Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT

Review No. 14-2940

The Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (the "Board"), by a vote of no less than four members, on May 29, 2014, adopted the following report and ordered it to be transmitted to the Committee on Ethics of the United States House of Representatives.

SUBJECT: Representative Ed Whitfield

NATURE OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS: From 2011 to 2014, Representative Ed Whitfield's wife, who is a registered lobbyist, lobbied on numerous bills, including bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored. Representative Whitfield's wife contacted his congressional staff in connection with her lobbying efforts. Representative Whitfield and his wife held joint meetings with other congressional offices related to legislation she lobbied.

If Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to lobby him or his congressional staff, then he may have violated House rules and standards of conduct.

If Representative Whitfield granted special favors or privileges to his wife, in her capacity as a lobbyist, and to her employer, then he may have violated House rules and standards of conduct.

RECOMMENDATION: The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield's wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

VOTES IN THE AFFIRMATIVE: 6

VOTES IN THE NEGATIVE: 0

ABSTENTIONS: 0

MEMBER OF THE BOARD OR STAFF DESIGNATED TO PRESENT THIS REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Omar S. Ashmawy, Staff Director and Chief Counsel.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CITATIONS TO LAW

Review No. 14-2940

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 3

A. Summary of Allegations 3

B. Jurisdictional Statement 4

C. Procedural History 4

D. Summary of Investigative Activity 4

II. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND HIS STAFF HAD CONTACTS WITH HIS WIFE RELATED TO HER LOBBYING 5

A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct 5

B. Representative Whitfield's Wife is a Registered Lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund 6

C. Representative Whitfield's Wife Had Contacts with His Staff in Her Capacity as a Registered Lobbyist 7

D. Representative Whitfield Did Not Prohibit His Staff from Having Contacts with His Wife Related to Her Lobbying 17

III. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD MAY HAVE PROVIDED SPECIAL FAVORS OR PRIVILEGES TO HIS WIFE AND HER EMPLOYER 21

A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct 21

B. Representative Whitfield's Congressional Office Assisted the Lobbying Activities of His Wife and Her Employer 21

IV. CONCLUSION 29

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CITATIONS TO LAW

Review No. 14-2940

On May 29, 2014, the Board of the Office of Congressional Ethics (the "Board") adopted the following findings of fact and accompanying citations to law, regulations, rules, and standards of conduct (*in italics*).

The Board notes that these findings do not constitute a determination that a violation actually occurred.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In 2011, Representative Whitfield's wife became a registered lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund ("HSLF") and began lobbying various bills concerning animal welfare issues.

2. From 2011 to 2014, Representative Whitfield's wife contacted his congressional staff concerning legislation she lobbied on numerous occasions. These contacts included discussions of advocacy strategy, selection of potential co-sponsors, drafting of bills, and obtaining Representative Whitfield's support for legislation.

3. During the same time period, Representative Whitfield's congressional office provided HSLF with assistance related to its lobbying activities. The assistance included scheduling as many as 100 meetings with other congressional offices for Representative Whitfield's wife and HSLF and conducting joint meetings with Representative Whitfield and his wife with Representatives and Senators to promote HSLF legislative priorities.

A. Summary of Allegations

4. Representative Whitfield may have violated House rules and standards of conduct by permitting his wife to lobby him and his staff.

5. Representative Whitfield may have violated House rules and standards of conduct by using his congressional office to provide special favors and privileges to advance and facilitate the lobbying activities of his wife and her employer.

6. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield's wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

7. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason

to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

B. Jurisdictional Statement

8. The allegations that are the subject of this review concern Representative Ed Whitfield, a Member of the United States House of Representatives for the 1st District of Kentucky. The Resolution the United States House of Representatives adopted creating the Office of Congressional Ethics ("OCE") directs that, "[n]o review shall be undertaken . . . by the board of any alleged violation that occurred before the date of adoption of this resolution."[1] The House adopted this Resolution on March 11, 2008. Because the conduct under review occurred after March 11, 2008, the OCE has jurisdiction in this matter.

C. Procedural History

9. The OCE received a written request for a preliminary review in this matter signed by at least two members of the Board on January 28, 2014. The preliminary review commenced on January 29, 2014.[2] The preliminary review was scheduled to end on February 27, 2014.

10. At least three members of the Board voted to initiate a second-phase review in this matter on February 27, 2014. The second-phase review commenced on February 28, 2014.[3] The second-phase review was scheduled to end on April 13, 2014.

11. The Board voted to extend the second-phase review for an additional period of fourteen days on March 28, 2014. The second-phase review ended on April 27, 2013.

12. Pursuant to Rule 9(B) of OCE Rules for the Conduct of Investigations, Representative Whitfield presented a statement to the Board on May 29, 2014.

13. The Board voted to refer the matter to the Committee on Ethics and adopted these findings on May 29, 2014.

14. This report and findings were transmitted to the Committee on Ethics on June 10, 2014.

D. Summary of Investigative Activity

15. The OCE requested and received documentary and, in some cases, testimonial information from the following sources:

[1] H. Res. 895, 110th Cong. §1(e), as amended (the "Resolution").
[2] A preliminary review is "requested" in writing by members of the Board of the OCE. The request for a preliminary review is "received" by the OCE on a date certain. According to the Resolution, the time frame for conducting a preliminary review is thirty days from the date of receipt of the Board's request.
[3] According to the Resolution, the Board must vote on whether to conduct a second-phase review in a matter before the expiration of the thirty-day preliminary review. If the Board votes for a second-phase, the second-phase begins when the preliminary review ends. The second-phase review does not begin on the date of the Board vote.

(1) Representative Ed Whitfield;

(2) Representative Whitfield's Wife;

(3) Representative Whitfield's Chief of Staff ("Chief of Staff");

(4) Representative Whitfield's Congressional Aide ("Congressional Aide");

(5) Representative Whitfield's Former Staffer ("Former Staffer");

(6) Representative Whitfield's Scheduler ("Scheduler");

(7) The Humane Society of the United States ("HSUS");

(8) Humane Society Legislative Fund ("HSLF");

(9) HSLF Lobbyist;

(10) HSUS Federal Affairs Director;

(11) HSUS President; and

(12) HSUS Vice President of Equine Protection ("HSUS Vice President").

16. The OCE requested and received testimonial information from the following sources:

(1) Representative 1;

(2) Former Senator;

(3) Senate Staffer 1; and

(4) Senate Staffer 2

17. Representative Whitfield cooperated with the Review, but could not be interviewed for medical reasons.

II. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD AND HIS STAFF HAD CONTACTS WITH HIS WIFE RELATED TO HER LOBBYING

A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct

18. *House Rule 25, clause 7 provides that "[a] Member . . . shall prohibit all staff employed by that Member . . . (including staff in personal, committee, and leadership offices) from making any lobbying contact (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995) with that individual's spouse if that spouse is a lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 or is employed or retained by such a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing legislation."*

19. *House Rule 23, clause 2 provides that "[a] Member . . . shall adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Rules of the House and to the rules of duly constituted committees thereof."*

20. *The House Ethics Manual instructs that "[s]pecial caution must be exercised when the spouse of a Member or staff person, or any other immediate family member, is a lobbyist. At a minimum, such an official should not permit the spouse to lobby either him- or herself or any of his or her subordinates. . . . Furthermore, a recently enacted provision of the House rules (House Rule 25, clause 7) requires that the Member prohibit his or her staff from having any lobbying contacts with that spouse if such individual is a registered lobbyist or is employed or retained by a registered lobbyist to influence legislation."*

21. *The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, as amended, defines the term "lobbying contact," subject to certain enumerated exceptions, as "any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to -- (i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals); (ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government; (iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or (iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate."*[4]

B. <u>Representative Whitfield's Wife is a Registered Lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund</u>

22. On January 1, 2011, Representative Whitfield's Wife became a registered lobbyist according to HSLF's lobbyist registration statement filed with the Clerk of the House.[5]

23. Representative Whitfield's Wife is registered to lobby on various issues related to animals.[6]

24. From 2011 to 2014, Representative Whitfield's Wife reported lobbying the following bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored:[7]

---

[4] The Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance provides that "[i]f a communication is limited to routine information gathering questions and there is not an attempt to influence a covered official, the exception of Section 3(8)(B)(v) for "any other similar administrative request" would normally apply. In determining whether there is an attempt to influence a covered official, the identity of the person asking the questions and her relationship to the covered official obviously will be important factors." Lobbying Disclosure Act Guidance at 7 (last revised February 15, 2013).

[5] HSLF LDA Lobbying Registration Statement (Exhibit 1 at 14-2940_0001-04). Although the effective date of the registration is January 1, 2011, HSLF Lobbyist told the OCE that Representative Whitfield's Wife did not begin lobbying until approximately October 2011. The employment records of Representative Whitfield's Wife indicate that she transferred from the HSUS payroll to the HSLF payroll in October 2011.

[6] *Id.*

- Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act of 2011 (H.R. 2492);
- American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act of 2011 (H.R. 2966);
- Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act of 2011 (H.R. 1513);
- Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act of 2011 (H.R. 1733);
- Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2011 (H.R. 198);
- Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2011("Puppy Mill Bill") (H.R. 835);
- To Amend the Horse Protection Act of 2012 (H.R. 6388);
- Safeguard American Food Exports Act of 2013 (H.R. 1094);
- Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act of 2013 (H.R. 183);
- Prevent All Soring Tactics Act of 2013 ("PAST Act") (H.R. 1518);
- Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2013 (H.R. 847); and
- Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act of 2013 (H.R. 366).

25. Representative Whitfield's Wife and HSLF reported lobbying additional bills during the time period.[8]

C. **Representative Whitfield's Wife Had Contacts with His Staff in Her Capacity as a Registered Lobbyist**

26. Representative Whitfield's Wife, HSLF, and HSUS relied on Representative Whitfield's congressional office for assistance with their lobbying activities.

[7]HSLF LDA Quarterly Lobbying Reports (2011-2014) (Exhibit 2 at 14-2940_0006-58).
[8] *Id.*

27. For example, Representative Whitfield's Wife noted that for the PAST Act, "neither HSUS or HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices . . . . That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties."[9]

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

28. She stated that HSUS needed Representative Whitfield's congressional office to gain Republican support for the PAST Act because "HSUS is anathema to the majority of them."[10] "With Republicans, Ed and I emphasize that it is an industry backed bill . . . we don't even mention animal welfare groups . . . ."[11]

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 1:10 PM
To: Holly Hazard <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sam Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Patti Hoffman <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting on past

I totally concur, Holly. I think the HSUS can put this over the top but only by targeting certain members (though they constitute the majority). To pass this in the House we need at least 50 more Republican co-sponsors. Sadly, HSUS is anathema to the majority of them.
Example: we have a good shot of getting the Republican Study Group
(app'x 50 extreme conservative members) to support the bill. Yoho, who is one of them, has prepared a video to show the RSG. And I have prepared a Dear Colleague letter for Yoho.
BUT***** Yoho told Cong Whitfield and me that the HSUS is
evil because "They want to give ALL animals the exact same rights that humans have." He HATES HSUS.
If we allow him to sway the RSG, however, the bill is assured of passage.
That is the delicate tightrope we walk.

With Republicans, Ed and I emphasize that it is an industry-backed bill(AVMA,
AAEP, AHC etc.) we don't even mention animal welfare groups though they do appear on our list of supporters. AHC is grieving a briefing to House/Senate staff members on October 28.

Connie

29. HSUS and HSLF also relied on Representative Whitfield's congressional office to introduce bills.

30. In another email, HSUS Federal Affairs Director asked Representative Whitfield's Wife "any chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to

[9] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0064).
[10] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Holly Hazard, dated October 19, 2013 (Exhibit 4 at 14-2940_0093).
[11] *Id.*

add it to the Farm Bill during House floor debate?!" [12] She responded, "Yes! Working with Ed and [Chief of Staff] on it today."[13]

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 3:43 PM
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: We need to get the Walking Horse bill going? We can get that on the Farm bill.

Yes! Working with Ed and Cory on it today.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2012, at 9:07 PM, "Mimi Brody" [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Connie, I know you're already up to your eyeballs trying to turn things around on the HPA funding with Chairmen Rogers and Kingston, so I don't want to really aggravate you. But – per the emails below – any chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to add it to the Farm Bill during House floor debate?! Ag Comm will likely have a say on HPA, regardless of prime referral to E & C, and it would be sweet to get it done in the wake of all the media attention. (Farm Bill is supposed to be marked up in House Ag on July 11, so floor action would be after that.)
Mimi

31. HSUS also assisted other organizations with gaining the support of Representative Whitfield's congressional office.

32. In the email below, HSUS Federal Affairs Director requested that Representative Whitfield's Wife ask Representative Whitfield whether he would co-sponsor a bill that the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine was lobbying.[14]

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 1:27 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Arianna Brown
Subject: Cong. Whitfield as original cosponsor of reintroduced BEST Practices Act? (re: DOD Trauma Training)

PCRM would like our help getting Cong. Whitfield to agree to be an original cosponsor of the reintroduced BEST Practices Act, to phase out use of live animals in military trauma training. He cosponsored the bill last Congress, though he wasn't an original cosponsor (I pasted last year's cosponsor list at the end of this email string, FYI.) If Cong. Whitfield agrees, then Cong. Grimm will join him, and presumably Cong. Walter Jones will also be part of this team of original cosponsors.

This bill isn't a top priority for us, but we do support it. Connie, what do you think?
Mimi

33. From 2011 to 2014, as part of these lobbying activities that involved Representative Whitfield's congressional office, Representative Whitfield's Wife had numerous contacts with his congressional staff.

34. The contacts were related to drafting language for bills, scheduling meetings to discuss legislation with congressional offices, and directing Representative Whitfield to support or oppose legislation.

35. Representative Whitfield's Wife had multiple contacts with those members of Representative Whitfield's staff who were responsible for animal welfare issues, including: Chief of Staff, Congressional Aide, and Scheduler.

---

[12] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0095).
[13] *Id.*
[14] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated May 9, 2013 (Exhibit 6 at 14-2940_0097).

Contacts with Chief of Staff

36. Chief of Staff told the OCE that he communicated with Representative Whitfield's Wife concerning legislation. The contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife included discussions about the PAST Act related to strategy,[15] potential co-sponsors,[16] and drafting of the bill.[17] Representative Whitfield's Wife also contacted him about having Representative Whitfield support legislation that the congressional office previously refused to support.[18]

37. Representative Whitfield's Wife emailed Chief of Staff on numerous occasions concerning legislation. The following are examples of such emails:

- "Since you are working with Chris on the [Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act] bill, can you have him delete the two words 'if appropriate' after the mention of shelter dogs as an option? I can understand why he removed 'preferred' before 'option' but the added two words create too big of an out."[19] (1/7/11)

- "Could you mention the [Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act] bill to any of the LDs on your hallway or do you know any of them? If not, I can try to have Melissa set up 10 min meetings for me with the members."[20] (7/14/11)

- "If Ed's Press Secretary a good writer? If so, perhaps Ed should issue a statement [about an investigation of Horseracing Industry]."[21] (3/27/12)

- "Please be sure Ed votes FOR the Peters amendment [to the Sportsmen's Heritage Act] today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Natl Parks). Ed voted this way last time."[22] (4/17/12)

- "Ed just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it . . . ."[23] (9/12/12)

- "That means Ed and I need to talk to him [about the Horse Protection Act]. Can you set up an apt for us/Ed to talk to Pitts on April 9 and plan to move the intro date by a day or two?"[24] (4/4/13)

[15] Transcript of Interview of Chief of Staff, April 24, 2014 ("Chief of Staff Transcript") (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0111).
[16] Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0120-121).
[17] *Id*. at 14-2940_0123.
[18] *Id*. at 14-2940_0156.
[19] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated January 7, 2011 (Exhibit 8 at 14-2940_0168).
[20] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated July 14, 2011 (Exhibit 9 at 14-2940_0172).
[21] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated March 27, 2012 (Exhibit 10 at 14-2940_0175).
[22] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated April 17, 2012 (Exhibit 11 at 14-2940_0178).
[23] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated September 12, 2012 (Exhibit 12 at 14-2940_0181).
[24] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated April 4, 2013 (Exhibit 13 at 14-2940_0184).

- "Could you put together a group Congressional letter requesting an estimate of what USDA currently spends on the HIO/DQP arrangement [for the Horse Protection Act]?"[25] (4/16/13)

- "Ed is now focused on PAST. We discussed it this morning and have come up with the following checklist that needs to be implemented ASAP."[26] (6/16/13)

- "Please read [HSUS Vice President's] email in full. They would like a statement clarifying the weighted shoe provision [of the PAST Act] from Ed's office and the sooner the better."[27] (9/26/13)

- "Can you set up a meeting with [Representative] Yarmouth [about the PAST Act]?"[28] (10/14/13)

- "I gave Ed the draft Dear Colleague for Royce to reach out to Conservation Caucus and hopefully CA delegation. Ed also wants Schakowsky and Kinzinger to send one to the Illinois delegation. In both cases, should we give them a list of their delegation members missing from PAST or will they figure that out themselves?"[29] (10/15/13)

- "Did you talk to Gary about the bills being considered together . . . Ed said you can only do it at markup . . . PLEASE stand firm on this."[30] (10/31/13)

[25] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSUS Vice President, dated April 16, 2013 (Exhibit 14 at 14-2940_0186)
[26] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff and Justin Fareed, dated June 16, 2013 (Exhibit 15 at 14-2940_0189).
[27] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated September 26, 2013 (Exhibit 16 at 14-2940_0191).
[28] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff and Former Staffer, dated October 14, 2013 (Exhibit 17 at 14-2940_0194).
[29] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 18 at 14-2940_0198).
[30] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated October 31, 2013 (Exhibit 19 at 14-2940_0200).

38. In addition to the contacts listed above, Representative Whitfield's Wife contacted Chief of Staff in an effort to get Representative Whitfield to co-sponsor legislation that she lobbied. She requested that Chief of Staff have Representative Whitfield co-sponsor the Puppy Mill Bill in 2011.[31]

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Sparkman, John
Subject: Puppy Mill Bill

Connie wants us on the Puppy Mill Bill. NRA won't like it, but I think it is fine. We've been on it every year.

H.R.835 [112th] Print Subscribe Email/Save Share from THOMAS
Latest Title: Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act
Sponsor: Rep Gerlach, Jim [R-PA-6] (introduced 2/28/2011) **Cosponsors:** 145
Committees: House Agriculture
Related Bills: S.707
Latest Major Action: 3/9/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry.

Cory Hicks
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield

39. When the OCE asked Chief of Staff about the Puppy Mill Bill, he stated that he added Representative Whitfield as a co-sponsor after his wife mentioned it, but "it wasn't because she told me to or anything like that, it was more of, you know, I noticed we weren't a co-sponsor, we had been a co-sponsor since 2001 and it was sort of, it was an oversight to begin with."[32]

[31] Email from Chief of Staff to John Sparkman, dated December 2, 2011 (Exhibit 20 at 14-2940_0205).
[32] Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0142).

40. On another occasion, HSUS Federal Affairs asked Representative Whitfield's Wife for help to "get Cong. Whitfield on the FY13 animal welfare enforcement funding letter."[33] Representative Whitfield's Wife forwarded the request to Chief of Staff who agreed to "add the Congressman to the letter."[34]

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 2:20 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: can Cong. Whitfield join funding letter again before tomorrow's deadline?

Connie, sorry, I couldn't get off my conference call. I'm the leader so I couldn't leave, but I will call in a few minutes when it is over. I'll call Mimi and add the Congressman to the letter. We did discuss it in the office among the staff and we were going back and forth as to whether we should suggest that the Congressman should sign the letter because these spending issues are so controversial. I know the letter only asks for level funding, but we expect this year will be another year of big cuts. Also, we are not adding the Congressman on spending letters mainly because of the fact we hear constantly from constituents about spending. But, hopefully this letter won't get a great deal of attention in Kentucky. Also, if we decide to offer an amendment eliminating funds for the inspection of horses in slaughter houses, I'd hate for someone to view his request for level funding at the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to be used against us. Maybe the second concern isn't that big of a deal.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 1:38 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: can Cong. Whitfield join funding letter again before tomorrow's deadline?

Cory,

Ed said fine but I wanted to work it throughyou.

Also, can you check into HR4103, a bill introduced by Walter Jones? They want to fold it into NDAA. Frank Lo Biondo is only co-sponsor so far but that is because Jones's people have not worked it at all.

Let me know what you think about both, please.

Thanks,
Connie

41. Chief of Staff told the OCE that Representative Whitfield's Wife "may have mentioned that we were not on the [letter], but it was a similar situation where we had always signed onto the letter in the past."[35]

Contacts with Congressional Aide

42. Congressional Aide, a staff member with Representative Whitfield's congressional office responsible for animal welfare issues, told the OCE that Representative Whitfield's Wife contacted him on numerous occasions concerning the PAST Act. The nature of the contacts included discussions related to strategy,[36] identifying potential co-sponsors,[37] and scheduling meetings with other congressional offices.[38] He told the OCE that as of

[33] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 19, 2012 (Exhibit 21 at 14-2940_0207).
[34] Email from Chief of Staff to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 19, 2012 (Exhibit 21 at 14-2940_0207).
[35] Chief of Staff Transcript at (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0143).
[36] Transcript of Interview of Congressional Aide, April 24, 2014 ("Congressional Aide Transcript") (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0224); *see also*, Appointments for Conference call with Congressional Aide, HSLF Lobbyist and Representative Whitfield's Wife Regarding Strategy (Exhibit 23 at 14-2940_0260) (Exhibit 24 at 14-2940_0262).
[37] Congressional Aide Transcript (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0225).
[38] *Id.* at 14-2940_0227, 0236-237.

April 2014, he continued to have communications with Representative Whitfield's Wife concerning the PAST Act approximately once per week.[39]

43. Representative Whitfield's Wife emailed Congressional Aide on numerous occasions concerning the PAST Act. The following are examples of her emails to Congressional Aide:

- "Maybe we should try to get Ed to call [Rep.] Yoho."[40] (12/9/13)
- "Perhaps you (as Whitfield office) can let McCaskill's and Wagner's offices know that [Friends of Sound Horses] is trying to contact them, the importance of FOSH etc. That way, Teresa is apt to receive the reception she deserves."[41] (1/7/14)
- "I talked to Ed about Emma. He understands that she must set up appointments for out-of-town advocates and that you and I can tag along."[42] (1/9/14)
- "Can Ed back-channel a request to CBO?"[43] (1/14/14)
- "We need to use the story (not the Op-ed) with members of the Ohio delegation."[44] (1/19/14)

[39] *Id.* at 14-2940_0240.
[40] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 9, 2013 (Exhibit 25 at 14-2940_0265).
[41] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 7, 2014 (Exhibit 26 at 14-2940_0268).
[42] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 9, 2014 (Exhibit 27 at 14-2940_0270).
[43] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 14, 2014 (Exhibit 28 at 14-2940_0273).
[44] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 19, 2014 (Exhibit 29 at 14-2940_0276).

Contacts with Representative Whitfield's Schedulers

44. Scheduler has been employed with Representative Whitfield since August 2012.[45] She told the OCE that she communicated with Representative Whitfield's Wife concerning the scheduling of 50 to 70 meetings related to the PAST Act.[46] She told the OCE that at the request of Representative Whitfield and his wife, she routinely emailed Representative Whitfield's Wife the schedules for meetings she arranged with congressional offices about the PAST Act.[47]

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 5:28 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: Meetings
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Let's try the last four on the list plus Greg Walden.

Thanks,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 3:59 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma"
<Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov<mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican E&C members that we have not met with yet. The list is below. Please let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.

Barton
Walden
Shimkus
Scalise
Harper
Billy Long
Cassidy
Ellmers

Thanks,
Emma

45. After arranging certain meetings, Scheduler informed congressional offices that "[m]y boss's wife . . . will be joining them in the meeting as well."[48]

[45] Transcript of Interview of Scheduler, April 24, 2014 ("Scheduler Transcript") (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0279).
[46] *Id.* at 14-2940_0284-85.
[47] *Id.* *See also*, Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Scheduler, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 31 at 14-2940_0325); email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Scheduler, dated October 19, 2013 (Exhibit 32 at 14-2940_0328); email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Scheduler, dated October 9, 2013 (Exhibit 69 at 14-2940_0580).
[48] Email from Scheduler to Amanda Stevens, dated October 4, 2013 (Exhibit 33 at 14-2940_0331); email from Scheduler to Kristin Thomson, dated October 17, 2013 (Exhibit 34 at 14-2940_0335). *See also* Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0286-88).

46. Scheduler told the OCE that she did not have first-hand knowledge of who attended the meetings because she did not attend.[49]

47. Prior to August 2012, Representative Whitfield's Wife emailed his then-scheduler on numerous occasions to schedule meetings related to bills she lobbied, including the following examples:

    - "Ed and I need to meet with Senator Scott Brown sometime tomorrow to mention the bill Landrieu is introducing [on horse slaughtering]. Can you please set something up?"[50] (6/7/11)
    - "Any luck with any of my appointments?"[51] (7/14/11)
    - "Would you please try to set up a meeting with the Senator some time next week? The subject is Tennessee Walking Horses."[52] (5/21/12)

    Explanation of Representative Whitfield's Wife

48. Representative Whitfield's Wife told the OCE that she has contacted Representative Whitfield's staff about issues related to the PAST Act and other legislation, including scheduling meetings and having Representative Whitfield support bills.[53] However, she told the OCE that she had many contacts at the request of Representative Whitfield who used her as a messenger to contact the staff.[54]

49. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield's Wife her December 12, 2013 email and asked why she told Congressional Aide, "I am not to contact you or [Scheduler] directly in support of Ed's bill."[55] She responded "Okay, well, it's wrong – it's not wrong – I mean it's not right, because that's not true . . . . But I mean it's not true that I am not supposed to contact them in support of Ed's [b]ill, that's not true. If I am – I am if I am trying to include them [sic] information about something we are all working on together, is nothing wrong with that."[56]

50. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield's Wife her December 17, 2013 email and asked about her statement that "[Congressional Aide] and I communicate hourly on

[49] Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0286).
[50] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated June 7, 2011 (Exhibit 35 at 14-2940_0338).
[51] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated July 14, 2011 (Exhibit 36 at 14-2940_0340).
[52] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated May 21, 2012 (Exhibit 37 at 14-2940_0343).
[53] Transcript of Interview Representative Whitfield's Wife, April 25, 2014 ("Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript") (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0379-80, 14-2940_0401-04, 14-2940_0406-07, 14-2940_0418-19).
[54] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0379-80, 14-2940_0406-07, 14-2940_0418-19).
[55] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 11, 2013 (EW4_005262) (Exhibit 39 at 14-2940_0436).
[56] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0395).

PAST and I was hoping to take Fri off."[57] She responded "Well, clearly that's an embellishment exaggeration, obviously he and I do not communicate hourly on PAST. That's a – how do I say it, it's – it's an impossibility."[58]

51. When asked whether she contacted Congressional Aide *daily* during the December 2013 time period, Representative Whitfield's Wife said "No."[59] When asked whether she contacted the Congressional Aide *weekly* during the December 2013 time period, Representative Whitfield's Wife stated "If I did speak to [Congressional Aide], it was part of a group of people who were trying to advance legislation."[60]

52. The OCE showed Representative Whitfield's Wife her January 1, 2014 email and asked about her statement that "[Congressional Aide] and I met all day yesterday re strategy . . . ."[61] She responded, "I don't know what that means. I don't know how we can meet all day RE: Strategy, seems like an exaggeration."[62]

53. Overall, Representative Whitfield's Wife acknowledged that she has contacts with Representative Whitfield's staff concerning the PAST Act and other legislation. She did not describe the frequency of the contacts, but the documentary evidence established that she had consistent contacts with the staff from 2011 to 2014.

D. <u>Representative Whitfield Did Not Prohibit His Staff from Having Contacts with His Wife Related to Her Lobbying</u>

54. Representative Whitfield, his wife, and his staff have been contacted about potential ethics issues related to her lobbying since at least 2012.

- <u>November 11, 2012</u>: *The Washington Post* contacted Representative Whitfield's Wife concerning "a story about lawmakers who have family members that are registered to lobby Congress or work for firms that lobby."[63] Among other questions, she was asked "Have you ever lobbied your husband on these or other bills and issues?"[64]

- <u>June 20, 2013</u>: Representative Whitfield's Wife and Chief of Staff received a Press Release where the Performance Show Horse Association alleged that Representative Whitfield did not disclose that "he is sponsoring this amendment

[57] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated December 17, 2013 (Exhibit 40 at 14-2940_0438).
[58] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0377).
[59] *Id*. at 14-2940_0378.
[60] *Id.*
[61] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated January 1, 2014 (Exhibit 46 at 14-2940_0455).
[62] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0374).
[63] Email from David S. Fallis to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated November 21, 2012 (Exhibit 41 at 14-2940_0441-42).
[64] *Id. See also* Email from HSLF Lobbyist to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated December 4, 2012 (Exhibit 42 at 14-2940_0444-445).

because his wife is a paid lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, one of the main advocates for this amendment. This action by Mr. Whitfield would appear to be a violation of the House Code of Official Conduct and a violation of House Rule 25, Clause 7."[65]

- October 21, 2013: Chief of Staff emailed Representative Whitfield after a congressional office expressed concerns about the scheduling of meetings related to the PAST Act. He told Representative Whitfield: "Since people are starting to hear about these meetings on the Hill and their effectiveness, I think we need to be careful about [Representative Whitfield's Wife] attending these meetings. What do you think?"[66]

- December 10, 2013: *Politico* contacted HSLF concerning a story regarding Rep. Whitfield and his wife and what "would appear to be a violation of the House ethics rules regarding spouses and members of Congress."[67]

55. Despite being on notice of the potential ethics issues, Representative Whitfield's staff continued to have contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife related to her lobbying.

56. For example, as recently as April 24, 2014, the week the OCE's investigative period for this review ended, Congressional Aide told the OCE that he continued to have weekly contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife on the PAST Act.[68]

Ethics Advice

57. In October 2013, Chief of Staff and Representative Whitfield's Wife contacted the Committee on Ethics to seek advice about her interactions with Representative Whitfield's Congressional office.[69]

[65] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Chief of Staff, dated June 21, 2013 (Exhibit 43 at 14-2940_0448).
[66] Email from Chief of Staff to Representative Whitfield, dated October 21, 2013 (Exhibit 44 at 14-2940_0451).
[67] Email from Anna Palmer to Heather Sullivan, dated December 10, 2013 (Exhibit 45 at 14-2940_0453).
[68] Congressional Aide Transcript (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0239-40).
[69] Email from Chief of Staff to Representative Whitfield, dated October 21, 2013 (Exhibit 44 at 14-2940_0450-51).

58. On October 21, 2013, Chief of Staff emailed Representative Whitfield that he contacted the Committee on Ethics about the office scheduling meetings for a registered lobbyist, but Chief of Staff said, "I did not inform them that [Representative Whitfield's Wife] was attending these meetings as I suspected that they would have expressed concerns since she's married to you and a registered lobbyist."[70]

> On Oct 21, 2013, at 3:29 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov><mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
>
> Congressman, I just had a very uncomfortable conversation with Renee Ellmers office's legislative director. They were concerned with the optics of our office setting up a meetings for Marty and Donna. I called the ethics committee and they did not have a problem with our office setting up meetings on a bill that you have sponsored. I even asked what if we were requesting offices to take a meeting on behalf of a registered lobbyist. They also did not have a problem with us requesting meetings with registered lobbyists. I did not inform them that Connie was attending these meetings as I suspected they would have expressed concerns since she's married to you and a registered lobbyist. Since people are starting to hear about these meetings on the Hill and their effectiveness, I think we need to be careful about Connie attending these meetings. What do you think?

59. When asked why he did not tell the Committee on Ethics that Representative Whitfield's Wife was attending the meetings, Chief of Staff told the OCE "[w]ell, first of all, I wasn't exactly sure if she was attending the - - all of these meetings . . . ."[71]

60. When asked whether the Committee on Ethics discussed Representative Whitfield's Wife with him, Chief of Staff stated "[T]hey may have said something to the effect of you can't set these meetings up for Mrs. Whitfield but we weren't setting them up for Mrs. Whitfield anyway."[72]

61. Representative Whitfield's Wife told the OCE that the Committee on Ethics advised her that she could not "lobby" Representative Whitfield's staff.[73] She told the OCE that "I am not supposed to try to influence them to take a position on legislation on behalf of my client, my employer, HSLF."[74]

62. Representative Whitfield's Wife stated that the Committee on Ethics told her orally that it was "entirely okay" for her to attend meetings that Scheduler arranged for advocates of the PAST Act.[75]

[70] *Id.* at 14-2940_0451.
[71] Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0135).
[72] *Id.* at 14-2940_0136.
[73] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0419).
[74] *Id*. at 14-2940_0420.
[75] *Id*. at at 14-2940_0390-91.

63. On December 11, 2013 she emailed Congressional Aide: "I am not to contact you or [Scheduler] directly in support of Ed's bill."[76]

From:	Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent:	Wednesday, December 11, 2013 6:00 PM
To:	Irby, Marty; Heydlauff, Emma
Cc:	Keith Dane
Subject:	My Not Contacting You or Emma Directly

I have been working with you so long, I forget you are now part of Ed's staff. I am not to contact you or Emma directly in support of Ed's bill. Better to come from Sara or Keith.

Sent from my iPhone

64. However, less than one week later, she emailed HSUS Federal Affairs Director that "[Congressional Aide] and I communicate hourly on PAST . . . ."[77]

65. Approximately one month later, she told HSLF Lobbyist that "[Congressional Aide] and I met all day yesterday re strategy . . . ."[78]

66. Approximately two months after telling Congressional Aide that she could not communicate with him "in support of Ed's bill," Representative Whitfield's Wife told HSUS Vice President "[Congressional Aide] and I met on Friday and developed a list of Texas members who are candidates for co-sponsorship."[79]

67. Representative Whitfield's staff told the OCE that the congressional office does not have any rule or policy prohibiting contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife related to her lobbying for the HSLF.[80]

68. In conclusion, Representative Whitfield's congressional staff acknowledged that they had contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife concerning legislation that she lobbied from 2011 to 2014. She also confirmed that she contacted the staff. Representative Whitfield and his staff knew of the potential ethics issues related to the contacts and received informal advice from the Committee on Ethics that Representative Whitfield's Wife could not lobby the staff. Nevertheless, Representative Whitfield's staff continued to have contacts with Representative Whitfield's Wife related to her lobbying activities for HSLF.

---

[76] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated December 11, 2013 (Exhibit 39 at 14-2940_0436).
[77] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated December 17, 2013 (Exhibit 40 at 14-2940_0438).
[78] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated January 1, 2014 (Exhibit 46 at 14-2940_0455).
[79] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSUS Vice President, dated February 2, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0078).
[80] Congressional Aide Transcript (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0247-48); Chief of Staff Transcript (Exhibit 7 at 14-2940_0132-33); Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0303-04). Transcript of Interview of Former Staffer, April 25, 2014 ("Former Staffer Transcript") (Exhibit 47 at 14-2940_0474-45).

69. Based on the evidence before the OCE, there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to lobby his congressional staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

III. REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD MAY HAVE PROVIDED SPECIAL FAVORS OR PRIVILEGES TO HIS WIFE AND HER EMPLOYER

A. Laws, Regulations, Rules, and Standards of Conduct

70. *The Code of Ethics for Government Service provides that, "[a]ny person in Government service should: . . . Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not . . . ."*[81]

71. *The House Ethics Manual specifically states that this prohibition applies "to the employment activities of one's spouse or any other family member" and states that "[t]he prohibition against doing any special favors for anyone in one's official capacity is a fundamental standard of conduct, and it applies to an official's conduct with regard to not only his or her spouse or other family members, but more broadly to any person."* [82]

B. Representative Whitfield's Congressional Office Assisted the Lobbying Activities of His Wife and Her Employer

72. Representative Whitfield and his congressional office provided significant assistance to the lobbying of Representative Whitfield's Wife and her employer.

73. In particular, Representative Whitfield: (1) permitted his office to schedule numerous meetings for HSLF and HSUS at the request of his wife; (2) attended joint meetings with his wife and other lawmakers; and (3) permitted his office to perform numerous official actions for HSLF and HSUS at the request of his wife.

Congressional Meetings Scheduled for HSLF and HSUS

74. Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged 50 to 70 meetings with congressional offices for the PAST Act in October and November 2013.[83] Congressional Aide, who attended most of these meetings, estimated that there were 75 to 100 meetings.[84]

75. Although Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged the meetings at the request of Representative Whitfield, emails from HSUS Vice President and Representative Whitfield's Wife indicate that many meetings were scheduled at the request of HSUS.[85]

[81] Code of Ethics for Government Service ¶ 5.
[82] House Ethics Manual 245.
[83] Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0291).
[84] Congressional Aide (Exhibit 22 at 14-2940_0216).

76. For example, HSUS Vice President asked Scheduler, "Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be attending."[86] He also asked Representative Whitfield's Wife, "Can [Chief of Staff] try to get a meeting with Corker's office for Marty and Donna?"[87]

From: Keith Dane [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 3:49 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Senate member meetings

Emma,

Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be attending.

Thanks so much.

Keith

Sessions*
Shelby
Cochran
Thune*
Boozman*
Blunt*
Heller
Coats
Scott
Fischer
Johnson, Ron
Corker
Burr*
Coburn*
Murkowski

77. Scheduler told the OCE that she could not think of any other group for which she arranged as many meetings.[88]

78. In January 2014, Congressional Aide asked Scheduler to arrange additional meetings with congressional offices for advocates of the PAST Act.[89] Scheduler initially declined to arrange more meetings due to the difficulty of arranging the meetings.[90] Chief of Staff noted that "[i]t seems that we've asked a lot of [Scheduler] lately on these meetings."[91]

[85] Email from HSUS Vice President to Scheduler, dated October 29, 2013 (Exhibit 48 at 14-2940_0491); email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield's Wife dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 49 at 14-2940_0493).
[86] Email from HSUS Vice President to Scheduler, dated October 29, 2013 (Exhibit 48 at 14-2940_0491).
[87] Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 49 at 14-2940_0493).
[88] Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_0291).
[89] Email from Congressional Aide to Scheduler, dated January 24, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).
[90] Email from Scheduler to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).
[91] Email from Chief of Staff to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0061).

Chief of Staff told Congressional Aide, who had been recently hired, "[i]t is out of the ordinary for us to be handling folks schedule this much. This precedence [sic] was started at a time when we thought it would only be a hand full of meetings."[92]

79. Congressional Aide informed Representative Whitfield's Wife that Scheduler declined to arrange the meetings.[93] In response, Representative Whitfield's Wife instructed Congressional Aide to "tell [Chief of Staff] that these [PAST Act advocates] have NOT been to DC before and that we are talking about passing Ed's bill not [Scheduler's] feelings of effectiveness . . . Compromise: Have her call offices she hasn't called before."[94]

80. Scheduler told the OCE that she arranged approximately 15 more meetings with congressional offices for PAST Act advocates around January 2014.[95]

81. Representative Whitfield's Wife told Congressional Aide and PAST Act advocates that Representative Whitfield's office was "crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties."[96]

Joint Meetings with Members of Congress

82. On several occasions, HSLF and HSUS determined that Representative Whitfield needed to meet with certain Members of Congress to help gain support for their lobbying efforts. Representative Whitfield attended these meetings with his wife where they discussed legislation that she lobbied.

Meeting with Representative 1

83. On May 9, 2012, HSUS Federal Affairs Director informed Representative Whitfield's Wife that Representative 1 had not responded to HSUS President.[97] She asked, "Do you think Cong. Whitfield (or you) might be willing to approach him personally about helping lead on [the Horse Protection Act]?"[98] Representative Whitfield's Wife responded, "I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes."[99]

[92] Email from Chief of Staff to Congressional Aide, dated January 27, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
[93] Email from Congressional Aide to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
[94] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_0060).
[95] Scheduler Transcript (Exhibit 30 at 14-2940_00296).
[96] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Congressional Aide, dated January 28, 2014 (Exhibit 3 at 14-2940_00064).
[97] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSUS Federal Affairs Director, dated May 9, 2012 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497).
[98] *Id.*
[99] *Id.*

84. On July 18, 2012, Representative Whitfield's then-scheduler emailed Representative Whitfield and his wife, "I just set up a meeting for you both with [Representative 1] regarding the Tennessee Walking Horse Issue."[100]

85. When the OCE showed Representative Whitfield's Wife the email to her and Representative Whitfield from the then-scheduler concerning "the meeting for you both with [Representative 1]," she stated, "I don't ever remember Ed being in a meeting with me and [Representative 1]."[101]

86. Representative 1 told the OCE that he recalled Representative Whitfield and his wife coming to meet with him in July 2012 to ask him to co-sponsor horse soring legislation.[102] He described the role of Representative Whitfield's Wife in the meeting as being "just there with him advocating for this."[103] Representative 1 considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield and not Representative Whitfield's Wife or the Humane Society.[104]

Meeting with Senator Lamar Alexander

87. On May 21, 2012, an HSUS staffer told Representative Whitfield's Wife that a meeting was scheduled with Senator Alexander and HSUS for May 23, 2012.[105] The staffer stated, "We could expand meeting to include TWHorse issue or set up a separate meeting."[106] After arranging a separate meeting, the HSUS staffer asked who would attend the meeting and Representative Whitfield's Wife replied, "I believe I would be more effective talking to Alexander directly- -along with Ed if Ed is available."[107]

88. Senate Staffer 1, who was Senator Alexander's lead staffer for the meeting in May 2012, told the OCE that Senator Alexander, Representative Whitfield, and Representative Whitfield's Wife attended the meeting about legislation to prevent the abuse of Tennessee Walking Horses.[108] He stated that Representative Whitfield's Wife spoke

[100] Email from Melissa Buchanan to Representative Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated July 18, 2012 (Exhibit 51 at 14-2940_0499).
[101] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0385).
[102] Transcript of Interview of Representative 1, April 25, 2014 ("Representative 1 Transcript") (Exhibit 52 at 14-2940_0503).
[103] *Id*. at 14-2940_0505.
[104] *Id.*
[105] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Representative Whitfield, dated May 22, 2012 (Exhibit 53 at 14-2940_0514).
[106] *Id.*
[107] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Cece Kremer, dated May 21, 2012 (Exhibit 53 at 14-2940_0514).
[108] Memorandum of Interview of Senate Staffer 1, April 25, 2014 (Exhibit 54 at 14-2940_0517).

about horse abuse and the legislation.[109] Representative Whitfield made similar comments during the meeting.[110]

89. At the time the meeting occurred, Senate Staffer 1 considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield.[111] However, he knew that Representative Whitfield's Wife was an advocate for the Humane Society.[112] He had additional follow-up meetings with Representative Whitfield's Wife and the Humane Society after the meeting.[113]

90. When the OCE asked Representative Whitfield's Wife about the meeting, she stated, "I can't remember why we went. But I know that Ed wanted to talk to Lamar about the bill . . . so Ed said come with me. I never opened my mouth the entire meeting, and I don't think Lamar Alexander even knew I worked for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, he saw me as Ed's wife."[114]

Meeting with Former Senator

91. On June 7, 2011, Representative Whitfield's Wife told his then-scheduler, "Ed and I need to meet with [Former Senator] sometime tomorrow to mention a bill Landrieu is introducing. Can you please set something up."[115] The same day, the scheduler confirmed a meeting with Former Senator for June 8, 2011 for Representative Whitfield and his wife.[116]

92. Former Senator told the OCE that he recalled meeting with Representative Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's Wife in his office to discuss horse slaughter legislation.[117] He stated, "I recall setting it up as a courtesy because he was member of Congress."[118]

93. He described Representative Whitfield and his wife as being both actively involved in the discussion of horse slaughter.[119] He saw the role of Representative Whitfield's Wife "as a spouse sort of at that point . . . they were working on this issue together, you know,

[109] *Id.* at 14-2940_0518.
[110] *Id.*
[111] *Id.*
[112] *Id.*
[113] *Id.*
[114] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0383).
[115] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to Melissa Buchanan, dated June 7, 2011 (Exhibit 55 at 14-2940_0520).
[116] *Id.*
[117] Transcript of Interview of Former Senator, April 22, 2014, ("Former Senator Transcript") (Exhibit 56 at 14-2940_0530).
[118] *Id.* at 14-2940_0525.
[119] *Id.* at 14-2940_0531.

because of an interest in horses."[120] At the time, he considered the meeting to be with Representative Whitfield and not the Humane Society.[121]

94. When the OCE asked Representative Whitfield's Wife about the meeting with Former Senator, she stated, "It may have been the horse slaughter legislation but I remember Ed wanted Brown to get on as a co-sponsor on the Senate bill . . . . I sat and listened . . . ."[122]

HSLF and HSUS Requests for Official Action

95. HSLF and HSUS frequently asked Representative Whitfield's Wife to have Representative Whitfield or his staff perform a significant amount of official actions. These included requests for co-sponsoring of bills, signing letters, and making floor speeches.

Date	HSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield's Wife
3/24/11	"[W]ould you be willing to reach out to them on the HPA funding – requesting a meeting perhaps or just talking more with them about it informally? I know that you and Cong. Whitfield will have their ear in a way the rest of us here don't."[123]
5/17/11	"[I]t would be great to have a quote or two from Rep. Whitfield. Do you want me to just go through the office?"[124]
10/26/11	"Would be great if we could get Ed to sign on to this."[125]
3/19/12	"[C]an you help get Cong. Whitfield on the FY13 animal welfare enforcement funding letter?"[126]
3/23/12	"[HSUS Vice President] and I reviewed these talking points and they're all set for you to pass on to Ed (see below). Thanks for your help!"[127]
4/23/12	"[Representative Whitfield's Wife is] all over it (she's working hard behind the scenes to find the witnesses). Earlier today she was checking with Cong. Whitfield to see what might be helpful in terms of HSUS/HSLF press, blog, crowd of PA activists, etc."[128]

[120] *Id.* at 14-2940_0528.
[121] *Id.* at 14-2940_0530.
[122] Representative Whitfield's Wife Transcript (Exhibit 38 at 14-2940_0384).
[123] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 24, 2011 (Exhibit 57 at 14-2940_0542).
[124] Email from HSLF Lobbyist to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated May 17, 2011 (Exhibit 58 at 14-2940_0548).
[125] Email from Lauren Silverman to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated October 26, 2011 (Exhibit 59 at 14-2940_0550).
[126] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 19, 2012 (Exhibit 21 at 14-2940_0207).
[127] Email from Tracie Letterman to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 23, 2012 (Exhibit 60 at 14-2940_0555).
[128] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to HSUS Vice President, HSUS President, Representative Whitfield's Wife, and Jessica Feingold-Lieberson, dated April 23, 2012 (Exhibit 61 at 14-2940_0558).

Date	HSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield's Wife
5/9/12	"[Representative 1's] staff hasn't responded to [HSUS President]/Mike's initial effort, but I wonder if we need to throw in the towel yet on him? He did send his own letter to Ag Approps the past two years seeking enforcement funding. Do you think Cong. Whitfield (or you) might be willing to approach him personally about helping lead on this?"[129]
6/21/12	"[A]ny chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to add it to the Farm bill during House floor debate . . . it would be sweet to get it done in the wake of all the media attention."[130]
9/14/12	"I think [Representative Whitfield's Wife] may want to intervene to make sure it happens, if staff is resisting. Let's see how we do reaching out to [Chief of Staff] ourselves, first though."[131]
12/12/12	"What do you think about asking Ed to give a floor speech on this poll?"[132]
5/9/13	"[The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine] would like our help getting Cong. Whitfield to agree to be an original cosponsor of the reintroduced BEST Practices Act, to phase out use of live animal in military trauma."[133] "Are you ok with us weighing in with Cong. Whitfield on it to see if he'll cosponsor again? If so, do you want to handle the communication or have me or someone else here reach out to [Chief of Staff] or Justin?"[134]
6/8/13	"[R]equest for reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on Best Practices [Act]."[135]
9/17/13	"Cong. Whitfield could say he's on the fence about Thursday's vote because he feels it's not enough of a cut to SNAP. Bottom line, though, is to signal to leadership that he's really determined to PAST to the floor this year . . . Thank you for considering this idea and discussing it with him!"[136]
9/26/13	"The Myths/Facts document is on Congressional stationery and is Cong. Whitfield's document (though you drafted text for him last year). It doesn't have his name on it, but it would come from his office and be referred to as his document."[137]

[129] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated May 9, 2012 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497).
[130] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0095).
[131] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Cece Kremer and Michael Markarian, September 14, 2012 (Exhibit 62 at 14-2940_0560).
[132] Email from Michael Markarian to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated December 12, 2012 (Exhibit 63 at 14-2940_0563).
[133] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, *et al*., dated May 9, 2013 (Exhibit 6 at 14-2940_0097).
[134] *Id.*
[135] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated June 8, 2013 (Exhibit 64 at 14-2940_0567).
[136] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated September 17, 2013 (Exhibit 65 at 14-2940_0569).
[137] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to HSUS Vice President and Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated September 25, 2013 (Exhibit 66 at 14-2940_0571).

Date	HSLF/HSUS Requests for Representative Whitfield's Wife
10/15/13	"Can [Chief of Staff] try to get a meeting with Corker's office for [PAST Act advocates]?"[138]
1/6/14	"I had thought that [HSLF Lobbyist] felt (and we collectively have felt all along) that it would be best coming from [Congressional Aide]/Mr. Whitfield's office, rather than HSUS . . . ."[139]

96. In response to the requests, Representative Whitfield's Wife usually agreed to contact her husband or send the request to his staff. Her responses included the following:

    - "I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes."[140]
    - "I will talk to Ed after he gets out of his Health Subcommittee hearing."[141]
    - "I have already talked to Ed about this."[142]
    - "Yes! Working with Ed and [Chief of Staff] on it today."[143]
    - "I will ask him."[144]
    - "I don't need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office. I will get a couple of quotes from him."[145]

97. The OCE did not find any evidence that the volume of assistance that Representative Whitfield's staff provided to Representative Whitfield's Wife and her employer from 2011 to 2014 was comparable to assistance provided to other individuals or organizations.

[138] Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated October 15, 2013 (Exhibit 67 at 14-2940_0573).
[139] Email from HSUS Vice President to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated January 6, 2014 (Exhibit 68 at 14-2940_0577).
[140] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Direct to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated May 9, 2012 (Exhibit 50 at 14-2940_0497).
[141] Email from Lauren Silverman to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated October 26, 2011 (Exhibit 59 at 14-2940_0550).
[142] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated March 24, 2011 (Exhibit 57 at 14-2940_0542).
[143] Email from HSUS Federal Affairs Director to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated June 21, 2012 (Exhibit 5 at 14-2940_0095).
[144] Email from Michael Markarian to Representative Whitfield's Wife, dated December 12, 2012 (Exhibit 63 at 14-2940_0563).
[145] Email from Representative Whitfield's Wife to HSLF Lobbyist, dated May 17, 2011 (Exhibit 58 at 14-2940_0548).

98. In sum, HSLF and HSUS used Representative Whitfield and his staff to support their lobbying activities. Representative Whitfield's Wife appeared to act as a liaison for HSLF, making frequent requests of Representative Whitfield and his staff.

99. Based on the evidence before the OCE, there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield provided special favors or privileges to his wife, in her capacity as a lobbyist, and to her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

IV. CONCLUSION

100. Representative Whitfield's Wife has been a registered lobbyist for HSLF since 2011. Since 2011, she has reported lobbying on numerous bills, including bills that Representative Whitfield sponsored or co-sponsored.

101. Based on evidence before the OCE, Representative Whitfield's Wife contacted Representative Whitfield and his staff about bills she lobbied. The contacts included discussions about drafting bills, selecting potential bill co-sponsors, and scheduling meetings with congressional offices.

102. During the same time period, Representative Whitfield's office provided direct assistant to the lobbying efforts of HSUS and HSLF at the request of Representative Whitfield's Wife. In particular, HSUS and HSLF had Representative Whitfield's Wife assist with attempts to have Representative Whitfield schedule congressional meetings, introduce legislation and support certain legislation.

103. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegation concerning the lobbying contacts of Representative Whitfield's wife because there is a substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield had lobbying contacts with his wife and permitted his wife to have lobbying contacts with his staff in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

104. The Board recommends that the Committee on Ethics further review the allegations concerning the granting of special favors or privileges because there is substantial reason to believe that Representative Whitfield permitted his wife to use his congressional office to advance and facilitate her lobbying activities and the lobbying activities of her employer in violation of House rules and standards of conduct.

EXHIBIT 1

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REGISTRATION

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 4)

Check One: ☑ New Registrant ☐ New Client for Existing Registrant ☐ Amendment

1. Effective Date of Registration 01/01/2011

2. House Identification _____ **Senate Identification** 400873559

REGISTRANT

☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

3. Registrant Organization Humane Society Legislative Fund

Address 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip 20037 - Country USA

4. Principal place of business (if different than line 3)

City State Zip - Country

5. Contact name and telephone number ☐ **International Number**

Contact Ms. Sara Amundson Telephone (202) 676-[redacted] E-mail

6. General description of registrant's business or activities

social welfare organization for the protection of animals

CLIENT

A Lobbying Firm is required to file a separate registration for each client. Organizations employing in-house lobbyists should check the box labeled "Self" and proceed to line 10. ☑ ***Self***

7. Client name Humane Society Legislative Fund

Address

City State Zip - Country

8. Principal place of business (if different than line 7)

City State Zip - Country

9. General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYISTS

10. Name of each individual who has acted or is expected to act as a lobbyist for the client identified on line 7. If any person listed in this section has served as a "covered executive branch official" or "covered legislative branch official" within twenty years of first acting as a lobbyist for the client, *state the executive and/or legislative position(s) in which the person served.*

Name			Covered Official Position (if applicable)
First	Last	Suffix	
Richard	Patch		
Sara	Amundson		
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield		Please see page 3 for list of positions held

LOBBYING ISSUES

11. General lobbying issue areas (Select all applicable codes).

ANI AGR CHM VET SCI FOO BUD

12. Specific lobbying issues (current and anticipated)

H.R. 835/ S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, Puppy Mills
H.R. 198, Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act, Veterans and service dogs
H.R. 2492, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, Animal fighting
H.R. 1513, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, Chimps in research

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

13. Is there an entity other than the client that contributes more than $5,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant in a quarterly period and either actively participates in and/or in whole or in major part plans, supervises or controls the registrant's lobbying activities?

☑ No --> Go to line 14. ☐ Yes --> Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then proceed to line 14.

Internet Address:

Name	Address: Street / City	State/Province	Zip Code	Country	Principal Place of Business			
					City			
					State		Country	
					City			
					State		Country	
					City			
					State		Country	

FOREIGN ENTITIES

14. Is there any foreign entity

a) holds at least 20% equitable ownership in the client or any organization identified on line 13: or
b) directly or indirectly, in whole or in major part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances or subsidizes activities of the client or any organization identified on line 13; or
c) is an affiliate of the client or any organization identified on line 13 and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity?

☑ No --> Sign and date the registration. ☐ Yes --> Complete the rest of this section for each entity matching the criteria above, then sign the registration.

Name	Address: Street / City	State/Province	Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)				Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership
				City					%
				State		Country			
				City					%
				State		Country			

Signature **Date** 02/29/2012

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

ADDITIONAL LOBBYISTS

10. Supplemental. List any addtional lobbyists for this client not listed on page 1, number 10.

Name			Covered Official Position (if applicable)
First	Last	Suffix	
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield		Department of Justice--Attorney Advisor;
"	"		Department of Interior--Special Asst to Solicitor,
"	"		Asst Solicitor Energy & Natural Resources, Asst
"	"		Secretary Fish, Wildlife and Parks;
"	"		US Import-Export Bank--Director
"	"		

ADDITIONAL LOBBYING ISSUES

11. Supplemental. General lobbying issue areas. Enter any additional codes for issues not listed on page 2, number 11.

ADDITIONAL AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

13. Supplemental. List any other affiliated organization thats meets the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 13.

Name	Address				Principal Place of Business		
	Street						
	City	State/Province	Zip Code	Country	City		
					State	Country	
					City		
					State	Country	
					City		
					State	Country	

ADDITIONAL FOREIGN ENTITIES

14. Supplemental. List any other foreign entity that meets the criteria specified and is not listed on page 2, number 14.

Name	Address				Principal place of business (city and state or country)		Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership
	Street							
	City	State/Province	Country		City			
					State	Country		%
					City			
					State	Country		%
					City			
					State	Country		%

EXHIBIT 2

Clerk of the House of Representatives
Legislative Resource Center
B-106 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov

Secretary of the Senate
Office of Public Records
232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20510
http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) **- All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ **Check if different than previously reported**

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 - Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code - Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number ☐ International Number c. E-mail

Ms. Sara Amundson (202) 676-[redacted]

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2011 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1-9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☑

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature **Date** 03/12/2012

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | ANI | Animals | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders

H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☑
Sara	Amundson			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: ANI - Animals

H.R. 2492 & S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | VET | Veterans | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

S. 1838, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | BUD | Budget/Appropriations | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 2584, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency prioritization and funding for alternatives to animal testing

S. 1599, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2012, agency

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: BUD - Budget/Appropriations

S. Amdt. 791, H.R. 2112, FY 2012 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, Amendment related to agricultural subsidies for high-income persons

H.R. 2112, Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act 2012, related to increased for animal care, Horse Protection Act, and USDA Investigative and Enforcement Services and veterinary loan forgiveness

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Registrant Humane Society Legislative Fund Client Name Humane Society Legislative Fund

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City State Zip Code - Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City State Zip Code - Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1	Richard	Patch		3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)
		City State Country City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5

2 4 6

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Clerk of the House of Representatives
Legislative Resource Center
B-106 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov

Secretary of the Senate
Office of Public Records
232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20510
http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) **- All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ **Check if different than previously reported**

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 - Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code - Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number ☐ International Number c. E-mail

Ms. Sara Amundson (202) 676-[redacted]

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2012 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☑ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1-9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature **Date** 04/12/2012

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

v6.0.2a

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI Animals (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders

H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
Dane	Waters			☑
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: ANI - Animals

H.R. 2492 & S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures

S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rails) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another

H.R. 3798, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions.

H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing.

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET Veterans (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | BUD | Budget/Appropriations | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

No bill yet, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing

No bill yet, various appropriations issues, including Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Registrant Humane Society Legislative Fund Client Name Humane Society Legislative Fund

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City State Zip Code - Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City State Zip Code - Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)
		City State Country City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5

2 4 6

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Clerk of the House of Representatives
Legislative Resource Center
B-106 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov

Secretary of the Senate
Office of Public Records
232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20510
http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) **- All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ **Check if different than previously reported**

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 - Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code - Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number ☐ International Number c. E-mail

Ms. Sara Amundson (202) 676[redacted]

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2012 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☑ Q3 (7/1-9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature **Date** 07/20/2012

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

v6.0.2a

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | ANI | Animals | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research
H.R. 2966 & S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
Dane	Waters			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: ANI - Animals

S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rails) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another
H.R. 3798, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions.
H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing.
H.R. 4103 & S. 2134, Canine Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retiring military working dogs.
H.R. 2492/S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | VET | Veterans | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | BUD | Budget/Appropriations | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H 6091, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing
H 5973/S 2375, various appropriations issues, including House and Senate Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and House Agriculture Appropriations

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

Registrant Humane Society Legislative Fund Client Name Humane Society Legislative Fund

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City State Zip Code - Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City State Zip Code - Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)
		City State Country City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5

2 4 6

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Clerk of the House of Representatives
Legislative Resource Center
B-106 Cannon Building
Washington, DC 20515
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov

Secretary of the Senate
Office of Public Records
232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20510
http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) **- All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address ☐ **Check if different than previously reported**

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 - Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code - Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number ☐ International Number c. E-mail

Ms. Sara Amundson (202) 676-[redacted]

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2012 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1-9/30) ☑ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature **Date** 10/19/2012

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | ANI | Animals | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders
H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research
H.R. 2966 & S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
Dane	Waters			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

ADDENDUM for General Lobbying Issue Area: ANI - Animals

S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rails) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another
H.R. 3798, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions.
H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing.
H.R. 4103 & S. 2134, Canine Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retiring military working dogs.
H.R. 2492/S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, relating to increasing penalties for animal fighting
H.R. 6388, To amend the Horse Protection Act to, among other things, designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | VET | Veterans | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code | BUD | Budget/Appropriations | (one per page)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H 6091, various appropriations strategies, including House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations, related to alternatives to animal testing
H 5973/S 2375, various appropriations issues, including House and Senate Animal Welfare Act funding, Horse Protection Act funding, Class B dealers, and House Agriculture Appropriations

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

House of Representatives, Senate

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐
				☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Printed Name and Title **Sara Amundson, Executive Director**

Registrant Humane Society Legislative Fund Client Name Humane Society Legislative Fund

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address

City State Zip Code - Country

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City State Zip Code - Country

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country)
		City State Country City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5

2 4 6

Printed Name and Title Sara Amundson, Executive Director

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2012 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☑

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 01/18/2013

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 835 & S. 707, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders H.R. 1513 & S. 810, Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, relating to the use of chimps in research H.R. 2966 & S. 1176, American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
H.R. 2492 & S. 1947, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures S. 1281, Horse Transportation Safety Act, to prohibit transporting a horse in interstate commerce in a motor vehicle (except a vehicle operated exclusively on rail or rails) containing two or more levels stacked on top of one another H.R. 3798, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments of 2012, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing. H.R. 4103 & S. 2134, Canine Members of the Armed Services Act, relating to retiring military working dogs.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐
Dane	Waters			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R.198, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5
2 4 6

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual
Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2
City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*
Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2013 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☑ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 20,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 04/19/2013

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 847 & S. 395, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders Lobbying relating to the use of chimps in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
H.R. 366 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing Lobbying related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐
Sara	Amundson			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 183, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5
2 4 6

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual
Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2
City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*
Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2013 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☑ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 10,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 07/19/2013

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 847 & S. 395, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders Lobbying relating to the use of chimps in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
H.R. 366 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing. Lobbying related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act H.R. 1518, Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal Lobbying relating to a proposed NMFS rule that would preempt state and territorial statutes on shark finning H.R. 2642, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language; to add horse soring bill language; to add horse slaughter bill language S. 954, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language H.R. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities Lobbying to lift the cap on chimpanzee retirement funding.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE, Health & Human Services - Dept of (HHS), Labor - Dept of (DOL), Education - Dept of

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Connie	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 183, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5
2 4 6

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual
Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2
City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*
Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2013 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☑ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☑

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 10/21/2013

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 847 & S. 395, Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act, relating to commercial dog breeders Lobbying relating to the use of chimps in research and permanent retirement to sanctuary H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption H.R. 366 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. H.R. 1733 & S. 886, Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act, would amend the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 to prohibit the use of performance-enhancing drugs in horseracing Lobbying related to upgrading the Horse Protection Act H.R. 1518, Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal Lobbying relating to a proposed NMFS rule that would preempt state and territorial statutes on shark finning Lobbying to lift the cap on chimpanzee retirement funding H.R. 2642, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language H.R. 1947, Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and add egg bill language; to add horse soring bill language; to add horse slaughter bill language S. 954, Agriculture Reform, Food, and Jobs Act, to add animal fighting bill language

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE, Health & Human Services - Dept of (HHS), Labor - Dept of (DOL), Education - Dept of

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code BUD BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 183, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1	Dane	Waters		5			
2				6			
3				7			
4				8			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1
2
3
4
5
6

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual
Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address
Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2
City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)
City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*
Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2013 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☐ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☑

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 20,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 01/21/2014

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 366 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures H.R. 1518 & S. 1406 Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption
H.R. 1731 & S. 820, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. S. 252, PREEMIE Act Reauthorization, to lift the cap on funding for retiring chimpanzees Lobbying relating to a proposed NMFS rule that would preempt state and territorial statutes on shark finning Farm Bill: Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and maintain the animal fighting language

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code BUD BUDGET/APPROPRIATIONS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities
S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities Appropriations re: Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies to lift the cap on chimpanzee retirement funding

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 183, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman-Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5
2 4 6

Clerk of the House of Representatives	Secretary of the Senate
Legislative Resource Center	Office of Public Records
B-106 Cannon Building	232 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20515	Washington, DC 20510
http://lobbyingdisclosure.house.gov	http://www.senate.gov/lobby

LOBBYING REPORT

Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (Section 5) - **All Filers Are Required to Complete This Page**

1. Registrant Name ☑ Organization/Lobbying Firm ☐ Self Employed Individual

Humane Society Legislative Fund

2. Address

Address1 2100 L Street, N.W., Suite 310 Address2

City Washington State DC Zip Code 20037 Country USA

3. Principal place of business (if different than line 2)

City State Zip Code Country

4a. Contact Name b. Telephone Number c. E-mail

5. Senate ID# 400873559-12

7. Client Name ☑ *Self* ☐ *Check if client is a state or local government or instrumentality*

Humane Society Legislative Fund

6. House ID# 419410000

TYPE OF REPORT

8. Year 2014 Q1 (1/1 - 3/31) ☑ Q2 (4/1 - 6/30) ☐ Q3 (7/1 - 9/30) ☐ Q4 (10/1 - 12/31) ☐

9. Check if this filing amends a previously filed version of this report ☐

10. Check if this is a Termination Report ☐ Termination Date _____ 11. No Lobbying Issue Activity ☐

INCOME OR EXPENSES - YOU MUST complete either Line 12 or Line 13

12. Lobbying

INCOME relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period was:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☐ $ _____

Provide a good faith estimate, rounded to the nearest $10,000, of all lobbying related income from the client (including all payments to the registrant by any other entity for lobbying activities on behalf of the client).

13. Organizations

EXPENSE relating to lobbying activities for this reporting period were:

Less than $5,000 ☐

$5,000 or more ☑ $ 20,000.00

14. REPORTING Check box to indicate expense accounting method. See instructions for description of options.

☑ **Method A.** Reporting amounts using LDA definitions only

☐ **Method B.** Reporting amounts under section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code

☐ **Method C.** Reporting amounts under section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code

Signature Digitally Signed By: Sara Amundson, Executive Director **Date** 04/24/2014

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code ANI ANIMALS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 366 & S. 666, Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act, to prohibit attendance at animal fighting ventures H.R. 1518 & S. 1406 Prevent All Soring Tactics Act, to strengthen penalties and make the soring of horses illegal
Lobbying relating to a proposed NMFS rule that would preempt state and territorial statutes on shark finning Lobbying to prioritize funding for alternatives to traditional animal tests.

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code AGR AGRICULTURE

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 1731 & S. 820, Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments, would amend the Egg Products Inspection Act to revise housing and treatment of egg-laying hens and related enforcement provisions. Lobbying related to a proposed USDA rule that would regulate the importation of puppies Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, to strike the King Amendment and maintain the animal fighting language H.R. 2410, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities S. 1244, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, to secure adequate funding for the enforcement of animal welfare laws and defund the inspection of horse slaughter facilities

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐
Constance	Harriman Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code FOO FOOD INDUSTRY (SAFETY, LABELING, ETC.)

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 1094 & S. 541, Safeguard American Food Exports Act, to prohibit sale, transport, etc. of horses for slaughter for human consumption

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S. SENATE

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Sara	Amundson			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

LOBBYING ACTIVITY. Select as many codes as necessary to reflect the general issue areas in which the registrant engaged in lobbying on behalf of the client during the reporting period. Using a separate page for each code, provide information as requested. Add additional page(s) as needed.

15. General issue area code VET VETERANS

16. Specific lobbying issues

H.R. 183, Veteran's Dog Training Therapy Act, to create a pilot program on dog training therapy

17. House(s) of Congress and Federal agencies ☐ Check if None

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18. Name of each individual who acted as a lobbyist in this issue area

First Name	Last Name	Suffix	Covered Official Position (if applicable)	New
Constance	Harriman Whitfield			☐

19. Interest of each foreign entity in the specific issues listed on line 16 above ☑ Check if None

Information Update Page - Complete ONLY where registration information has changed.

20. Client new address

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

21. Client new principal place of business (if different than line 20)

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____ Country _____

22. New General description of client's business or activities

LOBBYIST UPDATE

23. Name of each previously reported individual who is no longer expected to act as a lobbyist for the client

	First Name	Last Name	Suffix		First Name	Last Name	Suffix
1				3			
2				4			

ISSUE UPDATE

24. General lobbying issue that no longer pertains

AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

25. Add the following affiliated organization(s)

Internet Address:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Zip Country	Principal Place of Business (city and state or country) City State Country

26. Name of each previously reported organization that is no longer affiliated with the registrant or client

1 2 3

FOREIGN ENTITIES

27. Add the following foreign entities:

Name	Address Street Address City State/Province Country	Principal place of business (city and state or country)	Amount of contribution for lobbying activities	Ownership percentage in client
		City State Country		%

28. Name of each previously reported foreign entity that no longer owns, or controls, or is affiliated with the registrant, client or affiliated organization

1 3 5
2 4 6

EXHIBIT 3

RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 1:55 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

You need to tell Cory that these Das have NOT been to DC before and that we are talking about passing Ed's bill not Emma's feelings of effectiveness.

Also, this legal angle is our best shot at getting more co-sponsors. You shouldn't have immediately offered to do it. That gave Cory an easy out.

Compromise: Have her call offices she hasn't called before.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 1:42 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfie
Subject: FW: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

Please don't share.

From: Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov
To: [redacted]@msn.com
Subject: FW: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling
Date: Mon, 27 Jan 2014 21:42:45 +0000

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:41 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

She says her effectiveness has gone way downhill, especially with those offices she's already reach out to once. It is out of the ordinary for us to be handling folks schedule this much. This precedence was started at a time when we thought it would only be a hand full of meetings. Happy to chat if you want more background.

From: Irby, Marty
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:33 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

I take that back...she did one day and sent about ten emails then forwarded it all to me. I don't mind doing this, its just that she has seemed to be much more effective and knows the other schedulers.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:32 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

I thought she helped schedule several this past month. No?

From: Irby, Marty
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:30 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

I'll just do it. I haven't asked her to schedule anything in a longtime, and I know these are the most important of all of the people we have had to come advocate. I assured them we would handle meetings.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:28 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

It seems that we've asked a lot of Emma lately on these meetings. I also suspect this isn't the District Attorney's first trip to DC. Can their staff try to set up these meetings?

From: Irby, Marty
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 4:20 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

Advice?

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 3:09 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

Marty,

In looking over this list I realized I have reached out to several of these members already regarding meetings with PAST Act supporters. Because of that I feel like it would not be as effective for me to go back to them again. Also, the House will only be in session on the 12th and only until 1pm that day. There are no votes scheduled on the 13th. I do not know the Senate schedule, but I know that may make it more difficult to schedule any Member meetings. February and March are also two of the busiest months we have on the Hill, meeting wise, so many Members schedules may already be full during those days. While I was happy to help set up meetings last October and on, this time of year is also significantly busier for me as well.

All in all, I think it would be more effective if either you or Mark reach out to these offices to schedule the meetings. I am happy to provide you with contacts in the offices if you are having trouble finding them.

Thanks,

Emma

From: Irby, Marty
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2014 10:14 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Hicks, Cory; 'Mark E. Davidson'
Subject: Tennessee District Attorney Scheduling

Emma-

Please see the attached spreadsheet of House and Senate Members our coalition has compiled for the District Attorney Mike Dunavant, and Assistant District Attorney Mark Davidson to meet with on the two days they are available in February. I believe the 12th and 13th are the two days and they are open any time after 10:30 on the 12th. This is a long list and there is no way we will get to all of these people so I have highlighted the most important ones on the list.

In person meetings with members are most important, so please schedule with this in mind. Senator Alexander, and Senator Corker are very important as well since Mike and Mark are from Tennessee. Please let the members you are scheduling with know they were the prosecuting attorneys in the Jackie McConnell case. The link to ABC's expose is http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/tennessee-walking-horses-abused/story?id=16360835 If you need to utilize it.

Let me know if you need anything from me. I will be attending the meetings with them and have copied Mark Davison on this email.

Thanks,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | https://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Ed wants a copy of the spreadsheet you gave Emma

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 2:00 PM
To: [redacted]@msn.com ([redacted]@msn.com)

Sent from my iPhone

RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 3:26 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org)
Cc: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs – who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying – I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist – but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to *know* that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png><image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Connie Harriman ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org)

On my end, any help from anyone is welcome.

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org
CC: [redacted]@msn.com
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:25:59 +0000

Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs -- who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying -- I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist -- but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to *know* that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png> <image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 3:35 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Marty, we worked to get these folks to agree to come. If you need help with scheduling or attending their meetings, I don't think it's appropriate or reasonable to ask AHC, AVMA or ASPCA. If you need help, please let us know with what, and ask – us. We have enough people to accompany folks during the week of the 25th – and as I said, Michael Blackwell doesn't need accompanying.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

On my end, any help from anyone is welcome.

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org
CC: [redacted]@msn.com
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:25:59 +0000

Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs – who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying – I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist – but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to *know* that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png><image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

HSUS should not sit in on

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 3:38 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Republican meetings!

Sent from my iPhone

RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 3:45 PM
To: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Harriman ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Keith-

Quite honestly if I had hair, I would pull it out today. My outreach was to try to help garner Republican meetings. I have had very little luck in getting responses myself, and within our office on help with scheduling but we are working on that issue.

I don't think it is unreasonable to request AVMA, or AHC along with Ayotte's staff to help garner Republican meetings. AVMA and AHC have both recently expressed to me they are willing to help with R's.

Like it or not, the Humane Society doe not seem to be popular with Republicans, and in light of recent events with the ethics committee and word around the hill with I think we need to look more at what works best.

I also thought informing everyone in the group of who all we have coming would provide some enthusiasm and motivation to light a fire under some of those who have not been as active.

I can completely understand regarding ASPCA because they are HSUS competition in the grand scheme of things.

Frustrated,
Marty

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@msn.com; [redacted]@hslf.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:35:34 +0000

Marty, we worked to get these folks to agree to come. If you need help with scheduling or attending their meetings, I don't think it's appropriate or reasonable to ask AHC, AVMA or ASPCA. If you need help, please let us know with what, and ask - us. We have enough people to accompany folks during the week of the 25th – and as I said, Michael Blackwell doesn't need accompanying.

From: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

On my end, any help from anyone is welcome.

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org
CC: [redacted]@msn.com
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:25:59 +0000

Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs – who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying – I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist – but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to know that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png> <image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 4:06 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@bslf.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Just today I asked Connie to let you know that if you needed help, you should ask us; I'm sure she hasn't had a chance to do so yet.

I understand your frustration, but that doesn't mean you have to resort to a shotgun approach. This email was the first I've heard that you've had problems scheduling meetings.

It's perfectly reasonable to ask AHC or AVMA to arrange meetings for people they are bringing to DC to lobby for the bill. If they are willing to help with Rs, that's great – they should be scheduling meetings for themselves or their constituents, or asking some of their affiliated groups (state horse councils or VMAs) to do outreach to legislators.

It's not appropriate for them to accompany constituents to meetings that we have asked to come, and have offered to pay expenses for. I don't want to drop people that we've cultivated into the hands of other groups that they don't know and have no connection to – sorry.

It has nothing to do with competition, with ASPCA (who honestly is not in competition with us on this bill) or any other group. It has to do with proper handling of constituents that we have brought to the table

If you or others in Mr. Whitfield's office can't get meetings set, we may have to huddle to see how best to get this task done.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:46 PM
To: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Keith-

Quite honestly if I had hair, I would pull it out today. My outreach was to try to help garner Republican meetings. I have had very little luck in getting responses myself, and within our office on help with scheduling but we are working on that issue.

I don't think it is unreasonable to request AVMA, or AHC along with Ayotte's staff to help garner Republican meetings. AVMA and AHC have both recently expressed to me they are willing to help with R's.

Like it or not, the Humane Society doe not seem to be popular with Republicans, and in light of recent events with the ethics committee and word around the hill with I think we need to look more at what works best.

I also thought informing everyone in the group of who all we have coming would provide some enthusiasm and motivation to light a fire under some of those who have not been as active.

I can completely understand regarding ASPCA because they are HSUS competition in the grand scheme of things.

Frustrated,
Marty

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@msn.com; [redacted]@bslf.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:35:34 +0000

Marty, we worked to get these folks to agree to come. If you need help with scheduling or attending their meetings, I don't think it's appropriate or reasonable to ask AHC, AVMA or ASPCA. If you need help, please let us know with what, and ask - us. We have enough people to accompany folks during the week of the 25th – and as I said, Michael Blackwell doesn't need accompanying.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

On my end, any help from anyone is welcome.

EW3 000313

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org
CC: [redacted]@msn.com
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:25:59 +0000

Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs -- who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying -- I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist -- but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to *know* that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

EW3 000314

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png> <image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 4:18 PM
To: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Hartiman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Marty,

I think you should give Ben Pendergast some specific meetings to handle without 3rd parties in attendance. Eg McCain, Risch etc..

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 4:06 PM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Just today I asked Connie to let you know that if you needed help, you should ask us; I'm sure she hasn't had a chance to do so yet.

I understand your frustration, but that doesn't mean you have to resort to a shotgun approach. This email was the first I've heard that you've had problems scheduling meetings.

It's perfectly reasonable to ask AHC or AVMA to arrange meetings for people they are bringing to DC to lobby for the bill. If they are willing to help with Rs, that's great - they should be scheduling meetings for themselves or their constituents, or asking some of their affiliated groups (state horse councils or VMAs) to do outreach to legislators.

It's not appropriate for them to accompany constituents to meetings that we have asked to come, and have offered to pay expenses for. I don't want to drop people that we've cultivated into the hands of other groups that they don't know and have no connection to - sorry.

It has nothing to do with competition, with ASPCA (who honestly is not in competition with us on this bill) or any other group. It has to do with proper handling of constituents that we have brought to the table.

If you or others in Mr. Whitfield's office can't get meetings set, we may have to huddle to see how best to get this task done.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:46 PM
To: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Keith-

Quite honestly if I had hair, I would pull it out today. My outreach was to try to help garner Republican meetings. I have had very little luck in getting responses myself, and within our office on help with scheduling but we are working on that issue.

I don't think it is unreasonable to request AVMA, or AHC along with Ayotte's staff to help garner Republican meetings. AVMA and AHC have both recently expressed to me they are willing to help with R's.

Like it or not, the Humane Society doe not seem to be popular with Republicans, and in light of recent events with the ethics committee and word around the hill with I think we need to look more at what works best.

I also thought informing everyone in the group of who all we have coming would provide some enthusiasm and motivation to light a fire under some of those who have not been as active.

I can completely understand regarding ASPCA because they are HSUS competition in the grand scheme of things.

Frustrated,
Marty

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
To: [redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>; [redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>;
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:35:34 +0000
Marty, we worked to get these folks to agree to come. If you need help with scheduling or attending their meetings, I don't think it's appropriate or reasonable to ask AHC, AVMA or ASPCA. If you need help, please let us know with what, and ask - us. We have enough people to accompany folks during the week of the 25th - and as I said, Michael Blackwell doesn't need accompanying.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

On my end, any help from anyone is welcome.

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>;
[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>
CC: [redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential
Date: Tue, 28 Jan 2014 20:25:59 +0000
Since we (HSUS) have provided all of these contacts (except for the TN DAs - who became involved and took interest in the soring issue, and in lobbying on behalf of the PAST Act because of their work on the McConnell case and relationship with our legal staff), I would like to have HSUS/HSLF staff or Marty accompany them to Hill meetings if at all possible (if they need accompanying - I don't think Michael Blackwell does). If we need help arranging meetings with Republican offices, hopefully sponsor staff can assist - but I don't think ASPCA will have much better luck than we will, and I don't think we can rely on AHC or even AVMA to set up meetings for these folks. We need to know that these meetings are set, if these folks are going to travel to DC to help us.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; Ben Pendergrass; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org<[redacted]@ASPCA.org>; Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Sadly, I need to say that neither HSUS nor HSLF will be able to do well setting up meetings with Republican offices. It is just an unfortunate fact. That is why Ed's office was so crucial in setting up meetings between Republicans and third parties.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 28, 2014, at 3:04 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby
Congressional Aide
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:robert.hankins@mail.house.gov>|http://whitfield.house.gov<http://whitfield.house.gov/>
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>
<image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

FW: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 1/28/14 5:53 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Connie, per our conversation this morning I emailed Whitney to request that she ask state VMAs to contact key targets to urge cosponsorship. I'll let you know how she responds.

Keith

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 5:25 PM
To: 'Dr. Whitney Miller'
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Hi Whitney,

Thanks so much for everything you're doing!

I was actually going to contact you today to see if you would get some of the state VMAs to weigh in with legislators from their states, to urge their cosponsorship of PAST. In some states we have a strong advocate base and/or horse groups that have endorsed the bill and agreed to lobby their Congressmen, but in others we need any help we can get.

Do you think you could ask the following VMAs to contact the legislators listed (and/or send a letter to them) urging cosponsorship?

AK – Sen. Murkowski

AZ – Sen. McCain

FL – Sen. Rubio

NC – Sen. Burr

ND – Sen. Hoeven

VA – Rep. Cantor

TX – Rep. Burgess, Sens. Cruz and Cornyn

McCain is a top priority to try to get on board; we've heard he's open to cosponsoring, but needs to hear from groups in his state. If we can get him, others may follow. Rubio would be another key target.

Please let me know if you think this is something you could pose to these VMAs – thanks.

Best,

Keith

From: Dr. Whitney Miller [[redacted]@avma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 4:52 PM
To: 'Irby, Marty'; Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Wow, great Marty! Just let us know how we can help. Happy to do what we can!

Whitney

Whitney L. Miller, DVM, MBA

Assistant Director

American Veterinary Medical Association

Governmental Relations Division

1910 Sunderland Place NW

Washington, DC 20036

202-289-[redacted] | [redacted]@avma.org | www.avma.org

From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:04 PM
To: Sara Amundson; 'Keith Dane'; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: PAST Advocates - Confidential

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavent & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

FW: Another Big Lick show bites the dust!

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Thu 1/30/14 10:42 AM
To: Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com) ([redacted]@aol.com); Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Just FYI

From:
Date: January 30, 2014 10:35:30 AM EST
To:
Subject: Another Big Lick show bites the dust!

Email from Jill Wait

The Corn Belt officers met today and decided to cancel the 2014 Spring and Fall Horse Shows, due to low attendance, lack of funds, and declining membership in CBWHA. There comes a time when you have to face facts and those are the Tennessee Walking show horse has all but disappeared in the State of Iowa. It does not make sense to have a Walking Horse show in Iowa and expect exhibitors to travel from MO, IL & MN in order to have a decent show. For those that were members, we will not be sending out 2014 Membership Applications due to the above reasons. We will see how this show season goes for the remaining shows in the Midwest, and re-evaluate our position for 2015, but without renewed interest and additional funding, it doesn't look promising, and we may have to close the book on the Corn Belt Walking Horse Assoc. This makes me really sad, but also alittle relieved I won't have the stress of worrying if we will have enough money to pay the bills. Hope your show season in MO is successful, and I will try to make it to a show to keep in touch with "my horse show family". Jill

Fwd: Connie, for your feedback asap: suggested edits to PAST/HIO letter

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Thu 1/30/14 1:18 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Please respond ONLY to me.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: January 30, 2014 at 1:17:47 PM EST
To: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>
Cc: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>

Subject: Re: Connie, for your feedback asap: suggested edits to PAST/HIO letter

My thoughts:
1. I think our best argument is that the new approach has as it's goal the ABOLITION of soring rather than its continued REGULATION. This envisions bringing costs to 0.

2. I think we need more detail on things USDA does now that will vanish under our scheme. We need to make it sound more complicated and costly.

3. What is our point in mentioning that 3 HIOs were created in the past 5 years? So what?

3. HIOs "that" not "which" refuse to comply.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 30, 2014, at 10:37 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>> wrote:

Keith, the letter looks good. We were originally asked by Warner/Ayotte to craft three tight talking points on cost to respond to push-back they were getting. However, I don't think it hurts to have it addressed to Rockefeller and Thune, too. Connie?

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 10:03 AM
To: Mimi Brody
Cc: Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: suggested edits to PAST/HIO letter
Importance: High

Thanks, Mimi; I've attached the latest version with your edits, and with Rockefeller and Thune added.

I have taken this as far as I can, and am going need your collective help in finalizing who the addresses should me, and Mimi's help with the proper titling and addresses. Please give this your attention at your earliest convenience today, as we all gave this a high priority and I believe we'd like to get this into the hands of the HIOs as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Keith

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 9:23 AM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: Re: suggested edits to PAST/HIO letter

I am fine with you doing it whichever way you think best in terms of a) overall endorsement of PAST vs just the cost issues, and b) solo parallel letters vs joint letter. Hope Sara and Connie can also share their sense re: most appropriate addressees (lead sponsors vs Committee Chair/Ranking). Thank you all!
Mimi
[redacted] (c)
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 30, 2014, at 9:15 AM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
Thanks, Mimi - your edits look fine, but the problem with including total support of the PAST Act is that some of the HIOs may not feel ready to endorse it, but might agree to sign on to the statement that the bill will not cost any more money. If we want to get as many HIOs on board as possible, we should focus the message on cost. If we only care about getting two or three (out of 13), then we can include endorsement of PAST.

Similarly, if we wait for all of them to deliberate about whether to jointly sign any version of the letter, it will take much longer than getting a few of them to agree, and getting their letters to the Senators. If we want to get this right away, I suggest we ask each HIO to submit their own letter. If we don't mind waiting a week or two (or possibly longer) for all of them to decide, then we can ask them to sign a joint letter.

I'm adding Sara and Connie for their input on these points. It would be great if we could get this resolved today, as I had hoped to send the draft out to the HIOs by COB yesterday.

Keith

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2014 2:33 AM
To: Keith Dane
Subject: suggested edits to PAST/HIO letter

Keith, your draft is EXCELLENT!!! Many thanks for doing such a great job with it! I've marked a few suggested edits and comments below in red. I think it's important that they endorse the full bill, so no one will think they have problems with the rest of it besides the portions getting rid of self-policing. I also think it'll be strongest to have one letter co-signed by several of them, rather than identical letters individually sent by different HIOs (not sure if that's why you said "please do not hesitate to contact me," but it's why I changed that to "us").

I'm at the hospital with my daughter, but will be checking email during the day if you have questions. Please confirm that you got this. Thanks again!

Mimi

[redacted] (cell/text)

[might work best to address to Senate Committee Chair and Ranking Member, and do parallel letter to House counterparts, but I'm fine with addressing it to lead sponsors if you, Sara, and Connie think that's better -- should use standard format for addresses to committee or personal offices ("The Honorable..." and include U.S. Senate/U.S. House of Representatives, room, building, etc.) -- I don't have contact info w/me here, but we can help them refine that]
Senator Kelly Ayotte
Senator Mark Warner

Date

Dear Senators Ayotte and Warner,
I am writing to you as a representative of _____, a Horse Industry Organization (HIO) certified by USDA under the Horse Protection Act (HPA) regulations to inspect horses for compliance with the Act at horse shows, exhibitions, sales or auctions.
Our HIO has worked diligently to penalize soring and eliminate it from the ranks of our affiliated events; we have a miniscule violation rate, and that rate never varies regardless of whether USDA staff are in attendance to oversee our efforts[delete:,] or not. However several of the largest HIOs have serious, inherent conflicts of interest, work to protect the violator rather than the horse, and have allowed and even facilitated the ongoing practice of horse soring.
Based on our experience in working with USDA to enforce the Act, we have come to the conclusion that the provisions of the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act which eliminate the HIO system of industry self-regulation and place the responsibility with USDA for the licensure, training, assignment and oversight of independent third party inspectors are urgently needed, will not increase costs to the taxpayer, and in the long term may reduce the cost of enforcing the HPA.
We hold this position for the following reasons:

[awkward, I'd remove the heading altogether and just go straight to bullet points:Horse Protection Act Enforcement under the PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act - S. 1406/H.R. 1516]

* USDA's own Inspector General called the current HIO system a failure, and recommended in a 2010 audit that the system be abolished, and that USDA assume full oversight and responsibility for inspectors as envisioned by the PAST Act.

* Under PAST, USDA will no longer have to spend an inordinate share of its modest HPA budget ($697,000 in FY14) overseeing the failed industry self-policing scheme. It has been a major drain of resources for the agency to watch the "fox who's guarding the hen house." The rate of violations cited is much higher when USDA staff are present to look over the shoulders of industry inspectors during spot checks at events. The PAST Act cuts out the corrupt middleman, and will eliminate the need for USDA to certify, oversee, sanction and decertify HIOs which refuse to comply with the Act and regulations. (There are currently 13 HIOs; 3 of these are new entities that [delete:which] have been certified in the past 5 years.)[flip order of punctuation:).]

* As under current law, show management will continue to pay for inspections, so this will not become a new federal cost. It will still be optional - not mandatory - for show management to hire inspectors. However if they do, the PAST Act will ensure that the inspectors are legitimate. USDA will license, train and assign them, and they will be accountable to the agency.

* USDA already trains inspectors, conducts spot checks by agency veterinarians to monitor the integrity of inspectors in the field, maintains an online database of violations, and does other HPA enforcement activities, but this work is too often thwarted by those HIOs [delete b/c too far removed from reference two bullets up to corrupt middleman:in the middle] with conflicts of interest. For example, they pressure inspectors not to write citations, seldom apply appropriate penalties when violations are cited, and don't readily provide the agency with data on violations.

* When the [delete:a] system of USDA-licensed inspectors and other provisions of the PAST Act are in place, far fewer people will bring sore horses to shows, as there will be a meaningful deterrent, and the violation rate is expected to be dramatically reduced. This will result in a need for fewer USDA spot inspections, citations, investigations, and federal cases - and therefore not only less soring, but less costly administrative oversight by USDA.

[delete:In summary, t] The PAST Act should certainly not add any significant burden to USDA, but will simply enable the agency to redirect its Horse Protection Act enforcement efforts and resources in a more efficient and effective way.
We are convinced that the elimination of the HIO system and the licensure and oversight by USDA of third party inspectors are essential in removing the existing conflicts of interest from the inspection program and guaranteeing unbiased, robust enforcement of the HPA - and that this change will be possible with no additional cost to the taxpayer. We strongly endorse the PAST Act for these reasons, and fully support the other aspects of this legislation as well, including its prohibition on the use of devices associated with soring and its enhanced penalties.
If you should have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact us [delete:me].
Sincerely,

Signature

Name, title, organization

Fwd: lobbying Texas members

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Sat 2/01/14 10:45 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Please start from bottom.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: February 1, 2014 at 10:43:08 PM EST
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Re: lobbying

Did that result in a different list than we developed on the phone the other day? If you or he can send us that list, we'll see if there are any new targets we should be focusing on.

I don't know Barb, or her background. I had asked Julie if she could come, because she has lobbied with us before. She can't make it, but recommended Barb as a good representative of the Texas State Council.

I'm not sure who her Congressman is, but will find out. But since she is representing the State Council, she can visit any office from the delegation.

If you'd like to talk with her, I can arrange a call. The main thing we need to do is determine if and when we like her to come.

-----Original message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
To: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Sent: Sun, Feb 2, 2014 03:20:41 GMT+00:00
Subject: Re: lobbying

Marty and I met on Friday and developed a list of Texas members who are candidates for co-sponsorship.

Who is her Congressman and what is her background?

It's wonderful she is willing to do this.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 1, 2014, at 7:58 PM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

We have a member of the Texas State Horse Council willing to come to DC in March to lobby on PAST. Should we make plans to have her come in the early part of the month?

