

Walt Goodson Interview
August 6, 2008

STANFORD: Today is going to be 8-6-2008. The time is 9:03 AM. My name is Mike Stanford with Internal Affairs visiting with Lieutenant Walt Goodson with Polygraph in the CIS service. If you will, Walt, for the record, just say your name.

GOODSON: Walt Goodson.

STANFORD: And you're located here?

GOODSON: Yeah, I'm stationed here in Austin at the District Office.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: What's the (inaudible)...

STANFORD: Forget about that thing because, like I said, it will pick up all over the room and...

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: ...I'm not going to worry about it. One of the things I'd like you to do and I don't care if you read this out loud. It will be part of the report. I feel it's important to let, to allow you to do this, is read through the complaint letter that we received and all the information. The first two pages are the complaint and, as you know, the complainant is Sue Luttrell in this case.

GOODSON: That's about all I know.

STANFORD: And then she also sent us a telephone recording of a message you left her which was received, I guess, by her August 6th at 10:50 AM, I believe this is going to be in 2007. She didn't put the year on there. But I'll let you, kind of, talk about that. And it may take you a few minutes to read through it and take all the time you need. I'm going to grab one thing out of my office...

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: ...while you're reading that.

(Long pause.)

GOODSON: Okay. I don't think I've got it.

STANFORD: That's the...it's transcribed. We transcribed that from the audio recording she sent us with her complaint.

(Long pause.)

5

WJ

GOODSON: Okay. I have questions. One of the things about this whole investigation that bothers me...

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: ...is can I, is not protocol for you guys that show that up front because that would have made me feel a whole ton better.

STANFORD: No, it is not.

GOODSON: To know what that is. Most of that stuff has happened in one way or another but there's, of course, circumstances surrounding everything.

STANFORD: There's different views on it. And, you know, in any investigation a lot of it's up to the investigator and in some cases. Is there a policy that prohibits me from doing that? No. I don't do it because, one, while it probably would have set you at great ease, as you well know, a little bit of anxiety, unfortunately, is always good for an investigator.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And then I'm and then I will tell you this, Polygraph, polygraphers and the Ranger Service are probably about the most difficult people to actually go out and interview for folks. Now, you know, my goal is not to bring your stress level to paramount peaks to where you can't function or anything like that...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...but you know the other side is if I give you this information up front, Walt, and you have information that and for some reason you choose to go out there and talk to somebody...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...about it, it has more of an ability and this is my whole point...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...more ability to interfere with my case as it goes on.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Especially one that takes a period of time.

GOODSON: I understand. I understand. I just, I have, I mean I have 17+ years with the state, never had anything like this happen and I have been, I've always...my claim to fame is I don't let stuff bother me and I always talked to Mike Gougler about, he said he got stuff like this all the time. And I said, "Well, that's you, Mike. I can handle stuff like this."

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: And come to find out, no, he's absolutely right. This is...the last three months have been miserable. Just because I get calls...I get calls. Probably the most disturbing thing of this whole process and most disappointing was Kelly Hendricks. He didn't tell me anything other than walking up to me in the hall and says to me, "I was told I can't talk to you," and walks away.

STANFORD: That's not helpful.

GOODSON: And that's all...I had inquired, man, I didn't even know where it was coming from at that point. I had no idea how he was involved or knew anything. I said, "Kelly, can I just ask you one question?" I didn't know if it was Sue or you or who. I said, "Who told you that?"

STANFORD: Well those aren't the instructions we give to people.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Yeah.

STANFORD: The instructions we give to people are...

GOODSON: But you get...

STANFORD: ...that was what he...

GOODSON: ...my side of the story, I mean, my, this is what I get, you know, but whatever you tell these guys I get. This is how it comes back to me.

STANFORD: And we have no control over that.

GOODSON: That's was the day before I was going to (inaudible) on my annual big vacation. Talk about a good time at the beach.

STANFORD: I can't imagine how that was.

GOODSON: Spend my big vacation and he says, "Yeah, well I just want you to know I had an interview and the Rangers were there." Nice.

STANFORD: You can't talk about this investigation...

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...is the way we put it.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: That doesn't mean, you know...let me give you another example. Let's say you have a sergeant in a sergeant area over people, you know, you have to talk on a daily basis but they...

GOODSON: No. No. No. I understand that. I'm just...my, and you know it comes but just...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...but just for your. No matter how you guys put it, that's how it comes back to the person involved.

STANFORD: And you can't control the way other people react and how they say things and, regardless, I've had...

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...a couple of people in this investigation I've absolutely told - Do not go contacting anybody and they've outright done it. And it's very frustrating on the investigator's side, too, when that does happen. Let's go over this initial complaint letter.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Talk to me about this Axciton laptop, polygraph instrument that Sue...

GOODSON: I know nothing about a laptop she fixed. I don't deny they did that. She and Mike worked, Mike Gougler, worked very close together and there certainly could have been an instance where we, she did something or maybe updated something or...I have no idea because all our laptops are state-issued. They're Dell laptops. If there's a problem with a laptop, we take it to Dell so I don't know what she did there. As far as the instrument and that's part of that message there and part of my frustration and that's probably explainable. That's one side of many messages that went back, and I know I'm getting ahead of myself, but she called me and demanded her instruments back. And this was right after Lafayette had won the bid, the initial bid that Lafayette won, the low bid. She sends me, and I've just recently deleted it before this investigation. I kept that thing a year because it was so doggone hateful. Saying well, I guess, to paraphrase and I may be a little off, says, "Well, I guess we're not doing business anymore. Would you be so kind as to ship my instruments back." And that's the way it was. And the way I interpreted that was well, I'll be nice but is she thinking all the ones we've bought from her? I was confused by it. So I sent her a...I don't know if that was the voicemail or it was the next one, but I replied to her. I said, "Hey, we're going to continue this bidding process. If you're low bid...we're going to constantly buy instruments. We're not kicking you guys out. You're a great company. And I've been close to Sue for a long time, I mean, I had pictures of her that, you know, I was taking that I gave her a rifle one time. Oh, she wanted to hold a gun.

STANFORD: Um.

GOODSON: Here, I'll take a picture of you holding the gun. That was one thing she wanted to do and I took all the bullets out...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...and it's a long time ago. But we were real close so I mis-interpreted that and I don't know if we had a conversation or two before then but it finally came down to a five channel instrument she says that she gave me. I said, "Sue, you didn't give me an instrument. You gave Jules Peterson an instrument a long time ago." And I remembered it vaguely, a case where Jules had a loaner instrument but I didn't know. Turns...come to find out, it's not even a five channel instrument. They gave him an old instrument.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And that's what I was thinking. But that was through Jules. I know nothing about that. She said, "No, no, no, I gave you one." I said, "Sue, you didn't give me an instrument." She says, "Well, maybe I left it at the school for you." I said, "Well, I don't know where it is. We don't have one." At that point, this was their new instrument and they look way different than the others and they have what's called an activity sensor, this pad you sit on and it's the latest rage and it was why we were, as a Department, were going out because we wanted these instruments. This is what...this is the upgrade we needed to buy, this is the biggest thing we needed because it's...I digress a little bit because by 2012 the American Polygraph Association to maintain accreditation of polygraph programs says you have to have these. So we were saying, we need them now and we'll definitely need them then. Let's go ahead and get these. So, I guess what I'm saying in a nutshell is, this would have been something that would have stuck out tremendously to have this instrument. Somebody would have used it. I would have used it or somebody because it's the latest gadget, so if she...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...gives us this loaner go give this thing a whirl, go. It never happened. So I don't know where she got that or where that came from. I never saw that instrument.

STANFORD: Did...have you had any conversations with Jules Peterson regarding that?

GOODSON: I've had extensive conversations with him because I was supervising him and he was given clear instructions to go give that instrument back because I thought that might have been a five channel.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Turns out it wasn't. It was an old instrument. And it wasn't until this investigation started that Todd going around and...

STANFORD: Todd?

GOODSON: Kresnik.

STANFORD: Kresnik. I'm sorry. Audit and Inspection.

GOODSON: He came around and did an audit to make sure we had all of our instruments.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Well we went to looking and we checked and something that I totally missed was when we got the Lafayette instruments in back in, I guess it was November, Jules Peterson came in. What we did was, we had a list and I had Felicia Ruiz sit there with a list and say, okay, we got 11 instruments to divvy out. I want an instrument in your hands and then you issue a new one. And take the serial number and then give them the new instrument. That way we're good on it. Because I had three or four of them saying, "Well, can I hold on to the other instrument?" I said, "No, that's just going to cause problems if you have two." And they were afraid because it was a new type of instrument that they would not understand how to use it and they would have this other one to revert back to. I said, "No. Trial by fire. You've got to learn or you'll never...if we don't wean you now you're not going to do it." So we turned them all in and I never paid attention. I think the question, I'm sure I asked her was, you've got eleven instruments, right? For eleven instruments. She said, "Yeah." So it wasn't until Todd came in and did this interview or this audit, that I went back through and checked all the serial numbers and one of them was a loaner instrument from Axciton.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I called Jules and said, "Brother, you have another instrument? Do you have a five channel instrument? And he said, "No, I don't think so." And he, anyway, two or three conversations including with his lieutenant who also, Trey Holleway, who I also called and said, "Can you get with Jules and make sure he doesn't have another instrument." He checked, Jules checked, I got feedback from both of them that this was the only instrument. Well, what he did was, he had a loaner instrument that apparently - and I learned this even after this conversation - that about two years ago his instrument went down and he lives in Houston...Axciton is right down the road. He drives over to Axciton and says, "Hey, my instrument crapped out on me. I need a new polygraph instrument or I need you to fix this." And they said, "Well, here just take this loaner and we'll keep your box and you take our box." And that never got resolved. And Axciton wrote it off as no big deal and from what, the best I interpret on that, that probably went through either one or two inventories where somebody looked at the box...there's your box, kind of like looking at a pistol, didn't take the number down and he had that one. Since then I've called Axciton and Sue's called...not Sue, uh, Felicia's called Axciton and we have yet to hear back from them but they were doing a complete search for Jules' instrument, the one he had. They have not found that instrument and basically, when I was told by...I'll think of the guy's name in a minute...one of the reps there. He said, "I remember that deal when that happened." His name is, I believe it's Joe, Joe something. He told me, he said, "When we did that deal, we just thought it was a...we were just switching instruments. It was not a big deal to us."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Because it was the old style instrument they weren't even manufacturing anymore. This was not that five channel that Sue is referring to in the letter. This was an old four channel box.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And they just switched and nothing was ever done, nothing was ever changed on the inventory and we even called Axciton about it and they said, "We're not missing it. That's not an instrument we're even have any concern about," is the conversation, basically, that they told me and said, "Well, we'll get it resolved and the ball is, really as we speak right now, in their court until they tell us we can't find the instrument and that we'll cut some paperwork saying hey, we're giving you this instrument because they may very well have fixed it and sold it.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And there was...they were under the assumption, and that was just one of those deals, like I said, they have...Axciton has a program...to give you a little more insight and make this transcript fifty pages long.

STANFORD: That doesn't matter.

GOODSON: They have, they take trades on their upgrades, they pay cash for trades.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So everybody, any time now, everybody is upgrading to this new sensor box. Well, they get the old one in and they throw it in the closet and because I talked to the president of the company maybe 6 months to a year ago...way before...when we were considering buying new instruments. I had visited with him, he had called me for something, I said, "Yeah we're," I said, "will you give us a good deal on some instruments if we go out for the new five channel." He said, "Yeah, I'll do something for you because we're not taking trades anymore like we used to. I've got two closets full of those four channel instruments with nothing to do with them." They're...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...you can't do anything and they're just, it's basically an obsolete item that was once purchased for five or six grand. I guess he can't part with throwing them away or, you know, the components and everything are trash or just...this is nothing salvageable out of that. If the box had to get bigger, anything in the inside wouldn't really be worth anything. The bottom line on these instruments, so you know, is I'd be willing to guess, and this is just complete speculation on my part, these instrument manufacturers probably have two hundred dollars worth of materials in one of those boxes that they sell for six grand.

STANFORD: I believe it.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: That's typically the way things work.

GOODSON: Yeah. But it's the research, the software, the development that goes into that, the constant upgrades like a car or anything else. You have to pay for that.

STANFORD: Yeah, the car may cost you 5,000 or maybe really costs \$5,000.00 but after legal fees and paying the manufacturer and people and all this other stuff it's a \$30,000.00 car.

GOODSON: Yeah. And they have to continue, I mean, they have to continue to press and move forward but that's why there's such extreme latitude that we are cognizant of as a Department and I'll slam her on the next comment she made about asking for a low price but we know they have an incredible latitude to give us a better price than retail because they do it all the time. Everybody buys for different prices, it just depends on the price you negotiate with the company.

STANFORD: Their mark up is huge...

GOODSON: Yeah. Yeah.

STANFORD: ...compared to the cost.

GOODSON: Everybody. Everything is negotiable with every company I'm aware of.

STANFORD: But as far as this, what you're telling me, this instrument she says she loaned to you personally, you're saying that that didn't happen.

GOODSON: Did not happen.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Never have seen that instrument...

STANFORD: Now the deal for...

GOODSON: ...that I can recall.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: I don't remember her leaving one. If she let, I mean, she could have very well left one, somebody walked out with it. I can't believe in a million years that would have happened. We've never lost an instrument like that.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I think she's just mistaken.

STANFORD: And that's very possible. Apparently their paperwork is not all that great.

GOODSON: Then that would explain why we're going on two months and they still can't find Jules' instrument.

STANFORD: That, I'm not, that part wouldn't surprise me at all.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Now as far as Jules' instrument goes, which isn't really part of this complaint, but just so I know. We're doing stuff right now to rectify that: either one, put this instrument on our books...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: ...and take the old one off?

GOODSON: And ours is not even an inventoriable item now but we have to get that right. We have to make, for this reason or any other reason, we have to get that situation straight and we have to have...I'll get something in writing from Axciton before this is all done that says this is what happened.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So we have that to put away in a file.

STANFORD: So if somebody asks us we know what we have, at least.

GOODSON: Yeah. And we know what we have. And we're right. And our inventory, if that question comes up we'll visit about that more extensively, but it's, it's, we're not missing anything other than an instrument UPS lost.

STANFORD: Yeah, I think, I think in visiting with Todd or the Ranger, I can't remember who told me, it was, they said we have two instruments that were unaccounted for. One of which was lost in the mail and the other one is just missing which may be Jules'.

GOODSON: That was Jules'. That was the other instrument.

STANFORD: And we lost one in the mail? How did that happen? What is that?

GOODSON: UPS sent one, this was during Polygraph School, this past Polygraph School so in the spring or early summer of this year, uh, Larry Cosby's instrument went down and we over-nighted him one. We had an extra instrument so Felicia Ruiz over-nighted him one through UPS. He got an empty envelope. Don't know how it happened but we called UPS and they looked into it and admitted fault in it so we...

STANFORD: Did they reimburse us for it?

GOODSON: Yeah. They gave us, and here's the funny thing, they wrote us a check for \$100.00 because the Department has a contract with UPS that says anything we lose of yours, we'll only reimburse you up to \$100.00 because that's...they're working out some kind of special arrangement. We get a discount on it or something.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: But that was the, part of the agreement with UPS, which I learned after the fact but anytime you send an item more expensive, you have to insure it.

STANFORD: Specifically?

GOODSON: You have to insure it or get a waiver, I think they said you could possibly get a waiver on it and say hey your...bottom line is the instrument is of no value to us anymore anyway.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: We have plenty of these and now that we're upgrading...this was one of the old instruments.

STANFORD: So at this point it probably is something you're willing to write off?

GOODSON: Yeah, it's just, we got \$100.00...probably \$100.00 more than we would have gotten for the doggone thing.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: And we're sitting on about 25 of these things right now.

STANFORD: That satisfies me on that deal. I don't want to get to the bid stuff yet but I do want to start off with these allegations that comments were improperly made to students in this last Polygraph School...

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: ...that might give some sort of preference to a particular vendor whether it be Lafayette, Limestone, Axciton, whoever...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...or Stoelting. I think probably the best way to ask you is straight up. Did you make any comments that might be construed in such a way?

GOODSON: Absolutely not.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: The part about that, that I remember reading in there that if you own a Limestone, you're just screwed.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I said that.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And the whole class erupted in laughter because that was said in a joking manner which they knew and it was two Limestone students in the class that I was extremely close to.

They're sharp students from Colorado. I had worked with those guys but, in particular, we had spent extra time, we had dedicated our extra time for them. We brought those guys in on a Sunday because their instructor could only make it on a Sunday. They got specialized, basically one on one instruction. They had two instructors come in so they had a full day of one on one instruction. They got the, they got every benefit that the other ones did not even receive. Nobody had one on one instruction for a full day. So, and I sat in on the class with them and kind of brought myself up to speed with the software, too, because I didn't know that software very well and I was quite impressed with it actually. So we had been talking about that and that was...because we knew the other manufacturers were there and that was one of those at 4:50 at the end of class, everybody's walking out and I make that comment as a joke and, like I said, everybody just cracks up. There was no seriousness to it. They laughed. I mean, it was...

STANFORD: Was Sue there when you made this comment?

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Yes, she was sitting in the back of the room. I'm pretty sure she was. I mean, it was as a joke and she...I mean, the class erupted in laughter because they knew it was not true. That was one of those just joking things. And 10 week school and you're all but business and you're not making your...they knew it...there was no way you could construe that as me saying you're...buddy, you're screwed. There was no way. These were top...both of these guys were in our top in grades. They were the top two students in the class or they were both probably finished in the top 5. Very sharp. One of them was Colorado State Police. The other one was, oh, it's a suburb of Denver. But they knew that and if you talked to them and I think you did, you'd find out they knew I wasn't serious about that.

STANFORD: Tell me about the context or the way that statement came out. What was it related to because there's something more there...

GOODSON: It was...

STANFORD: ...besides what you're telling me.

GOODSON: Oh, well, it was, and I think the letter explains it. So to back up a little bit, I was making a comment, hey, and I can't remember exactly when or what day I was making this but I knew a test was coming up. And I said if you have any further questions or there's anything about the operational aspects of these instruments you don't understand, you have the two reps. You have Axciton rep here and you have Mark Handler here that can answer any of your questions and I was real serious and I said, "Oh yeah, Limestone you're screwed."

STANFORD: Because they didn't have a rep there?

GOODSON: They didn't have a rep there. Their rep had come and they already knew it. This was a Monday or Tuesday. Their rep had been with them all day Sunday. Because of flight...they had other situations and obligations, they came in over the weekend and had

their one on one class with them and they...these guys went above and beyond. They didn't have to be there...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...for this class. I told them, I said, you can play hooky if you like because you've already had your training course.

STANFORD: On your particular instrument?

GOODSON: On your particular instrument. And they took the initiative. They said, "No, we'll learn another instrument. We'll come."

STANFORD: Just to see what else is out there?

GOODSON: Exactly.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So they didn't even have to be there and I'm just, so I'm just messing with them. They're...anything that was discussed in the class was not for their exam. They already had their material. It was given to them prior to that point. So I'm making a joke with the guys that are just there for fun.

STANFORD: And just so I surmise right or summarize it right...that basically these folks had already had their section on their particular instrument, with the actual instrument vendor.

