

1
2
3
4 SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
5 JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL,
6 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
7 WASHINGTON, D.C.

8
9
10
11 INTERVIEW OF: CASSIE DOCKSEY
12
13
14

15 Thursday, August 25, 2022

16
17 Washington, D.C.
18
19

20 The interview in the above matter was held via Webex, commencing at 11:01 a.m.

1

2 Appearances:

3

4

5 For the SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE

6 THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE U.S. CAPITOL:

7

8 [REDACTED], INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL

9 [REDACTED], STAFF ASSOCIATE

10 [REDACTED], PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

11 [REDACTED], FINANCIAL INVESTIGATOR

12 [REDACTED], FINANCIAL INVESTIGATOR

13 [REDACTED], SENIOR INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL

14

15

16 For CASSIE DOCKSEY:

17

18 TODD R. STEGGERDA

19 EMILY KELLEY

20 McGuireWoods

21 888 16th Street NW, Suite 500

22 Black Lives Matter Plaza

23 Washington, D.C. 20006

1

2 Mr. ██████████. This is a transcribed interview of Cassie Docksey,
3 conducted by the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the
4 United States Capitol pursuant to House Resolution 503.

5 At this time, I'll ask the witness to please state your full name and spell your last
6 name for the record.

7 Ms. Docksey. Sure. Cassie Docksey, D-o-c-k-s-e-y.

8 Mr. ██████████. Now, Ms. Docksey, this will be a staff-led interview,
9 although members may choose to ask questions. I don't see any members currently
10 present.

11 My name is ██████████, and I'm an investigative counsel with the
12 select committee. And, with the select committee, with me as well are ██████████,
13 senior investigative counsel; ██████████, financial investigator. And joining us
14 on the Webex, we have two other investigators, ██████████ and ██████████

15 At this time, I'd ask for counsel to please identify himself for the record.

16 Mr. Steggerda. I'm Todd Steggerda, a partner at McGuireWoods in Washington,
17 representing Ms. Docksey in her individual capacity.

18 I am joined off screen by an associate at McGuireWoods, Emily Kelley. And there
19 are no other people in the room here.

20 Mr. ██████████. Now, Ms. Docksey, you are voluntarily here for this
21 transcribed interview. Ground rules for the interview:

22 There's an official reporter transcribing the record of this interview. The
23 reporter transcription is the official record of the proceeding. This proceeding is also
24 audio- and video-recorded.

25 Please wait until each question is complete before you begin to respond, and we'll

1 do our best to wait until your response is complete before we ask the next question.
2 The reporter cannot note nonverbal responses such as shaking or nodding your head, so
3 it's important that you respond to each question with an audible, verbal response.

4 Please give complete answers to the best of your recollection. If a question is
5 unclear, please ask for clarification. If you do not know the answer, please just say so.

6 Also, as we remind all witnesses, it's unlawful to deliberately provide false
7 information to Congress, and doing so could result in criminal penalties.

8 Logistically, please let us know if you need any breaks or would like to discuss
9 anything with your attorney. We're happy to accommodate.

10 Do you have any questions before we begin?

11 Ms. Docksey. No.

12 EXAMINATION

13 BY [REDACTED]: -

14 Q Can you please provide us with any other names you've used besides
15 "Docksey"?

16 A Yeah, my maiden name, Smedile, S-m-e-d-i-l-e.

17 Q And what's your date of birth?

18 A [REDACTED]

19 Q And where do you reside?

20 A Where? Sorry?

21 Q Yes, ma'am.

22 A Do you want, like, my full address?

23 Mr. Steggerda. Yeah. Where do you live?

24 Ms. Docksey. [REDACTED]

25 BY [REDACTED]:

1 Q And what's your cell phone number?

2 A [REDACTED]

3 Q Is that the number you used while you were working at the RNC?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Did you have a separate RNC-provided phone number?

6 A No.

7 Q Do you have an Instagram or Twitter account?

8 A Yes, I have both. Both are cmsmedile, c-m-s-m-e-d-i-l-e.

9 Q And were those the accounts you had in November 2020 through
10 January '21?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Could you please provide us very generally your educational background?

13 A Sure. I have a bachelor's degree from Marquette University, graduated in
14 2007.

15 Q And when did you first join the RNC?

16 A In August of 2017.

17 Q And what was your job before you joined the RNC?

18 A Right before the RNC, I was on Capitol Hill as the communications director
19 for Senator Todd Young from Indiana.

20 Q When you joined the RNC in August of 2017, what was your role?

21 A I was the national press secretary.

22 Q And what did that mean?

23 A I primarily took the incoming reporter requests and then pitched and placed
24 stories about the RNC, you know, our field program, how many doors we'd knocked,
25 volunteers, things like that.

1 Q And who did you report to while national press secretary?

2 A The deputy communications director was a gal by the name of Lindsay
3 Jancek, and the communications director was Ryan Mahoney.

4 Q And how do you spell "Jancek"?

5 A J-a-n-c-e-k.

6 Q Did your title at some point change from national press secretary to
7 something else?

8 A In January of 2019, I was promoted to the deputy communications director.

9 Q And did your responsibilities change?

10 A Yes. They grew, and I was no longer the primary person to pitch and place
11 the stories.

12 Q What were your new responsibilities?

13 A So the communications and research department at the RNC has a lot of
14 subdivisions -- rapid response or the specialty medias, or regional media is the booking
15 operation, and then the national press team. So primarily I would help to coordinate
16 the message or the task for each of those subdivisions, if we had a message that we
17 wanted everybody to be on message about.

18 And then I also worked with the GOP social team, the digital team that did the
19 GOP accounts. I approved their social. And then that's also where I started doing
20 some of the approval for the fundraising emails, the small-dollar fundraising emails.

21 Q This is through TMAGAC?

22 A Yes.

23 Q All right. Let's finish going through your background at the RNC, and then
24 we'll come back to your role in approving fundraising emails.

25 A Okay.

1 Q Did you ever take on another title after deputy comms director?

2 A No, not at the RNC.

3 Q And when did you leave the RNC?

4 A January of 2021.

5 Q Do you know the date?

6 A So I started my new job at America Rising on January 11th.

7 Q So you left the RNC sometime between the 1st and the 11th?

8 A Yes. So, if the 11th was probably a Monday -- so my last day would've been
9 that Friday. So, because of the holidays and COVID, people weren't at the office, so they
10 just gave me a little bit of a grace period to be able to -- I went to the last winter meeting
11 that week prior, to be able to say bye to people. So that's why it's a little funny, because
12 I wasn't, like, actively still doing a lot of the work but I was still on payroll so that I could
13 have that opportunity.

14 Q Okay.

15 Let's move to the year -- well, in your role as deputy comms director, who did you
16 report to? And if that changed over '19 through '20, if you could let us know.

17 A So, for that whole cycle, '19 and '20, I reported to Michael Ahrens, who was
18 the communications director, and then Mike Reed, who was the deputy chief of staff for
19 communications and research. So I sort of reported to them interchangeably.

20 Q Did you understand Mr. Reed to report to Mr. Ahrens, or no?

21 A No. I would put them on the same level, on the same plane.

22 Q And who did you understand them to report to?

23 A Probably Richard Walters, the chief of staff, would've probably been their
24 primary person.

25 Q And in your work in the fall of the 2020 cycle, did you have a lot of

1 interaction with the chairwoman, Ronna McDaniel?

2 A A fair amount. I was no longer the primary person who would go with her
3 to media appearances or things like that, like I did in the press secretary role, but I would
4 see her from time to time.

5 Q Would you ever attend meetings with her at the White House?

6 A No, I didn't do that with her.

7 Q All right.

8 Let's go back to when you took on reviewing the fundraising emails from
9 TMAGAC. Tell us a bit about how you understood the approval process for TMAGAC
10 emails to work.

11 A For the approval process? So, from the RNC side, we had a
12 communications approver, of which I was the primary communications approver for the
13 majority of the cycle; a legal approver; and then a research approver.

14 And then I understood that there was a team from the campaign that I think was
15 largely parallel to us. I don't know if they had a research approver, but I know there was
16 a comms approver and a legal person.