From: Julie Caramante ([redacted]@att.net]
Sent: Friday, January 31, 2014 6:21 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Barb Chopek
Subject: lobbying

Hi there,

Barb got back to me and she said that March was open for her. I have a personal situation going on with my Mothers estate and with my step dad which is involving court. We will be back in court sometime in March and I do not know what days.

I might be able to go in April if you can wait until then. Maybe Barb can go then too. If not, Barb is fabulous, a very good speaker and professional and you have her in March. You will really, really like her.

If this works out then the TSHC can lobby for both pieces of legislation. I had not heard of the other bill until today.

I cc'd Barb on this email.

Have a great weekend.

Julie

Re: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Sun 2/02/14 2:47 PM
To: Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org)
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); [redacted]@aol.com ([redacted]@aol.com); Stephanie Twining ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

I can't either ill be en route on airplanes back to DC.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 2, 2014, at 12:57 PM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org> wrote:

> I can't that day.
>
> On Feb 2, 2014, at 1:56 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>
>> Fine w/ me.
>>
>> Connie
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>>> On Feb 2, 2014, at 12:37 PM, "Jennifer Lonergan" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>>>
>>> Hi all!
>>>
>>> Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.
>>>
>>> Call-in Information: please note that the security code has changed.
>>> 1-800-504-[redacted]
>>> [redacted]#
>>> [redacted]#
>>>
>>> <meeting.ics>

PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Jennifer Lonergan** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 8:34 AM
To: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); [redacted]@aol.com ([redacted]@aol.com); [redacted]@msn.com ([redacted]@msn.com); Stephanie Twining ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Sorry all! I think we should move to a time when Sara and Marty can make it—can everyone do this Thursday, the 6th, at 1pm EST instead?

Hi all!

Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.

Call-in Information: please note that the security code has changed.
1-800-504-[redacted]
[redacted]#
[redacted]#

Re: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Mimi Brody** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 9:51 AM
To: Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); [redacted]@aol.com ([redacted]@aol.com); [redacted]@msn.com ([redacted]@msn.com); Stephanie Twining ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

I can - thanks, Jen.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 3, 2014, at 8:34 AM, "Jennifer Lonergan" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>

> Sorry all! I think we should move to a time when Sara and Marty can make it--can everyone do this Thursday, the 6th, at 1pm EST instead?
>
> Hi all!
>
> Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.
>
> Call-in Information: please note that the security code has changed.
> 1-800-504-[redacted]
> [redacted]#
> [redacted]#
>
> <meeting.ics>

Re: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 12:47 PM
To: Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); [redacted]@aol.com ([redacted]@aol.com); Stephanie Twining ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Yes that works for me.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 3, 2014, at 7:34 AM, "Jennifer Lonergan" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Sorry all! I think we should move to a time when Sara and Marty can make it--can everyone do this Thursday, the 6th, at 1pm EST instead?
>
> Hi all!
>
> Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.
>
> Call-in Information: please note that the security code has changed.
> 1-800-504-[redacted]
> [redacted]#
> [redacted]#
>
> <PAST Task List Review_Updates>

Accepted: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 6:00 PM
To: Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org; [redacted]@aol.com; [redacted]@msn.com; [redacted]@humanesociety.org
Subject: PAST Task List Review/Updates
Date: Sun, 2 Feb 2014 17:37:23 +0000

Hi all!

Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.

Call-in Information: please note that the security code has changed.
1-800-504-[redacted]
[redacted]#
[redacted]#

Accepted: PAST Task List Review/Updates

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)

EW3 000324

Sent: Mon 2/03/14 6:03 PM
To: Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@humanesociety.org; [redacted]@hslf.org; [redacted]@aol.com; [redacted]@msn.com; [redacted]@humanesociety.org
Subject: PAST Task List Review/Updates
Date: Mon, 3 Feb 2014 13:34:08 +0000

Sorry all! I think we should move to a time when Sara and Marty can make it—can everyone do this Thursday, the 6th, at 1pm EST instead?

Hi all!

Please let me know if you'll be available Tuesday, February 4th at 1pm EST for a review of the PAST Act task list. I will circulate an updated task list in advance.

Call-in information: please note that the security code has changed.
1-800-504-[redacted]
[redacted]#
[redacted]#

Re: PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Poll Shelbyville Now

From: **Mimi Brody** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 9:53 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com); Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

FYI, I just voted, and it's currently running 50% yes (support PAST), 49% no.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 3, 2014, at 7:48 PM, "Marty Irby" <[redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>> wrote:

Please vote FOR the PAST Act in this poll:

http://www.shelbyvillenow.com/home?results=483

Re: PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Poll Shelbyville Now

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Mon 2/03/14 10:00 PM
To: Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com); Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Than you Mimi!

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 3, 2014, at 8:53 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> FYI, I just voted, and it's currently running 50% yes (support PAST), 49% no.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Feb 3, 2014, at 7:48 PM, "Marty Irby" <[redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>> wrote:
>
> Please vote FOR the PAST Act in this poll:
>
> http://www.shelbyvillenow.com/home?results=483

RE: Sen. Rubio on PAST! FW: PAST Advocates - Confidential

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:11 PM
To: Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Fed Leg List ([redacted]@hsus.org)

Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); [redacted]@aol.com ([redacted]@aol.com); Jennifer Lonergan ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Marty asked Yoho to call Rubio.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 12:55 PM
To: Fed Leg List
Cc: Keith Dane; [redacted]@aol.com; Jennifer Lonergan
Subject: Sen. Rubio on PASTI FW: PAST Advocates - Confidential

I know Equine was doing phone banking for him, and lots of other outreach -- fantastic development!!! FYI, he's #4 R on the Commerce Committee.

From: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner) [[redacted]@warner.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 12:53 PM
To: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); 'Dr. Whitney Miller'; 'Irby, Marty'; Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cheryl Jacobson; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Way to go Samantha! That's huge news thanks for sharing

From: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 12:49 PM
To: 'Dr. Whitney Miller'; 'Irby, Marty'; Sara Amundson; 'Keith Dane'; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'; Cheryl Jacobson; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Just a quick note to let you all know that Senator Rubio has agreed to cosponsor the PAST Act.

Sam

From: Dr. Whitney Miller [[redacted]@avma.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 4:52 PM
To: 'Irby, Marty'; Sara Amundson; 'Keith Dane'; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'; Cheryl Jacobson; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: PAST Advocates - Confidential

Wow, great Marty! Just let us know how we can help. Happy to do what we can!

Whitney

Whitney L. Miller, DVM, MBA

Assistant Director

American Veterinary Medical Association

Governmental Relations Division

1910 Sunderland Place NW

Washington, DC 20036

202-269-[redacted] | [redacted]@avma.org | www.avma.org

From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:04 PM
To: Sara Amundson; 'Keith Dane'; Jennifer Lonergan; Mimi Brody; 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'; Cheryl Jacobson; Dr. Whitney Miller; 'Ben Pendergrass'; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Dillihay, Marilyn; [redacted]@ASPCA.org
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: PAST Advocates - Confidential

All-

I wanted to provide you all with a comprehensive list of the advocates coming and the dates they have kindly offered to help us on the PAST Act in February.

February 5- Marion & Burl Lattshaw, President and Past President of the Pennsylvania Walking Horse Association

February 12 & 13- Mike Dunavant & Mark Davidson, Tennessee District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney

February 25 & 26- Priscilla Presley, wife of Elvis Presley and Tennessee Walking Horse Owner

February 26 & 27- Dr. Michael Blackwell, former Dean of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tennessee

February 25, 26, 27, & 28- Nicholas Hughes, Constituent of Speaker Boehner who owns Tennessee Walking Horses and had one abused in training

Because the list has grown, and you can see the overlaps we will probably need some help in scheduling and having others attend several meetings with these advocates. February will be a big month for us, and we appreciate any help you can provide!

Please keep this list between those listed on the email.

All the best,

Marty

Marty Irby

Congressional Aide

Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)

2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547

marty.irby@mail.house.gov | http://whitfield.house.gov

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:35 PM

To: MartyIrby@msn.com ([redacted]@msn.com); Heydlauff, Emma (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov); Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov); Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.
>
> Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.
>
> Connie

RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Mimi Brody** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:49 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

Good to hear!! Fabulous work on Sen. Rubio, Marty!!! Do you know if Rep. Yoho did contact him about it, as Connie said you had in the works?

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Sara Amundson** ([redacted]@hslf.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:51 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Heydlauff, Emma (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov); Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Yes, I thought we'd focus on Rs regardless?

On Feb 4, 2014, at 1:48 PM, "Marty Irby" <[redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>> wrote:

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Heydlauff, Emma** (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby' ([redacted]@msn.com); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:55 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov); 'Marty Irby' ([redacted]@msn.com)
Cc: Keith Dane ([redacted]@humanesociety.org); Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Well, that is good news because House Rs will not be around on Thursday.

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.
>
> Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.
>
> Connie

FW: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:56 PM
To: 'Marty Irby' ([redacted]@msn.com)

Can you have Emma update you on meetings scheduled for DAs thus far, and then send a copy to me?

Thanks,

Connie

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.
>
> Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.
>
> Connie

RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Keith Dane** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:57 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov); 'Marty Irby' ([redacted]@msn.com); Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)
Cc: Sara Amundson ([redacted]@hslf.org); Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Makes perfect sense - thank you both!

-----Original message-----
From: "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
To: 'Marty Irby' <[redacted]@msn.com>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>, Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>, Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tue, Feb 4, 2014 18:51:11 GMT+00:00
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:57 PM
To: Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

I do not. Last I heard a few weeks ago he was going to call him.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:49 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Good to hear!! Fabulous work on Sen. Rubio, Marty!!! Do you know if Rep. Yoho did contact him about it, as Connie said you had in the works?

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Fwd: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:58 PM
To: Emma Heydlauff (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Date: February 4, 2014, 12:56:17 PM CST
To: 'Marty Irby' <[redacted]@msn.com>
Subject: FW: Re-Scheduling DAs

Can you have Emma update you on meetings scheduled for DAs thus far, and then send a copy to me?

Thanks,

Connie

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

EW3 000332

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Marty Irby** ([redacted]@msn.com)
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:58 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield ([redacted]@humanesociety.org)

Yes. Ill be back late tonight and talk to her tmrw.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:56 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Can you have Emma update you on meetings scheduled for DAs thus far, and then send a copy to me?

Thanks,

Connie

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Heydlauff, Emma** (Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:59 PM
To: 'Marty Irby' ([redacted]@msn.com)

I've sent you all the meetings I have heard back from.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:58 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Fwd: Re-Scheduling DAs

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Date: February 4, 2014, 12:56:17 PM CST
To: 'Marty Irby' <[redacted]@msn.com>
Subject: FW: Re-Scheduling DAs

Can you have Emma update you on meetings scheduled for DAs thus far, and then send a copy to me?

Thanks,

Connie

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

From: **Connie Harriman-Whitfield** ([redacted]@humanesociety.org) You moved this message to its current location.
Sent: Tue 2/04/14 1:59 PM
To: Marty Irby ([redacted]@msn.com)

How is it going?

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 1:58 PM, "Marty Irby" <[redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>> wrote:

Yes. Ill be back late tonight and talk to her tmrw.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:56 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Can you have Emma update you on meetings scheduled for DAs thus far, and then send a copy to me?

Thanks,
Connie

From: Heydlauff, Emma [mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:51 PM
To: 'Marty Irby'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Re-Scheduling DAs

Marty and I have been focusing on House meetings for the 12th and Senate meetings for the 13th since the House has a shortened week.

From: Marty Irby [[redacted]@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 04, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Re-Scheduling DAs

The DAs are not available those days they will be at a conference. We will just have to focus on R meetings. We actually have started with R's and haven't called D's yet because we had a long list.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 4, 2014, at 12:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
I just found out from Ed that the Democrats are having their retreat Feb 13 and 14. It begins on the night of the 12th. If meetings with the DAs have been scheduled for Feb 13, they need to be moved to Feb 11 and the DAs need to be told to alter their schedules accordingly. These are terribly important meetings, and I hope these changes can be made.

Also, we need to assure that we are more current with events on the House Calendar.

Connie

EW3 000335

EXHIBIT 4

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 1:10 PM
To: Holly Hazard <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Patti Hoffman <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting on past

I totally concur, Holly. I think the HSUS can put this over the top but only by targeting certain members (though they constitute the majority). To pass this in the House we need at least 50 more Republican co-sponsors. Sadly, HSUS is anathema to the majority of them.
Example: we have a good shot of getting the Republican Study Group
(app'x 50 extreme conservative members) to support the bill. Yoho, who is one of them, has prepared a video to show the RSG. And I have prepared a Dear Colleague letter for Yoho.
BUT***** Yoho told Cong Whitfield and me that the HSUS is
evil because "They want to give ALL animals the exact same rights that humans have." He HATES HSUS.
If we allow him to sway the RSG, however, the bill is assured of passage.
That is the delicate tightrope we walk.

With Republicans, Ed and I emphasize that it is an industry-backed bill(AVMA,
AAEP, AHC etc.) we don't even mention animal welfare groups though they do appear on our list of supporters. AHC is grieving a briefing to House/Senate staff members on October 28.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 19, 2013, at 12:01 PM, "Holly Hazard" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Right. Thanks. That was my sense. I'd expect we can inspire the mothership to do some heavy lifting (mixed metaphor) but we need to be clear on our strategy and specific things that would help. So I think a meeting would be good to flesh this out.
>
>> On Oct 19, 2013, at 11:58 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org> wrote:
>>
>> Thanks Holly. I don't know that there's been a whole lot of support from other departments. Equine, Connie, Mimi and I have been it. HSLF is planning a big roll-out next week for online communications.
>>
>>> On Oct 19, 2013, at 11:38 AM, "Holly Hazard" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>>>
>>> I'd like to schedule a meeting on where we are, and what resources do we need to kick this over the top? Maybe I'm just out of the loop but it seems to me this is our moment to galvanize the strength of the HSUS with emails to members in targeted districts, work on the hill, communications finding constituents who may influence member if we aren't the best messenger and I'm not seeing this.
>>> I do know what GREAT work has been going on with gaining co sponsors on the house side which is fantastic!!
>>>
>>> I compare the organizational focus to the wolf push or the NJ gestation crates in which the entire organization has gotten involved at critical junctures.
>>>
>>> I'm not saying there isn't a plan or strategy, it's just that I'm not up to speed on where we are.
>>> Let me know what may work.
>>>
>>>
>>> Holly

EXHIBIT 5

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2012 3:43 PM
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: We need to get the Walking Horse bill going? We can get that on the Farm bill.

Yes! Working with Ed and Cory on it today.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2012, at 9:07 PM, "Mimi Brody" [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Connie, I know you're already up to your eyeballs trying to turn things around on the HPA funding with Chairmen Rogers and Kingston, so I don't want to really aggravate you. But – per the emails below – any chance we could get the HPA bill introduced in time so it might be possible to try to add it to the Farm Bill during House floor debate?! Ag Comm will likely have a say on HPA, regardless of prime referral to E & C, and it would be sweet to get it done in the wake of all the media attention. (Farm Bill is supposed to be marked up in House Ag on July 11, so floor action would be after that.)
Mimi

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 3:44 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle
Cc: Michael Markarian ([redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>); Cece Kremer
Subject: RE: We need to get the Walking Horse bill going? We can get that on the Farm bill.

I'd love to! I'll check w/Connie. She'd said Cory told her they're very close, but it's been hard to get Leg Counsel to focus on it when they've got lots of approps drafting to do, and they still need to figure out how to do the redirected payments (have to be cast that way, rather than user fees, so tea party crowd won't go nuts, per Cong. Whitfield's personal assessment).

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2012 3:14 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: We need to get the Walking Horse bill going? We can get that on the Farm bill.

Wayne Pacelle
President & CEO
The Humane Society of the United States
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
t 202-452-[redacted] f 301-258-3077
humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
WaynePacelle.org <http://www.waynepacelle.org/> (blog)
Facebook.com/WaynePacelle<http://www.facebook.com/WaynePacelle>
Join Our Email List<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhkl> Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>
Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>
<image001.gif><http://www.humanesociety.org/>
The Humane Society of the United States is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>, approved by the Better Business Bureau<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by GuideStar's Philanthropedia<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

EXHIBIT 6

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 9, 2013 2:21 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Kate Wall <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Arianna Brown <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: oops, forgot to paste in the list...RE: Cong. Whitfield as original cosponsor of reintroduced BEST Practices Act? (re: DOD Trauma Training)

Thanks – good idea, Connie! We'll definitely pursue LoBiondo!

Are you ok with us weighing in with Cong. Whitfield on it to see if he'll cosponsor again? If so, do you want to handle that communication or have me or someone else here reach out to Cory or Justin?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 2:14 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Arianna Brown
Subject: Re: oops, forgot to paste in the list...RE: Cong. Whitfield as original cosponsor of reintroduced BEST Practices Act? (re: DOD Trauma Training)

Even if Ed joins, you should ask Lo Biondo too because he is on Armed Forces Committee and passionate.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 9, 2013, at 1:29 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Please see my email below, this time with the list added at the end, as promised.☺
Mimi

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 1:27 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Arianna Brown
Subject: Cong. Whitfield as original cosponsor of reintroduced BEST Practices Act? (re: DOD Trauma Training)

PCRM would like our help getting Cong. Whitfield to agree to be an original cosponsor of the reintroduced BEST Practices Act, to phase out use of live animals in military trauma training. He cosponsored the bill last Congress, though he wasn't an original cosponsor (I pasted last year's cosponsor list at the end of this email string, FYI.) If Cong. Whitfield agrees, then Cong. Grimm will join him, and presumably Cong. Walter Jones will also be part of this team of original cosponsors.

This bill isn't a top priority for us, but we do support it. Connie, what do you think?
Mimi
202/955-[redacted]

From: Noah Gittell [[redacted]@pcrm.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 1:09 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Sara Amundson
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi Mimi –

That's great, thank you! I'll definitive give her a call.

It looks like Hank Johnson will be introducing the bill, but we are lining up a small, bipartisan team of original cosponsors. I met with Grimm's and Whitfield's offices today. Grimm will get back on the bill if Whitfield does, and Whitfield's new defense staffer Adam Moore told me that he is likely to get back on, but that he wanted to look over everything first because he is new to the issues.

It strikes me now that Whitfield's support is very crucial. If we lose Grimm and Whitfield, there is only 1 Republican from last year left, Walter Jones.

I know that the HSUS has a good relationship with Whitfield's office. Would you be willing to contact Adam (or better yet, Taylor Booth) and let him know that the HSUS is behind this bill?

-Noah

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 08, 2013 3:44 PM
To: Noah Gittell; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Sara Amundson
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

I finally connected with Courtney Cochran in Rep. Adam Smith's personal office. She is very happy to help – was somewhat familiar with the trauma training issue already, though not the details of how it sorted out in NDAA last year. I gave her a quick summary of where things stand now and how we're hoping to have NDAA report language that will press DOD for a timeline, but I let her know that you and PCRM really worked this and can fill them in on all the angles. She asked me to share her contact info with you, Noah, so you can follow up with her, and she'll be glad to connect you

with the right staff on the Minority side of the committee. Her info is:

Courtney.Cochran@mail.house.gov
202/226-[redacted] (direct line)

Are you trying to get Andrews to be lead sponsor of the BEST Practices Act, as well as pushing the report language? If not, I guess you could pitch the bill to Courtney also (I didn't raise it with her, not knowing your strategy).

Good luck, and let me know if you have any trouble reaching her. Thanks,

Mimi
202/955-[redacted]

From: Noah Gittell [[redacted]@pcrm.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 4:18 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Sara Amundson
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Fantastic. Thanks.

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 4:17 PM
To: Kate Wall; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Noah Gittell; Sara Amundson
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi, Noah. The staffer I worked with in Rep. Smith's office on another issue in the 2011 DOD reauthorization is now his Political Director based in his district office. But I just left a message with Courtney Cochran, who's picked up the animal welfare portfolio for him. I can give her background and let you know once we connect, so you can follow up with her.
Mimi

From: Kate Wall
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Noah Gittell; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi Noah,

Have you been in touch with McKeon's office at all? If not, we might be able to be helpful with introductions there.

Best,
Kate

From: Jessica Feingold-Lieberson
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Noah Gittell; Kate Wall; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi Noah,

I'd be more than happy to hook you up with our friends in Blumenthal's office. I don't know A. Smith's staff very well, but I believe Mimi has a relationship there.

Best,
Jessica

From: Noah Gittell [[redacted]@pcrm.org]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 5:36 PM
To: Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Kate Wall; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Cc: Ryan Merkley
Subject: RE: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi friends,

We're thrilled that you guys are able to help. As Laura has explained it to me, the HSUS will mostly be working the regulatory side of this, although you can help with lobbying efforts here and there. That sounds perfect to us.

Here's what we're up to. We feel that it is very important for Congress to respond to this awful report DOD issued, otherwise they'll think that they've satisfied everyone's concerns. I think we've got a good case – Congress asked DOD to commit to a timeline, and they haven't done that at all. We'll be reintroducing the BEST Practices Act soon and I hope to have found a new House champion for it in the next couple weeks.

In the meantime, we'd really like to get some report language in the NDAA as part of the manager's amendment. I've got some language in front of Rob Andrews's staffer right now, but it would be great to have Adam Smith on board with it. I'd also like to get Blumenthal to submit similar language to the Senate NDAA, and I'm trying to get a meeting with his office.

Can you help with either Smith or Blumenthal?

Thanks again for your help. I'm looking forward to this collaboration.

Best,
Noah

From: Laura Schierhoff [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 4:36 PM
To: Jessica Feingold-Lieberson; Kate Wall; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Cc: Noah Gittell
Subject: Legislative Help re: Trauma Training

Hi All,

As follow up to our Fed Affairs meeting today, I wanted to pass along the requests for Hill efforts on military medical training. I have attached a report that the DoD recently completed as required by the NDAA FY2013.

After meeting with PCRM last week on this issue, there were some offices mentioned as being helpful/critical to reach out to soon re: asking for report language in FY14 NDAA that expresses dissatisfaction with the recent DoD report. Noah will be able to more fully clarify and refine what PCRM needs assistance with, but there were at least 2 office mentioned: Blumenthal (S) and Smith (H). PCRM has talked with Ethan Saxon in Blumenthal's Office, who is in charge of defense issues, but any further outreach HSUS could do would be helpful.

Thanks so much to all of you for helping with this issue and feel free to reach out to Noah if you have any questions.

Laura Schierhoff
Regulatory Specialist, Federal Affairs
[redacted]@humanesociety.org
t 202.955.[redacted] f 202.676.2301

The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037
humanesociety.org
Join Our Email List Facebook Twitter Blog

<image001.gif>

To support The Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly donation, or give in another way, via a gift donation or memorial donation or donating your vehicle. You can also volunteer for The HSUS, and see our 55 ways you can help animals.

The HSUS is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator, approved by the Better Business Bureau for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by Guidestar's Philanthropedia experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

H.R.1417
Latest Title: Battlefield Excellence through Superior Training Practices Act
Sponsor: Rep Filner, Bob [CA-51] (introduced 4/7/2011) Cosponsors (53)
Related Bills: H.R.403, S.3418
Latest Major Action: 5/18/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

COSPONSORS(53), BY DATE [order is left to right]: (Sort: alphabetical order)
Rep Jones, Walter B., Jr. [NC-3] - 4/7/2011
Rep Rothman, Steven R. [NJ-9] - 4/7/2011
Rep Critz, Mark S. [PA-12] - 4/7/2011
Rep Andrews, Robert E. [NJ-1] - 4/7/2011
Rep Frank, Barney [MA-4] - 4/7/2011
Rep Miller, George [CA-7] - 4/7/2011
Rep Bartlett, Roscoe G. [MD-6] - 4/7/2011
Rep Johnson, Henry C. "Hank," Jr. [GA-4] - 4/7/2011
Rep Kucinich, Dennis J. [OH-10] - 4/7/2011
Rep McGovern, James P. [MA-3] - 4/15/2011
Rep Berman, Howard L. [CA-28] - 4/15/2011
Rep Hinchey, Maurice D. [NY-22] - 4/15/2011
Rep Peters, Gary C. [MI-9] - 4/15/2011
Rep Moran, James P. [VA-8] - 4/15/2011
Rep Ackerman, Gary L. [NY-5] - 4/15/2011
Rep Norton, Eleanor Holmes [DC] - 4/15/2011
Rep Stark, Fortney Pete [CA-13] - 5/5/2011
Rep Jackson, Jesse L., Jr. [IL-2] - 5/5/2011
Rep Sutton, Betty [OH-13] - 5/5/2011
Rep Maloney, Carolyn B. [NY-14] - 5/5/2011
Rep Farr, Sam [CA-17] - 5/25/2011
Rep Himes, James A. [CT-4] - 5/25/2011
Rep Pingree, Chellie [ME-1] - 5/25/2011
Rep Cohen, Steve [TN-9] - 6/23/2011
Rep Schakowsky, Janice D. [IL-9] - 6/23/2011

Rep Gutierrez, Luis V. [IL-4] - 6/23/2011
Rep Rush, Bobby L. [IL-1] - 7/11/2011
Rep Grimm, Michael G. [NY-13] - 7/11/2011
Rep Doyle, Michael F. [PA-14] - 7/12/2011
Rep Honda, Michael M. [CA-15] - 7/12/2011
Rep Jackson Lee, Sheila [TX-18] - 7/21/2011
Rep Whitfield, Ed [KY-1] - 7/21/2011
Rep Grijalva, Raul M. [AZ-7] - 7/21/2011
Rep Napolitano, Grace F. [CA-38] - 7/21/2011
Rep Lofgren, Zoe [CA-16] - 9/12/2011
Rep Towns, Edolphus [NY-10] - 9/12/2011
Rep Roybal-Allard, Lucille [CA-34] - 9/12/2011
Rep DeLauro, Rosa L. [CT-3] - 11/3/2011
Rep Clarke, Yvette D. [NY-11] - 11/16/2011
Rep Woolsey, Lynn C. [CA-6] - 1/18/2012
Rep Carnahan, Russ [MO-3] - 1/31/2012
Rep Rangel, Charles B. [NY-15] - 1/31/2012
Rep Olver, John W. [MA-1] - 1/31/2012
Rep Polis, Jared [CO-2] - 2/8/2012
Rep Lewis, John [GA-5] - 2/14/2012
Rep Pascrell, Bill, Jr. [NJ-8] - 2/14/2012
Rep Chu, Judy [CA-32] - 2/14/2012
Rep Slaughter, Louise McIntosh [NY-28] - 2/14/2012
Rep Blumenauer, Earl [OR-3] - 2/16/2012
Rep Lee, Barbara [CA-9] - 5/7/2012
Rep Clay, Wm. Lacy [MO-1] - 5/10/2012
Rep Clarke, Hansen [MI-13] - 7/18/2012
Rep Conyers, John, Jr. [MI-14] - 8/2/2012

EXHIBIT 7

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD'S CHIEF OF STAFF

INTERVIEW OF [redacted]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Bryson Morgan

[redacted]

Stefan Passatino

Benjamin Keane

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3

4 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan

5 with the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we are

6 here with [redacted] and his attorneys Stefan

7 Passatino and Benjamin Keane. It is April 24, 2014.

8 [redacted], we want to just begin with a

9 little bit of background and somewhat obvious

10 information but can you give us your current job

11 title?

12 A. Chief of Staff.

13 Q. Chief of Staff and for whom?

14 A. Congressman Ed Whitfield.

15 Q. And for how long have you been Chief

16 of Staff?

17 A. Since January of 2013.

18 Q. And what was your title prior to that?

19 A. Legislative Director.

20 Q. How long were you Legislative

21 Director?

22 A. For, let's see, so for about four

23 years, so probably January 2009 until January of

24 2013 roughly.

25 Q. And as Chief of Staff, what are your

1 duties?

2 A. I oversee the office and, you know,

3 management of the office and, you know, generally

4 advise the staff on a variation of issues and, you

5 know, I work with schedulers on various meeting

6 stuff, I work with the legislative staff on whatever

7 is going on with the legislative issues, and then

8 also work with constituents and district staff on

9 issues dealing with constituents, so pretty much

10 jack of all trades I guess you could say.

11 Q. Okay. And how are your duties

12 different as Legislative Director, what were you

13 responsible for as Legislative Director?

14 A. Well, so the Legislative Director I

15 would say oversees closely the legislative staff,

16 maybe more so than the Chief of Staff, but, you

17 know, the Chief of Staff obviously has the final say

18 -- final say unless it's one of those issues that

19 you bring to the Congressman's attention on a lot of

20 things. You know, as you know, working on the hill,

21 you can't bring every decision to the Congressman's

22 attention, so the Legislative Director works with

23 the legislative staff organizing those efforts but

24 the Legislative Director then talks to the Chief of

25 Staff as to what is going on in the legislative shop

1 and, you know, then the Legislative Director and the
2 legislative staff may make a decision based on what
3 the issue is.
4 Q. And as the Legislative Director, were
5 you responsible for animal welfare issues?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And are you currently responsible for
8 such issues?
9 A. No.
10 Q. And that changed when you changed your
11 position?
12 A. So whenever I was Legislative
13 Director, a guy by the name of Justin Fareed came
14 into the office, and he handled animal issues, and
15 then at that point, I took on more of an overseeing
16 role rather than a, you know, hands on role. But
17 since Justin was a new staffer and had not worked on
18 the hill that much, it was probably a little more
19 hands on for me since I was sort of his supervisor
20 as the Legislative Director. And then when Justin
21 left, Chris Pack handled our animal issues for a
22 period there, short period, and then Marty started,
23 and then Marty handles the animal issues now, and so
24 -- you know, Marty, he's a little older than Justin,
25 more professionally developed, I guess you could

1 say, so, you know, I haven't had to coach him as
2 much as I have coached the previous people.
3 Q. Are you familiar with the PAST Act?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. What is that?
6 A. Well, the PAST Act deals with soring
7 of horses. You have this issue where some people in
8 the Tennessee walking horse industry, they sore the
9 bottom of the horse, the hoof of the horse or around
10 the legs in order to force that horse to jerk their
11 legs up, and it's really an issue because it's
12 already illegal as a result of the 1976 law -- or
13 1970 law and then there were some amendments in
14 1976, and even though it's already illegal, the
15 enforcement of the act really hasn't gone that well,
16 and there is still a lot of abuse out there, and we
17 actually contacted the USDA, because the USDA did an
18 Office of the Inspector General report on the issue,
19 and they issued a report talking about some of the
20 problems that was associated with the act, and as a
21 result of that, that's what guided our efforts to
22 introduce the PAST Act, and that that Inspector
23 General Report models the PAST Act, in fact I was
24 the one that drafted the PAST Act and worked with
25 legislative counsel on the PAST Act whenever I was

1 Legislative Director in the last Congress.
2 Q. So when did you first start working on
3 the legislation?
4 A. Well, I started working on the
5 legislation probably, let's see, so this is 2014, I
6 probably started working on this early in 2012, the
7 legislation, I worked on early in 2012 but there was
8 a lot of stuff that led up to the legislation that
9 got us to the point of actually drafting
10 legislation, for example, I think it was in 2010, we
11 sent a letter to USDA urging them to implement the
12 findings of the Inspector General Report. So that
13 -- that -- that letter in 2010 was sort of our
14 efforts to get the administration to address the
15 issue separately of legislation so we didn't have to
16 do anything legislatively. And unfortunately USDA
17 hasn't decided to do anything to implement the
18 findings of the Inspector General Report which is
19 what prompted us to introduce the legislation.
20 Now, prior to the Inspector General
21 Report, you know, we -- before 2010 we were urging
22 USDA to finish the Inspector General Report, and we
23 had previously -- you know, I have worked in the
24 office since 2004 and you know, I have handled
25 animal issues since 2004 up until, you know, Justin

1 came to the office, and I have handled horse issues
2 on and off since then, and you know, during that
3 whole period of time, we -- we knew that this abuse
4 occurred, we were trying to get funding for the
5 Horse Protection Act in the appropriation process,
6 and you know, over the course of that amount of
7 time, we were, you know, trying to figure out how to
8 get USDA to implement this law that is already on
9 the books better.
10 Q. You are saying we, what do you mean
11 when you are saying we?
12 A. Oh, me and the Congressman and you
13 know, our Chief of Staff -- you know, so whenever I
14 was Legislative Director we obviously had a Chief of
15 Staff, his name was John Sparkman. I would
16 obviously have to get sign off from him on things,
17 and I just mean the office in general whenever I say
18 we.
19 Q. Sounds like you are heavily involved
20 in the legislation?
21 A. I was, I am not as involved anymore.
22 Q. When did you change your involvement?
23 A. Oh, whenever Marty started in the
24 office.
25 Q. So was that around December of 2013?

1 A. Right, because Marty took on these
2 issues, and Marty has a lot of experience in, you
3 know, animal issues.
4 Q. Were you involved with finding
5 co-sponsors for the legislation?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. What else were you involved in with
8 the legislation?
9 A. I mean I drafted the legislation,
10 worked with legislative counsel to get it drafted,
11 we kicked off the legislation, we issued dear
12 colleagues, we met with people, we met with a
13 variation of stakeholders to get the legislation
14 drafted, we worked with American Horse Council, the
15 American Equine Practitioners, we worked with
16 American Veterinary Medical Association, we worked
17 with the Humane Society, we worked with the ASPCA,
18 American Society of Prevention of Animal Abuse, we
19 worked with all of these organizations to get the
20 legislation drafted and then we continued to work
21 with the organization to urge them to go meet with
22 people, urge them to get us co-sponsors and
23 everything of that nature, so, you know, I worked on
24 all of that, and -- prior to Marty starting and then
25 whenever Marty started, they sort of took the bulk

1 of everything that was going, on, but he still
2 periodically comes to me and asks for advice, hey,
3 what did you do on -- to try to urge people to
4 co-sponsor in previous situations, so we used some
5 of my background information having worked in the
6 office and on this issue for awhile to try to, you
7 know, further his efforts.
8 Q. And when you have been doing all that,
9 the drafting and then the co-sponsoring and the
10 strategy, what has been your interaction with Mrs.
11 Whitfield?
12 A. Well, I mean Mrs. Whitfield has been
13 involved in, you know, building coalitions and stuff
14 like that, and, you know, whenever we were drafting
15 the legislation, I worked with Keith Dane, and
16 Keith, you know, he serves on the board, or one of
17 the boards of the Tennessee Walking Horse, you know,
18 they have these horse industry organizations and
19 he's on one of those, so he had a lot of background
20 knowledge as far as working with that, so, you know,
21 my interaction with Mrs. Whitfield was more of she
22 was on some of the calls that I was on. But, you
23 know, that was kind the extent of it.
24 Q. When you say some of the calls, some
25 of the calls --

1 A. We had various conference calls with
2 all of the stakeholders discussing, like, you know,
3 okay, you know, during the drafting process, you
4 know, okay, what would be the best way to handle
5 this particular circumstance in the legislation and,
6 you know, we already made the decision to do the
7 legislation, we just needed to figure out the
8 details on exactly how to do it so, you know, we
9 were able to get it past the finish line. So, you
10 know, she was on those type of calls just sort of
11 figuring out, you know, what would be the best
12 course, I guess, to get to the finish line which is
13 to ultimately get it signed into law.
14 Q. These were calls to discuss strategy
15 dealing with the PAST Act?
16 A. Right.
17 Q. And she participated in those. Anyone
18 else on those phone calls other than the
19 stakeholders?
20 A. Oh, yeah -- oh, besides the
21 stakeholders? So the stakeholders were all of the
22 ones that I mentioned.
23 Q. Other members of Congress or staff of
24 Congress other than --
25 A. Well, so Congressman Cohen's office

1 sometimes participated, he's our democratic lead,
2 you know, they weren't as involved as we were, and
3 then at one point we also included our Senate
4 sponsors, so, you know, we introduced the bill on
5 the house side first and then several months passed
6 by and then the Senate introduced their bills, so we
7 had some strategy meetings or strategy calls once we
8 were working to try to get the Senate introduced and
9 sometimes the Senate participated.
10 Q. So when did these calls take place,
11 they started when, what year?
12 A. Well, we started drafting the
13 legislation in 2012, so, you know, it took us
14 probably from about May to October, and May is a
15 rough start time to actually draft the legislation,
16 because this is -- I mean I am sure you know, this
17 has been somewhat of a controversial issue and we
18 have made some people mad as a result of introducing
19 this legislation, because you know, we feel there
20 are some bad activities out there, a lot of bad
21 activities in fact, and you know, we wanted to make
22 sure we had all of our I's dotted and all of our T's
23 crossed and so it took us awhile to get it drafted
24 but prior to that, we were working on a lot of the
25 administrative stuff but that didn't really involve

1 that much conference calls and just planning and
2 stuff like that.
3 Q. So I am okay with the timeline, I
4 understand it, from May to October you were
5 drafting. During that time, were there conference
6 calls?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. These were the same type of conference
9 calls you described earlier where Connie was
10 present?
11 A. She was present on some of them, she
12 wasn't present on all of them, and it wasn't like we
13 were planning around her. You know, I would say we
14 were more planning around Keith because Keith was an
15 expert, and also Jay Hickey with the American Horse
16 Council, that was very helpful because he was a
17 group that we identified that wanted to support our
18 efforts that had not previously supported some of
19 the animal issues that we had been involved in, so,
20 you know, I would say Jay was probably one of the
21 most important players and also Ronda Haven with the
22 American Veterinary Medical Association was one of
23 the more important players.
24 MR. MORGAN: I want to step back a
25 little bit. Do you remember when it was first

1 decided that you would draft the PAST Act? Can you
2 tell me a little bit about how that decision was
3 made in the office?
4 A. Oh, you know, I told you we sent this
5 letter in 2010 about urging USDA to implement the
6 findings of the Inspector General Report. So USDA
7 responded to that letter and basically it was a
8 vanilla response that said, you know, we are -- we
9 are in the process of, you know, trying to implement
10 the findings. One of the things that we were urging
11 USDA to do was to eliminate the self policing
12 provisions and also to ban the use of the action
13 devices. And those two things are really important
14 and it became clear that they weren't going to do
15 that.
16 So not long after we received that
17 USDA letter back in 2010 we decided that the only
18 course of action we have here is to introduce
19 legislation.
20 MR. MORGAN: When you say we decided?
21 A. The Congressman, the Congressman and I
22 decided that we needed to introduce the legislation.
23 MR. MORGAN: Was Mrs. Whitfield
24 involved in those decisions?
25 A. Not whenever me and the Congressman

1 were talking about it.

2 Q. Was she there any other time?

3 A. Not whenever I was there, I can't

4 speak to, you know, the conversations that they may

5 or may not have had at home.

6 Q. Well, did she have communications with

7 you about, yes, we should pursue this legislation?

8 A. Well, she made her views known on the

9 conference calls with, you know, various people

10 after we had decided to introduce the legislation.

11 Q. You understood his question was before

12 that decision was made, was she participating in

13 that decision making? I think I am characterizing

14 your question right?

15 A. I mean I don't recall a situation

16 where Mrs. Whitfield said you need to do this or you

17 don't need to do this. Now, you know, Mrs.

18 Whitfield has a very assertive personality, and a

19 very, you know, she makes very declarative

20 statements and even if she would have said that,

21 she, you know, I would have -- I would have made

22 sure that this was the Congressman's and I's

23 discussions, so whenever Mrs. Whitfield calls the

24 office on various issues, people come to me and they

25 talk to me, about how do we handle this situation,

1 and you know, just because she's asking about a
2 particular situation, doesn't mean that she, you
3 know, gets what she wants. We always bring these
4 types of things to the Congressman's attention and
5 it's the Congressman's decision.
6 MR. MORGAN: Was she involved in the
7 back and forth with the USDA? You sent a letter in
8 2010, they responded, was she involved?
9 A. No, actually how that 2010 letter or
10 the idea of the 2010 letter came to our attention
11 was Former Senator Joe Tidings who was the original
12 drafter of the Horse Protection Act I think in 1976,
13 not the original act but the amendments in 1976, he
14 works at the law firm called Dickstein Shapiro.
15 They came to us and was like, hey, these problems
16 are still taking place, we think it would be good
17 for you to take a look at this letter that we have
18 prepared as a potential draft, and we think it would
19 be helpful to, you know, send this letter to USDA,
20 so that's how, you know, that whole process got
21 started.
22 Now, you know, at some point, because
23 whenever we sent that letter, we had a few other
24 people sign onto the letter, and so, you know, at
25 some point Mrs. Whitfield may have been involved in

1 getting other people to sign onto that letter. But,
2 you know, we already made the decision to do the
3 letter as a result of having this meeting with
4 Senator Tidings and some of the people from
5 Dickstein Shapiro.
6 Q. Approximately when did that happen
7 with Senator Tidings?
8 A. Well, it would have been a month or
9 two before the letter went, and I don't remember the
10 exact month that the letter -- that we sent the
11 letter. I think we provided a copy of the letter, I
12 didn't bring a copy with me, but, you know, it took
13 a couple of months to get -- because we had Senator
14 Mary Landrieu on there and Steve Cohen who is our
15 lead on the PAST Act --
16 Q. This is all during 2013?
17 A. No, this was 2010.
18 Q. 2010?
19 A. Yeah, this was 2010. I mean it may
20 have been the end of 2009 -- or 2009 because I don't
21 know exactly when the letter was sent in 2010, I
22 don't remember that.
23 Q. Earlier you mentioned that during May
24 and October 2013 is when --
25 A. Right, we drafted the bill.

1 Q. I have an email I want to take a look
2 at, EW401271. Feel free to read the entire email
3 but I want to draw your attention to the email from
4 Mrs. Whitfield to you at the bottom of page one.
5 I'm sorry, take a look at the email from Mrs.
6 Whitfield to you on page two.
7 A. Okay.
8 Q. So in this --
9 A. So these are documents that we already
10 had, these are just resources that we had prepared,
11 when I say we, I mean our office collectively
12 gathered this information working with our
13 stakeholders, so the OIG report is a USDA document,
14 American Horse Council press release is one of our
15 stakeholders, AVMA AAP, that's another stakeholder,
16 list of endorsers is just a list of everybody and
17 see here Connie suggested we move the American
18 Quarter Horse Association up to number four which
19 the American Quarter Horse Association had never
20 introduced -- never supported any of our horse
21 legislation so that was a win, and the reason why
22 she wanted to move it up to number four is because
23 we wanted to make sure we had them at the top, which
24 I think is a great suggestion.
25 Q. What I am trying to understand --

1 A. Text of the amendment, that is the
2 bill I drafted, the text of the amendment is the
3 bill that I drafted. So did you see the list of
4 endorsers --
5 Q. No, I'll frame -- I am trying to
6 understand why is Mrs. Whitfield sending to you an
7 email that says we discussed it this morning and
8 have come up with the following checklist that needs
9 to be implemented ASAP.
10 A. Well, this was right around the time
11 that we were planning on introducing the
12 legislation, so I don't remember exactly when we
13 introduced this legislation, but I would suspect
14 that, these are some things that she felt like
15 needed to happen before we introduced the
16 legislation.
17 Q. You said she feels like it begins with
18 A -- Ed is now focused on PAST, is it your
19 understanding this was simply coming from Mrs.
20 Whitfield or was it coming from Mrs. Whitfield and
21 the Congressman?
22 A. No, I just -- I took this as Mrs.
23 Whitfield was sending this email.
24 Q. And what conversation did you have
25 with her concerning the checklist that she sent?

1 A. Like a verbal conversation?
2 Q. Or email communication.
3 A. Well, we may have gone over the
4 various checklist and items that are there but there
5 really wasn't that much of a conversation. I mean
6 the only reason why we were getting this information
7 together to begin with so we had all of our, you
8 know, facts together before we introduced the
9 legislation. We were obviously going to get a lot
10 of questions, we were trying to build co-sponsors
11 and she played a role in building those coalitions,
12 so.
13 Q. What role did she play in building the
14 co-sponsors, did she assist you in any way, did you
15 work with her?
16 A. She met with other offices, and there
17 was, you know, she didn't assist me, she may have
18 made suggestions on who we should meet -- like who
19 would be easy targets for us to get to co-sponsor
20 the legislation, but that was really her role.
21 Q. And what was her role?
22 A. She, you know, worked -- she met with
23 -- she met with people separately of us, because she
24 -- the Humane Society supports this legislation, and
25 you know, they obviously want to see this get done

1 too, so, you know, you have to ask her as to what
2 she did for the Humane Society to further the cause.
3 Q. I am following up on you said it was
4 her role to do the co-sponsor, so did she contact
5 you communicate with you about finding co-sponsors?
6 A. I mean we talked about the -- the
7 people that she met with and, you know, the
8 co-sponsors that she got, the people that said no.
9 So, you know, she was telling us that information
10 because, you know, she went in and talked to people.
11 We didn't -- we wanted to make sure we went in, if
12 they said no because of a particular reason, if it
13 was a veterinary reason, we wanted to make sure and
14 send in the American Veterinary Medical Association.
15 It was more information sharing than anything.
16 Q. Was she involved in deciding or
17 talking about or recommending to you about which
18 co-sponsors to approach?
19 A. Yeah, she recommended some people that
20 she thought would be easy targets. But, you know,
21 we obviously wanted that input, to ensure that we
22 were able to get as many co-sponsors as possible.
23 At this point, we had already introduced the bill
24 and we were moving forward full steam ahead, so we
25 were trying to build as much stakeholder support as

1 possible. And you know, Mrs. Whitfield is very
2 experienced in the law, she's been around DC awhile,
3 and she knows how to build coalitions real well.
4 Q. Okay.
5 A. So it would be -- we wanted to use
6 that.
7 Q. Did she also discuss with you any of
8 the text of the bill, any possible changes to that?
9 A. You know, most of my conversations on
10 the text of the bill primarily dealt with Keith
11 Dane. I worked with him, because he was a subject
12 matter expert. I don't recall whether Connie made
13 specific, you know, asks as a result of the text of
14 the bill.
15 Q. I guess would you say that would fit
16 in her role though, so you described before this
17 idea of her role, would that fall into her role to
18 be involved in what the actual language of the bill
19 is?
20 A. Well, first of all, I wouldn't really
21 say that her role was a defined -- it wasn't
22 defined. But, you know, if she had suggestions and
23 if she, you know, had a good reason to -- good
24 reasons to back that up, then we would have
25 definitely taken, when I say we, the office and the

1 Congress -- we would have taken that into
2 consideration.
3 MR. MORGAN: If she did have a
4 suggestion, what would be the process by which she
5 would communicate that to the office?
6 A. She would -- well, during the drafting
7 process, whenever I was working on the issue, she
8 would either email or call me.
9 MR. MORGAN: Was that sometime -- did
10 she speak with Representative Whitfield directly
11 about those issues?
12 A. Well, you would have to ask her that.
13 MR. MORGAN: But not to your
14 knowledge?
15 A. Yeah. I mean this email here -- yeah.
16 MR. MORGAN: Would she also reach out
17 directly to another staffer in the office that you
18 are aware of to talk about the substance of the
19 bill?
20 A. Yeah.
21 MR. MORGAN: Who do you -- who are you
22 aware of that she would also reach out to?
23 A. You mean whenever I handled the issue
24 or whenever other people handled the issue? When
25 Justin handled the issue, there was a little overlap

1 between me and him. When I handled the issue before
2 Justin showed up, I was the primary contact on the
3 legislation, and she would have had no reason to
4 call anybody else other than me.
5 MR. MORGAN: Her standard procedure
6 would be to contact whoever was the point person on
7 the legislation at that time?
8 A. Right, right.
9 Q. During October 2013, there were
10 meetings that were -- do you recall those meetings?
11 A. Yes, they were very effective and
12 there were a lot of them.
13 Q. Yes. So my question was related to
14 the scheduling of those meetings that was done by
15 Representative Whitfield's office. Correct?
16 A. Right.
17 Q. Did there come a time when some
18 offices were concerned about Representative
19 Whitfield scheduling meetings that involved Mrs.
20 Whitfield?
21 A. Nobody expressed concern that involved
22 Mrs. Whitfield. One office expressed concern that
23 we were setting up meetings for people that cared
24 about our legislation, so I called the House Ethics
25 Committee, they advised me to call House

1 Administration. House Administration told me that
2 if we couldn't set up meetings for our bill, that we
3 decided to do and that we cared about, that the
4 boss, you know, when I say we, I mean the office and
5 the Congressman and I, we all wanted this to happen,
6 if we couldn't set up meetings for something that
7 was on our bill, for advocates that were going to
8 potentially co-sponsor our bill, then there was no
9 reason for the Congressman to be in Congress.
10 That's what House Administration told us.
11 MR. MORGAN: Do you recall who you
12 spoke with at House Administration?
13 A. Kelly Kravens I believe was the
14 person. Now, these meetings were set up for -- they
15 were set up because Marty Irby and Donna Bennefield
16 were in town. They were not -- you know, Marty at
17 the time did not work for our office, and he's the
18 past president of the Tennessee Walking Horse
19 Exhibitors Breeders Association. And he took a
20 position to support the legislation as a past
21 president which was a huge win for the cause.
22 So, you know, he brought a lot of
23 experience to what was going on, he and Donna both,
24 Donna was the President of the International Walking
25 Horse Association. So we were setting the meetings

1 up for Marty and Donna to go and meet with people to
2 urge them to co-sponsor the legislation. So
3 whenever one office expressed concern about us
4 setting up the meetings, they were expressing
5 concerns just generally setting up meetings for
6 people that cared about this issue.
7 Q. Who else was attending those meetings
8 with Marty and Donna?
9 A. Keith Dane attended a lot of them, the
10 -- Sara Amundson attended a lot of them, and Connie
11 may have attended some of them, but I don't think
12 she attended as many as Keith and Sara and I don't
13 even know which ones she attended and which ones she
14 didn't attend.
15 Q. Did you attend any of the meetings?
16 A. I may have attended one or two.
17 Because we were really working hard to get
18 Congressman Roe from Tennessee onto the legislation,
19 and may have attended that meeting, but that would
20 have probably been one of the very few. Because
21 there was no reason for me to really attend them,
22 the point was we were getting these meetings for
23 Marty and Donna who were the subject matter experts.
24 Q. The meeting with Congressman Roe, who
25 attended that meeting?

1 A. I did, and, you know, we met with
2 Congressman Roe on several occasions. So I don't
3 recall -- I don't know -- I don't recall whether I
4 was in the meeting with Marty and Donna and the
5 Congressman Roe meeting.
6 Q. Who do you recall me being at the
7 meeting with Congressman Roe?
8 A. Connie was at a meeting -- Mrs.
9 Whitfield was at a meeting with Congressman Roe and
10 it was either -- I think it was Congressman Row's
11 staff, and Mrs. Whitfield and I were at a meeting
12 once, I believe.
13 Q. When did that happen?
14 A. That probably would have happened
15 sometime after the introduction of the bill in the
16 last Congress, so sometime after October, sometime
17 between October and December.
18 Q. In 2012?
19 A. Right.
20 Q. Did you have any meetings with
21 Congressman Roe in this Congress?
22 A. I did not, because it became pretty
23 clear that he wasn't going to co-sponsor the bill.
24 Q. I want to make sure I understand about
25 the contact you had with the Committee on Ethics.

1 You called the Committee on Ethics after there was
2 concern about the meetings, and what did you tell
3 the Committee on Ethics?
4 A. I told the Committee on Ethics that we
5 were setting up meetings for advocates, Marty and
6 Donna, lobbying our efforts. They said -- they --
7 they -- I believe what they said was I would need to
8 contact the House Administration committee to get a
9 final determination on that, because it dealt with
10 the expenditure of, you know, federal funds.
11 Q. Did you tell them that Mrs. Whitfield
12 was -- could possibly attend meetings?
13 A. I don't believe that I told them that.
14 Q. Was there a particular reason why you
15 did not?
16 A. Well, that wasn't the point of setting
17 up the meetings, we weren't setting up the meetings
18 for Mrs. Whitfield, and so, you know, frankly I
19 didn't know which ones she was going to and which
20 ones she wasn't going to.
21 Q. Did you have concern about the fact
22 she was a lobbyist and the Congressman's wife, and
23 that's why you didn't mention it to committee?
24 A. Well, we -- I contacted the Ethics
25 Committee pretty regularly to make sure -- because

1 obviously this is a touchy issue for our office. We
2 have to be very careful because the house rules
3 state what it does, that, you know, she can't
4 influence the office. So I mean I talk pretty
5 regularly to make sure that we are walking as far
6 away from the line as possible. So --
7 Q. So had you received advice from the
8 committee on this line, what did they advise you
9 about dealing with Mrs. Whitfield and the office?
10 A. Pretty specific to the meetings?
11 Q. Specific to any information --
12 A. The advice that we got was she can't
13 lobby our office, so, you know, she can't urge us to
14 do something legislatively for her. But as far as
15 like coalition building and, you know, because the
16 Humane Society cares about this issue too, she
17 obviously was well within her rights to go meet with
18 other members as well and do her job.
19 Q. And when did you receive that advice
20 about the -- the first advice you mentioned?
21 A. About where --
22 Q. About she can't lobby the office.
23 A. Well, we have had several
24 conversations with House Ethics, since I think she
25 started lobbying sometime in 2011, and you know, we

1 periodically do a check on specific situations with
2 regard to her lobbying. So I mean I am probably on
3 the phone with House Ethics, you know, once or twice
4 a month just asking about case by case situations.
5 Q. Involving Mrs. Whitfield?
6 A. Not involve -- all involving -- you
7 know, maybe once a month involving Mrs. Whitfield.
8 Q. And overall, you are saying the advice
9 -- one bit of advice is related to the lobbying, but
10 what other advice have you received from the
11 Committee of Ethics related to Mrs. Whitfield?
12 A. I don't think I understand what you
13 are asking?
14 Q. You mentioned multiple times you
15 talked to the Ethics Committee --
16 A. Right, right, right.
17 Q. I am trying to get the --
18 A. Oh, the different things. You know, I
19 don't recall, it was -- it wasn't related to the
20 PAST Act, it was, just -- yeah, I don't recall what
21 other things.
22 MR. PASSATINO: You might not have
23 understood his question, and I'll let you ask it
24 again, but you were asking subject matter, you were
25 asking House Ethics. I am not sure you guys were

1 answering the same question.

2 MR. PAYNE: If that helps, if the way

3 he describes it helps, if you remember based more on

4 the subject matter or any more specific, it's just

5 very important for us to understand what advice you

6 received.

7 A. Well, I mean, you know, I know I had a

8 specific conversation about the PAST Act, and you

9 know, because I knew that the Humane Society, and I

10 told you about that but I don't recall, you know,

11 Mrs. Whitfield contacts the office on various things

12 throughout the week, and every time she calls about

13 an issue or something like that, you know, the staff

14 comes and talk to me about it. But I don't remember

15 the exact --

16 Q. Can you give me examples, what type of

17 issues are coming up, Mrs. Whitfield wants to do

18 what?

19 A. Well, I mean like, you know, there is

20 a lot of overlap between the Congressman's schedule

21 and her schedule, so there is a lot of events, you

22 know, outside of the Humane Society, because she

23 does a lot of, like, non profit stuff, I mean she's

24 on a few boards here in town beyond -- completely

25 outside of the Humane Society, so there would be

1 some interaction there that I would want to make
2 sure, like, you know, if the Congressman goes to
3 this and he receives a meal and is that appropriate,
4 and you know, those types of things. You know, it
5 was more, I think, just making the logistics of her
6 life as a lobbyist, and his life as a member of
7 Congress, a lot of those things -- well, her life as
8 a lobbyist never really overlapped with him, but,
9 you know, some of the other outside stuff that she
10 does overlaps with some of the stuff that he -- like
11 she attends, you know, she is a member of Congress'
12 spouse, like, she attends or allowed to attend
13 congressional delegation trips, and you know, he's
14 invited to various things and she attends those
15 things, so, you know, it's just a matter of figuring
16 out can they attend those things together, how does
17 that process work, what type of paperwork do we have
18 to fill out, you know, do we need to declare on the
19 front end that she's a lobbyist if she's attending
20 these type of things, there are just a lot of
21 questions that come about, and I am not a lawyer, so
22 we have to get peoples' advice on these things, and
23 we try to follow the letter of the house rules as
24 closely as possible.
25 Q. Well, what is the policy in the office

1 currently, because it sounds like you are the person
2 who tells it to everyone else, when it comes to her
3 contacts with the office, you mentioned generally
4 she's not supposed to lobby. But what does that
5 mean on a day-to-day, what are your marching orders
6 to staff?
7 A. Well, the staff knows -- the staff
8 knows if Connie asks for something, then they have
9 to bring it to me and then we talk about it and then
10 we will get the Congressman's ultimate decision on
11 that. The Congressman is the ultimate decision
12 maker, and you know, frankly whenever she's
13 involved, there is an extra level of scrutiny just
14 because she is a registered lobbyist, and that is
15 part of the reason I am frequently calling the
16 Ethics Committee. So, you know, the Congressman
17 makes a decision on things, you know, involving her,
18 unless it's one of those situations where we have
19 always been involved in this issue, and you know,
20 this is something -- like for example the Puppy Mill
21 Bill.
22 We have been involved in the Puppy
23 Mill Bill since 2001 whenever the Congressman first
24 introduced that legislation. If she were to contact
25 me on the Puppy Mill Bill, then, you know, I

1 wouldn't feel the need to ask the Congressman
2 because he -- he's always been involved in this
3 issue, he's already made a decision like this is
4 something I support, this is something we are going
5 to work towards.
6 Q. Okay. Okay. So the situation where
7 she's contacting you and you have already worked on
8 it before, you handle that differently as opposed to
9 something you haven't dealt with before, and then if
10 it's something new, you bring it to the
11 Congressman's attention?
12 A. Right.
13 Q. Okay. Did you have a question?
14 I wanted to ask about this email Bate
15 stamped HSLFOCE15759. And you can read the entire
16 thing but I really want to ask you about your email
17 on the second page to Mrs. Whitfield.
18 A. Yeah, this was the Renee Elmer's
19 conversation.
20 Q. Okay. Here you said you did not
21 inform them that Connie was attending these meetings
22 as I suppose they would be -- have expressed concern
23 since she's married to you and a registered
24 lobbyist.
25 A. Right.

1 Q. Can you just explain --
2 A. Well, first of all, I wasn't exactly
3 sure if she was attending the -- all of these
4 meetings, so, and also going back to the point of
5 the meetings was to set up the meetings for Marty
6 and Donna and so that was the reason why I didn't
7 really want to get into that point with the Ethics
8 Committee but I wanted the Congressman to know that
9 we were getting push back from Renee Elmer's office.
10 Q. Okay. And then on the first -- on the
11 first page, you did say that the Committee changed
12 their mind. What did they --
13 A. They told us to contact the House
14 Administration Committee, which I did, so the person
15 at the Ethics Committee told me, well, whenever you
16 find out -- whenever you hear from the House
17 Administration Committee, I'd be interested to hear
18 what they have to say, and so whenever I called them
19 back to tell them what that House Administration
20 Committee told me, they said that -- they said that
21 -- wait a minute, okay.
22 So I am trying to recall all of this.
23 Because this was back in October. So I contacted
24 the Ethics Committee, they told me to contact House
25 Administration, and then I think what happened was

1 the House Ethics Committee called me back and said
2 you can't set up the meetings, so I still went ahead
3 and contacted House Administration, they said we
4 could set up the meetings. So I contacted the House
5 Ethics Committee and told them that House
6 Administration told me I could do the meetings.
7 Then House Ethics says if House Administration says
8 you can do it, then you can do it.
9 At that point I was thoroughly
10 confused as to what should be going on and shouldn't
11 be doing -- shouldn't be going on and hence, why I
12 am bringing this to the Congressman's attention, and
13 I think -- yeah, that's how things transpired.
14 Q. Did the Committee on Ethics on any of
15 those exchanges bring up any issues with Mrs.
16 Whitfield?
17 A. I don't -- they may have said
18 something to the effect of you can't set these
19 meetings up for Mrs. Whitfield but we weren't
20 setting them up for Mrs. Whitfield anyway. We were
21 setting them up for Marty and Donna.
22 MR. MORGAN: Going to that, I think
23 you listed various organizations that were
24 stakeholders of the PAST Act, HC, AGP -- ASPCA?
25 A. Yeah, we set up meetings.

1 MR. MORGAN: Did the office,
2 Representative Whitfield's office set up meetings
3 for those --
4 A. We set up a few meetings for the
5 American Horse Council, we advised the American
6 Horse Council on, hey, we got this response on this
7 stakeholder, can you go meet with them. So we set
8 up meetings for them and suggested meetings for them
9 and the AVMA as well. So the AVMA and the American
10 Horse Council were our two other go-to
11 organizations.
12 MR. MORGAN: How many meetings would
13 you say you set up for AVMA if you were to estimate?
14 A. Probably only like five or ten at
15 most. We obviously set up a lot more with Marty and
16 Donna and, you know, the Humane Society was involved
17 in those because they were -- they were one of the
18 people that -- the Humane Society brought Marty and
19 Donna to town. Well, they didn't -- I don't know
20 the logistics as far as who paid for them to come to
21 town and stuff like that, but, you know, they helped
22 identify those people, so.
23 MR. MORGAN: But you viewed the office
24 as setting up the meetings for Marty and Donna not
25 for the Humane Society?

1 A. No, not for the Humane Society.
2 Q. Were any of the other stakeholders
3 invited or --
4 A. Yeah.
5 MR. MORGAN: -- participated in those
6 meetings?
7 A. Yeah, absolutely the other
8 stakeholders knew we were doing these meetings, they
9 knew Marty and Donna were being effective, so none
10 of them really asked to attend but, you know, we did
11 send them in sort of as a follow-up to try to seal
12 the deal but there wouldn't have been a problem had
13 they wanted to attend.
14 MR. MORGAN: Why didn't the Humane
15 Society set those meetings up directly?
16 A. Well, you know, this issue is
17 something the Congressman cared about very -- this
18 one was one of his biggest priorities, this was
19 something he wanted done, he decided to introduce
20 the legislation, so the Congressman wanted us to
21 facilitate these meetings because, you know, he felt
22 like that by bringing in these subject matter
23 experts, Marty and Donna, then, you know, that would
24 be more effective, you know, if they knew the
25 Congressman cared about this legislation.

1 MR. MORGAN: So that was a specific
2 request from Representative Whitfield?
3 A. Uh-huh, yeah, he asked us to set up
4 those meetings.
5 MR. MORGAN: Do you recall if he
6 specifically requested that the office set up
7 meetings on behalf of the other stakeholders as
8 well?
9 A. Yeah, he asked us to set up meetings
10 with the American Horse Counsel and AVMA.
11 You know, every one of the meetings he
12 didn't ask us to set up, but there were occasions --
13 I mean there were -- he doesn't need to be involved
14 in every situation, you know, I as the Chief of
15 Staff and even the person that handled the animal
16 issues can see, okay this person needs to hear from
17 the veterinarians and that will help seal the deal
18 as far as getting co-sponsors, so he wasn't involved
19 in every one of those, but there were a couple of
20 occasions where the Congressman said I want AVMA to
21 go meet with these people, can you set that up.
22 Congressman Ted Yoho, for example, was
23 a large veterinarian or was before he came to
24 Congress, so it was more important for the American
25 Veterinary Medical Association to get his

1 co-sponsorship, so he asked us to set up a meeting
2 between AVMA and Congressman Ted Yoho.
3 Q. I want to quickly move onto other
4 legislation. Did you have anymore questions about
5 the PAST Act?
6 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, so who was the
7 point person in Representative Whitfield's office
8 for setting up the meetings for Marty or -- and
9 Donna?
10 A. Emma.
11 MR. MORGAN: Did she at any point --
12 A. During the shut down, we had to
13 furlough -- we decided to furlough half of our
14 staff. So on a couple of days, Emma was furloughed.
15 So on a few occasions I reached out to staff and
16 asked for meetings for Marty and Donna. But I would
17 say Emma did most of the asking.
18 MR. MORGAN: Are you -- to your
19 knowledge, was there any discussion of
20 Representative Whitfield's office setting up those
21 meetings as opposed to the Humane Society setting
22 them up for a strategic purpose, like you might have
23 more success getting the meetings if it was the
24 member's office requesting them as opposed to the
25 Humane Society, was there a discussion along those

1 lines?

2 A. What do you mean, was there a

3 discussion with the Congressman --

4 MR. MORGAN: In your office, or

5 between you and the Humane Society.

6 A. Yeah, I mean because the people we

7 were reaching out to knew the Congressman, there was

8 a greater success of us getting the meetings, and

9 there was also a greater success that they would

10 co-sponsor the legislation as a result of us asking

11 for the meetings, so, yeah, it was effective. We

12 have 270 co-sponsors as a result of it, so, you

13 know, obviously our people that are fighting us on

14 this cause have reason to be scared and that's

15 probably the reason we are sitting here today.

16 Q. So we will talk about other

17 legislation.

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. I want to quickly ask you about a few

20 pieces of legislation and get an idea of your role.

21 With the Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act?

22 A. Right.

23 Q. Of 2013, did you work on it?

24 A. I worked on it in the sense of I added

25 the Congressman as a co-sponsor and I may have

1 worked on signing onto dear colleagues. But I
2 wasn't as involved in that legislation as some of
3 the other legislation that the Congressman was
4 taking the lead on. That bill was first introduced
5 in 2001 and the Congressman was the original sponsor
6 of that legislation, that was prior to me coming to
7 the office so I didn't play a role in drafting that
8 legislation.
9 Q. Is that the Puppy Mill Bill that you
10 referred to earlier?
11 A. Uh-huh.
12 Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield discuss with
13 you anything about him sponsoring the puppy mill
14 ban?
15 A. You know, I don't remember if it was
16 this Congress or last Congress, but she may have
17 brought it to my attention that we were not listed
18 on -- as a co-sponsor for this particular Congress.
19 And I think I -- I then added her -- added the
20 Congressman as a co-sponsor, but it wasn't -- I mean
21 it wasn't because she told me to or anything like
22 that, it was more of, you know, I noticed we weren't
23 a co-sponsor, we had been a co-sponsor since 2001
24 and it was sort of, it was an oversight on my part
25 to begin with. We should have been a co-sponsor

1 since the very get-go.

2 Q. The Animal Welfare Enforcement Funding

3 of 2012, there is a letter, do you recall that?

4 A. Right, right.

5 Q. And what was your role with that?

6 A. So, we were -- we had co-sponsored or

7 co-signed that letter in the past. So, you know,

8 they get a number of signers onto that letter and I

9 think it was a similar situation with the Puppy Mill

10 Bill where, you know, there is a lot of these

11 spending letters that go around the hill at the time

12 of the appropriations taking place and it's sort of

13 easy to sort of not recognize every email that comes

14 into your email box. So I think we signed onto that

15 a little bit late, and -- but we did, we may have

16 signed onto it.

17 Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield communicate

18 with you about signing on?

19 A. She may have mentioned that we were

20 not on that one, but it was a similar situation

21 where we had always signed onto that letter in the

22 past.

23 Q. Did you have any concern about signing

24 onto it in 2012 because of any --

25 A. Yeah, I mean there was a concern of

1 signing onto all spending letters, not just this
2 one, but all spending letters after the financial
3 bail out and everything that happened as a result of
4 that, and then the stimulus bills, our district
5 became very concerned about federal spending, which
6 they were always concerned but more so after the
7 bail out and the stimulus bills, and I -- we ended
8 up signing onto the animal welfare letter, and I
9 think we ended up signing onto one or two others but
10 we didn't sign onto as many as we had in the past.
11 And I am pretty sure I communicated to Connie, Mrs.
12 Whitfield, that, you know, that these spending
13 issues are, you know, more challenging than they
14 used to been -- used to be because of the public
15 perception that you are signing onto a letter
16 results in government spending.
17 Q. And just so I am clear, you decided
18 to sign onto it that year despite those concerns,
19 why?
20 A. Because there was an issue that the
21 Congressman had been involved in in the past, and
22 the letter specifically talks about funding for, you
23 know, the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, I think
24 one of the other funds it wanted to provide funding
25 for was the Tennessee Walking Horse issue, it also

1 talks about the animal welfare laws, you know, all
2 of these are issues that he's been involved in in
3 the past and he really, you know, passionately
4 believes in the humane treatment of animals, so
5 that's something that has always been a
6 long-standing position in our office, so that was
7 the reason we decided that that would meet the
8 exception of going ahead and signing him onto the
9 letter.
10 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield's communication to
11 you concerning him signing on impact the decision at
12 all to have him sign on?
13 A. No, I mean we were going to sign onto
14 the letter, and, you know, like I said, it's
15 something we have always been involved in.
16 Q. The Safeguard American Food Export Act
17 of 2013?
18 A. Is that the horse slaughter?
19 Q. Yes, different names.
20 A. Right.
21 Q. So you know it as the Horse Slaughter
22 Bill of --
23 A. Right.
24 Q. -- of which Congress was that?
25 A. Well, it's introduced to every

1 Congress and they come up with a new name every
2 Congress.
3 Q. So you have worked on the Horse
4 Slaughter Bill for 2013?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And have you had contacts with Mrs.
7 Whitfield concerning that?
8 A. I may have communicated with her on
9 that bill as well.
10 Q. Do you recall any --
11 A. I don't recall any details. I mean --
12 yeah, go ahead.
13 Q. Well, I am just understanding it seems
14 as though you described the PAST Act, certain things
15 you may discuss with her was strategy, co-sponsors
16 or signing onto something, is that similar for --
17 A. Yeah.
18 Q. The SAFE Act? Okay.
19 A. We weren't as involved in the Horse
20 Slaughter Bill this Congress as we have been in
21 previous Congresses, mainly because we were focusing
22 -- we are prioritizing our efforts.
23 Q. Did you have more contacts with her
24 then regarding the Horse Slaughter Bill of 2011?
25 A. No, 2011 -- you know, we tried to push

1 forward this legislation and we actually got it
2 passed through the house in 2008 or nine. And then
3 the Senate didn't take it up, and it was -- maybe it
4 was even before 2008, it might have been 2006, but
5 anyway, we got it passed through the house sometime
6 during that timeframe and the Senate didn't take it
7 up, and the Congressman just realized that this is
8 something that is probably not going to get done, so
9 let's focus our priorities on other things that we
10 stand a better chance of getting done. But, you
11 know, the Congressman has been involved in that
12 issue since 2001 or sooner as well.
13 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act
14 of 2013, did you have any involvement with that?
15 A. Not really -- no, I didn't really have
16 involvement in that.
17 Q. Who is the person over that?
18 A. The person that handled our Veteran's
19 affairs issues would have been the person that would
20 have handled that issue, I believe.
21 Q. Do you know who that is?
22 A. What year was it?
23 Q. 2013.
24 A. 2013, I think Adam Moore. Adam no
25 longer works in our office and the only thing -- I

1 was Chief of Staff at that time, and the only thing
2 that we would have done with regard to that
3 legislation is sign the Congressman onto the
4 legislation. We didn't really participate in
5 anything else other than signing onto the
6 legislation.
7 Q. Did you have any contacts with --
8 communication with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that?
9 A. I didn't. I don't think that I did.
10 And I don't think that Adam did either but, you
11 know, that's -- that's going complete off my memory
12 on that one.
13 Q. And the Animal Fighting Spectator
14 Prohibition Act?
15 A. Right.
16 Q. So you are familiar with that?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And what was your role with that
19 legislation?
20 A. We co-sponsored it.
21 Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield have similar
22 communications with you on this, as you described
23 earlier, with the PAST Act and the other
24 legislation?
25 A. I don't -- I mean I don't think so.

1 Q. You don't recall any?
2 A. I don't recall any.
3 Q. Communications?
4 A. Yeah, yeah.
5 Q. And the Best Practices Act, are you
6 familiar with that?
7 A. Best Practices Act, no.
8 Q. Okay.
9 A. Which one is that?
10 Q. It's not -- if you don't recall --
11 A. I don't recall it by name but I may
12 know it if you tell me what the issue is.
13 Q. That's fine. Were you involved in the
14 hiring of Marty Irby?
15 A. Yes, I was the Chief of Staff at the
16 time and we were looking for someone to, you know,
17 we had Justin left our office and Adam left our
18 office, so we had two open slots, and we were
19 looking for somebody and the Congressman called me
20 and asked me to interview Marty, so I interviewed
21 him.
22 Q. Did you have any conversation with
23 Mrs. Whitfield about the interview or the hiring of
24 Marty?
25 A. No.

1 Q. Did you have any conversation with
2 anybody at the Humane Society concerning the hiring
3 of Marty?
4 A. No.
5 Q. How many people interviewed for the
6 position?
7 A. We -- we didn't like openly or like
8 open the position to the public. We did word of
9 mouth. But I probably got, you know, like I said,
10 we were trying to fill two positions. And I
11 probably got eight or ten resumes, just by word of
12 mouth.
13 Q. Of those eight or ten resumes you
14 received, how many actually sat with you?
15 A. How many I interviewed?
16 Q. Yes.
17 A. I interviewed -- since we were doing
18 word of mouth and the people that, you know,
19 referred these people to me, I think I interviewed
20 at least eight.
21 Q. Okay.
22 A. And then, you know, I narrowed that
23 down and passed two or three onto the Congressman.
24 Those are just rough numbers.
25 Q. No, I understand.

1 A. Don't hold me to those numbers.
2 Q. So you were filling one position or
3 filling two position?
4 A. Two.
5 Q. So you hired two people?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. Marty was hired at the same time as
8 who else?
9 A. Cassie Leonard is the person's name.
10 She's our legislative correspondent. So Cassie
11 handles our mail issues, and Marty was coming into
12 handle our animal issues or AG issues.
13 Q. Are you familiar with the Peters
14 Amendment that deals with the banning of polar bear
15 hunting?
16 A. I am familiar with polar bear issues
17 generally, just because the Congressman has been
18 involved in that in the past. I don't remember
19 specifically the Peters Amendment.
20 Q. Do you recall Mrs. Whitfield
21 communicating with you about the Congressman voting
22 on that amendment?
23 A. She may have communicated with me on
24 that amendment. But that was again another one of
25 those circumstances where the Congressman had

1 previously been involved with the polar bear issues,
2 and you know, he actually went to the floor and
3 spoke on the floor about one of the amendments. I
4 think, you know, this was probably back in 2009. He
5 spoke on the Ensley -- Congressman Ensley was in
6 Congress and had an amendment, so he went and spoke
7 on that amendment. So the Peterson Amendment -- if
8 the polar bear -- was we had always been involved
9 in, something we always supported.
10 Q. I want to check my notes, but I think
11 we have covered, I think, most of our questions.
12 Bryson, do you have any questions?
13 MR. MORGAN: I just want to understand
14 a little bit more generally what this interaction
15 with Mrs. Whitfield was like. If I were in your
16 situation, I would imagine that that might be a bit
17 challenging to juggle, getting requests from the
18 Congressman's wife, trying to determine how to
19 handle those, which once you agree to, which ones
20 you vet with the member --
21 A. Yeah.
22 MR. MORGAN: So that's my words --
23 those are my words, but I was wondering if you could
24 describe generally what managing that relationship
25 was like for you.

1 A. I mean it is challenging which is part
2 of the reason why I am always on the phone with the
3 House Ethics Committee, to make sure, you know, I am
4 trying my best to operate within the confines of the
5 house rules.
6 MR. MORGAN: Have you ever discussed
7 with the House Ethics Committee, you know, you
8 discussed you sort of have a methodology, if she
9 mentioned to you --
10 A. Right.
11 MR. MORGAN: -- that Representative
12 Whitfield should sign onto something or vote a
13 certain way if it's what he's done in the past, you
14 would generally do that?
15 A. Right.
16 MR. MORGAN: Have you ever discussed
17 that with the Ethics Committee?
18 A. No, like our procedure of signing onto
19 legislation?
20 MR. MORGAN: Yes, at her request.
21 A. No, no.
22 MR. MORGAN: Okay.
23 MR. PASSATINO: To be fair, I'm not
24 sure he said they signed on at her request. I think
25 you are mischaracterizing --

1 A. Yeah, I agree.

2 MR. MORGAN: Signed on subsequent to a

3 request by her.

4 A. What do you mean subsequent?

5 MR. MORGAN: Were there -- were there

6 instances in which she reached out to you and asked

7 that you have Representative Whitfield sign onto a

8 bill, were there instances?

9 A. Yeah, but --

10 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Were some of those

11 instances, were there times when he did in fact sign

12 onto a bill?

13 A. Yeah.

14 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

15 A. But it wasn't because she was asking.

16 MR. MORGAN: Right.

17 A. It was because either he had

18 long-standing -- long-standing, you know, cause for

19 being involved in that or I asked him if he wanted

20 to get involved, and you know, he's the boss. But

21 you know, going back to your first question, you

22 know, Mrs. Whitfield is probably disadvantaged in a

23 certain extent because she does get an extra layer

24 of scrutiny whenever she contacts our office, just

25 because she is the Congressman's wife and she is a

1 registered lobbyist.

2 Q. How often does she contact the office?

3 A. On -- well, I mean -- she contacts our

4 office two or three times a day, but you have to

5 keep in mind, a lot of those are probably like, you

6 know, when is the Congressman going to be home

7 tonight or did he feed the dogs or, you know, what

8 is the schedule look like for the rest of the week,

9 you know, those types of things.

10 Q. How many of the calls per week would

11 you say as an estimate is the ones where the staff

12 have to come to you and ask a question whether

13 something should be decided on what to do going

14 forward?

15 A. I wouldn't know. I mean that would be

16 purely guessing on that. I mean it sort of varies

17 on a week by week basis, so I wouldn't know how to

18 even guess on that.

19 MR. MORGAN: Have there been times

20 when she reached out to you and requested that

21 Representative Whitfield sign on as a co-sponsor or

22 vote a certain way or take any other form of an

23 official act where ultimately that course of action

24 was not taken?

25 A. Yes.

1 MR. MORGAN: Can you describe some of
2 those instances if you recall any specifics.
3 A. So there is this Egg Bill.
4 MR. MORGAN: As in E-G-G?
5 A. Yeah, there is this Egg Bill that the
6 Humane Society cares about and the bill sets federal
7 parameters on the cage size for chickens for
8 hatching eggs, and farmers in our district don't
9 want it, farm bureau doesn't like it, the
10 cattleman's association doesn't like it, the pork
11 producers don't like it. So Humane Society is one
12 of the leads on that legislation. She had contacted
13 me in the past about the Congressman engaging on
14 this issue. I told her it was a bad idea, we can't
15 do that and then I talked to the Congressman about
16 it, explained to him why we can't do it, he agreed
17 with me and we are not a co-sponsor of the
18 legislation.
19 And there are other examples too, but
20 that I think is one of the most recent.
21 MR. PASSATINO: Hey, do you mind if I
22 ask a question, do you mind if -- I think he might
23 have misspoken in response to a question, and I can
24 ask him about that in front of you all -
25 (inaudible).