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: And when you were going over it with the rest of the class, these folks obviously didn't have to be there...

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: ...that had the Limestone instrument. They came anyway. But had they had any further questions, the Limestone rep was already gone...

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: ...and so an off the cuff comment might be the best way to describe it. You said, oh you guys, you guys, have this guy over here and you guys have this guy over here, you guys, you're screwed, you know, just kind of...

GOODSON: Yeah, yeah, exactly.

STANFORD: And I'll tell you, as you well know, I did visit with those folks.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I pulled them out of your class.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And neither one of them took offense to any of that, so...

GOODSON: I would hope not because they know that if somebody's offended...because we have a 10 week school and somebody's going to get offended. We've had a complaint we've had to answer to in the past. We tell them up front, hey buddy, we don't know if we're pushing it to far...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...but if we are please come tell us. We'll adjust it the class or we'll apologize. We certainly don't want to offend anybody but we've got to have fun in 10 weeks.

STANFORD: I guess for clarification...that comment wasn't related to the product?

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: Limestone's or anybody else's? What I'm hearing you say is that comment was related to the situation in which these folks didn't have the instructor of their instrument there.

GOODSON: And that's partially why I'm aggravated by this because I think the world of the Limestone product.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They make a heck of a good instrument. Those guys are smart. The problem with them is they're Canadian and I think they get a bad reputation, ah, they're foreigners, we don't want to use them. They make an outstanding product.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: There is no question about that. *WJ* *→ Jamie* Gandy Brown, the president of that company, is a smart man. A little difficult to get along with, from what I understand, but I love, I like their stuff. I would never say anything negative toward that because they are, they have some of the best, innovative products I have seen. That Sunday I sat in there before and sat with them, I was thoroughly impressed by that product.

STANFORD: Talk to me about, in the class, do you make recommendations as far as what instruments people should use or where they should go...

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: ...or anything like that? Tell me about how that works with you being the coordinator of the Polygraph School.

GOODSON: Yeah. And...what I don't do is I don't make a recommendation. I tell them...I have the standard answer for everybody. I said, "They all, all manufacturers make good instruments." I said, "It comes right down to price and customer service. Call and get you the best price." I said, "These guys will bargain with you." And that's what it simply boils down to. I have given some particular advice in the past where they said, "Well, all things being equal. I've got two bids that are the same." I've told them, "Well, which instrument is the person that's going to train you use?" I would go with that for simplicity.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. But rather than...what you're telling me is you don't necessarily recommend the vendor, per se, just...

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: ...whichever one...

GOODSON: Absolutely not.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: I never have done that because I've always been friends with all of them and I've not ever got and...I've learned a lot in this process since taking this employment with Lafayette. That, you know, you cannot maintain, I mean, I've maintained neutrality but no matter how hard you do that, in their eyes that's not the perception. They're not going to see you as that way. And you can interview anybody that's ever been in the school and ask them that question, if I've ever recommended a particular instrument they buy and nobody...They're not being truthful if they tell us I've recommended an instrument in particular...said go by Lafayette or go buy Axciton. I've never done so. Now I've, if they pull me aside and say, "What do you think about this instrument?" I'd say, "Well, I like this feature. I don't like this feature. I think this one." And I've even made comments in the class, "Well, I think this instrument does this the best. I think this instrument does that the best." So, they all have their strengths and their weaknesses but I don't see any one that just is a stand-out.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. I guess what I'm hearing you say is that each, you know, each one has its own idiosyncratic pluses and minuses.

GOODSON: That's a nice word.

STANFORD: You like that? (Inaudible) But is that pretty fair to say?

GOODSON: Yeah. Exactly. I agree.

STANFORD: And, before we leave this topic, because I...this is a very simple, to me, this is very simple. If this is all it is, this wouldn't have taken this long. I wanted to kind of bracket this part of the investigation and move on.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Is there anything else regarding these, regarding those allegations regarding that, that you'd like to discuss or you think we should know?

GOODSON: No, unless you have other questions, I think that's put to bed. I just...there's was no malice toward any instrument manufacturer. I wouldn't put myself in that position. I wouldn't do that to a student because they're going to go out and talk. I just, I don't put myself in that position.

STANFORD: Had any...an interesting question. Has anybody ever cautioned you against that or anybody in the Department ever given you advice regarding that or is this just something that you just do intuitively?

GOODSON: No. I just, I know better than to do...you're going to get yourself sideways over something like that over nothing. And, more importantly, not only did I see that as something that, you know, if I'd started doing that, they could really bad or bias. And number two, I considered, like I told you earlier, at the point, Sue included, the...gosh, I lost this name, too. Sean Edwards from Stoelting, is an issue in this. All four manufacturers have people I'm close to and can pick up the phone and call and visit with.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Mark Handler was really a mentor of mine, what led me in that direction. This is how I kind of got into that because they were all...I would never do anything to jeopardize a friendship and, more than...they're not personal friends but they were business relationships I could call if I needed something. If I needed a question answered, if I needed help with something, if I needed help with something, if I needed advice. Those guys were in the know. And I would never do anything to harm that or affect that. These guys come to the school, most of them free of charge...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and teach. I'm not going to do anything to jeopardize them coming to the school and benefiting the state by them coming in and giving instruction. So I'm never going to do anything to offend anybody. I've, you know, I've had beers with most of them at one point after hours and, you know, socialized when they've come to Austin to teach and talked with them and, uh, I mean, to develop and nurture a long-term working relationship that certainly benefits, I mean, it doesn't benefit me, it benefits DPS to have that.

STANFORD: I'll tell you this, and that basically concludes my portion on that deal, on that little bracketed incident...

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: ...that I've interviewed several, as you well know, of the Polygraph students...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...involved in this deal. No one took offense to it. It would appear that at this point, Sue Luttrell, was the only one that took offense to it and that I believe, in the context in which the comment occurred, that it's blown out of proportion and that I'm not, as the investigator, I'm not real concerned that something inappropriate happened here. In fact, if there was a complaint from a student, it would be that I asked Walt to give me a specific recommendation regarding an instrument and he refused to give it to me because he wouldn't choose one over the other. And so...

GOODSON: You were told that?

STANFORD: Yes. Because that is, and I understand your point of view. If anything, he was too objective.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So...and I don't know that we can be too objective but if there was a complaint from an outside agency, that would be it. You know, they were looking for recommendations and we wouldn't give it to them because that's not the business that we're in.

GOODSON: And no matter what my status is, that's not something we want to delve off into as a Department. We're not going to go there.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: We have everything to lose and nothing to gain by doing that.

STANFORD: I see that. So, you know, to put that to bed on that thing...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: To me it's really not an issue and I think that particular aspect of the complaint probably is more emotional rather than a real, factual violation of policy.

GOODSON: There's a lot of other circumstances surrounding that but if this is put to bed, I'm not going to even go into that...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...because it was looking like she was looking for a fight there.

STANFORD: Well, and I want to talk about that, here, after one more question I have for you.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Can you explain to me the relationship between these major four vendors; Stoelting, Limestone, Lafayette, and Axciton, between their roles and polygraph schools in general and what role the polygraph school plays with association? Not necessarily ours, but polygraph schools in general.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: What kind of relationships are there out there?

GOODSON: It varies extremely from school to school. There are Lafayette schools.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: There's been Axciton schools. There's instructors out there and, or there's schools out there and, why I say this, a little more background before I go into this. There's private schools.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: There's law enforcement only schools. There's government, federal government schools. And so everyone has a little different take. But, talking about everything as a whole, the relationships vary. You have instructors, you have schools out there that will only teach a certain instrument because that's the instrument they use. There's only a few of those. There's schools around the country where the director is the rep and that's how they make part of their money.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They buy...you come to my school, you buy an instrument, and they get, they get, I don't know it personally, but I assume they get kickbacks for them coming and buying all those instruments.

STANFORD: Their sales commission.

GOODSON: Yeah. I just assume that they do that, if they're buying, and say you need to go buy this instrument and they all use that instrument coming in. The mainstream schools, the ones that I respect, because I think they have the best program, I think they're respected, not just by me but as a whole, there's about four or five schools around the country that run class act programs. They have relationships with anybody that comes in. They are friends with the vendors. Their relationship is very similar to our own where they will bring in, and the little I know is that I've talked to Mark Handler, this rep for Lafayette and a couple of others that have actually kind of done a traveling road show. In fact, Limestone was another one where I was talking to their reps where they have gone around to the different schools like they go to ours. And it's, whoever shows up to the school with whatever instrument they happen to be using, that's what's taught to them. Now I don't know how they give recommendations. I have no idea how those schools operate where they might say, hey, you really ought to use this instrument and they may, well my department's been using this and this is what they issued me. Okay, well, if that's the case, you've already purchased one then that's acceptable. If you haven't bought one you need to buy this one.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

- GOODSON: I don't know if that happens. I assume it does in circumstances but everything's a little bit different but, for the most part, the ones we hold ourselves that are equal with and (inaudible) is one of them and Atlanta. There's one in Pennsylvania that's a real good school. There's one in Kentucky that's a good school. They teach whatever is brought and the situation is the same. If a Limestone comes in, they call Limestone and say, hey, do you mind sending a rep down and helping with Limestone. I don't understand Limestone. But, in many cases, they have experts or they're an expert at least in one or two of the instruments and they may teach it themselves to avoid paying any travel related expenses or anything like that. They may do that. So they're all...it completely varies.
- STANFORD: What about from a...and let's associate more with the schools that are very similar to DPS rather than to schools that are just one particular school of instrument.
- GOODSON: Yeah, and there's not too many of those. And to add something to that, Lafayette holds schools...
- STANFORD: Uh-huh.
- GOODSON: ...and Axciton has had a Axciton Polygraph School just to get people to buy their instruments.
- STANFORD: Uh-huh. That makes sense.
- GOODSON: Yeah.
- STANFORD: From a marketing standpoint, putting myself in the shoes of these vendors.
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: What relationship, what aspects are pluses and minuses of a vendor getting associated with a polygraph school or trying to get in there and teach? And I guess what I'm trying to get at is it would appear to me that that's probably, from a marketing standpoint, probably one of the most positive things that a vendor can do, kind of as a baseline, because you can't put a billboard out there on the side of the road as say buy my Axciton polygraph instrument.
- GOODSON: No, there's not just....the market is so tight, so they do that. And the way we handle it, and I think we handle it similar to most other schools, is if there's a...once we're aware of what a student's using...we really don't know that so we call these guys on really short notice a lot of times because we don't ask them, we don't...I don't even want to give any perception that we're swaying one way or another so we don't know until they show up to class and say and we pass out a few papers, all right, write down what instrument you're going to use so we can make sure the instructor is there. I get on the phone to Canada and say, "Hey, I didn't realize we have two guys using Limestone. Is there any way you can send us a rep?" And that was why we did it on a weekend. They said, "Yeah, but can we do it on a weekend? We're really tight." I said, "We'll make arrangements for these two students." The other two, Lafayette and Limestone. We already or Lafayette and Axciton we know are the two staples here and we already lined

the instructors up because we know it's never not happened that we're not going to have...

STANFORD: Those two?

GOODSON: Yeah, those two be there.

STANFORD: That makes sense.

GOODSON: Because they're the big market down here.

STANFORD: Just so I understand it properly, though. It would appear that probably, from a vendor's standpoint and a marketing standpoint, that getting your foot into the door at polygraph school is your first and premiere way that the vendor would want to get their marketing out, here.

GOODSON: Well, no.

STANFORD: Because and let me get throw this out. In my impression it seems like if you're not...if you can get folks trained out there on your instrument that like it and use it, they'll tell somebody else they like it and use it.

GOODSON: Yeah. No, they're going to come out and do it but you're still kind of putting the cart before the horse because you can't come to school unless you have a school that's using it...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...or a student that's in the school that's using it. The initial, their initial marketing comes from the associations. They go through AAPP, APA, and even TALEPI, for example. Sue Luttrell came.

STANFORD: Oh.

GOODSON: I'm the president of TALEPI and she asked to come and as a professional you're going to, "Yeah." I'm not going to hold all this against her. "Come on." If you want to teach your instrument or I set up a booth for her and they can display their product. That's usually where it starts is them seeing it but then, yeah, they expound on that by the fact that when somebody buys it, they get it in an organization and then that organization sends somebody to polygraph school. They'll come down and enhance that by teaching it, making them clearly understand how that instrument works, and make sure that...and it's just all part of it. And they tell them that up front, hey, you buy our instrument. We're going to be at the polygraph school. We're going to make sure you know how to use it.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Polygraph's an old folk's game. And it, I shouldn't say old, but it's an old school way of thinking and customer service rules.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Hence, my employment with them. It's...they want...people want to know when they buy an instrument that they can pick up the phone and call somebody if their instrument breaks because polygraph is money, especially in private industry. When you're running a \$750.00 test and you're about to sit down and fire your instrument and it doesn't work, it just cost you 750 bucks if you can't get hold of somebody to get it running.

STANFORD: Maybe it's the credibility...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: ...that's worth more than money.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: So I guess what I'm hearing you say is that, you know, maybe step with, maybe step wise, there probably is more viewed as a whole...

GOODSON: Yeah, it's...

STANFORD: Step one is conferences and things of that nature. But step two and quite equally or not maybe equally, not as equally important, is this getting their foot in the door at these schools and that, to me, paints a picture of the marketing plan for some of these.

GOODSON: Yeah, you have to get noticed, especially for a new one. Axciton was the first on the market. They were the first one and they dominated the market for years.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And then you had Lafayette come on.

STANFORD: In regard to digital polygraphs.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: Correct?

GOODSON: In the modern era, there was certainly...Stoelting was one of the originals and, yeah, they but since then these other ones have had to do things to catch up.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And they had these aggressive marketing strategies...putting together elaborate websites, getting the word out really through the conferences saying hey, here's our product, come look at it. You know, Axciton is not the only game in town.

STANFORD: That makes sense. Just...and I'm trying to get a firm understanding of the industry as a whole.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Which I have a must better understanding now than I ever did.

GOODSON: Probably than you ever wanted to.

STANFORD: I'll bet. I don't anticipate being a polygrapher but, you know, I'm one of these guys that never say never, you know.

GOODSON: We have another school starting in March.

STANFORD: Oh, I don't know. I think I'm pretty...

GOODSON: Or to make this real short, you could just test me right now and we'll get this done.

STANFORD: Yeah. No, I'm satisfied with that part unless there's anything else you want to add on that as...but it sounds like we've covered it pretty well. Talk to me about your history and relationships with Sue Luttrell and Axciton. And be candid with me on this deal. You know, I've heard things from several different people that are...some flattering, some not so flattering.

GOODSON: Do you mind if I get a little drink of water, just real quick?

STANFORD: No.

GOODSON: Is there a water fountain outside?

STANFORD: There's a...we have a faucet... I'm going to refill my coffee while we're doing this.

(Short pause)

STANFORD: Okay, this will set your world on fire right here.

GOODSON: Dark coffee.

STANFORD: I don't know what he put in it. So, back to Sue Luttrell.

GOODSON: My relationship with her, from the time I first met her, was in 2001 when I went to Polygraph School. She came and taught Axciton and she has done probably every school since then, maybe with one exception, the Mexican Polygraph School we had that we didn't have Axciton. But she's always come, she's always been real pleasant, very outgoing personality, uh, nice. Sue is an attractive lady. Most people would find her attractive. I think she was a Miss Texas candidate at one point in time and she is not afraid to show that and that's kind of the reputation she has. Nothing sexual, never heard of any allegations against her like that and stuff but she's very, very friendly, put your

arm around her, around you, and I don't think that hurts her ability to sell polygraph instruments.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: But I found her pleasant to be around. I think, in 2004, was the first polygraph school that I coordinated as a sergeant. I promoted to lieutenant a short time after that. Our relationship probably got a little bit closer because now I'm calling her and saying, "Hey, I need your help. Can you come down? I've got some Axciton students to teach." She came down, and that's what I was talking about, took a picture of her one time holding an empty rifle. She went, "I always wanted to touch a gun." And she sent me, started sending me emails...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...personal emails, not anything...like joke email stuff and put me on her distribution list and every once and a while she'd send me something, and it was a pretty tight knit community that she was doing this with. Most of them were related to the DPS Polygraph School or they were pretty high-ups in other schools. It was a...I looked at the distribution list and it was nothing obscene or anything like that. I'd get a few and I think that probably was on Department email, wasn't too many but I never forwarded them or anything like that. And they were...but then she sent me something sexual about something to do with breasts and she called me and she said, "I just got a breast job and you ought to see it," and, uh, "I'm real happy with it." And she sent me a couple of jokes about boob jobs. I mentioned it to my boss at the time, Mike Gougler, and said, "What do you think about that?" And he said, "Stay away." And I said, "I'm a step ahead of you already, Mike. I'm not doing anything." But I think that kind of changed my relationship with her, a little bit. Or she may have sensed something in me.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I was still extremely professional with her but I was a step back.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I was a step removed in the school. I said, I am not putting myself in any situation. The email started. When she sent me something like that, I just deleted and drove on. There was a couple of more and it was nothing really obscene or offensive but they were suggestive. But we always had a very professional relationship right up until that point when she found out that Lafayette had won that first bid. Then when she made...when she sent me that hateful email and hindsight, I went back because I blasted off with an email back to her and her email, like I told you earlier, said, you know, "send me all those instruments back, I guess, you know, since Axciton will no longer be serving the Department of Public Safety's needs," and that's almost word for word. I remember that. And I sent her an email back that said, "Sue, I'm sorry you feel that way but before you jump off and," I think she asked about, oh yeah, send me the instrument. I said, "We don't have your instruments. Every instrument we have, we've paid for. We're still going to go out for these bids." Really similar to what my voicemail said because she never responded to it and I think that may have been the reason I left the voicemail. She

never ever responded to it and I, uh, I think I visited with Mike Gougler about that. And kind of told him what was going on and this was coming up before APA last August, a year ago, and I said, "Well, is there something wrong there. I certainly want to make amends but she hasn't responded or replied." And, oh, what happened from that point? It just pretty well ended. There was no other conversation but I got to thinking that maybe I offended her.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So I went to my email, I looked at the reply and I read it over and over again and I said, you know what, her email, maybe, okay, maybe there was no intent there. Maybe she wasn't, you know, trying to blast me. She was just asking for her instrument. Maybe I interpreted it wrong. I was trying to read it over and said, because you know, email sucks. Bottom line is...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...you send somebody a message and you can misinterpret it so easily and I looked at it and I said, well, maybe that wasn't her intent. And I looked at mine and I said, well, maybe mine came off harsher if there was no intent there but there was just a miscommunication is what it boiled down to.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I said, well, I'll get it right at APA. I visited with her and I talked to her and I said, well, I'm not going to go up and say I'm sorry for anything that happened, I just opened up a conversation with her and nothing seemed to be wrong. I said, maybe bygones are bygones and we're just, we're moving forward. Okay. Great. Well, her and Mike are sitting around and Mike has an instrument that he has a problem with, Mike Gougler, has an instrument that there's something wrong with.

STANFORD: An Axciton instrument?

