coast Guard was there and the Coast Guard dealt primarily with Captain Hazelwood and other folks. I tried to confine my activities to the oil pollution incident, what we could do to mitigate that. And so that meant that I spent most of my time with the chief mate who was gauging the vessel. That's measuring how much oil was remaining in it, trying to determine how much was lost. I gave him the directive to gauge it at least every two hours to get some kind of a leak rate, see whether we were slowing down. I had various conversations through this period of time with the Coast Guard, so we were keeping tabs with each other. Mine were letting them know about the pollution and they were dealing with me about their investigation about what happened. I was not particularly concerned about what happened, but how we were going to deal with the pollution incident.

And I made several telephone calls from the

25

vessel. I called my boss, Bill Lameraux, in Anchorage again and advised him of the situation, requested additional help, suggested that we hire some additional people to help us with this incident and that he updated me on where he was on the notification process and who was headed down to Valdez with help and about what time they would get there. And that happened periodically through the morning.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had a phone conversation with Alyeska, with Larry Shire, who was the man that had gone to the terminal to dispatch the equipment. We discussed the situation, apprised him of how much oil had leaked, what the leak rate was, where I suspected that it was. I had advised him that he should, one, notify his dispersement contractors to get the planes headed this way that were in Arizona; two, that he get CIRO, that's a regional response, Cook Inlet clean-up response team; that he get all available personnel and equipment; suggested then to him to get a helicopter out of Anchorage in Valdez. We normally don't have helicopters immediately available. I had made the same suggestion to my boss, Bill Lameraux, to get a twin engine helicopter down there to help us and tried to provide the information that I'd learned over my 12 years of dealing with oil pollution and various oil spill cleanups that had taken place.

Shire advised me that the equipment was essentially on the way. I did tell him that I would call him back right after first light and give him a more definitive position of where the oil was.

sometime during that period of time between 4:30 and 7:00, I was asked by Delozier whether I had been -- had smelled any alcohol on Captain Hazelwood's breath and I replied that I was never close enough to him to get that indication and I really hadn't spent any time talking to him, either.

Later, I passed Captain Hazelwood in the stairwell between the bridge and the radio room and I did detect something that smelled to me like there was alcohol of some description.

Q You said later. What time would you think?

A I'd say that was -- I didn't, really didn't mark the time down, but I would say that that was between 5:30 and 7:00. Again, I wasn't dealing with Captain Hazelwood and what caused the incident. I was dealing with the fact that we had oil in the water and that we had to take immediate steps to reduce environmental damage.

When -- I did become aware during that period of time that the Coast Guard was interested in getting someone on board to administer certain tests related to alcohol and that was kind of going on around me. Again, I wasn't

had a very limited conversation about that and I told him what I had observed and later identified the smell that I had smelled about Captain Hazelwood in a companionway and that was there was some kind of a near beer or a low alcohol beer on board the vessel that when Mike Fox opened a bottle of it, that was the smell I had detected. And, again, I was not dealing with that particular aspect of it. The Coast Guard was and Mike Fox, he was dealing with that. And I was, again, trying to confine my activities to deal with the pollution incident.

directly involved in that. When Trooper Fox arrived, we

- Q Did you interview witnesses like the helmsman, the third mate, Captain Hazelwood, other members of the crew --
  - A No.
  - Q -- to find out how it happened?
- A No.
  - Q Did you prepare reports that you submitted to a criminal prosecutor --
    - A No.
    - Q -- on what you had observed?
  - A No. I've been interviewed one time by someone connected with the state.
  - Q Mr. Lawn, would you have gone to the Exxon Valdez had the report been only of a grounding?
    - A Yes. I've got a clear written record of my

concern about ships running aground in Prince William

Sound. I knew intuitively -- no one had to tell me that
the ship was leaking oil. I knew intuitively that it was
leaking oil. It would be a miracle if it would not be
leaking oil. And there's no place where you can run a ship
aground in Prince William Sound where you won't leak oil.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1980 or so, there was a vessel called the Prince William Sound that drifted in Prince William Sound for around 17 hours without power. During that period of time, the seas became progressively worse and the tugboats that went out to assist were unable to assist the vessel because there was no way to get a line from the tugboats up to the vessel. After that period of time, the Department spent a good deal of effort with Alyeska trying to prevent oil spills and that eventually required all of the tankers coming to Prince William Sound to have a towing bridle that is passive, that, in other words, you don't need any power on the ship at all. You can throw pieces of this over the side and a tugboat can come up and collect this bridle and hook up without needing power from the ship. That was a major, major focus. Even Alyeska retrofitted one tug to do a better job because during the Prince William Sound incident, a tug almost sank. We had 20-foot waves and a 65-foot Fish and Wildlife boat was surfboarding down these waves. So Prince William Sound can be very, very

1

5

7 8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

dangerous. And during that period of time, it became real obvious that you can't drop an anchor in Prince William Sound in most places, particularly if you're drifting over a knot, knot and a half, without a good chance of the anchor line parting and --

Why is dropping an anchor significant? Q

Well, dropping an anchor is -- if you're adrift there and you don't want to hit the beach, you would normally anchor. But from the experience I've had and many conversations with tanker captains and other knowledgeable people, most of them have told me that a knot, knot and a half is a maximum speed at which you can do that and maybe it won't part; most likely, it will.

The other thing about Prince William Sound, it's a series of submerged mountain ridges and there is no real shallow water until you get right up next to the beach. by the time you drop your anchor line and it didn't pull off the boat and you get enough scope out on your anchor line to actually hold the ship, your stern of the vessel is going to be on the beach. And the industry has recognized that and that's why they spent several million dollars in retrofitting ships to have these towing bridles and they have periodic exercises, some of which are at the Department's request or instigation. We had just had an exercise to test this equipment back in November of '88,

just four months before this. It was actually the end of November, I think the 28th of November.

So it's recognized that there is no place to run a ship aground in Prince William Sound without it being a major catastrophic event.

Q Is that statement based on --

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: I think we'd better take a break. We're running past. It'll be about a ten- or 15-minute break.

THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands recessed for --

(Whereupon, at 10:55 a.m., a recess was taken.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Can I get a feel for how long we're going to need? It sounds like we're going to need a whole two weeks from what I'm hearing now. Is that a pretty good estimate?

MR. LINTON: I'm loathe to judge on the basis of one witness, Judge.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay. Let's try to confine our questions and responses to the issues that are germane. I don't want to try the whole case here.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q In addition to the factors you've pointed out, is there something about the geography or the nature of the bottom of Prince William Sound that is the basis for your

statement that you would have gone out anyway?

A Yes, there are a number of reefs and rock pinnacles there that really aren't covered with any mud. There is not any soft bottom so that when a vessel runs aground there, it's going — it indicates to me that there will be an oil spill. And even if it doesn't initially have an oil spill, the way the weather chain is in Valdez, it can have one before you can get the ship off the reef.

# CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Mr. Lawn, my name is Rick Friedman and I'm one of Captain Hazelwood's lawyers. When you first got the call, who was that who called you?

A It was the Alyeska Operational Control Center.

Q All right. And you said that after receiving that call, you called your boss in Anchorage?

A No, I said that I called the Coast Guard. The OCC really had no information, other than some very basic stuff, that the ship had run aground and may be leaking some oil. So I immediately called the Coast Guard, talked to Commander McCall.

Q And McCall told you that it was leaking oil?

A He -- yes, he indicated it was leaking, but he didn't really have any information about how much oil was leaking, either.

U

Q And at that point, you called your boss in Anchorage?

A After I hung up with Commander McCall, I called Bill Lameraux.

- Q Okay. What was the last name?
- A Lameraux.
- Q Lameraux. Okay, and Mr. Lameraux asked you if it couldn't wait until morning or something of that kind?
  - A Yes.
  - Q And you said no, it couldn't.
  - A Correct.
  - Q Why couldn't it wait until morning?

A Well, I tried to impress upon Bill Lameraux, and I did, finally, that I didn't need to go look to see whether it was leaking oil. I knew that it was a major catastrophe and if it wasn't right then leaking oil, it was only a matter of a few hours before it would be leaking oil. And I believe my exact words to him were, "I do not need to go look. We need to make this happen now."

Q Let me ask you this. Given how extensive the damage to the ship turned out to be, did it do any good to get out there so soon?

A Well, I believe that it gave us an opportunity to get things in motion faster because we were there on site.

I think the adequacy of response, initial response, by

those parties is another argument, that my firm belief is that if people had done what they were supposed to have done, it would have made a difference.

Q That that amount of time would have made a difference if people had been prepared to do the right things.

A Absolutely, absolutely. If we had followed the contingency plan, it would have bought some more time and we needed more time.

- Q And that time is important in a catastrophe of this size.
  - A Absolutely.
  - Q Okay.
- A It's that immediate response that's important on any oil spill to prevent downstream damage.
  - Q So the sooner you get there, the better.
  - A Absolutely.
- Q Now you said that when you first thought that you smelled alcohol on Captain Hazelwood, you were already aware that the Coast Guard personnel were making some efforts to have him tested.

A I don't believe I said that. I believe that I said that Mark Delozier had asked me whether I had smelled alcohol and I had replied to him, "No, but I haven't been close enough to him to find out." Some time thereafter, as

5

У

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

I was going from the radio room just on the first deck below the bridge to the bridge, or back and forth, I passed Captain Hazelwood in the stairway and I did smell something that I determined was alcohol.

Q When Mr. Delozier asked you whether you smelled alcohol on the captain's breath, was that the first time you became aware of alcohol as a potential issue in the incident?

A Yes.

- Q When you talked to Commander McCall back in, when you were still in Valdez, he didn't mention that to you.
  - A There was no discussion of it.
- Q Okay, and when you met with McCall at the Coast Guard station and Falkenstein was in and out and so on --
  - A I never had a discussion with him about that.
- Q Now did I understand correctly, you said that you believed you got off board around 6:30, you left the ship about 6:30?

A It was in the evening, 6:30 or 7:00 o'clock. It was probably closer to 7:00.

- Q Okay, in the evening.
- A In the evening.
- Q And, finally, when you were going out to the ship in the pilot boat, you were aware that there had been some discussion between the captain and Commander McCall about

1

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

getting the ship off the reef.

Yes, that's correct.

During your first trip to the vessel on the 24th, did you, yourself, seize any records or look at any records of the vessel?

I seized no records. Records of the vessel, if Α you include the pieces of paper that we were writing on with the gauging and making some notes on, I did see those records, yes.

Q Did you subsequently seize any records from the ship?

I do not believe that I seized any records. Α

Did anyone working for you with the DEC seize any Q records that you're aware of?

I don't believe I've ever had a discussion with anyone who told me that they personally seized records.

Let me tell you why I am asking that and maybe you can enlighten me a little bit. There's a criminal pleading that was filed in the case. It's the information; it's a charging document, charging Captain Hazelwood with some misdemeanors. And then there's a sworn statement from Mr. Linton which is part of that complaint. And part of the sworn statement says, "The records of the vessel, Exxon Valdez, obtained by investigators of the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation . . .," and then he goes on

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

to say what they talk about. Are you aware of the DEC seizing any records?

There was another investigator by the name of Joe LeBeau that relieved me on the vessel and he was involved more in the investigation of what happened with Captain Hazelwood than I was and I really wasn't involved in that.

Okay, good enough. Thank you, I don't have any Q other questions.

MR. LINTON: No questions.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Thank you, you may step down.

MR. LINTON: Call Michael Fox, Your Honor. Whereupon,

## MICHAEL J. FOX

having been called as a witness by Counsel for the State, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full name and spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: My name is Michael James Fox. The last name is F-o-x. My business address, Post Office Box 650, Valdez, Alaska, the office of Fish and Wildlife Protection.

THE CLERK: Your current occupation?

THE WITNESS: I'm an Alaska state trooper, assigned to the Division of Fish and Wildlife Protection.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

BY MR. LINTON:

- Q How long have you been an Alaska state trooper?
- Α Since January 1979.
- How long have you been in Valdez? Q
- Since February of 1981. Α
- On March 23d and March 24th, 1989, were you Q assigned to Valdez?
  - Yes, sir. Α
- What are your normal responsibilities with the Fish and Wildlife?

My priority would be enforcing the fish and game regulations, commercial fishing, trapping and hunting, et cetera. As part of the Department of Public Safety, I'm also responsible to handle state trooper responsibilities on a secondary nature if a trooper is out of town or he needs additional help.

- Q Is there a trooper assigned to Valdez?
- Yes, Ken Alexander. Α
- Was he in Valdez on March 23d or 24th? Q
- Α No, he was vacationing out of the state.
- Some time on the evening of March 24th, 1989, did you get a call regarding the Exxon Valdez?

Yes, sir, I received a call. It was around 2:30 in the morning, actually on the 25th. The 24th was at

midnight. It was in the morning of that -- yes, 2:20 on the 24th.

- Q 2:20.
- A Yes, a.m.
- Q And who did you get a call from?
- A The Coast Guard.
- Q What was communicated to you?

A I believe it was Chief Peterson of the Marine Safety Office who told me that the Exxon Valdez was hard aground on Bligh Reef.

- Q Did he tell you his purpose in calling you?
- A He said that our agency was on their list of notification. They go down a list when something happens and if your name is on it, they call you and tell you.
  - Q What did you do?

A Well, I asked him a few of the details and then we hung up and then I woke up a little bit more and called him right back and asked him if there was any fire, injuries, threat of imminent disaster and what that might be. And he said no, it was just hard aground and doesn't look like it's going to go anywhere.

- Q Did he say anything about leaking oil?
- A Yes, he said it was leaking.
- Q As a result of that conversation, did you take any action?

-

A No.

2

1

Q Did you receive another call later in the morning about the Exxon Valdez?

**4** 5

think I was actually asleep again, I was still checking on this. And at this time, they said that the captain had

Yes, about 4:30, the phone rang again.

6 7

been drinking and they wanted me to -- they wanted a

8

trooper.

Q What did you do?

with a drunken sailor.

10

second call was made by the commanding officer, Steve

11

 ${\tt McCall}$ , I believe, and I asked for a few of the details.

13

And he said that Tom said the captain had been drinking and

Well, I asked for a few of the details and the

14

they wanted a trooper to come out. So I took it to mean

15

that he said, he was referring to Tom McCarthy, DEC,

16

because often -- well, I shouldn't say often, but in the

17

regular course of business, we insist DEC, when they have

18

problems -- if it's an unhappy landowner who wants to throw

19

them off his property, if it's a restaurant person who

20

doesn't want to be inspected or whatever -- a lot of times,

21

they'll call the troopers to help deal with otherwise

22

impossible situations. So I had in mind that Tom McCarthy

23

of DEC was calling me to come out there and help them deal

24

So I -- drunk driving was the immediate thought.

25

5

7

6

8

11

10

12

14

15

16 17

. .

19

20

21

23

24

25

I called the Anchorage Dispatch Office and got a message to the on-duty district attorney, Gene Cyrus, through Sergeant Loudon of the troopers. I asked for some advice on drunk driving because right from the beginning, I realized this was going to be a big thing.

Q What do you mean by that?

Well, it was just amazing to me that there was a tanker on Bligh Reef and I spent quite a bit of time wondering what circumstances could have possibly placed a tanker on Bligh Reef. And then when they came back and said that the captain had been drinking, I figured that it was a case of incompetence or impaired operation. I knew it would be the biggest drunk driving case in quite awhile, so I wanted to have some pretty good advice on what to do. And seeing as I'm a Fish and Wildlife trooper, I haven't gained any experience, really, in drunk driving cases, so I wanted to know the elements I needed to prove and what steps I could take as an outline for my own \_\_\_\_\_ when I got out there. And Sergeant Loudon told me, he said, "Well, the elements would be control and impairment," and just try to gather whatever physical evidence I could find or statements in regards to those two elements.

So I arranged with the Coast Guard to meet them at 5:00, I believe it was, at the dock and I ran down there, hopped on their boat and went out.

4

7 8

6

10

9

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

23

2425

Q What time did you get out to the Exxon Valdez?

We arrived alongside at about 6:45 and it took Α awhile to get on board because of all the oil that was -the oil was coming out of the ship so fast that it was pressing up out of the water, up above the level of the water. It was like someone had a hose, pointing it under the water and cresting up -- it was actually coming up out of the water all along, well, for a good section along the starboard side. So as I was trying to board the boat, the Coast Guard boat had a hard time laying alongside and putting me off and the deck of the Coast Guard boat was icy and snow covered and the rope ladder I was to climb was about chin high, so I was standing on this icy platform with this hot oil swirling around me and it took quite awhile. And we ended up having to go back around to the other side, the port side of the boat where they were able to get the ladder a little lower and there was less oil moving alongside the ship and I was able to climb up. So from about 6:45 to 7:05, I was alongside and then I was on the deck at 7:05.

Q What did you do when you got on board?

A There were two crewmen in coveralls, hard hats.

They met me at the top of the ladder and escorted me to the wheelhouse.

Q When you got there, what did you do?

A In the wheelhouse, there was Dan Lawn, DEC; Mark Delozier of the Coast Guard; the XO, Tom Falkenstein of the Coast Guard; and the second mate of the boat, I believe his name was LeCain. And I got up on the bridge, fully expecting to have to deal with a drunk type situation and it wasn't that at all. It was very quiet and dark, the guy just kind of gazing out the window at the -- it was a very quiet and a very sad kind of atmosphere.

- Q Was Captain Hazelwood on the bridge at the time?
- A No, he wasn't.
- Q What happened then?

A Well, I figured -- I wanted to know what the heck to deal with, what was the problem, why was I there, who was in trouble, who needed help, et cetera. And I talked to the XO, Falkenstein, because he's been the ranking officer with the Coast Guard there, and that's when I realized that he was Tom, that was the Tom they were referring to, not Tom McCarthy, it was Tom Falkenstein of the Coast Guard. So I asked him what the deal was and he said that he and Delozier had both smelled alcohol on Captain Hazelwood's breath and they wanted me to haul him off and take a blood sample and do whatever. And I explained to them that I really couldn't do that if there wasn't a crime going on. We could investigate it, but I wasn't going to go ahead and go to the guy's room and wake

him up and arrest him while he was in his room. They told me he was in his bed, sleeping, when I got there.

So I talked to them about what they could do, what I could do and they told me that they could take blood. I said, "Fine, let's get the show on the road. Let's go ahead and do it."

Q And that conversation took how long?

A Oh, just a few minutes. Right away, when I got there, I realized there was going to have to be a Coast Guard investigation, per se. I didn't want to start a search or an investigation that could later be invalid because of no probable cause or no evidence in front of me, which is why I didn't immediately go to the captain's room and arouse him and start interviewing him.

Q Did you discuss with Mr. Delozier or Mr. Falkenstein at any point whether it was appropriate to take the captain from the vessel into town for --

A Oh, yes, for sure.

Q -- an investigation?

A The Coast Guard was anxious to get urine and breath or blood samples and we discussed how we could do that and there was a lot of options. For some reason, they were under the impression that I could take blood and I don't know how they believed that, but I'm not going to be taking blood from anybody. I can take them to a facility

1 where we can take blood if it's the smart thing to do or we 2 can get a nurse or a doctor or EMT-3, of which there are 3 several at the Police Department, for example. 4 time, the Police Department had a unified force that was 5 both EMT-3s, EMT-2s and policemen and it would have been a 6 very simple matter to get one of those guys out because 7 they can do injections and take blood. And I had, before I 8 left town, told the Police Department that I was doing this and to be ready for a call if I needed some help. And we 10 discussed all the options and the Coast Guard said, "Well, 11 we can do this without any problem." I said, "Well, let's 12 do it then and I'll just help you do whatever you need to do." And they kind of just took over the blood sampling 13 14 process and Mark Delozier told me that he would be doing the investigation for the cause of the accident and 15 Lieutenant -- I think he's a lieutenant, the commander, 16 17 Falkenstein told me that he would be doing the oil spill 18 end of the thing. So those two guys were on the phone to town a lot, trying to get somebody out to take blood, and I 19 20 kept offering my knowledge because I'm more familiar with what's there, as to where they could get that, whether it 21 22 be a doctor or a lab tech, EMT-3 or whatever.

Q Did Mark Delozier conduct some interviews that you sat in on and/or tape recorded?

A Yes, sir. He pretty much right away, as we

23

24

25

started finding out who was at the wheel, who was on lookout, who was in charge of the conn, et cetera, and started arranging to interview the people -- and they'd go on and off ship and go to bed and whatnot. It's kind of difficult to organize who you're going to do first and whatnot. And eventually, they decided they were going to interview Mr. Kagan, who was the helmsman. And Mr. Delozier invited me to sit in with him on the interviews and help him develop questions or whatever during the interviews, so I said, "Fine, I'll go in there with you."

And I was off, making a phone call or something from the radio room and came back to the wheelhouse and Delozier was gone and I said, "Well, where's Delozier," and they said, "Oh, he's interviewing Mr. Kagan." I said, "Where's that?" And then I ended up with I believe it was the chief, maybe the second mate, I don't know which one, walking all over the place, looking for these guys and eventually we found them in a spare officer's quarters, I believe it was, so I was arrived for Mr. Kagan's interview, probably five or ten minutes into it.

Q That was approximately 7:50 a.m. At approximately 8:30, did you meet the captain?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that a time that you recorded in your notes the first time?

A Yes.

Yes, sir. One of the first things I did was I told him that -- I mean it was real obvious that this was a real big deal and I knew right then, just from the volume of oil that was coming out of this thing. And we live with tankers, you know, we see them coming and going and we practice \_\_\_\_\_, we practice oil spill, we talk about separation, I mean all this stuff. It's what we focus on in Valdez is oil, oil, oil. But when I saw this, I knew, "This is the big baby." I knew this was going to be what it is. And I told the lieutenant, I said, "We're going to have to find out what . . ., " (unintelligible). We have to have our own conclusions. We can't rely on the Coast Guard, we can't rely on the \_\_\_\_\_. We have to have our own conclusions. And I suggested that they send a trooper or troopers from somewhere else to go to Valdez and start an investigation (unintelligible).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I suggested right off the bat that they contact Alamar, which are the shipping agents, because I know that the agents represent the oil companies with the tankers. The individual agents come and go from the tankers at the arrivals and departures. They have intimate, I should say close contact with the crew, captain, right at the time of departure. And I knew that an agent would have information on the condition of the captain and the crew immediately prior to sailing.

G

Q What happened then?

A We were between interviews. We were going to interview the third mate, Mr. Cousins. And when you're walking around on a ship, it's pretty narrow and there is no real gathering area. And I was walking through a hall and here was another guy that I hadn't met and I just said to somebody, "Is this the captain?" And I said hello to him and I told him who I was and introduced myself. Well, in the process of me telling him who I was — it was not clear why a game warden would be on your ship, so I told him I was representing the state and we were trying to find out how this happened and why it happened and just what in the heck the problem was because we were all, you know, "How did this happen? What was the problem?" And he said to me, "You're looking at it."

Q Did you communicate with anyone higher up your organization after meeting with the captain?

A Yes, sir, I made more than one call to my lieutenant who's stationed in Palmer. They have a phone there on the ship that you can just, with the assistance of the radio officer, can just dial up whoever I need to talk to and I called up my lieutenant and told him this was a real big problem and that a lot of things had to be done.

Q Did you suggest any lines of investigation to conduct?

I also knew that there's a pilot that's on board and it's a standard operating procedure. I know where the pilots get on and off and I knew that they had to have a pilot. So I suggested to my boss to have a trooper come down and investigate any leads that he might uncover through the shipping agents in Alaska Maritime and the pilots (unintelligible) for starters.

Q And that was in a conversation which occurred

A Well, it was early in the morning, prior to the captain (unintelligible). I called him several times, telling him how things were progressing and how much oil was dumped in the water.

Q Did you sit in as Mr. Delozier interviewed Gregory Cousins, the third mate?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did that occur at 8:43?

A Yes.

Q At some time after your interview with Mr. -- Mr. Delozier's interview with Mr. Cousins, did you become aware of the blood testing process?

A Yes, it was a major concern of myself and Mr.

Delozier, you know, when was this going to take place and we talked about it all the time. And there was a great deal of conversation between the boat and the Coast Guard

station over getting somebody out there to do this blood testing. And because I was in sort of an agency assistant position, I never really made any decisions, who was saying this and who was saying what. And I never really got down to the point where I directed anybody to do anything. And it was very frustrating for me because I knew what had to be done and I knew that time was important and no one seemed to be able to tell me what the problem was.

And some time before lunch, it was 10:00, 10:30, somewhere in there, I said to Delozier, I said, "We've got to get this blood sample. I mean what's going on here?"

And he said, "Oh, we've got a guy doing it." And I said, "Well, good, fine." And it turned out that there was some sampling kits on board the boat from the beginning that they carried with them and it was just a matter of getting a person out there that could do the lab work and take the sample.

And then I went into the captain's stateroom which is right across from the radio room there and they were taking blood from one of the lookouts, a lady, Maureen something, Maureen Jones. She was sitting there, at the captain's desk, and the medic was taking her sample.

And I asked the medic, I said, "How are you doing this? Are you sealing this stuff up so that it's going to be good evidence and all that?" He said, "Oh, yes." He

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

showed me a container that was a standard blood and urine sampling kit that was taped closed, signed and dated by him and so I saw that and I said, "Well, that looks good to me," and I made no steps to secure it as evidence because he already was securing it as evidence. Then after he left, I asked Delozier what happened to the samples and he said the medic took them with him, so I was confident that their integrity would be safe (unintelligible).

Do you know what time actually the blood test Q was --

No, I couldn't tell you, but it was late in the Α morning. It was late in the morning, before lunch.

What time was lunch? O

We ate, right around noon we ate, in the officers Α mess.

Did you see bottles of the substance labeled Q Mousey?

Yes, there was Mousey, I believe is the pronunciation, nonalcoholic brew I think is what it says on the label. It's a green bottle with a foil top, like a beer bottle. And they were in the refrigerator in the captain's -- in the officer's mess. And there was also a couple of bottles in the refrigerator in the captain's office, stateroom, suite.

After lunch, what -- how many bottles were there

that you saw in the --

A In the captain's room, there were roughly two, I guess, and in the officer's mess, there was a lot, a case or two, I suppose, in the refrigerator. It's a glass fronted case full of pop and whatnot, juice and milk, and there was a whole shelf of them in there.

- Q After lunch, did you sit in on the interview with Captain Hazelwood conducted by Mr. Delozier?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - Q And was that tape recorded?
  - A Yes, I tape recorded it.
- Q After the interview with Captain Hazelwood, did you go look for those two bottles again?

thought it would be a good idea to have a sample of the stuff, so I went back to the officer's mess and I took two bottles out of there and one of the bottles, I opened it, smelled it, offered it to Delozier, Dan Lawn and Mr. Falkenstein so they could smell it, see if it resembled what they smelled on the captain's breath. Then, later, Delozier took another one out of the captain's stateroom and gave it to me and, eventually, I took it to town and delivered it back to their Coast Guard station there. So I ended up with one bottle and the Coast Guard ended up with one bottle and the other one I opened and dumped it out.

- A It was around 3:00, I believe.
- Q Mr. Fox, would you have gone to the Exxon Valdez in response to the report of a grounding, alone, had there been no report of leaking oil?
  - A No doubt.

- Q Explain why.
- A It's my back yard. Well, I'm the only Fish and Wildlife trooper there. It's my beat. It's where I work; it's where I live. You get news like this, you've got to go check it out.
- Q Did you make efforts over the next few days to get help with the investigation?
  - A Yes, from the beginning.
  - Q Tell the judge what you did.
- A Not to repeat what I did from the boat, after I got back to town, I continued to call my lieutenant and the colonel, the head guy in our division, and tried to press upon them the size of this problem. And everybody was listening, but nobody was really saying anything. And then, on Sunday, the commissioner called me up and he said, "What's going on," so I told him. And then I talked to Michelle Brown in the Attorney General's office, she came to town. And by Sunday night, I had gotten word that the District Attorney's office as sending someone and the State

Troopers' Headquarters was sending someone. And, in fact, we ended up with one person from the AG's office, one person from the DA's office, this is like on the first day, Sergeant John McGhee of the troopers and then, the next day, about three more troopers showed up.

