IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION

DYLAN BRANDT, et al.,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	Case No. 4:21-CV-00450-JM
LESLIE RUTLEDGE, et al.,	:	
Defendant.	:	

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE PLAINTIFFS' EVIDENTIARY DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS

Defendants seek to exclude the deposition designations of Rep. Robin Lundstrum, architect and lead sponsor of HB 1570 (the "Health Care Ban" or "Ban"), a law that prohibits gender-affirming medical care for adolescents with gender dysphoria.[1] Defendants principally argue that *all* of her testimony is shielded by "legislative privilege," an argument Defendants should have included in their *Motion in Limine*[2] and that this Court rejected in ruling on Rep. Lundstrum's *Motion*

[1] *Defendants' Motion to Exclude Plaintiffs' Evidentiary Deposition Designations of Representative Robin Lundstrum and Incorporated Brief in Support*, ECF 184 ("Motion to Exclude" or "Mot."), ¶¶ 7-13; *Exhibit 1*, Deposition Transcript of Rep. Robin Lundstrum ("Lundstrum Dep. Tr.") at 253:25-254:1 ("[Q.] You were the architect of the SAFE Act, correct?/ A. Yes.").

[2] ECF 164, 165.

to Quash.[3] Defendants also object to all but one of Plaintiffs' deposition designations based on six objections; none has merit.

First, Defendants claim that all of Rep. Lundstrum's testimony is irrelevant. As addressed below and in the accompanying *Appendix A: Responses to Objections*, each of the designated portions of Rep. Lundstrum's deposition is relevant because it relates to the actual purpose of the General Assembly in enacting the Health Care Ban and tends to show that the Ban was enacted with an improper purpose. *Second*, Defendants assert without any explanation that certain portions of Rep. Lundstrum's deposition are speculative. This position is meritless because her testimony relates solely to matters within her personal knowledge, including Rep. Lundstrum's personal beliefs as to LGBT people and the legislative context of the Health Care Ban. *Third*, Defendants claim that one of Plaintiffs' designations is inadmissible hearsay. But the testimony is not being offered for the truth of the matter asserted and plainly is not hearsay.[4] *Finally*, Defendants raise a litany of

---

[3] *See Brief in Support of Motion to Quash and for Protective Order*, ECF 120, at 6-12 (asserting legislative privilege arguments); Order, ECF 147 (rejecting absolute privilege argument and permitting deposition of Rep. Lundstrum). Further, it is noteworthy that although being served with Plaintiffs' deposition designations, Rep. Lundstrum has not filed her own motion objecting to the admissibility of the designated portions or renewing any assertion of legislative privilege.

[4] Defendants' *Motion to Exclude* identifies a number of objections based on Plaintiffs supposedly "designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106." (Mot. ¶ 10.) "To sustain a Rule 106 objection, the party urging admission of an excluded conversation must specify the portion of the testimony that is relevant to the issue at trial and that qualifies or explains portions already admitted." *McCoy* v. *Augusta Fiberglass Coatings, Inc.*, 593 F.3d 737, 747 (8th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and

other objections—asserting legislative privilege, claiming embarrassment and harassment, and asserting that testimony about religious beliefs is improper—relying on arguments that have either already been rejected by this Court or briefed extensively by the parties. Those, too, are baseless.

I. PLAINTIFFS' DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS ARE ADMISSIBLE.

A. Plaintiffs' Deposition Designations Are Relevant.

Defendants broadly assert that none of Rep. Lundstrum's testimony is relevant but fail to present any argument or authority in support of their position. The reason why is plain: the testimony of the architect and lead sponsor of the Health Care Ban bears directly on the actual purpose of this legislation and any improper motive for passing the Health Care Ban.

Under Federal Rule of Evidence ("FRE") 401, "evidence is relevant if it has a tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence and the fact is of consequence in determining the action." Relevant evidence is admissible. FRE 402. Plaintiffs allege violations of the Equal Protection Clause, the Due Process Clause, and the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. For each of these claims, one element is whether the legislation sufficiently furthers a government interest. At a minimum, the State has the burden

---

Defendants' *Motion to Exclude* does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary to "qualif[y] or explain[]" a portion of the testimony designated by Plaintiffs. *Id.*

of satisfying heightened scrutiny, which requires it to show that the law is substantially related to an important government interest.[5] And under heightened scrutiny, "[t]he justification must be genuine, not hypothesized or invented post-hoc in response to litigation." *United States* v. *Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533 (1996). Thus, the actual purpose of the legislation is relevant to assessing its constitutionality.

Whether the Health Care Ban was passed for an improper purpose also is at issue. Although such a finding is not necessary to strike down the Health Care Ban, it is an additional basis for doing so, because, under any level of equal protection scrutiny, a law enacted for the impermissible purpose of disapproval of the class of people affected by the law is unconstitutional. *See Romer* v. *Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 632 (1996) (invalidating state constitutional amendment barring non-discrimination protections for gay people under rational basis review after concluding it was motivated by "animus toward the class it affects"); *City of Cleburne* v. *Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 448 (1985) (finding that "negative attitudes" toward the developmentally disabled was not a legitimate basis for zoning ordinance singling out group homes for such individuals); *U.S. Dep't of Agric.* v.

[5] Heightened scrutiny under the Equal Protection claim requires that the statute be substantially related to an important government interest. *Sessions* v. *Morales-Santana*, 137 S. Ct. 1678, 1690 (2017). Infringements on the Due Process Clause and First Amendment require the State to show that the statute is narrowly tailored to further a compelling government interest. *Washington* v. *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 721 (1997); *Reed* v. *Town of Gilbert*, 576 U.S. 155, 163 (2015).

Moreno, 413 U.S. 528, 534 (1973) ("[I]f the constitutional conception of 'equal protection of the laws' means anything, it must at the very least mean that a bare congressional desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot constitute a legitimate governmental interest.").

To discover the reasons behind legislation, "[c]ourts look to direct and indirect evidence to determine whether a state adopted a statute with a discriminatory purpose. This evidence includes [] statements by lawmakers." *Smithfield Foods, Inc.* v. *Miller*, 367 F.3d 1061, 1065 (8th Cir. 2004); *see also Cano* v. *Davis*, 193 F. Supp. 2d 1177, 1181-82 (C.D. Cal. 2002) ("the statements of legislators involved in the process, especially leaders and committee chairmen, as well as the authors of the legislation involved, may in some instances be the best available evidence as to legislative motive" and "[m]otive is often most easily discovered by examining the unguarded acts and statements of those who would otherwise attempt to conceal evidence of discriminatory intent"). Indirect evidence of discriminatory intent can also include "[t]he historical background of the decision" and "[t]he specific sequence of events leading up to the challenged decision. *Vill. of Arlington Heights* v. *Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 267 (1977).

As principal sponsor of the Health Care Ban and the member of the General Assembly responsible for introducing and guiding this legislation to passage, Rep. Lundstrum's testimony regarding her own and other legislators' views

and statements about transgender people,[6] and the fact that the bill was part of a coordinated effort to enact a package of anti-transgender legislation,[7] are relevant to the actual purpose of the legislation and whether disapproval of transgender people was at play.

All of this testimony is relevant to the actual purpose of the Health Care Ban and whether the purpose was impermissible, and the testimony bolsters additional evidence from the legislative record supporting this conclusion. (*See Plaintiffs' Pretrial Disclosures*, ECF No. 183, at 14-15, discussing the fact that the Ban was one of at least twelve bills and resolutions that targeted transgender people during the 2021 Arkansas legislative session; that both chambers passed resolutions expressing their view that "gender reassignment medical treatments" are not "natural"; and that some members of the General Assembly further expressed during

---

[6] For example, Rep. Lundstrum testified that a purpose of the Act is to protect children from "the transgender movement," which she believes is "proselytiz[ing]" them. *Exhibit 1* at 98:10-99:9; *see also id.* at 158:5-9 (testifying that she believes "gender transition [is] always wrong"); *id.* at 154:11-22, 246:8-13 (testifying that she believes being transgender, lesbian, or gay is a choice and individuals can leave the "transgender lifestyle"). She also testified that another member of the General Assembly, Rep. Della Rosa, wrote her a text that "LGBTQABCXYZ people are always the worst[,]" to which Rep. Lundstrum responded "yep." *Id.* at 205:12-206:7.

[7] *See id.* at 22:19-23:20, 119:5-13, 136:23-137:16, 141:12-13, and 141:21-142:2, 142:19-143:5; *Exhibit 2*, Lundstrum Dep. Ex 29; *Exhibit 3*, Lundstrum Dep. Ex 30 (testimony and exhibits referenced efforts to enact the SAFE Act and the GIRLS Act (which prohibits transgender girls from playing on girls' athletic teams), as well as potential measures "restricting or prohibiting LGBT activities in schools"). Exhibits have been included for the Court's reference because the exhibits were not read into the record in their entirety.

the legislative debates their personal and religious opposition to people being transgender).

B. Plaintiffs' Deposition Designations Did Not Call for Speculation.

Defendants assert, without any explanation, that large swaths of Plaintiffs' deposition designations sought speculation from Rep. Lundstrum and were therefore inadmissible under FRE 602.[8] Defendants waived any speculation objection.[9] But even if preserved, the Court should reject this argument. Rule 602 requires that witnesses testify only to those matters within their personal knowledge. Each of Plaintiffs' designations relates to Rep. Lundstrum's own efforts to enact the Health Care Ban and related legislation, organizations she worked closely with, the context in which the General Assembly enacted the Health Care Ban, and her own personal beliefs. Rep. Lundstrum has personal knowledge of—and does not have to

[8] *See e.g.*, Mot. ¶ 14, lines 33:20-33:22; 33:24-34:4; 46:7-47:4; 49:5-49:15; 49:20-49:22; 50:9-50:10; 50:16-50:20; 62:13-63:10; 70:8-70:14; 74:16-74:25; 107:11-107:18; 119:10-119:23; 122:25-123:3; 133:11-134:1; 135:24-137:16; 138:7-138:16; 142:14-142:18; 143:20-143:23; 143:23-144:2; 144:7-144:25; 146:4-148:8; 154:11-154:25; 156:4-158:9; 176:12-176:23; 177:18-177:24; 178:2-178:13; 203:11-208:6; 212:7-212:14; 214:13-216:10.

[9] Under FRCP 32(d)(3)(B), "[a]n objection to an error or irregularity at an oral examination is waived if: (i) it relates to . . . the form of a question or answer . . . or other matters that might have been corrected at that time; and (ii) it is not timely made during the deposition." Objections on the basis of speculation are form objections, which must be raised during the deposition so that the noticing attorney has the opportunity to cure the question, or else the objection is waived. *See Otis* v. *Demarasse*, 399 F. Supp. 3d 759, 765-66 (E.D. Wis. 2019). As such, Defendants have waived their speculation objections in every instance where they failed to make a form objection during Rep. Lundstrum's deposition. (*See Appendix A*.)

speculate on—her own actions, who she worked with,[10] what she sought to accomplish, and her own beliefs.[11]

C. Plaintiffs' Deposition Designation Is Not Inadmissible Hearsay.

Defendants claim that Plaintiffs' deposition designation regarding Rep. Lundstrum's text messages with Arkansas legislators about LGBT people is inadmissible hearsay under FRE 801 and FRE 802.[12] Not so. Plaintiffs do not offer the testimony "to prove the truth of the matter asserted" in the text messages but to show the legislators' impermissible purpose in enacting the Health Care Ban. This is plainly permissible.

II. DEFENDANTS' GENERAL OBJECTIONS ARE BASELESS.

A. Defendants' Objections Based on Rep. Lundstrum's Personal Beliefs about LGBT People and Religion Lack Merit.

Defendants rehash many of the same arguments they raised in their *Motion in Limine*,[13] simply asserting that numerous "designated questions and answers . . . were intended to harass and unduly embarrass Rep. Lundstrum, in

---

[10] For example, when asked whether Family Council was involved with the Medical Conscience Act, Rep. Lundstrum responded, "I am sure they were involved in that." (*Exhibit 1* at 33:24-25.) And when asked about whether she "rel[ied] heavily on Jerry Cox and Family Council in relation to the SAFE Act," she replied,"I relied heavily on Family Council, and I relied heavily on Family Research Council, and I'm very thankful for their help." (*Exhibit 1* at 46:23-47:4.)

[11] *See* Section I.A, *supra*.

[12] Mot. ¶ 14, lines 203:11-208:6.

[13] ECF 164.

violation of Rule 610 and 611" and "therefore, do not comply with Rules 401, 402, 610, and 611."[14] None of these arguments has merit.[15]

First, there simply is no basis for Defendants' claim that Plaintiffs' designations are "intended to harass and unduly embarrass Rep. Lundstrum" and "are ultimately an attempt to illicit irrelevant testimony."[16] Given the clear relevance of each of Plaintiffs' deposition designations, as described in Section I.A, *supra*. and in *Appendix A*, the Court should reject Defendants' claim based on FRE 611 that any reference to Rep. Lundstrum's personal beliefs about LGBT people or religion is an improper attempt to "harass" and "embarrass" her.

Second, Defendants assert that unspecified portions of Rep. Lundstrum's testimony should be excluded under FRE 610, which says that "[e]vidence of a witness's religious beliefs or opinions is not admissible to attack or support the witness's credibility."[17] But as Defendants acknowledge, FRE 610 does not prohibit using evidence of a witness's religious beliefs for *all* purposes.[18] To the

---

[14] Mot. ¶ 11.

[15] Plaintiffs respectfully direct the Court to their *Opposition to Defendants' Motion in Limine* (ECF 171).

[16] Mot. ¶ 11.

[17] Mot. ¶ 12. The term "credibility" refers to a witness's character for truthfulness or untruthfulness. FED. R. EVID. 608 Advisory Committee's notes to 2003 amendments.

[18] *See* Mot. ¶ 12 (acknowledging "exception" to FRE 610).

contrary, "an inquiry for the purpose of showing interest or bias because of [religious beliefs] is not within the prohibition." FED. R. EVID. 610 Advisory Committee's notes to 1972 proposed rules. Nor is an inquiry for the purpose of assessing whether the General Assembly's stated purpose for enacting a law is pretextual. Here, Plaintiffs are entitled to explore fully whether the General Assembly's stated purpose in enacting the Health Care Ban was pretextual and whether its actual purpose was improper. As discussed above, Section I.A., *supra*, as architect and lead sponsor of the Health Care Ban, Rep. Lundstrum's personal beliefs about LGBT people, including those based on her religious beliefs, are directly relevant and admissible. *See, e.g.*, Wright & Miller, *Rule 610, Religious Beliefs or Opinions: Scope*, 28 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Evid. § 6153 (collecting cases; noting that "[FRE] 610 is inapplicable when such evidence is offered for any other purpose [than attacking a witness's credibility], even if it impacts credibility in some other way"); *see also Firemen's Fund Ins. Co.* v. *Thien*, 63 F.3d 754, 760-61 (8th Cir. 1995) (holding that evidence of church membership and close relationships with religious leaders was "properly admitted for the purpose of showing that [witnesses] may have been biased in favor of [the defendant] through their religious affiliation with him").

B. "Legislative Privilege" Is Not a Basis for Exclusion of *All* of Rep. Lundstrum's Testimony.

Defendants' claim—without citation to a single authority[19]—that *all* of Rep. Lundstrum's testimony, "whether in a deposition or at trial," should be excluded based on her purported "legislative privilege."[20] The Court rejected this argument when it denied Rep. Lundstrum's *Motion to Quash*, directing her "to sit for a deposition regarding her non-legislative activity."[21] The Court should adhere to its original reasoning and reject the argument here too.

Should the Court wish to consider these arguments *de novo*, they are baseless. Legislative privilege is qualified, not absolute, and its applicability is governed by a five-factor balancing test. *See, e.g.*, *Nashville Student Org. Comm.*v.

---

[19] Defendants purport to "incorporate the arguments made by Rep. Lundstrum in her Motion to Quash and for Protective Order" pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("FRCP") 10(c) (Mot. ¶ 9 n.1), which says that "[a] statement in a *pleading* may be adopted by reference elsewhere in the same pleading or in any other pleading or motion." (emphasis added.) FRCP 10(c) does not absolve Defendants of having to make arguments and provide authority in support of their *Motion to Exclude*. *See Express Scripts, Inc.* v. *Kincaid*, 2020 WL 3027200, at *2 n.3 (E.D. Tenn. June 5, 2020) ("[T]he Court notes Rule 10(c) only permits parties to adopt, by reference, statements made in *pleadings*, not other motions" (emphasis in original) (citations omitted).). If the Court is inclined to consider arguments and authority cited in other motions filed in this action, Plaintiffs respectfully direct the Court to their *Response in Opposition to Motion to Quash and for Protective Order*, ECF 134.

Further, Plaintiffs note that the proper party to raise the issue of legislative privilege is Rep. Lundstrum herself—not Defendants—and Rep. Lundstrum has not done so. Rep. Lundstrum, through her counsel, was served with Plaintiffs' deposition designations and has not sought to prevent the introduction of any of that testimony.

[20] Mot. ¶ 9.

[21] ECF 147.

Hargett, 123 F. Supp. 3d 967, 970 (M.D. Tenn. 2015) (the balancing test considers "(i) the relevance of the evidence sought to be protected; (ii) the availability of other evidence; (iii) the 'seriousness' of the litigation and the issues involved; (iv) the role of the government in the litigation; and (v) the possibility of future timidity by government employees who will be forced to recognize that their secrets are violable").

Each of these factors weighs in favor of admitting Rep. Lundstrum's testimony by designation: (i) her statements about her sponsorship of and advocacy around the Health Care Ban are highly relevant to assessing whether the State's asserted interests in enacting the law are pretextual; (ii) Plaintiffs have no other avenue to obtain the information sought; (iii) the constitutional rights at issue, including whether transgender minors with gender dysphoria in Arkansas are able to obtain medically necessary gender-affirming medical care, are of great importance; (iv) the Health Care Ban was sponsored and shepherded through the Arkansas House of Representatives by Rep. Lundstrum, and it was enacted by the Arkansas General Assembly, which thus plays an important role in this litigation; and (v) Defendants have not provided any basis for some theoretical fear of "future timidity" by Rep. Lundstrum as a result of disclosure, and, in any event, such fear comes nowhere close to outweighing the other four factors. *See Newport Pac. Inc.* v. *Cty. of San Diego*, 200 F.R.D. 628, 640 (S.D. Cal. 2001) ("[I]f because of this case,

members of government agencies acting on behalf of the public at large are reminded that they are subject to scrutiny, a useful purpose will have been served.”).[22]

Lastly, as the Court recognized in granting in part Plaintiffs’ *Motion to Compel* the production of documents from Arkansas legislators, legislative privilege does not protect information that is “purely factual and/or dated after the passage of the [Health Care Ban]” or “communications between legislators and third parties.”[23] *See Rodriguez* v. *Pataki*, 280 F. Supp. 2d 89, 101 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (“[A] conversation between legislators and knowledgeable outsiders, such as lobbyists, to mark up legislation [is] a session for which no one could seriously claim privilege.”); *Bethune-Hill* v. *Va. State Bd. of Elections*, 114 F. Supp. 3d 323, 324 (E.D. Va. 2015) (“The privilege only protects ‘integral steps’ in the legislative process and does not extend to commentary or analysis following the legislation’s enactment.”). Thus, to the extent Defendants object to Rep. Lundstrum’s testimony about such information or communications, those objections are meritless and should be rejected.

---

[22] Plaintiffs note that because they have not yet received the Legislators’ documents the Court ordered to be produced on August 4, 2022, it may become necessary to call Rep. Lundstrum (or other Legislators) to testify live at trial and reserve their right to do so. The factors on legislative privilege weigh in favor of admitting Rep. Lundstrum’s testimony regardless of whether she is called to testify in person or by video deposition. Any additional burden on Rep. Lundstrum from having to appear for testimony is heavily outweighed by her central role in passing the Health Care Ban, the lack of other sources for the evidence she can provide, and the gravity of the issues presented in this case.

[23] ECF 178, at 3.

III. CONCLUSION.

Rep. Lundstrum's designated deposition testimony is relevant. It is not speculative. It is not hearsay. Simply put, Defendants' objections based on Rep. Lundstrum's personal beliefs and legislative privilege lack merit. For the foregoing reasons, the Court should overrule Defendants' objections and allow Plaintiffs' designations of Rep. Lundstrum's video deposition to be used at trial.

Dated: August 16, 2022

Leslie Cooper

Leslie Cooper
Chase Strangio*
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad St.
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: (917) 345-1742
lcooper@aclu.org
cstrangio@aclu.org
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

Beth Echols, Ark. Bar No. 2002203
Christopher Travis, Ark. Bar No. 97093
Drake Mann, Ark. Bar No. 87108
Gill Ragon Owen, P.A.
425 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 3800
Little Rock, AR 72201
Telephone: (501) 376-3800
echols@gill-law.com
travis@gill-law.com
mann@gill-law.com
On behalf of the Arkansas Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Inc.
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

Breean Walas, Ark. Bar No. 2006077
Walas Law Firm, PLLC
P.O. Box 4591
Bozeman, MT 59772
Telephone: (501) 246-1067
breean@walaslawfirm.com
On behalf of the Arkansas Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Inc.
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

Sarah Everett, Ark. Bar No. 2017249
Gary Sullivan, Ark. Bar No. 92051
Arkansas Civil Liberties Union Foundation, Inc.
904 W. 2nd Street
Little Rock, AR 72201
Telephone: (501) 374-2842
sarah@acluarkansas.org
gary@acluarkansas.org
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

Garrard R. Beeney*
Lauren M. Goldsmith*
Arun Bodapati*
Rebecca S. Kadosh*
Alexander Peacocke*
Emily T.L. Armbruster*
Alexander S. Holland*
Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004
Telephone: (212) 558-4000
beeneyg@sullcrom.com
goldsmithl@sullcrom.com
bodapatia@sullcrom.com
kadoshr@sullcrom.com
peacockea@sullcrom.com
armbrustere@sullcrom.com
hollanda@sullcrom.com
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

Daniel J. Richardson*
1700 New York Avenue NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 956-7500
richardsond@sullcrom.com
Attorney for the Plaintiffs

Laura Kabler Oswell*
Aviv S. Halpern*
Sullivan & Cromwell LLP
1870 Embarcadero Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 461-5600
oswell@sullcrom.com
halperna@sullcrom.com
Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

**Admitted pro hac vice*

Appendix A – Responses to Objections

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
18	13	18	16	No objection.	N/a
22	19	22	22	Object to lines 22:19–22:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 22:19–22:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
23	1	23	17	Object to lines 23:1–23:17 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 23:1–23:17 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
25	19	26	9	Object to lines 25:19–26:9 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 25:19–26:9 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
27	10	27	15	Object to lines 27:10–27:15 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 27:10–27:15 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
28	15	29	5	Object to lines 28:15–29:5 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 28:15–29:5 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 28:15–29:5 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness, and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
30	10	32	5	Object to lines 30:10–32:5 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 30:10–32:5 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
32	21	32	24	Object to lines 31:21–32:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 31:21–32:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
33	8	33	14	Object to lines 33:8–33:14 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 33:8–33:14 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
33	20	33	22	Object to lines 33:20–33:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 33:20–33:22 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
33	24	34	4	Object to lines 33:24–34:4 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 33:24–34:4 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
46	7	47	4	Object to lines 46:7–47:4 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 46:7–47:4 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 46:7–47:4 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
48	21	48	24	Object to lines 48:21–48:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 48:21–48:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
49	5	49	15	Object to lines 49:5–49:15 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 49:5–49:15 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 49:5–49:15 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
49	20	49	22	Object to lines 49:20–49:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 49:20–49:22 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 49:20–49:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Rule 106.	Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
50	9	50	10	Object to lines 50:9–50:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 50:9–50:10 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 50:9–50:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
50	16	50	20	Object to lines 50:16–50:20 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 50:16–50:20 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 50:16–50:20 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
50	23	51	4	Object to lines 50:23–51:4 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 50:23–51:4 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
51	15	51	23	Object to lines 51:15–51:23 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 51:15–51:23 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
52	5	52	17	Object to lines 52:5–52:17 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
53	5	53	9	Object to lines 53:5–53:9 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 53:5–53:9 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
60	18	60	21	Object to lines 60:18–60:21 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 60:18–60:21 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
62	13	63	10	Object to lines 62:13–63:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 62:13–63:10 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 62:13–63:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
64	7	64	15	Object to lines 64:7–64:15 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
65	11	65	14	Object to lines 65:11–65:14 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
67	12	67	16	Object to lines 67:12–67:16 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 67:12–67:16 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
67	22	68	3	Object to lines 67:22–68:3 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 67:22–68:3 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
68	19	68	24	Object to lines 68:19–68:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 68:19–68:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
70	8	70	14	Object to lines 70:8–70:14 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 70:8–70:14 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 70:8–70:14 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
71	2	71	8	Object to lines 71:2–71:8 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 71:2–71:8 due to	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
73	13	73	21	Object to lines 73:13–73:21 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 73:13–73:21 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 73:13–73:21 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
74	6	74	10	Object to lines 74:6–74:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 74:6–74:10 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
74	16	74	25	Object to lines 74:16–74:25 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 74:16–74:25 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 74:16–74:25 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
76	18	77	22	Object to lines 76:18–77:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 76:18–77:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
78	8	78	12	Object to lines 78:8–78:12 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
79	18	79	18	Object to lines 79:18–79:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 79:18–79:18 due to designating incomplete testimony under	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Rule 106. Object to lines 79:18–79:18 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
80	5	80	10	Object to lines 80:5–80:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 80:5–80:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 80:5–80:10 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
97	2	97	10	Object to lines 97:2–97:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 97:2–97:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
98	3	99	24	Object to lines 98:3–99:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 98:3–99:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
107	11	107	18	Object to lines 107:11–107:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 107:11–107:18 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 107:11–107:18 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
108	1	108	4	Object to lines 108:1–108:4 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
108	8	109	14	Object to lines 108:8–109:14 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit.
116	17	116	22	Object to lines 116:17–116:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 116:17–116:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
118	24	119	1	Object to lines 118:24–119:1 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 118:24–119:1 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
119	10	119	23	Object to lines 119:10–119:23 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 119:10–119:23 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 119:10–119:23 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
120	3	120	23	Object to lines 120:3–120:23 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
122	25	123	3	Object to lines 122:25–123:3 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 122:25–123:3 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
133	11	134	1	Object to lines 133:11–134:1 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 133:11–134:1 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 133:11–134:1 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
135	24	137	16	Object to lines 135:24–137:16 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 135:24–137:16 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
138	7	138	16	Object to lines 138:7–138:16 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 138:7–138:16 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
139	21	140	22	Object to lines 139:21–140:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
141	5	141	12	Object to lines 141:5–141:12 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
141	21	142	2	Object to lines 141:21–142:2 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
142	14	142	18	Object to lines 142:14–142:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 142:14–142:18 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 142:14–142:18 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
143	20	143	23	Object to lines 143:20–143:23 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 143:20–143:23 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
143	24	144	2	Object to lines 143:24–144:2 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 143:24–144:2 due to calling	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				for speculation under Rule 602.	that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
144	7	144	25	Object to lines 144:7–144:25 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 144:7–144:25 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.
145	4	145	5	Object to lines 145:4–145:5 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit.
145	6	145	7	Object to lines 145:6–145:7 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit.
146	4	148	8	Object to lines 146:4–148:8 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 146:4–148:8 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 146:4–148:8 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
148	12	148	18	Object to lines 148:12–148:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 148:12–148:18 due to designating incomplete testimony under	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Rule 106.	Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
149	23	151	3	Object to lines 149:23–151:3 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
154	11	154	25	Object to lines 154:11–154:25 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 154:11–154:25 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 154:11–154:25 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
156	4	158	9	Object to lines 156:4–158:9 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 156:4–158:9 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 156:4–158:9 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
175	19	175	22	Object to lines 175:19–175:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 175:19–175:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for relevant testimony. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
176	12	176	23	Object to lines 176:12–176:23 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 176:12–176:23 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 176:12–176:23 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
177	18	177	24	Object to lines 177:18–177:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 177:18–177:24 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 177:18–177:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
178	2	178	13	Object to lines 178:2–178:13 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 178:2–178:13 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 178:2–178:13 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
180	11	180	22	Object to lines 180:11–180:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 180:11–180:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
190	6	190	10	Object to lines 190:6–190:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 190:6–190:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
190	21	191	6	Object to lines 190:21–191:6 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 190:21–191:6 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 190:21–191:6 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
203	11	208	6	Object to lines 203:11–208:6 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 203:11–208:6 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 203:11–208:6 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 203:11–208:6 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610. Object to lines 203:11–208:6 based on inadmissible hearsay.	more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not being offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted and so is not hearsay.
209	3	209	13	Object to lines 209:3–209:13 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 209:3–209:13 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
210	9	210	19	Object to lines 210:9–210:19 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 210:9–210:19 due to	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 210:9–210:19 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
211	5	211	7	Object to lines 211:5–211:7 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 211:5–211:7 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 211:5–211:7 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
211	13	211	24	Object to lines 211:13–211:24 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 211:13–211:24 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 211:13–211:24 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
212	7	212	14	Object to lines 212:7–212:14 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 212:7–212:14 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 212:7–212:14 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides a definitive statement of fact or her understanding of that fact. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
214	2	214	8	Object to lines 214:2–214:8 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 214:2–214:8 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that anti-LGBTQ lobbyist groups were heavily involved in its passage, tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
214	9	214	9	Object to lines 214:9–214:9 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit.
214	13	216	10	Object to lines 214:13–216:10 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 214:13–216:10 due to calling for speculation under Rule 602. Object to lines 214:13–216:10 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 214:13–216:10 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum provides her own opinion or belief.

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is not speculative because Rep. Lundstrum is asked to read directly from an Exhibit. Objection is waived as to all questions within the line designations for which an objection was not raised during the deposition. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
217	14	217	17	Object to lines 217:14–217:17 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit.
224	24	225	19	Object to lines 224:24–225:19 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 224:24–225:19 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
228	6	228	22	Object to lines 228:6–228:22 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 228:6–228:22 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because it provides the foundation for an Exhibit. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
229	1	230	18	Object to lines 229:1–230:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 229:1–230:18 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				Object to lines 229:1–230:18 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
230	24	231	25	Object to lines 230:24–231:25 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 230:24–231:25 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106. Object to lines 230:24–231:25 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				610.	designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
232	25	233	6	Object to lines 232:25–233:6 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 232:25–233:6 due to designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
233	25	234	13	Object to lines 233:25–234:13 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 233:25–234:13 due to	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed, including that it was part of a coordinated effort to pass a series of anti-transgender bills, tends to make more probable

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
				designating incomplete testimony under Rule 106.	that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. Testimony is not incomplete and Defendants cannot now claim the designations are incomplete because Plaintiffs did not object to any of Defendants' counter-designations and Defendants' motion does not offer additional designations they believe are necessary.
242	25	243	18	Object to lines 242:25–243:18 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 242:25–243:18 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the

Page Start	Line Start	Page End	Line End	Objection	Response
					Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
246	8	246	13	Object to lines 246:8–246:13 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402. Object to lines 246:8–246:13 pursuant to Rule 611 to protect witness from harassment, and outside the scope of Rule 610.	Testimony is relevant because the lead sponsor of the Health Care Bans' disapproval of the LGBTQ+ community and of gender transition tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible. The line of questioning does not harass the witness and elicits relevant evidence. Testimony about Representative Lundstrum's religious beliefs is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating the stated purpose for enacting the Health Care Ban is pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.
253	25	254	1	Object to lines 253:25–254:1 as to relevance under Rules 401 and 402.	Testimony is relevant because the legislative context in which the Health Care Ban was passed tends to make more probable that the stated purpose of the Health Care Ban was pretextual and the actual purpose was impermissible.

Exhibit 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION

DYLAN BRANDT, ET AL.,
Plaintiffs,

vs. CASE NO. 4:21-CV-00450-JM

LESLIE RUTLEDGE, ET AL.,
Defendants.

ORAL DEPOSITION OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM
JUNE 30, 2022

APPEARANCES:

MS. BREEAN WALAS, ESQ.
Walas Law Firm
P.O. Box 4591
Bozeman, Montana 59772
breean@walaslawfirm.com

MS. SARAH EVERETT, ESQ.
Arkansas Civil Liberties Union
904 West 2nd Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
sarah@acluarkansas.org

MR. GARY SULLIVAN, ESQ.
Arkansas Civil Liberties Union
904 West 2nd Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
gary@alcuarkansas.org
(Appearing via Zoom)

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

MR. BRANDYN J. RODGERSON, ESQ.
Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP
125 Broad Street
New York, New York 10004
rodgersonb@sullcrom.com
(Appearing via Zoom)

MS. EMILY T. L. ARMBRUSTER, ESQ.
Sullivan & Cromwell, LLP
125 Broad Street
New York, New York 10004
armbrustere@sullcrom.com
(Appearing via Zoom)
*** For the Plaintiffs ***

MR. GRAHAM TALLEY, ESQ.
Mitchell Williams Law Firm
425 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1800
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
graham@mitchellwilliamslaw.com
*** For the Witness Representative Robin Lundstrum ***

MS. AMANDA LAND, ESQ.
Assistant Attorney General
323 Center Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
amanda.land@arkansasag.gov
*** For the Defendants ***

ALSO PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

Leslie Cooper
Martha Garrity
Nicholas Rush
Saskia De Vries
Sophia M. Matthew

TAKEN BEFORE Jeff Bennett, Certified Court Reporter, LS Certificate No. 19, Veritext, 620 West Third Street, Suite 302, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 on June 30, 2022 at Mitchell Williams, 425 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1800, Little Rock, Arkansas commencing at 10:05 a.m.