1 (Whereupon, the recording is
2 terminated.)
3 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER
4
5 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
6 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
7 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
8 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
9 forth.
10 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
11 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
12 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
13 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
14 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
15 the action.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 _____
24 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XI01717
25 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey

1 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A

aap 17:15
able 10:9 20:22
absolutely 37:7
abuse 5:16 7:3 8:18
accurate 56:6
act 5:3,6,15,20,22 5:23,24,25 7:5 10:15 13:1 15:12 15:13 16:15 29:20 30:8 35:24 39:5 40:21 43:23 44:16 45:14,18 46:13 47:14,23 48:5,7 54:23
action 13:12,18 54:23 56:12,15
activities 11:20,21
actual 21:18
adam 46:24,24 47:10 48:17
added 40:24 41:19 41:19
address 6:14
administration 6:14 24:1,1,10,12 27:8 34:14,17,19 34:25 35:3,6,7
administrative 11:25
advice 9:2 28:7,12 28:19,20 29:8,9 29:10 30:5 31:22
advise 3:4 28:8
advised 23:25 36:5
advocates 24:7 27:5
affairs 46:19
ag 50:12
agp 35:24
agree 51:19 53:1
agreed 55:16
ahead 20:24 35:2 44:8 45:12
allowed 31:12
amendment 18:1,2 50:14,19,22,24 51:6,7,7
amendments 5:13 15:13 51:3
american 8:14,15 8:16,18 12:15,22 17:14,17,19 20:14 36:5,5,9 38:10,24 44:16
amount 7:6
amundson 25:10
animal 4:5,14,21 4:23 6:25 8:3,18 12:19 38:15 42:2 43:8 44:1 47:13 50:12
animals 44:4
answering 30:1
anybody 23:4 49:2
anymore 7:21 39:4
anyway 35:20 46:5
approach 20:18
appropriate 31:3
appropriation 7:5
appropriations 42:12
approximately 16:6
april 1:5 2:7 57:1
asap 18:9
asked 37:10 38:3,9 39:1,16 48:20 53:6,19
asking 15:1 29:4,13 29:24,25 39:17 40:10 53:15
asks 9:2 21:13 32:8
aspca 8:17 35:24
assertive 14:18
assist 19:14,17
associated 5:20
association 8:16 12:22 17:18,19 20:14 24:19,25 38:25 55:10
attend 25:14,15,21 27:12 31:12,16 37:10,13
attended 25:9,10 25:11,12,13,16,19 25:25
attending 25:7 31:19 33:21 34:3
attends 31:11,12,14
attention 3:19,22 15:4,10 17:3 33:11 35:12 41:17
attorney 56:11,13
attorneys 2:6
avma 17:15 36:9,9 36:13 38:10,20 39:2
aware 22:18,22
awhile 9:6 11:23 21:2

B

back 12:24 13:17 15:7 21:24 34:4,9 34:19,23 35:1 51:4 53:21
background 2:9 9:5,19
bad 11:20,20 55:14
bail 43:3,7
ban 13:12 41:14
banning 50:14
based 4:2 30:3
basically 13:7
basis 54:17
bate 33:14
bear 50:14,16 51:1 51:8
begins 18:17
behalf 38:7
believe 24:13 26:12 27:7,13 46:20
believes 44:4
benjamin 1:13 2:7
bennefield 24:15
best 10:4,11 48:5,7 52:4
better 7:9 46:10
beyond 30:24
biggest 37:18
bill 11:4 16:25 18:2 18:3 20:23 21:8 21:10,14,18 22:19 24:2,7,8 26:15,23 32:21,23,25 41:4 41:9 42:10 44:22 45:4,9,20,24 53:8 53:12 55:3,5,6
bills 11:6 43:4,7
bit 2:9 12:25 13:2 29:9 42:15 51:14 51:16
board 9:16
boards 9:17 30:24
books 7:9
boss 24:4 53:20
bottom 5:9 17:4
box 42:14
breeders 24:19
bring 3:19,21 15:3 16:12 32:9 33:10 35:15
bringing 35:12 37:22
brought 24:22 36:18 41:17
bryson 1:10 2:4 51:12
build 19:10 20:25 21:3
building 9:13 19:11 19:13 28:15
bulk 8:25
bureau 55:9

C

cage 55:7
call 22:8 23:4,25
called 15:14 23:24 27:1 34:18 35:1 48:19
calling 32:15
calls 9:22,24,25 10:1,10,14,18 11:7,10 12:1,6,9 14:9,23 30:12 54:10
cant 3:21 14:3 28:3 28:12,13,22 35:2 35:18 55:14,16
cared 23:23 24:3 25:6 37:17,25
careful 28:2
cares 28:16 55:6
case 29:4,4
cassie 50:9,10
cattlemans 55:10
cause 20:2 24:21 40:14 53:18
certain 45:14 52:13 53:23 54:22
certificate 56:3
certify 56:5,10
challenging 43:13 51:17 52:1
chance 46:10
change 7:22
changed 4:10,10 34:11
changes 21:8
characterizing 14:13
check 29:1 51:10
checklist 18:8,25 19:4
chickens 55:7
chief 2:12,13,15,25 3:16,17,24 7:13 7:14 38:14 47:1 48:15
chris 4:21
circumstance 10:5
circumstances 50:25
clear 13:14 26:23 43:17
closely 3:15 31:24
coach 5:1
coached 5:2
coalition 28:15
coalitions 9:13 19:11 21:3
cohen 16:14
cohens 10:25
colleagues 8:12 41:1
collectively 17:11
come 14:24 18:8 23:17 31:21 36:20 45:1 54:12
comes 9:2 30:14 32:2 42:13
coming 18:19,20 30:17 41:6 50:11
commission 57:1

committee 23:25 26:25 27:1,3,4,8 27:23,25 28:8 29:11,15 32:16 34:8,11,14,15,17 34:20,24 35:1,5 35:14 52:3,7,17
communicate 20:5 22:5 42:17
communicated 43:11 45:8 50:23
communicating 50:21
communication 19:2 44:10 47:8
communications 14:6 47:22 48:3
complete 47:11
completely 30:24
concern 23:21,22 25:3 27:2,21 33:22 42:23,25
concerned 23:18 43:5,6
concerning 18:25 44:11 45:7 47:8 49:2
concerns 25:5 43:18
conference 10:1 12:1,5,8 14:9
confines 52:4
confused 35:10
congress 6:1 10:23 10:24 22:1 24:9 26:16,21 31:7,11 38:24 41:16,16,18 44:24 45:1,2,20 51:6
congresses 45:21
congressional 2:5 31:13
congressman 2:14 7:12 10:25 13:21 13:21,25 18:21 24:5,9 25:18,24 26:2,5,7,9,10,21 31:2 32:11,16,23 33:1 34:8 37:17 37:20,25 38:20,22 39:2 40:3,7,25 41:3,5,20 43:21 46:7,11 47:3 48:19 49:23 50:17 50:21,25 51:5 54:6 55:13,15
congressmans 3:19 3:21 14:22 15:4,5 27:22 30:20 32:10 33:11 35:12 51:18 53:25
connie 12:9 17:17 21:12 25:10 26:8 32:8 33:21 43:11
consideration 22:2
constituents 3:8,9
contact 20:4 23:2,6 26:25 27:8 32:24 34:13,24 54:2
contacted 5:17 27:24 34:23 35:3 35:4 55:12
contacting 33:7
contacts 30:11 32:3 45:6,23 47:7 53:24 54:3
continued 8:20
controversial 11:17
conversation 18:24 19:1,5 30:8 33:19 48:22 49:1
conversations 14:4 21:9 28:24
copy 16:11,12
correct 23:15
correspondent 50:10
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:6,8
cosigned 42:7
cosponsor 9:4 19:19 20:4 24:8 25:2 26:23 40:10 40:25 41:18,20,23 41:23,25 54:21 55:17
cosponsored 42:6 47:20
cosponsoring 9:9
cosponsors 8:5,22 19:10,14 20:5,8 20:18,22 38:18 40:12 45:15
cosponsorship 39:1
couldnt 24:2,6
council 8:14 12:16 17:14 36:5,6,10
counsel 5:25 8:10 38:10 56:11,14
couple 16:13 38:19 39:14
course 7:6 10:12 13:18 54:23
covered 51:11
crossed 11:23
csr 1:16
current 2:10
currently 4:7 32:1

D

dane 9:15 21:11 25:9
date 56:8
day 54:4
days 39:14
daytoday 32:5
dc 21:2
deal 37:12 38:17
dealing 3:9 10:15 28:9
deals 5:6 50:14
dealt 21:10 27:9 33:9
dear 8:11 41:1
december 7:25 26:17
decided 6:17 13:1 13:17,20,22 14:10 24:3 37:19 39:13 43:17 44:7 54:13
deciding 20:16
decision 3:21 4:2 10:6 13:2 14:12 14:13 15:5 16:2 32:10,11,17 33:3 44:11
decisions 13:24
declarative 14:19
declare 31:18
defined 21:21,22
definitely 21:25
delegation 31:13
democratic 11:1
describe 51:24 55:1
described 12:9 21:16 45:14 47:22
describes 30:3
despite 43:18
details 10:8 45:11
determination 27:9
determine 51:18
developed 4:25
devices 13:13
dickstein 15:14 16:5
didnt 6:15 11:25 16:12 19:17 20:11 25:14 27:19,23 34:6 36:19 37:14 38:12 41:7 43:10 46:3,6,15 47:4,9 49:7
different 3:12 29:18 44:19
differently 33:8
directly 22:10,17 37:15
director 2:19,21 3:12,13,14,22,24 4:1,4,13,20 6:1 7:14
disadvantaged 53:22
discuss 10:14 21:7 41:12 45:15
discussed 18:7 52:6 52:8,16
discussing 10:2
discussion 39:19,25 40:3
discussions 14:23
district 3:8 43:4 55:8
document 17:13
documents 17:9
doesnt 15:2 38:13 55:9,10
dog 46:13
dogs 54:7
doing 9:8 35:11 37:8 49:17
donna 24:15,23,24 25:1,8,23 26:4 27:6 34:6 35:21 36:16,19,24 37:9 37:23 39:9,16
dont 14:15,17 16:9 16:20,22 18:12 21:12 25:11,12 26:2,3,3 27:13 29:12,19,20 30:10 30:14 35:17 36:19 41:15 45:11 47:9 47:10,25,25 48:1 48:2,10,11 50:1 50:18 55:8,11
dotted 11:22
draft 11:15 13:1 15:18
drafted 5:24 8:9,10 8:14,20 11:23 16:25 18:2,3
drafter 15:12
drafting 6:9 9:9,14 10:3 11:12 12:5 22:6 41:7
draw 17:3
duties 3:1,11

E

earlier 12:9 16:23 41:10 47:23
early 6:6,7
easy 19:19 20:20 42:13
ed 2:14 18:18
effect 35:18
effective 23:11 37:9 37:24 40:11
efforts 3:23 5:21 6:14 9:7 12:18 27:6 45:22
egg 55:3,4,5
eggs 55:8
eight 49:11,13,20
either 22:8 26:10

47:10 53:17
eliminate 13:11
elmers 33:18 34:9
email 17:1,2,3,5 18:7,23 19:2 22:8 22:15 33:14,16 42:13,14
emma 39:10,14,17
employee 56:11,13
ended 43:7,9
endorsers 17:16 18:4
enforcement 5:15 42:2
engaging 55:13
ensley 51:5,5
ensure 20:21
entire 17:2 33:15
entirety 1:24
equine 8:15
estimate 36:13 54:11
ethics 2:5 23:24 26:25 27:1,3,4,24 28:24 29:3,11,15 29:25 32:16 34:7 34:15,24 35:1,5,7 35:14 52:3,7,17
events 30:21
everybody 17:16
ew401271 17:2
exact 16:10 30:15
exactly 10:8 16:21 18:12 34:2
example 6:10 32:20 38:22
examples 30:16 55:19
exception 44:8
exchanges 35:15
exhibitors 24:19
expenditure 27:10
experience 8:2 24:23
experienced 21:2
expert 12:15 21:12
experts 25:23 37:23
expires 57:1
explain 34:1
explained 55:16
export 44:16
expressed 23:21,22 25:3 33:22
expressing 25:4
extent 9:23 53:23
extra 32:13 53:23

F

facilitate 37:21
fact 5:23 11:21 27:21 53:11
facts 19:8
fair 52:23
fall 21:17
familiar 5:3 47:16 48:6 50:13,16
far 9:20 28:5,14 36:20 38:18
fareed 4:13
farm 55:9
farmers 55:8
federal 27:10 43:5 55:6
feed 54:7
feel 11:19 17:2 33:1
feels 18:17
felt 18:14 37:21
fighting 40:13 47:13
figure 7:7 10:7
figuring 10:11 31:15
fill 31:18 49:10
filling 50:2,3
final 3:17,18 27:9
financial 43:2
financially 56:14
find 34:16
finding 8:4 20:5
findings 6:12,18 13:6,10
fine 48:13
finish 6:22 10:9,12
firm 15:14
first 6:2 11:5 12:25 21:20 28:20 32:23 34:2,10,11 41:4 53:21
fit 21:15
five 36:14
floor 51:2,3
focus 46:9
focused 18:18
focusing 45:21
follow 31:23
following 18:8 20:3
followup 37:11
food 44:16
force 5:10
foregoing 56:5
form 54:22
former 15:11
forth 15:7 56:9
forward 20:24 46:1 54:14
four 2:22 17:18,22
frame 18:5
frankly 27:18 32:12
free 17:2
frequently 32:15
front 31:19 55:24
full 20:24
funding 7:4 42:2 43:22,24
funds 27:10 43:24
furlough 39:13,13
furloughed 39:14
further 9:7 20:2 56:10

G

gathered 17:12
general 5:18,23 6:12,18,20,22 7:17 13:6
generally 3:3 25:5 32:3 50:17 51:14 51:24 52:14
getgo 42:1
getting 16:1 19:6 25:22 34:9 38:18 39:23 40:8 46:10 51:17
give 2:10 30:16
go 8:21 25:1 28:17 36:7 38:21 42:11 45:12
goes 31:2
going 3:7,25 9:1 13:14 19:9 24:7 24:23 26:23 27:19 27:20 33:4 34:4 35:10,11,22 44:8 44:13 46:8 47:11 53:21 54:6,13
good 15:16 21:23 21:23
goto 36:10
government 43:16
great 17:24
greater 40:8,9
group 12:17
guess 3:10 4:25 10:12 21:15 54:18
guessing 54:16
guided 5:21
guy 4:13
guys 29:25

H

half 39:13
handle 10:4 14:25 33:8 50:12 51:19
handled 4:14,21 6:24 7:1 22:23,24 22:25 23:1 38:15 46:18,20
handles 4:23 50:11
hands 4:16,19
happen 16:6 18:15 24:5 26:13
happened 26:14 34:25 43:3
hard 25:17
hasnt 5:15 6:17
hatching 55:8
haven 12:21
havent 5:1 33:9
hc 35:24
hear 34:16,17 38:16
heavily 7:19
help 38:17
helped 36:21
helpful 12:16 15:19
helps 30:2,3
hereinbefore 56:8
hes 4:24 9:19 11:1 24:17 31:13 33:2 33:3 44:2 52:13 53:20
hey 9:2 15:15 36:6 55:21
hickey 12:15
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:6
hill 3:20 4:18 42:11
hired 50:5,7
hiring 48:14,23 49:2
hold 50:1
home 14:5 54:6
hoof 5:9
horse 5:8,9,9,10 7:1 7:5 8:14 9:17,18 12:15 15:12 17:14 17:18,19,20 24:18 24:25 36:5,6,10 38:10 43:25 44:18 44:21 45:3,19,24
horses 5:7
house 11:5 23:24 23:25 24:1,10,12 27:8 28:2,24 29:3 29:25 31:23 34:13 34:16,19,24 35:1 35:3,4,5,7,7 46:2 46:5 52:3,5,7
hslfoce15759 33:15
huge 24:21
humane 8:17 19:24 20:2 28:16 30:9 30:22,25 36:16,18 36:25 37:1,14 39:21,25 40:5 43:23 44:4 49:2 55:6,11
hunting 50:15

I

id 34:17
idea 15:10 21:17 40:20 55:14
identified 12:17
identify 36:22
ill 18:5 29:23

illegal 5:12,14
im 17:5 52:23
imagine 51:16
impact 44:11
implement 6:11,17 7:8 13:5,9
implemented 18:9
important 12:21,23 13:13 30:5 38:24
inaudible 55:25
included 11:3
industry 5:8 9:18
influence 28:4
inform 33:21
information 2:10 9:5 17:12 19:6 20:9,15 28:11
input 20:21
inspector 5:18,22 6:12,18,20,22 13:6
instances 53:6,8,11 55:2
interaction 9:10,21 31:1 51:14
interested 34:17 56:14
international 24:24
interview 1:4 48:20 48:23
interviewed 48:20 49:5,15,17,19
introduce 5:22 6:19 13:18,22 14:10 37:19
introduced 11:4,6 11:8 17:20 18:13 18:15 19:8 20:23 32:24 41:4 44:25
introducing 11:18 18:11
introduction 26:15
invited 31:14 37:3
involve 11:25 29:6
involved 7:19,21 8:4,7 9:13 11:2 12:19 13:24 15:6 15:8,25 20:16 21:18 23:19,21 32:13,19,22 33:2 36:16 38:13,18 41:2 43:21 44:2 44:15 45:19 46:11 48:13 50:18 51:1 51:8 53:19,20
involvement 7:22 46:14,16
involving 29:5,6,7 32:17
irby 24:15 48:14
issue 4:3 5:7,11,18 6:15 9:6 11:17 22:7,23,24,25 23:1 25:6 28:1,16 30:13 32:19 33:3 37:16 43:20,25 46:12,20 48:12 55:14
issued 5:19 8:11
issues 3:4,7,9,18 4:5,8,14,21,23 6:25 7:1 8:2,3 12:19 14:24 22:11 30:17 35:15 38:16 43:13 44:2 46:19 50:11,12,12,16 51:1
items 19:4

J

jack 3:10
january 2:17,23,23
jay 12:15,20
jerk 5:10
jersey 56:25
job 2:10 28:18
joe 15:11
john 7:15
juggle 51:17
justin 4:13,17,20 4:24 6:25 22:25 23:2 48:17

K

keane 1:13 2:7
kedric 1:9 2:4
keep 54:5
keith 9:15,16 12:14 12:14 21:10 25:9 25:12
kelly 24:13
kicked 8:11
kind 9:23
knew 7:3 30:9 37:8 37:9,24 40:7
know 3:2,3,5,17,20 3:20 4:1,16,24 5:1 6:21,23,24,25 7:2 7:6,7,13,13 8:3,23 9:7,13,14,16,17 9:20,23 10:2,3,4,6 10:8,10,11 11:2,4 11:13,16,19,21 12:13,20 13:4,8,9 14:4,9,17,19,21 15:1,3,19,20,22 15:24 16:2,12,21 19:8,17,22,25 20:1,7,9,10,20 21:1,9,13,22,23 24:4,16,22 25:13 26:1,3 27:10,18 27:19 28:3,13,15 28:25 29:3,7,18 30:7,7,9,10,13,19 30:22 31:2,4,4,9 31:11,13,15,18 32:12,16,17,19,25 34:8 36:16,19,21 37:10,16,21,23,24 38:11,14 40:13 41:15,22 42:7,10 43:12,13,23 44:1 44:3,14,21 45:25 46:11,21 47:11 48:12,16 49:9,18 49:22 51:2,4 52:3 52:7 53:18,20,21 53:22 54:6,7,9,15 54:17
knowledge 9:20 22:14 39:19
known 14:8
knows 21:3 32:7,8
kravens 24:13

L

landrieu 16:14
language 21:18
large 38:23
late 42:15
law 5:12,13 7:8 10:13 15:14 21:2
laws 44:1
lawyer 31:21
layer 53:23
lead 11:1 16:15 41:4
leads 55:12
led 6:8
left 4:21 48:17,17
legislation 6:3,5,7,8 6:10,15,19 7:20 8:5,8,9,11,13,20 9:15 10:5,7 11:13 11:15,19 13:19,22 14:7,10 17:21 18:12,13,16 19:9 19:20,24 23:3,7 23:24 24:20 25:2 25:18 32:24 37:20 37:25 39:4 40:10 40:17,20 41:2,3,6 41:8 46:1 47:3,4,6 47:19,24 52:19 55:12,18
legislative 2:19,20 3:6,7,12,13,14,15 3:22,23,24,25 4:1 4:2,4,12,20 5:25 6:1 7:14 8:10 50:10
legislatively 6:16 28:14
legs 5:10,11
leonard 50:9
letter 6:11,13 13:5 13:7,17 15:7,9,10 15:17,19,23,24 16:1,3,9,10,11,11 16:21 31:23 42:3 42:7,8,21 43:8,15 43:22 44:9,14
letters 42:11 43:1,2
level 32:13
license 1:17 56:24
life 31:6,6,7
line 10:9,12 28:6,8
lines 40:1
list 17:16,16 18:3
listed 35:23 41:17
little 2:9 4:18,24 12:25 13:2 22:25 42:15 51:14
lobby 28:13,22 32:4
lobbying 27:6 28:25 29:2,9
lobbyist 27:22 31:6 31:8,19 32:14 33:24 54:1
logistics 31:5 36:20
long 2:15,20 13:16
longer 46:25
longstanding 44:6 53:18,18
look 15:17 17:1,5 54:8
looking 48:16,19
lot 3:19 5:16 6:8 8:2 9:19 11:20,24 19:9 23:12 24:22 25:9,10 30:20,21 30:23 31:7,20 36:15 42:10 54:5
lyn 1:16 56:24

M

mad 11:18
mail 50:11
maker 32:12
making 14:13 31:5
management 3:3
managing 51:24
marching 32:5
married 33:23
marty 4:22,23,24 7:23 8:1,2,24,25 24:15,16 25:1,8 25:23 26:4 27:5 34:5 35:21 36:15 36:18,24 37:9,23 39:8,16 48:14,20 48:24 49:3 50:7 50:11
mary 16:14

matter 21:12 25:23 29:24 30:4 31:15 37:22
meal 31:3
mean 7:10,17 8:9 9:12 11:16 14:15 15:2 16:19 17:11 19:5 20:6 22:15 22:23 24:4 28:4 29:2 30:7,19,23 32:5 38:13 40:2,6 41:20 42:25 44:13 45:11 47:25 52:1 53:4 54:3,15,16
medical 8:16 12:22 20:14 38:25
meet 8:21 19:18 25:1 28:17 36:7 38:21 44:7
meeting 3:5 16:3 25:19,24,25 26:4 26:5,7,8,9,11 39:1
meetings 11:7 23:10,10,14,19,23 24:2,6,14,25 25:4 25:5,7,15,22 26:20 27:2,5,12 27:17,17 28:10 33:21 34:4,5,5 35:2,4,6,19,25 36:2,4,8,8,12,24 37:6,8,15,21 38:4 38:7,9,11 39:8,16 39:21,23 40:8,11
member 31:6,11 51:20
members 10:23 28:18 39:24
memory 47:11
mention 27:23
mentioned 10:22 16:23 28:20 29:14 32:3 42:19 52:9
met 8:12,12 19:16 19:22,23 20:7 26:1
methodology 52:8
methods 43:23
mill 32:20,23,25 41:9,13 42:9
mind 34:12 54:5 55:21,22
minute 34:21
mischaracterizing 52:25
misspoken 55:23
models 5:23
month 16:8,10 29:4 29:7
months 11:5 16:13
moore 46:24
morgan 1:10 2:4 12:24 13:20,23 15:6 22:3,9,13,16 22:21 23:5 24:11 35:22 36:1,12,23 37:5,14 38:1,5 39:6,11,18 40:4 51:13,22 52:6,11 52:16,20,22 53:2 53:5,10,14,16 54:19 55:1,4
morning 18:7
mouth 49:9,12,18
move 17:17,22 39:3
moving 20:24
multiple 29:14

N

name 4:13 7:15 45:1 48:11 50:9
names 44:19
narrowed 49:22
nature 8:23
need 14:16,17 27:7 31:18 33:1 38:13
needed 10:7 13:22 18:15
needs 18:8 38:16
neither 56:10,13
never 17:19,20 31:8
new 4:17 33:10 45:1 56:25
nine 46:2
non 30:23
notary 56:25
note 1:24
notes 51:10
noticed 41:22
number 17:18,22 42:8
numbers 49:24 50:1

O

obvious 2:9
obviously 3:17 7:14 7:16 19:9,25 20:21 28:1,17 36:15 40:13
occasions 26:2 38:12,20 39:15
occurred 7:4
october 11:14 12:4 16:24 23:9 26:16 26:17 34:23
office 2:5 3:2,3 4:14 5:18 6:24 7:1,17 7:24 9:6 10:25 13:3 14:24 17:11 21:25 22:5,17 23:15,22 24:4,17 25:3 28:1,4,9,13 28:22 30:11 31:25 32:3 34:9 36:1,2 36:23 38:6 39:7 39:20,24 40:4 41:7 44:6 46:25 48:17,18 53:24 54:2,4
officer 56:3
offices 19:16 23:18
official 54:23
oh 7:12,23 10:20,20 13:4 29:18
oig 17:13
okay 3:11 10:3,4 12:3 17:7 21:4 33:6,6,13,20 34:10,21 38:16 40:18 45:18 48:8 49:21 52:22 53:10 53:14
older 4:24
once 11:7 26:12 29:3,7 51:19
ones 10:22 25:13 25:13 27:19,20 51:19 54:11
open 48:18 49:8
openly 49:7
operate 52:4
opposed 33:8 39:21 39:24
order 5:10
orders 32:5
organization 8:21
organizations 8:19 9:18 35:23 36:11
organizing 3:23
original 15:11,13 41:5
outside 30:22,25 31:9
overall 29:8
overlap 22:25 30:20
overlapped 31:8
overlaps 31:10
oversee 3:2
overseeing 4:15
oversees 3:15
oversight 41:24

P

pack 4:21
page 17:4,6 33:17 34:11
paid 36:20
paperwork 31:17
parameters 55:7
part 32:15 41:24 52:1
participate 47:4
participated 10:17 11:1,9 37:5
participating 14:12
particular 10:5 15:2 20:12 27:14 41:18
parties 56:12
passatino 1:12 2:7 29:22 52:23 55:21
passed 11:5 46:2,5 49:23
passionately 44:3
payne 1:9 2:1,4 30:2
people 5:2,7 8:12 8:22 9:3 11:18 14:9,24 15:24 16:1,4 19:23 20:7 20:8,10,19 22:24 23:23 25:1,6 36:18,22 38:21 40:6,13 49:5,18 49:19 50:5
peoples 31:22
perception 43:15
period 4:22,22 7:3
periodically 9:2 29:1
person 23:6 24:14 32:1 34:14 38:15 38:16 39:7 46:17 46:18,19
personality 14:18
persons 50:9
peters 50:13,19
peterson 51:7
phone 10:18 29:3 52:2
phonetic 1:25
pieces 40:20
place 11:10 15:16 42:12 56:8
planning 12:1,13 12:14 18:11
play 19:13 41:7
played 19:11
players 12:21,23
please 1:24
point 4:15 6:9 11:3 15:22,25 20:23 23:6 25:22 27:16 34:4,7 35:9 39:7 39:11
polar 50:14,16 51:1 51:8
policing 13:11
policy 31:25
pork 55:10
position 4:11 24:20 44:6 49:6,8 50:2,3
positions 49:10

possible 20:22 21:1 21:8 28:6 31:24
possibly 27:12
potential 15:18
potentially 24:8
practices 48:5,7
practitioners 8:15
prepared 15:18 17:10
present 1:8 12:10 12:11,12
president 24:18,21 24:24
press 17:14
pretty 3:9 26:22 27:25 28:4,10 43:11
prevention 8:18
previous 5:2 9:4 45:21
previously 6:23 12:18 51:1
primarily 21:10
primary 23:2
prior 2:18 6:20 8:24 11:24 41:6
priorities 37:18 46:9
prioritizing 45:22
probably 2:23 4:18 6:5,6 11:14 12:20 25:20 26:14 29:2 36:14 40:15 46:8 49:9,11 51:4 53:22 54:5
problem 37:12
problems 5:20 15:15
procedure 23:5 52:18
proceedings 56:7
process 7:5 10:3 13:9 15:20 22:4,7 31:17
producers 55:11
professionally 4:25
profit 30:23
prohibition 47:14
prompted 6:19
protection 7:5 15:12 40:21
provide 43:24
provided 16:11
provisions 13:12
public 43:14 49:8 56:25
puppy 32:20,22,25 40:21 41:9,13 42:9
purely 54:16
purpose 39:22
pursue 14:7
push 34:9 45:25

Q

quarter 17:18,19
question 14:11,14 23:13 29:23 30:1 33:13 53:21 54:12 55:22,23
questioning 2:1
questions 19:10 31:21 39:4 51:11 51:12
quickly 39:3 40:19

R

rahn 1:16 56:24
reach 22:16,22
reached 39:15 53:6 54:20
reaching 40:7
read 17:2 33:15
real 21:3
realized 46:7
really 5:11,15 11:25 13:13 19:5 19:20 21:20 25:17 25:21 31:8 33:16 34:7 37:10 44:3 46:15,15 47:4
reason 17:21 19:6 20:12,13 21:23 23:3 24:9 25:21 27:14 32:15 34:6 40:14,15 44:7 52:2
reasons 21:24
recall 14:15 21:12 23:10 24:11 26:3 26:3,6 29:19,20 30:10 34:22 38:5 42:3 45:10,11 48:1,2,10,11 50:20 55:2
receive 28:19
received 13:16 28:7 29:10 30:6 49:14
receives 31:3
recognize 42:13
recommended 20:19
recommending 20:17
recording 56:1
referred 41:10 49:19
regard 29:2 47:2
regarding 45:24
registered 32:14 33:23 54:1
regularly 27:25 28:5
related 23:13 29:9 29:11,19
relationship 51:24
relative 56:11,13
release 17:14
remember 12:25 16:9,22 18:12 30:3,14 41:15 50:18
renee 33:18 34:9
report 5:18,19,23 6:12,18,21,22 13:6 17:13
reported 56:7
representative 22:10 23:15,18 36:2 38:2 39:7,20 52:11 53:7 54:21
request 38:2 52:20 52:24 53:3
requested 38:6 54:20
requesting 39:24
requests 51:17
resources 17:10
responded 13:7 15:8
response 13:8 36:6 55:23
responsible 3:13 4:5,7
rest 54:8
result 5:12,21 11:18 16:3 21:13 40:10,12 43:3
results 43:16
resumes 49:11,13
right 8:1 10:16 14:14 16:25 18:10 23:8,8,16 26:19 29:16,16,16 33:12 33:25 40:22 42:4 42:4 44:20,23 47:15 52:10,15 53:16
rights 28:17
roe 25:18,24 26:2,5 26:7,9,21
role 4:16,16 19:11 19:13,20,21 20:4 21:16,17,17,21 40:20 41:7 42:5 47:18
ronda 12:21
rough 11:15 49:24
roughly 2:24
rows 26:10
rules 28:2 31:23 52:5

S

safe 45:18
safeguard 44:16
safety 40:21
sara 25:10,12
sat 49:14
saying 7:10,11 29:8
says 18:7 35:7,7
scared 40:14
schedule 30:20,21 54:8
schedulers 3:5
scheduling 23:14 23:19
scrutiny 32:13 53:24
seal 37:11 38:17
second 33:17
see 2:22 6:5 17:17 18:3 19:25 38:16
self 13:11
senate 11:3,6,8,9 46:3,6
senator 15:11 16:4 16:7,13
send 15:19 20:14 37:11
sending 18:6,23
sense 40:24
sent 6:11 13:4 15:7 15:23 16:10,21 18:25
separately 6:15 19:23
serves 9:16
set 24:2,6,14,15 34:5 35:2,4,18,25 36:2,4,7,13,15 37:15 38:3,6,9,12 38:21 39:1 56:8
sets 55:6
setting 23:23 24:25 25:4,5 27:5,16,17 35:20,21 36:24 39:8,20,21
shapiro 15:14 16:5
sharing 20:15
shes 15:1 21:2 30:23 31:19,19 32:4,12 33:7,23 50:10
shop 3:25
short 4:22
shouldnt 35:10,11
showed 23:2
shut 39:12
side 11:5
sign 7:16 15:24 16:1 43:10,18 44:12,13 47:3 52:12 53:7,11 54:21
signed 10:13 42:14

42:16,21 52:24 53:2
signers 42:8
signing 41:1 42:18 42:23 43:1,8,9,15 44:8,11 45:16 47:5 52:18
similar 42:9,20 45:16 47:21
simply 18:19
sitting 40:15
situation 14:15,25 15:2 33:6 38:14 42:9,20 51:16
situations 9:4 29:1 29:4 32:18
size 55:7
slaughter 43:23 44:18,21 45:4,20 45:24
slots 48:18
society 8:17,18 19:24 20:2 28:16 30:9,22,25 36:16 36:18,25 37:1,15 39:21,25 40:5 49:2 55:6,11
somebody 48:19
somewhat 2:9 11:17
sooner 46:12
sore 5:8
soring 5:6
sorry 17:5
sort 4:19 6:13 8:25 10:10 37:11 41:24 42:12,13 52:8 54:16
sounds 7:19 32:1
sparkman 7:15
speak 14:4 22:10
specific 21:13 28:10,11 29:1 30:4,8 38:1
specifically 38:6 43:22 50:19
specifics 55:2
spectator 47:13
spellings 1:24
spending 42:11 43:1,2,5,12,16
spoke 24:12 51:3,5 51:6
sponsor 41:5
sponsoring 41:13
sponsors 11:4
spouse 31:12
staff 2:12,13,16,25 3:4,6,8,15,16,17 3:23,25 4:2 7:13 7:15 10:23 26:11 30:13 32:6,7,7 38:15 39:14,15 47:1 48:15 54:11
staffer 4:17 22:17
stakeholder 17:15 20:25 36:7
stakeholders 8:13 10:2,19,21,21 17:13,15 35:24 37:2,8 38:7
stamped 33:15
stand 46:10
standard 23:5
start 6:2 11:15
started 4:22 6:4,6 7:23 8:25 11:11 11:12 15:21 28:25
starting 8:24
state 28:3 56:25
statements 14:20
steam 20:24
stefan 1:12 2:6
stenographically 56:7
step 12:24
stephanie 1:16 56:24
steve 16:14
stimulus 43:4,7
strategic 39:22
strategy 9:10 10:14 11:7,7 45:15
stuff 3:6 6:8 9:13 11:25 12:2 30:23 31:9,10 36:21
subject 21:11 25:23 29:24 30:4 37:22
subsequent 53:2,4
substance 22:18
success 39:23 40:8 40:9
suggested 17:17 36:8
suggestion 17:24 22:4
suggestions 19:18 21:22
supervisor 4:19
support 12:17 20:25 24:20 33:4
supported 12:18 17:20 51:9
supports 19:24
suppose 33:22
supposed 32:4
sure 11:16,22 14:22 17:23 20:11,13 26:24 27:25 28:5 29:25 31:2 34:3 43:11 52:3,24
suspect 18:13

T

take 11:10 15:17 17:1,5 46:3,6 54:22
taken 21:25 22:1 54:24
talk 14:25 22:18 28:4 30:14 32:9 40:16
talked 20:6,10 29:15 55:15
talking 5:19 14:1 20:17
talks 3:24 43:22 44:1
targets 19:19 20:20
ted 38:22 39:2
tell 13:2 27:2,11 34:19 48:12
telling 20:9
tells 32:2
ten 36:14 49:11,13
tennessee 5:8 9:17 24:18 25:18 43:25
terminated 56:2
testimony 56:6
text 18:1,2 21:8,10 21:13
thats 5:21 15:20 17:15 24:10 27:23 35:13 40:14 44:5 47:11,11 48:13 51:22
therapy 46:13
thing 33:16 46:25 47:1
things 3:20 7:16 13:10,13 15:4 18:14 29:18,21 30:11 31:4,7,14 31:15,16,20,22 32:17 35:13 45:14 46:9 54:9
think 6:10 14:13 15:12,16,18 16:11 17:24 25:11 26:10 28:24 29:12 31:5 34:25 35:13,22 41:19 42:9,14 43:9,23 46:24 47:9,10,25 49:19 51:4,10,11 52:24 55:20,22
thoroughly 35:9
thought 20:20
three 49:23 54:4
tidings 15:11 16:4 16:7
time 7:3,7 11:15 12:5 14:2 18:10 23:7,17 24:17 30:12 42:11 47:1 48:16 50:7 56:8
timeframe 46:6
timeline 12:3
times 29:14 53:11 54:4,19
title 2:11,18
today 40:15
told 13:4 24:1,10 27:4,13 30:10 34:13,15,20,24 35:5,6 41:21 55:14
tonight 54:7
top 17:23
touchy 28:1
town 24:16 30:24 36:19,21
trades 3:10
training 46:13
transcribed 1:16
transcript 1:25 56:6
transpired 35:13
treatment 44:4
tried 45:25
trips 31:13
true 56:5
try 9:3,6 11:8 31:23 37:11
trying 7:4,7 13:9 17:25 18:5 19:10 20:25 29:17 34:22 49:10 51:18 52:4
ts 11:22
twice 29:3
two 13:13 16:9 17:6 25:16 36:10 43:9 48:18 49:10,23 50:3,4,5 54:4
type 10:10 12:8 30:16 31:17,20
types 15:4 31:4 54:9

U

uhhuh 38:3 41:11
ultimate 32:10,11
ultimately 10:13 54:23
understand 12:4 17:25 18:6 26:24 29:12 30:5 49:25 51:13
understanding 18:19 45:13
understood 14:11 29:23
unfortunately 6:16
uniform 40:21
urge 8:21,22 9:3

25:2 28:13
urging 6:11,21 13:5 13:10
usda 5:17,17 6:11 6:16,22 7:8 13:5,6 13:11,17 15:7,19 17:13
use 13:12 21:5

V

vanilla 13:8
variation 3:4 8:13
varies 54:16
various 3:5 10:1 14:9,24 19:4 30:11 31:14 35:23
verbal 19:1
vet 51:20
veterans 46:13,18
veterinarian 38:23
veterinarians 38:17
veterinary 8:16 12:22 20:13,14 38:25
viewed 36:23
views 14:8
vote 52:12 54:22
voting 50:21

W

wait 34:21
walking 5:8 9:17 24:18,24 28:5 43:25
want 2:8 12:24 17:1,3 19:25 26:24 31:1 33:16 34:7 38:20 39:3 40:19 51:10,13 55:9
wanted 11:21 12:17 17:22,23 20:11,13 20:21 21:5 24:5 33:14 34:8 37:13 37:19,20 43:24 53:19
wants 15:3 30:17
wasnt 12:12,12 19:5 21:21 26:23 27:16,20 29:19 34:2 38:18 41:2 41:20,21 53:15
way 10:4 19:14 30:2 52:13 54:22
week 30:12 54:8,10 54:17,17
welfare 4:5 42:2 43:8 44:1
went 16:9 20:10,11 35:2 51:2,6
whitfield 2:14 9:11 9:12,21 13:23 14:16,18,23 15:25 17:4,6 18:6,20,20 18:23 21:1 22:10 23:19,20,22 26:9 26:11 27:11,18 28:9 29:5,7,11 30:11,17 33:17 35:16,19,20 38:2 41:12 42:17 43:12 45:7 47:8,21 48:23 50:20 51:15 52:12 53:7,22 54:21
whitfields 23:15 36:2 39:7,20 44:10
wife 27:22 51:18 53:25
win 17:21 24:21
wondering 51:23
word 49:8,11,18
words 51:22,23
work 3:5,6,8 8:20 19:15 24:17 31:17 33:5 40:23
worked 4:17 5:24 6:7,23 8:10,14,15 8:16,17,19,23 9:5 9:15 19:22 21:11 33:7 40:24 41:1 45:3
working 3:20 6:2,4 6:6 9:20 11:8,24 17:12 22:7 25:17
works 3:22 15:14 46:25
wouldnt 21:20 33:1 37:12 54:15,17

X

xio1717 1:17 56:24

Y

yeah 10:20 16:19 20:19 22:15,15,20 29:20 33:18 35:13 35:25 37:4,7 38:3 38:9 39:6 40:6,11 42:25 45:12,17 48:4,4 51:21 53:1 53:9,13 55:5
year 11:11 43:18 46:22
years 2:23
yoho 38:22 39:2

Z

0

1

18 57:1
1970 5:13
1976 5:12,14 15:12 15:13

2

2001 32:23 41:5,23 46:12
2004 6:24,25
2006 46:4
2008 46:2,4
2009 2:23 16:20,20 51:4
2010 6:10,13,21 13:5,17 15:8,9,10 16:17,18,19,21
2011 28:25 45:24 45:25
2012 6:6,7 11:13 26:18 42:3,24
2013 2:17,24 7:25 16:16,24 23:9 40:23 44:17 45:4 46:14,23,24
2014 1:5 2:7 6:5
2017 57:1
24 1:5 2:7
270 40:12

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

EXHIBIT 8

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, January 7, 2011 3:32 PM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Press Release: The HSUS Applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs

---

Yes, I was assuming the changes would be made in markup.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 7, 2011, at 3:26 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> The problem is that the bill has already been introduced and so changes to it can't be made. We could suggest that they make the change during a markup later. We'll go ahead and touch base with him and get on his radar screen about making this changes during the committee process. I do not anticipate the Committee will be moving this bill for a couple of months at the earliest.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> **Sent:** Friday, January 07, 2011 3:02 PM
> **To:** Hicks, Cory
> **Subject:** Re: Press Release: The HSUS Applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs
>
> Since you are working with Chris on the bill, can you have him delete the two words "if appropriate" after the mention of shelter dogs as an option? I can understand why he removed "preferred" before "option" but the added two words create too big of an
>
> out.
>
> Thanks
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jan 7, 2011, at 2:44 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
> > Thanks, Connie. We've been talking to their office about the bill and working through the new republican rules regarding introducing legislation and constitutional authority.
> >
> > ---
> >
> > **From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> > **Sent:** Friday, January 07, 2011 2:13 PM
> > **To:** Hicks, Cory
> > **Cc:** Sparkman, John
> > **Subject:** Fwd: Press Release: The HSUS Applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs
> >
> > FYI
> >
> > Cory,
> >
> > Note that the pilot is 5 years instead of 3 and unlike Ed's bill, it has no requirements to ensure the prgram produces scientifically reliable conclusions. More later.
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Martin Montorfano" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Date: January 6, 2011 5:56:47 PM EST
To: "Everyone List" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Press Release: The HSUS Applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs

The Humane Society of the United States Applauds Rep. Grimm for Seeking to Help Veterans and Shelter Dogs

WASHINGTON, D.C. (Jan. 6, 2010) —The Humane Society of the United States commends U.S. Rep. Michael Grimm, R-N.Y., for introducing the Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act on the first day of the 112th Congress.

With the support of original cosponsors Reps. Michael Michaud, D-Maine, Peter King, R-N.Y., and Leonard Lance, R-N.J., H.R. 198 would create a pilot program for training dogs to help treat veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or other post-deployment mental health conditions. The bill was crafted so that the program will use the dog training process itself to provide therapeutic benefits, as veterans train them for use as service animals for their disabled comrades. Another feature of the bill that has brought praise from the animal welfare community is that it will allow shelter dogs to be rescued so they can be part of the program.

In May, the House passed H.R. 3885, a similar bill directing the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to create a pilot program using dogs for therapy, but that legislation did not pass the Senate and did not include the shelter dog provision. This new aspect of the legislation is not only good news for homeless dogs who might otherwise be euthanized, but it also has the potential to bring a more fiscally sound approach to the program and save tax dollars, as purpose-bred dogs cost as much as $50,000 per animal.

"This bill is about veterans helping veterans," said Rep. Grimm. "So many servicemen and women returning from combat struggle with severe PTSD. My legislation provides an opportunity to ease these symptoms through the process of training service dogs. These dogs – many of which I hope will be saved from shelters – will then be given to physically disabled veterans to assist them with their daily activities. As a veteran and animal lover, I am proud to make this my first bill in Congress."

Injured soldiers returning from the war often experience a profound lack of purpose and focus. Skills necessary to survive in a war zone can become a hindrance when transitioning back into everyday life. Studies show an increase in suicide and domestic violence among returning soldiers as a result of unaddressed emotional stress and guilt. Giving former soldiers this worthy goal and new companion could be a life-saving plan for thousands of U.S. veterans.

"Our veterans need and deserve every opportunity to heal. This innovative legislation gives the wonderful dogs in shelters a chance to live and to serve by helping to heal the stresses and wounds so many soldiers battle when they come home," said Wayne Pacelle, president and CEO of The HSUS.

More localized programs have already demonstrated the powerful benefits of dog training for veterans. Celebrity dog trainer Tamar Geller created Operation Heroes & Hounds™ to aid wounded Marines at Camp Pendleton, Calif. In her program, homeless dogs are used to teach wounded military personal new skills, provide companionship, and enhance the healing process.

Washington Humane Society's "Dog Tags" program brings together wounded soldiers recovering at Walter Reed Army Medical Center with homeless dogs from WHS's shelter. This three-tiered program teaches the basics of dog training, with a certificate-based educational curriculum that gives returning servicemen the opportunity to pursue a career in the field of animal training, care, and welfare. In the process of gaining skills for themselves, participants provide the homeless animals with training, socialization, and love, which will undoubtedly increase their chances for adoption and help to ensure that they stay in life-long, loving homes.

The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act would assist our wounded warriors who suffer from both physical and psychological ailments as a result of their service in war zones. Smart and loving homeless dogs, who were in danger of euthanasia, will have the honor of assisting these heroes integrate back into society. Together, they can heal their emotional wounds while gaining new life skills.

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure
Provisions of H.Res. 895 or the 110th Congress
as Amended Requested

In the last session of Congress, Sens. Al Franken, D-Minn., and Johnny Isakson, R-Ga., and Reps. Ron Klein, D-Fla., and Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., championed provisions in the 2009 Defense authorization bill instructing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to partner with nonprofit organizations on a three-year pilot study of the use of service dogs to treat and rehabilitate wounded veterans, including those suffering from PTSD.

Media Contact: Martin Montorfano, 240-888-[redacted]@humanesociety.org

-30-

Follow The HSUS on Twitter. See our work for animals on your iPhone by searching "HumaneTV" in the App Store.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation's largest animal protection organization—backed by 11 million Americans, or one of every 28. For more than a half-century, The HSUS has been fighting for the protection of all animals through advocacy, education, and hands-on programs. Celebrating animals and confronting cruelty—on the web at humanesociety.org.

If you would rather not receive future communications from Humane Society of the United States, let us know by clicking here.
Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037 United States

EXHIBIT 9

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 5:15 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: HR 2492

I've got to get this tails bill I need to get ready next week. I'll get rest in August...

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: HR 2492

What about taking a day next week, when we were going to be in So Africa?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 14, 2011, at 2:28 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Yes, I need to find a good week. We were looking at the week of November 7th, but november 8th is election day. After that we run into Holiday issues. So, we either can do it in september (week of the 26) or October (week of the 17th). If that doesn't work, we may have to postpone until January of February. Can you give me some feedback?
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> **Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 10:38 AM
> **To:** Hicks, Cory
> **Subject:** RE: HR 2492
>
> Can I help with re-arranging the South Africa trip? Lots of members have asked about it...
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
> **Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 10:34 AM
> **To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> **Subject:** Re: HR 2492
>
> Sure, I'll mention, but I'm sure you'll have a bigger impact. Melissa is in the office. I was supposed to get an extra day, but my flight got canceled that week I was supposed to go to KY, so I think it dropped by the wayside. I hear lilly got a good home.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> **Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 10:19 AM
> **To:** Hicks, Cory
> **Subject:** Re: HR 2492
>
> Could you mention the bill to any of the LDs on your hallway or do you know any of them? If not, I can try to have Melissa set up 10 min meetings for me with the members. Is she in today?
>
> Did you ever get an extra day for taking such good care of Lily at the Bark Ball?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jul 14, 2011, at 10:01 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
> > They got back with me. We are on the animal fighting bill.
> >
> > ---
> >
> > **From:** Franklin, Kevin
> > **Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 09:56 AM
> > **To:** Hicks, Cory
> > **Subject:** FW: HR 2492
> >
> > Hey Cory,
> >
> > Sorry I didn't get back with you yesterday. I was in a markup. I emailed Drew to let him know. Thanks!
> >
> > Kevin Franklin
> > Legislative Assistant
> > Congresswoman Betty Sutton (OH-13)
> >
> > ---
> >
> > **From:** Franklin, Kevin
> > **Sent:** Thursday, July 14, 2011 9:54 AM
> > **To:** Kent, Drew
> > **Subject:** FW: HR 2492

Hi Drew. Please add Rep. Ed Whitfield as a cosponsor.

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 3:39 PM
To: Franklin, Kevin
Subject: HR 2492

Kevin, I tried to email Drew Kent, but it bounced back. Can you add Rep. Whitfield as a cosponsor to HR 2492?

Cory Hicks
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield
202-225-[redacted]
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png> <image002.png> <image003.png><image004.png> <image005.png>
Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov

EXHIBIT 10

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:20 AM
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org'
Subject: Re: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

---

Ok, I'll talk to Corry and John.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:15 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

I was just thinking that Ed is the lead in the House AND two more articles are coming AND people say the articles may earn a Pulitzer award.

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:12 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

She's a good writer. I think Udall is in a different position for issuing a statement because the article is about his state. I dtrthink it makes as much sense for EW to do one, but I can ask our press secretary to work on one?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 11:07 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

Is Ed's Press Secretary a good writer? If so, perhaps Ed should issue a statement.

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2012 8:02 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

Thanks. Walter Jones cosponsored.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 10:50 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

---

From: Cummins, Kevin (Tom Udall) [mailto:Kevin_Cummins@tomudall.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 5:15 PM
To: Cummins, Kevin (Tom Udall)
Subject: Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

FYI.

Below is the statement Sen. Tom Udall released today in response to the New York Times investigation of horse racing, "Breakdown -- Death and Disarray at America's racetracks."

Regards,

Kevin

Kevin Cummins
Office of Sen. Tom Udall

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 26, 2012
news@tomudall.senate.gov | @TomUdallPress

Udall: Times Investigation Paints Disturbing Picture of Horseracing Industry

WASHINGTON – Following an in-depth report by **The New York Times** on the state of horseracing in the United States, **U.S. Senator Tom Udall (D-NM)** issued the following statement:

"The findings uncovered in The New York Times investigation about horseracing in the United States, and New Mexico in particular, paint a very disturbing picture of the industry.

"The sport of horseracing which, at its best, showcases the majestic beauty of this animal and the athleticism of jockeys, has reached an alarming level of corruption and exploitation. The consequence of inconsistent state-level regulation is an epidemic of animal doping that has lead to countless euthanizations of helpless horses and the injury and death of their riders.

"The Times exposé has shined a glaring light on the need for national standards in a sport that reaps gambling profits, but has lacked proper oversight for decades.

"I urge our leaders in Congress to advance the bipartisan legislation Congressman Ed Whitfield and I have introduced in both chambers to renew the sport of horseracing and set minimum, nationwide standards for medication and doping. The Interstate Horseracing Improvement Act would kick cheaters out of the sport. The horseracing industry has promised voluntary reforms for decades, but as we've painfully observed, our legislation is the only viable way to address doping problems plaguing the sport.

"Now is the time to end the unscrupulous practices of those trainers and track veterinarians in horseracing who abuse these magnificent animals and endanger jockeys for gambling profits."

#######

EXHIBIT 11

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 11:50 AM
To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org'
Subject: Re: Jockey

Ok

----- Original Message -----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 11:48 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Jockey

Cory,

Please be sure Ed votes FOR the Peters amendment today (banning polar bear imports and hunting in Natl Parks). Ed voted this way last time.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 17, 2012, at 11:07 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Good point on how hard it is to ban medication on tracks. Maybe I don't fully appreciate how hard it might be for a track owner to prohibit meds, but I know he is very controversial as he was involved in slots in Maryland. We need to have good witnesses, without baggage and from what I've found out, he has baggage.
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Staci Hancock [[redacted]@stonefarm.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 10:47 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Cc: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>;
> 'Arthur Hancock' <[redacted]@stonefarm.com>
> Subject: RE: Jockey
>
> Gotcha...maybe don't need to rock the boat right yet.
>
> But we do need to follow up on the issue with Magna and
> Stronach....because he did ATTEMPT to ban medication on his tracks.
> WE all know by now that it isn't as easy as just stopping
> medication...sure he needs for his tracks to make money....but if the
> trainers threaten to leave there and run elsewhere...that is just
> another example of WHY we need the federal legislation.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 8:55 AM
> To: '[redacted]@stonefarm.com'; '[redacted]@humanesociety.org'
> Cc: '[redacted]@stonefarm.com'
> Subject: Re: Jockey
>
> Thanks, Staci. We'll follow up with Gary today.
>

> We looked into Stronach and he seems to be a pretty controversial
> person, especially in Maryland. Plus, if he owns all these racetracks
> he can just stop drugs period. I know he tried, but I'm concerned
> about putting him on the spot to explain why he failed- answer
> probably being he needed to make money.
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Staci Hancock [[redacted]@stonefarm.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 08:49 AM
> To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Hicks,
> Cory
> Cc: 'Arthur Hancock' <[redacted]@stonefarm.com>
> Subject: RE: Jockey
>
>
> Spoke with Gary yesterday from the airport.....he is working
> on coming up with another jock to testify.
> He mentioned Jerry Bailey.
> I explained again the hook of the hearing and that jockey safety and
> health would be a major issue.
>
> Cory do you want to work directly with him? Or .....?
> I sent you his email address last week.....
> Let me know...either you can follow up today or I will.
>
> Also...just back in town...what happened about MAGNA testifying?
> Stronach himself, Marge Verge, or.....
> Gary said he could make some calls about this as well. He just needs
> the go ahead.
>
> Gary is such a great team member!!!!!!
>
> Staci
>
>
>

EXHIBIT 12

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:48 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: Re: Memphis Commercial Appeal: "Memphis representative to push for banning of soring"

That's a bad idea. Pork producers were just in today lobbying against it. Cattleman don't like it and farm bureau doesn't either.

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:35 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Ed just decided to sign on to the Egg Bill. I advised against it....
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:32 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> No. She did not. She understands the sensitivities.
>>
>> Sent from my iPad
>>
>> On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:02 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Cory,
>>> Did Corry make reference to the HSUS in Ed's press release as this article seems to suggest?
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On Sep 12, 2012, at 8:14 PM, "Michael Markarian" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
>>>
>>> http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2012/sep/12/memphis-representat
>>> ive-to-push-for-banning/?CID=happeningnow
>>>
>>> <image001.gif>
>>> Memphis representative to push for banning of soring By Bartholomew
>>> Sullivan Wednesday, September 12, 2012 WASHINGTON – Soring, the
>>> practice of putting irritating chemicals on a horse's legs to make it prance, would be prohibited if a law U.S. Rep. Steve Cohen plans to introduce becomes law.
>>> The Humane Society of the United States has condemned the practice as cruel. In a statement circulated by both Tennessee Democrat Cohen's and Kentucky Republican Congressman Ed Whitfield's offices, they describe soring as "an abusive practice used by some horse trainers in the Tennessee Walking Horse industry."
>>> Mike Holbrook, president of the East Tennessee Walking Horse Association, said Wednesday he was aware of some controversy regarding the practice raised by the U.S. Department of Agriculture but was not familiar with the proposed legislation.

>>> Cohen and Whitfield have scheduled a news conference Thursday to discuss amendments to the 1970 Horse Protection Act.
>>> <image002.gif>
>>> © 2012 Scripps Newspaper Group - Online
>>>
>>> <image002.gif>
>>> <image001.gif>

EXHIBIT 13

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2013 12:05 PM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Pennsylvania Pleasure Walking Horse Assoc.

That means Ed and I need to talk to him. Can you set up an appt for us/Ed to talk to Pitts on April 9 and plan to move the intro date by a day or two?

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 4, 2013, at 11:55 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> She agrees something needs to be done, but she doesn't get excited about issues unless her boss tells her too.
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 11:44 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Subject: Re: Pennsylvania Pleasure Walking Horse Assoc.
>
> What was her reaction?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Apr 3, 2013, at 5:42 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
>
> Spoke to Heidi and sent her info.
>
> From: Keith Dane [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 04:28 PM
> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>; Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>; Hicks, Cory
> Subject: Pennsylvania Pleasure Walking Horse Assoc.
>
> I just spoke with the president of the PPWHA club, who lives in Pottstown, PA (adjacent district to the 16th) and asked her to call and ask (as the president of the statewide Walking Horse club) Mr. Pitts to be an original lead sponsor of the HPA bill. She said she would gladly do that, and call right away. I asked her to let me know how it went – to which she agreed.
>
> I'll let you know what I hear back.
>
> Keith Dane
> Director, Equine Protection
> [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
> t 301-258-[redacted] f 301-258-3078
> The Humane Society of the United States
> 700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879
> humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
> Join Our Email List<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY_ID=2820&ACTION_REQUIRED=URI_ACTION_USER_REQUESTS>
Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841> Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety> Blog<http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/>
> <image001.gif><http://www.humanesociety.org/>
>
> To support The Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=2320&2320.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig2320>, or give in another way<http://www.humanesociety.org/donate/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=donate>, via a gift donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1590&1590.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig1590> or memorial donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1505&1505.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig1505> or donating your vehicle<https://onecarhelpshumane.com/?utm_campaign=hsusStaffEmailSig_2012&utm_source=emailClient&utm_medium=email> or create your legacy<http://legacy.humanesociety.org/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=legacy>. You can also volunteer<http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=volunteer> for The HSUS, and see our 55 ways you can help<http://www.humanesociety.org/action/55_actions_to_help_animals.html?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=helpanimals> animals.
>
> The HSUS is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>, approved by the Better Business Bureau<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by Guidestar's Philanthropedia<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.
>

EXHIBIT 14

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 5:23 PM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>; 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; 'Keith Dane' [redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: 'Mimi Brody' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; 'Sara Amundson' <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Fareed, Justin <Justin.Fareed@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Cost of the HPA bill

Connie, I see what you mean now. We will draft a letter to USDA.

-----Original Message-----
From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 5:19 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'; Keith Dane
Cc: Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson; Fareed, Justin
Subject: RE: Cost of the HPA bill

Keith, does USDA spend money on HIOs or is that a private arrangement as well?

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 5:11 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Hicks, Cory; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson; Fareed, Justin
Subject: Re: Cost of the HPA bill

Cory,

Could you put together a group Congressional letter requesting an estimate of what USDA currently spends on the HIO/DQP arrangement (See Keith's description below)?

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 16, 2013, at 5:00 PM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

I think that's good, Cory. I've made just a couple small edits in red - see what you think.

This doesn't address how the licensing, training and assignment of inspectors by USDA will impact the agency's budget - but we have maintained that when all of the costs of certifying, overseeing, auditing and regulating the HIOs (and their DQPs) go away, USDA can use the funds to develop its licensed inspector program.

From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 4:41 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson
Cc: Fareed, Justin
Subject: Cost of the HPA bill

I think Connie informed you all we need to come up with an argument as to why PACT does not score. I've put together this short paragraph that I think explains it. Can you take a look and let me know your thoughts?

The existing 1970 authorization under the Horse Protection Act will cover the cost of licensing, training, and assigning inspectors if horse show managers voluntarily decide they want to hire a licensed inspector. Currently, horse show managers rely on Horse Industry Organizations (HIOs) to supply them with designated qualified persons (DQPs) that show managers hire to inspect horses, so instead of hiring DQPs supplied by the HIOs, horse show managers will hire the licensed inspectors through a voluntary process. Since that is a private transaction between the horse show management and the licensed inspectors, the legislation does not speak to the payment of the licensed inspectors. As a result, this bill will not cost the government additional money and it will end soring, which the 1970 law has failed to do.

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-[redacted]
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01> <image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov<http://whitfield.house.gov/>

EXHIBIT 15

From: Fareed, Justin
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 3:08 PM
To: '[redacted]@humanesociety.org'; Hicks, Cory
Cc: '[redacted]@aol.com'; '[redacted]@gmail.com'; Blackberry, Ed; Pack, Chris
Subject: Re: Ed/Rules Committee/PAST

That is correct.

Justin Fareed
Legislative Aide
Rep. Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
(202)225-[redacted]

----- Original Message -----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 03:01 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Fareed, Justin; [redacted]@aol.com <[redacted]@aol.com>; [redacted]@gmail.com <[redacted]@gmail.com>; Blackberry, Ed; Pack, Chris
Subject: Re: Ed/Rules Committee/PAST

Isn't the current Dear Colleague signed by only Whitfield and Cohen?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 16, 2013, at 2:40 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Yes. We'll make that change
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 02:36 PM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Fareed,
> Justin; [redacted]@aol.com <[redacted]@aol.com>; [redacted]@gmail.com
> <[redacted]@gmail.com>; Blackberry, Ed; Pack, Chris
> Subject: Re: Ed/Rules Committee/PAST
>
> Cory,
>
> Did you see that the list of endorsers needs to be revised ?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jun 16, 2013, at 2:28 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> Thanks, Connie. Deadline to submit amendments is 2pm on Monday and the cmte will meet at 5pm, but the amendments may not be discussed until the following day on Tuesday. We have all the items below except the AQHA support letter.
>>
>> ----- Original Message -----

>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 02:19 PM
>> To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin; Justin Fareed <[redacted]@aol.com>;
>> Cory Hicks <[redacted]@gmail.com>; Blackberry, Ed; Pack, Chris
>> Subject: Ed/Rules Committee/PAST
>>
>> Ed is now focused on PAST. We discussed it this morning and have come up with the following checklist that needs to be implemented ASAP.
>>
>> 1. When on Mon/Tues is he scheduled to go before Rules Committee?
>>
>> 2. Supporting documents etc. need to be finalized for his appearance before Rules.
>> 1. OIG Report
>> 2. AHC Press Release
>> 3. AVMA& AAEP Press Release
>> 4.List of Endorsers (needs to be revised: American Quarter Horse Association should be #4 on list and under Horse Industry Professionals, items 13-27 should be eliminated)
>> 5.Text of Amendment
>> 6. Article showing violations of top trainers in Ryder program
>> 7. USDA swabing results- 2011, 2012
>> 8.Mason Dixon Poll
>> 9.Myth v Facts Sheet
>> 10. Tennessean articles
>>
>> 3. Send out Dear Colleague letter Mon Tues, Wed with signatures of
>> all 6 lead co-Sponsors.
>>
>> 4. Obtain written document of endorsement from American Quarter Horse Association.
>>
>> 5. If amendment is allowed, arrange meeting with Lucas.
>>
>> 6. Arrange meeting with Peterson.
>>
>>
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 16

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:45 AM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Please read Keith's email in full. They would like a statement clarifying the weighted shoe provision from Ed 's office and the sooner the better. Poll person cannot distribute it. It would be Marty Irby.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 26, 2013, at 9:31 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> So, they want a statement at the hearing? That's easy, but far off. This is an official document from our office, so can't someone at TWHBEA get it widely distributed? Maybe the person conducting the poll?
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:09 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin
> Subject: Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
> In view of the poll that is being conducted by the TWHBEA, please give this high priority.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Date: September 25, 2013, 7:36:41 PM EDT
> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Subject: Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Date: September 25, 2013, 6:15:44 PM EDT
> To: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
> The Myths/Facts document is on Congressional stationery and is Cong. Whitfield's document (though you drafted text for him last year). It doesn't have his name on it, but it would come from his office and be referred to as his document. I'm looping Connie and others in here, so they'll be aware of Marty Irby's suggestion and our email exchange...
>
> From: Keith Dane
> Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:59 PM
> To: Mimi Brody
> Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
> Thanks; are you referring to our Myths/Facts document, or does Whitfield's office have one, too? I think Marty was hoping whatever was put out, would come from Whitfield. So a statement at a hearing would be great, or a reference in an official document from his office would work, too.
>
> From: Mimi Brody
> Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:54 PM
> To: Keith Dane
> Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
> I think it's an excellent idea! If there's a hearing, it could maybe be part of his statement for the record. If the hearing isn't scheduled soon, maybe there'd be another way to put this "out there" - perhaps in the Myths/Facts document? Or maybe we'd want it in the Myths/Facts document whether there's a hearing or not? Could add this along with the BSL response, since that document needs to be updated to incorporate that additional issue anyway.
>
> From: Keith Dane
> Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:09 PM
> To: Mimi Brody
> Subject: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
>
> Hi Mimi,
>
> In talking with Marty Irby (past president of TWHBEA who has come on in support of PAST in a big way) he mentioned that much of the resistance to the act within the TWH industry is from people who should be supporting it, but have heard that it will eliminate all shoes (because of the "weighted shoe" provision), or just don't trust USDA to make a decision about what shoes will be allowed, that they can live with.
>
> I've explained many times that the USDA sets all regulations on equipment that is allowable under and within the parameters of the HPA, and that it's appropriate for them to do so when PAST becomes law - not for Congress to proscribe in detail what is allowed through legislation.
>
> Marty thinks that if Mr. Whitfield's office would provide a statement explaining the process (i.e. that USDA would seek the input of veterinarians, farriers and other industry participants in the development of regulations, and that the proposed regs would be put out for public comment) that it would help squelch the ongoing churning on this issue, and even gain more support for the bill.
>
> What do you think about this idea, and whether we should approach Justin and Cory with it?
>
> Thanks,
> Keith

>
> Keith Dane
> Vice President, Equine Protection
> [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
> t 301-258-[redacted] f 301-258-3078
> The Humane Society of the United States
> 700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879 humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
> Join Our Email List<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY_ID=2820&ACTION_REQUIRED=URI_ACTION_USER_REQUESTS>
Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841> Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety> Blog<http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/>
> <http://www.humanesociety.org/>

EXHIBIT 17

Unknown

From: Pack, Chris
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 2:03 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Hicks, Cory
Subject: RE: Correction...RE: cosponsor list on PAST

Sure thing.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 1:59 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Pack, Chris
Subject: Fwd: Correction...RE: cosponsor list on PAST

Can you set up a meeting with Yarmouth?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: October 14, 2013, 1:01:37 PM EDT
To: "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, "Pack, Chris" <Chris.Pack@mail.house.gov<mailto:Chris.Pack@mail.house.gov>>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Lauren Allen <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Correction...RE: cosponsor list on PAST

I just noticed that Rep. Yarmuth recently joined on the Energy and Commerce Committee (replacing Markey), and is on the Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade Subcommittee. I added the double carrot symbol after his name on the attached list, so this is the better version to use if you need it. Thanks, Mimi

-----Original Message-----
From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:37 PM
To: 'Hicks, Cory'; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Pack, Chris
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Cece Kremer
Subject: cosponsor list on PAST

FYI, so you all have it, attached is our current cosponsor list -- which doesn't yet have Rep. Marino. (Note that the 191 here does not include Cong. Whitfield as prime sponsor, since these sheets are meant to match THOMAS. In the scorecard and my emails to the Hill, I do include the prime sponsor in the total count.) Mimi

-----Original Message-----
From: Hicks, Cory [mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Pack, Chris
Cc: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane
Subject: RE: checking on this...RE: Marino will sign on to soring

Not yet. They said they would get back with us tomorrow when their LD gets back.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2013 12:26 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Hicks, Cory; Pack, Chris
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Keith Dane
Subject: Re: checking on this...RE: Marino will sign on to soring

Has Marino contacted Ed's office to
co-sponsor?

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 14, 2013, at 12:04 PM, "Mimi Brody"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
wrote:

We haven't yet added Marino to the list, which explains the discrepancy in our counts. With him and counting Cong. Whitfield, there are currently 193 on PAST. Do you know where we're at on this? Please let me know if you'd like me to reach out to Bill Tighe or Ansley Fox. I don't want to duplicate, and wasn't part of the meeting last week, but I'm happy to try contacting them and could play dumb - just wanting to confirm before we include check for him on the scorecard we'll be circulating via email to House offices tomorrow.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 3:46 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Marino will sign on to soring

Working on that.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 10, 2013, at 2:58 PM, "Mimi Brody"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
wrote:
Sara wrote me back, "No, please don't. Marino's office should contact Cory first." I told her I'd wait. Frankly, we could wait a long time for Marino's staff to do the next step. Maybe Cory or Chris can call Marino's office to confirm what they heard Marino (or his staff) told you?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 2:55 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: Marino will sign on to soring

Go for it!

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 10, 2013, at 2:41 PM, "Mimi Brody"
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
wrote:

Hooray -- great work, Sara, Connie, and Keith!! Is it ok to let Rep. Barletta's staff know that Marino has agreed to join on PAST? I ask because when I met with his staffer Catie Kawchak last fall, she said she was surprised that Marino wasn't yet a cosponsor of PAST, having found the animal fighting analogy compelling. She's not the point person now for Barletta - I'm following up with Thomas Lamberti, who may not have noticed that Marino wasn't on the bill. But it couldn't hurt to let him know as an update (reason to double-back after my email to him on Tues), if you're ok with my indicating that Rep. Marino has said he will sign on?

-----Original Message-----
From: Sara Amundson
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 2:26 PM
To: Fed Leg List
Subject: Marino will sign on to soring

But likely can't add him today, so please dont change score. Jess/JP, connected on animal fighting quickly. Let's catch up.

EXHIBIT 18

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 9:49 PM
To: '[redacted]@humanesociety.org'
Cc: Pack, Chris <Chris.Pack@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: DC Letters

We will give them the list along with the proposed text as soon as we get your edits.

----- Original Message -----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 09:43 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: DC Letters

Cory,

I gave Ed the draft Dear Colleague for Royce to reach out to Conservation Caucus and hopefully CA delegation. Ed also wants Schakowsky and Kinzinger to send one to the Illinois delegation. In both cases, should we give them a list of their delegation members missing from PAST or will they figure that out themselves.?

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 19

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:48 AM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'
Subject: RE: Does MB still get 2 witnesses?

Ok, let me know.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: Re: Does MB still get 2 witnesses?

Let me talk to Joan.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 31, 2013, at 11:34 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Spoke to Gary. He basically wanted to let me know that they are updating Fred on all of this on Tuesday. I informed him that a duel bill legislative hearing was not acceptable. Also spoke with him about HSUS and he agreed that wasn't a good thing. He is talking to Joan later today on this issue and he is going to ask Joan to call HSUS and tell them not to testify. We're still working Schcowsky's office too. I mentioned this other guy that could testify and he was very reluctant to have a secret witness because he was worried that we couldn't keep it secret (which was my main worry as well). What if we just suggested to the dems that they ask someone else (maybe Tydings)?
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:48 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Subject: Re: Does MB still get 2 witnesses?
>
> Ed said you can only do it at markup. Cory, PLEASE stand firm on this.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 31, 2013, at 10:45 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> Yes and I am talking to him again at 11. Told him that was not workable.
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 10:42 AM
>> To: Hicks, Cory
>> Subject: Re: Does MB still get 2 witnesses?
>>
>> Did you talk to Gary about the bills being considered together?
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> On Oct 31, 2013, at 9:58 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

>>
>>> So far she's only got Dr. Bennett, but they're giving her two. I doubt she can find anyone else.
>>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>> Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 9:50 AM
>>> To: Hicks, Cory
>>> Subject: Does MB still get 2 witnesses?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On Oct 31, 2013, at 9:35 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Yes. The office number 225-2111. He should call and ask to be connected to her. How I have been describing the problem is the hearing is supposed to be about the bill and the illegal abuse of the horses. If HSUS comes, the story changes and it become about HSUS, so we lose momentum and we have to waste time and energy changing the narrative.
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>>> Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 9:32 AM
>>>> To: Hicks, Cory
>>>> Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RE: E&C hearing on soring
>>>>
>>>> Should Ed talk to her as well?
>>>>
>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>
>>>> On Oct 31, 2013, at 6:43 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> We told Schakowsky that we think this will stop any chances of moving the bill further. They're personal office is trying to stop it. I'm going to try to talk to their chief of staff today.
>>>>>
>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 10:48 PM
>>>>> To: Hicks, Cory
>>>>> Subject: Re: HSUS testifying? RE: E&C hearing on soring
>>>>>
>>>>> Apparently, Michelle on Schakowsky's staff called Mike Markarian to see if HSUS was involved. HSUS'sproposed witness would be Keith Dane.
>>>>>
>>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>>
>>>>> On Oct 30, 2013, at 7:39 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>> Thanks. I'll work on this. Can you express your opinion on your end?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 07:36 PM
>>>>>> To: Hicks, Cory
>>>>>> Subject: Fwd: HSUS testifying? RE: E&C hearing on soring

>>>>>>
>>>>>> Cory,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I think the HSUS is working with the Dems to be able to testify.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Begin forwarded message:
>>>>>>
>>>>>> From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
>>>>>> Date: October 30, 2013, 7:34:21 PM EDT
>>>>>> To: Michael Markarian
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Wayne Pacelle
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Sara Amundson
<[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Cece Kremer
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Keith Dane
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
>>>>>> Subject: HSUS testifying? RE: E&C hearing on soring
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I'm sorry I didn't respond earlier, Mike, as I got pulled in other directions.
Looping in Connie, et.al.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> From: Michael Markarian
>>>>>> Sent: Wednesday, October 30, 2013 2:23 PM
>>>>>> To: Mimi Brody; Wayne Pacelle
>>>>>> Subject: E&C hearing on soring
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I assume we will want to testify if invited to the soring hearing. Michelle from the
Dem staff called me about it.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Michael Markarian
>>>>>> Chief Program & Policy Officer
>>>>>> [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
>>>>>> t 301.721.[redacted] f 301.258.3077
>>>>>> The Humane Society of the United States
>>>>>> 2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037
>>>>>> humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
>>>>>> Join Our Email
List<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY_ID=2820&ACTION_REQUIRED=URI_ACTION_
USER_REQUESTS> Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>
Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety> Blog<http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/>
>>>>>> [Description: Description: Description: The Humane Society of the United States -
Celebrating Animals | Confronting Cruelty]<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
>>>>>> To support The Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly
donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=2320&2320.donation=form1&s_src
=dn_emstaffsig2320>, or give in another
way<http://www.humanesociety.org/donate/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campa
ign=donate>, via a gift
donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1590&1590.donation=form1&s_src
=dn_emstaffsig1590> or memorial
donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1505&1505.donation=form1&s_src
=dn_emstaffsig1505> or donating your
vehicle<https://onecarhelpshumane.com/?utm_campaign=hsusStaffEmailSig_2012&utm_source=emailCl
ient&utm_medium=email>. You can also
volunteer<http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_me
dium=email&utm_campaign=volunteer> for The HSUS, and see our 55 ways you can

help<http://www.humanesociety.org/action/55_actions_to_help_animals.html?utm_source=staffsign
ature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=helpanimals> animals.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> The HSUS is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity
Navigator<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>, approved
by the Better Business Bureau<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-
protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129> for all 20 standards
for charity accountability, voted by Guidestar's
Philanthropedia<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-
united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/> experts as the
#1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth
Magazine<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_cha
rities.pdf> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.
>>>>>>

EXHIBIT 20

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2011 3:40 PM
To: Sparkman, John
Subject: Puppy Mill Bill

Connie wants us on the Puppy Mill Bill. NRA won't like it, but I think it is fine. We've been on it every year.

H.R.835 [112th] Print Subscribe Email/Save Share from THOMAS
Latest Title: Puppy Uniform Protection and Safety Act
Sponsor: Rep Gerlach, Jim [R-PA-6] (introduced 2/28/2011) **Cosponsors:** 145
Committees: House Agriculture
Related Bills: S.707
Latest Major Action: 3/9/2011 Referred to House subcommittee. Status: Referred to the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry.

Cory Hicks
Legislative Director/Policy Coordinator
Rep. Ed Whitfield
202-225-[redacted]

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov

EXHIBIT 21

From: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 2:20 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: can Cong. Whitfield join funding letter again before tomorrow's deadline?

Connie, sorry, I couldn't get off my conference call. I'm the leader so I couldn't leave, but I will call in a few minutes when it is over. I'll call Mimi and add the Congressman to the letter. We did discuss it in the office among the staff and we were going back and forth as to whether we should suggest that the Congressman should sign the letter because these spending issues are so controversial. I know the letter only asks for level funding, but we expect this year will be another year of big cuts. Also, we are not adding the Congressman on spending letters mainly because of the fact we hear constantly from constituents about spending. But, hopefully this letter won't get a great deal of attention in Kentucky. Also, if we decide to offer an amendment eliminating funds for the inspection of horses in slaughter houses, I'd hate for someone to view his request for level funding at the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to be used against us. Maybe the second concern isn't that big of a deal.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 1:38 PM
To: Hicks, Cory
Subject: FW: can Cong. Whitfield join funding letter again before tomorrow's deadline?

Cory,

Ed said fine but I wanted to work it throughyou.

Also, can you check into HR4103, a bill introduced by Walter Jones? They want to fold it into NDAA. Frank Lo Biondo is only co-sponsor so far but that is because Jones's people have not worked it at all.

Let me know what you think about both, please.

Thanks,
Connie

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 11:34 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Sara Amundson
Subject: can Cong. Whitfield join funding letter again before tomorrow's deadline?

Connie, can you help get Cong. Whitfield on the FY13 animal welfare enforcement funding letter?I try calling Cory, but wanted to flag it for you, too. I just realized he's not yet back on. We've got 15 other Republicans at this point (see list below and also attached target list), and this year's letter doesn't call for any increases. The final signed letter must be turned in tomorrow- and we're coming down to the wire for signature collection. Thank you for any help you can provide!

Mimi
202/955-[redacted]

HOUSE – Republicans who've already agreed to sign on this year:

Chris Smith
Mike Fitzpatrick
Michael Grimm
Richard Hanna
Vern Buchanan
Peter King
Elton Gallegly
Robert Dold
Jim Gerlach
Tom Marino*
Nan Hayworth
Judy Biggert
Leonard Lance
Steve LaTourette* (actually awaiting word from the boss, but Ian Steger is pitching it to him)
Dave Reichert*

*Submitted individual request for these funds to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure
Provisions of H.Res. 895 or the 110th Congress
as Amended Requested

EXHIBIT 22

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD'S CONGRESSIONAL AIDE

INTERVIEW OF [redacted]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Bryson Morgan

[redacted]

Stefan Passatino

Benjamin Keane

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan

4 with the Office of Congressional Ethics, and we are

5 joined by [redacted] as well as his attorneys

6 Benjamin Keane and Stefan Passa`tino.

7 [redacted], I want to just begin with a few

8 background questions. Some are pretty obvious but

9 we need them for the record.

10 What is your current job title with

11 Representative Whitfield's congressional office?

12 A. Press Secretary.

13 Q. And how long have you been Press

14 Secretary?

15 A. Since March 1.

16 Q. And what was your title prior to being

17 Press Secretary?

18 A. Congressional Aid.

19 Q. And how long were you in that

20 position?

21 A. I think it was December 2 when I

22 started, so three months.

23 Q. Where were you employed prior to

24 working in the Congressman's office?

25 A. I had my own company in Tennessee,

1 Baskin Irby Construction Company which we closed in
2 August or decided to close in August of last year.
3 Q. What type of construction is that
4 company?
5 A. Home exterior.
6 Q. How long have you known Representative
7 Whitfield?
8 A. I met him by phone in -- around the
9 first week of September, just before Labor Day of
10 2013.
11 Q. And can you describe that phone call?
12 A. Yes, I actually reached out to his
13 office in DC, I could give you a lot more
14 background, but I was in the Tennessean newspaper
15 for coming out endorsing the PAST Act, and I reached
16 out to his office in Washington, D.C. to let them
17 know I'd like to help with the PAST Act and if there
18 is anything I could do, I'd be willing to help and
19 probably three weeks, four weeks later, Emma his
20 scheduler finally contacted me, it took awhile, and
21 said he would like to talk to me and set up a phone
22 call for me to talk to him.
23 Q. And what was discussed during that
24 phone call?
25 A. Basically my background in the walking

1 horse industry, what goes on as far as soring and
2 the abusive practices that the PAST Act would stop.
3 What my -- you know, my most recent turn of events
4 had been over the past year with coming out sort of
5 publicly against the soring, and he asked me if I
6 would be willing to testify at Congress if they had
7 a hearing.
8 Q. And did you agree to testify?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. And were there also any discussions
11 about you coming to DC and meeting with members of
12 Congress or staff for Congress concerning the PAST
13 Act?
14 A. No.
15 Q. How long have you known Mrs.
16 Whitfield?
17 A. About the same time. She was actually
18 on the phone call when he called me.
19 Q. And what did she say on the call?
20 A. She really didn't say that much, she
21 just asked some questions about my background as
22 well.
23 Q. Who else was on the call?
24 A. That was all.
25 Q. And when did you learn that you would

1 testify in the hearing?

2 A. Well, the next morning, Cory Hicks,

3 his Chief of Staff, contacted me and said he thought

4 they would have a hearing, and he asked me again,

5 and I said yes, I told the Congressman I would be

6 willing to testify and we really didn't know, it was

7 up in the air for several months because the hearing

8 date kept getting pushed back, and I came to DC for

9 another reason, a Sound Horse Conference, and we

10 finally found out the date of the hearing while I

11 was actually here in DC.

12 Q. What conference did you say you were

13 here for?

14 A. Sound Horse Conference.

15 Q. When was that that you came for the

16 Sound Horse Conference?

17 A. Within a few days of October 13, 2013,

18 one way or the other, a few days.

19 Q. And when was the hearing when you

20 testified?

21 A. November 13.

22 Q. November 13?

23 A. I believe that's right.

24 Q. What did you do between November --

25 October 13 and November 13 related to the PAST Act?

1 A. An associate of mine Donna Bennefield
2 and I went to meetings to basically lobby for the
3 PAST Act and try to educate people about the soring
4 issues.
5 Q. And how was that arranged, that you
6 and Donna would go and speak to people about the
7 PAST Act?
8 A. Some of our first meetings we actually
9 went to ourselves and were set up through the Sound
10 Horse Conference people, and then a few days later,
11 Congressman Whitfield's office started setting up
12 appointments for us.
13 Q. How did Congressman Whitfield's office
14 get involved?
15 A. We basically told them since the
16 hearing was postponed, we would be willing to stay
17 and help, you know, support the bill if they would
18 be willing to set up meetings for us to go to.
19 Q. Who is Donna, can you give me more
20 details on her?
21 A. She is a Sound Horse advocate that's
22 been involved in this since the early 1980s, she's
23 probably been involved in this issue probably longer
24 than anybody on earth that I know of and she's the
25 Vice President of the International Walking Horse

1 Association, and she was the former -- don't hold me
2 to this title exactly, Director of the Horse
3 Protection Association -- Horse Protection
4 Commission.
5 Q. These meetings that you had on the
6 hill during that time period, October up until the
7 hearing, can you describe those meetings in general,
8 what were they, who attended, what would you say in
9 general?
10 A. Some of the meetings were with actual
11 members of Congress, some of the meetings were with
12 staff members, some of the meetings were set up by
13 Congressman Whitfield's office, some of the meetings
14 were set up by other people, like Former Senator Joe
15 Tidings. I know he set up some meetings that we
16 went to, he actually introduced the original Horse
17 Protection Act of 1970.
18 Donna and I went to most of the
19 meetings together, sometimes we had other people
20 that went with us, Keith Dane from the Humane
21 Society or Sara Admundson, a few of those Connie
22 Whitfield went to with us, and there were other
23 people from the Sound Horse Summit, Laurie Northrop
24 from Friends of Sound Horses that went,
25 veterinarians that went with us to some of the

1 meetings. There may have been some with the
2 American Horse Council, there were a lot of
3 meetings, so it's hard for me to remember.
4 Q. How many meetings were there?
5 A. Oh, gosh, between 75 to 100 probably,
6 I mean -- well, if we did it four days a week, there
7 were probably five to six -- yeah, probably about
8 that number.
9 Q. And these meetings went from October
10 until after the hearing or before the hearing?
11 A. Until about three or four days after
12 the hearing. Whenever Donna left, she had to go
13 back to Tennessee.
14 MR. MORGAN: You were here in the DC
15 area that entire period?
16 A. Uh-huh.
17 MR. MORGAN: Who was covering your
18 expenses while you were up here?
19 A. Well, for part of the time I stayed
20 with a friend, Keith Dane, and for about a one week
21 period of that, an organization Friends of Sound
22 Horses that I am a member of covered the expenses
23 and then the rest of the time Congressman Whitfield
24 actually let me stay at his home with him.
25 Q. Approximately how many days or weeks

1 did you stay with Congressman Whitfield?

2 A. Probably altogether about six weeks or

3 so, and part of that was prior to working for him

4 and part of that was after coming to work for him,

5 because I basically was homeless.

6 Q. Okay.

7 MR. MORGAN: I think you mentioned it,

8 I don't want to -- you know, ten minute explanation,

9 but give us sort of a more general idea of how you

10 came to be homeless, your transition up here to DC,

11 we understand from the documents that there was a

12 little bit of a story there.

13 A. I don't mind telling it, well, I had

14 to file for bankruptcy, my wife left me and half of

15 my family doesn't speak to me because I came out

16 publicly for this issue because my family is very

17 deeply entrenched in the soring issue and very

18 against having the bill forward. My business

19 partners were very heavily involved in it, all of

20 the people I am naming have Horse Protection Act

21 violations and so my whole world collapsed, the best

22 way I know to sort of describe it.

23 I had to leave shortly after I first

24 talked to Congressman Whitfield about testifying.

25 My wife actually went and told the general public

1 that I had agreed to testify, so for safety reasons,
2 because I had threats, I actually had to leave where
3 I lived and went to Alabama for about a week, and
4 then I ended up going, I didn't have a safe place to
5 go, I ended up going and staying with Donna
6 Bennefield at her home in Tennessee for about five
7 or six weeks prior to coming to DC and came to DC
8 with her.
9 Q. And then after going through all of
10 that and coming up here and doing the hearings and
11 the meetings, how did you come to settle up here and
12 specifically, how did you come to work for
13 Congressman Whitfield?
14 A. Well, because I didn't have a job
15 while I was here, actually lobbying, I applied for
16 other jobs, I really enjoyed DC and liked what I was
17 doing. I applied for some jobs with the Senate
18 committee and some other members' office and I think
19 you all probably have the emails about those, and
20 then after I testified, I had a threat that was very
21 -- the Huffington Post actually wrote an article
22 about it and it's out there, and my safety was an
23 issue of going back to Tennessee or not, and so
24 Congressman Whitfield said we would like for you to
25 say with us for a little longer, we don't think it's

1 safe for you to go back to Tennessee, we don't want
2 anything to happen to you.
3 So I was still here, staying with him,
4 looking for a job and I went to friends in Virginia,
5 actually let me back up, I went -- first he
6 mentioned to me that there was a job, a legislative
7 correspondent, that just a few days before, the guy,
8 Adam, I can't tell you his last name, was leaving
9 because he's getting married and asked me if I might
10 be interested in it, and I said what did it entail?
11 It was basically just writing letters and I said I
12 need some kind of job, and he said if you are
13 interested, would you go talk to the Chief of Staff
14 and send him your resume and everything like that.
15 So I went through that process, talked with the
16 Chief of Staff and then he said basically he thought
17 I was a little more seasoned for something a little
18 bigger than that job, and they did have another
19 position that a guy named Justin Fareed had been in
20 several months before that handled the PAST Act and
21 he had not filled that position and he asked me if I
22 might be interested in that, and I said yes, that
23 would be something more apt for what I'd like to do,
24 and he said okay, I'll get back to you. Then I
25 probably didn't hear anything for a week or so or

1 maybe ten days, and I was gone out of town to
2 Virginia for a friend of mine to Thanksgiving and I
3 came back the Sunday after Thanksgiving, Sunday
4 night and was still staying at the Whitfields,
5 Congressman Whitfield told me that he thought that
6 Cory was really interested in hiring for me for that
7 job, and told me the next day to talk to Cory about
8 it and he hired me for the job.
9 Q. And did you have any -- did you apply
10 for any jobs at the Humane Society?
11 A. I did in August of last year, I
12 applied for the Director of the Doris Day Rescue
13 Ranch in Texas and then in either late October or
14 early November, I applied for the Director of Rural
15 Outreach and there was another job that was in
16 public relations or communication and I can't
17 remember what the title was but there were three
18 different jobs I applied for.
19 Q. And did you speak with Keith Dane
20 about possible employment with the Humane Society?
21 A. I did once but not really him so much
22 as they have a process, they have a very lengthy
23 process, I spoke with -- I went through three or
24 four different interviews on different levels,
25 mainly I spoke with Ben Callison who was in Texas

1 with the Doris Day Ranch out there.

2 Q. Did you speak with Wayne Pacelle?

3 A. Yes, once.

4 Q. Concerning employment?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And what did he say about your

7 employment with the Humane Society?

8 A. He basically said that he thought I

9 would be good at government affairs and he referred

10 my name to another gentleman Wayne Waters but I

11 never heard anything back from him.

12 Q. Did Wayne or Keith mention to you the

13 possibility of you working in Representative

14 Whitfield's office?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Okay. And did you speak with Mrs.

17 Whitfield about your seeking employment in

18 Representative Whitfield's office?

19 A. After he said something to me, I told

20 her I applied for a job there and went and talked to

21 Cory.

22 Q. And what did she say about you working

23 there?

24 A. She said well, she thought I would be

25 good to have in the office, outgoing, and an

1 effective communicator and would be an asset.
2 Q. And did she go into any more details
3 in terms of being good in the office and being an
4 asset, what did she mean by that?
5 A. I think because of my outgoing
6 personality and I have been effective with talking
7 with other legislators and I don't meet a stranger.
8 Honestly Justin Fareed, I think, in the office who
9 had my position before was very similar.
10 Q. Okay. And did you guys -- well, did
11 you and Mrs. Whitfield discuss the PAST Act and how
12 that may be impacted by you going into
13 Representative Whitfield's office?
14 A. Yes, we talked about that it would be
15 good to help promote the PAST Act along with all the
16 other agricultural issues, but, you know, that I had
17 the knowledge and background and I think there was
18 sort of a disconnect in the office at the time of
19 people who actually really had a lot of first-hand
20 knowledge and experience, so I brought a lot to the
21 table with my experience and knowledge about it.
22 Q. When you started working for the
23 Congressman in December 2013, can you describe your
24 role with the PAST Act?
25 A. It was probably about half of my time

1 I spent on the PAST Act. The other half, there is a
2 whole portfolio of issues. I went to some meetings
3 with a variety of people, set up some meetings for a
4 variety of people, called a lot of offices trying to
5 get co-sponsors. Just basically generally gaining
6 support from different people for the bill and the
7 coalition there.
8 Q. And were you also involved in with
9 strategy and determining the best way to promote the
10 bill?
11 A. Yes, yes.
12 Q. What were your other duties?
13 A. The Science and Technology Committee,
14 all of the entire AG portfolio which is, you know,
15 anything to do with farming, GMO labeling, just a
16 variety of issues and ethics -- trying to, there is
17 a couple more, postal issues, the -- did a lot of
18 work on the farm bill, because at that time we were
19 working on the farm bill, so a lot of my time was
20 spent on the farm bill.
21 Q. When you first started the job, were
22 you expecting that it actually may be more time
23 spent on the PAST Act, say maybe 70 to 80 percent of
24 your time on the PAST Act?
25 A. I don't know that I expected it to be

1 that much but I thought there would be a good bit of
2 my time, yes.
3 Q. When you were working on the PAST Act,
4 are you still currently working on the PAST Act?
5 A. I am. I still handle all the
6 agricultural issues, and they gave all the other
7 issues to somebody else.
8 Q. Let me clarify that then, currently as
9 Press Secretary, you deal with all the agricultural
10 issues, which includes the PAST Act?
11 A. That's right.
12 Q. And then you deal with press?
13 A. Yes, and social media, all
14 communications basically.
15 Q. When you are working on the PAST Act,
16 I am saying from December until the present, can you
17 describe your communication with Mrs. Whitfield on
18 that, and I am saying in general, so what role does
19 she play with those things that you just described
20 ranging from meeting with members, gaining
21 co-sponsors, strategy, just gaining support?
22 A. You know, we talked maybe once a week,
23 maybe every other week about horse -- when I was
24 staying with them, we talked more, but since I
25 haven't been staying with them, we talk every week,

1 every other week, about strategy, and is there
2 anybody that we need to sure up and find out if they
3 are interested in helping us with the bill or are
4 there any -- you know, new co-sponsors that we could
5 gain, things like that, mainly co-sponsors.
6 Q. Let me make sure I understand the
7 timing of when you no longer lived with the
8 Whitfields. So you were basically --
9 A. The month of December.
10 Q. So in January --
11 A. My lease started January 1, so the
12 month of December, but we were closed for part of
13 that time with Christmas and the holidays, so it was
14 actually about three weeks of December.
15 Q. And your communication with her during
16 this time period from December to present, when it
17 comes to what you just described, is that typically
18 over email, in person, over the phone?
19 A. That was at night when we were at home
20 and eating dinner or just talking in general.
21 Q. So that was more so in December, how
22 about in January to present now that you are living
23 separately?
24 A. A lot less, I mean like I said,
25 probably once a week or every other week, maybe for

1 -- I have probably talked to her a total of 30
2 minutes in the past two weeks.
3 Q. Was there a time in, say, December,
4 when the communication was a lot more, so that for
5 whatever reason, you were speaking with her multiple
6 times per day?
7 A. I don't think during the day really
8 but like I said, at night, yes, there definitely was
9 because I was staying with them and it was the topic
10 that we both were interested in and cared about so
11 we talked about it every day.
12 Q. Do you recall scheduling of interviews
13 in -- sorry, scheduling of meetings in January and
14 issues with whether or not Emma would be able to
15 schedule the interviews that were related to the
16 PAST Act?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. I keep saying interviews.
19 A. Meetings, yes.
20 Q. And can you describe that, the issues
21 that were involved and the concerns?
22 A. There were some offices that I think
23 Emma had already reached out to prior to me coming
24 to work there that she said she had reached out to
25 and I can't give you specifics, and they either

1 didn't respond or had not met with anybody, and so
2 she wanted me to, Cory and I had a discussion about
3 this, she wanted me to contact the offices and set
4 up the meetings instead of her, and she said, you
5 know, now that you work here, you need to be the one
6 setting up the meetings, and then I think other -- I
7 started setting up the meetings from that point
8 forward other than when the district attorneys from
9 the State of Tennessee came in town, and we all sort
10 of chipped in, Cory, Emma and I to schedule meetings
11 for them.
12 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield speak with you on
13 how to deal with the scheduling issues and having
14 Emma make the calls for the meetings?
15 A. I think one time she said something
16 about would you see if Emma would help you about the
17 meetings because you have so much work now, and I
18 did, and then I had push back from Emma that
19 basically it was my job to do that not her job.
20 Q. Do you have communications with Mrs.
21 Whitfield about making sure or having Representative
22 Whitfield do certain things related to the PAST Act?
23 A. No, not really.
24 Q. Any situation you can think of? Like
25 having him meet with certain potential co-sponsors?

1 A. There -- I really don't remember
2 anything specifically that, you know I have asked
3 him things that I came up with, you know, like I
4 would take a list of co-sponsors and ask Cory or
5 somebody are these people somebody likely to get on
6 the bill and then give him packets to go to the
7 floor but not really directly from Connie, no.
8 Q. I am going to show you a document
9 that's bates stamped EW4002881. Feel free to read
10 the entire document but I will ask you a question
11 concerning the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you that
12 begins with maybe we should try to get Ed to call
13 Yoho.
14 A. Yes, I remember this. It was really
15 more, I think -- I initiated and asked Connie about
16 it. Could you contact Yoho's office -- (inaudible).
17 Yeah, I do remember discussing this
18 with her about talking to Yoho but it was more of a
19 collective effort of, you see they are talking about
20 Whitney here, that was Whitney Miller with AVMA, the
21 American Veterinary Medical Association, and they
22 have met with Congressman Yoho on a number of times
23 and occasions and I think he's a veterinarian and a
24 member of the organization, so I do remember this,
25 yes.

1 Q. So are you saying -- so I am clear,
2 whose idea was it to have him meet with Yoho --
3 A. I don't remember specifically. I mean
4 if we sat here and read this whole thing you could
5 probably figure it out, but I know we discussed Yoho
6 on a number of occasions with American Veterinary
7 Medical Association Whitney Miller from there.
8 MR. MORGAN: Who were some of the
9 other people you were in frequent contact with once
10 you started working in the congressional office with
11 regards to the PAST Act?
12 A. Did I answer what you wanted to ask
13 about that?
14 Q. Yes.
15 A. Well, you have Jay Hickey and Ben
16 Pendegrass with the American Horse Council, and then
17 Keith Klein with the American Association of Equine
18 Practitioners, and Ronda Haven and Whitney Miller
19 with the American Veterinary Medical Association,
20 and then you have Wayne Pacelle and Keith Dane with
21 the HSUS, and then you have Sara Admundson with HSLF
22 and Carolyn Snur I think is how you say it and
23 Anthony with the ASPCA. And then you have Chris
24 Hyde with the Animal Welfare Institute, and then you
25 have Samantha Roberts with Senator Ayotte's office

1 and Kaitlyn Runyon with Senator Warner's office and
2 Marilyn Dilhay with Congressman Cohen's office and
3 Mike Dunvet and Mark Davidson who are the district
4 attorney and assistant district attorney in
5 Tennessee who prosecuted the Jackie McConnell case,
6 and Laurie Northrop with Friends of Sound Horses,
7 Teresa Bippen with Friends of Sound Horses, there is
8 more. I am just trying to remember.
9 MR. MORGAN: Any one of those
10 organizations that you were in more frequent contact
11 with?
12 A. I would say AVMA, American Horse
13 Council, AAEP and HSUS and ASPCA, those five are
14 probably the main ones that I have talked with the
15 most. I mean the others are in there pretty much,
16 because I have like a sort of coalition when we have
17 information, we send it out or ask a question about
18 what they think about this or that, but those are
19 the main five groups that have volunteered to do the
20 most work really.
21 Q. I am going to show you another
22 document bates stamped EW3000459. I really want to
23 ask you about meetings with Senator Alexander.
24 A. I remember this.
25 Q. Okay. So you -- when Mrs. Whitfield

1 says Ed and I met with him, what was your
2 understanding of --
3 A. That was before I was ever involved in
4 the PAST Act and I know they met with him but I
5 don't really know what happened, it was before I
6 ever met them I believe.
7 Q. The email is dated December 13 but you
8 are saying she's referencing a meeting?
9 A. Prior to meeting them.
10 Q. Have you attended a meeting with
11 Senator Alexander?
12 A. No, not in person. Well, met him on
13 the subway train and brought it up.
14 Q. You don't miss an opportunity?
15 A. No, not at all.
16 Q. Okay. Are you aware of Mrs. Whitfield
17 and Representative Whitfield meeting the Senator
18 other than this reference in the email of something
19 that happened before you were involved?
20 A. No.
21 Q. Have you attended any meetings with
22 members of Congress or their staff where you were
23 there along with Mrs. Whitfield and Congressman
24 Whitfield?
25 A. No, not with both of them.

1 Q. So you have had meetings with
2 Representative Whitfield and other members of
3 Congress?
4 A. Uh-huh.
5 Q. And you have had meetings with Mrs.
6 Whitfield and other members of Congress?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. Okay. And all related to the PAST
9 Act?
10 A. Yes. Well, with him, far more than
11 the PAST Act, but --
12 Q. Okay.
13 A. Yes. I mean I meet with him with
14 anybody that has to do with AG issues, so.
15 Q. Did you meet with Representative Phil
16 Roe?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And did Mrs. Whitfield or
19 Representative Whitfield attend?
20 A. Mr. Whitfield did not but I believe
21 Mrs. Whitfield did with Donna Bennefield and myself.
22 Q. And when did that meeting take place?
23 A. Sometime in the second half of October
24 or first half of November, I couldn't tell you the
25 date.

1 Q. 2013?

2 A. Yes, 2013.

3 Q. And can you describe the meeting?

4 A. We discussed the PAST Act with him,

5 Donna and I both being from Tennessee, he's a

6 medical doctor, he said his issue was it that it had

7 a felony provision, and we explained to him that

8 Tennessee statute had passed a law in the previous

9 year that made it a felony in the State of Tennessee

10 and now people were going over to Kentucky and other

11 areas, particularly Congressman Whitfield's district

12 and doing more of the soring, so that was a need for

13 the felony provision nationally, and he said I'll

14 take a look at it, and you guys have done a good job

15 presenting this to me and we will see what we can

16 do.

17 And then I think we had follow-up

18 emails with his staff who just kept blaming it back

19 on the felony provision and wouldn't really give us

20 a straight answer really.

21 Q. Did you have any other meetings with

22 the member?

23 A. With Phil Roe?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. I think I stopped him in the hallway

1 one time too, outside of his office, and brought it
2 up again, yes, I think that was just me.
3 Q. With the meetings you had in October
4 2013, that was prior to you being a staffer, were
5 there any current staffers with Representative
6 Whitfield at that time?
7 A. At that particular meeting?
8 Q. Let me rephrase it. Tell me everyone
9 who attended the meeting?
10 A. That meeting? Donna Bennefield,
11 myself, and Connie Whitfield.
12 Q. Okay. And that was it?
13 A. Yes. I am not -- there wasn't a staff
14 person but I am not telling you that -- who was in
15 his office and was there or there is a possibility
16 that Keith Dane could have been there, I just -- I
17 have had a lot of meetings.
18 Q. Okay. Have you attended a meeting
19 with -- well -- Senator Thad Cochran?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Who attended that meeting?
22 A. Connie Whitfield, myself, Senator Joe
23 Tidings who is a former senator, he set up the
24 meeting, Cory Hicks and Chris Pack.
25 Q. You said Tidings set up the meeting?

1 A. Uh-huh.
2 Q. Can you explain?
3 A. Well, I think they are sort of the
4 same era, same age bracket, and Senator Cochran was
5 somebody we were trying to get on board the PAST Act
6 and Senator Tidings had a list of people he brought
7 up to us, Rockefeller, I think people he had known a
8 long time that he wanted us to go meet with and he
9 said he would set up the meetings if we would go.
10 Q. I am going to show you an email bates
11 stamped HSLFOCE029215. And I want to ask you about
12 the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you which she
13 begins perhaps you as Whitfield's office can let
14 McCaskill's, et cetera, et cetera.
15 A. Let me read.
16 Q. Sure, take your time.
17 A. From here up and then let me see.
18 Okay. So you are asking me about the email at the
19 top from Connie?
20 Q. That's right. Basically the question
21 what does that mean and then can you explain the
22 will do?
23 A. Background is Teresa Bippen is the
24 President of Friends of Sound Horses, FOSH, this
25 starts. She and I and Connie went to a meeting with

1 Roy Blunt's Chief of Staff during the days prior to
2 the hearing because Teresa was here and she
3 testified at the hearing. I think Connie set up
4 that meeting on her own because she's friends with
5 Roy Blunt and knows him, somehow, and then -- so
6 Teresa got actively involved and wanted to get the
7 people from Missouri on board, and basically she's
8 mentioning here, I kind of let McCaskill's and
9 Wagner's offices know FOSH is trying to get a hold
10 of them and maybe pass along Teresa's information
11 and I can't remember if I did or I didn't.
12 Q. What was the significance to you as
13 you read as Whitfield's office, that she puts after
14 perhaps you?
15 A. I don't really -- just me, I worked
16 there at the time, so.
17 Q. Are there other ways that you would
18 contact the office other than as Whitfield's office?
19 A. Not after coming to work there, no.
20 Q. Okay. Did you receive similar
21 requests from Mrs. Whitfield about setting up
22 meetings for --
23 A. Yes, a few times. I can't remember
24 specifics, but -- I am trying to think if there is
25 any -- I think maybe she suggested some of the

1 people that I asked the Tennessee attorneys to meet
2 with. Basically educating me because I was new on
3 names of good people to try to meet with.
4 Q. Did there come a time in December 2013
5 when Mrs. Whitfield contacted you and informed you
6 she would no longer contact you at Representative
7 Whitfield's office?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. Okay. And what do you recall about
10 that?
11 A. I think there was an email she sent
12 Emma and I had that she and I had been working
13 together and she really didn't think about it as
14 working in his office, and she was instructed or
15 something she wasn't supposed to contact us anymore
16 or something like that.
17 Q. And after that, how did the
18 communication change between you --
19 A. I just talk to her on my own time, I
20 mean at night or something like that.
21 Q. Okay. Can you define your own time,
22 so at night?
23 A. At night, weekends and sometimes I go
24 for -- we have lunch hour, sometimes I go for dinner
25 to their house, something like that, you know.

