I. INTRODUCTION

On May 19, 2022, the FBI arrested Daniel Nothbeassistant coach for the UC Davis men's water polo team at the timfer, knowingly distributing visual depictionsminors engaging in sexually explicit conductuC Davis placed Noble on administrative leave that same day and terminated Noble's employment on May 20, 2022. Also on May 20, 2022, UC Davis launched an investigation to determine whether Noble may have violated certain University policies and whether there are potential victims in the UC Davis community. UC Chavised myself and my law firm, London & Stout P.C., with conducting that investigation as charge letter directing me to

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

We did not find evidence that Noble engaged in conduct that would violate the BYSH P connection with his University or DWPC coaching activities. We found no evidence of potential victims of the type of conduct described in the pending criminal charges against Noble or other sexual abuse, sexual violence, harassment, or privacy violations in the UC Davis community.

Other than evidence suggesting that Noble knowingly retained and used funds that he received with his paycheck from UC Dairisexcess of what he was owed under his coaching contract, we found no evidence that Noble engaged in any activity that would constitute an improper governmental tivity ("IGA") under the Whistleblower Policy. By failing to report that UC Davis had inadvertently paid him more than he was owed for a certain period Noblemenay have engaged in fraud, theft of government property, or economically wasteful conduct that may qualify as an IGA. This single instance of potential misconduct, however, has no relation to the conduct that led to Noble's arrest and, once the overpayment was discovered, UC Davis employees took appropriate corrective action requiring Noble to returthe overpaid amount

III.

government, whether or not that activity is within the scope of his or her employment, and that (1) is in violation of any state or federal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, corruption, malfeasance, bribery, theft of government property, fraudulent claims, fraud, coercion, conversion, malicious prosecution, misuse of government property, or willful omission to perform duty, or (2) is in violation of an Executive order of the Governor, a California Rule of Court, or any policy or procedure mandated by the State Administrative Manual or State Contracting Manual, or (3) is economically wasteful, involves gross misconduct, incompetency, or inefficiency.

C. Witnesses

We spoke with the following witnesses on the following dates:

Name	Affiliation	Date Interviewed
	UC Davis Athletics	June 1, 20222nd June
		23, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 1, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 3, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 6, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 7, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 7, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 7, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 8, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 8, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 8, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 8, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 9, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 13, 2022
	UC Davis Athletics	June 13, 2022
	DWPC	June 15, 2022
	UC Davis SafetServices	June 15, 2022
	DWPC	June 15, 2022

 would be providing a report following the investigation, which would be posted on the University website. For witnesses not affiliated with the University, I confirmed that the toapgrete in the interview voluntarily and for University employetes on firmed that they understood that they had a duty to cooperate. I reminded witnesses the University policy prohibiting retaliation for participating in the investigation. All of the witnesses stated that they were comfortable speaking with us without an attorney or other support person present.

Given the broad scope of the conduct implicated by the policy provisions, and our mandate to identify any potential conduct in violation of these esclives ked the witnesses questions aimed at uncovering misconduct more broadly just that related to CSAM. The witnesses were cooperative and forthcoming in response to our questions, and no witness appeared to be hiding potentially relevant information witnesses who knew Noble were shocked at the news of his arrest and his alleged possession of CSAM. Several witnesses displayed feelings of sadness and ang in response to the criminal allegations deemed all of the witnesses to be credible.

D. <u>Documentary Evidence</u>

We reviewed the following documents:

- 1. The charging documents in the criminal case against Noble;
- 2. The Univeristy's HR and related administrative: fileserning Noble;
- Emailssent to or from Noble's UC Davis email accometreviewed all of Noble's emails except those that we identificate as (based on the sender or recipient information);
- 4. End-of-season surveysmpleted by members of the men's water polofoealine UC Davis Ahletics Department
- 5. Documentation regarding summer water polo clinics run by UC Davis water polo coaches and held at UC Davis facilities
- 6. Publicly available information on the internet about Noble we located by conducting internet searches on his name, including his public social media posts.

IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Noble began coaching for the DWPC in 20 Me. University hire Noble in August of 2019 to serve at the partime second assistant coach for the men's water polo Theae envidence showed that UC Davis followed its standard protocols in hiring Noble. Noble was required to complete a criminal background check as part of the University hiring protests he passed August 6, 2019. A few months after the University dhim, Noble beganorking as the second assistant coach for the women's water polo tendrile continuing is work with the men's team. In October of 2020, Noble became threst assistant coach for the men's teamer the prior first assistant coach let fand vacated the position. Noble initially continued his work as the second assistant coach for the women's team full time and stopped coaching the women's team. Noble was termin the Linguist on May 20, 2022 following his arrest



With respect to Noble's coaching style and interactions with playbess, consistently with Noble's coaching described Noble as professional. Noble was consistently described as etempered with both athletes and coaches. He understood and by all accounts respected the boundaries between coandess ayers and none of the witnesses that we interviewed believed that specializes with or contacted UC Davis water polathletes for social reasons.

With respect to recruiting oble appeared to have adhered to the requirements of his role Much of he recruiting during Noble's tenure was done by Zoom due to the pandemic, although he also traveled off campus fecruiting trips and assisted withcampus visitwith recruits When Noble traveled to tournaments for recruiting poses the witnesses told us that he would not have interacted directly with the players then, Noble was directed it balone, observine players during the tournament, and tak

B. There Is Some Evidence that Noble May Have Egraged in Conduct that Constitutes an IGA underthe Whistleblower Policy

Due to an administrative error at UC Davis, Noble was overpaid in the amount of approximately \$10,000 in takene pay over a period of nine months witness told us that