Q At some time, did you receive instructions that you should not get information from the National Transportation Safety Board investigators who were in Valdez working on an investigation on their own?

A Actually, before they were even there. It was well before anyone came. It was in the very early parts of the investigation and we became aware of NTSB's efforts to investigate the crime. And the Coast Guard told us that the NTSB was going to do everything they weren't going to, so I felt that there was the state people and there were the NTSB people and the NTSB people were a one-way operation. You tell them things; they tell you nothing. And so from the very beginning, what we did is we weren't going to get any help from the NTSB anyway, so we just went about our business and then, eventually, the NTSB caught up with me and sort of drug me in for a couple of hour interview on theirs.

However, right from the very beginning, we never had any exchange of information with the federal investigation, the NTSB.

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Did you receive specific instructions not to get Q information --
  - Yes, from you.
  - When did that happen?
- I really can't say the date and time, but I know that in the very first part of the investigation, I was told to clear every bit of information through your office first or from you and to not necessarily share anything with any other agencies, but to strictly limit my contacts with other investigators to the point where I really didn't have any.
- Did you ever, for example, send reports to Mary Ann Henry or Brent Cole in the District Attorney's Office?
- No, everything that I ever generated went to Sergeant McGhee, who was organizing our things, or directly to you. Anything written went to Sergeant McGhee who was organizing our report. A lot of information, investigative leads that needed checking or follow-up or whatnot I discussed with you prior to doing anything.
- At a somewhat later point, did you receive instructions, an explanation about the inevitable discovery doctrine, the investigation that you were being asked to help in regarding that?
  - Yes. Α
  - Explain to the judge what your understanding was Q

and what you understood your role to be.

A Sure. Well, it was prior to interviewing Mr. Lindennow, this specific group. I talked to Mr. Lindennow at 5:12 and we hadn't done anything or I hadn't done anything involving the investigation for some time prior to that, for a couple of weeks probably. And then I received a call from the DA's office, saying to go out and find these people and interview them. And the subject of the interview was supposed to be, "What would you have done, had you not already known that this ship was on the rocks? When would you have seen it? What would your actions have been? Did you in fact see it and what in fact did you do?"

And it was explained to me at that time, really not in very great detail because I didn't ask, I just went along with the job, explained to me that we needed to have an idea of when we would have inevitably discovered this thing. And my little part of it was to talk with these people. So I went and talked to Mr. Lindennow and Mr. Bradigan and basically Mr. Heston and I offered some advice on who else we might contact, spotter pilots for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Fish and Game, you know, other commercial traffic, et cetera.

But I couldn't say -- before actually doing that work with Mr. Lindennow, I couldn't say when I actually knew about it. However, it seems like I've known it from

1

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

13

14

12

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

the beginning because we were doing our one little route. You know, we were not NTSB or anyone and there weren't any other investigators in town until much later when Trooper Stockard came to town.

At some point, did you suggest that an investigation could go in the direction of talking to guards at the Alyeska terminal?

Oh, yes, that was prior to -- when I knew that the help was coming, that additional help was coming, what I thought I should do is try to have some of the groundwork done, a list of people that need to be interviewed, a list of offices that we could contact, so that we had an organized approach to the investigation. And because I am a longtime Valdez resident, I had a lot of contacts. deal with these people every day and I knew the people and the places where to find them. So I made a list of everybody we needed to talk to and as soon as some help arrived, we sort of dispatched ourselves to interview all these people. And one of the first places we went was the terminal because when people go in and out of the terminal, they are screened by the guards for contraband. face-to-face contact and I thought that perhaps the guards could give us information in regard to the condition of the crew and I wanted to get right to them as quick as we could before their memories faded, et cetera. And that was on

the weekend, Sunday I believe, was when I called them up over there.

3

Q How about as to a cab company?

•

5

6

A When you go to the guard shack, they give you a log, if you ask for it, they give you a log of who goes in and out. And they had them coming in in a Yellow Cab which they --

Excuse me, what do you mean by "they had," when

7

Q

8

you say "they had"?

9

A The guards had them logged into the terminal via a

10

Yellow Cab. I know the guy who runs the Yellow Cab

11

Company, so I called him up and said, "Who was your driver

13

this night," and he told me and I put his name down on the

14

list of people to interview.

15

Q How about a woman, Patricia Caples?

16 17

Caples. She's a longtime, lifelong Valdez person. I know

Pat Caples. She's usually referred to as Tiny

18

her family well. She works for Alamar, Alaska Maritime.

19

And I didn't know that she was the agent right off the

20

bat. However, the manager, the office manager of Alamar is

21

a good friend of mine. I've known him for a long time and

22

I knew that he would know who it was, so I called him up

23

and said -- his name is Bob Barts -- I asked him, "Who is

24

the agent that saw the Exxon Valdez off," and he told me it

25

was Tiny Caples. I said okay and I put her on the list of

conversation with the captain?

Were there leads like that one that you got from a

24

25

2 florist. He told us he had been by the Pipeline Club, the 3 Pizza Palace. He told us he was in the Yellow Cab. 4 told us he had been next door, at the bar, from the Pizza 5 Palace. Certainly all those were leads that we followed 6 up. 7 MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor. 8 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Do you want to take lunch? 9 MR. : It would probably be about right. 10 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, we'll take about an 11 hour and a quarter and come back at about 1:15. We'll 12 stand recessed. 13 THE CLERK: Please rise. The Court stands 14 recessed until --15 (During the luncheon recess, State's Exhibits 1 and 2 and 16 17 3 through 9 were marked for 18 identification.) 19 (During the luncheon recess, 20 Defendant's Exhibit A was marked for identification.) 21 22 (Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., a luncheon recess was 23 taken.) 24

Sure. He told us that he had been by the

25

1

3

# 5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

## AFTERNOON SESSION

(Whereupon, at 1:25 p.m., proceedings resumed.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: All right, Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

### CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Trooper Fox, I want to ask you a couple of questions that Mr. Madson may be interested in in a week or two relating to you being on the vessel when you first arrived and were told about the Coast Guard's suspicions about alcohol. At that point in time, did you feel that you had probable cause to arrest Captain Hazelwood?

Α No.

Q And at any point during the 24th, did you feel that you had probable cause to arrest him?

Α No.

Thank you. Now as I understand it, your first phone call regarding the spill was basically to tell you that there's been a grounding and a spill, but you weren't specifically asked for any assistance, is that correct?

Α Correct.

And you didn't take any action in regard to that Q first phone call or in response to that first phone call?

Α Other than I called them right back and asked about the public safety aspect.

Q And after they told you there was no immediate public safety danger, in essence, if you didn't go back to sleep, you stayed at your house and --

A Correct, I was waiting.

- Q Next, you got a call asking for your assistance --
- A Correct.
- Q -- is that correct? And that was for your assistance regarding an alcohol issue, although you may have misunderstood or somehow there was a lapse in communication.

A I thought that it was wrestling a drunk type of a call, yes.

- Q Okay. Now you told Mr. Linton that if you had only been informed of a grounding, you eventually would have gone out to the vessel anyway.
  - A For sure, yes.
- Q Do you know how soon you would have gone out there?

A I would have waited until I could call my boss without waking him up. Probably 7:30 or so, I'd probably try him at his house, 7:00, 7:30, at his home. And then I would have run to where I keep -- I have a Boston Whaler skiff that I keep in a state of readiness in a warehouse on a trailer in the winter because if you leave it in the water, it gets filled up with snow and it's real hard to

use it. So I would have run to the warehouse and launched it and gone out. It would have taken, oh, maybe 30 minutes to put it in the water, total, and another 30 minutes to run out there or less.

Q Now would you have gone out there to investigate in an official capacity or how would you characterize your activities if this were the chain of events?

A Information gathering, see how bad is it, what are we looking at. Certainly, I'm not going to rely on the Coast Guard's information of whether or not it is a hazard, you know. I can make my own judgments on that. As the tide changes and as things develop, I thought it would be important for me to come to my own conclusions.

Q Now in fact, around -- did you say around 4:00 o'clock in the morning, you got a call, requesting assistance?

A I think it was 4:30.

Q All right. And at that point, you knew that they needed assistance with regard to alcohol and thought that they had a problem with a drunk.

A That's the way I heard it.

Q Okay.

A It was a very brief message, you know. When someone's calling for your help, you don't really go into a lot of details. The first thing you do is get moving.

3 4

6

5

7 8

10 11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Hopefully between the time you get moving and you get there, you'll have more of the story.

Q When you arrived out at the -- I'm sorry. 4:30 phone call, that was Commander McCall?

I think it was, yes.

Q Did he tell you anything about who had been in charge of the vessel or whether there were attempts to get it off the reef, anything of that kind?

Α No.

You arrived at the vessel at approximately 6:45? Q

Α Correct.

And when you met with the Coast Guard personnel at 6:45, they told you that they suspected that Captain Hazelwood had alcohol on his breath or they thought they had smelled --

I arrived at the vessel at about 6:45. I was actually up in the bridge, where the Coast Guard fellows were, closer to 7:05, 7:10. And those two people, Delozier and Falkenstein, told me that they had smelled alcohol on the captain's breath and I went on to question them in regards to sobriety, you know, slurred speech, stomping gait, et cetera, and they had not observed that.

Now they also told you in that first conversation Q that the third mate had been on the conn at the time of the grounding.

Q Now did you think the fact that the captain may have alcohol on his breath was a significant fact?

A Well, for sure, yes.

Q And something that warranted further investigation by yourself?

A Yes.

Q That's why you asked that series of questions about did he have a stumbling gait or --

A Well, sure, if you get called to a drug call, that's the first thing on your mind, you know, is it the truth or not, is it a problem or not. And so you'd have to investigate whether it is an accurate summons for your help and you have to figure out what your role is going to be.

Q Is it fair to say that during the rest of the time, your time on the vessel that day, you did your best, given the constraints you were under to investigate that issue of alcohol as a factor in the accident?

A When I say I did my best, I did what I thought was correct. But if I had my way, if I had actually been doing the investigation, it would have been different.

Q Okay.

A The Coast Guard told me they could get the blood sample, they could get the urine sample and I just allowed them to do that. And certainly we talked about it.

Certainly I made suggestions and encouraged them. But to say that I really did it is not really fair because I was having a hard not to do it. I was having a hard time not to do it.

Q Fair enough. I guess what I'm getting at is -that's what I meant by within the constraints that you
had. For example, you asked various people about potential
alcohol use.

A Yes.

Q And that was as a result of having been told that the people had smelled alcohol on the skipper's breath.

A Correct.

Q And as another example, you looked around the captain's cabin for signs of alcohol use.

A Well, actually, I was in his cabin and I looked around for things obvious. I was in his cabin when Mr. Delozier gave it a more thorough search, you could say. What I did certainly was not a search. However, I was there when Mr. Delozier looked in his waste basket and in his stateroom. I was standing right there, in the office part.

Q You had some input into that in that you discussed --

A Sure.

Q -- the looking around for alcohol signs.

וו

A "What did you find?"

Q Right. Now as to the issue of the third mate being on the conn at the time of the grounding, was that something that you thought was significant at the time?

A Sure.

Q And is that something, again within the constraints you were operating under, something that you pursued as you talked to people on down the line?

A I'm not sure there was much of a focus on the third mate. Certainly, when we did our investigation, it was more than just one prong, Captain Hazelwood. However, we never developed any leads to indicate there was a problem with him drinking or what would ever --

Q No, I understand that.

A I can't really say that we did much, you know, in regards to --

Q I didn't ask the question right. What I'm getting at is whether or not you asked questions of other witnesses about who was on the conn at the time of the grounding.

For example, did you ask the helmsman who was on the conn?

A Well, Delozier did and I was sitting there when he did, so I heard him say that, yes.

Q Okay. You indicated that if you had been doing the alcohol investigation, you would have done some things differently. Can you tell us what those things are?

I don't have a chain of command to worry about, 1 If I want something done, it's just a matter of 2 locally. me doing it. When I became aware of alcohol sampling or 3 blood sampling and urine sampling equipment on the boat, it would have been a simple matter for me to call up the 5 Police Department and I would have said, "I want somebody 6 out here right now to draw blood," because I had the 7 authority to do it, and I would have been able to do it a 8 lot faster. I wouldn't have worried about who it was or 9 how they got there or who was paying for it or any of 10 11 that. And apparently the guy, the Coast Guard officer that was there, was concerned about the procedure that he had to 12 go through to get somebody there. Now what that was I 13 don't know because I wasn't really involved in that 14 process. And when I say things would have been done 15 differently, I am convinced that I, given the same set of 16 authority as they had, could have accomplished the goal 17 faster because I would have been able to do it myself with 18 just that one phone call. 19

Q Okay. Now after getting aboard and getting oriented and becoming aware that this alcohol issue needed to be investigated, you mentioned in your direct testimony that you began to think of witnesses who might be able to account for Captain Hazelwood's condition earlier in the day.

20

21

22

23

24

25

The whole crew's condition.

Q Right, such as --

A Anybody who got off the boat.

Q Such as Pat Caples, the agent; the pilot, Murphy; people of that type. And the reason you were interested in interviewing them or having other troopers interview them was again to see what they could say about this alcohol issue, is that right?

A Well, the accident. I mean, you know, what caused this, how did this happen. You know, there had to be some remarkable event we figured, you know. And certainly at that point, we weren't focusing on one single problem of alcohol. It was, "What the heck happened," you know. Were these guys okay? Were they healthy? Was there some kind of problem? And you have to find that out. And to say we were just focusing on alcohol just isn't true because that wasn't the case at all. We were trying to trace everyone to see what happened.

Q Okay, I thought you had said on direct examination that you were interested in talking to Murphy and the agent, Pat Caples, because they could give an account of what his condition, what Hazelwood's condition was earlier in the day.

A Yes, they could.

Q And the reason that was important is, barring some

epileptic seizure or something of the kind, the reason you were interested in talking to those two people is they could tell you whether he was drunk or not earlier in the day.

- A Well, they certainly should be able to.
- Q Now when you got out to the boat and had talked to the Coast Guard people and had been made aware of alcohol as an issue, you then spoke with Captain Hazelwood at approximately 8:30, is that right?
  - A Right.
- Q And at the time, at that time, you had already talked to Sergeant Lowne about what you should look for in terms of gathering evidence of DWI?
  - A It was not Lowne.
  - Q Did I pronounce his name wrong? Loudon.
- A I called him -- I called the Dispatch Office in Anchorage and he apparently was the only fellow or the main person at the dispatch center. So, yes, I asked him.
- Q So you had already talked to Sergeant Loudon about what to look for in terms of making an alcohol case.
  - A Sure.
- Q And you had already talked to the Coast Guard people and they told you that they suspected alcohol used by the captain.
  - A Yes, that's right.

Q And then you talked to the captain at 8:30 and noticed no sign of alcohol on his breath, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And you were close enough to smell his breath and his breath was sour, but you didn't note any sign of alcohol, is that right?

A When I talked to him, he was drinking a soda, some sort of seltzer or whatever, and he was smoking cigarettes and he had just come out of his room from, I suspect, sleeping and he had sour breath with cigarette smoke in it and whatever else.

Q Yes. My point is that you were close enough to smell his breath --

A Sure.

Q -- and that you didn't smell any sign of alcohol.

A No.

Q All right. And at the same time, at 8:30, you saw no other signs of impairment by alcohol.

A No, he had bloodshot eyes, but it had been a long night.

Q Okay, no other signs of impairment such as slurred speech, unsteadiness, anything like that.

A No.

Q Okay. Now at 8:00 o'clock -- excuse me just one minute. At 8:00 o'clock on the evening of the 24th, you

3

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

passed on what you considered to be investigative leads relating to alcohol to the Coast Guard people, is that correct?

- Α To D.J. Towle is who I think I talked to.
- Who is that? Q
- I think he's a warrant officer for the Coast Guard Α or he's a lower echelon Coast Guard officer.
- Q And in essence, you were saying, "Here are the leads I think you should follow up on to determine whether the captain had been using alcohol that day.
- Well, it was more like, "This is what I found out so far today. What have you found out," and they didn't know anything or they didn't tell me.
- At any rate, the leads that you passed on were in Q reference to alcohol use, what you thought you found or would --
- Actually, most of them were, if I can remember correctly, most of the things that I passed on to them was not so much alcohol as tracking movements and who would have seen these people and who would have been able to say who was off the boat and where they went and what they did and who they may have come in contact with, that sort of thing. If anything other, sort of foul play or any other problem was evident, perhaps some of those people could help us in those areas of the investigation.

Q Have you been briefed by Mr. Linton on what this hearing is about, that is the inevitable discovery and independent source arguments?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you make a report close in time to the 24th in which you noted that you had passed on leads to the Coast Guard?

A Sure, I wrote that.

Q I wonder if you could read to the judge what you wrote about passing on leads to the Coast Guard, if you'd just read the yellow circle there.

A "At 8:00 p.m., I called the U.S. Coast Guard office and passed on several investigative leads to Coast Guard Investigative Officer, D.J. Towle. The leads were in reference to tracking the captain's suspected use of alcohol. Towle advised that he was interested in information and that he would check on it."

Q Your purpose in passing on these leads was to assist the Coast Guard in investigating the alcohol issue, wasn't it?

A I wanted to help them, pass them on \_\_\_\_\_ and I wanted them to help me.

Q At the same time, you were going to continue your investigation of that issue.

A Sure.

Q Okay. Now you told us that -- this was a holiday weekend, wasn't it?

A Easter.

Q Yes. And you called some of your superiors to try to convince them of the seriousness of this incident and how important it was to get other investigators to the scene.

A Right.

Q And I don't know if I can quote your exact words, but you said something to the effect that people were listening, but you weren't sure if they were hearing you or they weren't --

A It's difficult to pass on information in a factual manner that gets the correct result. And I didn't want to do it in an emotional fashion. I wanted to do it in a manner that would help them understand the situation. And I knew that this process was going to be difficult because no one had ever dealt with it before. Nobody knew it was going to happen. And, you know, it was easier for people like myself, Dan Lawn and others, who sat there and watched this happening, to understand what was going to happen. And we knew what was going to happen and the fellows on the ship knew what was going to happen, the Exxon employees. And it was a tremendous event and it was difficult convincing — well, I shouldn't say difficult, but it was

difficult for me to accurately describe what I felt was going to happen to my bosses.

- Q And you were telling your bosses that the state needed to do its own investigation --
  - A Right.
  - Q -- of this major event.
  - A Right.
- Q When you talked to your bosses about it, did you tell them that there were indications that alcohol had been involved?
  - A Well, I told them everything that I knew.
  - Q And that was one of the things that you knew.
  - A Sure.
- Q And did you tell them that you needed troopers or other investigators to investigate that issue?
  - A I recommended it, sure.
- MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I wonder if it would be all right for me to move this chart over to the easel to ask Trooper Fox some questions about it.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Sure.

(Tape Changed to C-3501.)

(Inaudible discussion.)

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

Q Trooper Fox, is it correct that at approximately 7:05 a.m., you arrived at the ship?

I was on the deck about then.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Q Okay, I'm sorry, that's correct. Did you ask him questions about pilotage?

A We asked him, "What's the story," you know, to replay the events for us and he did from the time that he was with Mr. Hazelwood in town until he got off the ship at the Rocky Point Pilot Station.

Q Was there anyone else present when you interviewed him?

A Mr. Linton and I think also Joe LeBeau of the DEC. Someone else was in there. I think it might have been Joe LeBeau.

Q Did you ask Mr. Murphy any questions about what endorsements were necessary to pilot a ship in this area?

A I think -- I remember him talking about it. He was interviewed twice and I don't remember if it was the first time or the second time we talked about that.

Q Okay, at any rate, you questioned him about the pilotage issue on one of those occasions.

A Yes.

Q All right. You, also on the 27th, questioned him about alcohol?

A Yes.

Q Now on March 27th, you also met with Mr. McGhee, is that correct?

A Sergeant, trooper, Trooper Sergeant McGhee.

Q And what was the purpose of that meeting?

A He arrived in town to take over the investigation and pretty much from that point on, my role was sort of a local knowledge person. I didn't really do a whole lot as far as creative thought. They would say, "We want to do this," and I would say, "Okay, these are the people we need to talk to. We need to talk to these people. Here's where we find them." I was the guy who drove people around, set up meetings, said, "Yes, this person works there," that sort of thing. That's what my role became.

Q And on this meeting, the 27th, you're, in essence, briefing him as to what you found so far and what needs to be done --

A Yes.

Q -- as far as your opinion goes, what needs to be done in the future.

A Yes. Well, I didn't have a whole lot of input on that --

Q Okay.

A -- from then on, but I certainly told them what I had done.

Q Now back to the 24th, is it correct that at 7:37 in the morning, you were present when Mr. Delozier interviewed the helmsman, Mr. Kagan?

A For most of the interview.

- Q That's right, you were gone for the first --
- A Right.
- Q And you were present at 8:43 when Mr. Delozier questioned the third mate, Mr. Cousins.
  - A Yes.
- Q And both of those people were asked questions relating to who was on the conn --
  - A Yes.
  - Q -- during the time of the grounding.
  - A Yes.
- Q On April 1st, you were present at a search warrant hearing, is that correct?
  - A Gee, I really can't remember.
  - Q Would you have a record of it there?
- A I can look in my notebook. Let's see if I have it written down here. At 1950, offered testimony in support of an affidavit for a search warrant.
- Q And at that hearing, you reported parts of what you had discovered so far in terms of your investigation.
- A I can't remember what I said there, but that was the whole point for being there, yes.
- Q Right. You made references to suspicions of alcohol on the part --
  - A I assume so.
  - Q Okay. And did you participate in the search that

took place on April 2d?

- A I looked through garbage bags.
- Q Out on the vessel?
- A Yes.

- Q And what were you looking for when you went through the garbage bags?
  - A Garbage.
  - Q Alcohol bottles?

A We were supposed to look for anything that we thought might indicate alcohol use on board or any destruction of documents or evidence that might be useful to determine the cause.

- Q I guess no one's really asked you this morning. You said that you weren't really in control of the investigation on the 24th, that the Coast Guard had the authority. Was that explicitly discussed by you and the Coast Guard? Did they say, "We're in charge"?
  - A Oh, yes.
  - Q "Tag along, if you want to"?
- A Oh, yes. Well, mostly, I told them -- I asked them, "Do you have the authority to do this? Are you a hundred percent sure you can do this?"
  - Q Meaning what?
- A Interviews, search the room, take blood alcohol samples. I said, "Are you sure you can do this? Because

if you can't do this, then we'll try. We'll get a search warrant or whatever it takes to get blood or whatever."

Because I wanted to be sure that as much was going to be done as could be. And they said, "Yes, we're well within our rights to do this.

Q "We can do this without a search warrant. We can . . "

A Right. So I said, "Okay, fine, as long as you're sure, go ahead and I'll help you in any way that I can."

Q Mr. Linton asked you a question this morning about whether you had received instructions not to share information with other agencies or not receive information from other agencies. And as I recall, you weren't able to tell us exactly when you got those instructions from him.

A Well, very early in the investigation, the Coast Guard made it clear that they weren't going to do anything as far as investigating.

Q Right.

A It might have been after the first day. And they said that the NTSB was going to do everything and the NTSB is a public organization, it's not a -- it's a fact-finding organization and we didn't want to or couldn't get involved in their public review of the case to prejudice our case. So, initially, that was the reason that I understood that we were to work completely independent of any other agency

or

or group.

Q What was your understanding as to why it would prejudice your case to be involved in the NTSB?

A Well, it's just not a good idea when you're doing an investigation to broadcast what you're going to be doing.

Q I take it, then, at that point, there wasn't any discussion of immunity or problems with immunity issues.

A I don't remember, I really can't say.

Q But your recollection is your concern or your understanding was that it had to do with broadcasting your investigative steps.

A And you just have to be careful, you know. There's a lot of money involved. There's a lot of emotion involved. And there are people with microphones, sticking them in your face every time you turn around. And it's just real important that when you're going about your business that you keep your business to yourself and that you do it properly. You don't just go off discussing things with people. You don't tell people what you're doing. There's a chain of authority that began with Mr. Linton and investigators and Mr. McGhee and you just stay within your own lanes, so to speak.

Q Now as a matter of fact, ultimately, the Coast Guard did turn over its transcripts of interviews of the

various witnesses to the state, didn't it?

- A I couldn't say.
- Q Okay, you're not aware of that.
- A No.
- Q You, at any rate, participated, at least by your presence, in many of the early interviews by the Coast Guard of the Exxon Valdez personnel.

A Well, I tape recorded one. I asked the Coast Guard guy if he was tape recording and he said no and I thought that was a mistake. So I tape recorded, at the point when I found out he wasn't, I tape recorded the last one with Captain Hazelwood.

- Q Okay, and you were present for the other ones --
- A Yes.
  - Q -- except for that portion of Mr. Kagan's.
  - A Right.
  - Q When can you recall first hearing that immunity or inevitable discovery might be an issue in this case?

A Well, I never wrote it down in my notes and I've reviewed, looking to see. I understood early in the investigation, and I just wouldn't feel comfortable telling you a date if I don't know a date.

- Q What is it that you understood early in the investigation?
  - A Well, I knew that our investigation had to be

independent of the NTSB's and I knew that, farther along, I knew that Trooper Stogsdill was going to be assigned to another part. I was summoned to Anchorage to appear in Court and I was sent home without testifying and it was --

Q To appear at Grand Jury?

A Grand Jury. And it was explained in fairly good detail that time.

Q Let's take that as a fixed point because we can tell when the Grand Jury was held. Did anyone talk to you about the immunity issue, use the word "immunity" with you prior to your showing up for Grand Jury duty?

A It sure seems that I was aware of it because I knew when I came to the Grand Jury that that was an issue. However, I didn't know that it was an issue that was going to prevent me from appearing at the Grand Jury.

Q Let me ask you this. Did anyone ever say to you -- let's take before the Grand Jury date, again, that's a fixed point. Before the date of Grand Jury, did anyone say to you, "As you continue your investigation, Trooper Fox, we don't want you to utilize any information you obtained that first day"?

A I was -- as I said, when Sergeant McGhee came, I fell into a role that was so minor that that sort of a statement would have been unnecessary.

Q How about before Sergeant McGhee came, did anyone

say that to you?

A No, no.

Q All right. How long did you stay on the vessel on the 24th?

A I left around 3:00 o'clock to drive back into town around 3:00 o'clock. I flew in by helicopter, so it didn't take long.

Q Now after participating in the investigation on the 24th and after participating in the follow-up investigations that you did let's say in the next week or two, talking to Pilot Murphy, talking to the other witnesses you interviewed -- by the way, do you have some estimate of how many witnesses you interviewed in the first couple of weeks?

A I didn't actually -- Pilot Murphy, Mr. Murphy, the pilot -- I think Captain is probably appropriate, Captain Murphy --

Q All right, Captain Murphy.

A -- is the only one that I was really a main interviewer at and Mr. Linton was key there, also. After that, we relied on the investigators that were sent down and I was present for several of the interviews. However, once again, it was, "This is where we go. This is who we see, how we do it." And the questioning and the tape recording and whatnot was actually conducted by Sergeant

McGhee or Trooper Burke or whoever else there might have been.

- Q I don't mean to put words in your mouth, but it sounds like you're saying you were essentially a facilitator, once the other investigators arrived --
  - A Absolutely, yes, absolutely.
  - Q -- but, nevertheless, aware of what was going on.
  - A Absolutely, yes.
- Q Okay, having been that intimately connected with the first several weeks of the investigation, as I understand it, then your involvement dropped off significantly?
  - A Oh, yes.
- Q And then you were called back up in roughly early May some time to do this inevitable discovery investigation?
- A Once again, I was the only guy in town and I was called up and asked to locate and interview Lindennow, the Hestons and Mr. Berodikin.
- Q Were you given any instructions along the lines of, "When you interview these people, you should not make use of whatever you learned in your earlier investigations"?
- A Well, I was asking them. I wasn't giving them information; they were giving me information. And I just

asked them what the story was. So, no, I guess not.

Q In other words, you weren't given any specific instructions, "Limit your questions to these areas," or, "Don't utilize certain information in formulating your questions"?

A They didn't give me negatives. They said, "Do this. Interview the people and find out, question the inevitable line, 'When would you have found this out?' 'When, in fact, did you find it out?' 'How would it have been different if you hadn't heard it on the news,'" that sort of thing. Those were the instructions that I received.