1 Q. And during your own time, is when you
2 would have conversations about the PAST Act?
3 A. Uh-huh.
4 MR. MORGAN: So the way you
5 interpreted her message was that she wasn't to
6 contact you during official time?
7 A. Yes.
8 MR. MORGAN: But she was permitted to
9 contact you outside of official time?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. When is the most recent time that you
12 communicated with her?
13 A. Last night.
14 Q. Okay. And what was that concerning?
15 A. Basically Congressman Whitfield, he's
16 hurting really bad right now and has some pains, I
17 was checking on him and actually I called to let her
18 know that one of the Senate offices had contacted
19 me, that they might be interested in co-sponsoring
20 and it was some good news, thought she might need
21 some good news with the way he's kind of been
22 hurting lately.
23 Q. And so at this point, I guess you
24 answered this before, I guess at this point you
25 communicate with her probably how many times a

1 week?

2 A. Once a week, once every other week.

3 MR. MORGAN: How often would you say

4 those communications involve the PAST Act?

5 A. We probably discuss it every time, but

6 nine times out of ten, but I mean we discuss a lot

7 of personal things too, she is with me like my

8 family was, she's sort of become like my second

9 mother through all this too, and really helped me

10 with some personal things, just talking.

11 MR. MORGAN: We did notice that some

12 of the emails, you refer to her as mom?

13 A. Yeah, I mean she's -- like, yeah, I

14 love her to death and she's been great, just, you

15 know, emotionally and things like that, just talking

16 about things, so.

17 Q. And the way you just described it is a

18 situation where you contact her but how frequently

19 does she contact you, whether on your own time or

20 whatever, concerning --

21 A. I probably call her more than she

22 calls me.

23 Q. Does she email you still?

24 A. Yes, she emails more than she calls,

25 and I'll email -- you know, I'll email her back,

1 sometimes it's about the PAST Act, sometimes it not.
2 Q. And just estimating, how frequently
3 does she email you about the PAST Act?
4 A. A couple times a week, two or three
5 times a week.
6 Q. I want to ask you about other
7 legislation?
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. The Puppy Uniform Protection and
10 Safety Act, is that part of your portfolio, have you
11 worked on that at all?
12 A. It would probably be part of it but I
13 don't specifically remember that bill. It sounds
14 like it if relates to an animal, I deal with it.
15 Q. Safeguard American Food Export Act?
16 A. I know what it is, SAFE Act.
17 Q. Do you work on that now?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And have you had communication with
20 Mrs. Whitfield similar to what we described about
21 the PAST Act about co-sponsors, strategy?
22 A. I think I asked her about it one time,
23 because when I was new, I was trying to educate
24 myself on all of these other bills, because I knew
25 about the PAST Act, I didn't know about the other

1 bills, and maybe she told me what it was about, and
2 I remember talking to her one time about it.
3 Q. Do you remember any other time
4 communicating with her about it?
5 A. No, I don't think so.
6 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act?
7 A. Is that the one with the -- yeah, I
8 think I know the bill you are talking about. That's
9 the -- what is the name of it?
10 Q. Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act?
11 A. I am not sure if that's the same bill.
12 There is another bill that's related to veterans and
13 rescuing dogs, but I don't know if that's the same
14 bill or not, a different name.
15 Q. So the bill you have in mind deals
16 with veterans and rescue dogs?
17 A. Uh-huh.
18 Q. And what is your role with that
19 legislation?
20 A. I handle it under the portfolio of
21 animal portfolios, and actually the American Welfare
22 Institute is who brought it to my attention.
23 Q. Have you had communication with Mrs.
24 Whitfield concerning anything related to that bill,
25 whether it's -- like we mentioned before,

1 co-sponsors or strategy?

2 A. I don't remember if I did or not.

3 Q. And the Animal Fighting Spectator

4 Prohibition Act?

5 A. I don't know what that one is.

6 Q. Dog fighting related?

7 A. Not cock fighting?

8 Q. I'm not sure. Are you familiar with

9 the cock fighting?

10 A. There is a cock fighting bill but I

11 don't know about the one you are talking about.

12 Q. Is it the one where the member is

13 co-sponsoring?

14 A. I couldn't tell you. It's not one

15 that I worked on.

16 Q. Okay. Okay.

17 MR. MORGAN: With regards to the PAST

18 Act, you listed a bunch of organizations and bunch

19 of names. How relative to the other people you are

20 in contact with, how do your contacts with Mrs.

21 Whitfield compare, is she one of the more frequent

22 persons you have contact with?

23 A. She's one of the less frequent.

24 Q. Less frequent. Who would you say is

25 the most frequent person you have contact with about

1 the PAST Act?

2 A. I would say -- probably equally Keith

3 Dane, Ben Pendegrass, Teresa Bippen and Whitney

4 Miller. Maybe a little bit more with Keith Dane but

5 it's only because they forward a lot of emails to

6 me, I don't really respond to all of them, they just

7 like to forward emails.

8 Q. Is Mrs. Whitfield on those emails as

9 well?

10 A. Sometimes yes, sometimes no.

11 Q. Just so I am clear, when you say

12 equal, you mean of those four people you listed,

13 it's equal amount of time with them?

14 A. Yeah. I mean I really -- probably

15 Keith Dane and Teresa Bippen the most two, Teresa is

16 with FOSH but I have known them a lot longer, so I

17 may contact them and ask them a question about

18 something I don't know the answer to or hey, guys,

19 do you have the statistics on this. They have the

20 records and what not, stuff like that, so if I need

21 statistics or information, I'll go to them to get it

22 usually.

23 MR. MORGAN: Going down from that,

24 those are the people you have the most contact with,

25 Mrs. Whitfield would be significantly below that or

1 less frequently --

2 A. Eighth or ninth.

3 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

4 A. Something like that.

5 MR. MORGAN: You said it was in that

6 October time period leading up to the hearing, I

7 think you said you did about 75 to 100 meetings?

8 A. Yeah, probably about right.

9 MR. MORGAN: How many of those

10 meetings were attended by Humane Society folks?

11 A. I don't know the exact number, half.

12 MR. MORGAN: Half.

13 A. I am guessing that.

14 MR. MORGAN: Any other organizations,

15 any other organization that had a large chunk of

16 meetings?

17 A. FOSH, Friends of Sound Horses, some of

18 the veterinary people with some, I guess ASPCA, I

19 guess, had some, I'd say FOSH is probably the other

20 organization that had the most, because their main

21 purpose for existence is this one thing, that

22 organization.

23 MR. MORGAN: So is it -- would it be

24 correct to say that -- well, you said that you have

25 contacted -- you have the most contact with Keith

1 Dane and Teresa Bippen?
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 MR. MORGAN: That would be with FOSH
4 and the Humane Society?
5 A. Yes.
6 MR. MORGAN: Would it be fair to say
7 those are the two main organizations primarily
8 involved in the issues, do they have more
9 involvement than the others?
10 A. I think they are probably equal with
11 AVMA, American Horse Council, AAP, and ASPCA but I
12 personally reach out to them more because I know
13 them better, because I have a longer history with
14 them, and if I need information, those are the two
15 people I know I can get it the fastest from.
16 MR. MORGAN: Okay.
17 A. And with me, getting something fast in
18 Congress is important.
19 Q. Good luck with that.
20 I just want to go back to something
21 you mentioned in the beginning, your portfolio was
22 ethics when you first started, and I just want to
23 understand, what was the policy for dealing with
24 contacts from Mrs. Whitfield with the office when
25 you started?

1 A. Contacts from Mrs. Whitfield?
2 Q. Was there any policy, any discussion
3 that the people had with you when you started at the
4 office about what is the normal way that they deal
5 with Mrs. Whitfield contacting the office?
6 A. Basically it was on a case by case
7 thing. If there was something I felt like I should
8 ask somebody else about, I went to Cory our Chief of
9 Staff and asked them is this okay or not okay.
10 MR. MORGAN: Do you remember any
11 specific instances when you took something to Cory?
12 A. Talking about some of the meetings
13 that we set up and things like that.
14 MR. MORGAN: Do you recall, what was
15 the question for Cory?
16 A. Basically there was some meetings that
17 -- I think we set up, and I went to with Keith Dane
18 from the Humane Society, and I really, I think it
19 may have come from Keith Dane, I don't think
20 necessarily that came from Connie, but I asked Cory,
21 is it okay to set up and go to these meetings, so.
22 Q. You set up the meetings with Keith
23 Dane or Mrs. Whitfield?
24 A. Keith Dane.
25 Q. Why would it not be okay?

1 A. Because we already had the ethics
2 issue come up.
3 MR. MORGAN: Was Mrs. Whitfield going
4 to attend those meetings as well?
5 A. No. I only attended two meetings with
6 her since I worked there and she set those meetings
7 up.
8 Q. Which two were those?
9 A. Pennsylvania Senator that's a
10 Democrat, his Chief of Staff, don't ask me -- Casey,
11 and Rand Paul.
12 Q. When did those meetings occur?
13 A. December or January, I'm not certain.
14 Q. December 2013 and January 2014?
15 A. Yeah, somewhere in there. She met
16 Casey's Chief of Staff at a fundraiser or something,
17 some party she went to herself, and then knew Rand
18 Paul.
19 Q. And just so I am clear, it seems like
20 then with respect to any issues that come up with
21 Representative -- well, Mrs. Whitfield contacting
22 Representative Whitfield's office, is it a case by
23 case situation and then you take it to Cory?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. But there is no, just one policy one

1 way or the other of what is supposed to happen?
2 A. Well, basically I just kind of go on a
3 -- if I think this looks like something, you know,
4 that there could be a question about, I am going to
5 ask Cory about it whether it be her or anybody else,
6 I mean it's -- I tend to air on the side of caution
7 with anything whether it's her or somebody else on
8 another issue and ask the Chief of Staff, so.
9 Q. Do you have anymore questions?
10 MR. MORGAN: I don't think so. But
11 let me check my notes.
12 MR. PAYNE: I think that's all we
13 have.
14 MR. PASSATINO: Can I ask a quick
15 question and clarify one thing?
16 MR. PAYNE: Yes.
17 A VOICE: Independent of conversations
18 that you might have had either with the Chief of
19 Staff or anyone else, did you have an understanding
20 with respect to what office policy was with regard
21 to Mrs. Whitfield engaging in lobbying efforts with
22 your office?
23 A. Yes, I understand from reading the
24 ethics manual and ethics training that she could not
25 directly lobby our office.

1 MR. MORGAN: What did you understand
2 the word lobby to mean in that context?
3 A. She couldn't try to get us to get on a
4 bill, to write legislation or change legislation,
5 co-sponsor a bill, things like that.
6 MR. MORGAN: Would that have included
7 discussing legislation with her?
8 A. Well, I mean --
9 MR. MORGAN: Strategy?
10 A. In my opinion, no, because I discussed
11 strategy with her but it wasn't about changing the
12 legislation or Congressman Whitfield getting on a
13 bill or things like that. From our office
14 standpoint, it was strategy of getting other
15 offices, co-sponsors to support our bill.
16 MR. MORGAN: And your understanding of
17 what -- is your understanding just from your reading
18 of the ethics manual or is that informed from
19 conversations with somebody else in the office?
20 A. That's the way I took it and from
21 other conversations with Cory, our Chief of Staff.
22 Q. Did you have any conversations with
23 Representative Whitfield concerning that policy?
24 A. No.
25 Q. Or that rule or anything?

1 A. No.

2 MR. MORGAN: Any conversations with

3 Mrs. Whitfield about that policy?

4 A. Yes.

5 MR. MORGAN: Can you tell us about

6 those conversations?

7 A. Basically, you know, just like what we

8 were talking about earlier when we strategized and

9 things like that, I try to do it on my own time

10 basically when I was with them at their house or

11 something like that.

12 MR. MORGAN: Was that her

13 understanding?

14 A. I guess it's something we kind of both

15 came to, just to make sure we were going above and

16 beyond not to do anything improper.

17 MR. PAYNE: Okay.

18 A. Okay.

19 MR. PAYNE: Thanks.

20 (Whereupon, the recording is

21 terminated.)

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

2

3 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
4 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
5 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
6 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
7 forth.
8 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
10 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
11 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
12 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
13 the action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 _____
22 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XIO1717
23 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey
24 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
25

A

aaep 22:13
aap 37:11
able 18:14
abusive 4:2
accurate 43:4
act 3:15,17 4:2,13 5:25 6:3,7 7:17 9:20 11:20 14:11 14:15,24 15:1,23 15:24 16:3,4,10 16:15 18:16 19:22 21:11 23:4 24:9 24:11 25:4 27:5 30:2 31:4 32:1,3 32:10,15,16,21,25 33:6,10 34:4,18 35:1
action 43:10,13
actively 28:6
actual 7:10
adam 11:8
admundson 7:21 21:21
advocate 6:21
affairs 13:9
ag 15:14 24:14
age 27:4
agree 4:8
agreed 10:1
agricultural 14:16 16:6,9
aid 2:18
air 5:7 40:6
alabama 10:3
alexander 22:23 23:11
altogether 9:2
american 8:2 20:21 21:6,16,17,19 22:12 32:15 33:21 37:11
amount 35:13
animal 21:24 32:14 33:21 34:3
answer 21:12 25:20 35:18
answered 30:24
anthony 21:23
anybody 6:24 17:2 19:1 24:14 40:5
anymore 29:15 40:9
applied 10:15,17 12:12,14,18 13:20
apply 12:9
appointments 6:12
approximately 8:25
april 1:5 43:24
apt 11:23
area 8:15
areas 25:11
arranged 6:5
article 10:21
asked 4:5,21 5:4 11:9,21 20:2,15 29:1 32:22 38:9 38:20
asking 27:18
aspca 21:23 22:13 36:18 37:11
asset 14:1,4
assistant 22:4
associate 6:1
association 7:1,3 20:21 21:7,17,19
attend 24:19 39:4
attended 7:8 23:10 23:21 26:9,18,21 36:10 39:5
attention 33:22
attorney 22:4,4 43:9,11
attorneys 2:5 19:8 29:1
august 3:2,2 12:11
avma 20:20 22:12 37:11
aware 23:16
awhile 3:20
ayottes 21:25

B

back 5:8 8:13 10:23 11:1,5,24 12:3 13:11 19:18 25:18 31:25 37:20
background 2:8 3:14,25 4:21 14:17 27:23
bad 30:16
bankruptcy 9:14
basically 3:25 6:2 6:15 9:5 11:11,16 13:8 15:5 16:14 17:8 19:19 27:20 28:7 29:2 30:15 38:6,16 40:2 42:7 42:10
baskin 3:1
bates 20:9 22:22 27:10
beginning 37:21
begins 20:12 27:13
believe 5:23 23:6 24:20
ben 12:25 21:15 35:3
benjamin 1:13 2:6
bennefield 6:1 10:6 24:21 26:10
best 9:21 15:9
better 37:13
beyond 42:16
bigger 11:18
bill 6:17 9:18 15:6 15:10,18,19,20 17:3 20:6 32:13 33:8,11,12,14,15 33:24 34:10 41:4 41:5,13,15
bills 32:24 33:1
bippen 22:7 27:23 35:3,15 37:1
bit 9:12 16:1 35:4
blaming 25:18
blunt 28:5
blunts 28:1
board 27:5 28:7
bracket 27:4
brought 14:20 23:13 26:1 27:6 33:22
bryson 1:10 2:3
bunch 34:18,18
business 9:18

C

c 3:16
call 3:11,22,24 4:18 4:19,23 20:12 31:21
called 4:18 15:4 30:17
callison 12:25
calls 19:14 31:22,24
cant 11:8 12:16 18:25 28:11,23
cared 18:10
carolyn 21:22
case 22:5 38:6,6 39:22,23
casey 39:10
caseys 39:16
caution 40:6
certain 19:22,25 39:13
certificate 43:1
certify 43:3,8
cetera 27:14,14
change 29:18 41:4
changing 41:11
check 40:11
checking 30:17
chief 5:3 11:13,16 28:1 38:8 39:10 39:16 40:8,18 41:21
chipped 19:10
chris 21:23 26:24
christmas 17:13
chunk 36:15
clarify 16:8 40:15
clear 21:1 35:11 39:19
close 3:2
closed 3:1 17:12
coalition 15:7 22:16
cochran 26:19 27:4
cock 34:7,9,10
cohens 22:2
collapsed 9:21
collective 20:19
come 10:11,12 29:4 38:19 39:2,20
comes 17:17
coming 3:15 4:4,11 9:4 10:7,10 18:23 28:19
commission 7:4 43:24
committee 10:18 15:13
communicate 30:25
communicated 30:12
communicating 33:4
communication 12:16 16:17 17:15 18:4 29:18 32:19 33:23
communications 16:14 19:20 31:4
communicator 14:1
company 2:25 3:1 3:4
compare 34:21
concerning 4:12 13:4 20:11 30:14 31:20 33:24 41:23
concerns 18:21
conference 5:9,12 5:14,16 6:10
congress 4:6,12,12 7:11 23:22 24:3,6 37:18
congressional 2:4 2:11,18 21:10
congressman 5:5 6:11,13 7:13 8:23 9:1,24 10:13,24 12:5 14:23 20:22 22:2 23:23 25:11 30:15 41:12
congressmans 2:24
connie 7:21 20:7,15 26:11,22 27:19,25 28:3 38:20
construction 3:1,3
contact 19:3 20:16 21:9 22:10 28:18

29:6,15 30:6,9 31:18,19 34:20,22 34:25 35:17,24 36:25
contacted 3:20 5:3 29:5 30:18 36:25
contacting 38:5 39:21
contacts 34:20 37:24 38:1
context 41:2
conversations 30:2 40:17 41:19,21,22 42:2,6
correct 36:24
correspondent 11:7
cory 5:2 12:6,7 13:21 19:2,10 20:4 26:24 38:8 38:11,15,20 39:23 40:5 41:21
cosponsor 41:5
cosponsoring 30:19 34:13
cosponsors 15:5 16:21 17:4,5 19:25 20:4 32:21 34:1 41:15
couldnt 24:24 34:14 41:3
council 8:2 21:16 22:13 37:11
counsel 43:9,12
couple 15:17 32:4
covered 8:22
covering 8:17
csr 1:16
current 2:10 26:5
currently 16:4,8

D

d 3:16
dane 7:20 8:20 12:19 21:20 26:16 35:3,4,15 37:1 38:17,19,23,24
date 5:8,10 24:25 43:6
dated 23:7
davidson 22:3
day 3:9 12:7,12 13:1 18:6,7,11
days 5:17,18 6:10 8:6,11,25 11:7 12:1 28:1
dc 3:13 4:11 5:8,11 8:14 9:10 10:7,7 10:16
deal 16:9,12 19:13 32:14 38:4
dealing 37:23
deals 33:15
death 31:14
december 2:21 14:23 16:16 17:9 17:12,14,16,21 18:3 23:7 29:4 39:13,14
decided 3:2
deeply 9:17
define 29:21
definitely 18:8
democrat 39:10
describe 3:11 7:7 9:22 14:23 16:17 18:20 25:3
described 16:19 17:17 31:17 32:20
details 6:20 14:2
determining 15:9
didnt 4:20 5:6 10:4 10:14 11:25 19:1 28:11 29:13 32:25
different 12:18,24 12:24 15:6 33:14
dilhay 22:2
dinner 17:20 29:24
directly 20:7 40:25
director 7:2 12:12 12:14
disconnect 14:18
discuss 14:11 31:5 31:6
discussed 3:23 21:5 25:4 41:10
discussing 20:17 41:7
discussion 19:2 38:2
discussions 4:10
district 19:8 22:3,4 25:11
doctor 25:6
document 20:8,10 22:22
documents 9:11
doesnt 9:15
dog 33:6,10 34:6
dogs 33:13,16
doing 10:10,17 25:12
donna 6:1,6,19 7:18 8:12 10:5 24:21 25:5 26:10
dont 7:1 9:8,13 10:25 11:1 14:7 15:25 18:7 20:1 21:3 23:5,14 28:15 32:13 33:5 33:13 34:2,5,11 35:6,18 36:11 38:19 39:10 40:10
doris 12:12 13:1
dunvet 22:3
duties 15:12

E

earlier 42:8
early 6:22 12:14
earth 6:24
eating 17:20
ed 20:12 23:1
educate 6:3 32:23
educating 29:2
effective 14:1,6
effort 20:19
efforts 40:21
eighth 36:2
either 12:13 18:25 40:18
email 17:18 20:11 23:7,18 27:10,12 27:18 29:11 31:23 31:25,25 32:3
emails 10:19 25:18 31:12,24 35:5,7,8
emma 3:19 18:14 18:23 19:10,14,16 19:18 29:12
emotionally 31:15
employed 2:23
employee 43:9,11
employment 12:20 13:4,7,17
ended 10:4,5
endorsing 3:15
engaging 40:21
enjoyed 10:16
entail 11:10
entire 8:15 15:14 20:10
entirety 1:24
entrenched 9:17
equal 35:12,13 37:10
equally 35:2
equine 21:17
era 27:4
estimating 32:2
et 27:14,14
ethics 2:4 15:16 37:22 39:1 40:24 40:24 41:18
events 4:3
ew3000459 22:22
ew4002881 20:9
exact 36:11
exactly 7:2
existence 36:21
expected 15:25
expecting 15:22
expenses 8:18,22
experience 14:20 14:21
expires 43:24
explain 27:2,21
explained 25:7
explanation 9:8
export 32:15
exterior 3:5

F

fair 37:6
familiar 34:8
family 9:15,16 31:8
far 4:1 24:10
fareed 11:19 14:8
farm 15:18,19,20
farming 15:15
fast 37:17
fastest 37:15
feel 20:9
felony 25:7,9,13,19
felt 38:7
fighting 34:3,6,7,9 34:10
figure 21:5
file 9:14
filled 11:21
finally 3:20 5:10
financially 43:12
find 17:2
first 3:9 6:8 9:23 11:5 15:21 24:24 37:22
firsthand 14:19
five 8:7 10:6 22:13 22:19
floor 20:7
folks 36:10
followup 25:17
food 32:15
foregoing 43:3
former 7:1,14 26:23
forth 43:7
forward 9:18 19:8 35:5,7
fosh 27:24 28:9 35:16 36:17,19 37:3
found 5:10
four 3:19 8:6,11 12:24 35:12
free 20:9
frequent 21:9 22:10 34:21,23,24 34:25
frequently 31:18 32:2 36:1
friend 8:20 12:2
friends 7:24 8:21 11:4 22:6,7 27:24 28:4 36:17
fundraiser 39:16

further 43:8

G

gain 17:5
gaining 15:5 16:20 16:21
general 7:7,9 9:9 9:25 16:18 17:20
generally 15:5
gentleman 13:10
getting 5:8 11:9 37:17 41:12,14
give 3:13 6:19 9:9 18:25 20:6 25:19
gmo 15:15
go 6:6,18 8:12 10:5 11:1,13 14:2 20:6 27:8,9 29:23,24 35:21 37:20 38:21 40:2
goes 4:1
going 10:4,5,9,23 14:12 20:8 22:21 25:10 27:10 35:23 39:3 40:4 42:15
good 13:9,25 14:3 14:15 16:1 25:14 29:3 30:20,21 37:19
gosh 8:5
government 13:9
great 31:14
groups 22:19
guess 30:23,24 36:18,19 42:14
guessing 36:13
guy 11:7,19
guys 14:10 25:14 35:18

H

half 9:14 14:25 15:1 24:23,24 36:11,12
hallway 25:25
handle 16:5 33:20
handled 11:20
happen 11:2 40:1
happened 23:5,19
hard 8:3
haven 21:18
havent 16:25
hear 11:25
heard 13:11
hearing 4:7 5:1,4,7 5:10,19 6:16 7:7 8:10,10,12 28:2,3 36:6
hearings 10:10
heavily 9:19
help 3:17,18 6:17 14:15 19:16
helped 31:9
helping 17:3
hereinbefore 43:6
hes 11:9 20:23 25:5 30:15,21
hey 35:18
hickey 21:15
hicks 5:2 26:24
hill 7:6
hired 12:8
hiring 12:6
history 37:13
hold 7:1 28:9
holidays 17:13
home 3:5 8:24 10:6 17:19
homeless 9:5,10
honestly 14:8
horse 4:1 5:9,14,16 6:10,21,25 7:2,3 7:16,23 8:2 9:20 16:23 21:16 22:12 37:11
horses 7:24 8:22 22:6,7 27:24 36:17
hour 29:24
house 29:25 42:10
hslf 21:21
hslfoce029215 27:11
hsus 21:21 22:13
huffington 10:21
humane 7:20 12:10 12:20 13:7 36:10 37:4 38:18
hurting 30:16,22
hyde 21:24

I

id 3:17,18 11:23 36:19
idea 9:9 21:2
ill 11:24 25:13 31:25,25 35:21
im 34:8 39:13
impacted 14:12
important 37:18
improper 42:16
inaudible 20:16
included 41:6
includes 16:10
independent 40:17
industry 4:1
information 22:17 28:10 35:21 37:14
informed 29:5 41:18
initiated 20:15
instances 38:11
institute 21:24 33:22
instructed 29:14
interested 11:10,13 11:22 12:6 17:3 18:10 30:19 43:12
international 6:25
interpreted 30:5
interview 1:4
interviews 12:24 18:12,15,18
introduced 7:16
involve 31:4
involved 6:14,22,23 9:19 15:8 18:21 23:3,19 28:6 37:8
involvement 37:9
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:5 3:1
issue 6:23 9:16,17 10:23 25:6 39:2 40:8
issues 6:4 14:16 15:2,16,17 16:6,7 16:10 18:14,20 19:13 24:14 37:8 39:20

J

jackie 22:5
january 17:10,11 17:22 18:13 39:13 39:14
jay 21:15
jersey 43:23
job 2:10 10:14 11:4 11:6,12,18 12:7,8 12:15 13:20 15:21 19:19,19 25:14
jobs 10:16,17 12:10 12:18
joe 7:14 26:22
joined 2:5
justin 11:19 14:8

K

kaitlyn 22:1
keane 1:13 2:6
kedric 1:9 2:3
keep 18:18
keith 7:20 8:20 12:19 13:12 21:17 21:20 26:16 35:2 35:4,15 36:25 38:17,19,22,24
kentucky 25:10
kept 5:8 25:18
kind 11:12 28:8 30:21 40:2 42:14
klein 21:17
knew 32:24 39:17
know 3:17 4:3 5:6 6:17,24 7:15 9:8 9:22 14:16 15:14 15:25 16:22 17:4 19:5 20:2,3 21:5 23:4,5 28:9 29:25 30:18 31:15,25 32:16,25 33:8,13 34:5,11 35:18 36:11 37:12,15 40:3 42:7
knowledge 14:17 14:20,21
known 3:6 4:15 27:7 35:16
knows 28:5

L

labeling 15:15
labor 3:9
large 36:15
late 12:13
lately 30:22
laurie 7:23 22:6
law 25:8
leading 36:6
learn 4:25
lease 17:11
leave 9:23 10:2
leaving 11:8
left 8:12 9:14
legislation 32:7 33:19 41:4,4,7,12
legislative 11:6
legislators 14:7
lengthy 12:22
letters 11:11
levels 12:24
license 1:17 43:22
liked 10:16
list 20:4 27:6
listed 34:18 35:12
little 9:12 10:25 11:17,17 35:4
lived 10:3 17:7
living 17:22
lobby 6:2 40:25 41:2
lobbying 10:15 40:21
long 2:13,19 3:6 4:15 27:8
longer 6:23 10:25 17:7 29:6 35:16 37:13
look 25:14
looking 11:4
looks 40:3
lot 3:13 8:2 14:19 14:20 15:4,17,19 17:24 18:4 26:17 31:6 35:5,16
love 31:14
luck 37:19
lunch 29:24
lyn 1:16 43:22

M

main 22:14,19 36:20 37:7
making 19:21
manual 40:24 41:18
march 2:15
marilyn 22:2
mark 22:3
married 11:9
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:5,7
mccaskills 27:14 28:8
mcconnell 22:5
mean 8:6 14:4 17:24 21:3 22:15 24:13 27:21 29:20 31:6,13 35:12,14 40:6 41:2,8
media 16:13
medical 20:21 21:7 21:19 25:6
meet 14:7 19:25 21:2 24:13,15 27:8 29:1,3
meeting 4:11 16:20 23:8,9,10,17 24:22 25:3 26:7,9 26:10,18,21,24,25 27:25 28:4
meetings 6:2,8,18 7:5,7,10,11,12,13 7:15,19 8:1,3,4,9 10:11 15:2,3 18:13,19 19:4,6,7 19:10,14,17 22:23 23:21 24:1,5 25:21 26:3,17 27:9 28:22 36:7 36:10,16 38:12,16 38:21,22 39:4,5,6 39:12
member 8:22 20:24 25:22 34:12
members 4:11 7:11 7:12 10:18 16:20 23:22 24:2,6
mention 13:12
mentioned 9:7 11:6 33:25 37:21
mentioning 28:8
message 30:5
met 3:8 19:1 20:22 23:1,4,6,12 39:15
mike 22:3
miller 20:20 21:7 21:18 35:4
mind 9:13 33:15
mine 6:1 12:2
minute 9:8
minutes 18:2
missouri 28:7
mom 31:12
month 17:9,12
months 2:22 5:7 11:20
morgan 1:10 2:3 8:14,17 9:7 21:8 22:9 30:4,8 31:3 31:11 34:17 35:23 36:3,5,9,12,14,23 37:3,6,16 38:10 38:14 39:3 40:10 41:1,6,9,16 42:2,5 42:12
morning 5:2
mother 31:9
multiple 18:5

N

name 11:8 13:10 33:9,14
named 11:19
names 29:3 34:19
naming 9:20
nationally 25:13
necessarily 38:20
need 2:9 11:12 17:2 19:5 25:12 30:20 35:20 37:14
neither 43:8,11
never 13:11
new 17:4 29:2 32:23 43:23
news 30:20,21
newspaper 3:14
night 12:4 17:19 18:8 29:20,22,23 30:13
nine 31:6
ninth 36:2
normal 38:4
northrop 7:23 22:6
notary 43:23
note 1:24
notes 40:11
notice 31:11
november 5:21,22 5:24,25 12:14 24:24
number 8:8 20:22 21:6 36:11

O

obvious 2:8
occasions 20:23 21:6
occur 39:12
october 5:17,25 7:6 8:9 12:13 24:23 26:3 36:6
office 2:4,11,24 3:13,16 6:11,13 7:13 10:18 13:14 13:18,25 14:3,8 14:13,18 20:16 21:10,25 22:1,2 26:1,15 27:13 28:13,18,18 29:7 29:14 37:24 38:4 38:5 39:22 40:20 40:22,25 41:13,19
officer 43:1
offices 15:4 18:22 19:3 28:9 30:18 41:15
official 30:6,9
oh 8:5
okay 9:6 11:24 13:16 14:10 22:25 23:16 24:8,12 26:12,18 27:18 28:20 29:9,21 30:14 34:16,16 36:3 37:16 38:9,9 38:21,25 42:17,18
once 12:21 13:3 16:22 17:25 21:9 31:2,2
ones 22:14
opinion 41:10
opportunity 23:14
organization 8:21 20:24 36:15,20,22
organizations 22:10 34:18 36:14 37:7
original 7:16
outgoing 13:25 14:5
outreach 12:15
outside 26:1 30:9

P

pacelle 13:2 21:20
pack 26:24
packets 20:6
pains 30:16
part 8:19 9:3,4 17:12 32:10,12
particular 26:7
particularly 25:11
parties 43:10
partners 9:19
party 39:17
pass 28:10
passa 2:6
passatino 1:12 40:14
passed 25:8
paul 39:11,18
payne 1:9 2:1,3 40:12,16 42:17,19
pendegrass 21:16 35:3
pennsylvania 39:9
people 6:3,6,10 7:14,19,23 9:20 14:19 15:3,4,6 20:5 21:9 25:10 27:6,7 28:7 29:1,3 34:19 35:12,24 36:18 37:15 38:3
percent 15:23
period 7:6 8:15,21 17:16 36:6
permitted 30:8
person 17:18 23:12 26:14 34:25
personal 31:7,10
personality 14:6
personally 37:12
persons 34:22
phil 24:15 25:23
phone 3:8,11,21,24 4:18 17:18
phonetic 1:25
place 10:4 24:22 43:6
play 16:19
please 1:24
point 19:7 30:23,24
policy 37:23 38:2 39:25 40:20 41:23 42:3
portfolio 15:2,14 32:10 33:20 37:21
portfolios 33:21
position 2:20 11:19 11:21 14:9
possibility 13:13 26:15
possible 12:20
post 10:21
postal 15:17
postponed 6:16
potential 19:25
practices 4:2
practitioners 21:18
present 1:8 16:16 17:16,22
presenting 25:15
president 6:25 27:24
press 2:12,13,17 16:9,12
pretty 2:8 22:15
previous 25:8
primarily 37:7
prior 2:16,23 9:3 10:7 18:23 23:9 26:4 28:1
probably 3:19 6:23 6:23 8:5,7,7 9:2 10:19 11:25 14:25

17:25 18:1 21:5 22:14 30:25 31:5 31:21 32:12 35:2 35:14 36:8,19 37:10
proceedings 43:5
process 11:15 12:22 12:23
prohibition 34:4
promote 14:15 15:9
prosecuted 22:5
protection 7:3,3,17 9:20 32:9
provision 25:7,13 25:19
public 9:25 12:16 43:23
publicly 4:5 9:16
puppy 32:9
purpose 36:21
push 19:18
pushed 5:8
puts 28:13

Q

question 20:10 22:17 27:20 35:17 38:15 40:4,15
questioning 2:1
questions 2:8 4:21 40:9
quick 40:14

R

rahn 1:16 43:22
ranch 12:13 13:1
rand 39:11,17
ranging 16:20
reach 37:12
reached 3:12,15 18:23,24
read 20:9 21:4 27:15 28:13
reading 40:23 41:17
really 4:20 5:6 10:16 12:6,21 14:19 18:7 19:23 20:1,7,14 22:20 22:22 23:5 25:19 25:20 28:15 29:13 30:16 31:9 35:6 35:14 38:18
reason 5:9 18:5
reasons 10:1
recall 18:12 29:9 38:14
receive 28:20
record 2:9
recording 42:20
records 35:20
refer 31:12
reference 23:18
referencing 23:8
referred 13:9
regard 40:20
regards 21:11 34:17
related 5:25 18:15 19:22 24:8 33:12 33:24 34:6
relates 32:14
relations 12:16
relative 34:19 43:9 43:11
remember 8:3 12:17 20:1,14,17 20:24 21:3 22:8 22:24 28:11,23 32:13 33:2,3 34:2 38:10
rephrase 26:8
reported 43:5
representative 2:11 3:6 13:13,18 14:13 19:21 23:17 24:2,15,19 26:5 29:6 39:21,22 41:23
requests 28:21
rescue 12:12 33:16
rescuing 33:13
respect 39:20 40:20
respond 19:1 35:6
rest 8:23
resume 11:14
right 5:23 16:11 27:20 30:16 36:8
roberts 21:25
rockefeller 27:7
roe 24:16 25:23
role 14:24 16:18 33:18
ronda 21:18
roy 28:1,5
rule 41:25
runyon 22:1
rural 12:14

S

safe 10:4 11:1 32:16
safeguard 32:15
safety 10:1,22 32:10
samantha 21:25
sara 7:21 21:21
sat 21:4
saying 16:16,18 18:18 21:1 23:8
says 23:1
schedule 18:15 19:10
scheduler 3:20
scheduling 18:12 18:13 19:13
science 15:13
seasoned 11:17
second 24:23 31:8
secretary 2:12,14 2:17 16:9
see 19:16 20:19 25:15 27:17
seeking 13:17
senate 10:17 30:18
senator 7:14 21:25 22:1,23 23:11,17 26:19,22,23 27:4 27:6 39:9
send 11:14 22:17
sent 29:11
separately 17:23
september 3:9
set 3:21 6:9,18 7:12 7:14,15 15:3 19:3 26:23,25 27:9 28:3 38:13,17,21 38:22 39:6 43:6
setting 6:11 19:6,7 28:21
settle 10:11
shes 6:22,24 23:8 28:4,7 31:8,13,14 34:23
shortly 9:23
show 20:8 22:21 27:10
side 40:6
significance 28:12
significantly 35:25
similar 14:9 28:20 32:20
situation 19:24 31:18 39:23
six 8:7 9:2 10:7
snur 21:22
social 16:13
society 7:21 12:10 12:20 13:7 36:10 37:4 38:18
somebody 16:7 20:5,5 27:5 38:8 40:7 41:19
soring 4:1,5 6:3 9:17 25:12
sorry 18:13
sort 4:4 9:9,22 14:18 19:9 22:16 27:3 31:8
sound 5:9,14,16 6:9 6:21 7:23,24 8:21 22:6,7 27:24 36:17
sounds 32:13
speak 6:6 9:15 12:19 13:2,16 19:12
speaking 18:5
specific 38:11
specifically 10:12 20:2 21:3 32:13
specifics 18:25 28:24
spectator 34:3
spellings 1:24
spent 15:1,20,23
spoke 12:23,25
staff 4:12 5:3 7:12 11:13,16 23:22 25:18 26:13 28:1 38:9 39:10,16 40:8,19 41:21
staffer 26:4
staffers 26:5
stamped 20:9 22:22 27:11
standpoint 41:14
started 2:22 6:11 14:22 15:21 17:11 19:7 21:10 37:22 37:25 38:3
starts 27:25
state 19:9 25:9 43:23
statistics 35:19,21
statute 25:8
stay 6:16 8:24 9:1
stayed 8:19
staying 10:5 11:3 12:4 16:24,25 18:9
stefan 1:12 2:6
stenographically 43:5
stephanie 1:16 43:22
stop 4:2
stopped 25:25
story 9:12
straight 25:20
stranger 14:7
strategized 42:8
strategy 15:9 16:21 17:1 32:21 34:1 41:9,11,14
stuff 35:20
subway 23:13
suggested 28:25
summit 7:23
sunday 12:3,3
support 6:17 15:6 16:21 41:15
supposed 29:15 40:1
sure 17:2,6 19:21 27:16 33:11 34:8

42:15

T

table 14:21
take 20:4 24:22 25:14 27:16 39:23
talk 3:21,22 11:13 12:7 16:25 29:19
talked 9:24 11:15 13:20 14:14 16:22 16:24 18:1,11 22:14
talking 14:6 17:20 20:18,19 31:10,15 33:2,8 34:11 38:12 42:8
technology 15:13
tell 11:8 24:24 26:8 34:14 42:5
telling 9:13 26:14
ten 9:8 12:1 31:6
tend 40:6
tennessean 3:14
tennessee 2:25 8:13 10:6,23 11:1 19:9 22:5 25:5,8,9 29:1
teresa 22:7 27:23 28:2,6 35:3,15,15 37:1
teresas 28:10
terminated 42:21
terms 14:3
testified 5:20 10:20 28:3
testify 4:6,8 5:1,6 10:1
testifying 9:24
testimony 43:4
texas 12:13,25
thad 26:19
thanks 42:19
thanksgiving 12:2 12:3
thats 5:23 6:21 16:11 20:9 27:20 33:8,11,12,13 39:9 40:12 41:20
therapy 33:6,10
thing 21:4 36:21 38:7 40:15
things 16:19 17:5 19:22 20:3 31:7 31:10,15,16 38:13 41:5,13 42:9
think 2:21 9:7 10:18,25 14:5,8 14:17 18:7,22 19:6,15,24 20:15 20:23 21:22 22:18 25:17,25 26:2 27:3,7 28:3,24,25 29:11,13 32:22 33:5,8 36:7 37:10 38:17,18,19 40:3 40:10,12
thought 5:3 11:16 12:5 13:8,24 16:1 30:20
threat 10:20
threats 10:2
three 2:22 3:19 8:11 12:17,23 17:14 32:4
tidings 7:15 26:23 26:25 27:6
time 4:17 7:6 8:19 8:23 14:18,25 15:18,19,22,24 16:2 17:13,16 18:3 19:15 26:1,6 27:8,16 28:16 29:4,19,21 30:1,6 30:9,11 31:5,19 32:22 33:2,3 35:13 36:6 42:9 43:6
times 18:6 20:22 28:23 30:25 31:6 32:4,5
timing 17:7
tino 2:6
title 2:10,16 7:2 12:17
told 5:5 6:15 9:25 12:5,7 13:19 33:1
top 27:19
topic 18:9
total 18:1
town 12:1 19:9
train 23:13
training 33:6,10 40:24
transcribed 1:16
transcript 1:25 43:4
transition 9:10
true 43:3
try 6:3 20:12 29:3 41:3 42:9
trying 15:4,16 22:8 27:5 28:9,24 32:23
turn 4:3
two 18:2 32:4 35:15 37:7,14 39:5,8
type 3:3
typically 17:17

U

uhhuh 8:16 24:4 27:1 30:3 32:8 33:17 37:2
understand 9:11 17:6 37:23 40:23 41:1
understanding 23:2 40:19 41:16 41:17 42:13
uniform 32:9
usually 35:22

V

variety 15:3,4,16
veterans 33:6,10,12 33:16
veterinarian 20:23
veterinarians 7:25
veterinary 20:21 21:6,19 36:18
vice 6:25
violations 9:21
virginia 11:4 12:2
voice 40:17
volunteered 22:19

W

wagners 28:9
walking 3:25 6:25
want 2:7 9:8 11:1 22:22 27:11 32:6 37:20,22
wanted 19:2,3 21:12 27:8 28:6
warners 22:1
washington 3:16
wasnt 26:13 29:15 30:5 41:11
waters 13:10
way 5:18 9:22 15:9 30:4,21 31:17 38:4 40:1 41:20
wayne 13:2,10,12 21:20
ways 28:17
week 3:9 8:6,20 10:3 11:25 16:22 16:23,25 17:1,25 17:25 31:1,2,2 32:4,5
weekends 29:23
weeks 3:19,19 8:25 9:2 10:7 17:14 18:2
welfare 21:24 33:21
went 6:2,9 7:16,18 7:20,22,24,25 8:9 9:25 10:3 11:4,5 11:15 12:23 13:20 15:2 27:25 38:8 38:17 39:17
whitfield 3:7 4:16 7:22 8:23 9:1,24 10:13,24 12:5 13:17 14:11 16:17 19:12,21,22 20:11 22:25 23:16,17,23 23:24 24:2,6,18 24:19,20,21 26:6 26:11,22 27:12 28:21 29:5 30:15 32:20 33:24 34:21 35:8,25 37:24 38:1,5,23 39:3,21 40:21 41:12,23 42:3
whitfields 2:11 6:11,13 7:13 12:4 13:14,18 14:13 17:8 25:11 27:13 28:13,18 29:7 39:22
whitney 20:20,20 21:7,18 35:3
wife 9:14,25
willing 3:18 4:6 5:6 6:16,18
word 41:2
work 9:4 10:12 15:18 18:24 19:5 19:17 22:20 28:19 32:17
worked 28:15 32:11 34:15 39:6
working 2:24 9:3 13:13,22 14:22 15:19 16:3,4,15 21:10 29:12,14
world 9:21
wouldnt 25:19
write 41:4
writing 11:11
wrote 10:21

X

xio1717 1:17 43:22

Y

yeah 8:7 20:17 31:13,13 33:7 35:14 36:8 39:15
year 3:2 4:4 12:11 25:9
yoho 20:13,18,22 21:2,5
yohos 20:16

Z

0

1

1 2:15 17:11
100 8:5 36:7
13 5:17,21,22,25,25 23:7
18 43:24
1970 7:17

1980s 6:22

2

2 2:21
2013 3:10 5:17 14:23 25:1,2 26:4 29:4 39:14
2014 1:5 39:14
2017 43:24
24 1:5

3

30 18:1

4

5

6

7

70 15:23
75 8:5 36:7

8

80 15:23

9

EXHIBIT 23

Appointment

From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
Sent: 1/7/2014 7:31:03 PM
To: Irby, Marty [Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]; Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]

Subject: Strategy
Location: conf call

Start: 1/8/2014 4:00:00 PM
End: 1/8/2014 5:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Please dial:

800/504-[redacted]
Access: [redacted]
Security: [redacted]

EXHIBIT 24

Appointment

From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
Sent: 1/10/2014 5:32:05 PM
To: Irby, Marty [marty.irby@mail.house.gov]; Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]

Subject: Follow-up PAST
Location: conf call

Start: 1/10/2014 8:00:00 PM
End: 1/10/2014 8:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

800/504-[redacted]
Access: [redacted]
Security: [redacted]

EXHIBIT 25

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 3:41 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Subject: Re: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act

Maybe we should try to get Ed to call Yoho.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 9, 2013, at 3:13 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Ok. I'll ask Larry to help. I just sent him another message and reminder about Scalise.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 3:09 PM
> To: Irby, Marty
> Subject: Re: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>
> Yoho is a huge Tea Party guy.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Dec 9, 2013, at 2:50 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> Or Cory Gardner?
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:49 PM
>> To: Sara Amundson
>> Cc: Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Irby, Marty; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: Re: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> What about having Yoho call him?
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> On Dec 9, 2013, at 2:45 PM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>> wrote:
>>
>> Please do. But I don't think that's the problem. He is a very tea-party guy who just doesn't cosponsor legislation.
>>
>> From: Keith Dane
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:40 PM
>> To: Mimi Brody; Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> I'd be glad to have you reach out to Whitney - thanks, Mimi.
>>
>> From: Mimi Brody
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:37 PM
>> To: Irby, Marty; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> I can forward it to Whitney with that request, unless Keith wants to or Sara/Connie object?
>>
>> From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:35 PM

>> To: Mimi Brody; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> Good call. Hit them from a different angle. I have been instructed once they say "No" to leave them alone on my end....
>>
>> From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:34 PM
>> To: Irby, Marty; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> That's disturbing ("I spoke to some veterinarians/ranchers in our district and they would prefer we do not cosponsor at this time."). Maybe we should let AVMA know and see if they can follow up (and get Nevada Veterinary Medical Association to do so as well)?
>> Mimi
>>
>> From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:27 PM
>> To: Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>> Subject: FW: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> Congressman Amodei said NO.
>>
>> From: Irby, Marty
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:26 PM
>> To: Miller, Bruce
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> Bruce:
>>
>> Thank you, and for your quick response. I look forward to working with you in the future on other issues.
>>
>> All the best,
>>
>>
>>
>> Marty Irby
>> Congressional Aide
>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
>> 2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] Fax: 202.225.3547
marty.irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:robert.hankins@mail.house.gov>|http://whitfield.house.gov<http://whitfield.house.gov/>
>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>> <image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>
<image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
>> Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
>> This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.
>>
>>
>>
>> From: Miller, Bruce
>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:24 PM
>> To: Irby, Marty
>> Subject: RE: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> Hey Marty - Congrats on the new job... after my meeting with the TN association and Human Society, I spoke to some veterinarians/ranchers in our district and they would prefer we do not cosponsor at this time.
>>
>> From: Irby, Marty

>> Sent: Monday, December 09, 2013 2:18 PM
>> To: Miller, Bruce
>> Subject: HR 1518 PAST (Prevent All Soring Tactics) Act
>>
>> Alexandra:
>>
>> I just wanted to follow up with on our meeting from a month or so ago regarding Mr. Whitfield's bill. Since then, a hearing has been held in the House on the issue. I have pasted the link to the hearing infonnation below. In addition, I was hired by Mr. Whitfield last week as a staff member to handle this and other equine/ag issues. We would greatly appreciate Congressman Amodei's co-sponsorship. Please let me know if you have questions on the hearing information or anything else. We are up to 243 co-sponsors in the House.
>>
>> I look forward to working with you further on this and other issues.
>>
>> http://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=101469
>>
>> All the best,
>>
>>
>>
>> Marty Irby
>> Congressional Aide
>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
>> 2184 Rayburn House Office Building | Tel: 202.225.[redacted] | Fax: 202.225.3547
marty.irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:robert.hankins@mail.house.gov>|http://whitfield.house.gov<http://whitfield.house.gov/>
>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>> <image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01>
<image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
>> Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
>> This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee, you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake, and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing, or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.
>>

EXHIBIT 26

From: Marty Irby <[redacted]@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2014 11:47 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Teresa Bippen <[redacted]@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: Missouri Update/Questions

Will do.

> From: [redacted]@humanesociety.org
> To: [redacted]@msn.com
> CC: [redacted]@yahoo.com; [redacted]@humanesociety.org
> Subject: Re: Missouri Update/Questions
> Date: Tue, 7 Jan 2014 16:40:21 +0000
>
> Marty,
>
> Perhaps you (as Whifield office) can let McCasklll's and Wagner"s offices know that FOSH is trying to contact them, the importance of FOSH etc.. That way, Teresa is apt to receive the reception she deserves.
>
> Best ,
> Connie
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jan 7, 2014, at 10:19 AM, "Marty Irby" <[redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>> wrote:
>
> Hi Teresa!
>
> Yes please do contact McCaskill. She is one of only 5 females in the Senate not on the bill. We need her! Also Rep. Ann Wagner's COS is Christian Morgan (Christian.Morgan@Mail.House.Gov<mailto:Christian.Morgan@Mail.House.Gov>) & her LD is Brian O'Shea (Brian.O'Shea@Mail.House.Gov<mailto:Brian.O'Shea@Mail.House.Gov>). You should contact both of them. Please also let them know I will be glad to meet with them in person anytime to discuss.
>
> Thanks for all you do!
>
> Marty
>
> _____
> Date: Tue, 7 Jan 2014 04:48:18 -0800
> From: [redacted]@yahoo.com<[redacted]@yahoo.com>
> Subject: Missouri Update/Questions
> To: [redacted]@msn.com<[redacted]@msn.com>; [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
>
> Hi Marty and Connie,
>
> I doubt if my own Congressperson is going to be a cosponsor--he is in Heart of America land and he fought puppy mill legislation bill big time--his own mother has owned mills for decades and has numerous violations. His name is Jason Smith. After visiting his office in October and sending emails, I have called numerous times and no one will return my calls.
>
> So, I am going after first time Congresswoman Ann Wagner, (R) who is in district next to mine. Should I call first and ask for name of Chief of Staff or just complete the letter form on her site? I am writing as President of FOSH and as a Missouri resident. I also have information on the Missourians that support for the Bill and of numerous FOSH activities in Missouri.
>
> On another note, I have written Blunt's COS, Glen, about 4-5 times. Should I start approaching Senator Claire McCaskill? She is a Dem and I know we wanted to load up on Rs first. Just let me know.
>
> Time to bundle up to feed and shovel--a brisk -5 this a.m.! Makes letter writing look easy. :)
>
> Thanks,
>
> Teresa

EXHIBIT 27

From: Irby, Marty <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2014 12:32 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: Priscilla Presley

Will do. Thank you for talking ton him about this.....a major help Mom!

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 9, 2014, at 12:30 AM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>
> Need to be more thorough next time.
>
> I talked to Ed about Emma. He understands that she MUST set up appointments for out-of-town advocates and that you and I can tag along. If you have ANY problem with her, please let me know immediately.
>
> Sweet dreams
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
>> On Jan 9, 2014, at 12:24 AM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>
>> We sent him the Senate session calendar that's all....
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>>> On Jan 9, 2014, at 12:14 AM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>>>
>>> What does he mean "after consulting with Marty and Emma"?
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> Begin forwarded message:
>>>
>>> From: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
>>> Date: January 8, 2014 at 10:43:24 PM EST
>>> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]field@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
>>> Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Marty Irby <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>>
>>> Subject: RE: Priscilla Presley
>>>
>>> Connie,
>>>
>>> I got all three of your messages on this subject tonight.
>>>
>>> I am sorry to hear you are disappointed to learn that Priscilla Presley is coming to DC on a Monday. After consulting with Marty and Emma and determining the best days for her to come to DC to lobby and sharing them with her, she advised me of the day that she could make it, based on her schedule.
>>>
>>> I will go back to Ms. Presley and let her know that we'd like her to arrive on a more opportune day, and see what she can work out.
>>>
>>> Keith
>>>
>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>>> Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 10:33 PM
>>> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
>>> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Marty Irby
>>> Subject: Priscilla Presley
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On Jan 8, 2014, at 10:29 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On Jan 8, 2014, at 10:05 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
>>> Keith,
>>>
>>> I am disappointed to learn that Priscilla Presley is visiting DC on a Monday. Members of Congress return to their districts on weekends and drift back to their offices late Monday afternoon. Some fly all day Monday to be able to return to their offices by 5pm. Therefore, she will be unlikely to see few if any members.
>>>
>>> Connie
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On Jan 8, 2014, at 9:19 PM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
>>> Priscilla Presley demands return of trophy honoring Tennessee walking horses, joins others calling for tougher laws
>>> · http://www.commercialappeal.com/news/2014/jan/05/priscilla-presley-demands-return-of-trophy-joins/
>>> · By Cindy Wolff<http://www.commercialappeal.com/staff/cindy-wolff/>
>>> · Posted January 5, 2014 at 5:11 p.m.
>>>
>>> <image001.jpg><http://www.commercialappeal.com/photos/2014/jan/05/646822/>
>>>
>>> PHOTO BY JIM WEBER<http://www.commercialappeal.com/staff/jim-weber/>
>>>

>>> Priscilla Presley introduced Max and Bandit, a pair of rescue horses adopted by Graceland, to fans at what would have been the King's 74th birthday in 2008. "Graceland is a living breathing home," said Presley, and she wanted "to keep it the way Elvis left it," including the barn and horses that were a part of life for Elvis. (Jim Weber/The Commercial Appeal)
>>>
>>> Priscilla Presley is demanding the return of the Graceland Challenge Trophy, an award she established in 1983.
>>>
>>> Priscilla Presley is demanding the return of the Graceland Challenge Trophy, an award she established in 1983 at the prestigious Tennessee walking horse National celebration, held for 75 years in Shelbyville, Tenn. She donated the trophy in honor of her late husband, Elvis Presley, who owned several of the horse breed known for its prancing gait.
>>>
>>> She's joined a growing list of celebrities and a coalition of horse industry, veterinary and animal protection organizations in support of a Congressional amendment toughening the 43-year-old Horse Protection Act.
>>>
>>> Much of the outrage stems from a disturbing hidden-camera investigation by the Humane Society of the United States. The probe captured video of a painful training method called "soring" used by Collierville area trainer Jackie McConnell. The video aired nationally on ABC's "Nightline" and caused worldwide concern about the abuse of the gentle breed known for its prancing gait.
>>>
>>> "Soring" refers to putting caustic chemicals on a horse's legs to burn them and cause the horse to lift its step to an exaggerated height known in the industry as the "big lick."
>>>
>>> McConnell pleaded guilty to charges of violating the federal Horse Protection Act and state charges of animal cruelty. He received fines, probation and a lifelong ban from owning or training horses.
>>>
>>> "They are show horses," Presley said in a phone interview from Los Angeles. "Elvis and I grew up with the beauty of the Tennessee Walkers, but to be honest, we were very, very naive as new horse owners about what it took and what they (trainers) did to them that make them look so beautiful."
>>>
>>> Even though Ebony's Double, the last horse Elvis bought, wasn't a world champion, officials invited Priscilla Presley to show the horse at a 1983 celebration. During that event, the walking horse initially struggled to show his high-stepping gait, according to an article written in 2005 for Elvis Australia, a fan club of the late entertainer. Presley doesn't believe the couple's horses were sored.
>>>
>>> "What I've learned and if Elvis knew, we would have never supported an industry that tortured horses," Presley said. "It's a criminal act and shameful."
>>>
>>> The 43-year-old Horse Protection Act was created to monitor and prosecute trainers who transport or show sored horses, which also involves an abusive training method called "stewarding." In that technique horses are beaten, struck with cattle prods or hurt in other ways to train them not to react in the show ring if their sored legs are painful.
>>>
>>> An amendment to the bill, sponsored by Kentucky Republican Ed Whitfield and co-sponsored by 244 representatives and 28 senators, is expected to be debated in this year's Congressional session.
>>>
>>> Tennessee Democrat Steve Cohen was an original co-sponsor of the bill in the House and the only Tennessee legislator to back the bill called the "Prevent All Soring Tactics."
>>>
>>> In addition to elevating soring to a felony, the bill proposes to outlaw the use of tall horseshoes and ankle chains, longtime training tools. It would also strengthen inspections of horses for signs of soring or other abuse.
>>>
>>> Members of the walking horse community are mounting a fight through petitions and other means to prevent the passage of the bill, which they believe will effectively end the walking horse breed because it prevents trainers from using methods they believe are acceptable.
>>>
>>> The Humane Society maintains that there are Tennessee walking horses that perform a high gait naturally, though typically not as high as the award-winning "big lick." Many walking horse owners and trainers believe the Humane Society has targeted their industry as a means of raising donations and support for the group.
>>>
>>> Keith Dane, Humane Society vice president of equine protection, said the organization is using its resources to protect the horses. He said the decision by the group to focus on the Tennessee walking horse breed comes in response to the longtime, institutional abuse of the horses.
>>>
>>> "These horses endure this treatment throughout their entire lives," Dane said. "Many of them die of colic, which can be brought on by stress and pain. Some legislators who are engaged in the walking horse industry argue that McConnel is just a bad apple. We believe the abuse is widespread and ubiquitous. We have no intention of stopping our work in stopping this."
>>>
>>> © 2014 Memphis Commercial Appeal. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

EXHIBIT 28

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 4:43 PM
To: Irby, Marty <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?

Can Ed back-channel a request to CBO?

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 14, 2014, at 4:32 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
> Verbally she told me so....don't have it in writing but she is a close friend and wants to see this bill pass. The issue is higher ups such as Chester Gipson and Kevin Shea. They could be another matter. What I asked from her was to be informal. If we submit for something formally it could backfire. From past personal experience I don't think Gipson or Shea want to more USDA Oversight...they want to regulate soring and not eradicate it.
>
> I do not trust Chester Gipson at all in anyway. I trust Rachel. Chester is Rachel's boss.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 4:29 PM
> To: Irby, Marty
> Cc: Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> Subject: Re: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> How do we know that Rachel agrees with our arguments?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jan 14, 2014, at 4:12 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
>
> I still have nothing from Rachel...she is back from her cruise and now at home sick. I don't want to hold this up waiting on her so I like Sara's suggestion. I'll respond to the other emails later....just got back and had a pile of work thrown on me for the Omnibus I have to do immediately.
>
> From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 3:57 PM
> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> Cc: Irby, Marty
> Subject: RE: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> That's Marty's call. I think she's going to wind up continuing to have to work her seniors at USDA/Chester and Kevin-and if that's the case-ugh. Why can't we get an abbreviated piece from our document and sell it in the meantime? We worried it will be used for outreach to USDA and CBO from Senate staff?
>
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 3:54 PM
> To: Sara Amundson
> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Irby, Marty
> Subject: Re: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> Marty wanted Ed and me to meet with Rachel. Would it help to set up the meeting for next Thurs. or Fri. and ask her to bring the finalized cost document to the meeting?
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jan 14, 2014, at 3:33 PM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>> wrote:
> We have got to get things wrapped up with Rachel/USDA. They aren't going to move without a short explanation of cost we can back up. Mimi's document is pages long...
>
> From: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner) [mailto:Caitlin_Runyan@warner.senate.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 2:46 PM
> To: Sara Amundson; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
> Cc: Irby, Marty
> Subject: RE: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> That's great, thanks. The majority side of the Commerce is ready to support us but I feel like we need to have the cost question answered before we're ready for prime time in the Committee. Samantha and I have received inquiries from both sides of the aisle on cost.
>
> From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 2:45 PM
> To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
> Cc: Irby, Marty
> Subject: RE: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> Yes, thanks so much! Our "insider contact" has been on travel and that's made it difficult to reaffirm our existing information. I was hoping we'd distill it down to even less than a page-so will be in touch as soon as possible. I'm guessing that's holding us up a bit?
>
> Thanks, Sara
>
> From: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner) [mailto:Caitlin_Runyan@warner.senate.gov]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 2:42 PM
> To: Sara Amundson; Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
> Cc: Irby, Marty
> Subject: RE: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> Hi Sara- thanks for checking in. We are still hearing a lot of questions about cost of the bill. Any progress on the cost one-pager? I know Marty was reaching out to folks in December but the holidays are busy on everyone!
>
> Thanks,

>
> Caitlin
>
> From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 2:40 PM
> To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
> Cc: Irby, Marty
> Subject: Following-up regarding PAST exec session?
>
> Hi Caitlin and Sam, hope you survived the omnibus discussions and the Senate moves it before Saturday (really hoping you don't have votes that day). We are at 300 cosponsors between the House and Senate and are seeing more interest every day-very exciting and many thanks! Marty is in meetings today, so I thought I'd reach out and check in.
>
> I'm sure Chairman Rockefeller has been focused on home given the chemical spill, but wanted to check back in to see if we might see PAST on the committee calendar for mark-up soon?
>
> All the best, Sara
>
> Sara Amundson
> Executive Director
> Humane Society Legislative Fund
> 2100 L Street, NW - Suite 310
> Washington, DC 20037
> 202/676-[redacted]
> hslf.org<http://hslf.org>
> [redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>
>
> <image001.jpg>
>

EXHIBIT 29

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2014 11:55 AM
To: Irby, Marty <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; [redacted]@aol.com
Subject: Re: Major's Story

We need to use the story (not the
Op-ed) with members of the Ohio delegation.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 16, 2014, at 2:36 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
> Great! Thanks.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Keith Dane [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 5:34 PM
> To: Irby, Marty; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; '[redacted]@aol.com'
> Subject: RE: Major's Story
>
> Corrin first contacted us a few months ago with her story, and Cherie and Jen are working on turning it into an OpEd that can be pitched to papers in OH. This is on the action plan/task list; Cherie can give us further updates.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
> Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2014 5:31 PM
> To: Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; '[redacted]@aol.com'
> Subject: FW: Major's Story
>
> Here is another letter/story I forgot to send everyone in December. Let me know if this is something you all think we want to utilize.....
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: corrin zumwalt [[redacted]@gmail.com]
> Sent: Friday, December 13, 2013 11:48 AM
> To: Irby, Marty
> Subject: Major's Story
>
> Hello,
> Attached is the story of my horse Major who was a big lick horse the first 7-8 years of his life. I have written this story to get the word out that big lick is nothing but abuse and neglect. Big lick ruined the most beautiful creature I have ever known and I want the world to know his story. He endured years of abuse but learned to trust me and become the most special thing in my life and the life of my family. Our time was short but the five years that we spent together were magical. He truly was the most magnificent, loving, and compassionate horse I have ever known. I hope you will share his story with other who have had the same experience. If there is anything I can do to help in banning big lick or becoming a supporter please let me know.
>
> Thank You
> Corrin Zumwalt

EXHIBIT 30

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD'S SCHEDULER

INTERVIEW OF [redacted]

April 24, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Bryson Morgan

[redacted]

Benjamin Keane

Stefan Passantino

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kendric Payne and Bryson

4 Morgan with the Office of Congressional Ethics and

5 we are with [redacted] --

6 A. [redacted]. It's a mouthful.

7 Q. Spell your last name for the record?

8 A. Yes, [redacted]

9 [redacted].

10 Q. And she is joined with her attorneys

11 Ben Keane and Stefan Passantino. It is April 24,

12 2014.

13 [redacted], I want to start with a little

14 background, get a few questions in here that are

15 pretty much obvious but we need them for the record.

16 What is your job title with

17 Representative Whitfield's office?

18 A. I am a Scheduler and Office Manager.

19 Q. Go ahead. How long have you been

20 employed with his office?

21 A. Since August 2012.

22 Q. And have you had any other job titles

23 other than Scheduler and Office Manager?

24 A. No.

25 Q. What was your prior employment?

1 A. I worked for a fundraising firm on the
2 hill called Bogart Associates, so not with Federal
3 Government.
4 Q. How long were you with Bogart
5 Associates?
6 A. For about a year and a half.
7 Q. Have you ever worked on the hill
8 before?
9 A. No.
10 Q. Can you describe your job duties as
11 Scheduler and Office Manager?
12 A. Sure, I handle the Congressman's
13 schedule predominantly, I process all meeting
14 requests that come into the office, I schedule for
15 staff as well. I meet almost daily with my Chief of
16 Staff to go over the calendar, the meeting requests,
17 I communicate daily with the congressman regarding
18 his calendar and the rest of the staff for committee
19 events, receptions, dinners, I also handle all of
20 our campaign side scheduling, so I work with the
21 firm that handles all of our fundraising here in DC,
22 just on -- you know, the scheduling side.
23 As for office management, I handle all
24 of our technology support, system administration, so
25 anything with emails or cell phones, things of that

1 nature for my staff, purchase orders, communicate
2 with the district staff about district scheduling
3 and then I handle all of the Congressman's travel,
4 so, you know, getting him to and from Kentucky,
5 rental cars, hotels, I create travel packets, I also
6 handle all of his foreign travel if he is traveling
7 overseas, so I handle their passports, visa
8 applications things of that nature.
9 Q. Okay. With those job duties of
10 scheduling, are you in contact with Mrs. Whitfield?
11 A. I am, yes.
12 Q. Okay. And can you describe the type
13 of communication you have with Mrs. Whitfield?
14 A. Most of the time it is just strictly
15 about scheduling, so what is on the Congressman's
16 calendar, when he will be home during the day, you
17 know, we talk about events that she has scheduled,
18 so I can hold them on the calendar, any trips that
19 they have planned. I work with her with all of
20 that, you know, she -- I tell her whenever he is
21 traveling so she's aware of what flights he's taking
22 and when he will be gone, and that's really pretty
23 much it. We talk -- and a variety of other things
24 but mostly, you know, scheduling and just about what
25 his daily schedule is.

1 Q. Does she communicate with you about
2 scheduling outside what the Congressman is doing,
3 that is scheduling for anything that she's concerned
4 with?
5 A. No, and I mean unless it's involving
6 something that she wants him to also attend, a
7 dinner or something that she has set up with another
8 member or if she's involved in a charity event,
9 then, yes, but that would be only because he would
10 also be attending.
11 Q. Does she discuss with you scheduling
12 for meetings that she's going to have with people on
13 the hill whether they are members or staff of
14 Congress?
15 A. No.
16 Q. Does she communicate with you at all
17 about Humane Society issues or scheduling events or
18 meetings relating to the Humane Society?
19 A. I don't directly with her, no. I am
20 usually aware of the Humane Society events that are
21 happening on the hill but not because she tells me
22 about them, because I communicate with other Humane
23 Society staffers.
24 Q. Who are the Humane Society staffers?
25 A. I communicate mostly with Sara

1 Amundson.

2 Q. And anyone else there?

3 A. Really just Sara.

4 Q. Mimi Brody?

5 A. Oh, yes, and Mimi, but not -- I

6 haven't spoken to Mimi in months.

7 Q. How about Keith Dane?

8 A. I have emailed with Keith, yes.

9 Q. During the time period of October

10 2013, around that time, do you recall arranging

11 meetings for Marty and Donna?

12 A. Uh-huh, yes.

13 Q. And who is Marty?

14 A. Marty is currently our press secretary

15 in our office. He at the time was a part of the

16 Tennessee Walking Horse Association, and was asked

17 to come to the hill by the Congressman to promote

18 and educate people about his -- the PAST Act.

19 Q. Who is Donna?

20 A. Donna, I actually don't know that many

21 details about Donna, but she is also involved in

22 Tennessee Walking Horses, so she used her expertise

23 to also meet with members to promote the PAST Act.

24 Q. Approximately how many meetings did

25 you set up for Marty and Donna?

1 A. Between 50 and 70 meetings.
2 Q. And with whom were they meeting?
3 A. They were meeting with members and
4 members' staff, so depending if the member was
5 available, then they -- I would set up a member
6 level meeting, if not then most times they met with
7 the Chief of Staff or the staffer that handles
8 animal issues in that office that I was reaching out
9 to.
10 Q. And just to be clear, what was the
11 subject matter of the meetings as you understood it?
12 A. About the PAST Act.
13 Q. And the PAST Act is?
14 A. HR 1518 it's about preventing soring
15 of Tennessee walking horses.
16 Q. How did it come that you were the
17 person scheduling these meetings?
18 A. I was asked by the Congressman to set
19 up the meetings because Marty and -- Marta -- Marty
20 and Donna were coming by his request, so he asked me
21 to set up these meetings on his behalf.
22 Q. And did you have any communications
23 with Mrs. Whitfield about the scheduling of these
24 meetings?
25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Can you describe those communications?
2 A. Well, I shared with her the schedule I
3 had created for the meetings, so I prepared a Word
4 document and I would share that with her.
5 Q. Why did you share it with her?
6 A. Because I was asked to by her and the
7 Congressman.
8 Q. Okay. And who attended those
9 meetings, the meetings with Marty and Donna and the
10 members?
11 A. I don't know who attended every single
12 meeting. I only know that I shared it with -- I
13 sent these meetings to Marty, Donna, Keith, Sara and
14 Connie. And to a certain point, and whoever was
15 available attended. I never knew exactly who
16 attended the meetings.
17 Q. Was it your understanding at any point
18 that Mrs. Whitfield would attend those meetings
19 along with Marty and Donna?
20 A. If she did, I never knew. If she was
21 actually there or not, I never attended any of the
22 meetings so I didn't know who showed up each time,
23 so I wouldn't have --
24 Q. Okay.
25 A. I wouldn't be able to tell you exactly

1 if she was planning on attending or not, so.
2 Q. So just so I am clear, you didn't know
3 whether she was actually at the meeting because you
4 were never at any meetings?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. However, did you know whether it was
7 anticipated that she would attend?
8 A. I was told that she could attend but I
9 never knew for sure if she was going to.
10 Q. Who told you that she --
11 A. Because I shared the information with
12 her, was really the only way that I knew she would
13 be potentially attending the meetings.
14 Q. Did she tell you that she was going to
15 possibly attend any meetings?
16 A. Not specifically, no.
17 Q. I just want the to show you a document
18 that's bates stamped EW4004518.
19 A. Okay. Okay.
20 Q. So in the email it says Connie says
21 that those with asterisks below are more likely to
22 agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be
23 attending.
24 A. Okay.
25 Q. When you were scheduling the meetings,

1 did you tell or notify members or staff that Mrs.
2 Whitfield planned on attending?
3 A. I never did in the initial ask, I
4 would only tell people that she may be attending if
5 they asked me who all was going to be attending with
6 Marty and Donna because I never knew for sure
7 whether or not that -- that she would be attending.
8 Q. And I am going to show you now a
9 document bates stamped EW4005227.
10 A. Uh-huh.
11 Q. And feel free to read the entire
12 document but I want to draw your attention to the
13 email from you to Amanda Stevens at 5:21 p.m. on the
14 first page.
15 A. Uh-huh.
16 Q. You just referred to situations where
17 you would notify later that --
18 A. Uh-huh.
19 Q. That Mrs. Whitfield was attending,
20 here it says my boss' wife Connie Harriman-Whitfield
21 will be joining them in the meeting as well. Is
22 this one of the circumstances?
23 A. Uh-huh, yes.
24 Q. Here you say will be joining, doesn't
25 say may?

1 A. Well here -- well, I mean as a
2 Scheduler and I feel this is very common for
3 Schedulers on the hill, we want to know who all will
4 be attending the meeting, that's a question I ask
5 probably daily to the people I am scheduling
6 meetings with. So, you know, it's just common
7 courtesy for me to inform a fellow scheduler, this
8 is the amount of people that may be attending your
9 meeting, and so we usually just communicate saying
10 they will be attending. Whether or not they
11 actually attend, I don't know. That happens to me,
12 I set up meetings where people say there will be six
13 people there and I end up with three.
14 So I mean -- I don't always know, and
15 so I like to give them the courtesy of knowing this
16 potentially could happen, that she potentially could
17 be coming because I was told she could potentially
18 be coming but that's all I know.
19 Q. So I am clear, in the situation where
20 you say she will be joining, you are saying you
21 thought she potentially would be joining the
22 meeting?
23 A. Yeah, uh-huh.
24 Q. Is there any reason you didn't say she
25 may be joining?

1 A. I don't know in that scenario, I don't
2 remember.
3 Q. Okay. You also identify her as my
4 boss' wife. Why did you do that?
5 A. Because that is what she is to me, you
6 know, I mean she's my boss' spouse, so I mean --
7 yeah, I probably could have said, my boss' wife who
8 works for the Humane Society as well, but for this
9 particular member, she -- he knows my boss and so I
10 probably just assumed that they were aware that she
11 also worked for the Humane Society. You know, my
12 boss has been in Congress for 20 years, a lot of
13 people know what his wife -- what the occupation of
14 his wife is.
15 Q. Did you include my boss' wife for any
16 other reason other than to make sure it was okay for
17 her to attend?
18 A. No, it was just the courtesy of
19 letting them know that she could be attending.
20 Q. Okay. And this email in general is
21 similar to other emails you would have sent to
22 people that you were scheduling meetings with?
23 A. Uh-huh, yup. I didn't read through
24 the whole thing, but -- yeah, uh-huh.
25 Q. When you were scheduling these 50 to

1 70 meetings during that time, approximately how much
2 time would that take you per day?
3 A. Um, that's a really good question.
4 Um, probably, you know, several hours. Actually
5 going through and sending the initial asks don't
6 actually take that long, it's the follow-up, and I
7 mean as you can see, from this one email, there was
8 a variety of emails back and forth before the
9 meeting was actually set and that's usually what
10 takes the additional time.
11 Q. So what was the process, walk me
12 through it, you send the initial ask and then follow
13 it up with an email?
14 A. Yes, our office policy is to handle
15 everything in writing, and so that is kind of how I
16 work with other offices as well, so I would have
17 some people that would call me, but I would always
18 ask them to, you know, confirm with me via email, so
19 I would send the initial ask based off of a list,
20 you know, that usually Cory would provide me. Cory
21 or whomever was handling the horse issues at the
22 time. Which I think actually was Chris, and Chris
23 and Cory would put together a list and ask me who to
24 reach out to, so I would prepare those emails with
25 the schedulers, Cory actually sent this one as you

1 can see, to the Chief of Staff and copied me on it,
2 so I would email them to ask and then once I heard
3 back from them, go through the schedule and schedule
4 the meeting for when it worked best for that member.
5 Q. How much follow-up would you do, so
6 once you send the initial ask and do a follow-up,
7 would you do an additional follow-up?
8 A. No, if they came and said we are not
9 available for a meeting, then I did not -- I didn't
10 follow-up. If that was -- if other people on my
11 staff may have followed up, but I did not.
12 Q. Okay.
13 A. Uh-huh.
14 Q. You said there were 50 to 70 meetings
15 that you scheduled for Marty and Donna?
16 A. Uh-huh.
17 Q. Have you scheduled that many meetings
18 for any other group or people?
19 A. In my job in total?
20 Q. Since 2012 when you started.
21 A. Not that I am aware of. Or not that I
22 can think of right now.
23 Q. And what was it about these meetings
24 that resulted in you doing this type of level I
25 should say of --

1 A. Well, October was when the government
2 was shut down, so my current -- my -- you know my
3 job was kind of at a standstill, we weren't really
4 having any meetings in our office, and no meeting
5 requests were coming through to our office because
6 of the shut down, so during those two weeks, I had
7 some additional time to work on this project. So I
8 was asked by Cory to help assist with the
9 scheduling. And in it's -- it's pretty basic on the
10 hill for, you know, if a member is asking for a
11 meeting, then they go scheduler to scheduler. So it
12 wasn't out of the ordinary in anyway for me to help
13 out in this scenario.
14 MR. MORGAN: Who were among the people
15 that might attend the meetings? There is Marty.
16 A. And Donna. Well the ask was for Marty
17 and Donna and then the only thing I was aware of was
18 that I sent the schedules to Keith, Sara and Mrs.
19 Whitfield. Beyond that, I didn't know who else from
20 the Humane Society may be attending the meeting. I
21 was never told.
22 MR. MORGAN: Were you ever told that
23 any representative of Representative Whitfield's
24 staff might attend?
25 A. Yes. At times, you know, depending on

1 the meeting, one of our staffers would also attend,
2 so it just depended on the meeting entirely.
3 MR. MORGAN: But you weren't sharing
4 the schedule for these meetings with any staffers?
5 A. You know, I was -- Cory was always
6 aware of the schedule, we had a folder in our shared
7 drive of where all the Word documents were and he
8 could access it just as easily as I could, Cory and
9 Chris and Marty once he started working there, you
10 know, our shared drive is open to anyone on the
11 staff.
12 Q. Are you aware of Representative
13 Whitfield planning on or attending any of these
14 meetings that you scheduled in October?
15 A. There were some, actually I don't
16 remember for sure, but I don't think he attended
17 many of the meetings at all. It depended on the
18 member or if it was a certain Senator. He would try
19 and attend, but most of the time, no, he did not
20 attend those meetings.
21 Q. Do you recall any particular Senators
22 or members where he attended?
23 A. I don't.
24 Q. Were you involved in additional
25 scheduling of meetings similar to these in January

1 of 2014?

2 A. January 2014, with other --

3 Q. With --

4 A. Do you have an example, you have to

5 jog my memory here.

6 Q. So this is document Bates stamped

7 EW3000304, the next page is what I am going to

8 direct your attention to, which is --

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. -- an email from you to Marty dated

11 January 27, 2014.

12 A. Oh, yeah, so this is when we had some

13 additional people come into town, and I -- once

14 Marty was hired, I was not as involved in any of the

15 scheduling, Marty handled that on his own, but in

16 some situations, we realized that I could be more

17 effective if it was coming from me, as I mentioned

18 before, you know, the member to member ask, going

19 through the schedulers is very common on the hill,

20 so, yes, I helped with this scenario.

21 Q. Let's walk through it then. You said

22 more people came to town. What people came to town?

23 A. In this scenario, it was the two

24 Tennessee district attorneys that were, you know,

25 supporters of the PAST Act.

1 Q. So these meetings were regarding the
2 PAST Act?
3 A. Uh-huh.
4 Q. And which situations were you more
5 effective, was it determined you were more effective
6 with scheduling?
7 A. We -- Cory, Marty and I sat down with
8 a list of members that we could reach out to and
9 determined which members that I would assist with
10 with reaching out to and then the rest Marty reached
11 out to, so I don't remember exactly who they were,
12 or people that I personally have connections with,
13 for instance, I am from Ohio originally, I remember
14 reaching out to Senator Portman's office. You know,
15 I know in that scenario, I knew people in his
16 office, so we deemed it would be probably be
17 effective for me to reach out to them as opposed to
18 Marty. And a few other house members but I had
19 really reached out to a lot of house members,
20 clearly with 50 to 70 meetings I set up in the fall,
21 and so I felt like an additional ask from me
22 probably would not be as effective coming from me as
23 it would be coming from someone else in our office.
24 Q. And approximately how many meetings
25 were scheduled this go around, was it more, less?

1 A. A lot less. I think for this one
2 there were maybe at max 15 meetings and that's
3 probably a high estimate.
4 Q. And those were meetings that you
5 scheduled or --
6 A. Marty scheduled a majority of them, I
7 may have scheduled one or two.
8 Q. For a total of 15 approximately?
9 A. Uh-huh.
10 Q. And was it anticipated that Mrs.
11 Whitfield would attend those meetings?
12 A. I wasn't aware of any of that.
13 Q. Was it the same situation as before in
14 October --
15 A. No, she -- I did not communicate
16 almost at all with her about any of this. I
17 actually don't think I communicated with her at all
18 about this situation.
19 Q. And why is that?
20 A. Because Marty handled it, I wasn't as
21 involved, I didn't need to be as involved. And the
22 decision between Cory, Marty and I was I wasn't
23 going to be as involved, so I did not communicate
24 with her about any of this.
25 Q. Was it a situation where you did not

1 want to be involved based on the volume of work it
2 was or was it some other issue?
3 A. I mean partially but part of that was
4 just that, you know, Marty -- when Marty was hired
5 he started handling these issues and it came from
6 him as opposed to coming from me, so.
7 Q. During the time period when you were
8 scheduling the meetings in October of 2013?
9 A. Uh-huh.
10 Q. Did there come a time when there were
11 issues or ethics concerns with you scheduling these
12 meetings for Marty and Donna?
13 A. Not for Marty and Donna. There were
14 no concerns about that.
15 Q. Well, what were the concerns about?
16 A. Well, I mean -- the only thing that we
17 come to realize is I should not be directly
18 communicating with Mrs. Whitfield about the
19 meetings, and so I no longer emailed with her about
20 it. I emailed with Keith and Sara.
21 Q. And when was that determined?
22 A. I don't know the exact date but
23 October, late October, mid October maybe.
24 Q. And who told you that it would be
25 better if you did not communicate directly --

1 A. Cory.
2 Q. And what was his reason?
3 A. Because, you know, because she is the
4 Congressman's wife, we thought we just, you know,
5 directly communicate with Keith and Sara as opposed
6 to also sending that information to her.
7 Q. And did Cory relay any information he
8 received from the committee on ethics concerning
9 what was okay and not okay?
10 A. I mean we briefly discussed a call
11 that he made to the ethics committee about it but
12 really it just came down to him asking me just to
13 not send her that information anymore. So I am not
14 sure exactly what was discussed in the call.
15 Q. Was it your understanding -- let me
16 show you this.
17 MR. MORGAN: While you are looking for
18 that, let me go back to these October meetings,
19 2013, you said you were asked by the Congressman to
20 set up the meetings?
21 A. Uh-huh.
22 MR. MORGAN: I want to see if there is
23 anything more of his request that you remember, do
24 you remember how that request was conveyed to you?
25 A. I just -- I was told by Cory and Chris

1 that these people were going to be coming into town
2 and the Congressman wanted me to reach out to the
3 members to set up the meetings.
4 MR. MORGAN: So that wasn't directly
5 communicated to you by Representative Whitfield?
6 A. Honestly it might have been and I just
7 don't really remember. I talk to my boss about a
8 lot of different things, so I can't remember every
9 single request.
10 MR. MORGAN: To your knowledge, did
11 that request come from Mrs. Whitfield?
12 A. No.
13 MR. MORGAN: I know we -- you said
14 that setting up that volume of -- that number of
15 interviews for other groups, you couldn't think of
16 any other instances of that. I want to just ask you
17 if it was typical, you know, or if it was unusual or
18 out of the ordinary for you to set up meetings where
19 the attendees were predominantly not members of your
20 staff, so here --
21 A. Uh-huh.
22 MR. MORGAN: You said you shared the
23 schedule with five individuals, all of whom were not
24 members of the staff.
25 A. Uh-huh.

1 MR. MORGAN: Would that be common for
2 you to do?
3 A. No, but this was, you know, a scenario
4 where, you know, this is a bill that my boss is
5 really passionate about and if he asks me to work to
6 do some additional work for this bill, then, you
7 know, I would be willing to do that. I -- you know,
8 that's my job, when he asks me to, you know, help
9 schedule, then I am going to say yes to him, so.
10 Q. I want to show you a document that's
11 bates stamped HSLFOCE015759.
12 A. Uh-huh.
13 Q. I really wanted to draw your attention
14 to the email from Mrs. Whitfield to you but you can
15 read the entire document. My question is going to
16 be about -- well, let me know when you are done.
17 A. Okay.
18 Q. Do you recall having a conversation
19 with Renee Elmer's office?
20 A. Uh-huh.
21 Q. Can you describe that conversation
22 that they had with you concerning scheduling these
23 meetings?
24 A. I just sent the initial ask to them,
25 and they reached out to Cory. They didn't come back

1 to me with anything, so it went from me sending them
2 an initial ask directly to Cory, so I was never
3 involved in the in between of any of their concerns
4 or what not.
5 Q. Did Cory share with you in general
6 what they spoke with them about in response to your
7 email, what did he say?
8 A. He just said that they were concerned
9 about the situation because Mrs. Whitfield was
10 involved.
11 Q. And at that point did you have any
12 conversations with Mrs. Whitfield about the concerns
13 with the scheduling?
14 A. No.
15 Q. And according to this email, you
16 continued to schedule meetings after what occurred
17 with this office?
18 A. Uh-huh. I scheduled meetings, yes.
19 Q. That was at Mrs. Whitfield's request?
20 A. No, that was at Cory's request.
21 Q. Have you scheduled any other meetings
22 for additional people who are in town or any other
23 similar type meetings that we haven't discussed so
24 far?
25 A. Well, Priscilla Presley was in town in

1 February and I helped Marty with a couple of those
2 meetings, but she was only in town for a day, so I
3 -- they -- we did not have any meetings scheduled,
4 and I helped with -- I communicated with Sara about
5 a reception that they had for her, but I did not
6 communicate with any other members regarding the
7 reception or anything. I mean I -- once Marty
8 started working, I would send, if asked, I would
9 send the initial request and then let Marty handle
10 everything else. So --
11 Q. Approximately how many initial
12 requests did you send?
13 A. For that instance?
14 Q. For the Priscilla Presley?
15 A. Probably like maybe five.
16 Q. And what was your understanding of who
17 could possibly attend those meetings?
18 A. My understanding was it was Marty was
19 going to be with her and Sara, and then she came
20 with I guess a staffer of her own, and that those
21 were -- that -- my understanding is that -- the only
22 people that were in the meetings but I never knew
23 for sure. So --
24 Q. Did anyone mention to you that it was
25 possible that Mrs. Whitfield may attend those

1 meetings --

2 A. No.

3 Q. -- with Priscilla Presley?

4 A. No.

5 Q. No one ever mentioned it?

6 A. Uh-huh.

7 Q. Any other additional meetings?

8 A. No. Marty, if any other people came

9 in, Marty handled it. I mean I was -- I am aware of

10 pretty much everyone who comes in and out of our

11 office, so I knew there were additional people

12 coming in and helping him, you know, meet with

13 members to discuss the PAST Act but was not involved

14 in any of that.

15 Q. Going back to the discussion that

16 happened in October 2013 about scheduling meetings

17 and Mrs. Whitfield's involvement, what is currently

18 the policy as you understand it in the office with

19 respect to scheduling meetings when she is involved?

20 A. I don't schedule any meetings that she

21 is involved in, I mean if she has meetings she wants

22 to schedule, she does that herself, I don't

23 communicate with her about any of that.

24 Q. Are you instructed that that is the

25 office policy?

1 A. Well, that's always been our office
2 policy, that's her job, I am not in relation to
3 that, anything I communicate to her is regarding the
4 Congressman and his job, so I -- yeah, I am not
5 aware of what she's doing on a work -- for her work
6 on a day-to-day basis.
7 Q. I guess what I am trying to
8 understand, in October 2013, you were scheduling the
9 meetings and then this ethics issue came up and then
10 you seem to have changed how those meetings were
11 going to be scheduled?
12 A. I didn't necessarily change how they
13 were going to be scheduled, I just became aware that
14 I was not to share this information -- well, not
15 necessarily, but, you know, I wasn't going to
16 communicate with Mrs. Whitfield about it.
17 Q. Okay. Okay. Alright. So currently
18 --
19 A. If she was going to gain this
20 information, it wasn't going to be from me.
21 Q. Okay. Okay. I think I got it, so
22 currently, the way you handle any scheduling as it
23 relates to the Humane Society?
24 A. Uh-huh.
25 Q. Is that you do it, but you don't

1 communicate that to Mrs. Whitfield?
2 A. Well, I -- you know, communicate with
3 the people who communicate with me which is
4 predominantly Sara.
5 Q. Have you been involved in other
6 scheduling for the Humane Society, and I'll be more
7 specific, have you reserved rooms in the capitol for
8 the Humane Society?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Can you describe why you did that and
11 what it is?
12 A. They have a reception every year where
13 they give out their humane awards to, I don't even
14 know who, a variety of members, you know, hundreds
15 of members, and they ask me to, you know, use the
16 speaker's office and reserve rooms for them, so,
17 yup, for the last two years since I have worked
18 here, I have reserved a room for them.
19 Q. You said they ask, who asks you to do
20 it?
21 A. Sara.
22 Q. Has Mrs. Whitfield ever asked you to
23 reserve a room?
24 A. No, I mean she's aware of the
25 situation. She didn't this year in 2012 -- or '13

1 -- yeah, 2013, I know she was aware of the
2 situation, you know, we -- I think we communicated
3 about dates but other than that, no. The request
4 came from Sara, in 2013 it came from Jessica who
5 works there. I don't remember her last name, it's
6 hyphenated, so I don't know if you are familiar with
7 her.
8 Q. I am familiar with a lot of people.
9 A. So, yeah, I worked with Jessica in
10 2013 and I worked with Sara this year, because it
11 was just a couple weeks ago.
12 Q. Have you reserved rooms for -- let me
13 rephrase it, have you reserved rooms in the capitol
14 for any other person other than someone in the
15 office before?
16 A. Oh, I don't understand what you mean,
17 like other organizations?
18 Q. Yes.
19 A. Oh, yeah, I reserve rooms like every
20 week, I mean we get a lot of requests for rooms for
21 a variety of different organizations the Congressman
22 is involved in, you know, a lot of energy companies
23 will ask for me to reserve rooms for them for
24 receptions or briefings or meetings. I mean that's
25 a big chunk of my job, yes.

1 Q. So you have -- and you actually do
2 reserve the rooms?
3 A. Well, I run everything by Cory, you
4 know, in some scenario, really it's rare that I
5 would say no especially if it's an organization that
6 I am familiar with, but I do run everything by Cory
7 just to make sure he is aware that I am reserving a
8 room, I mean there is a kind of complicated process
9 with reserving rooms in every single building, so,
10 you know, I just want to make sure he's aware, for
11 instance, the Kentucky Realtors come in every year,
12 and I reserve a room for them and the CVC so they
13 can have rooms with meetings with members.
14 Q. Okay. Can you give me a few more
15 examples, the type of --
16 A. Sure, actually did one yesterday for
17 First Energy, they want to do a staff briefing, so
18 they had asked me to reserve a committee room, so I
19 reached out to the Energy and Commerce Committee and
20 there is a form you have to fill out and everything,
21 my boss is the co-chair of the Turkey Caucus and I
22 reserve rooms for them very regularly for breakfast,
23 lunches, reception in either of the house office
24 buildings, in the capitol or the CVC, so.
25 Q. You say these come weekly?

1 A. Oh, yeah.
2 Q. These requests?
3 A. Oh, yeah.
4 Q. So you say you know Sara at the Humane
5 Society?
6 A. Uh-huh.
7 Q. And were you aware she went to the
8 State of the Union address in January of this year?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Were you involved in at least getting
11 the ticket to her?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. How did you become involved with that?
14 A. I -- as usual -- as our office policy
15 whenever we receive tickets to the State of the
16 Union for instance, this week was the Whitehouse
17 Easter Egg Roll, same kind of thing, I ask the
18 Congressman if he would like to use these tickets or
19 if they he would like me to invite someone to use
20 the tickets, and in that instance, all I heard back
21 from telling him that we have State of the Union
22 tickets was an email from Connie saying I have
23 someone who wants to use the ticket. I didn't know
24 it was Sara until I was -- had to gather the
25 information about, you know, I have to submit a form

1 on who is going to be using the ticket.
2 Q. Okay.
3 A. So.
4 Q. Similar to my question about reserving
5 the room, can you give me other instances where you
6 have provided a State of the Union ticket to anyone
7 else?
8 A. I don't even remember who went to the
9 State of the Union the year before or if we even --
10 honestly if the Congressman doesn't want to use the
11 ticket, than our staffers usually go to the State of
12 the Union. For this past year, for the White House
13 Easter Egg Roll is another example, the
14 Congressman's daughter invited a friend who lives
15 here and she attended with her family, actually
16 escorted them, so I was there. The year before Cory
17 went with his family and his son.
18 Q. This is the Easter egg roll?
19 A. Yeah, State of the Union we only get
20 one ticket, so I think in years past, we have
21 received a request from the UPS, their executives
22 are usually in town for the State of the Union and
23 they have asked to use our ticket as well. So I
24 know Cory has communicated with them about that.
25 Q. Do you know who attended in 2013?