17 Q And so, for the majority of the cycle, you were the comms approver. Is that
18 right?

19 A Yes.

20 Mr. Steggerda. And "cycle" -- I'm sorry. You might want to clarify. Because
21 we're going to get into the timing, but --

22 Mr. [REDACTED] Yeah --

23 Mr. Steggerda. -- when you said "cycle," it just --

24 Mr. [REDACTED]. Yeah, that's my next question.

25 Mr. Steggerda. Okay. Sorry.

1 [REDACTED] No, no. You're all good, Todd.

2 Mr. Steggerda. All right.

3 BY [REDACTED]:

4 Q So you took the deputy comms director job in January of '19. How soon
5 after that did you start approving fundraising emails?

6 A I think pretty early on. I think I have a memory of for sure the spring of
7 2019. I don't know that it was something that started on day one, but it was pretty
8 early on in the cycle.

9 Q And who directed you to start doing that?

10 A It would've been Michael Ahrens or Mike Reed. I don't recall who
11 specifically, or which one.

12 Q And when did you stay in that role until?

13 A As the approver or as deputy communications director?

14 Q The comms approver for the RNC fundraising emails.

15 A So, to the best of my knowledge, it was a couple weeks after the election,
16 but I don't believe I was the primary approver from about Thanksgiving on. I think that's
17 where I dropped off, and even a little bit before then, but I don't have a clear memory of
18 the exact date.

19 Q And why do you think you dropped off from Thanksgiving -- oh, let me
20 rephrase that. Why do you think you weren't the primary comms approver from
21 Thanksgiving on?

22 A Or even a little before. So I think a little personal context might be helpful.
23 So I was supposed to get married on December 12th of 2020, and so I was in the
24 home stretch of planning that wedding. And then I think December 15th -- or
25 November 15th I got the call that, because of COVID, the wedding was no longer

1 happening on December 12th, and I was going to reschedule it to February.

2 So I had to really quickly cancel a wedding and re-plan the wedding. And so I
3 remember Mike Reed and the team giving me the grace to do that, not just on these
4 emails but just my job as a whole. They knew that I was kind of handling a lot there.

5 So that's why I think I dropped off as the primary approver, but it's possible that I
6 still did some from time to time. But that was a key moment that there was just a lot
7 going on personally.

8 Q And who did you understand to become the primary comms approver after
9 that period?

10 A I think it was Mike Reed, because he was "comms and research" in his title.
11 So that's what I think happened and why that was able to happen.

12 Q All right.

13 And as far as the legal approver, who did you understand that to be for the 2020
14 cycle? And do tell us if that changed over time.

15 A So I don't recall if it was always -- I know Justin Riemer, who was the chief
16 legal counsel, was on the emails and approved from time to time, but I think -- I think
17 there were others. There were certainly others from the legal team who hopped in.
18 And I don't know when that happened or what rhyme or reason, other than maybe just
19 bandwidth. And I don't recall -- and I don't want to speculate on who that was. I just
20 don't recall their names to say for certain.

21 Q How about the name Jenna Kirsch?

22 A Now that you mention it, I think -- yeah, I think I recall Jenna. But I didn't
23 recall that until you mentioned it. But I recall Jenna being on them, yes.

24 Q Lawyers call that "refreshing your recollection."

25 A I appreciate the refresher.

1 Q And for research, who handled research from the RNC side for the 2020
2 cycle?

3 A So I think primarily it would have been Joe Ascioti, who was the research
4 director. But then again, Mike Reed may have taken that on at some point or may have
5 been interchangeable. I just don't remember exactly.

6 Q And how do you spell Joe's last name?

7 A Oh, I knew you were going to ask me. A-s-c-o-t-i (sic), I believe.

8 Q Thank you.

9 Did you have an understanding of who the Trump campaign individuals were for
10 comms, research, legal, or whichever way they set it up?

11 A I really didn't. There might've been -- I might've seen a name from time to
12 time, or someone chime in, or, I should say, like, noticed in the thread of the email that
13 there had been commentary. But no name stands out, and I don't recall that that was
14 something that I saw every time.

15 Q Does the name Zach Parkinson for research sound familiar?

16 A I know Zach and knew him from that time. Again, I don't recall if he was on
17 the emails or if he was a person that I saw responding to the emails. I just don't
18 remember.

19 Q What about the name Alex Cannon for legal?

20 A Again, the name sounds familiar, but I just don't recall seeing it on the email
21 thread, like, as an active voice in the email thread. I just don't remember. I'm sorry.

22 Q Let's go through: As the comms approver, what did you understand your
23 role to be in approving the fundraising emails?

24 A So, for the emails that were primarily campaign-focused messaging or
25 coming from a campaign surrogate, my primary role was to make sure that everything

1 worked, that there weren't any glaring typos, or they weren't saying this was coming from
2 the President or X surrogate and then the body of the email didn't match that -- you
3 know, because they would come in these big digest forms, so it was a lot of copy that
4 they would copy and paste over -- you know, the links worked. I just took my role to
5 make sure that there weren't any glaring errors from that standpoint on these emails.

6 And then, if it was more RNC-focused, maybe from the chairwoman, then I would
7 look to make sure it aligned with her public statements on that topic.

8 Q And is that what you were directed from either Mr. Reed or Mr. Ahrens of
9 how to handle your role?

10 A I actually don't recall that they ever gave a clear directive or directions on
11 how this should be done. Just based on all of the different sets of eyes on it, I carved
12 that out as my niche, to make sure that that box got checked.

13 Q Now, you said something glaring for the Trump campaign-focused emails.
14 Is it fair to say that if an email came from either Team Trump or Donald Trump or a
15 surrogate, like a Trump family member, that those were the kind of emails you're talking
16 about that are campaign-focused?

17 A Yes, I think that's fair to say. Definitely.

18 Q And you mentioned that you looked to see whether everything worked or
19 that nothing glaring was wrong. What were the kind of things that would be glaringly
20 wrong or that didn't work that you were looking for?

21 A So sometimes maybe when they send it through, the subject line wouldn't
22 match the body of the email. Like, clearly they had just copied and pasted incorrectly.
23 So I'd flag that as something that they should correct. Or, like I said, if a link went to a
24 landing page that didn't seem to fit, then I would flag that. Or certainly typos and things
25 like that. And, again, because these emails had a lot in them, that would happen more

1 often than you might think.

2 Q And just for your background, we've seen numerous of these approval
3 chains, so we have a sense -- and we've seen you responding on them, so we understand
4 that there, you know, can be a lot of text messages and then several emails and it's a lot
5 of text. So we do have some background there, just so you're aware.

6 When you reviewed these emails, focusing on the Trump campaign emails, did
7 you see it as your role to revise the substance of the email? Meaning, an email was
8 written, it makes an assertion, let's say even a political assertion about something; did
9 you see it as your role to refine that, or was that a role held by someone else?

10 A Are you referring to something specifically or just meaning generally?

11 Q Well, we'll talk about specific emails and especially the post-election
12 messaging and what that looked like. But I'm just trying to get a sense of, when you
13 opened these emails up and you read -- like any fundraising email, it's going to make an
14 assertion, a claim about the state of the world in some way and why people should
15 donate. When you were reviewing those, were you looking at that and thinking, it's my
16 job to revise this, make this better, to kind of deal with that in a substantive way, as
17 opposed to --

18 A Oh, okay.

19 Q -- as opposed to the kind of things we've just talked about -- typos, links,
20 glaring errors?

21 A Uh-huh. So, if it was a campaign message, clearly something, like we've
22 talked about, from the President or one of the campaign surrogates, then I really didn't
23 look at it from a substance standpoint. I might've from time to time said, "Is this what
24 he said?" or, "Does this match his voice?" You know, there might have been some
25 commentary. I'm not speaking or thinking of anything specifically. And they would

1 point to a tweet or something that they drew this from. But, generally, if it was from
2 the campaign, I left that to them and their approval chain.