INDEX

WITNESS SWORN: REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM

	Page
Examination by Ms. Walas	18
Examination by Mr. Talley	250
Re-Examination by Ms. Walas	253

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 June 21, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum to Tom Lundstrum, re: Draft, Please Help	27
Exhibit 2 April 1, '21 Email from Charisse Dean to Robin Lundstrum, re: Updated final SAFE Act Talking Points for Media and Interviews	31
Exhibit 3 March 11, '22 Email from Robin Lundstrum to Marty Garrity, re: Search Word "SAFE Act"	37
Exhibit 4 February 25, '21 Email from Charisse Dean to Robin Lundstrum, re: SAFE Act Q & A	43

Exhibit 5 March 9, '21 Email from Charisse Dean to Joseph Backholm, re: Dr. Janet Cathey of Planned Parenthood at the Capitol	45
Exhibit 6 April 5, '21 Email from Jerry Cox to Robin Lundstrum, re: Representative Lundstrum's Comments	46
Exhibit 7 April 8, '21 Email from Jerry Cox to Robin Lundstrum, re: Expert Briefing on HB 1570 Gender Reassignment	47
Exhibit 8 April 9, '21 Email from Erin Hogan to Robin Lundstrum, re: List of People on the call	49
Exhibit 9 April 9, '21 Email from Jerry Cox to Robin Lundstrum, re: Answers to Two main questions on HB 1570 Gender Transition	52
Exhibit 10 March 10, '21 Email from Charisse Dean to Robin Lundstrum, re: HB 1570	65
Exhibit 11 Text messages with Quena Gonzalez	68

Page 6

1 Exhibit 12
2 April 13, '21 Email from Quena Gonzalez
3 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Save Adolescents
4 from Experimentation for North Dakota 72
5 Exhibit 13
6 Screen shot - Pray Vote Stand 75
7 Exhibit 14
8 Family Research Council, The President's
9 Cabinet, Tom and Robin Lundstrum Itinerary 77
10 Exhibit 15
11 July 8, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
12 to Robin Lundstrum, re: ALEC 2021 82
13 Exhibit 16
14 ALEC Dinner Itinerary 94
15 Exhibit 17
16 July 29, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
17 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Dinner Tonight:
18 Gener Clinics Don't Help Kids 96
19 Exhibit 18
20 July 27, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
21 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Dinner with a Dad
22 Fighting to Protect His Son from the
23 Transgender Movement 98
24
25

Page 7

1 Exhibit 19
2 September 9, '21 Email from Quena Gonzalez
3 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Invitation to
4 Speak 100
5 Exhibit 20
6 October 22, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
7 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Exclusive Invitation:
8 Hear from Arkansas Rep Robin Lundstrum on
9 Sponsoring the First Successful Bill to Protect
10 Minors from Gender Transition 100
11 Exhibit 21
12 October 5, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
13 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Invitation:
14 SAFE Act Virtual Summit, Week of Oct. 26 101
15 Exhibit 22
16 October 26, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
17 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Rehearsal Virtual
18 SAFE Act Summit 102
19 Exhibit 23
20 October 25, '21 Email from Nicolas Reynolds
21 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Exclusive Invitation:
22 Be a Part of the Movement to Protect Minors
23 from Sterilization 104
24
25

Page 8

1 Exhibit 24
2 May 28, '21 Email from Amanda Banks,
3 Subject: Statesman Academy Alumni
4 Newletter, April-May 2021 108
5 Exhibit 25
6 November 3, '21 Email from Statesmen
7 Academy, Subject: Your Application to
8 the Statesmen Academy 109
9 Exhibit 26
10 July 6, '21 Email from Amanda Banks,
11 Subject: Called Together Agenda & More,
12 Your Response Needed 117
13 Exhibit 27
14 June 19, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
15 to Amanda Banks, re: Gender Issues Policy
16 Panel 119
17 Exhibit 28
18 August 27, '21 Email from Amanda Banks,
19 Subject: Statesmen Academy Alumi
20 Newsletter: August 2021 120
21 Exhibit 29
22 July 17, '21 Email from Autumn Stroup to
23 Dr. Roger Hiatt, re: Outline for Gender
24 Panel Next Week 123
25

Page 9

1 Exhibit 30
2 Family Policy Alliance more Detailed
3 Version of the Gender Issues Policy
4 Panel Outline 124
5 Exhibit 31
6 July 30, '21 Email from Amanda Banks,
7 Subject: Follow-up Info and Resources:
8 Called Together 145
9 Exhibit 32
10 For Immediate Release, August 31, '21,
11 Family Policy Alliance, Help Not Harm:
12 A National Child Safety Campaign 148
13 Exhibit 33
14 Social Media Engagement Packet-Help Not
15 Harm, Family Policy Alliance 149
16 Exhibit 34
17 January 13, '22 Email from Amanda Banks
18 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Help Not Harm
19 Model Leg & Messaging 151
20 Exhibit 35
21 November 10, '21 Email from Amanda Banks,
22 Subject: Statesmen Academy Alumni
23 Newsletter: November 2021 152
24
25

Page 10

1 Exhibit 36
2 June 9, '21 Email from Jason Wessell to
3 Robin Lundstrum, re: Thank you for Meeting
4 with Changed Movement Today 155
5 Exhibit 37
6 CHANGED #Oncegay Stories 158
7 Exhibit 38
8 April 17, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
9 to Quena Gonzalez, re: Very Very Rough
10 Draft to members SAFE Act Points to
11 Forward to Media 162
12 Exhibit 39
13 April 7, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
14 to Justin Boyd, re: SAFE Act Talking Points
15 For Media and Interviews 164
16 Exhibit 40
17 Washington Watch with Tony Perkins
18 Guest List 170
19 Exhibit 41
20 April 17, '21 Email from Emily Barsh
21 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Link to Mike's
22 Show 176
23 Exhibit 42
24 Screen Shot The Born Identity 177
25

Page 11

1 Exhibit 43
2 May 5, '21 Email from Dick Morris to
3 Robin Lundstrum, re: Monologue for Show
4 on Friday 182
5 Exhibit 44
6 Screen Shot of EPPiC Broadcast, What's
7 Next for the SAFE Act, with Robin
8 Lundstrum, August 17, '21 186
9 Exhibit 45
10 Text Messages - Leslie Rutledge 190
11 Exhibit 46
12 April 14, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
13 to Alex Pfieffer, re: Support Transgender
14 Patients' Access to Medically Necessary
15 Care 191
16 Exhibit 47
17 Text Messages - Jerry Cox 193
18 Exhibit 48
19 April 14, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
20 to Quena Gonzalez, re: Support Transgender
21 Patients' Access to Medically Necessary
22 Care 196
23
24
25

Page 12

1 Exhibit 49
2 March 3, '21, Screen Shot, YouTube.com,
3 Dr. Paul Questions Rachel Levine During
4 Confirmation Hearing 198
5 Exhibit 50
6 August 24, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
7 to Bryant Richardson, re: SAFE Act 199
8 Exhibit 51
9 April 1, '21 Screen Shot Pray Vote Stand
10 Call to Prayer and Listen Closely 200
11 Exhibit 52
12 Text Messages - Jana Della Rosa 203
13 Exhibit 53
14 April 6, '21 Email from Missy Irvin to
15 Robin Lundstrum, re: Must Read, "Male
16 and Female He Created Them" 207
17 Exhibit 54
18 Robin Lundstrum PowerPoint Presentation 209
19 Exhibit 55
20 May 26, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
21 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Print 217
22 Exhibit 56
23 June 21, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
24 to Robin Lundstrum, re: Ground Zero!
25 Focusing on What Brings us Together 228

Page 13

1 Exhibit 57
2 April 5, '21 Email from Robin Lundstrum
3 to Jimmy Gazaway, re: March 22 Senate Public
4 Health Arkansas Legislature 235
5 Exhibit 58
6 Senate Committee on Public Welfare
7 and Labor Hearing, re: HB 1570 - Lundstrum
8 to Create The Arkansas Save Adolescents
9 From Experimentation (SAFE) Act 238
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 Certificate 255
24 Witness' Signature 258
25

ANSWERS AND DEPOSITION OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM, a witness produced at the request of Plaintiffs, taken in the above styled and numbered cause on the 30th day of June, 2022, before Jeff Bennett, Certified Court Reporter, LS Certificate No. 19, a Notary Public in and for Saline County, Arkansas, taken at the offices of Mitchell Williams, 425 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1800, Little Rock, Arkansas at 10:05 a.m.

S T I P U L A T I O N S

IT IS STIPULATED and AGREED by and between the parties through their respective counsel that the deposition of REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM may be taken at the time and place designated pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM

The witness hereinbefore named, having been duly cautioned and sworn or affirmed to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We are going on the record at 10:05 a.m., on June 30, 2022.

Please note that this deposition is being conducted both in person and virtually. The quality of the recording depends on the quality of the camera and internet connection. What is seen from the witness and heard on the screen is what will be recorded. Audio and video recording will continue to take place unless all parties agree to go off the record.

This is Media Unit 1 of the Video Recorded Deposition of Robin Lundstrum taken by counsel for the Plaintiff "In the Matter of Dylan Brandt, et al. versus Leslie Rutledge, et al.", filed in United States District Court, Eastern District of Arkansas, Central Division, Case Number 4:21-CV-00450-JM.

The location of the deposition is Mitchell Williams at 425 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1800 in Little Rock, and we also have some participating via Zoom.

My name is Mike Tschiemer. I'm representing Veritext, and I'm the videographer. The court reporter is Jeff

Bennett, also representing Veritext.

I'm not related to any party in this action, nor am I financially interested in the outcome. If there are any objections to proceeding, please state them at the time of your appearance.

Counsel and all present, including remotely, will now state their appearances and affiliations for the record beginning with the noticing attorney.

MS. WALAS: Breean Walas on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

MS. EVERETT: Sarah Everett on behalf of the Plaintiff.

MS. WALAS: The Plaintiffs also have some attorneys attending via Zoom, and we'll ask them to identify themselves at this time.

MS. ARMBRUSTER: Emily Armbruster, Sullivan and Cromwell, for the Plaintiff.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm Gary Sullivan, ACLU of Arkansas for the Plaintiffs.

MS. MATTHEW: Sophia Matthew for the Plaintiffs.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We still got some joining.

MS. WALAS: I believe Plaintiffs will also be joined by Brandyn Rodgerson and Leslie Cooper.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Saskia De Vries, will you also state your appearance?

MS. DE VRIES: Yes, I am here.

(Inaudible)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: If we have any others attending, they'll be so reflected in the written transcript.

Mr. Reporter, would you please swear in the witness?

(The witness was sworn.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. Please proceed.

MR. TALLEY: Before we get started. This is Graham Talley on behalf of the witness. I believe Marty Garrity from the Bureau of Legislative Research is going to be joining by Zoom. It's my understanding, Ms. Walas, that we are here today pursuant to a Notice of Deposition for a Deposition in compliance with the Court's Order that was entered earlier this month, is that right?

MS. WALAS: That is correct.

1 MR. TALLEY: That's all I've got. Thank
2 you.
3 MS. WALAS: Does the State want to state
4 your presence?
5 MS. LAND: Yeah. I'm Amanda Land on
6 behalf of the Attorney General's Office.
7 UNIDENTIFIED COUNSEL: (Inaudible) for
8 the Attorney General's Office.
9 MS. GARRITY: This is Marty Garrity. I'm
10 participating by Zoom.
11 EXAMINATION
12 BY MS. WALAS:
13 Q. All right. Good morning. Will you please
14 introduce yourself for the Court, who may ultimately see
15 this video?
16 A. Robin Lundstrum, State Representative.
17 Q. Is this your first time giving a deposition?
18 A. Yes, it is.
19 Q. Okay. Would you like to go over some ground rules
20 today about how this will proceed?
21 A. Sure.
22 Q. Okay. I'm going to be asking you some questions.
23 And I am going to try to be succinct and clear. If at
24 any point you don't understand a question that I've
25 asked, will you ask me to rephrase it?

1 A. Yes, thank you.
2 Q. And if you answer a question, is it safe to
3 presume that you understood the question?
4 A. Yes. If I don't understand, I'll ask again.
5 Q. Okay. And did you meet with your attorney prior
6 to the deposition today?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. And did y'all -- I don't want to know anything
9 that y'all talked about, but did you do anything to
10 prepare for your deposition today?
11 A. We met.
12 Q. Did you go over any documents or anything?
13 A. The documents you were presented with.
14 Q. Okay. And so you reviewed some documents that
15 were produced in this case prior to your deposition
16 today?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And did you assist in gathering the documents that
19 were produced for your -- produced pursuant to the
20 document subpoena?
21 A. No.
22 Q. Who gathered all of those documents?
23 A. My attorneys.
24 Q. The court reporter is going to be trying to record
25 everything that we're saying. So I'm going to do my

1 best to not interrupt you. I will probably fail at that
2 a few times. And if you could do the same, wait until I
3 finish my question and then answer, does that make
4 sense?
5 A. It makes perfect sense.
6 Q. Okay. And then, if you need a break at any time,
7 please let me know. The only request would be that if a
8 question is pending, that you answer the question and
9 then we can go ahead and take that break.
10 A. Okay.
11 Q. And then there might be some objections at certain
12 times throughout today. If there's an objection, go
13 ahead and let the attorney finish making the objection,
14 and then you can go ahead and answer unless your
15 attorney has instructed you not to answer, do you
16 understand that?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Okay. Is there anything that could affect your
19 ability to be truthful and honest today?
20 A. No.
21 Q. Okay. You haven't taken any sort of medication or
22 any sort of thing like that that could affect your
23 ability today?
24 A. No.
25 Q. Okay. How did you get the idea to propose a ban

1 on gender transition procedures for minors?
2 A. This is something I've been concerned about, and
3 something I had read about, and was concerned that this
4 might be occurring in Arkansas.
5 Q. How long have you been concerned about this?
6 A. A couple of years prior to the session.
7 Q. When would you say this issue first came on your
8 radar?
9 A. At least a year and a half, two years before
10 session, just following the issues concerning children.
11 Q. So the session was 2021?
12 A. 2021. So '20, '19.
13 Q. Okay. Did someone suggest this legislation to
14 you?
15 A. No.
16 Q. When did you first become interested in
17 legislating gender affirming healthcare?
18 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form. And I'm
19 going to object on legislative privilege
20 grounds. Ms. Walas, I believe that the
21 Court's Order regarding this deposition was
22 fairly clear that Representative Lundstrum
23 could not be deposed on her legislative
24 activity. I believe the language used in the
25 Order is the deposition may proceed as to her

1 quote, "non-legislative activity." The
2 question you just asked calls for testimony
3 regarding her actual legislative activity. If
4 there's a way you might be able to ask that
5 question that does not call for testimony on
6 Representative Lundstrum's legislative
7 activity, I would welcome that. But
8 otherwise, I will instruct the witness not to
9 answer.
10 MS. WALAS: I don't believe that the
11 question falls outside the scope of the
12 Court's Order based on the documents that were
13 produced and the argument and presentation
14 that was in the non-legislative activity
15 section. However, for purposes of time, I'll
16 just go on to the next question.
17 MR. TALLEY: Thank you.
18 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
19 Q. Were you a sponsor of any other legislation during
20 the 2021 Session that impacts the transgender community
21 in Arkansas?
22 A. I'm not sure. I may have been a cosponsor.
23 Honestly, I don't know off the top of my head without
24 looking at -- I'm not sure. I don't think so, but I'm
25 not sure.

1 Q. Do you recall if you were a sponsor or cosponsor
2 of the Girls Act?
3 A. Yes, the Women's Sports Bill. Yes, I was
4 cosponsor.
5 Q. Do you recall if you were sponsor or cosponsor of
6 the Medical Conscience Bill?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. And do you recall if you were cosponsor or
9 cosponsor of the Promise to Arkansas Children's
10 Resolution?
11 A. I can't recall the contents of that, but I do
12 believe I was a cosponsor.
13 Q. Was the SAFE Act part of the Republican Women's
14 Caucus' 2021 Dream Big Strategy?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Was the Girls Act also part of that platform?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Was the Medical Conscience Bill a part of that
19 platform?
20 A. I don't believe so.
21 Q. Are all three of those bills; the SAFE Act, the
22 Girls Act and the Medical Conscience Bill, transgender
23 bills?
24 MS. LAND: Object to form.
25 MR. TALLEY: You can answer if you

1 understand.
2 A. Those are not bills aimed at any particular group
3 at all. They're to protect children.
4 Q. Do you agree that both the SAFE Act and the Girls
5 Act prohibit transgender Arkansans from participating in
6 society in ways that affirm their gender?
7 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
8 Q. You need to repeat your answer, please?
9 THE WITNESS: Should I answer?
10 MR. TALLEY: You may answer if you
11 understand it
12 A. Would you repeat the question? I want to make
13 sure I answer clearly.
14 Q. Do you agree that the SAFE Act and the Girls Act
15 prohibit transgender Arkansans from participating in
16 society in ways that affirm their gender?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
18 A. No, absolutely not.
19 Q. Gender incongruity is real, correct?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Is gender incongruity serious?
22 A. I believe so.
23 Q. Is gender dysphoria real?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. Is gender dysphoria serious?

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. Do children experience gender dysphoria?
3 A. I believe adolescents do experience gender
4 dysphoria.
5 Q. Do prepubertal adolescents experience gender
6 dysphoria?
7 A. I'm not a doctor, and I'm not a psychiatrist, but
8 I believe that young children can experience gender
9 dysphoria.
10 Q. Are puberty-suppressing drugs given to minors to
11 treat gender dysphoria?
12 A. They are. But again, I'm not a doctor. But those
13 drugs do have a long-term impact, and I'm very concerned
14 about that.
15 Q. Do families and children deserve compassion and
16 care?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
18 A. Absolutely.
19 Q. When it comes to treating gender dysphoria, is it
20 your belief that finding a good family counselor who
21 gets to the root of the problem, not a gender affirming
22 counselor, is critical?
23 A. There's two different parts of that question, if I
24 understand the question correctly. So let me make sure
25 I understand the question. Finding a good family

Page 26

1 therapist is critical. A gender affirming therapist,
2 I'm not sure. In my personal opinion, again, I'm not a
3 doctor or psychiatrist, but a gender affirming
4 therapist, I'm not sure if that's, in my personal
5 opinion, a good thing. We wouldn't have an anorexia
6 affirming therapist or an alcoholic affirming therapist.
7 But a child that's experiencing gender dysphoria
8 deserves a gold standard, the best possible quality care
9 they can get.
10 MS. WALAS: I'm going to go ahead and
11 mark as Exhibit 1 what's been identified
12 through the production as GA-Members 004066,
13 which for the sake of time and the record, are
14 we all good with me just using the numbers
15 from here on out if it's part of the GA
16 production?
17 MS. LAND: Yes.
18 MS. WALAS: Okay.
19 MR. TALLEY: And by "GA production" do
20 you mean the documents that were produced on
21 behalf of the five non-party legislators in
22 this case?
23 MS. WALAS: Yes. The GA dash members
24 Bates stamped documents. Perfect.
25

Page 27

1 BY MS. WALAS:
2 Q. All right. I'm going to go ahead and hand this to
3 you. If you can go ahead and take a look at that?
4 (Deposition Exhibit 1 was marked for
5 identification.)
6 Q. I believe, in response to my question, you asked
7 for some clarification on the gender affirming
8 counselor's statement, correct?
9 A. Uh-huh.
10 Q. And is Exhibit 1 a statement that you wrote on
11 June 21st of 2021?
12 A. This is an email from me on June 21st to my
13 husband, and it is a draft email where I'm trying to
14 work out my thoughts so that I can speak clearly. So
15 it's a draft email.
16 Q. And if you'll go to the third paragraph beginning
17 with, "The press?" Will you go ahead and read the last
18 three sentences that you wrote regarding the SAFE Act?
19 A. Okay.
20 Q. Starting with the word "finding," if that's
21 helpful.
22 A. Okay. "Family counseling is often needed as well.
23 These children and families --"
24 Q. Pause you real quick. Let me go ahead --
25 MS. WALAS: Do you mind if I get up to

Page 28

1 just show her where I'm --
2 MR. TALLEY: I was going to suggest that
3 perhaps it might be easier if you show the
4 witness.
5 MS. WALAS: All right.
6 BY MS. WALAS:
7 Q. I will go ahead and highlight this part that I
8 would like you to go ahead and take a look at.
9 MR. TALLEY: Ms. Walas, can you repeat
10 your question before the witness responds?
11 MS. WALAS: Okay.
12 THE WITNESS: I'm wishing now I used
13 bigger font.
14 BY MS. WALAS:
15 Q. Would you go ahead and read the yellow
16 highlighting from Exhibit 1, please?
17 A. "Finding a good family counselor who gets to the
18 root of the problem, NOT a gender affirming counselor is
19 critical. A gender affirming counselor is a joke and a
20 waste of time! Would anyone use an anorexia affirming
21 counselor or an alcoholic affirming counselor,
22 absolutely not!!!""
23 Q. Do you still agree with your statement a gender
24 affirming counselor is a joke and a waste of time?
25 A. Yes.

Page 29

1 Q. Is it your belief that the gender transition
2 process is creating a new income stream for drug
3 companies and gender affirming therapists?
4 A. Yes, I'm very concerned what's going to happen to
5 these children in the long run.
6 Q. Do you believe that a parent who affirms their
7 child's gender is a bad parent?
8 A. No.
9 Q. If you'll go ahead and look at Exhibit 1. If you
10 don't mind passing that to me, I'll skip this --
11 A. Please.
12 MR. TALLEY: Ms. Walas, are you
13 highlighting additional portions of Exhibit 1
14 you wish the witness to read?
15 MS. WALAS: Yes, I'm going to ask her
16 that question.
17 BY MS. WALAS:
18 Q. If you will go ahead and read the second portion
19 of the highlighting on Exhibit 1, please?
20 A. Okay. I probably should read the whole sentence.
21 Q. If you'll go ahead and read the portion of the
22 sentence that is highlighted, please?
23 A. Well, it's part of a full sentence. That's taking
24 it out of context. "These children and families are
25 often thrown into a difficult situation with little

Page 30

1 support and little encouragement except go with what's
2 popular or you're a bad parent."
3 Q. Do you believe the parents who affirm their
4 child's gender are bad parents?
5 A. No. I believe they're put in a very difficult
6 situation.
7 Q. I'd like to talk to you about some of the
8 organizations mentioned in the documents that you have
9 produced and your involvement with those groups.
10 Starting out with the Family Council, what is
11 Family Council?
12 A. Family Council is an organization that works
13 diligently to protect families.
14 Q. Is it a conservative organization?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Is it a pro-family organization?
17 A. Yes, I would characterize it that way.
18 Q. Is the mission of Family Council to promote and
19 protect and strengthen traditional family values found
20 and reflected in the Bible by impacting public opinion
21 and public policy in Arkansas?
22 A. I would say that's a fair reflection, yes.
23 Q. Did Family Council provide you talking points and
24 sound bites for use with your colleagues, media and
25 interviews related to the SAFE Act?

Page 31

1 MS. LAND: Object to form.
2 MR. TALLEY: If you understand, you can
3 answer.
4 A. I do understand the question.
5 To be clear, when this bill was taking form, I
6 asked Family Council for their help and they agreed to
7 help me. And when I needed talking points, I asked them
8 for help and they helped me form the talking points. So
9 it was a team effort, and I'm thankful for their help.
10 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit 2,
11 and it's 4414 to 4417.
12 (Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for
13 identification.)
14 Q. Does this April 1st, 2021 email contain some of
15 those talking points and sound bites that you just
16 discussed preparing with the Family Council?
17 A. Yes, this is from Charisse Dean, Thursday,
18 April 1st, 2021 to me, and it says, the subject line,
19 Update, final SAFE Act talking points and media
20 interview. Yes.
21 Q. And do you know if -- well, first of all, who's
22 Charisse Dean?
23 A. She's an employee of Family Council.
24 Q. What is her role there?
25 A. She works as a legislative aide.

Page 32

1 Q. Do you know if Charisse prepared these talking
2 points herself?
3 A. I think it was a group effort between Charisse,
4 myself, Jerry Cox. I'm not sure who all worked on them.
5 These things get passed around quite a bit.
6 Q. Was anyone else from another organization involved
7 in creating these talking points?
8 A. I'm not sure, but I would guess that probably they
9 were shared with the Family Research Council.
10 Q. Is Family Research Council a separate organization
11 than Family Council?
12 A. Yes, ma'am.
13 Q. Okay. Well, we'll talk about them separately
14 then.
15 A. All right.
16 Q. Do you agree that public policy should reflect
17 traditional family values as found in the Bible like
18 Family Council?
19 A. I do think that public policy should reflect
20 family values.
21 Q. Did you have any discussions, meetings or calls
22 with Family Council about legislation on transgender
23 issues?
24 A. I'm sure we probably did at some point.
25 Q. How many calls do you think you had with them

Page 33

1 about those issues?
2 A. I honestly couldn't tell you. We talk about a
3 variety of different issues, whether it's pro-life or
4 school. It's usually about the SAFE Act, which is a
5 pro-child issue. It's not trans, it's pro-child. These
6 children need time to grow up and then they can decide
7 what they choose to be when they grow up.
8 Q. Do you regularly work with Family Council in
9 putting legislation together?
10 A. I do work with Family Council quite a bit on a lot
11 of different subjects, yes.
12 Q. What other types of issues did you discuss
13 besides, say, the SAFE Act?
14 A. Pro-life issues, a little bit on girls sports.
15 Q. Anything else you can think of?
16 A. I'm sure there probably is. I'm not trying to be
17 difficult, it's just not coming to mind.
18 Q. We all have many things in our mind, so that makes
19 sense.
20 Were they involved with the Medical Conscience
21 Act?
22 A. I believe so, yes.
23 Q. Okay.
24 A. Not a "believe so," I am sure they were involved
25 in that.

1 Q. Okay. And were they involved in the resolution
2 to -- Promise to -- Promise to Save Arkansas' Children
3 Resolution, were they involved with that?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. Okay. And did you discuss any issues about
6 teachers using pronouns that match natal sex?
7 A. That wasn't my bill. So I wasn't involved with
8 that. It would have been a cursory conversation at
9 best.
10 Q. Okay. Did you discuss trans -- wait. I'm sorry.
11 I think you just said that earlier. So I'll strike that
12 question.
13 Did you discuss school curriculum concerning
14 sexual orientation or gender identity?
15 A. I have discussed that, but that's really not in my
16 wheelhouse. So I would have passed that on.
17 Q. And when you say, when you discussed that, we're
18 talking about discussions with Family Council, correct?
19 A. Discussions with Family Council or if a
20 constituent had a question I might have sent them to
21 Family Council. But I have other bills this session
22 besides this. So I tried to stick with the ones that
23 were on my plate.
24 Q. Okay. That makes sense.
25 Did you discuss any concerns during these

1 conversations about the need for gender affirming
2 healthcare in Arkansas?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
4 answer if you understand the question.
5 A. The need for gender affirming care. I would see
6 this bill as a bill to protect children and allow them
7 to participate in their care. That's why I ran the
8 bill.
9 Q. Did you have any concerns or in your discussions
10 with Family Council did y'all have any concerns about
11 transgender ideology?
12 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
13 A. I don't have any concerns about transgenderism. I
14 want these kids to be old enough to participate. They
15 need to get to be 18 so that they can make decisions in
16 their own healthcare; whether they be gay, straight,
17 transgender, whatever, they just need to be old enough
18 to make good decisions concerning their healthcare.
19 Q. And you used the term transgenderism. And if you
20 will, will you define what that means to you so that we
21 kind of know exactly what we're talking about when you
22 use it?
23 A. In my opinion, it's someone that prefers to be the
24 gender that they are not.
25 Q. Was there any concern about the fact that

1 transgender people were becoming more accepted?
2 A. No.
3 Q. Who is Jerry Cox?
4 A. He is the director of Family Council.
5 Q. Who's David Cox?
6 A. He is the IT person, computer person at Family
7 Council.
8 Q. And who's Luke McCoy?
9 A. He works for Family Council as well.
10 Q. What's his role at Family Council?
11 A. Oh, boy, he does a lot of different roles at
12 Family Council. I couldn't tell you off the top of my
13 head. Sorry.
14 Q. Is he a lawyer?
15 A. No.
16 Q. Okay. So he's kind of like a jack-of-all-trades
17 at Family Council?
18 A. If he ever sees this, he's going to kill me. Can
19 we keep that in-house. Let's not give him too much
20 credit.
21 Q. Okay. So we'll just silently say that.
22 A. Yeah.
23 Q. Okay.
24 All right. Did Luke help you to get some
25 witnesses or some people to assist you in putting forth

1 the SAFE Act?
2 A. No, he was not an integral part of this. Charisse
3 Dean did more of the leg work on this.
4 Q. I want to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 3, 3800 to
5 3812.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 3 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 Q. And putting aside the -- well, first, at the top
9 there's a -- there's kind of a forward, is that from
10 you, Robin Lundstrum, do you see that?
11 A. Uh-huh. It's from me, Robin Lundstrum, sent
12 Friday, March the 11th, and it's from Luke McCoy and
13 he's, I believe, helping to get a witness for --
14 Q. Was this on the email from Luke to Dr. Wagner?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Okay.
17 MR. TALLEY: Before you proceed,
18 Ms. Walas, I think I'm a little bit mixed up
19 on which part of this email string we're
20 talking about. I think I heard Representative
21 Lundstrum say March 11, which is the date at
22 the very top of the email, which does not
23 appear to be the substantive portions of that
24 email that I think are the ones that are
25 germane to your line of questioning here.

Page 38

1 MS. WALAS: I did not know what date she
2 said. So let's go ahead and clarify that
3 first.
4 MR. TALLEY: Thank you.
5 BY MS. WALAS:
6 Q. So at the very top of Exhibit 3, yes, where your
7 finger is.
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. That is where you forwarded this email to someone
10 else in relation to this litigation, correct?
11 A. Yes, I believe so.
12 Q. Okay. Let's put that aside and disregard that for
13 purposes of my questioning, and we'll start at the next
14 part where it says, from Luke McCoy, do you see that?
15 A. I see that. And it says, February 16, 2021.
16 Q. Okay. And so, on February 16, 2021, Luke McCoy of
17 Family Council reached out to Dr. Wagner on your
18 behalf --
19 A. Correct.
20 Q. -- about the SAFE Act?
21 A. Uh-huh.
22 Q. And do you agree that the purpose of Family
23 Council's email was to see if Dr. Wagner would support
24 or give you advice about the SAFE Act draft?
25 A. Yes, this is part of the legislative process.

Page 39

1 Q. But this was produced as part of this litigation,
2 correct?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
4 A. I believe so. If you have it, I'm sure it was
5 produced as part of -- yes.
6 Q. And do you agree with Luke McCoy's statement that
7 the SAFE Act would prohibit parents from letting their
8 children change genders, essentially?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
10 A. I'm not sure I see that in this email.
11 Q. Would you like me to highlight it for you?
12 A. That would be helpful.
13 Q. Okay. Go ahead and note for the record that I'm
14 highlighting Exhibit 3 at the witness's request, and
15 I'll go ahead and reask my question.
16 A. All right.
17 Q. Do you agree with Luke McCoy's statement that's
18 now been highlighted on Exhibit 3 that the SAFE Act
19 would prohibit parents from letting their children
20 change genders essentially?
21 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
22 A. That's what it says.
23 Q. Do you agree with that statement?
24 A. It would prohibit minors from chemically or
25 surgically altering their genders or their outside form,

Page 40

1 not their chromosomes, no, but their outside, yes.
2 Q. So are you saying that you agree with Luke McCoy's
3 statement?
4 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
5 Q. The bill protects children from chemically and
6 surgically altering their genders.
7 Q. So you disagree that the SAFE Act prohibit parents
8 from letting their children change genders, essentially?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
10 A. It does for minors.
11 Q. Did you ask Family Council to reach out to Dr.
12 Wagner?
13 A. You know, I can't remember. There's been so much
14 back and forth. I didn't know Dr. Wagner before this.
15 Q. Did you know that Family Council was also going to
16 ask Dr. Wagner to reach out to Representative Justin
17 Boyd to offer up help and advice, but not to mention the
18 Family Council?
19 A. Again, there was a lot of email chatter. So I
20 wasn't privileged to all of it, and I didn't read every
21 single thing. So I may have missed something.
22 Q. Did you know that, as part of Family Council's
23 recruitment for House Bill 1570 support, that they'd be
24 also asking Dr. Wagner to join their Rapid Response
25 Volunteer Team?

Page 41

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
2 A. I'm glad to hear that they did.
3 Q. Do you know what that Rapid Response Team of
4 Volunteers does on behalf of the Family Council?
5 A. I would assume that it's just like any rapid
6 response team for any political action group, it's to
7 notify their legislators of their opinions.
8 Q. And those would be opinions consistent with Family
9 Council's views on LGBT people?
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
11 A. Their opinions on the bill.
12 Q. Okay. So on whatever bill that the rapid response
13 volunteer was going forth for on behalf of Family
14 Council, they would be putting forth Family Council's
15 message?
16 A. The message if they're supporting the bill or if
17 they are against a bill.
18 Q. Do you agree with Family Council that radical
19 activists are trying to exploit the Covid-19 pandemic
20 and the racial tensions in our state so they can push a
21 liberal agenda?
22 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. And while I
23 am not going to instruct the witness not to
24 answer that question, I do have some concerns
25 on how a question regarding the Covid-19

Page 42

1 pandemic bears on relevant issues in this
2 litigation. That said, I'm not going to
3 instruct the witness not to answer. But I do
4 want to make that clear from the outset.
5 A. Could you ask the question again? That was out of
6 left field.
7 Q. Well, if you want to go ahead, go ahead and turn
8 to page 3812 of Exhibit 3. It will be the final page.
9 A. Okay.
10 Q. And we were talking about Family Council and the
11 use of volunteers for their rapid response team,
12 correct?
13 A. Uh-huh.
14 Q. And would you agree that this paragraph at the top
15 of 3812 kind of describes what the Rapid Response Team
16 does?
17 A. It says, "Family Council is building a Rapid
18 Response Team in Arkansas. You can join. Okay."
19 Q. And do -- does Family Council want the state
20 lawmakers to hear from their constituents on important
21 social and moral issues?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And immediately before that, do you agree with
24 their statement that radical activists are trying to
25 exploit the Covid-19 pandemic and the racial tensions in

Page 43

1 our state so they can push a liberal agenda?
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. I'm not
3 going to instruct the witness not to answer.
4 But I do have some concerns, if this is going
5 to be something that continues throughout the
6 litigation, that we might have to get
7 potentially the Court involved. With that
8 said, Representative Lundstrum, you may answer
9 the question if you understand it.
10 A. They're entitled, just like any group, to state
11 their opinion and push their agenda.
12 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark 4422 to 4424 as
13 Exhibit 4.
14 (Deposition Exhibit 4 was marked for
15 identification.)
16 Q. Can you identify Exhibit 4 for the record?
17 A. It's from Charisse Dean, Thursday, February 25,
18 2021 to me, Robin Lundstrum.
19 Q. And what's the purpose of this email?
20 A. It's a Q and A.
21 Q. And why was the -- you said Charisse Dean was the
22 legislative aide for Family Council?
23 A. She worked on different legislative issues for
24 Family Council, and she's still with Family Council.
25 Has done a good job.

Page 44

1 Q. So why was Charisse Dean providing you answers to
2 questions that might surface about the SAFE Act?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
4 A. I believe this was something we had discussed
5 going through, because legislators had questions about a
6 lot of different issues, and we wanted to put something
7 together so that there was a clear Q and A.
8 Q. So this is something that you asked her to put
9 together to help you in recruiting legislators to --
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
11 A. No, this --
12 Q. Well, first let me go ahead and finish my question
13 before --
14 A. Sorry.
15 Q. So is this one of those things that you used to
16 assist other legislators in deciding whether to support
17 the SAFE Act?
18 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
19 A. No.
20 Q. I thought you just said that you had this prepared
21 because legislators were asking you questions about the
22 SAFE Act?
23 A. That was not the question. This is something we
24 wanted to put together to help, but also to clarify and
25 not to necessarily recruit legislators, but just help in

Page 45

1 the confusion. When all the questions fly, it helps to
2 have clear answers.
3 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 5 page
4 428.
5 (Deposition Exhibit 5 was marked for
6 identification.)
7 Q. And do you recognize Exhibit 5?
8 A. It's from Charisse Dean, Tuesday, March the 9th.
9 My name is on the email group. I'm not familiar with
10 this email, but I'll be glad to try to answer some
11 questions.
12 Q. You don't remember getting an email from Charisse
13 Dean, in March of 2021, about Dr. Janet Cathey
14 testifying against the Girls Act?
15 A. I'm sorry, there was a lot of emails during
16 session.
17 Q. Do you agree with David Cox's statement that
18 transgender therapies are big business for Planned
19 Parenthood?
20 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
21 A. It is my understanding it's their second largest
22 income stream.
23 Q. And what is that based on?
24 A. Evidently, Planned Parenthood. That's something
25 they've discussed, but I'm --

Page 46

1 Q. Do you have any data or is it just kind of
2 scuttlebutt you've heard?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
4 A. Evidently Texas Planned Parenthood has been
5 bragging about it. So I don't know. That's up to them.
6 I'll take your word for it. I don't know.
7 Q. I'm going to mark Exhibit 6, 1186 to 1187.
8 (Deposition Exhibit 6 was marked for
9 identification.)
10 Q. And is this an email from Jerry Cox to you on
11 April 5, 2021?
12 A. Yes, it's from Jerry Cox, April 5, 2021, to me,
13 cc'ed Charisse Dean.
14 Q. Why did Jerry Cox prepare comments attributable to
15 you urging the General Assembly to override the
16 Governor's veto?
17 A. Actually, I requested and I believe we discussed
18 this. And I asked for help, because when the -- when
19 you're in the middle of all this, the last thing you
20 want to do is go cowboy all on your own and try to do
21 something off the cuff, and it's always good to ask for
22 some help.
23 Q. Did you rely heavily on Jerry Cox and Family
24 Council in relation to the SAFE Act?
25 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can

Page 47

1 answer.
2 A. I relied heavily on Family Council, and I relied
3 heavily on Family Research Council, and I'm very
4 thankful for their help.
5 Q. Did Jerry Cox ask you to invite your colleagues to
6 an April 9, 2021 Expert Briefing on House Bill 1570,
7 Gender Reassignment?
8 MS. LAND: Object to form.
9 A. If that's in the email, I'm sure you have
10 something. So I'm sure there is something out there.
11 Q. Would it be helpful to have the email?
12 A. Yeah, it would.
13 MR. TALLEY: We would welcome that.
14 Q. All right. I'll go ahead and mark as, am I at 7?
15 (Deposition Exhibit 7 was marked for
16 identification.)
17 Q. 1887. And again that's Exhibit 7 is 1887.
18 And does this refresh your recollection about
19 whether Jerry --
20 A. Yes, thank you. This is very helpful. I
21 recognize it.
22 MR. TALLEY: And real fast. Can you
23 repeat your full question, then Representative
24 Lundstrum, you can answer. You guys are
25 communicating very well. But I want to make

Page 48

1 sure our record is clear.
2 A. Okay.
3 Q. Did Jerry Cox ask you to invite your colleagues to
4 an April 9, 2021 Expert Briefing on House Bill 1570,
5 Gender Reassignment?
6 A. Actually, this was my idea and I asked for help
7 putting this together. I stink at putting together Zoom
8 meetings. I'm not technologically savvy. So I asked
9 for help, and I asked Jerry to help put it together.
10 Because I felt it was important that members of the
11 Legislature hear from Dr. Hiatt, Dr. Lewis and Dr.
12 Conway, and they have an opportunity to ask questions of
13 those physicians.
14 Q. And besides the Zoom part, did you write the
15 paragraph that went along with the invite?
16 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
17 A. I think I probably did. Do you have a specific
18 question about that?
19 Q. I was just wondering if you wrote it.
20 A. If it's bad grammar, it's mine.
21 Q. Okay. Did you actually invite all your colleagues
22 to attend that April 9, 2021 Briefing?
23 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
24 A. All of the Republican Caucus, yes.
25 Q. Did you invite both members of the Senate and the

Page 49

1 House?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. So Republican Caucus as a whole?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. What was the purpose of the April 9, 2021 Expert
6 Briefing?
7 A. Just to give members followup time to ask any
8 additional questions that they wanted to ask.
9 Q. Was it to prep legislators for interviews when
10 they go back to their districts?
11 A. Oftentimes we have interviews, and it's just good
12 to have that chance to ask physicians questions.
13 Q. Did you attend the April 9th briefing?
14 A. Yes, I was on the Zoom call.
15 Q. Who else attended that briefing?
16 A. I am sorry. I --
17 Q. We'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 8 -- before I
18 hand you the exhibit, can you remember off the top of
19 your head anyone that attended that Expert Briefing?
20 A. It was fairly well attended, but I couldn't --
21 people pop in and out of those things. I couldn't tell
22 you off the top of my head.
23 Q. I'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 8, 1927.
24 (Deposition Exhibit 8 was marked for
25 identification.)