1 A. I think that UPS used it or it was a
2 staffer, one of our staffers.
3 Q. When you say UPS, you are referring to
4 the United Parcel Service?
5 A. Uh-huh.
6 Q. And also with the Inauguration of
7 2013?
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. Were you involved with Sara receiving
10 a ticket to --
11 A. I wasn't involved in that at all.
12 That's another staffer who handled all of our
13 Inauguration materials.
14 Q. I am going to ask you about this email
15 which is bates stamped HSLFOCE014649.
16 A. Okay.
17 Q. And it's just a general question once
18 you finish reading, can you just describe what this
19 dinner is?
20 A. It was a dinner with Senator Vitter,
21 he didn't actually attend. And I didn't really know
22 anybody else who was invited to the dinner. I
23 emailed with a couple of them, actually I think I
24 emailed with everybody to figure out what kind of --
25 what their option was for dinner, but I didn't know

1 anybody -- I didn't know of any of the people that
2 were attending.
3 Q. It was for Senator Vitter?
4 A. I have no idea.
5 Q. Do you know if it was a campaign
6 fundraiser?
7 A. No, it was not a fundraiser.
8 Q. Was it discussing any particular
9 legislation?
10 A. I have no idea.
11 MR. MORGAN: How did you come to know
12 that Senator Vitter did not attend?
13 A. How he did not attend? Because his
14 scheduler told me he wasn't going to be able to
15 attend.
16 MR. MORGAN: Did a staffer or somebody
17 else go in his place?
18 A. I think his Chief of Staff and then a
19 member of one of the committees he works on
20 attended. I think they were planning on attending
21 anyway, but something came up in Louisiana and he
22 had to fly home that evening.
23 Q. Similar email bates stamped
24 HSLFOCE006209. Basically the same question for you
25 which is can you explain to me what this dinner is?

1 A. This -- I don't remember exactly which
2 dinner this is, but I think it had something to do
3 with the class of 1994 which is the Congressman's
4 class that he was elected and those are all the
5 other people, and this is -- Mrs. Whitfield usually
6 asks me for a guest list before any event she
7 attends with him, fundraising event, whatever, and
8 so I provided that to her.
9 Q. Why does she ask for the list of
10 attendees?
11 A. I don't know.
12 Q. She's never shared with you why she
13 wants it?
14 A. No, I think she just wants to know who
15 is going to be there, if she has any friends there
16 or what not, I don't know.
17 Q. This is an email bates stamped
18 EW4005262.
19 A. Uh-huh.
20 Q. My question with this document is
21 simply when you received it, what did this mean to
22 you, what was to change, if anything?
23 A. Um, that was just really -- I mean
24 saying what we talked about earlier, once I became
25 aware of the ethics issue, I just didn't communicate

1 -- I emailed strictly Keith and Sara as opposed to
2 communicating and I actually had not been
3 communicating with her for awhile before she sent
4 this. I think she just realized that she shouldn't
5 -- once Marty started, she shouldn't be
6 communicating with Marty in the way that she was
7 before he was hired. So in my perspective, this was
8 more about her contacting Marty and not as much
9 about contacting me because I was already aware of
10 the situation with Marty, not communicating with her
11 about it, so.
12 Q. Going to that issue, or event of the
13 hiring of Marty, you were there when he was hired?
14 A. Uh-huh.
15 Q. And how did it come to be that he was
16 hired there?
17 A. We had our legislative correspondent
18 decided to leave and take another job, and we had an
19 opening in our office and the Congressman decided to
20 hire Marty.
21 Q. And what are his job responsibilities?
22 A. When he first started?
23 Q. Yes.
24 A. He was a congressional aid and he
25 handled a variety of issues including animal issues

1 and AG, I don't remember what all of them were.
2 Q. And you mentioned earlier that when
3 you came on, he was working on scheduling for the
4 PAST Act. Was the PAST Act one of his main things
5 in his portfolio?
6 A. Uh-huh.
7 Q. Did he spend most of his time working
8 on the PAST Act?
9 A. Not necessarily, I mean the farm bill
10 was also around that time, so that was definitely
11 one of his responsibilities as well. I don't know
12 exactly everything that Marty does everyday.
13 Q. And what is -- what are his job
14 responsibilities now?
15 A. He is our press secretary now and he
16 handles just agriculture and animal issues in the
17 legislative portfolio.
18 Q. And when did he become press
19 secretary?
20 A. Um, when Chris left which is the end
21 of February so the beginning of March.
22 Q. Chris Pack?
23 A. Uh-huh.
24 Q. You mentioned that you work on some of
25 the scheduling of travel for the member, does that

1 scheduling also involve plane tickets for Mrs.
2 Whitfield?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. And when they are traveling, and
5 paying for Mr. Whitfield's travel, are you using the
6 MRA for his travel?
7 A. It depends on the trip. So if he is
8 traveling to Kentucky for official events, then,
9 yes. If he's traveling to Kentucky for campaign
10 events or anywhere, then, no, I put it on our
11 campaign. She travels only on the campaign.
12 Q. So when there are flights --
13 A. If she travels with him for any, you
14 know, related trip.
15 Q. Okay. So if Mrs. Whitfield is
16 traveling with a member, you are saying you have
17 always paid for it with the --
18 A. Campaign account.
19 Q. And it's being paid for by the MRA?
20 A. No, never.
21 MR. MORGAN: Going back to those
22 October 2013 meetings, I just want, I think we have
23 this from you perhaps already, but I want to make
24 sure we get it, did you view yourself as scheduling
25 meetings for Representative Whitfield?

1 A. Uh-huh.

2 MR. MORGAN: Or did you view yourself

3 as scheduling meetings for the Humane Society?

4 A. Oh, for Congressman Whitfield. I mean

5 I was asking for these meetings on behalf of him.

6 So, uh-huh. I mean that's how the ask was in the

7 email.

8 Q. Do you have anything else? So that's

9 it.

10 A. That's it, alright. Thanks.

11 (Whereupon, the recording is

12 terminated.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

2

3 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
4 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
5 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
6 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
7 forth.
8 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
10 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
11 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
12 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
13 the action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 _____
22 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XI01717
23 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey
24 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
25

A

able 8:25 34:14
access 16:8
account 38:18
accurate 40:4
act 6:18,23 7:12,13 17:25 18:2 26:13 37:4,4,8
action 40:10,13
additional 13:10 14:7 15:7 16:24 17:13 18:21 23:6 24:22 26:7,11
address 31:8
administration 3:24
ag 37:1
ago 29:11
agree 9:22
agriculture 37:16
ahead 2:19
aid 36:24
alright 27:17 39:10
amanda 10:13
amount 11:8
amundson 6:1
animal 7:8 36:25 37:16
anticipated 9:7 19:10
anybody 33:22 34:1
anymore 21:13
anyway 15:12 34:21
applications 4:8
approximately 6:24 13:1 18:24 19:8 25:11
april 1:5 2:11 40:24
arranging 6:10
asked 6:16 7:18,20 8:6 10:5 15:8 21:19 25:8 28:22 30:18 32:23
asking 15:10 21:12 39:5
asks 13:5 23:5,8 28:19 35:6
assist 15:8 18:9
associates 3:2,5
association 6:16
assumed 12:10
asterisks 9:21
attend 5:6 8:18 9:7 9:8,15 11:11 12:17 15:15,24 16:1,19,20 19:11 25:17,25 33:21 34:12,13,15
attended 8:8,11,15 8:16,21 16:16,22 32:15,25 34:20
attendees 22:19 35:10
attending 5:10 9:1 9:13,23 10:2,4,5,7 10:19 11:4,8,10 12:19 15:20 16:13 34:2,20
attends 35:7
attention 10:12 17:8 23:13
attorney 40:9,11
attorneys 2:10 17:24
august 2:21
available 7:5 8:15 14:9
awards 28:13
aware 4:21 5:20 12:10 14:21 15:17 16:6,12 19:12 26:9 27:5,13 28:24 29:1 30:7 30:10 31:7 35:25 36:9
awhile 36:3

B

back 13:8 14:3 21:18 23:25 26:15 31:20 38:21
background 2:14
based 13:19 20:1
basic 15:9
basically 34:24
basis 27:6
bates 9:18 10:9 17:6 23:11 33:15 34:23 35:17
beginning 37:21
behalf 7:21 39:5
ben 2:11
benjamin 1:12
best 14:4
better 20:25
beyond 15:19
big 29:25
bill 23:4,6 37:9
bogart 3:2,4
boss 10:20 12:4,6,7 12:9,12,15 22:7 23:4 30:21
breakfast 30:22
briefing 30:17
briefings 29:24
briefly 21:10
brody 6:4
bryson 1:10 2:3
building 30:9
buildings 30:24

C

calendar 3:16,18 4:16,18
call 13:17 21:10,14
called 3:2
campaign 3:20 34:5 38:9,11,11 38:18
cant 22:8
capitol 28:7 29:13 30:24
cars 4:5
caucus 30:21
cell 3:25
certain 8:14 16:18
certificate 40:1
certify 40:3,8
change 27:12 35:22
changed 27:10
charity 5:8
chief 3:15 7:7 14:1 34:18
chris 13:22,22 16:9 21:25 37:20,22
chunk 29:25
circumstances 10:22
class 35:3,4
clear 7:10 9:2 11:19
clearly 18:20
cochair 30:21
come 3:14 6:17 7:16 17:13 20:10 20:17 22:11 23:25 30:11,25 34:11 36:15
comes 26:10
coming 7:20 11:17 11:18 15:5 17:17 18:22,23 20:6 22:1 26:12
commerce 30:19
commission 40:24
committee 3:18 21:8,11 30:18,19
committees 34:19
common 11:2,6 17:19 23:1
communicate 3:17 4:1 5:1,16,22,25 11:9 19:15,23 20:25 21:5 25:6 26:23 27:3,16 28:1,2,3 35:25
communicated 19:17 22:5 25:4 29:2 32:24
communicating 20:18 36:2,3,6,10
communication 4:13
communications 7:22 8:1
companies 29:22
complicated 30:8
concerned 5:3 24:8
concerning 21:8 23:22
concerns 20:11,14 20:15 24:3,12
confirm 13:18
congress 5:14 12:12
congressional 2:4 36:24
congressman 3:17 5:2 6:17 7:18 8:7 21:19 22:2 27:4 29:21 31:18 32:10 36:19 39:4
congressmans 3:12 4:3,15 21:4 32:14 35:3
connections 18:12
connie 8:14 9:20 10:20 31:22
contact 4:10
contacting 36:8,9
continued 24:16
conversation 23:18 23:21
conversations 24:12
conveyed 21:24
copied 14:1
correspondent 36:17
cory 13:20,20,23,25 15:8 16:5,8 18:7 19:22 21:1,7,25 23:25 24:2,5 30:3 30:6 32:16,24
corys 24:20
couldnt 22:15
counsel 40:9,12
couple 25:1 29:11 33:23
courtesy 11:7,15 12:18
create 4:5
created 8:3
csr 1:16
current 15:2
currently 6:14 26:17 27:17,22
cvc 30:12,24

D

daily 3:15,17 4:25 11:5
dane 6:7
date 20:22 40:6
dated 17:10

dates 29:3
daughter 32:14
david 2:8
day 4:16 13:2 25:2
daytoday 27:6
dc 3:21
decided 36:18,19
decision 19:22
deemed 18:16
definitely 37:10
depended 16:2,17
depending 7:4 15:25
depends 38:7
describe 3:10 4:12 8:1 23:21 28:10 33:18
details 6:21
determined 18:5,9 20:21
didnt 8:22 9:2 11:24 12:23 14:9 15:19 19:21 23:25 27:12 28:25 31:23 33:21,21,25 34:1 35:25
different 22:8 29:21
dinner 5:7 33:19,20 33:22,25 34:25 35:2
dinners 3:19
direct 17:8
directly 5:19 20:17 20:25 21:5 22:4 24:2
discuss 5:11 26:13
discussed 21:10,14 24:23
discussing 34:8
discussion 26:15
district 4:2,2 17:24
document 8:4 9:17 10:9,12 17:6 23:10,15 35:20
documents 16:7
doesnt 10:24 32:10
doing 5:2 14:24 27:5
donna 6:11,19,20 6:21,25 7:20 8:9 8:13,19 10:6 14:15 15:16,17 20:12,13
dont 5:19 6:20 8:11 11:11,14 12:1,1 13:5 16:15,16,23 18:11 19:17 20:22 22:7 26:20,22 27:25 28:13 29:5 29:6,16 32:8 35:1 35:11,16 37:1,11
draw 10:12 23:13
drive 16:7,10
duties 3:10 4:9

E

earlier 35:24 37:2
easily 16:8
easter 31:17 32:13 32:18
educate 6:18
effective 17:17 18:5 18:5,17,22
egg 31:17 32:13,18
either 30:23
elected 35:4
elmers 23:19
email 9:20 10:13 12:20 13:7,13,18 14:2 17:10 23:14 24:7,15 31:22 33:14 34:23 35:17 39:7
emailed 6:8 20:19 20:20 33:23,24 36:1
emails 3:25 12:21 13:8,24
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:5,13
employed 2:20
employee 40:9,11
employment 2:25
energy 29:22 30:17 30:19
entire 10:11 23:15
entirely 16:2
entirety 1:24
escorted 32:16
especially 30:5
estimate 19:3
ethics 2:4 20:11 21:8,11 27:9 35:25
evening 34:22
event 5:8 35:6,7 36:12
events 3:19 4:17 5:17,20 38:8,10
everybody 33:24
everyday 37:12
ew3000304 17:7
ew4004518 9:18
ew4005227 10:9
ew4005262 35:18
exact 20:22
exactly 8:15,25 18:11 21:14 35:1 37:12
example 17:4 32:13
examples 30:15
executives 32:21
expertise 6:22
expires 40:24
explain 34:25

F

fall 18:20
familiar 29:6,8 30:6
family 32:15,17
far 24:24
farm 37:9
february 25:1 37:21
federal 3:2
feel 10:11 11:2
fellow 11:7
felt 18:21
figure 33:24
fill 30:20
financially 40:12
finish 33:18
firm 3:1,21
first 10:14 30:17 36:22
five 22:23 25:15
flights 4:21 38:12
fly 34:22
folder 16:6
follow 13:12
followed 14:11
followup 13:6 14:5 14:6,7,10
foregoing 40:3
foreign 4:6
form 30:20 31:25
forth 13:8 40:7
frank 2:9
free 10:11
friend 32:14
friends 35:15
fs 2:9
fundraiser 34:6,7
fundraising 3:1,21 35:7
further 40:8

G

gain 27:19
gather 31:24
general 12:20 24:5 33:17
getting 4:4 31:10
give 11:15 28:13 30:14 32:5
go 2:19 3:16 14:3 15:11 18:25 21:18 32:11 34:17
going 5:12 9:9,14 9:22 10:5,8 13:5 17:7,18 19:23 22:1 23:9,15 25:19 26:15 27:11 27:13,15,19,20 32:1 33:14 34:14 35:15 36:12 38:21
good 13:3
government 3:3 15:1
group 14:18
groups 22:15
guess 25:20 27:7
guest 35:6

H

half 3:6
handle 3:12,19,23 4:3,6,7 13:14 25:9 27:22
handled 17:15 19:20 26:9 33:12 36:25
handles 3:21 7:7 37:16
handling 13:21 20:5
happen 11:16
happened 26:16
happening 5:21
happens 11:11
harrimanwhitfield 10:20
havent 6:6 24:23
heard 14:2 31:20
help 15:8,12 23:8
helped 17:20 25:1,4
helping 26:12
hereinbefore 40:6
hes 4:21 30:10 38:9
heyd 2:8
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:6
high 19:3
hill 3:2,7 5:13,21 6:17 11:3 15:10 17:19
hire 36:20
hired 17:14 20:4 36:7,13,16
hiring 36:13
hold 4:18
home 4:16 34:22
honestly 22:6 32:10
horse 6:16 13:21
horses 6:22 7:15
hotels 4:5
hours 13:4
house 18:18,19 30:23 32:12
hr 7:14
hslfoce006209 34:24
hslfoce014649 33:15
hslfoce015759

23:11
humane 5:17,18,20 5:22,24 12:8,11 15:20 27:23 28:6 28:8,13 31:4 39:3
hundreds 28:14
hyphenated 29:6

I

idea 34:4,10
identify 12:3
ill 28:6
inauguration 33:6 33:13
include 12:15
including 36:25
individuals 22:23
inform 11:7
information 9:11 21:6,7,13 27:14 27:20 31:25
initial 10:3 13:5,12 13:19 14:6 23:24 24:2 25:9,11
instance 18:13 25:13 30:11 31:16 31:20
instances 22:16 32:5
instructed 26:24
interested 40:12
interview 1:4
interviews 22:15
invite 31:19
invited 32:14 33:22
involve 38:1
involved 5:8 6:21 16:24 17:14 19:21 19:21,23 20:1 24:3,10 26:13,19 26:21 28:5 29:22 31:10,13 33:9,11
involvement 26:17
involving 5:5
issue 20:2 27:9 35:25 36:12
issues 5:17 7:8 13:21 20:5,11 36:25,25 37:16

J

january 16:25 17:2 17:11 31:8
jersey 40:23
jessica 29:4,9
job 2:16,22 3:10 4:9 14:19 15:3 23:8 27:2,4 29:25 36:18,21 37:13
jog 17:5
joined 2:10
joining 10:21,24 11:20,21,25

K

keane 1:12 2:11
kedric 1:9
keith 6:7,8 8:13 15:18 20:20 21:5 36:1
kendric 2:3
kentucky 4:4 30:11 38:8,9
kind 13:15 15:3 30:8 31:17 33:24
knew 8:15,20 9:9 9:12 10:6 18:15 25:22 26:11
know 3:22 4:4,17 4:20,24 6:20 8:11 8:12,22 9:2,6,22 11:3,6,11,14,18 12:1,6,11,13,19 13:4,18,20 15:2 15:10,19,25 16:5 16:10 17:18,24 18:14,15 20:4,22 21:3,4 22:13,17 23:3,4,7,7,8,16 26:12 27:15 28:2 28:14,14,15 29:1 29:2,6,22 30:4,10 31:4,23,25 32:24 32:25 33:21,25 34:1,5,11 35:11 35:14,16 37:11 38:14
knowing 11:15
knowledge 22:10
knows 12:9

L

late 20:23
lau 2:8
leave 36:18
left 37:20
legislation 34:9
legislative 36:17 37:17
letting 12:19
level 7:6 14:24
license 1:17 40:22
list 13:19,23 18:8 35:6,9
little 2:13
lives 32:14
long 2:19 3:4 13:6
longer 20:19
looking 21:17
lot 12:12 18:19 19:1 22:8 29:8,20 29:22
louisiana 34:21
lunches 30:23
lyn 1:16 40:22

M

m 10:13
main 37:4
majority 19:6
management 3:23
manager 2:18,23 3:11
march 37:21
marta 7:19
marty 6:11,13,14 6:25 7:19,19 8:9 8:13,19 10:6 14:15 15:15,16 16:9 17:10,14,15 18:7,10,18 19:6 19:20,22 20:4,4 20:12,13 25:1,7,9 25:18 26:8,9 36:5 36:6,8,10,13,20 37:12
materials 33:13
matter 7:11
max 19:2
mean 5:5 11:1,14 12:6,6 13:7 20:3 20:16 21:10 25:7 26:9,21 28:24 29:16,20,24 30:8 35:21,23 37:9 39:4,6
meet 3:15 6:23 26:12
meeting 3:13,16 7:2,3,6 8:12 9:3 9:22 10:21 11:4,9 11:22 13:9 14:4,9 15:4,11,20 16:1,2
meetings 5:12,18 6:11,24 7:1,11,17 7:19,21,24 8:3,9,9 8:13,16,18,22 9:4 9:13,15,25 11:6 11:12 12:22 13:1 14:14,17,23 15:4 15:15 16:4,14,17 16:20,25 18:1,20 18:24 19:2,4,11 20:8,12,19 21:18 21:20 22:3,18 23:23 24:16,18,21 24:23 25:2,3,17 25:22 26:1,7,16 26:19,20,21 27:9 27:10 29:24 30:13 38:22,25 39:3,5
member 5:8 7:4,5 12:9 14:4 15:10 16:18 17:18,18 34:19 37:25 38:16
members 5:13 6:23 7:3,4 8:10 10:1 16:22 18:8,9,18 18:19 22:3,19,24 25:6 26:13 28:14 28:15 30:13
memory 17:5
mention 25:24
mentioned 17:17 26:5 37:2,24
met 7:6
mid 20:23
mimi 6:4,5,6
months 6:6
morgan 1:10 2:4 15:14,22 16:3 21:17,22 22:4,10 22:13,22 23:1 34:11,16 38:21 39:2
mouthful 2:6
mra 38:6,19

N

name 2:7 29:5
nature 4:1,8
necessarily 27:12 27:15 37:9
need 2:15 19:21
neither 40:8,11
never 8:15,20,21 9:4,9 10:3,6 15:21 24:2 25:22 35:12 38:20
new 40:23
notary 40:23
note 1:24
notify 10:1,17
number 22:14

O

obvious 2:15
occupation 12:13
occurred 24:16
october 6:9 15:1 16:14 19:14 20:8 20:23,23,23 21:18 26:16 27:8 38:22
office 2:4,17,18,20 2:23 3:11,14,23 6:15 7:8 13:14 15:4,5 18:14,16 18:23 23:19 24:17 26:11,18,25 27:1 28:16 29:15 30:23 31:14 36:19
officer 40:1
offices 13:16
official 38:8
oh 6:5 17:12 29:16 29:19 31:1,3 39:4
ohio 18:13
okay 4:9,12 8:8,24

9:19,19,24 12:3 12:16,20 14:12 17:9 21:9,9 23:17 27:17,17,21,21 30:14 32:2 33:16 38:15
once 14:2,6 16:9 17:13 25:7 33:17 35:24 36:5
open 16:10
opening 36:19
opposed 18:17 20:6 21:5 36:1
option 33:25
orders 4:1
ordinary 15:12 22:18
organization 30:5
organizations 29:17,21
originally 18:13
outside 5:2
overseas 4:7

P

p 10:13
pack 37:22
packets 4:5
page 10:14 17:7
paid 38:17,19
parcel 33:4
part 6:15 20:3
partially 20:3
particular 12:9 16:21 34:8
parties 40:10
passantino 1:13 2:11
passionate 23:5
passports 4:7
paying 38:5
payne 1:9 2:1,3
people 5:12 6:18 10:4 11:5,8,12,13 12:13,22 13:17 14:10,18 15:14 17:13,22,22 18:12 18:15 22:1 24:22 25:22 26:8,11 28:3 29:8 34:1 35:5
period 6:9 20:7
person 7:17 29:14
personally 18:12
perspective 36:7
phones 3:25
phonetic 1:25
place 34:17 40:6
plane 38:1
planned 4:19 10:2
planning 9:1 16:13 34:20
please 1:24
point 8:14,17 24:11
policy 13:14 26:18 26:25 27:2 31:14
portfolio 37:5,17
portmans 18:14
possible 25:25
possibly 9:15 25:17
potentially 9:13 11:16,16,17,21
predominantly 3:13 22:19 28:4
prepare 13:24
prepared 8:3
present 1:8
presley 24:25 25:14 26:3
press 6:14 37:15,18
pretty 2:15 4:22 15:9 26:10
preventing 7:14
prior 2:25
priscilla 24:25 25:14 26:3
probably 11:5 12:7 12:10 13:4 18:16 18:22 19:3 25:15
proceedings 40:5
process 3:13 13:11 30:8
project 15:7
promote 6:17,23
provide 13:20
provided 32:6 35:8
public 40:23
purchase 4:1
put 13:23 38:10

Q

question 11:4 13:3 23:15 32:4 33:17 34:24 35:20
questioning 2:1
questions 2:14

R

rahn 1:16 40:22
rare 30:4
reach 13:24 18:8,17 22:2
reached 18:10,19 23:25 30:19
reaching 7:8 18:10 18:14
read 10:11 12:23 23:15
reading 33:18
realize 20:17
realized 17:16 36:4
really 4:22 6:3 9:12 13:3 15:3 18:19 21:12 22:7 23:5 23:13 30:4 33:21 35:23
realtors 30:11
reason 11:24 12:16 21:2
recall 6:10 16:21 23:18
receive 31:15
received 21:8 32:21 35:21
receiving 33:9
reception 25:5,7 28:12 30:23
receptions 3:19 29:24
record 2:7,15
recording 39:11
referred 10:16
referring 33:3
regarding 3:17 18:1 25:6 27:3
regularly 30:22
related 38:14
relates 27:23
relating 5:18
relation 27:2
relative 40:9,11
relay 21:7
remember 12:2 16:16 18:11,13 21:23,24 22:7,8 29:5 32:8 35:1 37:1
renee 23:19
rental 4:5
rephrase 29:13
reported 40:5
representative 2:17 15:23,23 16:12 22:5 38:25
request 7:20 21:23 21:24 22:9,11 24:19,20 25:9 29:3 32:21
requests 3:14,16 15:5 25:12 29:20 31:2
reserve 28:16,23 29:19,23 30:2,12 30:18,22
reserved 28:7,18 29:12,13
reserving 30:7,9 32:4
respect 26:19
response 24:6
responsibilities 36:21 37:11,14
rest 3:18 18:10
resulted 14:24
right 14:22
roll 31:17 32:13,18
room 28:18,23 30:8 30:12,18 32:5
rooms 28:7,16 29:12,13,19,20,23 30:2,9,13,22
run 30:3,6

S

sara 5:25 6:3 8:13 15:18 20:20 21:5 25:4,19 28:4,21 29:4,10 31:4,24 33:9 36:1
sat 18:7
saying 11:9,20 31:22 35:24 38:16
says 9:20,20 10:20
scenario 12:1 15:13 17:20,23 18:15 23:3 30:4
schedule 3:13,14 4:25 8:2 14:3,3 16:4,6 22:23 23:9 24:16 26:20,22
scheduled 4:17 14:15,17 16:14 18:25 19:5,6,7 24:18,21 25:3 27:11,13
scheduler 2:18,23 3:11 11:2,7 15:11 15:11 34:14
schedulers 11:3 13:25 17:19
schedules 15:18
scheduling 3:20,22 4:2,10,15,24 5:2,3 5:11,17 7:17,23 9:25 11:5 12:22 12:25 15:9 16:25 17:15 18:6 20:8 20:11 23:22 24:13 26:16,19 27:8,22 28:6 37:3,25 38:1 38:24 39:3
secretary 6:14 37:15,19
see 13:7 14:1 21:22
senator 16:18 18:14 33:20 34:3 34:12
senators 16:21
send 13:12,19 14:6 21:13 25:8,9,12
sending 13:5 21:6 24:1
sent 8:13 12:21 13:25 15:18 23:24 36:3
service 33:4

set 5:7 6:25 7:5,18 7:21 11:12 13:9 18:20 21:20 22:3 22:18 40:6
setting 22:14
share 8:4,5 24:5 27:14
shared 8:2,12 9:11 16:6,10 22:22 35:12
sharing 16:3
shes 4:21 5:3,8,12 9:22 12:6 27:5 28:24 35:12
shouldnt 36:4,5
show 9:17 10:8 21:16 23:10
showed 8:22
shut 15:2,6
side 3:20,22
similar 12:21 16:25 24:23 32:4 34:23
simply 35:21
single 8:11 22:9 30:9
situation 11:19 19:13,18,25 24:9 28:25 29:2 36:10
situations 10:16 17:16 18:4
six 11:12
society 5:17,18,20 5:23,24 12:8,11 15:20 27:23 28:6 28:8 31:5 39:3
somebody 34:16
son 32:17
soring 7:14
speakers 28:16
specific 28:7
specifically 9:16
spell 2:7
spellings 1:24
spend 37:7
spoke 24:6
spoken 6:6
spouse 12:6
staff 3:15,16,18 4:1 4:2 5:13 7:4,7 10:1 14:1,11 15:24 16:11 22:20 22:24 30:17 34:18
staffer 7:7 25:20 33:2,12 34:16
staffers 5:23,24 16:1,4 32:11 33:2
stamped 9:18 10:9 17:6 23:11 33:15 34:23 35:17
standstill 15:3
start 2:13
started 14:20 16:9 20:5 25:8 36:5,22
state 31:8,15,21 32:6,9,11,19,22 40:23
stefan 1:13 2:11
stenographically 40:5
stephanie 1:16 40:22
stevens 10:13
strictly 4:14 36:1
subject 7:11
submit 31:25
support 3:24
supporters 17:25
sure 3:12 9:9 10:6 12:16 16:16 21:14 25:23 30:7,10,16 38:24
system 3:24

T

take 13:2,6 36:18
takes 13:10
talk 4:17,23 22:7
talked 35:24
technology 3:24
tell 4:20 8:25 9:14 10:1,4
telling 31:21
tells 5:21
tennessee 6:16,22 7:15 17:24
terminated 39:12
testimony 40:4
thanks 39:10
thats 4:22 9:18 11:4,18 13:3,9 19:2 23:8,10 27:1 27:2 29:24 33:12 39:6,8,10
thing 12:24 15:17 20:16 31:17
things 3:25 4:8,23 22:8 37:4
think 13:22 14:22 16:16 19:1,17 22:15 27:21 29:2 32:20 33:1,23 34:18,20 35:2,14 36:4 38:22
thought 11:21 21:4
three 11:13
ticket 31:11,23 32:1,6,11,20,23 33:10
tickets 31:15,18,20 31:22 38:1
time 4:14 6:9,10,15 8:22 13:1,2,10,22 15:7 16:19 20:7 20:10 37:7,10 40:6
times 7:6 15:25
title 2:16
titles 2:22
told 9:8,10 11:17 15:21,22 20:24 21:25 34:14
total 14:19 19:8
town 17:13,22,22 22:1 24:22,25 25:2 32:22
transcribed 1:16
transcript 1:25 40:4
travel 4:3,5,6 37:25 38:5,6
traveling 4:6,21 38:4,8,9,16
travels 38:11,13
trip 38:7,14
trips 4:18
true 40:3
try 16:18
trying 27:7
turkey 30:21
two 2:9 15:6 17:23 19:7 28:17
type 4:12 14:24 24:23 30:15
typical 22:17

U

uhhuh 6:12 10:10 10:15,18,23 11:23 12:23,24 14:13,16 18:3 19:9 20:9 21:21 22:21,25 23:12,20 24:18 26:6 27:24 31:6 33:5,8 35:19 36:14 37:6,23 39:1,6
um 13:3,4 35:23 37:20
understand 26:18 27:8 29:16
understanding 8:17 21:15 25:16 25:18,21
understood 7:11
union 31:8,16,21 32:6,9,12,19,22
united 33:4
unusual 22:17
ups 32:21 33:1,3
use 28:15 31:18,19 31:23 32:10,23
usual 31:14
usually 5:20 11:9 13:9,20 32:11,22 35:5

V

variety 4:23 13:8 28:14 29:21 36:25
view 38:24 39:2
visa 4:7
vitter 33:20 34:3,12
volume 20:1 22:14

W

walk 13:11 17:21
walking 6:16,22 7:15
want 2:13 9:17 10:12 11:3 20:1 21:22 22:16 23:10 30:10,17 32:10 38:22,23
wanted 22:2 23:13
wants 5:6 26:21 31:23 35:13,14
wasnt 15:12 19:12 19:20,22 22:4 27:15,20 33:11 34:14
way 9:12 27:22 36:6
week 29:20 31:16
weekly 30:25
weeks 15:6 29:11
went 24:1 31:7 32:8 32:17
white 32:12
whitehouse 31:16
whitfield 4:10,13 7:23 8:18 10:2,19 15:19 16:13 19:11 20:18 22:5,11 23:14 24:9,12 25:25 27:16 28:1 28:22 35:5 38:2 38:15,25 39:4
whitfields 2:17 15:23 24:19 26:17 38:5
wife 10:20 12:4,7 12:13,14,15 21:4
willing 23:7
word 8:3 16:7
work 3:20 4:19 13:16 15:7 20:1 23:5,6 27:5,5 37:24
worked 3:1,7 12:11 14:4 28:17 29:9 29:10
working 16:9 25:8 37:3,7
works 12:8 29:5 34:19
wouldnt 8:23,25

writing 13:15

X

xio1717 1:17 40:22

Y

yeah 11:23 12:7,24 17:12 27:4 29:1,9 29:19 31:1,3 32:19
year 3:6 28:12,25 29:10 30:11 31:8 32:9,12,16
years 12:12 28:17 32:20
yesterday 30:16
yup 12:23 28:17

Z

0

1

13 28:25
15 19:2,8
1518 7:14
18 40:24
1994 35:3

2

20 12:12
2012 2:21 14:20 28:25
2013 6:10 20:8 21:19 26:16 27:8 29:1,4,10 32:25 33:7 38:22
2014 1:5 2:12 17:1 17:2,11
2017 40:24
21 10:13
24 1:5 2:11
27 17:11

3

4

5

5 10:13
50 7:1 12:25 14:14 18:20

6

7

70 7:1 13:1 14:14 18:20

8

9

EXHIBIT 31

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 6:10 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: Meeting Schedule
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Emma,

If a member is available to meet on Thurs at 11:00am, feel free to cancel Bera. Meeting with an LA for a Calif Dem isn't worth much.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 15, 2013, at 6:04 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov<mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

All -

Attached and below is the meeting schedule for tomorrow and Thursday. I have contacted many more offices today and am in the process of scheduling additional meetings. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Emma

Meeting Schedule
Ms. Donna Benefield and Mr. Marty Irby

Wednesday, October 16

Meeting with Congressman Frank Pallone (NJ) 9:45am
Location: 237 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Billy Long (MO) 10:30am
Location: 1541 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Bill Cassidy, M.D. (LA) 11:15am
Location: 1131 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Mike Rogers (AL) 1:00pm
Location: 324 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman John Barrow (GA) 1:45pm
Location: 2202 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Gregg Harper (MS) 2:15pm Location 307 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Roger Williams (TX) 3:00pm Location 1122 Longworth

Meeting with Richard Vaughn, Chief of Staff for Congressman Scott DesJarlais (TN) [Marty and Donna ONLY] 3:30pm

Location: 413 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Devin Nunes (CA)
4:15
Location: 1013 Longworth

Thursday, October 17

Meeting with Congressman Gus Bilirakis (FL-12) 10:00am
Location: 2313 Rayburn

Meeting with Legislative Aide, Nisha, for Congressman Ami Bera (CA-07) 11:00am
Location: 140B Longworth

Meeting with Dan Scandling, Chief of Staff for Congressman Frank Wolf (VA-10) 11:45am
Location: 233 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Dan Maffei (NY-24) 2:00pm
Location: 422 Cannon

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01> <image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

<Wednesday.Oct.16.Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx> <Thursday.Oct.17.Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx>

EXHIBIT 32

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2013 12:32 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Sara Amundson; Marty Irby; Hicks, Cory; Pack, Chris; Edward Whitfield
Subject: Re: Meetings for Next Week

These are marvelous meetings. I think we can cancel McCleod because she signed up yesterday.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 18, 2013, at 4:09 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov<mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

All -

Attached and below are the meetings scheduled for next week. I am still in the process of scheduling some others. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Emma

Monday, October 21

Meeting with Justin Ouimette with Congressman Mark Sanford's Office 10:00am
Location: 322 Cannon

Meeting with Miriam Fry with Congressman Mo Brooks' Office 2:00 PM
Location: 1230 Longworth

Wednesday, October 23

Meeting with Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart (FL-25) 10:30am
Location: 436 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Gus Bilirakis (FL-12) 11:15am
Location: 2313 Rayburn

Meeting with Congressman Joe Garcia (FL-26) 11:45am
Location: 1440 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Richard Nugent (FL-11) 12:30pm
Location: 1727 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Kevin McCarthy (CA-23) 1:30pm
Location: H-107, Capitol

Meeting with Congressman Gene Green (TX-29) 3:00pm
Location: 2470 Rayburn

Meeting with Jon Amar and Amanda Slade, Legislative Assistants for Congressman Alan Lowenthal (CA-47) 4:00pm
Location: 515 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Dan Maffei (NY-24) 4:30pm
Location: 422 Cannon

Thursday, October 24

Meeting with Congressman Mike Thompson (CA-05) 9:00am
Location: 231 Cannon

Meeting with Saul Hernandez, Legislative Director for Congressman GK Butterfield (NC-01) 10:00am
Location: 2305 Rayburn

Meeting with Congresswoman Gloria McLeod (CA-35) 1:30pm
Location: 1641 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Duncan Hunter (CA-50) 2:00pm
Location: 223 Cannon

Meeting with Congressman Devin Nunes (CA) 3:00pm
Location: 1013 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Joe Crowley (NY-14) 4:00pm
Location: 1436 Longworth

Meeting with Congressman Ted Yoho (FL-03) 4:30pm
Location: 511 Cannon

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01> <image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

<Monday.Oct.21.Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx> <Wednesday.Oct.23.Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.doc> <Thursday.Oct.24.Schedule for M. Irby and D. Benefield.docx>

EXHIBIT 33

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:23 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: favor
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Thanks for those details! We are confirmed for Tuesday at 415

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-[redacted]/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:21 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

You can just contact me or Cory with any questions. My boss's wife, Connie Harriman Whitfield, will be joining them in the meeting as well.

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:19 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: favor

Will anyone from your office accompany them? If not, can you send me their contact information?

Thanks!

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-[redacted]/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:18 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

That works. Thanks so much!

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:18 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: favor

I can do 415

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-[redacted]/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:16 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: RE: favor

They have another meeting at that time. Would a 3pm meeting work for your boss on Tuesday?

Thanks!

From: Stevens, Amanda
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 5:12 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: FW: favor

Can we make something work Tuesday at 1pm in our office?

Thank you, Amanda

Amanda Stevens Baldwin
Scheduler/Office Manager
US House of Representatives
Michael C Burgess, M.D.
2336 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515
202-225-[redacted]/FAX 202-225-2919

From: Strickland, Kelle
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 1:37 PM
To: Stevens, Amanda
Subject: FW: favor

Kelle Strickland
Chief of Staff
Rep. Michael Burgess (TX-26)
2336 Rayburn HOB

Washington, DC 20515
(202)225-[redacted]

From: Hicks, Cory
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2013 1:31 PM
To: Strickland, Kelle
Cc: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: favor

Kelle, I hope you are well. Quick question: two people are coming into town next week for a conference with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of those people are involved in the TN Walking Horse Industry and are supportive our efforts with the PAST Act. One of them is- Marty Irby- the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. Marty is actually a constituent from what I've been told. The other person is Donna Benefield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available all day Monday (except 2 and 3pm), from 11 to close of business Tuesday and all day Friday. Do you think you can make something work?

Cory Hicks
Chief of Staff
Chairman Ed Whitfield
202-225-[redacted]

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
http://whitfield.house.gov

EXHIBIT 34

From: Thomson, Kristin
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:33 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Favor
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Ok, great! Thanks!

Kristin Thomson
Executive Assistant
Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: RE: Favor

Great! Thanks so much. I will have them there next week. My boss's wife Connie will be joining them in the meeting as well.

Thanks,
Emma

From: Thomson, Kristin
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:25 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Favor

Yep, we can make 1:30PM work! Thanks!

Kristin Thomson
Executive Assistant
Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:24 AM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: RE: Favor

Could we do 1:30pm? If not, I can make 1pm work. Let me know.

Thanks,
Emma

From: Thomson, Kristin
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 10:21 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: RE: Favor

Hi Emma,

Kevin would be happy to meet with them. Would 1PM on Wed October 23 work? This would be in H-107. Thanks!

Kristin Thomson
Executive Assistant
Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]

From: Heydlauff, Emma
Sent: Wednesday, October 16, 2013 12:10 PM
To: Thomson, Kristin
Subject: Favor

Kristin,

Quick question: two people are in town this week and next for a conference with the Friends of Sound Horses. Two of those people are involved in the TN Walking Horse Industry and are supportive our efforts with the PAST Act. One of them is- Marty Irby- the former president of the TN Walking Horse Association. The other person is Donna Benefield, President of the International Walking Horse Association. If your boss could take a meeting with them, my boss would really appreciate it. They are available on Thursday and all next week. Do you think you can make something work?

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
Fax: (202) 225-3547

Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.

EXHIBIT 35

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown

Fantastic!

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2011, at 5:55 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield
>
> I have a meeting confirmed for you for tomorrow afternoon at 4pm with Sen. Scott Brown. The meeting will be in his office, 359 Dirksen.
>
> Thank you:
> Melissa
>
> Melissa Buchanan
> Scheduler
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
> Fax: (202) 225-3547
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>
> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 2:25 PM
> To: Buchanan, Melissa
> Cc: Sparkman, John
> Subject: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown
>
> Ed and I need to meet with Senator Scott Brown sometime tomorrow to mention a bill Landrieu is introducing. Can you please set something up?
> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 36

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 5:16 PM
To: Ed Whitfield <[redacted]@verizon.net>
Subject: Fwd: Any luck with any of my appointments?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
> **Date:** July 14, 2011 4:06:50 PM GMT-04:00
> **To:** "'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
> **Subject: RE: Any luck with any of my appointments?**
>
> Yes. So far I have:
> Congressman Aderholt--9:30am on Wednesday, July 20
> 2264 RHOB
>
> Congressman LaTourette--10:00am on Wednesday, July 20
> 2371 RHOB
>
> Congressman Bass--11:00am on Wednesday, July 20
> 2350 RHOB
>
> I am still waiting to hear from the offices of Congressman Petri, Dold, Frelinghuysen, and Congressman Grimm's Chief of Staff.
>
> I will send you a final schedule as soon as I have it complete.
>
> Melissa Buchanan
> Scheduler
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
> Fax: (202) 225-3547
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>
> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 4:02 PM
> To: Buchanan, Melissa
> Subject: Any luck with any of my appointments?
>
> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 37

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 4:11 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Lamar Alexander

You are marvelous!

Sent from my iPhone

On May 21, 2012, at 3:53 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> No, Congressman Whitfield was not planning to go to the District this weekend. I was already holding Saturday evening on his calendar, and I have also added the other three evenings.
>
> Melissa
>
> Melissa Buchanan
> Scheduler
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
> Fax: (202) 225-3547
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>
> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 3:52 PM
> To: Buchanan, Melissa
> Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Lamar Alexander
>
> I hope he was not planning to go to the
> District!
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On May 21, 2012, at 3:49 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> I will hold those evenings on Congressman Whitfield's calendar.
>>
>> Thank you.
>>
>> Melissa Buchanan
>> Scheduler
>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
>> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
>> Washington, DC 20515
>> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
>> Fax: (202) 225-3547
>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>>
>> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 3:48 PM
>> To: Buchanan, Melissa
>> Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Lamar Alexander
>>
>> Thanks, Melissa!
>>
>> Did I tell you to hold the nights of Thurs., Fri and Mon for social events with Ed?
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> On May 21, 2012, at 3:40 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>
>>> Hi Mrs. Whitfield:
>>>
>>> I just called Senator Alexander's office. He will not be in Washington, DC on Friday, but his scheduler is checking on his availability for Thursday and will call me back very soon.
>>>
>>> Thank you:
>>> Melissa
>>>
>>> Melissa Buchanan
>>> Scheduler
>>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
>>> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
>>> Washington, DC 20515
>>> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
>>> Fax: (202) 225-3547
>>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>>>

>>> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>>>
>>>
>>> -----Original Message-----
>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>> Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 3:30 PM
>>> To: Buchanan, Melissa
>>> Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Lamar Alexander
>>>
>>> Ideally, Ed will be in the meeting. Is the Senator here Thursday or Friday of this week?
>>>
>>> Thanks!
>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>
>>> On May 21, 2012, at 3:11 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Good Afternoon Mrs. Whitfield:
>>>>
>>>> The Senate is not scheduled to be in session at all next week. Is there another time that you would like for me to set up this meeting? Also, does Congressman Whitfield also need to be in the meeting?
>>>>
>>>> Thank you:
>>>> Melissa
>>>>
>>>> Melissa Buchanan
>>>> Scheduler
>>>> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
>>>> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
>>>> Washington, DC 20515
>>>> Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
>>>> Fax: (202) 225-3547
>>>> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>>>>
>>>> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> -----Original Message-----
>>>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>>>> Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 3:04 PM
>>>> To: Buchanan, Melissa
>>>> Cc: Hicks, Cory
>>>> Subject: Meeting with Sen Lamar Alexander
>>>>
>>>> Melissa,
>>>>
>>>> Would you please try to set up a meeting with the Senator some time next week? The subject is Tennessee Walking Horses.
>>>>
>>>> Thanks,
>>>> Connie
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 38

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD'S WIFE

INTERVIEW OF [redacted]

April 25, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Bryson Morgan

[redacted]

Susannah May

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson Morgan

4 with the Office of Congressional Ethics. We are

5 joined by [redacted] --

6 A. [redacted]

7 Q. [redacted]

8 A. Not [redacted], just [redacted].

9 Q. [redacted] and her attorney

10 Suzannah May. It is April 25, 2014.

11 [redacted], are you currently

12 employed with the Humane Society Legislative Fund?

13 A. I am.

14 Q. What is your job title?

15 A. I think it's called Legislative

16 Specialist.

17 Q. How long have you been employed with

18 HSLF?

19 A. Well, I think I was hired towards the

20 end of 2011, like -- not, you know, maybe at the end

21 of October or so.

22 Q. And where were you employed prior to

23 HSLF?

24 A. The Humane Society of the United

25 States.

1 Q. And what was your title there?
2 A. Well, I was -- something -- I am not
3 big on titles, something like Senior Policy Advisor
4 to the President.
5 Q. And when did you begin employment
6 there?
7 A. There being the Humane Society?
8 Q. Yes.
9 A. I think 2000 -- August of -- I'm not
10 good on dates either, I think approximately August
11 2007.
12 Q. And how did you begin employment
13 there, and what I am just trying to understand is
14 how did you seek employment there, did someone reach
15 out to you, how did you decide to work for HSUS?
16 A. Well, I never sought employment there.
17 My husband -- was working on a bill that involved
18 banning the slaughter of horses in the United
19 States, and I was the Vice Chairman of the Kentucky
20 Horse Racing Authority, and had jurisdiction over
21 all racing in the State of Kentucky and many of the
22 horses that are sent to slaughter are failed race
23 horses, failed thoroughbreds, failed standard
24 breads, failed quarter horses, all of whom race and
25 they were all under my jurisdiction.

1 So I was asked to talk on behalf of
2 different people in Kentucky who were constituents
3 of Ed's and outside of Ed's district to go to
4 Washington DC with them, these are people that owned
5 horses, breed horses, raise horses that were in
6 favor of this bill, so I was in meetings with a lot
7 of members with these very famous people, one man
8 won the Kentucky Derby three times.
9 Anyway, Wayne Pacelle I guess heard
10 about me and that I was a very passionate advocate
11 for this legislation and he observed me in a couple
12 of speaking situations and asked me whether I would
13 be interested in working with the Humane Society.
14 Q. And to the best of your recollection
15 was that around 2007, right before you started
16 working there?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Did Representative Whitfield speak
19 with anyone at the Humane Society about your hiring?
20 A. Not at all, not to my knowledge.
21 Q. And as Senior Policy Advisor or -- to
22 the president or whatever your title was, what were
23 your duties, job duties?
24 A. Well, first of all I started out in
25 fundraising, that was my first job, so it didn't

1 have anything to do with -- that was my very first
2 job, fundraising, had nothing to do with legislation
3 or the hill or anything like that. And I did that
4 for, I want to say a year and a half maybe, two
5 years, and then moved to the -- the second role
6 which was the special advisor and in that capacity,
7 I worked directly with Wayne Pacelle to come up with
8 ways of involving wealthy individuals or external
9 groups or celebrities to become involved with the
10 Humane Society in one way or another, like
11 endorsements, like giving money, like doing a PSA,
12 like coming to the hill, stuff like that.
13 Q. Anything else?
14 A. Not that I can remember.
15 Q. And why did you transition to the
16 HSLF?
17 A. I am trying to remember. I don't
18 remember that anybody consciously said you need to
19 change your job, I don't remember that. I think it
20 was a combination of things, Wayne and I never sat
21 down and discussed it. I think it was a realization
22 on his part that the Humane Society has wonderful
23 contacts on the hill with Democrats, it's perceived
24 as a democratic organization by Republicans,
25 therefore they don't -- the Humane Society probably

1 feels like less comfortable trying to get
2 Republicans to understand their position, positions.
3 And I think because Ed Whitfield had been such a
4 passionate supporter of animals, I wouldn't say the
5 Humane Society because there are a lot of positions
6 he's taken against the Humane Society, but such a
7 passionate animal supporter, that they felt that
8 having me involved was not a problem because I am a
9 passionate animal supporter.
10 Q. And when you made the transition, did
11 Representative Whitfield have any conversations or
12 discussions with people at the Humane Society or
13 people at the HSLF regarding your transition?
14 A. First of all, I think the only person
15 he would have known back then was Wayne Pacelle and
16 to my knowledge, they never talked about it. I
17 don't think he would have known anybody else to talk
18 to.
19 Q. With HSLF, to whom do you report?
20 A. Well, directly I report to Sara
21 Amundson.
22 Q. Does anyone report to you?
23 A. No.
24 Q. And what are your job duties?
25 A. Well, my job duties are to make --

1 well, my job duties are informal often. If I am
2 with a member, a republican member like say Roy
3 Blunt, and I run into him in the hallway, and I'll
4 say, hey, Roy, how do you think the puppy mill
5 initiative is going in Missouri, he will -- we will
6 talk about it, you know. A lot of my job involves
7 kind of chance encounters, that sounds funny to say,
8 but a lot of it really does involve chance
9 encounters, because I am around members a lot.
10 If Ed is flying home and I am at the
11 airport, I might run into Jim Cooper from Tennessee,
12 because we are all flying into Nashville. He will
13 run into me and raise a question like, Connie, this
14 bill that you guys have, it's a great bill, you
15 know, I really like it.
16 So I think in some ways, I am kind of
17 like a listening post for members because they know
18 me from 20 years of being at events, CODELs,
19 whatever and they feel comfortable talking to me.
20 The Republicans especially, Bill Cooper is not a
21 Republican, but the Republicans especially, if they
22 have a question, they will come to me or call me,
23 like Roy Blunt called me once and said I want a dog,
24 can you help me get a dog, and I got him a dog.
25 Q. Okay.

1 A. But so, it sounds silly but it's kind
2 of like I am a safe person to talk to, and so if
3 they have questions or if they have concerns, I am
4 the go-to person, especially -- I mean mainly for
5 Republicans, because they don't trust most of the
6 people at the Humane Society.
7 Q. And you are a registered lobbyist?
8 A. I am a registered lobbyist, I have --
9 except -- well, I have had meetings, specific
10 meetings with people but unlike most lobbyists, I
11 don't spend my time going to fundraisers or having a
12 daily log of meetings on the hill. That's just --
13 Q. Okay.
14 A. It's much less formal.
15 Q. But you lobbied some bills and other
16 policies and things for the Humane Society, and I
17 should say HSLF?
18 A. When I first started trying to
19 influence people on the hill, it was before I was
20 employed by the Humane Society, it was the ban on
21 horse slaughter, and that was in my capacity as a
22 Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Horse Racing
23 Authority, and also bringing citizens from the State
24 of Kentucky to members on the house with people like
25 T.Boone Pickens and his wife Madeline Pickens, we

1 would all go together, and I wasn't a lobbyist then,
2 I was just representing the interests of horses, and
3 helping people who could not otherwise get meetings
4 except for, you know, I would -- some of them could
5 have, but T. Boone Pickens could have gotten a
6 meeting no problem.
7 So anyway, when I first started out,
8 it was -- it had nothing to do with the Humane
9 Society or HSLF, and then my fundraising experience
10 and dealing directly with the President wasn't until
11 really I think the beginning of 2012. And even
12 then, I mean I left out a really important piece of
13 what I do. A lot of what I do, I would say, 70
14 percent of what I do, is I talk on the phone with
15 other members of HSLF or HSUS about strategy,
16 strategy.
17 Q. Strategy for what?
18 A. Strategy for finding out information,
19 the best way to find out information, strategy like
20 which members like each other, strategy like things
21 that -- things that certain members really care
22 about.
23 Q. So legislative type strategy?
24 A. Yeah, but I am mainly giving
25 information to my colleagues, because again, they

1 don't have access to most Republicans, so they don't
2 know what I know from having been around members for
3 20 years, but I would say strategy is my most
4 important strong point.
5 Q. And through those duties, working on
6 strategy and also whatever else you were doing as a
7 registered lobbyist, have you been involved with the
8 PAST Act?
9 A. I have.
10 Q. Some questions I ask are very --
11 A. That's fair, you are doing a record, I
12 get it.
13 Q. And the PAST Act, is to Prevent All
14 Soring Tactics?
15 A. Yes, it is.
16 Q. And how long have you been involved
17 with that act?
18 A. Well, again, you are saying involved,
19 involved at all? It's hard for --
20 Q. Yes.
21 A. Okay, first of all, I cannot give you
22 a date, because I am brain dead when it comes to
23 dates. When I took my dad for an Alzheimer's test,
24 he passed, I failed.
25 But when you say involved, do you mean

1 talking to people about it or do you mean
2 specifically talking to members about it or just
3 being, like --
4 MR. MORGAN: What was your first
5 recollection of the act or the idea for legislation
6 to address that issue?
7 A. Well, I was not involved in the
8 drafting of the act at all, not at all. So any
9 involvement I had came after the legislation
10 existed. And I know that over time, different
11 groups, like the American Horse Council in
12 particular and the American Veterinary Medical
13 Association to a lesser extent had particular points
14 they wanted in the legislation, and I never talked
15 to them about it. I don't even know what the points
16 were, but I know they talked with Ed's office and
17 that -- I mean that's all I know. So I mean I was
18 not involved at all in actually writing the bill,
19 and I am trying to -- really trying to remember my
20 first involvement.
21 Q. Well, were you --
22 A. I don't know.
23 Q. Were you involved with finding
24 co-sponsors before the bill was introduced?
25 A. No, you wouldn't -- you couldn't have

1 a co-sponsor before the bill was introduced.
2 Q. Potential sponsors before it was
3 introduced?
4 A. No.
5 Q. What were you involved in with the
6 legislation -- let me rephrase it.
7 Do you remember when the legislation
8 was introduced?
9 A. No, I do not. And I don't know even
10 know if it was introduced twice. I don't know if it
11 was introduced once and reintroduced, I don't know.
12 Q. Were you involved with the bill after
13 it was introduced in 2013 with scheduling meetings
14 or being involved with meetings with potential
15 co-sponsors?
16 A. The first meetings that I can
17 remember, distinctly, were probably in October or
18 November, the end of 2013.
19 Q. And can you describe those meetings in
20 general?
21 A. Well, I didn't go to very many. Most
22 of them were -- I could say most nearly all of them
23 were with Republicans. I went -- well, some I went
24 with Marty Irby who was visiting from Tennessee and
25 essentially a citizen lobbyist but somebody who was

1 involved in the horse soring world since he was like
2 three years old, so he was like a super expert on
3 the subject.
4 Some of them involved Marty Irby and
5 Donna Bennefield and she also was visiting from
6 Tennessee, citizen advocate, very knowledgeable
7 about horse soring issues.
8 There was one meeting that Senator --
9 or maybe at least one maybe two, Senator Hollings
10 who was one of the two Senators that passed the
11 original bill in the senate back in 1970 called and
12 -- called and insisted that I attend. And I can't
13 remember everybody who was there, but he was -- he's
14 really good friends with Senator Cochran, and he
15 arranged this meeting with Senator Cochran and said
16 Connie, the day before, you have to be here, you
17 have to be here, and I said well, fine, whatever.
18 So I went, I think Marty was there and
19 then Cory and one other person from Ed's office
20 walked in, they never said one word the entire time.
21 And that meeting was basically Hollings talking to
22 Cochran and Cochran had his staffer there, and
23 Hollings was trying to tell to him the history and
24 everything, and so that was kind of a unique
25 meeting.

1 Q. That meeting took place, I know you
2 are bad with dates, took place around October or
3 November of 2013?
4 A. I think so. It could have been
5 earlier this year, but it's --
6 Q. It could have been --
7 A. I don't really remember when it
8 happened, but it would be sometime from October
9 forward.
10 Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you
11 are involved in strategy in general, specifically
12 with the PAST Act. Have you been involved with
13 strategy for that?
14 A. Not so much because there is so many
15 groups involved, and one of the things that I know
16 -- Cory and Ed feel very strongly about, is that on
17 this particular bill, they didn't want the Humane
18 Society to be out in front, because most Republicans
19 don't like the Humane Society, and they felt that
20 they needed a strong Republican showing to get the
21 bill passed, so for example, the Humane Society was
22 excluded from the hearing that they had and so they
23 wanted this to be seen as a horse industry bill, so
24 the American Horse Council, the American Veterinary
25 Medical Association, The Medical Association of

1 Equine Practitioners, all these groups were going to
2 be, you know, front and center, so they have been
3 very involved in strategy, and, you know, there have
4 been disagreements.
5 Q. Were you also involved in that
6 strategy of realizing that it would be better for
7 the Humane Society to not be on the front end of --
8 A. It wasn't a choice for me. It's not
9 my decision. I mean it's not my decision, I agree
10 with it, but it's not my decision.
11 Q. Whose decision is it?
12 A. It was -- well, it was Ed's and
13 Corey's decision.
14 Q. And as an employee of the Humane
15 Society, did you have a position on whether or not
16 the Humane Society should be out front on this
17 legislation that you were --
18 A. My reaction was this is the man who
19 introduced the bill, this is the man who is leading
20 the charge, if he doesn't want the Humane Society
21 involved then that's the way it's going to be.
22 Q. During this time period when you were
23 working on the PAST Act, say the fall of 2013 and
24 you attended these meetings, did you contact
25 Representative Whitfield's staff regarding these

1 meetings that you were attending?
2 A. Did I contact Whitfield's staff
3 regarding these meetings? Okay. You mean about the
4 fact they occurred?
5 Q. Scheduling the meetings, so scheduling
6 meetings in October and November of 2013?
7 A. Emma -- Emma was asked to set up
8 meetings for Marty and Donna. Ed wanted her to do
9 that, because he felt very strongly that they would
10 -- he had told several members about them, and that
11 they were both experts, and he wanted other members
12 to have the benefit of their expertise.
13 So he told a lot of members that he
14 wanted them to talk to them, and so then Emma was
15 asked to set up meetings. Now sometimes Ed tells me
16 things, we will be in the car, and he'll say, oh,
17 tell Cory such and such, tell Emma such and such, so
18 it's quite possible he said to me tell Emma to set
19 up meetings and I called Emma and said set up
20 meetings.
21 Q. Did you instruct Emma to send you all
22 of the meetings that being scheduled, send you a
23 calendar of the meetings that were being scheduled
24 --
25 A. Do you have a document?

1 Q. Yes.
2 A. You know I have to say for all of
3 these questions you have been asking me, it would be
4 nice if you had given me documents.
5 Q. Well, I don't want to effect what you
6 remember or what you recall by showing you a
7 document, so if you recall it without the
8 document --
9 A. How could I recall something like
10 that? So I feel like you are playing games now. I
11 am putting that on the record.
12 Q. Alright. Well, I will let you know
13 that we are not playing games, the way the
14 investigation works is to see what you recall --
15 A. Well, you know what, you could have
16 said that at the beginning.
17 Q. Are you clear now --
18 A. No, I am not clear. You can tell me
19 exactly what it is you should have said at the
20 beginning.
21 Q. Let me just understand with the
22 meetings that were being scheduled --
23 A. No, I am not talking to you about the
24 meetings that were being scheduled. Because I am
25 very annoyed at the moment. I want to know exactly

1 how you are planning to treat the documents you
2 have.
3 Q. I am conducting the interview, I have
4 to ask you certain questions. We will get to any
5 document I need to show you.
6 A. Fine, then if you are asking me a
7 question and you have a document relating to it,
8 show it to me.
9 Q. The process through which we ask the
10 questions will not be dependent upon whether I have
11 a document. So I cannot --
12 A. Okay, fine.
13 Q. -- establish that every time I am
14 going to ask you a question --
15 A. But you just said you did have a
16 document.
17 Q. We have 20,000 pages worth of
18 documents.
19 A. I am talking about the document
20 relating to the question you just asked me.
21 Q. Every question I am asking has a
22 document. Some I will show you, some I will not.
23 A. Okay. And why will you not show me
24 certain documents?
25 Q. I don't have all of them here.

1 A. Okay, but are you therefore going to
2 show me all the documents you do have here?
3 Q. Depends on what we get to the in the
4 interview.
5 A. Why are you not showing me documents
6 you do have here, what is your reason?
7 Q. I cannot go through the entire
8 interview and try to describe to you why we are
9 asking questions?
10 A. I am not asking that. I am asking why
11 are you not showing me documents that you have here
12 that relate to the questions you are asking me.
13 Q. If you have a recollection of
14 something where I don't need to have a document to
15 refresh your recollection?
16 A. How do you know that you have a
17 document that I need to refresh my recollection, how
18 do you know that?
19 Q. There is only way to find out is for
20 me to ask the questions, see what you remember --
21 A. Okay, go ahead.
22 Q. Okay. Thank you. With scheduling of
23 meetings with the members in this October November
24 time period, did you contact any of Mr. Whitfield's
25 staff other than Emma and I think you mentioned

1 Cory?

2 A. I don't remember.

3 Q. With respect to identifying potential

4 co-sponsors --

5 A. I don't remember.

6 Q. So I didn't finish my question.

7 A. Go ahead.

8 Q. You don't remember?

9 A. Well, you said with respect to --

10 Q. Co-sponsors?

11 A. Go ahead.

12 Q. With response to -- with respect to

13 identifying potential co-sponsors with the PAST Act

14 during this time period, October 2013, did you have

15 contacts with Mr. Whitfield's staff?

16 A. I don't remember.

17 Q. And with respect to determining

18 strategy, discussing strategy, with Representative

19 Whitfield's staff, did you have such contacts?

20 A. I don't remember.

21 Q. And did you have any contacts with

22 Representative Whitfield concerning the PAST Act and

23 different steps he should take with advocating that

24 legislation?

25 A. I don't remember.

1 MR. MORGAN: You said that Ed wanted
2 Marty and Donna to do the meetings.
3 A. Uh-huh.
4 MR. MORGAN: How did you become aware
5 that that's what Representative Whitfield wanted.
6 A. Because Marty told me, Marty and Donna
7 told me.
8 MR. MORGAN: So Marty and Donna told
9 you that Ed wanted them to do meetings, that wasn't
10 a direct conversation you had with Representative
11 Whitfield?
12 A. No, no. I mean why would he tell me
13 that?
14 MR. MORGAN: I believe you said
15 sometimes Ed would tell me things that he wanted and
16 have me tell the staff.
17 A. No, no, no, that's if we are driving
18 in the car, and he's saying, oh, there is this -- I
19 was on the house floor last night and so and so
20 wants to know why I am not co-sponsoring the bill.
21 I meant to be on the bill. Call Cory I am going to
22 be in meetings all day, call Cory and tell him I
23 want to be on that bill. I am talking about he's
24 wanting something done by the staff and I am the
25 messenger.

1 MR. MORGAN: He relays that through
2 you.
3 A. Right.
4 Q. I want to show you a document bates
5 stamped EW3000946. Feel free to read the entire
6 document. I want to ask you about the email from
7 you to Emma at the top.
8 A. What is the question?
9 Q. The question is, why was Ms. -- why
10 was Emma sending you the schedule for the meetings?
11 A. First of all, I don't think this is a
12 list of schedules, a scheduled list, it says I went
13 through the list of Republican E&C members that we
14 have not met with yet, so it's not scheduling
15 meetings.
16 Q. What is it?
17 A. The list -- well, you can read.
18 Q. No, no --
19 A. It says the list of Republican E&C
20 members that we have not met with yet.
21 Q. Okay. When you say let's try the last
22 four on this list plus Greg Walden, what does that
23 mean?
24 A. Well, I think what that means is -- I
25 mean I don't remember this, but I think that it

1 means they are probably good people to talk to.
2 Q. And were you going to attend any of
3 these meetings that she scheduled?
4 A. I wouldn't have known at the time if I
5 was going to attend them or not.
6 Q. Of the members that are listed here,
7 did you attend any meetings with those members?
8 A. Yes, and I did so because the House
9 Ethics Committee told me I could. I was advised by
10 the general counsel that I could do that.
11 Q. And which meetings did you attend?
12 A. I attended the meeting with Billy Long
13 and Cassidy. Harper I am drawing a total blank on.
14 Oh, wait a minute, I may have gone to Harper too.
15 General Counsel told me I could go to any meetings I
16 wanted to with Marty and Donna and Ed's scheduler
17 could set them up.
18 Q. You went to multiple meetings with
19 Marty and Donna that were set up by Representative
20 Whitfield's office?
21 A. Sometimes I set them up on my own, but
22 in the Senate side, I don't think his office had
23 anything to do with it.
24 Q. Okay.
25 A. And again, house counsel said that

1 Ed's office could set up meetings through Emma for
2 Marty and Donna because he wanted members to hear
3 from them and that I could attend them.
4 Q. Okay. And you indicate to the staff
5 members that -- well, let me rephrase that, did you
6 indicate to Emma that you would attend --
7 A. I never knew from one day to the next,
8 there were lots of them I never showed up for,
9 depended what else I was doing that day. She never
10 knew, she never ever knew, ever knew which meetings
11 I was going to. Because I didn't know. And
12 furthermore, it's none of her business. I don't
13 have to tell her that kind of thing, it's just
14 another waste of time for me.
15 Q. I want to show you a document here
16 that is Bates stamped EW3000753. Feel free to read
17 the entire document, but my question simply is why
18 were you requesting that Mr. Hicks set up a meeting?
19 A. I have no idea because I have never
20 met with Yarmouth in my life. I have never stepped
21 foot in his office.
22 Q. Thank you.
23 A. Also it's to the press secretary,
24 Chris Pack, it's not from Cory.
25 Q. Did I say Cory, sorry, I misspoke,

1 from Chris?

2 A. That's another reason why it doesn't

3 make any sense.

4 MR. MORGAN: Well I think the first or

5 second email there is from you to Cory, Hicks and

6 Chris Pack.

7 A. Oh.

8 MR. MORGAN: And then the response at

9 the top there appears to come from Chris Pack.

10 A. Wait, this is confusing, we have an

11 email from Mimi, and then we have Mimi Brody saying

12 I just noticed Representative Yarmouth, and then I

13 added whatever, and then I said can you set up a

14 meeting with Yarmouth, I have no idea. Because

15 number one, he's a Democrat, and I don't tend to

16 work with Democrats, and number two, Chris Pack is

17 the Press Secretary, so that doesn't make any sense.

18 MR. MORGAN: So who would that meeting

19 have been for then.

20 A. I have no idea. I don't understand

21 why -- I have no clue, because as I have said, I

22 have never -- I have been never been in Yarmouth's

23 office, I don't know where it is, I would have no

24 reason to talk to him myself, he was a co-sponsor on

25 the bill, I think, already, so I have absolutely no

1 idea what this refers to, I mean it makes no sense,
2 because Chris Pack was the Press Secretary.
3 Q. At this time period in October of
4 2013, was Chris Pack handling animal welfare issues?
5 A. He's never handled animal welfare
6 issues. Chris Pack?
7 Q. Was there a time period before the
8 hiring of Marty and after Justin Fareed left --
9 A. Well, maybe, maybe, but again, I
10 don't -- I don't know what this question is there, I
11 don't know.
12 Q. Okay.
13 A. I mean I don't understand what it
14 means.
15 Q. That's fine.
16 A. Or what it's for.
17 Q. That's fine, thank you. I want to
18 show you a document Bates stamped HSLFOCE29215, feel
19 free to read the entire document, but I want to ask
20 about the email you sent to Marty at the top.
21 A. Well, FOSH was one of the
22 organizations that strongly supports the bill,
23 Friend of Sound Horses, and they are based in
24 Missouri, which is I think where McCaskill is, and I
25 think that -- I don't know if she was coming to the

1 hill or had been to the hill and was trying to get
2 through to them afterwards, but she met with -- I
3 went with her to Roy Blunt's office from Missouri,
4 and I think, Um, I was just working with Marty to --
5 because Marty was with me I think in a meeting with
6 this woman Teresa, just trying to let him know that
7 those other Missouri offices or the McCaskill office
8 anyway, I don't know who Bragner represents. It
9 would be helpful for them to tell them she's from
10 Missouri.
11 Q. When you say Whitfield's office, what
12 is the significance of that?
13 A. I have no idea.
14 Q. Is there any other way he would
15 contact her other than being from Whitfield's
16 office?
17 A. No.
18 Q. Is this part of what you described
19 earlier, the strategy so that it comes from
20 Representative Whitfield's office as opposed to the
21 Humane Society?
22 A. Probably, although McCaskill is a
23 Democrat, so she likes the Humane Society. I am not
24 sure that would be applicable then.
25 Q. This email is January 2014. Do you

1 have similar type contacts with Marty concerning the
2 PAST Act this year, have you been having contact
3 with him?
4 A. Well, we are on conference calls once
5 a week without about 15 other people.
6 Q. Those conference calls are related to
7 strategy or what specifically?
8 A. Strategy, whose has done what to whom,
9 state of play, it's -- you know, all sorts of
10 people.
11 MR. MORGAN: Who are the people that
12 are on these calls? Is it the coalition of groups
13 interested in the PAST Act?
14 A. Sometimes, it depends on the call.
15 Sometimes it will be people from the equine
16 department, sometimes it will be people from the
17 press department, sometimes it will be people from
18 Federal Affairs, sometimes --
19 MR. MORGAN: You are referring to the
20 Humane Society?
21 A. Yeah.
22 MR. MORGAN: So is this a Humane
23 Society weekly call.
24 A. Sometimes people from HSLF, sometimes
25 from people outside, like AVMA, or the American

1 Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or the
2 Animal Welfare Society, depends on what the agenda
3 is.
4 MR. MORGAN: And Marty is on those
5 calls?
6 A. Yes, he is on those calls.
7 MR. MORGAN: Is anybody else from
8 Representative Whitfield's office on those calls?
9 A. Not to -- I don't think so.
10 Q. Do you also have one on one meetings
11 -- I should rephrase that, have you had one on one
12 meetings with Marty concerning the PAST Act?
13 A. Meetings?
14 Q. Meetings or phone calls or even emails
15 concerning the PAST Act?
16 A. Sure, yeah, as in updating.
17 Q. Did they relate to strategy, strategy
18 as well on the PAST Act?
19 A. No, we are beyond that pretty much.
20 Q. I'm sorry, maybe I am not clear about
21 the time period, I am saying ever, so since Marty
22 has started working for the congressman in December
23 2013 until the present, have you had those type of
24 communications with him where it's not a conference
25 call but it's the two of you discussing strategy or

1 anything else related to the PAST Act?

2 A. That's a broad question.

3 Q. Okay. Have you had conversations with

4 him related to strategy on the PAST Act?

5 A. Since when?

6 MR. MORGAN: Since the time he started

7 working for Representative Whitfield's office.

8 A. I don't know. I mean I don't -- Marty

9 lived with us for almost two months, so we talked

10 about a lot of things. It was more -- it would be

11 more likely that we were talking about status

12 reports, where things are, you know, who is still

13 not on the bill.

14 Q. This is a document bates stamped

15 HSLFOCE0239306, and I draw your an attention to the

16 email from January 1, 2014, when you say Marty and I

17 met all day yesterday RE: Strategy?

18 A. This is what is so cute when you don't

19 show the document. I don't know what that means. I

20 don't know how we can meet all day RE: Strategy,

21 seems like an exaggeration.

22 Q. And the title of the email says --

23 A. Because -- because Marty would have

24 nothing to do with Mary Landrieu doing a fundraisers

25 or women Senators.

1 Q. This is --
2 A. And I am not sure, go ahead.
3 Q. Next sentence says -- all women
4 senators will present to the PAST committee and
5 Priscilla Presley will be the draw, is this related
6 to the PAST Act, this email?
7 A. Well, the part where I am talking
8 about Mary Landrieu doing a fundraiser, yes. And
9 the women Senators who support PAST, yes, and
10 Priscilla Presley being the draw, yes.
11 Q. Just so I am clear, you are just
12 saying that with respect to the sentence of Marty
13 and I met all day regarding strategy, you said you
14 don't know what the strategy was concerning?
15 A. No, I don't. I don't remember.
16 Q. And do you have any --
17 A. It could have been fundraising, I
18 don't know.
19 Q. Do you work with Marty on fundraising?
20 A. No, I do not. He has nothing to do
21 with fundraising. I meant to say media or
22 attention, because it looks like I was talking about
23 get media attention.
24 Q. Concerning Priscilla Presley? Or
25 concerning --

1 A. Concerning attention to people knowing
2 about the topic.
3 Q. What is the topic?
4 A. It's, I think the fact that women
5 Senators support the PAST Act.
6 Q. Okay.
7 A. And that Priscilla Presley supports
8 the PAST Act.
9 Q. Okay. So the discussion would have
10 been about -- well, let me ask you, are you -- does
11 this refresh your recollection that you had a
12 conversation about strategy related to women
13 Senators in supporting the PAST Act?
14 A. No, they already support the PAST Act.
15 Q. Do you have any better understanding
16 what you meant by strategy after what you just said
17 concerning the PAST Act?
18 A. No.
19 Q. And just so I am ultimately clear,
20 with respect to this email, you don't know what
21 strategy was discussed with Marty?
22 A. Not at all, and this is the problem
23 with emails as you know, we write tons and tons of
24 them, thousands and thousands.
25 Q. And the RE line on here is (inaudible)

1 Priscilla Presley, what does Priscilla Presley refer
2 to?
3 A. If you look in the last paragraph of
4 the email, it says Priscilla Presley will be the
5 draw if Keith can get her to do it.
6 Q. And the draw is for discussing the
7 PAST Act?
8 A. No, it's a draw for the fundraiser
9 that Mary Landrieu would be having.
10 Q. Did Priscilla Presley come into town
11 to speak on behalf of the PAST Act?
12 A. Yes, she did.
13 Q. Thank you. This is document bates
14 stamped HSLFOCE029449. Feel free to read the entire
15 document, but I want to draw your attention to the
16 email from you to Mimi which says if okay with you
17 all, I may have Marty stand in for me on Friday. He
18 and I communicate hourly on PAST and I was hoping to
19 take Friday off.
20 A. Well, clearly that's an embellishment
21 exaggeration, obviously he and I do not communicate
22 hourly on PAST. That's a -- how do I say it, it's
23 -- it's an impossibility.
24 Q. How often do you -- well, at that time
25 period, December 2013, how often would you say that

1 you actually communicated regarding PAST?
2 A. Not that often, because -- I don't
3 know when he was hired.
4 Q. December 2, 2013.
5 A. Okay. When he was first hired, he was
6 going through all sorts of training and ethics
7 classes and he was wasn't able -- I mean he was very
8 busy, he was filling out employee reports and
9 meeting people, and whatever, whatever. This is so
10 out of context, I mean he and I -- there is no way
11 we could communicate hourly on PAST, even if we
12 wanted to.
13 Q. And so you are saying you communicated
14 at that time period daily?
15 A. No, no, I don't think so, no.
16 Q. Weekly?
17 A. Let me explain something, because you
18 know what, these questions are very redundant. If I
19 did speak to Marty, it was as part of a group of
20 people who were trying to advance legislation. We
21 are all sharing with each other all the time things
22 like how many co-sponsors do we have, who is pushing
23 back. What is Marsha Blackburn up to. When is
24 Marsha Blackburn going to have an ethics complaint
25 filed against Ed Whitfield, that's the kind of thing

1 we talk about, so it's something all of us are
2 discussing, just as you would if you were working on
3 a project and you wanted to know what the status of
4 the project was.
5 Q. Did you have any conversations --
6 well, did you have conversations with people in his
7 office beyond -- that were beyond typically what the
8 status of it was regarding strategy, not necessarily
9 with Marty Irby, but other staffers with regard to
10 the strategy on how to push the PAST Act?
11 A. I don't remember.
12 Q. I want to show you a document bates
13 stamped EW4001271. I'll ask you questions about the
14 email on the second page from you to I believe Cory
15 Hicks.
16 A. Second page?
17 Q. Yes, where it says Ed is now focused
18 on PAST, we discussed it this morning.
19 A. This is a typical example of Ed
20 Whitfield using me as a messenger. Basically I mean
21 -- often times it's a spouse, the spouse will call a
22 staff person and say this is what my husband wants
23 you to do. That's just what happens, and it happens
24 because the member -- well, Ed is the Chairman of
25 the Energy and Power Subcommittee, okay, so he has

1 meetings like three times a week, so there are
2 plenty of times when he and I are in the car, and he
3 will say to me, oh, get Emma to do this, get Cory to
4 do this, get Marty to do this, and he doesn't have
5 the time to do it so I do it as the dutiful wife.
6 Q. So you are saying that he had you send
7 this list to the staff members related to the PAST
8 Act?
9 A. Sorry?
10 Q. You are saying your husband had you
11 send this list to the --
12 A. Well, he would have said to me, I
13 didn't know he was going before the rules committee,
14 but he was going before the rules committee and he
15 wanted to know when. Because I didn't have anything
16 to do with the rules committee.
17 Q. In what --
18 A. This would be the kind of thing that
19 Ed said to me, these will be the type of documents I
20 need, tell Cory. I need the OIG report, this, this
21 this and this. He knows about all these documents
22 because he has seen them in his office, they all
23 have big stacks of stuff. He knows about the list
24 of endorsements, he's seen all this stuff, and he
25 would say -- he would say I want all the articles in

1 the Tennessee newspapers, this is what I want, tell
2 Cory this is what I want.
3 I think part of the problem was that,
4 because I don't know when Justin left, but after
5 Justin left, Ed felt that there was nobody in the
6 office who was really that familiar with things, and
7 so he -- in this case is a good example, he was --
8 he knew that I knew what these things were, he knew
9 that I knew what these things were, so I was acting
10 like a secretary almost, saying okay, Cory this is
11 what Ed wants.
12 Q. It says here we discussed it this
13 morning and have come up with the following
14 checklist. Did you two --
15 A. Meaning he gave me this checklist to
16 convey to Cory.
17 Q. So you had no input on this checklist?
18 A. As to documents they needed to gather?
19 Q. As to the six that are listed here,
20 did you have any conversations with Representative
21 Whitfield about what should be included?
22 A. Well, if he asked me, is there
23 anything I have left out, maybe I did, but I am
24 telling you what, my husband is probably more
25 knowledgeable about every document related to this

1 bill than anybody I know including me. So he -- I
2 mean he's seen all these things over and over, so he
3 probably would take them off, but he probably said,
4 is there anything I have forgotten.
5 And again, I mean at that point, I am
6 his wife, he's asking me, okay, I am trying to put
7 something together, can you think of anything I have
8 forgotten. I am not working for the Humane Society
9 at that point or HSLF, I am not speaking for HSLF, I
10 am answering his question, is there anything I have
11 forgotten.
12 Q. Does that happen often when it may be
13 something related to the PAST Act where he just
14 needs your help as a wife with working on it and
15 working on the strategy or what to do?
16 A. My husband does not like to ask for
17 help. Usually it's only when he's in a mad rush,
18 and he can't do it himself or there is a deadline
19 and he will say, call Cory, call Emma, call so and
20 so and tell them X.
21 But this kind of stuff, I mean, if
22 amendment is allowed, arrange meeting with Lucas,
23 that's nothing I could have come up with, and only
24 Ed could have said I want to meet with Lucas. I
25 couldn't, say, I arranged a meeting with Congressman

1 Lucas, or arrange a meeting with Peterson. I mean
2 -- that's something Ed would have to say.
3 Q. Okay. Did you have any conversations
4 -- well, let me -- let me ask this.
5 Did you have any meeting with your
6 husband and other members of congress related to the
7 PAST Act?
8 A. I remember two meetings on the Senate
9 side.
10 Q. What were those meetings?
11 A. One was with Alexander, I think this
12 was a long time ago, I don't really remember when it
13 was, it was a long time ago. And I don't even
14 remember why we went over there. I can't remember
15 why we went. But I know that Ed wanted to talk to
16 Lamar about the bill. And Lamar Alexander was the
17 first person to do a fundraiser for my husband when
18 he ran in 1994 and he and I know each other, so Ed
19 said come with me. I never opened my mouth the
20 entire meeting, and I don't think Lamar Alexander
21 even knew I worked for the Humane Society
22 Legislative Fund, he saw me as Ed's wife.
23 Q. But that the meeting was related to,
24 back then, and I guess it was a different version of
25 the PAST Act?

1 A. Probably.
2 Q. And what is the second meeting that
3 you had --
4 A. Second meeting was with Senator Brown
5 of -- from Massachusetts, and again, was it the PAST
6 Act? It may have been the horse slaughter bill. I
7 can't remember which it was. It may have been the
8 horse slaughter legislation but I remember Ed wanted
9 Brown to get on as a co-sponsor on the Senate bill,
10 and --
11 Q. What was your role in that meeting?
12 A. Nothing, I sat there and listened, met
13 his dogs and his daughter.
14 Q. Did you discuss horses and --
15 A. No.
16 Q. Did you discuss the two of you on
17 horses or discuss Scott Brown on horses, and that
18 you all own horses, were there any discussions like
19 that?
20 A. I mean who knows. We do own horses,
21 so it's possible.
22 Q. Do you remember any meetings on the
23 house side with you and Representative Whitfield
24 together discussing the PAST Act?
25 A. With 433 other members.

1 Q. Oh, do you frequently have meetings
2 there with Representative Whitfield, so much that
3 you are saying there are too many meetings?
4 A. No, I am trying to think about all the
5 members, not the number of meetings. I rarely have
6 meetings with my husband.
7 Q. Okay.
8 A. And other members. I don't need to
9 have him in the room, nor does he need me, he
10 definitely doesn't need me. I can't remember any.
11 Q. Document bates stamped HSLFOCE20139.
12 A. I don't think -- I don't think Ed ever
13 went to this meeting.
14 Q. Did you attend the meeting?
15 A. I have met with Phil Roe. Yes, I
16 have. I do not remember -- I don't ever remember Ed
17 being in a meeting with me and Phil Roe. I don't
18 remember. I think -- you know, he often times
19 doesn't show up for meetings.
20 Q. With the meeting with Phil Roe, who
21 attended that meeting that -- (inaudible)?
22 A. I don't remember. When is this, July
23 18, 2012? Well, it couldn't -- I just -- I don't
24 remember. I know I spoke to him and it was the very
25 -- very -- you know, I think he was one of the very

1 first people I ever spoke to.

2 Q. Do you know if a staff member from

3 Representative Whitfield's office attended?

4 A. Well, I definitely don't think Ed did,

5 definitely don't think he did. I don't know.

6 Maybe. I just don't remember.

7 Q. Do you remember if Cory Hicks

8 attended?

9 A. He may have. Here is the deal, Cory,

10 I know, talks to Roe's staff about a lot of issues,

11 so I know he talks with Roe's staff, I know I was in

12 a meeting with Roe, I know. I remember sitting

13 across from him talking to him in his office. Cory

14 may have been in the meeting, I just don't remember.

15 Q. Do you recall what the meeting was

16 about, which legislation?

17 A. Well, it would have been -- well, I

18 know -- he invited Ed and me to a party down in

19 Tennessee at the Bark Ball, the equivalent of the

20 Bark Ball, but I think it was -- yeah, I think

21 Tennessee walking horses, because they are in his

22 district. But again, the house counsel advised me

23 that there was nothing wrong with attending meetings

24 in this set up, so that's what -- and that's why I

25 was there.

1 Q. And I'll be -- when I ask you
2 questions, does not necessarily mean something was
3 wrong, not only does it mean something was wrong,
4 but our office can't even say something was wrong.
5 A. I understand. I just want you to know
6 it was on advice from the General Counsel from the
7 House Ethics Committee that I went to these
8 meetings.
9 Q. Go ahead and explain that then, at
10 what point did you approach the -- at what point did
11 that become a time you were speaking with the
12 General Counsel?
13 A. Again, I don't remember, it was
14 probably sometime -- most recently, I remember over
15 the years, we talked to them all the time. Probably
16 October maybe.
17 MR. MORGAN: Do you recall what
18 prompted you --
19 A. Yes, I can tell you exactly what
20 prompted it. Someone visited Renee Elmer's -- no,
21 no, wrong, somebody who talked to Renee Elmer's --
22 Chief of Staff or LD, trying to arrange a meeting
23 with Ellmers who I have never met in my life, so I
24 was not involved in this but I heard about it. The
25 person on her staff made a statement that they

1 thought that Ed's office shouldn't be involved in
2 setting up meetings, so that got back to me, so I
3 immediately called the House Administration
4 Committee like that day, and I asked to talk to
5 Sensinbrenner, the General Counsel, and I said could
6 you please tell me your position on this. And he
7 said, well, tell me what is going on, what are you
8 doing, blah, blah, blah, so I told him the whole
9 thing, and he said no, that's not a violation, not a
10 violation.
11 Q. What was the issue, you said it was --
12 A. That Whitfield was not supposed to be
13 using his office to set up meetings for Marty and
14 Donna.
15 Q. And then why did you call, was there
16 any issue about you and these meetings, I am trying
17 to understand --
18 A. It's not about the meetings, it's
19 about my husband, my husband, I protect my husband.
20 MR. MORGAN: Why did you call?
21 A. Because he's my husband. I don't want
22 him -- I don't want him to be accused of ethics
23 violations, he's my husband, I am his wife, purely,
24 that's the only -- why wouldn't I do it.
25 MR. MORGAN: We are not suggesting

1 that reaching out to them is something you shouldn't
2 have done, we are trying to understand why you were
3 reaching out to them as opposed to some
4 representative on his staff.
5 A. Because I will tell you why, I want to
6 hear it directly, I don't want to hear it through
7 somebody else.
8 Q. You also mentioned that the reason why
9 you attended the meetings was they told you you
10 could attend the meetings.
11 A. No, that's something different. Okay?
12 I was first dealing with house administration,
13 because I don't want to play the game of telephone
14 and have a word mistranslated by the time it gets to
15 me. And I don't want imprecision, I want to hear it
16 directly, that's why I called, and that's why I will
17 always call myself, and I called Mr. Sensinbrenner
18 back a second time, why, I can't remember, but
19 probably to, okay, I just want to make sure that
20 everything in this scenario is okay, and that what
21 we are doing is okay.
22 It all stemmed from a staff person on
23 Renee Elmer's staff making a statement to somebody
24 that, you know, this isn't right, these meetings
25 aren't right, so Mr. Sensinbrenner said from the

1 standpoint of Mr. Whitfield using his office to set
2 up meetings, we don't have a problem with that. And
3 he said but Connie, I am going to call the General
4 Counsel of House Ethics, he's a friend of mine, and
5 I am going to ask him to call you and I am going to
6 explain to him as a lawyer to lawyer what you have
7 said to me and then you can talk to him about it.
8 Because he said, because I want to talk to him about
9 this also, I want to talk to -- I want the two of us
10 to talk together, so one night at about 6 p.m., I
11 get a phone call from the General Counsel at the
12 House Ethics Committee, and he said, I have talked
13 with Mr. Sensinbrenner and I wanted to get back to
14 you because I wanted to go through with you all of
15 this, and make you feel comfortable that you are not
16 doing anything wrong. And he said I want you to
17 know, this is my last day on the job, I am leaving
18 for a private sector job but I feel so strongly that
19 you need to know that everything is okay, that that
20 is why I am calling you.
21 Q. Okay.
22 A. So he went through every single thing,
23 and he said it is entirely okay for Emma to be
24 setting up meetings. He said it is entirely okay
25 for Emma to be setting up meetings for Donna and

1 Marty and for you to attend any meeting you want,
2 and it is entirely -- what else -- it's entirely
3 okay for you to set up meetings for Marty and Donna.
4 He said you are not doing anything wrong.
5 MR. MORGAN: Was there a discussion
6 with him about the fact that you are a registered
7 lobbyist.
8 A. Yes, he knew that, absolutely.
9 Q. So that was the thing that he was
10 trying -- because he said you are not doing anything
11 wrong, so the thing he was focusing was whether or
12 not something was wrong with you being a lobbyist
13 and attending these meetings?
14 A. Yes, but also the starting point is
15 with Renee Elmer's office, so like what did that
16 meeting, when they said Ed's office is doing
17 something wrong, well, okay Ed's office, what were
18 they doing wrong, I wanted to know, what were they
19 doing wrong, so that's why I called Sensinbrenner
20 and then he called said I want you to talk to this
21 guy at house ethics, because he wanted to make sure
22 we all agree, so he said I am going to call the guy
23 at house ethics, and then I am going to have him
24 call you.
25 Q. Who was the person you spoke with at

house ethics?

A. Whoever was the guy who left recently.

Q. Was that Dan Schwager?

A. Probably.

MR. MORGAN: Does that ring a bell.

A. Yeah, I think that's who it was. It was literally his last night on the job. Because I said I can't believe you are taking the time -- I think we talked, you know, it was in the evening. And he kept saying you are not doing anything wrong, don't worry.

MR. MORGAN: So with that second call, there was the first call where you reached out to Sensinbrenner and then you said it was a second call --

A. I don't remember. Maybe there wasn't a second call.

MR. MORGAN: This is that same October timeframe.

A. Would have been right next to each other, if there was a second call.

MR. MORGAN: Okay. Just want to make sure we have the timeframe right.

A. You know what, I'll tell you what. We had an problem with the chief -- not the chief -- we

1 had a problem with some policemen at -- I had a
2 problem with some policemen at Capitol Hill, and it
3 may have been about that, I may have been calling
4 Sensinbrenner to say look, what was ever done about
5 that.
6 Q. I am going to show you a document
7 bates stamped HSLFOCE012822. Now my question is
8 about, in the middle of the paragraph, it says --
9 this is an email from you to Holly Hazzard, says
10 Yoho told Congressman Whitfield and me that HSUS is
11 evil. I am not trying to get to that part, I am
12 just trying to refresh your recollection about you
13 and Representative Whitfield having a meeting with
14 Yoho?
15 A. A meeting?
16 MR. MORGAN: A conversation.
17 A. Okay. October 19. Okay. About the
18 video, he told Ed about the video. This guy is a
19 veterinarian, okay, Yoho, he's a veterinarian from
20 Florida, he's seen the results of this soring
21 practice to horses which basically cripples them.
22 And he probably feels as passionate or more
23 passionate about the bill as Ed does, and he's a
24 freshman, so he doesn't really know that much, he's
25 brand new.