3 Q And --

4 A But over the course of the 2 years, we might've had some dialogue back and
5 forth.

6 Q And just to clarify, when you say "some dialogue," are you talking about
7 dialogue with the copywriting folks who came up with the email or dialogue with the
8 campaign approval team?

9 A I see. I'd usually just reply-all to the chain. And if I had a question about
10 a -- you know, felt like something looked out of place, they'd point me to -- say, for
11 example, one instance, and I can't think of what the context of the copy was or anything,
12 but I know, for example, there was one time where I had raised a question if this line read
13 right from, I think it was Don Jr., and they pointed me to a tweet where he had tweeted
14 that exact thing. And they said, "So, you know, if he's comfortable saying that here, are
15 you good with that?" And I think it was just something that didn't read right to me.
16 And I said, "Sure, if he's okay with it, then no additional questions from me."

17 So it might be some kind of flag like that. But, generally speaking, if it was their
18 surrogate and their message, then I really yielded to them to sort that through on their
19 own approval chain.

20 Ms. █. When you say "read right," like, "it didn't read right," do you mean it
21 didn't read factually correct? It had typos? Like, what didn't read right to you that you
22 flagged?

23 And I know you probably don't remember the specifics, but I'm just trying to
24 understand -- like, that could be a broad range of things. Like, what do you mean when
25 you say "read right"?

1 Ms. Docksey. I see. Like a weird phrasing. You know, if we might say, "I
2 walked to the store," and this said, "I was walking myself to the store," or something like
3 that, you know, I'd say, "Is that how you want that to read?" And then they'd show me
4 how they took that straight from a public comment.

5 ██████████ Got it. Okay.

6 BY ██████████:

7 Q So is it fair to say that when a campaign-focused email came across your
8 desk for approval, you didn't see it as your job to revise the substance of the email if
9 there weren't otherwise glaring errors, such as typos or an odd reading to the casual
10 reader, for example?

11 A Right, I did not see that as my primary role. I saw my primary role as just
12 looking for glaring typo errors, but not to look at the substance of the email, if that helps.

13 Q Now, you mentioned that legal was also on the approval chain for the RNC.
14 What did you understand legal to be doing on the chain?

15 A What lawyers do. They would usually go through it just to make sure, I
16 think, that things from their perspective were as clear as they could be, or they just made
17 edits that I felt, you know, always -- I'm trying to think of the right word -- like, a cleaner
18 way to phrase something or something like that.

19 So I just viewed them as taking their legal eye to it. I don't know exactly what
20 they were looking for.

21 Q Let's move to research. What did you understand research to be doing?

22 A So, based on how the RNC research approached their research documents
23 that they would send out from the RNC, and so I would say this was probably the same
24 eye that they were taking here, just to make sure if they were saying, you know,
25 "Forty percent chance of rain today," and they'd go through and say, "Actually, it's a

1 65 percent chance of rain today," you know, for example.

2 So just to say publicly available information, that all of that was consistent with
3 what was publicly available from the RNC side. Again, that's my understanding of how
4 they approached their own research documents.

5 Q So would an example be, the email says, "President Trump in Pennsylvania
6 said X, Y, Z," they would go check that is Pennsylvania the right place where he actually
7 said that, as opposed to Michigan?

8 A So I actually don't know. In that case, my assumption would be that would
9 be more of the campaign side, to check that. That's not to say that they didn't or that
10 they wouldn't feel compelled to check that. I just don't know if that was how he
11 thought about it.

12 I'm sorry I don't know. So much of this was just an email chain.

13 Q Yeah. So is it fair to say that there were not meetings that were held
14 outside of the email chain between the two approval sides to discuss how to handle the
15 emails, or strategy, or kind of broader planning? Is that fair to say?

16 A Yes. I don't recall any meetings like that.

17 Q So there was no, in a sense, coordination between the RNC approval side
18 and the Trump campaign approval side outside of these email chains and questions that
19 came back and forth on specific chains.

20 A I don't recall or recall being a part of any meetings where that would've been
21 discussed. There might have been a one-off conversation between folks, but certainly
22 no established meeting that I'm aware of.

23 Q Now, if there was ever a conflict between the views of the RNC approval
24 versus the Trump approval folks, would that all be handled, again, by this kind of reply-all
25 process?

1 A Yes. That's my recollection, that people would put in their edits, and then
2 that would be for the campaign team, which I think had the final look. I think at one
3 point we got it after they reviewed it, but then I think it switched. And that would be on
4 them, to accept or else discuss why they wanted to go ahead with the copy as they
5 wanted it or something like that.

6 But, again, I think this was all pretty much in the context of the email chain. If
7 they were having side conversations, I don't believe I was a part of them.

8 Q But it's fair to say that, at least from your perspective, the RNC deferred to
9 the campaign when it came to campaign-focused messaging from either President Trump,
10 so-called Team Trump, or other Trump campaign surrogates?

11 A I would say, primarily, yes. At least in terms of my role, I deferred and
12 yielded to them on that, yes.

13 Q Do you recall -- we'll talk about 2020. Actually, anytime in the 2020 cycle,
14 were there any conflicts between the approval teams that stand out to you where there
15 was difficulty in reaching consensus regarding an email or an email that was sent to the
16 approval chain was not sent out because the parties couldn't agree on how it should go
17 out or revisions?

18 A I can't think of any specific instance. Again, that's not to say there might
19 not have been emails that had a lot of back-and-forth on them. I just don't recall them
20 specifically.

21 Q So, fair to say it wasn't a contentious approval change, generally speaking?
22 Folks put in their edits; if people were fine, it went out. If people had pushback, they
23 might ask a followup question. Is that a fair characterization?

24 A Yes, I think so. Yes.

25 Q All right.

1 So let's move later into the year in 2020. We're getting close to the election.
2 We've looked at a lot of these emails, and I'm going to characterize it the way that we see
3 it. But, in post-election, as President Trump is challenging the results of the election, a
4 lot of the emails focus on that same messaging, as to the state of the race after the
5 election, court battles, raising money for an election defense fund.

6 Is that fair to say that's your recollection of what the November emails looked
7 like?

8 A Yeah, that sounds familiar. Yes.

9 Q So let's fast-forward to right before the election. We've seen evidence in
10 our investigation about discussions about what kind of emails were approved prior to
11 election day. And we've seen communication that indicate that the RNC, for its
12 copywriters that work in TMAGAC, there had been approval for messaging that was
13 referred to as the "trying to steal" messaging. Namely, the Democrats -- that's the
14 messaging we see come out the day after the election: Democrats are trying to steal
15 the election.

16 Do you recall emails to that effect?

17 A Well, I've seen an email that has that in it recently, but I didn't recall it at
18 the -- I don't have a memory of it from that time.

19 Mr. Steggerda. [REDACTED] just to clarify --

20 Ms. Docksey. Yeah.

21 Mr. Steggerda. [REDACTED] do you mean emails from TMAGAC with that text or side
22 emails about the planning of that message?

23 Ms. Docksey. Oh.

24 BY [REDACTED]:

25 Q So my initial question is, do you recall TMAGAC sending out emails that, in

1 sum and substance, made assertions that Democrats were trying to steal the election?

2 A Okay. Yeah, so that's an email I've come across more recently or I've seen
3 more recently, but I don't recall it specifically during that time, if that makes sense.

4 Q It does.

5 Do you recall messaging more broadly about Democrats' attempts to subvert the
6 election or undermine the election, whether it was for mail-in ballots or anything else,
7 that was the focus of TMAGAC messaging post-election?

8 A Generally, yes, that sounds like topics that were going out in emails. I'm
9 not thinking of anything specifically, but, yes, generally.

10 Q Leading into the 2020 election, did you have any discussions, whether on the
11 approval chain or otherwise, about the approval of the post-election emails going out?

12 A No, not that I can recall.

13 Q Do you recall approving any emails prior to the election or on the day of the
14 election that would then go out after the election?

15 A I don't recall specifically, but I would say it's possible, because in these email
16 digests, they didn't tell us, okay, these are the emails going out today at 5:00 or tomorrow
17 at whatever. So it wasn't unusual that there would be an email for somewhere down
18 the road in a digest. But I'm not thinking of anything specific.