Page 50

1 MR. TALLEY: Perhaps there's a list of
2 attendees.
3 A. This is from Erin Hogan, April the 9th, to me,
4 cc'ed Jerry Cox, list of people on the call.
5 Q. And so does this Exhibit 8, this April 9th email,
6 does this refresh your recollection about who was on
7 that Expert Briefing?
8 A. Yes, thank you.
9 Q. And who attended that Expert Briefing from the
10 General Assembly?
11 A. There's -- would you like me to read the names of
12 the members or --
13 Q. Yes, please, they need to be read into the record
14 so you can identify the members of the General Assembly
15 that attended the Expert Briefing?
16 A. Cindy Crawford, Karilyn Brown, Robin Lundstrum,
17 John Carr, Charlene Fite, Delia Haak, Julie Mayberry,
18 Deanne Vaught, Mary Bentley, Josh Bryant, Ken Bragg, Les
19 Eaves, Cameron Cooper, Rick McClure, Lee Johnson, Johnny
20 Rye, Jason Rapert.
21 Would you like me to read the members doctors and
22 other folks?
23 Q. I'll go ahead and ask a followup on those. So of
24 the representatives, and it looks like only one senator
25 attended the Briefing; is that correct?

Page 51

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. And of the representatives that attended, how many
3 were members of the Republican Women's Caucus?
4 A. All of the women.
5 Q. Okay. And you said that you had some doctors to
6 do the Expert Briefing. Who were the doctors that you
7 had on the call?
8 A. Melanie Conway, Charles Lewis and Dr. Hiatt.
9 Q. Who is Dr. Greg Bledsoe?
10 A. That is the Surgeon General.
11 Q. And who's Dr. Anton Duke?
12 A. He was a doctor that was in support of the bill.
13 Q. Okay. So he just -- did he get an invite as well?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. Okay. And who attended from any other
16 organizations?
17 A. Tony Perkins and Quena Gonzalez were with Family
18 Research Council. Jerry Cox, Charisse Dean, David Cox,
19 Erin Hogan, and Chip Gross were from Family Council.
20 And Vince Wagner was from the AG's Office.
21 Q. Why was the AG's Office on the Expert Briefing?
22 MS. LAND: Object to form.
23 A. Because I invited them.
24 Q. And is it your understanding that Vincent Wagner
25 is no longer with the AG's Office?

Page 52

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
2 A. Yes, that's my understanding.
3 Q. Is he at the Alliance Defending Freedom now?
4 A. I don't know.
5 Q. So this Expert Briefing was held after each of
6 these representatives had already voted to pass the ban
7 and the Governor had vetoed the measure, correct?
8 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
9 A. Yes. I guess April the 9th, yes.
10 Q. So the purpose wasn't to get support for the bill,
11 but to train those legislators who supported the bill
12 about the bill so that they could talk to their
13 constituents?
14 A. Actually, they understood the bill. They simply
15 just as a chance to -- after session is over, it's a
16 great time to just educate and update questions that
17 they get from constituents.
18 Q. And after the Expert Briefing, did you ask anybody
19 to prepare any summary or breakdown of the briefing?
20 A. I can't recall. There may have been some emails.
21 There's been so much.
22 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit 9.
23 (Deposition Exhibit 9 was marked for
24 identification.)
25 Q. And this is 1983 through 2015. That's Exhibit 9.

Page 53

1 A. Okay.
2 Q. Do you recognize this email?
3 A. Yes. That was -- this is April 9th in the
4 afternoon after the Zoom call.
5 Q. And so, following the meeting, Jerry Cox provided
6 you with answers to two of the main questions on House
7 Bill 1570, Gender Transition?
8 A. Yes, those were two of the questions that people
9 had as followup.
10 Q. I'm sorry to interrupt you.
11 A. Just as a followup.
12 Q. And what are those two questions?
13 MR. TALLEY: Ms. Walas, real fast. I'm
14 not trying to break your line of questioning.
15 Is it okay if Representative Lundstrum has a
16 chance to read this email? Do you need a
17 second?
18 THE WITNESS: Yes.
19 MR. TALLEY: You guys are communicating
20 pretty well. So I just wanted to make sure
21 that we're all on the same page.
22 BY MS. WALAS:
23 Q. Have you had a chance to review that email?
24 A. Yes, ma'am.
25 Q. All right. So what are the two main questions

Page 54

1 that Jerry Cox identifies that people are asking?
2 A. Concerns about hormone therapy and concerns about
3 suicide.
4 Q. Will you read the question number 1 that he had?
5 A. "Will HB 1570 prevent needed hormone therapy and
6 other necessary medical treatment or procedures?"
7 Q. Do you agree with the answer that HB 1570 is
8 narrowly written to only prohibit using drugs or
9 surgeries with the intent to change the person's gender
10 from male to female and vice versa?
11 A. HB 1570 was tightly crafted to only impact
12 chemical and surgical castration, puberty blockers and
13 cross sex hormones for minors only, not to impact any
14 healthcare. And to allow that child to reach the age of
15 majority, 18, so that the child could participate in all
16 the decisions that they are making. No healthcare was
17 impacted for that child.
18 Q. Do you agree with Jerry Cox that in answering
19 question number 1 that the bill allows the use of all
20 other surgeries or drugs that are not being used for the
21 purpose or intent to change a person's gender?
22 A. Correct, it also doesn't impact counseling.
23 Doesn't impact counseling. There was a lot of
24 misinformation in social media that was truly cruel.
25 Q. With respect to the second question, "Will HB 1570

Page 55

1 cause children to commit suicide?" Do you agree that
2 House Bill 1570 will not cause an increase in suicides?
3 MS. LAND: Object to form.
4 A. I don't think a bill could cause suicide. I think
5 there's already a problem with suicide and these
6 children deserve serious care. And if a child is
7 suicidal, that child needs to be in the hospital. I'm
8 not a doctor. I'm not a psychiatrist. But as we all
9 know, suicide is a serious, serious situation you can't
10 walk back from and that child needs to be seen in a
11 hospital.
12 Q. Are you aware that between the time of
13 introduction and passage of the ban, at least seven
14 transgender Arkansas adolescents or youth had a serious
15 suicide attempt?
16 MS. LAND: Object to form.
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
18 A. I followed this issue closely, and I am aware that
19 there are children that attempt suicide for a variety of
20 different reasons, all of which are tragic and need to
21 be taken seriously.
22 Q. Do you agree with the answer to question number 2,
23 "That gender reassignment does not reduce the suicide
24 rate and prohibiting gender reassignment in children
25 will not increase the suicide rate?"

Page 56

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
2 A. I believe that -- I believe that gender dysphoria
3 needs to be addressed and taken seriously and we need to
4 get to the bottom of what those issues are for those
5 children. Giving those children cross sex hormones and
6 puberty blockers may actually aggregate that. They need
7 to be seen by a doctor.
8 Q. Are children that are receiving hormone therapy
9 being seen by a doctor?
10 A. I would hope. But we don't know the long-term
11 consequences and we don't know the impact that that's
12 having on that child.
13 Q. Let me ask my question again. Do we -- are
14 patients or children who are receiving hormone therapy,
15 are they being seen by a doctor?
16 MS. LAND: Object to form. Asked and
17 answered.
18 A. Yes, we are experimenting on children when you
19 give them puberty blockers and cross sex hormones.
20 They're not approved by the FDA. We are already dealing
21 with children that have gender dysphoria. These
22 children are already at a crisis point. Why would we
23 give them a drug that is not approved and experiment on
24 them. They are already a vulnerable population and we
25 are putting them in an even more vulnerable situation.

Page 57

1 There's no rush. Give them time to grow up.
2 Isn't the first rule of medicine to do no harm.
3 What happens to these children later. I'm no doctor,
4 but isn't cardiovascular disease, cerebral vascular
5 disease, osteoporosis, the long-term consequences,
6 aren't they serious enough to take these children
7 seriously. Don't they matter.
8 Q. If you had seen research demonstrating that the
9 treatments do reduce suicide, would that have changed
10 your view on the law?
11 MS. LAND: Object to the form.
12 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. And I
13 believe that the way that question is phrased
14 calls for matters of legislative activity that
15 would be prohibited in this deposition by the
16 Court's Order.
17 BY MS. WALAS:
18 Q. I'll rephrase the question. If you had seen
19 research demonstrating that the treatments do reduce
20 suicide, would that change your view?
21 MR. TALLEY: Are you asking about
22 Representative Lundstrum's personal views or
23 the legislative-related decisions that she
24 made during the legislative session last year
25 in 2021?

Page 58

1 MS. WALAS: The view that she just
2 testified to. I'm just asking a followup
3 question to that statement that she just said.
4 MR. TALLEY: Her personal views?
5 MS. WALAS: Yes.
6 A. I've read a variety of different research
7 articles. I couldn't list which ones. I think the one
8 that sticks in my mind is the one that keeps coming back
9 over and over and over where the transgender population
10 has a 19 times higher suicide rate than anybody else in
11 the population. All of us, we're all human beings, and
12 someone that has a 19 times higher suicide rate, I don't
13 know why we're not all running in circles screaming and
14 shouting and saying something's wrong with this.
15 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
16 Q. And if you had seen research demonstrating that
17 treatments do reduce suicide, would that change the view
18 that you just stated?
19 MS. LAND: Object to form.
20 A. What little I've read on what the research has
21 said is the first year it shows that suicidally drops,
22 but then long-term it goes back up. There's not
23 controlled research, there's not controlled long-term
24 research that bears out. I don't know. There may be
25 some. You may have some that may give me some comfort.

Page 59

1 I don't know is the only answer I can give you. And we
2 could probably trade research articles all day long, and
3 I'd have to buy the pizza and the beer. So I don't
4 know. You tell me.
5 Q. Well --
6 A. We just have to agree to disagree and be
7 respectful about that.
8 Q. I'm actually going to switch and start asking you
9 about the Family Research Council now. So if you would
10 like to go ahead and set those exhibits to the side over
11 here.
12 MS. WALAS: And I wanted to see if
13 anybody needed to take a quick break?
14 MR. TALLEY: Since we've been going about
15 an hour, and you've hit a nice stopping point,
16 I would suggest that we go off the record for
17 a brief break.
18 MS. WALAS: Okay.
19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This will end Media
20 Part 1. We're off the record at 11:09 a.m.
21 (A recess was had.)
22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the
23 record at 11:26 a.m. This will begin Media
24 Part 2. Please proceed.
25 MR. TALLEY: This is Graham Talley,

Page 60

1 counsel for the witness. During our break the
2 parties conferred about objections on the
3 record during this deposition, and I believe
4 we're in agreement to stipulate that an
5 objection as to one party is good as to all
6 parties. Is that fair, Ms. Walas?
7 MS. WALAS: Yes.
8 MR. TALLEY: Ms. Land?
9 MS. LAND: Yes.
10 MS. WALAS: With the exception that
11 obviously Plaintiffs are not joining in the
12 objection to their own questions.
13 MS. LAND: Right.
14 MR. TALLEY: Fair enough.
15 BY MS. WALAS:
16 Q. All right. Before we move on to Family Research
17 Council, I wanted to ask you a couple of followup
18 questions on some testimony you gave earlier. Is it
19 your understanding that no healthcare is impacted by the
20 SAFE Act?
21 A. Correct.
22 Q. Okay. Do you consider gender affirming medical
23 care healthcare?
24 MS. LAND: Object to form.
25 MR. TALLEY: You can answer if you

Page 61

1 understand.
2 A. I don't consider giving a nine year old, ten year
3 old, a minor, puberty blockers and cross sex hormones
4 which are experimental healthcare. I do consider
5 counseling healthcare, and we did not block counseling.
6 We had -- we didn't veer into that lane at all.
7 Q. I believe you testified earlier about --
8 A. And let me correct one thing. We also didn't --
9 the bill blocked surgery for minors as well, and
10 removing healthy tissue is not healthcare. I just want
11 to be correct on that.
12 Q. Do you consider surgery healthcare?
13 A. I do consider surgery healthcare. But removing
14 healthy tissue from a minor is not healthcare in my
15 opinion and in the opinion of the bill.
16 Q. I believe you used the phrase "do no harm"
17 earlier; is that correct?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And what do you mean when you say "do no harm"?
20 A. I was referring to this oath that doctors take.
21 I'm not a doctor, but I think that's something in
22 society that we all refer to and we expect our
23 physicians to first do no harm.
24 Q. Do you believe withdrawing gender affirming
25 medical care from minors currently receiving it is not

Page 62

1 harmful?
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
3 A. Again, we disagree on the term gender affirming
4 care for minors.
5 Q. Do you believe withdrawing hormone therapy from
6 minors currently receiving it is not harmful?
7 MR. TALLEY: Same objection.
8 A. If we're using experimental drugs on a child that
9 cannot participate in giving informed consent. I
10 believe the bill, as it's written, protects those minors
11 and allows them to grow up so that they can give
12 informed consent.
13 Q. Now, really switching to Family Research Council.
14 What is Family Research Council?
15 A. It is a national organization that is pro-family.
16 Q. Are they pro-marriage?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Is Family Research Council's slogan, quote,
19 "Advancing faith, family and freedom," unquote?
20 A. I haven't looked at the slogan in a while, but
21 that sounds about right.
22 Q. It's about their general philosophy?
23 A. Yes, yes.
24 Q. Did you have any discussions or meetings or calls
25 with Family Research Council about legislating

Page 63

1 transgender issues?
2 A. I -- when we were crafting this bill, I called
3 Jerry Cox and asked for help. And I wanted the bill to
4 be extremely tightly crafted. We didn't want to get
5 into any -- I wanted it to be pro-child and protective.
6 And we felt like we needed assistance and we called
7 Family Research Council and asked for help, because they
8 have attorneys and folks that do research, and asked if
9 they had any assistance they could provide and they
10 agreed.
11 Q. Did they provide any model legislation?
12 A. We already had draft legislation, and we sent it
13 to them and asked for help.
14 Q. And did you discuss any other set types of issues
15 besides the gender affirming medical care?
16 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
17 A. We talked about a variety of different issues. If
18 you could be more specific. I'm not trying to be
19 difficult. I just, over time you talk about a lot of
20 different issues.
21 Q. Do you use Family Research Council in a similar
22 way to how you described using Family Research Council
23 on different issues?
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. By the
25 second part of that question do you mean

Page 64

1 Family Council?
2 MS. WALAS: Can you reread my question?
3 (The requested question was read back.)
4 MS. WALAS: Let me go ahead and rephrase
5 that question.
6 BY MS. WALAS:
7 Q. Do you use Family Research Council in the same way
8 that you use Family Council?
9 A. Yes, as a group to give advice.
10 Q. And they provide you with various resources?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Did you discuss trans students' participation in
13 school sports with Family Research Council?
14 MS. LAND: Object to form.
15 A. I'm sure I probably did. I don't remember.
16 Q. Did you discuss anything about non-discrimination
17 protections for LGBT individuals with Family Research
18 Council?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
20 A. I don't recall.
21 Q. Did you discuss any concerns you had about
22 transgender minors in Arkansas with Family Research
23 Council?
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
25 A. Could you be more specific? I'm not sure what you

Page 65

1 mean.
2 MS. WALAS: Could you read my question
3 back, please?
4 (The requested question was read back.)
5 BY MS. WALAS:
6 Q. Do you understand that question?
7 A. Yes, did I -- I talked about my concerns for
8 children with a variety of different folks and a variety
9 of different groups. I'm confident I probably discussed
10 it with Family Research Council as well.
11 Q. What role did Family Research Council play in
12 getting the SAFE Act passed?
13 A. They were a very helpful group. They're very
14 professional.
15 Q. I'm going to mark as Exhibit 10 pages 534 through
16 536.
17 (Deposition Exhibit 10 was marked for
18 identification.)
19 Q. And this is a March 10, 2021 email exchange
20 between you, Mr. Gonzalez and Charisse Dean, correct?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And how do you say Mr. Gonzalez' first name?
23 A. Quena.
24 Q. Quena?
25 A. Yeah.

Page 66

1 Q. Okay.
2 A. It's a toughy.
3 Q. I just wanted to ask before I tried to do it
4 myself.
5 MR. TALLEY: I've had the same issue.
6 A. I've butchered it so many times.
7 Q. Okay. So Quena --
8 A. Quena. Quena Gonzalez. Quena.
9 Q. Quena.
10 Okay. Looking at this email to -- from Charisse
11 to you and there's a conversation with Charisse and
12 Quena and also with Quena, you and Charisse, correct?
13 A. Let's see. It's from --
14 Q. Actually, strike that question. It's really
15 horrible.
16 This is a conversation between you, Charisse and
17 Quena?
18 A. Quena.
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
20 A. It's -- the email includes Charisse Dean. It's to
21 me, there's Charisse, there's Quena Gonzalez. Good
22 morning, Quena. Representative Lundstrum did a great
23 job, blah, blah, blah, signed Charisse, and then there's
24 another one from Quena to me and Charisse is cc'ed on
25 it.

Page 67

1 Q. Do you agree with Charisse's statement that all
2 the additional FRC documents and witnesses FRC provided
3 really helped to get the ball across the line?
4 A. I do agree they helped, yes.
5 Q. Did you and Quena have any conversation after this
6 March 10th email about you helping to train sponsors
7 of the SAFE Act in other states?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. Did you agree to do it?
10 A. Yes, I was very happy to help other legislators.
11 That's not uncommon.
12 Q. And who is Joseph Backholm?
13 A. He is an attorney for Family Research Council.
14 Q. And Family Research Council sent him to testify in
15 favor of House Bill 1570, correct?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. And what role does Quena Gonzalez have at Family
18 Research Council?
19 A. I believe he is assistant director and he is --
20 let's see. It may say on here. Director of State and
21 Local Affairs.
22 Q. Did you consult with him, with Quena in responding
23 to questions about where the language from the SAFE Act
24 came from?
25 A. I didn't ask specifically where the language came

Page 68

1 from. My biggest concerns, I believe, were just making
2 sure the bill was tightly crafted. I can't remember
3 specific conversations.
4 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 11, 6359
5 to 6381.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 11 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 MS. WALAS: Can we go off the record real
9 quick? I just put the sticker on the wrong
10 exhibit.
11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're off the
12 record at 11:38 a.m..
13 (Off the record)
14 MS. WALAS: We can go back on.
15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: One second. We're
16 back on the record at 11:38 a.m. Please
17 proceed.
18 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
19 Q. I've handed you what's been marked as Exhibit 11.
20 A. Uh-huh.
21 Q. Do you remember having text message conversations
22 with Quena?
23 A. We had a ton of text messages on a variety of
24 different subjects.
25 Q. Okay. And if you'll go ahead and go to page 6359?

Page 69

1 It'll be in the bottom right corner.
2 MR. TALLEY: I believe it's the first
3 page.
4 A. Okay.
5 Q. And do you need a moment to review that?
6 A. Okay. I did ask where it came from. Okay.
7 Q. And is this -- asking my question again, does this
8 refresh your recollection about whether you consulted
9 with Quena about responding to questions about where the
10 language from the SAFE Act comes from?
11 A. Okay. I'm glad I asked. That's good.
12 Q. So does it refresh your recollection?
13 A. Somewhat. Again, this -- there was a lot of
14 things going on at the time. I'll do my best to answer
15 your questions.
16 Q. And where did the language from the SAFE Act come
17 from?
18 MR. TALLEY: Are you asking about the
19 commentary in this text message?
20 MS. WALAS: Yes.
21 A. I'm sure it says in here somewhere.
22 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
23 Q. Will you take a moment to review it?
24 MR. TALLEY: It might help the witness if
25 you point out the portion of Mr. Gonzalez'

Page 70

1 text message to which you're referring.
2 MS. WALAS: We are still on page 6359.
3 MR. TALLEY: Thank you.
4 THE WITNESS: Okay.
5 MR. TALLEY: Can you repeat your
6 question?
7 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
8 Q. Have you had a moment to review page 6359?
9 A. Okay.
10 Q. And where did the language from the SAFE Act come
11 from according to Quena?
12 A. It says, questions you've been asked -- let's see
13 -- prior years, similar bills and there have been other
14 bills in the past.
15 Q. Why did you need to ask Quena where the language
16 for the SAFE Act came from that you drafted?
17 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to that
18 question. I believe that bears on legislative
19 activity that is outside the scope of today's
20 deposition. As phrased, I will instruct the
21 witness not to answer that question.
22 MS. WALAS: Will you read the question
23 back, please?
24 (The court reporter read back the
25 requested question.)

Page 71

1 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
2 Q. Why did you need to ask Quena about the -- where
3 the language for the SAFE Act comes from?
4 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to the
5 form of the question and as phrased, I am --
6 if the witness understands that question, it's
7 okay to answer.
8 A. I think I was just curious.
9 Q. Did FRC or Family Research Council, excuse me,
10 also prepare you SAFE Act talking points?
11 A. Actually, I think that was a group effort and a
12 lot of emails and phone conversations just to boil
13 everything down and make it clear.
14 Q. Did you use these talking points when speaking to
15 the media?
16 A. I've used a lot of talking points just to keep
17 things clear and concise.
18 Q. Did you use the talking points within Arkansas to
19 promote the SAFE Act?
20 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
21 answer if you understand.
22 A. I have used them in Arkansas in a variety of
23 situations.
24 Q. What is that variety of situations?
25 A. In press calls or conversations or if another

Page 72

1 legislator from another state asked, I've sent them
2 sound bites, just taken a picture of them and sent them
3 to explain the bill so that they don't have to read the
4 whole thing.
5 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit 11
6 -- 12.
7 (Deposition Exhibit 12 was marked for
8 identification.)
9 Q. And it's 2072 to 2074.
10 And I believe you said earlier that Family
11 Research Council provides resources --
12 A. Uh-huh.
13 Q. -- for legislators, correct?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And what is Exhibit 12?
16 A. It's an email from Quena Gonzalez, April 13th, to
17 me.
18 Q. And attached to the email is FRC's State Policy
19 Brief on the State Act?
20 A. On the SAFE Act.
21 Q. On the SAFE Act.
22 And Quena knows that this is an updated version of
23 the handout. Had you received the previous version of
24 this policy paper?
25 A. I'm sure I probably did. I couldn't tell you off

Page 73

1 the top of my head.
2 Q. Have you read the policy paper included with
3 Exhibit 12 prior to today?
4 A. It's been a while.
5 Q. But you have read it before?
6 A. Not every word. It's been a while.
7 Q. Would you like to take a moment to look over it
8 real quick before I ask you some questions about it?
9 A. Okay.
10 Q. And if I could, would you mind -- I'll go ahead
11 and mark on page 2073, I'll highlight the portion that
12 I'd like to ask you about.
13 If you'll go ahead and read Family Research
14 Council's Statement that I've highlighted on page 2073
15 of Exhibit 12?
16 A. Okay. "Propagating an ideology of fluid sexuality
17 not only undermines a scientific understanding of human
18 anatomy but also damages the lives of the next
19 generation."
20 Q. Do you agree with that statement?
21 A. Yes, I do.
22 Q. Do you agree with Family Research Council that the
23 Biden-Harris Administration has made the LGBT agenda a
24 cornerstone of their public policies?
25 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form. Are you

Page 74

1 referring to a specific statement on what
2 you've marked as Exhibit 12?
3 Q. Can you answer the question?
4 A. Biden-Harris Administration is entitled to their
5 political opinion.
6 Q. Do you believe that it is necessary to stand up
7 for Biblical principles now?
8 MS. LAND: Object to form.
9 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
10 A. I do.
11 Q. Is that why you sponsored the SAFE Act?
12 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form, and I
13 will instruct the witness not to answer
14 because that clearly calls for testimony on
15 her legislative activities.
16 Q. Do you recall doing an interview with Tony Perkins
17 and Franklin Graham, on March 31st of 2021, as part of
18 FRC's Pray Vote Stand Initiative?
19 A. Yes. I don't remember every word of it, but I do
20 recall doing the interview.
21 Q. What is Family Research Council's Pray Vote Stand
22 Initiative?
23 A. It is a call to action for citizens to pray, to
24 vote and to stand with legislators on specific agenda
25 items for specific pieces of legislation.

Page 75

1 Q. Do legislators join the Pray Vote Stand
2 Initiative?
3 A. If they're invited to the video chat, yes.
4 Q. And is that what you were invited to on
5 March 31st of 2021?
6 A. Yes, I did an interview as part of that.
7 Q. What did you do an interview on?
8 A. The SAFE Act.
9 Q. And what type of questions did Tony Perkins and
10 Franklin Graham ask you during that interview?
11 A. I don't recall the specific questions. It's
12 online. But I don't recall the specific questions. Do
13 you have one that --
14 Q. Well, actually, I'm going to go ahead and mark as
15 Exhibit 13.
16 (Deposition Exhibit 13 was marked for
17 identification.)
18 Q. And this is a screen shot of the online video?
19 A. Uh-huh.
20 MR. TALLEY: Just so our record is clear.
21 Ms. Walas, is this a document that was
22 produced on behalf of the non-party
23 legislators?
24 MS. WALAS: This is a document that was
25 accessible online just as public record and is

Page 76

1 also mentioned in her documents that were
2 produced as well as she confirmed that she
3 recalled doing this interview.
4 MR. TALLEY: I just want to make sure our
5 record is clear. Is this a document that was
6 produced by my office on behalf of the five
7 non-party legislators?
8 MS. WALAS: The document itself is not.
9 It is available online.
10 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
11 Q. Representative Lundstrum, does Exhibit 13 reflect
12 how you would access your Pray Vote Stand interview
13 online?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And is that your picture there in the middle?
16 A. That's me.
17 Q. Okay. And can you please -- strike that.
18 Was the title of the show that you were
19 interviewed on "Protecting Children From Gender
20 Confusion?"
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Okay. So you were speaking with Family Research
23 Council about how to protect children from gender
24 confusion, correct?
25 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.

Page 77

1 A. That's the title of the show. I think I spoke
2 specifically on the SAFE Act. I don't have the
3 transcript in front of me, so I don't want to misspeak.
4 Q. Does the SAFE Act protect children from gender
5 confusion?
6 MS. LAND: Object to form.
7 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
8 A. The SAFE Act protects children from
9 experimentation and allows them to grow up and get to be
10 18 before they -- and they can participate in their own
11 decision-making process, and I think that's a pro-child
12 attitude to take.
13 Q. What does gender confusion mean to you?
14 A. Gender dysphoria.
15 Q. So you went on a -- you were interviewed about
16 protecting children from gender dysphoria?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
18 A. We talked about the SAFE Act.
19 Q. Do you recall a June 9, 2021 interview with Tony
20 Perkins at a dinner?
21 A. Yes, and I don't know specifics. But, yes, there
22 was a dinner in Washington, D.C., I believe in June.
23 Q. I'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 14, 5736 to
24 5738.
25 (Deposition Exhibit 14 was marked for

Page 78

1 identification.)
2 A. Yes, I was at this event.
3 Q. Okay. So does Exhibit 14 refresh your
4 recollection about the June 9th Tony Perkins interview?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Okay. And what is Exhibit 14?
7 A. This is a agenda timeline for the event.
8 Q. And you were slated to be interviewed by Tony
9 Perkins during the "Standing on the Front Lines for
10 Biblical World View of Life, Family and Human Sexuality"
11 segment?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And do you agree with the Genesis quote -- or
14 Genesis 1:27-28 quote included on this itinerary?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And what is that quote?
17 A. "Be fruitful and increase in number." Genesis
18 1:27-28.
19 Q. Is that the full Genesis 1:27-28 quote that's on
20 Exhibit 14?
21 A. I would have to pull out a Bible and give you the
22 full quote. I'm sure there's more to it.
23 Q. Do you agree that God created man in his own
24 image?
25 A. Yes.

Page 79

1 Q. In the image of God, he created him?
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 MR. TALLEY: Real fast --
4 A. I'm sorry. Yes.
5 MR. TALLEY: -- if you answer in the
6 affirmative.
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. And do you believe that male -- excuse me -- "Male
9 and female, he created them. God blessed them and said
10 to them, 'Be fruitful and increase in number?"
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. And so what was your purpose in going on or doing
13 this interview?
14 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
15 A. The purpose of this interview was simply to talk
16 about the SAFE Act and just to encourage legislators to
17 speak up on -- to be pro-family.
18 Q. Is there a separation between church and state?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. And while I
20 am not going to instruct the witness not to
21 answer matters of religion cloaked in those
22 types of terms I believe are pretty far afield
23 from issues germane to this lawsuit. So like
24 I said earlier on in this deposition, I have
25 some concerns about questions like that and

Page 80

1 right now I'm going to be a little bit more
2 patient about it, and with that said, if the
3 witness understands the question, she can
4 answer it.
5 A. The issue of separation from church and state, the
6 state cannot interfere with the church; however, the
7 church or believers can speak up and have an action or
8 be involved in anything that involves the state. We
9 have the freedom of religion and we have the freedom to
10 be involved.
11 Q. Did you cover any topics besides the SAFE Act
12 during the June 9th, 2021 interview?
13 A. I -- I can't recall. I'm sure we probably talked
14 about a lot of different things, but not off the top of
15 my head.
16 Q. Did you also receive an award from Family Research
17 Council and Tony Perkins during that segment?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. What was that award?
20 A. I believe it's a Statesmanship Award or the
21 Alliance -- I can't remember the name of the award off
22 the top of my head. Let's see.
23 Q. They just said "award."
24 A. Yeah. I can't remember the exact name of the
25 award. It was nice. I can't remember the exact name.

Page 81

1 Q. Do you remember why they gave you the award?
2 A. I believe it was just for the courage of standing
3 up and running the SAFE Act.
4 Q. Did you give an acceptance speech?
5 A. A very short acceptance speech. I'm not long on
6 speeches.
7 Q. Was it off the cuff?
8 A. Pretty much, probably about 30 seconds.
9 Q. So you didn't prepare anything ahead of time to
10 get the award?
11 A. No.
12 Q. Okay. And did Family Research Council pay your
13 expenses for this interview?
14 A. They paid my expenses to, out and back, and they
15 paid for the hotel.
16 Q. Okay.
17 A. And I filed that with the Bureau of Legislative
18 Research as we're supposed to do. Secretary of State's
19 Office, whoever you're supposed to file it.
20 MR. TALLEY: Breean, if you're in between
21 questions, can I take a look at a copy of
22 Exhibit 14 you handed the witness? My copy
23 doesn't have Bates numbers on it.
24 MS. WALAS: Oh, that happened with some
25 of them --

MR. TALLEY: That's okay.
MS. WALAS: -- I apologize.
MR. TALLEY: You're fine. I just wanted to make sure we're all looking at the same thing.
MS. WALAS: And if that happens again with any of the copies y'all get, just let me know.
MR. TALLEY: It's no problem. I just wanted to make sure we're all on the same page.
MS. WALAS: I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 15 page 4141.
(Deposition Exhibit 15 was marked for identification.)
BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
Q. Have you had a chance to take a look at Exhibit 15?
A. This is from Nicolas Reynolds, July the 8th. This is concerning the ALEC conference in Utah, and I was speaking at a dinner on July the 29th.
Q. Who's Nicolas Reynolds?
A. He works for Family Research Council.
Q. Does he have a specific role; is he just kind of like an assistant?

A. He's a legislative assistant.
Q. Okay. Had you had any interactions with Nicolas Reynolds prior to going to the ALEC dinner?
A. I believe I -- we had maybe spoke on the phone or had an email exchange or two. I'm not sure.
Q. And what was the scope of that dinner?
A. It was to meet legislators and answer questions about the SAFE Act, just informative.
Q. Did you answer questions about the enactment of the SAFE Act?
A. Mostly it was just about the SAFE Act and just if they had questions.
Q. And did you share your experience sponsoring and championing the SAFE Act with those people that were in attendance?
A. Yes.
MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
Q. And will you share with us your experience sponsoring the SAFE Act?
MR. TALLEY: I object to the form of the question, in addition to that, as phrased, I believe that question calls for testimony on Representative Lundstrum's legislative activities in a manner that's inconsistent with the Court's Order. For that reason, I

will instruct the witness not to answer that question as phrased.
MS. WALAS: She's waived that right when she shared it openly and publicly her experience sponsoring and championing the SAFE Act during a public dinner and during this discourse; and so, following up on what she shared with them is fair game.
MR. TALLEY: If Representative -- I disagree that any waiver of a legislative privilege has occurred. If the question that is posed to Representative Lundstrum is couched in terms of what she shared during a public event in June or July 2021, then I would not instruct the witness not to answer that question.
MS. WALAS: This is fair game. If you're going to instruct her not to answer, then I think we need to take a break.
MR. TALLEY: If the question posed to Representative Lundstrum is what she shared during this meeting, I would not instruct her not to answer that question. If the question is posed in terms of what was your experience on a more global basis, I believe that would

be out of bounds.
Do you see that distinction and where I'm drawing it?
MS. WALAS: There is no distinction. I do not think that there's a distinction between the two. She testified that she shared her experience sponsoring the -- championing the SAFE Act. I asked her to share that experience with us.
MR. TALLEY: If that question is posed strictly in terms of what she would have shared on this occasion with this group of individuals, I would not instruct her not to answer that question.
MS. WALAS: I don't think there's any confusion or whatnot. So if you're going to instruct her not to answer, then I think we're going to need to take a break.
MR. TALLEY: Perhaps you can ask the question again and I can evaluate my position on privilege and we can move forward.
MS. WALAS: Will you read the question back, please?
(The court reporter read back the requested question.)

Page 86

1 MR. TALLEY: To me there is one tiny, but
2 to me, very important distinction at the very
3 end of that question. As posed to the
4 witness, it calls for testimony on a global
5 basis, her entire experience. If asked what
6 did you share on that occasion with whoever
7 showed up to this meeting, I would not object
8 to that question.
9 MS. WALAS: I do not think there is a
10 need to clarify. That is a clear followup
11 question to the previous question that was
12 answered when she said, yes, she shared her
13 experience, and I clearly say will you share
14 that with us.
15 MR. TALLEY: I think that the testimony
16 on the record is a little bit different. But
17 if the question posed to Representative
18 Lundstrum is as simple as what did you share
19 about your experiences with this group of
20 individuals at this meeting, I would not
21 instruct her to answer if you asked that
22 question.
23 MS. WALAS: I have asked the question
24 posed and that is the question that I'm asking
25 her to answer. The followup question, will

Page 87

1 you please read it back?
2 (The court reporter read back the
3 requested question.)
4 MR. TALLEY: The first two questions were
5 fine in my view. The third question, will you
6 share with us your experience in sponsoring
7 the SAFE Act clearly calls for testimony on
8 legislative issues in violation of the Court's
9 Order. If that question was rephrased, will
10 you share with us your experiences sponsoring
11 the SAFE Act that you told this group of
12 individuals in June or July of 2021, I would
13 not instruct the witness not to answer and
14 welcome you to ask that question.
15 MS. WALAS: I don't see the difference
16 between the question that I have posed on the
17 table and the question that you have just
18 asked. There is no difference, which is why
19 the question that is on the table is fine.
20 MS. LAND: I see the distinction he's
21 making. And you also made the comment that
22 she waived her privilege. See that kind of
23 insinuates that you aren't expecting to be
24 broad. To me you're expecting her response to
25 be more broad as to her entire experience, not

Page 88

1 just what she shared what her experience was
2 with that crowd.
3 MS. WALAS: If she shared -- if you're
4 saying that sharing her experience sponsoring
5 and championing the SAFE Act with us gets into
6 legislative, how is that different than her
7 sharing that with them in its legislative when
8 she shares with them, but if she shares it
9 openly in a public forum with those
10 individuals, then she has waived any privilege
11 that she might have had that you all have been
12 standing on by sharing it with those
13 individuals and we are entitled to know what
14 her experience sponsoring and championing the
15 SAFE Act was in followup to that line of
16 questioning what she talked about at the
17 dinner.
18 MR. TALLEY: I welcome a question asked
19 to Representative Lundstrum on what she shared
20 with these attendees at a dinner in June or
21 July of 2021. I would not obstruct -- or
22 would not instruct the witness not to answer
23 that question and would not take the position
24 that what she shared on that occasion is
25 privileged. However, when posed on a more

Page 89

1 global basis as phrased in your question
2 that's on the table, I have to instruct the
3 witness not to answer that question because,
4 as posed to the witness and as phrased, it
5 bears on matters of legislative activity that
6 the Court said could not be inquired about
7 during this deposition. So I would welcome
8 you to ask the question of what she shared
9 with the folks at that dinner, but it's not my
10 deposition.
11 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
12 Q. We're going to go ahead and certify the question
13 as asked, and I'll go ahead and ask the next question
14 is, share with us what you shared at the July 29th
15 dinner as to your experience sponsoring and championing
16 the SAFE Act?
17 MR. TALLEY: You may answer.
18 A. I shared the talking points that we had earlier,
19 the bill. I think that's the reason I was digging
20 through the policy brief, and this was an invitation to
21 fellow legislators, it was not open to the public, and
22 then we went to Q&A.
23 Q. And so your experience sponsoring the SAFE Act
24 that you shared with them was just simply rereading
25 talking points?