1 Okay. So what is your question?
2 Q. Does that refresh your recollection of
3 a meeting or conversation between you,
4 Representative Yoho and Congressman Whitfield?
5 A. Ed, I think, met with Yoho and I think
6 I was meeting Ed, and I came into the -- I think I
7 came into the room. And that's when Yoho was saying
8 to Ed, we have to pass this, because otherwise the
9 Humane Society is going to be all over us, and did
10 you know the Humane Society wants animals to have
11 the same rights that humans have, I am standing
12 there listening to this, and that -- and he --
13 that's why I know that part. And he told Ed about
14 the video he had prepared. I never prepared a
15 direct colleague letter for Yoho.
16 Q. And was this in Representative
17 Whitfield's office?
18 A. No, it was somewhere like -- it was
19 like some -- no, it was not in his office. It was
20 like some -- some random room somewhere, there were
21 a bunch of people running around, it may have been
22 near a hearing room. It was very brief, it was very
23 brief.
24 Q. Okay. So not a scheduled meeting?
25 A. No, it was not a scheduled meeting.

1 Q. Okay. Okay. Document bates stamped
2 EW4005262.
3 A. Question?
4 Q. The question is what prompted you to
5 send this email that says that I am not to contact
6 you or Emma directly --
7 A. Okay, well, it's wrong -- it's not
8 wrong -- I mean it's not right, because that's not
9 true. Because Ed -- again, in support of Ed's bill,
10 I mean we were all supporting Ed's bill at that
11 point. I think because of the fact that Marsha
12 Blackburn went to -- went to Fred Upton in a rage
13 and said I am going to file an ethics complaint
14 against Ed Whitfield, that my reaction and because
15 she was roaring around, you know, going to Eric
16 Cantor and all sorts of members threatening Ed, I
17 think I was -- I started to like the turtle putting
18 its head in its shell.
19 MR. MORGAN: I see.
20 A. But I mean it's not true that I am not
21 supposed to contact them in support of Ed's Bill,
22 that's not true. If I am -- I am if I am trying to
23 include them information about something we are all
24 working on together, there is nothing wrong with
25 that.

1 MR. MORGAN: Well, what did you
2 understand Marsha Blackburn's complaint to be
3 regarding?
4 A. Well, I have no idea. I have no idea,
5 she's crazy.
6 MR. MORGAN: She was just going to
7 file a complaint with the ethics committee.
8 A. She's crazy.
9 MR. MORGAN: But you have no idea --
10 A. I have no idea. She went to Fred
11 Upton, she went to Eric Cantor, she went to all
12 sorts of people just foaming at the mouth, just
13 probably because there were so many co-sponsors on
14 the bill, probably because Ed was so successful,
15 probably because there were 51 Senators on the bill,
16 who knows, I am guessing.
17 MR. MORGAN: You don't know what the
18 subject matter of her complaint might have been?
19 A. How would I, how could I possibly
20 know.
21 MR. MORGAN: Well, it seems like what
22 you just said is her doing that prompted you to send
23 this email.
24 A. Ethics, the word ethics.
25 MR. MORGAN: All you knew was ethics.

1 A. Ethics, it's just like with what's her
2 names office, Ellmers, okay, what you are doing
3 isn't right. Okay? Okay. I need to investigate,
4 what does that mean, what are we doing wrong. So
5 she's going to file an ethics complaint.
6 Q. And from that --
7 A. Okay, halt --
8 MR. MORGAN: You thought somehow that
9 ethics complaint might involve you.
10 A. No, absolutely not. Look, do you know
11 what it's like to be in the spotlight for 20 years
12 being married to a member of congress?
13 MR. MORGAN: I don't.
14 A. Okay. You wouldn't want to do it, I
15 assure you. Everything you do and say is completely
16 distorted, usually ends up in the press, always
17 negative, you are attacked for everything you do and
18 say. Okay? So if someone makes a threat like that
19 against my husband who I am very protective of,
20 anything I do, I automatically just like go into a
21 robot mode.
22 MR. MORGAN: Okay. I don't mean to
23 make you defensive, I am just trying to understand
24 --
25 A. I'm sorry, I just get really worked up

1 about this. Because there have been so many hatchet
2 jobs done on us, and the fact is Marsha Blackburn is
3 defending criminals, they are breaking the federal
4 law, every single one of them is breaking the law
5 right now.
6 MR. MORGAN: So was she one of the
7 main opponents of the PAST Act.
8 A. She is the main opponent. She is the
9 main opponent.
10 Q. After this email, did you stop
11 contacting Emma and -- I guess emailing Marty
12 directly or are you saying because it was okay --
13 A. No, first of all, this was a letter to
14 Marty. It basically was trying to tell him, let's
15 cool it. Okay? So it's as much saying to him,
16 like, I don't want to be apart of this right now
17 because of the Marsha thing. But it's sort of like
18 an education of him as much as my saying, look, I
19 don't want to -- I don't to do anything that's going
20 to hurt my husband. No, did I stop working on the
21 bill, no.
22 Q. Did you stop having direct contacts
23 with Emma and Marty?
24 A. Well, I talked to Emma every single
25 day about plane flights, fundraisers, whether or not

1 -- whether we are going to accept an invitation,
2 whether we are going to go on a CODEL, no, I did not
3 stop direct contacts with Emma.
4 Q. Did you stop direct contacts with her
5 as you put it here, related to Ed's bill?
6 A. First of all, she's a scheduler, so I
7 would have very little reason to talk to her about
8 Ed's bill.
9 Q. Would you talk to her about scheduling
10 meetings related to Ed's bill?
11 A. I don't think she scheduled any
12 meetings since -- well, I don't know. I mean --
13 MR. MORGAN: Well, we are trying to
14 understand the email better too. So --
15 A. Alright, what is it -- what is your
16 question?
17 Q. You are saying in this email that you
18 were going to stop contacting Emma and Marty.
19 A. No, that's not what I am saying.
20 MR. MORGAN: Directly in support of
21 Ed's bill.
22 A. No, that's not what I am saying.
23 Q. What are you saying?
24 A. I said I am not to contact Emma or
25 Marty directly in support of Ed's bill. That's me

1 talking, that's me. No one told me that. No one
2 told me that.
3 MR. MORGAN: So this email wasn't
4 something you sent after reaching out to the ethics
5 committee or house administration.
6 A. No, not at all. No, they told me
7 everything I was doing was okay, everything. I did
8 this because of Marsha Blackburn and that was me, I
9 am imposing that on myself, no one told me this, no
10 one.
11 MR. MORGAN: Did at any point the
12 ethics committee tell you it was okay for you to
13 contact Ed's staff in support of legislation?
14 A. No, that didn't come up.
15 MR. MORGAN: The conversations you had
16 with house administration and the ethics committee
17 were related to your ability to attend meetings that
18 his office had set up? I just want to make sure I
19 understand --
20 A. They said that, well, we have already
21 cleared that part, okay, the meetings, all of that,
22 that was all okay.
23 MR. MORGAN: Okay. We talked about
24 that.
25 A. All of that was okay. So what is your

1 question?

2 MR. MORGAN: Other issues that you

3 discussed with ethics beyond those meetings, were

4 there any other times that you reached out to

5 ethics.

6 A. No.

7 MR. MORGAN: As I am sure you can

8 imagine to the extent you or Representative

9 Whitfield's office had communication with the ethics

10 committee and they okayed certain things, that's

11 very relevant to what we are looking at.

12 A. Oh, yeah, but this was this one

13 conversation, because this was this guy's last

14 night, literally on the job.

15 Q. In January of this year, did there

16 come a time when Emma was working on scheduling

17 meetings for PAST Act activities and there was push

18 back --

19 A. Yes, yes, there was.

20 Q. Okay. And --

21 A. I can't remember who the meetings were

22 with, but I remember there was -- yes, there was

23 push back, and it was because in my opinion, she was

24 being lazy.

25 Q. Did you discuss that with

1 Representative Whitfield about the need for her to
2 actually schedule the meetings?
3 A. I think I talked to Cory.
4 Q. Do you recall any contacts or
5 communications with Representative Whitfield about
6 the need for Emma to schedule the meetings?
7 A. I complain about his staff on
8 occasion, I may have said -- I may have said that --
9 to him that she was being -- dragging her feet.
10 Q. And what was his response?
11 A. He basically never responds to what I
12 am saying. He just takes it in and then -- you
13 know, a day or two later, he may say to Emma or Cory
14 or to me something, but at the time that I am
15 talking to him, he usually never says anything.
16 Q. I want to talk about different
17 legislation quickly. Have you had contact with
18 Representative Whitfield's staff regarding other
19 legislation that you were working on with the Humane
20 Society, such as the Puppy Uniform Protection and
21 Safety Act?
22 A. Uh-uh. Well, have I had contact --
23 what does that mean?
24 Q. Asking them to -- regarding language
25 in the bill?

1 A. God, I can't imagine.
2 MR. MORGAN: Just trying to refresh
3 your recollection here.
4 Q. This is document number HSLFOCE020961.
5 I am drawing your attention to your email to Cory
6 that begins since you are working with Chris on the
7 bill, can you have him delete the two words.
8 A. Oh, this is not the puppy mill bill.
9 Q. Oh, okay, okay.
10 A. This is not the puppy mill bill.
11 Q. What is this? I'm sorry, I apologize,
12 what is this?
13 A. I don't know.
14 MS. MAY: Is this the Doctrine of the
15 Therapy at the Veteran's.
16 A. Oh, this has to do with Michael Grimm.
17 This is Michael Grimm's bill. This bill was
18 Congressman Michael Grimm's of New York bill.
19 Q. You are sending the language to Cory
20 -- why did you send the language to Cory?
21 A. He was working with Congressman
22 Grimm's -- oh, since you are working with Chris on
23 the bill, can you have him delete the two words if
24 appropriate after the mention of shelter dogs --
25 (inaudible). Who is he, I don't know who he is.

1 I can understand why he removed
2 preferred before option. I don't -- I mean I don't
3 know who he is.
4 Q. Okay. This is an email to Cory. Is
5 that correct?
6 A. Yeah.
7 Q. Okay.
8 A. Well, this talks about the HSUS
9 applauds Representative Grimm for seeking to help
10 veterans and shelter dogs, press release.
11 Q. And in working with Chris, can you
12 have him, is it possible that the him refers to
13 someone by the name of Chris?
14 A. Chris was Michael Grimm's Legislative
15 Director.
16 Q. Okay. And did you want Cory to send
17 this information to Chris?
18 A. He was working with Chris on it.
19 Q. So was that the purpose of this email,
20 to send this information to Chris?
21 A. Yeah, because I know that Grimm did --
22 okay, that -- I was -- okay, the Humane Society
23 wanted shelter dogs to be eligible. Michael Grimm
24 didn't really want that, so I -- I think was trying
25 to tell Cory that Mike -- because I had met with the

1 LD in Michael Grimm's office, that even though the
2 Humane Society wanted shelter dogs, Michael Grimm
3 didn't, so I think that was why the suggestion of if
4 appropriate.
5 Q. Okay.
6 A. Instead of making it sound like you
7 have to have shelter dogs. So I was just relaying
8 what Chris wanted.
9 Q. Okay. I see. We understand that
10 better. Thank you.
11 A. Because I met with Chris a lot on this
12 bill because that's a personal interest I have, that
13 -- and Michael Grimm introduced the bill.
14 MR. MORGAN: Why wouldn't you send
15 that email to directly to Chris then or call him
16 directly.
17 A. Because I think I had just talked to
18 him, and I think -- I don't even know what this
19 refers to, the two words if appropriate, and I don't
20 know if it's talking about the press release or
21 legislation or what. I don't really know what it's
22 talking about. So -- I don't know. All I know is
23 that Grimm didn't want shelter dogs, the Humane
24 Society and HSLF did, I was just trying to convey to
25 Cory because I know Grimm looks to Ed for animal

1 issues that Grimm's office didn't want shelter dogs.
2 Q. Do you ever contact Representative
3 Whitfield's staff related to Representative
4 Whitfield signing onto bills?
5 A. Well, sometimes if Ed forgets and
6 somebody runs into him on the house floor, and they
7 say why are you not on this bill this year, and
8 again, we will be home or something, and I'll be --
9 Ed will say remind Cory to put me on this bill, or
10 if Ed was on a bill, and it's about to come up for a
11 vote or something like that, and he's not on it, I
12 will say to Cory, why isn't he on this bill this
13 year?
14 Q. Okay.
15 MR. MORGAN: Let me try to understand
16 that a little bit more. You would be then relaying
17 the message for --
18 A. Yeah, yeah.
19 MR. MORGAN: Is that a common
20 practice?
21 A. More common probably than I would
22 like.
23 MR. MORGAN: Okay. Does
24 Representative Whitfield, does he --
25 A. I mean his staff will tell you --

1 MR. MORGAN: -- himself --
2 A. He's very bad about that.
3 MR. MORGAN: -- emails --
4 A. No, he's not good about sending
5 emails. He doesn't even look at most of his emails.
6 The biggest problem my husband has with his staff is
7 he's so consumed with being the Chairman of the
8 Energy and Power Subcommittee and that takes up like
9 five or six hours, a single hearing, preparation for
10 that takes hours. So they will all tell you he's
11 not good as a manager, he is not good internally and
12 Emma will wait a month to talk to him about whether
13 he wants to respond yes or no to an invitation, so a
14 lot of times they will call me.
15 MR. MORGAN: Because you are more
16 responsive.
17 A. Yeah, because I am more available.
18 They will say Mrs. Whitfield we have been trying to
19 get Congressman Whitfield to tell us -- well, it's
20 just like the other day, Cory called me and said
21 will the Congressman be able to testify, he didn't
22 call Ed, he called me, so I mean that happens a lot.
23 MR. MORGAN: Okay.
24 Q. Has the Humane Society ever had you
25 try to get Ed to -- sorry, Representative Whitfield

1 to sign onto a bill or to sign a letter or anything
2 like that?
3 A. Get him to sign onto a bill? Well,
4 maybe to mention it, you know, maybe, there is this
5 bill coming around the corner. But, you know what,
6 I can't get my husband to do things, he and his
7 staff are the ones who decide, and what they care
8 about more than anything is constituents, so that's
9 why for example, that's why he will not support the
10 Humane Society on certain issues, if it's contrary
11 to his constituents' positions, views, values.
12 Q. In those situations where they -- the
13 Humane Society may ask you to run something by Ed,
14 do you speak to him about it?
15 A. Sorry, just one second. Good God,
16 this says the Feds are readying criminal charges
17 against Representative Michael Grimm? Sorry?
18 Q. In those situations where the Humane
19 Society may ask you to speak with Representative
20 Whitfield, do you run things by him to see whether
21 or not he wants to sign on or take some type of
22 action that they have requested?
23 A. It's possible, again, as an efficiency
24 thing, it's possible, it's possible. Like are you
25 planning to sign onto this bill, yeah, it's

1 possible. But I mean I ask him about all sorts of
2 bills, are you going to sign onto Moran's bill for X
3 or are you going to sign onto Tim Petri's bill for
4 Y.
5 MR. MORGAN: Has there ever been a
6 time where you had disagreements over what action
7 he should take with regards to a Humane Society
8 issue?
9 A. Probably. However, you know, I am so
10 acutely aware of his constituents, honestly there
11 are certain issues I don't touch because of his
12 district, I don't touch anything having to do with
13 farming, so for example he's opposed to the Humane
14 Society's position on don't use antibiotics in
15 cattle, Ed believes in using them. I would never
16 discuss that with him.
17 MR. MORGAN: So you have a general
18 sense --
19 A. Nor do I -- I don't work on that
20 stuff. I would never even go there.
21 MR. MORGAN: I see.
22 A. Anything relating to EPA, anything
23 relating to climate change, anything relating to oil
24 and gas, natural gas, they all know, I don't work on
25 that, ever. So it's basically dogs and horses that

1 I work on.

2 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

3 A. Basically that's all I work on, dogs

4 and horses.

5 MR. MORGAN: And those are areas where

6 you and Representative Whitfield tend to agree.

7 A. Like that, yeah. I mean I can't think

8 of an instance when we have never not agreed on

9 anything relating to dogs and horses, anything. But

10 I mean the other stuff, I don't even work on that

11 stuff, I don't even know about that stuff as far as

12 the Humane Society and it's a lot more of their

13 work, I mean dogs and horses are a dot in their

14 universe.

15 Q. You mentioned earlier that you know

16 Marty Irby. How long have you known him?

17 A. Well, that's so funny, it's not long

18 but it's been intense. I can't remember when we

19 first met, I knew about him, I knew of him because

20 of the huge sacrifices he made. Cory Hicks knew him

21 long before I did. And he talked to Marty a lot on

22 the phone and he said, you know, this guy is

23 unbelievable, and blah, blah, blah, and then he

24 offered to come up here and talk about the issue as

25 someone who lived it and who -- when he took his

1 position, he lost everything. So I mean that was --
2 I had nothing to do with that as far as how he ended
3 up here. I had no thought about whether he should
4 be here because I didn't know him. I thought it was
5 sad what had happened to him.
6 So I can't remember the first time we
7 met but we did, and I think he and I were in a
8 meeting together, and he was incredibly
9 knowledgeable and so he -- you know, he -- he was
10 staying -- he and Donna were staying somewhere and
11 then that time passed, and then I invited him to
12 stay with us, because he had absolutely no money,
13 and he was trying to find a job, and, you know,
14 because his job had been taken away from him, so he
15 was thinking about jobs with the Humane Society at
16 that point.
17 Q. Did you help him or -- with his
18 attempt to find a job with the Humane Society?
19 A. No.
20 Q. And why is that?
21 A. Why would I?
22 Q. You worked at the Humane Society?
23 A. I don't. I work at HSLF.
24 Q. Okay. Alright, did you attempt to
25 have him find a job at HSLF?

1 A. No, I never was involved in any of his
2 job activities.
3 MR. MORGAN: You didn't assist with
4 his job search in anyway.
5 A. No.
6 Q. Including with the Congressman's
7 office?
8 A. I mean I know that he applied for
9 different jobs, I don't -- I can't tell you exactly
10 how many, I can't tell you exactly where. I knew
11 about the Humane Society job because it was just
12 mentioned to me that he was being considered for a
13 job.
14 Q. This is a document Bates stamped
15 HSLFOCE --
16 A. Wait, I did try to help him with one
17 -- before we look at this document, I did try to
18 help him, I talked with Keith Dane of our office and
19 said why don't you call the American Horse Council
20 or the American Veterinary Medical Association and
21 see if they will hire him because then he could
22 continue to be an advocate for this issue and
23 because he's so passionate about it and he could be
24 paid.
25 MR. MORGAN: When he was -- we

1 understand he was up here in Washington, D.C. for
2 awhile going to these meetings, October,
3 November-ish. You said he didn't have any money.
4 He didn't have a job. Is that correct?
5 A. Correct.
6 MR. MORGAN: Do you know who was
7 covering his day-to-day expenses during that period.
8 A. I think Friends of Sound Horses was,
9 which is an outside group supporting the bill.
10 Q. Did you have any conversations with
11 Representative Whitfield about the fact that if Mr.
12 Irby went to work at his office, he could still work
13 on the PAST Act?
14 A. I think that was assumed. I mean I
15 don't think I would have said that because I mean --
16 first of all, you know, he's Ed's Press Secretary
17 now, so what happens with people in Ed's office, I
18 don't have anything to do with. I mean I don't
19 know. I think Justin Fareed left, I don't think
20 there was anybody working on the legislation the way
21 -- there had been a dedicated person before, so I am
22 sure that's why Ed wanted to hire him.
23 Q. But you don't recall any conversations
24 with Representative Whitfield concerning that?
25 A. Concerning what? Concerning what?

1 Q. Hiring Marty that such that he could
2 be able to work on the PAST Act when he entered the
3 congressional office?
4 A. It's possible that I said, oh, that
5 would be a great idea or he would be a great
6 advocate.
7 Q. Okay. The document before you
8 HSLFOCE006209. My question to you simply is what is
9 this dinner that is scheduled and referred to?
10 A. These members and spouses are
11 attending along with you and Congressman Whitfield.
12 I want -- I know exactly what this is. This is the
13 annual reunion that the class of 1994 has.
14 Q. Why did you forward it to the
15 individuals at the Humane Society cc Kate and
16 Jessica?
17 A. What year is this? 2012? But what
18 did I say?
19 Q. You didn't say anything.
20 A. I don't know. Because I don't really
21 work with Kate. This is -- some of these people are
22 out of office, I mean -- I don't know.
23 Q. Okay. Did you know -- well, are you
24 aware that Sara Amundson attended the State of the
25 Union address in 2014?

A. I am.

Q. How did that come about, did you invite her --

A. I get a ticket to every inauguration and every State of the Union. It's my ticket and I give it to people I want to give it to. One year I gave it to a woman who was dying of cancer.

And I am tired of listening to President Obama talk and I have no interest of going to either his inauguration or his State of the Union. Sara on the other hand worships the ground that he walks on, so I thought she will enjoy this.

Q. I have a question about email addresses. In the emails we received, there is one email [redacted]@verizon.net. Who email address is that?

A. It's our home computer.

Q. Do you use that email address personally?

A. You mean for my personal?

Q. No, I mean do you use that email address?

A. Sometimes if this thing isn't working, sometimes I do, yeah.

Q. Does Representative Whitfield use it

as well?

A. Sometimes, not often.

Q. And then there is another email, wew --

A. That's his personal.

Q. He uses that one?

A. Yeah, but he lost it, it's gone.

Q. Okay. Did you ever use that email address?

A. If it was something like do you want to go on this CODEL, shall I take the dogs out, have you fed the dogs, maybe.

Q. Oh, I mean you would send something from it?

A. Oh, no, no, no. No, no, no, no, no.

Q. But you do send emails from [redacted]@verizon.net --

A. To whom?

Q. To anyone, well to members of Representative Whitfield's staff.

A. It's possible. As I said, if my computer is down, yeah.

Q. Okay. You complete evaluations as an employee of HSLF?

A. I go through the motions, yeah, I

1 don't take them very seriously.

2 Q. In one of your evaluations in 2011 you

3 had a quote that says unusual willingness -- when

4 you were self-evaluating, says "unusual willingness

5 to sacrifice political capital and my husband's

6 political fortunes for the sake of the HSLF?

7 A. Right.

8 Q. What does that mean when you say

9 husband's political fortunes?

10 A. Can you hand me the document?

11 Q. I don't have the document.

12 A. Okay. You have to reread it then.

13 Q. Unusual willingness to sacrifice

14 political capital and my husband's political

15 fortunes for the sake of the HSLF.

16 A. Making people mad at me, making people

17 mad at what I do.

18 Q. So can you explain? I just don't

19 understand how that sacrifices his political

20 fortunes.

21 A. Making other members of congress

22 angry, so they are angry at him.

23 Q. Because of your work for the Humane

24 Society?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. What is your current salary?
2 A. $87,000. And I get paid that
3 regardless of what I work on, regardless of what I
4 work on.
5 MR. MORGAN: That amount is not tied
6 to the success of any particular pieces of
7 legislation.
8 A. Nothing, zero, nothing, no. If I were
9 working on a bill related to dog kennels, I would be
10 paid the same amount. Anything, doesn't matter what
11 I am working on.
12 Q. Do you have any questions?
13 MR. MORGAN: I would like to go back
14 through my notes to see.
15 Q. While he's looking, I just want to ask
16 you about this, it's a document bates stamped
17 EW4004770. I am going to ask about the statement
18 when you say Cory, please be sure that Ed votes for
19 the Peters amendment today.
20 A. This is another example of Ed and I
21 were probably in the car, it's 11:48 a.m., is that
22 we were talking -- wait a minute, oh, no, he was
23 talking with Stacey. And he probably said -- well,
24 maybe not, I don't know. I think what I was doing
25 here, I was reminding Cory that the time before Ed

1 was actually -- went to the house floor and spoke on
2 behalf of this bill, he was one of the primary
3 sponsors. And probably I had just found out that it
4 was coming up and probably I was wanting to make
5 sure they were aware that it was coming up for a
6 vote. And that he voted that way before, so.
7 Q. Okay. Thank you.
8 Well, I want to know in general about
9 the ethics restrictions that -- if you had any with
10 respect to contacting Ed's office, so did
11 Representative Whitfield ever talk to you about if
12 there are limits or restrictions on contacting his
13 staff?
14 A. He didn't need to. I mean I knew what
15 the restrictions were.
16 Q. What are the restrictions as you
17 understand them?
18 A. I am not supposed to lobby his staff.
19 I am not supposed to lobby him.
20 Q. Okay. You can -- which question were
21 you saying?
22 MR. MORGAN: I don't know that we have
23 the email here, but there was an email in which I
24 think you referenced having a meeting with
25 Representative Whitfield and outside ethics counsel,

1 not the ethics committee but like a political
2 attorney, I think it was Jan Baran perhaps that was
3 referenced in the email?
4 A. It had nothing to do with ethics, it
5 was a personal matter. It was not a political
6 matter, it had absolutely nothing to do with
7 congress.
8 MR. MORGAN: And when you say you
9 understand you are not to lobby Representative
10 Whitfield or his staff, what do you understand
11 lobbying means in that context.
12 A. I am not supposed to try to influence
13 them to take a position on legislation on behalf of
14 my client, my employer, HSLF.
15 MR. MORGAN: Okay. At any time of
16 day? Does that restriction apply sort of 24 hours a
17 day, seven days a week, wherever you happen to be or
18 is it limited to not lobbying them while they are in
19 the office or on official time?
20 A. I think it's all the time.
21 MR. MORGAN: Okay.
22 Q. And have you had that understanding
23 since you registered to lobby in 2011?
24 A. What is the relevancy of that
25 question? I don't understand what -- I don't

1 understand --

2 Q. I am trying to understand. You said

3 that's what your understanding is. How long has

4 that been your understanding?

5 A. It's kind of like a fish in water, I

6 don't know precisely when it started.

7 Q. Okay.

8 MR. MORGAN: Okay.

9 Q. Fair enough. Well, do you have

10 anything that you think would be helpful, anything

11 you want to clarify, any comments you would like to

12 make?

13 A. No. I mean -- no, I mean you know how

14 I feel, you can tell, I have made myself pretty

15 clear. I think -- I think you guys have done a

16 great job and I say that, even though it's been a

17 horrendous stress on ten or so people, but I think

18 you have done what you had to do, and so I don't

19 hold any ill-will against you, but I do know several

20 members, good men, who are choosing not to run again

21 because of the OCE, and it's really sad to me that,

22 you know, it is -- you know, I get upset because I

23 just think there are better things to do than drag

24 people.

25 But on the other hand, I understand

1 when a complaint is made even anonymously or by
2 someone stated that they are angry and they are
3 going to file one, you have to see it through,
4 but I just -- you know, I just think it's
5 unfortunate.
6 (Whereupon, the recording is
7 terminated.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

2

3 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
4 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
5 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
6 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
7 forth.
8 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
10 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
11 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
12 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
13 the action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 _____
22 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XIO1717
23 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey
24 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
25

A

ability 56:17
able 34:7 63:21 70:2
absolutely 25:25 47:8 53:10 67:12 76:6
accept 55:1
access 10:1
accurate 79:4
accused 44:22
act 10:8,13,17 11:5 11:8 14:12 15:23 20:13,22 28:2,13 29:12,15,18 30:1 30:4 31:6 32:5,8 32:13,14,17 33:7 33:11 35:10 36:8 38:13 39:7,25 40:6,24 54:7 57:17 58:21 69:13 70:2
acting 37:9
action 64:22 65:6 79:10,13
activities 57:17 68:2
acutely 65:10
added 25:13
address 11:6 70:25 71:15,18,22 72:9
addresses 71:14
administration 44:3 45:12 56:5 56:16
advance 34:20
advice 43:6
advised 23:9 42:22
advisor 3:3 4:21 5:6
advocate 4:10 13:6 68:22 70:6
advocating 20:23
affairs 28:18
agenda 29:2
ago 39:12,13
agree 15:9 47:22 66:6
agreed 66:8
ahead 19:21 20:7 20:11 31:2 43:9
airport 7:11
alexander 39:11,16 39:20
allowed 38:22
alright 17:12 55:15 67:24
alzheimers 10:23
amendment 38:22 74:19
american 11:11,12 14:24,24 28:25 68:19,20
amount 74:5,10
amundson 6:21 70:24
angry 73:22,22 78:2
animal 6:7,9 26:4,5 29:2 61:25
animals 6:4 29:1 50:10
annoyed 17:25
annual 70:13
anonymously 78:1
answering 38:10
antibiotics 65:14
anybody 5:18 6:17 29:7 38:1 69:20
anyway 4:9 9:7 27:8 68:4
apart 54:16
apologize 59:11
appears 25:9
applauds 60:9
applicable 27:24
applied 68:8
apply 76:16
approach 43:10
appropriate 59:24 61:4,19
approximately 3:10
april 1:5 2:10 79:24
areas 66:5
arent 45:25
arrange 38:22 39:1 43:22
arranged 13:15 38:25
articles 36:25
asked 4:1,12 16:7 16:15 18:20 37:22 44:4
asking 17:3 18:6,21 19:9,10,10,12 38:6 58:24
assist 68:3
association 11:13 14:25,25 68:20
assumed 69:14
assure 53:15
attacked 53:17
attempt 67:18,24
attend 13:12 23:2,5 23:7,11 24:3,6 41:14 45:10 47:1 56:17
attended 15:24 23:12 41:21 42:3 42:8 45:9 70:24
attending 16:1 42:23 47:13 70:11
attention 30:15 31:22,23 32:1 33:15 59:5
attorney 2:9 76:2 79:9,11
august 3:9,10
authority 3:20 8:23
automatically 53:20
available 63:17
avma 28:25
aware 21:4 65:10 70:24 75:5
awhile 69:2

B

back 6:15 13:11 34:23 39:24 44:2 45:18 46:13 57:18 57:23 74:13
bad 14:2 63:2
ball 42:19,20
ban 8:20
banning 3:18
baran 76:2
bark 42:19,20
based 26:23
basically 13:21 35:20 49:21 54:14 58:11 65:25 66:3
bates 22:4 24:16 26:18 30:14 33:13 35:12 41:11 49:7 51:1 68:14 74:16
beginning 9:11 17:16,20
begins 59:6
behalf 4:1 33:11 75:2 76:13
believe 21:14 35:14 48:8
believes 65:15
bell 48:5
benefit 16:12
bennefield 13:5
best 4:14 9:19
better 15:6 32:15 55:14 61:10 77:23
beyond 29:19 35:7 35:7 57:3
big 3:3 36:23
biggest 63:6
bill 3:17 4:6 7:14 7:14,20 11:18,24 12:1,12 13:11 14:17,21,23 15:19 21:20,21,23 25:25 26:22 30:13 38:1 39:16 40:6,9 49:23 51:9,10,21 52:14,15 54:21 55:5,8,10,21,25 58:25 59:7,8,10 59:17,17,18,23 61:12,13 62:7,9 62:10,12 64:1,3,5 64:25 65:2,3 69:9 74:9 75:2
bills 8:15 62:4 65:2
billy 23:12
bit 62:16
blackburn 34:23,24 51:12 54:2 56:8
blackburns 52:2
blah 44:8,8,8 66:23 66:23,23
blank 23:13
blunt 7:3,23
blunts 27:3
boone 8:25 9:5
bragner 27:8
brain 10:22
brand 49:25
breads 3:24
breaking 54:3,4
breed 4:5
brief 50:22,23
bringing 8:23
broad 30:2
brody 25:11
brown 40:4,9,17
bryson 1:10 2:3
bunch 50:21
business 24:12
busy 34:8

C

c 22:13,19 69:1
calendar 16:23
call 7:22 21:21,22 28:14,23 29:25 35:21 38:19,19,19 44:15,20 45:17 46:3,5,11 47:22 47:24 48:12,13,14 48:17,21 61:15 63:14,22 68:19
called 2:15 7:23 13:11,12 16:19 44:3 45:16,17 47:19,20 63:20,22
calling 46:20 49:3
calls 28:4,6,12 29:5 29:6,8,14
cancer 71:7
cant 13:12 38:18 39:14 40:7 41:10 43:4 45:18 48:8 57:21 59:1 64:6 66:7,18 67:6 68:9 68:10
cantor 51:16 52:11
capacity 5:6 8:21

capital 73:5,14
capitol 49:2
car 16:16 21:18 36:2 74:21
care 9:21 64:7
case 37:7
cassidy 23:13
cattle 65:15
cc 70:15
celebrities 5:9
center 15:2
certain 9:21 18:4 18:24 57:10 64:10 65:11
certificate 79:1
certify 79:3,8
chairman 3:19 8:22 35:24 63:7
chance 7:7,8
change 5:19 65:23
charge 15:20
charges 64:16
checklist 37:14,15 37:17
chief 43:22 48:25 48:25
choice 15:8
choosing 77:20
chris 24:24 25:1,6,9 25:16 26:2,4,6 59:6,22 60:11,13 60:14,17,18,20 61:8,11,15
citizen 12:25 13:6
citizens 8:23
clarify 77:11
class 70:13
classes 34:7
clear 17:17,18 29:20 31:11 32:19 77:15
cleared 56:21
clearly 33:20
client 76:14
climate 65:23
clue 25:21
coalition 28:12
cochran 13:14,15 13:22,22
codel 55:2 72:11
codels 7:18
colleague 50:15
colleagues 9:25
combination 5:20
come 5:7 7:22 25:9 33:10 37:13 38:23 39:19 56:14 57:16 62:10 66:24 71:2
comes 10:22 27:19
comfortable 6:1 7:19 46:15
coming 5:12 26:25 64:5 75:4,5
comments 77:11
commission 79:24
committee 23:9 31:4 36:13,14,16 43:7 44:4 46:12 52:7 56:5,12,16 57:10 76:1
common 62:19,21
communicate 33:18,21 34:11
communicated 34:1,13
communication 57:9
communications 29:24 58:5
complain 58:7
complaint 34:24 51:13 52:2,7,18 53:5,9 78:1
complete 72:23
completely 53:15
computer 71:17 72:22
concerning 20:22 28:1 29:12,15 31:14,24,25 32:1 32:17 69:24,25,25
concerns 8:3
conducting 18:3
conference 28:4,6 29:24
confusing 25:10
congress 39:6 53:12 73:21 76:7
congressional 2:4 70:3
congressman 29:22 38:25 49:10 50:4 59:18,21 63:19,21 70:11
congressmans 68:6
[redacted] 7:13 13:16 46:3
consciously 5:18
considered 68:12
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:5
constituents 4:2 64:8,11 65:10
consumed 63:7
contact 15:24 16:2 19:24 27:15 28:2 51:5,21 55:24 56:13 58:17,22 62:2
contacting 54:11 55:18 75:10,12
contacts 5:23 20:15 20:19,21 28:1 54:22 55:3,4 58:4
context 34:10 76:11
continue 68:22
contrary 64:10
conversation 21:10 32:12 49:16 50:3 57:13
conversations 6:11 30:3 35:5,6 37:20 39:3 56:15 69:10 69:23
convey 37:16 61:24
cool 54:15
cooper 7:11,20
coreys 15:13
corner 64:5
correct 60:5 69:4,5
cory 13:19 14:16 16:17 20:1 21:21 21:22 24:24,25 25:5 35:14 36:3 36:20 37:2,10,16 38:19 42:7,9,13 58:3,13 59:5,19 59:20 60:4,16,25 61:25 62:9,12 63:20 66:20 74:18 74:25
cosponsor 12:1 25:24 40:9
cosponsoring 21:20
cosponsors 11:24 12:15 20:4,10,13 34:22 52:13
couldnt 11:25 38:25 41:23
council 11:11 14:24 68:19
counsel 23:10,15,25 42:22 43:6,12 44:5 46:4,11 75:25 79:9,12
couple 4:11
covering 69:7
crazy 52:5,8
criminal 64:16
criminals 54:3
cripples 49:21
cruelty 29:1
csr 1:15
current 74:1
currently 2:11
cute 30:18

D

d 69:1
dad 10:23
daily 8:12 34:14
dan 48:3
dane 68:18
date 10:22 79:6
dates 3:10 10:23 14:2
daughter 40:13
day 13:16 21:22 24:7,9 30:17,20 31:13 44:4 46:17 54:25 58:13 63:20 76:16,17
days 76:17
daytoday 69:7
dc 4:4
dead 10:22
deadline 38:18
deal 42:9
dealing 9:10 45:12
december 29:22 33:25 34:4
decide 3:15 64:7
decision 15:9,9,10 15:11,13
dedicated 69:21
defending 54:3
defensive 53:23
definitely 41:10 42:4,5
delete 59:7,23
democrat 25:15 27:23
democratic 5:24
democrats 5:23 25:16
department 28:16 28:17
depended 24:9
dependent 18:10
depends 19:3 28:14 29:2
derby 4:8
describe 12:19 19:8
described 27:18
determining 20:17
didnt 4:25 12:21 14:17 20:6 24:11 36:13,15 56:14 60:24 61:3,23 62:1 63:21 67:4 68:3 69:3,4 70:19 75:14
different 4:2 11:10 20:23 39:24 45:11 58:16 68:9
dinner 70:9
direct 21:10 50:15 54:22 55:3,4
directly 5:7 6:20 9:10 45:6,16 51:6 54:12 55:20,25 61:15,16
director 60:15
disagreements 15:4 65:6

discuss 40:14,16,17 57:25 65:16
discussed 5:21 32:21 35:18 37:12 57:3
discussing 20:18 29:25 33:6 35:2 40:24
discussion 32:9 47:5
discussions 6:12 40:18
distinctly 12:17
distorted 53:16
district 4:3 42:22 65:12
doctrine 59:14
document 16:25 17:7,8 18:5,7,11 18:16,19,22 19:14 19:17 22:4,6 24:15,17 26:18,19 30:14,19 33:13,15 35:12 37:25 41:11 49:6 51:1 59:4 68:14,17 70:7 73:10,11 74:16
documents 17:4 18:1,18,24 19:2,5 19:11 36:19,21 37:18
doesnt 15:20 25:2 25:17 36:4 41:10 41:19 49:24 63:5 74:10
dog 7:23,24,24 74:9
dogs 40:13 59:24 60:10,23 61:2,7 61:23 62:1 65:25 66:3,9,13 72:11 72:12
doing 5:11 10:6,11 24:9 30:24 31:8 44:8 45:21 46:16 47:4,10,16,18,19 48:10 52:22 53:2 53:4 56:7 74:24
donna 13:5 16:8 21:2,6,8 23:16,19 24:2 44:14 46:25 47:3 67:10
dont 5:17,19,25 6:17 8:5,11 10:1,1 11:15,22 12:9,10 12:11 14:7,19 17:5 18:25 19:14 20:2,5,8,16,20,25 22:11,25 23:22 24:12 25:15,20,23 26:10,10,11,13,25 27:8 29:9 30:8,8 30:18,19,20 31:14 31:15,15,18 32:20 34:2,15 35:11 37:4 39:12,13,20 41:8,12,12,16,17 41:22,23 42:4,5,5 42:6,14 43:13 44:21,22 45:6,13 45:15 46:2 48:11 48:16 52:17 53:13 53:22 54:16,19,19 55:11,12 59:13,25 60:2,2 61:18,19 61:21,22 65:11,12 65:14,19,24 66:10 66:11 67:23 68:9 68:19 69:15,18,18 69:19,23 70:20,20 70:22 73:1,11,18 74:24 75:22 76:25 76:25 77:6,18
dot 66:13
drafting 11:8
drag 77:23
dragging 58:9
draw 30:15 31:5,10 33:5,6,8,15
drawing 23:13 59:5
driving 21:17
duties 4:23,23 6:24 6:25 7:1 10:5
dutiful 36:5
dying 71:7

E

e 22:13,19 71:15 72:17
earlier 14:5,10 27:19 66:15
ed 6:3 7:10 14:16 16:8,15 21:1,9,15 34:25 35:17,19,24 36:19 37:5,11 38:24 39:2,15,18 40:8 41:12,16 42:4,18 49:18,23 50:5,6,8,13 51:9 51:14,16 52:14 61:25 62:5,9,10 63:22,25 64:13 65:15 69:22 74:18 74:20,25
eds 4:3,3 11:16 13:19 15:12 23:16 24:1 39:22 44:1 47:16,17 51:9,10 51:21 55:5,8,10 55:21,25 56:13 69:16,17 75:10
education 54:18
effect 17:5
efficiency 64:23
either 3:10 71:10
eligible 60:23
ellmers 43:23 53:2
elmers 43:20,21 45:23 47:15
email 22:6 25:5,11 26:20 27:25 30:16 30:22 31:6 32:20 33:4,16 35:14 49:9 51:5 52:23 54:10 55:14,17 56:3 59:5 60:4,19 61:15 71:13,15,15 71:18,21 72:3,8 75:23,23 76:3
emailing 54:11
emails 29:14 32:23 63:3,5,5 71:14 72:16
embellishment 33:20
emma 16:7,7,14,17 16:18,19,21 19:25 22:7,10 24:1,6 36:3 38:19 46:23 46:25 51:6 54:11 54:23,24 55:3,18 55:24 57:16 58:6 58:13 63:12
employed 2:12,17 2:22 8:20
employee 15:14 34:8 72:24 79:9 79:11
employer 76:14
employment 3:5,12 3:14,16
encounters 7:7,9
ended 67:2
endorsements 5:11 36:24
ends 53:16
energy 35:25 63:8
enjoy 71:12
entered 70:2
entire 13:20 19:7 22:5 24:17 26:19 33:14 39:20
entirely 46:23,24 47:2,2
entirety 1:24
epa 65:22
equine 15:1 28:15
equivalent 42:19
eric 51:15 52:11
especially 7:20,21 8:4
essentially 12:25
establish 18:13
ethics 2:4 23:9 34:6 34:24 43:7 44:22 46:4,12 47:21,23 48:1 51:13 52:7 52:24,24,25 53:1 53:5,9 56:4,12,16 57:3,5,9 75:9,25 76:1,4
evaluations 72:23 73:2
evening 48:9
events 7:18
everybody 13:13
evil 49:11
ew3000753 24:16
ew3000946 22:5
ew4001271 35:13
ew4004770 74:17
ew4005262 51:2
exactly 17:19,25 43:19 68:9,10 70:12
exaggeration 30:21 33:21
example 14:21 35:19 37:7 64:9 65:13 74:20
excluded 14:22
existed 11:10
expenses 69:7
experience 9:9
expert 13:2
expertise 16:12
experts 16:11
expires 79:24
explain 34:17 43:9 46:6 73:18
extent 11:13 57:8
external 5:8

F

fact 16:4 32:4 47:6 51:11 54:2 69:11
failed 3:22,23,23,24 10:24
fair 10:11 77:9
fall 15:23
familiar 37:6
famous 4:7
far 66:11 67:2
fareed 26:8 69:19
farming 65:13
favor 4:6
fed 72:12
federal 28:18 54:3
feds 64:16
feel 7:19 14:16 17:10 22:5 24:16 26:18 33:14 46:15 46:18 77:14
feels 6:1 49:22
feet 58:9
felt 6:7 14:19 16:9

37:5
file 51:13 52:7 53:5 78:3
filed 34:25
filling 34:8
financially 79:12
find 9:19 19:19 67:13,18,25
finding 9:18 11:23
fine 13:17 18:6,12 26:15,17
finish 20:6
first 4:24,25 5:1 6:14 8:18 9:7 10:21 11:4,20 12:16 22:11 25:4 34:5 39:17 42:1 45:12 48:13 54:13 55:6 66:19 67:6 69:16
fish 77:5
five 63:9
flights 54:25
floor 21:19 62:6 75:1
florida 49:20
flying 7:10,12
foaming 52:12
focused 35:17
focusing 47:11
following 37:13
foot 24:21
foregoing 79:3
forgets 62:5
forgotten 38:4,8,11
formal 8:14
forth 79:7
fortunes 73:6,9,15 73:20
forward 14:9 70:14
fosh 26:21
found 75:3
four 22:22
fred 51:12 52:10
free 22:5 24:16 26:19 33:14
frequently 41:1
freshman 49:24
friday 33:17,19
friend 26:23 46:4
friends 13:14 69:8
front 14:18 15:2,7 15:16
fund 2:12 39:22
fundraiser 31:8 33:8 39:17
fundraisers 8:11 30:24 54:25
fundraising 4:25 5:2 9:9 31:17,19 31:21
funny 7:7 66:17
further 79:8
furthermore 24:12

G

game 45:13
games 17:10,13
gas 65:24,24
gather 37:18
general 12:20 14:11 23:10,15 43:6,12 44:5 46:3,11 65:17 75:8
give 10:21 71:6,6
given 17:4
giving 5:11 9:24
go 4:3 9:1 12:21 19:7,21 20:7,11 23:15 31:2 43:9 46:14 53:20 55:2 65:20 72:11,25 74:13
god 59:1 64:15
going 7:5 8:11 15:1 15:21 18:14 19:1 21:21 23:2,5 24:11 34:6,24 36:13,14 44:7 46:3,5,5 47:22,23 49:6 50:9 51:13 51:15 52:6 53:5 54:19 55:1,2,18 65:2,3 69:2 71:9 74:17 78:3
good 3:10 13:14 23:1 37:7 63:4,11 63:11 64:15 77:20
goto 8:4
gotten 9:5
great 7:14 70:5,5 77:16
greg 22:22
grimm 59:16 60:9 60:21,23 61:2,13 61:23,25 64:17
grimms 59:17,18 59:22 60:14 61:1 62:1
ground 71:11
group 34:19 69:9
groups 5:9 11:11 14:15 15:1 28:12
guess 4:9 39:24 54:11
guessing 52:16
guy 47:21,22 48:2 49:18 66:22
guys 7:14 57:13 77:15

H

half 5:4
hallway 7:3
halt 53:7
hand 71:11 73:10 77:25
handled 26:5
handling 26:4
happen 38:12 76:17
happened 14:8 67:5
happens 35:23,23 63:22 69:17
hard 10:19
harper 23:13,14 [redacted] 2:6,7,8,9 2:11 [redacted] 2:5
hatchet 54:1
hazzard 49:9
head 51:18
hear 24:2 45:6,6,15
heard 4:9 43:24
hearing 14:22 50:22 63:9
hell 16:16
help 7:24 38:14,17 60:9 67:17 68:16 68:18
helpful 27:9 77:10
helping 9:3
hereinbefore 79:6
hes 6:6 13:13 21:18 21:23 25:15 26:5 36:24 38:2,6,17 44:21,23 46:4 49:19,20,23,24 62:11 63:2,4,7,10 65:13 68:23 69:16 74:15
hey 7:4
hicks 24:18 25:5 35:15 42:7 66:20
hill 5:3,12,23 8:12 8:19 27:1,1 49:2
hire 68:21 69:22
hired 2:19 34:3,5
hiring 4:19 26:8 70:1
history 13:23
hold 77:19
hollings 13:9,21,23
holly 49:9
home 7:10 62:8 71:17
honestly 65:10
hoping 33:18
horrendous 77:17
horse 3:20 8:21,22 11:11 13:1,7 14:23,24 40:6,8 68:19
horses 3:18,22,23 3:24 4:5,5,5 9:2 26:23 40:14,17,17 40:18,20 42:21 49:21 65:25 66:4 66:9,13 69:8
hourly 33:18,22 34:11
hours 63:9,10 76:16
house 8:24 21:19 23:8,25 40:23 42:22 43:7 44:3 45:12 46:4,12 47:21,23 48:1 56:5,16 62:6 75:1
hslf 2:18,23 5:16 6:13,19 8:17 9:9 9:15 28:24 38:9,9 61:24 67:23,25 72:24 73:6,15 76:14
hslfoce 68:15
hslfoce006209 70:8
hslfoce012822 49:7
hslfoce020961 59:4
hslfoce0239306 30:15
hslfoce029449 33:14
hslfoce20139 41:11
hslfoce29215 26:18
hsus 3:15 9:15 49:10 60:8
huge 66:20
humane 2:12,24 3:7 4:13,19 5:10 5:22,25 6:5,6,12 8:6,16,20 9:8 14:17,19,21 15:7 15:14,16,20 27:21 27:23 28:20,22 38:8 39:21 50:9 50:10 58:19 60:22 61:2,23 63:24 64:10,13,18 65:7 65:13 66:12 67:15 67:18,22 68:11 70:15 73:23
humans 50:11
hurt 54:20
husband 3:17 35:22 36:10 37:24 38:16 39:6,17 41:6 44:19,19,19 44:21,23 53:19 54:20 63:6 64:6
husbands 73:5,9,14

I

idea 11:5 24:19 25:14,20 26:1 27:13 52:4,4,9,10 70:5
identifying 20:3,13
ill 7:3 35:13 43:1 48:24 62:8
illwill 77:19
im 3:9 29:20 53:25 59:11
imagine 57:8 59:1
immediately 44:3
important 9:12 10:4
imposing 56:9
impossibility 33:23
imprecision 45:15
inaudible 32:25 41:21 59:25
inauguration 71:4 71:10
include 51:23
included 37:21
including 38:1 68:6
incredibly 67:8
indicate 24:4,6
individuals 5:8 70:15
industry 14:23
influence 8:19 76:12
informal 7:1
information 9:18 9:19,25 51:23 60:17,20
initiative 7:5
input 37:17
insisted 13:12
instance 66:8
instruct 16:21
intense 66:18
interest 61:12 71:9
interested 4:13 28:13 79:12
interests 9:2
internally 63:11
interview 1:4 18:3 19:4,8
introduced 11:24 12:1,3,8,10,11,13 15:19 61:13
investigate 53:3
investigation 17:14
invitation 55:1 63:13
invite 71:3
invited 42:18 67:11
involve 7:8 53:9
involved 3:17 5:9 6:8 10:7,16,18,19 10:25 11:7,18,23 12:5,12,14 13:1,4 14:11,12,15 15:3 15:5,21 43:24 44:1 68:1
involvement 11:9 11:20
involves 7:6
involving 5:8
irby 12:24 13:4 35:9 66:16 69:12
isnt 45:24 53:3 62:12 71:23
issue 11:6 44:11,16 65:8 66:24 68:22
issues 13:7 26:4,6 42:10 57:2 62:1 64:10 65:11

J

jan 76:2
january 27:25 30:16 57:15
jersey 79:23
jessica 70:16
jim 7:11
job 2:14 4:23,25 5:2,19 6:24,25 7:1 7:6 46:17,18 48:7 57:14 67:13,14,18 67:25 68:2,4,11 68:13 69:4 77:16
jobs 54:2 67:15 68:9
joined 2:5
july 41:22
jurisdiction 3:20 3:25
justin 26:8 37:4,5 69:19

K

kate 70:15,21
kedric 1:9 2:3
keith 33:5 68:18
kennels 74:9
kentucky 3:19,21 4:2,8 8:22,24
kept 48:10
kind 7:7,16 8:1 13:24 24:13 34:25 36:18 38:21 77:5
knew 24:7,10,10,10 37:8,8,8,9 39:21 47:8 52:25 66:19 66:19,20 68:10 75:14
know 2:20 7:6,15 7:17 9:4 10:2,2 11:10,15,16,17,22 12:9,10,10,11 14:1,15 15:2,3 17:2,12,15,25 19:16,18 21:20 24:11 25:23 26:10 26:11,25 27:6,8 28:9 30:8,12,19 30:20 31:14,18 32:20,23 34:3,18 35:3 36:13,15 37:4 38:1 39:15 39:18 41:18,24,25 42:2,5,10,11,11 42:12,18 43:5 45:24 46:17,19 47:18 48:9,24 49:24 50:10,13 51:15 52:17,20 53:10 55:12 58:13 59:13,25 60:3,21 61:18,20,21,22,22 61:25 64:4,5 65:9 65:24 66:11,15,22 67:4,9,13 68:8 69:6,16,19 70:12 70:20,22,23 74:24 75:8,22 77:6,13 77:19,22,22 78:4
knowing 32:1
knowledge 4:20 6:16
knowledgeable 13:6 37:25 67:9
known 6:15,17 23:4 66:16
knows 36:21,23 40:20 52:16

L

lamar 39:16,16,20
landrieu 30:24 31:8 33:9
language 58:24 59:19,20
law 54:4,4
lawyer 46:6,6
lazy 57:24
ld 43:22 61:1
leading 15:19
leaving 46:17
left 9:12 26:8 37:4 37:5,23 48:2 69:19
legislation 4:11 5:2 11:5,9,14 12:6,7 15:17 20:24 34:20 40:8 42:16 56:13 58:17,19 61:21 69:20 74:7 76:13
legislative 2:12,15 9:23 39:22 60:14
lesser 11:13
letter 50:15 54:13 64:1
license 1:16 79:22
life 24:20 43:23
likes 27:23
limited 76:18
limits 75:12
line 32:25
list 22:12,12,13,17 22:19,22 36:7,11 36:23
listed 23:6 37:19
listened 40:12
listening 7:17 50:12 71:8
literally 48:7 57:14
little 55:7 62:16
lived 30:9 66:25
lobbied 8:15
lobby 75:18,19 76:9,23
lobbying 76:11,18
lobbyist 8:7,8 9:1 10:7 12:25 47:7 47:12
lobbyists 8:10
log 8:12
long 2:17 10:16 23:12 39:12,13 66:16,17,21 77:3
look 33:3 49:4 53:10 54:18 63:5 68:17
looking 57:11 74:15
looks 31:22 61:25
lost 67:1 72:7
lot 4:6 6:5 7:6,8,9 9:13 16:13 30:10 42:10 61:11 63:14 63:22 66:12,21
lots 24:8
lucas 38:22,24 39:1
lyn 1:15 79:22

M

m 46:10 74:21
mad 38:17 73:16 73:17
madeline 8:25
main 54:7,8,9
making 45:23 61:6 73:16,16,21
man 4:7 15:18,19
manager 63:11
married 53:12
marsha 34:23,24 51:11 52:2 54:2 54:17 56:8
marty 12:24 13:4 13:18 16:8 21:2,6 21:6,8 23:16,19 24:2 26:8,20 27:4

27:5 28:1 29:4,12 29:21 30:8,16,23 31:12,19 32:21 33:17 34:19 35:9 36:4 44:13 47:1,3 54:11,14,23 55:18 55:25 66:16,21 70:1
mary 30:24 31:8 33:9
massachusetts 40:5
matter 52:18 74:10 76:5,6
mccaskill 26:24 27:7,22
mean 8:4 9:12 10:25 11:1,17,17 15:9 16:3 21:12 22:23,25 26:1,13 30:8 34:7,10 35:20 38:2,5,21 39:1 40:20 43:2,3 51:8,10,20 53:4 53:22 55:12 58:23 60:2 62:25 63:22 65:1 66:7,10,13 67:1 68:8 69:14 69:15,18 70:22 71:20,21 72:13 73:8 75:14 77:13 77:13
meaning 37:15
means 22:24 23:1 26:14 30:19 76:11
meant 21:21 31:21 32:16
media 31:21,23
medical 11:12 14:25,25 68:20
meet 30:20 38:24
meeting 9:6 13:8 13:15,21,25 14:1 23:12 24:18 25:14 25:18 27:5 34:9 38:22,25 39:1,5 39:20,23 40:2,4 40:11 41:13,14,17 41:20,21 42:12,14 42:15 43:22 47:1 47:16 49:13,15 50:3,6,24,25 67:8 75:24
meetings 4:6 8:9,10 8:12 9:3 12:13,14 12:16,19 15:24 16:1,3,5,6,8,15,19 16:20,22,23 17:22 17:24 19:23 21:2 21:9,22 22:10,15 23:3,7,11,15,18 24:1,10 29:10,12 29:13,14 36:1 39:8,10 40:22 41:1,3,5,6,19 42:23 43:8 44:2 44:13,16,18 45:9 45:10,24 46:2,24 46:25 47:3,13 55:10,12 56:17,21 57:3,17,21 58:2,6 69:2
member 7:2,2 35:24 42:2 53:12
members 4:7 7:9 7:17 8:24 9:15,20 9:21 10:2 11:2 16:10,11,13 19:23 22:13,20 23:6,7 24:2,5 36:7 39:6 40:25 41:5,8 51:16 70:10 72:19 73:21 77:20
men 77:20
mention 59:24 64:4
mentioned 14:10 19:25 45:8 66:15 68:12
message 62:17
messenger 21:25 35:20
met 22:14,20 24:20 27:2 30:17 31:13 40:12 41:15 43:23 50:5 60:25 61:11 66:19 67:7
michael 59:16,17 59:18 60:14,23 61:1,2,13 64:17
middle 49:8
mike 60:25
mill 7:4 59:8,10
mimi 25:11,11 33:16
mine 46:4
minute 23:14 74:22
missouri 7:5 26:24 27:3,7,10
misspoke 24:25
mistranslated 45:14
mode 53:21
moment 17:25
money 5:11 67:12 69:3
month 63:12
months 30:9
morans 65:2
morgan 1:10 2:3 11:4 21:1,4,8,14 22:1 25:4,8,18 28:11,19,22 29:4 29:7 30:6 43:17 44:20,25 47:5 48:5,12,18,22 49:16 51:19 52:1 52:6,9,17,21,25 53:8,13,22 54:6 55:13,20 56:3,11 56:15,23 57:2,7 59:2 61:14 62:15 62:19,23 63:1,3 63:15,23 65:5,17 65:21 66:2,5 68:3 68:25 69:6 74:5 74:13 75:22 76:8 76:15,21 77:8
morning 35:18 37:13
motions 72:25
mouth 39:19 52:12
moved 5:5
multiple 23:18

N

name 60:13
names 53:2
nashville 7:12
natural 65:24
near 50:22
nearly 12:22
necessarily 35:8 43:2
need 5:18 18:5 19:14,17 36:20,20 41:8,9,10 46:19 53:3 58:1,6 75:14
needed 14:20 37:18
needs 38:14
negative 53:17
neither 79:8,11
net 71:15 72:17
never 3:16 5:20 6:16 11:14 13:20 24:7,8,9,10,19,20 25:22,22 26:5 39:19 43:23 50:14 58:11,15 65:15,20 66:8 68:1
new 49:25 59:18 79:23
newspapers 37:1
nice 17:4
night 21:19 46:10 48:7 57:14
notary 79:23
note 1:24
notes 74:14
noticed 25:12
november 12:18 14:3 16:6 19:23
novemberish 69:3
number 25:15,16 41:5 59:4

O

obama 71:9
observed 4:11
obviously 33:21
occasion 58:8
occurred 16:4
oce 77:21
october 2:21 12:17 14:2,8 16:6 19:23 20:14 26:3 43:16 48:18 49:17 69:2
offered 66:24
office 2:4 11:16 13:19 23:20,22 24:1,21 25:23 27:3,7,11,16,20 29:8 30:7 35:7 36:22 37:6 42:3 42:13 43:4 44:1 44:13 46:1 47:15 47:16,17 50:17,19 53:2 56:18 57:9 61:1 62:1 68:7,18 69:12,17 70:3,22 75:10 76:19
officer 79:1
offices 27:7
official 76:19
oh 16:16 21:18 23:14 25:7 36:3 41:1 57:12 59:8,9 59:16,22 70:4 72:13,15 74:22
oig 36:20
oil 65:23
okay 7:25 8:13 10:21 14:10 16:3 18:12,23 19:1,21 19:22 22:21 23:24 24:4 26:12 30:3 32:6,9 33:16 34:5 35:25 37:10 38:6 39:3 41:7 45:11 45:19,20,21 46:19 46:21,23,24 47:3 47:17 48:22 49:17 49:17,19 50:1,24 51:1,1,7 53:2,3,3 53:7,14,18,22 54:12,15 56:7,12 56:21,22,23,25 57:20 59:9,9 60:4 60:7,16,22,22 61:5,9 62:14,23 63:23 66:2 67:24 70:7,23 72:8,23 73:12 75:7,20 76:15,21 77:7,8
okayed 57:10
old 13:2
once 7:23 12:11

28:4
ones 64:7
opened 39:19
opinion 57:23
opponent 54:8,9
opponents 54:7
opposed 27:20 45:3 65:13
option 60:2
organization 5:24
organizations 26:22
original 13:11
outside 4:3 28:25 69:9 75:25
owned 4:4

P

p 46:10
pacelle 4:9 5:7 6:15
pack 24:24 25:6,9 25:16 26:2,4,6
page 35:14,16
pages 18:17
paid 68:24 74:2,10
paragraph 33:3 49:8
part 5:22 27:18 31:7 34:19 37:3 49:11 50:13 56:21
particular 11:12,13 14:17 74:6
parties 79:10
party 42:18
pass 50:8
passed 10:24 13:10 14:21 67:11
passionate 4:10 6:4 6:7,9 49:22,23 68:23
payne 1:9 2:1,3
people 4:2,4,7 6:12 6:13 8:6,10,19,24 9:3 11:1 23:1 28:5,10,11,15,16 28:17,24,25 32:1 34:9,20 35:6 42:1 50:21 52:12 69:17 70:21 71:6 73:16 73:16 77:17,24
perceived 5:23
percent 9:14
period 15:22 19:24 20:14 26:3,7 29:21 33:25 34:14 69:7
person 6:14 8:2,4 13:19 35:22 39:17 43:25 45:22 47:25 69:21
personal 61:12 71:20 72:5 76:5
personally 71:19
peters 74:19
peterson 39:1
petris 65:3
phil 41:15,17,20
phone 9:14 29:14 46:11 66:22
phonetic 1:24
pickens 8:25,25 9:5
piece 9:12
pieces 74:6
place 14:1,2 79:6
plane 54:25
planning 18:1 64:25
play 28:9 45:13
playing 17:10,13
please 1:24 44:6 74:18
plenty 36:2
plus 22:22
point 10:4 38:5,9 43:10,10 47:14 51:11 56:11 67:16
points 11:13,15
policemen 49:1,2
policies 8:16
policy 3:3 4:21
political 73:5,6,9 73:14,14,19 76:1 76:5
position 6:2 15:15 44:6 65:14 67:1 76:13
positions 6:2,5 64:11
possible 16:18 40:21 60:12 64:23 64:24,24 65:1 70:4 72:21
possibly 52:19
post 7:17
potential 12:2,14 20:3,13
power 35:25 63:8
practice 49:21 62:20
practitioners 15:1
precisely 77:6
preferred 60:2
preparation 63:9
prepared 50:14,14
present 1:8 29:23 31:4
president 3:4 4:22 9:10 71:9
presley 31:5,10,24 32:7 33:1,1,4,10
press 24:23 25:17 26:2 28:17 53:16 60:10 61:20 69:16
pretty 29:19 77:14
prevent 10:13
prevention 29:1
primary 75:2
prior 2:22
priscilla 31:5,10,24 32:7 33:1,1,4,10
private 46:18
probably 5:25 12:17 23:1 27:22 37:24 38:3,3 40:1 43:14,15 45:19 48:4 49:22 52:13 52:14,15 62:21 65:9 74:21,23 75:3,4
problem 6:8 9:6 32:22 37:3 46:2 48:25 49:1,2 63:6
proceedings 79:5
process 18:9
project 35:3,4
prompted 43:18,20 51:4 52:22
protect 44:19
protection 58:20
protective 53:19
psa 5:11
public 79:23
puppy 7:4 58:20 59:8,10
purely 44:23
purpose 60:19
push 35:10 57:17 57:23
pushing 34:22
put 38:6 55:5 62:9
putting 17:11 51:17

Q

quarter 3:24
question 7:13,22 18:7,14,20,21 20:6 22:8,9 24:17 26:10 30:2 38:10 49:7 50:1 51:3,4 55:16 57:1 70:8 71:13 75:20 76:25
questioning 2:1
questions 8:3 10:10 17:3 18:4,10 19:9 19:12,20 34:18 35:13 43:2 74:12
quickly 58:17
quite 16:18
quote 73:3

R

race 3:22,24
racing 3:20,21 8:22
rage 51:12
rahn 1:15 79:22
raise 4:5 7:13
ran 39:18
random 50:20
rarely 41:5
reach 3:14
reached 48:13 57:4
reaching 45:1,3 56:4
reaction 15:18 51:14
read 22:5,17 24:16 26:19 33:14
readying 64:16
realization 5:21
realizing 15:6
really 7:8,15 9:11 9:12,21 11:19 13:14 14:7 37:6 39:12 49:24 53:25 60:24 61:21 70:20 77:21
reason 19:6 25:2,24 45:8 55:7
recall 17:6,7,9,14 42:15 43:17 58:4 69:23
received 71:14
recollection 4:14 11:5 19:13,15,17 32:11 49:12 50:2 59:3
record 10:11 17:11
recording 78:6
redundant 34:18
refer 33:1
referenced 75:24 76:3
referred 70:9
referring 28:19
refers 26:1 60:12 61:19
refresh 19:15,17 32:11 49:12 50:2 59:2
regard 35:9
regarding 6:13 15:25 16:3 31:13 34:1 35:8 52:3 58:18,24
regardless 74:3,3
regards 65:7
registered 8:7,8 10:7 47:6 76:23
reintroduced 12:11
relate 19:12 29:17
related 28:6 30:1,4 31:5 32:12 36:7 37:25 38:13 39:6 39:23 55:5,10 56:17 62:3 74:9

relating 18:7,20 65:22,23,23 66:9
relative 79:9,11
relaying 61:7 62:16
relays 22:1
release 60:10 61:20
relevancy 76:24
relevant 57:11
remember 5:14,17 5:18,19 11:19 12:7,17 13:13 14:7 17:6 19:20 20:2,5,8,16,20,25 22:25 31:15 35:11 39:8,12,14,14 40:7,8,22 41:10 41:16,16,18,22,24 42:6,7,12,14 43:13,14 45:18 48:16 57:21,22 66:18 67:6
remind 62:9
reminding 74:25
removed 60:1
renee 43:20,21 45:23 47:15
rephrase 12:6 24:5 29:11
report 6:19,20,22 36:20
reported 79:5
reports 30:12 34:8
representative 4:18 6:11 15:25 20:18 20:22 21:5,10 23:19 25:12 27:20 29:8 30:7 37:20 40:23 41:2 42:3 45:4 49:13 50:4 50:16 57:8 58:1,5 58:18 60:9 62:2,3 62:24 63:25 64:17 64:19 66:6 69:11 69:24 71:25 72:20 75:11,25 76:9
representing 9:2
represents 27:8
republican 7:2,21 14:20 22:13,19
republicans 5:24 6:2 7:20,21 8:5 10:1 12:23 14:18
requested 64:22
requesting 24:18
reread 73:12
respect 20:3,9,12 20:17 31:12 32:20 75:10
respond 63:13
responds 58:11
response 20:12 25:8 58:10
responsive 63:16
restriction 76:16
restrictions 75:9,12 75:15,16
results 49:20
reunion 70:13
right 4:15 22:3 45:24,25 48:20,23 51:8 53:3 54:5,16 73:7
rights 50:11
ring 48:5
roaring 51:15
robot 53:21
roe 41:15,17,20 42:12
roes 42:10,11
role 5:5 40:11
room 41:9 50:7,20 50:22
roy 7:2,4,23 27:3
rules 36:13,14,16
run 7:3,11,13 64:13 64:20 77:20
running 50:21
runs 62:6
rush 38:17

S

sacrifice 73:5,13
sacrifices 66:20 73:19
sad 67:5 77:21
safe 8:2
safety 58:21
sake 73:6,15
salary 74:1
sara 6:20 70:24 71:11
sat 5:20 40:12
saw 39:22
saying 10:18 21:18 25:11 29:21 31:12 34:13 36:6,10 37:10 41:3 48:10 50:7 54:12,15,18 55:17,19,22,23 58:12 75:21
says 22:12,19 30:22 31:3 33:4,16 35:17 37:12 49:8 49:9 51:5 58:15 64:16 73:3,4
scenario 45:20
schedule 22:10 58:2,6
scheduled 16:22,23 17:22,24 22:12 23:3 50:24,25 55:11 70:9
scheduler 23:16 55:6
schedules 22:12
scheduling 12:13 16:5,5 19:22 22:14 55:9 57:16
schwager 48:3
scott 40:17
search 68:4
second 5:5 25:5 35:14,16 40:2,4 45:18 48:12,14,17 48:21 64:15
secretary 24:23 25:17 26:2 37:10 69:16
sector 46:18
see 17:14 19:20 51:19 61:9 64:20 65:21 68:21 74:14 78:3
seek 3:14
seeking 60:9
seen 14:23 36:22,24 38:2 49:20
selfevaluating 73:4
senate 13:11 23:22 39:8 40:9
senator 13:8,9,14 13:15 40:4
senators 13:10 30:25 31:4,9 32:5 32:13 52:15
send 16:21,22 36:6 36:11 51:5 52:22 59:20 60:16,20 61:14 72:13,16
sending 22:10 59:19 63:4
senior 3:3 4:21
sense 25:3,17 26:1 65:18
sensinbrenner 44:5 45:17,25 46:13 47:19 48:14 49:4
sent 3:22 26:20 56:4
sentence 31:3,12
seriously 73:1
set 16:7,15,18,19 23:17,19,21 24:1 24:18 25:13 42:24 44:13 46:1 47:3 56:18 79:6
setting 44:2 46:24 46:25
seven 76:17
sharing 34:21
shell 51:18
shelter 59:24 60:10 60:23 61:2,7,23 62:1
shes 27:9 52:5,8 53:5 55:6
shouldnt 44:1 45:1
show 18:5,8,22,23 19:2 22:4 24:15 26:18 30:19 35:12 41:19 49:6
showed 24:8
showing 14:20 17:6 19:5,11
side 23:22 39:9 40:23
sign 64:1,1,3,21,25 65:2,3
significance 27:12
signing 62:4
silly 8:1
similar 28:1
simply 24:17 70:8
single 46:22 54:4 54:24 63:9
sitting 42:12
situations 4:12 64:12,18
six 37:19 63:9
slaughter 3:18,22 8:21 40:6,8
society 2:12,24 3:7 4:13,19 5:10,22 5:25 6:5,6,12 8:6 8:16,20 9:9 14:18 14:19,21 15:7,15 15:16,20 27:21,23 28:20,23 29:1,2 38:8 39:21 50:9 50:10 58:20 60:22 61:2,24 63:24 64:10,13,19 65:7 66:12 67:15,18,22 68:11 70:15 73:24
societys 65:14
somebody 12:25 43:21 45:7,23 62:6
soring 10:14 13:1,7 49:20
sorry 24:25 29:20 36:9 53:25 59:11 63:25 64:15,17
sort 54:17 76:16
sorts 28:9 34:6 51:16 52:12 65:1
sought 3:16
sound 26:23 61:6 69:8
sounds 7:7 8:1
speak 4:18 33:11 34:19 64:14,19
speaking 4:12 38:9 43:11
special 5:6

specialist 2:16
specific 8:9
specifically 11:2 14:11 28:7
spellings 1:24
spend 8:11
spoke 41:24 42:1 47:25 75:1
sponsors 12:2 75:3
spotlight 53:11
spouse 35:21,21
spouses 70:10
stacey 74:23
stacks 36:23
staff 15:25 16:2 19:25 20:15,19 21:16,24 24:4 35:22 36:7 42:2 42:10,11 43:22,25 45:4,22,23 56:13 58:7,18 62:3,25 63:6 64:7 72:20 75:13,18 76:10
staffer 13:22
staffers 35:9
stamped 22:5 24:16 26:18 30:14 33:14 35:13 41:11 49:7 51:1 68:14 74:16
stand 33:17
standard 3:23
standing 50:11
standpoint 46:1
started 4:15,24 8:18 9:7 29:22 30:6 51:17 77:6
starting 47:14
state 3:21 8:23 28:9 70:24 71:5,10 79:23
stated 78:2
statement 43:25 45:23 74:17
states 2:25 3:19
status 30:11 35:3,8
stay 67:12
staying 67:10,10
stemmed 45:22
stenographically 79:5
stephanie 1:15 79:22
stepped 24:20
steps 20:23
stop 54:10,20,22 55:3,4,18
strategy 9:15,16,17 9:18,19,20,23 10:3,6 14:11,13 15:3,6 20:18,18 27:19 28:7,8 29:17,17,25 30:4 30:17,20 31:13,14 32:12,16,21 35:8 35:10 38:15
stress 77:17
strong 10:4 14:20
strongly 14:16 16:9 26:22 46:18
stuff 5:12 36:23,24 38:21 65:20 66:10 66:11,11
subcommittee 35:25 63:8
subject 13:3 52:18
success 74:6
successful 52:14
suggesting 44:25
suggestion 61:3
super 13:2
support 31:9 32:5 32:14 51:9,21 55:20,25 56:13 64:9
supporter 6:4,7,9
supporting 32:13 51:10 69:9
supports 26:22 32:7
supposed 44:12 51:21 75:18,19 76:12
sure 27:24 29:16 31:2 45:19 47:21 48:23 56:18 57:7 69:22 74:18 75:5
susannah 1:12
suzannah 2:10

T

t 8:25 9:5
tactics 10:14
take 20:23 33:19 38:3 64:21 65:7 72:11 73:1 76:13
taken 6:6 67:14
takes 58:12 63:8,10
talk 4:1 6:17 7:6 8:2 9:14 16:14 23:1 25:24 35:1 39:15 44:4 46:7,8 46:9,10 47:20 55:7,9 58:16 63:12 66:24 71:9 75:11
talked 6:16 11:14 11:16 30:9 43:15 43:21 46:12 48:9 54:24 56:23 58:3 61:17 66:21 68:18
talking 7:19 11:1,2 13:21 17:23 18:19 21:23 30:11 31:7 31:22 42:13 56:1 58:15 61:20,22 74:22,23
talks 42:10,11 60:8
telephone 45:13
tell 13:23 16:17,17 16:18 17:18 21:12 21:15,16,22 24:13 27:9 36:20 37:1 38:20 43:19 44:6 44:7 45:5 48:24 54:14 56:12 60:25 62:25 63:10,19 68:9,10 77:14
telling 37:24
tells 16:15
ten 77:17
tend 25:15 66:6
tennessee 7:11 12:24 13:6 37:1 42:19,21
teresa 27:6
terminated 78:7
test 10:23
testify 63:21
testimony 79:4
thank 19:22 24:22 26:17 33:13 61:10 75:7
thats 8:12 10:11 11:17 15:21 21:5 21:17 25:2 26:15 26:17 30:2 33:20 33:22 34:25 35:23 38:23 39:2 42:24 42:24 44:9,24 45:11,16,16 47:19 48:6 50:7,13 51:8 51:22 54:19 55:19 55:22,25 56:1 57:10 61:12 64:8 64:9 66:3,17 69:22 72:5 77:3
therapy 59:15
thing 24:13 34:25 36:18 44:9 46:22 47:9,11 54:17 64:24 71:23
things 5:20 8:16 9:20,21 14:15 16:16 21:15 30:10 30:12 34:21 37:6 37:8,9 38:2 57:10 64:6,20 77:23
think 2:15,19 3:9 3:10 5:19,21 6:3 6:14,17 7:4,16 9:11 13:18 14:4 19:25 22:11,24,25 23:22 25:4,25 26:24,25 27:4,5 29:9 32:4 34:15 37:3 38:7 39:11 39:20 41:4,12,12 41:18,25 42:4,5 42:20,20 48:6,9 50:5,5,6 51:11,17 55:11 58:3 60:24 61:3,17,18 66:7 67:7 69:8,14,15 69:19,19 74:24 75:24 76:2,20 77:10,15,15,17,23 78:4
thinking 67:15
thoroughbreds 3:23
thought 44:1 53:8 67:3,4 71:12
thousands 32:24,24
threat 53:18
threatening 51:16
three 4:8 13:2 36:1
ticket 71:4,5
tied 74:5
tim 65:3
time 8:11 11:10 13:20 15:22 18:13 19:24 20:14 23:4 24:14 26:3,7 29:21 30:6 33:24 34:14,21 36:5 39:12,13 43:11,15 45:14,18 48:8 57:16 58:14 65:6 67:6,11 74:25 76:15,19,20 79:6
timeframe 48:19,23
times 4:8 35:21 36:1,2 41:18 57:4 63:14
tired 71:8
title 2:14 3:1 4:22 30:22
titles 3:3
today 74:19
told 16:10,13 21:6 21:7,8 23:9,15 44:8 45:9 49:10 49:18 50:13 56:1 56:2,6,9
tons 32:23,23
top 22:7 25:9 26:20
topic 32:2,3
total 23:13
touch 65:11,12
town 33:10
training 34:6
transcribed 1:15
transcript 1:24 79:4
transition 5:15 6:10,13

treat 18:1
true 51:9,20,22 79:3
trust 8:5
try 19:8 22:21 62:15 63:25 68:16 68:17 76:12
trying 3:13 5:17 6:1 8:18 11:19,19 13:23 27:1,6 34:20 38:6 41:4 43:22 44:16 45:2 47:10 49:11,12 51:22 53:23 54:14 55:13 59:2 60:24 61:24 63:18 67:13 77:2
turtle 51:17
twice 12:10
two 5:4 13:9,10 25:16 29:25 30:9 37:14 39:8 40:16 46:9 58:13 59:7 59:23 61:19
type 9:23 28:1 29:23 36:19 64:21
typical 35:19
typically 35:7

U

uhhuh 21:3
uhuh 58:22
ultimately 32:19
um 27:4
unbelievable 66:23
understand 3:13 6:2 17:21 25:20 26:13 43:5 44:17 45:2 52:2 53:23 55:14 56:19 60:1 61:9 62:15 69:1 73:19 75:17 76:9 76:10,25 77:1,2 77:25
understanding 32:15 76:22 77:3 77:4
unfortunate 78:5
uniform 58:20
union 70:25 71:5 71:11
unique 13:24
united 2:24 3:18
universe 66:14
unusual 73:3,4,13
updating 29:16
upset 77:22
upton 51:12 52:11
use 65:14 71:18,21 71:25 72:8
uses 72:6
usually 38:17 53:16 58:15

V

values 64:11
verizon 71:15 72:17
version 39:24
veterans 59:15 60:10
veterinarian 49:19 49:19
veterinary 11:12 14:24 68:20
vice 3:19 8:22
video 49:18,18 50:14
views 64:11
violation 44:9,10
violations 44:23
visited 43:20
visiting 12:24 13:5
vote 62:11 75:6
voted 75:6
votes 74:18

W

wait 23:14 25:10 63:12 68:16 74:22
walden 22:22
walked 13:20
walking 42:21
walks 71:12
want 5:4 7:23 14:17 15:20 17:5 17:25 21:23 22:4 22:6 24:15 26:17 26:19 33:15 35:12 36:25 37:1,2 38:24 43:5 44:21 44:22 45:5,6,13 45:15,15,19 46:8 46:9,9,16 47:1,20 48:22 53:14 54:16 54:19 56:18 58:16 60:16,24 61:23 62:1 70:12 71:6 72:10 74:15 75:8 77:11
wanted 11:14 14:23 16:8,11,14 21:1,5 21:9,15 23:16 24:2 34:12 35:3 36:15 39:15 40:8 46:13,14 47:18,21 60:23 61:2,8 69:22
wanting 21:24 75:4
wants 21:20 35:22 37:11 50:10 63:13 64:21
washington 4:4 69:1
wasnt 9:1,10 15:8 21:9 34:7 48:16 56:3
waste 24:14
water 77:5
way 5:10 9:19 15:21 17:13 19:19 27:14 34:10 69:20 75:6
wayne 4:9 5:7,20 6:15
ways 5:8 7:16
wealthy 5:8
week 28:5 36:1 76:17
weekly 28:23 34:16
welfare 26:4,5 29:2
went 12:23,23 13:18 22:12 23:18 27:3 39:14,15 41:13 43:7 46:22 51:12,12 52:10,11 52:11 69:12 75:1
wew 72:3
whats 53:1
whitfield 1:4,11 2:7 2:8 4:18 6:3,11 20:22 21:5,11 34:25 35:20 37:21 40:23 41:2 44:12 46:1 49:10,13 50:4 51:14 58:1,5 62:4,24 63:18,19 63:25 64:20 66:6 69:11,24 70:11 71:25 75:11,25 76:10
whitfield2 71:15 72:17
whitfields 15:25 16:2 19:24 20:15 20:19 23:20 27:11 27:15,20 29:8 30:7 42:3 50:17 57:9 58:18 62:3 72:20
wife 8:25 36:5 38:6 38:14 39:22 44:23
willingness 73:3,4 73:13
woman 27:6 71:7
women 30:25 31:3 31:9 32:4,12
won 4:8
wonderful 5:22
word 13:20 45:14 52:24
words 59:7,23 61:19
work 3:15 25:16 31:19 65:19,24 66:1,3,10,13 67:23 69:12,12 70:2,21 73:23 74:3,4
worked 5:7 39:21 53:25 67:22
working 3:17 4:13 4:16 10:5 15:23 27:4 29:22 30:7 35:2 38:8,14,15 51:24 54:20 57:16 58:19 59:6,21,22 60:11,18 69:20 71:23 74:9,11
works 17:14
world 13:1
worry 48:11
worships 71:11
worth 18:17
wouldnt 6:4 11:25 23:4 44:24 53:14 61:14
write 32:23
writing 11:18
wrong 42:23 43:3,3 43:4,21 46:16 47:4,11,12,17,18 47:19 48:10 51:7 51:8,24 53:4

X

x 38:20 65:2
xio1717 1:16 79:22

Y

y 65:4
yarmouth 24:20 25:12,14
yarmouths 25:22
yeah 9:24 28:21 29:16 42:20 48:6 57:12 60:6,21 62:18,18 63:17 64:25 66:7 71:24 72:7,22,25
year 5:4 14:5 28:2 57:15 62:7,13 70:17 71:6
years 5:5 7:18 10:3 13:2 43:15 53:11
yesterday 30:17
yoho 49:10,14,19 50:4,5,7,15
york 59:18

Z

zero 74:8

0

000 18:17 74:2

1

1 30:16

11 74:21
15 28:5
18 41:23 79:24
19 49:17
1970 13:11
1994 39:18 70:13

2

2 34:4
20 7:18 10:3 18:17 53:11
2000 3:9
2007 3:11 4:15
2011 2:20 73:2 76:23
2012 9:11 41:23 70:17
2013 12:13,18 14:3 15:23 16:6 20:14 26:4 29:23 33:25 34:4
2014 1:5 2:10 27:25 30:16 70:25
2017 79:24
24 76:16
25 1:5 2:10

3

4

433 40:25
48 74:21

5

51 52:15

6

6 46:10

7

70 9:13

8

87 74:2

9

EXHIBIT 39

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 6:00 PM
To: Irby, Marty; Heydlauff, Emma
Cc: Keith Dane
Subject: My Not Contacting You or Emma Diectly

I have been working with you so long, I forget you are now part of Ed's staff. I am not to contact you or Emma directly in support of Ed's bill. Better to come from Sara or Keith.

Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 40

From: Irby, Marty <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:38 PM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: Conf Call Fri w HSUS

That is fine with me. Just let me know.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Subject: Conf Call Fri w HSUS

See below.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: December 17, 2013, 12:28:24 PM EST
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, "Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>)" <[redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>>
Subject: Re: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

If okay with you all, I may have Marty stand in for me on Friday. He and I communicate hourly on PAST and I was hoping to take Fri off.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 17, 2013, at 12:18 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Works for me.

From: Sara Amundson
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 12:18 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Cc: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>)
Subject: Re: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

Maybe Friday from 10:30-11?

Sent from my iPad

On Dec 17, 2013, at 12:02 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
I'm available, not sure about others this week.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Mimi Brody; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>)
Subject: RE: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

Should we have a call this week, before everyone takes off for the holidays, to discuss our current strategy, Senate targets, etc. - as well as our game plan once Congress is back in session in January?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:33 PM
To: Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cece Kremer; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty ([redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>)
Subject: FW: email exchange with Wayne on PAST

FYI, emails with Wayne below re: cosponsor goal and other strategy...

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Right. She won't back off. I'd really like to get to 50 in the Senate, and then we have an ironclad public case to make for moving it, with majorities in both chambers.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:29 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Then there's Alexander's top fundraiser, Steve Smith, now leading the charge at TWHBEA (Big Lick group). I'm glad that didn't make Ayotte back off the bill!

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:27 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

We need to overlay HPA violators with McConnell's donor list, and make it too radioactive for him. If Commerce passes it, then Reid, if we give him enough time, can do a cloture vote on it. This would be our one cloture ask of him this Congress. We've got enough ins with him that we just might get it done.

From: Mimi Brody

Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:25 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Indeed, I just brought that up with Sara the other day - we need a scandal to make these key ones afraid or unable to stand in the way.

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:23 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Remember when Allard was carrying animal fighting, and Lott was the problem.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:22 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

We need it to be a total flood, to overcome McConnell's, Blackburn's and Rogers' machinating behind-the-scenes to keep it from getting done.

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 12:20 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Great get, too. With Daines in the House and Thune in the Senate,the dam has burst.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 11:04 AM
To: Fed Leg List; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty; marty.irby@mail.house.gov<mailto:marty.irby@mail.house.gov>; chris.pack@mail.house.gov<mailto:chris.pack@mail.house.gov>; Hicks, Cory
Subject: Sen. Begich on PAST...FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

In case it may help, we need to make sure Sen. Murkowski's staff knows. I can send email to those in her office who got the scorecard letter, or if Marty and any others who met with her staff would prefer to pass along this news to her office, please let me know. Thanks,
Mimi

From: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte) [mailto:Samantha_Roberts@ayotte.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:52 AM
To: Mimi Brody; Runyan, Caitlin (Warner)
Subject: RE: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Senator Begich will cosponsor, as well.

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:37 AM
To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner); Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte)
Subject: RE: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Thanks, Caitlin. I also heard last week from Karla Thieman for Chairwoman Stabenow that she wanted to be added.

From: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner) [mailto:Caitlin_Runyan@warner.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:57 AM
To: Roberts, Samantha (Ayotte); Mimi Brody
Subject: FW: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

FYI

From: Stanczuk, Alexis (Agriculture)
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 9:55 AM
To: Runyan, Caitlin (Warner)
Cc: Thieman, Karla (Agriculture)
Subject: Prevent All Soring Tactics Act (S. 1406)

Hi Caitlin,

Chairwoman Stabenow would like to be added as a cosponsor to the PAST Act.

Thank you,
Alexis Stanczuk

Legislative Correspondent
U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee
(202) 224-[redacted]

EXHIBIT 41

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Monday, December 3, 2012 10:35 AM
To: cory.hicks@mail.house.gov
Subject: Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

---

Here are questions Post sent me.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: December 2, 2012, 3:47:11 PM EST
To: Heather Sullivan <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, HSLF Heather Sullivan <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

For purposes of tomorrow's discussion, here are the questions the Post sent me four days ago. I will be forwarding my draft answers later today. Talk tomorrow!

Connie

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: December 2, 2012, 3:43:18 PM EST
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Fwd: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington Post; Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

>>
>>
>> ----- Forwarded by David S Fallis/news/TWP on 11/28/2012 11:57 AM -----
>>
>> From: David S Fallis/news/TWP
>> To: [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>,
>> Date: 11/21/2012 11:30 AM
>> Subject: Questions for Constance Harriman-Whitfield from Washington
>> Post; Thank you
>>
>>
>>
>> Dear Constance Harriman-Whitfield,
>>
>> This year at The Post we have been reporting on the personal finances of
>> lawmakers and their families and their official actions in Congress. As
>> part of that we're working on a story about lawmakers who have family
>> members that are registered to lobby Congress or work for firms that
> lobby.
>>
>> Public records show that you are a registered lobbyist for the Humane
>> Society Legislative Fund. A review of lobbying disclosure forms and the
>> Congressional Record show that you registered to lobby on bills this
>> session sponsored by or cosponsored by your husband.
>>
>> Those bills and the corresponding lobbying reports include (I have
> embedded
>> links to the bills and the reports for your convenience, please let me
> know
>> if they do not open):
>>
>> - HR 6388 (112th), sponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>> - HR 1733 (112th), sponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>> - HR 2492 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>> - HR 2966 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>> - HR 1513 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>> - HR 835 (112th), cosponsor. Here is a lobbying report.
>>
>> I have some questions so that we may include your answers in our
> reporting:
>>
>> 1) Why did you first register as a federal lobbyist and what are your
>> qualifications?
>> 2) Have you ever lobbied your husband on these or other bills and issues?
>> If so, what bills/issues and what were the circumstances?
>> 3) If you have not lobbied your husband on these bills or other bills or
>> issues, why not? And has that hampered your effectiveness as a lobbyist
> for
>> the group?

>> 4) Have any of your fellow lobbyists from the Humane Society Legislative
>> Fund lobbied your husband regarding these or other bills? If so, please
>> explain the circumstances.
>> 5) Who are you lobbying in Congress regarding the bills listed above and
>> what is it you are advocating? Please describe the circumstances.
>> 6) Have you ever communicated with your husband in any other manner on
>> behalf of your clients on these or other issues that involve Congress? If
>> so, what were the circumstances?
>> 7) Did you or anyone from the Humane Society Legislative fund or the
> Humane
>> Society have input on or help draft language on the bills listed above?
> If
>> so, please describe the circumstances and what was done.
>> 8) Please cite any cases in which your husband has acted in opposition or
>> contrary to the interests of the Humane Society's lobbying efforts.
>> 9) Would you like to provide any additional comments in the interest of
>> fairness or accuracy?
>>
>> This is not for a daily story, but we would like to hear back in the
> coming
>> two weeks (December 3) so that we can include the information in our
>> reporting for our story. Thank you very much for your time and
>> consideration.
>>
>> Respectfully,
>>
>> David S. Fallis
>>
>> Staff Writer
>> Washington Post
>> 202-334-[redacted] - desk
>>[redacted] - mobile
>
>

EXHIBIT 42

From: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>
Sent: Tuesday, December 4, 2012 10:52 AM
To: Ed Whitfield <[redacted]@verizon.net>
Subject: RE: Answer to Questions 2-7

Connie: Thanks so much for this message--I do appreciate it. I only sent the cursory feedback on Sunday night as I understood we three would connect yesterday to walk through the answers.

I understand your assertion about providing enough information to ensure you didn't appear to be hiding or withholding. When there's the possibility of a negative piece, it's helpful to send the reporter to the documentation (the Scorecard links) instead of trying to articulate where a member agreed/disagreed with us. That's one area I would have addressed with you. I thought it was concerning that you should have to address that at all!

I also would have provided background/distinction between HSUS and HSLF. I would have referred to myself as a "registered lobbyist" since you have done some lobbying, just not enough until this year to require registration.

Those are a few areas I would have addressed with you.

Talk soon and thank you,
Sara

-----Original Message-----
From: Ed Whitfield [[redacted]@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 9:21 AM
To: Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: Answer to Questions 2-7

Sara,

I am really sorry that I did not get your final sign-off.

I sent you and Heather all my answers on Sunday. The only thing Heather wrote back was 1) talk in the first person and 2) tell your story not Ed's and 3) a few sentences for each question would suffice. The only thing I heard back from you was you thought I was going to answer with one over-arching paragraph.

I changed it to the first person and cut my answers. Since some of the questions are precise, they did not lend themselves to a one paragraph-answers- all format. I wrote a one paragraph answer to questions 2-7. The other questions are entirely different.

Ed was asked 10 other questions and he went into a full-blown discussion of his record because he feels he has a good story to tell. So, that information was out anyway. Furthermore, since this is a continuation of an article about Congressional members and he was already mischaracterized in an earlier article by not answering the questions, he felt that a full response was required.

Please tell me how you would have answered the questions differently. I do know you feel that less is more but the press is often more harsh if they sense you are witholding information or being uncooperative.

Again, I am sorry. I was not attempting to by-pass you. It will never happen again.

Connie

-----Original Message-----
From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 7:13 AM
To: Ed Whitfield
Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7

We agreed on Friday that Heather and I would vet your answers before submission to the Post to ensure we were all on the same page with the submission. I urged less is more, especially when representing his record and influence (or not) by us. Heather's got a ton of PR experience and would have weighed in to help protect you and the organizations from areas where the reporter may attempt to trip you up. I'll have someone cut and paste these into one document and see if Heather notes areas that may be ripe for follow-up or concern. I have no idea if the Post will contact us.

