EXHIBIT I
WE BUILD WINNING CAMPAIGNS

DELIVERING RESULTS FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM CHAMPIONS

We know that electability requires far more than just commitment to a set of principles. It requires political savvy, message discipline, and tenacious fundraising. That's why we seek to help electable advocates of the freedom and opportunity agenda who will be forceful at both the policy and political levels.
PLANNING YOUR CAMPAIGN

DEVELOPING YOUR STRATEGY

ACHIEVING YOUR VICTORY

Keep In Touch. Receive Periodic Email Updates.

Email address

First name

http://aegis-strategic.com/
The Aegis team was professional, flexible and extremely responsive throughout the twists and turns of the campaign. It was reassuring to know that no matter what challenges arose, I could rely on Aegis to provide solid, strategic advice about everything from vendor choices to fundraising plans and media relations, all in a way that was in the best interest of my campaign and uniquely reflected my vision for my candidacy. I highly recommend Aegis to anyone looking for a solid team that wants to help you succeed on your own terms.

MariLinda Garcia, 2014 Republican Nominee for NH-02
LATEST UPDATES

2016 PRESIDENTIAL WATCH

August 6th, 2015

With a flurry of campaign announcements, June closed out the second quarter of 2015. At this point, 20 candidates are running for two nominations, wit...

SPOTLIGHT: JIM BANKS

August 6th, 2015

When U.S. Representative Marlin Stutzman announced his bid to succeed retiring U.S. Senator Dan Coats, Indiana conservatives did not have to look far ...
Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax

Under section 501(c), 527, or 4947(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code (except private foundations)

Do not enter social security numbers on this form as it may be made public.

Information about Form 990 and its instructions is at www.irs.gov/form990.

A For the 2014 calendar year, or tax year beginning , 2014, and ending , 201

C Name of organization

FREEDOM PARTNERS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.

Doing business as

2200 WILSON BLVD STE 102-533

ARLINGTON, VA 22201-3324

D Employer identification number

45-3732750

E Telephone number

(703) 888-2527

G Gross receipts $ 126,878,597.

H(a) Is this a group return for subsidiaries? Yes X No

H(b) Are all subsidiaries included? Yes X No

J Website: WWW.FREEDOMPARTNERS.ORG

H(c) Group exemption number

K Form of organization: X Corporation

Trust Association Other

L Year of formation: 2011 M State of legal domicile: DE

Part I Summary

1 Briefly describe the organization's mission or most significant activities: FREEDOM PARTNERS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ADVANCES ITS MEMBERS' COMMON BUSINESS INTERESTS BY PROMOTING ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND IMPROVING BUSINESS CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES. (SEE SCHEDULE O)

2 Check this box if the organization discontinued its operations or disposed of more than 25% of its net assets.

3 Number of voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1a) 3

4 Number of independent voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1b) 4

5 Total number of individuals employed in calendar year 2014 (Part V, line 2a) 5 133

6 Total number of volunteers (estimate if necessary) 6 0

7a Total unrelated business revenue from Part VIII, column (C), line 12 7a 0

7b Net unrelated business taxable income from Form 990-T, line 34 7b 0

8 Contributions and grants (Part VIII, line 1h) 8 50,000

9 Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g) 9 1,310,321

10 Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d) 10 2,043

11 Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 10c, and 11d) 11 0 122,197

12 Total revenue - add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12) 12 35,852,043 126,378,889

13 Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1-3) 13 18,850,000

14 Benefits paid to or for members (Part IX, column (A), line 4) 14 87,631,900

15 Salaries, other compensation, employee benefits (Part IX, column (A), lines 5-10) 15 1,655,113 13,273,681

16a Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11a) 16a 0

16b Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) 16b 0

17 Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a-11d, 11f-24f) 17 1,804,654 28,487,887

18 Total expenses. Add lines 13-17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 28) 18 22,309,767 129,393,468

19 Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 18 from line 12 19 13,542,276 3,014,579

Part II Signature Block

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return, including accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, and complete. Declaration of preparer (other than officer) is based on all information of which preparer has any knowledge.

Signature Here

Signature of officer

Type or print name and title

Michael J Engle

Paid Preparer Use Only

Print/Type preparer's name Preparer's signature Date

MICHAEL J ENGLE

Check if self-employed PTIN 00482834

Firm's EIN 44-0160260

Check if preparer is a principal of the tax-exempt organization.