GOODSON: An Axciton instrument. Thank you. And I look over to Mike and I made, I say something inappropriate, with no meaning behind it but I realize afterwards that, yeah, that probably came off wrong. I said, "Yep, it's another old broken Axciton instrument."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I was just absolutely joking with Mike because we had...Axciton sold us 25 instruments. At that point, we'd probably had 3 of them go down in 10 years. So, I mean, it was one of those that I was meaning the opposite of what I was saying because we've never had problems and she knows it. They're good instruments. We've joked about the durability of them. We've joked about...they've put them in the dishwasher...they're almost indestructible once you get them so I was just kind of making a joke. But realizing, in the capacity that she saw me in at Lafayette...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...that...

STANFORD: Did she hear you make that statement?

GOODSON: What's that? Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. So she talked to Mike. She says, "That was inappropriate. I can't believe he said that." Mike brings it to my attention and says, "Hey, Walt, you upset her." And I said, "Oh man," I said, "I didn't mean to." And I never got a chance to talk to her and apologize to her. When I got back to Austin, I wrote her a letter. I wrote her an apology, a long apology email and said, "Look, I didn't...had not intent...I really, really apologize if I did anything to offend you. I'm really sorry. I didn't mean anything by that at all," and I emailed it off to her and never ever heard a reply.

STANFORD: Was that before or after this telephone call?

GOODSON: That would have been well after that telephone call. Oh no, no, no, that would have been...this would have happened - Do you have a date on that?

STANFORD: It's August 6th and I'm assuming it's 2007, is what...

GOODSON: Okay. Then this would have been before. Okay. This would have been before.

STANFORD: Before.

GOODSON: I probably didn't mail that letter off until the last week of August or the first week of September.

STANFORD: Okay. So all this happened fairly quickly, though?

GOODSON: Pretty close time frame. So I never heard anything back from her. Right? Well, I talked to Mike and I said, "You know, I sent her a letter. I don't know what else to do. She hasn't called me." And Mike said...it was one of those things, I was thinking, what if she complains or is this going to turn into some type of a...well, let me make sure Mike Governor, my supervisor, understands, because everything's going. And he clearly understood the dynamics. He said, "Well, I knew it was b.s. when you said it." He said, "But you offended her," and I said, "Oh, I don't want to do that." He said, you know, and I felt pretty confident after that, you know, my supervisor was sitting right there and says, "I knew what you meant when you said that."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: There's no problem. But, nevertheless, she took offense to it and I wrote the letter and never heard anything back so I don't hear anything more from her. And that may have been the very last conversation, that letter, I'm not sure on that but the best I can remember we didn't talk after that letter. And so this is late August, early September, okay, early September maybe that I wrote the letter. I probably talked to her then in the springtime and she actually called me. I said, well we'll let it go. We had a Polygraph School coming up and she had either learned it on the website or I hadn't called her yet or talked to Sabino Martinez or somehow she found out there was a school going on so she

calls me. "Hey, what day are you teaching Axciton so I can be there." I said, "Oh, Sue, good to here from you." Like nothing was wrong. I gave her the dates and said, "Okay. I look forward to having you. Let me know if you need anything." "No, no, no, I'll be down there. I'll be driving in. You don't need to do anything for me." And I said, "Okay. I look forward to seeing you," and I hung up the phone and the next time I saw her was at the Polygraph School when it started here in...I think it started April 14th. I can't remember what week Axciton was, the third or fourth week, so probably some time in early May this happened. I could tell she was fishing for something. She was...it was like an accident waiting to happen. She made a couple of comments...I don't...there's a lady named Sissy something. Mike always warns me. Mike Gougler always warns me about her, said this woman has sued everybody she can sue.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: All on business, he said she files discrimination...anything she can do to discredit another polygraph examiner in her area, in fact, Kelly Hendricks was one of them that she was involved in a process that got him removed as presiding officer of the Texas Polygraph Examiners' Board.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: He always said, "Steer clear." I said, "You won't have any problem with that, Mike. I don't even know this lady." But what he did tell me is her and Sue are best friends. "And there's something there you need to be careful of because this woman is lawsuit happy and whoa, you know, they're always looking." The first day I found something kind of puzzling to myself, Sue Luttrell and Sabino Martinez sitting in a closed office. You know, we were talking about nothing and she brings up how much of an idiot that she thinks that this Sissy is and, "I can't believe she's doing this and I'm befriending her and now she's suing somebody else," you know, it was like she was baiting us to make a comment about her. And we knew that she was friends. She also started making comments, "Well, you know Mike Gougler is having sex, or been having a long-term affair with Pam Shaw," which is the president of the Kentucky Polygraph School which is not true. You know, I'll go on record and say that from the best I, we can recall. We think she's not interested in his sexual orientation; I'll put it that way.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Anyway, we knew it was false.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: She's a thirty-five year old attractive basketball coach. Played college basketball...there's a lot of things, you know, and I don't ask her but some things are more apparent than others and just got that assumption, feeling about her but Mike and her are good friends and Mike helped her move up to vice-president of Law Enforcement for the American Polygraph Association and they're very close. And now she works for Mike and comes and Mike has some polygraphs he runs out in West Texas. She'll fly in from Kentucky and run the tests and fly back to Kentucky. Sabino and I are looking at each other like we know that's not true but she's in there throwing that out there. Why would she say

something like that and why would you say something about Sissy and the whole time it was, you know, the hairs on the back of my neck were standing up like this is going to get ugly. Something's going to happen. But I didn't, you know, I wasn't going to engage that. I walked out and Sabino and I had a conversation, said, "Hey, she's just looking for something. I get that feeling." And I talked to Mike about it. I called Mike, I said, "Somebody needs to call Mike and let him know what's being said," and I picked up the phone. I said, "Mike, I just want you to know the conversation I had and where this came from." And he said, "Well, I appreciate that. I'd like to let it rest." And Mike called me later and said, "I had [REDACTED] in the car with me when you told me that." You know, I told her, we know it's absurd. [REDACTED] thinks the world of...they're both named Pam, [REDACTED] and her.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: She's met Pam on several occasions and there's no concern on her part. But anyway, it was...so if things had started to change, they were definitely, with everything that happened up to that point, it was 100% business with her. It was no other conversation outside of, how do you do this...business-related questions. There was no more conversations. I said this is just getting too bad. And I'm sure she sensed that on my part that I was backing away. I am not engaging any of that stuff and no I'm not going to be a fun person to be around any more because I could see where this was going and, even backing up to the comment I made in the school. You know, that...if I would have caught myself and thought that through, I wouldn't even have made that comment. But it was so off the cuff as in joking. You know, it wasn't directed at her and she just happened to be in the room and the other part of that is her being in the room...she shouldn't even have been there because the Axciton block had been done. She hadn't done anything in the class for probably three or four hours. She had just been hanging around.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Was supposed to go back that night. And she had just parked herself in the back of the class. We were having a class that wasn't even related to instrumentation. She was just sitting back there. But I wasn't going to be disrespectful and say, hey, you need to go.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: You're done. I mean, I was...mainly there's an Axciton rep there, if you've got a question, there she is, she's there available for you. Great. But it was almost like she was sitting there waiting...

STANFORD: Looking for...

GOODSON: Looking for something. And I really got that feeling. And I should've, I should've wised up. I was wise but I just didn't take it far enough.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Well, this telephone message. Let's talk about this for a second. In the time when all this was going on...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...so that I understand it. It appeared that some things occurred in which...maybe the bridge wasn't burned but it certainly was smoldering a little bit and you wanted to try to put the fire out.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And then I've listened to this audio message and it's obvious that you were going to leave a message and...

GOODSON: I'm not arguing that. That's me.

STANFORD: ...you don't raise your voice. There's nothing there that I took as offensive, per se, but I do see it as somewhat necessarily trying to mend some degree of issue that had occurred and what you're telling me is that it was when Lafayette received the winning bid...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...is really what kind of instigated that and that set her off. Now I don't see this thing as particularly offensive, in fact, I kind of see it in the best interests of the Department...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...to maintain positive vendors out...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...there so I'm not overly concerned with this part either that I don't...I see a lot of emotion on her part when she brings this up rather than rational thought. And I don't necessarily see this as a problem that we did, per se.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: She didn't complain necessarily about a comment you made at APA or anything like that.

GOODSON: That was just all little minor things that led up to this.

STANFORD: And maybe you're right. Hindsight 20/20, it wasn't the best thing to say.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I don't know necessarily that it would have offended anybody else but Sue, per se, but she could have easily laughed it off, you know. Sometimes it's not what we say but how other people perceive it.

GOODSON: Oh, no, you're exactly right.

STANFORD: I can walk up to you and say have a nice day and you say, why do you say that, you know, you just can't control how you feel about it. But I believe your intent was joking and there might have been a better time for it.

GOODSON: Yeah, well, I hadn't, you know, hindsight is always 20/20. You never know exactly what's going through their mind or what you...I appreciate that you see that.

STANFORD: In the realm of reasonableness, I'm not, to me that doesn't just stand out there saying malicious intent or anything like that. I do understand her perspective, and we're going to go into that in a minute, with why she would be, you know, hey, Walt's working for Lafayette. We're losing our foothold here...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...as an Axciton vendor. I see frustration on her part and, you know, I don't think that necessarily it's the same way that you interpret it that she interpreted it. So I can see that.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: We've covered the polygraph instrument and this telephone message and, basically, your relationship with Sue Luttrell. I want to take a five minute break here.

GOODSON: (Inaudible).

STANFORD: There's nothing sitting here that I wouldn't show you if you asked. But I would tell you this. Look through - these are three bid processes - and this is what we're fixing to go over next. I'm sure you're very familiar with these.

GOODSON: I've never seen 'em but...

STANFORD: Well, you may not have seen the whole packet. There's probably some forms in here you've seen. I'd ask you...let's go over this first one first. I believe this is the Lafayette bid.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: And we'll talk about that one first.

(Pause)

GOODSON: (Inaudible).

STANFORD: Well, these things are kind of document laden in many cases.

GOODSON: Is there any emails in there from me that I need to be aware of.

STANFORD: You know, I don't see this thing as being extremely out of the ordinary as a bid packet and I've had to look through several of them here lately.

GOODSON: Just to get an idea of what a normal one looks like?

STANFORD: Yeah. I think that's a decent way...the way we did the bid in that case. I don't necessarily see anything improper with the bid process.

GOODSON: Can you answer a question for me...

STANFORD: Sure.

GOODSON: ...because I was always confused about this? Was this...were the bids called in by our Department or was it another agency that handles that?

STANFORD: It depends on the size, the expectation of the bid.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: I think it's...

GOODSON: 25 grand.

STANFORD: If it's 25 grand or over, the comptroller's office handles it, pretty much.

GOODSON: Oh, okay. So this would have went through DPS?

STANFORD: Yeah, DPS.

GOODSON: I had no idea if it even went through here.

STANFORD: It always goes through our accounting process. It's just the comptroller has a bigger hand in it...

GOODSON: If it's out of control they forward it on. (inaudible).

STANFORD: I don't want to go into this aspect in great detail because I want to cover this towards the end.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: However, your employment with Lafayette? Do you recall the approximate date that you became employed with them?

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: Could you give me an estimate, like a fall or spring or something?

GOODSON: I cannot. I was hoping you could clarify that.

STANFORD: I think we'll be able to go through some things that I want to go through...

GOODSON: I, I'll tell you what I know.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I asked Lafayette for all their records.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And this is a long story. I apologize. Because this has, this has been of some concern to me trying to figure this out myself. Now, I'll tell you the story so you have a clear understanding of this. The first time I received compensation from them was the first week of November of last year.

STANFORD: Of '07?

GOODSON: Of '07.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Now when I actually went to work for them is a little unclear because they sent me an invoice, or they sent me a...I said send me everything I've ever received because when this first came out, I first got wind of this said, oh lord, the one thing that will be a major mess up, I cannot overcome is if I ever received a penny of compensation from any department sale and so I called...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I called and said, "Hey, can you send me a list of every commission that's ever been paid and who that was from," and I did that. And they listed out everything for the whole year of 2007. Well, I went back to my records and said, well, when did I first get paid and it was November. Now, let me tell you, and there's...obviously there's a huge problem with me and I'll admit...I'll take full ownership of not turning the extra job requests in, in a timely manner. But how this all started was Mark Handler called me and asked me, he said, "Walt, I," this is kind of a funny story, he said, "I got a deal for you." He said, "I'm the rep for Lafayette." He said, "How would you like to be the rep for Lafayette?" And I said, "Well, you're the rep for Lafayette." He said, "Well, not much longer." He said, "My wife is a doctor and she got a job," and I think at that time it was in Michigan somewhere. He said, "I'm going to be leaving and when I leave the job's yours if you want it." And he goes on to tell me some details about it. He says, "Walt, it's free money."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: How wrong he was. How wrong he was.

STANFORD: Nothing's for free. Right?

GOODSON: Nothing's...and I knew that. There's no free lunch. But he says, "You don't do anything." He said, "You're a sales rep on paper but you don't sell anything. You're

I don't see how it can be wrong." He said, "No, there's nothing wrong with that." He said that he had worked for Axciton. Sabino had worked for Axciton, Sabino Martinez. I talked to John Bateman about it, who was my captain at the time. I said, "John, what do you see?" And, in fact, I had them both in the room at the same time, I believe when I was having this conversation and John said, "I don't see a problem with it." I said, "Okay. Well, maybe I'll consider it then." But I'll write on there, I'm not going to receive any compensation from anything to do with state or any of my guys or anybody that calls me. I'm not going to make a commission off of them.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And really, to give you a little more background, the big thing that enticed me to do that because Mark said all along, "You really don't make any money doing this. You get a miniscule commission. It's not about the money. It's about any time they get the latest advancements or the latest little gadgets and tools, they send them to you to do them." And so they sent me a couple of things. They sent me this little (inaudible) that goes on the finger...stuff that's not even, it's the kind of stuff they're in the research stage.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I said, you know, what a great deal and especially for somebody involved in the polygraph school. Now I get to see where polygraph is going in the next few years and be a step up, be involved in the research, be involved in some of the field testing and see some of that stuff coming out. Well, during this timeframe, Mark Handler calls me up and says, "Buddy, change of plans. My wife didn't take that job. I'm going to maintain, I'm going to continue to be the rep here." So I said, "Okay. Well, if you ever do leave," I said, "I guess I'm still interested."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And he calls me back at some later time, way down the road and says, "You know what?", he thought about it and he says, "That's not right. I told you I'd bring you on." He said, "How about I talk to Chris Fausett and we both be the reps here?"

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: "And we'll just split anything." He said, "I don't care about the money." His wife makes \$350,000.00 a year. She's a heart surgeon. I don't think he needs the money.

STANFORD: Yeah. I can see that.

GOODSON: But he was doing it for the same reason. It's not about the money for me. He said, "This is for money. You get a couple hundred dollars, you can go take your family out to dinner every quarter."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: You know, it's something. But he said, "It's more for the benefit," and being around and Mark has went from a nobody to he can't answer his phone any more. He is requested all over the country. He is so connected and Lafayette did a lot to help him become known.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Mainstream and people respect the heck out of Mark.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: He is one of the lions of polygraph and people see him as that. That certainly didn't hurt was his connection with them and going around. He taught courses at a couple of schools for them and just got out there and, I don't know if that was his ultimate goal but, this guy went from a...from not any kind of law enforcement background, just some really private citizen that took a job at a...well, he was a police officer but went to polygraph school pretty well on his on to become huge and I really respected Mark and looked up to him and thought a lot of Mark. I look to Mark, right now, as one of the most brilliant minds in polygraph and he is definitely seen that way. So, I'm back on, I'm back on this having a job and he says, "Well, we'll split the commission." Well, I never did anything. I never got another call from Chris. Mark called me and I talked to Mark here very recently, "Yeah, they messed up on...they were supposed to cut you a check but I guess they screwed that up," and that was supposed to be around August. He said, "You were supposed to get a check but, you know, there's something wrong there." So I never got paid.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So I said, "I haven't done anything. I haven't received any money." I had received some items from them. I've received...they actually mailed me some shirts that said Lafayette on them. They mailed me a, like I said, this (inaudible) and some cards, some big laminated cards and a couple of other things to look at.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: November rolls around and I get a rather large check and it's...

STANFORD: Large being...can you estimate how much it was?

GOODSON: It was about 11 hundred dollars.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And they said, well that was for back six months...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...or so, give or take. I don't know what that date is. But at that point, I was fully aware that I was working for them. It was clear in my mind when I got that check because I even remember I got it and I showed it to my wife and I said, "I guess I'm working for

them." I said, "It's all...you know, I'm never talking to the guy and being around them because them even because I was around Chris at APA in August. He never said anything to me about that. He just, "Hey," just real professional. "Hey how's it going?" Never anything. Never asked me to do anything and he had a lot of the other reps helping him do things and getting...never asked me to do anything. Of course, I wouldn't do that because I was on Department time and couldn't.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: But he never asked me. Maybe he was aware of that. So, it's...at that point it clicks. And in November there...at that point, in my mind, any issue with not turning in a request prior to that would...I don't think there's any burden on me because I really didn't know. But, as of November, I was aware I was working for them. I was...it was clear in my mind when I got that check. And I went back and checked my tax returns to make sure that was right. I checked all my stubs. That was the first check I received from them and it was, in fact, that's what I showed on my tax return. That was the W9 they sent me. Is that what you have?

STANFORD: You know, the records they sent are a little bit...some of them are more difficult to read than others.

GOODSON: I think that's what they sent me.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: So it didn't really clear it up and it wasn't until I went back to my...I went back to my bank...

STANFORD: Probably.

GOODSON: ...and looked at everything...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and I don't think...they may have paid me for those commissions all the way back. I don't know. I couldn't figure out a way to add that up.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Yeah, their records are hard to read. It's kind of like a personal account, accounting (inaudible).

GOODSON: If you're looking at the same one, they had me and Mark Handler both on there across the top of it and see I wasn't...I think they just did that for the whole year and I know that's not the case.

STANFORD: You know this is something...and we're going to get back to these business since we're already this far into this.

GOODSON: Okay. I'm sorry.

STANFORD: No, no, no, no. I know these things are fluid.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So we'll just kind of stick with your employment with Lafayette for right now. What we have...and let's start off here. I think it's the email from you to Chris Fausett in Lafayette and the date on that is February of '07.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: And...

GOODSON: That would have been right.

STANFORD: It would appear that at that point, in February of '07, you were giving him your information as far as if he wanted to send you a check or any kind of, any kind of employment material.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: That's your address there to send it to. Is that pretty accurate?

GOODSON: Uh-huh. And then, like I said, that...at that point, that would have been accurate but then, at that point, that was when Mark said, "Well, my wife's not moving," and that kind of went on the back burner and then came back, moved back in the forefront.

STANFORD: And, you know, at that point, that's...I don't know...maybe the best way to say it is that's when the real serious courtship kind of began...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: ...between...

GOODSON: Yeah. No, that was...yeah. And that's completely accurate.

STANFORD: Okay. Now these financial statements, I can't make hide nor hair of these things. There's two pages. And I'll...I don't know what this \$98.56 is here that they have totaled at the bottom but...

GOODSON: I guess that was the check I was supposed to receive for the third quarter.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: I don't...Hey, I couldn't figure it out either.

STANFORD: You know, and at this point, Walt, I'd be willing to go off of your recollection and your documents you have.

