## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

ANDREW SANBORN

ORIGINAL

INTERVIEW OF RICHARD LEHMANN - 1/23/18 - CD#10
TRANSCRIBED FROM AUDIO

Prepared for:

Geoffrey W. Ward, Esquire Senior Assistant Attorney General Criminal Justice Bureau Attorney General's Office 33 Capitol Street Concord, NH 03301-6397

## AVICORE Reporting

The Beacon Building 814 Elm Street - Suite 400 Manchester, NH 03101 Licensed Court Reporters Certified Videographers Videoconferencing (603) 666-4100 Toll Free (888) 212-2072 Fax (603) 666-4145

www.AvicoreReporting.com

Email: Info@AvicoreReporting.com

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Today's date is 1 January 23rd. The time is approximately five minutes after noon. The speaker is Scott Gilbert from the 3 New Hampshire Attorney General's Office. I'm at the Attorney General's Office in a first floor conference 5 room with Richard Lehmann, Associate Attorney General Jane Young, and Senior Assistant Attorney General Geoffrey Ward. We're recording this interview. 8 Rick, you're --RICHARD LEHMANN: I'm aware that you're 10 recording it. 11 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And you're okay 12 with that. We've been tasked with looking into a 13 matter that's several years old now that occurred at the State House, early 2013. Your current position 15 there is Senate --RICHARD LEHMANN: Legal Counsel to the 17 Senate. 18 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And for the 19 year 2013, it was the same? 20 RICHARD LEHMANN: Same position. 21 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: I draw your 22 attention to the beginning of 2013. Can you describe

```
to us how you first become aware of the possible,
   call it a sexual harassment or inappropriate comment,
   that involved Senator Andrew Sanborn?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I heard it myself.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Can you tell
5
   us, to the best of your memory from 2013, what that
6
   was that you heard?
7
            RICHARD LEHMANN: What I heard was Senator
8
   Sanborn was in his office with his wife, Laurie, a
9
   Senate staff member, and a UNH intern, and
10
   Representative Sanborn, Laurie Sanborn, had said -- '
11
   there was a conversation about going or not going to
   Florida. And one -- the person who was the UNH
13
   intern said, well if she can't go, I'll go to
14
   Florida. And Senator Sanborn said, it depends how
15
   good you are at giving blow jobs. That's it.
16
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Can you put a
17
   name on the intern?
18
            RICHARD LEHMANN: The intern's name was
19
                 I believe.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Can you put a
21
   name on that staffer?
22
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              No. 6
23
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

PENGAD - 11800 631-6989 - www.pengad.com

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Okay. What do you -- your office is across the right. hall. You're in your office and you overhear it? Correct. RICHARD LEHMANN:

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So, it's loud enough --

RICHARD LEHMANN: The doors are -- no, I was 10 or 12 feet away.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Before we get into any more detail about that, can I ask you, if you could put a number on how many incidents, given your proximity to Senator Sanborn's office, how many incidents of whether we call it sexual harassment, or comments that are of an inappropriate nature, do you think you've personally witnessed?

RICHARD LEHMANN: One.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Just that one? RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: How about incidents you've been involved in, whether it's been brought to your attention, or you have to interview someone, or sit in on an interview, regarding the incidents of a similar nature, would you guess you've

```
been involved in?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember ever
2
   being involved in another similar incident.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: All right.
   We'll just take them one at a time then. So this one
5
   we're talking about, what do you remember?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: No, that's not correct.
7
   There was one other incident in which I was involved,
   in a conversation.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: All right.
10
   We'll take them in order then. What, Rick, do you do
11
   upon hearing that comment from Senator Sanborn?
12
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I tapped out a memorandum
13
   on my laptop, writing down what I heard, and notified
14
   the Chief of Staff.
15
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And at the
16
   time, was Jay Flanders?
17
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.
18
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Can you take us
19
   through and educate me in the process that it then
20
   took?
21
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember the -- I
22
   mean, I don't remember it in any detail in terms of
```

the chronology of how things happened. But I know
that I notified Jay that I heard a comment that I
thought was inappropriate, and I thought that it was
in the interest of protecting the Senate from
potential liability going in the future really, for
me to follow up with the person whom the comment was
directed and the other staff member who was in the
room, and ask them how they felt about it and make
them aware that if they were uncomfortable working
with Senator Sanborn in any way, that we would find a
work assignment, or do whatever it took to make them
feel that their workplace was not uncomfortable for
them.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Sure. So I missed it. Did you do that, or were you directed to do it?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't -- I did that after speaking to Jay. I don't remember if he suggested I did it -- do it, or I suggested I do it. I think we spoke and agreed that was the thing to do.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Okay. So you

go and you speak directly to No. 1 and No. 6

No. 6

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Do you know if anyone else sat in on that?

RICHARD LEHMANN: No, nobody else sat in.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: What do you get for a response from the two of them?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Everybody -- both of them took it, as I took it when I heard it, as a -- sort of a foolish comment, a poor attempt at a joke that, you know, probably was not the kind of joke that should be made in that environment, but that's it.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And that's the impression you got, both of them had felt the same, similar way?

> Right. RICHARD LEHMANN:

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Do you talk to Senator Sanborn about it?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't recall speaking to him directly about what the people that I spoke to But I believe there was a conversation that he was involved in and that Jay Flanders was involved in, in which we said, generally, without specifically identifying anybody -- I mean, without identifying