Paid preparer's signature

Date

May the IRS discuss this return with the preparer shown above? (see instructions) X Yes No

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the separate instructions.

Form 990 (2014)
### Part VII
Compensation of Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees, and Independent Contractors

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VII.

#### Section A. Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees

1a. Complete this table for all persons required to be listed. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

- List all of the organization's current officers, directors, trustees (whether individuals or organizations), regardless of amount of compensation. Enter 0 in columns (D), (E), and (F) if no compensation was paid.
- List all of the organization's current key employees, if any. See instructions for definition of "key employee."
- List the organization's five current highest compensated employees (other than an officer, director, trustee, or key employee) who received reportable compensation (Box 5 of Form W-2 and/or Box 7 of Form 1099-MISC) of more than $100,000 from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's former officers, key employees, and highest compensated employees who received more than $100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's former directors or trustees that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than $10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

List persons in the following order: individual trustees or directors; institutional trustees; officers; key employees; highest compensated employees; and former such persons.

- Check this box if neither the organization nor any related organization compensated any current officer, director, or trustee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Name and Title</th>
<th>(B) Average hours per week</th>
<th>(C) Position</th>
<th>(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)</th>
<th>(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)</th>
<th>(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAYNE GABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD FINK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESTOR WEIGAND JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN GENTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK HOLDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC SHORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR/PRESIDENT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>759,741</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD RIBBENTROP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>241,748</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL JORJANI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP GEN COUNSEL/VP COMPL</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>214,553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMILY SEIDEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>341,666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUSTIN PERRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>188,819</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSH FISHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>214,015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULIE TASSAUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL COUNSEL AND SECRETARY</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>113,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEATHER LOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURER</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMES DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>338,242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Name and title</td>
<td>(B) Average hours per week (or any related organizations below dotted line)</td>
<td>(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)</td>
<td>(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)</td>
<td>(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)</td>
<td>(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) JONATHAN BLACK</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>220,015.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,758.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) MICHAEL LANZARA</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>487,835.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,838.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP MEMBER RELATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) DOUGLAS PILERI</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>382,417.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,346.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) MICHAEL ROMAN</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>268,903.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,474.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b Sub-total: ...........................................  |
2 Total number of individuals (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization  |

3 Did the organization list any former officer, director, or trustee, key employee, or highest compensated employee on line 1a? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual ..................................................  

4 For any individual listed on line 1a, is the sum of reportable compensation and other compensation from the organization and related organizations greater than $150,000? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual .........................  

5 Did any person listed on line 1a receive or accrue compensation from any unrelated organization or individual for services rendered to the organization? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such person ...........................................  

Section B. Independent Contractors

1 Complete this table for your five highest compensated independent contractors that received more than $100,000 of compensation from the organization. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Name and business address</th>
<th>(B) Description of services</th>
<th>(C) Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMETER ANALYTICS SERVICES, INC ARLINGTON, VA 22201</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>11,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUNTZ GLOBAL LLC MANASSAS, VA 20110</td>
<td>MARKET RESEARCH</td>
<td>1,496,879.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARENA COMMUNICATIONS LLC SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84104</td>
<td>DIRECT MAIL</td>
<td>1,350,741.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEGIS STRATEGY LLC ARLINGTON, VA 22201</td>
<td>CONSULTING</td>
<td>1,286,184.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MD LLC WASHINGTON, DC 20004</td>
<td>EVENTS</td>
<td>1,228,026.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Total number of independent contractors (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 in compensation from the organization 
**Grants and Other Assistance to Organizations, Governments, and Individuals in the United States**

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to Form 990, Part IV, line 21 or 22.

> Attach to Form 990.

Information about Schedule I (Form 990) and its instructions is at www.irs.gov/form990.

**Part I** General Information on Grants and Assistance

1. Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of the grants or assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance? ☑️ Yes ☐ No