Q And how many witnesses did you interview?

A Mr. Berodikin, Mr. Lindennow and Mr. Heston. And I talked to Mr. Brady, Fish and Game biologist, and found out that he didn't have a flight scheduled that day, so there wasn't --

Q Did you do any further investigation, other than what you just described, on the inevitable discovery issue?

A Well, I sure can't remember it.

Q Thank you, Trooper Fox. I don't have any other questions.

MR. LINTON: Call Mark Delozier in. Whereupon,

MARK D. DELOZIER

1 having been called as a witness by Counsel for the State, 2 and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and 3 testified as follows: THE CLERK: Sir, would you please state your full 4 5 name and spell your last name? 6 THE WITNESS: It's Mark James Delozier, 7 D-e-1-o-z-i-e-r. 8 THE CLERK: Your current address? 9 THE WITNESS: Post Office Box 1934, Valdez, 10 Alaska. 11 THE CLERK: Current occupation? 12 THE WITNESS: Vessel supervisor. 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. LINTON: Who do you work for now? 15 Q 16 Α North Employment Agency. 17 And what type of work do you do? Q 18 Escort laden tankers outside of Prince William Α 19 Sound. 20 Q Were you in the Coast Guard? 21 Α Yes. 22 How long were you in the Coast Guard? Q 23 Α 21 years. 24 Q When did you get out of the Coast Guard? 25 November 1st of this year. Α

A Yes, I did.

2

Q Would you tell the judge where you got that -- who the call came from and what you learned in that call?

4

A I was at home, in bed. I received a phone call from our duty watch stander at the Coast Guard base.

5

Q Who was that?

7

8

9

A I don't recall who exactly it was. I know it was the radio operator that was on watch at the time, but I don't know who it was. He informed me that the Exxon Valdez was hard aground on Bligh Reef and that everyone was being recalled to the station. I said okay and hung up, got dressed and came into the station.

10

Q What time did you get the call?

13

14

12

A Around I'd say about 20 minutes before 1:00.

15

Q What time did you get to the station?

16

A About ten minutes later.

17

Q Tell the judge what happened when you got to the station.

18

A I walked upstairs and met in the hallway with Commander McCall and Commander Falkenstein.

20 21

Q Who is Commander McCall?

22

A He's the commanding officer of the Marine Safety
Office now, overall in charge.

2324

Q And who is Commander Falkenstein?

25

A He's the executive officer, executive in charge at

the station.

Q What did you talk about?

A Just discussed the fact that what was learned at that time was that the vessel was aground at Bligh Reef and we were pooling our thoughts for what we should do.

Q What are the responsibilities of Commander McCall in the overall operation? What are his responsibilities at the Marine Safety, at the Valdez station?

- A He's overall in charge of the whole operation.
- Q And Commander Falkenstein is what?
- A He's second in charge.
- Q And who, if anyone, was in charge of casualty investigations?
  - A I was.
- Q Was a decision made that someone would go to the ship, the Exxon Valdez?
  - A Yes.
  - Q How did that decision come about?
- A Among the -- during the initial discussions with myself and Falkenstein and Commander McCall, we discussed what we should do and I suggested that it's imperative that we try to make immediate arrangements to visit the vessel.
- Q At the time you suggested to them that it as imperative that you make arrangements to get out to the vessel, what was your understanding of what the situation

was at the vessel?

A The understanding was that she was hard aground and hard aground for a vessel of that size or any vessel means that there is more than likely structural damage to the vessel. Structural damage does mean that there is a possibility for loss of life or property.

Q Did you know that there was a report of leaking oil?

A On the telephone notification, I was informed that she was hard aground. I did not know that there was oil in the water at that time. Upon arrival at the station and after the discussions with the CO and XO, we weren't certain whether there was oil in the water. We had not received any quantities that had been released, although I do believe that, at that moment, they did realize there was oil in the water, but we did not know how much or to what extent there was.

Q Would you have made the decision to go out -- well, was a decision made to go out as a result of this discussion?

A Yes.

Q Would the decision to go out have been made, even if there had been no report of leaking oil?

A Yes.

Q Explain why, please.

A Well, the vessel was in distress. There was a problem with the vessel. In our zone of responsibility, it's our responsibility to check into these types of things. They had a serious problem there, whether or not there was oil in the water. The vessel being aground is a serious problem.

- Q Does the master of a vessel have an obligation to report marine casualties?
  - A Yes, he does.
  - Q Does that include groundings?
  - A Yes, it does.
- Q Did the Coast Guard station to which you were assigned -- what's the proper lingo, Coast Guard Marine Safety Office?
  - A Marine Safety Office.
- Q -- the Marine Safety Office have a responsibility to investigate marine casualties?
  - A Yes.
- Q Does it have a responsibility to collect documentary evidence?
  - A Yes, it's part of the investigation, yes.
  - Q What time did you leave to go to the ship?
  - A I think it was around quarter to 2:00.
  - Q What time did you arrive at the ship?
- A I believe it was around 3:40 in the morning.

Q What did you do when you arrived there?

A Climbed the ladder on the starboard side, came up to the main deck, walked across the deck, up to the house, ordered the elevator and made our way up to the wheelhouse, entered the wheelhouse and walked up to the port side up by the windshield there and met with Captain Hazelwood.

- Q Did you detect an odor of alcohol on him?
- A Yes.
- Q Tell the judge what you observed about him and what you could detect.

A As I approached Captain Hazelwood, he was standing at the forward part of the wheelhouse on the port side and Commander Falkenstein and Dan Lawn were in our group, along with a crew member that escorted us up to Captain Hazelwood. The crew member introduced us to Captain Hazelwood and Commander Falkenstein had a couple of brief words with him. And then we slowly started to discuss the nature of what types of information had been developed at that time, as far as the safety of the vessel, how she's sitting, if any tanks are breached, et cetera. And during those moments of about ten or 15 minutes is when I observed a strong odor or alcohol coming from Captain Hazelwood.

Q While you were on board, did you and Commander Falkenstein share responsibilities or did you have them divided somehow?

A Yes, we divided responsibilities.

Q Explain what the division was.

A After we discovered the extent of the casualty and it would be more than just one person could handle, even though he is my superior officer, we decided to break it up so that he would be in charge of the marine salvage and oil pollution aspect and then I would take over the investigation of the casualty.

Q Would you tell the judge what you went through, then, while you were on board to investigate the marine casualty?

A Well, at that particular point there, I was concerned with fulfilling my job, but I was also concerned with not interfering with the safety of the vessel. And I knew that Captain Hazelwood and the rest of his crew members and everyone else would need to devote their time and energy to insuring that the vessel remained in a safe condition. So I didn't want to interfere with them by drawing them over to a corner and questioning them and so forth, so I kind of just wandered around, observed, looked at documents that were readily available in the wheelhouse and the charts. And when I had an opportunity, then I asked Captain Hazelwood for permission to start interviewing people, the crew members.

Q Mr. Delozier, I show you what's been marked as

Number 3 is also marked Grand Jury Exhibit 15. Number 4 is Grand Jury Exhibit 19. Number 5 is Grand Jury Exhibit 18. Number 6, Grand Jury Exhibit 22. Number 7, Grand Jury Exhibit 20. Number 8, Grand Jury Exhibit 16 and Number 9, Grand Jury Exhibit 21.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Do you recognize those documents you got from on board the Exxon Valdez while you were on board, conducting your investigation?

A Yes, sir.

Q You've told us that you looked around at some point while you were on board and would you explain fully when and under what circumstances you took the documents which we've just referred to from the Exxon Valdez?

A Well, it's customary in a casualty investigation, from the Coast Guard's aspect, first of all, to ascertain whether the vessel comes under Coast Guard jurisdiction. So thereby you need to gather certain documents, for instance, their certificate of inspection, the names of the persons on board, the licenses that the persons on board are operating under, et cetera. So during the course of this period after arrival is when I started to look around and make a mental list of which documents I would need in order to proceed for a Coast Guard casualty investigation.

The crew list is one and the licenses are another,

the log book entries, things of this nature.

Q Let's interrupt for a second. The crew list is Grand Jury -- excuse me, is State's Exhibit 7. That was one of the documents you found.

A Yes.

Q In the form in which it is before the jury, there is -- as it was before the Grand Jury and is before the Court, there is a stamp which says, "I have seen the original and compared the copy with it and found it to be a true copy. Mark J. Delozier, CWO3, USCG, Marine Investigator/Inspector, Marine Safety Office, Valdez, Alaska, USCG, dated 26 March . . ., "Mar, ". . . 1989." What is that stamp?

A It's a stamp that I put on anything that I duplicate after I've seen the original. The original in this case was a -- off of a computer printout and I copied this (inaudible).

Q And that was one of the documents that you found on board the vessel.

A Yes, it is.

Q Is it one of the documents which is required by Coast Guard regulations to be maintained on board a vessel?

A Yes, it is.

Q And (unintelligible) for a period of at least 30 days after a marine casualty?

A A list of the crew is required to be kept on board, yes.

- Q For a period of 30 days?
- A For a period of 30 days? I don't know.
- Q But required to be kept on board.
- A Yes.
- Q How about the licenses, those are \_\_\_\_\_\_, they are exhibits?

A All the officers that are required to be on board as per their certificate of inspection are required to carry -- have these posted in a conspicuous place on board the vessel on which they're serving.

- Q Have you ever heard of a Prince William Sound endorsement for such certificates?
  - A Yes.
- Q Does it appear on any of the certificates in the packet of exhibits you're holding?
  - A Yes, it does.
- Q Would you read what language on the certificate and then point it out so the judge can see the language?
- A Captain Hazelwood has a license here. He's licensed to be a master of motor vessels and steam vessels of any gross tonnage on the oceans, et cetera. In addition to that, he also has a first-class pilot of steam and motor vessels of any gross tons upon waters of Prince William

Well, it's not that they're required. It's that

1 the more documents you have, the easier it is to prove the 2 case. So, yes, I did pursue and find whatever documents I 3 felt was necessary. MR. LINTON: The crew list is Number 7. Honor, I move for the admission of Number 7. 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection. 6 7 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Received. (State's Exhibit 7 was 8 9 received in evidence.) 10 MR. LINTON: (Inaudible.) I move for the 11 admission of 4, also. 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection. (State's Exhibit 4 was 13 received in evidence.) 14 MR. LINTON: Let's try to get back in order. 15 Let's go to Exhibit 3. 16 17 BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming) What is Exhibit 3, sir? 18 This is a copy of the engine room bell logger. 19 Tell the judge what (inaudible). 20 Q On this particular vessel here, it's a tape which 21 is run in the engine room, control room, and for every 22 order that the control room receives for the engine, it will display it on a running tape. 24

MR. LINTON: I move the admission of 3, Your

24

25

Honor. MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection. JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Admitted. (States Exhibit 3 was received in evidence.) BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming) This was, again, one of the documents you found on board the vessel. Α Yes, it is. Let's go to 5. Is Exhibit 5 one of the documents you bound on board the vessel? Yes, it is. Α What is Exhibit 5? 0 Exhibit 5 is a copy of the course recorder of the wheelhouse. Q Explain what a course recorder is, please. A course recorder is a tape, also, which is run. It has time increments on it and it has heading increments on it and it prints out, on a graphic form, the movements 20 of the rudder of the ship as she swings from side to side. 21 Q Is time recorded in some fashion? 22 Yes, it is. 23 Q How is time recorded?

On one side here, it's incremented in time and then it is calibrated prior to -- well, in this case, prior

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What do you mean by calibrated prior to departure?

Well, you take a look at the chart and you match it up to the time where the needle sits versus the time on the graph here and look at your watch or your ship's clock and assure that both of them are the same and you note it.

MR. LINTON: I move the admission of Exhibit 5, Your Honor.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Are these courses that are (inaudible)?

> THE WITNESS: I don't (inaudible).

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: 5 is admitted.

(State's Exhibit 5 was received in evidence.)

MR. LINTON: Judge, I don't know whether I moved for the admission of 3 or not. I'd do so at this time if I neglected to do that.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: 3 has been admitted.

MR. LINTON: Let's go to Exhibit 6.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Explain what Exhibit 6 is. Q

Exhibit 6 is a copy of the bell book which is a handwritten log which is kept in the wheelhouse of this particular vessel and it is used by the mate on watch to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

A It was identified by Third Mate Cousins and, also, during the course of the -- from the time I arrived until approximately 2:00 o'clock the next afternoon, at some

point during that period, I had discussed it with Captain Hazelwood and he acknowledged that that was also the chart that was used.

MR. LINTON: I move the admission of Exhibit 8, Your Honor.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Admitted.

(State's Exhibit 8 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Referring to Exhibit 8, there are on the exhibit figures located near or on the Z in Valdez arm and Figure 12339 and then there's a Figure written just west of Busby Island, 2355. Both have a circle and a dot beside them, that is the 2339 and the 2355. Was that handwriting on the chart at the time you took it?

A Yes, it was.

Q Let's go to Exhibit 9. What is Exhibit 9?

A Nine is a copy of the deck log book of the Exxon Valdez.

Q What's recorded in that book?

A Events that occur daily on board the vessel, such as who's on watch, the lookouts, helmsmen, mates, weather, sea conditions and end remarks, also any tests of electronics or safety gear, unusual events or just events

that they want to have noted throughout the log book.

Q Was that one of the documents that you took with you when you left the vessel?

A Yes, it was.

Q In each of these instances of these exhibits, beginning with 3 and including 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, are they documents ordinarily kept on board in the ordinary course of business in the operation of a ship, in your experience?

A Yes, they are.

MR. LINTON: I ask that this be marked as the next exhibit.

(State's Exhibit 14 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q What's been marked as Exhibit 14, do you recognize that as the subpoena you prepared and left with the vessel when you took the documents we've just been referring to?

A This is a copy of the subpoena that I issued to Captain Hazelwood.

MR. LINTON: I move the admission of Exhibit 14.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Excuse me, could I see that one more minute?

MR. LINTON: Sure.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I wonder if I could

That's correct.

Q Who is he?

A Mr. Debby was the relief master of the Exxon Valdez. I gave the subpoena to Captain Hazelwood and during the period just prior to my departure, Captain Hazelwood was getting very busy. There were a lot of Exxon people coming aboard and I believe it was handed over to Captain Debby who, in turn, acknowledged receipt of the subpoena.

- Q When was it, then, that you physically took the documents off the vessel?
  - A That evening, March 26th, around 18, 1900.
- Q I show you now four exhibits, numbered 10, 11, 12 and 13.

(States Exhibits 10, 11, 12 and 13 were marked for identification.)

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

- Q Do you recognize those as statements in your handwriting that you took from various people on board the Exxon Valdez on March 24th, 1989?
- A These are notes of interviews which I conducted with these individuals.
  - Q In your handwriting?
  - A In my handwriting.
  - Q Filled out when?

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

```
1
             0737 means 7:37 in the morning.
        Q
2
        Α
             Right, a.m.
             A.m. With respect to Exhibit 11, what time did
3
    that interview take place?
4
5
             1000 in the morning, 10:00 a.m.
        Α
6
        Q
             10:00 a.m. on the 24th of Gregory P. Cousins?
7
        Α
             Yes.
8
             MR. LINTON: Move the admission of 11, Your Honor.
9
             MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection.
                                Admitted.
10
             JUDGE JOHNSTONE:
11
                                  (State's Exhibit 11 was
12
                                   received in evidence.)
             BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)
13
14
             Exhibit 12 is an interview at 1315, 1:15 p.m. on
    March 24th, 1989, of Joseph J. Hazelwood.
15
        Α
             That's correct.
16
17
             MR. LINTON: Move the admission of 12, Your Honor.
18
             MR. FRIEDMAN: No objection.
             JUDGE JOHNSTONE:
                                Admitted.
19
20
                                  (State's Exhibit 12 was
21
                                   received in evidence.)
             BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)
22
23
        Q
             And 13, with respect to the date, the 25th, at
    1600, an interview with Jerzi Glowacki, G-l-o-w-a-c-k-i.
24
             That's correct.
25
```

who was on board the vessel, informed him that we needed to

make such arrangements for someone to come out to the vessel to conduct such a test and that when he next makes his phone call back to the main office to Commander McCall that he should relay our desires to make arrangements for someone to come out to the vessel.

Q Do you recall what time you communicated that to Commander Falkenstein?

A It was at our first -- it was just prior to the first phone call off the vessel, so it had to be somewhere around 4:00 a.m. in the morning that I relayed it to Commander Falkenstein and the phone call was made somewhere around 4:10 a.m.

Q Did you specify who you wanted to come out when you made the request of Commander Falkenstein yourself?

A We specified that we needed either a medical type person, qualified person, or a law enforcement type person to come out to conduct such a test.

Q After you made that communication, were you aware of what efforts were made on the Valdez end of the line to get such a person?

A At that time?

Q At that time.

A I was not aware of what methods they were going through at that time, but I did find out later, during the course of the investigation.

Q That day?

2

No, after I returned back to Valdez.

3 4

Later that day, what did you find happened as a Q result of your request for such help?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

Well, the message was relayed to Commander McCall. Commander McCall was extremely busy because of the nature of the casualty, to begin with, and he either relayed the request to a subordinate of his back at the office or he did it himself. But he made contact with the local state police, looking for Trooper Alexander. Trooper Alexander was apparently on leave or not in town at the time, so the local office referred us to Trooper Fox.

Trooper Fox apparently was contacted by Commander McCall and the request was relayed to him. The arrangements were transferred to him for him to head on down to the Coast Guard dock for transportation out to the Valdez. And Trooper Fox arrived somewhere about 7:00 a.m., in the morning.

Sometime thereafter, did you have to make arrangements again for someone to come out to help with blood?

Α Yes. Apparently, the word wasn't totally relayed to Trooper Fox that we needed someone to come out and actually take a blood alcohol test or a Breathalyzer test. He was -- when he arrived, he was under the impression that

he was dispatched to come out here to take an unruly intoxicated person off the vessel and he was prepared with his handcuffs and his sidearm to do such.

Upon his arrival, I indicated to him that there was no need for anything of that nature and that what we did need was a qualified person to take either a Breathalyzer test or a blood alcohol test. So his arrival at that time was not helpful.

Q Did you try again?

A Yes. As soon as I discovered that he was going to be of no help, I got back together with my boss and, once again, we relayed the request back to our office. They took steps to get ahold of a Coast Guard medical technician that had been in town, a TAV. They rounded him up and put him on a helicopter, flew him out to the vessel.

Q What time did -- you met him at some point, then?

A Yes, he arrived I believe it was around 9:30, somewhere around 9:30.

Q And were you with him when he began to draw samples from people on board the vessel?

A Yes, I was already in process of -- from the time that Mr. Fox arrived and I realized that he was not going to be of any help to the time that the Coast Guard technician arrived is when I found out that Exxon Company had sample kits on board the vessel, which consisted of a

sample bottle for the taking of urine and tubes for the taking of blood, syringes, et cetera. These all came prepackaged in a kit.

I talked with Captain Hazelwood. He informed me that, yes, they did have these on board. And I was getting a bit impatient at this time here, so I asked him if we could proceed and draw urine from the crew members that were on watch. We proceeded and conducted the urine test with Captain Hazelwood being last. And just before — actually, Captain Hazelwood could not fill the urine bottle at that time, so I had finished the other three or four crew members and that's when the Coast Guard technician arrived. At that time, that's when we started to commence to take the blood samples from the same persons that I had already taken urine specimens from.

- Q And did you witness the corpsman taking the blood samples from crew members?
  - A Yes, I did.
  - Q And who were blood samples taken from?
- A They were taken from Captain Hazelwood first, AB Kagan. AB Maureen Jones and Mr. Cousins.
  - Q What time were these taken?
- A The urine tests were taken between 8:30 and 9:30 and the blood tests commenced at 9:30 and I believe they were finished at around 11:30. It was quite an extensive

ordeal, not to draw the blood, but to seal all the specimens, witness them, sign them, initial them and so forth.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Excuse me. Did you say that Captain Hazelwood did give a urine sample or did not?

THE WITNESS: Captain Hazelwood -- I started in sequence with the ABM watch and worked on through. Captain Hazelwood was supposed to be last. I asked him if he could give me a urine sample and he informed me that he was unable to go at that time, so I waited around for a few moments and that's when the Coast Guard corpsman arrived. So when he arrived, I talked to him and said that we needed to take blood samples and that because I was unable to take a urine sample from Captain Hazelwood, I would like to start taking a blood sample from him first, which he did. Moments before we took his blood sample was when Captain Hazelwood walked up and said that he could then give me a urine sample, which he did provide both a urine sample and a blood sample at the same time or back to back.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

- Q Did I understand you to say that you would have gone to the Exxon Valdez even if it had only been reported that the Exxon Valdez was hard aground on Bligh Reef?
  - A Absolutely.
  - Q Is one of your reasons related to the nature of

1 the bottom in Prince William Sound? 2 Α Well, yes. Q Explain that, please. 3 The rocky bottom. 4 Α 5 Q What does that mean for why you would have gone out? 6 If you aground on rocks, it's going to be more 7 detrimental to the hold than if you went aground on soft 8 9 mud, silt in some cases. 10 Did you have responsibility with respect to 11 determining whether there was a danger to life? 12 Yes. Was the grounding a major event in the work that 13 Q 14 you had done there, in Valdez? Α Was the ground a major event? 15 Yes, alone. 16 Q 17 I don't understand. 18 Had you ever, in the course of your roughly hundred casualty investigations, had you ever had one with 19 20 ship as large in such peril before? 21 Α Yes. 22 Q When was that? 23 '84, the tanker Alvenus. Α 24 Q I can't hear you. What did you say, the day 25 before?

No, in 1984, I believe it was in '84, somewhere around there, either '84 or '85, in the Gulf of Mexico, the tanker, Alvenus, had ran aground outside of Cameron,

Did you go to the scene of that one?

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Let's take a break, about ten or

THE CLERK: Please rise. The Court stands

(Whereupon, at 2:57 p.m., a recess was taken.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Friedman.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

Mr. Delozier, just as a point of clarification, would it be fair to say that the urine test given by Captain Hazelwood was approximately 50 minutes before the

Now would it be accurate to say that you were, for the Coast Guard, the chief investigator of this incident?

Q And when you got the initial call regarding this

3

6

5

7

8 9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

incident, you were told that not only was the vessel aground, but that it was leaking oil, is that correct?

I don't recall.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Delozier, do you want to move that microphone up a little higher? I'm told that you get a better recording if you do that. That's good, thanks.

# BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

- Mr. Delozier, I'm showing you page 639 of your Q NTSB testimony and what I'd like to ask you is whether at the NTSB, you testified, "It was relayed to me, both over the telephone on the initial contact that the Exxon Valdez was hard aground on Bligh Reef and she was leaking oil."
  - What is your question? Α
- Is that what you told the NTSB during your testimony?
- If the court reporter wrote that down, then I assume I said that.
- And was your recollection of that first telephone call clearer back when you testified at the NTSB than it is today?
  - Α More than likely, it would have been, yes.
- When you arrived at the Coast Guard station, you told Commander McCall that it would be advisable to call in the strike force?

A I said I would make arrangements to have the national strike force called in, yes -- not called in, but placed on alert and notified.

Q What does it mean to place them on alert?

A So they can start rounding up their folks and being prepared, as prepared as they can to make a quick and fast flight to Valdez.

Q Is that because you anticipated a major oil spill or oil leak?

A I anticipated a problem with the vessel. A vessel this size that is aground is a problem which we would more than likely need some assistance from the strike force.

Q Now when you arrived at the Coast Guard station, you discussed the problem with Commander McCall and Lieutenant Falkenstein, is that right?

A I listed in to their conversations. I was incorporated into them. But, mostly, I was a listener, trying to observe and trying to find out what they knew to make determinations as to what I should do.

Q Did you listen in on any radio communication between either Commander McCall or Lieutenant Falkenstein and the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes, I did.

Q Did you listen in on the transmission with Captain

Hazelwood in which he indicated he was going to try to get

the vessel off the reef?

A I believe so.

Q In that transmission, did you overhear Captain Hazelwood report that, "Major damage has been done"?

A I don't recall.

Q In discussing this with Commander McCall at this first meeting, did -- I'm sorry, let me take that back. When you listened to this conversation between Captain Hazelwood and Commander McCall, did you hear Captain Hazelwood say, "A little problem with the third mate"?

A Yes, I do recall that.

Q So at the time you went out to the vessel, you were aware that Captain Hazelwood thought there had been a little trouble with the third mate and that he had tried or was going to try to get the vessel off the reef.

A I don't recall listening to the conversation in which Captain Hazelwood said he was going to try to get the vessel off the reef, but I do recall him saying that he had a problem with the third mate.

Q Let me show you -- Mr. Delozier, I'm showing you this just to see if this jogs your memory about what you heard of the transmission, if you'll just read this section in yellow.

A What is your question?

Q Whether you recall any transmission from Captain

5

6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

Hazelwood indicating attempts to get the vessel off the reef.

I don't recall.

Do you recall a discussion with Commander McCall about whether attempts should be made to get the vessel off the reef or keep it on the reef or things of that nature?

Α Yes, I do.

Okay, could you tell us, just in general terms, what was discussed?

Commander McCall was opposed to trying to maneuver the vessel off the reef if it meant sustaining any additional damage.

MR. LINTON: Excuse me. Just so the record is clear, could we have him state how he knows that? I mean did he hear that tape afterwards or was he on the vessel when he heard it or was he in the Coast Guard station when he heard it, so we know what --

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: It would be helpful to me if, when we have these discussions, if we can lay a foundation for them, as well.

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

Mr. Delozier, I'd like to focus still on you at Q the Coast Guard station before you leave to go out to the Exxon Valdez. Did you discuss with Commander McCall the issue of whether the ship should be moved from the reef or

2 A

Q Okay, did you discuss that with Lieutenant

Falkenstein either -- well, first, while you -- before you

left the Coast Guard station?

A No, I did not.

No, I did not.

Q Did you discuss it with him on the way out to the vessel?

A No, I did not.

Q Did you discuss it with him while you were on the vessel?

A I don't -- in so many words, I don't believe we did, but I would like to elaborate a little bit.

Q Okay, what -- did you say you would like to elaborate?

A Yes, I would.

Q Sure, go ahead.

A I believe it was both apparent to myself and Commander Falkenstein that it would not be a prudent thing to do, to try to drive the vessel off the reef, upon our arrival.

Q Okay, upon your arrival, did you see any indication that Captain Hazelwood was trying to do that, that is drive it off the reef?

A Upon my arrival?

- Q Right.
- A You mean in the wheelhouse --
- Q Right.
- A -- of the vessel?
- Q Right.
- A Yes, I did see an indication that that had been done.
- Q Okay, my question was more specific. When you got there, did it seem like he was trying to take it off the reef at that time?
- A No, when I arrived at the vessel, Captain

  Hazelwood was on the port side of the bridge and nowhere

  near the controls for the vessel.
- Q Now as the Coast Guard's chief investigator, did you consider it significant that Captain Hazelwood indicated that there had been a problem with the third mate?
  - A I thought it was significant to look into, yes.
  - Q What did you do to look into that issue?
- A I didn't narrow myself to any particular lead for the purpose of coming to a conclusion of this particular casualty.
- (Tape Changed to C-3502.)
- Q I'm not trying to put you on the spot in that way. I'm just asking what did you do to pursue this lead.

Nothing specifically, as far as to pursue that

- Are you telling us that although you considered the lead significant, once you got on the boat, you didn't
  - No, I'm not saying that at all.
  - What did you do to pursue that lead?
- I did exactly the same thing that I did with all other assumptions or leads or things that may or may not have caused this casualty.
- And what were things that you thought would be helpful in pursuing this lead that you actually did do?
- To question the principals, to gather evidence, to gather documents, to find out all the facts that I could.
- Likewise, did you think it was significant when you smelled alcohol on Captain Hazelwood's breath?
  - Yes, likewise.
- And after smelling it on his breath, did you talk to Lieutenant Falkenstein about that?
  - Yes, I did.
- And did you try to get someone out to the ship who could do an alcohol test?
  - Yes, I did. Α

22

23

24

25

Do you know who actually called Mr. Conner? Is it Conner or Conners?