19 BY N [REDACTED]:

20 Q Do you remember any conversations before the election about fundraising
21 emails continuing to go out after the election?

22 A Not that I can recall, no.

23 Q So did that seem normal to you? Is that just normally how it is? Election
24 happens; you keep fundraising off of the election?

25 A Well, except that we didn't have a result on election night, so that wasn't

1 strange to me, that then there would be more that came through for approval or more
2 that were sent out, because we didn't have that clear moment on election night. And I
3 knew that there were efforts -- you know, people were deploying to States for legal
4 efforts. So all of that felt in line with the emails that were going out on this general
5 topic.

6 Q So, to that point, when the election happens, there's no clear result, the
7 machine kind of keeps moving on the track that it's been moving. Is there a point ever
8 that you remember at which there's any discussion of, should the machine still be
9 moving?

10 A I don't recall that conversation. But, also, you know, I wasn't the primary
11 approver, like I said, you know, several weeks out from the election. It was only for
12 those couple of weeks when I think there still were a lot of legal battles happening in the
13 States. So I wasn't a part of that conversation. And, again, it didn't seem abnormal to
14 me that there would still be work being done.

15 Q Okay.

16 BY [REDACTED]:

17 Q Ms. Docksey, I'm going to show you what's been marked as exhibit 2, which
18 is an email chain that you're on. And it's a November 4th email chain. This would be
19 the day after the election.

20 A Okay.

21 Q And if you look on this first page, if we go all the way to the top, we see it's
22 for approval, election defense fund. Your name is there.

23 We scroll down to the middle of this first page, and you see your okay there, your
24 approval. Do you see that?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Is this typically how you would indicate your approval, something of this kind
2 of messaging?

3 A Is it possible to see the full email? But, yes, I mean, that's consistent, yeah,
4 typically with --

5 Q Yeah, we'll scroll up. And just for any document which we show you, we're
6 always happy to show you the full email. Generally speaking, by default, we'll try to go
7 to the relevant parts, just because we're trying to keep you on a quick timeframe here.
8 But any time you want to see more than we're showing you, let us know, and we're happy
9 to do that, okay?

10 A Okay. All right. Thanks.

11 Q All right. So, here, you see this is the email from Julia Trent, sending
12 out -- she says, "Good afternoon all. Can you please approve as soon as possible?"

13 Now, if you scroll down, we see SMS messaging here indicating a variety of
14 messages.

15 Is that fair? These are the SMS messaging, like, text messages going out?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay.

18 And then when we scroll down, at the bottom it says -- the first email, and it
19 says -- the subject line for the first one is, "Here's the truth." And then it says at the
20 bottom, "The Democrats are trying to steal the election. We will never let them do it."

21 So this is the messaging I was referencing earlier, which we see repeatedly
22 throughout the emails that go out post-election.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q We can keep scrolling to the second page. Here, we see at the top of the
25 third page, excuse me, the email from President Trump says, "I've activated the official

1 election defense fund."

2 Have you heard that term before, the "official election defense fund"?

3 A Yes. Yes, I've heard it.

4 Q And what did you understand it to be?

5 A I thought that was our legal fund that was for these specific efforts.

6 Q So your understanding was that, when the emails indicated "official election
7 defense fund," that money was raising legal fees that would then go to a fund that was
8 for the use of litigation? Or can you expand on that?

9 A So, as far as I was aware, for a long time we've had a legal fund. The joint
10 fundraising accounts had a legal fund. Or, I guess, the RNC has a legal fund, but it all -- if
11 you donated to a joint fundraising account, the waterfalls -- you know, of every dollar,
12 pennies of that would go into every fund. So that's what I'm sure I assumed this was all
13 related to.

14 Q Now, when you say the legal fund, are you saying TMAGAC had a legal fund
15 or the RNC had a legal fund?

16 A So I'm not exactly sure. I just know certainly for large dollar -- I think it
17 worked this way for TMAGAC and small dollar -- that when you gave your money, that it
18 would go into each of these pots. There was one for the general use. There was one
19 for legal fund. There was one for the building from the RNC side.

20 So that's, I'm sure, what I was thinking of when I see things like this. I knew that
21 that existed.

22 Q Now, from our investigation, our understanding is: Money comes to
23 TMAGAC. There's a split that's agreed upon between the RNC and the campaign that
24 changes through different times. The RNC takes its split and TMAGAC takes its
25 split -- excuse me, the campaign. The campaign then has the money to do as it sees fit.

1 And the RNC does have, like, the general account, a legal account --

2 A Yes.

3 Q -- fund, all that. Does that sound accurate to you?

4 A Yes. That was what I was familiar with. Yes.

5 Q Okay.

6 So, here, when it says that President Trump writes, "I've activated the official
7 election defense fund," you're not saying you understood him to be saying he's activated
8 the RNC's separate from the campaign legal fund. Is that fair?

9 A Activated the RNC's -- ultimately, I --

10 Q I think, here, what we see going out is from President Trump to his
11 supporters, and he's saying --

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q -- "I, President Trump, have activated the official election defense fund," and
14 he wants his supporters to donate to that. So I'm just clarifying that -- I do not
15 understand you to be saying that you believe this election defense fund referenced here
16 is talking about the RNC's specific legal account. Is that accurate?

17 A I don't know that I'm exactly following, but I also -- I don't think that I ever
18 thought that much about it beyond the legal fund that I knew existed. So I'm not sure in
19 my mind I was distinguishing that one was RNC and one was campaign. I just knew
20 there was a legal account. So, if I had to guess my frame of mind at that time, that's
21 probably where it was.

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q You've been involved in politics for quite a while, right? I got that
24 impression from your background. Is that fair?

25 A Yes, mostly on the official side, but then -- of, like, the, you know, official

1 government office side. But yes.

2 Q We've had other witnesses explain that, basically, when they saw the official
3 election defense fund, they didn't think about what fund it went to or what it was tied to
4 because those are usually marketing tactics and it's not necessarily a real fund anywhere.

5 Is that something that you would've thought of, or is that something that you
6 would agree with the characterization?

7 A Again, I don't know that I was thinking about it in any of these -- in any of
8 these ways. I know that a legal account existed, and I knew that we were actively in
9 States with lawsuits, counter lawsuits, checking on all of the validity of every ballot cast or
10 the legality of every ballot cast or whatever. So I think that's where my head would've
11 been, because that's the area that I was familiar with.

12 So I'm just not sure that I would've thought about it differently, one way or the
13 other. It's possible I could've thought, "Yeah, that's marketing," but I know about this
14 legal account, so I think that made sense to me.

15 Q Well, let me ask you: Without understanding exactly which account, would
16 you have actually thought, reading this, that the funds that were being raised were going
17 to fund the litigation efforts that you were just referencing?

18 A Yes, I think that's fair to say, because, again, at that time, I knew we were
19 out in all of these States with a lot of legal battles, lawsuits, looking into flags of
20 irregularities, all of that. So that would've made sense to me, yes.

21 Q Because there was a lot of news out at the time, right, that there were legal
22 challenges, there were things --

23 A Right.

24 Q -- that either the RNC, the Trump campaign, other supporters -- people were
25 trying to have some impact on the election, right?

1 A Sure. Yes.

2 Q So, as you're sitting reading this email, even as a person involved in politics
3 or not, you thought that when he said "I've activated the official election defense fund,"
4 that the funds raised for that would be going towards election defense funding, right?

5 A I think that's fair. Again, I knew that we had a legal account. I didn't
6 know the breakdown of who had access to that legal account or who was paying for these
7 efforts. But it all made sense to me that I knew we were doing this out in the States,
8 and so the funds from that account were helping to make that possible.

9 Q Right.

10 And I think what I'm trying to get at is, without expecting you to know which fund
11 the election defense fund may have been, your understanding when reading this is: I'm
12 assuming that funds raised for the official election defense fund are going towards
13 activities related to either challenging the election or the integrity of the election or
14 something to do with the election.