2. Describe in Part IV the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of grant funds in the United States.

**Part II** Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to Form 990, Part IV, line 21, for any recipient that received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Name and address of organization or government</th>
<th>(b) EIN</th>
<th>(c) IRC section of organization</th>
<th>(d) Amount of cash grant</th>
<th>(e) Amount of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>(f) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)</th>
<th>(g) Description of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>(h) Purpose of grant or assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>AMERICAN CIVIC TRUST</td>
<td>53-250335</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>AMERICAN ENERGY ALLIANCE</td>
<td>26-2731617</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>2,387,500</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>AMERICANS FOR PROPERTY</td>
<td>75-3729958</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>36,000,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM</td>
<td>22-1403587</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>CENTER FOR SHARED SERVICES TRUST</td>
<td>43-2533548</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>9,750,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>COLORADO WOMEN'S ALLIANCE</td>
<td>45-1874873</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>DR. GEORGE WASHINGTON'S INSTITUTE</td>
<td>43-2336742</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>EVANGELICAL TRUST</td>
<td>53-2348472</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>5,749,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>GENERATION OPPORTUNITY</td>
<td>27-2936305</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>IACE ACTION</td>
<td>46-2650593</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>ILLINOIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE</td>
<td>36-1254650</td>
<td>501(c)(6)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>MAINSTREET GROWTH PROJECT</td>
<td>46-2520933</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Enter total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed in the line 1 table.

3. Enter total number of other organizations listed in the line 1 table.
Part I  General Information on Grants and Assistance

1  Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of the grants or assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance?  

   Yes [x]  No  

2  Describe in Part IV the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of grant funds in the United States.

Part II  Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to Form 990, Part IV, line 21, for any recipient that received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name and address of organization or government</th>
<th>EIN</th>
<th>IRC section if applicable</th>
<th>Amount of cash grant</th>
<th>Amount of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)</th>
<th>Description of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>Purpose of grant or assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION INSTITUTE FOR LIFE</td>
<td>53-01-6130</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>4,855,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>OHIO FREE SPEECH PROJECT, INC.</td>
<td>46-4660847</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>PR-DIST LLC (AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY)</td>
<td>27-3120702</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>RULES OF LAW DEFEND FUND</td>
<td>46-3103903</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>TCB 49 PLUS ASSOCIATION, INC.</td>
<td>54-1564818</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>THE LEATHER INITIATIVE</td>
<td>45-2686411</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>VETERANS FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM TR</td>
<td>45-3723242</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>VETERANS OF LIBERTY INC</td>
<td>46-51-23864</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE</td>
<td>53-0045720</td>
<td>501(c)(6)</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>VETS FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM TRUST</td>
<td>46-3502766</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>12,735,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>CLUB FOR GROWTH</td>
<td>20-0691603</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>HERITAGE ACTION FOR AMERICA, INC.</td>
<td>27-3234720</td>
<td>501(c)(4)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2  Enter total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed in the line 1 table

3  Enter total number of other organizations listed in the line 1 table

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.
Grant recipients:

1. CITIZENLINK
   - Colorado Springs, CO 80920
   - EIN: 22-0960855
   - IRC Section: 501(c)(4)
   - Amount of Cash Grant: $85,650
   - Purpose of Grant: Advocacy

2. SUSAN S ANTCY LIST, INC.
   - Washington, DC 20036
   - EIN: 54-1850126
   - IRC Section: 501(c)(4)
   - Amount of Non-Cash Assistance: $225,000
   - Purpose of Grant: General Support

3. CITIZENLINK
   - Colorado Springs, CO 80920
   - EIN: 22-0960855
   - IRC Section: 501(c)(4)
   - Amount of Non-Cash Assistance: $125,000
   - Purpose of Grant: General Support

Total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed: 26.
**Part III**  Grants and Other Assistance to Individuals in the United States. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 22. Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of grant or assistance</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>Amount of cash grant</th>
<th>Amount of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)</th>
<th>Description of non-cash assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part IV**  Supplemental Information. Complete this part to provide the information required in Part I, line 2, Part III, column (b), and any other additional information.

SCHEDULE I, PART I, LINE 2

TO SUPPORT THE ORGANIZATION, AS OUTLINED ABOVE, THE ORGANIZATION PROVIDED

GENERAL SUPPORT GRANTS TO THE ABOVE GRANTEES WHOSE ACTIVITIES ADVANCE THE

ORGANIZATION'S GOALS. ALL GRANTS WERE MADE PURSUANT TO SPECIFIC GRANT

LETTER AGREEMENTS, WHICH UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED, INCLUDED

PROHIBITIONS ON THE USE OF THE GRANT FUNDS, FOR EXAMPLE, ACTIVITIES THAT

WOULD VIOLATE FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL LAWS, RULES OR REGULATIONS, OR THAT

WOULD BE CONSIDERED POLITICAL OR LOBBYING ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL OR

STATE LAW. THE GRANT LETTERS ALSO CONTAINED A REVIEW AND MONITORING

PROCEDURE WHICH REQUIRES REPORTS BY GRANTEE ON THE USE OF THE GRANT FUNDS
### Part III  Grants and Other Assistance to Individuals in the United States