Page 90

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
2 A. Pretty much every legislator knows how a bill is
3 run. So it would be somewhat redundant. And I think
4 their interest was more on we -- it was -- it's a
5 straightforward bill. So it was like any bill that is a
6 little bit difficult, here's the bill, here are --
7 here's what's going on, here's where we are. And I'm
8 not a big, long speech giver. So it's -- I'm better off
9 with Q and A, letting people ask me questions.
10 Q. Well, it was an interview, correct?
11 A. It was more of a stand at a podium, give an update
12 on the SAFE Act and then let members of the audience ask
13 some questions.
14 Q. What did you tell the attendees it was like
15 championing the SAFE Act?
16 A. It was definitely a much more positive experience
17 than I thought it would be. I've made friends that I --
18 all across the country and I have met so many
19 transgender adults that have championed this bill and
20 it's been an incredible experience to hear their
21 stories, the good and the bad, and I consider myself a
22 better person for having run this bill. It's been good
23 for me, and I'm proud of this bill, and I hope it
24 protects children in the future.
25 Q. Did you share with the attendees your strategies

Page 91

1 on how you passed the SAFE Act?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And what were those strategies that you shared?
4 MR. TALLEY: Go ahead.
5 A. I don't believe in dragging things out when you
6 run a bill. Get in there and run it. Don't spend all
7 day. Be forthright and truthful.
8 Q. Are those strategies?
9 A. I believe they are. If you get in there and run a
10 bill -- a lot of people drag things out. I don't. I
11 met with individual members. I moved quickly.
12 Q. Were you also asked to tell others how they could
13 successfully pass the SAFE Act in their state?
14 A. Yes, that's what I'm talking about.
15 Q. So what did you tell them about how they could
16 successfully pass the SAFE Act in their state?
17 A. Meet with members, be clear.
18 Q. Is there a reason that you're still promoting the
19 SAFE Act after you passed the legislation in Arkansas?
20 A. Yes, there are legislators in other states that
21 call and ask about the Act.
22 Q. And it's also because Family Research Council
23 asked you do it, right?
24 A. It's a combination. Legislators reach out, they
25 hear about it. I forward the emails to Family Research

Page 92

1 Council. They have the bandwidth and the time and they
2 are excellent at working with legislators. I enjoy
3 talking to legislators from other states.
4 Q. And you said the dinner included a Q&A session,
5 right?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. Do you recall any of the types of questions that
8 you were asked?
9 A. Not off the top of my head.
10 Q. What questions do you typically get asked when you
11 go to these conferences or things to speak on the SAFE
12 Act?
13 A. People are concerned about suicide. That's
14 usually the number one question. They're concerned
15 about that this is experimentation. They're concerned
16 about surgery, mainly top surgery for girls. That this
17 is happening in younger and younger and younger. And
18 the long-term impacts, what are the long-term impacts on
19 these kids. What's going to happen to them in 10, 15,
20 20 years. Where is their health going to be.
21 Q. Are you aware of teenage girls getting breast
22 reductions?
23 A. Uh-huh.
24 MS. LAND: Object to form.
25 Q. And is that an acceptable form of healthcare?

Page 93

1 MS. LAND: Object to form.
2 MR. TALLEY: You can answer if you
3 understand it.
4 A. I am aware of a few, yes.
5 Q. Do you believe that it's acceptable to perform a
6 breast reduction on a teenager girl?
7 MS. LAND: Object to form.
8 A. That is -- I'm not a doctor. That's two different
9 issues. Removing a child's healthy breast completely
10 when that child may look back in 10, 15 years and not
11 have the chance to breastfeed and be disfigured, that
12 child cannot participate. We're talking those two
13 different things. That's apples to oranges.
14 Q. Are they both a surgery?
15 A. They are.
16 Q. Did your discussion at the ALEC Conference Dinner
17 include any legislation other than the SAFE Act?
18 A. I can't recall. I'm sure -- legislators talk
19 about a variety of different things. When you get
20 legislators together, it could go from whose state won
21 this to what are you running. So I'm confident we
22 probably did.
23 Q. Did you speak about any other legislation from the
24 podium?
25 A. I honestly don't remember. If somebody asked me a

Page 94

1 question, I may have. But I -- I honestly can't
2 remember.
3 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 16, page
4 5740.
5 (Deposition Exhibit 16 was marked for
6 identification.)
7 Q. Have you had a chance to look at Exhibit 16?
8 A. This is the Salt Lake City, Utah, July the 29th,
9 Little America Hotel.
10 Q. Is this the agenda for the ALEC Dinner?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Okay. What was the Matt and SAFE Act Real-World
13 Application segment of the dinner?
14 A. I can't remember Matt's last name. Basically what
15 does the real world -- or what does the SAFE Act mean in
16 the real world. Basically we're protecting from
17 chemical and surgical castration and that we're trying
18 to protect minors so that they can grow up enough to
19 participate in their own decision-making process.
20 Q. Was the Real-World Application segment a speaking
21 event or was it kind of like an interactive program?
22 A. I can't recall if he -- if we did a Q&A or if we
23 just pointed out people in the audience to ask
24 questions; you go first, you go first. I can't
25 remember.

Page 95

1 Q. And what was the real-world application of banning
2 hormone therapy for minors as it played out in the real
3 world?
4 MR. TALLEY: Are you asking about what
5 was shared during this presentation at the
6 ALEC Dinner?
7 MS. WALAS: Yes.
8 MR. TALLEY: Okay.
9 A. I think it's the hope that we'll protect children
10 and they can grow up to participate and make their own
11 decisions as 18 year olds.
12 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
13 Q. Did y'all discuss any scenarios such as what would
14 happen to a transgender teenager that had their hormone
15 therapy taken away due to the bill?
16 A. That has been a discussion, yes.
17 Q. Did you have any discussions about that at this
18 ALEC Dinner?
19 A. I don't recall. I'm sorry.
20 Q. During this Real-World Application segment, did
21 y'all acknowledge the risk of suicide associated with
22 removing such care?
23 A. I don't know --
24 MS. LAND: Object to form.
25 A. I don't know if we did at this dinner. We have

Page 96

1 discussed that. I have asked doctors that question.
2 Because I'm not a doctor and that's -- I'm just
3 concerned what happens to these children and their
4 suicide risk at all times.
5 Q. Who else spoke at that event?
6 A. Brenton -- I can't remember his last name. And
7 then there was Walt, he's a -- he's written a book.
8 Brenton, he's in the middle of a lawsuit, parental
9 lawsuit where the mother wants to give the child
10 hormones and he does not and the child doesn't want to
11 take them.
12 Q. Is that Brenton Netz?
13 A. Yes, I believe so.
14 Q. Okay.
15 A. And Walt Hires, who has written a book about a
16 parent that wanted him to be a girl when he was a boy,
17 and he has since, I believe, he may be a counselor. I'm
18 not sure. And I believe he's now retired. I'm not
19 sure. But I know he's written a book.
20 Q. Did Billy Burleigh also speak at the ALEC Dinner?
21 A. No.
22 Q. Was he invited to speak?
23 A. I don't know.
24 Q. I'm going to mark as Exhibit 17, 2785.
25 (Deposition Exhibit 17 was marked for

Page 97

1 identification.)
2 Q. And is Exhibit 17, is this an invitation to --
3 that was sent to you to attend the July 29th ALEC
4 Dinner?
5 A. This is from Nicolas Reynolds, Thursday,
6 July 29th. "You are cordially invited to join us
7 tonight in the Little America Hotel."
8 Q. So is this an invitation that you received from
9 Family Research Council to attend the July 29th event?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And do you agree with the subject line of the
12 dinner tonight that gender clinics don't help kids?
13 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. Why is that?
16 MR. TALLEY: Same objection. Go ahead.
17 A. You're giving -- excuse me. Gender clinics that
18 give children puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones
19 are experimenting on children. We don't know the
20 long-term effects. What effects do we know are
21 extremely detrimental to children. They need to grow up
22 so that they can participate in this process. This is
23 an informed consent issue.
24 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 18, page
25 2770.

Page 98

(Deposition Exhibit 18 was marked for identification.)
Q. And is 18 another invitation that was sent by FRC to the July 29th event?
A. It's from Nicolas Reynolds. This one is July the 29th, but the time is different. It's at 2:51.
Q. But this is an invitation for the ALEC Dinner, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you agree with the statement in the Subject Line that children need to be protected from the transgender movement?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. I think that characterizes the form which is the Subject Line. You can answer if you understand the question.
A. I do understand the question, and I do believe some children do need to be protected from the transgender movement that are trying to push them when they are minors.
Q. What is the transgender movement?
MS. LAND: Object to form.
A. The transgender movement for adults are adults that prefer to have sexual relations -- or excuse me, not sexual relations, but people that would prefer to

Page 99

change their gender. And I believe the political side of that is trying to proselytize, and I'm concerned about children, and that's what this bill deals with.
Q. When you use the term, "transgender movement," because I heard a couple of different definitions in there; is that accurate?
A. No, the transgender movement is more of a political issue. The bill deals with protecting children.
Q. And my question is, though, you used the term -- or you said you agree with the transgender movement statement a moment ago, correct?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
A. I disagree with putting children in the middle of that. If people want to have a transgender movement, they can do that. I just don't think we ought to proselytize children. They shouldn't be in the middle of any political issues. And so I would agree to protect them from political pushing them towards anything.
Q. Were you also invited by Tony Perkins to speak at the Inaugural Pray Vote Stand Summit on October 7th or 8th of 2021?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Would it help to see the --

Page 100

A. Yes.
Q. -- packet again?
Okay. We'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 19, 3847 through 3848.
(Deposition Exhibit 19 was marked for identification.)
Q. I'll go ahead and hand you Exhibit 19.
And does Exhibit 19 refresh your recollection about the October Pray Vote Stand Summit?
A. Yes, but I don't believe I was able to attend this.
Q. Well, that was going to be my next question is did you attend this summit?
A. No, I don't think so.
Q. Okay. Did you attend a October 28th legislative summit hosted by Family Research Council?
A. Where was that one?
Q. I'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 20, page 3602.
(Deposition Exhibit 20 was marked for identification.)
Q. Does Exhibit 20 refresh your recollection about the October 28th event?
A. Yes, and I believe I couldn't attend.
Q. So did you -- you did not attend the October 28th event?

Page 101

A. I do a lot of traveling. I don't think I -- I couldn't make this one. I think Leslie Rutledge, the Attorney General, went instead.
Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit 21, page 3851.
(Deposition Exhibit 21 was marked for identification.)
Q. And is Exhibit 21 confirmation of your attendance at the October 28th SAFE Act Virtual Summit?
A. I may have been at the virtual, but I don't -- I didn't physically attend.
Q. It was a virtual summit.
A. Okay.
Q. Does that help you remember if you were there or not?
A. I've done so many things online. I could -- I'm sure, if there was something online and I could attend, I probably was there.
Q. Okay. Sitting here today --
A. This looks like there was a special session at the time.
Q. It looks like -- I'm going to go ahead and just see one more thing to ask you about this, and then if you still don't understand attending, you've attended quite a few?

Page 102

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. Okay. I'm going to go ahead and mark as Exhibit
3 22, 3759 to 3761.
4 (Deposition Exhibit 22 was marked for
5 identification.)
6 Q. And if you'll go ahead and turn to the second
7 page, 3761 of Exhibit 22?
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. And this is the agenda for the Virtual SAFE Act
10 Summit, correct?
11 A. Yes, and I'm on here at 12:30 for 15 minutes.
12 Q. Okay. And who were the other speakers that day?
13 A. Tony Perkins, Joseph Backholm is interviewing
14 Brenton Netz, and Dr. Hiatt, Dr. Conway, and then I'm on
15 here for some Q&A. And it's a virtual summit, so I
16 quite likely was there, yes.
17 Q. And did Attorney General Rutledge also attend this
18 summit?
19 A. I don't see her on here, but she's mentioned in
20 the email. So if she committed to it, I'm sure she's
21 there somewhere.
22 Q. It looks like she spoke at 12:15 on page 3761.
23 A. Yes.
24 MR. TALLEY: The fonts a little light.
25 MS. WALAS: It is.

Page 103

1 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
2 Q. Do you recall what Attorney General Rutledge spoke
3 about regarding the SAFE Act?
4 A. No, I don't.
5 Q. But you do recall that she did attend to speak on
6 the SAFE Act?
7 MS. LAND: Object to form.
8 A. I'm sorry. I think we were all in kind of a -- I
9 just don't recall.
10 Q. Okay. And looking at page 3759 of Exhibit 22. It
11 will be the first page. You were asked to share on
12 three things, correct?
13 A. My experience on running the SAFE Act, the tactics
14 you used gaining sponsors and anything else you think
15 would be helpful to fellow legislators.
16 Q. Now, in sharing your experience running the SAFE
17 Act during the Virtual SAFE Act Summit, what sort of
18 experience did you share?
19 A. I talked about, probably the same thing I've
20 always talked about, that it was an experience. There's
21 been ups and downs as it is with any bill that's this
22 emotionally charged. I'm sure I mentioned something
23 about civility. And then the next thing is tactics, and
24 we discussed that before, not lingering, getting on with
25 your business, keeping -- anything else you would be

Page 104

1 helpful, it's probably I'm big on keeping people that
2 are involved, my fellow legislators, my cosponsors
3 up-to-date on the issues.
4 Q. Can you think of anything else that you might have
5 mentioned that would be helpful to other legislators
6 trying to run the SAFE Act in their state?
7 A. Not off the top of my head, I'm sorry.
8 Q. Are you part of a movement to protect minors from
9 sterilization?
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
11 answer if you understand the question.
12 A. Can you be specific about "a movement?"
13 Q. We'll go ahead and mark this Exhibit 23, page
14 3605.
15 (Deposition Exhibit 23 was marked for
16 identification.)
17 A. This is from Nicolas Reynolds, Monday --
18 Q. Hold on one second.
19 MR. TALLEY: Yeah, just wait for her
20 question.
21 A. Sorry.
22 Q. All right. Looking at Exhibit 23, this is an
23 invitation to an event put on by Family Research
24 Council, correct?
25 A. Yes.

Page 105

1 Q. And the subject line of the invitation is to "Be
2 part of the movement to protect minors from
3 sterilization;" is that -- did I accurately read that
4 subject line?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And my question for you is, is are you part of a
7 movement to protect minors from sterilization?
8 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
9 answer.
10 A. Okay. If you're referring to the SAFE Act, the
11 SAFE Act does protect minors from sterilization. When
12 you give a minor puberty blockers and cross sex
13 hormones, sterilization is a result. I don't know that
14 if you would call that a movement. I would call it
15 adults protecting children.
16 Q. And this email also notes that Arkansas Attorney
17 General, The Honorable Leslie Rutledge will be speaking
18 at event on the SAFE Act.
19 MS. LAND: Object to form.
20 A. She would be speaking on the SAFE Act. I'm very
21 proud of Leslie Rutledge.
22 Q. Besides yourself and Leslie Rutledge, did anyone
23 from Arkansas attend the -- that event?
24 A. I don't remember. I am sorry.
25 Q. Do you remember if Representative Mary Bentley

Page 106

1 attended?
2 A. I don't know. Where -- this is -- where was the
3 meeting?
4 Q. This is the virtual.
5 A. Oh, it's quite possible then.
6 Q. Okay. Did this virtual legislative summit discuss
7 any model legislation besides the SAFE Act?
8 A. I don't recall.
9 MS. WALAS: We'll go ahead and take a
10 break.
11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This will end Media
12 Part 2, and we're off the record at
13 12:40 p.m.. Please remove your microphone
14 before you get up.
15 (Off the record.)
16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the
17 record at 1:25 p.m.. This will begin Media
18 Part 3. Please proceed.
19 (A recess was had for lunch)
20 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
21 Q. All right. We're back after lunch. Now I'm going
22 to start talking to you about the Family Policy Alliance
23 and the Family Policy Foundation. Are you familiar with
24 those organizations?
25 A. Yes.

Page 107

1 Q. Are they one in the same?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. Okay.
4 A. Well, technically there are two different ones;
5 one's political, one's apolitical, but --
6 Q. They kind of operate together?
7 A. Somewhat.
8 Q. Somewhat.
9 Okay. If I say Family Policy Alliance --
10 A. I'll know what you're talking about.
11 Q. Okay. What is the Family Policy Alliance?
12 A. It's a pro-family organization.
13 Q. Is it Christ-centered?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. Did it used to be known as Focus on the Family?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. Did it also used to be known as Citizen Link?
18 A. Yes, I believe that's in the history of it.
19 Q. Okay. Is the Family Policy Alliance, is it made
20 up of other groups?
21 A. I believe there are spinoffs in different states;
22 hence, alliance.
23 Q. Is Family Council one of the allies of the Family
24 Policy Alliance?
25 A. Yes.

Page 108

1 Q. How did you become involved with the Family Policy
2 Alliance?
3 A. I don't remember specifically how we got connected
4 over time. We did connect over this bill.
5 Q. Do you know if you -- strike that.
6 I'll go ahead and mark, have marked as Exhibit 24,
7 439 -- 4349 to 4351.
8 (Deposition Exhibit 24 was marked for
9 identification.)
10 Q. Now, is the statement -- Statesmen Academy a part
11 of the Family Policy Alliance?
12 A. Yes, and it has been around for a few years.
13 Q. Okay. And taking a look at Exhibit 24, this is a
14 Statesmen Academy Alumni Newsletter; is that correct?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And are you a Statesmen Academy Alumni?
17 A. Yes, I am.
18 Q. What is the Statesmen Academy?
19 A. That is a part of Family Policy Alliance where
20 they bring in different legislators from states
21 basically to educate us on how to be statesmen, what is
22 the process of not just running a bill but talk about
23 issues. They usually try to work with freshman
24 legislators or people who are just beginning about just
25 the whole process of what it means to be a legislator,

Page 109

1 but also talk about different policy questions.
2 Q. In Exhibit 24, the title of this newsletter is
3 "Preserving Gender One State at a Time," is that
4 accurate?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And does it mean to you as a Statesmen Academy
7 Alumni to preserve gender one state at a time?
8 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
9 answer.
10 A. To protect minor children.
11 Q. Is that a state-by-state basis?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. Would you like the SAFE Act to be a national law?
14 A. I think that would be wonderful.
15 Q. I'm going to hand you what I've marked as Exhibit
16 25, and this is 4333.
17 (Deposition Exhibit 25 was marked for
18 identification.)
19 Q. And who is Amanda Banks?
20 A. She is the, I believe she's the Director of the
21 Statesmen Academy and Vice President.
22 Q. Okay. And do you have a lot of interactions with
23 Ms. Banks?
24 A. Yes, she is very professional and does a great
25 job.

Page 110

1 Q. And as the Director of this Statesmen Academy, has
2 she asked you to speak at any Statesmen Academy events?
3 A. Yes, she has.
4 Q. Okay. And, first of all, when did you attend the
5 Statesmen Academy?
6 A. I don't remember the specific dates, but I have
7 attended one in Washington, D.C.. I am not good with
8 dates, but I attended at least two and done some Zoom
9 calls, so.
10 Q. Do you know what year you first attended the
11 Statesmen Academy?
12 A. 2017.
13 Q. And have you continued to go -- have they had a
14 reunion every year?
15 A. They have. Covid, everybody is off, so.
16 Q. So there's just a little lapse in there?
17 A. Yeah. It may have even been '16.
18 Q. And you said that you were asked to speak at one
19 of the Statesmen Academys?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. And did you have to pay to attend?
22 A. I don't believe on the one where I spoke I paid to
23 attend.
24 Q. Did you have to pay to attend the Statesmen
25 Academy?

Page 111

1 A. No, if you were invited to attend, I believe they
2 paid for you to come to that.
3 Q. And is attendance at the Statesmen Academy free
4 due to the generosity of Ministry Partners?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. As a participant of the Statesmen Academy, were
7 you equipped with a Christian world view and America's
8 founding principles?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
10 answer.
11 A. I already came equipped, but I enjoyed the process
12 and enjoyed learning more.
13 Q. As a participant of the Statesmen Academy, were
14 you equipped with wisdom from experienced Christian
15 statesmen and public relations professionals?
16 A. Yes.
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
18 answer.
19 THE WITNESS: Sorry.
20 MR. TALLEY: You're good.
21 Q. As a participant of the Statesmen Academy, were
22 you equipped with in-depth knowledge of hot button
23 policy issues and prudent legislative strategy?
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
25 answer.

Page 112

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. What hot button policy issues were covered when
3 you attended the Statesmen Academy?
4 A. It's a good thing I'm not getting a grade now.
5 Without looking at specific agenda items from each one,
6 I think I can safely say we discussed whatever was
7 newsworthy at the time.
8 Q. Did you discuss LGBT issues?
9 MS. LAND: Object to form.
10 A. I don't recall specifically discussing LGBTQ
11 issues. I'm sorry.
12 Q. What type of issues do you consider hot button
13 policy issues?
14 A. In my personal opinion, it would be education,
15 pro-life, religious freedom, freedom of speech.
16 Q. What were your takeaways from the Statesmen
17 Academy that you attended?
18 A. I really enjoyed all the aspects. I enjoyed
19 hearing from other legislators. I enjoyed the PR. I
20 enjoyed the history. Just a lot of different -- a lot
21 of different aspects. They really did a good job of
22 putting together -- anybody would enjoy just the give
23 and take.
24 Q. Have you used any of the legislative strategy on
25 hot button policy issues that you learned during the

Page 113

1 Statesmen Academy?
2 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to that
3 question because, as phrased, it's calls for
4 testimony on specific legislative strategies
5 which I would believe bare on legislative
6 activities which are prohibited by the Court's
7 Order prior to this deposition. So as
8 phrased, I'll instruct the witness not to
9 answer that question.
10 Q. You were trained on legislative strategies at this
11 Statesmen Academy, correct?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And you were -- you discussed different hot button
14 policy issues, correct?
15 A. Correct.
16 Q. And you went to the Statesmen Academy to be
17 trained as a legislator, correct?
18 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
19 answer.
20 A. Yes, and trained in decorum, trained in
21 statesmanship. I believe some of the most important
22 stuff is just staying calm and appreciating other
23 people's point of view and not being afraid to state
24 your point of view on a particular issue. That's the
25 type of thing the Statesmanship Academy focuses on as

Page 114

1 well as family policy.
2 Q. Do they provide model legislation as part of the
3 Statesmen Academy?
4 A. I am sure they have. I don't recall off the top
5 of my head, because I'm sure your followup is going to
6 be something about followup and I don't know. So I'm
7 sorry.
8 Q. To the best of your recollection, have you used
9 any of the strategies that you learned at the Statesmen
10 Academy?
11 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to the
12 question and instruct the witness not to
13 answer because that question, as posed,
14 involved Representative Lundstrum's
15 legislative activities which are a prohibited
16 matter of inquiry under the Court's Order. I
17 will instruct the witness not to answer.
18 MS. WALAS: The Court's Order covers
19 non-legislative activities which includes the
20 participation in the Statesmen Academy
21 particularly in the motion and in our
22 opposition to your motion to quash and I think
23 in the topics about whether she used the --
24 what she learned in trainings of strategies is
25 within the Court's Order.

Page 115

1 MR. TALLEY: What she learned absolutely
2 is -- would be okay to inquire about. But the
3 question that was asked was whether or not she
4 has used those strategies, which is a question
5 aimed at discovering information about
6 Representative Lundstrum's legislative
7 activities. If she's used those strategies,
8 she would have done so at the State Capitol.
9 MS. WALAS: Our position is that it has
10 been that the inclusion of third-parties that
11 are not legislators or part of the Bureau of
12 Legislative Research or a part of her staff
13 took it outside of the legislative privilege;
14 and, therefore, we will certify the question
15 and move on.
16 MR. TALLEY: Before -- just so we're on
17 the same page and I make sure I'm comfortable
18 with the way I am, can you read that question
19 back.
20 (The court reporter read back the
21 requested question.)
22 MR. TALLEY: I will instruct the witness
23 not to answer that question to the extent her
24 response would include information about her
25 legislative activities. If Representative

Page 116

1 Lundstrum has used strategies she learned at
2 the Statesmen Academy in some other capacity,
3 such as in a media interview or some other
4 non-legislative purpose, I will instruct her
5 to answer that question.
6 Do you understand my limitation on that,
7 Representative Lundstrum?
8 THE WITNESS: Yes.
9 MR. TALLEY: Then you may answer.
10 A. I have used the Statesmen Academy's media
11 training.
12 Also, I have a correction on a previous question.
13 You asked me when I first attended the Statesmen
14 Academy, and I believe I was in the second class in
15 2017.
16 Q. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.
17 Was the SAFE Act part of the model legislation
18 that was covered when you were at the Statesmen Academy?
19 A. The one I last attended, yes.
20 Q. And was the one you last attended the July 20th to
21 23rd, 2021, Called Together Statesmen Academy?
22 A. In Washington, D.C.
23 Q. The July 20-23 Called Together was in Salt Lake
24 City, do you recall that one?
25 A. I do recall there was a Statesmen Academy in Salt

Page 117

1 Lake City.
2 Q. Okay.
3 A. And there was also one in Washington, D.C.
4 Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 26, which is 4091 to
5 4095.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 26 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 Q. And if you will take a look at that Exhibit 26 for
9 a moment just to refresh your recollection?
10 MR. TALLEY: While Representative
11 Lundstrum is reviewing that, Ms. Walas, are
12 you asking about the 2021 in Utah or in D.C.?
13 I'm a little confused.
14 MS. WALAS: We are discussing this one
15 which appears to be in D.C., and I misspoke.
16 MR. TALLEY: Okay. I just wanted to make
17 sure that our record is clear on that.
18 MS. WALAS: Yes.
19 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
20 Q. So this -- and that was going to be my followup
21 question, was this July 20 to 23, 2021, Called Together
22 Conference, this was in D.C.?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. Okay. And the Salt Lake City was the ALEC Dinner?
25 A. Yes.

Page 118

1 Q. Okay. That's my confusion. I apologize.
2 Looking at Exhibit 26, this is the agenda for the
3 Called Together Reunion, correct?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. What were the topics that were covered during this
6 reunion?
7 A. I believe they're stated on page 4, The New
8 Conservative Movement, Gender Issues Policy Panel,
9 Prudence in Imprudent Times, there's a museum tour,
10 Individual Media Training.
11 Q. Did you attend the entire conference?
12 A. Yes, I did. I didn't go to each -- I don't think
13 I went to every breakfast. I'm not an early morning
14 person.
15 Q. Did you attend the panel on the New Conservative
16 Movement?
17 A. I vaguely remember that, yes. I believe I did go
18 to that, yes.
19 Q. What is the New Conservative Movement?
20 A. This had some young people in it and it just
21 talked about where they see the conservative movement
22 going and where young people are taking the conservative
23 movement.
24 Q. And you were asked to be one of the speakers for
25 the Gender Issues Policy Panel; is that correct?

Page 119

1 A. Yes.
2 Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 27, which is 3920.
3 (Deposition Exhibit 27 was marked for
4 identification.)
5 Q. And do you recall communicating with Amanda Banks
6 about your speaking engagement at the Gender Issues
7 Policy Panel?
8 A. Yes, that's what this email is about for Saturday,
9 June 19th. It's with Amanda Banks and myself.
10 Q. Was the purpose of that panel to cover three
11 primary policy topics; the Save Girls Sports, the SAFE
12 Act and the Promise To America's/Arkansas's Children?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. And as a Statesmen Academy Alumni, you offered
15 strategy and insight into policy making to protect
16 children from gender interventions and to preserve girls
17 sports?
18 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
19 answer.
20 A. I spent my time on the SAFE Act. I believe Jerry
21 Cox covered the Arkansas' Children, Promise to Arkansas
22 Children and the South Dakota talked about Save Girls
23 Sports.
24 Q. I'm going to hand you what I've marked as Exhibit
25 28, 4703 to 4705.

Page 120

1 (Deposition Exhibit 28 was marked for
2 identification.)
3 Q. And is Exhibit 28 another Statesmen Academy Alumni
4 Newsletter?
5 A. Yes, it's from Amanda Banks.
6 Q. And if you turn to page 4704 of Exhibit 28, do you
7 see the bulleted list there at the top of the page?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. Okay. And do you see where you're referenced in
10 those bullets?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Would you please read the sentence where you're
13 referenced?
14 A. "Gender Issues Panel featuring Statesmen Academy
15 Alumni Representative Robin Lundstrum of Arkansas offers
16 strategy and insight into policy making to protect
17 children from gender interventions and preserve girls
18 sports."
19 Q. And so did you do that?
20 A. I'm sure I probably did. I probably didn't speak
21 very much the girls sports bill because that -- I wasn't
22 the lead cosponsor, but I was a cosponsor on the bill.
23 It's a very good bill.
24 Q. And you offered various strategies on policy
25 making to protect children from gender interventions?

Page 121

1 A. I think the bill is a policy, and we probably
2 talked about the bill.
3 Q. What sort of insight did you offer to the people
4 that attended the Gender Issues Policy Panel?
5 A. Without having any of my notes in front of me, I
6 think one of the biggest insight is assuming that people
7 on the other side of the aisle aren't going to agree
8 with you. There are a lot of folks on both sides. This
9 is not a Republican or Democrat bill. This is a bill
10 about protecting children. And we need not to be so
11 strident in assuming that just because someone disagrees
12 with us politically on a lot of different issues, we
13 can't come together on issues that protect children.
14 And I think that's refreshing nowadays when everybody is
15 so strident not to make those assumptions.
16 As far as offering strategies or insights, when
17 you run a bill, talk about your bill with your fellow
18 legislators and be honest about what your bill does,
19 state your points and move on.
20 Q. And I believe you mentioned earlier that you had
21 some -- did you have some notes while you were speaking?
22 A. You've seen those, the same talking points. I
23 stuck to those.
24 Q. Were you provided an outline or anything ahead of
25 the policy panel?

Page 122

1 A. I believe there is an outline that they put
2 together just so that we all stay on the same sheet of
3 music, for lack of a better terminology. They put
4 together a pretty good conference and they like
5 everybody to stay on track and on time. Shockingly, a
6 lot of legislators talk a lot, so.
7 Q. Did anyone else join you on that panel?
8 A. I want to say Jerry Cox. It says right here. I
9 believe Dr. Hiatt was on that one. I'm not sure. And I
10 think one other gentleman. It's probably on the agenda
11 somewhere.
12 Q. Did you play a role in recruiting Dr. Hiatt to
13 speak on the Gender Issues Panel?
14 MS. LAND: Object to form.
15 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
16 A. Yes, he's a very good speaker and very
17 knowledgeable.
18 Q. And did you tell Dr. Hiatt, when you asked him to
19 speak at the Gender Issues Policy Panel, that the
20 primary audiences would be a network of state
21 policy-makers who are graduates of the Statesmen Academy
22 and then kind of the Alliance of State-Based Family
23 Policy Councils in the states?
24 A. I probably told him something similar to that.
25 Q. And was the purpose of the panel to encourage

Page 123

1 legislators from other states to take up the SAFE Act
2 bill?
3 A. And the Save Women's Sports bill.
4 Q. Did -- oh, I asked you this earlier. So I'm going
5 to go ahead and hand you what I will mark as Exhibit 29.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 299 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 Q. And this is 3817 to 3823.
9 Taking a look at Exhibit 29, is this a copy of the
10 outline that y'all were provided ahead of the Policy
11 Panel?
12 A. Okay. This is from Autumn Stroup, Saturday,
13 July 17th to Dr. Hiatt, myself, Jerry Cox and Norm
14 Woods. Yes.
15 Q. And in providing you this outline, did the Family
16 Policy Alliance also provide you what they were looking
17 for in your responses?
18 A. No, I was part of making the outline and making
19 sure that this reflects what happened. And I think it's
20 really important when an organization does this, it's
21 very comforting to see the timeline and things be kept
22 on track. People tend to get off and chase rabbit
23 trails and you're there forever.
24 Q. So the answers that were provided were to keep you
25 on track?

Page 124

1 A. Yes, and, I mean, we know the answers. But it's
2 helpful when you're in front of an audience to stay on
3 track.
4 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
5 30, and this is 5833 to 5844.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 30 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 Q. And I'm using a black and white copy due to the
9 color copy you can't read some of the words. I'll
10 provide y'all with both copies and you can see if you
11 need two.
12 Is Exhibit 30 a more detailed version of the
13 Gender Issues Policy Panel outline?
14 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
15 Representative Lundstrum, if you need to take
16 a second and review Exhibit 30, I hope you get
17 an opportunity to do that if that's okay,
18 Breean?
19 Q. Oh, yeah. I thought you took a look at it. I was
20 looking down. If you need to take some more time to
21 look at it, please go ahead.
22 A. It looks very similar. I don't see a lot of
23 changes.
24 Q. Let's take a look at -- at this Exhibit 30, and
25 what did you tell your fellow Statesmen Alumni was your

Page 125

1 inspiration for the SAFE Act?
2 I'll direct your attention to --
3 A. Yes, please.
4 Q. -- page 5837 to 5838. That looks like about when
5 you begin speaking.
6 Do you need me to ask the question again?
7 A. No, tell me where we're going with it.
8 Q. We're going to be looking at page 5837 and 5838,
9 and I would like to know what you -- what did you tell
10 your fellow Statesmen Alumni was your inspiration for
11 the SAFE Act?
12 A. Okay.
13 Q. It carries over to --
14 A. I am not seeing what you're referring to.
15 Q. I'll go ahead and highlight it for you.
16 A. It would help me if you would. I'm not seeing
17 what you're --
18 Q. Here's the question --
19 A. Okay.
20 Q. -- to Robin.
21 A. All right.
22 Q. And then there's -- and the question, that's the
23 italics.
24 A. Okay. Thank you.
25 Q. Yeah.

Page 126

1 A. Okay. Thank you.
2 Q. Uh-huh. And so what did you tell your fellow
3 Statesmen Alumni was your inspiration for the SAFE Act?
4 A. Basically to prevent this from occurring to
5 children in Arkansas. I was surprised to find out that
6 this had already started, and I was concerned. What's
7 going to happen to these kids.
8 Q. Were GOP Women in Arkansas an inspiration for the
9 SAFE Act?
10 A. The GOP Women of Arkansas were equally concerned.
11 We're all moms, parents. Like all of us, whether you
12 agree or disagree with the bill, I think everybody
13 agrees that kids are precious.
14 Q. What did you tell them when you described your
15 strategy for gathering cosponsors for the bill?
16 MR. TALLEY: Are you asking that question
17 in the context of what was discussed in
18 Exhibit 30?
19 Q. I'm asking in the context of the question that is
20 asked in Exhibit 30 that is, "You also had a very
21 successful strategy in how you gathered cosponsors for
22 your bill, tell us about that?" So I'm asking for you
23 to tell us, to describe your strategy for gathering
24 cosponsors for the bill that you told the audience?
25 A. I secured them ahead of time. I went to

Page 127

1 individual cosponsors by committee and met with
2 individual legislators.
3 Q. Did you target cosponsors on the committees that
4 the bills would go through?
5 MR. TALLEY: Object to the question based
6 on it calls for testimony on Representative
7 Lundstrum's legislative activities, and as
8 posed to the witness, I will instruct her not
9 to answer that question.
10 Q. On page 5838, do you see where we were discussing
11 the practical stuff?
12 A. Uh-huh.
13 Q. And about your strategy on gathering cosponsors
14 for the bill?
15 A. Uh-huh.
16 Q. And you said you assisted in kind of putting
17 together the prepared answers to stick to the schedule
18 of the panel, correct?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. Okay. And the answer -- one of the answers that
21 is written down here is "targeted cosponsors on
22 committees the bill could go through," is that accurate?
23 A. That's a normal legislative strategy that most
24 legislators use for any bill.
25 Q. So that wasn't specific to the SAFE Act here,

Page 128

1 that's just something you do in general?
2 A. In general any legislator would do. There's no
3 secret sauce. It's -- in my opinion.
4 Q. Did you advise the attendees that targeting as
5 many women as possible to cosponsor was important for
6 the SAFE Act?
7 A. Well, it's part of the Women's Dream Big agenda.
8 So we started with us.
9 Q. What did you tell them were the other key factors
10 that made the SAFE Act a success story?
11 MR. TALLEY: By "them," do you mean
12 attendees at this conference?
13 Q. Yes. All the questions, if I say them, and it's
14 related to this document.
15 MR. TALLEY: I'm just trying to make sure
16 I'm doing my job.
17 A. Fair enough.
18 I think this is pretty straightforward. It says
19 that -- these are my words, "Key factors that make a
20 success story." Team spirit, we all work together as a
21 team, prayer team. I am not a big talker. I know
22 that's strange sometimes for politicians, but you just
23 say what you've got to say and move on. I did get the
24 help of medical professionals. And if there was a
25 question, if a legislator asked me how do I answer this

Page 129

1 question or whatever, the talking points I provided
2 them. And there was a video, and I'm sure you've
3 probably seen that.
4 Q. There have been quite a few videos that were
5 identified in the documents. So could you identify
6 which video that you're referring to here?
7 A. We made an informational video that people could
8 post on Facebook if they choose to.
9 Q. Was that at the Drop Box link?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. Okay. And that was -- was that circulated widely
12 amongst the conference?
13 A. I think a copy was sent after the conference.
14 After that, I have no clue.
15 Q. Did you also use a video of Rand Paul questioning
16 Dr. Rachel Levine?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And why would -- what were you using that video
19 for.
20 A. I thought it was a very compelling video.
21 Q. What does the video show?
22 A. Dr. Rand Paul questioning Rachel Levine and her
23 failing to answer the question.
24 Q. What was he questioning her about?
25 A. I believe -- I don't remember the exact question.