GOODSON: Like I said, I mean, I'm...the first check I received was first week of November.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: It was 1100 and something dollars. That was when it became really apparent, but I mean I realize, you know, Mark, like I said, I had never contacted Chris. I had never talked to him about it. One time other than this and one brief telephone conversation. I think I may have given him that and he said, "Hey, I need your social."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And that was the only time I ever spoke to him.

STANFORD: Have you ever seen this before here?

GOODSON: No, I don't recall that.

STANFORD: Apparently it's some sort of employment contract.

GOODSON: Huh. When does it say...does it say when I'm supposed to start? April 1". Huh. I never signed anything like that.

STANFORD: Well, you know, I believe you because the copy we have is unsigned so I think it was one of those things they intended to get you to sign. This is my speculation here. They intended to get you to sign this thing because even they were shocked that they didn't have it signed in your file up there. That this was something they wanted to get you to sign at some point in the...

GOODSON: I guess courtship.

STANFORD: And your contract somehow slipped through the holes.

GOODSON: And I think that was part of the problem, like I mentioned earlier, where they told me I was and then Mark called and said, "Hey Buddy, I didn't get the job after all, my wife didn't get the job," and then he called me back to say, "It's not right. You need to split it between us."

STANFORD: Do you have a copy of your pay stub or any of that documentation you have here with you?

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: What do you have there?

GOODSON: This is the deal to do with the memo, the memo that was written.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: That's the only thing I brought.

STANFORD: Were you able to print out that, you said you had a list of what they had paid you to date?

GOODSON: I have...actually what I did was I pulled my checkbook out and I went back and looked at my checkbook. And I went back and was no...it was an entry around the middle of November was the only, was the earliest entry I could possibly find and it was for about \$1,100.00. And I went back and I found my tax return for last year and it was for that same amount that they'd sent me. The same dollar amount that I had cashed. It was for like \$1,100.00.

STANFORD: That \$1,100.00 dollars? What was your impression for what quarters that encompassed?

GOODSON: From what Mark told me, that was for the prior two quarters.

STANFORD: So that would be the...

GOODSON: So it would have been...that quarter actually ended in...if you get paid in November...the end of October. I think it ends September 30th, I would guess, so back up 6 months from September 30th. They were supposed to pay...yeah, I think that period ends and it takes until November before they get the check for that prior. I think that's the way...in fact, I know that's the way it works. They pay on a quarterly basis and I know one of the quarters ends in...well, I mean, you get a check in August, you get a check in November...January, February, March...I don't know. November, January, February and then I guess you get one in May. So back up 6 months from September.

STANFORD: See that would almost be...

GOODSON: That they were paying me for.

STANFORD: That they were paying you for. That would be pretty much the second and third quarter...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: ...of '07.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: So the second quarter would begin...January, February, March...would begin April.

GOODSON: April, May, June, July, August, September. Yeah.

STANFORD: So, and that would correspond with whatever intended contract they have there which has you starting April 1st.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: So that appears to be what they paid you back to. Is that...does that...

GOODSON: I guess so.

STANFORD: You know all that together seems like it would match.

GOODSON: Yeah. That sounds correct.

STANFORD: So we can come to some sort of agreement on that.

GOODSON: Yeah. No, I think that would be right.

STANFORD: And regardless of whether you signed it or not, it appears that this was their intent.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: And so that would be seemingly corresponding to what you're telling me they paid you for. So I think we can establish April 1st as the day they started to actually accumulate whatever they were going to pay you for...

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...regardless of whether you want to call it free work or whatever. It turned out how much labor you intended it to be. So.

GOODSON: But, like I said, I was not officially aware because I'd never heard anything from her until then, getting the check, and then I guess they are.

STANFORD: Well, did...granted, it doesn't sound like they sent you the contract. You know, judging from the paperwork that you sent, that you sent them and the correspondence it would appear that at some point there was an understanding that you were going to be on their payroll.

GOODSON: Yeah, eventually but Mark told me it was off and then it was back on. He said, "I'll get you back on there," but I never spoke to Chris one time about it and I said. They sent me the material, like I said, they sent me some shirts during that time frame. They sent me the little, a couple of little gadgets for the instrument.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: But that's really what I was in it for. Because Mark would say, "You don't get big money."

STANFORD: His version of not enough big money and yours and my version...

GOODSON: Was different was, yeah, it was different. And he told me, "You get a couple of hundred bucks here and there," and at that point, [REDACTED] had just passed away during that time period, within a month of that happening. I was up to my rear end in stuff going on with the estate. I was in the middle of building a house. My builder had left, had ran off and abandoned me. And I had a little inheritance from [REDACTED]

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I had some...I had money in my pocket. I wasn't...I was dealing with what amounted to over \$100,000.00 and \$200.00 wasn't really on the radar with me at that point. It just didn't...it was...this whole deal was, aah, whatever...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...really and it's my fault for blowing it off. Well, like I said, without ever having a conversation with Chris and I'm not trying to make an excuse there but it just was not on my front burner...

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Let me ask you...

GOODSON: ...during that time frame and I said, you know, it was one of those I'm not doing anything, if they want to send me a check, I was really, I had one phone call, whatever. Whatever. And they send me a check. And the thing was and the way I looked at it was, yeah, I should have turned one in but, you know, it was like I had an idea and he's telling me that it's true. Mark's telling me it's true. I'm working...look...I had run...I clearly just want to make sure this is clear for the record. At no instance and because, before that date I had a specific conversation with Mike Gougler and John Bateman and asked them and they were both in a supervision capacity to me.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I said, "What do you think about doing this?" And they said, and during that point in time they'd even asked me, "Hey, can you get me deal," on Axeiton, I mean, "on Lafayette?" I said, "I don't know. I can call and tell them. Maybe they can give you a good deal." That's about. I don't know. I don't know how much the dang things cost. I'd say give them the best deal you can give them. That's about the stroke I have. But it was kind of, everybody knew it because I didn't...it wasn't some secret. I said, you know, I think I'm working for them. They sent me a shirt and there was a little DPS off-duty function. I wore the shirt. I was kind of proud of the shirt, "Yeah, look." I was making fun of Sabino because, "Alls you get is a pen? I got a shirt." And, you know, that's the way I looked at it. I didn't look at it as doing anything and we joked and had a good time about that but it was never anything...there was no intent for me to harm anybody in this or to do something secret that nobody was not completely aware of. And Mike and I, Mike Gougler and I had several conversations about that. And, I mean, I told him, "I don't know what the status is on this." I mean, it should have been, I mean, I shouldn't say that. It shouldn't have been his responsibility...it's my responsibility to put the work in, to put the request in right then but I didn't do it. He didn't tell me to do it and I didn't think about it and it, and even when I got the check, that was...the month I got that was the month my builder had abandoned me. I was worrying about having a place to live.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: That was probably the most stressed I'd ever been in my life. We had already moved out of one house into a second rent house because our lease was up and we're living in boxes.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And just...just not even, I mean, it was so far from the radar but work is work and I understand that and I was wrong for doing so. But it really wasn't even until the following year when it finally snapped when I was...I think I turned an extra job request in probably February because that's the time frame to turn all your extra job requests in for the year. I had one for Dell. I was about to quit Dell.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I had one...I think I had three I turned in normally and actually one of them was to cancel Dell because I didn't work at Dell anymore. One was for the Terrace. One of them was for my private polygraph business which I may run two or three tests a year, marriage type tests. Don't do hardly do any of those, (inaudible) I don't answer my phone. But those are the ones I turn in and when I was getting that paper, that documentation together, second, I never turned in a request for that. And that's...I was waiting because it was a little bit outside the window but I was just being proactive in getting the other ones ready because you have that 15-day window to turn them in. I said, oh damn.

STANFORD: I think it's 45, 45 days from the, March 31st.

GOODSON: Yeah. Yeah, mid-February to the end of March, whatever it is but Hawk likes them in a certain 2-week window so he can look at them all at one time. So, anyway, as soon as I saw that I filled out and thought this one needs to run up the flagpole real quick. I had completely forgotten.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: And when I talked to Mike Gougler about it, I told him, "Mike, I never turned this in." And he said, "I knew you were working there." And he signs it and moves it on.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And it got kicked back initially from Hawk and Hawk had questions, "Is he receiving sales or any kind of sales commission or what is he doing?" Wanted some clarification. I said, "No." I think he handwrote that in there. And the Ranger had asked me why there was two copies of that and I think that was...I think Hawk kicked it back and Mike wrote on there and just turned it in like that, "Look he's not receiving any compensation from any sales to a state agency." Sent it back and Hawk, "Okay," signed it and moved it on.

STANFORD: For clarification purposes, I know you told me you answered one phone call. But is that \$1,100.00, I can't help but think that's on a percentage of some sort of sales other than just your customer service.

GOODSON: It is. No, it is. It's certainly not based on sales.

STANFORD: Or not based on your customer service calls?

GOODSON: No. No. It, from what I understand, I think I get 2% of every sale that happens in Texas for the service...nothing to do with what I sell.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So there's no incentive to sell anything because I'm going to get, as long as they're standing in Texas and they buy an instrument, whether or not and obviously, because I don't know a lot of these people. Well, actually I know most of them but I haven't talked to any of them about buying instruments.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They just went out and bought them and they give me 2% of it.

STANFORD: Or, do you think some of these sales might have gone to PDs and things of that nature?

GOODSON: Very well could have. Very possible.

STANFORD: Okay. Then I guess...do they send you a summary of everything they've sold in Texas?

GOODSON: Yeah. Yeah. In fact I'm sure. Yeah. I mean, I know some of those things did. I don't...I mean, that wasn't the stipulation. I think, because I think I remember there was one from Houston PD that went in, that Houston bought some items.

STANFORD: This is like an El Paso PD in July of '07 for \$465.00. I don't know what that is.

GOODSON: Yeah, no, I assume that those are from PD sales, too.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Just not the state?

GOODSON: Just no state. And Mike even, Mike Gougler and I had a very specific conversation about that, too. He said, "You know, as long as it's." I said, "What about," I said, "I can make it all government." He said, "No, you don't need to do that, just state. Really it's only DPS." I said, well, I'll extend it because AGs office, somebody buys an instrument...let me go and take that a step further.

STANFORD: So this, since we're on this topic, you're on the Lafayette website because I printed this up.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: But there was another, another HQ-43 you filled out. This one is going to be completed on the...January 31st of '08 and submitted. Can you tell me that this probably...I'm surmising that this is the 2nd one because it looks like there's some handwritten stuff on here for no compensation for state of Texas sales and this would be Mike Gougler's initials there.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And this is the one that went up the chain and was approved basically February 15th is what it looks like. You know, and I think we both agree...I don't hear you arguing with me over this one that it's obvious that you were working for Lafayette before this was submitted.

GOODSON: No question.

STANFORD: And I don't think anybody is going to argue this. The manual is pretty explicit on these things and how they want it.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And it sounds like you told me Mike Gougler knew but really didn't push your buttons on whether or not you had that HQ-43 in for that secondary employment. Is that accurate?

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: Which is probably unfortunate because, as a good supervisor, he probably should have pushed your buttons on it.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: And I would think if I was in his shoes that I'd want to make sure I have a vested interest in your well-being. While it's your responsibility primarily...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...as your supervisor, I would hope that I would come down and say, hey, Walt...

GOODSON: Oh no and I agree with you. Yeah. It's, it's my...that's my burden to bear. That was certainly my mistake that I didn't do that. There was, like I said, a...and you're the one that used mitigating circumstances, there's a ton of things that surround that but I just didn't. You know, the only thing I'd say in my defense on it is I never did anything that Mike was not, my chain of command was not fully aware of.

STANFORD: At least your immediate chain of command.

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: Do you know if Mike Gougler had any conversations like this with, regarding these issues, Commander Hawkins regarding this employment or suspicion of your employment with Lafayette prior to this HQ-43?

GOODSON: No, not that I'm aware...I don't know. I never asked him. I, you know, I looked at that and said, "Well," and after talking to him and talking to John, I thought that was satisfying enough and looked around and Pam Shaw that works for Kentucky State Police...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and is a sales rep for them. Another friend of mine just recently took a job. He's the new sales rep for, for Lafayette. And he's with the Louisiana State Police. Woody Overton. He called me awhile back and said he's working. You know, looking at all those things, I said, aah, well.

STANFORD: I would hope that and since we're on the topic, as far as what other violations are they're working for a vendor.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I've had a casual conversation with you in the past. There's really two other things here that and I'll ask you this. Were you aware of any policy violations at the time that you took this employment...

GOODSON: Absolutely not.

STANFORD: ...or at the time you submitted the HQ-43 that would prohibit you from working...

GOODSON: Also, somewhat in defense of what's going on here. When I did, when all this was going on, when I first was talking about employment, we had never considered buying anything from Lafayette. We had never made any purchase.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Like with (inaudible). Uh, I think somebody may have bought, somebody bought some polygraph...wasn't me...bought some polygraph chairs from them.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: There the only ones that manufacture a polygraph chair. Not a huge purchase but bought some chairs from them. Thinking back, I think that's the only thing we've ever really bought from Lafayette other than we bought maybe three instruments from them that were training instruments we just had to have for the polygraph school. And I don't know what year that was, before I even came along, that we had had these instruments for quite a number of years. They even had to be upgraded because they were kind of old. But those were, I think they were paid, we gave something like \$1,500.00 a piece for two instruments just so we'd have them as training instruments for the school. But outside of that, we really hadn't done any significant business with them.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I didn't know we ever would. I thought we were going to go Axciton. I figured as long as Mike Gougler is there, you know, we were going to buy Axciton.

STANFORD: With, uh, are you aware now of any policy violations that...

GOODSON: Well, not clearly. No. No. To this point, I have heard but I have not seen, and that was the most exciting part of actually coming here to meet was to...because obviously nobody

is until you had briefly mentioned that somebody else briefly mentioned that, is it the comptroller's or some code of ethics or?

STANFORD: Well, I'll show you. And you know, as a state agency, we're kind of...and able to purchase our own things. To a certain level, we have to go through the comptroller's office to purchase because they're the...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...keeper of the money so to speak. Right? We're kind of an arm of the comptroller and they give us certain powers to be able to go out and purchase our own things because, quite frankly, they don't want to purchase our day to day stuff for us.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: They're just not able to do that.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: We're so big. But we do adopt the state comptroller's code of ethics in our policy, our accounting policy.

GOODSON: Where, I mean, is this in the General Manual?

STANFORD: This actually isn't in the General Manual. I believe there's, and I may be incorrect on how it's worded, I'm having Legal pull it up and write it up because, quite frankly, it's not something most folks know or need to know. It's folks like in your position, my position, positions with an upper level chain of command that actually are involved in the procurement process...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...that need to know it.

GOODSON: Should have been Mike of all people then that...

STANFORD: I would argue the same thing. I would also argue, too, there's a little bit of common sense in here. Okay? I'm not saying that you don't have common sense...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...because I know you and I believe you have a great deal of common sense. I think somewhere in your heart of hearts, after visiting with you thus far...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...that you suspected something might not be right. Otherwise you wouldn't be asking as many questions to Mike Gougler or John Bateman. Is this okay?

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Is this right to do? And...

GOODSON: Well, they were my supervisors.

STANFORD: Sure. But in the end it didn't sound like you were quite as sure as maybe you would be if maybe you wanted to go work security at Whataburger, which is a no-brainer. We can do that.

GOODSON: But they had both worked, and that was part of my reason, too. I know we've already covered that, but the fact that they had, he had worked for Axciton for so many years.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And everybody knew that. That was no secret either.

STANFORD: Yeah. And it was no secret to service (inaudible). It was probably a big secret to others.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Had Accounting known about it, they wouldn't have wrote...and the facts of the matter, I'm sure this would have come to light well ahead of time.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But this is basically, this is what the code of ethics and conflict of interest...this is what I called Legal and they shipped it to me right away. Apparently this isn't the first time they've heard this sort of scenario which doesn't surprise me.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But that's what standards of conduct does require by the Comptroller's public accounts employees, vendors, potential vendors, and employees of other state agencies when acting under the authority delegated under the Comptroller of Public Accounts. And it says that state employee may not be approved or agree to work for a vendor or potential vendor.

GOODSON: Um.

STANFORD: And it's pretty, it's pretty explicit. Now, when I visit with DPS Legal on this, there are some other factors that can go into this. We had a very frank discussion.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Where you're involved it depends on how close to the procurement process you are.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I'll give you a good example. Jerry Newberry over here in Fleet Operations...

GOODSON: Yeah, you told me this.

STANFORD: Yeah. If he wants to work for the Ford house, no, can't happen. Right? Now...because he's involved with vehicle purchases and things of that nature and Ford over here. Bad, bad, bad relationship. That falls under this. If a trooper wants to go work security at the Ford house, has no signature or does anything with the procurement process, that's going to be approved because it doesn't really fall under this. He has no interest or any kind of influence or anything like that regarding...he's going to get whatever car DPS hands to him and that's that. So it depends on how far from the process you're removed. And I asked the Legal Department here. I said, "Well, what about in this situation?" with Walt. He's a polygraph, you know, we'll go over it when we get into these contracts here. Depending on what role we played and, you know, whether by advice or by documentation how close to the fire are we on this thing? And there version is he's right in the middle of the fire. So this...that's where this would apply.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Now...

GOODSON: You know...

STANFORD: Go ahead.

GOODSON: No, I was just going to...there was so many case in points, too, that were made to me, you know, in other situations, you know, since this has come up but before I even say those, I mean, this is simple to me and I'll give up the job. I had no idea that I was aware, I mean, I'd never seen that document until right now and it's never been clear to me and that's...if Legal feels that way and you guys feel that way, there's no question. The job's not worth that. I'll turn in a termination request immediately and call them today to say this is just not right if that's the way they feel because...I'll go into it later but...I'm just wondering, you know, I kind of got into some, I don't want to say arguments but discussions with you the couple of short conversations we had and I threw out an example like that but there is. I got it from the Rangers after that investigation was closed and said, yeah, they found people like chiefs, for example, work, sitting on a board of directors for a somebody that we do a lot of business with.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And it's gone on, it's gone on. People have moved on and retired. But there was countless circumstances of that happening. Not that that makes my situation right but being unaware of this...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and, you know, that's why I put those stipulations in there because I did. I asked him like you said, you're right on the money. I felt something wasn't correct about that and I

went and asked them, let me ask Mike, let me ask John. John's removed from it. John doesn't work part-time jobs at all.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: John Bateman. He's never...I've never heard of him working one. He's not working for any of these companies and I figure that's a good man to ask.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: "What do you think about this? What's your opinion?" Getting Mike's second opinion and, "No problem. I don't see a big issue with that." And...but, man, if that's the way Legal feels, I, it's, like I said, for \$1,100.00 that's not much money to me.

STANFORD: It's almost not worth this hassle.

GOODSON: No, it's not. It's not. And it's not...I can defend everything I've done because I have never made a penny from the state of Texas nor was there ever an intent and everything I've ever done and even what we're about to discuss was intended to benefit the state and CIS which I treat, I mean, I treat their money like it's my money. And if I could save them a nickel, I saved them a nickel. And I'm going to do everything I can to do that. And I thought that this employment...I wasn't even looking at it for the money.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I looked it as say it's extra training, extra contacts, extra connections for the school. It gets my name out there. Hindsight and this process, the hard lesson learned in this, is it's the perception of the way everybody else sees it and perception quite frankly, you're right on the money, it stinks. It stinks. Even though I feel personally I'm right, and I don't think I'm doing anything much different than a lot of other members of this Department are doing. I'm not going to be involved in that.