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 22. Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type of grant or assistance</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>Amount of cash grant</th>
<th>Amount of non-cash assistance</th>
<th>Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)</th>
<th>Description of non-cash assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UPON REQUEST, AND RETURN OF ANY FUNDS USED IN VIOLATION OF THE AGREEMENT.**
EXHIBIT K
The group Freedom Partners serves as an outlet for the Koch brothers' ideas and cash. | AP Photos

The Koch brothers' secret bank

By MIKE ALLEN and JIM VANDEHEI | 09/11/13 09:00 PM EDT | Updated 09/13/13 05:54 AM EDT

An Arlington, Va.-based conservative group, whose existence until now was unknown to almost everyone in politics, raised and spent $250 million in 2012 to shape political and policy debate nationwide.

The group, Freedom Partners, and its president, Marc Short, serve as an outlet for the ideas and funds of the mysterious Koch brothers, cutting checks as large as $63 million to groups promoting conservative causes, according to an IRS document to be filed shortly.
The 38-page IRS filing amounts to the Rosetta Stone of the vast web of conservative groups — some prominent, some obscure — that spend time, money and resources to influence public debate, especially over Obamacare.

( PHOTOS: 25 unforgettable Obamacare quotes)

The group has about 200 donors, each paying at least $100,000 in annual dues. It raised $256 million in the year after its creation in November 2011, the document shows. And it made grants of $236 million — meaning a totally unknown group was the largest sugar daddy for conservative groups in the last election, second in total spending only to Karl Rove’s American Crossroads and Crossroads GPS, which together spent about $300 million.

Short, a soft-spoken but ferociously conservative 43-year-old operative, provided us a draft of a forthcoming IRS filing that will soon be available to the public. Short, like most in the Koch empire, feels wealthy conservative activists such as Charles and David Koch get a bum rap from the media. So, Short wants to ease his groups and their cause out of the shadows.

“There’s a mystery around us that makes an interesting story,” Short said in an interview in his conference room. “There’s also a vilification that happens that gets exaggerated when your opposition thinks you’re secretive. Our members are proud to be part of [the organization].”

( Also on POLITICO: RGA haul far outpaces DGA haul)

Democrats have their own vast web of secretive funders — and Short is right: Few liberals got as much scrutiny as the Koch brothers over the past few years.

But the “proud” donors are not so proud they will publicly identify themselves as donors. Short refused to open up about the men and women behind the quarter-billion-dollar fund, beyond saying that Koch-linked entities provided a “minority” of the funds and that the largest single donor gave about $25 million.

Freedom Partners is organized under the same section of the Tax Code as a trade association, a 501(c)6, which allows the group to conceal its donors from public release, although the amounts and recipients of its major grants are public.
The filing offers a rare tour of the conservative movement and how it gets its funds:

- Center to Protect Patient Rights, a group that vehemently opposes Obamacare: a total of $115 million, from three grants.

- Americans for Prosperity, an organizing and advocacy group that is courted by Republican presidential candidates: $32.3 million.

- The 60 Plus Association, a free-market seniors group that also opposes Obamacare: $15.7 million.

- American Future Fund, an Iowa group that spent a lot of money on ads in 2012, many for Mitt Romney: $13.6 million.

- Concerned Women for America Legislative Action Committee, which gets involved in a number of social policy debates: $8.2 million.

- Themis Trust, a Koch-based voter database that is made available to other conservative organizations: $5.8 million.

- Public Notice, a fiscal policy think tank: $5.5 million.

- Generation Opportunity, a group for “liberty-loving” young people: $5 million.

- The LIBRE Initiative, which targets a free-market message to Hispanic immigrants: $3.1 million.

- The National Rifle Association: $3.5 million.

- The U.S. Chamber of Commerce: $2 million.

- American Energy Alliance: $1.5 million.

- And several groups — including the State Tea Party Express, the Tea Party Patriots and Heritage Action for America — got less than $1 million each.

Members are drawn from the Koch brothers’ semiannual conferences, a 10-year-old tradition that draws top politicians — including, last month, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) and House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-Wis.). Many seminar attendees also give directly to Koch-approved groups, and the
Freedom Partners funds do not include the Kochs’ many gifts to university think tanks.

