WITNESS INTERVIEW EXCERPTS

November 24, 2009 - Bill Postmus and Matt Brown Secret Recording [Track 01]

MATT BROWN: You have this internal conflict on your staff with your two top people. At the same time you are on drugs and not of sound mind.

BILL POSTMUS: Yes, yes, yes, yes. That was real good, wasn’t it?

BROWN: It was a nice dysfunctional, uh - -

POSTMUS: It sounds like a County operation, doesn’t it? Yeah. Yeah. That was - that was real, real swift, right? Ugh, yeah, don’t remind me about it.

November 24, 2009 - Bill Postmus and Matt Brown Secret Recording [Track 02]

MATT BROWN: Based on the complaints . . .

BILL POSTMUS: Based - based on the complaints of them not being honest because like, for instance, with nothing that they served of my warrant on is accurate. And they know it’s not accurate, and they actually basically just lie. Adam would give them little - little snippets - basically other than, than the warrant - other than where they said we took the PAC money and the quid pro quo, okay, other than that, Adam, nothing Adam said was a lie.

November 24, 2009 - Bill Postmus and Matt Brown Secret Recording [Track 03]

BILL POSTMUS: I read through a lot of discovery now, and I don’t know how much Adam actually lied - you know what I mean, you know what I mean -- with Jim. I mean with the Jim stuff, know what I mean.

January 16, 2010 - Bill Postmus and Matt Brown Secret Recording [Track 04]

BILL POSTMUS: Well, he didn’t really lie. What he did is -- he took a story and made and -- but see, I don’t listened to the tapes yet. I don’t know how the investigator asked the questions. Okay. I just have read the transcripts. Okay. It’s important for me to listen to the tapes eventually because you can hear -- you know what I mean -- how the conversation -- but
what was said though either by them asking or Adam telling is the story were twisted. You know
- Like you can tell a story, but not all the background behind the story, you know.

    MATT BROWN: Right.

    POSTMUS: So it makes it sound different.

    BROWN: Well, I'm like this thing on these fucking campaign contributions and payoffs
is bullshit.

    POSTMUS: It's total bullshit.

    BROWN: Well, then how can you say he didn't lie then?

    POSTMUS: He never actually said that there were, that there were, you know, that
people bribed. He never actually said that, that's what the investigators just –

    BROWN: They – they asked him?

    POSTMUS: Yeah.

---

**February 16, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 05]**

    BILL POSTMUS: That, you know, were, were . . .

    BOB SCHREIBER: [Inaudible.]

    POSTMUS: Yeah. That, were, were, he did not take place in China. But, uh, that
discussions that took place where, where Jeff, ya know, I mean, Jeff and I became friends. Uh, we
became friends, ya know. And, and . . .

    SCHREIBER: I understand.

    POSTMUS: Yeah.

    SCHREIBER: But, but, but, but don't frame it that way. We're very . . . We want to be
very specific about this.

    POSTMUS: Sure.

    SCHREIBER: Okay. There are discussions about taking care of you politically. Let's
hear about that.

    POSTMUS: Well, Yeah. No. He - he had said that that they would support me in the
future, that he would personally support me in the future.
SCHREIBER: If --

POSTMUS: He didn’t say if the settlement was done. He said he would support me in the future.

SCHREIBER: If - if what?

POSTMUS: Well, I mean Jeff and I were good friends. You know.

SCHREIBER: Okay. Come on, Bill --

POSTMUS: No. I’m not. You want me to tell you the truth and [Inaudible] that’s what I’m doing.

February 16, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 06]

BILL POSTMUS: Jeff never crossed the line with me with regards to the Colonies.

February 16, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 07]

BUD RANDLES: What about incentives that, uh, he proposed, uh, for you to approval the Colonies settlement?

BILL POSTMUS: Like, with respect to what, Bud?

RANDLES: Like, I will support your candidacy for the Assessor.

POSTMUS: No, well, he - he never did that. Because, I mean, he never did – he never said that. He never - never said that. He was very clear – he was very, very clear, Jeff was, that he wasn’t going to support or give anybody or do anything during the Colonies settlement.

February 16, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 08]

BILL POSTMUS: He didn’t have to incentivize me to do . . . I believe, and I still do believe, that we needed to settle the Colonies. That it was just about coming to the right number. And he never, he never - Jeff Burum never ever had a conversation with me with respect to, you know, where he made any threats or, or, said to the fact, you know, if you, you know, if you do this, I’ll do this.
BUD RANDLEs: There was a $100,000 that was contributed to you and others that, uh, approved the lawsuit and Jim Erwin, who facilitated it. This $100,000 was discussed with you prior to the lawsuit being settled. The $100,000 contribution to you in some form.

BILL POSTMUS: No. No. That was not discussed. As I stated earlier that was discussed after I was sworn in as Assessor. It was never discussed prior.

RANDLEs: The $100,000 contributions to others that were involved in the approving of this lawsuit was discussed with you prior to the lawsuit . . .

POSTMUS: No.

RANDLEs: . . . being settled.

POSTMUS: No. It was discussed after. Money - money was never - money was never discussed.

BOB SCHREIBER: How about support, Bill?