STANFORD: Even if, it's kind of like the lemmings and the cliff thing. Even if other people are doing it does it make it right?

GOODSON: No, it doesn't make it right. But that was, that was a part of the basis of my judgment when I did it. And I looked at it not for the money aspect. I know they won't let me do it but I would do this job for free and tell them, hey, just don't pay me. Can you give me the stuff? But I know they're going to frown on that, too, because they're going to say, hey, you're still receiving a benefit.

STANFORD: Yeah, that's...

GOODSON: You're still receiving a...just by being there but I've developed...I've thought about this a lot and I've developed a relationship during this course of time that's not going to go away.

STANFORD: Sure.

GOODSON: And I'll still gain those benefits and I bet they still take care of me.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. You know, I agree you've talked to folks and things like that.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I would caution you that any kind of equipment type benefit...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...like for free type stuff, take care, just use caution because the word benefit...

GOODSON: They don't, they don't give you the stuff, they say test this and send it back.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Sure we could do that as a state agency.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: So I don't see that as being just unreasonable.

GOODSON: But I've even, you know, the instrument that I received from Lafayette, I bought.

STANFORD: Let me also say this, too. And, again, you said if Legal feels that way. Legal is basically just interpreting what the law is and what's written...

GOODSON: Well, Legal's the one that's going to defend my butt.

STANFORD: Yeah, they're the ones that either going to be on your side or not.

GOODSON: Yeah, and if they can't defend that, then I can't work for them. I can't, I can't do that. I'm not a guy, you know, if that's, I'll, if that's their opinion, I don't even need anything. I trust that that's what they told you.

STANFORD: I didn't print this up. They sent it to me, so.

GOODSON: No, no, no, no I mean about being right in the middle of the fire on this deal.

STANFORD: Yes.

GOODSON: Can you tell me who you spoke to?

STANFORD: At the time it was Duncan Fox.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: And I didn't, I mean...

GOODSON: Everybody else retired.



STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: There's nobody left over there.

STANFORD: Now I'm visiting with another gentleman over there because Duncan is pretty busy but.

GOODSON: Okay. Well, I mean, you know, I had contemplated doing this before hand but I didn't want to make that look like I'm trying to cover or defend my actions or cover something up by quitting the job real quick or making myself appear to be guilty because I'm on the table with this of what exactly happened and I just...I wanted clear information from you back to make a decision.

STANFORD: You know, I will tell you this and I...you know, the Ranger's report, as you well know, is concluded.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: They didn't find any prosecutable criminal offenses there as far as wrong-doing that they would take to the prosecutor. You know, I visited with the prosecutor also, administratively...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...just to find out, you know, what is out there. What kind of liabilities does Walt have here on this thing and there is an offense there that exists criminally but they're not going to prosecute it. Because of the way the law is written it's a rather weak law...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...and specially, you know, folks in our positions here. If you're going to go after somebody's job or somebody's livelihood, you better be 100% on the up and up...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...and right, which I respect them for making that decision and personally I'm relieved.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But it's one of those things that, you know, in doing my job, you know, my position we have a, again, we're going to leave every stone not unturned, per se. We're going to...and I'll share that with you as well. But this is something, while criminally is not going to be prosecuted...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: It is something administratively which will be included. Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And again just because it doesn't match the, make up to the 95% provability, if you will, or proof beyond reasonable doubt in criminal court, at the more likely than not standard again it's verifiable facts, it's there.

GOODSON: Oh yeah, you know what I've done.

STANFORD: It's based off of the abuse of official capacity law. It's going to be here in Section 1, "violates a law relating to the public servant's office or employment." If it was prosecuted criminally, it would be prosecuted as a Class A Misdemeanor.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Now what law is it saying that you broke, per se? There's no way of saying that. It would be Government Code Section 572.051 and here's where the law becomes a little weaker in my opinion. It says, "A state employee or officer should not." It doesn't say shall not, it says should not.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: That right there weakens the statute immensely.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: "Accept other employment or compensation that should reasonably be expected to impair the officer's or the employee's independence of judgment in their performance of the officer's or employee's official duties." In this case it would be involving yourself in the procurement process while working for a vendor.

GOODSON: I'm not involved in the procurement process.

STANFORD: Well to some degree you are. We're going to go over that here in just a minute on these things.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You're not, you're not the Accounting and Budget Control guys over here but to some degree you are. We're going to go over that in a minute. It's kind of why I wanted to put this before this.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But it's hard to do in this setting. But these are some things we need to get out there. But, just so you know, that will probably be included in there as, you know, what did Walt Goodson, his behavior do, violate, you know. That's there. There's no getting around it. Also the code of ethics and then this HQ-43 issue.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Those are the three things that I see. I've provided to this date the facts that I have to Legal. If they come up with any others that I haven't found, you know, I don't know at this time, but again, I'm not here to hide anything from you.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And just so you know where I'm coming from and what I see at this point and at the conclusion of this thing we'll have a candid conversation if you like and any questions you have that I may or may not be able to answer...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...you know, we'll go over that stuff. So I'm kind of an open book to you. But, like I said, I have nothing to hide. I think you had credibility when you walked in here. I feel like you'll have credibility when you walk out of here.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So then there's some folks that have walked in here that's...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: They had credibility when they walked in here that didn't have any once they left my office. I think you're being honest with me and forthright and, you know, that goes a long way. There's a lot of folks been, gotten in more trouble for being dishonest than actually what they did to bring themselves into the office.

GOODSON: Well, no that's not.

STANFORD: No, I don't see you being there. Now that we're done with that aspect of it...

GOODSON: What are they...

STANFORD: Go ahead.

GOODSON: What are they looking at? I mean, what is the punishment for that?

STANFORD: It's a policy, an administrative violation, you know, and it varies.

GOODSON: Obviously this is going to a C-1. What...

STANFORD: When we conclude this deal, I'll be glad to tell you what my interpretation of some of these things are.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And it's a bigger picture of you than just what we presented right now between you and I together.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And again, and I think I've told you in the past, "Walt, I think it's in your best interests to allow us to tell the whole story and not just part of it."

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Because if we just painted this picture as you and I have discussed it today it doesn't look real good. But there's a bigger picture out there involving your chain of command and whether or not they knew about it and when they knew about it and what advice they gave you and what actions they took or didn't take, if they knew about the policies or didn't know about the policies and that could have directed you in other directions. These are all things that I think are articulable.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And may not have bearing on your behavior, whether or not you conducted the behavior, but may have bearing on what happens as a result of conducting this behavior. Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I...at the end of the day Mike Stanford doesn't assess punishment so...

GOODSON: Is my job in jeopardy? Should I not give up this job?

STANFORD: No. No. You know, I don't believe so, Walt. And I'll tell you I don't think, to me, this isn't a terminable offense, in my personal opinion.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But I've already told you Mike Stanford doesn't make decisions. If I were to tell you today, Walt, expect this many days off without pay or get this probation or whatever it would be talking out of turn because I don't make any of those decisions. And I probably should have prefaced our whole interview with this. My job, as you well know, by the Manual is to report the facts and the truth of the matter, put it down on paper, and give it to the Chief's office and the Colonel to make whatever administrative decisions that they choose to make. So, where does the gambit run? Well, it runs all the way from a written reprimand all the way up to termination, if you get down to it, until a violation of law. I think there's circumstances in here that mitigate this in such a way that brings us more down to the center of things.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And removes the ends of the spectrum. But that's Mike Stanford's interpretation.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Mike's not Colonel for the day.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Nor am I Chief for the day. And so... Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: Probably not the most exciting thing you'll hear in here today.

GOODSON: No. I'm not real happy about that but I understand there's no sense in discussing it any further.

STANFORD: I don't have any answers for you on that. All I can do is apologize to you but I'm not in a position to have answers for that.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Let's talk about the bid process for a second. And this is kind of on the heels of what we were just talking about. This is that first bid that you were looking at. I think it's P71188 and this is the bid in which Lafayette Instruments received the winning, the prevailing bid if you will, the low bid.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And it was for 11 instruments?

GOODSON: Yeah. I looked at it.

STANFORD: When this bid was going on and the date that this was awarded or the order date that we ordered from them was August of '07. And it's hard to find that date that this actual...the bids were done over the summer, at least in July of '07.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: That's when the bids occurred. Now going back to what we've kind of established, what they paid you for, the time period they paid you for if we start off with April 1st then it appears that, whether you knew it or not, during this bid you were considered, by Lafayette at least, to be an employee for Lafayette.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. I agree with that.

STANFORD: You agree with that? I think the criminal investigation...my huge concern when I first got this case, Walt, is oh my gosh did Walt Goodson tell anybody at Lafayette what to bid, make recommendations, or have any influence during this bid process that would certainly lend itself to criminal activity. That was a huge concern of mine.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I'll ask you that straight up. Did...during this particular bid process, did you have any conversations or make statements or references regarding what Lafayette should bid or disclose any information that might be considered confidential?

GOODSON: Absolutely not.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Not even close.

STANFORD: Okay. Did anybody ask you to?

GOODSON: Ye-e-e-h, not exactly, but in a roundabout way. I think I was having a conversation with a lady by the name of Kari Bumbleburg and I may be getting this confused. She said, "What do you think we ought to bid?" And I told her right then, I said, "Kari," I said, "I can't, we can't even have this conversation." I said, "No. I can't talk to you about that." And she said and she apologized, "Oh, I'm sorry."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And that was about as close as it came of it. And I don't think she had any intent. I think she was just kind of, she was like looking to me for an inside scoop or didn't even realize the relationship. Number one, I would have had no idea what to tell her.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: But number two, I cautioned her and said, "We can't even discuss that," and that was the end of the conversation. And she does work for Lafayette. End of story. Never knew what the winning bid was until Mike brought it into his office, called me in, and said, "Hey, hey, come look at this."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And we looked at it and said, "Wow, can't believe they bid that. Wow, can't believe they bid that." "Wow," I guess, "wow," remember to have... "guess Limestone didn't really want to play ball"...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and the first I'd ever seen of the bids or even had any idea what they would have been.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: And that was about as much of the process that I knew about rather than write, helping them write the initial stats. It went off to Mike and I never heard from it again until it was over.

STANFORD: Okay. These are the specifications that we put out for that bid. I know you looked at it awhile ago.

(Pause).

GOODSON: Yeah. I think. Yeah. I don't remember writing that but I'm sure I did.

STANFORD: How, how did...do you remember how this thing came about? Can you explain it to me? How we arrived at these bid processes...who was...or not the bid processes...these specifications? Who was involved with that?

GOODSON: Myself and Mike.

STANFORD: Mike?

GOODSON: Gougler.

STANFORD: Was Frank Chambers involved in this in any way?

GOODSON: Frank was around so little but I think, I think this like many other things, he was tasked with and didn't do it.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I ended up doing it. And, you know, he may have wrote that but it was, we, Mike and I had so many conversations about this that, I mean, we were clear on what we wanted and there was a lot of other ones, I think I remember it was Striking that was different input. I think, I think he got input from all of us. I think he got input from Doug Wrentz, too. Because it seems like I remember Doug putting in a, one of the...what do you call these, the specs...is to have a minimum of eight channels or maybe it was...maybe that was Frank. I don't even remember at this point. But what it effectively did, because I remember having the conversation, the details of the conversation was it would have removed Axciton. Axciton was the only one that didn't meet those specs. And we didn't want to do that. We wanted to be fair to everybody and yeah, Axciton, they're limited because they're the only manufacturer that doesn't have additional channel capacity. What you see is what you get if you upgrade again.

us ↑ ???

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: You can't or, if there's another upgrade, you can't do that with Axciton. That was our whole problem. A new component had come out and we're stuck with this sensor box that can't adapt. Where the new ones come out and all the other ones had additional channel capacity for future expansion. And that was, uh, an availability but we're all agreed that Axciton had, you know they're a good company, been around for a long time, they've treated us well. Let's not exclude them from the bid process and let's remove that spec because they couldn't even have bid if that would have been the case. And I don't know if that was right to do or wrong to do. We just saw that as the fair way to do it because we didn't, we didn't see any new advancements coming out within the next 10

years or so that we just really thought we had...that would have been something that would have been a...something we would have had to jump on right away anyway.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So we said, a-a-h, just leave it at that. So I know there was extensive conversation about these and I never put this form together. I'm sure that I either told Diane Schexnyder or sent it to Mike or Diane in an email or maybe I just had the discussion and somebody else wrote 'em. But I remember all these and we had discussed them all between us. It was not something that they said, well, I'll take...throw some specs together and send them on.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I don't even remember if I, and I apologize, this is last year. I can't remember to what aspect I was involved...if I wrote those or not. It doesn't look like my handwriting.

STANFORD: You know that.

GOODSON: I mean, it doesn't...

STANFORD: It's typed.

GOODSON: Let me retract that. It doesn't look like the way I write.

STANFORD: Okay. Maybe...let me ask you this to summarize but maybe not...I don't want to put words in your mouth.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Is it fair to say that it was a collaborative effort in putting these bid specifications together, an effort in which you played a role...

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: ...to some degree?

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Extremely.

STANFORD: And would that be accurate to say it that way?

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: And I kind of, I get the sense that there were multiple people working on these things and that a group think effort...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...if you will, went into this. And I see that as being a positive thing in anything we do.

GOODSON: Yeah. And this was a big purchase and we weren't going to do anything that would have jeopardized one of the instruments. More than concern about eliminating somebody we were just making sure that we were getting what we needed, not spending money on what we didn't need...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...but to make sure that the instrument manufacturers stepped up and honored the warranties, honored making sure we were up to speed on the training on these instruments, and those were the main, those were the main issues involved.

STANFORD: Does any of this stuff look unreasonable to you?

GOODSON: Unreasonable?

STANFORD: Or unreasonable or not desirable?

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: No?

GOODSON: No. I think that those were all absolute staples of what we needed.

STANFORD: Each instrument include the minimum of the following. Okay. And that, so it would be fair to say that these did?

GOODSON: Yes. And what we received did.

STANFORD: You know, at this point we can kind of revert back to what we were talking about before. How does your role play in the procurement process as a lieutenant in CIS? That's a good question because it's kind of like how close to fire are you...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...in this procurement process. There's two ways, there are probably multiple ways, but the two ways that come to mind on how to affect a procurement process...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: One way is to actually outright go out there and tell other vendors during a sealed bid what other vendors what other people are bidding...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...and make recommendations and things of that nature. The other way is to write the specifications for the bid in such a way to where it eliminates specific competition...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...on purpose with a vested interest, I think, for private benefit.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Does that make sense.

GOODSON: Yeah. I understand.

STANFORD: And I don't think you're necessarily there when you did that because it was a collaborative effort and you weren't able to do that. And I'm not saying you would even if you were able to do that.

GOODSON: In fact, I argued...my argument was to the contrary because they had one in there that would have eliminated one and that, those specs are able to be met by all four manufacturers.

STANFORD: I think it's good because it opened, it broadens our applicant or pool, our vendor applicant pool if you will.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I think that's a positive thing. Life is all about options...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...you know, and the more options you have, while it gets a little more confusing, the better off we typically are, you know. But as far as your ability to have a role in that procurement process there, by sheer virtue of you having some sort of influence, in the actual writing of the bid specifications.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: And, you know, if we choose to sole source for a vendor, for whatever reason, we have to be very articulate in the reasons why we chose to sole source. Other than that, absent that we have to open it up to competitive bidding which is the state process.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So we get the bigger bang for the buck. So that. Does that answer your question as what...how and what role you play in the procurement process?

GOODSON: Yeah, but, no, it does. It does. It's...I figured I was pretty far removed by having, having my boss do all that and just being asked for input is not.

STANFORD: But, you know, it's different. You're, by input you still have a say and influence...

GOODSON: Yeah, I understand.

STANFORD: So, you know, again if you look at the pyramid, you know, if you're up here in Accounting, the folks that have access to the top secret information...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...that go out there in the seal bid and should, you know, I don't think you contacted accounting and asked them for this information to ship out to Lafayette or whoever. I don't believe that occurred.

GOODSON: No, it didn't.

STANFORD: However, you know, in that tier, regardless of whether how crucial or important you believe your role is, it's still a part of that tier and that we can't, can't excuse or can't remove, per se, from being part of that process. Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So. And again I don't think anything in the deal looks, as far as the way the process went, looked out of the ordinary. When we talk about perception I can, and I've made this statement to you before, that, you know, I understand why this came to our office, you know. At the end of the day we'll figure out everything that's going to occur and it's certainly not completely over. But I can understand somebody's perception that wrongdoing has occurred. I can see Sue Luttrell out here saying, hey, Walt's working for Lafayette, Lafayette just won this bid. Her not privy to all this information sitting that's sitting here in front of us, her assumption and her natural assumption, and I think the assumption of a reasonable person would be to question...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...did Walt have any hand in this. I can see that. You know, I think we've pretty much eliminated that...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...as far as that but absent the thou shalt not work for vendor to the state of Texas or potential vendors, which is an issue that will be addressed somehow. I can see that a reasonable person would. So while I believe that we didn't do wrongdoing that you didn't do wrongdoing in this deal, especially criminally or by influencing the bid in a detrimental manner to the Department or to the people of the state of Texas. I see the perception as being not so good, you know, so when you look at it objectively I think...I

situation more difficult to resolve. This will directly impact the efficiency of our polygraph examiners and add to long-term costs of operating with a Stoelting polygraph instrument over an instrument which all our polygraphers or polygraph examiners are familiar." You know, I'm not going to argue that one. I think...you tell me. How often do our guys have to borrow one?

GOODSON: It's kind of a pass the bullets deal. I would say, because I'm not...I don't know as a supervisor, my guys, it was happening three or four times a year. Something would go down. Something would break, snap.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Usually a component. Half the time it was a laptop, more than anything, and they had to borrow a laptop but it didn't have the software. So that could have probably been remedied by going and loading every application on it but, then again, they may not know that program. But there was times where, and I could think when I was writing that of two recent times that just happened, one in Laredo where a...and one in Del Rio were both instances. The remedy was in Austin where these guys called, or would have been in Austin. Where the guy, it was Gilbert Capuchina running a test in Laredo is the one I can think of real clearly and the port burned out on his computer and he was able to get another instrument...he only had to go to San Antonio to pick up one...and was able to finish the test that day. But without that software loaded for another one it would have been more difficult...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...to do so if there had only been one of these other ones in the state somewhere. To get that up and running. But there is times where you do borrow. You go on location or, especially now, even more so where we just take it for granted because we do it so often. There's an internship process...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...with a new examiners and we send them out with both having the same instrument and if, sometimes they're both running or they can run vice versa or one of them's running but the one forgot an instrument and the other one has one and it just makes that an issue that's a lot easier to resolve by them having the same...the interchangeable components there where nothing on these instruments is compatible with another manufacturer. But it does happen. I've fielded several calls where we've had to go and run to the next, the nearest DPS office and I was calling around the state, hey, do you have an instrument or can you get an instrument or can you meet Gilbert halfway with an instrument from San Antonio and get one down there, because he's got a criminal on a homicide sitting in the chair and he needs, he needs something to run this test and would solve that. Where, you know, outside of that, it could have still happened. There could have been enough with it but it would have increased the likelihood of affecting a criminal test.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And, and, you know, reality. Okay. 4 to 6 a year. I mean, it's not that big of a number but if it's your...