(Also on POLITICO: Cantor, Ryan headline Koch summit)

Short says his members are “concerned that the nation that they grew up in and that their businesses have flourished in will not be there for their children and grandchildren,” and are “committed to trying to restore what they view are free markets in a free society in America.” Many, he said, are “Horatio Alger-type stories,” most of them not household names, who got rich after starting small businesses, from service to manufacturing to information technology: “They are really worried about the country that’s going to be left for their future generations.”

Freedom Partners now has 48 employees. The executive director is Richard Ribbentrop, a former head of the New York Stock Exchange’s Washington office, who was chief of staff to former Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison and longtime legislative director to Sen. Phil Gramm, both Texas Republicans. At Hutchison’s office, Ribbentrop hired Short, who succeeded him as chief of staff. Short later was chief of staff to then-Rep. Mike Pence (R-Ind.), who was chairman of the House Republican Conference, and is now governor of Indiana. The Freedom Partners vice president of strategic communications is James Davis, who was communications director of the 2012 Republican National Convention.

The group has five directors: Short; Wayne Gable, a longtime Koch Industries employee who was the new group’s first director and holds a Ph.D. in economics from George Mason University; Richard Fink, a Ph.D. in economics who is president of the Charles G. Koch Charitable Foundation; Kevin Gentry, a Koch official and vice chairman of the Republican Party of Virginia; and Nestor Weigand, a board member of Regal Entertainment Group and former president of the National Association of Realtors.

We asked Short what he has to show for all that money spent in 2012, when Republicans failed at a within-reach effort to take back the Senate and Romney left the GOP in a deep hole by getting wiped out among some demographic groups, including Hispanic and Asian voters. “Our members are committed to the long term,” Short said, “not to one individual cycle.”
Kenneth P. Vogel contributed.
EXHIBIT L
## Contract # 1821977

**Schedule Dates**
04/25/14-05/02/14

**Advertiser**
Trees of Liberty
(90638)

**Agency**
Smart Media Group-Alexandria
(6613)

**Product**
POLITICAL ISSUE (ns) (1187)

**Brand**
TREES OF LIBERTY (627372)

**Salesperson**
Millennium DC, Washington DC
(1108)

**Sales Office**
Millennium Washington DC

**Buyer Name**
Good, Carolyn

**Phone/Fax**

**CPE**
TREE/ORDR/42502

**Account Types**
National/Political Issue Agency BRD

**Billing Type**
Standard

**Comments**
TREES OF LIBERTY

### Des Moines (KDSM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Broadcast Month</th>
<th>Spots</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May. 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,300.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total:**
11

$2,350.00

### Line | Line Type / Break Type (Ref #) | Dates | Sec | Length | Run Times | SPW | Mo | Tu | We | Th | Fr | Sa | Su | Spots | Rate | Total | Station | Comments | Entered |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (8)</td>
<td>05/02/14-05/02/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Family Feud(Fr), [P]Family Feud 2(Fr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>FAMILY FEUD 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (1)</td>
<td>04/28/14-04/29/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Judge Judy(Mo), [P]Judge Judy 2(Mo)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>JUDGE JUDY 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (3)</td>
<td>04/30/14-04/30/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Judge Judy(We), [P]Judge Judy 2(We)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>JUDGE JUDY 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (4)</td>
<td>05/02/14-05/02/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Judge Judy(Fr), [P]Judge Judy 2(Fr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>JUDGE JUDY 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (5)</td>
<td>04/25/14-04/25/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Family Feud(Fr), [P]Family Feud 2(Fr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>FAMILY FEUD 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (6)</td>
<td>04/29/14-04/29/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Family Feud(Tu), [P]Family Feud 2(Tu)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>FAMILY FEUD 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / SPOT (7)</td>
<td>05/01/14-05/01/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]Family Feud(Th), [P]Family Feud 2(Th)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>FAMILY FEUD 2X</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / Prime (9)</td>
<td>04/29/14-04/29/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>Orbit- [P]FOX-New Girl (Tuesday)(Tu), [P]FOX-The Mindy Project (Tuesday)(Tu)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>NEW GIRL/ THE MINDY P</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Normal Line / Prime (11)</td>
<td>05/01/14-05/01/14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>:30</td>
<td>30085AP- FOX-Hells Kitchen (Thursday)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>Des Moines (KDSM)</td>
<td>HELL'S KITCHEN</td>
<td>4/23/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONFIRMATION CONTRACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted-Agency/Advertiser:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Accepted-Station:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