On Dec 3, 2012, at 11:50 PM, "Ed Whitfield" <[redacted]@verizon.net>
wrote:

> Sorry, I am not tracking you. What do you mean by "consistent approach?"
> Are you expecting the Post to submit questions to HSLF and HSUS?
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
> Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 10:03 PM
> To: Ed Whitfield
> Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7
>
> Yea, I want the rest. I understood we were going to vet this so we
> had a consistent approach. If there are follow-ups, we're responding
> to answers we didn't settle on.
>
> On Dec 3, 2012, at 9:54 PM, "Ed Whitfield" <[redacted]@verizon.net>
wrote:
>
>> That was the response for questions 2-7.
>>
>> Question 1 asked about my qualifications. Question 8 asked for
>> examples of Ed's going against HSUS interests. Question 9 was
>> anything I

> wanted to add.
>> Question 10 was about my compensation.
>>
>> Let me know if you want to read any of my answers.
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
>> Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 9:13 PM
>> To: Ed Whitfield
>> Subject: Re: Answer to Questions 2-7
>>
>> Thanks, Connie. That was the whole response?
>>
>> On Dec 3, 2012, at 8:48 PM, "Ed Whitfield"
>> <[redacted]@verizon.net<[redacted]@verizon.net>> wrote:
>>
>>
>> <<...>>
>>
>> <Wash Post # 2-#6.doc>
>>
>

EXHIBIT 43

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 11:22 AM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony

---

They are mischaracterizing the provision. Nevertheless, I think I will call Jan Baran.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 21, 2013, at 10:57 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Connie, I researched what they alleged in the House Rules in their press release. I pasted it below.
>
> 7. A Member, Delegate, or Resident
> Commissioner shall prohibit all staff
> employed by that Member, Delegate, or
> Resident Commissioner (including staff
> in personal, committee, and leadership
> offices) from making any lobbying contact
> (as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying
> Disclosure Act of 1995) with that
> individual's spouse if that spouse is a
> lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure
> Act of 1995 or is employed or retained
> by such a lobbyist for the purpose of
> influencing legislation.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Friday, June 21, 2013 10:51 AM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Subject: Re: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony
>
> I was kidding! Just choose a good moment!
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jun 21, 2013, at 7:40 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>
>> Connie, I do not feel comfortable not show Ed.
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
>> Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 7:50 PM
>> To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony
>>
>> Don't show this to Ed!
>>
>> Cory. I would like to scan and send to Roy Exum the legislative record and text we sent to the Wash Post about this issue.
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>> From: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
>> Date: June 20, 2013, 4:23:51 PM EDT
>> To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield
<[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Cherie Beatty
<[redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>>
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony
>>
>>
>>
>> Sent from my Verizon Wireless Droid
>>
>>
>> -----Original message-----
>> From: roy exum <[redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>>
>> To: [redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>" <[redacted]@aol.com<[redacted]@aol.com>>
>> Sent: Thu, Jun 20, 2013 20:20:03 GMT+00:00
>> Subject: Fwd: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony
>>
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Walking Horse <[redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>>
>> To: pshassoc <[redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>>
>> Sent: Thu, Jun 20, 2013 3:48 pm
>> Subject: PRESS RELEASE: PSHA Reacts to Misleading Testimony
>>
>> PRESS RELEASE: June 20th, 2013
>> Whitfield (R-KY) Pushes Elimination of Walking Horse Industry and Risks Ethics Violation to Help Wife's Employer Shelbyville, TN - Today, the Performance Show Horse Association (PSHA) reacted to misleading and inaccurate testimony given by U.S. Representative Ed Whitfield yesterday to the Rules Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. Whitfield was pushing to add an amendment to the Farm Bill that would destroy the walking horse industry, an industry that generates hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity each year and

tens of millions of dollars to charities throughout the country. In addition, the Whitfield Amendment would add millions of dollars to the cost of the Farm Bill to taxpayers by forcing the U.S. Department of Agriculture to hire hundreds of new inspectors and other personnel.
>>
>> Yesterday Whitfield told the Members of the Committee, during a discussion of proposed amendments to the farm bill, that the amendment would only would only change the industry's self-inspection process. What Whitfield failed to tell his fellow Members of Congress is that:
>>
>> * The amendment eliminates a total division of the equine breed, impacting more than 10,000 horses that would be deemed no longer fit for their intended purpose;
>> * Take from hard-working taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars of investments and income without cause or any scientific evidence;
>> * Eliminates the Horse Protection Act's self-regulation, which is far superior to that of the federal government and which does not need the hundreds of new federal employees required by Whitfield's amendment;
>> * Eliminates self-regulation that is far superior than that of the federal government whose services he wants to expand; and
>> * Creates a federal bureaucracy that will result in a huge cost to taxpayers by increasing the agency's budget in order to do the same thing that the industry does today at minimal cost to the taxpayers.
>>
>> One other important fact Mr. Whitfield failed to tell his fellow Members is that he is sponsoring this amendment because his wife is a paid lobbyist for the Humane Society Legislative Fund, one of the main advocates for this amendment. This action by Mr. Whitfield would appear to be a violation of the House Code of Official Conduct and a violation of House Rule 25, Clause 7.
>>
>> ###

EXHIBIT 44

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 11:35 AM
To: Heydlauff, Emma <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Ellmers' Office

You have been doing a GREAT job.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 22, 2013, at 11:25 AM, "Heydlauff, Emma" <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I am currently working on the meetings that we have pending and any that may need to be rescheduled. I set up a meeting with Issa's office already this morning.
>
> Thanks,
> Emma
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 11:19 AM
> To: Heydlauff, Emma
> Subject: Fwd: Ellmers' Office
>
> Emma,
>
> Please see second paragraph below.
>
> Thanks,
> Connie
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Date: October 22, 2013, 10:51:18 AM EDT
> To: "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>>
> Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, "Blackberry, Ed" <[redacted]@mail.house.gov<[redacted]@mail.house.gov>>, [redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>" <[redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>>
> Subject: Re: Ellmers' Office
>
> Cory,
>
> John Sabo failed to tell you that he asked me to call the House Administration Committee for a final "ruling." So the issue is NOT yet resolved. I plan to call them later today.
>
> John also said that ANY meeting already set up --including meetings that need to be rescheduled--can go forward.
>
> So, don't back down so quickly.
>
> Connie
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 22, 2013, at 9:25 AM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
>
> Congressman and Connie, I received a phone call from the House Ethics Committee this morning and they changed their mind. They advised us that we cannot set up these meetings all together for Donna and Marty. It may be that Ellmers' office called them. John Sabo said he spoke with Connie and informed her of this change in course as well. For the meetings that we have set up, I've asked Emma to follow through and finish what we started, but going forward I've asked her to stop setting up the meetings. Marty and/or Donna will have to set them up going forward.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Hicks, Cory
> Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 3:54 PM
> To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield'
> Cc: Blackberry, Ed; [redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>
> Subject: RE: Ellmers' Office
>
> Connie, Marty is reaching out to Ellmers staff to set up the meeting. I did inform their LD that she was wrong and that there is nothing wrong with our office setting up these meetings. The person I spoke with at Ethics is John Sabo at 225-7103. I actually just spoke with him again and he advised against your attending because we are setting them up and you are a registered lobbyist.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 3:39 PM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Cc: Blackberry, Ed; [redacted]@gmail.com<[redacted]@gmail.com>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> Subject: Re: Ellmers' Office
>
> Cory,
>
> I am happy to talk to the Ethics Committee myself.
>
> In the meantime, please tell Elmers 'LD that you spoke to the Ethics Committee and they see no problem because Ed sponsored the bill and all three are on the same page.
>
> What is the name of the ethics person with whom you spoke? I would like to talk to the same person.
>

> Thanks,
> Connie
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Oct 21, 2013, at 3:29 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov><mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>> wrote:
>
> Congressman, I just had a very uncomfortable conversation with Renee Ellmers office's legislative director. They were concerned with the optics of our office setting up a meetings for Marty and Donna. I called the ethics committee and they did not have a problem with our office setting up meetings on a bill that you have sponsored. I even asked what if we were requesting offices to take a meeting on behalf of a registered lobbyist. They also did not have a problem with us requesting meetings with registered lobbyists. I did not inform them that Connie was attending these meetings as I suspected they would have expressed concerns since she's married to you and a registered lobbyist. Since people are starting to hear about these meetings on the Hill and their effectiveness, I think we need to be careful about Connie attending these meetings. What do you think?
>
> Cory Hicks
> Chief of Staff
> Chairman Ed Whitfield
> 202-225-[redacted]
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
> <image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield> <image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01> <image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
> Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.
> http://whitfield.house.gov<http://whitfield.house.gov/>
>

EXHIBIT 45

From: Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 11, 2013 8:46 AM
To: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>
Subject: Re: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

Pls get response from her ASAP

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 11, 2013, at 8:07 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>> wrote:

I know she was in direct touch with House Ethics about six weeks ago to seek advice on specific activities, which is why she backed off asks/communications with Whitfield's staff and Keith and I took more prominent role. An overarching prohibition? Didn't come up.

On Dec 11, 2013, at 8:00 AM, "Michael Markarian" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

What does Connie say about the rule?

From: Heather Sullivan
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:14 PM
To: Michael Markarian
Cc: Alan Heymann; Sara Amundson
Subject: FW: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

Hi, Mike.

Would you like to talk to her, or would you like me to send her a statement?

From: Anna Palmer [[redacted]@politico.com>[redacted]@politico.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 5:08 PM
To: HSLF Heather Sullivan
Subject: Story, Anna Palmer Politico

Heather,

Hi, my name is Anna Palmer. I am working on a story regarding Rep. Whitfield and his wife Connie Harriman-Whitfield. The congressman has co-sponsored and sponsored legislation that Connie has specifically lobbied on for HSLF, according to Senate lobbying disclosure reports. This includes cosponsoring HR. 847, 1094, 366, 183 and sponsoring HR. 1518. This would appear to be a violation of the House ethics rules regarding spouses and members of Congress. I am interested to see if Connie has a comment and/or if someone at the Humane Society Legislative Fund can speak to this issue and whether HSLF sees this as a conflict of interest. I am on deadline for 5 pm Wednesday. The best number for me is [redacted]

Thanks,

Anna

Anna Palmer
POLITICO

Cell: [redacted]
Twitter: @apalmerdc

EXHIBIT 46

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, January 1, 2014 6:47 PM
To: Marty Irby <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Vail/Priscilla Presley

Sara makes a good point about Landrieu. She is in a tough re-election campaign.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>
Date: January 1, 2014 at 6:36:52 PM EST
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Re: Vail/Priscilla Presley

Love the Landrieu idea, but she's going to be concentrated other own fundraising! How about a reception featuring Presley with the other female senators as hosts too? An easier ask of a senator in cycle likely to be forced to a December run-off as she may not get 50% again...

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 1, 2014, at 5:27 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Ed and I will be in Vail 1/2-1/6 for five Republican fundraisers including Pompeo, Schock, Aderholt, Adrian Smith and Ed. Lots of lobbyists, of course.

Marty and I met all day yesterday re strategy and I arranged for a former McCain staffer to set up meetings with McCain and Graham.

My latest idea is to have Mary Landrieu do a fundraiser for our cause at her double townhouse. All women Senators who support PAST will be the Host Committee and Priscilla Presley will be the draw (if Keith can get her to do it). Crazy but an ideal way to get media attention and to box Republican Senators into a corner.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 1, 2014, at 4:37 PM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>> wrote:

Ugh!!! They ordered it in November and it was back ordered. Ridiculous. Will yell.

Happy New Year!

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 1, 2014, at 4:31 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

a new computer!!! Mine will not work!

Happy New Year!!!!

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 47

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE WHITFIELD'S FORMER STAFFER

INTERVIEW OF [redacted]

April 25, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Nate Wright

By Telephone:

[redacted]

Lawrence Tabus

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Nate Wright

4 with the Office of Congressional Ethics and we are

5 joined via conference call with [redacted] and his

6 attorney Lawrence Tabus. It is April 25, 2014.

7 [redacted], I just want to begin with a

8 few background questions. Can you let me know when

9 you were employed with Representative Whitfield's

10 congressional office?

11 A. Yes, February 2013 through the end of

12 February 2014.

13 Q. Okay. And during that time, what was

14 your job title?

15 A. Press Secretary.

16 Q. And as Press Secretary, what were your

17 duties?

18 A. I handled the communications and

19 outreach effort for Congressman Whitfield.

20 Q. And did you have any legislative

21 responsibilities, say a portfolio of certain issues?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And what were those issues?

24 A. They were handling agriculture issues,

25 basic -- primarily during the government shut down

1 which coincided with a former staffer leaving the
2 office.
3 Q. And did the AG issues include animal
4 welfare issues?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Okay. So how long were you
7 responsible for animal welfare issues?
8 A. Maybe six weeks, if I had to guess. I
9 don't really -- I'm not sure. I didn't mark it on a
10 calendar.
11 Q. Are you familiar with the PAST Act,
12 the Prevent of All Soring Tactics Act of 2013?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. And what was your role with this
15 legislation?
16 A. I would say generally tracking
17 co-sponsors, because I took over the issue after it
18 was already introduced and well circulated.
19 Q. Anything else besides tracking
20 co-sponsors?
21 A. Helping set up meetings, again, during
22 the shut down, because we were short staffed and
23 obviously I would say 90 percent of my job still
24 focused on my press duties, and answering
25 constituent phone calls due to the short staff. I

1 would try to help set up meetings with interest
2 groups, supporters of the PAST Act, with other
3 offices.
4 Q. Okay. And let me make sure I am
5 clear, you would set up meetings between other
6 congressional offices and interest groups?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. Anything else that you did for the
9 bill?
10 A. Not that I can recall. I know I --
11 helped draft a few dear colleague letters, I think
12 that goes into the whole tracking co-sponsors and
13 gathering co-sponsors.
14 Q. Okay. Do you know Mrs. Whitfield?
15 A. Professionally, yes.
16 Q. And how long -- well, let me rephrase
17 that. When did you first meet her?
18 A. The first day I actually started, she
19 was in with the Congressman's dog.
20 Q. Okay. And are you aware that she
21 worked with the Humane Society?
22 A. Now or then?
23 Q. Then.
24 A. No.
25 Q. When did you first learn that she was

1 employed with the Humane Society?
2 A. I couldn't point to a specific date.
3 Q. During the time period in October of
4 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act, did you
5 know she was employed with the Humane Society?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. At that time, did you know whether she
8 was a registered lobbyist?
9 A. I don't know.
10 Q. Just so I am clear, you are saying at
11 that time, you didn't know, are you saying at this
12 time you don't know what you knew then?
13 A. I can't tell you the specific time I
14 found out she was a lobbyist.
15 Q. And are you aware she's a registered
16 lobbyist now, currently, today?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. During your work on the PAST Act that
19 you described earlier, did you have communication
20 with Mrs. Whitfield concerning that legislation?
21 A. Can you be more specific on
22 communications?
23 Q. Absolutely. Communication ranging
24 from emails, telephone conversations and in person
25 conversations.

1 A. My initial answer is primarily email,
2 but I guess I would want you to be more specific on
3 emails, you mean direct one on one emails, group
4 emails, I would say the majority -- I would say over
5 90 percent of my communication was through group
6 emails to which I was not the originator of.
7 Q. Okay. Let's take them one by one
8 then. With the group emails that you were on during
9 that time period with Mrs. Whitfield, those were
10 emails that you received from her and you were on a
11 group of recipients?
12 A. Correct, yes.
13 Q. And then with respect to one on one
14 emails, where she's communicating with you or you
15 are communicating with her, what was the percentage
16 of those?
17 A. I would say less than one percent.
18 Q. And in the remaining percentage of
19 emails that you had, how would you describe those?
20 A. Just group emails where I would -- I
21 was cc'd on a bunch of them.
22 Q. You said bc'd?
23 A. Cc'd.
24 Q. And just so I am clear, it seems as
25 though I don't get the distinction between the 90

1 percent you mentioned that were group emails and
2 this remaining percentage of approximately nine
3 percent?
4 A. I'm sorry. Sorry, 99 percent of the
5 emails were group emails, and one percent -- less
6 than one percent were direct one on one. In fact,
7 I'm not sure, aside from the one example in your
8 email that you sent us, I can't recall if I had any
9 other direct emails where at least one other person
10 was not cc'd.
11 Q. Now let's discuss telephone calls with
12 Mrs. Whitfield. Did you have telephone
13 communications with her during this time period in
14 2013 when you were working on the PAST Act?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. What was the nature of those calls in
17 general, I am not expecting you to remember
18 specifics on every call, but in general, how would
19 you describe the nature of those calls?
20 A. I would say a lot of them, the ones
21 that come to mind would be during the shut down when
22 I was again, aside from focusing 90 percent of my
23 time on my official press duties, another part of
24 the time would be answering the phone because our
25 legislative assistants were laid off, I would say

1 some of them would be asking for another person or
2 if the Congressman was in the office, that she
3 needed to speak to or -- and it was more of well,
4 while she had me on the phone, do you know the
5 current co-sponsor number of the PAST Act, and I
6 feel like a lot of the time, I was just like the
7 middle man in connecting her to someone else.
8 Q. Would those phone calls also relate to
9 scheduling meetings with potential co-sponsors?
10 A. I don't remember.
11 Q. Okay. With the emails or -- let me
12 rephrase that. Your communications in general with
13 her during that time period, did they include
14 discussions on scheduling meetings with potential
15 co-sponsors?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. Okay. And can you explain, describe
18 in general what was going on, what type of
19 information you were sharing or discussing with her?
20 A. With her or with the scheduling of
21 meetings?
22 Q. With her concerning the scheduling of
23 the meetings.
24 A. Just when the two interested parties
25 were meeting at the offices, her not being the party

1 but typically just two other people, not her.
2 Q. Were those two other people, Marty
3 Irby and Donna?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. And during this time period when you
6 were working on those meetings, was it your
7 understanding that Mrs. Whitfield could possibly
8 attend those meetings?
9 A. No, but again, a majority of my
10 efforts were focused on dealing with the press
11 during the shut down. I think it's important to
12 realize we were under media fire in Congress for
13 forcing the government shut down and I spent a
14 majority of my efforts trying to protect the
15 congressman from bad press and being accused of
16 starting the government shut down.
17 Q. Who was the staff person who was most
18 involved in scheduling the meetings?
19 A. I don't know.
20 Q. Are you familiar with Emma Heydlauff?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Is she the Scheduler in the
23 Congressman's office?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. Do you recall whether or not she was

1 working on scheduling these meetings?
2 A. I believe she did have involvement,
3 yes.
4 Q. Do you recall approximately the number
5 of meetings that were scheduled related to this PAST
6 Act at that time in October 2013?
7 A. I don't want to speculate, because I
8 don't know the number.
9 Q. Do you know whether it was more than
10 50?
11 A. 50 or 15?
12 Q. 50, five zero.
13 A. That seems high.
14 Q. Okay. Did you have communications
15 with Mrs. Whitfield related to communications like
16 dear colleagues letters?
17 A. Yes, to check for accuracy, because
18 again, I was the Press Secretary, I was primarily
19 focused on the Congressman's external communications
20 publically, so obviously I am not familiar with
21 legislative background or the legal language of a
22 bill, so I -- I had her verify -- the dear colleague
23 to make sure I was adequately explaining the bill
24 that I wanted other members of Congress to
25 co-sponsor.

1 Q. Who suggested you send out the dear
2 colleague letter?
3 A. I think it's just a general thing,
4 everybody does it. Once I took over the agriculture
5 issue briefly, I would get 20 or 30 dear colleagues
6 a day, it's a pretty standard known practice.
7 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield request that you
8 send out a dear colleague letter?
9 A. Not that I recall.
10 Q. And any other letters that you are
11 involved in related to the PAST Act, such as the
12 Royce letter, do you recall discussing such letters
13 with Mrs. Whitfield?
14 A. Honestly, I don't even recall the
15 Royce letter.
16 Q. And from the --
17 A. I think it's important to remember
18 that all -- really all of my focus was on my actual
19 job of not -- during the shut down, but doing my job
20 as Press Secretary.
21 Q. From the documents that we sent, did
22 that refresh your recollection as to whether you had
23 an email between you and Mrs. Whitfield discussing a
24 "Royce letter"?
25 MR. TABUS: Kedric, is there a

1 specific Bates number document that you can identify
2 that he can --
3 MR. PAYNE: Yes, absolutely. It is
4 EW4001542. EW4001542.
5 A. Okay. And what was your question
6 again?
7 Q. The question is, after taking a look
8 at that email, does that refresh your recollection
9 as to whether you were involved in drafting a letter
10 that's entitled Royce letter?
11 A. I mean obviously I must have, it's on
12 there. I don't recall it but again, I am writing
13 press releases, I am writing talking points on the
14 shut down, I am writing emails, I write for a
15 living, so I could not -- I could not recall a
16 majority of the press releases that I wrote, I don't
17 think it's --
18 Q. Did Mrs. Whitfield ever request that
19 you write a press release?
20 A. No.
21 Q. Did she ever request that you write a
22 letter?
23 A. Not to my recollection.
24 Q. And did she ever request that you
25 write any public statement or other document on

1 behalf of Representative Whitfield?
2 A. No.
3 Q. I want to also draw your attention to
4 another document that is in there, it is EW3000753.
5 EW3000753.
6 A. Okay.
7 Q. And in the email, Mrs. Whitfield sends
8 it to you and Mr. Hicks and says can you set up a
9 meeting with Yarmouth and you respond sure thing.
10 Can you describe what the purpose of this meeting
11 was?
12 A. I would assume -- actually I don't
13 want to assume -- I don't know what the purpose -- I
14 would say it was probably, to set up the meeting for
15 Marty and Donna.
16 Q. During that time period, October 13
17 when this is dated and you are setting up those
18 meetings, why would Mrs. Whitfield contact you about
19 setting up meetings for Marty and Donna?
20 A. I think you have to ask her that
21 question.
22 Q. We absolutely will ask her but I want
23 to get your understanding of this email that was
24 sent to you where you say sure thing to her request
25 about setting up the meeting?

1 A. Ask the question again.
2 Q. Why are you receiving an email from
3 Mrs. Whitfield to set up a meeting for Marty and
4 Donna?
5 A. So Marty and Donna could advocate on
6 on behalf of the PAST Act for which they are
7 supporters.
8 Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in
9 getting the supporters for the PAST Act?
10 A. I don't know.
11 Q. Did Marty and Donna have any
12 connection with the Humane Society?
13 A. I think they all were supporters of
14 this bill.
15 Q. And did you have any communication
16 with Mrs. Whitfield about her attending any meetings
17 with Marty and Donna at this time period?
18 A. Not that I can recall.
19 Q. Did you work on any additional
20 legislation related to animal welfare issues other
21 than the PAST Act?
22 A. I -- I think I did something with the
23 horse racing doping bill but I couldn't tell you --
24 the name -- I couldn't tell you beyond that, I don't
25 know what it is really about, or I don't recall

1 tracking co-sponsors or anything like that either.
2 Q. With that bill, do you recall having
3 any communications with Mrs. Whitfield?
4 A. No.
5 Q. Did you do any work on the Puppy
6 Uniform Protection and Safety Act of 2013?
7 A. No.
8 Q. The SAFE Act of 2013, the Safeguard
9 American Food Exports Act?
10 A. It is a tough one, I don't remember if
11 I am remembering it because of potential press or
12 because of legislation.
13 Q. To the extent you do remember, do you
14 recall any communications with Mrs. Whitfield on
15 that -- on that bill?
16 A. No.
17 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act
18 of 2013?
19 A. The question what was?
20 Q. The Veterans Dog Training Therapy Act
21 of 2013, do you have any role or work that you
22 performed related to that act?
23 A. Again, I don't know. I could have
24 seen it on the house GOP communications, email
25 saying that this bill is on the floor, I guess. I

1 could have heard the name but I don't know why I
2 heard the name.
3 Q. And Animal Fighting Spectator
4 Prohibition Act, are you familiar with that?
5 A. No.
6 Q. Okay. During your time period working
7 with Representative Whitfield's office, did Mrs.
8 Whitfield ever have you working on special projects
9 or assignments?
10 A. No.
11 Q. Okay. And in the material that we
12 sent to you, there is a document bates stamped
13 EW4001549. Let me know when you have it.
14 A. I have it.
15 Q. And at the top it's from you to Cory
16 Hicks and it says Connie called and asked me on a
17 side project at the moment.
18 A. Uh-huh.
19 Q. Can you describe what you meant with
20 that statement?
21 A. I truthfully don't recall the email.
22 Again, I just want to say it was in the middle of
23 the shut down, I get hundreds of emails a day and I
24 am doing double duty with answering phones and
25 handling this issue and obviously doing my real job.

1 Q. And with those emails and telephone
2 calls that you are getting and your real job, did
3 you receive multiple phone calls and emails from
4 Mrs. Whitfield related to various issues?
5 A. Not other than what I described
6 earlier, where I was answering the phones during the
7 shut down and she may have called for her husband,
8 but nothing out of what I said earlier.
9 Q. And you don't recall her requesting
10 any activity from you to do anything related to the
11 PAST Act other than what you have described with the
12 meetings?
13 A. You are -- just setting up meetings
14 for Marty and Donna?
15 Q. That's correct. That's correct.
16 A. No, I don't recall anything other than
17 that.
18 Q. During that time period, October 2013,
19 did issues arise related to press focusing on the
20 contacts between Mrs. Whitfield's office and
21 Representative Whitfield's office?
22 A. Yes, I believe so. I believe some
23 papers from Tennessee had contacted us about the
24 bill.
25 Q. Okay. And as you said, that was what

1 you were really focused on was the press, that's the
2 main thing you handle and is your bread and butter.
3 During that time period, did Mrs.
4 Whitfield contact you related to a response that you
5 were preparing for the media on that issue?
6 A. I can't recall. I mean I think all of
7 my -- when dealing with the press, I usually go to
8 my Chief of Staff to verify accuracy of any
9 statements I would make publicly, because I really
10 truly never understood the language of this bill,
11 because it's not my area, it's not my bread and
12 butter.
13 Q. With respect to the contacts between
14 Mrs. Whitfield and the Congressman's office, were
15 you ever given any advice from the office on any
16 restrictions to those contacts?
17 A. Can you elaborate on what you mean by
18 restrictions?
19 Q. Was there any policy in the office on
20 how to handle requests from Mrs. Whitfield?
21 A. No, not that I can recall.
22 Q. Okay.
23 A. I am obviously being polite, it's the
24 Congressman's wife.
25 Q. Right, but were there any policies or

1 procedures related to her lobbying the office?
2 A. I don't believe so.
3 Q. Okay. And did you have any
4 conversations with Representative Whitfield about
5 any ethics rules concerning her lobbying the office?
6 A. No.
7 MR. WRIGHT: This is Mr. Wright here,
8 I am wondering how often was Mrs. Whitfield in
9 Representative Whitfield's office, like how often
10 would she stop by?
11 A. Not very often.
12 Q. Is that once per week, daily, can you
13 be more specific?
14 A. I mean average that I worked for the
15 congressman, I would say far far less than a week,
16 once a week.
17 Q. So maybe like once a month?
18 A. If that, yes, on average over a year,
19 I'd say maybe -- (inaudible), I would say average if
20 I saw her 12 times in a year.
21 MR. WRIGHT: How often would she make
22 requests of people in the office that you were aware
23 of?
24 A. I wasn't aware -- the way the press
25 job is set up there, pretty much a lot of times

1 offices are set up where they are communications
2 heavy or legislative heavy where the Legislative
3 Director would have pretty much control over the
4 other employees, and that's how ours was set up,
5 where I basically was just in my own little world,
6 for lack of a better term, doing press duties.
7 MR. WRIGHT: Did Mrs. Whitfield ever
8 make a request of you to do something that you
9 thought was unusual or you may not want to have done
10 given all the other duties that you had at the time?
11 A. No.
12 MR. WRIGHT: Alright, were there ever
13 discussions going back to October 2013, discussions
14 about getting enough materials for these meetings
15 that were being set up?
16 A. I guess I don't -- what do you mean
17 materials?
18 MR. WRIGHT: So you have Mr. Irby
19 going around and doing a variety of different
20 meetings and I was wondering, were there any
21 discussions about we need to make sure that he has
22 enough materials for all of the meetings that he has
23 set up in the day?
24 A. I think so, yes.
25 MR. WRIGHT: Does that help you recall

1 at all the number of meetings that he may have been
2 going to?
3 A. No. I do recall them preparing
4 packets but, I don't know the quantity of the
5 packets.
6 MR. WRIGHT: Did you think that -- you
7 talked about how there were a lot of staffing
8 constraints at the time. Did you think it was
9 unusual to do this kind of push to try to set up all
10 these meetings in October of 2013?
11 A. Nothing was getting done, I don't see
12 why not, they weren't -- there was a shut down, they
13 had nothing but time.
14 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. And who in the
15 office would set the priority to do something like
16 that?
17 A. All I could say it wasn't me, so I
18 don't know -- it happens outside of my scope, so I
19 am not sure who handled that.
20 MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember around
21 that timeframe meeting with Senator Cochran that you
22 attended with Mrs. Whitfield?
23 A. She was -- I wouldn't say that I
24 attended with her, I attended with my Chief of Staff
25 and I believe Marty.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Why did you leave the
2 office?
3 A. When?
4 MR. WRIGHT: In, I believe you said --
5 Q. You left in February of '14?
6 A. Oh, leave employment, better
7 opportunity.
8 Q. And I just want to go back to the
9 meeting with Senator Cochran. What occurred during
10 that meeting?
11 A. From what I can recall, Marty just
12 talked about why the bill was so important, drawing
13 on his expertise as a former -- I believe he was the
14 President of the Tennessee Walking Horse whatever,
15 group, industry, association.
16 Q. And when did that meeting occur?
17 A. I don't know.
18 Q. But it was --
19 A. During the fall.
20 Q. Okay. During that October November
21 2013 time period?
22 A. Yeah, in the fall.
23 Q. And was Mrs. Whitfield in attendance?
24 A. I believe she joined afterwards, yes.
25 Q. You said joined afterwards, what do

1 you mean, she was -- when the meeting was taking
2 place, she was present?
3 A. Yeah, I walked over with my Chief of
4 Staff and then at that time I had no idea she was
5 going to be attending.
6 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Did you think it
7 was unusual that she attended?
8 A. No. I mean lobbyists meet with elected
9 officials all the time, that's how they earn their
10 paycheck.
11 MR. WRIGHT: And it wasn't unusual,
12 because you said you thought earlier when these
13 meetings were being set up and even when she
14 requested that you set the meeting, you said you
15 didn't think she was attending these meetings, so
16 did it surprise you at all when she was there?
17 A. No, because I knew like the groups,
18 they all had a vested interest in the bill.
19 Q. And you just mentioned that it did not
20 stand out to you because lobbyists do that every
21 day. So during that time period, did you know that
22 she was a lobbyist?
23 A. No, again, as I said I don't know when
24 I discovered she was a lobbyist, exactly.
25 Q. Okay.

1 A. But I was speaking from the knowledge
2 I have now.
3 Q. From the knowledge you have now is why
4 you didn't think it was strange at the time? Is
5 that what you are saying?
6 A. Can you rephrase that?
7 Q. What I am unclear about, is the reason
8 why you did not think it was strange that Mrs.
9 Whitfield showed up and your reply was that
10 lobbyists do that type of thing all the time and I
11 am paraphrasing, but you did say lobbyist, so how at
12 that time did you not think it was strange and at
13 the same time not know she was a lobbyist?
14 A. Okay, a person -- I may have misspoke
15 because I knew now she's a lobbyist. I knew the
16 Humane Society had an interest in the bill so it
17 wasn't a surprise for me to see her there. Again, I
18 don't know exactly when I found out she was a
19 lobbyist.
20 MR. WRIGHT: And it wouldn't surprise
21 you if she was attending some of the other meetings
22 that were being set up?
23 A. I don't know. I hadn't thought about
24 it. I attended one other meeting and she was not
25 present. All I remember, attending two meetings,

1 one she was there, and one she was not.
2 MR. WRIGHT: Do you remember if Mrs.
3 Whitfield said anything during the meeting or what
4 her involvement in the meeting was?
5 A. No, usually I was just on my work
6 phone trying to keep track of press. I couldn't
7 even tell you one thing that was said during that
8 Cochran -- Corkran -- I don't know -- who was the
9 Senator?
10 Q. Cochran.
11 A. Yeah, I could tell you that the topic
12 was the PAST Act, I couldn't really tell you
13 specifics of what was said.
14 Q. Why exactly were you at the meeting
15 again, I know you said you were there to join your
16 colleague, but what was your role in the meeting?
17 A. I don't think I said anything during
18 the meeting, I think aside from the fact that I was
19 the person handling that issue at the time, whether
20 it was the shut down or still looking to fill the
21 position.
22 MR. WRIGHT: Were there any other
23 interactions that you had with Mrs. Whitfield at the
24 Humane Society that stick out in your mind?
25 A. No.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Were there, you know, any
2 other interactions with Mrs. Whitfield that might be
3 helpful for us to know?
4 A. No.
5 Q. And were you in the office when Marty
6 Irby was hired?
7 A. Was I employed by the office?
8 Q. Yes.
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Okay. And did you interview Mr. Irby?
11 A. Interview for his -- I believe now
12 he's the Press Secretary. Are you talking did him
13 and I talk when he became Press Secretary or when he
14 joined the office as a legislative staffer?
15 Q. When he joined the office as a
16 legislative staffer around December 2013.
17 A. I didn't interview him, not that I
18 remember, no.
19 Q. And what were his duties when he came
20 to the office in December of 2013?
21 A. He took over the issues I was filling
22 in for.
23 Q. So you had to transition everything
24 over to him?
25 A. There really wasn't much to

1 transition, I basically gave him the co-sponsor
2 spreadsheet or told him where it was located in the
3 shared folder.
4 Q. What was your understanding of how he
5 became employed with the office?
6 A. His expertise on the issues.
7 Q. And what is your understanding of Mrs.
8 Whitfield's role in his employment with the office?
9 A. I don't know.
10 Q. Okay. Well, those are all of our
11 questions. We do thank you again for your time. Do
12 you have any questions for us, anything you want to
13 clarify?
14 MR. TABUS: Kedric, there was one
15 thing way back, hang on, let me go to my -- you had
16 asked -- I think you were asking him about whether
17 Mrs. Whitfield had him working on any activity on
18 the PAST Act and it was like the question seem to be
19 narrowed, and [redacted] answered but did you also mean,
20 and cause [redacted] had testified that he also said that
21 he had helped and worked on the co-sponsors part. I
22 think your question was so limited, I didn't want to
23 -- [redacted] you worked on helping get co-sponsors was
24 part of your responsibility. Correct?
25 A. Yes.

1 MR. TABUS: I just wanted to make sure
2 that was clarified that he said that to you.
3 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you,
4 Lawrence. So, yeah, thank you. Thank you for that
5 clarification. Alright, anything else?
6 A. No.
7 MR. PAYNE: Alright, thank you and
8 enjoy your weekend.
9 A. Alright, thank you.
10 (Whereupon, the recording is
11 terminated.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

2

3 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
4 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
5 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
6 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
7 forth.
8 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
10 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
11 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
12 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
13 the action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 _____
22 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XIO1717
23 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey
24 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
25

A

absolutely 5:23 12:3 13:22
accuracy 10:17 18:8
accurate 29:4
accused 9:15
act 3:11,12 4:2 5:4 5:18 7:14 8:5 10:6 11:11 14:6,9 14:21 15:6,8,9,17 15:20,22 16:4 17:11 25:12 27:18
action 29:10,13
activity 17:10 27:17
actual 11:18
additional 14:19
adequately 10:23
advice 18:15
advocate 14:5
ag 3:3
agriculture 2:24 11:4
alright 20:12 28:5,7 28:9
american 15:9
animal 3:3,7 14:20 16:3
answer 6:1
answered 27:19
answering 3:24 7:24 16:24 17:6
approximately 7:2 10:4
april 1:5 2:6 29:24
area 18:11
aside 7:7,22 25:18
asked 16:16 27:16
asking 8:1 27:16
assignments 16:9
assistants 7:25
association 22:15
assume 13:12,13
attend 9:8
attendance 22:23
attended 21:22,24 21:24 23:7 24:24
attending 14:16 23:5,15 24:21,25
attention 13:3
attorney 2:6 29:9 29:11
average 19:14,18 19:19
aware 4:20 5:15 19:22,24

B

back 20:13 22:8 27:15
background 2:8 10:21
bad 9:15
basic 2:25
basically 20:5 27:1
bates 12:1 16:12
bcd 6:22
behalf 13:1 14:6
believe 10:2 17:22 17:22 19:2 21:25 22:4,13,24 26:11
better 20:6 22:6
beyond 14:24
bill 4:9 10:22,23 14:14,23 15:2,15 15:25 17:24 18:10 22:12 23:18 24:16
bread 18:2,11
briefly 11:5
bunch 6:21
butter 18:2,12

C

calendar 3:10
call 2:5 7:18
called 16:16 17:7
calls 3:25 7:11,16 7:19 8:8 17:2,3
cant 5:13 7:8 18:6
cause 27:20
ccd 6:21,23 7:10
certain 2:21
certificate 29:1
certify 29:3,8
check 10:17
chief 18:8 21:24 23:3
[redacted] 1:4,13 2:5 27:19,20,23
circulated 3:18
clarification 28:5
clarified 28:2
clarify 27:13
clear 4:5 5:10 6:24
cochran 21:21 22:9 25:8,10
coincided 3:1
colleague 4:11 10:22 11:2,8 25:16
colleagues 10:16 11:5
come 7:21
commission 29:24
communicating 6:14,15
communication 5:19,23 6:5 14:15
communications 2:18 5:22 7:13 8:12 10:14,15,19 15:3,14,24 20:1
concerning 5:20 8:22 19:5
conference 2:5
congress 9:12 10:24
congressional 2:4 2:10 4:6
congressman 2:19 8:2 9:15 19:15
congressmans 4:19 9:23 10:19 18:14 18:24
connecting 8:7
connection 14:12
connie 16:16
constituent 3:25
constraints 21:8
contact 13:18 18:4
contacted 17:23
contacts 17:20 18:13,16
control 20:3
conversations 5:24 5:25 19:4
corkran 25:8
correct 6:12 17:15 17:15 27:24
cory 16:15
cosponsor 8:5 10:25 27:1
cosponsors 3:17,20 4:12,13 8:9,15 15:1 27:21,23
couldnt 5:2 14:23 14:24 25:6,12
counsel 29:9,12
csr 1:16
current 8:5
currently 5:16

D

daily 19:12
date 5:2 29:6
dated 13:17
day 4:18 11:6 16:23 20:23 23:21
dealing 9:10 18:7
dear 4:11 10:16,22 11:1,5,8
december 26:16,20
describe 6:19 7:19 8:17 13:10 16:19
described 5:19 17:5 17:11
didnt 3:9 5:11 23:15 24:4 26:17 27:22
different 20:19
direct 6:3 7:6,9
director 20:3
discovered 23:24
discuss 7:11
discussing 8:19 11:12,23
discussions 8:14 20:13,13,21
distinction 6:25
document 12:1,25 13:4 16:12
documents 11:21
dog 4:19 15:17,20
doing 11:19 16:24 16:25 20:6,19
donna 9:3 13:15,19 14:4,5,11,17 17:14
dont 3:9 5:9,12 6:25 8:10 9:19 10:7,8 11:14 12:12,16 13:12,13 14:10,24,25 15:10 15:23 16:1,21 17:9,16 19:2 20:16 21:4,11,18 22:17 23:23 24:18 24:23 25:8,17 27:9
doping 14:23
double 16:24
draft 4:11
drafting 12:9
draw 13:3
drawing 22:12
due 3:25
duties 2:17 3:24 7:23 20:6,10 26:19
duty 16:24

E

earlier 5:19 17:6,8 23:12
earn 23:9
effort 2:19
efforts 9:10,14
either 15:1
elaborate 18:17
elected 23:8
email 6:1 7:8 11:23 12:8 13:7,23 14:2 15:24 16:21
emails 5:24 6:3,3,4 6:6,8,10,14,19,20 7:1,5,5,9 8:11 12:14 16:23 17:1 17:3
emma 9:20
employed 2:9 5:1,5 26:7 27:5
employee 29:9,11
employees 20:4
employment 22:6 27:8
enjoy 28:8

entirety 1:24
entitled 12:10
ethics 2:4 19:5
everybody 11:4
ew3000753 13:4,5
ew4001542 12:4,4
ew4001549 16:13
exactly 23:24 24:18 25:14
example 7:7
expecting 7:17
expertise 22:13 27:6
expires 29:24
explain 8:17
explaining 10:23
exports 15:9
extent 15:13
external 10:19

F

fact 7:6 25:18
fall 22:19,22
familiar 3:11 9:20 10:20 16:4
far 19:15,15
february 2:11,12 22:5
feel 8:6
fighting 16:3
fill 25:20
filling 26:21
financially 29:12
fire 9:12
first 4:17,18,25
five 10:12
floor 15:25
focus 11:18
focused 3:24 9:10 10:19 18:1
focusing 7:22 17:19
folder 27:3
food 15:9
forcing 9:13
foregoing 29:3
former 3:1 22:13
forth 29:7
found 5:14 24:18
further 29:8

G

gathering 4:13
general 7:17,18 8:12,18 11:3
generally 3:16
getting 14:9 17:2 20:14 21:11
given 18:15 20:10
go 18:7 22:8 27:15
goes 4:12
going 8:18 20:13,19 21:2 23:5
gop 15:24
government 2:25 9:13,16
group 6:3,5,8,11,20 7:1,5 22:15
groups 4:2,6 23:17
guess 3:8 6:2 15:25 20:16

H

hadnt 24:23
handle 18:2,20
handled 2:18 21:19
handling 2:24 16:25 25:19
hang 27:15
happens 21:18
heard 16:1,2
heavy 20:2,2
help 4:1 20:25
helped 4:11 27:21
helpful 26:3
helping 3:21 27:23
hereinbefore 29:6
hes 26:12
heydlauff 9:20
hicks 13:8 16:16
high 10:13
hired 26:6
honestly 11:14
horse 14:23 22:14
house 15:24
humane 4:21 5:1,5 14:12 24:16 25:24
hundreds 16:23
husband 17:7

I

id 19:19
idea 23:4
identify 12:1
im 3:9 7:4,7
important 9:11 11:17 22:12
inaudible 19:19
include 3:3 8:13
industry 22:15
information 8:19
initial 6:1
interactions 25:23 26:2
interest 4:1,6 23:18 24:16
interested 8:24 29:12
interview 1:4 26:10 26:11,17
introduced 3:18
involved 9:18 11:11 12:9
involvement 10:2 25:4
irby 9:3 20:18 26:6 26:10
issue 3:17 11:5 16:25 18:5 25:19
issues 2:21,23,24 3:3,4,7 14:20 17:4 17:19 26:21 27:6

J

jersey 29:23
job 2:14 3:23 11:19 11:19 16:25 17:2 19:25
join 25:15
joined 2:5 22:24,25 26:14,15

K

kedric 1:9 2:3 11:25 27:14
keep 25:6
kind 21:9
knew 5:12 23:17 24:15,15
know 2:8 4:10,14 5:5,7,9,11,12 8:4 9:19 10:8,9 13:13 14:10,25 15:23 16:1,13 21:4,18 22:17 23:21,23 24:13,18,23 25:8 25:15 26:1,3 27:9
knowledge 24:1,3
known 11:6

L

lack 20:6
laid 7:25
language 10:21 18:10
lawrence 1:14 2:6 28:4
learn 4:25
leave 22:1,6
leaving 3:1
left 22:5
legal 10:21
legislation 3:15 5:20 14:20 15:12
legislative 2:20 7:25 10:21 20:2,2 26:14,16
letter 11:2,8,12,15 11:24 12:9,10,22
letters 4:11 10:16 11:10,12
license 1:17 29:22
limited 27:22
little 20:5
living 12:15
lobbying 19:1,5
lobbyist 5:8,14,16 23:22,24 24:11,13 24:15,19
lobbyists 23:8,20 24:10
located 27:2
long 3:6 4:16
look 12:7
looking 25:20
lot 7:20 8:6 19:25 21:7
lyn 1:16 29:22

M

main 18:2
majority 6:4 9:9,14 12:16
man 8:7
mark 3:9
marty 9:2 13:15,19 14:3,5,11,17 17:14 21:25 22:11 26:5
material 16:11
materials 20:14,17 20:22
mean 6:3 12:11 18:6,17 19:14 20:16 23:1,8 27:19
meant 16:19
media 9:12 18:5
meet 4:17 23:8
meeting 8:25 13:9 13:10,14,25 14:3 21:21 22:9,10,16 23:1,14 24:24 25:3,4,14,16,18
meetings 3:21 4:1,5 8:9,14,21,23 9:6,8 9:18 10:1,5 13:18 13:19 14:16 17:12 17:13 20:14,20,22 21:1,10 23:13,15 24:21,25
members 10:24
mentioned 7:1 23:19
middle 8:7 16:22
mind 7:21 25:24
misspoke 24:14
moment 16:17
month 19:17
multiple 17:3

N

name 14:24 16:1,2
narrowed 27:19
nate 1:10 2:3
nature 7:16,19
need 20:21
needed 8:3

neither 29:8,11
never 18:10
new 29:23
nine 7:2
notary 29:23
note 1:24
november 22:20
number 8:5 10:4,8 12:1 21:1

O

obviously 3:23 10:20 12:11 16:25 18:23
occur 22:16
occurred 22:9
october 5:3 10:6 13:16 17:18 20:13 21:10 22:20
office 2:4,10 3:2 8:2 9:23 16:7 17:20 17:21 18:14,15,19 19:1,5,9,22 21:15 22:2 26:5,7,14,15 26:20 27:5,8
officer 29:1
offices 4:3,6 8:25 20:1
official 7:23
officials 23:9
oh 22:6
okay 2:13 3:6 4:4 4:14,20 6:7 8:11 8:17 10:14 12:5 13:6 16:6,11 17:25 18:22 19:3 21:14 22:20 23:6 23:25 24:14 26:10 27:10 28:3
once 11:4 19:12,16 19:17
ones 7:20
opportunity 22:7
originator 6:6
outreach 2:19
outside 21:18

P

[redacted] 1:4,13 2:5,7
packets 21:4,5
papers 17:23
paraphrasing 24:11
part 7:23 27:21,24
parties 8:24 29:10
party 8:25
paycheck 23:10
payne 1:9 2:1,3 12:3 28:3,7
people 9:1,2 19:22
percent 3:23 6:5,17 7:1,3,4,5,6,22
percentage 6:15,18 7:2
performed 15:22
period 5:3 6:9 7:13 8:13 9:5 13:16 14:17 16:6 17:18 18:3 22:21 23:21
person 5:24 7:9 8:1 9:17 24:14 25:19
phone 3:25 7:24 8:4,8 17:3 25:6
phones 16:24 17:6
phonetic 1:25
place 23:2 29:6
please 1:24
point 5:2
points 12:13
policies 18:25
policy 18:19
polite 18:23
portfolio 2:21
position 25:21
possibly 9:7
potential 8:9,14 15:11
practice 11:6
preparing 18:5 21:3
present 1:8 23:2 24:25
president 22:14
press 2:15,16 3:24 7:23 9:10,15 10:18 11:20 12:13 12:16,19 15:11 17:19 18:1,7 19:24 20:6 25:6 26:12,13
pretty 11:6 19:25 20:3
prevent 3:12
primarily 2:25 6:1 10:18
priority 21:15
probably 13:14
procedures 19:1
proceedings 29:5
professionally 4:15
prohibition 16:4
project 16:17
projects 16:8
protect 9:14
protection 15:6
public 12:25 29:23
publically 10:20
publicly 18:9
puppy 15:5
purpose 13:10,13
push 21:9

Q

quantity 21:4
question 12:5,7 13:21 14:1 15:19 27:18,22
questioning 2:1
questions 2:8 27:11 27:12

R

racing 14:23
rahn 1:16 29:22
ranging 5:23
real 16:25 17:2
realize 9:12
really 3:9 11:18 14:25 18:1,9 25:12 26:25
reason 24:7
recall 4:10 7:8 9:25 10:4 11:9,12,14 12:12,15 14:18,25 15:2,14 16:21 17:9,16 18:6,21 20:25 21:3 22:11
receive 17:3
received 6:10
receiving 14:2
recipients 6:11
recollection 11:22 12:8,23
recording 28:10
refresh 11:22 12:8
registered 5:8,15
relate 8:8
related 10:5,15 11:11 14:20 15:22 17:4,10,19 18:4 19:1
relative 29:9,11
release 12:19
releases 12:13,16
remaining 6:18 7:2
remember 7:17 8:10 11:17 15:10 15:13 21:20 24:25 25:2 26:18
remembering 15:11
rephrase 4:16 8:12 24:6
reply 24:9
reported 29:5
representative 2:9 13:1 16:7 17:21 19:4,9
request 11:7 12:18 12:21,24 13:24 20:8
requested 23:14
requesting 17:9
requests 18:20 19:22
respect 6:13 18:13
respond 13:9
response 18:4
responsibilities 2:21
responsibility 27:24
responsible 3:7
restrictions 18:16 18:18
right 18:25
role 3:14 14:8 15:21 25:16 27:8
royce 11:12,15,24 12:10
rules 19:5

S

safe 15:8
safeguard 15:8
safety 15:6
saw 19:20
saying 5:10,11 15:25 24:5
says 13:8 16:16
scheduled 10:5
scheduler 9:22
scheduling 8:9,14 8:20,22 9:18 10:1
scope 21:18
secretary 2:15,16 10:18 11:20 26:12 26:13
see 21:11 24:17
seen 15:24
senator 21:21 22:9 25:9
send 11:1,8
sends 13:7
sent 7:8 11:21 13:24 16:12
set 3:21 4:1,5 13:8 13:14 14:3 19:25 20:1,4,15,23 21:9 21:15 23:13,14 24:22 29:6
setting 13:17,19,25 17:13
shared 27:3
sharing 8:19
shes 5:15 6:14 24:15
short 3:22,25
showed 24:9
shut 2:25 3:22 7:21 9:11,13,16 11:19 12:14 16:23 17:7 21:12 25:20
side 16:17
six 3:8
society 4:21 5:1,5 14:12 24:16 25:24

soring 3:12
sorry 7:4,4
speak 8:3
speaking 24:1
special 16:8
specific 5:2,13,21 6:2 12:1 19:13
specifics 7:18 25:13
spectator 16:3
speculate 10:7
spellings 1:24
spent 9:13
spreadsheet 27:2
staff 3:25 9:17 18:8 21:24 23:4
staffed 3:22
staffer 3:1 26:14,16
staffing 21:7
stamped 16:12
stand 23:20
standard 11:6
started 4:18
starting 9:16
state 29:23
statement 12:25 16:20
statements 18:9
stenographically 29:5
stephanie 1:16 29:22
stick 25:24
stop 19:10
strange 24:4,8,12
suggested 11:1
supporters 4:2 14:7 14:9,13
sure 3:9 4:4 7:7 10:23 13:9,24 20:21 21:19 28:1
surprise 23:16 24:17,20

T

tabus 1:14 2:6 11:25 27:14 28:1
tactics 3:12
take 6:7
talk 26:13
talked 21:7 22:12
talking 12:13 26:12
telephone 1:12 5:24 7:11,12 17:1
tell 5:13 14:23,24 25:7,11,12
tennessee 17:23 22:14
term 20:6
terminated 28:11
testified 27:20
testimony 29:4
thank 27:11 28:3,4 28:4,7,9
thats 12:10 17:15 17:15 18:1 20:4 23:9
therapy 15:17,20
thing 11:3 13:9,24 18:2 24:10 25:7 27:15
think 4:11 9:11 11:3,17 12:17 13:20 14:13,22 18:6 20:24 21:6,8 23:6,15 24:4,8,12 25:17,18 27:16,22
thought 20:9 23:12 24:23
time 2:13 5:3,7,11 5:12,13 6:9 7:13 7:23,24 8:6,13 9:5 10:6 13:16 14:17 16:6 17:18 18:3 20:10 21:8,13 22:21 23:4,9,21 24:4,10,12,13 25:19 27:11 29:6
timeframe 21:21
times 19:20,25
title 2:14
today 5:16
told 27:2
top 16:15
topic 25:11
tough 15:10
track 25:6
tracking 3:16,19 4:12 15:1
training 15:17,20
transcribed 1:16
transcript 1:25 29:4
transition 26:23 27:1
true 29:3
truly 18:10
truthfully 16:21
try 4:1 21:9
trying 9:14 25:6
two 8:24 9:1,2 24:25
type 8:18 24:10
typically 9:1

U

uhhuh 16:18
unclear 24:7
understanding 9:7 13:23 27:4,7
understood 18:10
uniform 15:6
unusual 20:9 21:9 23:7,11
usually 18:7 25:5

V

variety 20:19
various 17:4
verify 10:22 18:8
vested 23:18
veterans 15:17,20

W

walked 23:3
walking 22:14
want 2:7 6:2 10:7 13:3,13,22 16:22 20:9 22:8 27:12 27:22
wanted 10:24 28:1
wasnt 19:24 21:17 23:11 24:17 26:25
way 19:24 27:15
week 19:12,15,16
weekend 28:8
weeks 3:8
welfare 3:4,7 14:20
whitfield 2:19 4:14 5:20 6:9 7:12 9:7 10:15 11:7,13,23 12:18 13:1,7,18 14:3,16 15:3,14 16:8 17:4 18:4,14 18:20 19:4,8 20:7 21:22 22:23 24:9 25:3,23 26:2 27:17
whitfields 2:9 14:8 16:7 17:20,21 19:9 27:8
wife 18:24
wondering 19:8 20:20
work 5:18 14:19 15:5,21 25:5
worked 4:21 19:14 27:21,23
working 5:4 7:14 9:6 10:1 16:6,8 27:17
world 20:5
wouldnt 21:23 24:20
wright 1:10 2:3 19:7,7,21 20:7,12 20:18,25 21:6,14 21:20 22:1,4 23:6 23:11 24:20 25:2 25:22 26:1
write 12:14,19,21 12:25
writing 12:12,13,14
wrote 12:16

X

xio1717 1:17 29:22

Y

yarmouth 13:9
yeah 22:22 23:3 25:11 28:4
year 19:18,20

Z

zero 10:12

0

1

12 19:20
13 13:16
14 22:5
15 10:11
18 29:24

2

20 11:5
2013 2:11 3:12 5:4 7:14 10:6 15:6,8 15:18,21 17:18 20:13 21:10 22:21 26:16,20
2014 1:5 2:6,12
2017 29:24
25 1:5 2:6

3

30 11:5

4

5

50 10:10,11,12

6

7

8

9

90 3:23 6:5,25 7:22
99 7:4

EXHIBIT 48

From: Keith Dane [redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 3:49 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Senate member meetings

Emma,

Could you work on setting up member meetings next week from Tuesday through Friday for Marty and Donna? Connie says that those with asterisks below are more likely to agree to a meeting if they know she's going to be attending.

Thanks so much.

Keith

Sessions*
Shelby
Cochran
Thune*
Boozman*
Blunt*
Heller
Coats
Scott
Fischer
Johnson, Ron
Corker
Burr*
Coburn*
Murkowski

EXHIBIT 49

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Cory Hicks <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>; Emma Heydlauff <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Fwd: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: October 15, 2013, 10:16:19 PM EDT
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>
Subject: FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Can Cory try to get a meeting with Corker's office for Marty and Donna?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mike Markarian had reached out to Sen. Vitter's staff, but I haven't heard more about whether they connected. Kirk and Vitter are particularly friendly (as is Collins – already on). Wayne is also having me draft an email for him to send to Thune's and Burr's offices. Wayne thought Heller might be a good bet, too. It would be great if you could do outreach on your end to Senate Rs with whom the advocates in town may have a connection. At this point, I wouldn't characterize it as "taking the lead in cosponsoring," since that may scare them off and Collins is already cosponsoring. Thanks, Keith!
Mimi

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Excellent – thank you. It wasn't clear that the memo for Wayne was about getting the cosponsors listed – I thought it was more about the bounce backs…which I took to mean email bounce backs (perhaps full mailboxes, due to the shutdown?).

Do we have any strong ties to Rs in the Senate that we could press to sign on ASAP? Mr. Kirk, perhaps?

Whitfield's office is setting up meetings with Senate Rs, so hopefully that will bear fruit. But if there are any HSUS-friendly Rs, I think we should be asking them to take the lead in cosponsoring…and we should be able to get those meetings.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I have been asking, and am drafting an email for Wayne to send to Ayotte's staff to press this. Thanks for the intel, Keith.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Cc: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Aside from whatever technical issues are causing the bounce backs, Connie is being told by Senate offices (Alexander and Manchin) that the fact that cosponsors are not showing up on THOMAS is actually hurting us with offices we're visiting; they think no one is cosponsoring the Senate bill, and think there's no reason to hold them back (even if there are more Ds than Rs).

Can we ask Ayotte to please start adding all the cosponsors who've signed up thus far? Thanks!

Keith

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Sahar Eshghi; Jacqueline Tiaga; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty
Subject: FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I spoke with Wayne about his reaching out to Ayotte's staff to start adding the other D cosponsors. I'm going to draft an email on it for him. Just wanted you to be aware of the bounce-back issue below, FYI…

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:12 PM
To: 'Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)'
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Thank you for the heads up, Adam! We'll keep checking, too, and your boss will get credit on the scorecard regardless of THOMAS, but I really appreciate your flagging the difficulties so we'll be aware!

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [mailto:Adam_Durand@klobuchar.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:10 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Just on background. We have gotten some bounce backs on email requests to join this bill. I'm hoping that it will get resolved in the next few days, but I'll continue to monitor Thomas to make sure it happens.

Thanks,
Adam

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:07 PM
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

That's wonderful, Adam – thanks so much for your help on it and for Sen. Klobuchar's cosponsorship of this important bill!! Let me know if you need any additional info on the other bills, and many thanks again! :)
Mimi

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [mailto:Adam_Durand@klobuchar.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:02 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mimi,

Senator Klobuchar is cosponsoring S.1406, the Horse Soring bill. We have reached out to the bill's sponsor as well.

Thanks,
Adam

Adam Durand
Senior Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Amy Klobuchar
302 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-[redacted]

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)
Subject: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Dear Adam:

We wanted to give you a quick look at the preview version of the 2013 Humane Scorecard before it's launched publicly early next week:
http://www.hslf.org/assets/pdfs/humane-scorecard/113th-congressional-scorecard-preview.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BBAETKKPTE/9925564881>

If Senator Klobuchar is not yet cosponsoring all four of the bills whose cosponsors will be counted, please join during the next few days so your constituents will see your support for these priority bills on the preview! The scorecard will give credit to all Members who ask to cosponsor – whether they've officially shown up on THOMAS yet or not – if you let us know, as well as contacting the prime sponsor's office. Current cosponsor counts are indicated below, along with staff contacts for the prime sponsors.

Thanks again,

Mimi

On behalf of both the Humane Society Legislative Fund and the Humane Society of the United States, we want to flag for you the items we plan to include in our 2013 Humane Scorecard covering the first session of the 113th Congress. Note: if any recorded votes occur during the remainder of the session on legislation affecting animals, the scorecard may also include them. As of now, we expect the 2013 Humane Scorecard will count the following:

Horse Soring – Cosponsorship of S. 1406, the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act – currently with 17 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Ayotte and Warner – to crack down on the cruel practice of "soring," in which unscrupulous trainers deliberately inflict pain on the hooves and legs of Tennessee Walking Horses and certain other breeds to exaggerate their high-stepping gait and gain unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. Soring methods include applying caustic chemicals, using plastic wrap and tight bandages to "cook" those chemicals deep into the horse's flesh for days, attaching heavy chains to strike against the sore legs, inserting bolts, screws or other hard objects into sensitive areas of the hooves, cutting the hooves down to expose the live tissue, and using salicylic acid or other painful substances to slough off scarred tissue in an attempt to disguise the sored areas. More than 40 years ago, Congress tried to rein in this abuse by enacting the Horse Protection Act, but rampant soring continues, according to a 2010 audit by the USDA Inspector General that recommended reforms incorporated in the PAST Act. S. 1406 will amend the Horse Protection Act to end the failed industry self-policing system, strengthen penalties, ban the use of devices associated with soring, and make the actual soring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal, as well as directing another to do so. This legislation is endorsed by the American Horse Council and more than 30 other national and state horse groups, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, American Association of Equine Practioners, and many others (for full list, see www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/horse/past-act-endorsements pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/DPCBTKKPTF/9925564881>). Staff contacts: Samantha (Sam) Roberts (Ayotte) / Caitlin Runyan (Warner).

Eggs and Hen Housing – Cosponsorship of S. 820, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments – currently with 12 cosponsors; introduced by Sen. Feinstein, with Sens. Stabenow and Collins as original cosponsors – to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 15-16 years (during the normal course of replacing aged equipment for many producers), which will significantly improve animal welfare and provide a stable and secure future for U.S. egg farmers. The legislation is supported by the egg industry and animal welfare groups, and expressly does not affect any other livestock sector or food product other than eggs. Under this legislation, each laying hen will ultimately be provided nearly double the amount of current space, along with enrichments such as nest boxes and perches that permit hens to better express natural behaviors. Egg farmers will be able to invest in these enriched colony cage systems with the assurance that they will face regulatory certainty and not a patchwork of conflicting state laws – helping industry at no cost to the federal government (the preliminary CBO score on this legislation is zero). Studies have shown higher productivity for hens in enriched colony cage systems – i.e., more eggs and lower hen mortality. An economic study by the independent research group Agralytica concluded that the bill's reforms are expected to increase consumer prices by less than 1 penny per egg, spread out over the lengthy phase-in period. Consumers support this legislation by a margin of 4-to-1, and it has been endorsed by leading consumer organizations, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, more than 1,000 individual family farms across the country, and many others (for full list, see www.humanesociety.org/egg_bill_endorsements<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/JOHJTKKPTG/9925564881>). Cage-free and free-range systems, as well as operations with fewer than 3,000 laying hens, will be unaffected by S. 820, except that they may see increased sales as consumers are able to more clearly distinguish what's available on store shelves, thanks to the bill's labeling provisions. For responses to frequently asked questions, see http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg_bill_faq.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/GWZJTKKPTH/9925564881>. Staff contact: Devin Rhinerson (Feinstein).

Animal Fighting Spectators – Cosponsorship of S. 666, the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act – currently with 24 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Blumenthal, Kirk, Cantwell, and Vitter – to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor to such a fight. While Congress has strengthened federal animal fighting law in recent years, this bill will close a remaining gap: prohibiting spectating, as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights. They are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wagers, and helping conceal organizers and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs. This legislation is widely supported by nearly 300 national, state and local law enforcement agencies (covering all 50 states), including the Fraternal Order of Police and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law_enforcement_endorsements_animal_fighting_bill.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/CRQQTKKPTI/99255
The preliminary CBO estimate on this legislation is zero. It has been approved three times by the full Senate – in June as part of the Farm Bill (S. 954), and last year as a floor amendment to the Farm Bill and as free-standing legislation (S. 1947) on a vote of 88-11. Related language is also in the House-passed Farm Bill (H.R. 2642), as it was in last year's House Agriculture Committee bill. Staff contacts: James Mikolowsky (Blumenthal) / Sarah Walter (Kirk).

Horse Slaughter – Cosponsorship of S. 541, the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act – currently with 26 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Landrieu and Graham – to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. American horses are not raised for food and are routinely given hundreds of drugs over their lifetimes that can be toxic to humans if ingested. The shocking discovery of horse meat in beef products in the U.K.<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MPCFTKKPTJ/9925564881> underscores the potential threat to American health if horse slaughter plants were to open here. Horse slaughter is cruel and cannot be made humane, and the U.S. public overwhelmingly opposes it. Horses are shipped for more than 24 hours at a time without food, water, or rest in crowded trucks in which the animals are often seriously injured or killed in transit. Horses are skittish by nature due to their heightened fight-or-flight response, and the methods used to kill horses rarely result in quick, painless deaths; they often endure repeated blows during attempts to render them unconscious and sometimes remain alive and kicking during dismemberment. The horse slaughter industry is a predatory, inhumane enterprise. They don't "euthanize" old horses – but precisely the opposite: they buy up young and healthy horses, often by misrepresenting their intentions, and kill them to sell the meat to Europe and Japan. It makes no sense for the federal government to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to oversee new horse slaughter plants at a time when Congress is so focused on fiscal responsibility. Staff contacts: Megan Blanco (Landrieu) / Courtney Titus (Graham).

Funding Letter – Cosigning 4/26/13 group letter – led by Sens. Boxer and Vitter – or submitting a parallel individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, seeking funds for USDA enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease, through student loan repayment, the critical maldistribution of veterinarians practicing in rural and inner-city areas and USDA inspection positions: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/fy14-senate-animal-welfare.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BMTNTKKPTK/9925564881>.

Letter Opposing Rep. Steve King Amendment to House Farm Bill – Extra credit will be given to those who co-signed an 8/7/13 group letter – led by Sen. Feinstein – or who send their own letters to the leaders of the Senate Agriculture Committee voicing opposition to a provision in the House-passed Farm Bill (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642) known as the "King Amendment." Rep. Steve King offered this amendment during committee markup and it was adopted with minimal debate; opponents were then denied an opportunity to have a House floor vote on an amendment to strike it. The letter urges committee leaders to reject this provision in any form or context it may take (final Farm Bill conference report or otherwise), calling it "a serious infringement on states' rights with far reaching impacts": http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-senate-letter.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/ECRRTKKPTL/9925564881>.

For a complete list of those who have publicly stated opposition to the King amendment, please see: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-opposition-master.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/EKWSTKKPTM/9925564881>.
This amendment is so widely opposed because it could negate most state and local laws on the production or manufacture of agriculture products. It aims to block state laws protecting farm animals and could also preempt laws covering everything from child labor to dangerous pesticides to labeling of farm-raised fish to tobacco products and fire safety standards. A broad coalition of 89 organizations joined in a letter calling for the King Amendment to be kept out of any final House-Senate package: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king_amdt_opposition_group.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AUYWTKKPTN/9925564881>. And others such as the National Conference of State Legislatures (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-ncsl.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/IIOZTKKPTO/9925564881>), County Executives of America (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-cea.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NCQVTKKPTP/9925564881>), the Fraternal Order of Police (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-fop.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AJHITKKPTQ/9925564881>), and the National Sheriffs' Association (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-nsa.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/HLYTTKKPTR/9925564881>) have sent their own letters, as have the California Food and Agriculture Secretary and Mississippi Attorney General. Numerous editorials have also run in newspapers across the country, including USA Today<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NGBRTKKPTS/9925564881> and the Washington Post<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MELETKKPTT/9925564881>.

Leaders – Prime sponsors of pro-animal legislation or a letter to an agency will receive extra credit.

As in the past, our 2013 Scorecard will be prepared by the Humane Society Legislative Fund and distributed widely. If you have not already done so, we urge you to cosponsor the bills on soring of show horses, eggs and hen housing, animal fighting spectators, and horse slaughter. Please contact us if you need more information on these or other animal protection issues. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Amundson, Executive Director
Humane Society Legislative Fund
(202) 676[redacted]
[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>

Mimi Brody, Director of Federal Affairs
The Humane Society of the United States
(202) 955-[redacted]
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
[http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/9925564881/img/spacer.gif]

EXHIBIT 50

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, May 9, 2012 7:12 PM
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>; Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: do you think Cong. Whitfield might be able to get Cong. Roe engaged?...FW: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill
Attach: image001.gif

I will talk to Ed tonight in-between votes.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 9, 2012, at 6:25 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

Connie, Cong. Roe's staff hasn't responded to Wayne's/Mike's initial effort, but I wonder if we need to throw in the towel yet on him? He did send his own letters to Ag Approps the past two years seeking enforcement funding. Do you think Cong. Whitfield (or you) might be willing to approach him personally about helping lead on this?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:21 PM
To: Michael Markarian; Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane
Cc: Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman
Subject: RE: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

I don't really understand why it would go to E&C, so I'm not sure which subcommittee would be likely – maybe Commerce, Manufacturing and Trade (Bono Mack chair)? I think Ag will get at least a joint referral, so maybe we could also consider trying to have an R on that committee be part of the team. Perhaps Chris Gibson (he cosponsored horse slaughter and animal fighting, and seems to want to work with us)?

From: Michael Markarian
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:13 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Wayne Pacelle; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane
Cc: Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman
Subject: RE: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

Roe has not been responsive to us, so let's pivot to some other R's. Let's look at members of E&C Committee. Do we know which subcommittee it will go to?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2012 6:10 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Kate Wall; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane
Cc: Akisha Townsend; Mila Zain; Kimberly Ockene; Jonathan Lovvorn; Tracie Letterman
Subject: update on leads for Horse Protection Act bill

I had a wonderful talk with Marilyn Dillihay in Cong. Cohen's office. Though she couldn't speak for him, she thinks he will want to co-lead on the HPA bill with Cong. Whitfield and sounded enthusiastic about it. I said I'd send her the draft bill as soon as it's finalized.

We touched on the recent law enforcement actions under current law (first time in 40 years), the Senate Approps Committee approval of increased enforcement funding for FY13, our pending petition for regulatory reforms, the IG's audit identifying serious problems, and the need to fix gaps in the underlying statute that hasn't been updated since the 70's. We discussed potential jurisdiction for the bill (E & C / Ag) and our desire to have the bill introduced quickly.

Mike also asked me to check with Connie about Cong. Cooper as a possible part of the leadership team. She said Cooper is very unlikely, since he was strongly against us on horse slaughter and is quite tied in with the Tennessee Walking Horse industry. On Cong. Chandler, she feels he's not one to do a lot of legwork. But if you want his name on the bill to help demonstrate regional support, he'd be ok for that. She really liked the idea of having Cong. Roe as part of the team, and likewise on Sen. Landrieu if she's willing. She also suggested maybe Sen. Lindsey Graham, and that we consider the list Keith compiled showing which states have significant TWH industries (besides TN and KY, Keith recalled TX, MO, CA, Al, MS, SC, and GA).

Mimi Brody
Director, Federal Affairs
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
t 202/955-[redacted] f 202/676-2302 c [redacted]
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037
humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
Join Our Email List<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhkl> Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>
Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>
<image001.gif><http://www.humanesociety.org/>

The Humane Society of the United States is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>, approved by the Better Business Bureau<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by GuideStar's Philanthropedia<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

EXHIBIT 51

From: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 9:38 AM
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Blackberry, Ed <[redacted]@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: meeting with Congressman Roe

Good Morning Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield:

I just set up a meeting for you both with Congressman Phil Roe from Tennessee regarding the Tennessee Walking Horse Issue. The meeting is next Tuesday, July 24 at 4:30pm in Congressman Roe's office (419 Cannon).

Thank you:
Melissa

Melissa Buchanan
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2368 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:

Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.

EXHIBIT 52

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIVE 1

INTERVIEW OF CONGRESSMAN [redacted]

April 25, 2014

Present:

Kedric Payne

Nate Wright

By Telephone:

Congressman [redacted]

Rob Walker

Transcribed by:
Stephanie Lyn Rahn, CSR
License No. XIO1717

**PLEASE NOTE: All spellings through the entirety of the transcript are phonetic

1 QUESTIONING BY MR. PAYNE:

2

3 Q. This is Kedric Payne and Nate Right

4 with the OCE and we are joined with Congressman [redacted]

5 [redacted] and his counsel Rob Walker. It is April 25,

6 2014. We have noticed the member of the False

7 Statements Act and he said that he will supply us

8 with the acknowledgment form.

9 Congressman [redacted], do you know Connie

10 Harriman-Whitfield?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And how long have you known her?

13 A. I guess -- let me see, I have been in

14 Congress five and a half years, I guess five years.

15 Q. And how did you first meet her?

16 A. You know, Mr. Payne, I don't really

17 recall when I first met her.

18 Q. Okay. And do you know that she is a

19 lobbyist for the Humane Society?

20 A. Only by -- only by what you have said

21 or what I have read, I haven't seen any official

22 documents that say she is.

23 Q. Do you recall any meetings with Mrs.

24 Whitfield concerning issues related to animal

25 welfare?

1 A. I had one, that was in July of 2012,
2 almost two years ago.
3 Q. And can you describe what you recall
4 from that meeting?
5 A. Basically, Mr. Payne, Congressman
6 Whitfield has a bill on horse soring, and he knows
7 my interests -- my interests in animal welfare, knew
8 of it because of our family. My wife serves on the
9 local Humane Society board and we are very active in
10 the local Humane Society and animal welfare. He
11 knew that and set up a meeting in our office, my
12 office to come by and talk to me about his bill.
13 Q. And who attended that meeting?
14 A. Well, again, this is a recollection,
15 and my recollection is myself and Congressman
16 Whitfield, his wife Connie and my Chief of Staff was
17 there and I also think that at that time my
18 Legislative Assistant who is now my Communications
19 Director now was there.
20 Q. And was the conversation related --
21 well, I should ask you, what was the conversation
22 focused on, you mentioned that there is a bill
23 pending, but what specifically was discussed to the
24 best of your recollection?
25 A. That's a ways ago, but basically that

1 horse soring is an obviously a huge conflict, a very
2 controversial issues and the horse business is very
3 big in our state of Tennessee and in Kentucky. We
4 discussed horse soring and basically the bill, I
5 never did have it to this date co-sponsor the bill
6 yet, because of one provision in the bill, just
7 troubled me a little bit, basically that was it just
8 discussing the bill as best I recall.
9 Q. Was the discussion then related to you
10 possibly sponsoring or co-sponsoring the bill?
11 A. Sure, that's why they came by.
12 Q. And you mentioned that Representative
13 Whitfield set up the meeting, I don't want to
14 mischaracterize what you said?
15 A. You know, I'm not sure who set up the
16 meeting. My staff handles all that, obviously we
17 have multiple meetings every day and I have a
18 scheduler that does that, so probably what happened
19 is, typically what happens is there will be a staff
20 contact with our staff, and see if there is a time
21 available for both members, and that's how it's
22 typically done for anything, not just this meeting
23 but any meeting we have.
24 Q. And what was Mrs. Whitfield's role in
25 the meeting?

1 A. She was just there with him advocating
2 for this. I know Mrs. Whitfield is very passionate,
3 at least she was, about animal rights.
4 Q. Did you consider the meeting to be a
5 meeting with Representative Whitfield or the Humane
6 Society or with any other --
7 A. It was with the Congressman.
8 Q. Was there any follow-up after that
9 meeting with Representative Whitfield's office or
10 Mrs. Whitfield?
11 A. Now with Mrs. Whitfield, no. With the
12 office, I think that his office contacted my office,
13 but I don't think -- I don't -- wasn't involved in
14 any of that. I think his staff talked to my staff.
15 Q. Okay. In 2012, was there any other
16 meeting possibly in September of 2012 related to
17 that same issue?
18 A. Not that I am aware of.
19 Q. Okay.
20 A. Certainly wasn't in my office, I know
21 that.
22 Q. Do you recall a meeting in March 2013
23 with Mrs. Whitfield related to animal welfare
24 issues?
25 A. No, I think that there was a meeting

1 scheduled, I didn't attend that meeting because I
2 had votes on the house floor. I think my staff did
3 but I did not.
4 Q. And with -- are you familiar with the
5 PAST Act of 2013?
6 A. Yes, sir.
7 Q. Did Representative Whitfield or his
8 office have any meetings or discussions with you
9 concerning possibly co-sponsoring that bill?
10 A. Not my office, and again, on the house
11 floor which is very typical for members, we will
12 talk about various legislation that we have, it's an
13 opportunity that have during votes or motions to
14 recommit or just times that the votes have been not
15 completed, we do discuss this, I do it frequently, I
16 have worn everybody's ear out on my health care
17 bill. That could have happened. I don't remember
18 if it did or didn't.
19 Q. Okay. And do you recall any meetings
20 in 2013 with Marty Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?
21 MR. WALKER: Can you say that first
22 name again?
23 Q. Marty, M-A-R-T-Y, and the last name is
24 Irby, I-R-B-Y.
25 A. Irby?

1 MR. WALKER: Are you talking about
2 meetings that the Congressman [redacted] participated in?
3 Q. Yes, meetings where Congressman [redacted]
4 participated and related to animal welfare issues.
5 A. Mr. Payne, let me understand this
6 correctly, with Mr. Irby and Mrs. Whitfield?
7 Q. That's correct.
8 A. The answer would be no, I didn't.
9 Q. Do you recall a meeting just with Mr.
10 Irby?
11 A. I think he was, there was -- there
12 have been people in who have, and again, I am going
13 to have to rely on my staff as far as Mr. Irby, but,
14 yes, there have been people in my office who have
15 advocated for this bill.
16 Q. Okay.
17 A. But not with Mrs. Whitfield.
18 Q. Do you recall any additional meetings
19 then with Mrs. Whitfield around that time, October
20 2013 or 2013 after what we have already discussed?
21 A. No, sir.
22 Q. You said no?
23 A. Not myself.
24 Q. Okay.
25 MR. WRIGHT: Congressman, this is Mr.

1 Wright here, are there any other interactions with
2 Mrs. Whitfield and Representative Whitfield's office
3 related to animal welfare issues that stand out in
4 your memory?
5 A. No, sir.
6 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Is there any other
7 information that you think might be helpful for us
8 to know about your interactions with Mrs. Whitfield
9 and Representative Whitfield's office?
10 A. You know, I don't think so. I think
11 there was, as you pointed out, I think in March of
12 '13, there was another meeting set up which I
13 couldn't attend because of duties on the house
14 floor, but the answer is no.
15 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, Congressman,
16 we thank you for your time, and Rob, if you don't
17 have any other questions, clarifications or
18 comments, we are done.
19 MR. WALKER: Just back to the
20 transcription, you will provide a copy of that to
21 us?
22 MR. PAYNE: Yes, I'll provide a copy
23 to you basically with an errata form and you can
24 review it and make any suggested corrections.
25 MR. WALKER: Alright, thanks very

1 much.

2 A. Thank you, Mr. Payne.

3 MR. PAYNE: Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, the recording is

5 terminated.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICER

2

3 I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true
4 and accurate transcript of the testimony and
5 proceedings as reported stenographically by me at
6 the time, place and on the date as hereinbefore set
7 forth.
8 I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither
9 a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of
10 any of the parties to this action, and that I am
11 neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or
12 counsel, and that I am not financially interested in
13 the action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 _____
22 STEPHANIE LYN RAHN
License No. XIO1717
23 Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey
24 My Commission Expires
April 18, 2017
25

A

accurate 10:4
acknowledgment 2:8
act 2:7 6:5
action 10:10,13
active 3:9
additional 7:18
advocated 7:15
advocating 5:1
ago 3:2,25
alright 8:25
animal 2:24 3:7,10 5:3,23 7:4 8:3
answer 7:8 8:14
april 1:5 2:5 10:24
assistant 3:18
attend 6:1 8:13
attended 3:13
attorney 10:9,11
available 4:21
aware 5:18

B

back 8:19
basically 3:5,25 4:4 4:7 8:23
best 3:24 4:8
big 4:3
bill 3:6,12,22 4:4,5 4:6,8,10 6:9,17 7:15
bit 4:7
board 3:9
business 4:2

C

care 6:16
certainly 5:20
certificate 10:1
certify 10:3,8
chief 3:16
clarifications 8:17
come 3:12
comments 8:18
commission 10:24
communications 3:18
completed 6:15
concerning 2:24 6:9
conflict 4:1
congress 2:14
congressman 1:4 1:13 2:4,9 3:5,15 5:7 7:2,3,25 8:15
connie 2:9 3:16
consider 5:4
contact 4:20
contacted 5:12
controversial 4:2
conversation 3:20 3:21
copy 8:20,22
correct 7:7
corrections 8:24
correctly 7:6
cosponsor 4:5
cosponsoring 4:10 6:9
couldnt 8:13
counsel 2:5 10:9,12
csr 1:16

D

date 4:5 10:6
day 4:17
describe 3:3
didnt 6:1,18 7:8
director 3:19
discuss 6:15
discussed 3:23 4:4 7:20
discussing 4:8
discussion 4:9
discussions 6:8
documents 2:22
dont 2:16 4:13 5:13 5:13 6:17 8:10,16
duties 8:13

E

ear 6:16
employee 10:9,11
entirety 1:24
errata 8:23
everybodys 6:16
expires 10:24

F

false 2:6
familiar 6:4
family 3:8
far 7:13
financially 10:12
first 2:15,17 6:21
five 2:14,14
floor 6:2,11 8:14
focused 3:22
followup 5:8
foregoing 10:3
form 2:8 8:23
forth 10:7
frequently 6:15
further 10:8

G

going 7:12
guess 2:13,14

H

half 2:14
handles 4:16
happened 4:18 6:17
happens 4:19
harrimanwhitfield 2:10
havent 2:21
health 6:16
helpful 8:7
hereinbefore 10:6
horse 3:6 4:1,2,4
house 6:2,10 8:13
huge 4:1
humane 2:19 3:9 3:10 5:5

I

ill 8:22
im 4:15
information 8:7
interactions 8:1,8
interested 10:12
interests 3:7,7
interview 1:4
involved 5:13
irby 6:20,24,24,25 7:6,10,13
issue 5:17
issues 2:24 4:2 5:24 7:4 8:3

J

jersey 10:23
joined 2:4
july 3:1

K

kedric 1:9 2:3
kentucky 4:3
knew 3:7,11
know 2:9,16,18 4:15 5:2,20 8:8,10
known 2:12
knows 3:6

L

legislation 6:12
legislative 3:18
license 1:17 10:22
little 4:7
lobbyist 2:19
local 3:9,10
long 2:12
lyn 1:16 10:22

M

march 5:22 8:11
marty 6:20,23,23
meet 2:15
meeting 3:4,11,13 4:13,16,22,23,25 5:4,5,9,16,22,25 6:1 7:9 8:12
meetings 2:23 4:17 6:8,19 7:2,3,18
member 2:6
members 4:21 6:11
memory 8:4
mentioned 3:22 4:12
met 2:17
mischaracterize 4:14
motions 6:13
multiple 4:17

N

name 6:22,23
nate 1:10 2:3
neither 10:8,11
never 4:5
new 10:23
notary 10:23
note 1:24
noticed 2:6

O

obviously 4:1,16
oce 2:4
october 7:19
office 3:11,12 5:9 5:12,12,12,20 6:8 6:10 7:14 8:2,9
officer 10:1
official 2:21
okay 2:18 5:15,19 6:19 7:16,24 8:6 8:15
opportunity 6:13

P

participated 7:2,4
parties 10:10
passionate 5:2
payne 1:9 2:1,3,16 3:5 7:5 8:15,22 9:2,3
pending 3:23
people 7:12,14 [redacted] 1:4,13 2:4
phonetic 1:25
place 10:6
please 1:24
pointed 8:11
possibly 4:10 5:16 6:9
present 1:8
probably 4:18
proceedings 10:5
provide 8:20,22
provision 4:6
public 10:23

Q

questioning 2:1
questions 8:17

R

rahn 1:16 10:22
read 2:21
really 2:16
recall 2:17,23 3:3 4:8 5:22 6:19 7:9 7:18
recollection 3:14,15 3:24
recommit 6:14
recording 9:4
related 2:24 3:20 4:9 5:16,23 7:4 8:3
relative 10:9,11
rely 7:13
remember 6:17
reported 10:5
representative 4:12 5:5,9 6:7 8:2,9
review 8:24
right 2:3
rights 5:3
rob 1:14 2:5 8:16
[redacted] 1:4,13 2:5,9 7:2 7:3
role 4:24

S

scheduled 6:1
scheduler 4:18
see 2:13 4:20
seen 2:21
september 5:16
serves 3:8
set 3:11 4:13,15 8:12 10:6
sir 6:6 7:21 8:5
society 2:19 3:9,10 5:6
soring 3:6 4:1,4
specifically 3:23
spellings 1:24
sponsoring 4:10
staff 3:16 4:16,19 4:20 5:14,14 6:2 7:13
stand 8:3
state 4:3 10:23
statements 2:7
stenographically 10:5
stephanie 1:16 10:22
suggested 8:24
supply 2:7
sure 4:11,15

T

talk 3:12 6:12
talked 5:14
talking 7:1
telephone 1:12
tennessee 4:3
terminated 9:5
testimony 10:4
thank 8:16 9:2,3
thanks 8:25
thats 3:25 4:11,21 7:7
think 3:17 5:12,13 5:14,25 6:2 7:11 8:7,10,10,11
time 3:17 4:20 7:19 8:16 10:6
times 6:14
transcribed 1:16
transcript 1:25 10:4
transcription 8:20
troubled 4:7
true 10:3
two 3:2
typical 6:11
typically 4:19,22

U

understand 7:5

V

various 6:12
votes 6:2,13,14

W

walker 1:14 2:5 6:21 7:1 8:19,25
want 4:13
wasnt 5:13,20
ways 3:25
welfare 2:25 3:7,10 5:23 7:4 8:3
whitfield 2:24 3:6 3:16 4:13 5:2,5,10 5:11,23 6:7,20 7:6 7:17,19 8:2,8
whitfields 4:24 5:9 8:2,9
wife 3:8,16
worn 6:16
wright 1:10 7:25 8:1,6

X

xio1717 1:17 10:22

Y

years 2:14,14 3:2

Z

0

1

13 8:12
18 10:24

2

2012 3:1 5:15,16
2013 5:22 6:5,20 7:20,20
2014 1:5 2:6
2017 10:24
25 1:5 2:5

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

EXHIBIT 53

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 11:23 AM
To: Ed Whitfield <[redacted]@verizon.net>
Subject: Fwd: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Wayne Pacelle <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: May 22, 2012 2:11:06 AM EDT
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Cc: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Kate Wall <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Tracie Letterman <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Kira Svirsky <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

That sounds good.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 7:19 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cece Kremer
Cc: Keith Dane; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman; Kira Svirsky
Subject: RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I'm thinking the "right pieces" are your blog from today, the Tennessean editorial from 5/17/12 and the David Climer editorial from today. Are there any other pieces you want included? I can send to staff for all the TN delegation in the morning, but want to make sure to include what you have in mind. Note: we're meeting with staff for Sens. Alexander and Landrieu and Rep. Cohen tomorrow, and I'm waiting to hear back from Rep. Cooper's staff.
Mimi

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 2:03 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Cece Kremer
Cc: Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman
Subject: RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I am writing a blog about that. I am about to circulate a devastating Sports columnist piece in today's Tennessean. We must get the right pieces distributed to all Tennessee lawmakers.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 2:02 PM
To: Cece Kremer
Cc: Wayne Pacelle; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall; Tracie Letterman
Subject: Re: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I believe I would be more effective talking to Alexander directly ---along with Ed if Ed is available. Can we summarize our counter to the "lone incident" argument?

Sent from my iPhone

On May 21, 2012, at 1:36 PM, "Cece Kremer" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:
Ok, meeting set tomorrow with Alexander's office at 12:30 pm with Curtis Swager. Curtis, Alexander's LA on Ag, Environment, Energy and Transportation. He is an old pal, decent guy and former collegiate wrestling star athlete. Who will be attending? Keith? Connie?

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 1:30 PM
To: Cece Kremer; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall
Subject: RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

Separate meeting. Soonest. Our priority with him is Walking Horses.

From: Cece Kremer
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 1:30 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Mimi Brody; Kate Wall
Subject: RE: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

Kate and Lauren have meeting set in Alexander's office on Wednesday at 3 pm to talk GAPCSA.

We could expand meeting to include TWHorse issue or set up separate meeting. I'm trying to reach Curtis Swager in Alexander's office for possible meeting tomorrow. Will advise.