STANFORD: If it's me...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: ...if I'm the defendant.

GOODSON: Yeah, if you're the defendant or you're the Ranger sitting there with your suspect. You've got your one crack in to bring in a homicide and something happens.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: And that was the case and Gilbert's was resolved by meeting somebody halfway and hopping in the car and saying I'll meet you and we'll get one.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And he was up and running in a couple of hours.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: It was a way to solve that.

STANFORD: Again, on this deal, you know. I see the same issue with going, expanding from one to two, Axciton and Lafayette but again, the more you throw in there the more complex it does get. So...

GOODSON: Well, but what we were anticipating was...it wasn't going from two to three because we were really going to phase out Axciton.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: If Axciton didn't win the second bid, we were going to be all Lafayette. You may not be understanding because the Axciton we already had...

STANFORD: Was old.

GOODSON: All the old stuff. That was going away. So we were sitting on Lafayette only and thinking, well, if Lafayette wins then we're a Lafayette outfit. If Axciton wins, well at least the guys trained on Axciton. Yeah, we have two instruments but at least they have the training. We don't have that bridge to cross.

STANFORD: And it really convolutes everything though, I mean, just...

GOODSON: It was a mess.

STANFORD: Yeah, because really the justifications we're using, while I understand where you're coming from...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...when you look at them objectively over the period of time that as things occurred it's looking like, as a big picture, okay, Walt Goodson's working for Lafayette. We're phasing out Axciton. Right now we're going to...then we're going to be a total Lafayette.

GOODSON: But no, I mean, that was not...we were going...

STANFORD: May not be your intent but the perception of things.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...but the perception of things...

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...and then, oops, Stoelting won this bid, oops, we better discard this deal here. While your intent is different and your heart of hearts is different, Walt, from the outside looking in I can see somebody going that just looks bad, you know. But we'll move on to the next bullet. "At the present time the Criminal Intelligence Service is unaware of any Texas law enforcement or federal agencies who are using Stoelting polygraph instruments. Tell me about this one because. Did we do any research on this?"

GOODSON: The only research I did was, and I'm sure I'll get asked, hey, why didn't you call Stoelting and get a list of their vendors or the person they sold to. I can see how that phone call would have went. Hey, Stoelting, we don't want to use your product so can you tell me if anybody else uses it.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: So I used my experience and I would argue that I, of anybody in Texas that, that has their finger on the pulse of who's using what in this state, I'd argue there's nobody that has more knowledge of that than me.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Simply because I've been involved with the school for the last four years and I've seen everybody and every instrument that has come through. And all the new instruments and what all the agencies are using and anybody of anybody that comes, that uses instruments and polygraph, they use our school. Number two is I'm president of the Texas Association of Law Enforcement Polygraph Investigators. I don't know of a single person in there using Stoelting.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So outside of that I don't know of any...I said, there may be one we're not aware of it and, if it is, it's somebody's bought one somewhere and they're not coming to training. They're not going through our school. But most anybody that's anybody that's coming...not that our, man, I guess I'm bragging on our school. But they come, students come through our school that...so I didn't know of anybody that had ever come through that was a Stoelting student.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. In this, you said you had one Stoelting?

GOODSON: Yeah. He was from Alabama?

STANFORD: Well, you didn't call Stoelting but I did.

GOODSON: Enlighten me.

STANFORD: As you may know or understand, they're pretty hot over this thing and I am certain somewhat sympathetic and understand why they would be hot. Let's see here. I was told that...and I understand the difference in the definition of purchasing versus using...two different things.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I'd be willing to concede that the FBI currently has approximately 25 digital Stoelting instruments. The Euless Police Department, here in Texas, bought some in 2006. The Waco PD Department bought some in 2007. And Corpus Christi bought some in 2005. And...

GOODSON: Who is the...I have no idea who the...well, I do know who the examiner is for Waco, (inaudible). But she told me she's still running analog instruments.

STANFORD: Well the way...I'll say this...this statement in of itself, as it's written here on this piece of paper is weak. Not necessarily the intent of the statement but the way the statement is written. And, at the present time, the Criminal Intelligence Service is unaware of any Texas law enforcement agencies, blah, blah, blah.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: Just because we're unaware of it doesn't mean it's not occurring, you know, is what falls in my mind.

GOODSON: But is that statement true?

STANFORD: Well, if you're unaware of it you're unaware of it but we don't know what we don't know.

GOODSON: Yeah. You're right.

STANFORD: So, it's just...

GOODSON: I thought that I was in a position of being pretty well an expert knowing everybody...

STANFORD: Um.

GOODSON: ...and the three you mentioned don't come to our training.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I don't even know...I don't think Waco's...Waco called me the other day and they're trying to get somebody in the next school because they don't run any tests anymore.

STANFORD: Really?

GOODSON: They ask us to run their tests.

STANFORD: And I understand I'm asking Stoelting, here, to...I didn't ask them for receipts or anything like that which they would have probably provided had I asked. But I'd be willing to give them the benefit of the doubt on that thing.

GOODSON: I don't doubt that.

STANFORD: But, and I don't have any reason to disbelieve them but let's move on to the next one here. "The Stoelting polygraph instrument also lacks a pharmaceutical dictionary which is offered by Axciton and Lafayette polygraph instruments.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: How did you come to that conclusion?

GOODSON: Well, that's the one on there that's absolutely false.

STANFORD: Okay.

GOODSON: Uh, I talked to Mark Handler and Sabino Martinez. They're the ones that had worked with that software.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I said, "Hey, does that thing have a pharmaceutical?" Actually it was Mark that brought it up to me. He said, "This thing doesn't have pharmaceutical dictionary," and I said, "Really?"

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I talked to Sabino and I said, "Hey, you must run that software. Does it have a pharmaceutical dictionary in it?" "No, I couldn't find one in there." "Okay. Well maybe it doesn't have one." And that was a mistake on my part of believing everything that Mark tells me because Mark is a just...flat...he's a genius.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I don't know how he would not, uh, if it wasn't there it wasn't there and he told me that I took it as the gospel truth that it wasn't there. Since this time when all this became an issue, I went and looked at the instrument myself and I dug through the software and I found it.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They have one.

STANFORD: Okay. But, you know, that...

GOODSON: False statement.

STANFORD: ...was probably one of the things that certainly upset them the most because they do.

GOODSON: Yeah, they do. And I couldn't believe...I dug through there and there it was. And I said how'd they not find it.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: Because I know nothing about the software and I fumbled through and looked around and said, hey, what's that.

STANFORD: Okay. I can see them being hot over that one, so.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I'm not laughing at you and I'm not laughing at them. I just think the situation is funny that...it's just odd, you know, something we don't normally run into. "The Stoelting polygraph instrument does not offer in-state customer support however both Axciton and Lafayette does." You know, I've heard this explained to me a couple of different ways. What is your take on this thing?

GOODSON: They're both...they've both within driving distance of the Polygraph School.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And that was the main thing. Our guys had fostered very strong working relationships with Mark and with Sue and with the other ones there at Axciton where they had their telephone numbers handy and they would call them all the time.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: How do you do this? What about that? And just got to know them. And a phone call, it doesn't matter where it comes from. But there was instances, like I said, with Jules that I knew that Jules drove over there, was able to do that, local for Axciton. The Polygraph

School...we could call those guys on short notice...well, hey we're right over here in Houston. See you in the morning type of thing. It was, it was just more convenient.

STANFORD: And I'm not going to disagree with you on that.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: What I would say is, in 2008, all of these companies are a phone call away.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: UPS will overnight ship pretty much anything we want if we have a breakdown or something like that.

GOODSON: And that's, indeed, how we get most of our stuff.

STANFORD: Yeah, and what percentage of the time do we actually have our polygraphers who have problems drive to the manufacturer or have the manufacturer drive to us?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I don't know. I've been told not very often.

GOODSON: No, not very often.

STANFORD: But I can't imagine that, even if these folks are in Canada...

GOODSON: For the local ones, yeah, I mean, for the guys that are in and around Houston...yeah, that happens and they just take it for granted. Yeah, let's run over.

STANFORD: They're there. Why not?

GOODSON: Yeah. Outside of that, yeah, no, they have to. But, yeah, that's weak. I would say that...I wouldn't say that's not true...it's true but I don't know how much of an impact that would actually have.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Yeah, I'm kind of like you. Your statement here isn't true or dishonest. It's a, I don't know that it's a compelling factor.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Might be the best way to put it.

GOODSON: No, I agree with that. You should have said whether it's untrue.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: Like you said all along, it...

STANFORD: I believe it's very true. But, I mean, you can't help your geography but the, you know, the same thing with, you know, Lafayette Industries. If they need to overnight you something from Illinois...then they'll overnight it to you or from wherever.

GOODSON: Yeah. Jules is one of our slow ones, too, and he was there with Mark working with him on a daily...Mark would run down there...hey, I can't. He had a harder time with the Lafayette software.

STANFORD: Really?

GOODSON: And Mark would come over there and spend the entire day with him...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...getting him up to speed.

STANFORD: But even now...I don't Mark Handler is any longer with them.

GOODSON: He's not there. He's not there. He was when this was written.

STANFORD: When this was written. "The Stoelting polygraph instrument does not interface well with the Pentax pocket chip printer. This causes difficulty in reproducing physiological data in a clear manner on its printed polygraph charts. This lack of clarity directly impacts the ability of the polygraph examiner to accurately interpret the polygraph data thus directly impacting the accuracy of the Department's criminal and applicant screening polygraph examinations. The Department's polygraph examiners are all outfitted with Pentax pocket jet printers. This would require a considerable expense to purchase all new printers." How do we know this?

GOODSON: Well, from what I've learned, is they do. The misunderstanding on that is that leads someone to believe it won't work with a Pentax. And Stoelting's argument is that they work just as well with Pentax as they do with any other printer. However, what we've found in the polygraph school was we could not...the charts were very difficult to read and interpret. I mean, I had fits as a...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I would review all the charts that our one Stoelting student would have and they were just...our scientific term...they were ugly charts. They were...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...hard on the eyes, hard to interpret. Some of this stuff, it comes down to very fine measurements of fractions of an inch swaying a call one way or other and you couldn't tell exactly what you were measuring. So we thought that it may be the printer, that we had a problem. We changed the printers out.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Same thing. And this was a printer that was performing fine using other software. We just changed it out. We asked Stoelting about the drivers because we had the problems with it right off when the Stoelting representative, when Sean Edwards was there, and he said, "No. It's working fine. There's not anything wrong with it."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: So that's what that's based on and we just and you can ask Sabino or you can ask Mark Handler, who was there as well. We just looked at the charts and we said please tell me this is not as good as it gets.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: It's very, very hard to see. And a little of that was...I don't want to say assumptive on my part, but when we looked through the documentation, and Sabino even brought this point up, or the website for Stoelting, and this is way back when we were first looking at this. We said, well, is it designed to run on a Pentax? Because all the other manufacturers, they push the Pentax. Pentax printer. Pentax printer is the best thing out there. It's small. But when you would see the Stoelting or when a picture of the Stoelting instrument, it'd have some ridiculous big color printer with it.

STANFORD: Um.

GOODSON: And we were wondering if maybe it would work better on that printer. They got something in it. And, believe me, it does make a difference. They can make them compatible but a lot of these manufacturers, there's a lot of steps you have to take and I knew all these.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: You'd have to go in there and have every setting just right, uh, to get 'em to work because...so there's a lot of effort in getting the Pentax to be compatible and we tried all those things through Stoelting....hold on, is it this, is it that, you know, and it just did not print charts. What was coming across the screen was not what was going on the paper. And I don't know how else to articulate that. Whereas Axciton, Lafayette and Limestone, all of the other three, for that matter...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: What's on the screen goes on the paper.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And you can see it and you print out the paper and you look, oh, okay and you can score it out. And sometimes it does a better job of putting what's on the screen on the paper. You'd rather look at the paper. Oh, well that's easier to see than the screen. A lot of times it would make it, and I would think it was actually better. The lines were black and when you're just looking at black and white...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...really a lot of contrast and easy on the eyes to see. Where this one was just...it looked like you were in between chats or in between stations on a radio. There was just static in it and it just never...we couldn't figure it out. We did everything we could like I said and couldn't get a clear answer. Said, well, maybe it's just not as compatible. Maybe it's just not as compatible. Maybe we're going to have to look to go with...to get our examiners because we knew they were going to raise all holy hell if we sent out a product to the field and it printed out a jumbled mess. And said, wait a second, my Axciton didn't do that.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I don't want that. Give me my old instrument back.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: And they were going to lose confidence in it. And we're thinking, well, obviously it's overcomeable because we've seen pretty charts but maybe we'd have to buy another, different printer.

STANFORD: So you had seen better charts from Stoelting?

GOODSON: On the website. I'd seen 'em...well, no, I take that back. Not on the website. I'd seen 'em in demos like when they're out at APA, like I mentioned earlier, or APP.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Where they had the finished product there. You'd look, of course they would do it with a color printer because they want it to look as pretty...

STANFORD: (Inaudible).

GOODSON: No, they're going to bring some beautiful stuff. And what we were seeing was not what they were showing us it could do and we questioned that and I had heard that in the past from somewhere. I can't quote you, either it doesn't work as well on that printer. I know that...I'm sure that's a point of contention because it does print.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: You can't argue the fact that it's, if that's...if you're reading into that, that there's no compatibility that's not what...that's not the intent of that bullet point.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: The intent of that bullet point is to say, like I mentioned, what's on the screen is not going on the paper.

STANFORD: You know, I think you wrote it well, I mean, well enough to get that across. It says, "Does not interface well with the Pentax pocket jet printers." To me that's in essence the same, what you just said. This is an important question that I have. At any point in time, prior to this initiation of this investigation, did we do any kind of independent testing of all four major manufacturers polygraph instruments?

GOODSON: No. Yeah and no. We had the other two. I...no, we never did one from Stoelting. Because when I did it, it was prior to Stoelting even being on the radar. We had never had a Stoelting instrument in school. We never had a request. In fact, the day the student showed up, I was in shock.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: That somebody showed up and said, "I'm using Stoelting. I've got a Stoelting." I said, "Really?"

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I called Sean. "Sean, would you consider coming down?" And he was just as nice, and I love Sean to death. He's a good man. He said, "Yeah. Yeah, we'll get down there and we'll help you out." He came down. But prior to that happening, maybe a year or two we had a Lafayette and we had a Limestone that were given to us. The Limestone was given to us.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They sent me a letter, "Hey, this is on loan for the school." And I said, "Mike," Mike Gougler, "what do you think of us field testing some of these instruments?" And he said, "Great idea." Find somebody that wants to do it. So we kind of did and I even went to the point...I called Lafayette and I called Limestone and I asked them permission because they gave us these instruments for use in the school only. Said, "Do you mind us field testing those instruments?" And they, I've lost one of those letters, but I have the other one that said, "Sure, be my guest. Use it, whatever you'd like, to test it out to see what your agency thinks." But that was pre-Stoelting, even being really on the radar and, I mean, the whole time, you've got to understand, it's A, B, and C company and then it's Stoelting. And that is the way it was just perceived that Stoelting was just not up to par. When you'd hear Stoelting, you'd laugh. When there was jokes cut in the office, I guess you're going to issue me a Stoelting now, aren't you boss or this and that. It was...it had a bad, bad reputation and that would explain why nobody uses those and why people like Waco PD, who is not in the mainstream with anybody else because, if they were, they probably wouldn't... if they would have asked, and I'm not saying anybody in our Department. If they'd asked anybody else, they would have said, ooh, ooh, you're making a colossal mistake.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And they buy those because they get a low bid off of...they find it on the web and they go and buy it. Same thing with this one guy...it was not Alabama, it was Mississippi...Batesville, Mississippi used that instrument.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: First time, kind of a little bit backwards PD. First time they decided, we want us a polygraph examiner. Well, we need to get us an instrument. And they just...they didn't ask. They didn't look around. They didn't do any research. They just bought the first one they could find. And that's how those do come across.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: The one from Corpus Christi may have been trained at another school. I don't know anybody from Euless. I can't believe that. I didn't know they had examiners.

STANFORD: It's not. I'm just going by...

GOODSON: No, I don't doubt that, I'm just trying to give you a little background on the thought, of the way people perceive Stoelting the whole time. And, I mean, when Mike and I in these initial conversations and just to reiterate that and we're thinking, oh my gosh, this is, this is going to be war when we buy these instruments. These guys...it's going to be an uprising and I'm working Mike, "Hey, you're the boss. You quell it." "No, no, you're the lieutenant, you." And we were kind of joking in a way but, in all seriousness, we're thinking man, this is just the mindset of everybody.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And if you got anything different than that, and one thing that bothered me about the interview with Joe Hudson was I think he did get a little bit different feedback. But I think the persons he talked to...I don't know if they were candid with him.

STANFORD: I will say this. I visited with several people myself, Walt.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And it's kind of like...and I've heard Joe make this same type of statement...Ford, Chevrolet, Dodge...

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: What you prefer to drive. At the end of the day, they all get you there.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: Some ride better. A Cadillac is maybe going to get you there great. The Yugo is probably not going to be so hot. But at the end of the day, you know, you get from point A to point B. You know, do you want somebody's guilt or innocence being based off of that? You know, these are all philosophical questions that...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...somebody's going to have to answer. And I understand that...the majority of what I've gotten out of this is independent polygrapher preference. You know, if you've been trained on something...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...you know what you've been trained on, you know the instrument, you know the documentation, you feel very comfortable when you're making the decision based on somebody's guilt or innocence and you've grown up with this product. Changing would be difficult.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You have confidence in it which is really what it comes down to at the end of the day when you're fixing to actually sit down and interrogate somebody...based on your charts, especially, plus other facts. You want to have confidence in your instrument. Each one has a different preference. Some folks prefer Axciton. Some folks say Axciton's a piece of junk. Some folks prefer Lafayette.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Some folks say the same thing...it's a piece of junk. You know, some folks would put Limestone at the bottom. You particularly think Limestone's at the top, you know. It's just...I've had so many different versions of it, it can't help but come across as that no one's been able not to argue that at the end of the day it will get you from point A to point B.

GOODSON: Oh, it will. It will work.

STANFORD: I mean, it's still a polygraph instrument and so it does come down, to some degree...preference is in there...my concern is this. Is, at some point, whether right or wrong, or we able to defend whatever position we took on this deal? I'm not sure we're there on this. That's the question that I have. And, you know, it would be nice, it would be a lot more defensible if we had done an independent test with all four products and said, hey, we ran all four of these products at the same time on the same person with the same questions and these are the results we got. And we're throwing this vendor out because the charts they produced were a piece of junk. Uh, you know, that's what I'm kind of getting from these other people...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...when you asked me about that. So credibility wise and all that on their end, you know, a lot of it's opinion.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And, you know, opinions are important especially in this game here...not game, per se...but in this process.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But, you know, those are...at the end of day I've got to formulate an opinion to some degree off of other people's opinions and what not. But I understand where you're coming from with your opinion because you were brought up on Axciton...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...you've been working with Lafayette. Both of them are arguably very good polygraph instruments.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And some have their pluses and minuses and you have not been trained on the Stoelting and what you have heard and seen has not been a very positive thing. I think I understand. Is that pretty accurate?