B/E Bockend | P/B Piggy Back
Printed At: 11:51 AM on Thursday, April 24 2014
**OFFICIAL BILLING INVOICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Schedule Days to Run</th>
<th>Air Time</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Copy/ESCI</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>SPOT</td>
<td>By Orish[ familial fee] Per week CL/T</td>
<td>MDES 4-48MP (9)</td>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>TCL14TV01H</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0X</td>
<td>SPOT</td>
<td>By Orish[ special rate] Day, F</td>
<td>MDES 4-48MP (9)</td>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>TCL14TV01H</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Net 30—Payment is due within 30 days from invoice date. Station owned or provided services by the Sinclair Broadcast Group.**

---

**Warranty**—We warrant the above broadcast were made according to the official station log. Please note that we do not maintain invoices since the purpose of placing a memory seal on a document is to guarantee the authenticity of an individual's signature and not to certify the accuracy of commercially taped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Total</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Total Spots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>($15.00)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Total**

$85.00
EXHIBIT M
Outside group targets Jacobs

A national advocacy group is targeting Republican Senate hopeful Mark Jacobs with a new television ad that criticizes him for what it says was his support for cap-and-trade legislation backed by President Barack Obama and congressional Democrats.

Trees of Liberty, which says it is interested in economic policy issues, began airing the ad Friday.

In it, the group highlights comments Jacobs made on a conference call in 2009 while chief executive of Houston-based Reliant Energy. Jacobs, the ad noted, said that a bill passed in the U.S. House to establish a cap-and-trade system provided a "workable framework" and a national climate change policy would "hit the mark."

The ad says the proposal would have cost thousands of Iowa jobs.

Jacobs is one of five Republicans seeking the party's nomination to replace the retiring Sen. Tom Harkin, D-Iowa.

His campaign responded in an email Friday.

"Bottom line: Mark Jacobs does not support cap-and-trade legislation. He understands how bad it is for families and businesses and would not support such legislation in the U.S. Senate. This attack by an out-of-state shadow group is exactly what is wrong with politics," the campaign said.

The email noted that Reliant had 11 coal-fired power plants that would have suffered if the legislation had been signed into law.

Trees of Liberty says it is a 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization. It has set up a website, with the ad and a news release, but the site provides little identifying information about the group or its donors.

Typically, such nonprofit advocacy groups don't identify their donors.

A news release on the group's website lists a Mark Pfeifle as its spokesman. Pfeifle is president of Off The Record Strategies, whose website says it provides private counsel and
public results.

"If we told you exactly what we do, we'd have to go on the record," says a part of the company's website.

The company's website says Pfeifle is a former national security official in the George W. Bush administration.

The ad buy is for more than $250,000 and is scheduled to run for a week.

The primary is June 3.
EXHIBIT N
New outside group targets GOP's Mark Jacobs on cap and trade

By Jennifer Jacobs, jejacobs@dmgreg.com 10:54 p.m. CDT May 8, 2014

A new outside group called Trees of Liberty is airing a TV ad in Iowa that targets one of the GOP U.S. Senate candidates.

The organization hits Mark Jacobs for his stance on cap and trade, political operatives told The Des Moines Register Thursday night.

The $257,000 ad buy is scheduled to run through May 2 on broadcast TV in Cedar Rapids, Des Moines and Sioux City, and on cable TV in Cedar Rapids, Davenport, Des Moines, Omaha, Ottumwa and Sioux City, records show.

Jacobs is in a five-way race for the GOP nomination in the race to replace retiring U.S. Sen. Tom Harkin.

Trees of Liberty (http://www.realmarkjacobs.com/) is a national 501c4 advocacy organization "whose mission is to educate and engage citizens on national and state economic policy issues," according to spokesman Mark Pfeifle.

The ad's narrator says: "Remember cap and trade? Pushed by Barack Obama, Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid, and praised by Mark Jacobs. Like Obama, Texas businessman Jacobs said a Washington cap and trade system works very well and 'really hits the mark.' But the plan would have exploded energy costs, hurt the economy, and even cost American jobs up to 30,000 jobs in Iowa. Call Mark Jacobs. Tell him Iowa families can't afford higher energy costs from Washington."