- A Conner.
- Q Do you know who actually called Mr. Conner?
- A No, I don't.
- Q You, also in response to smelling alcohol on Captain Hazelwood's breath, you interviewed people and asked them about his alcohol usage that day or the day before?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q Did you look through Captain Hazelwood's cabin to see if there was any evidence of drinking?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q On April 3d, did you meet with investigators Burke and Grimes from the Alaska State Troopers?
- A I've met with those individuals, but I don't recall the dates.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Mr. Friedman, Mr. Purden has indicated to me that we're having a problem with this record. There's a constant hum and there's no way of knowing if we're making a good record unless we play it back, so I think we're going to have to test this now before we go any further. So let's do a test on it to make sure and if we have to go off the record to get another machine, we'll do so.

(Recording interruption.)

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: It looks like we're doing okay

And did you give them access to the interviews you

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q

conducted on the vessel on the 24th?

A I believe eventually I did, yes.

Q What did you do after let's say March 25th in terms of your investigation of this case?

A It was late on the 25th that I was informed that the Commandant of the Coast Guard had delegated the investigative powers to the NTSB for them to complete the casualty investigation, that I was to continue to do a collateral investigation along with them, but that I would also be at their call in case they were to need for anything at all. I would be working for them until I was properly relieved.

Q Let me ask you this. After you left the vessel on the 26th, did you conduct any independent interviews, that is interviews just with you, where you asked the questions of the witnesses?

A Yes.

Q Okay, can you give me an idea of who you interviewed?

A The cab driver, Ron French. Most of these were conducted in the presence of the NTSB.

Q Sort of a joint venture?

A On occasion, there were other investigators present, also.

Q Would those interviews be reflected as NTSB

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

interviews or investigations or would you have a separate set of Coast Guard investigative reports?

- They were NTSB interviews.
- Have you ever talked to Trooper Stogsdill about Q this case?
  - I don't recall the name. Α
- You testified that a captain has an obligation to Q report casualties such as groundings, is that correct?
  - Α That's correct.
- Does the captain also have an obligation to report an oil spill?
  - Α If he's the polluter.
- Q If he's in charge of the facility that is spilling oil, he has an obligation to report it.
  - Α If he's the person in charge of -- I would -- yes.
- And it's a crime not to do that, isn't it, not to Q report?
  - I'm not certain on that, I believe it is. Α
- The Grand Jury exhibits that have now been marked as exhibits in this hearing, were those all seized by you on either the 24th, 25th or 26th?
  - Α Seized?
  - Accumulated, accumulated. Q
- Accumulated? I requested them from Captain Hazelwood and he provided them for me, yes.

- Q On what of those three days?
- A All of those.
- Q You can look at them again, if you like.

A Just let me see the subpoena. This was a list of items that I had officially subpoenaed. Some of these items I obtained on the 24th, the 25th and the 26th and some of these items didn't come until a few days later.

- Q I see. What would be the longest in terms of days later before you had gotten all of these documents?
- A The report of morning of the casualty I believe was the latest one and that came approximately a week and a half to two weeks later.
- Q Mr. Delozier, would it be accurate to say that at approximately 3:35, you were on the bridge with the captain and Investigator Falkenstein?
  - A I believe the record book indicated 3:40.
- Q 3:40, okay. And at the time, I think you said within a few minutes or a few moments, you smelled alcohol on his breath, is that correct?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Also at that time, you felt he was exhibiting guilty behaviors or behaviors indicating he was trying to cover up alcohol on his breath, is that correct?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Okay. Now later on that day, you questioned the

master, Captain Hazelwood, about what he'd done the day before?

- A That's correct.
- Q And one of the things you were interested in when you questioned him was to try to see whether there was any basis or any more evidence regarding alcohol consumption.
  - A That's one of the things, yes.
- Q On the 24th, also, at approximately 4:00 o'clock p.m., did you question Mr. Glowacki?
  - A No.
  - Q You did not question Mr. Glowacki.
- A Not on the 24th.
  - Q Okay, what date did you question him?
- A I believe it's indicated on the interview sheet there. It's over there.
  - Q The 25th?
- A The 25th.
  - Q And at what time is that?

I believe so.

- A 1600.
  - Q Is that the first time you questioned Mr.
- Glowacki?

Α

MR. FRIEDMAN: Could I have just a minute, Your
Honor, I'm sorry? Thank you, Your Honor, I'm sorry for the
delay.

whether he had endorsement for operation of the vessel in the Prince William Sound area?

- A I don't believe I did.
- Q Did you participate in either of the searches of the vessel that were conducted in April?
  - A By whom?
  - Q By the troopers.
  - A No.
- Q Mr. Delozier, can you tell us your understanding of the requirement that a captain in charge of a vessel leaking oil report to the Coast Guard? What is he required to report?

A It is my understanding that a person who causes a sheen on waters that come under the jurisdiction of the U.S., that person has a responsibility to report that he created pollution to the U.S. Coast Guard. Along with that reporting requirement, I do believe that there are specific items which the Coast Guard is looking for, namely, the type of pollutant, the quantity, location, time, description and so forth.

- Q Some of the surrounding circumstances as to the pollution.
  - A That's correct.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, I don't have any other questions. Oh, excuse me just a second.

3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

Q I do have a couple of other questions, Mr.

Delozier, relating to your comment about how it appeared that Trooper Fox would not be much help in getting the blood test issue taken care of. He came out, he didn't bring a blood test kit with him. And did you ask his assistance in locating someone with the Police Department or the trooper's office who might be able to do a test?

A Yes.

Q And what did he tell you?

A He said that the local Police Department did not have a portable Breathalyzer to be used and he suggested that the best thing at this particular time, being as though it was late after the incident, would be a blood test.

Q And did he suggest that he could get somebody from the hospital or some other place to perform that test?

A No, he suggested the lab technicians at the hospital.

Q Did you make any effort to get those people to the vessel?

A Yes.

Q Is that the corpsman?

A No, when I got back on -- not me, but Commander Falkenstein, when I relayed the information back to

1 Commander Falkenstein, Commander Falkenstein got back on 2 3 5 6 7 8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the telephone and called up the office and informed them at that time that Trooper Fox was unable to fulfill our needs and that we needed to have a medical technician come out, capable of drawing blood samples. And we suggested at that time to look at the local hospital for either a lab technician, a local doctor or a paramedic of some sort. We did not tell them to look for the Coast Guard medical person.

So, in essence, Trooper Fox said that the police Q couldn't be any help because they didn't have the portable unit and that you might try the hospital. And that was the extent of his ability to assist you in getting the blood test taken. Is that a fair recap?

Α He did say that many of the members of the local Police Department are qualified EMTs and they were capable of drawing blood.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay, thank you. I don't have any other questions.

### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Mr. Delozier, did you take these documents from Q the ship because of an interview or was it something you would have taken in any event (inaudible)?

Did I take those because of what?

25

Q Because of the interviews with that person, because Glowacki said, "I've got this document," or, "Because Cousins said this, I went and got that document"?

A Yes.

Q Which instances were those?

A The engine room bell logger which is this one right here. I actually was not aware that the engine room had a bell logger and it was the chief engineer who indicated to me that there was one in existence and then I asked him to provide that, which he did.

Q How about the others? You've got the deck log.

A Well, I knew about the deck log. I knew about the charts. But I needed to get ahold of Third Mate Cousins and Captain Hazelwood to pinpoint exactly which chart was used. Incidentally, there was another chart that went with that one. And this is only a small portion of what I did gather.

Q The documents you have here are just a small portion of what you did get.

A Yes.

Q When Mr. Friedman asked you whether you had any indication that the ship had been run after it was aground, you said that there was an indication, once you got on board the vessel.

A Yes.

- Q Was the engine running at that point?
- A No, the engine was not running at that point.
- Q What was it that led you to -- you indicated there was an indication that the vessel had been run after it was aground.
  - A It was written in the log.
  - Q Which document are you referring to there?
  - A That one that you have in your hand.
  - Q The thing that has \_\_\_\_\_, Exhibit 6?
  - A Yes.
  - Q What did you find there?
- A "004, grounded, reef island." It's got a written position. Then you have, up above it, you have 035, you've got an engine order. 038, another engine order. 047, another engine order.
- Q Would you point those out to the judge so that he can see what it is that you're referring to that indicated to you that the engine had been run after it ran aground?
- A Okay, next to the last page, in the middle of the page, you'll see, "Grounded, reef island, 004," and then above that, you have 035, 038, 047, and these marks next to it reflect an engine order. The 004 entry was made after, in the past tense, after the actual time.
- Q When you say 004 was past time, what do you mean, sir?

0047 would have been after. Q

Α Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q 0139 would have been after.

Α Right.

> Q And that indicates what to you?

Α That indicated to me that someone had attempted to maneuver the vessel off after the grounding.

Q When did you figure that out? When did you look at that document to figure that out?

It was after the first phone call, so it would

have to have been about 4:30, between 4:30 and 5:30.

- Q Before you had interviewed any of the crew?
- A Yes.
- Q Tell us about your wife's situation. You were on board the vessel until the 26th.
  - A That's correct.
- Q And so the first time you got home, then, was on the 26th.
  - A Late, midnight, on the 26th.
- Q Had you talked to her since you had been out of the vessel?
- A I talked to her twice by telephone while I was on board the vessel.
- Q And what did you tell her about what was going on with the vessel?
- A I told her that I'd be home as quickly as I could and not to worry.
- Q When you got home, how did you find out that she might know something about the case?
- A It wasn't until about a week or so later and Captain Hazelwood's picture appeared in the local newspaper or the Anchorage paper. And she, one evening when I did get to come home, she said, "I saw that guy in the Pipeline Club." And then at that time, she said, "I could tell you everything that he did." And I really didn't know what to

Q Had you told her about alcohol?

A I wasn't discussing too much about the case with anyone. I don't believe I did.

Q It's just something she brought up by having seen the picture in the paper.

A Yes.

Q Then she told you something about what she had seen of his drinking that day.

A That's correct.

Q And then sometime thereafter, when troopers came to talk to you, you told them about what your wife had told you and suggested that they talk to her or that they might want to talk to her.

A She was reluctant, extremely reluctant to get involved, being as though I was already involved. Two persons from the same family in a case of this magnitude would have been a little bit more than stressful for both of us. I knew that her knowledge would be useful for the case. Yet, again, I didn't know how to pursue it because it may, for some reason, become a conflict between myself and her. So at that point, I told my Coast Guard people, informed the NTSB and then an interview was set up with the troopers and my wife and I.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Before we get off that subject,

9

when was it that she had mentioned to you she had seen the Defendant in the paper?

THE WITNESS: When did she mention to me that she saw him or when did she see him?

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: No, when did she mention to you that she saw him?

THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge, it had to be somewhere around Thursday or Friday, about a week after the incident.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Thank you.

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

Q You mentioned that some time after the 26th, you conducted interviews with some witnesses when you were working, I take it, at that time in conjunction with the National Transportation Safety Board. One of them was Ron French, a cab driver.

A Yes.

Q Where did you get the name, Ron French?

A Well, we started the investigation with what information and documents and evidence we could gather up from the vessel. And then, from that, we found out that there had been some activity prior to the vessel departing. So we started with the Alyeska security documents, check-in and checkout at the gate, which led us to specific times that the crew members departed the

terminal and specific times at which they returned and how they returned. And from that, we found out that Captain Hazelwood and his other officers that were with him returned by way of a Yellow Cab which was driven by Ron French.

- Q Were you working in conjunction with the state investigators at all at that time?
  - A No, not at that particular time, no.
- Q Had you gotten the name, the cab company name or Ron French's name, from them, as far as you know.

A Well, let me see, let me back it up. We were somewhat working with the state from the moment that Trooper Fox arrived on board. And he had gone off, by telephone, to his people and had pursued certain inquiries and he informed me a couple of times which was he was going and I was doing it mutually. Then the NTSB was there. We all kind of worked together there, also. So, yes, we were somewhat working together, but somewhat independent, too.

- Q Do you know whether the lines of investigation were separate or were crossed, to get the Ron French name particularly?
  - A I believe they were --
- Q Do you understand the question? In other words, did you get the Ron French name from a state investigator or did you give the Ron French name to the state

1

2

6 7

5

10

8

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

25

I believe I got the Ron French name from Chief Peterson who works for me at the Coast Guard office. While I was on board the vessel, I asked him to get ahold of the Alyeska security records and to try to track down the names of the three individuals from the ship as to their whereabouts prior to departure. And I do believe that it was he that first came to Ron French's name.

- Before this case came up, did you know that people who left the vessels or were reentering the terminal to get back on the vessels went through a security gate?
  - Α Oh, yes.
- And did you know that they were checked in or at Q least checked by security people for alcohol or any contraband?
  - Yes, I did. Α
- And did you know that that brought them into some kind of close distance to the guards at the gate in the course of that leaving or entering the terminal?
  - Α Yes, I did.
  - You knew all that before. Q
  - Α Yes.
- So then the idea of calling the Alyeska people, Q the Alyeska gate people to find out what time somebody had come or what time they had gone or how they got there or

what condition they were in wasn't something that you wouldn't already think of as a reasonably intelligent investigator.

A That's right.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Judge.

### RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

- Q Mr. Delozier, you were talking to the chief engineer and learned that there was a bell logger on the vessel.
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q And you then asked him to get it for you?
- A Well, I asked him during the interview if he would provide it to me and he said he would. He did not immediately get up and go and get it.
- Q Given that the vessel log indicated that after the grounding, the engines were run ahead, why did that indicate to you an attempt to get off the reef?
- A Well, if you're aground on a reef, there's only one motive for running the engines after you're aground, being though it's a direct drive vessel, and that's to get off.
- Q Were you looking for indications that Captain Hazelwood had tried to get off the reef?
  - A No, I wasn't.

Q Were you looking for indications as to how he operated the vessel, once the vessel came aground?

A Not specifically, no.

Q You said something about your investigation of the alcohol that I want to clarify. You didn't find any documents on the vessel that led you to people who maybe observed Captain Hazelwood at restaurants or bars, did you?

- A Any documents?
- Q That's right.
- A No, I don't believe I have.

Q Primarily, the investigation of his activities during the 23d was conducted by tracing the people that he had had contact with on that date, is that right?

A Yes, and himself, also.

Q Right. In other words, through real people, not through documents is the point I'm making.

A Right.

Q Okay. And what you were trying to track down was people who could have observed him at different times during the day to see whether he was drinking or appeared under the influence, is that correct?

A I was trying to determine anything that I possibly could that would be helpful for this investigation.

Q And one of the things you thought would be helpful was to try to determine whether he had been drinking that

day, wasn't it?

A I think that would have been a good thing to know.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, I don't have any other questions.

## FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

- Q Is there a relationship between the documents in Exhibit 3 -- what's the correct term for that?
  - A Engine bell logger.
  - Q -- engine bell logger, and Exhibit 6?
  - A Is there a relationship?
  - Q Yes.
    - A Yes, there is.
    - Q Explain what the relationship is, please.
- A The Exhibit 6 is a written log completed by the person in the wheelhouse. In most instances, it's the mate on watch, the person who has to conn, and he writes in his commands that he gives to the engine.
  - Q How does he make the commands?
- A He issues the commands or he is issued the command by some higher authority.
- Q How does he then communicate them to the engine room?
  - A With the engine order telegraph.
  - Q What is an engine order telegraph?

A It's like a gas pedal.

Q Could you describe it, please?

A It's a control on the bridge and you put it ahead

one notch and it will propel the vessel ahead in that specified rpms a little farther, a little quicker rpms, et cetera. You can go astern or be aft of the neutral position there and it will do the same thing, only astern.

Q The signal that is indicated by moving that handle forward, is it transmitted some place?

- A Yes, it is.
- Q Where?
- A Down to the engine room.
- Q And what happens when the signal is received in the engine room?

A I'm not certain on this particular vessel, but I believe it was in engine -- or in bridge control, which meant the bridge had total control over the engine. Any time the bridge gave a command, the engine would automatically respond. Once the engine responded or the command was received by the engine, then it would be recorded on the bell logger.

Q So is there another way for it to work, besides having direct connection between the bridge and the engine, itself?

A Yes, you can be on engine control.

Q What's that?

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You use the same control up in the wheelhouse, but for every movement that you put the engine into, it sends a signal down to the engine control room, at which time the watch stander in the engine room will then command the engine to do the order which it gave it.

So you have somebody up on the bridge signalling. Q The person down at the bottom would read the signal --

Α Right.

-- and take the action to change the engine in accordance with the order.

Α Right.

Other times, it's hooked up directly to the engine from the bridge.

Α Correct.

What is Exhibit 3? Q

That's the engine bell logger. Α

Now one of the documents that -- let me show you Coast Guard Regulation Section 4.05-15, Voyage Records (unintelligible), "The owner, agent, master or person in charge of any vessel involved in a marine casualty shall retain such voyage records as are maintained by the vessel, such as both rough and smooth deck and engine room logs, bell books, navigational charts, navigational work books, compass deviation cards, gyro records, stowage plans,

 records of draft, aids to mariners, night order books, radiograms sent and received, radio logs, crew and passenger lists, articles of shipments, official logs and other material which might be of assistance in investigating and determining the cause of the casualty."

What is an engine room log, sir?

A An engine room log is very similar to the deck log that you have right here. The deck log is maintained by the deck officers and the engine log is very similar, is kept in the engine room and is maintained by the engine room officers.

- Q And did you find such a document, seize such a document?
  - A Yes, I did.
- Q Did it contain signals as to what had been received as to engine orders down in the engine room?
  - A No.
- Q What record was there in the engine room as to what signals had been received down in the engine room?
  - A The bell log.
  - Q That's Exhibit --
  - A Exhibit 3.
- Q -- Exhibit 3. So the only record down in the engine room that you found as to what would be signals to the engine room side of things was Exhibit 3.

- A That's correct.
- Q And you found that because Mr. Glowacki said that there was such a thing?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q You didn't know there was before.
- A I am aware that these exist on some vessels, but I was not aware that it existed on the Exxon Valdez.
- Q So in some investigations you've worked, there were such records and some there weren't.
  - A That's correct.
- Q In the ordinary course of business, would you get whatever form there was down in the engine room as to the signal procedure?
  - A Yes, I would.
- Q Whether Mr. Glowacki told you it came in the form of a log or in the form of a computer printout like that.
  - A That's correct.
- Q So it wasn't because Mr. Glowacki told you that you happened to get it. You were going to get whatever was there. He just told you it was in that form.
- A He had informed me first. I would have found out anyway.
  - MR. LINTON: Okay, nothing further, Judge.
- JUDGE JOHNSTONE: When you look at Exhibit 6 and you see those times, 0035, 0038, 47 and 0139, there are

some checks alongside of them. The first one is a check with what looks like a little D or something above it.

That's for 0035. Do you know what that means, that check?

THE WITNESS: The check is a command that's given to the engine. I don't specifically know what that command is.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, and then on 003, there's another check. That's another command?

THE WITNESS: Right.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: And then 0047, there's a check with a slash through the check. Does that have any significance?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: What is that?

THE WITNESS: I don't know exactly what it means, though. I believe the check means ahead and then a check with a slash means ahead either a third or a half or something of that nature, but I'm not certain.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: 0139 has a circle with an X through it. Do you have any idea what that means?

THE WITNESS: I believe that means all stop.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, now, is there any correlation that those checks and those times might have on Exhibit 6 to Exhibit 3, the bell logger? Would it tell you what those mean?

THE WITNESS: Yes, it would.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: What do they mean? Why don't you tie it up? The 0035, let's start with that one.

THE WITNESS: Well, it's hard to locate the exact point here on this exhibit. This is written in Alaska Standard Time. This is written in Greenwich Mean Time.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: So it would have been about a ten-hour difference on the times?

THE WITNESS: There again, I'm not certain, sir.

It's on here, I have seen it, but I cannot pinpoint it at the moment. Leave me \_\_\_\_\_ and work upwards. I'm not certain, sir. I know that it's on here, I've seen it before, but I cannot pinpoint it for you right now.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: You indicated earlier that this was ahead, the engine's command was ahead, which I guess means forward. Is there anything on Exhibit 6 that suggests that it's ahead and not in reverse, for example?

THE WITNESS: I'm not certain, sir. I don't know what their code is for writing down their commands.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: So when you said ahead, you didn't know if it was ahead or behind; it could have been the stern.

THE WITNESS: That's correct, me, personally. I do know that they are commands, but I don't know what commands they are.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: And is that the sole basis for your opinion that the Defendant was trying to get off the reef? Is there anything else that forms a basis for that opinion, other than that, those entries in Exhibit 6 --

THE WITNESS: That there were commands after the vessel was aground indicates to me that there was an attempt to either drive ahead or drive astern, off towards — to position the vessel on the reef. But at some point in time, because there are commands here, there was engine orders given to either move the vessel in one way or the other.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: That's all the questions I have. Is there anything further because of those questions?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, Your Honor.

MR. LINTON: No, Your Honor.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, step down. Thank you. I think we've had enough for today. Perhaps would it be possible to get a copy of this exhibit for Mr. Linton, so he doesn't have to come over and sit so close?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, we'll have that tomorrow morning.

JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, and if you would get one for me, I'd appreciate it, too. We can only go until 1:30 tomorrow with breaks, but not for lunch. And then I have

1 full days available on Wednesday and Thursday, it turns 2 out, so we can do what we did today on those days. And I 3 have a full calendar on Friday for sentencings and other 4 things, so we won't be able to do anything on Friday. 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I had a request. I wonder if it would be possible for us to end at 1:20 6 7 I've got another hearing starting in another case almost immediately afterwards. 8 9 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Sure, we'll stop at 1:20. 10 Anything further. 11 MR. LINTON: Nothing further. 12 MR. FRIEDMAN: No, Your Honor. 13 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: We'll stand at recess. 14 THE CLERK: All rise. 15 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Let's stay on the record for a Would Counsel approach the bench? Why don't you 16 minute. 17 come over hear on this side. 18 (Bench conference -- inaudible recording.) 19 JUDGE JOHNSTONE: Okay, we're going to recess 20 Off the record. now. 21 THE CLERK: The Court stands at recess. 22 (Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m., the hearing adjourned.) 23

SUPERIOR COURT )
) Case No. 3AN589-7217 17218
STATE OF ALASKA )

I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was typed by me and that said transcript is a true record of the recorded proceedings to the best of my ability.

Nario a. Certeca

#### VOLUME 2

#### STATE OF ALASKA

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT AT ANCHORAGE

4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

In the Matter of:

STATE OF ALASKA

versus

JOSEPH J. HAZELWOOD

Case No. 3ANS89-7217

Case No. 3ANS89-7218

Anchorage, Alaska

November 28, 1989

The above-entitled matter came on for omnibus hearing before the Honorable Karl S. Johnstone, commencing at 8:40 a.m. on November 28, 1989. This transcript was prepared from tapes recorded by the Court.

#### APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the State:

LEONARD M. LINTON, JR., Esq.

On behalf of the Defendant:

RICHARD H. FRIEDMAN, Esq.

DICK L. MADSON, Esq.

21

22

23

24

25

PRO-TYPISTS, INC. Professional Transcription Service (202) 347-5395

1	li	

## CONTENTS

W	<u>I</u>	Т	N	E	<u>S</u>	<u>S</u>	Ε	<u>S</u>	
								_	

DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS STATE Steven A. McCall Eric R. Dohm Gary Graham Mary Ann Henry Michael Opalka Brent Cole 

# EXHIBITS

2	STATE'S	IDENTIFICATION IN EVIDEN	ICE
3	2	- 26	
4	15	57 63	
5	16	57 63	,
6	17	57 63	
7	18	57 63	
8	19	57 63	
9	20	57 63	
10	21	57 63	
11	22	57 63	
12	23	57 63	
13	24	57 63	
14	25	57 63	
15	26	57 63	
16	27	57 63	
17	28	57 63	
18	29	57 63	
19	30	57	
20	31	120 120	
21	32	128 128	
22			
23			

### PROCEEDINGS

(Tape No. C-3499)

THE COURT: Mr. Linton?

MR. LINTON: Your Honor, I'd ask to have the permission of the Court to have the next witness, Commander Steven McCall, testify telephonically. He's standing by a phone in St. Louis, Missouri where he is assigned to a Marine Safety Office now.

THE COURT: That's where he's stationed now?

MR. LINTON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Any objection from the defense?

MR. : No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. In the absent of objection and given that he's stationed in St. Louis and this is an omnibus hearing, I'll go ahead with it. It's generally my practice to do no telephonic witness testimony, but under the circumstances, I'll go ahead with it this time.

We'll see if we can reach him. Have you given Mr. Purden the telephone number?

MR. : I stuck it somewhere. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let's get ahold of him, and -- Just a second. Is this going to be calling collect? How do we handle this? Is he --

MR. : (Inaudible).

THE COURT: We'll charge it to the District

Attorney's office. When you call it, charge it to the

District Attorney's office.

How long do you expect this witness might be?

might be an hour or two?

MR. LINTON: I would guess more like twenty minutes, a half hour.

THE COURT: All right.

(Off-mike remarks)

THE COURT: Is he still titled Commander?

MR. LINTON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Commander McCall, this is Judge Johnstone. Can you hear me all right?

Commander McCall, this is Judge Johnstone. Can you hear me?

MR. : Commander McCall, can you hear him over the line?

THE COURT: Commander McCall, can you hear me okay?

COMMANDER McCALL: Yes, sir. I can.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's turn the volume up on him.

This is Judge Johnstone, Commander McCall. The State is calling you as their next witness, and before you testify, Mr. Purden, our in-court deputy, is going to swear

¹ | you in.

Whereupon,

#### STEVEN McCALL

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: You may be seated. Would you please state your full name, and then spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: My full name is Steven Alexander McCall. M-little C-capital C-a-l-l.

THE CLERK: And your current mailing address?

THE WITNESS: Current mailing address? Office mailing address is Commander, Second Coast Guard District.

1430 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63103.

THE CLERK: And your current occupation?

THE WITNESS: My current occupation is U.S. Coast Guard Officer.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Before we inquire, Commander, I'm going to see if we can turn this volume up. Will it go up any higher?

Can you still hear me, Commander?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I can.

THE COURT: Would you give us a short count to five, please?

THE WITNESS: One, two, three, four, five, four, three, two, one.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. We've got a volume we can live with, I think. Mr. Linton will inquire at this time.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. LINTON:

- Q What rank do you hold in the U.S. Coast Guard?
- A I'm a Commander in the U.S. Coast Guard.
- Q How long have you been in the U.S. Coast Guard?
- A Twenty years.
- Q On March 24, 1989, where were you assigned?
- A I was assigned as the commanding officer, officer in charge marine inspection, and captain of the port for the Port of Valdez, Alaska.
- Q Sometime on the morning of March 24, 1989, did you receive a telephone call about the Exxon Valdez?
- A Yes. At home, approximately 12:30 or so Friday morning, March 24th, I received a call at home when I was in bed.
  - Q What were you told by the person who called you?
- A The person who called me was Mr. Bruce Blandford, one of my watch standers, \_\_\_\_\_ Traffic Service watch standers, and he informed me that the Exxon Valdez had run aground on Bligh Reef.

Q In that initial telephone conversation from Mr. Blandford, did he tell you whether or not the vessel reported leaking some oil?

A I believe he did. I believe he mentioned that the ship was aground and was leaking oil.

Q Having received the telephone conversation, that telephone call, what did you do?

A I think I asked him, "Has the Exec been notified yet? -- that's Lieutenant Commander Falkenstein -- and I believe he said no, and I told him, "Fine. Notify the ExO and tell the ExO and tell the ExO that I'll swing by his house and pick him up on the way in." We only lived about -- oh, not even 50 yards away from each other.

Q After the telephone call, did you do that?

A Yes, I did. I hung up the phone, got dressed, met the Exec, and he and I, I believe in his vehicle, went into the office and arrived there within five, ten minutes or so after the phone conversation.

Q Once you had arrived at the Coast Guard Station

Marine Safety Office, did you and Lieutenant Falkenstein

meet with Chief Warrant Officer Mark Delozier?

A Yes. Mark Delozier was called in and, you know, he arrived at the office after we did, but yes, we met and spoke with Mr. Delozier.