POSTMUS: Well, they had already -- I mean, uh . . .

SCHREIBER: Even its through Jim. Did Jim?

POSTMUS: No. Jim was -- Jim was only the threats.

SCHREIBER: Only the threats?

POSTMUS: Correct.

SCHREIBER: Okay.

RANDLEs: Characterize . . .

POSTMUS: Nothing was positive with Jim. It was always . . .

RANDLEs: Characterize the $100,000, uh, that went to you from Colonies Partners, uh, that was for what purpose?

POSTMUS: Well, it was a campaign contribution after the fact.

RANDLEs: For what purpose?

POSTMUS: Well, I'm not gonna, you know, I'm not going to say because I do not, you know, I'm not going to say because I don't . . . Ya know, I know what you want me to say, but, I- I, you know.
February 16, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 10]

STEVEN LEVINE: You gave me a feeling and an impression yesterday, didn’t you, as to what you thought the money was for.

BILL POSTMUS: Not the campaign contribution.

LEVINE: Yes. In terms of the bad blood between the County and Colonies to make up for --

POSTMUS: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Just, you know, because the fact that there was -- after the Colonies settlement, there was a ton of bad blood. Everybody hated everybody. After the fact that it was over with.

March 01, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 11]

INTERVIEWER: Not but, I think what – [Inaudible] correct me if I’m wrong. Something – ya know, firing your outside expert, who is an expert in these matters – remember you guys aren’t –

BILL POSTMUS: Correct.

INTERVIEWER: . . . because the guy who’s suing you tells you to do it, there’s a reason why you and Paul did that. Talk about that.

POSTMUS: Oh, I mean, we . . . oh, talk about why we did it?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

POSTMUS: Well, the reason why we did it, I mean, we truly believed, we truly believed, at that time, I mean, Paul and I truly believed – I haven’t talked to Paul about this in a long time, but we truly believed that our attorney was giving us bad advice on this because the fact that we had lost that court trial.

INTERVIEWER: Because you lost the court trial –

POSTMUS: With, with uh, with Norell.
March 01, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 12]

BUD RANDLEs: Because what I understand from other interviews that I’ve had with other people is that you had already represented to them that you were getting $100,000 from Jeff Burum to settle Colonies.

BILL POSTMUS: That is not the fact. Yeah, I don’t – it took place when I was inside the Assessor’s office – it took place, the conversation took place – I don’t – I don’t remember exactly when I was in there, but it took place when I was in the Assessor’s office.

BOB SCHREIBER: So you knew you were going to get money, you just didn’t know how much.

POSTMUS: Well, I didn’t know how much I was going to get and when.

March 01, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 13]

BOB SCHREIBER: Jim Brulte calls you during the time between the time you had the agreement and the time you do the vote . . .

BILL POSTMUS: November 28th.

SCHREIBER: . . . and says you ought to scuttle it.

POSTMUS: Yeah. He didn’t use that word, but he said you shouldn’t, you shouldn’t support this deal. That was basically it and not allow it to move forward.

SCHREIBER: You didn’t ask him why?

POSTMUS: You know what Bud, I was so out of it. I mean, I am being totally honest with you, I was so out of it. I just wanted to get this damn thing done.

March 10, 2011 - Bill Postmus Interview [Track 14]

BUD RANDLEs: There are also instances when you have lapses of memory when one would expect you to remember those instances. Obviously you’ve explained to us that, uh, you were dealing with your addiction problems at the time and other things in your life, but because this is the fourth time we’ve met, you’ve had time to reflect upon some of these questions, some of these issues that we raised. I’m hoping that -- by that you are able to better remember

- 6 -
occurrences, meetings, statements by others, and when these occurred and what was said and what was done.

That’s, that’s my expectation, that’s my anticipation -- because we’ve raised certain things that you were able to go back think about them and come into our next meeting with uh, a better, uh, perception of what occurred in the past. Is that, uh, something that is occurring, something that is happening that, uh, by having these meetings, having certain issues, certain questions raised, that you’re able to better remember what occurred?

POSTMUS: Oh I think I’ve, I think every meeting I’ve, been able to, you know, um -- what’s the better, what’s the word I’m looking for -- I think ever meeting I’ve been able to, uh --

SPEAKER: Recollect.

POSTMUS: Recollect and, you know, explain things a little better. I think every meeting its -- positive.

January 21, 2009 - Adam Aleman and Dino DeFazio Phone Conversation [Track 15]

ADAM ALEMAN: He really let us down by being on drugs . . .

February 19, 2009 - Adam Aleman Phone Interview [Track 16]

INTERVIEWER: Did he ever give you any indication that he may have received monies from anyone in . . .

ADAM ALEMAN: Um.

INTERVIEWER: . . . respect to this, uh, Colonies settlement?

ALEMAN: No . . .

April 29, 2009 - Adam Aleman Phone Interview [Track 17]

ADAM ALEMAN: This is just Bill talking. And, we’re not dealing with, right now - I mean, his brain is a little fried. I mean, we’re not dealing with a smart Bill, a smart -- ya know, Bill, Bill is just talking out loud, and he seems to think that he could have issue -- he said, ya know, the issue is that I decided to support Brad, and -- and, Burum said we need to take care of
Mark Kirk. Um, and, so that, and then, so, they kind of came up with this package to get Mark to agree not to run against Brad.