15 A Yes. But I can only speak to what I knew existed, which was this legal
16 account and all of our work out in the States that, as you mentioned, was top news
17 everywhere. So that all made sense to me, that this was all contributing to that effort.

18 Q Right. And I guess in my efforts to not pin you down on a specific fund, you
19 kind of brought it back to the fund that you knew about.

20 A Uh-huh.

21 Q And what I don't want you to think is -- I'm not sitting here saying, "Well, you
22 knew it was going to Fund A or Fund B." Right?

23 What I understood you to be saying was, "I knew that there was a fund. I knew
24 that there were legal efforts. I assumed that funds raised were somehow going to fund
25 those legal efforts in some way."

1 Is that a fair characterization?

2 A Yes, I think that's fair. Yes.

3 Q Because I don't want you to think, if you're wrong about which fund it
4 was -- that's not really the point. The point is that you, reading this, thought that the
5 funds that were being raised or solicited in that email were going somehow to election
6 defense or something related to the 2020 election.

7 A Yes. Again, from my purview, it was this account. But, yes, I think that is
8 reasonable that would've been my thought process, to the extent that I had a clear
9 thought process about this.

10 Q Perfect. Thank you.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q Now, Ms. Docksey, in these emails and others, if we scroll down -- for
13 example, here at the bottom of the third page, it says, "Mail-in ballots have led to total
14 and complete chaos." He says, "They are finding Biden votes all over the place. So bad
15 for our country and for the millions who want to know the results."

16 The next email on the bottom of the fourth page has a subject line of "The left will
17 try to steal the election." And it says, "Last night, President Trump was leading, often
18 solidly, in many key States, in almost all instances Democrat-run and controlled. Then
19 one by one his lead started to magically disappear as surprise ballot dumps were counted.
20 Very strange."

21 And then further down, it says, "They will try to steal the election from the
22 American people, plain and simple."

23 Reading this, is it fair to say that these emails here were, at a minimum,
24 suggesting that there was going to be or there had been massive election fraud that
25 would impact the results of the election?

1 A I'm sorry. Say that again. I was still reading.

2 Q Reading these emails -- I'm trying to get a sense of, from your read of these
3 emails, would it be a fair characterization, in your opinion, that these emails suggest, at a
4 minimum, that there was massive election fraud in the 2020 election?

5 A Well, I'm trying to think back to the context that I was working with when
6 these would've come across my inbox, which was that we had been for months involved
7 in all of these counter lawsuits that I was pretty familiar with from my RNC position. So,
8 you know, when you talk about mail-in ballots causing chaos, that was something that
9 was predicted, given the nature of how that process was implemented in the States,
10 where they went to all-mail-in in very short notice.

11 So, with that context in mind, this seems to be talking about things that were not
12 only forecasted to be things that might happen but also things that people were talking
13 about in the media, flags that were being raised of irregularities out in the States. So I
14 believe that context was all in my mind as I would've been reading these, because that
15 was something we had been talking about for months.

16 Q But, to get back to my question, is it a fair read that these emails, to the
17 casual reader, are suggesting that there's massive fraud going on?

18 For example, one email says that "a surprise ballot dump," that's "very strange"
19 and makes President Trump's lead start to "magically disappear."

20 Would you say that's a fair read, that that's indicating some kind of fraud was
21 going on?

22 A I read that -- and I recall the thinking was -- because we were saying this
23 publicly, you know, not just the President or the chairwoman, but even our messaging
24 publicly was to make sure that any -- that we were able to make sure that every ballot
25 that's counted was legally cast. And there were a lot of people raising flags of things

1 that they felt were irregularities that they thought should be looked into or investigated.
2 And so we were actively doing that.

3 So some of the examples that you draw out of here recall to me things I was
4 seeing and hearing about in the news. And I think that's what is being referenced here.

5 So I don't know that you can say that -- what you're suggesting based on this.
6 Because I think the context of, at that time, there was a lot of public conversation around
7 people making these claims in public about these irregularities that were going to be
8 looked into and investigated. And that didn't sound abnormal to me.

9 Q Okay. But -- and I want to separate out adding context now and even then
10 in understanding what was happening broader.

11 These emails go into people's boxes, right? Millions of people get these. And
12 they don't come with, "Hey, watch these emails or paragraphs explaining the nuance for
13 this or this as to whether mail-in ballots should be used or not." They come into one's
14 box as written here for an individual to digest. Is that fair? They come as written here,
15 if approved by you and others.

16 A Sure.

17 Q Right. So, when someone gets this email here that says that President
18 Trump's lead is magically disappearing because surprise ballot dumps were counted and
19 that's very strange, is it not fair to say that that suggests to the reader that fraud is going
20 on?

21 A Sorry, I just can't speak to how someone might interpret an email.

22 And, also, this was talked about. I mean, it was all over the news, these types
23 of -- you know, in Philadelphia or in Wisconsin or Milwaukee or whatever it was. So I
24 don't think it's unreasonable that someone would be able to see what they were seeing
25 on the news mimicked in this email.

1 But I don't know; we're just talking here, but --

2 Q Yeah.

3 A -- I can't think of what my frame of mind would've been beyond that context
4 that I offered.

5 Q But you were a comms expert, right? You've been doing this for many
6 years. And as a comms expert, your job at its core, as I see it, right, is to draft messages
7 for people -- to understand how people think, how people perceive emails, how people
8 review and accept political messaging, right? That's the core of a comms messenger, as
9 I understand it.

10 So the reason why I asked you what people would think reading these emails is
11 because I understand that to be your job. That's what a comms person does, right?
12 You've got to get the average American to understand complex messaging in quick bites.

13 So -- and I don't want to beat a dead horse. Is it fair -- are you saying that, here,
14 you just don't think that is suggesting fraud?

15 A I think this reads as a mimicking of what was being said on TV and what was
16 being reported in the news. I --

17 Q And President Trump was on the news saying fraud, was he not?

18 A I don't recall specific instances, but, yes, I think he was using some of that
19 language. That sounds familiar, yes.

20 Q And President Trump was saying that he had won the election, not lost it,
21 correct?

22 A I don't know at what point he was saying those things, but, yes, I've certainly
23 heard him say that.

24 Q If I remember correctly, I think he said on election night at his early morning
25 speech that he had won the election.

1 So, if that's the context, that President Trump is saying that he's won the election,
2 that there's massive fraud -- as I recall it, he's saying that dead people have voted. He's
3 making a lot of assertions about the election not being on the up-and-up.

4 When this email goes out, in that context, is it fair to say that, read together with
5 the context you're suggesting, that people are meant to take this as evidence of fraud?

6 A So, again, my purview is from what I saw in the public domain. The
7 President has -- I mean, he's the President. He has his team, he has his lawyers. These
8 emails had a whole slew of people from his team to approve them, as well, in terms of
9 the text and content.

10 So I just didn't see that -- like, me thinking about all of these things, I never -- or,
11 not never, but largely, like, didn't see that as my role with these emails. But, like I said,
12 it wasn't inconsistent with what I was seeing on the TV in front of me.

13 [REDACTED]. That's actually an important point that I'd be curious to get your take
14 on. Because what we've heard from having talked to a number of folks on both the
15 campaign side and the RNC side is that, even though it was RNC staffers who were doing
16 a lot of the copywriting on behalf of TMAGAC, that really they were supervised and
17 largely driven by the Trump campaign folks in terms of content, messaging, strategy.
18 They might've had, quote, an RNC supervisor as an employee, but in terms of who was
19 really driving that train, it was the campaign.

20 And I'm curious if you would agree with that because, A, we've heard that. But,
21 B, it seems like a lot of times when we talk to the people in the RNC chain of approvals, it
22 was really, if the Trump campaign people are fine with it, this is really his voice, his
23 surrogates; like, they are driving this train. It's not really our place to derail it, unless it's
24 something glaringly awful.

25 Is that fair?

1 Ms. Docksey. Right. So I don't know about their process over there at the
2 annex of who was writing it, but I do recall a couple instances -- like, I mentioned that one
3 earlier about the Don Jr. wording tweet. And the response I received was, if they are
4 comfortable with that or if he's comfortable with that, are you good with it? So, yes, I
5 think that is a fair assessment based on interactions I'd had to that same effect.