And were you later joined by Dan Lawn of the

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation?

A Yes, we were. I phoned Dan and advised him of what had happened and told him that we were getting ready to go out to the ship, and if he wanted to come along with us, we had the pilot boat getting lined up to take us out. And he said yes, he would want to come.

Q Was it under your direction that Lieutenant
Commander Falkenstein and Chief Warrant Officer Delozier
went to the Exxon Valdez?

A Yes, it was.

Q Would you have exercised that authority to send a Coast Guard investigator the Exxon Valdez even if it had only been reported that the Exxon Valdez was hard aground on Bligh Reef?

A Yes, I would.

Q Would you explain your reasons, sir?

A Well, as far as my recollection goes, there's never been a grounding of an oil tanker in Prince William Sound, so just by that sheer fact alone, the tanker being aground in Prince William Sound outbound -- in other words, loaded -- we would have responded to investigate the casualties.

Q Casualty defined as grounding?

A Yes, casualty as defined in grounding. Also, to verify that there was no pollution. Even if there was

minor amount of pollution, it was dark, it was evening —
it was early morning — we would have sent someone out to
investigate that, and to confirm that there was no danger
to life. And, you know, also when we do the casualty
investigation, we would be reviewing these vessel documents
and chart recorders and interviewing personnel to find out
what actually went on, what happened?

Q Was this the kind of event that attracted more attention than usual in your work?

A Yes, sir. A grounding of any vessel draws a certain amount of interest, but particularly the grounding of an oil tanker would generate substantial interest in the local news media, at least.

MR. LINTON: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Commander McCall, Mr. Friedman will be cross-examining you now.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Commander, my name is Rick Friedman. I'm one of Mr. Hazelwood's attorneys. Can you hear me all right?

A Yes, sir. I can hear you fine.

Q Okay. Can you tell me what you and Lieutenant Falkenstein talked about when you first arrived at the Coast Guard station?

A I can't say for sure, but obviously I'd say -- I believe we were discussing the fact of amazement, initially, that the ship had run aground, and where it ran aground, and actions to be taken. Who was going to do what, who would go where, and just organize the initial response to both the casualty and the reported pollution.

Q Now, shortly after you arrived at the station, you initiated a radio call to Captain Hazelwood, is that correct?

A Yes, sir, I did.

Q And that was to receive information on the spill and the grounding?

A Yes, sir. To receive information on the spill and the grounding, to find out what the status of the vessel was that the Master could advise me, and I believe up until that time that I spoke on the phone, I didn't realize, or know, who the Master was, but when we spoke on the radio, Mr. Hazelwood identified himself, and you know, I had spoken to Mr. Hazelwood previously, like I have many of the Masters that come in and out of Valdez, and in addition, he's an alumni of the same college that I went to, so we knew each other a little bit.

Q Okay. And on this radio call, Mr. Hazelwood told you to the effect, or said to you to the effect, that there had been a problem with the third mate and that they were

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. Did you, as the person in charge of the Coast Guard response at this time, consider those two pieces of information to be significant?

A Yes, sir, I did. Let me take this separately.

The comment about working his way off the reef, I believe I commented about words to the effect of, you know, "Don't do anything you can't undo. Don't do a lot of wiggling." That was from, again, based on experience with other casualties, but also realizing that I really didn't feel I needed to tell the Master of a large supertanker with a lot of experience how to do his job, it was more of a memory refresher, I guess, or just stating what I felt I had to say.

Q Right.

A The other aspect of his comment concerning the third mate, that perplexed me a little bit, because I didn't know the details, obviously, that I know now, but my concern was maybe, you know, the Master was expressing that the third mate was having some problems of an emotional nature and maybe, you know, I didn't want to distract the Master from doing his job maintaining control of the bridge and looking to the safety and the seaworthiness of his vessel.

Q Now, when you listened to, or when you had this radio conversation with the Captain, was Lieutenant Falkenstein present?

A Yes, the radio conversation, Lieutenant Commander Falkenstein was in the radio room with me, along with Mr. Blandford, and I forget who the other -- the Petty Officer on our radio room side was, but I believe there were at least four persons in the office. I don't think Mr. Delozier had arrived on scene yet.

Q All right. After your radio call with the Captain, did you discuss with Mr. Delozier and Lieutenant Commander Falkenstein what you expected them to do out on the ship?

A Yes, I did. Lieutenant Commander Falkenstein and I had discussed -- one of the things we discussed on the way in, and then in the office, was that I wanted him to go out to the vessel to act as my eyes and ears and report back to me on the seaworthiness of the vessel and the pollution, the rate of pollution and how bad a situation we had.

I wanted Mr. Delozier to go out to concentrate on the casualty investigation, you now, gathering information and assessing the situation from the casualty side early on, and I felt my job was (inaudible) the effort would be best served by me coordinating over the phone with the

. Is th

Α

Yes.

chain of command from the Coast Guard side initiating the response from Alyeska and fielding the other calls that I knew would be coming in from concerned citizens and the news media.

Q Did you discuss with Mr. Delozier and Lieutenant Commander Falkenstein the issue or problem of the Captain trying to get the vessel off the reef?

A I think in those early hours, that was not a concern, and I think that was basically the feeling that, from my experience in working with the Masters of those vessels, whether they were Exxon, Arco or whomever, meeting with a lot of them, they all struck me as being experienced and in control and relating to the position they were in, where I didn't feel I need to tell the Master how to do his job.

Q Yeah. I guess maybe I didn't phrase the question. Let me go back a step.

Without reading back to you the transcript of your conversation with Captain Hazelwood, it sounds as though you did express some concerns to Captain Hazelwood about how he should handle the vessel — and I'm not implying that you were telling him what to do, but you did have some concerns that you expressed to him over the radio. Is that correct?

Q Okay, and my question was simply, when Mr.

Delozier went out to the vessel, and Lieutenant Commander

Falkenstein went out to the vessel, had you discussed this issue with them? Not in the sense of, "I want you to go out and tell the Captain what to do," but in the sense of, "We should keep track of what's going on?"

A I can't recall. That was probably implied, but I can't recall specifically talking about that issue.

Q Okay. Can you recall whether you talked to them about the problem with the third mate issue?

A Yes. Just basically reiterating that, you know, basically you guys heard the radio conversation, the Master's got a concern with the third mate, you know. Just be aware of it, and look into it.

Q Okay.

Commander McCall, were you aware at the time you received this radio call that the Master of a vessel leaking oil had a legal obligation to report that to the Coast Guard?

A Yes, sir.

Q Do you feel that Captain Hazelwood's calls to you complied with that requirement?

A Yes, sir.

Q Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't have any other questions.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have a couple for the Commander.

Commander McCall, this is Judge Johnstone.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I want to ask some questions about the facilities available to the Coast Guard and the Valdez and the surrounding areas, specifically radar facilities.

Does the Coast Guard have radar facilities available that could detect an outgoing tanker outbound from Valdez?

THE WITNESS: As a general answer, I'd have to say yes, but the coverage of the radar varies with weather conditions, atmospheric conditions, and we've had — that radar that's in place there, I think the radar in question, the one at Potato Point, since the casualty, at the request of the STSB, we have done some evaluation of the range in plotting outgoing tankers, and I believe the figures for the month of April that they asked us to look into showed that we covered, on an occasion, covered a tanker out to approximately the 30-mile bar, and on other occasions, we lost it at about the four-and-a-half, five-mile bar.

THE COURT: On March 24th of this year, when the Exxon Valdez went aground at Bligh Reef, was there radar available to the Coast Guard to show that grounding at the time?

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, sir. When we -- when I

arrived at the office, I could see on our radar the broad side view of the Exxon Valdez in a position on the radar scope approximating, you know, in the vicinity of Bligh Reef buoy.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any policy, either by Coast Guard policy rule or federal regulation that requires reporting of outbound tankers at designated points?

THE WITNESS: Yes. The vessel traffic rules for the operation of the vessel traffic system require various contact points, when they're entering the system at — well, even, hours out from \_\_\_\_\_ and when they are departing, departing Valdez, entering the narrows, departing the narrows, dropping the pilot, and, you know, clearing certain lets on their way out.

THE COURT: What policy, if any, or rules on March 24th was the Coast Guard required to follow if an outbound tanker required to report, of abeam Naked Island, and did not do so when he was supposed to?

THE WITNESS: Had the vessel not with a -- you know, just with a fair amount of time allotted, had the vessel not reported his position off of Naked Island, we would have attempted to establish radio contact with that vessel determining where it's position was, you know, if it had slowed down, or if it had a problem, or you know, what

was causing it to be late in arriving at its checkpoint.

THE COURT: Would the operator of the radar, would he be involved in trying to locate the vessel if it not report?

THE WITNESS: Out to Naked Island, we historically have not plotted vessels out that far, at least not since the 1980, '82 timeframe. It's a radio communication network basically past Bligh Reef buoy point. We would have expected and would have called back if the vessel had not made transmission in the vicinity of Naked Island or, later on, in the vicinity of Cape Hinchinbrook while departing the system.

THE COURT: Are vessels required to maintain two-way radio communication when they're outbound?

THE WITNESS: Outbound and inbound. Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. That's all the questions
I have of Commander McCall. If that opened up any other
avenues that counsel wished to inquire, they can do so.
Mr. Linton?

#### FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LINTON:

Q Is Naked Island one of the required reporting points?

A Yes, sir.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

#### THE COURT: Mr. Friedman?

#### FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Commander McCall, do I understand correctly that the radars in use at the time -- that is, on the 24th of March -- had several different settings for different ranges?

A Yes, sir. There were different scales on the radar: three mile, six mile, twelve mile.

Q And which scale did you have the radar on when you were able to see the ship when you arrived at the station?

A I believe it was on twelve mile scale, but I -- I can't be sure.

Q Do you know what scale the radar was on at the time of the grounding?

A I believe it was on the six mile scale with an offset so it could -- could potentially cover the Naked -- Bligh Reef position.

Q If Mr. Blandford were to say it was on the three mile scale at the time of the grounding, would you have any reason to doubt that?

A Well, we've got two radars so, you know, we've got two radar repeaters that are operating out at the Potato Point radar sight. So one of those could be on the

three mile scale for the narrows, and one of them could have been on the six mile scale.

The way the system was set up prior to the casualties, you could use both of those TPIs -- in other words, the scopes in the office, in the VTS room -- with one on the three mile and one on the six mile, but you couldn't have one on the three and one on the twelve.

You'd get feedback and distortion of the radar image.

So the radar -- if one of them was on three, the other one would have more than likely been on six, but one could have been on six with the other one on twelve.

Am I making myself clear, or --

Q I think so.

And do I understand correctly that when a tanker reaches Naked Island there's a Coast Guard regulation that requires them to report to the Coast Guard station?

A Yeah. They call in and let us know when they came abeam of Naked Island.

- Q Okay. And what regulation is that?
- A It's in the vessel traffic rules, 33

CFR \_\_\_\_\_ 151 -- oh, boy. I --

- Q That's all right. I didn't mean to -- if you have it at the tip of your tongue, fine. So it's in the CFR?
  - A The VTS rules for Prince William Sound, yeah.

Q All right.

A Various checkpoints.

Q If a vessel came abeam of Naked Island and did not call, is there some set procedure at the Coast Guard station as to how that situation will be handled?

A I don't believe that specific scenario in the Vessel Traffic Service operator's guide that we have in the office, operations manual, but general scenarios similar to that are in there.

Q Okay. And so it would be up to Mr. Blandford to decide how to handle it? And would it be Mr. Blandford who would make the decision on how to handle it if he receives no radio transmission from the vessel as it reached Naked Island?

A Yes. It would be the watch stander, in this case, this evening, Mr. Blandford, yes, who would initiate contact with the vessel and, depending on the response of the vessel, could possibly notify his superiors, the officer of the day, the Exec, or myself, depending on what the conditions were.

Q Okay.

A If the vessel was just delayed because he was slowing down for ice, or slowed down for whatever reason, you know, he would be later, and he would explain that, and that would be it. If he was having mechanical

# ERIC R. DOHM

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Sir, could you please state your full name, and spell your last name?

THE WITNESS: My name is Eric Raymond Dohm.

THE CLERK: And your current mailing address?

THE WITNESS: 555 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105.

THE CLERK: And your current occupation?

THE WITNESS: Ship's master.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. LINTON:

Q Would you tell us your educational background, please, sir?

A Through high school, and then I graduated from the California Maritime Academy in 1970.

Q And would you tell us, give us an overview of your work history, please?

A I've been employed, almost exclusively, with Chevron Shipping company since that time, starting as a rank of able seaman, working up through third mate, second mate, chief mate and Master.

Q When did you receive your Master's license?

.

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

Sound, were there reports that you made in accordance with Coast Guard regulations for the Vessel Traffic System entering Prince William Sound?

That is correct.

And would you tell the Judge briefly what those reports are, as you're approaching the entrance to Prince William Sound, at Hinchinbrook entrance?

On the approach to Prince William Sound, there's Α a required three hour precall prior to reaching Cape Hinchinbrook, and then followed by a one-hour precall, and then reporting abeam Cape Hinchinbrook on the way in.

On your way in to Valdez, Alaska, is there some communication with the Alyeska terminal as to where -whether you made -- whether the terminal is ready to receive the vessel, and load your vessel?

Currently, at that time, the -- at that time, the communication with the terminal was through Valdez We didn't have any direct link with the terminal. traffic.

Explain to the Judge what inquiries you would make, and what responses you would receive in the ordinary course of business?

Usually, on the three hour precall, we give the information of the vessel, the draft, and when we'll be abeam Cape Hinchinbrook, what -- if we're carrying any cargo, and the required report, and we ask at that time,

1 usually, if there is a berth available, and what our berth assignment will be, and then they will -- the Coast Guard 2 will notify the terminal and receive any information as to 3 4 berthing instructions. THE COURT: Where does that -- where does the 5 6 three hour precall take place? 7 THE WITNESS: Three hours would be three hours 8 outside Cape Hinchinbrook, approximately 50 miles outside 9 Cape Hinchinbrook. 10 MR. LINTON: Judge, the Captain was pointing out 11 -- I'll move Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 --12 THE WITNESS: We were upbound from Hawaii, out in this area, so the three hour precall would be down in this 13 14 area, somewhere in there. 15 BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming) 16 Q Referring to Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, to an area 17 roughly 5940 north and --18 THE COURT: Abeam Middleton Island, out there 19 someplace? 20 Approximately, yes, sir. THE WITNESS: 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. LINTON: Judge, I move the admission of 23 Exhibit 2 that he's referred to. 24 MR. : No objection. 25 (State's Exhibit 2 was

Naked Island is right here, passing abeam right

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

up there.

- Q And it is so marked on the chart?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q And there was another reporting point you referred to?

A Rocky Point was the pilot's station at the time, which is at the terminus to the traffic lane at the northern end.

- Q And could you point that out for the Judge, please?
  - A It's right here.
  - Q -- at the end of the pink -- pink line?
  - A Just out there,, yes, sir.
  - Q And it is so marched on the chart as Rocky Point.

There is illustrated on Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 a purple line, which I was just referring to, from basically the area of Cape Hinchinbrook to the area of Prince -- of Rocky Point. There's a solid -- I guess it's a magenta line, a dotted magenta line on either side of it. Do you know what that describes?

- A That's the traffic separation scheme for Prince William Sound.
  - Q Explain the parts of that to the Judge, please.
- A The shaded purple area in the middle is a separation zone, with the area between the shaded and the righthand side being the inbound lane, and the shaded area

and the dotted purple line on the lefthand side would be the southbound, outbound traffic lane.

- Q And those three areas, inbound lane, outbound lane and separation zone, are so marked on --
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q -- on the chart?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q In the course of the transit, then, beyond that point -- that is, beyond Rocky Point into Valdez Harbor, what rules of reporting are there?

A You reported abeam Cape Hinchinbrook at Rocky
Point and you will board a pilot at that time, and then you
report entering the narrows, and at the entrance island on
the far side of the narrows. It's usually -- reports up
there are taken care of by the pilot, traditionally.

- Q At that point, the vessel would be -- the pilot would be on board, and reports would not be made by the Master or other officer --
  - A They would be directed by the pilot.
  - Q They would be directed.
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q Is the entrance island shown on --
- A Yes, sir. Entrance island is where this line is here. It's very small there.
  - Q What you see is a light marked QG7M. Is that the

Α

0200.

Q And that was as part of the regular reporting process --

- A Yes, sir.
- Q -- estimating that time?

What is the distance from -- let's go back to

Exhibit 2. What is the distance from the point abeam Cape

Hinchinbrook -- maybe you could point out where a reporting

point abeam Cape Hinchinbrook would be?

A In this instance, we were abeam approximately about here, and it's approximately 27 miles to abeam Naked Island.

Q Okay. You're pointing to the H in -- second H in Hinchinbrook entrance?

A We're approximately two miles off Cape Hinchinbrook.

- Q And then to a position abeam Naked Island, would you point to that on the chart?
  - A There.
  - Q And that distance, you say, is approximately --
  - A Approximately 27 miles, yes, sir.
- Q At what speed would your vessel ordinarily be travelling?
  - A It's normally 16 knots.
- Q And therefore what time period would it take for the vessel to transit it from Cape Hinchinbrook to a point

abeam Naked Island?

- A Approximately an hour and forty-five minutes.
- Q So that -- it was on that basis that you estimated your 2:00 o'clock position?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q At that -- let me refer now to a point on Exhibit 1 which is marked with an X and MJD on it, and I would like for you to identify for yourself a point that is closest, that is in the northbound traffic land, and closest to the point with the red x on it, which would be, I take it, roughly somewhere in the area of the arrow with 15 -- the 32 155, \_\_\_\_\_ underneath it.
  - A Uh-huh.
- Q What distance is that from a position abeam Naked Island?
  - A Approximately 13 miles.
  - Q How can one determine that from a nautical chart?
- A Measuring with the latitude scale on the side of the chart.
  - Q Each minute of latitude equals a nautical mile?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q How long would it have taken your vessel to travel that distance?
  - A From Naked Island to --
  - Q Abeam Naked Island to a point identified as the

point within the traffic lane, but closest to the red X on Plaintiff's Exhibit 1.

- A Oh, approximately 50 minutes.
- Q And, therefore, you estimate that the vessel would have been there at 2:50 a.m.?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q In the course of the transit, did you expect to communicate with the Exxon Valdez?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q Would you explain to the Judge why?
- A We were -- in communicating with Valdez traffic, we were inquiring as to the ice conditions, and we were informed that the Exxon Valdez was outbound and would be able to provide an updated ice report later on the transit.
- Q And it was in anticipation of speaking to them about that, about the ice conditions --
  - A Yes.
- O -- that you were expecting to communicate with them.
- Where would you have expected -- where, in the course of your transit, would you have expected to engage in that communication?
- A Somewhere in the vicinity of Naked Island, or a little south of Naked Island.
  - Q Now, when one is meeting a vessel, and one is

A Yes, sir.

exiting form Valdez and meeting a vessel inbound -- vice versa, you were inbound and exiting -- is there a practice to watch for and communicate, and/or communicate with the inbound or outbound vessel, the vessel coming the other way?

- A I don't quite understand the question.
- Q When you're inbound, or outbound in the traffic system, and there is traffic coming the other way, is there any practice to communicate with, or look for the vessel, the traffic coming the other way?

A Yes, sir. You will keep track, visually on radar, the vessels coming the other way. Normally communication usually is not necessary because both vessels are reporting to Valdez traffic, and the situation is reported through the traffic system.

- Q Do they customarily use the same frequency?
- A Yes, sir.
- Q And how is that identified, the frequency?
- A VHF channel 13 is the working frequency.
- Q And so the inbound traffic and the outbound traffic would be monitoring that station?
  - A That is correct.
- Q Which is the station which they would use to communicate with the Coast Guard?

Q Did you have radar on board the Chevron
California which enable you to have seen traffic which were
meeting, coming the other way, whether inbound or outbound?

A Yes, sir.

Q Would you tell the Judge how many such units you had, and what ranges they are capable of operating on, and normally operated on?

A The vessel was equipped with two Raytheon pathfinder radar. One's a ten centimeter, one's a three centimeter radar. They're capable of operating up to 64 miles, or with a normal operation in this area would be in the 12 to 24 mile scale.

Q Would you be able to identify, on those radars, a vessel of the size of the Exxon Valdez at the 12 to 24 mile ranges respectively?

A You would be able to pick up the target, not specifically identifying the ship.

THE COURT: At 24 miles, you can --

THE WITNESS: In some cases, not in all cases.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Explain briefly. What cases --

A Well, depending on surrounding conditions and the location of the vessels and the atmospheric conditions.

Sometimes the vessels aren't detected as far as 24 miles.

Q What do you recall the atmospheric conditions

And ordinarily, are you able to see traffic the

were in the part of Prince William Sound that you transited

1

25

Q.

size of the Exxon Valdez when it's basically abeam your position, or thereabouts?

- A In clear weather conditions, yes, sir.
- Q At night, do ships carry lights which would assist in identifying a vessel at night?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q And are there standard patterns of lighting that enable you to identify not only that there is a vessel there, but what relative position you bear to the vessel?
  - A Yes, sir.
  - Q Describe that briefly to the Judge?
- A The general navigation lights consist of two forward-facing range lights, the aft one being higher than the forward one, to give a perspective, port and starboard side lights, and a stern light.
- Q Are those lights commonly visible at a distance that corresponds to the maximum width of the vessel traffic system?
- A The range lights are six mile visibility lights required.
- Q Besides expecting to receive a radio communication from the Exxon Valdez about ice, did you expect to meet it and -- in the course of its outbound transit and your inbound transit?
  - A I expected to pass the ship, yes, sir.

, 16

Q Did you have some idea of where that -- where you expected that to occur?

A Somewhere south of Naked Island.

Q In fact, did you receive any such ice report from the Exxon Valdez, or did you pass it?

A Yes, sir.

Q Explain what happened?

A To the best of my recollection, inbound at Cape Hinchinbrook when we passed about -- oh, it was sometime after passing Cape Hinchinbrook, we heard what was the Valdez reporting to the Vessel Traffic Center, but we did not hear the full context of the conversation. Shortly after that, approximately 0043 or 45, I believe, we were contacted by the Vessel Traffic System to notify us that the port was closed and to proceed to Knoll's Head anchorage.

Q What does the closing of a port mean?

A In this instance, they -- the Coast Guard did not want us to transit into the Port of Valdez. I called for a reconfirmation of that, and confirmed that we should proceed to Knoll's Head anchorage.

Q And, on Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, the chart -- is the anchorage shown there, as well?

A Yes, sir. It's on -- it's right here.

Q And is it so marked with Anchorage Area 110.233?

directed at me, so I just -- I did not respond.

That is correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α

Q Okay. But do you recall, was there -- was it a faint signal?

A It seemed like it wasn't fully clear. I don't recall if the signal was good or -- I just don't remember catching the full context of the conversation.

Q Okay.

If you have a report of ice in the channel -well, let me ask you this, first of all. At any point
going into Valdez, do you ordinarily slow the tanker down?

- A On approach to the pilot's station, yes, sir.
- Q Okay. And would you, on occasion, slow it down before then if you had reports of ice in the traffic lanes?
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q If, on this evening, you had -- well, you already had reports on ice in the traffic lane.
  - A Yes, sir.
- Q Ordinarily, how much would you slow down in response to that?

A It depends on the existing conditions, the visibility, how much ice was being picked up by radar, what was reported to me. It would vary.

Q Now, if you slowed down in the traffic lane, that would put your -- you gave us an estimated time at -- I think it's the red cross, at 0250. If you slowed down, it would be some time later than that, isn't that correct?

1 Yes, sir. That's correct. Α 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. I don't have any other 3 questions. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Linton? 5 MR. LINTON: Nothing further. THE COURT: What was the weather like at Knoll's 6 7 Head when you anchored? 8 THE WITNESS: I believe it was clear that night, 9 sir. 10 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may step 11 down. 12 (The witness was excused.) 13 THE COURT: Mr. Linton. Is your next witness 14 that gentleman who came in? 15 MR. LINTON: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. Is that the owner 16 17 of Air, Gary Graham? 18 MR. LINTON: I didn't know he was the owner. I 19 thought he was a pilot. 20 THE COURT: I think this it's the owner 21 of \_\_\_\_\_ Air. I know him. He's flown me around a few 22 times when I've been in Prince William Sound. He's an 23 acquaintance of mine. I don't consider him a friend, just 24 an acquaintance, and if that poses any problem, now is the 25 time to be heard about that.

1 MR. LINTON: Not from my standpoint. 2 MR. FRIEDMAN: No. 3 Whereupon, GARY GRAHAM 5 called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and 6 7 testified as follows: THE WITNESS: Good morning, Your Honor. 8 9 THE CLERK: Please state your full name, and 10 spell your last name? 11 THE WITNESS: My name is Gary E. Graham, 12 G-r-a-h-a-m. THE CLERK: And your current mailing address? 13 THE WITNESS: P.O. Box 731, Cordova, Alaska, 14 99574. 15 THE CLERK: And your current occupation? 16 THE WITNESS: I'm an air taxi operator. I'm a 17 18 pilot. THE COURT: Just for the record, since it didn't 19 bother you, I want to state that my knowledge of Mr. Graham 20 won't affect my ability to hear his testimony impartially. 21 You may proceed. 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. LINTON: 24 How long have you lived in Cordova, sir? 25 Q

business?

A Yes, sir, it is.

23

24

Q And at what time on March 24, 1989 were you scheduled to make a flight to Tatitlek?

A Our schedule normally calls for us to depart Cordova around 9:00 a.m., in the morning.

- Q What is the travel time of the average flight from -- well, first, do you first, do you fly those routes yourself?
  - A Yes, sir, I do.
- Q And were you scheduled to actually fly this route yourself on March 24, 1989?
  - A Yes, I was.
- Q What is the time of a flight from Cordova to the village of Tatitlek?
- A In a wheel plane, it's about 15 minutes; in a float plane, it's about 20 to 25 minutes.
  - Q Which were you scheduled to fly that day?
  - A The wheel plane that day.
- Q The landing strip at Tatitlek is in what direction, or directions?
- A It lies in a northwesterly, southeasterly direction.
- Q And does the traffic pattern -- do you recall which direction the traffic pattern at the strip lay that day?
- A That day, the traffic pattern would have been a righthand traffic pattern out over Tatitlek narrows, coming back around and landing to the southeast.

Q Is the traffic pattern set up so that aircraft stay to the west of the landing strip?

A Normally, sir, yes.

Q Is the location of the landing strip -- would you describe where, with respect to the village of Tatitlek, the landing strip you're referring to is?

A The landing strip is adjacent to the village, approximately a quarter of a mile down the hill from where the village, the village proper, lies.

- Q Is that to the south, north, east, west --
- A West.
- Q -- of the village?
- A West.
- Q West of the village.

There is, on Plaintiff's Exhibit 1 a red X marked MJB, located roughly ten miles, nautical miles, west of the cupula in Tatitlek. Would you tell us, estimate for us with respect to the cupula marked at the village in Tatitlek, where the air strip is and what the distance would be from the airstrip to the MJB red X that you see marked on Exhibit 1, please?

- A The air strip would be -- would you like me to --
- Q Yeah.
- A -- show you in a direct --
- Q That's right.

A The air strip runs this direction, right here, and it's approximately -- I didn't think it was ten miles. I'd estimated it somewhere between six and seven miles. But I suppose it is ten.

Q Roughly, just draw in the location of the air strip and put your initials by it, and identify that line as that the air strip.

(Pause)

- Q Did you fly the route that day?
- A Yes, sir, I did.
- Q And do you recall which direction the winds were so that you know what kind of an approach you made to get into the traffic pattern?

A I do recall. There was no wind that day, and normally, when we're landing there, the strip runs in an up hill -- has a little bit of an up hill gradient landing to the northwest, but if there's any kind of a wind at all, we'll land into the wind, but if there's no wind and the runway is not icy, we'll normally land downhill to keep from having to make a 180-degree turn on the runway. And I did, that day, make my approach out over Tatitlek narrows, over Ellamar, and come back on around and land to the southeast.

Q In the ordinary course of such an approach, would you have had a view of the location of the red X with the

\*

MJB beside it?