In July 2009, Jacobs, then the CEO of the Texas-based Reliant Energy, acknowledged a "need" for a federal climate change policy (http://story.news/politics/2010/01/02/liberal-group-questions-mark-jacobs-explanation-on-cap-and-trade/175073) and voiced support for the bill that had passed the Democratic-led U.S. House in June 2009.

"The Waxman-Markey bill that got passed out of the House, in our view, represents a workable framework," Jacobs said at the time.

On the campaign trail in Iowa, the Jacobs campaign says he "personally has never supported a cap and trade policy."

Jacobs is competing against Joni Ernst, Matt Whitaker, Sam Clovis and Scott Schaben for the opportunity to take on Democratic U.S. Senate candidate Bruce Braley. The primary vote is June 3; early voting by absentee ballot began yesterday.
Joni Ernst
January 20, 2014

Mark Jacobs clearly supports cap and trade. That's very troubling to me because cap and trade will kill Iowa jobs. We need a Republican nominee to defeat Bruce Braley, not agree with him. I am 100% opposed to cap and trade, always have been and always will be. #IASEN

GOP's Mark Jacobs in 2007: ‘Cap-and-trade system works very well’

An Iowa Republican running for U.S. Senate in the past spoke in favor of a federal cap-and-trade program for carbon emissions, a view that goes hard against...
US Senate

May 20th, 2014

Ernst on Gas Tax Vote: “I Made a Mistake”

More articles by Kevin Hall »
Written by: Kevin Hall
Tags: Bruce Braley, Homepage Spotlight, Joni Ernst, Mark Jacobs, Sam Clovis

BETTENDORF – Throughout countless U.S. Senate debates and forums during the GOP primary race, the candidates have largely agreed on the issues and avoided direct criticism of their colleagues. That changed Monday night in Bettendorf during a debate sponsored by the Scott County Republican Party, the Quad-City Times and KWQC.
The two frontrunners pointed out some of the biggest flaws in their main rival’s record. Mark Jacobs went after Joni Ernst for supporting tax increases. Later, Ernst pointed out that Jacobs supported Cap & Trade. They traded criticisms again in the final moments of the 90-minute debate.

The scene has played out online, in the media and in TV commercials, but this is the first time we have seen the candidates launch these criticisms face-to-face.

However, neither candidate was a clear winner of the exchanges. TheIowaRepublican.com spoke with several attendees after the debate. Many of them remain undecided with just two weeks remaining in the race.

“T’m more confused than ever,” Bettendorf resident Debbie Stelk said. “I have leanings in two or three directions. My real deep-seated thought is finding someone to beat Bruce Braley. I think it’s imperative and critical to get him out of there.”

Stelk joined around 500 residents of the Quad Cities in attendance at the event. Although it was held at Bettendorf High School, most of the attendees appeared to be over 45 and there were few students in the crowd.

The field of candidates was asked for their thoughts on military budgets, the minimum wage, entitlement spending, getting younger voters excited and medical marijuana. However, the most interesting moments came from the Ernst-Jacobs duel.

Ernst and Jacobs Spar in Scott County Debate

The first salvo was fired about a half-hour into the debate. The candidates were asked how they would contrast their record against Bruce Braley’s. Mark Jacobs took the opportunity to compare Braley’s record of tax and spending increases with Joni Ernst’s.

“One of us here has supported tax increases in the past and four of us have not. I think we’re not going to beat Bruce Braley if we’re the same. We need a contrast here,” Jacobs said.
In response, Ernst said the attack ads against her from the Jacobs campaign are “very, very inflammatory”. She asked specifically which taxes he was referring to. Jacobs mentioned she voted to raise the gas tax, internet tax and cell phone tax.

Regarding the gas tax increase, State Senator Ernst issued a mea culpa.

“I made a mistake. How’s that? I made a mistake on that one,” Ernst said.

“I am very proud of my conservative record and you know what, every once in awhile we get some things wrong and that one I got wrong. I’m not perfect. So, when I make a mistake, I am going to own up to it and you are going to hear it from me,” she added.

Regarding the internet tax increase, Ernst said she voted to close a loophole in the existing tax code that benefitted large, out-of-state corporations and claimed that does not equate to a tax increase.

Those two answers took 2 ½ minutes, so the moderator cut her off before she could explain the cell phone tax accusation.