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: One concern I do have with your level of experience with the Stoelting instrument is, it sounds like the majority of your observations have come from one instrument that an individual brought to their class here, you know.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. It actually belongs to us.

STANFORD: It belongs to us?

GOODSON: It didn't belong...it was loaned to us.

STANFORD: Loaned to us. You know, is it...and I know you're going to hate this question or this statement.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Is it possible that there was something wrong with this one instrument that we got?

GOODSON: No, no, we checked on that. That was one of the first things we did.

STANFORD: This is their typical off-line piece of work here?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You know, again, going back to...if that's the case...it sure would be nice to have these things laid out there side by side and have done this to say this is a consistent deal because the devil's advocate argument is...is going to be, well you've had 3 or 4 Axcitons you've had to send back because they weren't working quite right. Here you have 1 Stoelting that doesn't work right and all of a sudden the whole thing's a piece of junk.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: It may be true but...

GOODSON: Those were 12, 15 years old, like I said, and they were also...they also stopped working mainly because of wear and tear. Pieces broke of them and they were still rattling around on the inside and they just shut down all together. There's no in between.

STANFORD: Some of these things on this piece of paper here that Gene Hawkins put his name on, are true. And a couple of them don't look so good, one of them that we've pretty much established is not correct.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: It would be nice if we'd have had something more conclusive that would stand on its own. Unfortunately we don't. That was written at the time that this thing occurred. So now this is what we have to, as a Department, defend why we took what action and I question whether or not we would be able to defend it if it were really pushed.

GOODSON: Well, that's why we looked at it. And Mike looked at it and from the standpoint, number one, we didn't...he had no idea when I talked to him that that was sent on...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...when I first got notification of that letter from Stoelting. He said, "That was sent? That was...how?" He was puzzled by that as well because his whole, Mike's whole argument in that...and I don't know if you spoke to Mike or not...was that we didn't need the instruments any longer and that was kind of, well, we just won't make...we will not make a person...that's why he told me to take that or that memo that I gave you a copy of, the one where we're saying let's just move on and get some here, some there. And I said, "No. Let's not do anything. This looks bad. We don't want to go through with the process. We just want to cancel the bid."

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: We can base it off of that. Yeah, and we had, like I told you, and I know...I hope you don't doubt that that Mike and I had extensive conversations about that.

STANFORD: I don't doubt it. I think there's been enough paperwork here...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...that's flown back and forth that you had to have.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: My concern is for the Department. Did we inappropriately, without enough justification, cancel the bid? And I would say it kind of looks that way. Not that the justification didn't exist but that we didn't provide the proper justification when we did it.

GOODSON: Well, we were looking at that as the standpoint of protecting the Department's interests and not mine.

STANFORD: The bottom line interests. Sure.

GOODSON: On stuff that we didn't need or wasn't going to use or wasn't to our standards.

STANFORD: You know, if...let's throw this memo out for a second. If you had to write this today, what would you say the reason was why we should have not taken the Stoelting instruments?

GOODSON: Well, a lot of those would be very similar. I can't say what I might do now because I don't know that without having to sit down and think about it. Certainly there would be a couple of bullet points removed, the pharmaceutical dictionary would not be in there. I'll give you that one. The...if I knew this was going to Accounting, and that's the way it was being handled, I don't know if I ever would have wrote one or would have put myself in a position...in that position or stuck my neck out like that. I did do it so I may very well just not do it.

STANFORD: Do you think we should have bought the...based on the bid process?

GOODSON: No, I don't...I don't believe the Department is obligated just because somebody wins the bid, that we have to buy their stuff. And I don't think we have to do anything more. I can't believe we had to write a memo for it. And I, maybe I'm wrong, but it...I believe we don't...what we ultimately did was not buy the product...just say, you know what, we changed our mind. We don't want it anymore. Write a one line memo that says we're not interested in purchasing those products. We've cancelled the whole bid.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: No harm, no foul. Hey, what are these guys out...a number? A phone call? We'll bid this.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: We just don't want to do it anymore. And do we have to justify that to them? Now, I can see in this circumstance it certainly is convoluted because the perception of me working for a company...now we're looking like we're trying to penalize another company and I certainly see that but this...in this particular circumstance, I mean, things change like when Mike and I discussed we don't need that number of instruments. In fact, right now we're waiting on this to get cleared up so we can buy instruments because we desperately need instruments.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: We need two. That's the number we need.

STANFORD: That doesn't seem like a lot but you need them.

GOODSON: Yeah, we need two. We've got two examiners out there that don't have instruments. Everybody else is retired and moved off.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Our, kind of the mission of our service has really changed. And we'll probably need another one when Michelle Cianci comes back so feasibly I guess we could say we need three instruments. We don't need that number.

STANFORD: From an Accounting perspective, and not a field perspective, I think, I believe their view on...certainly you can cancel a bid process...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...for reasonable justification,...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...you know, I think. When we...if we wanted to exclude somebody from the bid process for a justifiable reason, we can write those in such a way that we only open up the bids to certain people for...because we can specify that these people will only provide the actual...and it goes down to writing the bid specifications for the product and all this stuff that we do. Bottom line is, here in this case, we opened up to everybody...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Oops, we didn't like what fell in the net and because they pulled a fast one, if you will.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And you're right. You working for Lafayette, while your intent is not malicious, complicated the matter when it comes to this process because now that perception out there is, oh, and Walt Goodson is working for Lafayette.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And, of course, they want to go with Lafayette. Why'd they even open up the bid to Stoelting?

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And it just...it looks bad.

GOODSON: And that's certainly not true.

STANFORD: Yeah, and I would agree with you and I do agree with you. I don't think your intent was malicious.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But I also don't think you would disagree with me when it comes to say it doesn't look right either.

GOODSON: No, I agree with that.

STANFORD: So I don't know what we're going to do with this deal and I don't know that there's anything we can do to make it right. I don't know. I think those questions will have to be answered by somebody else. You know, I look at this thing and if you're asking...I don't think you even asked....but I'll tell you. From the Mike Stanford evaluation of it, there's some strong points in here, some weak points and one falsehood.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You know, do the strong points...are they strong enough to outweigh the weak points and the falsehood enough to justify, on their own, removing them, removing us from the bid process in this thing? I would say it's questionable on the bubble, you know, so I don't know. I'm going to have this discussion with myself and my captain later on, sit down and talk about it, and I'm kind of leaning to no. I almost feel like we ought to have 14 Stoelting instruments here and next time don't open it up to...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...everybody.

GOODSON: Well, number one is that would be...that would be just a ridiculous use of resources, to waste the state's money when we only need two now.

STANFORD: I agree there.

GOODSON: We could buy the ones we need but things have changed during that process and that's why this wasn't...

STANFORD: I don't know what the right fix on this thing is. Maybe Accounting does. I don't know...if there is a fix to be made. It might be an oops, we're sorry...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...better luck next time.

GOODSON: Well, if that's what they want to do. It's the government's money. They have to account for it. My...I'm trying to protect the...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...fiscal interests of the Department by saying, "No, we don't need them."

STANFORD: And the other side is, though, we're the stewards of the government's money...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...and could we have done this process in a better way that would have alleviated all these problems? Probably, you know, and I will say that. It could have been written better. It could have been done better. But I will say this, too, that it sounds like, and correct me if I'm wrong...it sounds like when you wrote those bullet points, it was not your intention that those bullet points be used in justification for rescinding the bid process on a memorandum from Commander Hawkins?

GOODSON: No, no, I thought that was an in-house thing. No.

STANFORD: Knowing from what I know, and probably what you know about higher-ranking folks in the Department, it's not uncommon for them to adopt other people's writings as their own and cutting and pasting, if you will. So, in the future, you know...

GOODSON: Yeah. I'm aware of...I can't...you're not telling me anything. I can't tell you how many memos I've written for Mike in the past.

STANFORD: Maybe didn't even know you wrote them.

GOODSON: Right in the know.

STANFORD: Yeah, you're right there. That happens. There's one last thing I want to visit with you about and it doesn't necessarily revolve around you.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: There's a...Sabino Martinez. He holds himself out as working for Axciton.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Can you tell me about this? What do you know about that?

GOODSON: The only thing I know that Sabino does anymore...apparently, at one point in time, this was before I ever knew Sabino...way back...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...that he was...he worked in a very similar capacity with Axciton as I do with Lafayette. Actually no, I take that back. He was on a commission deal. He received commission for instruments he sold. He made good money off of the instruments. I think he would tell me I made, "\$1,200.00 or \$1,500.00 for selling polygraph instruments. Something happened or he...I don't know a time frame but it was a considerable time back. He and Bruce White, the president of Axciton, no longer saw eye to eye and I thought he gave that job up. But then, you know, I never did really just question Sabino. He said, "Yeah, I still do some out of country sales for them." And he was telling me that, at one time, he said, "Yeah. I can get a commission if they ask me to." But apparently, I think it was San Antonio or something that they had asked him to do something for the company or

asked him to do some...visit with some, I don't know if they were from Mexico or Central America, but he did some work for them...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...and he didn't get his commission paid to him. He said the heck with these guys. I'm out of here if that's the way they're going to treat me. But then, then again I heard him, a year ago, that...say something about...Mexico is trying to get into polygraph. Their federal government is trying to buy...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...a beaucoup of instruments. And he said, yeah, he could...he was apparently talking to somebody down there in Mexico and he said, "Yeah, this could be a deal. They're buying, they're acting like they're going to buy 150 instruments." He said, "You do the math. If I make a \$1,000.00 a pop on that." And he never said anything else and I never really asked.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: But I did find out, and I don't want to rub any salt on the wound, because at some point I found out that Lafayette won the bid down there.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I heard it through the grapevine, yeah, we're shipping a ton of instruments to Mexico City so I guess that didn't work out for him. So, I don't know what capacity, if any, he works for them or he's, I mean, I don't think he's on. My guess on it, and I may be wrong, he's not considered an employee by anyways but he's kind of a...would you call it an independent contractor that would come in or negotiate or something that would just come in and say, hey, you got a guy...I guess you'd call it a broker...I broker to deal in Mexico for this many instruments.

STANFORD: Good faith hooking you up?

GOODSON: Yeah. But I don't know if that's ever happened.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: But that's kind of the take I took on it with the Mexico deal because Sabino was connected with a lot of the, the Mexicans that run some of the polygraph program out of Mexico City. I don't know their names. I just know he makes calls from time to time down there and what's going on. They've asked him to...I think he went down there to teach before so he is somewhat connected in Mexico because he's taught some classes down there in Mexico. So that's kind of the way I saw that. And it would make sense that it might have been a broker type of situation on the ones that and, I mean, my bases may be way off. The vague thing I remember about San Antonio, but what it seems like I remember from that, is that he particularly asked for a comp day or something to make sure he was off or something on one of the days that he was...or actually I take that back.

WJ

He may have took comp for 40 hours and went to APA and this would have been 2005 in San Antonio. He took a week of vacation and went over there and worked and he attended the conference but he said, "I'm going to take a week of vacation. That way there's no question if I'm doing anything for Axciton or not."

STANFORD: Uh-huh. I think he did do some work for them then during that APA seminar.

GOODSON: But I don't, yeah, you were asking me...I don't know a whole lot and...what I guess I should...I mean, because technically he was...I don't....was he...was I supervising him at that time?

STANFORD: Well this is...and I don't see your name on this...but this is that HQ-43 in 2005.

GOODSON: Went right above me.

STANFORD: Your name is not on there, is it?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So, you know, again...should he have done that? By letter of policy, no. And Axciton probably had a stronger presence in the Department, even then.

GOODSON: And that was a part of my argument all along. No it doesn't make it right. But there...to know that Mike's working there...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...Sabino's working there, he's all...they have extra job requests in, they all or they know...they're not doing this in secret and the Department has viewed that or sanctioned that by saying, okay, maybe...

STANFORD: Certain folks probably sanctioned by their lack of cessation or stopping them.

GOODSON: But, good gosh, I mean, all mine...and that's the biggest, that's the biggest upset thing with Mike, you know, if the Chief would have called me and said, Walt, you can't do that, I would have said, okay, Chief.

STANFORD: Certainly not going to do it.

GOODSON: Yeah.

STANFORD: You know, I don't think...I know you're not that type of person, Walt.

GOODSON: I'm not going to...you know, they've told us we can't run sex offender tests. If I'm going to do anything to make some money, I'll go run sex offender tests. There is money to be made in to run sex offender polygraphs.

STANFORD: I'm sure.

GOODSON: I've never run a sex offender test. I disagree with that policy strongly. I think it was a knee-jerk reaction to a complaint exactly like this one that went through Internal Affairs about 5 years ago and they just blanketed and grand-fathered the people in, which was even more of a stupid thing, and said, okay, well we messed up as a Department. We told you, you could do it so now we're not going to tell you, you can't do it but anybody else can't do it so. We still have people out there doing it.

STANFORD: (Inaudible.)

GOODSON: Yeah. Effectively we've been told, well it's a conflict of interest but if you're doing it, it's not a conflict.

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: Which...see, you got all these, you've got so many factors that go into this and, I mean, again I'm not the guy that walks the line, you know, you can tell by my personnel file or my IA file which better be empty...

STANFORD: I've never looked you up.

GOODSON: ...because I've never...I don't operate that way.

STANFORD: I don't think you do either.

GOODSON: I don't. It is not worth it to me and the hell that I've been through in the last few months, worrying about this and what's going to happen, if this is affecting my livelihood. I mean, I think the worst because I don't commit crimes. I don't break the law. I assume, when I do something, that I'm going to prison for it. I don't, I'm losing my job for it. I mean, when this whole thing...I'm going to lose my job over this. I mean, that's the way I perceived it. And I can't help but think that no matter what anybody tells me until it's closed. That's the way I see it. I'm about to be looking for employment.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: And I...that's just the way I think because I don't act like that. I consider that...knowing what I know about this Department and what's happened in the past...hopefully the Department...be a personnel change and stop being so forgiving...but I assume the worst and it's...the Chief of APD was saying something and it kind of made me feel good because he was talking about what they were arguing...whether or not they should fire the guy for leaving his pistol on the slide. And he said there's crimes of the mind and there's crimes of the heart, I think, and I think he said, you know, the guy...this was not a crime of the mind, the guy's heart was in the right place and that's the most aggravating thing about this because every step of the way I've tried to think, what is the right thing to do on this?

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I think it all would be right and I think...I'm not sure if we would be having this conversation...maybe we would if I didn't work there so obviously...for Lafayette. Despite nothing happening there, I see that as obviously the problem.

STANFORD: You know, back on the Sabino Martinez thing real quick. Have you ever known Sabino to exaggerate or?

GOODSON: Yes.

STANFORD: Okay. I get that impression, too, but I don't...

GOODSON: Yeah, but I don't, I don't know about lying or anything if that's what you're implying.

STANFORD: No, I'm not saying...

GOODSON: Yeah. No. Yeah, and that might have been the case because case in point, I thought that would have been an exaggeration when he was talking about all these instruments they were shipping to Mexico and I don't think Lafayette sent that many but they sent a bunch.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: It was a big contract. I don't know what it was.

STANFORD: If he told you he made \$10,000.00, is it just possible he just made \$500.00? I mean, is that all?

GOODSON: Um, you know, possible but I know Sabino from a couple of things we've done together...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...maybe not to me because he knows I would call BS on him if I knew it wasn't true. I wouldn't, c'mon Sabino...

STANFORD: You can't lie to a polygrapher.

GOODSON: Not like that. Well, not. You can lie to me like you can to anybody. I'm no better a lie detector than anybody. But, when I can verify the facts, there's a little bit of a difference there. Or when I'm gonna...in the capacity of his supervisor, you know, you've got to tell me the truth.

STANFORD: Is he pretty tight with Sue Luttrell? Are they buddies?

GOODSON: He used to be.

STANFORD: Used to be.

GOODSON: But I don't think that's the impression anymore.

STANFORD: Really?

GOODSON: I think that was kind of, after the stuff that happened in the school...not related to this but to things she was saying about Mike and an affair and some of the other stuff and him wanting....and Sabino and I had a long talk about that and...

STANFORD: I'm not the bedroom police. I'll be the first to tell you that.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: But have him and...

GOODSON: No-o-o. I don't...

STANFORD: ...Sue had a relationship like that?

GOODSON: ...think so. No, he would have told me that. I have a feeling he would've. And I don't know if I would share that with you anyway but, no, in fact, he hasn't happened...it hasn't.

STANFORD: The only reason I would think it would become pertinent, is if relationships...not necessarily that particular type of relationship...but if the...I guess the closeness of the relationship comes into importance during the employment aspect of these things.

GOODSON: Yeah. Yeah.

STANFORD: Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Yeah. Yeah. No, I don't...

STANFORD: But I'm not...

GOODSON: I guess if he did it, I would say I would decline to comment but, no, I...he never said anything even remotely close to that.

STANFORD: Okay. I'll leave that one alone then. I don't want to go any further with that. But, you know, to some degree there's going to have to be some explaining of these things as well.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You know, if you can't work for a company, you know, a vendor. You know, at what point...how far removed is removed?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: And I don't know. I'm going to have to get with Legal and find out. Is a polygraph operator, whose opinion of polygraph instruments in the field's going to be related to you or your chain of command? Is that too close? I'll tell you right now, I'm very sure about

you. I don't know about him. I don't what...how close his relationship would be considered too close. And that's something that somebody else is going to have to help me to answer.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So, you know, I don't know. But, you know, we have covered a ton of ground today. Is there anything else that you think of that you think is important or you think I should know or you want included that...beyond what we've discussed here? This is your opportunity to kind of get that out there.

GOODSON: No, I think we've covered every aspect. I'd like to just reiterate a couple of things and to bury me further in this process, I guess. I don't know if this necessarily helps my situation but, you know, like I said, when I first...you just mentioned Sabino and how far does this go. Well, how far does it go, number one with Mike...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...Gougler. And knew he worked there and I was basing some of my judgment off of that and he's very connected to the Chief and he always says he's talking to Colonel and I don't think there was anybody that did not know he was working there. And he may have exaggerated that to me. But, certainly, I'm not asking a lieutenant, I'm asking an Assistant Commander.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: Somebody, you know, where do you stop asking? You know, I said, well, Mike, I don't really believe you. Can I go to the Chief and talk to him about this and see. You know, at some point that's what the HQ-43 is for and granted I didn't turn it in, in time but it ultimately was approved and, like my chain of command said it would have been. But, number two, like I said, to bury myself, we really weren't doing business with Lafayette when I started.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I mean, it kind of happened right after. Which I don't know if that helps or hurts but as far as the violation occurring of law. I went to work for them really before we had any kind of substantial dealings with that company. They happened to win through a competitive low bid process which, I had...when I went to work for them, I did not have any foresight or any thought that we would ever use a Lafayette instrument. I never dreamt we would have done it.

STANFORD: But it's possible?

GOODSON: Well, anything's possible. But where do you stop? Where do you stop on...what I view that is and we're getting off on a tangent here, may do business with.

STANFORD: Potential vendors.

GOODSON: Yeah, that's anybody under the sun but I think the real meaning of that...my interpretation...I'm not an expert but would say, there are negotiations in place...