From: Wayne Pacelle
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 1:18 PM
To: Legislation List; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: FW: The Tennessean: "Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors"

I want everyone in GA to read this story carefully. Look at Alexander's comments. We need to get into his office pronto. Can we get someone in who can talk about this with great clarity today or tomorrow?

http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120521/NEWS21/305210017/Tennessee-Walking-Horse-celebration-keeps-most-sponsors?odyssey=tab%7Ctopnews%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE

<image001.jpg>

Tennessee Walking Horse celebration keeps most sponsors
Supporters regard abuse on video as isolated incident

4:22 AM, May. 21, 2012
Written by G. Chambers Williams III<[redacted]@tennessean.com%20>
The Tennessean

Sponsors with financial and emotional ties to the Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration, some with family roots deep in the multimillion dollar sport, have risen to defend the industry after PepsiCo dropped its support because of shocking video of a trainer <http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120517/NEWS03/305180035/Humane-Society-releases-video-Tennessee-Walking-Horse-abuse> scarring and beating horses to get the perfect gait.
"We're still in it and have no intention of pulling out," said Joe Green Jr., manager of the Shelbyville Farm Center, a feed and supply operation that caters to Middle Tennessee's huge equine community.
"The Celebration (held in late August every year) is like the Super Bowl for us, and horse people are our biggest customers."
Last week's decision by the giant soft drink brand to withdraw its $25,000 sponsorship of the walking horse event came after ABC-TV's Nightline news show aired an undercover video<http://www.tennessean.com/videonetwork/1644527149001/Humane-Society-releases-graphic-and-disturbing-video-of-soring-at-TN-Walking-Horse-barn> of horses being beaten in a trainer's barn in Collierville, Tenn. That West Tennessee trainer, Jackie McConnell, had his license revoked<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120518/NEWS/305180089> late last week by the state association after the video aired.
"Pepsi withdrew their sponsorship, but they're the only ones that have," said Dr. Doyle Meadows, chief executive of the Walking Horse National Celebration, part of the business fabric in this tight-knit town 50 miles south of Nashville.
Rather than sparking a mass exodus of money and bookings by other advertisers and corporate sponsors, the fresh criticism of the horse industry has spurred numerous defenders to action.
TV report criticized
Rutherford County-based Celebration Feeds, a division of Burkmann Feeds in Danville, Ky., took its name from the Shelbyville walking horse showcase and counts horse owners among its best customers. It specializes in premium horse feed.
Division manager Joe Green Sr., whose son runs Shelbyville Farm Center, called the Nightline report "a bad picture."
"The good guys have tried so hard to make it right, then that bad guy comes along and tries to ruin it for everybody. We try to be involved in all breeds, but the Celebration is the bulk of our business," the elder Green said. "This won't deter our support."
Turning prized horses into higher steppers by "soring" — painful cutting and chemical treatments on the animals' legs — has plagued the industry for decades. Critics and animal rights activists contend owners and trainers won't stop the problem for fear of losing championships if a classic stepper loses height on its gait.
The Nightline segment relied on undercover video by the Humane Society of the United States. It revealed cruel beatings and chemical drips on a horse's legs to force a very high, "big lick" gait, which is popular among the judges at competitive shows.
People sticking up for the walking horse industry say the video showed a renegade trainer — not horse lovers — at work. These defenders say soring is no longer common practice, especially at national events such as the Shelbyville show, the world's most prominent walking horse exhibition, which draws 250,000 visitors to Middle Tennessee in late August.
"The walking horse industry has been under such a microscope for so long that most of the bad guys have been weeded out, and it was unfortunate that ABC tried to paint all of them as bad," argues the younger Green, who sells animal feed and farm supplies. "The way they did that TV piece wasn't even journalism."
Self-policing is hard
Meadows said only 1 percent of the horses entered in last August's Celebration showed signs of soring during U.S. Agriculture Department inspections, down from 13 percent in 2009.
Others argue that the practice has gone deeper underground and self-policing by the industry doesn't work since evidence of soring may be hidden to make horses appear healthy even when injured.
Soring has been illegal under the federal Horse Protection Act since 1970. But federal veterinarians charged with enforcing the law can make it to only a few horse shows because of budget constraints. That's where self-regulation by the industry comes into play. The horse industry hires inspectors, but critics say they aren't always thorough enough, and more federal oversight is needed.
A check of USDA Horse Protection Act violations reveals that inspectors issued more citations to Shelbyville trainers than any other horse industry organization for 2010-11.
What's clear about the horse business in Tennessee is that it's a big money maker<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20120519/NEWS21/305180095>, and walking horses are a major component of that.
U.S. Sen. Lamar Alexander is vowing to push for better enforcement.
"Anyone who cares about horses should be shocked by this video, which is why there is a 52-count criminal indictment under the U.S. Horse Protection Act," Alexander said in a news release. "I will work in the senate to strengthen the act and add more money to enforce it. The walking horse industry should step up its self-policing so that a few bad actors don't destroy one of our state's most treasured traditions."
Events draw dollars
A University of Tennessee Department of Agricultural Economics study of spending, sales and jobs in 2010 found that equine businesses and their spinoffs — across all breeds of horses — provided a $1.4 billion economic impact for the state.
According to an equine census five years ago, Tennessee ranked sixth nationally for the number of horses and ponies owned. About 40 percent of horses statewide were classified as Tennessee walkers, known for their small, well-placed ears, sloping shoulders and short back. Perhaps 15,000 walking horses are bred to compete.
Shelbyville, and its showpiece Calsonic Arena, are crown jewels of the walking horse business.
Meadows' organization operates the 105-acre Tennessee Walking Horse National Celebration Grounds in Shelbyville, which hosts the annual event over 11 days. Hundreds of other walking horse shows are held throughout the U.S.
Nearly a quarter-million fans come to Shelbyville's Celebration from as many as 40 states, Meadows said. The complex has 53 barns with 1,500 stalls. There is an outdoor stadium that seats 30,000, along with a 4,500-seat indoor arena.
Smaller events are held there 40 weekends a year, including a three-day spring fun show, a mini-version of the main walking horse show set for Thursday through Saturday this week.
Losing Pepsi's $25,000 contribution as a sponsor "is unfortunate," but the soft drink company will lose even more, Meadows contends. That's because only Pepsi products were being sold at events in the complex, which brought in more than $50,000 in revenue each year for Pepsi during the main Celebration alone.
Pepsi had been a sponsor since 2010. Middle Tennessee Ford dealers have been supporting the Celebration for about 18 years, and that's probably not going to change, Meadows said, although he added that he hadn't talked with anyone from Ford.
Jack Pirtle, general manager of Mark Pirtle Ford in Shelbyville, said he can't imagine the dealers pulling their support.
"The Celebration has been here for years and is very important to the community," he said. "Of course, I don't want to see anyone mistreat an animal. But to paint a broad stroke on the industry because of one person's mistreatment is not right."
Some sponsors put up big dollars to play a part in the Walking Horse National Celebration, which offers corporate sponsorships from $6,500 on the low end to $250,000 as title sponsor. Perks include box seats, VIP parking, advertising signage, electronic message board scrawls and access to exclusive mailing lists.
'Isolated incident'
Longtime event sponsor Yearwood Equipment Co., a farm equipment dealer in Fayetteville, Tenn., also is backing the industry.
"This was really an isolated incident, and I hate it as bad as anybody," said P.D. Shelton, Yearwood's manager. "But I wouldn't be supporting the Celebration if I thought that was what they were about.
"I believe they will come through it OK, but it's going to hurt every breeder, every trainer," he said. "The trainers as a whole have been doing an outstanding job getting these horses ready to show naturally."
Another vocal supporter is the Tennessee Farmers Co-Op, based in La Vergne, which has feed and farm supply stores.
"I did see the story, and I can tell you that we will be continuing our support of the Celebration," said Joe Huffine, manager of corporate and member services for the group, which is owned by its 70,000 Tennessee farmer members.
"We don't condone what has come out the past few days from a few individuals, and we're saddened by that," he said. "The story does raise some concern. It's unacceptable conduct, but it is not the norm. Are we going to do what Pepsi did? Of course not. We want to do everything we can to promote Tennessee agriculture."
Jennifer Jordan<http://www.tennessean.com/videonetwork/1648099583001/Shelbyville-merchant-Jennifer-Jordan-discusses-support-of-walking-horse-industry>, who operates J. Jordan Boutique on the square in Shelbyville, said her business is closely connected with the Celebration and her sponsorship won't be affected.
"I have a lot of customers who show horses, and they're just great people," she said. "Do I think regulations should be in place and enforced to prevent soring? Yes, and that's what they're doing. But I don't think this should shut down the horse show."
Contact G. Chambers Williams III at 615-259-[redacted] or [redacted]@tennessean.com<[redacted]@tennessean.com>.

***

EXHIBIT 54

Subject to the Nondisclosure Provisions of H. Res. 895 of the 110th Congress as Amended

OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MEMORANDUM OF INTERVIEW

IN RE:	Senate Staffer 1
REVIEW NO.:	14-2940
DATE:	April 25, 2014
LOCATION:	642 Hart Senate Building Washington, DC 20510
TIME:	1:03 p.m. to 1:14 p.m. (approximately)
PARTICIPANTS:	Kedric L. Payne Bryson B. Morgan Patricia Mack Bryan Morgan J. Frankel

SUMMARY: The OCE requested an interview with the witness and he consented to an interview. The witness made the following statements in response to our questioning:

1. The witness was given an 18 U.S.C. § 1001 warning and consented to an interview. He signed a written acknowledgement of the warning, which will be placed in the case file in this review.

2. The witness is a Legislative Assistant for Senator Lamar Alexander. He has been employed in the Senator's personal office since 2008. Prior to serving as Legislative Assistant the witness was a Legislative Correspondent for Senator Alexander.

3. The witness told the OCE that he is responsible for legislative issues related to the environment, energy, agriculture, and the Department of the Interior. The agriculture issues include animal welfare issues.

4. The witness stated that was the lead staffer for Senator Alexander for a meeting with Representative Ed Whitfield and his wife, Constance Harriman-Whitfield, that occurred around May 2012.

5. The meeting concerned legislation related to the abuse of the Tennessee walking horses. The witness stated that he considered the meeting to be a meeting with Representative Whitfield.

6. The witness recalled that the following people attended the meeting: Senator Alexander; Senator Alexander's staffer Tom Craig; Representative Whitfield; Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield; and Representative Whitfield's Legislative Director Cory Hicks.

7. The witness stated that he had not met Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield prior to the meeting. He knew at the time of the meeting that she worked for the Humane Society and did advocacy work on behalf of the organization.

8. He told the OCE that during the meeting, Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield described the abuses of the Tennessee walking horses and the need for legislative action. He recalled that Representative Whitfield played a similar role and made comments similar to those made by Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield during the meeting.

9. The meeting lasted less than thirty minutes. During the next several months following the meeting, the witness had additional meetings with the Humane Society concerning the Tennessee walking horse issue that Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield attended. He also had direct communications with Representative Whitfield's staff that included Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield.

10. The witness did not recall Senator Alexander having any additional meetings with Rep. Whitfield or Mrs. Harriman-Whitfield.

This memorandum was prepared on May 1, 2014, based on the notes that the OCE staff prepared during the interview with the witness on April 25, 2014. I certify that this memorandum contains all pertinent matters discussed with the witness on April 25, 2014.

Kedric L. Payne
Deputy Chief Counsel

EXHIBIT 55

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 7, 2011 6:07 PM
To: Buchanan, Melissa <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown

Fantastic!

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2011, at 5:55 PM, "Buchanan, Melissa" <Melissa.Buchanan@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> Congressman and Mrs. Whitfield
>
> I have a meeting confirmed for you for tomorrow afternoon at 4pm with Sen. Scott Brown. The meeting will be in his office, 359 Dirksen.
>
> Thank you:
> Melissa
>
> Melissa Buchanan
> Scheduler
> Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
> 2368 Rayburn House Office Building
> Washington, DC 20515
> Phone: (202) 225[redacted]
> Fax: (202) 225-3547
> Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
>
> Click here to sign up for Rep. Ed Whtifield's e-newsletter.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 2:25 PM
> To: Buchanan, Melissa
> Cc: Sparkman, John
> Subject: Meeting with Sen Scott Brown
>
> Ed and I need to meet with Senator Scott Brown sometime tomorrow to mention a bill Landrieu is introducing. Can you please set something up?
> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 56

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW OF FORMER SENATOR

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR [redacted]

Present:

Kedric Payne, Deputy Chief Counsel

Bryson Morgan

Senator [redacted]

Transcribed By:

Julie Thompson

1 MR. PAYNE: All right. This is Kedric Payne and Bryson
2 Morgan with the OCE, and we are joined by
3 conference call with Senator [redacted] and his
4 attorney Vincent Divito (phonetic). It's April
5 22, 2014. The Senator has been made aware that
6 the false statement act applies, and we are
7 going to begin the interview.
8 Senator, do you know Connie Harriman-
9 Whitfield?
10 SENATOR [redacted] (the "Witness"): Yes.
11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And how long have you known her?
12 WITNESS: I just met her in a meeting or two, so that
13 would have been about two and a half years ago
14 maybe, the first time I met her; and it was only
15 on a couple of occasions, various events for the
16 Humane Society or, you know, office meetings
17 that were set up.
18 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did you know her to be a lobbyist for
19 the Humane Society?
20 WITNESS: I knew her to be (inaudible), and Vincent asked
21 me -- you know, told me about this (inaudible)
22 in terms of the people. I needed someone to
23 refresh my memory about the subject matter. So
24 I was not aware that she was a lobbyist. She
25 probably told me, but since a meeting with my

1 office -- set up a meeting (inaudible) and, you
2 know, I would pop in, do, you know, (inaudible)
3 and that sort of thing. So I'm not sure if I
4 knew she was a lobbyist. I think she was the
5 wife of a member of Congress; is that correct?
6 MR. PAYNE: Yes. She -- she is married to Congressman Ed
7 Whitfield.
8 WITNESS: Yeah. So I'm sure that I was aware of it at
9 that time.
10 MR. PAYNE: Can you describe these meetings, to the extent
11 that you remember? Approximately how many
12 meetings did you have with Ms. Whitfield?
13 WITNESS: Well, I have been very active in issues of dog
14 fighting/horse slaughter long before I got to
15 the U.S. Senate. Those are issues that peaked
16 my interest back when I was a state Senator back
17 in Massachusetts. So the only occasion I would
18 have met her would have been in our office
19 situation or at an event in which those issues
20 are being discussed. So I would say my total
21 interaction is probably two or three times, you
22 know. The length would vary. It was probably,
23 you know, 10 to 15 minutes max total.
24 MR. PAYNE: When you met with her, do you recall whether
25 Representative Whitfield attended those meetings

1 as well?

2 WITNESS: Yes, yeah. He was there, and I remember -- it

3 was -- well, first of all, there's only one

4 meeting that I have memory of, and that would

5 have been in my office in my legislative -- with

6 one of my legislative assistants I think.

7 (Inaudible) issues would have been setting it

8 up, prepping it (inaudible) speaking about the

9 issue, and I would have come in after, you know,

10 5 or 10 minutes to say hello.

11 I remember setting it up as a courtesy

12 because he was a member of Congress. So I try

13 to, you know, go meet with everybody back then.

14 The fact that he was a member of Congress, I

15 obviously wanted to, you know, at least come in

16 and, you know, shake his hand and give him a few

17 minutes and say, "Hey. How's it going?"

18 And we had a meeting (inaudible). You

19 know how they have a lot of the legislative

20 awareness days up at the, you know, the various

21 buildings. My memory is that there was probably

22 something on dog fighting. There was probably

23 something on horse slaughter, and I probably

24 went into, you know, one of the rooms where they

25 basically have the information available. So,

1 you know, a hundred other people would have been
2 in there.
3 MR. PAYNE: Let me make sure I understand. So there's one
4 meeting that was in your office with a
5 legislative assistant --
6 WITNESS: Yeah.
7 MR. PAYNE: -- you, and Congressman Whitfield, and Ms.
8 Whitfield, just the four of you?
9 WITNESS: There could have been a fifth, but I would say
10 safely it was just the four of us. Yeah.
11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And what was the name of your legislative
12 assistant?
13 WITNESS: Probably Dan Diorio (phonetic) would have
14 handled it.
15 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Can you spell his last name?
16 WITNESS: Yeah. It's D-i -- D-i-o-r-i-o.
17 MR. PAYNE: Okay.
18 WITNESS: I-o-r-i-o, Diorio.
19 MR. MORGAN: Diorio.
20 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And then you said following that you
21 would have possibly seen the two of them at a
22 larger meeting with hundreds of people; is that
23 correct?
24 WITNESS: Well, I don't know if it was the two of them. I
25 do remember -- I do remember seeing her. It

1 would have been hundreds. It would have been --
2 you know, how the (inaudible), you know, there's
3 legislative copies in the various -- like if you
4 have an issue (inaudible) to sound the event
5 that I would have gone to, to learn more about,
6 you know, various issues that they were working
7 on.
8 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Going back to the meeting that took place
9 in your office, who actually led that meeting?
10 Who was leading the conversation?
11 WITNESS: Oh, it would have been Dan Diorio from my
12 office, you know, checking and, you know, asking
13 what the issue was. (Inaudible) I had an
14 interest in it anyway as a -- you know, my
15 daughter was a former horse owner, so she's very
16 keen and aware of a lot of those issues.
17 But Dan would have led the meeting. I
18 would have popped in, and then the first two
19 minutes was, "Hi. How you doing?" You know,
20 they were telling me about the history with the
21 Rep, you know, just finding out who, what, when,
22 wheres, the basic formalities. And the
23 information regarding the horse slaughter, if
24 I'm not mistaken, is the one issue that they
25 were focusing on, and they were asking for my

1 support because they had known, I believe of my
2 previous support when I was a Legislature on
3 those issues.
4 So it was -- I don't think anyone was
5 leading it, except, you know, Dan from my office
6 would have, you know, been -- we used to
7 (inaudible), especially when I was kind of
8 playing catch up all the time because we
9 started, you know, with the special election,
10 and I was just in (inaudible) meetings. So we
11 were like (inaudible) booked, and they were -- I
12 had my staff, during the meetings, I'd pop in
13 during the meeting, give them a courtesy thank
14 you. I look forward to viewing the information
15 later, you know, Dan will brief me. And, "It's
16 great to see you. Thank you very much." You
17 know, that's how it is.
18 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And do you recall the role of Mrs.
19 Whitfield in that meeting?
20 WITNESS: Yeah. I see her more as a spouse sort of at
21 that point, you know; that they were working on
22 this issue together, you know, because of an
23 interest in horses. So, you know, it didn't
24 raise my -- it didn't raise the radar at all
25 that she was there because, you know, we meet

1 with -- you know, we'll meet with pretty much
2 anybody on any issue just, you know, as long as
3 they set up a request. So, no, it didn't -- you
4 know, nothing kind of peeked my interest. It
5 seemed like a normal, everyday, you know, meet
6 and greet, "Thank you very much," you know.
7 Leave your information. I'll speak to Dan
8 later. So --
9 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And I'm trying to make sure I understand
10 the date of that meeting. Do you think that
11 meeting occurred around June 2011?
12 WITNESS: Yeah. I have no knowledge of that, and I can't
13 remember my names sometimes during that time
14 period. You know, I'm not sure if we have a
15 list somewhere of it, but I've have to refer it
16 to Dan and his knowledge of it.
17 MR. PAYNE: Okay. And did that meeting result in your
18 supporting the slaughter prevention act, horse
19 slaughter prevention act?
20 WITNESS: I don't think it did. I think I was already on
21 board anyway. That was already something -- the
22 dog fighting bill was one that I had a lot of
23 concern about and the horse slaughter one. It's
24 something I had a concern about, and there was
25 also one about -- you know, I mean, I was pretty

1 active in those issues (inaudible) as a state
2 elected official, you know. I'm not -- I'm not
3 a dog fighting proponent, and, you know,
4 (inaudible) horse slaughter, you know, I think
5 there are other options, you know. Adoption and
6 stuff like that. So I don't think it led to my
7 support. I think I was already on board, based
8 on my memory.
9 MR. PAYNE: Okay.
10 WITNESS: I think they were really coming, now that I
11 thinking about it -- to say, hey, thanks for
12 your support, you know. More of a courtesy type
13 of situation.
14 MR. PAYNE: And did you view that meeting as a meeting with
15 the Humane Society or as you described it, I
16 guess as a meeting with Representative
17 Whitfield?
18 WITNESS: Yeah. No. It would have been with Mr.
19 Whitfield because I had met with the head of the
20 Humane Society, with (inaudible) on issues. He
21 came in personally, you know (inaudible). So I
22 had already been (inaudible) with all their
23 legislative priorities. So, no, I didn't think
24 that they were representing the Humane Society.
25 No. It was more of a Rep to a Senator, you

1 know, knowing I have interest in this issue.
2 (Inaudible) issues (inaudible), if I'm not
3 mistaken. So, no.
4 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Well, I'm checking my notes. This pretty
5 much covers what we wanted to discuss with you.
6 I just want to confirm that there are no
7 additional meetings that you recall or other
8 communications that you had with the Whitfields
9 concerning any type of legislation or animal
10 welfare issues?
11 WITNESS: Well, not to -- to the best of my knowledge, no.
12 Like I said, it was -- it was sometime in 2011,
13 and we're in 2014 now, you know. If you have
14 something to refresh my memory, but that's based
15 on my, you know, knowledge at this point, you
16 know. What's -- we were working on so many
17 other things. I mean, if my memory serves me,
18 (inaudible) involved in that. We were doing
19 (inaudible), insider trading. I (inaudible).
20 There were so many other things that were a
21 priority in terms of the legislation that we
22 were working on and obviously running for
23 reelection too and establishing, you know, a
24 good record.
25 So, you know, if you had something to

1 refresh my memory, bit, no, it was just all
2 casual, you know, not even set up type of
3 things, except that one meeting in our office.
4 And the staff could have been in other meetings,
5 but I'm not -- I'm not aware of it.
6 MR. MORGAN: Senator, this is Bryson Morgan with the OCE.
7 You said that Ms. Whitfield's role in that
8 meeting was as a spouse. I'm wondering, do you
9 recall her being actively involved in the
10 discussion of the horse slaughter?
11 WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Of course, yeah. They were both
12 actively -- it was more of a -- it was a
13 (inaudible) type of (inaudible), you know.
14 They're going to have horses, and you enjoy
15 horses too. You've owned a horse, and, you
16 know, what do you think of these issues. Yeah.
17 It was, you know, just a regular, normal, free-
18 flowing, you know, conversation. I had no, you
19 know, no rhyme or reason, no itinerary. There's
20 no checklist that anyone was going through.
21 It was just like, hey, this is the
22 issue. We know you had an interest in it, you
23 know. Thanks for supporting it and, you know,
24 we wanted to come over and pay you a courtesy
25 call. Okay. Thanks. Bye. Next.

1 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. I see. Do you recall if you discussed
2 strategy on the legislation at all or next steps
3 on the legislation?
4 WITNESS: I could have -- she could have said or they
5 could have said, you know, how do you think we
6 could pass something like this? I have a
7 standard kind of -- a standard recommendation
8 for people -- like those (inaudible) who come in
9 with 30 things that they -- you know, absolutely
10 top priorities that they need to do, absolutely
11 positively. There's no butts.
12 And I more than likely said because I
13 saw it with everybody, "Hey, tell me your top
14 three items," you know. Tell me the top three
15 items, and, you know, the best way to go, you
16 know, to attack these things is take one or two
17 of your top priorities and go around and try to
18 get -- you know, get the support on one of those
19 items because, you know, everybody I know is
20 against dog fighting, you know. So I think
21 would be your best issue, the dog fighting bill.
22 If my memory serves me, we actually
23 did that one, or they did it after I left, you
24 know. They actually got some legislation on
25 that issue passed. And then on this horse

1 slaughter, I don't know what the ultimate
2 outcome was on it, you know. I just don't know.
3 But I would have probably, as I do
4 with every group that comes in, whether it be
5 the Humane Society, or the veterans or -- that
6 is my approach to everything because you're not
7 get everything. You guys know that. Take a
8 couple of items, you know, you go full tilt
9 trying to get as much support and then move
10 forward.
11 MR. MORGAN: Right. And do you happen to recall any specific
12 to do items or action items coming out of that
13 meeting by chance?
14 WITNESS: No, no. I would have just said, you know, go
15 meet the new -- (inaudible) with everybody. You
16 should probably go meet the, you know, the new
17 Legislature (inaudible) that have just come in
18 and establish relationships with their staff.
19 If you can meet with them, which is very common,
20 you know, you should feel confident when you
21 speak with the staff because, you know, when
22 you're speaking to my staff, you're speaking to
23 me. And, you know, I get briefed every day and
24 (inaudible). What were their issues? What were
25 their concerns? What is our position

1 (inaudible)? You know, we have a form that we
2 try to follow almost every day. So --
3 MR. MORGAN: Okay.
4 WITNESS: No. I don't remember like a (inaudible). I
5 didn't tell them here are your marching orders.
6 They didn't tell me here are your marching
7 orders. It was like this is what I would do if
8 it was me, and I says, you know, I'd go; and I'd
9 work. (Inaudible) folks. You give them the
10 information so they can make the logical
11 decision.
12 MR. PAYNE: Well, that is -- those are all the questions
13 that we have. Do you have any other information
14 you think that may be helpful, or anything else
15 that you wanted to share or clarify?
16 WITNESS: No. I -- no. Since there -- when you said --
17 when Vincent first told me, I had no idea who
18 you were talking about. I didn't know who the
19 people were. Then he said there's an issue with
20 the horse slaughter. Oh, okay. Those people,
21 okay. And that's how infrequent (inaudible)
22 contact, but, you know, I tried -- tried to
23 think since that time of anything that would be
24 helpful certainly. And there's nothing that I,
25 except from what I just told you, that I have

1 any, prior memory of. So that's about it.

2 MR. PAYNE: Okay. All right. Well, thank you for your

3 time.

4 WITNESS: Sure. Anytime, anytime. Something else, please

5 let me know.

6 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Will do.

7 WITNESS: Again, thank you.

8 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

10 MR. DIVITO: All right. See you guys. Bye.

11 MR. PAYNE: Okay. Thank you.

12 END OF INTERVIEW

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 1

10

11

12

13

A

absolutely 12:9,10
act 2:6 8:18,19
action 13:12
active 3:13 9:1
actively 11:9,12
additional 10:7
adoption 9:5
ago 2:13
animal 10:9
anybody 8:2
anytime 15:4,4
anyway 6:14 8:21
applies 2:6
approach 13:6
approximately 3:11
april 2:4
asked 2:20
asking 6:12,25
assistant 5:5,12
assistants 4:6
attack 12:16
attended 3:25
attorney 2:4
available 4:25
aware 2:5,24 3:8 6:16 11:5
awareness 4:20

B

back 3:16,16 4:13 6:8
based 9:7 10:14
basic 6:22
basically 4:25
believe 7:1
best 10:11 12:15,21
bill 8:22 12:21
bit 11:1
board 8:21 9:7
booked 7:11
brief 7:15
briefed 13:23
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:3 2:10
bryson 1:10 2:1 11:6
buildings 4:21
butts 12:11
bye 11:25 15:10

C

call 2:3 11:25
cant 8:12
casual 11:2
catch 7:8
certainly 14:24
chance 13:13
checking 6:12 10:4
checklist 11:20
chief 1:9
clarify 14:15
come 4:9,15 11:24 12:8 13:17
comes 13:4
coming 9:10 13:12
common 13:19
communications 10:8
concern 8:23,24
concerning 10:9
concerns 13:25
conference 2:3
confident 13:20
confirm 10:6
congress 3:5 4:12 4:14
congressman 3:6 5:7
connie 2:8
contact 14:22
conversation 6:10 11:18
copies 6:3
correct 3:5 5:23
counsel 1:9
couple 2:15 13:8
course 11:11
courtesy 4:11 7:13 9:12 11:24
covers 10:5

D

dan 5:13 6:11,17 7:5,15 8:7,16
date 8:10
daughter 6:15
day 13:23 14:2
days 4:20
decision 14:11
deputy 1:9
describe 3:10
described 9:15
di 5:16
didnt 7:23,24 8:3 9:23 14:5,6,18
diorio 5:13,16,18 5:19 6:11
discuss 10:5
discussed 3:20 12:1
discussion 11:10
divito 2:4 15:10
dog 3:13 4:22 8:22 9:3 12:20,21
doing 6:19 10:18
dont 5:24 7:4 8:20 9:6 13:1,2 14:4

E

ed 3:6
elected 9:2
election 7:9
enjoy 11:14
especially 7:7
establish 13:18
establishing 10:23
event 3:19 6:4
events 2:15
everybody 4:13 12:13,19 13:15
everyday 8:5
extent 3:10

F

fact 4:14
false 2:6
feel 13:20
fifth 5:9
fighting 3:14 4:22 8:22 9:3 12:20,21
finding 6:21
first 2:14 4:3 6:18 14:17
flowing 11:18
focusing 6:25
folks 14:9
follow 14:2
following 5:20
form 14:1
formalities 6:22
former 6:15
forward 7:14 13:10
four 5:8,10
free 11:17
full 13:8

G

give 4:16 7:13 14:9
go 4:13 12:15,17 13:8,14,16 14:8
going 2:7 4:17 6:8 11:14,20
good 10:24
great 7:16
greet 8:6
group 13:4
guess 9:16
guys 13:7 15:10

H

half 2:13
hand 4:16
handled 5:14
happen 13:11
harriman 2:8
head 9:19
hello 4:10
helpful 14:14,24
hey 4:17 9:11 11:21 12:13
hi 6:19
history 6:20
horse 3:14 4:23 6:15,23 8:18,23 9:4 11:10,15 12:25 14:20
horses 7:23 11:14 11:15
hows 4:17
humane 2:16,19 9:15,20,24 13:5
hundred 5:1
hundreds 5:22 6:1

I

id 7:12 14:8,8
idea 14:17
ill 8:7
im 3:3,8 6:24 8:9 8:14 9:2,2 10:2,4 11:5,5,8
inaudible 2:20,21 3:1,2 4:7,8,18 6:2 6:4,13 7:7,10,11 9:1,4,20,21,22 10:2,2,18,19,19 11:13,13 12:8 13:15,17,24 14:1 14:4,9,21
information 4:25 6:23 7:14 8:7 14:10,13
infrequent 14:21
insider 10:19
interaction 3:21
interest 3:16 6:14 7:23 8:4 10:1 11:22
interview 1:4 2:7 15:12
involved 10:18 11:9
iorio 5:18
issue 4:9 6:4,13,24 7:22 8:2 10:1 11:22 12:21,25 14:19
issues 3:13,15,19 4:7 6:6,16 7:3 9:1 9:20 10:2,10 11:16 13:24
items 12:14,15,19 13:8,12,12
itinerary 11:19
ive 8:15

J

joined 2:2
julie 1:16
june 8:11

K

kedric 1:9 2:1
keen 6:16
kind 7:7 8:4 12:7
knew 2:20 3:4
know 2:8,16,18,21 3:2,2,22,23 4:9,13 4:15,16,19,20,24 5:1,24 6:2,2,6,12

6:12,14,19,21 7:5 7:6,9,15,17,21,22 7:23,25 8:1,2,4,5 8:6,14,25 9:2,3,4 9:5,12,21 10:1,13 10:15,16,23,25 11:2,13,16,17,18 11:19,22,23,23 12:5,9,14,15,16 12:18,19,19,20,24 13:1,2,2,7,8,14,16 13:20,21,23 14:1 14:8,18,22 15:5
knowing 10:1
knowledge 8:12,16 10:11,15
known 2:11 7:1

L

larger 5:22
leading 6:10 7:5
learn 6:5
leave 8:7
led 6:9,17 9:6
left 12:23
legislation 10:9,21 12:2,3,24
legislative 4:5,6,19 5:5,11 6:3 9:23
legislature 7:2 13:17
length 3:22
list 8:15
lobbyist 2:18,24 3:4
logical 14:10
long 2:11 3:14 8:2
look 7:14
lot 4:19 6:16 8:22

M

marching 14:5,6
married 3:6
massachusetts 3:17
matter 2:23
max 3:23
mean 8:25 10:17
meet 4:13 7:25 8:1 8:5 13:15,16,19
meeting 2:12,25 3:1 4:4,18 5:4,22 6:8,9,17 7:13,19 8:10,11,17 9:14 9:14,16 11:3,8 13:13
meetings 2:16 3:10 3:12,25 7:10,12 10:7 11:4
member 3:5 4:12 4:14
memory 2:23 4:4 4:21 9:8 10:14,17 11:1 12:22 15:1
met 2:12,14 3:18,24 9:19
minutes 3:23 4:10 4:17 6:19
mistaken 6:24 10:3
morgan 1:10 2:2 5:19 11:6,6 12:1 13:11 14:3 15:9
move 13:9

N

name 5:11,15
names 8:13
need 12:10
needed 2:22
new 13:15,16
normal 8:5 11:17
notes 10:4

O

obviously 4:15 10:22
occasion 3:17
occasions 2:15
occurred 8:11
oce 2:2 11:6
office 2:16 3:1,18 4:5 5:4 6:9,12 7:5 11:3
official 9:2
oh 6:11 14:20
okay 2:11,18 5:11 5:15,17,20 6:8 7:18 8:9,17 9:9 10:4 11:25 14:3 14:20,21 15:2,6,8 15:11
options 9:5
orders 14:5,7
outcome 13:2
owned 11:15
owner 6:15

P

pass 12:6
passed 12:25
pay 11:24
payne 1:9 2:1,1,11 2:18 3:6,10,24 5:3 5:7,11,15,17,20 6:8 7:18 8:9,17 9:9,14 10:4 14:12 15:2,6,8,11
peaked 3:15
peeked 8:4
people 2:22 5:1,22 12:8 14:19,20
period 8:14
personally 9:21
phonetic 2:4 5:13
place 6:8
playing 7:8
please 15:4
point 7:21 10:15
pop 3:2 7:12
popped 6:18
position 13:25
positively 12:11
possibly 5:21
prepping 4:8
present 1:8
pretty 8:1,25 10:4
prevention 8:18,19
previous 7:2
prior 15:1
priorities 9:23 12:10,17
priority 10:21
probably 2:25 3:21 3:22 4:21,22,23 5:13 13:3,16
proponent 9:3

Q

questions 14:12

R

radar 7:24
raise 7:24,24
really 9:10
reason 11:19
recall 3:24 7:18 10:7 11:9 12:1 13:11
recommendation 12:7
record 10:24
reelection 10:23
refer 8:15
refresh 2:23 10:14 11:1
regarding 6:23
regular 11:17
relationships 13:18
remember 3:11 4:2 4:11 5:25,25 8:13 14:4
rep 6:21 9:25
representative 3:25 9:16
representing 9:24
request 8:3
result 8:17
rhyme 11:19
right 2:1 13:11 15:2,10
role 7:18 11:7
rooms 4:24
running 10:22

S

s 3:15
safely 5:10
saw 12:13
says 14:8
[redacted] 1:4,11 2:3,10
see 7:16,20 12:1 15:10
seeing 5:25
seen 5:21
senate 3:15
senator 1:4,11 2:3 2:5,8,10 3:16 9:25 11:6
serves 10:17 12:22
set 2:17 3:1 8:3 11:2
setting 4:7,11
shake 4:16
share 14:15
shes 6:15
situation 3:19 9:13
slaughter 3:14 4:23 6:23 8:18,19,23 9:4 11:10 13:1 14:20
society 2:16,19 9:15,20,24 13:5
sort 3:3 7:20
sound 6:4
speak 8:7 13:21
speaking 4:8 13:22 13:22
special 7:9
specific 13:11
spell 5:15
spouse 7:20 11:8
staff 7:12 11:4 13:18,21,22
standard 12:7,7
started 7:9
state 3:16 9:1
statement 2:6
steps 12:2
strategy 12:2
stuff 9:6
subject 2:23
support 7:1,2 9:7 9:12 12:18 13:9
supporting 8:18 11:23
sure 3:3,8 5:3 8:9 8:14 15:4

T

take 12:16 13:7
talking 14:18
tell 12:13,14 14:5,6
telling 6:20
terms 2:22 10:21
thank 7:13,16 8:6 15:2,7,8,9,11
thanks 9:11 11:23 11:25
thats 7:17 10:14

14:21 15:1
theres 4:3 5:3 6:2 11:19 12:11 14:19 14:24
theyre 11:14
thing 3:3
things 10:17,20 11:3 12:9,16
think 3:4 4:6 7:4 8:10,20,20 9:4,6,7 9:10,23 11:16 12:5,20 14:14,23
thinking 9:11
thompson 1:16
three 3:21 12:14,14
tilt 13:8
time 2:14 3:9 7:8 8:13 14:23 15:3
times 3:21
told 2:21,25 14:17 14:25
top 12:10,13,14,17
total 3:20,23
trading 10:19
transcribed 1:15
tried 14:22,22
try 4:12 12:17 14:2
trying 8:9 13:9
two 2:12,13 3:21 5:21,24 6:18 12:16
type 9:12 10:9 11:2 11:13

U

u 3:15
ultimate 13:1
understand 5:3 8:9

V

various 2:15 4:20 6:3,6
vary 3:22
veterans 13:5
view 9:14
viewing 7:14
vincent 2:4,20 14:17

W

want 10:6
wanted 4:15 10:5 11:24 14:15
way 12:15
welfare 10:10
went 4:24
whats 10:16
wheres 6:22
whitfield 2:9 3:7,12 3:25 5:7,8 7:19 9:17,19
whitfields 10:8 11:7
wife 3:5
witness 2:10,12,20 3:8,13 4:2 5:6,9 5:13,16,18,24 6:11 7:20 8:12,20 9:10,18 10:11 11:11 12:4 13:14 14:4,16 15:4,7
wondering 11:8
work 14:9
working 6:6 7:21 10:16,22

X

Y

yeah 3:8 4:2 5:6,10 5:16 7:20 8:12 9:18 11:11,11,11 11:16 12:1
years 2:13
youre 13:6,22,22
youve 11:15

Z

0

1

1 16:9
10 3:23 4:10
15 3:23

2

2011 8:11 10:12
2014 2:5 10:13
22 2:5

3

30 12:9

4

5

5 4:10

6

7

8

9

EXHIBIT 57

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:46 PM
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Nancy Perry <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

I have already talked to Ed about this. He is willing to talk to Rogers. Ed thinks Kingston is a lost cause, but I am willing to reach out to him.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 5:36 PM, "Mimi Brody" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Yes, tip of the iceberg was a metaphor that came to my mind, too, but then I worried that if we put in writing that this is just one of MANY more prosecutions that could happen, it may spook Kingston and/or Rogers, who might be concerned about over-zealous regulators and then hear industry's objections in a more sympathetic light? Maybe DOJ/USDA's new enforcement is a point that would lend itself best to personal briefing of Kingston/Rogers and their staffs? Connie, would you be willing to reach out to them on the HPA funding -- requesting a meeting perhaps or just talking more with them about it informally? I know that you and Cong. Whitfield will have their ear in a way the rest of us here don't!
>
> Mimi

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:28 PM
To: Nancy Perry
Cc: Mimi Brody; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Michael Markarian
Subject: Re: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Here is the rationale:

HPA was passed a long time ago.(40 years I think)

Enforcement until recently has been non/existent .

Congress does not like to appropriate money for laws that are not enforced.

The recent indictments show the law IS being enforced but do not in any way suggest DOA has sufficient funds for uncovering the many violations that are occurring. The indictments are addressing only the tip

of the iceberg.

Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 24, 2011, at 5:10 PM, "Nancy Perry" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> That was my first thought too, Mimi. It isn't intuitive to me that showing an example of good enforcement is helpful, but maybe just to demonstrate what would be possible in 90% of the other cases? Or possibly to give them a concrete example of the horrors out there in the very few instances when USDA can delve more deeply? I think we'd have to spell out very clearly what purpose that example is providing to buttress our argument for more funds.

Nancy Perry
Vice President, Government Affairs
[redacted]@humanesociety.org
t 202.955.[redacted] f 202.676.2302

The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037

humanesociety.org

Join Our Email List Facebook Twitter

<image001.gif>

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:05 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane
Cc: Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Hmm, interesting thought….I like giving them the nod that they are committed to trying to enforce better, but wouldn't want it to undercut our pitch for more money ("If they're already on track to fix the problem with the same amount they've always had, why do they need more?"). What do others think?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:02 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Keith Dane
Cc: Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Mimi,

Should we mention the recent indictments by DOJ and DOA to show they are enforcing the Horse Protection Act?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:58 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Nancy Perry; Michael Markarian
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Keith, it'd be good to include some acknowledgment at the beginning about the budget this year. Working from last year's joint House testimony (attached), maybe something like:

On behalf of the undersigned animal welfare and horse industry organizations, with combined supporters exceeding 12 million, we submit the following testimony seeking an increase in funding for the USDA/APHIS Horse Protection Program to $900,000, as requested in the President's budget for FY 2011. We recognize that Congress is focused on the imperative of cutting federal spending. But we believe that it should be possible to achieve meaningful reductions in the overall budget while still addressing shortfalls in very specific accounts that are vital and have been seriously underfunded. This $900,000 is urgently needed to begin to fulfill the intent of the Horse Protection Act – to eliminate the cruel practice of soring – by allowing the USDA to strengthen its enforcement capabilities for this law.

Thanks,

Mimi

-----Original Message-----
From: Keith Dane
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:17 PM

To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Yep - will do!

Sent from my Samsung Jack™, a Windows Mobile® smartphone from AT&T

-----Original Message-----

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:09 PM

To: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Carolyn Schnurr <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>

Cc: Nancy Perry <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Tracie Letterman <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>

Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Thanks so much! Since the letter can be VERY close to what they co-signed last year, hopefully all or nearly all can give you the green light in a matter of a few days. Please remember to ask the NWHA to do their own again, if they don't want to co-sign the group one. J

From: Keith Dane

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 4:06 PM

To: Mimi Brody; Carolyn Schnurr

Cc: Nancy Perry; Tracie Letterman

Subject: RE: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Yes, I'll update the constituent group testimony and circulate to the groups that have signed on in the past; we may not hear back from all of them by 4/1 (I assume we can still submit testimony on that date?), but we'll go with whomever we have confirmed, for the Senate version… and can add any stragglers to the House one by 4/14.

Keith

From: Mimi Brody

Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 3:00 PM

To: Keith Dane; Carolyn Schnurr

Cc: Nancy Perry; Tracie Letterman

Subject: outside testimony due to Senate Ag Approps on April 1 (!) and to House Ag Approps on April 14

Keith,

I've just found out about the deadlines, and am really scrambling re: the group letters. I wanted to flag this to you, since it will be extremely important to have strong joint testimony submitted again for HPA funding. Can you please update last year's testimonies on HPA and reach out to all the groups for cosignature (or doing their own), so they can be submitted by the deadlines?

Senate Ag Approps deadline for outside testimony: April 1

Houe Ag Approps deadline for outside testimony: April 14

Thank you!!

Mimi Brody

Director of Federal Affairs, Government Affairs Department

[redacted]@humanesociety.org <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>

t 202/955-[redacted] f 202/676-[redacted] c[redacted]

The Humane Society of the United States

2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037

humanesociety.org <http://www.humanesociety.org/>

Join Our Email List <https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhkl> Facebook <http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841> Twitter <http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>

<http://www.humanesociety.org/>

EXHIBIT 58

From: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 2:07 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: Quotes/Interview Rep. Whitfield?: Horseracing bill

---

Oh, I know you're the one to ask! I just think we ask A LOT! And, thank you, I already heard from Robert—you work fast! See you soon.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2011 12:42 PM
To: Sara Amundson
Subject: Re: Quotes/Interview Rep. Whitfield?: Horseracing bill

You are so thoughtful and nice to tell me. I do not need to tell YOU that going through a spouse is usually more efficient than going through the office !

I will get a couple of quotes from him.
He is in Ky. today, Louisiana tomorrow, then Ky. Thurs. Through Sunday. What is the deadline?

Sent from my iPhone

On May 17, 2011, at 11:47 AM, "Sara Amundson" <[redacted]@hslf.org> wrote:

> Hi Connie: We're going to do a short story on the horse racing bill in the next issue of Humane Activist and I thought it would be great to have a quote or two from Rep. Whitfield. Do you want me to just go through the office? Just want to be sure you are aware of what we're planning… ☺
>
> Thanks,
> Sara
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Michael Sharp
> **Sent:** Monday, May 16, 2011 5:34 PM
> **To:** Sara Amundson
> **Subject:** Horseracing bill
>
> Hello Sara,
>
> Thanks again for your time this morning.
>
> Quick question for you: I had wanted to reach out to either Rep. Whitfield or Sen. Udall about the horseracing bill, and perhaps get a quick quote or two to use with our short story in Humane Activist. Would you have a suggestion, between the two of them, for who to try first? Also, once we nail that down, are you ok with me reaching out directly to their office?
>
> Thanks again!
> --Michael
>
> **Michael Sharp**
> Assistant Managing Editor, Publications
> [redacted]@humanesociety.org
> t 301.721 [redacted] f 301.721.6462
>
> The Humane Society of the United States
> 700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879
> **humanesociety.org**
> Join Our Email List Facebook Twitter
>
> <image001.gif>

EXHIBIT 59

From: Lauren Silverman <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 10:18 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)

Cory just emailed that Ed will sign on! Hooray! I have actually only been focusing on getting the R's to sign on, and not the Dems – but I think having Israel and Stark lead the letter isn't helpful! And those offices have been pushing all the Dem offices to sign.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 10:15 AM
To: Lauren Silverman
Subject: Re: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)

Cory knows how Ed feels about animals!

Are the paucity of Republicans because they have arguments against , because only Dems signed the letter and/or because too few Republicans have been approached? (I know you have been working feverishly on this and could use additional help.)

I will talk to Ed after he gets out of his Health Subcommittee hearing.

Best,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 9:29 AM, "Lauren Silverman" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

Cory just asked me a list of co-signers, so he is working on this! Just wanted to let you know.

From: Lauren Silverman
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:24 AM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: FW: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)
Importance: High

Hey Connie - Would be great if we could get Ed to sign on to this. So sorry for flagging it in the 11th hour – I should have thought to send this to you earlier! Current list of signers are below. Bartlett and Reichert are on – and a few other R's are pending. Hoping for a few more R's so it's not so partisan!! (That's what happens when the two leads on the letter are both Dems!) I sent this to Cory – and followed up again with him this AM – but let me know if there's anything I can do to move this fwd!

Ackerman, Andrews, **Bartlett,** Bordallo, R. Brady, Capuano, Carson, Conyers, Ellison, Engel, Farr, Filner, Grijalva, Gutierrez, Hinchey, Holt, Israel, Kildee, Kucinich, Langevin, B. Lee, Lowey, Luján, C. McCarthy, G. Miller, Moore, Moran, Nadler, Neal, Olver, Peters, Polis, Rangel, **Reichert**, Richardson, Rothman, Schakowsky, Schiff, Stark, Towns, Woolsey

---

From: Lauren Silverman
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 9:19 AM
To: cory.hicks@mail.house.gov
Cc: Michele.Scarbrough@mail.house.gov; Colleen.Nguyen@mail.house.gov
Subject: Deadline --- RE: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)
Importance: High

Hi Cory!

Just wanted to check back with you on this – the deadline was yesterday but I think they're keeping the letter open for more sign-on's this morning.

I've copied both Michelle (Rep. Stark) and Colleen (Rep. Israel) here for any more info.

Thanks so much. We'd be so grateful for Rep. Whitfield's support on this important letter.

Best,
Lauren

From: Lauren Silverman
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 3:20 PM
To: cory.hicks@mail.house.gov
Subject: FW: Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity (deadline 10/25)
Importance: High

Hi Cory,

Hope you had a good week – I am sure you are just as thrilled as I am that Friday is finally here! I want to flag for you an important sign-on letter that is being circulated to protect captive chimpanzees – see below. The **deadline to sign is Oct. 25 – next Tuesday** – so I wanted to make sure you saw this in time. We'd be so grateful to have Rep. Whitfield sign on to this letter.

SUMMARY OF THE ISSUE:

- The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) is currently reviewing whether all chimpanzees should be listed as an endangered species.
- Currently, chimpanzees in the wild are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as "endangered" – but chimpanzees in captivity are only listed as "threatened." This special rule (known as a "split listing") specifically deprives captive chimps in the U.S. of ESA protection, allowing them to be used in commercials, invasive research, circuses, etc.
- A positive finding by FWS – that all chimpanzees should be listed as "endangered" whether in captivity or in the wild – could potentially put an end to all invasive research on these remarkable animals, with the exception of invasive research that qualified for a permit (i.e., if the research benefits chimp conservation).
- The Great Ape Protection and Cost Savings Act, however, goes a few steps further, requiring the retirement of the federally chimpanzees to sanctuary. However, a positive finding by the agency will without a doubt fuel movement for the legislation.

Thanks in advance for taking a look and let me know if you have any questions!

Best,
Lauren

Lauren Silverman Simon
Federal Legislative Specialist, Government Affairs
[redacted]@humanesociety.org
t 202.955.[redacted] f 202.676.2302

The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037
humanesociety.org
Join Our Email List Facebook Twitter

<image001.gif>

Ensure Chimpanzees are Protected in the Wild AND in Captivity

From: The Honorable Fortney Pete Stark
Sent By: michele.scarbrough@mail.house.gov
Date: 10/4/2011

Organizations also requesting the FWS increase protections for chimps: The Humane Society of the United States, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Jane Goodall Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, Humane Society International, Fund for Animals, and the New England Anti-Vivisection Society.

Dear Colleague,

We invite you to join us in sending a letter to the U.S. Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), requesting that they list chimpanzees as endangered regardless of whether they are in captivity or in the wild. The FWS is currently reviewing a rule regarding chimpanzees' status under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) that could rectify this inconsistency.

As it currently stands, chimpanzees in captivity in the U.S. are not afforded the same protections as those in the wild. We think U.S. laws should be consistent in their protection of these animals, which is why we're urging the FWS to rectify this inconsistency and list all chimpanzees, whether in captivity or in the wild, as endangered to ensure they are more stringently protected.

Chimpanzees are in danger of extinction, and the U.S. must do all it can to protect the species.Please join us in asking the FWS to provide the full protections available under the ESA to chimpanzees in captivity.

To cosign please contact Michele Scarbrough in Rep. Stark's office by email at Michele.scarbrough@mail.house.gov or by phone at 5-[redacted] or Colleen Nguyen in Rep. Israel's office by email atcolleen.nguyen@mail.house.gov or by phone at 5-[redacted].

Sincerely,

/s/

Pete Stark

Member of Congress

Steve Israel

Member of Congress

Director Dan Ashe

Fish and Wildlife Service

Department of the Interior

1849 C St. NW

Washington, DC 20240

Dear Director Ashe,

We are happy to see the United States Fish and Wildlife Service initiate a scientific review of chimpanzee conservation regulations to determine whether all chimpanzees should be listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In order for the Service to meet its statutory duty to promote conservation and defend wildlife, captive chimpanzees must be consistently listed as endangered and afforded full protection under the law.

As the agency is undoubtedly aware, the current lack of ESA protection for captive chimpanzees facilitates rampant exploitation of chimpanzees in the United States, as pets, in the entertainment industry, and for invasive biomedical experiments. The U.S. is the only country (other than Gabon) that still permits biomedical research on chimpanzees. Approximately one thousand chimpanzees are kept in laboratories in the U.S., where many languish in social isolation for years on end and are subjected to painful and stressful procedures. Many even suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder – a cruel existence for the species most similar to human beings. In order to ensure that the Service meets its obligation to protect endangered chimpanzees, the agency must exercise its authority to curtail uses of captive chimpanzees that not only create gross incentives for research labs, but also undermine national and international efforts to save the species.

Confidential Treatment Under the Nondisclosure
Provisions of H.Res. 895 or the 110th Congress
as Amended Requested

Furthermore, exploitation of captive chimpanzees in the U.S. causes western conservationists to lose political capital with citizens and policymakers in chimpanzee range countries in Africa. Rampant commercial use and frivolous depictions of chimpanzees in U.S. entertainment fuel demand for pet chimpanzees both domestically and abroad, contributing to poaching and trafficking of wild chimpanzees, which is a major threat to the species' continued existence. It is time for the U.S. to step up and be a leader in chimpanzee conservation by ensuring that our laws are consistent with those advocated by conservationists on the international level.

Populations of wild chimpanzees have declined by 66% in the last 30 years primarily due to habitat loss and related poaching, which is driven in part by U.S. exploitation of captive chimpanzees. We must do our part to protect these animals and ensure that they will have a long and enduring future on this earth. We urge the agency to find that upgrading the status of captive chimpanzees from "threatened" to "endangered" is warranted and to propose a rule implementing this finding.

Sincerely,

/s/

CC:

Public Comments Processing

Attn: FWS–R9–ES–2010–0086

Division of Policy and Directives Management

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MS 2042–PDM

Arlington, VA 22203

EXHIBIT 60

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 2:31 PM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: FW: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 12:34 PM
To: Tracie Letterman; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Subject: RE: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Yes, thank you for all of your help, Connie.

Keith

From: Tracie Letterman
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 12:27 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Keith Dane
Subject: FW: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Connie,
Keith and I reviewed these talking points and they're all set for you to pass on to Ed (see below).

Thanks for your help!

Tracie

From: Deborah Press [[redacted]@aspca.org]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2012 12:10 PM
To: Richard Patch; Tracie Letterman; Keith Dane
Subject: Talking points on mandatory penalty protocol

Can someone forward these to Connie? Let me know if these are okay.

Talking Points—Mandatory Penalty Protocol Regs

- Constituents are concerned that USDA has delayed publishing final rules
- The final rules will require Horse Industry Organizations to issue mandatory minimum penalties to individuals entering or exhibiting sore horses at horse shows
- Constituents have been waiting years for these regulations.
- USDA began developing and soliciting industry input on the mandatory penalty protocol several years ago and has been pushing the industry to adopt it since early 2010.
    - USDA began notifying HIOs as early as May 2010 that they should add the mandated penalty protocol to their rulebooks by the end of 2010.
    - In September 2010, in response to an OIG audit of the HPA program, USDA said that they had mandated a penalty protocol for the horse industry to implement and enforce by January 1, 2011.
    - Four out of twelve HIOs refused to adopt the protocol
    - USDA responded by publishing proposed rules on May 27, 2011 and accepting public comment until July 26, 2011.
    - It has been almost 9 months since the comment period closed and the Agency continues to sit on these rules
- The 2012 show season is underway and cruel trainers should not be allowed to coast through another horse show season with impunity.
- USDA has been promising that rules would be coming out this week (see http://www.t-g.com/story/1826657.html) but rumors are circulating that the rules have stalled in the Secretary's office.

Deborah Dubow Press
Regulatory Affairs Manager
American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
202.621[redacted] - office
[redacted] - cell

https://intranet.aspca.org/Tools

The information contained in this e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is from The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals® (ASPCA®) and is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of the contents of this e-mail, and any attachments hereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me by reply email and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout thereof.

EXHIBIT 61

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 5:03 PM
To: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Wayne Pacelle <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Carol England <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Sarah Speed <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

---

Connie's all over it (she's working hard behind the scenes to find the witnesses). Earlier today she was checking with Cong. Whitfield to see what might be helpful in terms of HSUS/HSLF press, blog, crowd of PA activists, etc. For the moment (earlier today), they were trying to keep it somewhat quiet, so as not to rouse the opposition. Will follow her lead on what's needed from us. Thanks, Keith!
Mimi

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 5:00 PM
To: Wayne Pacelle; Michael Markarian; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Carol England; Mimi Brody; Jessica Feingold-Lieberson
Cc: Sarah Speed
Subject: FW: BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

Just learned of this hearing -- did we know about it...and should we plan to have someone there?

I don't know if I can make it, but can see if Sarah Speed, our PA director (copied here), or another Equine staffer can attend, unless anyone else here plans to be there.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2012 4:52 PM
To: Keith Dane
Subject: BloodHorse.com: Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing

[redacted]@hsus.org thought you would be interested in the BloodHorse.com article below.

Congress Sets Hearing on Horse Racing
A subcommittee of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce will conduct a hearing on health and safety issues in horse racing April 30 in Pennsylvania, according to an April 23 notice.

Click here to view the full story or copy and paste the following link into your browser: http://www.bloodhorse.com/horse-racing/articles/69166/congress-sets-hearing-on-horse-racing

EXHIBIT 62

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 8:22 PM
To: Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Kira Svirsky <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

Thanks so much! Just submitted my timesheets, and need to head home.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cece Kremer
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 7:33 PM
To: Mimi Brody; Michael Markarian
Cc: Kira Svirsky
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

right Mimi, we tried calling Cory this evening but office closed. I'll follow up on Monday. Thanks for everything wonderful you and Kira did....and have a good day on Monday.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 5:59 PM
To: Cece Kremer; Michael Markarian
Cc: Kira Svirsky
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

I think Connie may want to intervene to make sure it happens, if staff is resisting. Let's see how we do reaching out to Cory Hicks ourselves first, though. I can try him on Tuesday. But feel free to contact him yourself on Monday, Cece, if you'd like to get the "ask" moving quickly!

-----Original Message-----
From: Cece Kremer
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 5:12 PM
To: Michael Markarian
Cc: Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

Got it, thanks.

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael Markarian
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 5:11 PM
To: Cece Kremer
Cc: Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

Chris has not been able to get confirmation from Cory in Whitfield's office, so he has not been officially added yet. I don't mind if we keep the checkmark for now, but we'll have to get staff confirmation next week before updating again.

-----Original Message-----
From: Cece Kremer
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 5:08 PM
To: Michael Markarian
Cc: Kira Svirsky; Mimi Brody
Subject: FW: Ed would like to be added to the

Mike,

Just want to confirm that you'd like Kira to "delist" Whitfield from on line preview? See Connie's confirmation below.

Thanks,

Cece

-----Original Message-----
From: Kira Svirsky
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2012 5:07 PM
To: Cece Kremer
Subject: FW: Ed would like to be added to the

-----Original Message-----
From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 11:10 PM
To: Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Kira Svirsky
Cc: Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: Ed would like to be added to the

That is really FABULOUS news, Connie!!! Thank you so much!!! Kira, please give him a check in the egg column and adjust his score. Connie, can you ask his staff to contact Chris Huckleberry in Cong. Schrader's office and indicate that he wants to join? Don't worry if Cory isn't able to do this tomorrow - we'll make sure Cong. Whitfield gets scorecard credit regardless - but we want him to actually be added in due course.
Mimi

-----Original Message-----

From: Sara Amundson
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2012 9:38 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Mimi Brody; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer
Subject: Re: Ed would like to be added to the

Sheesh! I told you you were a rock star. Best with HPA tomorrow!

On Sep 12, 2012, at 9:27 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> Egg Bill. Talk about 11th hour!!!
>
> Sent from my iPhone

EXHIBIT 63

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2012 2:44 PM
To: Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Re: Press Release - New Poll Shows Voters in Tennessee and Kentucky Overwhelmingly Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act
Attach: image002.jpg

I will ask him.

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 12, 2012, at 1:29 PM, "Michael Markarian" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>> wrote:

What do you think about asking Ed to give a floor speech on this poll?

<image002.jpg>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

New Poll Shows Voters in Tennessee and Kentucky Overwhelmingly Support Bill to Strengthen the Horse Protection Act

Legislation would address the widespread abuse in Tennessee walking horse industry

(Dec. 12, 2012)—A new poll conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research reveals statewide voters, by a more than 5-to-1 margin in Tennessee and a more than 3-to-1 margin in Kentucky, overwhelmingly support stronger legislation to prevent the cruel practice of horse "soring," the painful application of chemicals or other training methods to force the animals to perform an artificially high-stepping gait—known as the "Big Lick"—for show competitions.

Members of Congress from Kentucky and Tennessee recently introduced H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s_src=&s_src=web_ip_091912>, which would end the current, failed system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks (devices implicated in the soring process) on horses at shows, and increase penalties for violating the law. The legislation has the support of The Humane Society of the United States, other national animal protection and horse industry organizations, as well as the American Association of Equine Practitioners and the American Veterinary Medical Association.

The poll found that 75 percent of Tennessee voters and 69 percent of Kentucky voters support the federal legislation to strengthen the Horse Protection Act, with only 14 percent in Tennessee and 19 percent in Kentucky opposing the bill. Large majorities in all demographic groups and party affiliations support the legislation. In addition, voters polled in Tennessee (62 percent to 26 percent) and in Kentucky (45 percent to 36 percent) support legislation at the state level making the act of soring a felony offense.

"These poll results clearly indicate that in the heart of Tennessee walking horse country, the public strongly supports legislation to crack down on the corrupt 'Big Lick' industry and its widespread practice of horse soring," said Keith Dane, director of equine protection for The HSUS. "Abusing horses for the sake of a blue ribbon is cruel, and the majority of voters have expressed their disdain for this industry by saying they would avoid 'Big Lick' events altogether."

The poll results also show that Tennessee and Kentucky voters, by about a 3-to-1 margin, would avoid buying from companies providing financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses. And by a more than 2-to-1 margin, voters in both states said they would avoid attending a competition where they knew horses would be wearing chains and tall, heavy stacks or pads.

The survey of 625 registered Tennessee voters and 625 registered Kentucky voters interviewed statewide was conducted by Mason-Dixon Polling & Research, Inc., from Dec. 3 through Dec. 5, 2012. The margin of error is plus or minus 4 percent. The full survey results from both states are below.

TENNESSEE RESULTS

QUESTION: Tennessee Walking Horses are known for their high-stepping gait, called the "Big Lick." To make the horses lift their legs high in the air, trainers often use a practice called "soring" which means burning a horse's forelegs with caustic chemicals, cutting the horse's hoof painfully short, or using bolts, blocks or other devices to inflict pain to the sole of the horse's foot.

Were you aware or not aware of the details of this practice known as "soring"?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	59%	61%	56%	56%	56%	63%
NO	41%	39%	44%	44%	44%	37%

QUESTION: Chains and chemicals are often used in soring horses' legs. Instead of wearing regular horseshoes, the feet of "Big Lick" horses are fitted with tall, heavy stacks of pads to accentuate their gait. These "stacks" force the horses to stand at an unnatural angle, much like wearing high heel platform shoes all day, every day – even when not performing.

If you were aware that horses were wearing this equipment to perform at an event, would you avoid attending it, or not?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	62%	59%	64%	57%	59%	68%
NO	24%	24%	24%	32%	26%	15%
NOT SURE	14%	17%	12%	11%	15%	17%

QUESTION: A bill recently introduced in Congress, H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012, would strengthen the law against horse soring. It would end the system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks which have been implicated in soring, increase penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this practice.

Would you support or oppose this federal legislation?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	75%	70%	80%	74%	74%	77%
OPPOSE	14%	14%	14%	17%	18%	8%
UNDECIDED	11%	16%	6%	9%	8%	15%

QUESTION: Would you support or oppose state legislation that would make the act of soring a felony?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	62%	56%	67%	70%	53%	64%
OPPOSE	26%	31%	21%	19%	36%	19%
UNDECIDED	12%	13%	12%	11%	11%	17%

QUESTION: Horse shows that promote "Big Lick" events rely on corporate sponsorship to make a profit. Some major corporations, including Pepsi and Ford, have already withdrawn their sponsorship from major Tennessee Walking Horse events due to evidence that cruel methods are used to produce the exaggerated "Big Lick" gait.

Would you buy from companies or avoid buying from companies that provide financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
BUY FROM	18%	28%	7%	10%	23%	18%
AVOID	62%	49%	76%	75%	57%	58%
NOT SURE	20%	23%	17%	15%	20%	24%

KENTUCKY RESULTS

QUESTION: Tennessee Walking Horses are known for their high-stepping gait, called the "Big Lick." To make the horses lift their legs high in the air, trainers often use a practice called "soring" which means burning a horse's forelegs with caustic chemicals, cutting the horse's hoof painfully short, or using bolts, blocks or other devices to inflict pain to the sole of the horse's foot.

Were you aware or not aware of the details of this practice known as "soring"?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	29%	39%	18%	28%	30%	20%
NO	71%	61%	82%	72%	70%	80%

QUESTION: Chains and chemicals are often used in soring horses' legs. Instead of wearing regular horseshoes, the feet of "Big Lick" horses are fitted with tall, heavy stacks of pads to accentuate their gait. These "stacks" force the horses to stand at an unnatural angle, much like wearing high heel platform shoes all day, every day – even when not performing.

If you were aware that horses were wearing this equipment to perform at an event, would you avoid attending it, or not?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
YES	58%	49%	68%	56%	58%	78%
NO	26%	36%	15%	27%	25%	20%
NOT SURE	16%	15%	17%	16%	17%	2%

QUESTION: A bill recently introduced in Congress, H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012, would strengthen the law against horse soring. It would end the system of industry self-policing, ban the use of chains and stacks which have been implicated in soring, increase penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this practice.

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	69%	55%	83%	73%	61%	80%
OPPOSE	19%	35%	4%	18%	21%	20%
UNDECIDED	12%	10%	14%	9%	18%	-

QUESTION: Would you support or oppose state legislation that would make the act of soring a felony?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
SUPPORT	45%	38%	52%	46%	44%	47%
OPPOSE	36%	50%	22%	35%	37%	33%
UNDECIDED	19%	12%	26%	19%	19%	20%

QUESTION: Horse shows that promote "Big Lick" events rely on corporate sponsorship to make a profit. Some major corporations, including Pepsi and Ford, have already withdrawn their sponsorship from major Tennessee Walking Horse events due to evidence that cruel methods are used to produce the exaggerated "Big Lick" gait.

Would you buy from companies or avoid buying from companies that provide financial sponsorship to horse shows that promote "Big Lick" horses?

	STATE	MEN	WOMEN	DEMS	REPS	INDS
BUY FROM	23%	38%	9%	22%	24%	29%
AVOID	63%	54%	71%	65%	59%	69%
NOT SURE	14%	8%	20%	13%	17%	2%

Background:

* Last week, The HSUS asked 11 Tennessee District Attorneys General<http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/12/tenn-walking-horse-investigation-request-120612.html> to acquire and test all "foreign substance swab samples" collected from Tennessee walking show horses during 2012 and to prosecute violations of state animal cruelty laws.
* An HSUS undercover investigation<http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/05/horse_soring_investigation_051712.html> led to a 52-count indictment of notorious Tennessee Walking Horse Hall of Fame trainer Jackie McConnell, who pleaded guilty to one count of felony conspiracy to violate the Horse Protection Act, and three of his associates. In September, a federal court sentenced him to three years of probation and a $75,000 fine. McConnell also faces prosecution for violations of the Tennessee animal cruelty statute.
* USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service conducted random testing at various Tennessee walking horse competitions, and the results indicate that a shocking 97.6 percent of the samples tested positive for prohibited foreign substances in 2011. In 2010, 86 percent of samples tested positive. These prohibited substances included numbing agents and drugs that mask evidence of abuse.
* The HSUS filed a legal petition<http://www.humanesociety.org/news/press_releases/2012/03/usda_petition_horse_032112.html> asking USDA to treat the use of illegal numbing or masking chemicals on horses' legs as a felony under the Horse Protection Act.
* H.R. 6388, the Horse Protection Act Amendments of 2012<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=5725&s_src=&s_src=web_ip_091912>, sponsored by Reps. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., and Steve Cohen, D-Tenn., will end the failed system of industry self-policing, ban the use of certain devices associated with soring, strengthen penalties, and hold accountable all those involved in this cruel practice. The HSUS urges Congress to pass this

bill, which now has 53 co-sponsors in the House.

-30-

Media Contact: Stephanie Twining, 301-258-[redacted], [redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>

Follow The HSUS on Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>. See our work for animals on your Apple or Android device by searching for our "Humane TV" app.

The Humane Society of the United States is the nation's largest animal protection organization, rated the most effective by its peers. Since 1954, The HSUS has been fighting for the protection of all animals through advocacy, education and hands-on programs. We rescue and care for tens of thousands of animals each year, but our primary mission is to prevent cruelty before it occurs. We're there for all animals, across America and around the world. Celebrating animals and confronting cruelty — on the Web at humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>.

The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
Celebrating Animals, Confronting Cruelty

EXHIBIT 64

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2013 5:43 PM
To: Hicks, Cory <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Re: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices

---

Cory,
Do what you think is best. Ed doesn't need to be in everything.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 8, 2013, at 4:40 PM, "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> I'll talk to Adam on Monday.
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
> Sent: Saturday, June 08, 2013 03:08 PM
> To: Hicks, Cory
> Subject: Fwd: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Date: June 7, 2013, 11:50:18 AM EDT
> To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Michael Markarian <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Kate Wall <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Kathleen Conlee <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
> Subject: Defense report language and request for help reaching out to Cong. Whitfield and Grimm on BEST Practices
>
> Attached is the report language accompanying the House National Defense Reauthorization Act, following up on last year's NDAA requirement for a timeline from DoD on phasing out use of live animals in medical trauma training. PCRM worked this, and they're also hoping to have the BEST Practices Act reintroduced as a bipartisan bill again. Per Noah's email below, Rep. Grimm's staff has indicated to Noah that they're willing to be an original cosponsor if Rep. Whitfield joins on again, as he did last year, but Adam in Rep. Whitfield's office flagged concerns. Noah is looking for our help encouraging Reps. Whitfield and Grimm on this. I said we'd see what we could do. I know we're hoping to have their help on eggs/King, and that's not in hand yet.
>
> I'd earlier suggested to Noah that he try Rep. LoBiondo also – I don't know yet whether he's done so, but will remind him of that possibility, given Rep. LoBiondo's help on Defense/animal issues in the past.
>
> Thanks for any feedback you can provide.
>
> Mimi
>
> From: Noah Gittell [[redacted]@pcrm.org]
> Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 11:28 AM
> To: Mimi Brody
> Subject: RE: BEST Practices
>
> Sorry, forgot to attach. Here it is.
>
> From: Noah Gittell
> Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 11:26 AM
> To: Mimi Brody ([redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>)
> Subject: BEST Practices
>
> Hi Mimi –
>
> Hope you're doing well. We got some language in the report accompanying the FY14 NDAA. It's not as strong as we would have liked, but we thought it was important to respond to the recent DOD report in some way, while we're still figuring out the logistics of re-introducing BEST Practices. I've attached the language here.
>
> Also – we were hoping that Rep. Whitfield would be an original cosponsor (he was on the bill last year), but his LA, Adam Moore, just told me that they have heard from a company in their district that opposes it and are going to "stay off for now." Could you or someone reach out to him to get more details? His support is very important because Rep. Grimm's LD told me that his boss wouldn't support unless Whitfield does. If you guys could reach out to Whitfield AND Grimm, that would be ideal. In the meantime, I'm setting up meetings with other Republicans.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Noah Gittell
> Director of Government Affairs
> Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine
> 5100 Wisconsin Ave, NW – Suite 400
> Washington, DC 20016
> (p) 202.527.[redacted]
> (f) 202.527.7434
>

EXHIBIT 65

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 6:53 PM
To: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: Fwd: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

Cory's reaction to your suggestion.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Hicks, Cory" <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov<mailto:Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>>
Date: September 17, 2013, 3:20:35 PM EDT
To: 'Connie Harriman-Whitfield' <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, "Fareed, Justin" <Justin.Fareed@mail.house.gov<mailto:Justin.Fareed@mail.house.gov>>
Subject: RE: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

I think that ship sailed when we voted in favor of the ag portion earlier this year. Of course, this only works if the vote is so close that they need our vote. Horse slaughter was a last minute exchange to enable the passing of the Medicare prescription drug program. I think Ed will have to make the decision on the floor if the votes are going the wrong way for leadership. I'm not opposed to the idea, but these arrangements are easier said than done.

-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Hicks, Cory; Fareed, Justin
Subject: Fwd: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

Soliciting your thoughts on this.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: September 17, 2013, 12:42:57 PM EDT
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Cc: John Goodwin <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: P.S. on Thursday's vote and pushing leadership for commitment on PAST

P.S. from JP, whose idea I was passing along when I called - Cong. Whitfield could say he's on the fence about Thursday's vote because he feels it's not enough of a cut to SNAP. Bottom line, though, is to signal to leadership that he's really determined to get PAST to the floor this year (as he pressed leadership to do some years ago on horse slaughter, when he extracted a commitment in exchange for his vote), and that he'll play hard ball to get PAST done. Thank you for considering this idea and discussing it with him!

Mimi Brody
Director, Federal Affairs
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org><[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
t 202/955-[redacted] f 202/676-2302 c [redacted]
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037
humanesociety.org<http://humanesociety.org><http://www.humanesociety.org/>
Join Our Email List<https://community.hsus.org/humane/join?source=gabhkl> Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841>
Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety>
[cid:image001.gif@01CD545E.E290C590<mailto:gif@01CD545E.E290C590>]<http://www.humanesociety.org/>

To support The Humane Society of the United States, please make a monthly donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=2320&2320.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig2320>, or give in another way<http://www.humanesociety.org/donate/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=donate>, via a gift donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1590&1590.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig1590> or memorial donation<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/Donation2?df_id=1505&1505.donation=form1&s_src=dn_emstaffsig1505> or donating your vehicle<https://onecarhelpshumane.com/?utm_campaign=hsusStaffEmailSig_2012&utm_source=emailClient&utm_medium=email>. You can also volunteer<http://www.humanesociety.org/community/volunteers/?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=volunteer> for The HSUS, and see our 55 ways you can help<http://www.humanesociety.org/action/55_actions_to_help_animals.html?utm_source=staffsignature&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=helpanimals> animals.

The HSUS is rated a 4-star charity (the highest possible) by Charity Navigator<http://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.summary&orgid=3848>, approved by the Better Business Bureau<http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/humane-society-of-the-united-states-in-washington-dc-3129> for all 20 standards for charity accountability, voted by Guidestar's Philanthropedia<http://www.myphilanthropedia.org/blog/2011/08/24/humane-society-of-the-united-states-hsus-1-expert-identified-animal-rights-and-welfare-nonprofit/> experts as the #1 high-impact animal protection group, and named by Worth Magazine<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/about/worth_top_10_fiscally_responsible_charities.pdf> as one of the 10 most fiscally responsible charities.

EXHIBIT 66

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Cory Hicks <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>; Justin Fareed <justin.fareed@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST
Attach: image001.gif; ATT00001.htm; Myths-Facts on PAST Act 9-23-13.doc; ATT00002.htm

---

In view of the poll that is being conducted by the TWHBEA, please give this high priority.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: September 25, 2013, 7:36:41 PM EDT
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: Fwd: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: September 25, 2013, 6:15:44 PM EDT
To: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Cc: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>, Cece Kremer <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

The Myths/Facts document is on Congressional stationery and is Cong. Whitfield's document (though you drafted text for him last year). It doesn't have his name on it, but it would come from his office and be referred to as his document. I'm looping Connie and others in here, so they'll be aware of Marty Irby's suggestion and our email exchange…

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:59 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Thanks; are you referring to our Myths/Facts document, or does Whitfield's office have one, too? I think Marty was hoping whatever was put out, would come from Whitfield. So a statement at a hearing would be great, or a reference in an official document from his office would work, too.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:54 PM
To: Keith Dane
Subject: RE: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

I think it's an excellent idea! If there's a hearing, it could maybe be part of his statement for the record. If the hearing isn't scheduled soon, maybe there'd be another way to put this "out there" – perhaps in the Myths/Facts document? Or maybe we'd want it in the Myths/Facts document whether there's a hearing or not? Could add this along with the BSL response, since that document needs to be updated to incorporate that additional issue anyway.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:09 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: statement on weighted shoe implementation under PAST

Hi Mimi,

In talking with Marty Irby (past president of TWHBEA who has come on in support of PAST in a big way) he mentioned that much of the resistance to the act within the TWH industry is from people who should be supporting it, but have heard that it will eliminate all shoes (because of the "weighted shoe" provision), or just don't trust USDA to make a decision about what shoes will be allowed, that they can live with.

I've explained many times that the USDA sets all regulations on equipment that is allowable under and within the parameters of the HPA, and that it's appropriate for them to do so when PAST becomes law – not for Congress to proscribe in detail what is allowed through legislation.

Marty thinks that if Mr. Whitfield's office would provide a statement explaining the process (i.e. that USDA would seek the input of veterinarians, farriers and other industry participants in the development of regulations, and that the proposed regs would be put out for public comment) that it would help squelch the ongoing churning on this issue, and even gain more support for the bill.

What do you think about this idea, and whether we should approach Justin and Cory with it?

Thanks,
Keith

Keith Dane
Vice President, Equine Protection
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
t 301-258-[redacted] f 301-258-3078
The Humane Society of the United States
700 Professional Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20879
humanesociety.org<http://www.humanesociety.org/>
Join Our Email List<https://secure.humanesociety.org/site/SSurvey?SURVEY_ID=2820&ACTION_REQUIRED=URI_ACTION_USER_REQUESTS>
Facebook<http://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=6041057841> Twitter<http://twitter.com/HumaneSociety> Blog<http://hsus.typepad.com/wayne/>
<http://www.humanesociety.org/>

EXHIBIT 67

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 10:20 PM
To: Cory Hicks <Cory.Hicks@mail.house.gov>; Emma Heydlauff <Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Fwd: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>
Date: October 15, 2013, 10:16:19 PM EDT
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>>, Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>>
Subject: FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Can Cory try to get a meeting with Corker's office for Marty and Donna?

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 3:29 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Michael Markarian; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mike Markarian had reached out to Sen. Vitter's staff, but I haven't heard more about whether they connected. Kirk and Vitter are particularly friendly (as is Collins – already on). Wayne is also having me draft an email for him to send to Thune's and Burr's offices. Wayne thought Heller might be a good bet, too. It would be great if you could do outreach on your end to Senate Rs with whom the advocates in town may have a connection. At this point, I wouldn't characterize it as "taking the lead in cosponsoring," since that may scare them off and Collins is already cosponsoring. Thanks, Keith!
Mimi

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:52 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Excellent – thank you. It wasn't clear that the memo for Wayne was about getting the cosponsors listed – I thought it was more about the bounce backs…which I took to mean email bounce backs (perhaps full mailboxes, due to the shutdown?).

Do we have any strong ties to Rs in the Senate that we could press to sign on ASAP? Mr. Kirk, perhaps?

Whitfield's office is setting up meetings with Senate Rs, so hopefully that will bear fruit. But if there are any HSUS-friendly Rs, I think we should be asking them to take the lead in cosponsoring…and we should be able to get those meetings.

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I have been asking, and am drafting an email for Wayne to send to Ayotte's staff to press this. Thanks for the intel, Keith.

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:33 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Cc: Wayne Pacelle
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Aside from whatever technical issues are causing the bounce backs, Connie is being told by Senate offices (Alexander and Manchin) that the fact that cosponsors are not showing up on THOMAS is actually hurting us with offices we're visiting; they think no one is cosponsoring the Senate bill, and think there's no reason to hold them back (even if there are more Ds than Rs).

Can we ask Ayotte to please start adding all the cosponsors who've signed up thus far? Thanks!

Keith

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:18 PM
To: Sahar Eshghi; Jacqueline Tiaga; Cece Kremer; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Cherie Beatty
Subject: FW: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

I spoke with Wayne about his reaching out to Ayotte's staff to start adding the other D cosponsors. I'm going to draft an email on it for him. Just wanted you to be aware of the bounce-back issue below, FYI…

From: Mimi Brody
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:12 PM
To: 'Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)'
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Thank you for the heads up, Adam! We'll keep checking, too, and your boss will get credit on the scorecard regardless of THOMAS, but I really appreciate your flagging the difficulties so we'll be aware!

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [mailto:Adam_Durand@klobuchar.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:10 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Just on background. We have gotten some bounce backs on email requests to join this bill. I'm hoping that it will get resolved in the next few days, but I'll continue to monitor Thomas to make sure it happens.

Thanks,
Adam

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:07 PM
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

That's wonderful, Adam – thanks so much for your help on it and for Sen. Klobuchar's cosponsorship of this important bill!! Let me know if you need any additional info on the other bills, and many thanks again! :)
Mimi

From: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar) [mailto:Adam_Durand@klobuchar.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 2:02 PM
To: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Mimi,

Senator Klobuchar is cosponsoring S.1406, the Horse Soring bill. We have reached out to the bill's sponsor as well.

Thanks,
Adam

Adam Durand
Senior Legislative Assistant
Office of Senator Amy Klobuchar
302 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-[redacted]

From: Mimi Brody [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 12:40 PM
To: Durand, Adam (Klobuchar)
Subject: LAST CALL for preview Humane Scorecard 2013 (cosponsorships, etc.)

Dear Adam:

We wanted to give you a quick look at the preview version of the 2013 Humane Scorecard before it's launched publicly early next week:
http://www.hslf.org/assets/pdfs/humane-scorecard/113th-congressional-scorecard-preview.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BBAETKKPTE/9925564881>

If Senator Klobuchar is not yet cosponsoring all four of the bills whose cosponsors will be counted, please join during the next few days so your constituents will see your support for these priority bills on the preview! The scorecard will give credit to all Members who ask to cosponsor – whether they've officially shown up on THOMAS yet or not – if you let us know, as well as contacting the prime sponsor's office. Current cosponsor counts are indicated below, along with staff contacts for the prime sponsors.

Thanks again,

Mimi

On behalf of both the Humane Society Legislative Fund and the Humane Society of the United States, we want to flag for you the items we plan to include in our 2013 Humane Scorecard covering the first session of the 113th Congress. Note: if any recorded votes occur during the remainder of the session on legislation affecting animals, the scorecard may also include them. As of now, we expect the 2013 Humane Scorecard will count the following:

Horse Soring – Cosponsorship of S. 1406, the Prevent All Soring Tactics (PAST) Act – currently with 17 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Ayotte and Warner – to crack down on the cruel practice of "soring," in which unscrupulous trainers deliberately inflict pain on the hooves and legs of Tennessee Walking Horses and certain other breeds to exaggerate their high-stepping gait and gain unfair competitive advantage at horse shows. Soring methods include applying caustic chemicals, using plastic wrap and tight bandages to "cook" those chemicals deep into the horse's flesh for days, attaching heavy chains to strike against the sore legs, inserting bolts, screws or other hard objects into sensitive areas of the hooves, cutting the hooves down to expose the live tissue, and using salicylic acid or other painful substances to slough off scarred tissue in an attempt to disguise the sored areas. More than 40 years ago, Congress tried to rein in this abuse by enacting the Horse Protection Act, but rampant soring continues, according to a 2010 audit by the USDA Inspector General that recommended reforms incorporated in the PAST Act. S. 1406 will amend the Horse Protection Act to end the failed industry self-policing system, strengthen penalties, ban the use of devices associated with soring, and make the actual soring of a horse for the purpose of showing or selling it illegal, as well as directing another to do so. This legislation is endorsed by the American Horse Council and more than 30 other national and state horse groups, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, American Association of Equine Practioners, and many others (for full list, see www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/horse/past-act-endorsements pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/DPCBTKKPTF/9925564881>). Staff contacts: Samantha (Sam) Roberts (Ayotte) / Caitlin Runyan (Warner).

Eggs and Hen Housing – Cosponsorship of S. 820, the Egg Products Inspection Act Amendments – currently with 12 cosponsors; introduced by Sen. Feinstein, with Sens. Stabenow and Collins as original cosponsors – to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, phased in over a period of 15-16 years (during the normal course of replacing aged equipment for many producers), which will significantly improve animal welfare and provide a stable and secure future for U.S. egg farmers. The legislation is supported by the egg industry and animal welfare groups, and expressly does not affect any other livestock sector or food product other than eggs. Under this legislation, each laying hen will ultimately be provided nearly double the amount of current space, along with enrichments such as nest boxes and perches that permit hens to better express natural behaviors. Egg farmers will be able to invest in these enriched colony cage systems with the assurance that they will face regulatory certainty and not a patchwork of conflicting state laws – helping industry at no cost to the federal government (the preliminary CBO score on this legislation is zero). Studies have shown higher productivity for hens in enriched colony cage systems – i.e., more eggs and lower hen mortality. An economic study by the independent research group Agralytica concluded that the bill's reforms are expected to increase consumer prices by less than 1 penny per egg, spread out over the lengthy phase-in period. Consumers support this legislation by a margin of 4-to-1, and it has been endorsed by leading consumer organizations, as well as by the American Veterinary Medical Association, more than 1,000 individual family farms across the country, and many others (for full list, see www.humanesociety.org/egg_bill_endorsements<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/JOHJTKKPTG/9925564881>). Cage-free and free-range systems, as well as operations with fewer than 3,000 laying hens, will be unaffected by S. 820, except that they may see increased sales as consumers are able to more clearly distinguish what's available on store shelves, thanks to the bill's labeling provisions. For responses to frequently asked questions, see http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/egg_bill_faq.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/GWZJTKKPTH/9925564881>. Staff contact: Devin Rhinerson (Feinstein).

Animal Fighting Spectators – Cosponsorship of S. 666, the Animal Fighting Spectator Prohibition Act – currently with 24 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Blumenthal, Kirk, Cantwell, and Vitter – to establish misdemeanor penalties for knowingly attending an organized animal fight and felony penalties for knowingly bringing a minor to such a fight. While Congress has strengthened federal animal fighting law in recent years, this bill will close a remaining gap: prohibiting spectating, as 49 states have done, and helping take the profit out of animal fighting. Spectators are more than mere observers at animal fights. They are participants and accomplices who enable the crime, paying hundreds or thousands of dollars in admission fees and gambling wagers, and helping conceal organizers and handlers who try to blend into the crowd when a raid occurs. This legislation is widely supported by nearly 300 national, state and local law enforcement agencies (covering all 50 states), including the Fraternal Order of Police and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/law_enforcement_endorsements_animal_fighting_bill.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/CRQQTKKPTI/99255
The preliminary CBO estimate on this legislation is zero. It has been approved three times by the full Senate – in June as part of the Farm Bill (S. 954), and last year as a floor amendment to the Farm Bill and as free-standing legislation (S. 1947) on a vote of 88-11. Related language is also in the House-passed Farm Bill (H.R. 2642), as it was in last year's House Agriculture Committee bill. Staff contacts: James Mikolowsky (Blumenthal) / Sarah Walter (Kirk).

Horse Slaughter – Cosponsorship of S. 541, the Safeguard American Food Exports (SAFE) Act – currently with 26 cosponsors; introduced by Sens. Landrieu and Graham – to protect horses and consumers by prohibiting the transport and export of U.S. horses to slaughter for human consumption. American horses are not raised for food and are routinely given hundreds of drugs over their lifetimes that can be toxic to humans if ingested. The shocking discovery of horse meat in beef products in the U.K.<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MPCFTKKPTJ/9925564881> underscores the potential threat to American health if horse slaughter plants were to open here. Horse slaughter is cruel and cannot be made humane, and the U.S. public overwhelmingly opposes it. Horses are shipped for more than 24 hours at a time without food, water, or rest in crowded trucks in which the animals are often seriously injured or killed in transit. Horses are skittish by nature due to their heightened fight-or-flight response, and the methods used to kill horses rarely result in quick, painless deaths; they often endure repeated blows during attempts to render them unconscious and sometimes remain alive and kicking during dismemberment. The horse slaughter industry is a predatory, inhumane enterprise. They don't "euthanize" old horses – but precisely the opposite: they buy up young and healthy horses, often by misrepresenting their intentions, and kill them to sell the meat to Europe and Japan. It makes no sense for the federal government to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to oversee new horse slaughter plants at a time when Congress is so focused on fiscal responsibility. Staff contacts: Megan Blanco (Landrieu) / Courtney Titus (Graham).

Funding Letter – Cosigning 4/26/13 group letter – led by Sens. Boxer and Vitter – or submitting a parallel individual request to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, seeking funds for USDA enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, Horse Protection Act, Humane Methods of Slaughter Act, and federal animal fighting law, as well as for programs to address the needs of animals in disasters and to ease, through student loan repayment, the critical maldistribution of veterinarians practicing in rural and inner-city areas and USDA inspection positions: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/fy14-senate-animal-welfare.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/BMTNTKKPTK/9925564881>.

Letter Opposing Rep. Steve King Amendment to House Farm Bill – Extra credit will be given to those who co-signed an 8/7/13 group letter – led by Sen. Feinstein – or who send their own letters to the leaders of the Senate Agriculture Committee voicing opposition to a provision in the House-passed Farm Bill (Sec. 11312 of H.R. 2642) known as the "King Amendment." Rep. Steve King offered this amendment during committee markup and it was adopted with minimal debate; opponents were then denied an opportunity to have a House floor vote on an amendment to strike it. The letter urges committee leaders to reject this provision in any form or context it may take (final Farm Bill conference report or otherwise), calling it "a serious infringement on states' rights with far reaching impacts": http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-senate-letter.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/ECRRTKKPTL/9925564881>.

For a complete list of those who have publicly stated opposition to the King amendment, please see: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-opposition-master.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/EKWSTKKPTM/9925564881>.
This amendment is so widely opposed because it could negate most state and local laws on the production or manufacture of agriculture products. It aims to block state laws protecting farm animals and could also preempt laws covering everything from child labor to dangerous pesticides to labeling of farm-raised fish to tobacco products and fire safety standards. A broad coalition of 89 organizations joined in a letter calling for the King Amendment to be kept out of any final House-Senate package: http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king_amdt_opposition_group.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AUYWTKKPTN/9925564881>. And others such as the National Conference of State Legislatures (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-ncsl.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/IIOZTKKPTO/9925564881>), County Executives of America (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-cea.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NCQVTKKPTP/9925564881>), the Fraternal Order of Police (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-fop.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/AJHITKKPTQ/9925564881>), and the National Sheriffs' Association (http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/legislation/king-amendment-letter-nsa.pdf<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/HLYTTKKPTR/9925564881>) have sent their own letters, as have the California Food and Agriculture Secretary and Mississippi Attorney General. Numerous editorials have also run in newspapers across the country, including USA Today<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/NGBRTKKPTS/9925564881> and the Washington Post<http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/MELETKKPTT/9925564881>.

Leaders – Prime sponsors of pro-animal legislation or a letter to an agency will receive extra credit.

As in the past, our 2013 Scorecard will be prepared by the Humane Society Legislative Fund and distributed widely. If you have not already done so, we urge you to cosponsor the bills on soring of show horses, eggs and hen housing, animal fighting spectators, and horse slaughter. Please contact us if you need more information on these or other animal protection issues. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sara Amundson, Executive Director
Humane Society Legislative Fund
(202) 676-[redacted]
[redacted]@hslf.org<[redacted]@hslf.org>

Mimi Brody, Director of Federal Affairs
The Humane Society of the United States
(202) 955-[redacted]
[redacted]@humanesociety.org<[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
[http://capwiz.com/humanesociety/utr/1/FPFATKKPRA/9925564881/img/spacer.gif]

EXHIBIT 68

From: Sara Amundson <[redacted]@hslf.org>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2014 5:28 PM
To: Irby, Marty <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov>; Keith Dane <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>; Connie Harriman-Whitfield <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Cc: Mimi Brody <[redacted]@humanesociety.org>
Subject: RE: House Republican Goal

Let me know if I can help in any way. Thanks!

From: Irby, Marty [mailto:Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 5:24 PM
To: Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: House Republican Goal

Glad to do it! I will make it a priority tomorrow.

From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 5:23 PM
To: Keith Dane; Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Irby, Marty; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: House Republican Goal

I'm afraid I agree with Keith. We've been whipping and whipping these other groups and it would make a big difference coming from the congressman's office. Not about piling more work on poor Marty—it's about getting it done!

From: Keith Dane
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 5:01 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Cc: Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: House Republican Goal

I had thought that Sara felt (and we collectively have felt all along) that it would be best coming from Marty/Mr. Whitfield's office, rather than HSUS... but sure, I can do this. I too have a backlog, so will prioritize this ASAP.

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 4:10 PM
To: Keith Dane
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: House Republican Goal

Can you do that, Keith? It would be good coming from you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 1:30 PM, "Keith Dane" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:

> I agree; I think we need to ask each group if they will commit to focus their efforts on a list of members we provide -- or tell us which ones they will lobby.
>
> Since there is still so much ground to cover ☺, maybe give each group a list of ten and ask for a commitment, and ask them if there are any other offices they have a relationship with, and will commit to pursue?
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> **Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 2:44 PM
> **To:** Connie Harriman-Whitfield
> **Cc:** Irby, Marty; Sara Amundson; Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody
> **Subject:** Re: House Republican Goal
>
> The problem is we need commitments.
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Jan 6, 2014, at 12:43 PM, "Connie Harriman-Whitfield" <[redacted]@humanesociety.org> wrote:
>
>> That is a great idea. I think it would pay off.
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> On Jan 6, 2014, at 12:40 PM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:
>>
>>> I will do this but may take a few days.....I have a pile of work I'm catching up on.

From: Sara Amundson [[redacted]@hslf.org]
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 2:22 PM
To: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Irby, Marty
Cc: Keith Dane; Mimi Brody
Subject: RE: House Republican Goal

Thanks Connie. I really feel that a "drill-down" to force actual assignments with some of the other players is necessary. It is likely that the AVMA, for example, has 10 good prospects they could follow-up with but people are reluctant to volunteer. I hate to ask Marty, but it may be best coming from him to contact each party and ask for commitments?

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield
Sent: Monday, January 06, 2014 2:21 PM
To: Irby, Marty
Cc: Connie Harriman-Whitfield; Sara Amundson; Keith Dane; Mimi Brody
Subject: Re: House Republican Goal

Marty,

How do you propose to do this?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2014, at 10:14 AM, "Irby, Marty" <Marty.Irby@mail.house.gov> wrote:

> All-
>
> Cory and I discussed the Republicans in the House today we need to garner on PAST. Currently we have 82 with a few more pending that I am waiting on official responses from. We want to get 100 Republicans on the bill so we can really push to get the bill to the floor. I know we have been focused on the Senate, but let's keep in mind the House is still very important for the bill. We hope to have 100 Republicans within the next few weeks. Please help also focus efforts in this area.
>
> Thanks,
> Marty

EXHIBIT 69

From: Connie Harriman-Whitfield [[redacted]@humanesociety.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2013 5:28 PM
To: Heydlauff, Emma
Subject: Re: Meetings
Attachments: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.png

Let's try the last four on the list plus Greg Walden.

Thanks,
Connie

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 9, 2013, at 3:59 PM, "Heydlauff, Emma"
<Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov<mailto:Emma.Heydlauff@mail.house.gov>> wrote:

Mrs. Whitfield,

Since we are scheduling meetings for next week, I went through the list of Republican E&C members that we have not met with yet. The list is below. Please let me know if you would like me to reach out to them about a meeting.

Barton
Walden
Shimkus
Scalise
Harper
Billy Long
Cassidy
Ellmers

Thanks,
Emma

Emma Heydlauff
Scheduler
Office of Congressman Ed Whitfield (KY-01)
2184 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-[redacted]
Fax: (202) 225-3547
Follow Rep. Whitfield on the web:
<image001.png><http://www.facebook.com/RepEdWhitfield>
<image002.png><http://twitter.com/repedwhitfield>
<image003.png><http://www.flickr.com/photos/edwhitfield><image004.png><http://www.youtube.com/WhitfieldKY01> <image005.png><http://whitfield.house.gov/atom.xml>
Click here<https://whitfieldforms.house.gov/enews.shtml> to sign up for Rep. Ed Whitfield's e-newsletter.