Page 130

1 I'm sure you've probably seen it. It was -- she was not
2 willing to talk about the complexity of, I want to say
3 gender dysphoria, but I'm not sure that's correct. It's
4 been a while since I've looked at that video.
5 Q. How did you respond to questions like what about
6 the children who are already undergoing treatment with
7 puberty blockers and/or cross sex hormones?
8 A. I'm not a medical doctor, and I'm not a
9 psychiatrist. So I asked that question myself of
10 doctors and psychiatrists. And those children are truly
11 at risk long-term, their health. There's no long-term
12 studies. We don't know what's going to happen to those
13 children. The first thing that comes to my mind is the
14 suicide risk for those children later in life. I've
15 heard from so many transgender adults, those that want
16 to stay transgender, don't want to detransition, about
17 the horrors and the things that they've been through.
18 What's going to happen to those children long-term.
19 They just need to get to be old enough to understand
20 where they're going and then they can participate. And
21 I hope they would be happy in the decisions that they
22 make and be healthy in the decisions that they make.
23 But when we take away their adolescence and you take
24 away their childhood, we take away their health and
25 that's my concern.

Page 131

1 Q. In looking at page 5839, it says, quote, "Be
2 prepared to be blamed when a child identifying as
3 transgender commits suicide - it will happen." What do
4 you mean by that?
5 A. I think that's obvious. That's a, I think a fear
6 and a concern when you hear the concern 19 times suicide
7 rate. What's going happen to these children. I listen
8 to what's going on. I listen to these kids. It's
9 terrifying. If a child is suicidal, they should be in
10 hospital.
11 Q. What if a child is suicidal because their hormone
12 therapy has been taken away?
13 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
14 answer.
15 A. That child needs to be in -- under a doctor's care
16 that appreciates the impact of what it's doing to that
17 child's body. That's an experiment on that child.
18 Q. I'd like you to turn to page 5841 of Exhibit 30,
19 please?
20 And you see there where it's highlighted, "How we
21 passed the SAFE Act in Arkansas?" Do you have Exhibit
22 30? It will be page 5841. Right there.
23 MR. TALLEY: It's another font problem.
24 A. Okay.
25 Q. You see where it says, "How we passed the SAFE Act

Page 132

1 in Arkansas?"
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 Q. What did you tell them as to -- "them" as in the
4 attendees, as to how you passed the SAFE Act in
5 Arkansas?
6 A. Well, they -- the Family Policy Alliance helped
7 with this, because I might object to one of those. Well
8 written draft, I would agree to that. It's a very
9 succinct bill. Great cosponsor. I'm okay. Alan Clark
10 is awesome. Women's Caucus was great. We did have
11 great national support. We did have good committee
12 chairs, not because they were the right committee
13 chairs, but Jack Ladyman was a very calm committee
14 chair. Cecil Bledsoe was a very -- they run a clean
15 committee, a very fair committee. Right committee
16 makeup. I think they asked good questions. I do think
17 timing was important. We did have a powerful grassroots
18 network. I won't apologize for that. I think any time
19 you run a bill, I think the people care about those
20 bills, they will call in. There were some corporate
21 objections, but that's okay. I do think Billy Burleigh
22 gave some amazing testimony, so did the doctors. Joseph
23 Backholm did a great job, too. I don't think those are
24 any -- anything unusual.
25 Q. Of the few things that you just talked about, you

Page 133

1 mentioned a great national support was there. We talked
2 about the FRC. Who's the ADF?
3 A. That's Alliance Defending Freedom. That's part of
4 this Family Policy.
5 Q. Okay. So Alliance Defending Freedom is part of
6 the Family Policy Alliance?
7 A. It's part of the group.
8 Q. Okay. Is it like say one of those allies that we
9 were talking about earlier?
10 A. Right.
11 Q. Okay. And then you mentioned timing. Did the
12 conference bill and the female sports bill have anything
13 to do with the timing?
14 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to that
15 question because it calls for testimony on
16 Representative Lundstrum's legislative
17 activities. So I'll instruct the witness not
18 to answer that question as posed.
19 Q. On page 5841, you mentioned timing, correct?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. And there are three other reasons listed there,
22 correct?
23 A. Correct.
24 Q. And what are those?
25 A. Conscience, female sports, and once we started we

Page 134

1 ran it quickly. We didn't dawdle.
2 Q. And so, to followup, did you advise the attendees
3 that the timing of the conscience bill, the female
4 sports bill and the SAFE Act had an influence on how you
5 passed the SAFE Act in Arkansas?
6 A. We didn't create the timing. It just worked out
7 that way.
8 Q. Okay. And if you turn to the next page 5842, it
9 looks like that you might have given some other examples
10 to the attendees as to how you passed the SAFE Act?
11 A. Yeah, it mentions of the additional doctors,
12 prayer was mobilized, we worked together as a team. I
13 think it was important we didn't -- it wasn't something
14 of an us versus them. This was about protecting
15 children, and that's something that I think is very
16 important to emphasize.
17 Q. What does it mean where it says, "The Capitol is
18 our turf?"
19 A. I think that's probably a little bit of Republican
20 smack talk, to be real honest.
21 Q. Well, that's what we're here for. So I appreciate
22 your honesty.
23 What is prayer mobilization?
24 A. Christians coming together and praying for their
25 legislators.

Page 135

1 Q. Were similar methods used to pass the Girls Act?
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form of the
3 question, and I will also object to that
4 question as opposed because it calls for
5 testimony on Representative Lundstrum's
6 legislative activities. So as posed to the
7 witness, I will instruct her not to answer
8 that question.
9 Q. Looking on page 5842, do you see the kind of block
10 in the middle there that looks like highlighting?
11 A. Uh-huh.
12 Q. And is that identifying the Protect Women's
13 Sports?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And did y'all also cover how that was passed as
16 part of your Gender Issues Policy Panel?
17 MS. LAND: Object to form.
18 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
19 A. We spent a small amount of time. This agenda was
20 a good agenda, but we didn't get to everything on the
21 agenda. I wish the sponsors had taken this. They did a
22 really good job, and I was a cosponsor. Was proud to be
23 a cosponsor. They did a good job with the bill.
24 Q. If you want to go ahead and turn to page 5839, I'd
25 like to ask you some questions about this Promise to

Page 136

1 America's Children, are you familiar with that?
2 A. I am somewhat familiar with that. I was not -- I
3 believe I was a cosponsor but not the lead cosponsor.
4 Q. And that was the Promise to Arkansas' Children?
5 A. Correct.
6 Q. Okay. But the first question was, do you know
7 what the Promise to America's Children is that's
8 referenced here on 5839?
9 A. It is -- they're almost identical, but I'm not a
10 hundred percent sure.
11 Q. Okay.
12 A. And I wouldn't hold me to that.
13 Q. And do you know if the SAFE Act is part of the
14 Promise to America's Children?
15 A. You know, that's a really good question. I'm not
16 sure if that's -- I hope it is. I'm not a hundred
17 percent sure.
18 Q. Do you know if the Girls Act is part of the
19 Promise to America's Children?
20 MS. LAND: Object to form.
21 A. Those are all three separate bills, and I am not
22 sure.
23 Q. Okay. If you look at 5839, and I'll go ahead and
24 just mark it here for you to make it a little easier.
25 If you look at subpart 1.a.i., do you see where there's

Page 137

1 a note there that mentions both pieces of legislation?
2 MS. LAND: Object to form.
3 A. I do.
4 Q. Do you see that area?
5 A. Yeah, it says, "Both pieces fit squarely in the
6 Promise." It doesn't say that they are, but they fit
7 squarely with the Promise.
8 Q. Okay. The two pieces of legislation that y'all
9 were talking about on the panel was the SAFE Act and the
10 Girls Act --
11 A. Yeah.
12 Q. -- or the Girls Sports Act?
13 A. Well, there was three pieces, but yes.
14 Q. Okay. And what was the third piece?
15 A. Wasn't that the Save Women's Sports, SAFE Act and
16 the America's Children.
17 Q. Oh, yeah. This is part of that. That's what I'm
18 trying to figure out is this language here where it
19 says, "Both pieces of legislation today fit squarely
20 within the Promise."
21 A. Okay.
22 Q. I was trying to see if that was something you all
23 talked about more while you were there or if it -- if
24 that's just what it is?
25 A. That's just what it is.

Page 138

1 MR. TALLEY: When you say, "there," do
2 you mean on this Policy Panel?
3 MS. WALAS: Yes.
4 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
5 Q. Okay.
6 A. Yes. Sorry.
7 Q. Do you know what organizations are part of the
8 Promise to America's Children?
9 A. I believe it's mentioned on the next page.
10 Q. And what are those organizations?
11 A. It says, Heritage, Family Policy Alliance,
12 Alliance Defending Freedom.
13 Q. Does it also include state legislators?
14 A. Yes, it says 32 state legislators and I don't know
15 which 32, if they're referring to Arkansas State
16 Legislators and all of this is blacked out on mine.
17 Q. The printing on both sides were hard. So we'll
18 try to get you the best copy we can get you to look at,
19 and mine might be a little bit cleaner.
20 MS. LAND: I think the color copy
21 looks --
22 MS. WALAS: Did the color one come out
23 okay? It just doesn't come on some. You
24 can't see the green but you can see the
25 yellow.

Page 139

1 MR. TALLEY: I think it's six of one/half
2 dozen of the other. We might just have to
3 slowly walk through it.
4 MS. WALAS: Okay.
5 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
6 Q. So we'll just start with this one right here, and
7 say, looking at 5840, you were asked to share briefly
8 with what you did with the Promise in Arkansas, do you
9 recall that?
10 A. Yes, I do, but --
11 Q. Can you -- mine is somewhat clean. You're welcome
12 to it if you can see that.
13 A. We're going to have to ask Amanda to make that
14 yellow. We can all agree on that.
15 MR. TALLEY: I have -- I can read my
16 copy. If there's something that you want me
17 to help interpret, I'm happy to do that if
18 that's okay with you?
19 MS. WALAS: Yeah, that is fine.
20 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
21 Q. I'm really just seeing -- trying to find out what
22 you shared with how -- what you did with the Promise in
23 Arkansas?
24 A. Actually, I think my suggestion was a bill
25 cosponsor and gave it to somebody else.

Page 140

1 Q. Okay.
2 A. And I want to say it was Josh Bryant.
3 Q. And so you -- y'all basically took the Promise to
4 America's Children and adopted it in Arkansas?
5 A. Right.
6 Q. Okay. And was that a binding or a nonbinding
7 resolution?
8 A. Nonbinding.
9 Q. What are the goals of the Promise to Arkansas'
10 Children that y'all talked about at the summit?
11 MR. TALLEY: I have no objection to that
12 question.
13 A. Just the legislation and the -- or not, excuse me,
14 no legislation. Just the way we function in government
15 is respectful of family and that basically we're not
16 political when it comes to kids and how we manage or how
17 we educate, how state government functions, that we are
18 apolitical in all areas of state government.
19 Q. In looking at 5840, were some of the goals to
20 enact parts of the Promise to Arkansas' Children into
21 law?
22 A. Eventually, yes.
23 Q. And were you able to enact any parts of the
24 Promise to Arkansas' Children into law during the 2021
25 session?

Page 141

1 MR. TALLEY: I will object to that
2 question because it calls for matters of
3 legislative activity as posed to the witness.
4 So I'll instruct her not to answer.
5 Q. Did you discuss the laws that you passed related
6 to the Promise to Arkansas' Children as part of the
7 summit?
8 MS. LAND: Object to form.
9 MR. TALLEY: You may answer.
10 A. I'm sure we probably did. We'd have to be more
11 specific.
12 Q. If you take a look at 5840, and I will go ahead
13 and do my best.
14 MR. TALLEY: If you're not able to read
15 that, I can and am happy to read it out loud
16 provided Ms. Walas is okay with that.
17 Q. We tried many times to print this to see it and
18 that was some of the best we could do.
19 A. I wish somebody could call me, you could have
20 asked me to print it out.
21 Okay. From what I can see, The Session,
22 protecting women's sports, SAFE Act, student protection
23 act that keeps abortion providers out of schools.
24 Q. So those were the part of the Promise to Arkansas'
25 Children that you talked about at the summit that you

Page 142

1 all were able to enact in 2021?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And do you have any goals for the next legislative
4 session with respect to the Promise to Arkansas'
5 Children that you spoke about at the summit?
6 A. I don't.
7 Q. Are there any listed on 3840 that you might have
8 spoken to the committee about?
9 MR. TALLEY: By, "the committee," do you
10 mean the people at the summit?
11 MS. WALAS: Let me strike that. I used
12 committee.
13 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
14 Q. Is there anything on 3840 that y'all talked about
15 at the summit regarding the Promise to Arkansas'
16 Children in the next legislative session?
17 A. Others are looking at different items, I am not
18 personally.
19 Q. Are some of the items that are being looked at
20 restricting or prohibiting LGBT activities in schools?
21 MR. TALLEY: Is that something -- are you
22 asking about what might have been discussed at
23 this summit or what other legislators might be
24 looking at in Arkansas?
25 Q. Are these the matters that y'all discussed at the

Page 143

1 summit as the proposal for the next session?
2 A. Not in -- necessarily in Arkansas. Others, I
3 can't speculate what other people are going to do and I
4 can't speculate on what other legislators are going to
5 do.
6 Q. And so the SAFE Act, as y'all discussed it at the
7 summit, is just one of a number of provisions of the
8 Promise to Arkansas' Children?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
10 answer.
11 A. I didn't see it that way. The SAFE Act is a
12 stand-alone bill.
13 Q. Do the majority of the goals of the Promise to
14 Arkansas' Children impact transgender minors in the LGBT
15 community?
16 MS. LAND: Object to form.
17 A. I would say no. Children are just children. We
18 don't need to be interjecting politics to children. We
19 need to pull back and just be -- let kids be kids.
20 Q. Do you know if it's the Family Policy Alliance's
21 goal to get the Promise to America's Children enacted
22 into law in all the states?
23 A. I would think that's a goal.
24 Q. I'll go ahead and hand you -- have you heard of
25 Family Policy Alliance's Help Not Harm model

Page 144

1 legislation?
2 A. Yes, I have, and they have a website.
3 Q. Okay. I spoke too soon. It was in the one you
4 had. It's going to be in 30, page 5840. It's not the
5 highlighted part.
6 A. Okay.
7 Q. Looking at this Help Not Harm model legislation,
8 this is something y'all talked about as part of the
9 Gender Issues Policy Panel, correct?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And the Help Not Harm model legislation, is this
12 based on the Family Policy Alliance's originally from
13 the 2017-2018 cycle?
14 A. That is what I understood.
15 Q. Okay. And is that something that was covered
16 during, I believe you said you went to the Statesmen
17 Academy in 2018?
18 A. Yes, but I didn't have any information on it then,
19 and they weren't even putting together the website. It
20 wasn't even completed at this. They just announced that
21 there would be one coming.
22 Q. I'm talking about the prior, the original language
23 that they're referring to that the model Help Not Harm
24 is based on.
25 A. Right. I didn't have access to that.

Page 145

1 Q. You didn't have access to the prior version?
2 A. Right.
3 Q. Okay.
4 A. Now, others may have and it circled back through
5 in other ways, but not at that time.
6 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
7 31, and this is 3990 through 4024.
8 (Deposition Exhibit 31 was marked for
9 identification.)
10 Q. And I'll give you a moment to go ahead and look at
11 that since it's a little bit of a big pack here.
12 And just to get started, is Exhibit 31 a followup
13 email containing resources that you received from Family
14 Policy Alliance after the Called Together meeting?
15 A. I recognize the first email and it's a copy of
16 some of the model language and model bills. I -- I
17 don't know that I've looked through every single thing
18 on here, but this looks like it.
19 Q. And the packet includes a Help Not Harm Lawmaker
20 Cheat Sheet, correct?
21 A. Which page is that?
22 Q. The attachments on page 3990 is identified as Help
23 Not Harm Lawmaker Cheat Sheets.
24 And so that is my question is, did they include
25 the Help Not Harm Lawmaker Cheat Sheet in Exhibit 31?

Page 146

1 A. No, but it's not actually attached to this. It
2 just said it's attached. I'm sure it says -- it says
3 attachment pdf.
4 Q. If you take a look at page 4000, this is some Help
5 Not Harm Act messaging, correct? 4000.
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And the first suggested talking point on page 4000
8 is what?
9 A. "Talking Point Number 1, Transgender interventions
10 for kids violates Hippocratic Oath: Do not harm."
11 Q. What's the suggested line regarding that?
12 A. "Giving kids puberty blockers and cross-sex
13 hormones and even transgender surgery violates the first
14 duty of medicine: Do not harm."
15 Q. And do you agree with that statement?
16 A. I do.
17 Q. And in fact you've used that statement today when
18 discussing the SAFE Act, haven't you?
19 A. Yes, I have.
20 Q. And did you hear that statement from Family Policy
21 Alliance about the "do no harm?"
22 A. No, I'm not sure where I heard it. I think
23 everybody has probably heard it. It's kind of in our
24 American phraseology. It's from the Hippocratic Oath.
25 Q. Another suggestion is, "If a minor isn't old

Page 147

1 enough to get a tattoo or buy cough syrup
2 over-the-counter, why would we permit dangerous hormones
3 and drastic surgeries for them."
4 Had you used that talking point when discussing
5 the SAFE Act at the summit?
6 A. Yes, I have, and I've talked about that minors
7 can't drive until 16, cough syrup, get married. They
8 can't vote until 18. I've got a -- I won't bore you
9 with it, but I've got a list of probably 18, 19, 20
10 things, of all kinds of things that minors can't do
11 because they're not old enough to understand the
12 long-term consequences.
13 Q. So you have used similar talking points when
14 discussing the SAFE Act that are being used for the Help
15 Not Harm legislation?
16 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
17 Q. And is the Help Not Harm legislation just a new
18 name for the SAFE Act?
19 MS. LAND: Object to form.
20 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
21 A. You -- you could say that. There -- it's good
22 model legislation and I'm glad Family Policy Alliance is
23 championing that. It's kind of which came first, the
24 chicken or the egg. They've probably done it long
25 before I came along. It just worked out that way.

Page 148

1 Q. Do you endorse Family Policy Alliance's Help Not
2 Harm campaign?
3 A. I don't know that my endorsement means anything,
4 but I'm proud of what they're doing.
5 Q. And is the Help Not Harm campaign designed to
6 multiple laws like Arkansas' SAFE Act to protect
7 children from transgender interventions across the
8 country?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
10 A. I would --
11 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
12 A. I would agree with everything you said except the
13 part that it's not a -- to imply that your kids don't
14 even know which end is up at twelve or nine, that type
15 of thing, it's -- transgender interventions, these kids
16 need time to grow up. I think that's all I'm saying. I
17 think what they're doing is laudable and I'm proud of
18 them.
19 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
20 32, 5712 to 5715.
21 (Deposition Exhibit 32 was marked for
22 identification.)
23 Q. If you'll take a look at Exhibit 32, and is this
24 the Family Policy Alliance's press release for its Help
25 Not Harm campaign?

Page 149

1 A. Yes, this -- yes, this looks exactly like it.
2 Q. Did you participate in -- or strike that.
3 Did you assist Family Policy Alliance in putting
4 together this press release?
5 A. I contributed a statement.
6 Q. And what was your statement that you contributed?
7 A. I think it's on page 3.
8 Q. Which Bates stamp number is that?
9 A. It's 5713.
10 Q. Okay.
11 A. At the bottom of the page.
12 Q. And what did you contribute to the Help Not Harm
13 campaign?
14 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form. You can
15 answer if you understand.
16 A. Okay. Just this statement. They -- it's their
17 work. They've been around a lot longer than I've been
18 around, and they've done a fine job. I just contributed
19 this statement.
20 Q. Apologies. I got my numbers confused in my head.
21 I'm going to hand you what is 33 and this is 57 -- 5716
22 through 5719.
23 (Deposition Exhibit 33 was marked for
24 identification.)
25 Q. Have you seen this Family Policy Alliance Social

Page 150

1 Media Engagement Packet for the Help Not Harm campaign
2 before?
3 A. Yes, I received a copy of this in my email.
4 Q. Looking at page 5716 of Exhibit 33, do you agree
5 with this statement there and it says, "When children
6 are struggling to embrace their biological sex, our
7 first instinct should be compassionate care and helping
8 them embrace their God-given body?"
9 A. Absolutely.
10 Q. And on page 5717, do you agree with the Family
11 Policy Alliance statement that, "Kids struggling to
12 embrace their God-given bodies need real care?"
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. On page 5719, do you agree with FPA's statement
15 that, "The trans industry sets out to deceive patients,
16 parent and the legal system to push their drug (high
17 dose hormones and pituitary blocker) based on ideology?"
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And also on page 5719, do you agree with the
20 Family Policy Alliance's recommendation to use the video
21 of Rand Paul questioning Dr. Levine to explain why we
22 need to pass laws to give struggling kids #Help Not
23 Harm?
24 A. I do.
25 Q. And, in fact, you said that you used the Rand Paul

Page 151

1 questioning Dr. Levine video to convince Arkansas
2 legislators to pass the SAFE Act?
3 A. I did send it to Arkansas legislators, yes.
4 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark at Exhibit 34
5 and this is 4295 to 4321.
6 (Deposition Exhibit 34 was marked for
7 identification.)
8 Q. If you'll go ahead and take a look at that real
9 quick or as long as you need, I should say.
10 Were you aware that, in January of 2022, the
11 Family Policy Alliance updated their Help Not Harm
12 messaging?
13 A. I'm sorry. I must of missed it. I'm sure they
14 probably have updated it.
15 Q. Well, did you receive this email, Exhibit 34?
16 A. Yes, I did. It's sent to me from Amanda Banks,
17 January 13, 2022.
18 Q. And have you used any of this information or
19 distributed it to support your efforts to help pass the
20 SAFE Act or the updated Help Not Harm Act in other
21 states?
22 MS. LAND: Object to the form.
23 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
24 A. I most likely, yes, have forwarded this to other
25 legislators that have asked me for information and

Page 152

1 referred them back to these resources.
2 Q. In your experience with the Help Not Harm campaign
3 and with the Family Policy Alliance, is there anything
4 in the messaging that you don't agree with?
5 A. I can't think of anything off the top of my head.
6 I know they spend a lot of time and effort, and I
7 appreciate the fact that they try to be as
8 statesmen-like as possible, and they stick to the very
9 important point of protecting children, and they don't
10 attack, and I think that's a very important thing to do.
11 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
12 35, and this is 4329.
13 (Deposition Exhibit 35 was marked for
14 identification.)
15 Q. In looking at Exhibit 35, is this an invitation
16 for a webinar that you were going to be speaking at?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And on November 19th of 2021, what topic were you
19 covering at the Help Not Harm Policy Webinar?
20 A. The SAFE Act. It says right here the SAFE Act.
21 Q. And did you give practical advice about navigating
22 political challenges in getting the Help Not Harm
23 legislation over the finish line to attendees of that
24 webinar?
25 A. Yes.

Page 153

1 Q. Well, what did you share with them as practical
2 advice about getting Help Not Harm legislation over the
3 finish line?
4 A. Collect your sponsors, be clear, stick to your
5 points. Same -- same points that I always say. Sorry.
6 Q. Do you agree with Family Policy Alliance that the
7 hope and aim of the Help Not Harm campaign is that
8 several states will join Arkansas in passing?
9 A. I hope more than several.
10 MS. WALAS: We'll go ahead and go off the
11 record and take a break.
12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This will end
13 Media Part 3, and we're off the record at
14 2:41 p.m.. Please remove your microphone
15 before you get up.
16 (A recess was had.)
17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the
18 record at 2:52 p.m.. This will begin Media
19 Part 4. Please proceed.
20 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
21 Q. What other organizations, besides those that we
22 have spoken about, supported your efforts to pass the
23 SAFE Act?
24 A. There were quite a few, and I, at one point, had a
25 list. The Changed Movement, Tre Voices came in

Page 154

1 afterwards.
2 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. What
3 voices?
4 THE WITNESS: Tre, T-R-E, capital
5 V-O-I-C-E-S.
6 A. Family Research Council, Family Policy, Arkansas
7 Cox Council. And I'm sure there are others, I just
8 can't think of them off the top of my head.
9 Q. I heard you say Changed Movement is one of them?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And is the -- what is the Changed Movement?
12 A. Those are people that are -- have left the
13 transgender lifestyle or gay and lesbian lifestyle and
14 then Tre Voices are people that are gay lesbian
15 transgender that support protecting children.
16 Q. And is the Changed Movement basically a community
17 of friends who once identified as LGBTQ Plus but today
18 they celebrate the love of Jesus and his freedom in
19 their lives?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. And you support the Changed Movement?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And in fact you keep -- kept the Changed Movement
24 apprised of the status of the SAFE Act?
25 A. Yes.

Page 155

1 Q. Is one of the goals of the Changed Movement to
2 change the current social narrative about LGBTQ
3 individuals?
4 A. Their goal is to actually get along with folks.
5 And I've not gotten deep into the weeds with them, but I
6 like their goals and I like their civility and kindness.
7 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
8 36, 2436 through 2440.
9 (Deposition Exhibit 36 was marked for
10 identification.)
11 A. Uh-huh.
12 Q. Have you had a chance to look through Exhibit 36?
13 A. I'm working on it.
14 Q. And I'll go ahead and direct your attention to
15 page 2436, which is the first page of Exhibit 36.
16 A. Yes, that's from Jason -- I think that's Jason
17 Maxwell, June the 9th, to me. Thank you for meeting
18 with the Changed Movement.
19 Q. And so who's Jason Maxwell?
20 A. He is a member of the Changed Movement that I met
21 in Washington, D.C.
22 Q. Okay. And then the last sentence of Jason's email
23 to you, will you go ahead and read that into the record
24 beginning with thank you?
25 A. "Thank you for all you're doing and helping me

Page 156

1 connect to all the necessary people, organizations,
2 media outlets that we can come along beside as allies to
3 change the current social narrative."
4 Q. And so is it your understanding that one of the
5 goals of the Changed Movement is to change the current
6 social narrative about LGBTQ individuals?
7 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may
8 answer.
9 A. I think their goal is to definitely change the
10 social narrative, and I also think their goal is to have
11 a positive social narrative where people actually get
12 along even if they disagree and if somebody wants to
13 leave the LGBTQ movement, they can do so, or if they
14 want to stay and just get along, they can.
15 Q. What is the LGBT Movement?
16 A. I think that definition is probably global and
17 different for a lot of different folks.
18 Q. What did you mean when you used the term?
19 A. Well, gay and lesbian, bisexual, trans
20 questioning. I look at it as more political and not as
21 individual personal, more liberal.
22 Q. Do you agree with the Changed Movement that gay
23 and lesbian people can, through finding Jesus, come to
24 live heterosexual lives?
25 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may

Page 157

1 answer.
2 A. I believe that's their choice if they choose to
3 and that's something that the Changed Movement talks
4 about. That is certainly that individual's prerogative
5 and I would support that. But I also have gay friends
6 that are perfectly happy in their lifestyle and we get
7 along.
8 Q. Do you believe that being gay or lesbian is a
9 choice?
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. And I will
11 note for purposes of our record today that
12 while I'm not to instruct the witness not to
13 answer this question, I do feel questions like
14 being gay or lesbian being choice has very
15 little to do due to its relevance in a case
16 involving transgender legislation. With that
17 said, Representative Lundstrum, you may answer
18 the question if you understand it.
19 A. I do believe it's a choice, and I also believe
20 good manners and decorum are a choice as well, and we
21 seem to have lost that and that's a tragedy.
22 Q. Do you agree with the Changed Movement's position
23 that male and female are fundamental and essential
24 distinctions created by God?
25 A. Yes.

Page 158

Q. Do you agree with the Changed Movement that transgender people can, through finding Jesus, come to live a life consistent with their assigned birth sex?
A. Yes.
Q. In your view is gender transition always wrong?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
MS. LAND: Object to form.
MR. TALLEY: You may answer.
A. I do.
Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark Exhibit 37, 4966 through 4971.
(Deposition Exhibit 37 was marked for identification.)
Q. Is Exhibit 37 an example of some of the information Jason Maxwell has provided you about the Changed Movement?
A. Yes.
Q. How -- or strike that.
What from Jason's story has affected you?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may answer.
A. I think the most challenging thing in this culture today is that we don't allow people to change and that we're often cruel and bully people when they decide to change. We don't allow them to leave or change. And I

Page 159

think it takes real courage, and I think it's a tragedy that we bully people on both sides of an argument.
Q. In addition to being part of the Changed Movement, is Jason Maxwell also the founder of Flames to Fire Ministries in Centerton, Arkansas?
A. I am not real familiar with that. I think so. It says here at the bottom, "Flames to Fire Ministry." I know him as a realtor and a very nice gentleman and husband and father.
Q. If you'll take a look AT Exhibit 36, which was the exhibit we were just looking at a moment ago, and at page 2437?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And is this picture attachment that Jason Maxwell had sent you along with the email --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- we were discussing in Exhibit 36?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you attend any of the events that Flames to Fire Ministries is discussing here on 2437?
A. No.
Q. Has Jason Maxwell talked to you about Jesus setting him free from LGBT?
A. He told me his testimony.
Q. And has that -- did that testimony influence you

Page 160

in any way in deciding to propose the SAFE Act?
MR. TALLEY: I'm going to interpose an objection because the question as asked calls for testimony on Representative Lundstrum's legislative activities. It's out of bounds pursuant to the Court Order. So I'll instruct the witness not to answer that question as posed.
Q. Did you know Jason Maxwell before you proposed the SAFE Act?
A. No.
Q. So his story had no influence on your decision to --
MR. TALLEY: Before you -- go ahead and finish. I'm sorry to cut you off.
Q. So his story had no influence on your decision-making prior to deciding to put forth the SAFE Act?
MR. TALLEY: I will interpose the same objection with the same instruction for the witness not to answer that question as posed.
Q. Have you spoken with the Changed Movement about the other areas of concern that they have?
MS. LAND: Object to form.
A. Some.

Page 161

MR. TALLEY: Just so our record is clear, Breean, are you referring to Exhibit 36 again?
Q. And so you're looking at Exhibit 36 and it references some areas of concern that the Changed Movement has?
A. Specifically we've discussed education and some of the more radical books in some of the public schools in northwest Arkansas.
Q. Did you seek to control the messaging related to the SAFE Act?
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you do that?
A. I wanted things to be very clear, very civil and stick to the bill, and I think that's important for clarity.
Q. Did you provide your colleagues with the SAFE Act's talking points for interviews that were prepared between you, Family Research Council and Family Council?
A. Yes, and I think that's also incumbent upon the legislative, they're cosponsor of the bill, to educate about the bill and that's not uncommon in all legislators to educate about a bill. You're the one most likely to try to do the most research. And so that's just part of the common courtesy when you run a bill.

Page 162

1 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
2 38, 5325 to 5326.
3 (Deposition Exhibit 38 was marked for
4 identification.)
5 A. That's from me to Quena Gonzalez, April the 17th,
6 2021.
7 Q. In looking at the 9:07 a.m. email at the bottom of
8 5325, is that an email that you sent Quena?
9 A. Actually, I think I sent him -- that's April the
10 17th.
11 Q. April 17 at 9:07 a.m. --
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. -- at the bottom of 5325, is that --
14 A. It's a very, very rough draft.
15 Q. Hold on one second, please. If you can listen to
16 my question. Is this an email that you sent to Quena?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And this email is your very, very rough draft to
19 members on the SAFE Act points to forward to the media?
20 A. Yes, I believe I was asking for help to clean this
21 up before I sent it out.
22 Q. In looking at the April 17th, 9:07 a.m. email at
23 the bottom, you state that you're biggest concern is
24 that someone might misspeak on the bill unintentionally
25 or go on the hunt for big media headlines and accidently

Page 163

1 hurt the other states chances of passing the bill. What
2 do you mean by that?
3 A. Oftentimes people can get excited or misspeak or
4 say something that comes across as cruel or
5 unintentional and it hurts bills in other states, and I
6 don't want the SAFE Act to be twisted in any way. I
7 want it to reflect that it protects children. There are
8 other media outlets and sometimes have said things that
9 are completely wrong in an effort to scuttle the bill or
10 hurt the bill. And I wanted to speak in one voice
11 clearly this protects children. It's an informed
12 consent bill until the child is old enough to
13 participate. I wanted the -- all of us to speak about
14 the bill and not get off point, and I think that's a
15 very important thing to do.
16 Q. Looking at Quena's 10:32 a.m. response to you, do
17 you agree with him that you're the most knowledgeable
18 and able spokesman for the SAFE Act?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may
20 answer.
21 A. I've marinated in the information. I'm not an
22 expert, not a doctor, not a psychiatrist, but as far as
23 out of the 135, 134 members, my Senate cosponsor I'd say
24 probably has read as much. All the legislators don't
25 have time to keep -- they've got their own bills and

Page 164

1 their own responsibilities. So there's no way they
2 would have the time to read the type of notebooks full
3 of information that I've read, and I can't remember all
4 of it. You've done your homework and there's no way
5 you're an expert that you can remember all of it. So
6 I'm not holding myself up as an expert. But on the
7 basic knowledge of my bill, I've got the basic ABCs
8 fairly down, and to have someone go to a microphone and
9 just blurt out something unintentional is not -- is not
10 useful.
11 Q. Do you believe the SAFE Act was a strategic
12 opportunity for a political career?
13 A. No.
14 Q. When Quena mentions, "I'm glad you're reserving
15 your voice for strategic opportunities," do you know
16 what he's talking about?
17 A. No.
18 Q. I'll hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit 39, 1865
19 to 1868.
20 (Deposition Exhibit 39 was marked for
21 identification.)
22 Q. Looking at Exhibit 39, is this an April 7, 2021
23 email you sent to Representative Justin Boyd?
24 A. Yes, it's from me to Justin Boyd and it's talking
25 points on the SAFE Act.