- A Yes, sir. I would.
- Q When you flew the route that day, did you see anything in the location of the red X at MJB?
  - A Yes, sir, I did.
  - Q What did you see?
  - A A tanker.
  - Q Was that the first time that day you'd seen it?

A No, sir, it wasn't. I had been out earlier in the day when we heard about the tanker aground, we immediately jumped in an aircraft and went out to see how bad it was.

Q Could you explain to the Judge how you heard about it, and what you mean when you say you jumped in an aircraft -- was that business, or was that just curiosity?

A Well, it was actually business. We had -- well, it was more curiosity. I'll back that up a little bit. I'll have to admit that it was -- I was very curious, because we're all kind of afraid of it. But I woke up -- normally, at that time of year, it's kind of a laid back time of year for us. We're getting ready for the herring season to start, and woke up at 6:00 o'clock in the morning to the news that there was a tanker aground, and immediately flew out of bed, went down, and we usually keep an airplane fueled and on the dock or in the hangar,

normally keep an airplane fueled in case there's an emergency Medivac or something of this nature that we had to jump in and go, and we immediately jumped in the aircraft and went out and saw the tanker.

- Q What time was it that you saw the tanker?
- A About 6:45. Between 6:45 and 7:00 o'clock.
- Q Was the sun up at that point, that time of year?
- A The sun wasn't up, but there was sufficient daylight to see it.
  - Q Could you tell whether it was leaking oil?
  - A It was obvious that it was leaking oil.
  - Q Could you discern a pattern of oil in the water?
  - A Yes, sir, I could.
- Q Could you show us where, or describe for us where, it was with respect to the vessel?
- A The pattern of the oil was extending out in this direction from the tanker.
- Q So it was (inaudible) and describe it for the Judge?

## (Pause)

Put your initials by it to identify it, sir.

- A Yes, I did. Yes, I did.
- Q Were you out by yourself?
- A No, we had some fisherman friends that -everybody was obviously concerned about this because of the

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

upcoming fishing season, and we had some fisherman friends that wanted to jump on the airplane, so we had a load of fishermen on the aircraft.

What was their concern?

With the upcoming fishing season, whether or not we were going to have it.

That it might be closed, the period might be Q closed --

Α Yes, sir.

-- closed by the Department of Fish and Game. Q

Yes, sir.

Had they come to you that morning with such a request that you fly such a flight?

Two of them had, and I called another two of them that hadn't heard about it yet and asked them if they'd like to get on the aircraft and go out with us. There was a lot of concern about what was going to happen, what the impact would be on the fisheries.

I mean, Cordova's a fishing town, and we don't have any other source of income but fisheries, and everybody was very concerned.

Did you say the 7:15 time was the time you departed from Cordova, or the time you were in the vicinity of the --

I don't remember the exact time, but we were in

the vicinity somewhere around 7:00 o'clock or 7:15.

Q Had you not been aware that the vessel's situation there on the rocks was already known publicly by having heard it broadcast over the radio, would you have told somebody that you had seen it?

A Oh, yes, sir. I would have. I've been watching those tankers -- can I say something? I've been watching those tankers for a lot of years, and everybody knows where the tanker lanes are at and where those tankers belong and where they don't belong, and that's -- everybody knows where Bligh Reef is at, and knows the rocky areas in there. There's been a lot of ships over the last hundred years that have gone down or run aground on those reefs.

If I had seen that there, and it hadn't been obvious. I would have known.

- Q And reported it?
- A Yes, sir.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

- Q Mr. Graham, when was your scheduled Post Office flight?
  - A I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.
- Q As I understand it, you've got a Post Office contract --

A Yes, sir, I do.

Q -- to deliver mail that had you not heard of the tanker grounding, you would have gotten up in the morning and eventually gone to do the postal route. Is that right?

A Yes, I would.

Q And when would you have actually flown that route?

A Normally, we're able to pick the mail up from the Post Office at 8:00 o'clock, and the Tatitlek and Ellamar mail is normally our first run of the day. We have other Postal contracts, but normally on the Friday we run the Tatitlek-Ellamar mail first and then continue on around the Sound with the rest of the mail at a later time.

Q Okay. So what is your best estimate as to when you would have seen the tanker?

A Between 8:30 and 9:00 o'clock.

Q All right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. I don't have any other questions.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Graham. You may step down. You are excused.

Let's take a little break.

THE CLERK: Please rise. This Court stands in

1 recess until the call. 2 (A recess was taken from 9:50 a.m. to 10:08 a.m.) 3 THE COURT: Call your next witness. MR. LINTON: I call Mary Ann Henry. 5 Whereupon, 6 MARY ANN HENRY 7 called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and 8 having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and 9 testified as follows: 10 THE CLERK: Please state your full name, and 11 spell your last name? 12 THE WITNESS: My name is Mary Ann Henry. My last 13 name is spelled H-e-n-r-y. 14 THE CLERK: And your current business mailing 15 address? 16 THE WITNESS: 1031 West 4th, Suite 520. 17 THE CLERK: And your current occupation? 18 THE WITNESS: Assistant District Attorney. 19 THE COURT: You may inquire. I was advised that 20 the audio pick up is picking up your voices when you're 21 whispering back and forth, so you might want to watch that. 22 MR. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: All right. 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. LINTON:

accepted as part of her direct testimony in these proceedings, and I would ask a few more questions now.

THE COURT: I have the affidavit attached to the answer to the motion?

MR. LINTON: That is correct.

THE COURT: I have that. And you wish to have that stand --

MR. LINTON: Adopted by --

THE COURT: -- stand as direct testimony subject to cross-examination?

MR. LINTON: Yes, sir. (Inaudible).

THE COURT: And, for the record, that's an affidavit, five-page affidavit, sworn before a Notary Public on the 30th day of October at Anchorage, Alaska.

THE WITNESS: Perhaps I should clarify. I did two affidavits. One was in support of the opposition to the motion to dismiss for failure to present exculpatory evidence. That's another issue.

THE COURT: Was that a difference date than the 30th, or the same date? The one I have is a five-page affidavit --

THE WITNESS: I believe that was a different date.

THE COURT: Yes. In paragraph two, it says, "In April 1989, I was assigned responsibility for determining

whether felony charges should be brought against Captain Joseph Hazelwood."

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, the one dated the 30th, the five-page one, is the one that refers to this hearing.

THE COURT: We'll accept it as testimony at this time.

MR. LINTON: Judge, I have a copy (inaudible) for the record (inaudible).

THE COURT: 15 is admitted, subject to cross-examination.

(State's Exhibit 15 was marked for identification and was received in evidence.)

MR. LINTON: Judge, along the same administrative lines, I'm going to be asking questions from the Grand Jury transcript. I'm trying to think what is the best way to make that part of the record, and to make sure we're all operating from the same set of documents. I have had some indications that perhaps the defense's references are different than my references to the Grand Jury and --

THE COURT: I have a two-volume transcript of what I believe to be the Grand Jury proceedings. These are the originals, received August 18th. Is that the --

MR. FRIEDMAN: We have two different ones, Your

Honor. Maybe we could take a page at random and compare and see which one the Court has.

THE COURT: The one I have is a little over 500 pages.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I have 503 pages, Your Honor, total.

THE COURT: Grand Juror's decisions and deliberations on 502. The first witness was William Edward Murphy.

MR. LINTON: Yes, I was afraid that -- mine goes up to -- the final attestation is on 671 in mine. That's -- I thought there might be that problem. Rats.

THE COURT: I think I have the original. Perhaps we should proceed on the basis of the original. If it is numbered differently, it might be a little hard to follow. It sounds like Mr. Friedman and mine do not correspond.

MR. LINTON: Two out of three wins.

THE COURT: Two out of three wins.

MR. LINTON: Right.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LINTON: With the Court's permission, then, if I need to refer to it, perhaps I can use the Court's copy.

THE COURT: If you're going to refer to it, go ahead.

MR. LINTON: Thank you, sir.

(Pause)

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Miss Henry, referring to the Grand Jury transcript, you were responsible for the presentation of the witnesses that are listed in the Grand Jury transcripts?

A That is correct.

Q Brent Cole was not responsible for presenting any of the witnesses who testified?

A He was not responsible. As it turned out, he did present one witness, because I started choking.

Q At the time you decided which witnesses to call for the Grand Jury, had you received certain reports that had been identified to you as having been screened by --

A At the time, I decided -- or at the time I put out a subpoena list, I did not have any reports. At the time I presented the witnesses on May 1st, 2nd and 3rd, I had some reports, and then I got additional reports later, before I presented witnesses on the 17th and the 22nd.

Q On what basis did you then decide who to subpoena to the Jury?

A I was give the names, or at least the occupation, of proposed witnesses from Larry Weeks.

Q Can you list the witnesses who he proposed that

you call, and directed that you issue subpoenas for?

A Yes. Mr. Delozier from the Coast Guard; Trooper Fox; Mrs. Delozier, Mr. Delozier's wife; a pilot by the name of Murphy -- Mr. Weeks did not know his first name; a taxicab driver, name unknown; two Alyeska security guards; Mr. LeBeau. I believe those are the only names I got from Mr. Weeks. If I can just refer to the list for a moment.

Oh, Ms. Caples. He just said the ship's agent. He did not know her name. And Mr. Beevers.

Those were the names that I got, or the occupations that I got, from Mr. Weeks.

The intent was that Dean Guaneli was to obtain witnesses for me who would testify about damages, but I didn't have any names initially.

- Q Tell me what you mean by testify about damages?
- A Certain witnesses, particularly from Fish and Game and from DEC who had made observations of damages to wildlife and also to the beaches, and who protected the hatcheries, that would be testifying as to the costs of clean up, the costs of protecting the hatcheries, and just generally damages that they observed.
- Q But the witnesses who were to testify to that would be supplied at a later point by Mr. Guaneli?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q Prior to Grand Jury, did you receive -- well,

```
1
    first, did Michael Fox testify at Grand Jury?
2
              No, he did not.
              Have you ever received any statements from
3
    Michael Fox to be used in preparation for the case?
4
                   I think one statement where he interviewed
5
    somebody else, but I had nothing where Mr. Fox had any
6
7
    information to give me.
              Do you recall who that witness was?
8
         Q
              No, I don't.
         Α
10
              (Pause)
11
              Was it a witness that you called at Grand Jury?
12
              That I don't remember either.
              Let's go through the list of the witnesses who
13
    appeared at Grand Jury and tell us whether you have --
              MR. LINTON: Well, first, may I have the series
15
16
    of documents marked as the next State's Exhibit (inaudible)
17
    right on down the list, I think (inaudible).
                                   (State's Exhibits 16 through
18
                                   30 were marked for
19
20
                                   identification.)
              (Pause)
21
22
    (Tape changed to C-3503)
23
              (Pause)
24
              BY MR. LINTON:
                               (Resuming)
25
              I (inaudible) exhibits 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21,
```

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, and I ask you whether you recognize them?

- Yes, I do.
- Could you explain to the Judge what they are?

Setting aside Plaintiff's Exhibit for a moment, the rest of the exhibits, 16 through 29, are transcripts of interviews with witnesses, the interviews being conducted by one of various state troopers.

The Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 30 is a group of documents of interviews, not transcripts, but summaries of interviews, of witnesses again, these interviews being conducted by one of two FBI agents.

Q Did you have any of those prior to your presentation of witnesses to the Grand Jury?

I had all of them prior to each individual witness testifying. So, for instance, I had Mr. Delozier before he testified -- I mean, Mr. Murphy's before he testified -- but I didn't have the FBI interviews until later. But I had them before those witnesses testified.

Did you have one for Mr. Delozier? Q

I don't think I did. I had one for his wife. No, I don't believe I did. All I used him for was to introduce some documents, so --

- One of those (inaudible). Q
- Those --Α

Mr.

Radkey. Mr. Kunkel. Mr. LeCain. Mr. Roberson.

Peacock. Carl Jones. Maureen Jones. Mr. Kagan.

24

25

1 Ray Jones. Mr. Oldham. Ms. Haven. Mr. John Glowack. 2 Mr. Boyle. Mr. Enou, or Ennow (PH). Mr. Stewart. 3 Nanensus (PH) and Ms. Wright. Let's compare Exhibit 30 to Exhibit 7, the crew 4 5 list. With respect to the first individual, Mr. Claar, was 6 he a crew member? 7 Yes, he was, on the Exxon Valdez. 8 And the next individual? 9 Mr. Radkey -- should be there. Yes, he is. Do 10 you want me again to go through these? 11 Q Yes. 12 Okay. Mr. Kunkel --Is? 13 Q 14 Α -- is on the crew list. Mr. LeCain is on the crew list. Mr. Roberson is 15 16 Mr. Peacock, yes, he's there. Let's see. Mr. Carl 17 Jones is there. Maureen Jones is there. 18 Mr. Kagan is there. Mr. Glowacki is there. 19 Jones is there. Graham Oldham is there. Ms. Haven is 20 there. John Stewart is there. 21 (Inaudible). Q 22 Francis Boyle is there. Michael Ennow is there. Α 23 Mr. Nanensus is there, and Ms. Wright is there. 24 So the report that you had at the time of your Q

presentation (inaudible) individual to wasn't listed on the

25

1 crew?

- A Yes, that's correct.
  - Q Did Mr. Fox testify before the Grand Jury?
  - A No, he did not.
  - Q Explain why?

I was told that he was -- he had information that I was not permitted to have, and that, in fact, he had nothing that he could tell the Grand Jury. So I excused him. I met him in the front office -- the reception area of our office and apologized for bringing him up and told him that I wasn't going to be calling him.

- Q When you say he had nothing he could tell the Grand Jury, do you mean to say that he did not have any information about the circumstances of the grounding and oil spill, or that there was something else which
- \_\_\_\_\_ no information?
- A I was informed that he had nothing that he could tell the Grand Jury that would be permitted to be presented under the Grand Jury.
- Q Permitted under the guidelines set forth in your affidavit?
  - A That is correct.
  - Q How about Mr. Delozier?
  - A Mr. Delozier did testify.
  - Q Did he testify about anything other than -- other

than to identify records that he had seized from the ship?

A As best I recall, that's all he testified about. That was my only intent, was for him to identify records, documents. As I recall, that's all he testified to.

Q Did you interview him, or otherwise gain information from him about what he had observed while he was onboard the ship, apart from records?

A No.

Q I'd like to go through the witnesses, then, who appeared before the Grand Jury as it appears on the face of the Grand Jury transcript. The witnesses for the plaintiff number one were William Edward Murphy. Did you have a statement from another interview concerning an interview with William Edward Murphy?

A I did.

Q Could you identify the exhibit number (inaudible)?

A It's Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 27. It's a draft. It's not on final Trooper paper. That's all I had at the time.

Q An interview conducted on what date, according to \_\_\_\_\_?

A April 4, 1989.

Q The next witness was a Patricia Caples. Did you have a statement from her?

Q

James F. Haden.

23

24

25

A This is the second time he's testified, still no interview with him.

Q Jerzy Glowacki.

A Yes, I had one with him. That's Plaintiff's Exhibit 25, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Floyd LeCain.

A Mr. LeCain's interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 16, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Paul R. Radkey?

A Mr. Radkey's interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 21, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Harry Claar, C-l-a-r-r. C-l-a-a-r.

A Mr. Claar's interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit 24, dated March 30, 1989.

Q James R. Kunkel, K-u-n-k-e-l.

A Mr. Kunkel's interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 19, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Robert M. Kagan.

A Mr. Kagan's interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 20, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Maureen L. Jones.

A Ms. Jones' interview is Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 17, dated March 30, 1989.

Q Gordon Paul Taylor.

A I did not have an interview with Mr. Taylor.

Q Robert A. Beevers.

A Again, no interview with him, although I did talk to him before he testified.

Q What I'd like to do now is go through the same

A Excuse me. It looks like we have some duplicates here.

Q Mr. Kagan?

A Two of Mr. Kagan, yes. One is Plaintiff's Exhibit 20 and one is Plaintiff's Exhibit 19. They're both interviews with Mr. Kagan, and they appear to be duplicates.

THE COURT: 19 and 20, you say?

THE WITNESS: 18 and 20.

THE COURT: 18 and 20.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q With respect to William Edward Murphy, did you tell me you had a statement that was a basis for your question (inaudible)?

A That is correct.

Q As to Ms. Patricia Caples, you had a statement which was the basis for questioning him before the Grand Jury.

- A For questioning her, yes.
- Q For questioning -- and as to Michael Edward

5

6 7

8

10

9

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Craig, you had a statement from him which was the basis for questioning him before the Grand Jury.

- That is correct.
- Before meeting him (inaudible) questioning when he appeared before the Grand Jury?
  - Α That is correct.
  - 0 Okay.

Richard L. Wade. Did you have a statement from him beforehand?

No, I did not. Sergeant Stogsdill did interview him prior to his taking the stand.

Could you tell us briefly what Richard L. Wade had testified on?

Mr. Wade owns a diving business in Valdez, and he Α is one of the persons who dove underneath the Exxon Valdez for several days, I believe, after the grounding and the spill. The purpose of his testimony was to introduce a diagram that he had done showing the damages he observed as he dove under the Exxon Valdez.

Where did you find his name to call him to the Grand Jury?

- I was provided his name by Mr. LeBeau.
- And Mr. LeBeau is who?

He works for DEC, and I think he was temporarily assigned in the Valdez area during this time period.

Had you made a request from Mr. LeBeau that

1

9

11

12

15

18

19

20

21

24

25

caused him to do that?

(Resuming)

BY MR. LINTON:

24

25

Weeks.

5

7 8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

Q Did you have any statements from Joe LeBeau at the time you called him to testify?

I did not.

What was the purpose of calling him, now?

He had taken some video film of the oil on the beaches, and also picking up some of the wildlife, and I wanted to present that videotape to the Grand Jury. Additionally, he had collected aerial photographs -- I believe -- I'm not sure if he took them or not, but he was present when some aerial photographs were taken which showed some of the extent of the spill; and he also had some computer graphics, which again showed the extent of the spill over a period of time; and finally, he brought in a sample of oil.

- A sample that he had taken at some point.
- A sample he had taken off one of the beaches.
- At the time he appeared before the Grand Jury, did you know whether or not he had been present on the Exxon Valdez on March 24, 1989?
  - I don't know if I knew that at that point or not.
- Did you ask him any questions about whether he had been on board?

No.

And did you utilize any testimony from him about his observations on board on March 24, 1989?

The next witness is Gordon Paul Taylor who, if I

1

25

9

recall, is a civilian employed for the Coast Guard. What happened there is I had received from you an edited tape of a conversation partly between Mr. Hazelwood and the Coast Guard, and I wanted someone to introduce that tape. So I advised Miss Robinson, the paralegal, that she should find out who, from the Coast Guard's, voice was on that tape and to bring him in. It turned out to be Mr. Taylor.

Q Other than to have him authenticate that tape, did you elicit any other testimony?

A I don't believe so. I might have asked him a little bit of background about his responsibilities and perhaps some discussion of things that may have occurred before the tape, but then it was basically, "Do you recognize your voice on this tape?"

Q Feel free to \_\_\_\_\_ the Grand Jury \_\_\_\_\_ if that helps.

(Pause)

A Yes. His testimony was very short. I asked him what his responsibilities were. I asked him what his shift was on the 23rd of March, and I asked him if he had listened to a portion of the tape, which he said he had. I asked him if he recognized it, and I played the tape, and opened it up to the Grand Jury for questions. That's all.

Q What did he tell you about what shift he worked? What did he tell the Grand Jury about what shift he worked?

A Well, what he said was rotational 8:00 to 4:00.

4:00 to midnight, and midnight to 8:00. Those were the rotations of the shift, and that was in response to my question, "What shift did you work?" So I'm not sure which shift he did work.

- Q Presenting the matters to the Grand Jury, did you have any statement of Gregory Cousins?
  - A No, I didn't.
  - Q Did you have a statement of Joseph J. Hazelwood?
  - A No, I didn't.
- Q At the time that your presentation to the Grand Jury occurred -- or some of the presentation -- had there been hearings from the National Transportation -- had hearings of the National Transportation Safety Board been held in Anchorage?

A Yes. I believe they began on the 15th or 16th of May. One day of Grand Jury presentation in this case was May 17th so yes, they were going on during that time.

- Q Did you listen to any of the testimony before the National Transportation Safety Board, or receive any --
  - A No, I did not.
  - Q Okay.

(Pause)

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Friedman?

## CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Ms. Henry, you indicated that you received a memo from Mr. Guaneli outlining the damages witnesses that you thought might be available to you. Is that right?

A That is correct.

Q Did he indicate what those witnesses -- what areas they'd be able to testify to?

A Yes, he did.

Q Okay. As to the witnesses whose names were given to you by Larry Weeks, did you also get a memo from him outlining who they were and what they would be able to provide?

A No, I didn't. He just gave me the names over the phone.

Q Okay. And, just for the record, who is Mr. Guaneli?

A Mr. Guaneli is an Assistant Attorney General working in the central office in Juneau.

Q And what role did he play -- let me step back for a second. Let me think for a second here.

Would it be accurate to say that you viewed your role as taking the information that other people in the department passed on to you and not going beyond that in terms of searching for other information?

A Essentially, that was my role, however, there were some things that I felt I wanted to present to the Grand Jury \_\_\_\_\_\_. For instance, I'm the one that asked Mr. LeBeau about a witness that turned out to be Mr. Haden, and also, I believe it was my idea to call the diver, too.

Q Okay. You outlined in your affidavit and Mr. Linton has outlined in his affidavit how he would pass information on to you. Were there other people within the Department of Law, other than Mr. Guaneli and Mr. Weeks, who would pass on factual information to you regarding this case?

A No.

Q Okay. And other than passing on information relating to potential damages witnesses, did Mr. Guaneli pass any other factual information on to you?

A Not that I recall. Part of his job also was to communicate with Exxon and the attorneys for Exxon, trying to get documents from them, so I might have gotten a little bit of information regarding documents, but it was generally Mr. Guaneli was keeping me advised as to his success, or lack of success, in getting documents from them.

Q Okay. That's a specific answer to my specific question. I'd like to now ask a more general question.

What is -- what was, and what is, your understanding about Mr. Guaneli's role in Captain Hazelwood's prosecution?

Does it go at all beyond just providing the damages witnesses and the documents that you discussed?

A I would view his role also as being sort of the liaison between the Department of Law and the attorneys for Exxon. For instance, he's the one who arranged us to be able to reboard the Exxon Valdez.

Q Okay. Now, the same question for Mr. Weeks.

First of all, could you identify for the record who he is?

A Mr. Weeks is also in the central office. He is Chief of Criminal Prosecutions for the state.

Q All right. And can you describe for us your understanding of his role with regard to Captain Hazelwood's prosecution?

A My understanding is that he is simply my supervisor in this area. He is the one that decided I would be the person assigned to the case. He gave me the initial witness list, and then other than that, it's just been making decisions about the case, as opposed to doing any kind of investigative or court work.

Q Okay.

Do you have with you the memo that you received from Mr. Guaneli?

A I don't have it with me, but I do have it

available.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, I wonder if it would be appropriate to take a break at this time so that I could take a quick look at that memo?

THE COURT: Do you have other -- any other documents you wish this witness to produce that you can get to during the break?

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

Q Ms. Henry, just to make sure I understand, you received no other memos from Mr. Weeks or Mr. Guaneli regarding this case, other than what we've just discussed?

A I did receive a copy of Mr. Guaneli's letter to the Exxon attorneys making certain requests, and the subpoena duces tecum that he served on them.

Q Okay.

A During the break I can check, but that's all I can remember.

Q Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: There would be no other --

THE COURT: How long will it take you to get

it \_\_\_\_\_?

THE WITNESS: They're just in the conference room across the hall.

THE COURT: Well, we'll just stay in place, and why don't you go and go get it.

1 (Pause) 2 Thank you, Ms. Henry. The record will reflect 3 Ms. Henry's given these documents to both Mr. Friedman and 4 Mr. Linton. 5 MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, there's about four 6 typed pages. I wonder if I could just have a minute. 7 (Pause) 8 THE COURT: If you think you need a break, we can 9 take one. 10 MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. If that would be all 11 right --12 THE COURT: Sure, we have lots of time. 13 MR. FRIEDMAN: -- and then I would be able to 14 just go straight through. 15 THE COURT: That's not a problem. MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. 16 17 THE COURT: We'll take a break. 18 THE CLERK: Please rise. This court stands in recess until the call. 19 20 (A recess was taken from 10:57 a.m. until 11:10 21 a.m.) 22 THE CLERK: Be seated. 23 THE COURT: Ready to go? 24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. 25

THE COURT: All right?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. FRIEDMAN: (Resuming)

3

Q Ms. Henry, when did you first learn that you might be assigned to this case?

5

A April 12th.

6

Q Okay. And how did you learn that?

7

A DeWayne McConnell, the District Attorney, called me into his office.

8

Q And what did he tell you?

10

A He said that Larry Weeks wanted me to take over the preliminary investigation of the case and determine whether it should be presented to the Grand Jury.

12

11

Q And did he tell you why?

13 14

A Why me?

15

Q Well, why you, and did he also tell you whether there were any restrictions on what you could or couldn't

17

16

- 11

do?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A He told me that Mr. Linton, who had been in Valdez for the initial investigation, was not going to be able to present the case to the Grand Jury because of some problems. That's all he told me.

At that point, later on that day, we had a conference call with Larry Weeks and Larry Weeks explained it in more detail.

Q Okay. And at that point, in the first

conversation with Mr. McConnell, did he tell you whether they were getting limitations on what you could or couldn't do in terms of investigating or presenting the case?

- A I don't believe so.
- Q Okay. And at that point, did he tell you what charges were being considered by the office, or what charges they wanted you to consider presenting to the Grand Jury?
  - A No.
- Q Was your next conversation about the case the one that took place on a conference call with Mr. Weeks?
  - A That is correct.
  - Q Okay. And who was involved in that call?
- A Mr. McConnell; Mr. Linton, briefly; and then by phone from Juneau, Larry Weeks, Dean Guaneli and Lori Otto.
  - Q Who is Lori Otto?
- A She is in the office of the Assistant Attorney General in the chief office.
  - Q In the Juneau office?
  - A Central office. Central office, sorry.
  - Q All right. And that means the Juneau office?
  - A Yes.
  - Q All right.
- Can you basically recount for us what took place in that conversation?

9

A Larry Weeks told me that he wanted me to look into the case and see if we had sufficient evidence to present it to the Grand Jury. At that point, he told me that they were looking at potential charges of felony criminal mischief.

He also explained that the problem with Mr.

Linton was that he had received some information that he could not use, and so that we were going to be building up what he called a Chinese wall where Mr. Linton would screen information and give it to me, and then from there I could make decisions.

- Q Did the topic of immunity ever come up?
- A I don't think that word was used.
- Q All right.

Were you told what Mr. Weeks' involvement had been up to that point in terms of the case?

- A No. I wasn't.
- Q Were you told what Mr. Guaneli's involvement had been up to that point?
  - A No.
  - Q And did you say this was April 12th --
  - A Yes.
  - Q When this conversation took place?

All right. And were you told whether or not you would be doing anything other than considering the case for

m

1 ∥ Grand Jury?

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A That's all I was supposed to be doing. I would not be handling the trial.

- Q And you were told this on April 12th?
- A Yes.
- Q All right. Were you told who would be handling the trial?
  - A No.
- Q And you were told that one person who would be giving you information was Mr. Linton, is that correct?
  - A Yes, n-t-o-n.
  - Q L-i-n.
  - A N-t.
  - Q Close enough.
- All right. And then you subsequently received information from Mr. Guaneli about potential witnesses?
  - A Yes, on the damage witnesses by that memo.
- Q Right. Okay. Thank you. I know I don't know how to spell that.
  - A G-u-a-n-e-1-i.
- Q All right. And you received information from Mr. Weeks regarding information that you could present -- or regarding witnesses who would have information for the Grand Jury.
  - A Yes. Just the witness name or their occupation,

not

2 |

not what they would say.

Q Okay. Do you know how he got those names?

A No, I don't.

Q Did he give you -- if April 12th is the time you were first given the case, can you give us an estimate, or exact date, as to when Mr. Weeks would have given you the names for Grand Jury?

A During that conference call.