February 08, 2010 - Adam Aleman Phone Interview [Track 18]

BUD RANDELS: That’s okay. Uh, so you say Bill seems to be lucid or he does not?

ADAM ALEMAN: He seems – he seems to be lucid, but, um, he doesn’t seem to be as sharp as he does, he was in the past. So, I really can’t say if he’s on drugs or not. Um, I really – I really can’t tell. He does seem a little bit more jittery and um -- and uh -- paranoid.

April 15, 2010 - Adam Aleman Phone Interview [Track 19]

ADAM ALEMAN: Bud, I think he’s been hitting it hard, uh, the drugs again.

May 26, 2010 - Adam Aleman Interview [Track 20]

ADAM ALEMAN: Bill, has... his memory wasn’t that great at the time because of the drugs, um, also you noticed too in that the type is very large because that would mean Bill would be sitting down, so he could just like cross them off because it was [Inaudible] small, he would just not even read them... so they were talking points.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. And did that actually -- did Postmus requested those or that was your idea to give it to him?

ALEMAN: No, he requested them.

April 23, 2009 - Matt Brown Interview [Track 21]

MATT BROWN: And that person by this point in time had zero credibility with me. That was -- that was Bill Postmus.

February 18, 2010 - Matt Brown Interview [Track 22]

MATT BROWN: Bill Postmus, who is a - you know - a drug addict, out of his mind. And, you wouldn’t know how bad Bill was unless you observed him. The guy was so -- if you
pull up Board of Supervisors tapes from 2006, he would sit in the meetings, and he’s … he’s the
chair, he’s got his Blackberry, and he’s sitting there, and he’s like, and he would sit and twitch! I
mean, the guy was out of control.

February 20, 2010 - Matt Brown Interview [Track 23]

BUD RANDLE: They weren’t just throwing a lot of money around. There has been a
$102 million dollars settlement by the County by three supervisors in the County. One of your --
You were the Chief of Staff to one of them. This didn’t escape anybody. Even the stupidest,
dumbest reporter out there, that all he does is copy down what people tell him, understood what
was going on. They understood that this was a pay-off.

June 11, 2010 - Ted Lehrer Interview [Track 24]

BUD RANDLE: I’ve talked to Bill Postmus on a number of occasions. I’ve, uh -- I’ve
studied the man. I’ve, uh, you know, have talked to people that, uh -- as you, that are close to
him, that have a perception of him. Uh, I think I know him pretty well.

TED LEHRER: Okay.

RANDLE: I know -- I know him to the extent that, uh, you know, with the evidence
indicates that he’s impaired at times; is that correct?

LEHRER: Yes.

RANDLE: Okay.

LEHRER: And, he just, he was never really that smart of a guy to begin with. You throw
in the fact that he might be under the influence of a mind-altering substance, you never know
what you’re getting. If you were to ask Bill right now if he spoke to me yesterday, he probably
wouldn’t even remember.

March 17, 2010 - Dennis Wagner Phone Interview [Track 25]

BUD RANDLE: Mr. Lindley has indicated to me that he may recant the statement if
contacted or revise that he has never spoken to Burum.
September 16, 2010 - Dennis Wagner Recording [Track 26]

DENNIS WAGNER: It's not uncommon in litigation for the principals of the other side to contact elected officials, to have a mediator contact elected officials, to say that the County's attorneys are screwing up, that – you know – they are not giving you the right advice, and whatever, to try and negotiate some resolution of a case.

September 16, 2010 - Dennis Wagner Recording [Track 27]

DENNIS WAGNER: People try to contact elected officials and - ya know - tell them that their attorneys suck, that they aren't giving you the right advice, that this is really what's going on in the lawsuit, you need to do something, the County is going to go for a ride - ya know - if you don't settle this case. That happens. Now, most times public officials say, ya know, it's in litigation, we'll just, ya know, sort of let the lawyers handle it. And it's a good way to keep that pressure off of you. It seems to me as an elected official - you know, it's with the lawyers, ya know - whatever, there's really nothing I can do. But it happens – ya know. And, I mean, they can sit down if they want to agree privately to settle the case for a 102 million dollars, they can do that.

March 15, 2010 - Burkhardt Interview [Track 28]

MOREY WEISS: Oh, okay. [Inaudible]. But, anyway, uh, I believe you've been reading the papers and you're up on the fact that our office is looking into this $102 million situation.

ROBERT BURKHARDT: Yeah, okay.

WEISS: We have been for a couple of years. It's uh, and the reason I'm here is, as you know from what did you did with the Grand Jury work, it's like a puzzle.

BURKHARDT: Yeah.

WEISS: And we've got a hundred pieces and we don't want to leave that one piece out of the puzzle.

BURKHARDT: Okay.
WEISS: So what I'm going to talk to you about... we've got knowledge about her a long time. But, it's one of those things that we really weren't jumping into until certain things ignited it to get us going. So what it has to do with was apparently there was an ad hoc committee...

BURKHARDT: Correct.