Page 165

1 Q. And did he -- did Representative Boyd ask you to
2 send him these talking points?
3 A. I'm sure he did, probably he had a media interview
4 or something coming up.
5 Q. If he asked you to send them to him, why would you
6 say to him, "Just in case you need them?"
7 A. He probably told me he had something coming up and
8 I sent them just in case he needed them.
9 Q. Okay. And are these the same talking points for
10 media, interviews and soundbites that were prepared with
11 Family Research Council and Family Council?
12 A. Yes, and just about every legislator got them.
13 But we get hundreds of emails and they get lost in the
14 shuffle.
15 Q. Did you also provide Representative Carlton Wing
16 with media talking points and sound bites about HB 1570?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Did you provide him with a copy of the Women's
19 Liberation Front's letter to Governor Hutchinson?
20 A. Yes, I think I sent that to everyone. It was an
21 excellent letter.
22 Q. Why was it important for your colleagues to
23 understand the Women's Liberation Front's position?
24 A. Well, first of all, it was a very well done
25 letter. It's from somebody that's politically opposite,

Page 166

1 and I think hearing somebody from an opposing camp
2 that -- well, it's not -- this is not a political bill.
3 It's a bill that protects children and it was such a
4 good letter. I believe I even posted it on my Facebook.
5 Don't hold me to that. But it was -- they just did a
6 good job.
7 Q. You mentioned that this wasn't a political bill.
8 How did the vote split along party lines?
9 A. In the house, I believe it was 70 Republicans, and
10 in the Senate we had one Democrat that voted for it. So
11 it's safe to say it split along party lines.
12 Q. Did you run any comments that you received
13 regarding House Bill 1570 and the passage thereof by
14 Family Research Council and/or Family Council?
15 A. Did I run any comments by them?
16 Q. Did you run any comments that you received from
17 constituents regarding House Bill 1570 and the passage
18 thereof by Family Research Council and/or Family
19 Council?
20 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
21 answer if you understand it.
22 A. I'm sure I ran -- if there was a constituent, I
23 may have. I get a lot of constituent mail. If there
24 was somebody that was truly troubled or was having a
25 struggle responding, I might have. Most of them, if I

Page 167

1 had a phone number, I picked up the phone and called.
2 Q. Did Family Research Council help you draft this
3 statement responding to the Court's decision to grant
4 the preliminary injunction?
5 A. Actually, I wrote the rough draft and I sent it
6 and I can't remember if I sent it -- I think I sent it
7 to Quena and to Jerry Cox, but I can't remember.
8 Q. Did they make any changes to your draft?
9 A. I'm sure they did. My grammar in speed would --
10 I'm sure they did.
11 Q. Was there a reason that you chose not to do the
12 "60 Minutes" interview?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. What was that reason?
15 A. I did not feel comfortable getting in the ring
16 with "60 Minutes." I wasn't sure it would be a fair
17 interview. I'm an Arkansas State Legislator, part-time
18 legislator and not a PR person. And I did not trust "60
19 Minutes" to give a fair, both sides of the argument
20 interview at all.
21 Q. Did Jerry Cox advise you not to do the interview?
22 A. Actually, I asked Family Research Council for
23 advice on a number of interviews, because they have more
24 experience. I'm not a PR firm nor do I have a lot of
25 experience with out-of-state media. In fact, I have

Page 168

1 zero experience with out-of-state media. So I seek wise
2 counsel.
3 Q. Did you talk to Jerry Cox about what you should
4 tell your colleagues if they're contacted by "60
5 Minutes?"
6 A. I'm sure I talked to Jerry Cox, and I'm sure I
7 talked to Quena Gonzalez about "60 Minutes" because they
8 were calling every single legislator as well as emailing
9 and calling cell phones, they were persistent.
10 Q. Did you agree with Quena that "60 Minutes" was a
11 trap?
12 A. Yes, I did.
13 Q. And is that what you were talking about earlier
14 when you were saying that you didn't --
15 A. I would feel very ill-prepared.
16 Q. And both Jerry and Quena did not think that you
17 should do the mainstream media interview, correct?
18 MR. TALLEY: Are you finished with that
19 question? Object to form, you may answer.
20 Sorry.
21 A. I did a lot of media, state media, local media,
22 did Little Rock, northwest Arkansas, still do, but as
23 far as I don't know those other people at all, and I
24 don't feel comfortable in that situation. In that
25 situation, I just don't.

Page 169

1 Q. About how many interviews do you think you've done
2 about the SAFE Act, if you could estimate? And maybe
3 we'll narrow -- how about we narrow it down. Just how
4 many interviews do you think you've done that are
5 podcasts, webcasts, like visual interview?
6 A. I honestly don't know. I tried to Google it last
7 night thinking you would ask me this question. Because
8 I've not watched the interviews, because it's just
9 painful. I'm uncomfortable watching myself on video.
10 And so I've not looked, and I started to do little marks
11 and it's just -- I don't know.
12 Q. And when it comes to the interviews, the videos
13 that you've done, you've not gone back and watched any
14 of them?
15 A. I've watched a few. It's not my favorite pastime.
16 Q. Okay. I just want to talk to you about a few of
17 the interviews that you've done hopefully fairly
18 quickly.
19 MS. WALAS: Before I do that, let's go
20 ahead and take a good 5 to 10 minute, let's
21 take a 10 minute break. I'm going to try to
22 narrow this down a little bit so we can kind
23 of try to rush through in the next little bit
24 of time.
25 MR. TALLEY: Okay.

Page 170

1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record
2 at 3:23 p.m.. Please remove your microphones.
3 (A recess was had.)
4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the
5 record at 3:31 p.m.. Please proceed.
6 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
7 Q. All right. You were speaking about how you had a
8 few interviews that you did with podcasts and webcasts,
9 correct?
10 A. Correct.
11 Q. And was one of those on March 24th of 2021, "The
12 Washington Watch with Tony Perkins?"
13 A. I'll take your word on that.
14 Q. I'll go ahead and hand you exhibit -- what I'll
15 mark as Exhibit 40.
16 (Deposition Exhibit 40 was marked for
17 identification.)
18 Q. And in looking over Exhibit 40, does this refresh
19 your recollection about your May 24th "Washington
20 Watch" appearance?
21 A. March 24th, yes.
22 Q. Thank you. March 24th.
23 And what were you -- why were you asked to appear
24 on the show?
25 A. Because of the SAFE Act.

Page 171

1 Q. Did the show also include a segment on the Senate
2 vote on the nomination of Rachel Levine for the next HHS
3 Assistant Secretary?
4 A. It says right here, Rachel Levine to be the next
5 assistant secretary, and then I was after that.
6 Q. But during the show that you were on, they
7 discussed the ways in which Levine will use HHS to
8 infringe on religious freedom and parental rights?
9 A. Actually, the way they tape the shows, you're in a
10 quiet room segment area and they have your mike shut off
11 and whoever they're interviewing at that time or if Tony
12 Perkins is discussing something and you're waiting to be
13 brought on to talk about your segment. So you can hear
14 it, but you're not part of that discussion or brought
15 into that discussion. They've just done your sound
16 checks and you're kind of in a holding tank pattern.
17 Q. So for the topics that were covered on March 24th,
18 it was you speaking on the SAFE Act?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. And then somebody speaking on Dr. Levine and HHS
21 and the parental rights, correct?
22 A. Correct.
23 Q. And then did somebody also speak on South Dakota
24 Governor Kristi Noem using her veto power to gut the
25 Girls Sports Protection bill?

Page 172

1 A. Yes, once you're off of your part, though, they --
2 they cut your mike and you can listen to the rest of the
3 program. Most people either get off and just listen but
4 they don't participate in the discussions. It's too
5 chaotic.
6 Q. But those were all the topics covered on the show
7 that you were participating in?
8 A. Yes, you're correct.
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
10 Q. Even if you didn't speak on those topics?
11 A. Yes, but I wasn't part of that. I don't pick the
12 topics or the forums.
13 Q. Do you remember appearing on "Washington Watch"
14 again April 1st?
15 A. I'm sure I did. It's a really active show. I
16 don't know what the topic was, but I can guess.
17 Q. Based on the date?
18 A. No, based on why we're here.
19 Q. Okay. Is it safe to assume that if you went on
20 "Washington Watch" you were talking about the SAFE Act?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And you appeared again on April 6 with Tony
23 Perkins on "Washington Watch" to talk about the next
24 steps after the SAFE Act veto by Governor Hutchinson, do
25 you recall that?

Page 173

1 A. Was that the day before or after the veto?
2 Q. The title of the "Washington Watch" show is
3 "Arkansas Rep. Robin Lundstrum talks about next steps
4 after the SAFE Act veto by Governor Hutchinson." So
5 it's --
6 A. So it's right before the -- it's right after the
7 veto but before the veto override.
8 Q. Okay. And so, when you went on to speak, what was
9 your purpose for appearing on the show?
10 A. Without seeing the agenda, I would guess what do
11 we do next, do we override the veto and how does that
12 work. I'd need to see the agenda to be sure. But that
13 was the topic of discussion.
14 Q. And did you receive agendas for the "Washington
15 Watch" shows?
16 A. It would have looked similar to this with a link.
17 Most likely it just had a link and what time for a sound
18 check.
19 Q. And have you also appeared on "Washington Watch"
20 to speak in support of Missouri's SAFE Act?
21 A. I believe I've done that one time. I'm not sure.
22 I know I've done it at least once. It's either
23 "Washington Watch" or -- I'm not sure, but I think so,
24 yes.
25 Q. On April 1st, did you appear on "Pray Vote

Page 174

1 Stand," the FRC show again?
2 A. I'm sure I did if you have a copy of it.
3 Q. And you've also appeared on line stream -- live
4 stream hosting by Family Policy Alliance regarding
5 ending experimentation on children, do you recall that?
6 A. I've done a number of them. I'm -- that time is
7 all compressed. I'm sure I probably did if you've got a
8 copy of it. I think I tried to turn everything in so
9 that --
10 Q. Most of the videos that you were interviewed in,
11 they're available online, correct?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And one of those is an Intercessors for America
14 website, which do you recall speaking with them?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. What is the Intercessors for America?
17 A. That's a group of people that pray for legislators
18 as they move different bills through.
19 Q. And why were you asked to go on the Intercessors
20 for America?
21 A. They were concerned about the SAFE Act and were
22 also praying for me and the safety of the legislators in
23 Arkansas.
24 Q. Were you honored to be asked to --
25 A. Very honored.

Page 175

1 Q. -- speak on Intercessors for America?
2 A. Yes, very honored.
3 Q. Why would it be an honor to speak on their webcast
4 but not speak on "60 Minutes?"
5 MS. LAND: Object to form.
6 MR. TALLEY: You may answer.
7 A. This was not combative. It was more of a
8 apolitical supportive. I was honored to be prayed for.
9 "60 Minutes," I wasn't sure what I was getting. At that
10 time there had been an interview with Governor DeSantis
11 and he had been -- he had videoed his whole interview.
12 And when "60 Minutes" did the interview, they had cut
13 and pasted part of the interview. He was able to show
14 where they had actually manipulated the interview to say
15 not what he had said. That's very disconcerting.
16 That's not a reporter reporting. It's manipulation.
17 And that, to me, is not a useful exercise and I did not
18 feel comfortable.
19 Q. Do you remember appearing on the special entitled
20 "The Born Identity" with Mike Slater?
21 A. I think he's out of California. I'm not sure.
22 Vaguely.
23 Q. I'll hand you --
24 A. I believe that was a Zoom.
25 Q. -- what I'll mark as Exhibit 41, which is 2152 to

Page 176

1 2153.
2 (Deposition Exhibit 41 was marked for
3 identification.)
4 A. From Emily Brash, Saturday, April 17th, Mike's
5 show the "True Story."
6 Q. All right. And so Mike hosts the "True Story"
7 generally, and on April 11th at 4:03, they contacted
8 you about a special they were putting together, do you
9 recall that?
10 A. Vaguely. It's all in the email. It's a little
11 blurry. It's been while.
12 Q. And so they asked you to appear because they're
13 putting together a special on what seems to be a trend
14 of adults encouraging children to question their
15 biology, declare themselves in a different gender and
16 seek medical transition, is that accurate?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may
18 answer.
19 A. I would say that's accurate.
20 Q. And knowing that this was what they were putting a
21 special together for, you agreed to be included in the
22 special, correct?
23 A. And talk about the SAFE Act.
24 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
25 42.

Page 177

1 (Deposition Exhibit 42 was marked for
2 identification.)
3 Q. And you'll note that --
4 MR. TALLEY: Breean, it looks like one of
5 the earlier exhibits. I don't see any Bates
6 numbers on this. So for the purpose of our
7 record, can you tell me that this is a screen
8 shot that you took from your computer?
9 MS. WALAS: Yes.
10 MR. TALLEY: Okay.
11 MS. WALAS: Exhibit 42 is a screen shot
12 of the website which is referenced on Exhibit
13 41 at the very top where they provide the link
14 to Mike's show. This just gave it a little
15 bit clearer for us to look at here today.
16 MR. TALLEY: Thank you.
17 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
18 Q. So taking a look at Exhibit 42, what was the Born
19 Identity special about?
20 A. I vaguely remember, but I think based on -- it
21 was -- my portion was just on the legislation about the
22 SAFE Act and his inference and his discussion was on the
23 trend of adults encouraging children, if they were
24 questioning, to try to switch their gender.
25 Q. Okay.

Page 178

1 A. I think that's pretty self-explanatory.
2 Q. Looking at Exhibit 42, do you agree with Mike
3 Slater that there's an all-out assault on human biology
4 and human nature, a true gender war?
5 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
6 answer.
7 A. I do think there is a strong push, especially
8 towards children, and I'm concerned that a child that
9 has gender dysphoria is being pushed. Gender dysphoria
10 doesn't mean you are transgender, it just means you're
11 gender dysphoric. What if that child is gay or lesbian
12 and they're being told that's not good enough. And I
13 don't like that at all. And I think a child needs to
14 have a chance to grow up and then they can decide. They
15 should be told that they are special just the way they
16 are and we should find out why they are gender
17 dysphoric; maybe they've been abused, maybe they're
18 being bullied, maybe there's some health issues. But
19 that child deserves a safe place to find out what's
20 wrong before we give them experimental drugs or we push
21 pause on puberty. But those kids deserve better than
22 what they're getting right now and they deserve safety
23 first.
24 Q. Is it your belief that every minor diagnosed with
25 gender dysphoria has another mental health condition?

Page 179

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
2 answer.
3 A. I don't know what -- I'm not a doctor. I'm not a
4 psychiatrist. But gender dysphoria, just by definition,
5 something is mentally or physically, emotional wrong.
6 Gender dysphoria is a mental condition and it needs to
7 be addressed and needs to be treated. Many of these
8 kids will grow out of it, but there is something to be
9 addressed here and I don't think we should blow it off
10 or dismiss it. I think that's cavalier on our part as
11 adults, and I think it would be wrong to pigeonhole
12 these kids or medicate them with an experimental drug.
13 Q. Do you agree with Mike Slater that men and women
14 are different?
15 A. Definitely.
16 Q. Do you agree with him that the left is
17 methodically and systematically set out to destroy the
18 differences between men and women?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
20 answer.
21 A. I think some on the left have. I don't think
22 everybody on the left has. I think that's a blanket
23 statement, that we should probably steer away from
24 blanket statements.
25 Q. Do you agree with Mike Slater when he said on the

Page 180

1 program that the pinnacle of the broken ideology that
2 men and women are the same is transgenderism?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
4 answer.
5 A. I think that's a -- a blooming out of that. My
6 opinion though is irrelevant.
7 As far as the bill is concerned, my goal is, get
8 these kids to their 18th birthday and let them
9 participate and have informed consent and to protect
10 children.
11 Q. What is transgenderism as you understand the term?
12 A. As I said before, it's someone that would prefer
13 to be in another body; if they're male, they'd prefer to
14 be female, if female, they prefer to have male.
15 Q. Do you agree with Mike when he said that we need
16 to take a stand on the idea of gender?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
18 answer.
19 A. I think there's nothing wrong with being female
20 and I think there's nothing wrong with being male. I
21 think we need to look at the science and stand on that
22 science and confusing children is wrong. We're asking
23 them to make adult decisions at nine, ten, 11 and 12
24 that impact them for the rest of their life. We
25 shouldn't confuse kids. I think, if you're an adult,

Page 181

1 you can make those adult decisions. We're burdening
2 kids with a lot of big issues and kids just need to be
3 kids.
4 Q. What was your goal for this specific appearance on
5 "Born Identity?"
6 A. To talk about the SAFE Act.
7 Q. Why do you feel that it's important to talk about
8 the SAFE Act on a national level?
9 A. I think there's been a lot of misinformation. I
10 think there's been a lot of confusion, there's been a
11 lot of scare tactics. A number of organizations said
12 that we were taking away healthcare. That we were
13 purposely trying to hurt children that were identifying
14 as transgender. And I think that's absolutely cruel and
15 wrong. And I think it's important that we speak up and
16 speak on the bill.
17 Q. There was also a segment on gender politics in
18 schools during the "Born Identity" special, do you
19 remember that?
20 A. We can go there, but I -- it's been a long, long
21 time and we've all slept since then.
22 Q. Okay. Do you remember if you said anything on
23 that topic?
24 A. I probably did, but I don't recall.
25 Q. Do you recall there being a segment on God's plan

Page 182

1 for gender in society?
2 A. I'm sorry. I'm -- I'm sure there probably was.
3 You probably looked at it, I haven't.
4 Q. Do you remember if you said anything on that
5 topic?
6 A. No.
7 Q. Is that something that you would normally speak on
8 when you would go on these media shows?
9 A. If someone asked me a question on that show, but
10 usually they're pretty tight and pretty short. I'm
11 sorry.
12 Q. Who is Dick Morris?
13 A. He was a political -- he was active in the Clinton
14 administration, I believe, and he's now a radio talk
15 show host, political pundit.
16 Q. Did you do an interview for his show?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Do you remember what day his show aired?
19 A. Oh, no.
20 Q. I'm going to go ahead mark as Exhibit 43, 5678
21 through 5700.
22 (Deposition Exhibit 43 was marked for
23 identification.)
24 Q. Looking at the first page of Exhibit 43, is this
25 an email that you received from Dick Morris ahead of

Page 183

1 your show?
2 A. Yes, this is from Dick Morris. It was the
3 monologue for his show, and this is to me, May the 5th
4 of 2021.
5 Q. Did you review his monologue before appearing on
6 the show?
7 A. Out of shear curiosity.
8 Q. And did you disagree with anything he said about
9 gender affirming medical care in there?
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
11 answer.
12 A. I read his monologue because it was Dick Morris
13 and because I was curious. I found it to be well
14 written. It -- I don't remember what he said about --
15 Q. I'll go ahead and direct your attention to page
16 5690.
17 A. Okay.
18 Q. And there's a paragraph there beginning with
19 social pressure, do you see that?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Do you agree with Dick Morris that kids are saying
22 they are transgender because of social pressure and peer
23 group dynamics?
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
25 answer.

Page 184

1 A. Okay. I'm not a doctor or a psychiatrist, but I
2 think anybody looking at some of the issues right now,
3 especially with young girls, much like anorexia. Now,
4 I'm older than a lot of you guys in the room. But a
5 social contagion would run through junior high and
6 people would think that that was cool and start down
7 that process. We're still seeing this type of social
8 contagion when it comes to transgender and it might look
9 cool. I think that's a concern when we see these huge
10 spikes in numbers of something we didn't even see in
11 2010 and then '12 and then '15 and now we're seeing this
12 huge spike. I think that's a concern, and I think it
13 bears further research. I think he makes a legitimate
14 point that there's something here that we need to look
15 at. I don't know, except I think he's making a
16 legitimate point that bears further scrutiny.
17 Q. What did you talk about on the show?
18 A. The SAFE Act.
19 Q. Did you provide any information to viewers as to
20 how you passed the SAFE Act?
21 A. I can't remember specifically what we talked
22 about. He was pretty engaging and interesting on his
23 own. So I think we talked about pretty much the same;
24 my concerns about young children, my concerns about the
25 long-term consequences for kids, my concern about

Page 185

1 informed consent for children, my concerns of what
2 happens with cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular
3 disease, Type II diabetes, osteoporosis. What happens
4 to these kids after everything happens to them. What
5 about the suicide issue in the transgender population,
6 because nobody seems to want to talk about that. And so
7 I think pretty much the same Robin Lundstrum that has
8 been in every other program.
9 Q. And was that possible in part because of the
10 talking points that you had prepared with Family Council
11 and Family Research Council for media interviews?
12 A. I think it's probably possible because we started
13 the bill so early and I've continued to research and
14 continue to read and I continue to this day. Read
15 another article last night.
16 Q. And do you continue to research and read about
17 issues related to gender affirming care for transgender
18 minors because you're continuing to try to pass that
19 legislation in other states?
20 A. I do get questions from other states. I read a
21 lot just for my own edification, just out of -- just
22 keeping up with the research. There's so much happening
23 now in human sexuality on a lot of different areas. So
24 I just like to keep up. I feel like I'm swimming at the
25 deep end of the pool some days and the only way to swim

Page 186

1 better is to read more.
2 Q. Do you recall the Parental Rights Foundation
3 reaching out for an interview?
4 A. I'm sorry, I don't. I'm sure they probably -- or
5 I'm not familiar with them.
6 Q. I'll go ahead and hand you what we'll mark as
7 Exhibit 44.
8 (Deposition Exhibit 44 was marked for
9 identification.)
10 Q. And this is a screen grab of a EPPiC broadcast
11 entitled, "What's Next for the SAFE Act, with Robin
12 Lundstrum," that was identified at page 2,791 of the
13 document production.
14 MR. TALLEY: So if I understand you
15 correctly, Breean, there's a reference in the
16 documents produced by the non-party
17 legislators to a program entitled, "What's
18 Next for the SAFE Act, with Robin Lundstrum,"
19 and your team in turn went and found that
20 program and took the screen shot that you're
21 now marking as Exhibit 44?
22 MS. WALAS: It references the Parental
23 Rights Foundation asking her to do a podcast.
24 The search revealed the title that matched the
25 dates and all the other things. But, yes,

Page 187

1 that's the correlation between the two.
2 MR. TALLEY: Got it. Thank you.
3 MS. WALAS: Great.
4 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
5 Q. All right. Taking at look at Exhibit 44, does
6 this refresh your recollection about the Parental Rights
7 Foundation podcast?
8 A. Not really. Vague, vaguely. Very little. But it
9 looks like it's -- it mentions TREVoices, Family Policy
10 Alliance, Family Council and Parental Rights Foundation.
11 Q. Well, what I'd like to ask you about is what you
12 spoke about as to what's next for the SAFE Act, and
13 looking at this, it says here about how this bill was
14 designed with input from policy experts, doctors,
15 psychiatrists and more. Can you please tell us how you
16 explained to the EPPiC broadcast audience how the SAFE
17 Act was designed with that input?
18 A. I think I thanked Family Policy and Family
19 Research Council that, when I reached out and asked for
20 assistance, they responded.
21 Q. And do you know if your interview on What's Next
22 for the SAFE Act was part of a series that the EPPiC
23 broadcast was doing on gender ideology, parental rights
24 and the SAFE Act?
25 A. No.

Page 188

1 Q. Would you dispute if it's listed on their website
2 in that order? Would you like to take a look at it
3 or --
4 A. I wouldn't dispute that it would probably be
5 listed on their website. It would make logical sense.
6 Q. Is that the type of issues that they -- the
7 Parental Rights Foundation speaks out about?
8 A. I am not very familiar with them. I'm just
9 cursory.
10 Q. Was this kind of one of those interviews that you
11 took as an opportunity to speak about the SAFE Act?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. Okay. What are you trying to achieve by doing
14 these interviews about the SAFE Act?
15 A. More informational and that's pretty much it.
16 There have been a few legislators that have reached out,
17 but it's more informational. I hope that people see
18 that there are options. That children are not something
19 to be experimented on and that parents have options and
20 there's great counseling out there. There's hope.
21 Q. Why do you promote the SAFE Act or now the Help
22 Not Harm litigation nationally?
23 MR. TALLEY: Do you mean legislation
24 rather than litigation?
25 MS. WALAS: I thought I said -- did I say

Page 189

1 litigation? Okay. And I'm reading it. So
2 I'm going to just read it again.
3 MR. TALLEY: I just want to make sure our
4 record is clear.
5 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
6 Q. Yeah. Why do you --
7 MS. WALAS: Actually, will you read back
8 my question that I asked?
9 (The court reporter read back the
10 requested question.)
11 MS. LAND: Object to form.
12 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
13 Q. Why do you promote the SAFE Act now and the Help
14 Not Harm legislation now nationally?
15 MS. LAND: Object to form.
16 Q. All right. Let me try that one again. Why do you
17 promote the SAFE Act, which is now referred to as the
18 Help Not Harm legislation, nationally?
19 A. In an effort to help other legislators, it's
20 something that there's been some inquiries on.
21 MS. WALAS: Let's go off the record for a
22 moment?
23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This will end
24 Media Part 4. We're off the record at 4:05
25 p.m.. Please remember mikes when you get up.

Page 190

(A recess was had.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the record at 4:14 p.m.. This will begin Media Part 5. Please proceed.
BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
Q. All right. Do you recall producing some text messages between you and Attorney General Rutledge?
A. I have texted her a number of times.
Q. I will hand you what I marked as Exhibit 45, Bates Number 6040.
(Deposition Exhibit 45 was marked for identification.)
Q. And is the text on June 5th, at 11:43 a.m., is that representative of a text message from you?
A. No, not particularly.
Q. Were the text messages that are on the -- that are on the right side that are dark are attributable to you based on the text messages that you have produced?
A. This one's mine, this one's mine. I think this is Attorney General Rutledge.
Q. Okay. So let's take a look at this text of June 5th, 11:43 a.m., will you go ahead and read that into the record?
A. "Do you think gender matters? Go buy a rooster for eggs and buy a bull for milk. You will soon learn

Page 191

that God knew what he was doing."
Q. Do you believe that gender is dictated by God?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may answer.
A. Okay. First of all, God create man and women, yes, and I also believe gender is dictated by science.
Q. I'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 46, Bates 2120 to 2121.
(Deposition Exhibit 46 was marked for identification.)
Q. Is Exhibit 46, looking at Exhibit 46, have you had a chance to look this over?
A. This is --
Q. Well, first, have you had a chance to look this over while we've been sitting here?
A. I'm familiar with the American Society for Dermatologic Surgery Association.
Q. And you received an email from them that you forwarded to an Alex Pfeiffer; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Alex Pfeiffer?
A. He's with Fox News.
Q. And you wrote a message to Alec -- Alex where you mentioned, quote, "Where will they be when the trend stops." Do you see where that is?

Page 192

A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe that the existence of transgender youth is a trend?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can answer.
A. Okay. First of all, I think you need to read the whole thing. "These groups keep reaching out to legislators with these type of letters, where will they be when the trend stops and these kids are broken and hurting?" I'd like to know where would the Dermatologic Surgery Association be when these children are hurting and when their bodies are torn apart and cut up and they can't pay their medical bills and their bodies are ripped apart, where will these doctors be. I think that's a legitimate question.
MS. WALAS: I'll move to strike the answer as non-responsive.
BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
Q. The question was, is the existence of transgender youth, you believe that that is a trend?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can answer. And I disagree that Representative Lundstrum's answer was non-responsive. Go ahead.
A. Okay. I think it's a question that's worth

Page 193

asking. I think that transgender youth deserve to know and be a part of their healthcare decision-making when they're 18 and they understand all the decisions that they're making and then they can participate and make good decisions for themselves. I worry what's going to happen to them.
Q. What do you mean when you use the word "trend?"
A. When we use experimental drugs on children, puberty blockers that block puberty and prevent those children from growing up healthy and safe, this is a trend. This is not something that's been going on for 20 or 30 years. This is something that's happening in realtime in front of us. 2010, 2015, we're seeing numbers climbing out of nowhere. That denotes a trend.
Q. Have you considered that there has been a rising acceptance of the LGBT community, particularly transgender people, in the past ten years?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can answer.
A. I think there is an accepting, yes. But I think there is a definite concern of what's happening to children and that is my focus, and I think that should be the focus.
Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit 47. This is 6303 to 6304.

Page 194

1 (Deposition Exhibit 47 was marked for
2 identification.)
3 Q. Is this a copy of a couple of text messages that
4 you produced between you and Jerry Cox?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. Did you work with Jerry Cox to get Franklin Graham
7 to record a message to the Arkansas Legislature praying
8 for them and saying how proud he is of them?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Who is Franklin Graham?
11 A. Franklin Graham is a pastor, and I think you might
12 know Billy Graham, who was a pastor of national
13 recognition. He is the son of Billy Graham and still
14 does do some speaking. And Billy Graham was kind of
15 seen as the nation's pastor, and Franklin Graham has
16 carried that on with the Samaritan's Purse Ministry.
17 Q. Why did you ask Franklin Graham to pray for the
18 Arkansas Legislature?
19 A. I think the power of prayer is very important to
20 pray over people, and I also think it keeps the
21 discourse civil.
22 Q. If you look at your text message to Jerry on page
23 6303 of Exhibit 47, what was your answer to the question
24 as to why you were asking for the prayer?
25 A. You lost me.

Page 195

1 Q. If you look -- this is your text, the dark --
2 A. Right.
3 Q. -- circle or the dark square is your text message,
4 correct?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And I asked you a moment ago why you asked
7 Franklin Graham to pray for the Arkansas legislature.
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. And my question is, is what was your answer to
10 Jerry Cox as to why?
11 A. You're referring to this bottom --
12 Q. I'm referring to right here.
13 A. Oh, okay. I said, "Good. I would love to get him
14 to record a message just a short minute praying for them
15 saying how proud. Why? So if the veto happens they are
16 prayed up and fired up."
17 And then this bottom part, "We need to love
18 our --" and I think I said, We need to love up on our
19 members, and I think I said something about our enemies,
20 but I'm not sure. I don't know what this said right
21 here.
22 Q. The rest of your text is on 6304.
23 A. Okay. Love -- "We need to love up on our base and
24 be prepared. Monday is coming." I think that's
25 referring to the veto. I'm not sure.

Page 196

1 Q. What is your opinion of physicians who oppose
2 House Bill 1570?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
4 answer.
5 A. They're entitled to their opinion.
6 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
7 48, 2,118 to 2,119.
8 (Deposition Exhibit 48 was marked for
9 identification.)
10 Q. And does this email contain that email from the
11 American Society of Dermatological Surgery Association
12 in it?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. And what did you do with the email this go-around?
15 A. Well, let's see. At top is from me to Quena
16 Gonzalez, and I just said, "Really, question mark."
17 Q. When you forwarded to him, what do you mean by
18 really?
19 A. I think I'm expressing my angst in response to
20 that email.
21 Q. Are you a fan of Tucker Carlson?
22 A. I am.
23 Q. And did you assist his staff in preparing for
24 Tucker's interview with Governor Hutchinson after the
25 veto?

Page 197

1 A. I don't know if you would call it assist. They
2 did email me prior to Governor Hutchinson's interview.
3 Q. Did you give them any information to prepare for
4 that interview?
5 A. I don't think so. I have given them information
6 after the interview. I don't -- I don't remember if I
7 gave them anything before.
8 Q. Do you have a Facebook page?
9 A. Yes, I do.
10 Q. Do you personally maintain that Facebook page?
11 A. Yes. I have a campaign manager who also has
12 access to the campaign page, but I do 90 percent of it
13 myself.
14 Q. When something is posted, say by your campaign
15 manager, does it still reflect your thoughts on a
16 subject?
17 A. Yes, I'm responsible for mine.
18 Q. And you produced some excerpts from your Facebook
19 page in response to the documents subpoenaed in this
20 case, do you recall that?
21 A. You'd have to be more specific. I'm sorry.
22 Q. Do you recall producing some Facebook posts?
23 A. Oh, for this, yes, I did.
24 MR. TALLEY: And for the purpose of our
25 record, my office produced the documentation

Page 198

1 you're referencing on behalf of Representative
2 Lundstrum and four other non-party
3 legislators.
4 MS. WALAS: Correct.
5 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
6 Q. I'm going to go ahead and mark 5879 as Exhibit 49.
7 (Deposition Exhibit 49 was marked for
8 identification.)
9 Q. Is this a repost of the Rand Paul video that we
10 were discussing earlier?
11 A. Yes, where he's questioning Rachel Levine, and I
12 believe he discusses Care bill.
13 Q. And why did you post this video of Senator Rand
14 Paul questioning Dr. Rachel Levine?
15 A. I thought it was very poynant and -- I thought it
16 was poynant.
17 Q. Did you use this Rand Paul YouTube video to
18 convince your fellow legislators to cosponsor the SAFE
19 Act?
20 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to interpose an
21 objection as I believe that question as asked
22 to the witness asked Representative Lundstrum
23 for testimony on matters of legislative
24 activity which are prohibited by the Court's
25 Order entered prior to this deposition. For

Page 199

1 that reason, I will instruct the witness not
2 to answer the question as asked.
3 Q. Did you tell other legislators from other states
4 that you used this Rand Paul video to recruit sponsors?
5 MR. TALLEY: You may answer that
6 question.
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. And so did you use the video -- well, I'll go
9 ahead and mark as Exhibit 50, page 3769.
10 (Deposition Exhibit 50 was marked for
11 identification.)
12 Q. And does Exhibit 50, what did you tell Bryant
13 Richardson?
14 A. He's -- this is an email from me, August 24th,
15 Bryant Richardson with MS Publications, but he is a
16 Delaware Senator.
17 Q. And so, when you sent him the video, the Rand Paul
18 video, what did you tell them?
19 A. That I texted this to fellow members who was able
20 to recruit cosponsors.
21 Q. Also, on Exhibit 50 there's some jpg's at the
22 bottom that appear to have been pictures that didn't
23 show up in the document that was produced. Do you
24 happen to know what those documents would have been,
25 those pictures would have been that you sent him?

Page 200

1 A. Those are screen shots of the talking points.
2 Q. Okay.
3 A. I have them on my phone.
4 Q. Okay. Did you include any sort of personal
5 messages when you sent this video out?
6 A. No, other than I think I asked people to call me,
7 talk about the bill, would you like to be a cosponsor.
8 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
9 51, 5,882.
10 (Deposition Exhibit 51 was marked for
11 identification.)
12 Q. In looking at Exhibit 51, this is -- you posted on
13 your Facebook page about the Pray Vote Stand interview
14 that we discussed earlier, correct?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And why did you ask your followers to pray for and
17 ask Governor Asa Hutchinson to sign the SAFE Act?
18 A. Well, first of all, I wouldn't call them
19 followers. The -- they're friends and fellow
20 constituents and people that are interested in the
21 legislators -- legislature's actions, and if they want
22 to speak up or if they disagree, they need to let the
23 Governor know and I'm asking for them to support the
24 SAFE Act. A lot of legislators post on their Facebook.
25 It's a good way to get information out.

Page 201

1 Q. Did you exchange text messages with a lot of your
2 fellow legislators?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Did you have any texts with legislators about
5 issues related to transgender people?
6 A. I'm sure we had a wide variety of text messages.
7 Q. And if -- any of the text message that you had
8 with legislators about issues related to transgender
9 people would have been included with the production that
10 you assisted your attorneys in providing us?
11 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to interpose an
12 objection, and I believe that question as
13 asked to the witness potentially calls for
14 matters related to legislative activity,
15 though I can go ahead tell you that if there
16 was legislator-to-legislator communications
17 about matters of legislative activity, those
18 would have been withheld from any production
19 on privilege grounds based on a decision by
20 me.
21 Q. So to clarify the question, either any of the
22 texts with legislators about issues related to
23 transgender people, you would have produced to your
24 attorney who would have assisted in the production and
25 either would have been identified in the privilege log

Page 202

1 or something else, which obviously that's a lawyer
2 thing, but you -- you produced whatever you had to him
3 and let him make the decisions on what was appropriate
4 to turn over, correct?
5 A. I sent everything to my attorney.
6 Q. Okay. I just want to make sure that we have all
7 the texts that could possibly fall within this range of
8 things that we were discussing transgender people with
9 other legislators?
10 A. The bill is about children. It is what it is.
11 Q. Did you have any discussions with other
12 legislatures about gender transition specifically?
13 MR. TALLEY: You used the word
14 "legislatures," and are you asking about
15 out-of-state individuals or other legislators
16 within the Arkansas General Assembly?
17 MS. WALAS: I think that was a little bit
18 of my draw coming in. So if you'll read the
19 question back to me and then I'll say it again
20 for the record.
21 (The court reporter read back the
22 requested question.)
23 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
24 Q. Did you have any discussions with other
25 legislators about gender transition specifically?

Page 203

1 A. Could I get some clarification; in Arkansas or out
2 of Arkansas?
3 Q. Right now I'm asking if you've had any
4 conversations with legislators about gender transition.
5 A. And I'm asking legislators in Arkansas or
6 legislators out of Arkansas?
7 Q. I'm asking a broad legislators question. Have you
8 had discussion with legislators about issues related to
9 gender transition specifically?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And have you had those discussions with other
12 members of the Arkansas General Assembly?
13 A. We've had a variety of discussions, yes.
14 Q. Have you had those discussions outside the context
15 of your legislative deliberations?
16 A. We talk about a variety of different things.
17 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
18 52, 6312 through 6318.
19 (Deposition Exhibit 52 was marked for
20 identification.)
21 A. Okay.
22 Q. And are these copies of text messages between you
23 and Jana Della Rosa that you produced?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And is Jana Della Rosa a former representative

Page 204

1 from northwest Arkansas?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And a number of the messages between the two of
4 you discuss your views about transgender children and
5 the LGBT community, do you agree with that?
6 A. I'd have to look back over each one. It's our
7 conversation.
8 Q. Looking at page 6316 of Exhibit 52, this statement
9 that's in the lighter block of color, that would be a
10 statement from former Rep Della Rosa, correct?
11 A. "Believing children can make coherent and
12 responsible choices about sexual issues in the middle of
13 of a hormone-flooded and confusing puberty expecting --"
14 okay.
15 Q. Is that her statement?
16 A. I believe so, yes.
17 Q. Do you agree with former Rep Della Rosa that,
18 "Believing kids can make coherent and responsible
19 choices about sexual issues in the middle of
20 hormone-flooded puberty -- hormone-flooded and confusing
21 puberty is like expecting drug addicts to make coherent
22 responsible choices about drug dosages and use while
23 high as a kite on drugs?"
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
25 answer.