```
the people involved, that he needed to watch his
   behavior.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Besides your --
   the memo that you did about hearing it, so that would
   be addressed to Jay Flanders?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I think I addressed it to
6
   the file and handed it to Jay.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: All right.
            RICHARD LEHMANN: So it was my memo to
9
   myself.
10
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Gotcha. Do you
11
   think there's any other documentation about this
12
   incident, as far as you're aware?
13
            RICHARD LEHMANN: That I created?
14
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: No, that --
15
   yeah, we'll start -- yeah, that you created?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No, not that I'm aware of.
17
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Would you guess
18
   there's any that anyone would have created?
19
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I'm going to decline to
20
   answer the question on the grounds that it may reveal
21
   privileged material.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: All right.
23
```

```
Does February of 2013 is -- I mean, a ballpark of
1
  when this would have happened?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: They're talking
   about break and --
5
           RICHARD LEHMANN: I think it was February
6
   23rd -- I don't remember the exact date, but I think
7
   that's about it.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So you -- you
   speak to the intern and the staffer. Does it end
10
   there, your involvement with it, or does the whole
11
   incident seem to end right there?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Well, it depends how you
13
   define the incident. I mean, in some level my
   involvement continues to this exact moment.
15
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: I gotcha.
16
            RICHARD LEHMANN: There's been, you know,
17
   downstream incidents. That was the end of it for --
18
   the things that I've described, to the best of my
   recollection, are the end of it in the winter of
20
   2013.
21
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Are you aware
22
```

of any at least talk of -- well No.1

```
intern at the time?
1
           RICHARD LEHMANN: He's a UNH student intern
   at the time.
3
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Some time after
   this incident, he's put on the payroll as a paid --
5
           RICHARD LEHMANN: That's correct.
6
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- employee.
7
   You've heard talk of one being connected to the
8
   other, or how he got that job in a different fashion
   than others?
10
           RICHARD LEHMANN: You're asking me what
11
   rumors I've heard --
12
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: No, we're --
13
            RICHARD LEHMANN: -- or are you asking me if
14
   I know anything directly about a connection?
15
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: You're familiar
16
   with at least this being talked about?
17
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah.
18
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Do you know
19
   anything specific about it?
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No. Well, what do you
21
   mean, specific about it?
22
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: More than just
23
```

```
sitting in your office and hearing people talking
1
   about it.
           RICHARD LEHMANN: No. I mean, I've read a
   comment that somebody wrote online about it. So I
4
   know that it's a rumor.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: By specific, I
   mean nothing more than what you heard in the rumor
7
   mill like anything else?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Do you ever try to
10
   ferret it out?
11
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No.
12
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Do you ever ask
13
   anybody if there was a -- either a payoff, or a job
   as a result of --
15
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No.
16
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- the comment being
17
18
   made?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I was asked in -- before
19
         was hired, whether we should not hire him,
20
   because this incident occurred.
21
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Who asked you that?
22
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I believe it was Angela
23
```

Я

Leach. It was -- I think it was Angela Leach. And my response was that you can't penalize somebody for being on the receiving end of a comment like that, and that the Senate should hire whoever they think is the best person to fill the job. And people thought No.1 was the best intern we had around at that time, and he was looking for work.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Can I just take you back, when you think you're part of a conversation with Senator Sanborn and Jay Flanders?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: What goes on during that meeting?

about how the State House is a place where the breadth for making jokes, or crude jokes, or jokes that might be funny and appropriate in a different environment, you know, if it's a fraternity house environment, a comment like that probably wouldn't be very surprising. But in the State House, that kind of commentary is not appropriate or acceptable, and that it could create -- I mean, my concern and reason for acting in February of 2013 was because if there

```
were subsequent incidents, and the fact that we let something like this go unaddressed became known, that is the kind of thing that creates liability for an employer.
```

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: And what was Senator Sanborn's response?

what he said. My recollection is that he was angry that he was being confronted by two -- wasn't -- I don't know -- angry's not the right word. I don't -- I mean, it's hard for me to attribute his emotions to him. I don't think he was happy about being confronted by two staff members, and I think that he believed we were blowing things out of proportion and that it was just a joke, and that it didn't warrant any response.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Did he deny making the comment?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember if he denied making the comment. I would have been shocked if he denied making the comment, because I heard it myself. It's not something somebody brought to me. It's something that I heard.

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Did you tell him that? Did you tell him that you actually heard the comment vourself and --

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember. Honestly, I don't remember -- I don't remember if we told him that that comment was what we were talking to him about, because part of our responsibility in responding to potential sexual harassment, or inappropriate comment, circumstances involves protecting the privacy of the people who are They didn't want to go forward with involved. anything. Nobody wanted an investigation made of it. So I didn't -- and you know, and there's been all this Right to Know litigation -- not litigation but back and forth that's been going on, and newspapers have become interested in it. And our -- my feeling, and President Morse's feeling about it, and the current Chief of Staff's feeling about it is that in responding to those, we owe it to the staff member and the intern at the time to continue to protect their identities, so that they don't become in the middle of a controversy they want no part of.

ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: When you first take

```
this incident to Jay Flanders and notify him about it
   and had that memo, is -- the Senate President at the
2
   time was Peter --
3
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Peter Bragdon.
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Is he notified
5
   about it, or brought into the loop on it?
6
            RICHARD LEHMANN: The Chief of Staff
7
   controls the communication to the President, and I'm
   sure that Jay and Bragdon had a conversation about
   it. I don't remember if I had a conversation with
10
   the President about it at that time. I very well may
11
   have.
12
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: What do you
13
   know, Rick, of after this, we'll call it an incident
14
   with the comment, about the Chief of Staff giving
15
               a sum of money -- an envelope of a sum of
   No. 1
16
   money?
17
                                                 What do
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Say that again?
18
   I know about it?
19
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Yeah.
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Literally, that's what
21
   I've heard, that supposedly -- I mean, the way I've
```

heard this, and I've only heard this recently.