6 ██████████ Okay.

7 BY ██████████ :

8 Q That's helpful, Ms. Docksey.

9 So, moving further into the week after the election and the week after, President
10 Trump is making his assertions about the election that I just noted -- fraud, et cetera.
11 There were lawsuits going on. And there were emails going out from TMAGAC, emails
12 that you're approving, often with the same messaging regarding Democrats trying to steal
13 the election, lots of discussion about an election defense fund, you know, suggestions
14 that the election was not a proper election.

15 There was also -- and I'll show you these documents in a minute, but we see
16 documents where RNC legal seems to be more heavily revising emails that are coming
17 through TMAGAC. So we see Justin Riemer, we see Jenna Kirsch, who were drafting
18 emails, I would characterize them as softening the language in these approval emails.

19 By that I mean, an email comes out to you and others that says President Trump
20 won the election, and Justin Riemer removes that language that he won the election.
21 Jenna Kirsch -- emails come out to Jenna Kirsch indicating the same kind of claims, that
22 President Trump, you know, has won, and we see the redlining. In fact, I believe it says,
23 you know, don't say this; say this.

24 Did you have any conversations with anyone -- and if they're with lawyers, then
25 don't reveal the content of those. But did you have any conversations with anyone

1 post-election about whether to publicly state that Donald Trump had, in fact, won the
2 election or had not won the election?

3 A No specific conversations that I can recall that I was a part of.

4 Q Are you aware of conversations even if you weren't a part of them?

5 A Oh, I'm sorry. No, I don't recall any knowledge of any conversations. And
6 I don't remember being a part of any conversations. So, no.

7 Q Are you aware of any conversations about these fundraising emails and
8 about toning them down with regard to the assertions made in them?

9 A I don't recall any conversations, at least not that I was a part of.

10 Q Are you aware of any conversations where anyone expressed that the emails
11 were too inflammatory, too aggressive, or had anything that, you know, were -- that they
12 were too much in any way?

13 A I don't recall any conversations.

14 Q Did you yourself ever hold the view, even privately, that the emails were
15 either asserting things that were not true or too inflammatory in nature?

16 A I don't recall thinking that, not during the timeframe that I was the primary
17 approver.

18 Q Did there come a timeframe where you did think that, even after you
19 weren't the primary --

20 A Sorry. I should say, I wasn't really paying attention to the emails once I was
21 no longer the primary approver. So I can't -- so, no, I don't think I had those thoughts
22 beyond that. But during that timeframe when that was my task, I don't recall having
23 that thought.

24 Q And would the reason for that being as far as -- scratch that.

25 You mentioned that you didn't see it as your role to engage to substantively revise

1 these emails. Is that fair?

2 A Yes, that's fair.

3 Q And is it fair to say that, because of that not being part of your
4 responsibilities, when these emails came across your desk, you didn't kind of wrestle with
5 them substantively? You weren't grabbing out a pen and saying, like, what do I think, is
6 this true, is this not? If it looked generally fine and nothing seemed insane, you would
7 defer to others to bring up objections. Is that fair?

8 A Yes, I think that's fair, that I would defer to others, be that the campaign or
9 the other people on the approval chain who had different roles in the approval process,
10 yes.

11 Q And is it fair to say that if in these emails, for example, an email stated, "The
12 Democrats are trying to do X," or, "The left is going to steal the election," or, "This thing
13 happened and it's really sketchy," that you didn't review those emails and then think, is
14 that statement factually true, because it wasn't your job to go and say, is there enough
15 evidence to prove X, or would Y stand up under scrutiny? Your job, as comms person,
16 was something other than that. Is that fair?

1

2 [12:01 p.m.]

3 Ms. Docksey. Yes. So, again, as the RNC comms person, largely campaign
4 messaging, my job was largely, yes, to make sure that there were -- that things were
5 consistent, there weren't glaring typos.

6 But also, as you mentioned with the legal edits, I think -- and can't say across the
7 board that they always edit it before me -- but I think usually legal had edited something.
8 Or if I had approved it and then legal came through with edits, that was fine by me. I
9 knew they would be looking at it for their reasons or with their legal purview.

10 BY N [REDACTED] :

11 Q How often would legal offer edits in your time, in your 2 years on these
12 emails? How often would legal take pen to paper on these emails?

13 A I would say it was rare that there was a batch that they didn't have edits on.
14 Some more so than others. But they're pretty detailed oriented.

15 Q Is it fair to say that when legal had edits -- because we've seen a lot of emails
16 and they repeat sometimes, sometimes the messaging, obviously, repeats themselves.

17 Is it fair to say that if legal kept revising the same point, that that signaled to you
18 that that was something that mattered to the legal team?

19 A Yes. That makes sense. Yes. That's fair.

20 Q And going forward, that would be something that, at least in the abstract,
21 would impact how you reviewed emails. So, for example, if they kept removing
22 something, that would trigger to you that, okay, legal is saying that folks can't say that or
23 that's problematic. Is that fair?

24 A Yes. So you're refreshing my memory here, things I'd forgotten. But that
25 I do believe there were times when -- and Jenna, because she was this way with all of our

1 documents, had to go through op-eds, anything, very detailed oriented, and she would
2 maybe edit down. And then if something came back through later, she'd say, "Please
3 incorporate my prior edits," or something. There might be a note.

4 And so I might've said, "With legal's approval, okay," or, "No additional edits," or
5 something like that. I recall exchanges like that.

6 Q Okay. And we'll look at some of these.

7 We've seen numerous emails. And I've told you, for example, Riemer removes,
8 "Should not wrongfully claim the office of President," Riemer removes, "Won the election
9 by a lot." And that goes on and on. For example, if Jenna Kirsch says -- changes
10 claiming, "There are going to be 4 more years," to just, "Finish the fight."

11 We've also in the course of our investigation --

12 Mr. Steggerda. [REDACTED], just for the clarity, what date is that document that you're
13 reading?

14 [REDACTED]. So these emails are all when Ms. Docksey was still there.

15 So we're talking November --

16 Mr. Steggerda. First 2 weeks?

17 BY [REDACTED]:

18 Q Yeah. November 11th, November 12th, November 13th, November 11th.
19 So we see a lot of this happening -- 11th, 12th, 13th, the 18th has some of this. So
20 everything I'm referencing is all prior to Thanksgiving --

21 A Okay.

22 Q -- of this event, prior to November, whatever, 24th or 23rd, whenever
23 Thanksgiving is at that time.

24 And in the course of doing other interviews, it appears that, in looking at
25 everything in totality, the way we see it so far, it appears that President Trump is making

1 a lot of strong assertions. These emails often capture his voice. And when they're
2 coming up through the approval chain, they're kind of hitting a bit of a revision bubble
3 where folks are saying, "Okay, President Trump may claim that he won by a lot, but we're
4 not saying that. This may happen, but we're not saying that."

5 Were you involved with any conversations on the comms side as to here's where
6 RNC is diverting from President Trump's messaging or otherwise shifting focus from
7 President Trump's messaging in November of 2020?

8 A As it relates to these emails or just as a general matter?

9 Q Let's first talk about the emails and then we'll talk about it as a general
10 matter.

11 A Sure.

12 So I don't recall any conversations as they relate to the emails. As you're
13 refreshing my memory, recall, edits from legal -- and, again, I think my signoff would be
14 something like, "No additional edits beyond legal," or something like that, "With legal's
15 edits I'm good," or something. But I don't recall being a part of a conversation
16 about that, about our messages diverging.

17 Q What about more generally, whether you were part of or you were aware?
18 It seems in looking at this that there's a purposeful decision that the RNC basically is
19 initially lockstep with President Trump and at some point -- and I think there might even
20 be some support in the messages you produced that there's kind of a, "All right, guys, our
21 new talking points are: We're focused on Georgia, but we're not basically going out
22 saying every day this was a massive fraud, President Trump won by a lot, thousands of
23 dead people voted, it's all fraud, Democrats stole the election."