Page 205

1 A. I think she makes a valid point. It's difficult
2 on adolescents to make a lot of decisions in the middle
3 of puberty. That's why we wait until 18 to do a lot of
4 things and even 21 for alcohol and -- so it's her
5 opinion. She's entitled to it. But I think she has a
6 very valid opinion.
7 Q. Do you agree with it?
8 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
9 answer.
10 A. I agree that kids don't always make the greatest
11 decisions in puberty.
12 Q. If you'll turn to the next page 6317, and again
13 the light colored blocks are from former Rep Della Rosa,
14 correct?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Do you agree with former Rep Della Rosa that,
17 "LGBTQABCXYZ people are always the worst?"
18 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
19 answer.
20 A. I said, "Yep, I did one very cool email, a
21 transgender lady in support. Sadly, she didn't want to
22 share her name and location. I don't blame her."
23 I went on to get a whole lot more like that, too,
24 and that's the sad part.
25 Q. So do you agree with former Rep Della Rosa that,

1 "LGBTQABCXYZ people are always the worst?"
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
3 answer.
4 A. Thank you.
5 At times it can be. I have since learned
6 differently on some issues and have since made some
7 really good friends.
8 Q. Do you agree with former Rep Della Rosa's
9 statement that real deal statement LGBTQABCXYZ people
10 are nastiest?
11 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
12 answer.
13 A. I don't think you can lump everybody in there in
14 any way you can -- anymore than you can lump everybody
15 on the other side of the aisle.
16 Q. Do you agree with former Rep Della Rosa's
17 statement that LGBTQABCXYZ people are always the
18 meanest?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
20 answer.
21 A. I think she's expressing her opinion, which she's
22 entitled to. Sadly, I think sometimes in the heat of
23 battle people say things they don't always agree with or
24 don't -- or regret later.
25 Q. Well, sitting here right now or when -- or

1 actually when you responded to former Rep Della Rosa,
2 did you agree with her?
3 A. At that point I sure felt it. I was getting a lot
4 of hate mail and a lot of threats and it didn't feel
5 like a whole lot of fun. I also, like I pointed out,
6 had the reverse happen and got some very refreshing
7 emails from transgender folks who did agree and it was a
8 good lesson and I appreciated it and I shared that with
9 her as well.
10 Q. I'll go ahead and mark as 53, 1,210 through 1,238.
11 (Deposition Exhibit 53 was marked for
12 identification.)
13 Q. If you can, will you take a moment to look over
14 Exhibit 53?
15 A. This is from Senator Missy Irvin during session,
16 April the 6th, 2021, to me.
17 Q. And what did Missy -- Senator Missy Irvin send
18 you?
19 A. Missy is Catholic and she sent me a -- some
20 information from Vatican City dated 2019. I read the
21 title and didn't have time to read the whole thing.
22 Q. So you have not -- have you ever reviewed this
23 article?
24 A. I think I read the title and maybe the first
25 sentence or so. I didn't have time.

1 Q. And what is the title of the article that Senator
2 Irvin sent over to you?
3 A. "Male and Female, He Created Them."
4 Q. Okay.
5 A. "Towards a path of Dialogue on the Question of
6 Gender Theory in Education."
7 Q. Is it common for your fellow legislators to send
8 you articles about religion and their intersection of
9 policy?
10 MS. LAND: Object to form.
11 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
12 A. We send articles all the time on different
13 subjects. If we know somebody's particularly interested
14 in real estate or taxes and we send stuff back and
15 forth. It's a common practice.
16 MS. WALAS: Can we go off the record?
17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're off the
18 record at 4:48 p.m..
19 (A recess was had.)
20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the
21 record at 4:49 p.m.. Please proceed.
22 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
23 Q. I'll go ahead and mark as Exhibit 54, Bates
24 numbers 5575 through 5597.
25 (Deposition Exhibit 54 was marked for

1 identification.)
2 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
3 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 54?
4 A. Yes, I do.
5 Q. Is this a PowerPoint that you created?
6 A. It is a PowerPoint I created and used PowerPoints
7 from the Bureau of Legislative Research that they
8 produced some portions of it and then I produced the
9 vast majority of it.
10 Q. What was this PowerPoint for?
11 A. When I go to speak, for example, a local Rotary
12 Club or I can't remember which particular, it's
13 something to keep me on track, things keep moving.
14 Q. Did you keep this in a binder with some other
15 things?
16 A. I pretty much walk around with a binder. I'm a
17 geek.
18 Q. I just was trying to figure out, make sure the
19 holes were something that were part of the just the way
20 you kept your stuff together?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Okay. And if you'll go ahead and turn to page
23 5576, which is going to be the second page of this
24 packet which is Exhibit 54?
25 A. Uh-huh.

Page 210

1 Q. And whose handwriting is this on page 5576?
2 A. Mine.
3 Q. Okay. And your notes say, 1. Run the bill. 2.
4 Common Sense. 3. blank. What are these notes to?
5 A. I believe, when I'm referring to running the bill
6 in the -- run the bill, don't dawdle. Just like we've
7 referred to in the past. The bill is commonsense. And
8 I don't remember what number 3. Obviously, it's blank.
9 Q. And turning to page 5581, is this also your
10 handwriting?
11 A. Yes, it is.
12 Q. Do you believe that gender affirming care is a
13 Nazi-like experiment?
14 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
15 answer.
16 A. I believe, when you remove the breasts off a 13
17 year old, to me, I'm not a doctor, I'm not a
18 psychiatrist, but it does feel Nazi-like experiment to
19 hurt a child. I would like to see them reach age 18
20 before any of those things, removing a penis and scrotum
21 off a child to me is drastic, sterilization is drastic.
22 And I do feel like that is a horrible thing to do to a
23 child, and I'd like to see get to be 18 so they could
24 participate in the process.
25 Q. Are there surgeries -- excuse me.

Page 211

1 Are there surgeries that you just described being
2 performed in Arkansas?
3 A. I hope not. I'm not privy to what's going on in
4 hospitals.
5 Q. If you'll turn to page 5590 of this packet of
6 Exhibit 54? Do you see this carton at the top of page
7 5590?
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 MR. TALLEY: Is that a yes?
10 A. Yes. I'm sorry.
11 MR. TALLEY: You're doing good. I'm just
12 making sure our record is clean.
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. What does this carton mean?
15 A. Actually, that is not for public consumption. But
16 it just basically says, looking down, "How to end gender
17 confusion." It's basically you're a boy or you're a
18 girl. It's honestly that simple.
19 Q. So this is a cartoon of --
20 A. It's actually meant for me to remind to smile when
21 I'm looking at the audience. It was just something
22 that's not shared with the audience. It's just
23 reminding me to smile. That this doesn't have to be
24 confusing. It can be simple.
25 Q. If you'll turn to page 5596 of this PowerPoint?

Page 212

1 A. And the rest is -- this is the junk pile.
2 Q. Well, if you could turn to page 5596 of Exhibit 52
3 -- Exhibit 54? I apologize.
4 A. 5596?
5 Q. Yes, ma'am.
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. Was the SAFE Act Family Council legislation?
8 A. They prepare a book and -- if they're helping
9 somebody, and I'll give them credit. If they're
10 helping, they go all in and I appreciate that about
11 them. And they prepare a binder if they're helping
12 somebody with legislation and they take ownership and I
13 appreciate that. And, yes, they were a team member on
14 this.
15 Q. And if you'll turn to the next page 5597?
16 A. Uh-huh.
17 Q. This appears to be the Table of Contents of a
18 larger packet of the Family Council legislation, is that
19 accurate?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. And was the rest of this packet included in your
22 PowerPoint?
23 A. No.
24 Q. Okay.
25 A. This was part of the bill prep work that we worked

Page 213

1 on. And this PowerPoint ended early on, and then I had
2 a whole pile of junk slides that I would shuffle in and
3 out and like or didn't like and --
4 Q. But all of these are, they're all part of your
5 PowerPoint presentation and your information that you
6 kept together?
7 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
8 A. Yes, mine -- sorry.
9 MR. TALLEY: Hold on just a second.
10 Object to form. You can answer.
11 A. Of mine, these are mine not Family Council. This
12 is Family Council's. I don't want them on my bad
13 grammar.
14 Q. So you -- you basically just borrowed their stuff
15 and included it in your packet of -- for your
16 presentations?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead
18 and answer.
19 A. Correct.
20 Q. And on the Table of Contents in the packet that
21 they provide you, that includes FRC talking points and
22 analysis, correct?
23 A. Say that again? I'm sorry.
24 Q. If you look at the Table of Contents on page 5597,
25 the last one?

1 A. Okay.
2 Q. In the packet that Family Council gives you, not
3 -- in that Table -- in that it includes Family Research
4 Council Talking Points and Analysis, correct?
5 A. Yes.
6 Q. And it also includes Bill Drafts for you regarding
7 the proposed Family Council legislation?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. And if you'll turn to page 5583 of Exhibit 54?
10 A. 5583?
11 Q. Yes.
12 A. Okay.
13 Q. Looking at the top slide, what is the purpose of
14 including a slide "This is About Money?"
15 A. I think money is being made off these children and
16 their pain. I think Planned Parenthood is using this as
17 a source of an income stream. Doctors and surgeons,
18 this is the wild wild west. I think it's scary that we
19 have children that are being -- that surgery is being
20 performed on children. I'm disappointed in gender
21 affirming counseling. We don't have anorexia affirming
22 counseling or alcoholic affirming counseling. Maybe
23 this gender dysphoria child has been bullied or has
24 other issues. We need to have counseling that finds out
25 what the actual problem is. And I'm concerned that big

1 pharma, once this child starts this hormone therapy,
2 this is a lifetime. That's a lot of money. Money is
3 being made off these children. Whether you agree or
4 disagree, this is a cost to the child for a lifetime.
5 And I think that the cost needs to be counted both
6 physically and economically.
7 Q. Is it your belief that gender affirming counselors
8 are fake counselors?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
10 answer.
11 A. I disagree with gender affirming counseling. In
12 my opinion I think it's dangerous. I would like to see
13 counseling in its traditional form and find out what the
14 problem is and what's truly causing the gender dysphoria
15 in the child. Whatever it may be; sexual abuse,
16 bullying, there's health issues, we need to get to the
17 core of the issue for the child. It should be about the
18 child. Gender affirming denotes that there's already
19 labeling of that child. We don't know if -- what the
20 problem is. We don't know where that child's direction
21 is, but we ought to find out what the problem is first.
22 Q. In your PowerPoint, you used the word fake to
23 refer to gender affirming counselors, correct?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And you put the word doctors in quotes when you're

1 referring to gender surgeons, why is that?
2 A. The first rule of medicine is to do no harm. When
3 you remove the breast of a 13 year old child or you
4 remove the penis and scrotum off a 17 year old boy, I
5 don't know how anybody can call that a doctor. They
6 deserve the right to grow up and be safe and healthy and
7 then participate in the process. If they want to do
8 that when they're older, they have every right as adults
9 to do that, but as a child they don't know, if they're
10 12, what they're going to be at 22.
11 Q. So in the -- in the PowerPoint slide, you don't
12 consider gender -- or, excuse me -- you don't consider
13 surgeons who perform gender affirming surgeries to be
14 doctors?
15 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
16 answer.
17 A. In my opinion, not as a doctor but as a layperson,
18 they are risking that child's life and their future and
19 they are taking on a burden. They don't pay for it, the
20 child does for the rest of their life. And I think
21 that's a terrible decision to make for an adolescent who
22 cannot participate and give full consent, full informed
23 consent to that process. They can't even buy spray
24 paint or cough syrup, but they can have their genitals
25 and their health impacted for the rest of their life. I

1 think any doctor or counselor that would do that should
2 be called into question, and I don't think there's
3 anything wrong with calling them into question.
4 Q. These doctors do possess medical degrees, correct?
5 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
6 answer.
7 A. I hope so.
8 Q. And they're licensed by the state?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. I'm going to hand what you what I'll mark as
11 Exhibit 55. It's 3798.
12 (Deposition Exhibit 55 was marked for
13 identification.)
14 Q. Do you recognize Exhibit 55?
15 A. It's an email I sent to myself to print and it is
16 my statement of the ACLU having filed a lawsuit to
17 challenge the SAFE Act.
18 Q. So did you draft this public statement after the
19 lawsuit was filed?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Did you have any assistance in drafting this
22 statement?
23 A. I'm confident that I probably sent my draft around
24 to a couple of different folks.
25 Q. Would that likely have been Quena and Charisse?

Page 218

1 A. Probably Quena Gonzalez and maybe Jerry Cox.
2 Q. And did you release this statement to the public
3 that's contained in Exhibit 55?
4 A. I think I did, well, one very simular to this.
5 Q. Now, in this May 26 statement contained in Exhibit
6 55, you state that, "For the majority of adolescents who
7 struggle with gender dysphoria puberty is the cure not
8 the disease." What do you mean by that?
9 A. Puberty is a normal growth process. It's not
10 something that we should be afraid of. Gender dysphoria
11 is an issue that should be dealt with. 88 to 97 percent
12 of gender dysphoric children, children who struggle with
13 gender dysphoria, do accept the gender that they are
14 born with by the time they reach adulthood. Puberty is
15 something that they shouldn't be scared of. We need to
16 work with adolescents and help them through that
17 developmental process. I think puberty is something we
18 all go through, unfortunately. Nobody wants to go back
19 and repeat it, but it's part of the process.
20 Q. Are you -- is it your belief that adolescents
21 struggling with gender dysphoria are really struggling
22 with the changes that come with puberty?
23 MR. TALLEY: Object to form, you can
24 answer.
25 A. I'm not a doctor. Adolescents do struggle with

Page 219

1 puberty. Gender dysphoric adolescents are struggling
2 much -- having a much more difficult time and they need
3 attention and it can be from a lot of different sources;
4 it could be from sexual abuse, it could be bullying, it
5 could be from delayed onset of puberty, it could be from
6 a variety of different things. They need to have good
7 medical treatment and a good qualified counselor and a
8 good doctor.
9 Q. Do you believe that providing gender affirming
10 medical treatments like hormone therapy is like giving
11 drugs to an addict?
12 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
13 answer.
14 A. My opinion is that it's extremely harmful and it's
15 experimental and when -- it's not been proven; it's not
16 been tested. None of the things that we're doing in
17 this supposed gender affirming care has gone through any
18 of the FDA approval process and we are harming children
19 with long-term side effects. And that, to me, is
20 something we should never start down that path. These
21 children are going to pay for it, and that's wrong.
22 Q. If you look at Exhibit 55, you state, "I'm
23 thankful we have a capable Attorney General Leslie
24 Rutledge will fight to protect our children from those
25 who would pressure them into a lifetime of medical

Page 220

1 dependency and radical gender transition procedures
2 before they are old enough to make adult choices." Do
3 you still agree with that statement today?"
4 A. Very much so, and I also think these children are
5 being pushed. What's the rush? What's the harm in
6 letting them grow up when 88 to 97 percent of them will
7 chose to be the gender that they are. What's the rush.
8 Q. Is it your belief that all transgender Arkansans
9 under the age of 18 are not old enough to make adult
10 choices?
11 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
12 answer.
13 A. They're under 18. They may choose to be
14 transgender when they're older, but they have the right
15 to grow up healthy and they have the right to have a
16 healthy body to live in, and when they're 18, they can
17 make good choices.
18 Q. So if a transgender Arkansaan is 17 years old and
19 364 days old, they are not old enough to make this
20 decision but two days later, they are?
21 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
22 answer.
23 A. When they're 18, they can make adult decisions.
24 Q. Prior to the introduction of the SAFE Act, did
25 anyone report to you that Arkansas physicians were

Page 221

1 providing gender affirming medical treatment to
2 transgender Arkansans under the age of 18 without
3 parental consent?
4 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form of the
5 question. And I think as asked -- well, let
6 me -- when you -- when you asked that
7 question, were you talking about before the
8 introduction of the Act or before the passage
9 of the Act or the override of the Veto?
10 Q. Before the introduction of House Bill 1570, the
11 SAFE Act, did anyone report to you that Arkansas
12 physicians were providing gender affirming medical
13 treatment to transgender Arkansans under the age of 18
14 without parental consent?
15 MR. TALLEY: I will object to that
16 question to the extent it calls for matters of
17 legislative deliberations. I will instruct
18 the witness not to answer. As to
19 non-legislative discussions, the witness is
20 free to answer. Do you understand that
21 limitation?
22 THE WITNESS: No.
23 A. Could you ask it in a different way that --
24 Q. Sure.
25 A. -- works through that limitation?

1 Q. Prior to January 1st of 2021, did anyone report
2 to you that Arkansas physicians were providing gender
3 affirming medical treatment to transgender Arkansans
4 under the age of 18 without parental consent?
5 MR. TALLEY: Same objection, but to the
6 extent that question calls for testimony that
7 are outside of the legislative process or
8 legislative discussions, the witness is free
9 to answer.
10 A. First of all, you're assuming that -- I mean, not
11 you, but assuming that children who are gender dysphoric
12 are transgender. We don't know. They are experiencing
13 gender dysphoria. We don't know if -- what their issue
14 is and we're making an assumption and that's not ours to
15 make.
16 So setting that aside. I did learn that
17 Children's Hospital might be doing that. I did not know
18 that.
19 Q. When did you learn that?
20 A. Fall of '20, late '19 -- 2019 or -- I'm not sure.
21 Somewhere in there. I remember it was the fall, maybe
22 of 2020.
23 Q. Do you believe that a person's sex is always
24 genetically defined, objective, observable,
25 characteristic with permanent implications such as what

1 constitutes safe healthcare, it cannot be altered
2 cosmetically?
3 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
4 answer.
5 A. I believe a person's sex is determined when the
6 sperm and egg unite. There are some genetic defects
7 that occur and they can be assisted with medical care at
8 birth or with some drugs at birth. There's XX -- XXY
9 chromosome, that type of thing. But that's been
10 something that medicine has been handling for the last
11 50 years. Boys are born with an XY and girls are born
12 with XX, and it's just what it is, science.
13 Q. Given that, do you think people should never
14 transition gender?
15 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
16 answer.
17 A. That's an opinion that I'm not entitled to for
18 someone that's an adult. This bill addresses informed
19 consent for minors.
20 Q. My question was specific to your statement that
21 you gave regarding the male and female sex chromosomes.
22 And my question is, given that testimony that you gave,
23 do you think people should never transition gender?
24 MS. LAND: Object to form. Asked and
25 answered.

1 A. I'll let my answer stand.
2 Q. Given that testimony that you gave, do you think
3 people should never transition gender?
4 MR. TALLEY: Same objection. You can
5 answer.
6 A. It's still their decision. Whether I agree or
7 not, it's an adult decision.
8 Q. Do you believe that finding a good family
9 counselor who gets to the root of the problem, not a
10 gender affirming counselor, is critical for treating a
11 child or treating adolescents with gender dysphoria?
12 A. Absolutely.
13 MS. WALAS: Let's go off the record.
14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: It's probably over
15 with. I'm still on the record. Can we just
16 keep going?
17 MR. TALLEY: Yes.
18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Go ahead.
19 MS. WALAS: Did that question get
20 answered?
21 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. "Absolutely."
22 MS. WALAS: Okay.
23 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
24 Q. Is it your belief that a gender affirming
25 counselor is a joke?

1 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
2 answer.
3 A. Okay. I am not a fan of gender affirming
4 counseling. I think it puts children at risk, and I
5 think it puts them in a situation where you're pushing
6 children when we don't know where that child is going,
7 we need to address gender dysphoria.
8 Q. So when you used the word "joke" in your draft
9 statement to refer to gender affirming counselors, what
10 do you mean by that?
11 A. I'm not a professional counselor, but I don't
12 think that's a professional way to start. You wouldn't
13 have -- if I said anorexia affirming counselor or an
14 alcoholic affirming counselor was good counseling, I
15 would be laughed off the island, so to speak. Nobody
16 would agree with that. Why we would start from that
17 premise with a child. We need to find out what's wrong
18 first. Have they been sexually abused, have they been
19 bullied, what is the specific problem.
20 Q. You've stated that we don't let children in
21 Arkansas get a tattoo or smoke or drink or do drugs
22 because of long-term consequences; is that correct?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. Are any of those activities, such as getting a
25 tattoo, smoking, drinking or drugging, are those

Page 226

1 recommended for the treatment of any medical conditions?
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
3 answer.
4 A. Not that I know of.
5 Q. Are the activities, such as recommending hormone
6 therapy for an adolescent suffering from gender
7 dysphoria, are those recommended for the treatment of
8 gender dysphoria?
9 MS. LAND: Object to form.
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
11 answer.
12 A. When it's an experimental drug, it's not been
13 tested, we don't know the long-term side effects, my
14 question would be why would we do that on a child. We
15 don't experiment on children.
16 Q. Regardless of your opinion as to the treatment, is
17 hormone therapy recommended for the treatment of gender
18 dysphoria?
19 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
20 answer.
21 A. There are other treatments for gender dysphoria
22 that do no harm to that child. When they're older, if
23 they still feel that that's the direction they want to
24 go, then they can participate in their decision-making
25 process.

Page 227

1 MS. WALAS: Will you read the question
2 back, please?
3 (The court reporter read back the
4 requested question.)
5 BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
6 Q. So regardless of your opinion about the
7 treatment --
8 A. Uh-huh.
9 Q. -- is hormone therapy recommended for the
10 treatment of gender dysphoria?
11 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
12 answer.
13 A. I'm not seen where it's been beneficial, but
14 that's my opinion.
15 Q. But doctors do recommend it for the treatment of
16 gender dysphoria?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
18 answer.
19 A. Regardless of the long-term consequences, they do.
20 Q. Were you upset when the Walton family announced a
21 $1 million commitment to a new statewide fund to improve
22 the quality of life for LGBTQ Arkansans?
23 MS. LAND: Object to form.
24 A. I was upset when the Walton family joined the
25 lawsuit in a Friend of the Court Brief. As far as their

Page 228

1 donation process to different charities, that's
2 perfectly within their decision. It's their money, they
3 can do what want. Anything that impacts children, I --
4 again, that's their decision. I don't think we should
5 push children either way. Let them grow up.
6 Q. We'll mark as 56 pages 4515 to 4518.
7 (Deposition Exhibit 56 was marked for
8 identification.)
9 Q. And if you'll take a moment to take a look at
10 Exhibit 56?
11 A. It's from me to me, and it's a rough draft of a
12 letter that was never sent.
13 Q. So this is a three-page document, correct?
14 A. It's --
15 Q. Or four page if we count that. Five pages.
16 Anyway, look at page 4517, please? And is that
17 part of an email that was forwarded to you regarding the
18 Walton family donation?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. And if you'll turn to page 4515, to the draft --
21 or to the -- the draft email that you wrote there at the
22 top beginning with Alex? Turn back to page 4515?
23 A. Well, first of all, this is --
24 Q. Can you please turn back to page 4515?
25 A. Okay.

Page 229

1 Q. And on 4515, you drafted a letter to an Alex.
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 Q. Who is that Alex?
4 A. I am not sure.
5 Q. Could that be Alex Pfeiffer at Fox News?
6 A. It could be. But again, this was never sent.
7 Q. But this is a draft that you wrote for yourself in
8 response to receiving the forward about the Walmart
9 donation, correct?
10 A. Yes, and they also did some things targeting
11 children, which I thought was very unnecessary.
12 Q. And so, in the message that you were drafting,
13 were you upset that the Walton family had announced a
14 $1 million commitment to a statewide fund to improve the
15 quality of life of LGBTQ Arkansans?
16 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
17 MS. LAND: Asked and answered.
18 MR. TALLEY: You can answer.
19 A. I don't have a problem with donating to the
20 quality of life. I do have a problem with proselytizing
21 to young children, and I doubt anybody actually read the
22 Women's Sports Bill or the SAFE Act, because it's not a
23 threat to children. It's actually protecting children.
24 And I also was offended that somehow Arkansas was seen
25 as unfriendly, when we are extremely friendly, we are

Page 230

1 extremely welcoming. I've been door-to-door all over my
2 district, to Democrat's front doors and Republican's
3 front doors, and I have been treated with kindness and
4 respect, offered a glass of water and sat on the front
5 porch by both political parties. And I'm offended when
6 we're told to be welcoming. We are a welcoming state.
7 We welcome everybody and all kinds and we get along.
8 And I -- I don't think we need to be told to mind our
9 manners.
10 Q. Can you show me where on page 4517 Walmart is
11 targeting children.
12 A. I think, when you have money that goes to drag
13 shows and you have children that come to those drag
14 shows, that's a problem.
15 Q. Where does Walmart -- or the Walton Foundation
16 mention drag shows as part of where their money is going
17 to?
18 A. That's been in other communications.
19 Q. Is supporting efforts to improve the quality of
20 life for LGBTQ Americans a bad thing?
21 MS. LAND: Objection to form.
22 A. No.
23 Q. I'll rephrase that. I said American.
24 Is supporting efforts to improve the quality of
25 life for LGBTQ Arkansans a bad thing?

Page 231

1 MS. LAND: Same objection.
2 A. I'd like to point out again that I sent a draft to
3 myself. I stand by what I said. But I still sent it to
4 myself so I could cool off, which is something I think
5 is always a good idea.
6 Q. Then why did you write that, "The Walton family
7 has done so many amazing things for this state, and
8 Mr. Sam would have been so proud of the legacy he left
9 behind, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot, until now?"
10 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
11 answer.
12 A. I'm not sure he would approve of some of the
13 things. He was -- I'm just not sure he would approve.
14 Q. So you disagree with the Walton Family Foundation
15 supporting LGBTQ equality in Arkansas?
16 A. No.
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
18 A. I disagree with their support or their -- I
19 just -- I disagreed with, I guess I would say how some
20 of the things came across. It just, it hit me the wrong
21 way. So I started an email and didn't send it. Kept
22 working on it.
23 Q. But those were your thoughts, correct?
24 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
25 A. They were my personal thoughts.

Page 232

1 Q. Do you want to restrict LGBTQ activities in
2 schools?
3 MS. LAND: Objection to form.
4 MR. TALLEY: Go ahead.
5 A. I don't think there's a place for a variety of
6 different social issues in schools. I think schools
7 should be about math, science. A lot of political
8 issues get pushed in schools when kids don't even know
9 how to read.
10 Q. Do LGBT Arkansans attend schools?
11 A. Yes, and they should know how to read.
12 Q. Have you talked with anyone about potential
13 legislation concerning transgender people in the
14 upcoming legislative session?
15 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object. That
16 question clearly calls for testimony on
17 Representative Lundstrum's legislative
18 activities, and I will instruct her not to
19 answer the question.
20 Q. You discussed your plans for the upcoming session
21 as part of the summits that you have spoken at, correct?
22 MR. TALLEY: I believe that -- I will
23 object. I believe that misstates some of her
24 prior testimony.
25 Q. Did you support legislation last year authorizing

Page 233

1 teachers to refuse to use the preferred pronouns of
2 transgender students?
3 MS. LAND: Objection to form and
4 relevance.
5 MR. TALLEY: Go ahead.
6 A. I believe I voted for that legislation.
7 Q. Do you support legislation that would limit
8 discussion of gender identity and sexual orientation at
9 schools?
10 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object. That
11 question as phrased clearly calls for
12 testimony on matters of legislative activity
13 from Representative Lundstrum. So I will
14 instruct the witness not to answer.
15 Q. Do you support limiting discussion of gender
16 identity and sexual orientation in schools?
17 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object, and to
18 the extent that question as phrased requests
19 testimony from Representative Lundstrum
20 concerning matters of legislative activity, I
21 will instruct her not to answer, as to
22 potentially her personal beliefs, she may
23 testify.
24 A. Ask the question again, please?
25 Q. Subject to the objection that you just said, do

Page 234

1 you support limiting discussion of gender identity and
2 sexual orientation in schools?
3 MR. TALLEY: Same objection, same
4 limitation. Do you understand my -- what I'm
5 instructing you not to answer?
6 A. I think, when it comes to matters of human
7 sexuality in schools, we need to stick to the basics and
8 worry about teen pregnancy and STDs and let other
9 political issues be dealt with at home. And I'll add
10 one other thing, I think we need to have a real
11 discussion about manners and bullying.
12 Q. Are you talking about in schools?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. Okay. And do you support policies, like in Texas,
15 establishing that providing gender affirming medical
16 care to children is child abuse?
17 MR. TALLEY: Object to the question. To
18 the extent it calls for testimony on matters
19 of Representative Lundstrum's legislative
20 activity, I will instruct her not to answer.
21 To the extent that question calls for just
22 simply personal beliefs, the witness is free
23 to answer.
24 A. My personal belief is that when a child is given
25 puberty blockers and experimental hormones that have not

Page 235

1 been tested and we don't know all the long-term effects,
2 when you have the risk of cardiovascular disease,
3 cerebrovascular disease, Type II diabetes, stunted
4 growth, infertility, these children are at risk and it
5 is abusive to harm a child. They need to grow up so
6 they can participate. I do not understand the rush.
7 Let them grow up.
8 Q. I'm going to hand you what I'll mark as Exhibit
9 57, and this is number 5292.
10 (Deposition Exhibit 57 was marked for
11 identification.)
12 Q. Looking at Exhibit 57, I'd like to first look at
13 the email dated April 3, 2021 at 11:53 a.m., do you see
14 that?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And you sent an email to Brian Dunaway. Who is
17 Brian Dunaway?
18 A. He's a videographer.
19 Q. And why did you send him a copy of the March 22nd
20 Senate Public Health Hearing?
21 A. I hired him to create a video.
22 Q. Is this that Drop Box video --
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. -- that we were discussing earlier --
25 A. Uh-huh.

Page 236

1 Q. -- that you had created?
2 A. Uh-huh.
3 Q. So this was part of your media messaging?
4 A. Actually, it was an informational video that
5 members could use to post on their Facebook.
6 Q. Okay. So it was social media messaging?
7 A. Right.
8 Q. Okay. And you note that the two doctors are
9 awesome, correct?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And then you sent this email to Representative
12 Jimmy Gazaway, is that accurate?
13 A. Yes.
14 Q. And you did that and you included a statement to
15 Representative Gazaway. Can you read that into the
16 record?
17 A. "See below, the doctors are worth your time, the
18 rest not so much."
19 Q. Who are the two doctors you're referring to?
20 A. Drs. Hiatt and Dr. Roger -- Charles Lewis. Excuse
21 me. I'm sorry.
22 Q. And these are the doctors that you brought into
23 the committee hearing to speak?
24 A. Yes. They really did a good job and did a lot of
25 -- spent a lot of time explaining.

Page 237

1 Q. What do you mean by, "the rest not so much?"
2 A. The committee went for a long time. It was good
3 testimony. It's just, I was focusing on the doctors
4 because of their medical and that was the question that
5 he and I had questions about between the two of us, he
6 wanted to know about what the doctors asked.
7 Q. So the rest were individuals speaking against
8 House Bill 1570; such as, Plaintiffs Joanna Brandt, Dr.
9 Kathryn Stambough and Dr. Michele Hutchinson, correct?
10 A. And people speaking for. It was for and against.
11 There was a lot of testimony. He just had asked me
12 about -- specifically about the doctors.
13 Q. Have you reviewed the March 22nd hearing
14 transcript?
15 A. Not in a long time.
16 Q. And you said that all of the rest were people
17 speaking -- or that the rest included people speaking in
18 favor of the bill; is that correct?
19 A. It was for, it was against. People were very
20 civil.
21 Q. So during the March 22nd hearing, I will hand you
22 what I'll mark -- well, let's just go ahead and refresh
23 your recollection first.
24 I'm going to hand you this hearing, okay? I
25 actually will mark it.

Page 238

(Deposition Exhibit 58 was marked for identification.)
Q. Exhibit 58 is a copy of the hearing transcript -- or is a copy of a transcript of the hearing that you forwarded to the videographer as well as Representative Gazaway; is that correct?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
A. Actually, the only thing I forwarded was the video of the hearing. I didn't forward a transcript.
Q. So I will represent to you that we have had a transcript made that's been exchanged in discovery to make it easier on everyone so we don't have to play the video all the time.
A. I don't blame you there.
Q. And so this --
A. This is the first I've seen of the transcript.
Q. Of the transcript, okay.
So this is -- you forwarded the March 22nd, '21 hearing, Senate Public Hearing forward, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And --
MR. TALLEY: And just to stop you, what was forwarded, I believe, was probably a link to video --
MS. WALAS: Yes.

Page 239

MR. TALLEY: -- of that hearing. This transcript you have marked as an exhibit is a transcription of that video or that hearing that was prepared by the parties to this lawsuit --
MS. WALAS: Correct.
MR. TALLEY: -- is that right?
MS. WALAS: That is correct.
MR. TALLEY: Okay.
BY MS. WALAS (CONT.):
Q. Okay. And so, with Exhibit 58, this includes all the people that testified regarding House Bill 1570 on March 22nd, 2021. Is that your memory of the hearing?
A. I didn't create this, but I'm sure they -- they took it as best they could.
Q. And so, at the hearing, the rest of the people were, we mentioned the Plaintiffs, Joanna Brandt and Dr. Stambough and Dr. Hutchinson, correct?
A. If you say so, yes.
Q. And there were a number of other individuals, all of whom testified against House Bill 1570, correct?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. I'm not trying to be difficult. My client just got presented with the transcript, a 61 page transcript of a hearing that happened a year

Page 240

and a half ago and is being asked about what's not in it. I think it would only be fair for her to have an opportunity to review that transcript that's been marked as an exhibit in order to answer a question like that under oath.
A. I participated in the hearing. I have not gone back and watched the video.
Q. Would you agree that the testimony of the people that appeared at the hearing will reflect what side they stood on regarding the bill?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can answer.
A. Yes.
Q. And so, if the transcript reflects that the only people that testified in favor of the bill were the two doctors you brought, you don't have any reason to dispute that?
A. Not at this point, no.
Q. And if that's consistent with the hearing video, there's no reason to dispute that?
A. I wouldn't think so.
Q. Do you believe that people can have gender dysphoria?
MS. LAND: Objection to form.

Page 241

MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Asked and answered. Go ahead
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe people with gender dysphoria never benefit from gender affirming medical care?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can answer.
A. I do not believe they benefit from gender affirming counseling, and I am very concerned about the gender affirming medical care that they are receiving.
Q. Is that true for adults?
A. Adults make their own decisions. I'm concerned about their long-term health, but they make their own decisions. They are of the age to do that.
Q. Would you oppose gender affirming medical care even if there were mountains of research showing it is effective at alleviating gender dysphoria and improving mental health?
MR. TALLEY: Object to form. And in addition, to the extent that question calls for testimony on matters of Representative Lundstrum's legislative activity, I will instruct her not to answer. As to perhaps her personal views, the witness is free to answer.
A. Could you ask that question again, please?