```
INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And that was
1
   going to be my next question. So back in 2013 you
   never --
3
           RICHARD LEHMANN: No.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- you were
5
   completely unaware of that?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: No -- yes.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: You hear it for
8
   the first time, ballpark?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Within the last couple
10
   months.
11
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Any more than
12
   what I just shared with you?
13
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No, that's what I've heard
15
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: That's exactly
16
   what you heard?
17
            RICHARD LEHMANN: -- is that No. 1 had an
18
   envelope and made a comment about Jay giving him
19
   money for something. But I have no idea what that's
20
   about. And I was going -- I just don't know. And I
21
   -- you know, because I knew this had reached a level
22
   of inquiry, I've never followed up on it, and I never
```

```
asked -- I mean, I haven't spoken to No. 1 about it.
1
   I'm never gone to him and said, what are you talking
2
   about.
3
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And that would
   have been my next question. Have you done in your
5
   position any follow-up regarding --
6
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Not -- I mean --
7
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- any truth to
8
   that?
9
           RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              No.
10
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Okay.
                                                 Can you'
11
   describe what you would know from your time over
12
   there -- going back to No.1 going from being an
13
   intern, I guess he's given this -- he's --
14
            RICHARD LEHMANN: My recollection is it was
15
   a part-time job helping the Clerk's Office process
16
   out some things they were behind on.
17
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So as time goes
18
   on, there's more and more opportunity for people to
19
   connect dots, or at least try to. If one painted a
20
   picture that that employment position was out of
21
   character, say it's part time, it's renewed every two
22
   weeks for multiple months, it's difficult to find
23
```

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

```
that's ever happened before?
1
```

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't know if it's ever 2 happened before. 3

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Not -- would you be aware of these things if --5

RICHARD LEHMANN: Sometimes, but not necessarily.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Like if he -if he was placed in the Senate Clerk's Office without the Senate Clerk's involvement, which is -- has not happened before, would you be aware of anything like that?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Would -- I mean, I don't There is not a -- there's not a management manual that says, this is how we do everything that gets done over there, because the personnel -- I mean, for a hundred reasons there isn't one -- but there isn't. So things happen. You know, I found out, for instance, the Democratic Caucus hired two people within the past couple months. I found out who they were after -- you know, at the same time everybody else does, at the time that the hiring was announced. And the most recent person who was hired

```
was somebody I knew. So I mean, you know, I had no
1
   idea that that was going to happen.
2
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: If you're okay,
   we'll move onto the next one. There's another one
   that you're aware of -- an incident, or incidents, or
5
   series of incidents involving Senator Sanborn and
   inappropriate comments and someone else, that you got
   involved in, to some degree?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't think I got
9
   involved in anything. It's a -- and I'm not aware
10
   that something -- help me -- I'm aware that there's a
11
   rumor about a former staffer who had her office
12
   moved. I wasn't involved.
13
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Who was the
14
   staffer?
15
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I can't remember her name.
   She ended up moving down to work with Senator
17
   Forrester.
18
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Are you --
19
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Her name is No. 2
20
          something like that.
  No. 2
21
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Are you certain
22
   you weren't involved in that, or you don't remember?
23
```

I don't remember. RICHARD LEHMANN: 1 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Don't remember, 2 3 yeah. RICHARD LEHMANN: It's hard. Some -- like 4 me writing out the memo, when I heard the incident, is pretty unusual. But then I've done that a couple 6 times in the -- well, I mean written memos about things, that's the only time I think there was a sexual harassment or inappropriate comment. I would -- to me, it's not sexual harassment. To me, it was 10 a comment that was out of line, because -- just 11 because of what the definition of sexual harassment 12 is. 13 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So her 14 recollection was -- and specific recollection is that 15 she was brought in by you and Jay Flanders, sat down, 16 and you did a lot of questioning --17 RICHARD LEHMANN: No. 2 18 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: It could --19 yes. It could have happened, you just don't 20 remember. 21 RICHARD LEHMANN: Could have happened. 22 don't remember it happening, but it could have

```
happened.
1
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
                                        How about
2
   incidents with No.6
3
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Apart from the one I just
4
   described?
5
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Apart from the
6
   one that -- simultaneous with --
7
           RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              With
                                   No. 1
8
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
9
           RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember.
10
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
11
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So when -- I think
12
   when Scott asked you, was there only that one
13
   incident, you said yes. And then --
14
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Well it depends ---
15
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: A few seconds later
16
   you qualified it, is that the No. 2
17
   something else?
18
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I -- well, I'm not sure
19
   when we're talking about incidents, we're talking
20
   about that -- you know, things involving different
2.1
   people or different -- this same issue coming to the
22
   surface multiple times, because it's come to the
23
```

surface multiple times. 1 This, meaning the ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: 2 incident? No. 1 3 The No. 1 thing, yeah. RICHARD LEHMANN: 4 So --ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: 5 RICHARD LEHMANN: Mostly because I ve been 6 responding to Right to Know requests since October of 7 '16, I think. I don't ever remember. ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: . So let's stick with 9 what we'll call the -- the No 2 10 RICHARD LEHMANN: Okay. 15 ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- incident. 12 memory of there being a meeting with Senator 13 Forrester, you, Jay Flanders, No. 2 16 there's discussions that there were repeated comments 15 about the way that she dressed -- the Senator --16 Senator Sanborn was making comments to her about her 17 clothing, the way she looked, her shoes -13 RICHARD LEHMANN: No, you asked me that --19 yeah, I think that that's what the comment --- because 20 like I don't remember being in a meeting with Senator 21 Forrester, which is not to say it didn't happen. 22 just don't -- I have no recollection, and I feel like

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

15

20

21

ASEH BOTTO FOHM B

I'd remember it but, you know, again, what -- even what constitutes a meeting over there can be a very quick conversation. But yes to -- yeah -- and you were asking me the question, has it jogged a recollection. Again, and not of something that I heard, not something I would remember being involved in, but something involving --

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Or maybe something --RICHARD LEHMANN: -- Senator Sanborn making a comment to No. 6 about No. 2

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Okay. So but are you consulted, brought in, that Senator Sanborn is making -- let's stick with the first line -- making comments to her about the way she's dressed, how she looks?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember if it was making comments to her, or making comments to somebody else. I don't remember that.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Do you memember -moving on from the way you look, that he may have said something to No. 6

> RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah, I think he --ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- about what No. 6

would want to do with --No. 6