Q Okay. And did he tell you whether you were limited in any way in what you could say to these witnesses, or do with these witnesses?

A He did say that there were going to be limitations on what I could do, and suggested that, for some of the witnesses, that Mr. Linton talk to them first and caution them as to certain things they could not say to me.

Q Okay. Did he restrict you in any way in terms of what you could ask them about?

A At that initial conference call, no, he did not, because I still didn't understand exactly what the problem was. It wasn't until a day or two later when I was told there was a statute, and then I was told that I could not try to elicit any information regarding the report of the spill. In fact, it expanded to -- within several hours, or -- I think it was a day after the spill.

Q And that's a conversation you had several days after the April 12th date?

A It was still that -- it was either Thursday or Friday. The 12th was Wednesday, and it was either the next day or the day after that.

Q Okay. And who did you receive the information about the statute from?

A It was either Mr. Linton or Lori Otto.

Q Okay. And what were you told, other than that there was this -- were you told about the immunity, and were you given the statutory citation?

A I wasn't given the statutory citation. I was simply told that there's a statute that provides we cannot use information derived from the report of an oil spill.

Q Uh-huh. Okay.

At that point, you were told not to elicit information regarding the report, and then you said it expanded to -- to what?

A Essentially, I was told that I would not be able to receive any information from investigators from the time of the oil spill until, I believe, the next 24 hours. I wasn't sure of it. I was just told that that's -- there was about a day after the report, I was not to receive any information.

Q Okay.

11

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Did you -- on April 12th, do you recall whether the information had been filed at that point? The misdemeanor information? Okay. And were you allowed to look at that? I was only allowed to look at a portion of it. Mr. Linton whited out the probable cause portion of it and only gave me the charging section. All right. And have you ever seen the probable Did you attend the misdemeanor arraignment for And what was your role in that hearing? As the assistant for the state. Okay. And at that hearing, were you required, or did you address, the issue of bail? And do you recall what your recommendation to the

judge was regarding bail? My recommendation was that bail be set at \$50,000.00 which, it is my understanding, Mr. Hazelwood had

already posted in New York, and also the same conditions

that have been imposed there. I believe that's all I requested. Judge Stuart, I think, added a couple of conditions.

- Q Okay. Was there any discussion of the probable cause statement at that hearing?
  - A No. Not that I recall.
- Q Did you ever talk to Mr. Linton about the scope of the criminal mischief in the second degree statute, and whether it applied to the facts of this case?
  - A No. I did not.
- Q Did you ever discuss that with Mr. Weeks, Mr. Guaneli, or Lori Otto?
  - A I'm sure I discussed it with Mr. Weeks.
- Q Okay. You indicated that -- I think you indicated -- that he had suggested that that was one thing that the office was considering, or would like you to consider?
  - A That is correct.
  - Q Okay. Did the discussion go beyond that?
  - A No, un-nuh.
- Q Okay. Now, I think in your affidavit, you indicated that you were told not to approach -- let me get the exact wording -- you said, "I was told that I should not, and I did not, approach any of the investigators who had been working on the case more than" -- I'm not sure

H

what that refers to -- "namely, Sergeant John McGee,
Sergeant Chris Stockard, Trooper Julia Grimes, Trooper Paul
Burke, Fish and Wildlife Trooper Michael Fox, Trooper
Michael Alexander, and Gail (inaudible)." Is that correct?

A That is correct. Although Trooper Fox's name was on the witness list, so that would be in there. I was told of the other witnesses, though, Sergeant McGee and the other ones, and I was told not to approach them.

Q Okay. And you did not approach them?

A I did not approach them. I did have a couple of phone conversations with Sergeant McGee, complaining about the fact that I wasn't getting any police reports, and I had asked Mr. Linton about that and he had said that he hadn't received them from Mr. McGee, and so when Sergeant McGee called for something else, I picked up the phone and I said, "Will you please get on this."

Q Okay. But other than that, you didn't talk to him?

A No.

Q Okay. And you didn't talk to the other investigators?

A No, I didn't.

Q Okay.

A And Trooper Fox, just to apologize and let him go.

Q Okay.

2

Who is Gale Savage?

3

I believe he's an investigator with the Department of Law working in the civil division.

4 5

Okay.

6

Now, what was your understanding as to why you were not to approach these investigators?

7

Because they had information that I was not permitted to have.

9

8

Q All right.

10 11

And if you could just define for us -- I think you really have, but just so it is explicit, what was your

12 13

understanding as to the information you were not to have?

14

Information that would have been directly derived from the report of an oil spill. We just shortened it to

15 16

Right. Okay.

tainted evidence.

17 18

Now, when Mr. Linton would give you a particular report, a particular piece of information, you, yourself,

20

19

would have no way of determining whether that was derived

21

I wouldn't have any idea.

from the original report or not, would you?

23

22

Okay. And even today, you wouldn't have any idea of that, would you?

24 25

Α No.

Q Just as an example, you don't know how investigators Burke, Grimes, the FBI investigators, how they may have decided to formulate their questions of the crew members?

- A I do not know that.
- Q Okay. And you don't know how they even located some of the witnesses?
  - A I don't know that, either.
- Q You indicated that you were told by Mr. Weeks that there was a ship's agent who you might want to call at Grand Jury.
  - A Yes. That's how he referred to her.
- Q Okay. And you had no police report for that ship's agent?
  - A At that point, no.
  - Q How did you locate that ship's agent?
- A I don't remember if it was as a result of receiving her interview, or if I simply told the paralegal, Miss Robinson, to locate the ship's agent and have her subpoensed.
- Q All right. Once you located the ship's agent, how did you know what questions you wanted to ask her at Grand Jury?
  - A That was based upon her interview.
  - Q So before you actually presented her to the Grand

sat down with him in our office and asked him to draw a

25

diagram of the damages that he observed on the bottom of the Exxon Valdez, and then once Sergeant Stogsdill finished interviewing Mr. Wade, Sergeant Stogsdill told me a brief summary of what he said, and then I put him on.

There was another diver who was called, and I can't remember his name. Sergeant Stogsdill also interviewed him and decided -- determined that he wasn't going to be much help, so he was excused.

Q In the beginning of your answer just then, you made some comment about -- I forget what you said exactly, but could you tell us how you located Mr. Wade? Was he one of the names that was given to you by Mr. Weeks?

A No. He was given -- his name was given to me by Mr. LeBeau. I told Mr. LeBeau I needed one of the divers to testify about the damage that he observed.

Q What was your understanding about Mr. LeBeau's involvement in the case, in terms of when he got involved and what he had done?

A I don't know when he got involved, and I'm not sure exactly what he did initially. I know that he did go onto the beaches and take photographs. I also know that he did have tainted information.

Q Okay. He provided you with Mr. Wade. Did he provide you with other information?

A Mr. Haden's name, also.

Q Okay. How did you know that Mr. LeBeau had tainted information?

A Mr. Linton told me.

Q Okay. Did Mr. Linton tell you what you could and couldn't talk to Mr. LeBeau about?

A Yes, he did, and he also -- before I talked to Mr. LeBeau, he had Mr. LeBeau in his office for quite awhile, and I assume the intent was to explain it to Mr. LeBeau.

Q Okay. What were you told by Mr. Linton about what you could ask or couldn't ask Mr. LeBeau?

A Mr. Linton basically told me, "The only thing you should be asking Mr. LeBeau is to explain the videotape, the photographs, and the oil that he seized from the beaches."

Q All right. But it sounds like you went beyond that, at least in terms of getting Mr. Wade to talk about damage to the vessel.

A With Mr. LeBeau?

Q Yes.

A I --

Q In other words, you asked Mr. LeBeau for something other than what's in -- what you just described.

A That is correct. I did say to him that I was looking for a witness who could testify about the damage to

the vessel, and he said, "Well, I know that two divers went down, and this -- these are their names."

- Q Okay. Do you know how he knew that?
- A No, I don't.
- Q You indicated in your direct exam that you had talked to Mr. Beevers?
  - A Yes.
  - Q Could you tell the judge who Mr. Beevers is?
- A Mr. Beevers is a former Master, Captain, who is now retired, who was hired, I believe by Mr. Linton, to assist in the investigation. I was to use him to interpret documents for me.
- Q Was he going to interpret documents other than what Mr. Delozier introduced to the Grand Jury?
- A Yes, he was. He was going to basically explain what the bridge of the Exxon Valdez looked like, and explain certain instruments and how they worked. Also, just explain some of the rules of the sea, I guess. And then also the documents.
- Q Were you aware of whether or not Mr. Beevers had been on the Exxon Valdez?
- A Yes. I was aware that he was on the Exxon Valdez.
  - Q How were you aware of that?
  - A Mr. Linton told me.

Q All right. What else were you told about Mr. Beevers and how you could use him?

A I was told that he was also tainted, and Mr. Linton talked to him the day before I talked to Mr. Beevers, and I was told I should use him for purposes of interpreting documents, also use him as an expert to explain generally what happens on a tanker like this, and what each crew member's responsibilities are, specifically -- particularly the Master's.

- Q Okay. Did you know how Mr. Beevers came to be on the Exxon Valdez?
  - A No, I don't.
- Q You had an expert named Mr. Greiner. Did you ever talk to him?
  - A Mr. Riener?
  - Q Greiner.
  - A Greiner?
  - Q Yes.
  - A Yes, I did. I -- yes.
- Q Okay. Can you tell me how you learned about him, and then what you talked with him about?
- A I don't -- I don't remember how I learned about him. I know that Mr. Cole was the one who actually set up, or wanted to talk to, Mr. Greiner. Oh, that's right. Mr. Linton was talking to Mr. Greiner on the phone and came in

5 6

7

9

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

17

18

20 21

22

23

24 25 and said, "Mr. Greiner's on the phone. Do you want to talk to him?" And Mr. Cole did, and so we talked to him briefly over the phone.

By that point in time, Mr. Cole had been assigned Q as the chief trial attorney?

Α Yes.

All right. And what did you talk to Mr. Greiner Q about?

We talked to him about what help he might be in the presentation of the case to the jury, to the trial jury.

Were you aware of whether or not he was considered tainted?

I was aware that he had received some tainted information. I'm also aware that he was told to seal it, and not look at it, and he told us over the phone that's what he'd done.

All right. Do you know whether he'd ever been on the Exxon Valdez?

A I believe he -- he did reboard it when it was in San Diego. I don't know of any other -- he might have been on it before that. I don't know.

Were you aware of whether either of these experts Q had participated in any search of the Exxon Valdez?

A I believe I was aware that Mr. Beevers had been

1 |

-- I know he'd been on there. I'm not sure if he searched. He was part of the search of the Exxon Valdez when Mr. Cole got a search warrant, whenever that was.

Q Okay. What about before that?

A I'm pretty sure I knew he had been on there. I'm not sure if I knew that -- I don't think I knew he had participated in a search.

Q Okay. Were you aware of the searches of the Exxon Valdez prior to the time Mr. Cole conducted his search?

A I knew that search warrants had been executed.

Q Okay. Were you given access to either the warrants or the transcripts of the hearing, or the hearing itself?

A No.

Q Were you aware of what was obtained in those searches -- that is the ones prior to Mr. Cole's search?

A I'm not aware of what was obtained. I may have received some of the things that were obtained, but I don't -- I wouldn't have been told that's where they were obtained.

Q Okay.

(Pause)

You were allowed to get information from Mr. Stogsdill, weren't you?

Α Yes.

2 3

Q Okay. What was your understanding of what Mr.

5

4

limited.

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Stogsdill was allowed to do?

At the first conference call on April 12th, Larry Weeks told me that I should try to find an investigator who was not tainted, and so I called Sergeant Stogsdill, who is out of the Soldotna post, and asked him if he, you know, had been down in Valdez, or was tainted at all.

He was limited in the same way that I was

And from what -- my brief discussion with him, it was pretty clear to me that he was not tainted, so I asked him if he would be interested in helping me, and he said yes. I then explained to him what our limitations were.

What did you explain to him? Q

I told him that we would not be permitted to use any information directly derived from the report of the oil spill and that, in fact, everything we got would be screened by Mr. Linton first.

All right. But Mr. Stogsdill as an investigator, was he allowed to go interview people himself?

Yes, he was.

Just as an example, you understood that Mr. Delozier was a tainted witness.

That is correct. A-

Was Mr. Stogsdill allowed to -- under the rules Q

imposed, was he allowed to go interview Mr. Delozier based on what information you had, to see what else was out there?

A Not until more recently. During the Grand Jury portion of this, he was -- he did not interview Mr. Delozier, except to go over documents that Mr. Delozier, except to go over documents that Mr. Delozier was going to introduce.

I believe after the Grand Jury indictment.

Sergeant Stogsdill once or twice about things that had happened since the Grand Jury.

- Q Things that had happened since. Do you know what those were?
  - A I don't know.
  - Q Okay.

Under the rules that were imposed -- I guess what I'm having trouble with is the concept of an investigator who is supposed to investigate the cause of this accident, was he allowed to do anything, really, in terms of unearthing new facts?

A Yes, he was, to a certain extent. Again, under the understanding that he could not ask a witness, for instance, "Did you hear Captain Hazelwood talking to the Coast Guard?" He couldn't ask that, but he could ask, say, a crewman what was happening after the grounding, as far

6

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

as, you know, "What did you observe? Were you on the helm?" That sort of thing.

So could he ask -- let's assume Mr. Delozier went out to the vessel right after the grounding. Could he ask Mr. Delozier, "What did you see when you got there?"

I would say he could probably ask him -- well, he couldn't.

And why is that?

Because, it would be my understanding the only reason Mr. Delozier would have been there is because of the report of the spill, as opposed to crewmen, who would already be there anyway. So he could talk to crew, who would be present on the Exxon Valdez, not as the result of a spill, but because of their job.

Could Mr. Stogsdill ask, let's say, bar or Q restaurant people whether they had seen Captain Hazelwood on the 23rd?

Yes.

Okay. And he could ask them whether they saw Captain Hazelwood drinking alcohol, correct?

Yes. Or before that, also.

Could he ask crew members whether there were any Q efforts to get the ship off the rocks?

Α Yes.

Could he ask crew members whether -- I'm sorry. Q

Could he ask crew members who had been on the conn at the time of the grounding?

A Yes.

Q The diagram that Mr. Wade gave to you which was then presented to the Grand Jury, do you know when Mr. Wade made the observations which he incorporated in that diagram?

A I think he was called out at 4:00 p.m..

Q On which day?

A On the day of the spill, the spill shortly after midnight, so then 4:00 p.m., he was called out. I don't know when he actually got into the water and began diving, but sometime after that.

Q And I take it Mr. Stogsdill would be allowed to ask Mr. Wade what he saw at 4:00 p.m. and what was happening at that point in time?

A Yes. It was my understanding that, by then, we would have known about the spill, if it had been reported or not.

Q Okay. What was your understanding about where the line was being drawn in terms of what Mr. Stogsdill could ask about it -- the chronological line where he --

A My understanding was that as long as it was inevitable discovery, that is, that if we -- if it was something where we knew that we -- someone would have known

about the spill anyway, we could go into that area. My understanding is Mr. Linton's line was a little bit more conservative than that, and simply took in the whole 24-hour period.

- Q Which line were you trying to follow?
- A Well, I was trying, as much as I could, to follow Mr. Linton's, but there were -- for instance, Mr. Wade, I discovered after the fact, actually had started his investigation that same day.
- Q Okay. Mr. Mr. LeBeau, what was your understanding about what Mr. Stogsdill could ask him, in terms of time, again?
  - A Anything that occurred after the 24-hour period.
  - Q All right.

Now, we talked about Mr. Delozier, Mr. LeBeau, Mr. Beevers, Mr. Greiner, as being -- shorthand expression -- tainted witnesses. What was your understanding as to who the tainted witnesses were that you were going to have contact with?

A I can't think of anybody offhand that I would have contact with. Of course, I was told about Trooper Fox, that I shouldn't have any more contact with him, and then the other --

- Q That's the same with all the troopers, right?
- A And all the troopers. If you gave me a name, I

And how were you aware of that?

Because we were trying to work out bringing

11

14

19

20

21

24

25

Q

witnesses up for Grand Jury who -- the crew witnesses, the people that worked on the Exxon Valdez. We were trying to arrange them up to testify, and I don't remember who told me, but someone told me, "Well, they're going to be in Anchorage anyway, to testify at the NTSB hearings during this given week. Would you be able to put them on the Grand Jury at the same time?" And I said yes, so that's how we arranged it.

- Q Who is Kelly Mitchell? State employee who worksI'm not sure what department --
  - A That -- I don't know.
- Q Mr. Linton told me he works for the

  Alaska \_\_\_\_\_ Highway System. Does that refresh your

  memory in any way?
  - A No.
  - Q Okay.

When you presented the case to the Grand Jury, or began the Grand Jury proceedings, did you have in mind that there was sufficient evidence to justify an indictment for criminal mischief in the second degree?

- A Yes, I did.
- Q Okay. And what was your legal theory? What did you feel established the elements of criminal mischief?
- A Well, the element of risk of damage of over \$100,000.00 was pretty easy. Widely dangerous means, the

theory, although oil spill was not in the definition, in my reading of the definition, it looked like oil spill would be considered widely dangerous means.

And then the only other element, basically, would be the recklessness, and that was based upon the -- mostly on Mr. Beevers' interpretation on what occurred, his reading of the course recorder and the bell logger, and explaining to me what occurred.

It was mostly on that, you know, how the ship was handled before the grounding and after the grounding.

Q Okay. Well, if you were talking to the jury, but saying it shorter than you would say to the jury, what acts were there of recklessness, as you understood it?

A My understanding in this -- I don't want to be limited, because this is off the top of my head --

Q Sure.

A -- but from the fact that Mr. Hazelwood had been drinking prior to going to work, had left Mr. Murphy alone on the bridge while he was piloting it to Pilot Point, or Rocky Point, and was not supposed to leave the bridge, it was my understanding, and Mr. Murphy also told me that a Master usually never leaves the bridge while he's on the bridge.

The fact that Mr. Hazelwood left Mr. Cousins alone on the bridge during an important period of time.

The fact that, although they were trying, apparently, to avoid ice, that instead of slowing down to avoid the ice, they were still going full speed ahead, and although they had permission to divert their course, they didn't have permission to continue diverting it. They should have changed course again once they got into the outbound — inbound lane.

The fact that Mr. Cousins was not qualified to be in charge while the tanker was in those waters; and then, after the grounding, various actions by Mr. Hazelwood, which included being full speed ahead for a long period of time, and also ordering the helmsman to jockey the rudder several times.

- Q What was the conclusion about -- on that latter point, the conclusion about what that indicated, the going full speed ahead while the vessel was on the reef?
  - A That he was causing more damage.
- Q Was there -- I think it was in the Grand Jury where I saw the suggestion that he was trying to get it off the reef as a result of --

A I believe Maureen Jones said that it was her impression he was trying to get it off the reef. I'm not sure what he was doing, if he was trying to get it off, or not.

And also, the other thing that I forgot is having

it on auto pilot in those waters prior to the grounding.

Q You are not aware of how the issue of Captain Hazelwood's drinking first became a subject of investigation, are you?

A No.

Q You are not aware of how the issue of him leaving the bridge, or leaving Mr. Cousins in charge, first became an issue for investigation, are you?

A I'm not aware how it first became an issue. I still don't even know how it happened, if he announced it, or he just left, or what.

Q Uh-huh.

A But I knew that he was not on the bridge at the time of the grounding.

Q Right. But the point I'm making is, you're not aware of how the authorities began investigating that issue?

A No, un-nuh.

Q Likewise, you're not aware of how they began investigating the issue of whether or not Mr. Cousins was qualified to be operating the vessel in those waters?

A I'm not aware of how that came up initially.

(Pause)

Q After presenting the case to the Grand Jury, had you had any involvement with it, up until today?

A Yes, I have.

Q Can you tell us the nature of that involvement?

A All right. After the indictment was handed down, on the 22nd, I believe, of May, I worked with Mr. Cole in trying to basically educate him as to what I knew so far, and we also tried organizing all the paperwork that we had received from Mr. Linton.

We also had some brainstorming sessions, I guess you'd call it. That would be with Mr. Cole, myself and Sergeant Stogsdill, as to where to go from here.

I continued doing that until my vacation on June 2nd, and then when I returned from vacation, essentially I haven't really been working on the case, although I'm available in case Mr. Cole or Mr. Stogsdill want to talk to me.

Q Are any other lawyers in the Department of Law consulted about the progress -- obviously, the case has been separated, in a sense, into two teams, if you will, and Mr. Linton is handling the legal litigation related to the immunity issues. Let's put that aside.

A Okay.

Q In the area that you've been involved in, have any other attorneys with the Department of Law been consulted, other than Mr. Cole, yourself, and Mr. Adams, as the case has progressed?

(Tape changed to C-3505)

Do you anticipate that you would be available to talk to Mr. Cole during the trial and presentation of the case at trial?

A Yes. One of the goals, I guess, or purposes in making sure that I remain untainted is that I would be available to discuss things with Mr. Cole, or even assist in the trial.

Q All right. You indicated that you had made the decision not to interview, or talk to Mr. Cousins. Why was that decision made?

A To me, it is still not clear as to what information we -- or how the interview could be set up so that we do not become tainted, and the other problem is that -- and this attorney's name -- I've lost it.

Richmond. Mr. Richmond told us that he did not want us to do a complete interview, but only ask questions, you know, specific questions.

The problem is, since we haven't seen any of Mr. Cousins' statements, we can't ask just a couple of questions. We would have to go through the whole thing.

And Mr. Richmond is not willing to have us do that.

Q Okay.

Back for a moment to the issue of you attending the arraignment. At the time that you did that, did you

1

5

6 7

8

9 10

12

11

14

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have any conversations with Mr. Guaneli or Mr. Weeks about how they wanted that handled?

- Yes, I did. Α
- And who did you talk to?
- Mr. Weeks.
- And what did he tell you?

Well, actually it was a mutual type of discussion. We were discussing whether or not we should offer our services, or the trooper's services, for protection, and if we should have the media courtroom, if I should set it up that way, and also talked to Mr. Dennis, who was then local counsel for Mr. Hazelwood to arrange when he would fly in, and if he could fly out again.

- Okay. Was Mr. Guaneli in Anchorage at that In other words, did you talk to him in person?
  - I don't recall talking to him in person. Α
  - Okay. Q
- I don't recall talking to him, actually, about this issue. It's possible, but I don't recall.
  - 0 I'm sorry. You said Mr. Weeks, that's right.
  - Α Right.
  - Was Mr. Weeks in Juneau then? Q
  - Yes, he was in Juneau. Α
  - Q Okay. So you talked with him over the phone?
  - Α Yes.

```
1
              MR. FRIEDMAN: If I could have just a minute,
2
    Your Honor, I think I'm --
3
              (Pause)
              I don't have any other questions. Thank you.
5
                        REDIRECT EXAMINATION
6
              BY MR. LINTON:
7
              Could you help me locate Mr. Beever's testimony
         Q
8
    in this Grand Jury transcript (inaudible).
9
              (Pause)
10
              It begins at page 134, Volume 1.
11
         Q
              (Inaudible).
12
              (Pause)
              It's _____ pages in on my version. Let's
13
14
    try -- you said 134?
15
              Yeah.
         Α
16
              (Pause)
17
         Q
              (Inaudible).
18
         Α
              Yep. Which exhibit were you looking for?
19
         Q
              I was looking for --
20
              (Pause)
              The bell logger, which was Exhibit 15.
21
22
              (Pause)
23
              Exhibit 15?
24
              Yes, Grand Jury Exhibit 15. Exhibit 3 in this
         Q
25
    proceedings.
```

3

5

6

7

^

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

19

18

20

21

22

2324

25

Q Okay. On what page does he begin his discussion, then, of the first of those --

A I believe that would be page 159 of the first volume. Actually, I think before that.

(Pause)

All right. At page 156 and 157, he starts talking about the course recorder and the bell logger, and then I start asking him what those are.

- Q And the bell logger is which document?
- A I believe -- I got them mixed up, but I believe it's exhibit, which is the printout of the bells.
  - Q Computertype printout.
- A The computer printout, as opposed to the written log.
  - Q Which is Exhibit 6.
  - A Which is Exhibit 6.
  - Q Is there a relationship between them?
- A It's my understanding that there is a relationship. The computer obviously does it at the time that a bell occurs. The handwritten document, Exhibit 6 -- it's my understanding they attempt to enter those, that information, near the time that it occurs. Sometimes they may have to go back and fill in.
- Q And in the course of his presentation, did he explain how to interpret the bell log, or the computer

printout?

A Yes, he did.

Q And did he explain the course of the -- the document that has tally book on the front, Exhibit 6?

A Yes, he did.

Q And how to interpret that?

A Yes.

Q And did he explain the course recorder, which is --

A Plaintiff's Exhibit 6?

Q 5? He explained that?

A Yes, he did.

MR. LINTON: Judge, at this point, perhaps rather than belaboring the point with the witness, let me make a request. In questioning a witness yesterday, Your Honor asked Mark Delozier how to interpret checkmarks in the book, specifically the checkmarks in the tally book, (inaudible) before the entry about the grounding, but which chronologically fell afterwards.

THE COURT: I remember them.

MR. LINTON: There is a point in the Grand Jury transcript where Mr. Beevers explains those. I guess the question is, assuming that the Grand Jury is -- proceedings are before the Court, whether Your Honor takes that -- those explanations as admissible in these proceedings.

\_

(State's Exhibit 31 was marked for identification.)

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Do you recognize Exhibit 31 as a document -- as having been screened by me before your presentation to the Grand Jury? Not necessarily the whole presentation, but some portion of (inaudible).

A I do recognize the document and I know that I got it from you. I just -- I'm not sure when I got it.

Q Before Grand Jury, or after Grand Jury? Do you recall? Specifically, the Grand Jury testimony of Mr. Wade?

A It seems to me that I did have this during the Grand Jury presentation. I don't recall -- this is like the diagram that he drew, so I can't remember if I knew it from the diagram he drew or from this.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

I ask that it be admitted -- or at least identified -- admitted, even with that foundation, that she doesn't know whether she saw it or not.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's fine.

THE COURT: All right. Without objection, 31 is admitted.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. FRIEDMAN:

Q Ms. Henry, your understanding was that Mr.

Beevers testified -- gave his opinions to the Grand Jury

based upon the documents he presented to them, and his own

past experiences. Is that correct?

A That is my understanding, yes.

Q You don't know to what extent, if any, he may have relied upon searches of the vessel he participated in, do you?

A I know that he would have relied upon his own observation of the bridge of the Exxon Valdez, because he said that there were some changes since he was a Captain. So I know that he included that.

Q But beyond that, you don't know to what -- again, I don't want to taint you, but assuming Mr. Beevers did participate in a search of the vessel which can be considered a tainted search, you don't know to what extent he may have relied upon what he learned in that search for reaching certain conclusions or opinions, do you?

A I don't know that. He was well aware of the taint-untaint problem --

Q Uh-huh.

A But I don't know -- I can't tell you what he -- whether, in addition, he relied on from whatever I told you.

Q Okay.

Just one other question. Was it your understanding that Mr. Stogsdill could get leads from the Coast Guard investigators? In other words, he could talk to the Coast Guard investigators about what they had found?

A To a limited extent, I think he could have. He

-- it was clear to him that he couldn't talk to, or get

leads from, the investigators who had received information

during that time period.

Q I guess what I'm getting at is for the troopers, you said he was not to talk to any troopers who'd been working on the investigation up until the time you got involved. Was that same restriction placed on him with regard to U.S. Coast Guard people? In other words, any U.S. Coast Guard investigators who'd worked on the case up until April 12th -- or up through April 12th?

A It was my understanding that he could not talk to anyone who had information in that 24 hour period. now, I don't know if there were other Coast Guard people that came into the investigation after that time, or not.

## Q Okay.

Let me make sure I understand. So if there was a U.S. Coast Guard investigator who had information about that initial 24-hour period -- who was on the scene, or had done something in that initial 24-hour period, Mr. Stogsdill was not to contact that person?

A No. He could contact him. He had to just make sure to limit his contact. For instance, Mr. Delozier.

Q Uh-huh.