STANFORD: Yeah.

GOODSON: ...and there's...we're leaning that way, we're about to make a big purchase from, let's say, Sig Sauer, so...hey, how about a little job.

STANFORD: I think it's obvious that they were a potential vendor and here's why I'll tell you why I'll tell you because they ultimately received the bid.

GOODSON: Well, yeah, and you could make that argument to anybody that would be a vendor but...

STANFORD: And when there's such a small pool...

GOODSON: I didn't, you know, we've been Axciton since Axciton existed. I didn't believe that would change and I made that argument, you know, and it was even before then so I did, you know, we need to go out for bids, we need to look at all of them.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: I never believed anybody would be...I thought Axciton would give us those instruments before they would let somebody else beat us out...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...because Axciton is losing their grip in Texas in a big way. They're, they're, I mean, Lafayette is dominating the market. Nothing to do with me.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They make a nice product and they market it really well and people are just buying that instrument like crazy. They were making...they're the ones coming out with the innovations and so...I mean, we're getting off track here but, but...they have wireless. They do bluetooth stuff now. Nobody's in that ballpark of doing bluetooth stuff.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: They're just ahead of the game and people recognize that. No, I have nothing further. I just, and like I said, I mean, you know that and I appreciate you for seeing that my heart is no ill will toward the state, no, nothing to jeopardize anything. Everything that I did was to benefit the state and nothing was to benefit me personally. There was no monetary gain or something that I intentionally went out and sought when I was making what I would be...the minimal influence I had, which I did have influence and you made that clear and I agree with that. I had influence. That was not the intent.

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

- GOODSON: And if that's...I don't know where to proceed from here as far as turning in a job request because, as we speak, this minute I work for that company. Can you give me advice on how I proceed with that? Do I turn in a cancellation? Do I talk...call Legal? Can Legal call me and tell me, hey, this is...you know, what do I do or do I just? I don't want it to look bad and if that's the way the spin...the direction it's going, you know, I'd like anybody to know that I'm not going to continue to work there in defiance of what the Department sees as best.
- STANFORD: Sure.
- GOODSON: I'm not going to...so who's the person that tells me the best way to do that? Or do I just do it on my own and say, okay, well I see what's going on here...is there a better way to handle that?
- STANFORD: In a perfect world, of course there's no such thing, this investigation would be concluded in a very short fashion, you would receive notification of what's happening, and then you would know whether or not...at that point your chain of command would instruct you to do that, you know. There's several days beyond this interview here...
- GOODSON: Oh, I understand.
- STANFORD: ...that the process goes on.
- GOODSON: I know it drags on but I don't want to continue to do something that looks, looks bad if that's the case. I'll, I'll continue on the books...and like I said, it's not like...and this is such a unique circumstance. It's not like I got a...I'm showing up at the office in the morning...well, I've got to take some comp time and go to Lafayette and work a little bit. I don't do that. I'm just kind of...
- STANFORD: There.
- GOODSON: I'm just there.
- STANFORD: You know, I will tell you this, I would, you know I can't...I'm not in your chain of command, you know, I'm not...
- GOODSON: Well, I'll ask them. You know, I know where you're going.
- STANFORD: It's difficult for me to say without having a conclusion to this, to my part of this case because, once I turn my report in and I can tell you, Walt, you know, after....and I'm going to talk to Legal again many times before this is over with to make 100% sure. But, then again, based on what Legal has sent me here and I would tell you right now that I believe you're in violation of policy.
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: You know, what action you take to remedy that, you know, those are your actions. I would think that once I notified you that you're in violation of policy, you know, would it be a bad idea.

- GOODSON: No, that's what I'm asking you.
- STANFORD: Yeah. And I believe, if it was me, you know, yeah, Walt, I would cease employment because if the state says thou shalt not...
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: ...work for a vendor to the state of Texas, basically...
- GOODSON: And that's should not.
- STANFORD: That should not, apparently, by law, you know. Ultimately I believe in my heart of hearts that, that decision is going to come down to that. You know, I'll know more when I talk to Legal again. I'm very careful not to formulate my entire opinion of everything until the end, until I hand in that report because, Walt, there may be something else that pops on my desk that changes what I think. So if I were to tell you one thing one day, today and something different tomorrow.
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: But as of right now, you know, I believe you're in violation of policy and these are the reasons I've presented to you why. And I think it's fair to say that would be a wise decision.
- GOODSON: Well, they just need to do a better job of, you know. How was I supposed to know?
- STANFORD: Yeah.
- GOODSON: And until somebody shows you that, there's no way. I mean, that would not...
- STANFORD: This is not a lone case and, you know, we've been in here for hours now talking...
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: ...about this thing. You know, this isn't somebody stole a roast beef sandwich out of the lunch box in the auto shops, you know.
- GOODSON: Well, this is all grey.
- STANFORD: This is all...it's just been a very complicated case. It comes down to...and then when you throw in the criminal aspect and I'm glad we were able to remove that from this deal by having Ranger Hudson do that investigation. I think that added creditability to us and to you. I think that was a positive thing. Unpleasant, but certainly can't imagine being in your shoes. I've never been there but I know that was unpleasant. There's no other way to perceive that. But I think, in the long run, it's for the best for you and for us because now we can throw that, that thing to bed. We put that to bed. We're done with that. And it's...you'll be better off for it in the long run that we did that, I believe. And, you know, had it come to a different conclusion, well, then it's the state of Texas runs with it as they

do. But I think, in this case it certainly answered a lot of questions for us so, and I think we turned over every stone, too. I don't think there's going to be any question at the end of this thing that this investigation wasn't thorough.

GOODSON: No, I don't think so.

STANFORD: But that's really...could I do something fast? Yeah. Would it be right? No. You know, and to give you the benefit of every doubt, I would rather have thorough than fast. Unpleasant as it probably was. And I, you know, there's no, there's no way I could say I've ever been in your shoes in this manner but I do respect that feeling that you may have that gosh, this takes too long. And I have no doubt you've had some sleepless nights on this thing, Walt. But...and that wasn't the intent. But, again, given the option of having something done fast versus something done thorough and right...I think I'll always take the thorough and right. And at least know it was done correctly.

GOODSON: So I can put in my (inaudible). You promise not to fire me?

STANFORD: You know, I don't fire anybody. You know, going back to the range of punishment, what's going to happen from here is always the next question.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: I don't know if you have that question or not.

GOODSON: No, I just, I mean, anybody is curious. I just, and it depends on what they decide as to what level I agree with it or not agree with it. I admit that I have some things I'm accountable for.

STANFORD: Let me tell you this, Walt. If somebody were to come up and ask me, based on what's happened here. What do you think should happen to Walt Goodson? You know, and they may not ask me but I'll be glad to tell you, you know. You know, based on these mitigating issues here that his chain of command or part of his chain of command had done this same type of behavior. They knew about the behavior. Yes, you should have done an HQ-43 a lot sooner. That burden of that falls on you. The folks I visited with in your chain of command had no knowledge that this policy even existed so their education in the matter was poor. As a good gatekeeper, they should have stopped you from making that decision and told you it was wrong. But, yet, we cannot say...we can't remove the behavior because the behavior has already occurred, you know. There's no issue here of guilt or innocence, it occurred.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You know, now what happens is where...these other mitigating issues here, to me, bring down the level of punishment from that...the farthest ends of the level of punishment. You know, are they going to be something in my opinion that Walt probably needs to account for? You know, something's got to be done in consistency with the guidelines that other people have received for similar actions? Yes. It's got to happen that way. Otherwise the rule of administrative enforcement won't exist properly.

- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: But I don't believe that the range of punishment, at the end, should be falls in this category for Walt Goodson. If I'm ask, that's what I'm going to say.
- GOODSON: Uh-huh. So what is it?
- STANFORD: Somewhere between this and that, you know. Somewhere in between...
- GOODSON: When you're asked for a particular, what is it going to be?
- STANFORD: You know, I don't know that a written reprimand necessarily falls in there but, you know, if it was me...if Mike Stanford was the presiding guy...which I'm not.
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: I see...to me a day or two off and no extra job for a period of time. That to me and, you know what I'm basing that off of...is what I've seen other people get for off duty employment improprieties. Does that make sense? Because there's a history, the Department has several folks...
- GOODSON: Yeah, and those are, those are based on security related jobs, though.
- STANFORD: And you're right, you're right. And..but, you know, I'm basing off of what I know. And there's this, you know, I don't have a grid of punishment, per se, because I'm not involved in that process but I can tell you what I've seen happen and that's kind of what I've seen. You know, I don't think your intent was so malicious that it involves this other end of the spectrum of possibility. Does that make sense?
- GOODSON: Uh-huh.
- STANFORD: A written reprimand wouldn't be fair to the other folks out there that have received more for less, you know.
- GOODSON: Yeah, I don't know that there were that many circumstances surrounding those, though.
- STANFORD: I know. And you asked me and I told you. And I'm not dishonest with you. I'm straightforward and upright with you regardless of whether or not you like my answer or not.
- GOODSON: No, I don't have a problem with your answer.
- STANFORD: And...
- GOODSON: Like I said, I assumed...that's why I bring a recorder in here...that's somebody's out here for my job.
- STANFORD: I think you're assuming too far.

GOODSON: I've got to assume that I...

STANFORD: Yeah, Walt Goodson is assuming the worst.

GOODSON: I have to protect me and [REDACTED] so I don't know what to think when...that stems from the Ranger investigation and just being in the dark on a lot of things. I didn't know what was going on in the background. And a lot of other things that happened that are related to this and I didn't know how far my chain of command extended or what they were doing or if they were being truthful. I have strong concerns that I'm not being helped or that people are not coming forward and being truthful. Case in point, my commander has denied another extra job request that I have turned in that two other people in my office turned in the identical request. In fact, I wrote it for them for all three to work in the same place. The other two were approved. Mine wasn't.

STANFORD: What do you think that was based off of?

GOODSON: I'm not sure.

STANFORD: Did you ask?

GOODSON: Yeah, they...oh no, believe me I asked. They said that I was working for a gambling establishment which is...it was a big wedding. It's a long story that I won't go into. It's a whole other issue. It was...there was a picture of a poker table on the website and this is a company [REDACTED] owns and, in there it was under their advertising and they were showing all the magazines they advertise in. And in there, in one of the magazines, which happened to be a Jewish Outlook, which you know, Jews are real gamblers. There was a picture of a, one of those non-profit gambling tables in there. And even though I articulated, "Hey, we're doing private events." The governor was at the last one. I was denied. They had the same access to information, looked at it on the other two, which were Tim Ferguson and Chris Pratt and approved them, approved the extra job for them so it looks like they're picking. I've recently got...took the captain's test. I went from number one on the written, by a substantial margin, to a complete last based on two board scores...both of them from my service.

STANFORD: That's prior to this investigation being over?

GOODSON: It is. But I'm wondering...the extra job's not...the captain is. But, I'm wondering is there something going on that I'm just all of a sudden I've offended somebody to no end and they're not telling me. And I've asked. And I tried...after I received the board score, I went to my command and I said, "Commander, is there something I did? Please tell me. I'll change if there's something..." I don't like to live like this. If there's something I did. Because, based on the score he gave me, it didn't...it was substantially different than everybody else, by hundreds of points. And he said, "No, no, everything's just fine and dandy." But...so I...and hopefully it didn't happen and, from what it sounds like, you didn't bring up those issues...

STANFORD: No.

GOODSON: ...because you believe me and what I have told you sounds to be consistent with what everybody else...

STANFORD: Yes.

GOODSON: ...because I was really, really concerned that somebody was coming in here and trying to railroad me on something and said, Walt did this or that.

STANFORD: No.

GOODSON: It doesn't sound like that happened so I'm relieved...

STANFORD: You're thinking the worst.

GOODSON: I'm relieved. Well that's part of the reason for that...

STANFORD: Sure.

GOODSON: ...and everything else going on. I'm thinking, what in the world is going on. And I'm...I may be paranoid because of this and I'm seeing things like, little things like that. There were a couple of little issues. I'm thinking why did that happen. That doesn't...that's not how we have normally done things and now they're treating me different. They, you know, they denied me...I was approved to go to American Polygraph Association. Then they retracted my out-of-state travel request, which was already approved. But things like that. It just seemed like punishment. I'm guilty in this before and I have to prove myself innocent.

STANFORD: You know, that concerns me. You know, I don't know...I don't understand why, if you're telling me these things have been approved for others but not for you. I would hope it wouldn't be because of whatever somebody views the preliminary outcome...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...of this investigation before it's even concluded. It certainly better not be based off of any conclusions that have been drawn out of this case.

GOODSON: Well, it would be hard for them to defend that position. And I have to take an issue with that. And my full score on this...throwing all this stuff away and whatever comes of that saying, you know what, what's going on here. This is...there's too many of these things that...one of them, okay, yeah...that's explainable. When they start stacking up...

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: ...it's hard to explain them.

STANFORD: You know, I will say this in regard to that. At some point when this thing is concluded and things are completed and the Chief says this or whatever that he says, there may be a point in which that kind of decision, for a period of time, would be justified. Does that make sense?

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: Depending on whatever they choose to hand down as punishment for these offenses that can't be ignored. At this juncture, however, I would argue that if they're basing disciplinary issues or keeping you from that kind of stuff as a result of this investigation being underway, would be extremely preliminary.

GOODSON: Uh-huh. Well it's happening.

STANFORD: Yeah. And I would say that's, in my personal opinion, that's improper.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: You know, there may be a time in which that decision would be proper, you know, possibly depending on what the Chief says. I don't know.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: It would be very possible in the realm of all this thing that you could walk away with a written reprimand and that was it.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: It's in the range of punishment. And so, in which case, you're not really justified in keeping somebody from secondary employment.

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: So, you know, these are things that if you choose to, you know, you're welcome to...like anybody else is in this Department, to put it in writing and submit it to Internal Affairs and it will be investigated like any other thing would.

GOODSON: Yeah. Win that battle and lose that war.

STANFORD: Well, you know, it's easy for me to say when I sit up here...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...in Internal Affairs, too. You know, I...

GOODSON: They would certainly do things and it's at a rate, you can see, that I expect a little bit of distrust or based on everything that's going on, I'm sure what's going on and...

STANFORD: My concern is this, is that you know that regardless of whether or not you choose those options, those options are there for you.

GOODSON: Yeah, I know.

STANFORD: Like they are for anybody else.

GOODSON: You're preaching to the choir, brother.

STANFORD: And I have yet to fill out...I've never filled out a written complaint in my life...

GOODSON: Uh-huh.

STANFORD: ...with the Department, but I know it's there.

GOODSON: Yeah, and I don't think that way either but I guess it just comes to some point where you just say, okay, enough is enough.

STANFORD: Uh-huh. Just so you know that's there for you.

GOODSON: But I know the people that file those and I've always had a little special place in my heart for those people that are the ones that file those complaints. You know, they're usually your problem employees and I don't want to be classified as one of those problem employees. I just want to let it go and move on.

STANFORD: Yeah. Right is right and wrong is wrong, though. At some point there's only one way...

GOODSON: Yeah, no, you're right. You're right. At some point, you say, okay it's too much.

STANFORD: Yeah. And unfortunately some folks let it go too far before they deal with it appropriately but, anyway.

GOODSON: Well, based on this and the fact that this is going on right now. This is certainly not the time when I'm it looks like I'm just, uh, retaliating against something that...I would rather this be closed and resolved and then say, okay, now look at these issues if there is any...if I would choose to do that. Hopefully not. Hopefully it will go away.

STANFORD: Well, do you have anything else you want to ask me? Anything that I haven't answered that you can...

GOODSON: No.

STANFORD: You know you're always welcome to give me a holler if you do have questions. At this point, I can tell you what I anticipate is I'm going to have a lady transcribe this, one of our administrative assistants. I'm going to holler back at you and I'm going to give you a copy of it to read.

GOODSON: (Inaudible.)

STANFORD: Yeah. And read through it and feel free to compare it with your copy of the recording if you like. Make sure it's accurate.

GOODSON: Been there.

STANFORD: And I'll have the affidavit on top and sign it and this will be your written statement. Okay?

GOODSON: Okay. How long do you anticipate...is there any...this...at least from where you stand now, you're investigation is pretty well done?

STANFORD: Uh-huh.

GOODSON: It's just a matter of getting this over to Legal and getting it going?

STANFORD: Yeah. Getting it...it will probably take me another three or four days to get this thing typed out appropriately. A lot will be the hangup on finding out how long it takes her to do that and get your statement and all that.

GOODSON: Okay.

STANFORD: Okay. Walt, I appreciate it. Sorry to have to have you here under these circumstances.

GOODSON: I'm sorry to be here. I thought we were friends and, I mean, don't say it like that but friends don't have to do that to one another. And it's not your choice, I mean.

STANFORD: Right.

GOODSON: That was four hours and two minutes.

STANFORD: That will be a pretty good transcript.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, likely reading 'Walt', is located at the bottom right of the page.

05/07/2008

122275

LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENT CO. INC.

WALT GOODSON

INVOICE NUMBER	INVOICE DATE	REFERENCE	GROSS AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
QTR1-08COM	04/24/08	NONE	733.40	.00	733.40
DETACH AND RETAIN THIS STATEMENT THE ATTACHED CHECK IS IN PAYMENT OF ITEMS DESCRIBED ABOVE. IF NOT CORRECT PLEASE NOTIFY US PROMPTLY. NO RECEIPT DESIRED.			733.40	.00	733.40

NATIONS BANK

20-1421
760

CHECK NO. 122275

DATE 05/07/2008

AMOUNT
\$733.40**

PAYSEVEN HUNDRED THIRTY THREE DOLLARS AND 40 CENTS*****
TO THE ORDER OF

WALT GOODSON

LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENT CO. INC.

01/31/2008

121548

WALT GOODSON

INVOICE NUMBER	INVOICE DATE	REFERENCE	GRAND AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
4QTR07COMM	01/18/08	NONE	90.18	.00	90.18
DETACH AND RETAIN THIS STATEMENT THE ATTACHED CHECK IS IN PAYMENT OF ITEMS DESCRIBED ABOVE. IF NOT CORRECT PLEASE NOTIFY US PROMPTLY. NO RECEIPT REQUIRED.			90.18	.00	90.18

CUSTOMER NAME

20-1421
740

CHECK NO. 121548

DATE 01/31/2008

\$90.18**

PAYNINETY DOLLARS AND 18 CENTS*****
TO THE ORDER OF

WALT GOODSON



LAFAYETTE INSTRUMENT CO. INC.

11/13/2007

120996

WALT GOODSON

INVOICE NUMBER	INVOICE DATE	REFERENCE	GROSS AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
2&3QTRCOM	10/31/07	NONE	1,160.42	.00	1,160.42
DETACH AND RETAIN THIS STATEMENT THE ATTACHED CHECK IS IN PAYMENT OF ITEMS DESCRIBED ABOVE. IF NOT CORRECT PLEASE NOTIFY US PROMPTLY. NO RECEIPT DESIRED.			1,160.42	.00	1,160.42

EMISSION BANK

20-1421
740

CHECK NO. 120996

DATE 11/13/2007

AMOUNT
\$1,160.42**

PAYONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED SIXTY DOLLARS AND 42 CENTS*****
TO THE ORDER OF

WALT GOODSON