WEISS: ... started. And you guys were, uh, talking to, uh, Supervisor Paul Biane.

BURKHARDT: Yes. [Inaudible].

WEISS: And, uh, he got somewhat upset...

BURKHARDT: Right.

WEISS: ... or concerned about the questioning. Now when that whole situation started, was the whole idea of the ad hoc committee that the, uh, $102 million or did it have other avenues... you're [Inaudible] to tell me if there were avenues, but did they have other avenues that were going after besides the $102 million [Inaudible]?

BURKHARDT: As far as I know there weren't [Inaudible] were at the interview, but I wasn't there so I don't know.

WEISS: Okay. Do you know who the gentlemen were or the gentlemen or the ladies that were on that ad hoc committee?

BURKHARDT: Yeah, I know the one who made the trouble and he is dead. He died in the meantime. He was the Chair in that committee.

WEISS: And what was his name?

BURKHARDT: That was... gee, it’s right up here... I was surprised. He was one of the [Inaudible]. It says Lam.

WEISS: Lam?

BURKHARDT: Yeah. He is one that, uh, Biane got mad at, you know, between the two of them.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: And he was the kind of person on that Grand Jury that would cause problems for me...

WEISS: Okay.
BURKHARDT: ... from time to time.

WEISS: Was there other people on the committee?

BURKHARDT: There were and I don't remember who they were.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: I can't help you there any.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: I looked through all my stuff and I couldn't find...

WEISS: Now...

BURKHARDT: ... but they didn't last very long.

WEISS: How did the - how did the concerns first come to you? There was a concern over, uh, Lam making these ...

BURKHARDT: Yeah.

WEISS: ... inquiries.

BURKHARDT: Apparently, after Biane, is that the way you pronounce it?

WEISS: Yeah, yes.

BURKHARDT: Yeah, after he got real mad he went to the Judge. And whatever he said to the Judge, he upset the Judge. And then after that happened, the Judge made a memo and sent it over to our lawyer.

WEISS: That was Mr. Hansen at the time?

BURKHARDT: Yeah, yeah.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: And then he told the Grand Jury about it and that is when this witch hunt came in, you know, apparently somebody used [indiscernible] and whether the Judge did or not I don't know.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: But we went over there for... what I sent him over there for was...

WEISS: You said you went over there. Did you go in there?

BURKHARDT: Oh, no. I made an anti committee. I sent them to talk to him, yeah.
WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: It was supposed to be for Sanchez and Erwin. Remember the
[Inaudible]....

WEISS: Oh, okay. Yeah, yeah.

BURKHARDT: [Inaudible] because I knew them.

WEISS: Okay. So they went to talk to Biane it had to do with the fact that they had
entered into a relationship while they were negotiating the contract and...

BURKHARDT: Yes, [Inaudible] stuff.

WEISS: Okay. So that was what the initial ad hoc committee . . .

BURKHARDT: Right.

WEISS: . . . was formed for. And then when they got over there, Lam decided to take it
one step further and began to question about . . .

BURKHARDT: Whatever, that I don’t know.

WEISS: And, uh, did they prepare any reports as far as your aware of?

BURKHARDT: No.

WEISS: Like [“Oh, because if he’s not there anymore I’ll take] [Inaudible]

BURKHARDT: You could use that. It’s the way he said it because he was so mad that we
cut the big committee out [Inaudible] . . . we didn’t make a . . . he sent that to us to print he was
so mad.

WEISS: And then he gave a report on May 24th.

BURKHARDT: And it was late in the season in the term when this all started.

WEISS: Yeah, May 26th so it was about . . . you were probably getting ready to start
writing for him.

BURKHARDT: That is right, yeah. That was one of the reasons we cancelled the meeting
later on . . . we didn’t talk about that.

WEISS: You know, this thing with the Grand Jury regarding [Inaudible]. [Silence].

You’ve been on for a while.

BURKHARDT: Yeah.
[Inaudible]

WEISS: So you want to just start at you directed down to [Inaudible].

BURKHARDT: Well, you know, I checked with Clark first.

WEISS: Right.

BURKHARDT: So [Inaudible] reason that it was late in the term and there wasn’t nothing that was coming out of it at that time.

WEISS: And they start it as investigation regarding the clerk of the board and back again and they discuss [Erwin, Sanchez]. Also, there is no mention of a request of [Inaudible].

BURKHARDT: There was some problem with the clerk of the board at the time, too, [inaudible] Sanchez.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: And they all seemed to kind of, know the Governor was in the Supervisor’s group. She dated [Inaudible] we didn’t know why but…

WEISS: So these are the minutes from the ‘04…

BURKHARDT: ’05.

WEISS: ’05 meeting of May 26th.

BURKHARDT: I’m pretty sure that [inaudible] and I’m not sure anybody [Inaudible]

WEISS: Nick Costa?

BURKHARDT: Yeah, yeah. We didn’t know; Lam was pretty tight… retired Colonel of the Air Force.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: Had a lot of trouble with keeping him in line but…

WEISS: With, uh, Lam or with Nick?