A We knew that Mr. Delozier had tainted information, and I assumed it was based upon initial investigation. However, Mr. Stogsdill could talk to Mr. Delozier, as long as they didn't talk about that 24 hour period.

Q Okay. But the rule as to the troopers was broader than that?

A Yes.

Q You couldn't talk to the troopers at all?

A That's correct.

Q Who had been working --

A That is correct.

Q Okay.

Was the rule, then, the same for an NTSB investigators and the DEC investigators as it was for the Coast Guard investigators?

A Yes. He could contact them, but it had to be limited.

Q Okay. And did you have any understanding as to why the rule was more restrictive as to the troopers than as to these other investigators?

A Yes, because we viewed the Coast Guard people and

the DEC people not as investigators, but as potential witnesses, and it was important that we talk to them as potential witnesses, whereas we didn't really need to talk to the troopers, because they weren't witnesses, they were simply asking witnesses questions. That was my understanding. So that was the difference.

Q Did you know whether any of those troopers were witnesses themselves?

A Not that I know of.

Q Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. I don't have any other questions.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further.

THE COURT: You may step down. You're excused.

(The witness was excused.)

THE COURT: Let's take what will probably be our last break of the day.

THE CLERK: Please rise. This court stands in recess until the call.

(A recess was taken from 12:19 p.m. until 12:35 p.m.)

THE COURT: Please call your next witness. Whereupon,

## MICHAEL OPALKA

called as a witness by counsel for the State of Alaska, and

having been duly sworn by the Clerk, was examined and

١

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

while you were --

- A There was one incident, yes.
- Q Were you assigned responsibilities for listening to and recording the testimony of -- in some fashion -- of any of the witnesses there?

A Not particularly that, no. I did, out of my own edification.

- Q Out of your own -- for your own interests?
- A Yes.
- Q Did you transmit that information to anybody else?
  - A No, I did not.
- Q More specifically, did you transmit it to any other troopers whom you knew to be working on the Exxon Valdez oil spill case, or Captain Hazelwood's case?

A I relayed some information relevant to the -- my position, or our position, to the next troopers that were -- the other trooper that was supposed to relieve me after a couple of days, yes.

- Q Who was that?
- A Hans Rolly.
- Q And his function was what?
- A Essentially the same as mine.
- Q But neither of you had any responsibility for engaging in gathering information and submitting it to

received in evidence.)

ì

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. LINTON:

Q Explain what exposure you might have had to the case prior to being assigned to work on the prosecution of Captain Hazelwood on April 28, 1989?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. I neglected to bring something up when Miss Henry finished testifying. I just needed to get it on the record and make sure it's not going to present a problem.

Mr. Linton and I talked about this this morning. There may be some trooper notebooks which have not been turned over to the defense, and it's not clear yet. He and I have an agreement that if there are other trooper notebooks, and after reviewing them this evening I wished to recall Miss Henry and Mr. Cole to ask about things in those notebooks, that the state would have no objection.

I guess what I'm asking for is permission from the Court that the Court will honor that agreement so that I don't have to ask for a continuance now, or something of the kind.

MR. LINTON: I agree. I agree.

THE COURT: I'll accept that.

MR. LINTON: I think we've given everything, but I agree to check one more time and if there's something new, I agree that it's appropriate.

4 5

Q

THE COURT: (Inaudible) you may reopen the argument and call them back, sure.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q Tell us about your exposure, please.

A Judge, I was involved in the trial of the state of Alaska versus Dan Finnegan and George Miller, as I set out in my affidavit, from March 2nd through April 5th of 1989.

It was a complicated robbery case, many witnesses, a lot of immunity. I was -- it was a case that, at the time of the oil spill, was right when we were at the end of it, or getting close, somewhere in there, in the middle of it, we -- my exposure was not that great, because I wasn't reading the newspaper. I was working until 10:00 or 11:00 at night, getting up early, coming in at 6:00 in the morning, preparing the case, working in court until 2:00 o'clock, 1:00 o'clock, something like that.

There were a couple of incidents that occurred before I went on vacation. I think only one that I remember.

I distinctly remember being in Judge Rowland's courtroom -- or not his courtroom, in his office, and Mr. Shapiro, who was representing Mr. Miller, and Mr. Diani, who was representing Mr. Finnegan, and the Judge and I were there, and we were talking about something, and it had to

do with the trial.

And at that time, Judge Souter walked into the office and Judge Souter said something to the effect of, there was a blood test taken. I don't remember if it was mentioned what the result was. I don't remember anything more than that, and my -- my feelings are that it was indicated that he had been drinking, and that there was some proof -- I don't know when the blood test was taken. I didn't -- it wasn't said.

That is all I can remember as far as any exposure prior to me going on vacation on the 7th. I believe I read some of the newspapers -- I find it hard to believe that I didn't. I grew up in Alaska. But I don't remember anything that was involved.

I was in the office about 9:00 o'clock or 10:00 o'clock one night. I received a phone call from Mr. Linton, who was in Valdez, and I knew he was in Valdez. My -- we started talking, and he needed some help, and he said -- I said, "Well, how are things going?" and he generally told me that things were pretty screwed up, but the civil attorneys didn't seem to know how to do a case and build a case. He was helping them with getting evidence of damages, because I remember he was -- he told me that he had the camera people go out ahead of the oil that was travelling so that they could get footage of the areas and

how they looked before the oil hit, before the oil came.

He asked me to have Anita, who is his secretary, start collecting all of the daily news matter, Anchorage Times papers, the Wall Street Journal, as I remember, and the New York Times papers. He asked me to pass that message along.

THE COURT: When was this call to you, Mr. Cole?

THE WITNESS: Judge, it was some time several

days after Mr. Linton had gone to Valdez. I assume it was

one of the nights -- it had to be between the 24th when

this occurred and -- well, actually, it had to be between

the time Mr. Linton went to Valdez and the 5th, when my

case ended. Because I was working on the George Miller and

Finnegan trial at that time.

That's all we talked about, that I can remember.

I, then, on Friday the 7th, when I had planned to take an expedition on Mount Bona, which is in the Wrangell Mountains, I took that Friday off. We gathered gear, got our stuff ready, and we left for McCar -- Chitna (PH).

And we drove all day, got up early in the morning Saturday, drove, and flew into a camp called the Ultimatooli (PH) Lodge, which is passed McCarthy, about 60 miles where some people there are hunting guides, and they also fly parties in to do mountaineering expeditions.

When we were there, there were no newspapers, no

TV, and we were only in camp for about a day, but there was a shortwave radio, and you could pick up boats that were out in Prince William Sound, and I'm not really sure how that happens, but I do remember that there were communications on the radio about some of the cleanup activities, and as I remember, some boat had capsized.

I don't remember talking about anything in the case then.

We then climbed -- we were taken up the next day to -- I can't even remember the name of the glacier. We stayed there until the 22nd. It was two weeks that we were without communication with anybody. During that time we had one tran -- radio, but it was just for jets that were flying above. If we had any safety problems, we could contact them.

We came out on the 22nd, arrived in Anchorage on the 22nd, the night of the 22nd, and between then and the time that I was asked to try this case, I remember one other incident, and that was I happened to be either -- I can't remember if I was driving to work, whether I was watching the news, but I remember hearing a tape recording of a voice that I was, as I remember, was told was Captain Hazelwood's. I don't remember what was said. I don't remember in what context it was.

I was contacted on a Friday, I believe it was

April 28th in the afternoon by Mr. McConnell. He asked me if I was going to be in the DA's office for the next six to eight months, whether I would be interested in handling this case. I expressed an interest in doing it, and then, at that time, received instructions about how I would be proceeding as per Mr. Linton's plan.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q What were you told?

A I was told that I was not to read the newspapers. I was told that I was not to listen to the news. I was told -- well, let me -- I need to qualify that.

I was not to listen to the news or read the newspapers about anything that concerned the Exxon Valdez -- the Exxon Valdez oil spill. I was explained the reasons behind that and I was told that I was not to meet with -- talk to other people about it.

I was told that I was not supposed to talk with any of the attorneys in our office. in fact, there was a memo that was sent around that I saw from Mr. Linton that essentially stated that -- I'm sorry -- Miss Henry, myself, Sergeant Stogsdill, I guess -- I believe Sam Adams' name was on that also, or it was added later. We were not to -- the attorneys in the office were not to contact us, or talk to us, about this case.

I was told that I was not supposed to talk with other people who came up and talked to me about the facts of this case.

Q Tell us what you had to do, if anything, with the presentation of the case to the Grand Jury?

A I got assigned the case on April 28th. Certain parts of the Grand Jury proceeding happened almost immediately after that, and my involvement in that was minimal. I spoke with Bob Beevers, the expert that Mr. Linton had talked to.

I have to explain to you a little bit, I grew up in Fairbanks. I had never been near water. I had — knew nothing about the tanker industry, didn't know the difference between a chart and a map, and so I sat down with Mr. Beevers and said, "Listen. You need to explain this to me, because I don't understand what's going on at all."

That was pretty much all I did for the initial part.

The second part of the Grand Jury proceeding, in my mind, is the part where the tanker captains -- or the NTSB hearings were coming up, and I helped coordinate the witnesses that were going to be called in our case. In fact, Mary Ann Henry and I split up the duties, where I said I'll take these witnesses and draw up the questions

for them for you, and you take these witnesses and you draw up those questions, and then we'll criss-cross, see if there's anything that we need, we think we're forgetting.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

- Q These witnesses were crew members of the Exxon Valdez?
  - A Crew members of the Exxon Valdez.
  - Q Continue, please.

A I can't remember if I received permission -- I believe I did -- from Judge Shortell to sit in on the Grand Jury presentation, the second part, which I believe was the 17th. My memory is that it happened on a Mon -- that Monday, witnesses started coming in.

We -- and Tuesday, the NTSB hearings started.

Monday night, I went to the Captain Cook with Sergeant

Stogsdill and he was going to be handing the subpoenas -we had worked out an arrangement with Exxon to -- that they
would make these people available to us, and so he was
going to be handing them both a Grand Jury subpoena and a
trial subpoena.

I was also going to be introduced to the people so that I could have a feeling of, you know, who they were, they would know who I was, and so we went up to the floor -- I can't remember which one it was in the Captain Cook.

They -- the security guy, person for the Exxon -- for Exxon

-- was a man by the name of Jim Sturdivant, I believe. He would -- we would say, "We would like to give this person their subpoena." He'd walk down the hall, pick up that person, come in.

An attorney by the name of Dagle was in the room. He represented Exxon and he seemed to represent these people, too. He was kind of a person that helped them out.

What we would do is they would come in, I would just stand there, Sergeant Stogsdill would hand them a subpoena, explain to them what it meant, ask them to contact us on Tuesday, pick up their statement so they could reread it, indicated to them that we were interested in interviewing them before they testified, and we did that for a number of the witnesses, and I can't remember which ones we actually ended up serving that night.

The next day, none of the witnesses agreed to talk with us, except for Mr. Kagan, who was represented by an attorney from Louisiana, and I can't remember his name, and Mr. Hensley from -- he used to be a public defender here, and that's how I knew him.

We went over in the afternoon to speak with Mr. Kagan, and it was Mr. Hensley, the attorney from Louisiana, Mr. Kagan, Sergeant Stogsdill and myself. The NTSB hearings were playing at that time, and we started talking

-- in fact, they were on the TV, and we started -- and I informed the attorney that I -- that we couldn't hear what was going on, and we asked them to turn it off.

We spoke with Mr. Kagan for a short time there.

The next day, I received permission from Judge Shortell, I believe, to sit in on the Grand Jury proceeding. That was a Wednesday, and that was when the crew members were called, except for maybe one or two other people.

THE COURT: Were these the individuals that refused to be interviewed, the crew members?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: They -- essentially -- yeah. I didn't get a chance to interview them at all. We -- I just sat in the courtroom in the back.

At one point, Miss Henry -- I can't remember if she start -- I think she started coughing, and couldn't stop, and so I said, "Well, why don't you let me take over," and it was Mr. Claar, and I did the testimony of Mr. Claar.

I was involved in some of the decision-making involving the indictment, and sat in on the last day when it was the next hearing, which was the next week. It was like next Tuesday, the Tuesday following that.

Ĭ

And that was my involvement in the Grand Jury.

BY MR. LINTON: (Resuming)

Q What did you, or Mary Ann Henry, have to work with by way of reports or documents to know who to call, or to prepare witnesses for the Grand Jury?

A Well, who to call, for me, I was not really involved -- I wasn't involved in the first part of it, who was called in the first couple of days. Who was called in the second part, the crew members, I was involved in to the extent, and we were limited by, who Exxon had flown up for the NTSB. Those were the only people that we called.

What we had to work with was trooper interview. We received an FBI interviews, either the day before, on Monday, or Friday. It was -- I can't remember if it was Monday or Friday, but it was right before the Grand Jury.

We had various documents from the Exxon Valdez itself, course recorders, log books, bell loggers. We had maps -- charts, excuse me.

We had -- I spoke with Mr. Beevers as I talked to you -- told you before.

The other things that we had were discussions between myself and Sergeant Stogsdill, and discussions between Mary Ann Henry and myself, and the three of us.

Q I meant the question to apply to information, or police reports furnished, as things that you had -- when

you say you had conversations with them, what do you mean?

Describe what you mean?

A Well, we just shot around and did a lot of hypotheticals. What if.

Q Explain -- explain why you had to do hypotheticals?

A Well, one of the critical periods is the period between the time Captain Hazelwood left the bridge -- first of all, we had no statements from Captain Hazelwood, so we're trying to figure out what was going through his mind.

We had -- what we did have is the statements from Radkey, who was out on the bow. We had Claar's statements. We had Kagan's statements, and Maureen Jones. Those four people, that told us what went on -- oh, and we also had Murphy -- who told us what went on on the bridge that evening.

If you read -- there's two characters missing.

We knew that Captain Hazelwood was up there for awhile, and we knew Greg Cousins was there. We didn't have anything from Greg Cousins. We didn't have anything from Captain Hazelwood, and if you read Mr. Kagan's interview, it has -- you have a hard time picturing what's going on on the bridge.

So we sat around and tried to figure out what was going through these two guy's minds when this ship turned

 and went 180 degrees on a heading of 180 degrees.

We had no statements of what happened after the ship went aground, except we had a brief statement by Maureen Jones, and a brief statement by Kagan, and we have the course recorder that shows the twisting, and we've got the instrument that shows the tanker being put full ahead. But we don't have any reasons for that.

So we sat back there and brought up hypotheticals of, "Well, maybe he was trying to do this," or "Maybe he was trying to do that."

That's what I mean by sitting with Mary Ann Henry and with Sergeant Stogsdill.

There's a couple of things that go on in this thing. Mr. Linton had not allowed us to talk with any attorneys. One of the things that we do in the District Attorney's office is when we have cases, we sit there and we talk.

"Well, I got this problem. What do you think about this?" Well, it's not uncommon, after work, to sit around and say, "This is an issue that we have, or I have. How would you do this?" or "How would you have done this better?" or "How do I present this?"

So we really were narrowed down into who we could talk to. We couldn't talk to Mr. Linton, we couldn't talk to anybody else, so it was just Mary Ann Henry, myself, Jim

Stogsdill and then, a little bit after that, Sam Adams.

All we had, as far as police report, were the interviews by the troopers of the crew members and the FBI interviews. That's what I remember.

Q Have there been other aspects to this unusual nature of the case, like what you're describing, the situation you've been placed in by the restrictions placed on you?

A You mean how it's affected how I've dealt with this case?

Q How you -- Yes.

A Sure. A number of things.

Whenever you get assigned to a case, particularly of this magnitude, publicity, I've had friends from back east that I went to college with send me letters to my home address with clippings. When I open up the letter, I see the clipping, I take it, fold it up and put it in an envelope.

My folks -- my Dad's an attorney in Fairbanks, my uncle's an attorney in Fairbanks. They ask me questions.

My Mom asks me questions. My Mom sends me clippings from what's going on in Fairbanks. I had to tell her to stop.

I really didn't talk with the case much about her, though. I did talk a little bit with my Dad, just to explain the immunity issue, because I can explain these

things to him and he understands -- not that my Mom doesn't understand, but it would take for -- it would take longer, and I can tell my Dad about immunity, and independent source, and things like that. I'm probably going to get in trouble for this.

But -- so in that respect, it was always telling him what we were doing, but it was never -- when he would ever ask about -- I just told him from the beginning, I can't have you tell me anything about the case. I can tell you what I'm doing, and what steps we're taking and why we're taking them, and I would explain that to him.

People in town, as it became apparent that I was the one that had been assigned the trial in this case, you don't -- can't help but have people come up to you and start talking to you about it. I basically told those people, "Look, I just can't talk about it for reasons that will become apparent later."

Newspapers. I didn't -- I bought a new house in July. I don't get any newspapers. I read papers during that time, but every time I would look at a paper, if the headline looked like it had anything to do with the oil spill, I just didn't read it. I just went on.

I've had a couple of roommates during this time. Explain to them, if we were watching the news, or something like that, if something about this case care up, I would

have to walk out of the room, or they would go up and turn the volume down until the thing got taken care of.

That's how I've had to isolate myself against other people.

It's caused a little bit of dissension in the office. Mr. Linton and I, on several occasions, have had some real heated arguments — I would call them arguments — about turning over the NTSB hearing stuff. When we were preparing for the Grand Jury. We learned that there was going to be a representative from the state of Alaska there who was not going to be an attorney, and that there was going to be an attorney there, and my feeling was, we should have somebody there. This is going to be a great opportunity to find out, because we didn't have statements of Mr. Cousins, and we didn't know whether Mr. Hazelwood was going to testify or not — at least at the beginning.

And so we said, "Well, we should draw up questions for the state attorney to ask the crew members, and we should have somebody there, either Mr. Linton or another attorney, and we were just told, "You will not go near the NTSB hearings. You will not be there. You will not ask anybody any questions. You will not contact the state attorney that's dealing with the matter."

And that caused some real problems for me, because I looked at the NTSB as something independent, and

Mr. Linton didn't.

We then were contacted at one point by the Department of Justice, two attorneys -- Mark Nagle, or -- is it Mark Nagle? Mr. Nagle and Mr. Harman. They were looking at an investigation into this incident. They were conducting an investigation.

We had a meeting with them, Mary Ann Henry, myself, those two individuals and an FBI agent named Steele, and when we first met, I remember one of the -- one of our big concerns was that this hearing was not going to take place, and we didn't know whether we should raise a Criminal Rule 16 discovery motion that Mr. Linton should write it, to you, or to whoever the assigned Judge was, asking that the information that we had not received, or that we knew was out there, we suspected was out there, whatever way you want to put it, would get turned over to us, because we weren't sure that the defense was going to raise this.

people, the first thing I said was, have you guys ever done this before? And they told us about a case down in Arkansas, or Alabama, down south where a tanker farm had burst, and there was a huge, but oil spill, and they -- but their facts were a little bit different, because they had independent people calling up authorities saying, "Look,

•

2.

this tanker had been -- you know, there's oil going all over, so they had easily -- it was easy to determine that an independent source. We didn't have that in this case.

So what we did then is the first -- after they said, "Well, the defense really didn't raise this issue in that hearing, except right up -- right at the end, right before the case ended up settling." And I said, "Well, how do we do this? Do we wait for a motion to come in, a motion to dismiss, a motion to suppress, or do we file our own -- what I would call a Criminal Rule 16 motion to turn over the documents to our attorneys, the NTSB stuff, things like that?"

And they assured us that they thought it would come up in motion work before that happened.

We then sat down and they asked us what we had, what type of information we had reviewed, and when we told them that we had not reviewed any of the NTSB information, and that we couldn't hear anything about the NTSB, they were a little shocked, because at this time, they wanted to know what our plans were with Greg Cousins, and they wanted to us to listen to the NTSB hearings on Greg Cousins' testimony.

MR. : Who's they?

THE WITNESS: The two attorneys of the Department of Justice.

So they encouraged us to get the NTSB transcripts, and review his testimony, and then get back with them on what our plans were.

I ended up getting a copy of the NTSB stuff from Midnight Sun court reporters. It was sent to our office with two disks. I turned it over to Mr. Linton, which was our standard procedure.

I also received a package from the Department of Justice containing the NTSB material and all the exhibits, which I never looked in. I just handed it to Mr. Linton.

At one point, we had been assured that the NTSB stuff was being screened, or had been screened, and we would receive portions of it that were somebody else had decided were not tainted. That didn't happen.

Bob Maynard was supposed to do that. He ended up -- there was a mix up in communication. He ended up not doing it. Mr. Linton went on vacation. So we didn't get it then.

we've never seen the NTSB. About three weeks, a month ago, we raised the issue again, because we're looking at experts to come in and tell us certain things about what was going on when it -- just before the tanker hit, and -- oh, I have to backtrack.

We then entered into negotiations, or I had a lot of conversations with a gentleman by the name of John Clow

/

(PH), who's an attorney down in Juneau, and he was representing Exxon. And we asked him, we made a huge list of what things we wanted from Exxon, and he went back and came back to us and essentially said, "We're not going to allow you to interview any more of these witnesses. They've already testified at NTSB, or they've given depositions, and what we'll do is we'll turn over to you the NTSB stuff."

We also had asked for a lot of the information about how the ship was sitting on the rock, or on Bligh Reef, or however you want to characterize it. The angles, whether it was listing, the underwater topography, and he told us that he — that that information had been provided to the NTSB and that they would be sending that to us.

He did end up doing that. That information I gave also to Mr. Linton and haven't seen.

The experts that we've contacted need that information. I've continued to hound Mr. Linton and, for lack of a better word, trying to get that turned over to us, and then about three to four weeks ago, we had another meeting where it was decided that we would wait until after this.

So it's made it very difficult for us to hire any experts without the information.

THE COURT: What difference does it make that you

wait until after this proceeding? How will that affect decision?

THE WITNESS: Well, our feeling has been that after -- we -- when we were looking at this, we felt that what would happen -- again, we didn't know how this was going to proceed, so what we did is, we felt that what would happen is, that they would have this hearing, and if it was -- if there was a sufficient basis for determining -- see, Mr. Linton apparently cut off the information we received for the full day of the 24th. And there were things that were done on the 24th, there were pictures that were taken on the 24th, there were interviews that were conducted on the 24th, there were measurements taken, things that we needed.

And we figured that what would happen is we would put on evidence that this would have been discovered way before the cut-off date that Mr. Linton arbitrarily set, and I --

THE COURT: I understand.

THE WITNESS: And therefore, we figured that when the Court made a ruling on when — if we won, and the Court makes an independent ruling on that, then he could turn over the stuff that he had kept from us.

We also felt that, once and for all, we could take care of this whether or not the NTSB was a tainted

hearing. I mean, we just had real different philosophies on whether or not that was, and it really -- on top of that, here the Department of Justice, who had done things like this before, had turned -- had screened it, had turned it over, and I just could not understand why we couldn't do it in this case.

That's why we did that.

THE COURT: Okay. Before we go any further, did you want to break at 1:20 today?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, Your Honor, and -- I had an issue I thought maybe I should bring up at this time, and the Court, if that's appropriate.

THE COURT: Okay. Sure we can do that. You wanted to break at 1:20, and if you have got time --

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's what I -- I thought I would at least raise the issue --

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Cole, I'm going to excuse me right now. You may step outside, and we'll resume your testimony tomorrow at 8:30.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

(The witness stood aside.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your Honor, the point I'm bringing up, I guess, is a legal point, it's a procedural point, and it's also a factual point, and they all kind of intersect around Mr. Cole, and rather than kind of spring it on him

-- and I don't have any reason to think he even is aware of it -- I thought I would raise it now, and maybe we could decide how you want to approach it.

The cases say that at a castigor (?) hearing, the state has the burden of presenting to the Court each piece of evidence it plans to use at trial, and showing how that piece of evidence is untainted -- I'll use that shorthand phrase. So my expectation tomorrow would be to ask Mr. Cole, tell us each piece of evidence you plan to introduce at trial, and I presume we'll have a list of ten, twenty, thirty pieces of evidence.

I assume that later, then, Mr. Linton will get on the stand and say, "Here are additional pieces of evidence we wish to present at trial," and then -- we will then have a master list, and we will argue over whether it's tainted or not when this is all done.

THE COURT: Mr. Friedman, that could happen, if there is a trial, all the way up through trial, too, could it not?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: It could happen all the way through trial, too, could it now? If they think of some more evidence that might be relevant they want to produce, they would have to go through the same procedure.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's exactly right --

l

J

•

THE COURT: -- before producing that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I think that's exactly right, and I guess I just didn't think it was going to be fair to Mr. Cole to say, "Okay. Tell us, while you're sitting there, cold, every piece of evidence you want to present at trial." And so I wanted to give his warning, maybe through Mr. Linton, and I guess also make sure as to whether we're on the same wavelength as to that's what we're doing here, as to that's what — in other words, that the state does intend to present that sort of evidence.

We don't have the burden, but I think it would help if we were all kind of here for the same reason in that sense.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that we all are on the same wavelength. It seems like it's turning into that. At least we've heard some testimony about the Grand Jury presentation and what was presented, who was presented, and evidence tending to show lack of taint. I didn't know if we were turning it into a trial castigor proceeding as well.

Was that your intention at this time to do that, or was it your intention to get over, one way or the other, the immunity hurdles and then go to a castigor hearing?

What was your intention, Mr. Linton?

MR. LINTON: I wish I'd done a few more of these

before I tried to answer that question.

THE COURT: You and I have done just the same number, I think, before this.

MR. LINTON: I was a witness in one seventeen years ago, but -- I'm not sure I can answer the question in the time we've got left here.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's not worry about it, then. We can worry about it tomorrow.

But you're put on notice there may be some questions here, and there are a lot of issues we're going to have to take up. It seems to me that there's always a possibility of putting off the -- that portion of castigor to a later date and get directly to the immunity issue, but I don't mind doing it tomorrow and continue on through.

MR. FRIEDMAN: But the problem I see, Your Honor, is I'm not sure there is a difference between the castigor issue and the immunity issue. In other words, once we raise the claim of immunity, the state has the burden of presenting untainted evidence, and I think they acknowledge that. They're saying our evidence is untainted because of inevitable discovery, or what have you. That's one route to clear the evidence, if you accept that as an appropriate vehicle.

But if we are not trying to find out what's tainted and what isn't tainted, then I -- this is sort of

like what I brought up at the beginning of a hearing, is it seems to me that there's all kinds of possibilities of us going off in different directions, and if we're -- if Mr. Linton isn't trying to show us his untainted evidence and how his evidence is untainted, then it's not clear to me what he is trying to show, I guess is my --

THE COURT: Well, it would be nice if I could come up with some sort of a solution and say, "Okay, as of a certain time, it would have been inevitably discovered and that doctrine applies to Fifth Amendment rights." It would be nice if I could come up with that.

I can't do that right now until I hear more, and it's going to take me a little research and study to come up with some findings.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I understand.

THE COURT: Even if I did come up with a time
like that, there might be some evidence that was discovered
or produced after that cut-off time, but was somehow
connected with information supplied before the cut-off
time. And your analogy of the blood test. That might be
an example. I don't know.

But I can't come up with a solution right now, so I think we have to hear it all, either that or go in the direction of the inevitable discovery, or the independent source, and then stop and wait for me to come up with a

decision, and then come back in, but that seems to be breaking it up.

We could do that for just about every motion. We could see how you fare on those motions and come back in and take another shot.

And I'd rather just do it all at once. And if we can do all the taint evidence in this hearing, I'd like to do it, as much as we can. And it — I think it is a legitimate burden the state bears, and if you want to let Mr. Friedman ask those questions, I suppose that's up to you, but that's a little different than you normally would proceed, I suppose.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I just wanted to make it clear that I was going to go down that road unless somebody told me to stop.

THE COURT: Well, I think you've put everybody on notice on what you intend -- maybe Mr. Linton will go down the road and will plow it for you a little bit.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Fair enough.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. LINTON: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Please rise. This court stands in recess.

(Whereupon, at 1:27 p.m., the hearing recessed.)

SUPERIOR COURT )
Case No. 3ANS89-7217
STATE OF ALASKA ) Case No. 3ANS89-7218

I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was typed by me and that said transcript is a true record of the recorded proceedings to the best of my ability.

Alexandra Jonalones

ALEXANDRA TOMALONIS