```
RICHARD LEHMANN: Right, right, yes.
1
   again. I -- I can't tell you how I became aware of
2
   that rumor, comment, whatever you want to call it.
   But I, sitting here, am aware that people have at
   least said that Senator Sanborn said to \overline{\mathrm{No.6}}
   wouldn't you like to -- I mean, have sex with her.
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But in a more crude
7
   term?
8
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Yes. Well, I -- I don't
a
   know because I haven't heard -- I mean -- it's a --
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So do you talk to
11
            about that?
   No. 6
12
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember talking
13
              about that.
   to No. 6
14
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: And as you sit here
15
   today, at least right at this moment, you don't
13
   remember meeting with N_0.2 and hearing that --
17
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't.
13
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- there are at least
19
   some concerns about his comments about the way she
20
   looks and the way she dresses?
21
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't.
22
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Do you remember giving
```

2

3

Δ

5

6

8

13

12

13

14

15

16

17

12

19

20

21

22

23

advice of just don't be alone in a room with him with the door closed?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember that -you know, if somebody has a concern, that's good advice, but it's probably not enough.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But do you have any -would have any -- any notes or --

RICHARD LEHMANNN: I don't have any notes of it, which is not to say that there wasn't a time when I did or -- I mean, I just don't have a recollection of it.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So, to me, if something like that is transpiring, if you have a Senator who's making off-handed somewhat sexual comments, comments that would make the average person uncomfortable --

> Um-hmm. RICHARD LEHMANN:

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- I mean, I would assume though doesn't happen that cften, or does it? RICHARD LEHMANN: I would say it's fair to say it doesn't happen that often.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So that would -- I would think that would be something that would sort

```
of remain in your memory, unless it's commonplace.
just -- I don't know -- I don't know the inner
workings over there.
        RICHARD LEHMANN: It's not commonplace.
```

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Was it commonplace

with him, such as it's -- well, that's Senator Sanborn?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I have only heard -- I heard one remark myself. And I've heard of this other remark.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Which is the remark to

12

1

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

To No. 6 wouldn't you RICHARD LEHMANN: like to and -- I mean, I guess -- I don't have a specific recollection of somebody telling me'that Senator Sanborn was commenting on the way No. 2 dressed, appeared, or carried herself in any way. don't have a specific recollection of it. But I feel like people have -- I just don't remember.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: September -now we move onto September of '13

RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Chuck Morse

```
takes over as Senate President.
1
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.
2
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Does he come to
3
   you -- there's a -- what he referred to as a council
4
   or --
5
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Jackson-Lewis.
6
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Leadership --
7
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- the
8
   Leadership Committee, they tell him, among other
   things I'm sure, that this issue in their opinion is
10
   unresolved.
11
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Should have been handled
12
   -- they thought it should have been handled
13
14
   differently.
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
15
   unresolved.
16
            RICHARD LEHMANN: And so they thought it
17
   should have been handled differently by an outside --
18
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Which is the No. 1
19
   incident; correct?
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Yes.
21
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: The Leadership
22
    thought it should have been handled --
23
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

15

17

13

19

20

21

22

RICHARD LEHMANN: There were people in the group who thought it should have been handled differently.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Who are those people? RICHARD LEHMANN: I wasn't part of the -- I wasn't part of the meeting, but my understanding it was Forrester and Carson.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Do you know who -- so who decides to seek outside counsel in --

RICHARD LEHMANN: Well, the President makes the ultimate decision to have Jackson-Lewis come in. and review how we handled the situation and conduct a follow-up inquiry.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So your memory serves you then, the primary reason they're brought in is to look at that --

RICHARD LEHMANN: I think that --

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- matter?

RICHARD LEHMANN: -- at that point they were brought in to -- I don't remember the exact chronology of it. We were already being asked to look at updating our sexual harassment policy. Paul Twomey was the House Legal Counsel at the time. And

5

6

10

11

13

```
I think that that -- that we had already had
  conversation -- and I don't remember whether we hired
  Jackson-Lewis before that started. I think it
  started before we hired Jackson-Lewis. And Jackson-
  Lewis was brought in as much to consult with us on
  how to handle that, as to conduct the interview.
  it was all part of the same representation for them.
  The reason we called Jackson-Lewis was to deal with
  the specific attorney, Tom -- you have memos -- Tom
   -- I can't remember his name. He had -- and I
   suggested we call him, because he had represented a,
   staff member in the House, my first go-round in the
   early two thousands, who had won a -- I think they
   won a jury trial against the House for sexual
14
                                                     And
   harassment. I think her name was No. 11
15
   when Betsy Miller was the Legal Counsel to the House,
16
   I think she may even have testified in the case, and
17
   it was -- and it was complicated, so we knew he would
18
   be aware of the institutional limitations we have in
19
   dealing with elected officials who are sent to us by
20
   the people and were not our employees. in the
21
   strictest sense of the word. I'm embarrassed, I
   can't remember the lawyer's name right now.
```

23

```
ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: It's all right.
1
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So the -- at
2
   least one of the attorneys from Jackson-Lewis
3
   interviews No. 1
4
           RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              Correct.
5
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: You're present
6
   for that interview?
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              No.
8
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: You're not
9
   present for that?
10
                              No. I think that part of
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
11
   the reason they wanted to bring an outside lawyer in
12
   was more or less to double check my work. And there
13
   was -- there were people who thought that we should
14
   have brought in an outside person from the very
15
   beginning. And that's one way to handle it. I'm not
   sure if it's necessary, but it's, you know, now that
17
   we're here, it's nice to have had that.
18
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Is that the extent
19
   of what that attorney does, is interview No. 1
20
   you know --
21
            RICHARD LEHMANN: He did a lot of work with
```

us on rewriting the sexual harassment policy. As far

2)

2:

as double checking that I -- that's all I'm gware of that he did.

ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Meaning does he talk to No.6

RICHARD LEHMANN: See, I don't think he did
talk to No.6

I've only -- I think I've only ever seen his
interview notes or report of his conversation with

No. 1

ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Not notes of -- and that's all I've seen -- but not notes of interviews with anybody else that you're aware of?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Not that I can recall seeing, but it might be. Again, I mean, we're had all that stuff assembled and put together in a package that we reviewed with the Attorney General on the manner in which we responded to the Right to Know requests. And I think -- I mean, you have everything that exists.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: In your time there, in your position there, if Jay Flanders did, in fact, give a certain amount of monies to an intern, and you were aware of that, would you find it

worthy of follow-up, concern?

14.

1

2

3

5

8

Ģ

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

RICHARD LEHMANN: For me, personally?

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Well, like you witnessed that comment and you have -- you feel concern -- if you saw that, would it be -- what to you would be concerning?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't know, that's a hypothetical and I -- I mean, I never saw anything like that, or was aware of anything like that. don't know.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Does Jay Flanders have a reputation for helping people out?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Jay's my friend. mean Jay is an interesting character because he's very -- I don't even know if you've spoken to him. He's very -- he comes across as stiff on the outside. You know, that's his -- that's what he projects to the world as a very sort of removed, remote personality. But I've known him for a number of years, and I know he has -- he develops a soft spot for people. And I may know him better than anybody over there. And so it wouldn't surprise me if he took a liking to somebody who needed help and he

thought was a -- sort of a meritorious person who needed a boost. That wouldn't surprise me at all.

But I don't think that would be his reputation either, because I feel like I know him better than just about anybody over there. We went through -- you know, we went through some tough times together when our boss, Tom Eaton, was removed as Senate President by the body and replaced with Ted Gatsas, we all got run out together, more or lass. And, you know, that's -- that was hard.

ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: He never tells you, though, or exposes to you that he, you know, wants to help No.1 out and, you know, whether it's you know, something completely legitimate, he wants to give him some money to help out with gas or clothes. Never says anything along those lines?

RICHARD LEHMANN: No. I -- it's my understanding that No.1 was in a position that he needed that kind of help. I mean, when No.1 was an intern, people felt -- and I -- I again, I don't know his background. My understanding through third and fourth hand hearsay that goes around is that, you know, No.1 did not come from a privileged

background, and he worked very hard, and he was very eager about pursuing opportunities everywhere he went. He was always sort of looking for more to do and looking for work to do. And I think that's why Angela thought he was the best intern to bring in to do the job and -- his work -- quality of work was good. And that's my understanding of why they hired him, because --

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: On that note, do you think it was Angela then that put him in the position?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Angela was the Deputy
Chief of Staff at the time. And my recollection is
she was responsible for running the intern program.
The Chief of Staff was responsible for hirin, people
and deciding where they work and what their work
assignment is. More than most places, it's a -- it's
a balance and a negotiation that happens. Like I
said, you know, the Senate just hired two new people
to the Democratic Caucus. I'm -- I don't know for
sure -- I'm pretty confident that those are the two
people that the Democratic Caucus requested or
recommended. That's the way it works over there. I

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

2 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

don't know what the dynamic for deciding who was going to work in the Clerk's Office was, and I don't know if they checked with the Clerk's Office first or if they typically ask the Clerk for input. I don't know whether it was because -- you know, I mman, I guess it was -- if you're telling me it was & twoweek revolving contract, that's more than I knew. You know, whether on that basis somebody just gets put in, I really don't know.

Is there ever -- I ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: mean -- you know, with respect to No. 1 maybe not coming from means and working hard and needing help, is there ever, you know, office-wide solicitation, hey, let's pitch in for a gift card for No.1 or anything like that?

> I don't remember That. RICHARD LEHMANN: ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Okay.

I think -- I think that RICHARD LEHMANN: would be an unusual thing because it would be embarrassing.

ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Okay. And is there -- are you aware of accounts or monies that Bither the Chief of Staff or the Senate President would have

PENGAD • 1-800 631-6989 • www perigad corre

...

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

Do they have an account, or a fund, or access to? petty cash?

There's a budget. I have RICHARD LEHMANN: very little to do with the budgeting process, either in the State House or, you know, for legislative employees or for the government more broadly -- it's not my wheelhouse.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But are you aware of petty cash, you know, an envelope in the drawer that has 500 dollars in case you need to go to Staples and buy a thumb drive or something that you need quickly?

RICHARD LEHMANN: I assume that there must be something, but I don't know what it is. know anything about it, and I've never been asked to get anything, or told that anything we're purchasing is coming from there.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So you've never seen

RICHARD LEHMANN: I've never seen an envelope, or a box, or anything, no. In my office there's a box.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Yeah, sometimes box -you know, if you need stamps or -- used to be --

3

4

5

7

10

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

```
literally to go by a thumb drive or --
```

Um-hmm. RICHARD LEHMANN:

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- you need toner. Right in the old days, it used to be toner. Go buy some toner and then come -- you know, bring the receipt and the change back.

RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah. I don't know how they do it.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Would it be surprising to you if -- so there's -- if interns are informed as they come in, just as a matter of course, that Senator Sanborn is an individual you avoid -- at least you certainly don't allow yourself to be alone in a room with him or other --

RICHARD LEHMANN: As a group --

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Well if they told --

RICHARD LEHMANN: It would surprise me if the whole group was notified?

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: No, no They're told -- interns coming in are told as a matter of course, well Senator Sanborn -- other employees there saying something similar that is

```
common knowledge. Have you heard this --
           RICHARD LEHMANN: I have not heard --
2.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- sort of
3
   talk?
4
           RICHARD LEHMANN: -- that.
5
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: No.
6
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: What about other staff
7
   members, secretaries?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Other --
9
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Would the secretary --
10
           RICHARD LEHMANN: -- to stay away from him?
11
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Not to go into -- not
12
   to be left alone in the office with the door closed.
12
   Make sure you don't find yourself in that situation.
14
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No, I have not heard that.
15
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: What's your
16
   relationship with Senator Sanborn?
17
                RICHARD LEHMANN: Now? It's very
18
   strained.
19
          ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: What was it before?
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I would say it was never
21
   -- I was never friendly with him, but I was never
   hostile to him. I used to go to the Draft to have
23
```

```
ASEH BONU FORM 3
```

```
drinks after work sometimes. But most of the time he
1
   wasn't there.
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: What was Jay Flanders'
3
   relationship?
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Tense. They had a lot of
   tension between them.
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Did that ease over
7
   time?
8
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No, not that I'm aware of.
   I think it got more acute over time.
10
          ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Do you know what
11
   the cause of that tension was, or what the issues
12
   were between the two of them?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't -- I think it was
14
   a matter of style. I'm not aware of any specific
15
   debate or, you know, specific issue that happened.
16
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: It's not because
17
   Senator Sanborn's a headache for Jay, because of
18
   reasons like we're talking about?
19
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No, I don't think it has
20
   to do with reasons we're talking about. I think it
21
   has to do with -- with governing.
22
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Back to sort of the
23
```

```
ASER BOWD FORM B
```

```
staffer issue. Do you remember a time when he was
1
   told he wasn't going to have an intern or a staffer
3
           RICHARD LEHMANN: He -- Senator Sanborn?
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- until -- yes.
5
   Until --
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              Yeah.
7
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So tell me about that.
8
   Until he could do some type of training, or.
9
                              The Senate required him to
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
10
   do a sexual harassment training and establish that he
11
   had done it. And there was a -- there had been a
12
   reorganization happening. And I don't remember if it
13
   was midterm or immediately on the heels of an
14
   election -- probably would have been -- it wouldn't
   have been in an election year, I don't thin k_{\rm tr} but I'm
16
   just not sure. And he was told that he would not
17
   have any staff until he first showed us that he had
18
   completed the -- a sexual harassment training.
19
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Was this before or
20
   after the No 1 incident?
21
            RICHARD LEHMANN: After, I think.
22
    certainly after, because it's part of my
```

```
correspondence with his lawyer.
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Before or after the
2.:
          incident?
  No. 6
           RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't know. I don't
   remember the timing. When you say the No.\,6
5
   incident --
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: When he said to No.6
7
8
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Concerning No. 2
9
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Yes.
10
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember. I don't
11
   remember when that was. It -- I mean, we could
12
   probably -- I don't remember.
13
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So when he's told,
14
   you're not going to get any staff until you complete
   a sexual harassment training, what was his attitude
16
   at that point?
17
            RICHARD LEHMANN: He did it.
18
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: How quickly did he do
19
   it?
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: A couple weeks, I think.
21
   That was around -- the dates are on my correspondence
22
   with his lawyer. And he didn't go until after I
23
```

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

```
wrote a letter to his lawyer. So I believe that was
around December of '13, November of '13, somewhere in
there,
```

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: And then he got staff? RICHARD LEHMANN: Then he got staff. there was a -- because of staff reassignments that were happening, and I don't know that it's related to this at all, or just general churn -- because I think it was around the same time that Senators were moving, because Bragdon had resigned, I recall. there was a shuffle going on and then a staff listing was going to be published. And the question was whether or not he would have to explain why he had no staff to anybody or whether he was going to go to this sexual harassment training, and had a staff member assigned.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: And he did the training?

RICHARD LEHMANN: He did the twaining. ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: And since them, any other incidents that you're aware of involving either crass, crude, or sexual comments?

RICHARD LEHMANN: Not that I'm awars of.

```
PENGAD - 1-800 631-6989 - mm perigral con
LASEH BOND FOHM B
```

```
Any scuttlebutt about
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG:
1
   that?
2
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                               No.
 3
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: And the impetus for
 4
   that training requirement, as far as you're aware,
 5
                 incident?
   was the No 1
 б
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                               Yes.
 7
            ATTORNEY GEOFFREY WARD: Nothing else?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't know. I mean, the
 9
    -- I guess sitting here, there -- I'm feeling like I
10
    am aware that there were rumors but I -- other than
11
    the thing involving No. 2 I don't know specific -- no,
12
    nothing that's sort of actionable. But I think it
    was -- it all came together when we had the Jackson-
14
    Lewis report, we had sexual harassment training
15
    coming up, and somebody decided that the staff -- it
16
    was probably Jay, you know, because it's ultimately
 17
    his responsibility not to assign a staff member until
18
    he completed the course. I don't exactly regall how
19
    those things all tied together.
20
             ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Was he the only one
21
    that had to do the course or was this the -- sort of
 22
    the --
```

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

RICHARD LEHMANN: He's the only one who had to do an independent course. President Morse recommended that everybody attend the training that we did in January '14. We had Marty Van Oot come in and do it. She was at Jackson-Lewis too. And, you know, I -- everybody -- there was -- it was -- we made a point to make sure that everybody attended. ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But he had to have remedial training? RICHARD LEHMANN: He had -- he -- yes ahead of the staff listing coming out.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Anything that re haven't asked you?