BURKHARDT: No, you know, with both of them.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: And Clark, Anthony and me were members. We never talked to him. He had a lot of discussions with Lam, almost every meeting Lam would argue with him and, you know, they’d have to talk for a long time before doing anything.
WEISS: Okay. [Inaudible]. Okay, now so you are [Inaudible] these interviews for [inaudible].

BURKHARDT: No.

WEISS: It came back to you afterwards. Now would you send them to the Judge?

BURKHARDT: No, no.

WEISS: That was Clark and?

BURKHARDT: Just Clark that I know of.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: I don't even know if he actually talked to him but maybe he did after he got the memo. The Judge [Inaudible] memo went to Clark, that is the way...

WEISS: Do you have a copy of that memo?

BURKHARDT: I don't. No.

WEISS: Okay.

BURKHARDT: I have no idea.

WEISS: Okay, so that came to the Grand Jury somewhere along the road that the Judge wrote a memo. That day you saw the memo?

BURKHARDT: I didn't see it.

WEISS: You did not see it even?

BURKHARDT: No.

WEISS: Who would've seen it?

BURKHARDT: It was all verbal. Well Clark saw it.

WEISS: Clark saw it?

BURKHARDT: Yeah.

WEISS: Okay.

---

**February 16, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 29]**

RANDLES: And, uh, the, the threats that were made to you by Jim Erwin, the threats to expose your lifestyle, your sexuality, your drug use. Those in part influenced your decision to
settle the lawsuit, is that correct?

POSTMUS: Well, like I said, I’m going to clarify that. Um, I had from [inaudible] --

Once I learned -- once I had done my research, I was a supporter publicly for the Colonies
settlement. But it did speed the process up where, I mean, I, you know . . .

SCHRIEBER: This is where you need to be honest with us. Okay?

POSTMUS: Well, yeah. It did speed the process up. I mean, I, I, ya know, it did speed
the process up and Paul and I got it done.

SCHRIEBER: So it contributed to your decision to vote for it?

POSTMUS: Absolutely.

SCHRIEBER: Okay, well that’s --

SPEAKER: Tell them what you said yesterday . . . about retrospect.

POSTMUS: Well, ya, ya, I kind of, I kind of, I kind of said this, you know, I mean, and,
and, you know, as you guys know, it’s a complicated issue . . .

SCHRIEBER: Sure.

POSTMUS: . . . the Colonies Settlement. But, you know, after spending tons of time
with our attorneys -- with the Col -- with our attorneys . . .

SCHRIEBER: Yes.

POSTMUS: . . . and, and, after, you know, the fact that we had, you know, lost the two
superior court, uh, uh decisions up to the time that we spent with Justice Ward, Justice Penelli,
you know, I knew it was the right thing to do. But, but, but in saying it’s the right thing to do, it
all has to go with the dollar amount, you know, I mean what’s, what’s, what’s right, there. You
know what I mean, in terms of where we get -- and they were being unrealistic. They wanted like
$180 million, uh, uh, up until the end. When we finally went down to the – to they wanted the
twelve hundred acres, which we, we wouldn’t give in on. Uh, but time was running out, and you
know so --

SCHRIEBER: Time was running out, on what --

POSTMUS: Because I was going to be elected.

SCHRIEBER: But, but Bill, here, here’s what I’m saying. You started saying in
retrospect-- you know, we asked you did it, did it contribute to your decision to do the vote, these threats? Okay?

POSTMUS: What, to get the vote done then?

February 16, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 30]

RANDLES: Uh, let’s uh, let’s uh stop, take a breath for a minute, okay? Uh, this is becoming a bit of an issue here. I understand, I explained to you before while your attorney was here, that, uh, if you continue to try to minimize your involvement --

POSTMUS: Well, I’m not trying to minimize it, but I’m, you know.

RANDLES: In trying to uh, minimize other people’s involvement in this --

POSTMUS: But I don’t want to put words in people’s mouths that they, you know, that they didn’t say.

RANDLES: Whether they be friends of yours or people that you respect, or you have some sort of association, or even you have some fear of -- this is going to be a problem here, Bill. And I want to be up front with you, okay? I mean, I appreciate the fact that you’re talking to us, but, uh, the information that you seem to think came to us from Adam Aleman and that we don’t have any other corroborating evidence -- which is far from the truth. Okay? There are things that occurred that uh we’re well aware, of that uh for some reason you’re trying to skirt --

POSTMUS: Oh no, I’m not trying to skirt. I mean, I was - I was around. I’m the person that was there in a lot of cases.

RANDLES: So that this doesn’t become an exercise in futility, I just want to make that clear to you. Okay? I want you to be completely honest. I don’t want you to try to minimize your part. I don’t want you to try to minimize other people’s participation and their involvement in this, which uh seems to me because I know quite a bit of this case, what occurred even without your telling me. It seems to me what you’re doing. I know that uh you and Jim Erwin at this point are on the outs. Jim Erwin is someone that you are very willing to talk about his participation, his bad deeds. You’re very anxious to talk about him, whereas other people are involved, you’re not. You’re involvement, you’re not. And that’s not going to work here.
POSTMUS: Well, I'm telling you the truth, Bud.