24 That does not seem to be the messaging. It seems to be consistent with a focus
25 on Georgia, it's consistent with Jenna Kirsch's edits, consistent with Justin Riemer's edits.

1 So what knowledge do you have as to why the RNC seems to be diverging from
2 President Trump in November?

3 A So I can point to a time where I did have a conversation with Michael Ahrens
4 about this generally, and that was the same day as I think we can call it the infamous
5 Rudy Giuliani press conference, the one with the hair dye melting down his face.

6 So up to that point -- and like I mentioned earlier, I would work with the digital
7 team who ran the GOP social channel and I would approve their tweets or help them
8 come up with content -- and up to that point, I felt it had been pretty automatic that we
9 were out there every day pushing the same message as the campaign.

10 And then when that press conference happened -- and as a reminder, we were all
11 working from home for COVID. I was doing the wedding stuff, so I wasn't going into the
12 office regularly, maybe like an hour a week or something.

13 So on that press conference day, which I think is November 19th, Michael and I
14 talked after that where he was generally telling me, "Hey, we don't need to be out there.
15 It's not automatic that we're just going to go out there and parallel or mimic what the
16 campaign or what Rudy Giuliani or that legal team might be saying. Don't feel the need
17 to put that through on the GOP social channels."

18 And then actually that was the point where Michael ended up taking over the GOP
19 social channels.

20 And I viewed that mostly because I just wasn't as engaged with those day-to-day
21 conversations about what we were supporting or not, and I was working on the Georgia
22 stuff, I was working on personnel in the office, typical things that happened after an
23 election.

24 So that's why that made sense to me, that I shifted away from helping with the
25 GOP social channel. And that's the only conversation I can recall where we discussed

1 what you're pointing to of this sort of separation between the teams, that it just wouldn't
2 be an automatic lockstep same message.

3 [REDACTED] Did Mr. Ahrens give you any impression of where that was coming
4 from, in the sense that would he have had the unilateral ability to say, "Hey, we're going
5 to stop being in lockstep necessarily with the campaign," or did he give you any
6 impression that that came from somebody else possibly above him at the RNC?

7 Ms. Docksey. I don't recall him telling me anything specific or a specific directive
8 even. But certainly given his very senior staff status, I presumed he was having
9 conversations, he and Mike Reed both having conversations with Richard and others on
10 the high level senior staff at the RNC that I wasn't privy to.

11 So I think he was kind of looping me in on something that I hadn't otherwise been
12 a part of, conversations I hadn't been a part of.

13 [REDACTED]. I believe you said a moment ago that you all were working from home
14 and so it probably makes communication, I'm assuming, virtual -- Teams, chats, texts, et
15 cetera. And I think we've seen some of those.

16 I'm curious, I make no presumptions about what people have seen in terms of the
17 news or our hearings, but something that came out from some of the witnesses who
18 were involved in the hearings -- I think Mr. Stepien testified to this and a number of
19 others -- was this characterization that in mid-November, around the time that you're
20 discussing Team Normies, as Mr. Stepien referred to it, were kind of pushed out -- and I
21 can't remember if he said Team Crazy, but clown car -- I can't remember what the
22 characterization was, but Mr. Giuliani and Ms. Powell, et cetera come in. And there is
23 this kind of break in terms of a lot of the folks related to the Trump campaign and then
24 the new legal team coming in.

25 Do you remember having conversations with anyone, either officially kind of in

1 meetings through work or personally with people that you work with, regarding that
2 transition, if you will?

3 The timing is similar to what you were talking about with the divergence. And
4 I'm curious, I know it's hard to have watercooler chats from your home virtually, but to
5 the extent that that happened, do you remember any conversations that would have had
6 to do with that?

7 Ms. Docksey. So I don't remember any conversations except on the press
8 conference date, that November 19th, I saw on the news that a press conference was
9 happening that day. They teased that probably would be happening later in the day or
10 what have you. And I messaged Michael Ahrens to see if they needed any help with
11 that, if I had missed some sort of message that we were doing anything with that,
12 because we had previously.

13 There had been a press conference in our lobby with the chairwoman that the
14 team was more generally aware of. It had been, you know, I'm sure a note or something
15 had gone out that morning this was happening, which had not happened with this press
16 conference.

17 So I messaged him to see if there was any need for assistance. And he told me,
18 "No, we are not part of the planning. They're just using our lobby. The campaign sent
19 out a notice about it, but we have no involvement in it."

20 And that was different. That was the first time that I recall something like that
21 happening, that something was going on without any involvement from the RNC team.

22 And I would say -- I would point to that as a general, I guess, turning point. But,
23 again, we're getting to the point now where I'm pretty out of those day-to-day
24 conversations and I'm mostly just focused on the rest of my job, which was personnel
25 heavy at that time.

1 [REDACTED]. Okay. That's helpful to understand.

2 BY [REDACTED]:

3 Q Did you ever exchange text messages with your colleagues, like Mr. Ahrens
4 or Mr. Reed?

5 A Yes, from time to time.

6 Q Did you review those text messages for the purposes of your production?

7 A Yes. I looked as far as I could as wide as I could to find everything I could
8 find, but I don't have a lot on my phone. So I think I gave you whatever I could find or
9 my lawyer did.

10 Q Talking about the shift you just mentioned where Mr. Ahrens gives you the
11 directive about not automatic replication of the Trump messaging, did there come a time
12 where you became aware there was pushback, that he expressed to you there was
13 pushback, the fact that he was not -- that there wasn't the same kind of replication of the
14 messaging or the RNC kind of being behind Team Trump fully? Anything you're aware
15 about on that front?

16 A Can you be more specific? Pushback by who?

17 Q Well, so, for example, in your messages we see about 4 days after the press
18 conference there's some back and forth that you have with Mr. Ahrens, and Mr.
19 Ahrens sends you a message where he says, "Yeah, I am done getting yelled at for, quote,
20 'RNC did not respond and defend Trump,' end quote."

21 A Yes. So, I'm sorry, ask your question again.

22 Q So can you give us some context? What is Mr. Ahrens referencing there?

23 A So I think that was the time when we were talking about Georgia and our
24 efforts in Georgia were really underway there. And so then I recall -- and I think it's
25 included there -- that we provided a quote -- or it might have been in another

1 instance -- but it would say what we were doing in Georgia to help the Senate runoff as
2 well as the President. And we just kind of adopted that as our general position, to
3 include everybody whenever we made a comment.

4 So I think that was related to that. But based on those messages, I recall that we
5 probably got an inquiry, I don't know from who, and he said, "Can you just put together a
6 quote in case they want to use it?"

7 And I think he flagged it up to Richard Walters, and Richard seems to have said,
8 "No, we don't need it." And Michael -- we were just like, okay, well, at least we can say
9 we offered something.

10 Q So then when he tells you --

11 A [Inaudible.]

12 Q Yeah. Well, it sounds like there had been prior conflict, because he says
13 that he's done getting yelled at for, quote, "RNC did not respond to defend Trump."
14 And he's telling you that, which just on a plain read suggests that you would have the
15 context of what he means when he says he's done getting yelled at and who would have
16 been yelling at him.

17 Do you have a sense of that?

18 A So I actually don't know by that time who he might have been referring to or
19 what other instances he might have been referring to. Again, we're working virtually, so
20 whereas I might have heard that conversation or we might have popped into each other's
21 offices previously, we weren't doing that at that time.

22 So he must have gotten an inquiry -- or I did, and I flagged it to him, I'm not sure
23 which -- and said, "Do you want to participate in the story?" And he said, "Put together
24 a comment and we'll flag it for Richard to see if they want to use it."

25 But I don't have any context as to what else he might have been talking about

1 other than things that he was handling on his own. Michael handled a lot of press
2 inquiries on his own.

3 Q Are you aware of any individuals from the campaign who were directly -- or
4 who Mr. Ahrens directly interfaced with that might have been in position to give him
5 feedback for the RNC not responding or defending President Trump?