> RICHARD LEHMANN: Not that I can recall. INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Just so that I

am clear on this, Rick. If the incident involving

happens around February --

RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- and say recollection is she has -- it's a daily --No. 2 daily occurrence with her, and that she's brought in -- whether it's your direction or other -- someone else's direction, but she remembers it being yourself

```
and Senator Forrester and, I think Jay Flanders,
  anyway -- and she's not -- she's immediately removed
  after that meeting from -- directly from being in his
3
   office --
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm. Well she wasn't
   in his office. I mean --
6
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: She's removed
7
   from his --
8
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Staffing him.
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Yeah --
10
           RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah.
11
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
                                        -- staffing
12
   him. As a result, she believed, because she leaves
13
   that meeting and now she's -- her desk is moved --
14
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              Okay.
15
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Could that
16
   impetus for that investigation be a -- because of a
17
   pattern of conduct as opposed to an incident?
18
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Which investigation?
19
   Jackson-Lewis people coming in? It's possible.
20
   mean, I just sitting here right now don't have a
21
   recollection of thinking this is a -- sort of a
   consistent and ongoing thing. I remember No. 2
23
```

-13

1'7

2!

I'm trying to remember sitting in a meeting, and I just can't -- but I do feel like relative -- I don't know, I feel like I had a conversation with No.2 at some point, or a conversation that she was involved in at some point, to just say, if you have a problem, we'll take care of you, we want this to be a place you can work, that kind of conversation. I just -- I don't have any recollection of what the specifics of why were. I don't recall today knowing that at the time, and -- but if she's saying it happened. I'm not -- it absolutely could have.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Do you -- so the first incident with No.1 you hear it.

RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm.

discussion and then you go back and you have a conversation with Senator Sanborn, protecting sort of the identity, but saying -- you know, to the extent you're saying stuff, this isn't the -- you know, shouldn't say it and certainly not in this environment. Do you remember having a similar conversation after learning that there's some incident involving No. 2

RICHARD LEHMANN: I-don't remember that. ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- whether it's 2. comments to her or comments to --3 RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember that 4 happening. 5 ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Why wouldn't that have 6 happened? 7 RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't know. If what No. 2 8 is saying is that she was moved -- and I remember her being moved to Senator Forrester's office down -- I 10 think it was in the Finance Chair's -- I mean, I 11 think it was the time that Senator -- I thirt that all happened around the same time. I'm not Bure. So 13 -- but why didn't something happen? I just don't 14 know. 15 ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: I mean, I would assume 16 it was your recommendation the first time, hey, we 17 got to go talk to this guy, this is a liability 18 waiting to happen; correct? 19 RICHARD LEHMANN: I don't remember if it was 20 my suggestion to talk to him. I wrote a memo because 21 I was the witness to something. 22

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But there's of first

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

12

19

20

21

22

23

If it happened again within a matter conversation. of months, I guess I'm wondering why there wasn't a second conversation?

RICHARD LEHMANN: There might have been. don't recall it, but I'm not saying it isn't possible or didn't happen. I just don't recall it happening. And I remember one -- you know, one tense conversation with Sanborn and Flanders in the -saying don't behave like this, you're putting everybody -- you're putting the institution at risk, you're creating possible liability. And it was -you know, it was an uncomfortable conversation to have with a State Senator who outranks you in every way. But it was the -- you know, that's the right conversation to have. I don't remember when it happened or if it was before or after anything that happened with No. 2 I just know it happened.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: I would assume if No. 2 -- at least her desk gets initially moved and she's not staffing him anymore, there would have to have been some conversation why she wasn't his staffer, and you were not part of that conversation? "

RICHARD LEHMANN: Well, there was a

5

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

2.0

21

23

conversation about whether he was going to have any staff. And I don't remember if that happened -- I mean, I have no recollection. Based on the way this interview has gone, it seems to me that, that might have happened six months apart. I -- you know, because I know that the conversation about whether Sanborn was going to have any staff happened around the time I was writing letters to his lawyer. And I know that, you know, I've seen those dates - it's sometime in late fall, early winter of '13. I don't recall when No. 2 was moved out of -- I think she was moved out of 302, right, and downstairs? I don't know -- that's -- I mean, I think she went with Forrester, but I don't know. I didn't -- I'm guessing as much as remembering.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So you, early on, had asserted a privilege. At least do we have all the documents that have been compiled so we would have that document, or are there documents that --

RICHARD LEHMANN: The letters? Those are all -- those are the correspondence? documents that I collected that had -- that were relevant to Right to Know request. We received the

first one from Susan Olsen in October of '16. and from the very beginning we collected them all. did a Vaughn Index of materials we were not disclosing, just because it was -- I mean, that's the way the President wanted to respond to the Right to Know request, by being -- providing more information than we were required to, but doing everything we could to protect the identity of people involved.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: But are there any documents --

RICHARD LEHMANN: There's no other paper that I'm aware of.