February 16, 2011 — Bill Postmus Interview [Track 31]

RANDLES: We got a room down here where you guys can go where there's no recorders or anything else. You guys can go down there and discuss anything you need to discuss. But, you know, I'm concerned, that -- because you're trying to limit your involvement in certain things that I'm not getting the full story. I need to get the full story. I need to understand what happened.

February 16, 2011 — Bill Postmus Interview [Track 32]

SCHRIEBER: Okay, alright, and, um, I think Bud has said it, said it best. I know that there's yucky stuff, okay, to, you know, you're an important figure in the County of San Bernardino, Bill, um, a political prodigy. There's no question about it. Okay? Um, and -- This is the yucky stuff. This is the stuff that's hard to, you know, it's hard to face, that you were extorted over issues that are very personal in nature. And it's hard to -- it's very hard to face, given your position. Okay? And all the things you've accomplished. Well, I got that deal done to avoid this, or I knew that I was going to be taken care of as an example, something that you seemed reluctant to talk about. Okay? But that is -- but that's understandable. Okay? But Bud doesn't want to get into a problem about the value to everybody here. Okay? Just because -- God, you refused to believe it yourself. Okay? Ah, you wish -- you want to wish it away, really, that, you know, ah, that you know, whether it's Dan Richards or Jeff Burum.

POSTMUS: Well, I was going to say, uh, um, Jeff and I did have some discussions, not Dan, but Jeff.

SCHRIEBER: Okay.

POSTMUS: I only talked to Dan after the fact.

SCHREIBER: That's fine. Let's hear it.

POSTMUS: Jeff and I did have some -- had some conversations, uh, before the Colonies settlement. Uh, I don't know how many, but some conversations where, where Jeff did say that, you know, he said, you know, if we could just get all this -- you know, his, his basic words were
if we can get all this behind us, the Colonies settlement, that, you know, it would be good for us all, you know, on the board of supervisors and, you know that, he would support, support me.

SCHREIBER: Well, there you go. Okay? I appreciate it. Um, let’s go over that just a little more. Prior to the settlement he said if we can get the settlement -- in other words, your vote for the settlement --

POSTMUS: Correct.

SCHREIBER: Okay. I can take care of you. Is that correct?

POSTMUS: Correct.

SCHREIBER: Okay. And what did you believe that to mean?

POSTMUS: I was led -- I mean, I took that as, you know, if I helped get the Colonies settlement done, that in the future that I’d be taken care of in some way.

February 16, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 33]

RANDLES: And by skirting around Jeff Burum and uh your conversations with him and what he told you and what the deal was, makes me wonder and question whether you’re going to be truthful and honest and um, you know, frank and aboveboard with us. And the thing is, when we get to Jeff Burum and we start talking about him, it’s like, well, let’s get back on Jim Erwin.

POSTMUS: Sure.

RANDLES: Okay. Let’s talk about Jim Erwin. Let’s talk about the things he did wrong. Let’s talk about, you know, his coming to me with these threats and these uh, uh mailers that were prepared, they were going to send out, and -- A lot of our investigation, has been, uh, published. Affidavits, declarations in support of arrest. These things have been made public, for anybody to read. What I need from you, is specifics other than those. You understand?

POSTMUS: Uh-huh.

RANDLES: Because anyone can read a newspaper and what was published in a newspaper and say okay this is what happened. I need specifics from you about certain instances where you were with Jeff Burum, what was said -- that I can in, some way corroborate.
SCHREIBER: Yeah. Like the closed session thing is a perfect example, that you’re
sending communications about what’s happening in closed session to Jeff Burum -- and to Jim.

**February 16, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 34]**

RANDLES: And I can go on like this, and you can say “correct” all day long, you know, and this is going to sound like I’ve come up with a narrative that you’re agreeing to.

POSTMUS: Well, you’re not coming up with a narrative, but I mean I’m, I’m, at this point, I’m being totally honest with you when I say that, you know, I mean, so much has happened over the last, you know, so many years. Um, you know, I need to figure out a way to --

SPEAKER: Come to terms --

POSTMUS: Yah, to read, stuff --

**March 1, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 35]**

SCHRIEBER: Before we get into any of the details that we’re going to be talking about today and hopefully you’re comfortable talking about today. And what I want to start off with has to deal with that a little bit. And when I’m done and Bud will tell you his take on that and then he’ll get into some of the meat and I’ll be taking some notes and that type of thing. Again I want to thank you Bill for coming in. Thank you, Mr. Levine.

Um, Last time we met, we had, we had a fairly comprehensive initial meeting where we went over a lot of topics. We kind of just had it open ended and we’re going to actually have a similar format as we address different topics where the details are going to be coming from you. And, um, I don’t want it to devolve into, um, oh an aggressive interrogation type deal. I don’t think is necessary. Because, uh -- but there were certain things about the first meeting that we had that struck me, and us, and we’ve been analyzing, you know, our conversations, um nothing unusual. Okay. But things that are really great concern to the productivity of what we all hope to have going on here as far as getting to the truth of the matter.

Um, I mentioned to you a few different times, yes, you’re an accomplished politician. Very much so. It’s almost second nature for you to be able to answer questions that have a kernel of
truth in them, or they are truthful statements in and of themselves. But they really very skillfully
avoid the painful stuff, Bill. The painful stuff of what has been going on in this county for a long
time that you have had a major role in. I mean, that’s, that’s what we -- what I wanted to talk to
you a little bit about here.