Page 242

1 Q. Subject to the objection, would you oppose gender
2 affirming medical care even if there were mountains of
3 research showing it is effective at alleviating gender
4 dysphoria and improving mental health?
5 MR. TALLEY: Same two objections.
6 A. I have not seen a lot of research, and I tried to
7 read both sides of it. I'm not a doctor, nor am I a
8 psychiatrist. The mounds of research that you refer to
9 that would lead anybody to believe that this has a
10 long-term good outcome for a child.
11 Q. So if there were mountains of research beyond what
12 you have right now, like if there was additional
13 research, would that change your mind as to whether you
14 would oppose gender affirming medical care?
15 MR. TALLEY: Object to the form, and I
16 object as to any testimony that question calls
17 for that bear on matters of Representative
18 Lundstrum's legislative activity. Subject to
19 that limitation, the witness is free to
20 answer.
21 A. You're asking me to speculate on future research
22 that there's no way I could do that. Based on current
23 science, I don't believe you could change somebody's
24 genetic code. I don't think that is possible.
25 Q. Would you have a religious objection to gender

Page 243

1 transition regardless of what the research showed?
2 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You may
3 answer, but I will again lodge, for the
4 purposes of our record, some concerns about
5 questioning strictly on religious objections
6 or religious beliefs. I'm not going to
7 instruct the witness not to answer that
8 question, but I do want it on the record if
9 we're going to go further on that issue. Go
10 ahead, Representative Lundstrum.
11 A. I am a Christian, and I also believe science and
12 Christianity coexist, and the science is that there's
13 children -- children are born male or female and you
14 have chromosomes, your genetic makeup. You cannot
15 change your genetic makeup. You cannot unring the bell.
16 This bill is about protecting children, and when they
17 are the age of informed consent, they can make those
18 decisions. Those are adult decisions for adults.
19 Q. In your view what should someone struggling for
20 many years with gender dysphoria do to address the
21 suffering?
22 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. You can
23 answer if you understand.
24 A. I would encourage them to get good quality
25 counseling and a good physical exam. Again, I'm not a

Page 244

1 doctor or a counselor. But I am an advocate for good
2 mental health and good physical health. And if they
3 were my neighbor or my friend, I would encourage them,
4 support them and go with them.
5 Q. Do you think it's okay for, say, a bakery to
6 refuse to hire a baker because they are transgender?
7 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. I'm again
8 going to interpose a brief objection that has
9 some concerns about the relevance of questions
10 related to employment or hiring practice of a
11 hypothetical bakery in litigation like this.
12 I'm not going to instruct the witness not to
13 answer, but I do again want to make that
14 objection for our record. Representative
15 Lundstrum, you can go ahead.
16 A. I personally, if I were the baker, I wouldn't care
17 about their personal preferences. I would care about
18 their ability to bake a cake, their ability to decorate
19 the cake.
20 Q. Do you think parents should be allowed to permit
21 their minor children to socially transition?
22 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
23 A. That's a parental decision that doesn't involve
24 chemical and surgical castration. That's something I
25 would hope the parents would get -- because obviously

Page 245

1 they're gender dysphoric, that they would get good
2 counseling. Parents are in a very difficult situation
3 here. They love their kids. They're afraid. It's a
4 very difficult situation for kids and for parents.
5 Q. And is it your understanding that to socially
6 transition is to live their lives consistently with
7 their gender identity rather than with their natal sex,
8 such as using name and pronouns to match their gender?
9 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
10 A. That would be what that would look like if they
11 socially decide to dress as the opposite sex.
12 Q. Do you believe LGBTQ people are grooming children?
13 MR. TALLEY: Object to form.
14 A. I think that's an unfair statement to LGBTQ
15 people. I do think some people are grooming. I run
16 sexually bills -- I ran a bill against grooming and sex
17 trafficking. But I think to label LGBTQ people that way
18 is unfair and inappropriate.
19 Q. Do you believe gay and lesbian people can through
20 therapy come to live heterosexual lives?
21 MR. TALLEY: Objection to the form of the
22 question. I also have some concerns about
23 questions like that and their relevance in
24 this litigation which involves a piece of
25 legislation affecting transgender minors. I'm

Page 246

1 not going to instruct the witness not to
2 answer, but I do want my objection, which have
3 continued and become a little bit more
4 frequent the last few minutes, to be noted on
5 our record. Representative Lundstrum, you can
6 go ahead.
7 A. Could you ask the question again?
8 Q. Do you believe gay and lesbian people can through
9 therapy come to live heterosexual lives?
10 MR. TALLEY: Same objection.
11 A. I believe someone who is gay or lesbian, if they
12 choose to leave the lifestyle, they have that right to
13 do so.
14 Q. Do you think people who experience same sex
15 attraction should be encouraged to do that?
16 MR. TALLEY: I'm going to object to the
17 form of the question, and again note for the
18 purposes of our record that these questions do
19 not bear on issues relevant to transgender or
20 gender affirming care or the surgical
21 procedures or the hormones at issue in the
22 litigation. By asking this witness questions
23 about views on same sex marriage, on the
24 rights of LG -- gay and lesbian individuals on
25 a broader basis, I have some concern that

Page 247

1 those questions are being posed to the witness
2 for an improper purpose. I'm not going to
3 instruct Representative Lundstrum not to
4 answer these questions, but I have continuing
5 and increasing concerns of why they are being
6 asked this witness as we go forward.
7 Representative Lundstrum, you can go ahead.
8 A. Could you ask the question again, please?
9 MS. WALAS: Can you read the question
10 back, please?
11 (The court reporter read back the
12 requested question.)
13 MR. TALLEY: Same objection.
14 Representative Lundstrum, you can answer the
15 question if you understand it.
16 A. If they choose to have therapy, that is their
17 choice.
18 Q. Do you think that transgender people are the
19 result of a social trend?
20 MR. TALLEY: Object to form. Go ahead.
21 A. I think there are some issues with social
22 contagion, and I think that bears further research. And
23 I think there is some concern in that area, especially
24 with young, adolescent females.
25 Q. How much money have you received in speaking fees

Page 248

1 related to the SAFE Act?
2 A. I've not received any money in speaking fees. My
3 travel has been paid for and my hotel bills have been
4 paid for.
5 Q. Do you know the total dollar amount of your travel
6 and other expenses, either paid directly or reimbursed
7 by your host organization for speaking engagements
8 related to the SAFE Act?
9 A. No, not off the top of my head, but I have
10 reported it every time that reporting is required.
11 Q. And what gifts have you reported in connection
12 with your SAFE Act-related activities?
13 A. I haven't received any gifts. I've received an
14 award about that big, and I -- and I received a book,
15 two books.
16 MS. WALAS: If we can go off the record,
17 I think I'm close to being done right now.
18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This will end
19 Media Part 5, and we're off the record at 5:53
20 p.m.. Please remove your microphone before
21 you get up.
22 (Off the record.)
23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: All right. I'll start
24 back on the record, just one moment. We're
25 back on the record at 5:55 p.m. This will

Page 249

1 begin Media Part 6. Please to proceed.
2 MS. WALAS: At this time Plaintiffs will
3 reserve the right to continue or seek relief
4 from the Court to continue this deposition and
5 to compel further deposition based upon the
6 pending Motion to Compel on the privileged
7 documents, which if we had them before us, we
8 would cover in the deposition today. And so,
9 we're just going to make a record that, with
10 that pending, we just want to reserve our
11 right to potentially seek relief from the
12 Court or to further the deposition based upon
13 the Court's ruling at that time.
14 MR. TALLEY: You certainly can put
15 whatever you like on the record. And I just
16 will briefly, for the purpose of the record,
17 on behalf of Representative Lundstrum, to
18 start, the Plaintiffs have used 6 hours and 24
19 minutes of time to take her deposition today.
20 We object to any further questioning of
21 Representative Lundstrum beyond today on the
22 same reasons we articulated in our opening
23 Brief and also because she has given nearly
24 6 1/2 hours of testimony.
25 In addition to that, we object to the

Page 250

1 depositions of the other four non-party
2 legislators whose depositions have never been
3 requested at any point since I entered an
4 appearance on their behalf several months ago.
5 In addition to that, it's my
6 understanding that the Court's discovery
7 deadline in this litigation has long since
8 passed. We believe it would be improper to
9 request their deposition and it would
10 certainly be untimely.
11 So for those reasons, we would oppose any
12 such request. And I certainly understand you
13 putting it on the record. I'm just doing the
14 same thing.
15 MS. LAND: For that matter, without
16 seeing obviously the Court has not issued an
17 order on the Motion to Compel, so without
18 seeing it, we'll reserve any responses or
19 limitations we would seek on any depositions
20 that the Plaintiff would seek for when we have
21 the opportunity to look at that.
22 EXAMINATION
23 BY MR. TALLEY:
24 Q. Representative Lundstrum, I have just a couple of
25 questions for you.

Page 251

1 A. All right.
2 Q. To hopefully maybe clarify a thing or two.
3 Ms. Walas marked some text messages between you
4 and Jana Della Rosa as Exhibit 52 to your deposition.
5 Do you remember those text messages?
6 A. Yes, I do.
7 Q. Ms. Walas correctly referred to Ms. Della Rosa as
8 a former representative, is that right?
9 A. Yes, that's correct.
10 Q. Was Jana Della Rosa a member of the General
11 Assembly during the 2021 Regular Session?
12 A. No, she was not.
13 Q. And the correspondence marked as Exhibit 52 would
14 have been exchanged between you and Ms. Della Rosa after
15 your -- after she left the legislature?
16 A. That is correct.
17 Q. Okay. You can go to Exhibit 54. The final page
18 is the Table of Contents you briefly discussed with
19 Ms. Walas, is that right?
20 A. That's correct.
21 Q. Okay. That Table of Contents includes some draft
22 legislation, is that right?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. And I believe you testified that you had some
25 binders of materials related to your work on the SAFE

Page 252

1 Act?
2 A. That's correct.
3 Q. Was the content or were the documents in those
4 binders materials that you used as you went through the
5 deliberate process and prepared the SAFE Act for
6 introduction or passage in the General Assembly?
7 A. That is correct.
8 Q. Okay. You've expressed a number of viewpoints,
9 whether they're political beliefs or moral beliefs,
10 today in this deposition, is that right?
11 A. Yes, I have.
12 Q. Are those your personal beliefs?
13 A. Those are my personal beliefs.
14 Q. Do your personal beliefs reflect the beliefs of
15 the other 134 members of the Arkansas General Assembly?
16 MS. WALAS: Object to form.
17 A. Absolutely not.
18 MR. TALLEY: Before we finish, and I need
19 to just figure out, I think, to reask that
20 question. What is the basis for that
21 objection to the form? Let me see maybe if I
22 can reask that question.
23 MS. WALAS: The way I heard it sounded
24 speculative when I heard you say it. So if
25 you could rephrase it.

Page 253

1 BY MR. TALLEY (CONT.):
2 Q. Representative Lundstrum, how long have you been
3 at the General Assembly?
4 A. I believe it'll be eight years in December.
5 Q. In connection with your service in the House of
6 Representatives, have you gotten to know your fellow
7 legislators?
8 A. I have gotten to know my fellow legislators.
9 Q. You have expressed a number of personal, political
10 beliefs or moral beliefs today, is that true?
11 A. I have.
12 Q. Are your personal, political or moral beliefs your
13 own?
14 A. They are my own.
15 Q. Do they belong to the entire General Assembly?
16 A. No, we are a wide variety of opinions, beliefs.
17 We vote on bills, and we have a wide variety of opinions
18 and beliefs?
19 MR. TALLEY: I think that's all the
20 questions I have.
21 Thank you, Representative Lundstrum.
22 RE-EXAMINATION
23 BY MS. WALAS:
24 Q. I just have one followup.
25 You were the architect of the SAFE Act, correct?

A. Yes.
MS. WALAS: That's it.
MR. TALLEY: Before we go off the record, the witness will read and sign.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This concludes today's testimony given by Robin Lundstrum. The total numbers of media used was six will be retained by Veritext. And we are off the record at 6:01 p.m.. Please remove your microphones.
(WHEREUPON, at 6:01 p.m., the taking of the above-entitled deposition was concluded.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ARKANSAS *
ss *
COUNTY OF SALINE *

I, JEFF BENNETT, Certified Court Reporter, a Notary Public in and for the aforesaid county and state, do hereby certify that the witness, REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM, was duly sworn by me prior to the taking of testimony as to the truth of the matters attested to and contained therein; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me in machine shorthand notes and was thereafter reduced to typewritten form by me or under my direction and supervision; that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the testimony given to the best of my understanding and ability.

In accordance with Rule 30(e) of the Rules of Civil Procedure, review of the transcript was requested by the deponent or a party thereto.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this proceeding was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially interested, or otherwise, in the outcome of this action; and that I have no contract with the parties, attorneys, or persons with an interest in the action that affects or has a substantial tendency to affect impartiality, that requires me to relinquish control of an original deposition transcript or copies of the transcript before it is certified and delivered to the custodial attorney, or that requires me to provide any service not made available to all parties to the action.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND and SEAL OF OFFICE on this 16th day of July, 2022.

Jeff Bennett

Jeff Bennett, CCR, LS No. 19, Notary
Public in and for Saline County, Arkansas
My Commission expires November 29, 2030.

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION OF CERTIFIED COPY

I, JEFF BENNETT, LS No. 19, Certified Court Reporter in the State of Arkansas, certify that the foregoing pages 1 through 254 constitute a true and correct copy of the original deposition of REPRESENTATIVE ROBIN LUNDSTRUM taken on June 30, 2022.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Arkansas that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this 16th day of July, 2022.

Jeff Bennett

Jeff Bennett, CCR, LS No. 19, Notary
Public in and for Saline County, Arkansas
My Commission expires November 29, 2030.

GRAHAM TALLEY, ESQ.
graham@mitchellwilliamslaw.com
July 20, 2022
RE: Brandt, Dylan Et Al. v. Rutledge, Leslie Et Al.
6/30/2022, Rep. Robin Lundstrum (#5293301)

The above-referenced transcript is available for review.

Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are any changes, the witness should note those with the reason, on the attached Errata Sheet.

The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of Deponent and Errata and return to the deposing attorney. Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at erratas-cs@veritext.com.

Return completed errata within 30 days from receipt of testimony.

If the witness fails to do so within the time allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed.

Yours,
Veritext Legal Solutions

Brandt, Dylan Et Al. v. Rutledge, Leslie Et Al.
6/30/2022 - Rep. Robin Lundstrum (#5293301)

E R R A T A S H E E T

PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____
PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____
PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____
PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____
PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____
PAGE_____ LINE_____ CHANGE_____
_____
REASON_____

_____ _____
Rep. Robin Lundstrum Date

Brandt, Dylan Et Al. v. Rutledge, Leslie Et Al.
6/30/2022 - Rep. Robin Lundstrum (#5293301)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT

I, Rep. Robin Lundstrum, do hereby declare that I have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony given by me.

_____ _____
Rep. Robin Lundstrum Date
*If notary is required

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS
_____ DAY OF _____, 20___.

_____
NOTARY PUBLIC

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.

Exhibit 2

From: Autumn Stroup <autumn.stroup@familypolicyalliance.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 2021 7:40 PM CDT
To: Dr Roger Hiatt <rhiatt2310@gmail.com>; Robin Lundstrum <robin@lundstrum.us>; Jerry Cox <jerry@familycouncil.org>; Norman Woods <norman@familyheritagealliance.org>
CC: Erin Hogan <erin@familycouncil.org>; Meridian Baldacci <Meridian.Baldacci@familypolicyalliance.com>; Amanda Banks <Amanda.Banks@familypolicyfoundation.com>
Subject: OUTLINE FOR GENDER PANEL next week
Attachment(s): "Gender Issues Policy Panel - Outline.docx"

Dear Panelists,

Attached please find the outline I promised for the Gender Policy Issues panel next week. Please take a look and let me know if there are any problems with your section or changes you need made. I've color-coded the outline so that questions to you match your color so that you can find them more easily in scanning the document. ☺

I am so looking forward to this next week! I think it's going to be the BEST session of all (though I may be biased!), and I truly believe that the audiences will gain much from your experiences and expertise.

So, thank you again for giving of your time and for sharing your experiences with the state legislators and state family policy councils in attendance.

Final note: Even though we have 1 hour (plus 15 minutes for Q&A), there is a LOT to cover. So, I ask that you keep your answers as tight as possible. If the audience needs to know more, they will have time to ask during the Q&A, or I can ask you follow-ups to your answer if I think they are missing something critical or you may have forgotten something.

Thank you again! I am praying for each of you—that next week will be enjoyable, for safe travel, and for blessings over you all.

-Autumn

Family Policy ALLIANCE.

AUTUMN STROUP, ESQ.
Vice President, Strategy

UNLEASHING CITIZENSHIP
FamilyPolicyAlliance.com

o 719.308.2784

8675 Explorer Drive, Suite 112, Colorado Springs, CO 80920

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately that you have received this email and delete this email from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

EXHIBIT
29
PENGAD 800-631-6989

GENDER ISSUES POLICY PANEL – July 22, 2021

Family Policy ALLIANCE

KEY
Norman Woods
Jerry Cox
Robin Lundstrum
Roger Hiatt

What we're looking for in your response is text in italics

INTRODUCTION – Moderator, Autumn Stroup

1. **Overview of both topics & "state of play" for both**
   a. Huge success & pushback on the LGBT agenda from the states
   b. Federal impact with Biden Administration & Equality Act
2. **Gratitude**
   a. Thanks to lawmakers and FPCs who made the progress possible
   b. Thanks to national allies who contributed their resources and talents to take on these issues:
      i. The Heritage Foundation
      ii. Christian Medical and Dental Association
      iii. Alliance Defending Freedom
      iv. Concerned Women for America
      v. Family Research Council
      vi. Focus on the Family
      vii. American Principles Project
      viii. American College of Pediatricians
      ix. Ethics & Public Policy Center
3. **Introduction of Panelists**
   a. Norman Woods, Executive Director, Family Heritage Alliance of South Dakota
   b. Jerry Cox, Founder & President, Family Council of Arkansas
   c. Representative Robin Lundstrum, representative of District 87 since 2015
   d. Dr. Roger Hiatt, Medical Director, Residential Treatment Services, Perimeter Behavioral Health, West Memphis (AR) and Jackson (TN)

GIRLS SPORTS

1. **Huge success for girls' sports in 2021**
   a. 1 state last year with 38 states running legislation & 7 (maybe 8 with Texas!) signing it into law
   b. AP admits girls' sports legislation stopped the Equality Act in the Senate
2. **Success story: Arkansas**
   a. To Jerry: What were the key elements you knew would be essential to a good girls' sports bill?
   b. To Jerry: How do you recommend preparing your sponsors and hearing witnesses?
      Every sponsor gets a 3-ring binder to make them the most knowledgeable on the issue; preparation and hospitality for witnesses, especially those from out-of-state so they understand the culture and "state of play"; preparing all to understand the high tensions on these bills & need for security
   c. To Jerry: I understand there were some competing bills in Arkansas for awhile. Tell us the short story of what happened and your advice to preventing or managing this for other states.
3. **Dramatic Story: South Dakota**
   a. To Norman: Things in SD started and ended with a lot of drama. This was your 5th time trying a girls' sports bill in SD, and you didn't expect it to clear the more moderate Senate. Tell us what happened the last week of session that gave you hope.
      Bill dying in committee; Senators force it to floor; expected to die; Gov. Noem tweet on Women's Day (confirmed she verbally committed to the tweet)
   b. To Norman: But then things took a more negative dramatic turn when Gov. Noem sat on the bill a few days. What happened with the Governor's office?
      Gov's staff told Norman about changes to bill, which Norman explained were not welcome or helpful; things go silent; Gov. Noem announces style & form veto
   c. To Norman: Ok, what is a style & form veto and was Gov. Noem right to do that?
      Explain style & form; this was a misuse; Legislature strongly rejected the veto
   d. To Norman: How did you push back on Gov. Noem as this played out &

how was that received?
Share about your on-the-ground work, possibly thank national orgs who rallied around you; Gov. Noem announcing her own "window dressing" coalition; share about Lt. Gov's call to your Board if you like

4. **The Practical stuff**
   a. You both had a very clear strategy in getting bill sponsors and cosponsors. Tell us about that.
      i. Jerry *(strong female sponsors who will champion the legislation, including when groups attempt to weaken it; goal to get every female GOP on the bill)*
      ii. Norman *(first time in 5 tries to have female sponsors; goal to get as many GOP women as possible; female witnesses to female-sponsored legislation)*
5. **The questions we all want answered:**
   a. To Jerry: Why did Gov. Hutchinson sign girls' sports and reject the SAFE Act, the bill banning gender transition procedures on minors?
   b. To Norman: Why did Gov. Noem flip-flop so dramatically on this issue? *Please share whatever you're comfortable with, but please do mention that she had killed the minor gender transition bill in South Dakota behind-the -scenes last year. She is not with us on these issues.*
   c. To Jerry: How did Gov. Noem's behavior affect you all in Arkansas? *Concern that if a perceived strong Governor like Noem was scared, Arkansas should be, etc.*
   d. To Norman: What was the biggest win in all of this?
   Gov. Noem is exposed, loss of national stage & key support; now other GOP leaders and presidential hopefuls know that these are issues you can't mess up on

MINOR GENDER TRANSITION

1. **First-in-the-nation bill!**
   a. To Robin: You led a groundbreaking and challenging bill, seeing it overcome a veto and become the first of its kind in the nation. What inspired you to do this?
   GOP women in Arkansas; wanting to prevent it from coming to the state; shock at finding out it was already there; deep concern for these

children

b. To Roger: What about you, Dr. Hiatt, why do you care so deeply about this issue as a medical professional who actually works with children experiencing distress about identifying with their biological sex on a regular basis?
Every child Dr. Hiatt has treated with struggles with gender identity has a background of sexual abuse and/or comorbidities; NEVER seen a young person where gender dysphoria as been their only or even primary source of distress; has seen a growing number of his patients reject a gender identity when their psychopathology is under control; you can't actually change your sex—that is a lie

2. **The practical stuff**
   a. To Robin: You also had a very successful strategy in how you gathered cosponsors for your bill. Tell us about that.
   Secured cosponsors ahead of time; targeted cosponsors on committees the bill could go through and as many women as possible
   b. To Robin: What were other key factors that made this a success story?
   Team spirit in Arkansas; prayer team; "Talking is silver but silence is gold"; help of medical professionals; other legislators worked press with/through you; video
   c. To Roger: One of the biggest problems legislators and family policy councils face when running bills like this is feeling like the weight of the medical community is against them—the AMA, American Academy of Pediatricians, and more.
   A reminder to all that organized medicine is heavily skewed toward academics and not practitioners; they claim to speak for the entire membership, but there are many practitioners who do not agree with what's going on
3. **The Tough Stuff**
   a. One of the questions that kept coming up over and over again, even reverberating nationally, was "what about the children who are already undergoing 'treatment' with puberty-blockers and/or cross-sex hormones"? How do you both respond to that?
      i. Robin *(We're not looking in the medicine cabinet; these drugs are already dangerous; once off drugs, suicide risk goes down, so this is critical to get children off of these medications; need care of a*

physician to help them work off the drugs; be prepared to be blamed when a child identifying as transgender commits suicide—it WILL happen

ii. Roger *(the legislation comes with a window of time for weaning off which may be helpful for cross-sex hormones and isn't necessary for puberty-blockers)*

b. To Robin: What do you wish you had communicated more clearly on during this process or what lesson could you share with others as they go into the next session, possibly running this bill?
Made more clear that the legislation bans harmful gender transition procedures but other forms of treatment and help are all still available

c. To Roger: Hearing about how politicized medicine is affecting children already struggling with mental health issues is obviously a very hard topic. You shared with me something even more disturbing that I had not heard about puberty blockers and how they are making the problem worse. Can you educate the audience on that?
Puberty is one of the most powerful motivators for children to move away from a trans identity to a gender identity consistent with their biological sex. The use of puberty blockers itself is preventing them from acknowledging and experiencing the biological realities of their own bodies. Plus, when their peers are maturing and their bodies are frozen as 10-year-olds, this is bound to have its own healthcare effects

d. To Robin: The final word here—was it worth it?

RESOURCES

1. **Promise to America's Children: Growing Movement & Platform**
   - **a.** Platform with 10 key statements of agreement, promising to protect children's minds, bodies, and hearts—a positive rallying cry for what we stand FOR, not just against
     - **i.** Both pieces of legislation today fit squarely within the Promise
     - **ii.** Promise endorses other legislation as well
   - **b.** 60 state & national organizations
     - **i.** Led by Heritage, FPA, ADF
     - **ii.** Includes nearly every FPC

iii. Includes 32 state legislators

c. Media takeoff and anger by the Left

d. Adaptable by state

i. To Robin: Please share briefly what you did with the Promise in Arkansas

e. Encouragement to join

2. **Help Not Harm model legislation**

a. Based on FPA original language from 2017/2018 cycle, updates in Rep. Lundstrum's SAFE Act, wise counsel from the experts at Christian Medical and Dental Association, and increased access to a civil cause of action and damages for child victims—including when they become adults

b. Brief walkthrough of sections

3. **Introduction of Meridian Baldacci (Autumn)**

4. **Help Not Harm Messaging Resources (Meridian)**

a. Campaign website

b. Messaging packet

Exhibit 3

GENDER ISSUES POLICY PANEL - July 22, 2021

Family Policy ALLIANCE

KEY
Norman Woods
Jerry Cox
Robin Lundstrum
Roger Hiatt

What we're looking for in your response is text in italics

INTRODUCTION - Moderator, Autumn Stroup

1. **Overview of both topics & "state of play" for both**
   a. Huge success & pushback on the LGBT agenda from the states
   b. Federal impact with Biden Administration & Equality Act
2. **Gratitude**
   a. Thanks to lawmakers and FPCs who made the progress possible
   b. Thanks to national allies who contributed their resources and talents to take on these issues:
      i. The Heritage Foundation
      ii. Christian Medical and Dental Association
      iii. Alliance Defending Freedom
      iv. Concerned Women for America
      v. Family Research Council
      vi. Focus on the Family
      vii. American Principles Project
      viii. American College of Pediatricians
      ix. Ethics & Public Policy Center
3. **Introduction of Panelists**
   a. Norman Woods, Executive Director, Family Heritage Alliance of South Dakota
   b. Jerry Cox, Founder & President, Family Council of Arkansas
   c. Representative Robin Lundstrum, representative of District 87 since 2015
   d. Dr. Roger Hiatt, Medical Director, Residential Treatment Services, Perimeter Behavioral Health, West Memphis (AR) and Jackson (TN)

GIRLS SPORTS

EXHIBIT 30
PENGAD 800-631-6989

8675 Explorer Drive, Suite 112
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

P 866.655.4545

1. **Huge success for girls' sports in 2021**
   a. 1 state last year with 38 states running legislation & 7 (maybe 8 with Texas!) signing it into law
   b. AP admits girls' sports legislation stopped the Equality Act in the Senate
2. **Success story: Arkansas**
   a. To Jerry: What were the key elements you knew would be essential to a good girls' sports bill?
      i. Drafting a good bill:
         1. Based on biological sex, not what is on the birth certificate.
      ii. Right sponsor
         1. House: Female coach
         2. Senate: Female part time girls soccer
      iii. No opposition from the Arkansas Activities Assn.
      iv. Messaging
         1. All flowed through the Senate Sponsor
         2. Consistent
      v. Our sponsors were thoroughly prepared
   b. To Jerry: How do you recommend preparing your sponsors and hearing witnesses?
      Every sponsor gets a 3-ring binder to make them the most knowledgeable on the issue; preparation and hospitality for witnesses, especially those from out-of-state so they understand the culture and "state of play"; preparing all to understand the high tensions on these bills & need for security
      i. Three ring binder with: Making our sponsors the smartest people in the room.
         1. Policy brief
         2. Questions and Answers
         3. Research reports
         4. Copy of the bill
         5. Other relevant information
      ii. Teaching session with sponsors
      iii. Dialogue with the sponsor as questions and issues arise
      iv. Explain who things are done at your capitol the same as you would want a D.C. lobbyist to explain things to you if you were testifying in D.C.

1. Don't assume they know things you take for granted.
    a. Joseph Backholm: Didn't know they were going to vote on the SAFE act the day he testified.
2. Demonstrate hospitality.
    a. Assign a staff person to be their personal assistant.
        i. Airport, hotel, meals, transportation, briefing on what is going to happen next, errands.
3. Play ahead to include them.
4. Take care of their safety (ladies traveling alone in urban areas)

v. Prepare everyone that this is going to be a rough ride.
1. Physical safety threatened.
2. Dealing with verbal insults
3. Avoiding confrontation (even is small rural states)
    a. Police escort for us
    b. Armed escort for sponsors
    c. Watch your office.
4. Dealing with opponents in and around committee meetings.

c. To Jerry: I understand there were some competing bills in Arkansas for awhile. Tell us the short story of what happened and your advice to preventing or managing this for other states.
i. Three measures filed
ii. A couple more were planned
iii. Start circulating your bill and getting co-sponsors early
    1. If they co-sponsor your bill they're not likely to file their own.
iv. Get a strong lead sponsor that will discourage others
v. We had a competing bill filed.
    1. Worked it out.

3. Dramatic Story: South Dakota

a. To Norman: Things in SD started and ended with a lot of drama. This was your 5th time trying a girls' sports bill in SD, and you didn't expect it to

clear the more moderate Senate. Tell us what happened the last week of session that gave you hope.
Bill dying in committee; Senators force it to floor; expected to die; Gov. Noem tweet on Women's Day (confirmed she verbally committed to the tweet)

b. To Norman: But then things took a more negative dramatic turn when Gov. Noem sat on the bill a few days. What happened with the Governor's office?
Gov's staff told Norman about changes to bill, which Norman explained were not welcome or helpful; things go silent; Gov. Noem announces style & form veto

c. To Norman: Ok, what is a style & form veto and was Gov. Noem right to do that?
Explain style & form; this was a misuse; Legislature strongly rejected the veto

d. To Norman: How did you push back on Gov. Noem as this played out & how was that received?
Share about your on-the-ground work, possibly thank national orgs who rallied around you; Gov. Noem announcing her own "window dressing" coalition; share about Lt. Gov's call to your Board if you like

4. **The Practical stuff**
   a. You both had a very clear strategy in getting bill sponsors and cosponsors. Tell us about that.
      i. Jerry *(strong female sponsors who will champion the legislation, including when groups attempt to weaken it; goal to get every female GOP on the bill)*
      ii. Part of the Republican women's caucus dream big strategy
         1. Every woman Republican was a co-sponsor (appx 18 women)
      iii.
      iv. Norman *(first time in 5 tries to have female sponsors; goal to get as many GOP women as possible; female witnesses to female-sponsored legislation)*
5. **The questions we all want answered:**
   a. To Jerry: Why did Gov. Hutchinson sign girls' sports and reject the SAFE Act, the bill banning gender transition procedures on minors?

b. "Today, I have signed into law SB354 called the 'Fairness in Women's Sports Act'. I have studied the law and heard from hundreds of constituents on this issue. I signed the law as a fan of women's sports from basketball to soccer and including many others in which women compete successfully. This law simply says that female athletes should not have to compete in a sport against a student of the male sex when the sport is designed for women's competition. As I have stated previously, I agree with the intention of this law," he said in a statement.

c. Asa had 3 transgender bills:

- **i.** Conscience
- **ii.** Female Sports
- **iii.** Gender Reassignment

d. To Norman: Why did Gov. Noem flip-flop so dramatically on this issue? *Please share whatever you're comfortable with, but please do mention that she had killed the minor gender transition bill in South Dakota behind-the -scenes last year. She is not with us on these issues.*

e. To Jerry: How did Gov. Noem's behavior affect you all in Arkansas? *Concern that if a perceived strong Governor like Noem was scared, Arkansas should be, etc.*

- **i.** It made us afraid our governor would follow, but as far as I know her decision did not influence Asa. In 2015 when Indiana's RFRA blew up, Asa was in regular communication with Gov. Pence. He went is own way and preserved the integrity of our RFRA.

f. To Norman: What was the biggest win in all of this? *Gov. Noem is exposed, loss of national stage & key support; now other GOP leaders and presidential hopefuls know that these are issues you can't mess up on*

MINOR GENDER TRANSITION

1. **First-in-the-nation bill!**
   - **a.** To Robin: You led a groundbreaking and challenging bill, seeing it overcome a veto and become the first of its kind in the nation. What

inspired you to do this?
GOP women in Arkansas; wanting to prevent it from coming to the state; shock at finding out it was already there; deep concern for these children

b. To Roger: What about you, Dr. Hiatt, why do you care so deeply about this issue as a medical professional who actually works with children experiencing distress about identifying with their biological sex on a regular basis?
Every child Dr. Hiatt has treated with struggles with gender identity has a background of sexual abuse and/or comorbidities; NEVER seen a young person where gender dysphoria as been their only or even primary source of distress; has seen a growing number of his patients reject a gender identity when their psychopathology is under control; you can't actually change your sex—that is a lie

2. The practical stuff

a. To Robin: You also had a very successful strategy in how you gathered cosponsors for your bill. Tell us about that.
Secured cosponsors ahead of time; targeted cosponsors on committees the bill could go through and as many women as possible

b. To Robin: What were other key factors that made this a success story?
Team spirit in Arkansas; prayer team; "Talking is silver but silence is gold"; help of medical professionals; other legislators worked press with/through you; video

c. To Roger: One of the biggest problems legislators and family policy councils face when running bills like this is feeling like the weight of the medical community is against them—the AMA, American Academy of Pediatricians, and more.
A reminder to all that organized medicine is heavily skewed toward academics and not practitioners; they claim to speak for the entire membership, but there are many practitioners who do not agree with what's going on

3. The Tough Stuff

a. One of the questions that kept coming up over and over again, even reverberating nationally, was "what about the children who are already undergoing 'treatment' with puberty-blockers and/or cross-sex hormones"? How do you both respond to that?

i. Robin *(We're not looking in the medicine cabinet; these drugs are already dangerous; once off drugs, suicide risk goes down, so this is critical to get children off of these medications; need care of a physician to help them work off the drugs; be prepared to be blamed when a child identifying as transgender commits suicide—it WILL happen*

ii. Roger *(the legislation comes with a window of time for weaning off which may be helpful for cross-sex hormones and isn't necessary for puberty-blockers)*

b. To Robin: What do you wish you had communicated more clearly on during this process or what lesson could you share with others as they go into the next session, possibly running this bill?
Made more clear that the legislation bans harmful gender transition procedures but other forms of treatment and help are all still available

c. To Roger: Hearing about how politicized medicine is affecting children already struggling with mental health issues is obviously a very hard topic. You shared with me something even more disturbing that I had not heard about puberty blockers and how they are making the problem worse. Can you educate the audience on that?
Puberty is one of the most powerful motivators for children to move away from a trans identity to a gender identity consistent with their biological sex. The use of puberty blockers itself is preventing them from acknowledging and experiencing the biological realities of their own bodies. Plus, when their peers are maturing and their bodies are frozen as 10-year-olds, this is bound to have its own healthcare effects

d. To Robin: The final word here—was it worth it?

RESOURCES

1. **Promise to America's Children: Growing Movement & Platform**
   a. Platform with 10 key statements of agreement, promising to protect children's minds, bodies, and hearts—a positive rallying cry for what we stand FOR, not just against
      i. Both pieces of legislation today fit squarely within the Promise
      ii. Promise endorses other legislation as well

Family Policy ALLIANCE

b. 60 state & national organizations
  i. Led by Heritage, FPA, ADF
  ii. Includes nearly every FPC
  iii. Includes 32 state legislators

c. Media takeoff and anger by the Left

[redacted]

e. Encouragement to join

2. Help Not Harm model legislation

a. Based on FPA original language from 2017/2018 cycle, updates in Rep. Lundstrum's SAFE Act, wise counsel from the experts at Christian Medical and Dental Association, and increased access to a civil cause of action and damages for child victims—including when they become adults

   b. Brief walkthrough of sections
3. **Introduction of Meridian Baldacci (Autumn)**
4. **Help Not Harm Messaging Resources (Meridian)**
   a. Campaign website
   b. Messaging packet

How We Passed the SAFE Act in Arkansas

This is like fighting a coordinated battle. Align all your forces withal their weapons and unleash them in a coordinated fashion. We were guided by the hand of providence.

1) **Well written draft**
   a) No amendments
2) **Great Sponsor**
   a) Robin
   b) Alan
   c) Women's caucus
3) **Great National Support**
   a) FRC
   b) ADF
4) **The Right Committee Chairs**
   a) Ladyman
   b) Bledsoe
5) **Right Committee makeup**
6) **Timing**
   a) Conscience
   b) Female Sports
   c) Once it started we ran quickly
7) **Powerful grassroots network**
   a) Thousands of calls and emails
8) **Overcoming Walmart and** others
9) **Great committee Testimony**
   a) Billy Burrough
   b) Joseph Backholm

c) Dr. Grady Crossland
d) Dr. _____ Fort Smith
e) Dr. Roger Hiatt
f) Dr. Chuck Lewis
g) Dr. Melanie Conway

10) Prayer mobilization
a) Franklin Graham praying

11) Great messaging
a) All flowed through Rep. Lundstrum
b) Didn't let it get crazy
c) We didn't chase every negative comment or news story
i) Stay the course
ii) The Capitol is our turf

12) Advantages
a) Supermajorities in both houses
b)

Protect Women's Sports

Here are some of the parts that contributed to the whole as we secured passage of the bill to protect female sports. I can talk about any of these points and probably address others you may have. Highlighted are some that may be unique to Arkansas.

1) Drafting a good bill
a) Vetting the bill
b) Reading bills from other states
c) Keeping up with the fight elsewhere
2) Securing the right sponsor
3) Co-sponsors and coalition-building
a) Part of the Women's Caucus package
i) Every woman republican on board
(1) Appx 20
b) Lack of support from the Arkansas Activities Assn.

4) Dealing with competing bills and agendas
   a) Our bill
   b) Attorney General's bill
5) Managing personalities and disagreements
6) Dealing with attempts to weaken the bill
   a) Higher Education
      i) Redefine biological sex to birth certificate
   b) NCAA
      i) Exempt Higher ED
7) Messaging
   a) To lawmakers
      i) Policy briefs
      ii) Countering NCAA
   b) To the public
      i) News interviews
8) Committee testimony
   a) Sponsor Prep
      i) Notebook
      ii) Learning sessions with sponsor
   b) Experts
      i) Planning ahead to include them
      ii) Hospitality
9) Dealing with LGBT activists
   a) Invite our citizens to be at the Capitol
      i) In Committee
      ii) At the Capitol
   b) Responding to their aggression
   c) Physical safety of
      i) Bill sponsors
         (1) Hate messages
      ii) Experts for committee testimony
      iii) Our staff
10) Developments since passage
   a) Human Rights Campaign planning to file suit in Arkansas

Family Policy ALLIANCE

b) NCAA did not cancel events
   i) Baseball and Softball Regionals and Superregionals
   ii) Waltons $1 million for LGBTQ
   iii) Silence
      (1) DOE
      (2) AAA
   iv) Law on July 28
   v)

8675 Explorer Drive, Suite 112
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

P 866.655.4545