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So then just -- why did you assert the privilege -- so I just want to go back and --

RICHARD LEHMANN: There's one thing -- there is -- there's one piece of paper that you may not have, and it's not interesting. It's the backside of an invoice from the bookkeeping office that shows the slightest bit more billing detail than was criginally provided, because their scanner only scans on one side of the paper, and it was the backside. New Hampshire Public Radio kept pressing us for

```
information on the Right to Know request and within
1
   the past couple of months, I think after, we had a
   meeting with the Attorney General. So I don't know
3
   if we actually caught you guys up with that, but we
   can and bookkeeping has it. It's just -- it's
5
   billing information.
6
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So there's --
7
                              There's no other memos --
           RICHARD LEHMANN:
8
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Okay. I didn't know
9
   if there was --
10
            RICHARD LEHMANN: -- or correspondence.
11
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- some guidance from
12
   Jackson-Lewis that hadn't been turned over, or if you
13
14
                              I don't --
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
15
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- reduced something
16
   in writing that you're claiming the -- I'm just
17
   trying --
18
                              There may be some of --
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
19
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- to figure out --
20
            RICHARD LEHMANN: -- there may be
21
   correspondence, and I haven't looked for it and --
22
   having to do with recommendations about how we
23
```

```
changed our sexual harassment policy, but nothing
1
   dealing with the incident.
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Or any incidents --
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Or any incidents with
   anybody.
5
6
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- dealing with
   Sanborn and the way he conducts himself --
7
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Correct.
8
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- in the State House
9
   or allegations or complaints?
10
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Right.
                                      I'm not in
11
   possession of any other paper having to do with
12
   Sanborn.
13
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Has anybody else come
14
   to you that's not a State staffer to complain or give
15
   you any information about Senator Sanborn?
16
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              That's not a -- no.
17
18
   to me.
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Nobody at the bar has
10
20
   said anything to you?
            RICHARD LEHMANN: No. At the Draft --
21
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Yeah
22
                              -- or the Bar Association?
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
23
```

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: At the Draft? 1 RICHARD LEHMANN: No, nobody at the bar has 2 said anything to me. 3 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: As far as talk 4 about the possibility that Jay Flanders gave monies 5 to No. 1 as someone might call hush money, or he was 6 given a job --7 RICHARD LEHMANN: Um-hmm. INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- that he 9 would not have gotten had this incident not occurred, 10 are you aware of any follow-up on either one of 11 12 those, by anyone? RICHARD LEHMANN: No. Who would follow up 13 -- I mean --INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Well, I just 15 asked because you heard him make a comment and it got 16 followed up on --17 RICHARD LEHMANN: I didn't hear him make a 18 comment -- I heard somebody say he made a comment. 19 INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: No, no, I'm 20 talking about --21 RICHARD LEHMANN: I heard somebody say that 22 somebody else heard him make a comment. 23

```
PENGAD - 1:Bou 631:6989 • www.pengad.com
```

```
No, I mean as
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT:
 1
    far as the comment that you actually heard --
 2
            RICHARD LEHMANN: The Sanborn comment?
 3
             INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Right. You
 4
    followed up -- you --
 5
             RICHARD LEHMANN: I followed up on that one
 6
    too.
 7
             INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: -- saw that it
 8
    was followed up on.
 9
             RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah.
 10
             INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: I'm wondering
- 11
    of either of these two incidents, anyone felt were
 12
    worthy of follow-up?
 13
             RICHARD LEHMANN: By the -- no. I heard of
 14
     this -- the -- I heard of this hush money business
 15
    from Bob Clegg writing something about me on the New
 16
     Hampshire Public Radio's website. And by that time,
 17
     I mean, it was -- I don't remember the details.
 18
     Attorney General's have been involved to review Right
 19
     to Know proceedings and now, you know, we're here.
 20
     So I shut down my end of it --
 21
              INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Gotcha.
```

RICHARD LEHMANN: You know, I wasn't running

```
around, you know, talking to people about it anymore.
1
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: You good?
2
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Yeah.
3
           INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: Any questions
4
   of us?
5
           RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              No.
6
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: So we may have jogged
7
   your memory as far as, you know, meeting with _{
m No.\,2} or
8
   somebody. So if you leave here -- and you're going
9
   to think about it --
10
            RICHARD LEHMANN:
                              Yeah.
11
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- just call Scott and
12
   we can --
13
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Can I ask you this
14
   question? If I compare notes of my memory with
15
   anybody else, is that impeding your investigation in
16
   any way?
17
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: You know, I wouldn't
18
   recommend that you do that. I would --
19
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Okay.
20
            ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- try to go straight
21
    on your memory. And we can sort of sort those
22
    details out. It's time. I get -- four plus years,
```

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

that some of the details. But, also, there's many times that you think, I don't remember. And an hour later you're like, hey this is what happens. I mean, we do it all the time, right, because you haven't thought about it --

> Right. RICHARD LEHMANN:

ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: -- and then it sort of comes -- comes rushing back as you're driving home or

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: And if it's someone we haven't spoken to you yet, we're going to ask them that question, and then we're going to have to do this a second time.

> RICHARD LEHMANN: Yeah.

INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: So with that said, we'll end this interview at --

If I can ask -- if I have RICHARD LEHMANN: one feeling about it, it's that I feel like writing a memo about what I witnessed myself and passing it up the food chain, and then speaking to the people who might have been offended by it, was the right thing to do. And to be honest with you, I feel like I bought myself a whole lot of trouble for my -- for

```
doing that but -- and it's not just you guys, it's
1
   all the Right to Know request stuff and all -- none
2
   of this is what I signed on for.
           ATTORNEY JANE YOUNG: Sometimes the -- you
4
   know, the right road gets bumpy, but it doesn't mean
5
   it's not the right thing to do.
6
            RICHARD LEHMANN: Right.
7
            INVESTIGATOR SCOTT GILBERT: With that said,
   we will end this interview. Thank you very much.
9
           RICHARD LEHMANN: All right.
10
11
   (End)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```