I’m gonna give you a little example, even though it’s not the main point of what we’re
getting into here today, but it’s – it’s a test, Bill, okay? When I’m going to bring this up to you
and give you a little example. And I don’t do it to be antagonistic or anything like that, but it, it,
it kind of goes to this political thing about -- you know, you were very free and easy with
describing people’s being your friend. Okay? And sure we all have friends and we all have
falling-outs with friends, we all -- you know, that, that, that’s normal. But when we talk about
true friendship, um true loyalties, that lies within your, you real family, your real personal family,
the Lord above, your attorney perhaps, or attorneys, those people who are professional advisors to
you.

But other people, they may take the role of a friend as in a political sense. You may even be
friendly with them. Okay. But you know who your friends are. Okay? We’re just fact finders
here, and it’s not personal with us. Okay? Uh, we have to find the facts and the truth. I’m gonna
give you the little example from last week where I just brought up one topic and you gave me a
truthful answer about the topic, but it nothing to do with the truth of what happened. Nothing.
Okay?

Um, even though it’s a little off topic we’re going to get in here. I opened up the subject of
a Haven building, the Magnus building, and you were very quick – and I’m gonna tell you today I
don’t want you to be very quick to answer, I want you think about all the stuff we are going to
talk about, and I want you to do some soul searching with it and be able to really accept
everybody’s role. Okay? But when I asked you about that building, you immediately said, “I
wasn’t there to vote for that project.” Absolutely the truth. You didn’t lie to me. Okay? And we
moved on to a different subject. But using that little transaction as a perfect example, that’s not
the truth of what happened with that building, is it?
March 1, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 36]

RANDLES: Uh, yeah, well, take into consideration that our last meeting was the first time we actually sat down and talked at any length about . . .

POSTMUS: Correct.

RANDLES: . . . our investigation and what you knew and, uh, so that enters into what occurred at our last meeting. You have to understand that the questions we ask, for the most part, in many instances, we know the answers. We’ve done our investigation. We’ve not only talked to people, we’ve done investigations of documents, collected physical evidence, things that corroborate what we’re being told.

So, we can assess very well, in many instances, whether you’re being completely truthful upfront and honest with us. And that’s what we need. Um, we don’t want you to equivocate. Minimize your part or the part of anybody else where this is investigation is concerned. We need the information to flow from you. If it turns into an interrogation, which is like you’re interrogating a suspect . . .

POSTMUS: Correct.

RANDLES: Or, you know, I might let you tell me a falsehood and then stop you and then, uh, you know provide a different explanation for what might happened and try to get you to admit to something -- I don’t want to do that today -- it’s not going to be productive for us, in this process, in this interview, if we do that. So the information has to flow from you.

You have a lot of your information. The last time you didn’t know exactly what you were going to be asked of. You’ve had a week, two weeks -- to think about, you know, what we asked you. You made some notes for yourself. I don’t know if you’ve been able to review the recording, if you had a recording you didn’t record the last interview that we had. So, anyway, it looks like that you may made some effort to try to --

POSTMUS: It kinda gave me a -- I kind of know from what the last meeting where you guys – you know, and you asked these questions and I have more specifics.

RANDLES: As Bob mentioned --
POSTMUS: Never going through, you know, a situation like this, you really don’t know what to expect.

RANDLES: Well, we understand that, and we take that into consideration. Because again, last time was the first time we met, discussed things at any length. Bob had mentioned that you had indicated last time that certain people were close to you, you were close to certain people, people like brother to you, you had a relationship with people -- and that’s all well and good, but if you’re unable to speak to these things, to your participation, to the participation of others where this investigation is concerned and again, it’s not going to be very productive.

POSTMUS: Okay.

RANDLES: Okay. So I understand that you have a relationship with certain people. We’re going to be asking questions about those people, and we expect you to be forthcoming where that’s concerned. … Again, a good deal of this investigation deals with the Colonies settlement. And the Colonies settlement was approved, signed off by you, Paul Biane, Gary Ovitt and that was in November of 2006. We’re going to go back before that time. I know that last time we sat down, I think we started with the 2005 China trip. And, uh, we’re going to go back even before that. There were negotiations that were under way, litigation was in process – uh, Colonies partners had brought a suit against the county flood control in 2002. There was an attorney that was hired, an outside attorney that was hired by the county to review the uh, the case. And I believe this was Mr. --

SPEAKER: Winfield

RANDLES: -- Mr. Winfield, I’m sorry. Mr. Winfield. He was, do you recall him --

POSTMUS: I vaguely, but I remember him -- I remember what he looked like, and he was in closed session multiple times.

March 1, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 37]

RANDLES: Said what?

POSTMUS: He said, uh, that if I, you know, you know -- If I decided to move up higher
office he would support me, and if I decided to leave political office, that he would, you know, we would do business still together.