6 A I'm trying to think. I'm not -- no one's coming to mind, certainly not at that
7 time. I'm even trying to think earlier on in the cycle who he might have talked to,
8 whether that would have been -- I think he probably would have talked mostly early on in
9 the cycle to Tim, the comms director for the campaign. I'm blanking on his last name.

10 [REDACTED] Murtaugh? Tim Murtaugh?

11 Ms. Docksey. Yes. Tim Murtaugh. I think that's who he would have talked to
12 early on. But even then I feel like their chain of who you might hear from shifted as they
13 all got busier and were on the road and things like that towards the end of the cycle.

14 So I can't say for sure who he might have heard or been in communication with at
15 that time.

16 BY [REDACTED]:

17 Q Okay. I want to switch gears just a bit.

18 Are you familiar with the effort by Trump -- the effort to have Trump electors cast
19 votes in contested States regardless of who had been declared the winner? It's been
20 called fake electors, alternate electors. Have you heard about that whole idea?

21 A So I have now. You might be referring to -- I think I flagged an article or
22 someone flagged to me, like on a Gchat, and that was all that was really said about it. I
23 think I said, "Have you heard anything about this?" And then I don't recall any further
24 discussion. And it wasn't anything I recall that was ever discussed in our RNC world, but
25 2 years on I am familiar with this now.

1 Q So I think what you say is it might be -- it looks like it's to Mr. Ahrens, but it's
2 unclear the way the metadata is, but he's the last person you were talking to. And you
3 say, "Also, have you heard anything about campaign trying to stack the electoral college
4 with pro-Trump votes to try to save the vote?"

5 Is that what you're referencing?

6 A Yes, although I don't know that I would have talked with -- are you sure that
7 was to Michael? I thought maybe it was --

8 Q Well, just the way the emails -- the messages come across to us, it shows us
9 them in what appears to be generally chronological order. But we can't -- when it's a
10 message from you, we can't see who you're sending it to. But we can see that the last
11 person who sent you a message seems to be -- the back and forth seems to be between
12 you and Mr. Ahrens on that day and the next time you guys -- when you have chats.
13 So I'm not representing to you it's to Michael Ahrens.

14 A Got it.

15 Q I'm suggesting it could be based on the messaging structure.

16 A The only reason I ask is because I feel like there was a guy in our research
17 team, Jeff, that I was more likely to Gchat back and forth about things we were hearing or
18 seeing on the news. I don't know that I would have bugged Michael with that, if it was
19 something that I was hearing about or saw on Twitter or something. That just wasn't
20 the nature of Michael and my's relationship.

21 But with Jeff -- and I do believe I've shared with Todd some Gchats with Jeff -- that
22 was the kind of stuff that he and I would share back and forth probably.

23 [REDACTED]. What was Jeff's title?

24 Ms. Docksey. I don't know his title. He was on the RNC research team. I
25 think he was an associate researcher. I'm not quite sure how their title structure was.

1 But they were just always in Twitter and always flagging stuff. So we just
2 Gchatted. He Gchatted. He was a big Gchatter around the office.

3 ██████████. Okay.

4 ██████████. And so you had communications with Jeff in Gchat?

5 Ms. Docksey. Yes. And I believe I shared some of those with Todd that I think
6 were probably shared with you guys.

7 ██████████. Was this like a work -- was this a work function relationship or was
8 this more like a friend at work relationship? Like, is it a function of your job where it's
9 like, "Oh, Jeff sent me this," like, or is it more, "Jeff and I were friends at work and it was
10 like, oh, you'd be interested in this"?

11 Ms. Docksey. Yes. More Jeff and I friends at work.

12 In terms of Gchat, he put together research docs that would go out that I would
13 edit and we might Gchat back and forth about that doc. But usually the Gchats at work
14 were -- the Gchat was the virtual watercooler, like you referenced earlier.

15 ██████████. Todd, I don't think we have any messages with Jeff. So
16 we can talk about that offline, but --

17 Mr. Steggerda. Yeah. Based on what she just said, we'll go back. And I
18 thought we have everything out that's responsive from her Google Chat. So I'll go back
19 and look at that name again for you.

20 Ms. Docksey. Sorry. I recalled that as something I would have, like I said,
21 flagged with Jeff. That just matched more with the nature of our Gchats.

22 BY ██████████:

23 Q Yeah. Besides this inquiry related to an article or a news piece, did you
24 have -- would you have any other awareness of this plan for alternate electors in these
25 contested States?

1 A No, I didn't hear about it otherwise. And, again, it wasn't something that I
2 even recalled until much more recently when it had been in the news.

3 Q So no awareness at the time of the RNC's role in sending alternate electors
4 to Congress on the 6th or otherwise Ronna McDaniel's role in any of that. Is that fair?

5 A Correct. Yes. No aware- -- I had no awareness of that.

6 Q Okay. All right. Thank you for that.

7 Going back to our fraud discussions, just to put a fine point on it. While you
8 were reviewing the emails, you weren't otherwise being -- is it fair to say, going back to
9 the end of your time at the RNC, looking back, is it fair to say that you personally aren't
10 aware of any fraud that occurred in the 2020 election that would have been dispositive of
11 the results? Would that be fair?

12 A That would have been what of the result?

13 Q Dispositive, that would have impacted the results of who became President.

14 A No, not that I'm aware.

15 [REDACTED] Can we take just a 2-minute break so we can just kind of
16 see where we are and try to be efficient with Ms. Docksey's time?

17 Mr. Steggerda. Okay. Yeah.

18 [REDACTED]. Great. All right. Thanks so much.

19 Mr. Steggerda. We'll give you -- yeah, you want five?

20 [REDACTED]. That would be great.

21 Mr. [REDACTED]. Five, but not six. Five, Todd.

22 [Recess.]

23 [REDACTED]. So, Todd, in the break, we just discussed some of the
24 messages that have to do with Jeff Aubin, which we understand have to do with definitely
25 D.C. for the Bate stamps 1 through 4 and possibly D.C. 58, I think, 59 and 60, which are

1 one thread. But because of metadata limitations, you all can't confirm that, but it's
2 consistent with Ms. Docksey's, I think, prior testimony that she would discuss something,
3 about hearing about an article with Mr. Aubin versus discussing these things with Mr.
4 Ahrens. Does that all sound accurate?

5 Mr. Steggerda. That's my understanding.

6 Cassie, is that your understanding as well?

7 Ms. Docksey. Yes. That's my understanding.

8 [REDACTED] Okay. We appreciate that, Ms. Docksey.

9 So at this time we do not have any additional questions for you. Thank you for
10 taking out the time to speak with us. We appreciate it.

11 Typically, before we end, we give everyone the chance. Is there anything else
12 that you thought we would ask that we didn't or something that you wanted to say that
13 you haven't?

14 Ms. Docksey. Nothing that I can recall or think of.

15 [REDACTED]. Okay. If at any time you think of something else,
16 whether it's something that you want to clarify or you think we should know or anything
17 of the sort, reach out to Todd and he'll let us know. This doesn't have to be the end of
18 the conversation if there's something else you think we should know. So don't hesitate
19 to reach out to your lawyer who can always get in contact with us.

20 Mr. Steggerda. And I would say just for the -- while we're still going, I wanted to
21 thank you for continuing with the interview today. She was up all night with her
22 8-month old baby that has a fever. The fever's now back.

23 So we appreciate you doing this today. I know the committee appreciates it.
24 And thank you all for working through this in a timely way. That's very helpful today for
25 us.

1 [REDACTED] Obviously, we hope that everything is okay with your child. And we
2 do really appreciate you making the time to do this when you had that. So thank you
3 very much.

4 Ms. Docksey. Yeah. Thank you. Just first-time parent, first-time fever stuff.
5 So thanks.

6 [REDACTED] All right.

7 And thank you to our court reporter as well.

8 Everyone have a good day.

9 Ms. Docksey. Thank you.

10 Mr. Steggerda. Okay. Thank you all.

11 [Whereupon, at 12:41 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

1 Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

2

3

4 I have read the foregoing ____ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the
5 answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

6

7

8

9

10 Witness Name

11

12

13

14 Date

15