March 10, 2011 – Bill Postmus Interview [Track 38]

RANDLEs: As I was saying . . . in addition to investigating this, uh -- this case -- and being here and asking questions and getting information from you, part of our role, Bob's and mine, is to assess the level of your cooperation in these meeting and to report our assessment to our attorneys and to the attorneys with the AG's office. I can see by your demeanor that you are becoming more comfortable with this process and with, uh -- your encounters with us.

POSTMUS: Takes time.

RANDLEs: It does take time. It's uh, it's not a, um, an experience that one has often. But, uh -- on a level, if I were to judge from a level of one to ten, uh, the degree of your cooperation, uh, I don't believe that you still come up to the level that we expect. I think that, uh, there are instances, either because of self preservation, or because of your feelings of loyalty to others, your relationship to others, that you still tend to minimize your part and the parts of other people where bad deeds or perceived bad deeds come into question.

There are also instances when you have lapses of memory when one would expect you to remember those instances. Obviously you've explained to us that, uh, you were dealing with your addiction problems at the time and other things in your life, but because this is the fourth time we've met, you've had time to reflect upon some of these questions, some of these issues that we raised. I'm hoping that -- by that you are able to better remember occurrences, meetings, statements by others, and when these occurred and what was said and what was done.

That's, that's my expectation, that's my anticipation -- because we've raised certain things that you were able to go back think about them and come into our next meeting with uh, a better, uh, perception of what occurred in the past. Is that, uh, something that is occurring, something that is happening that, uh, by having these meetings, having certain issues, certain questions raised, that you're able to better remember what occurred?
POSTMUS: Oh I think I’ve, I think every meeting I’ve, been able to, you know, um --
what’s the better, what’s the word I’m looking for -- I think every meeting I’ve been able to, uh --

SPEAKER: Recollect.

POSTMUS: Recollect and, you know, explain things a little better. I think every meeting
its -- positive.

---

December 12, 2008 – Adam Aleman Phone Interview [Track 39]

SCHRIEBER: Well, how about Colonies?

ALEMAN: And then, then -- and that’s the main thing -- that’s the main thing. But also the fact the political connection.

SCHRIEBER: Right, right.

ALEMAN: The Colonies is for sure the main thing, and, and -- and the backroom *quid pro quo* and, you know, and, uh, deal making that has to take place, in order to, ya know, get it done.

SCHRIEBER: Right, right.

ALEMAN: And that’s the underlying -- that’s, that’s sort of the real . . .

SCHRIEBER: Well, sure.

ALEMAN: . . . where the real fear is with, with everyone.

SCHRIEBER: Well, of course.

ALEMAN: Ya know.

SCHRIEBER: And I mean is that -- is that, would -- see, like if you -- I don’t know if it would ever develop to that but, uh, obviously, ideally if you were to develop a discussion like that with Bill at some point in time --

ALEMAN: Absolutely. And -- and, and I think too -- I think beyond that too, I think, um -- I think the politicians are -- being the board members -- I think that they’re scared. They’re scared shitless of, of, of Burum because of what he did to Paul during the Colonies negotiations with Measure P.

---
March 10, 2009 – Josie Gonzales Interview [Track 40]

RANDLES: Okay. Paul Biane. Where Paul Biane is concerned, what do you think Colonies Partners used, Jeff Burum, in order to blackmail him to agreeing to this settlement in favor of Colonies?

July 30, 2008 – Ted Lehrer Interview [Track 41]

RANDLES: Alright, uh, but you are not aware of any, uh, uh, dealings between Mr. Postmus and Mr. Gallagher where money was exchanged, uh, for Mr. Postmus’s cooperation on any type of legislation or anything he may have been, uh, sitting on as a supervisor?

LEHRER: No that was, that was before my – supervisor, that was before my time, and he certainly wouldn’t talk to me about that.

RANDLES: And you’re not aware of [inaudible] -- Jeff Burum, uh is a, uh, another developer that Mr. Postmus had [inaudible] correct, Jeff Burum?

LEHRER: Oh, I know Jeff Burum, ya. He lives in um, he lives in my area in the county.

RANDLES: Jeff Burum was involved with the Colonies settlement, correct?

July 30, 2008 – Ted Lehrer Interview [Track 42]

RANDLES: In this county, uh, there is no limit on campaign donations for supervisors?

LEHRER: Sure. That’s correct.

RANDLES: And, uh, money is technically funneled to, uh, candidates and elected officials -- campaign moneys since there is no one and, uh, often so much that these moneys are [inaudible] that’s maybe the way that business is done in this county is that, uh, if you want access to the official or if there’s something, uh, specific that you want, uh, done by the official and you, uh can meet their demands as far as, uh, how much you donate and that money goes into your campaign coffers -- and, uh, than you receive favors in turn. And – uh, anything you’ve been made aware of where Mr. Postmus is concerned, where he’s giving uh uh favors to campaign contributors, uh, that would not otherwise be forthcoming, or ya know.

LEHRER: I would, I don’t know. I wouldn’t know. But generally, um, uh, people who
um, contribute large sums of money, they have access to a fundraiser …

RANDLES: It is the expectation that they have access to the uh XXX

LEHRER: … not between – that would be between them and the elected official… but

generally, um, if you give a large something of money you would like something, um -- you

would at least like the access and, and your voice to be heard.