Later, during a discussion on climate change, all of the candidates said they were skeptical of whether or not it is man made and expressed doubt that the science is settled on the issue. Ernst used the opportunity to point out that Mark Jacobs had expressed support for Cap and Trade when he was running Reliant Energy.

“Cap and Trade is the largest tax increase on industry in history and I know most of us at this table, Mr. Jacobs has supported Cap and Trade in the past. I’m opposed to that and I think most of us would be opposed to Cap and Trade,” Ernst said.

Jacobs said he has never personally supported Cap and Trade and called Ernst’s remarks disingenuous. When Ernst noted there is documentation that shows Jacobs expressing support for the controversial bill, Jacobs said his company was going to be devastated by any type of carbon dioxide legislation and at the time, he felt Cap and Trade was “the least damaging approach”.

Recent polls have shown Joni Ernst building a double-digit lead on Jacobs, so he entered the debate knowing time was running out for him to halt her momentum. To that end, Jacobs criticized Ernst again in the closing comments.

“Senator Ernst, you say you’re the frontrunner in this race, but again, I ask you to look at the contrast: Another career politician, someone who has missed 40 percent of the votes while campaigning for a promotion this year. I don’t think that represents a contrast against Congressman Braley,” Jacobs said.

“Four years in the Iowa State Legislature does not make me a career politician. It does make me a public servant,” Ernst replied. “I am very proud of my 90 percent voting record in the Iowa State Senate and I have a very strong, conservative voting record and I would put that record of success up against Bruce Braley any day of the week.”

The back and forth criticisms between the frontrunners took several minutes. Some attendees felt that time could have been spent more wisely.
“They were too political. They were more interested in attacking each other than speaking to the point,” said Rona Loweth of Bettendorf.

Her husband, Carl Loweth, agreed.

“The problem with allowing the candidates to parry with each other is it took up a lot of extra time while the other person had to defend themselves. They had a time problem. They didn’t need to add to it,” he said.

The Loweths said they were only familiar with Joni Ernst and Mark Jacobs prior to the debate. Now, they have a third candidate who could possibly earn their vote on June 3: Sam Clovis.

The consensus among everyone TheIowaRepublican.com spoke to afterwards was that Clovis was the most impressive candidate on the stage Monday night. However, many attendees remain undecided regarding who they will vote for in two weeks. That is a common theme statewide amongst Republicans.
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EXHIBIT Q
Mark Jacobs – Most Vulnerable Candidate?

Posted on April 26, 2014 by DesignatedZ

Issue baggage, political skill set, ostentatious self-funding indicating others are not matching the enthusiasm he has for himself — relate to electability.

By inferences from two recent news articles, and our own analysis, Mark Jacobs may be the most vulnerable candidate in Iowa’s U.S. Senate campaign — as a primary contender — or should he prevail there, as the Republican nominee in the general.

The Quad-City Times’ Ed Tibbetts reports that an advocacy group – Trees Of Liberty – has targeted Jacobs with a $250,000 ad run pointing out his support for cap and trade legislation. The group’s Website – The Real Mark Jacobs – also points out that Jacobs has supported Common Core type nationalized education standards and helped enable passage of Obamacare through his personal support of Democrat Senate candidate Arlen Specter.

Regarding Jacobs cap and trade support when he was an executive with a Houston energy firm, the Jacobs’ response team led by Davenport’s Victory Enterprises continues the mealy mouthed excuse that he was doing the bidding of the company he worked for. That is supposed to convince Iowa Republicans that he is a principled conservative who has Iowa and the rest of the country’s best interests at heart . . . now. Killing jobs nationwide back then was just about business.

Jacob’s support for nationalized education standards along the lines of Common Core will not endear him to Republicans who voted for platforms across the state this week. They repudiated such machinations federalizing education. That Jacobs so instinctively associated himself with such power grabs should likewise not endear him with Iowa’s homeschooling parents – a very active primary voting group.

Many proponents of Jacob’s candidacy have, with all the discretion they can muster, which is none, said that elections are all about money. Their candidate has a bunch of personal wealth, ergo he is the one. Never mind other components of electability, as if they can assuredly be bought. Given Jacob’s debate performances where used car manager Schaben out shown him, and the prospects of Jacobs going up against trial lawyer Braley, well Jacob’s another clunker for Braley to dispose of.

There is statistical evidence as well that the aggressive use of personal wealth may be a drawback to electability.
Jacobs has already surpassed any other Iowan’s self funding level in the state’s political history and there is over a month to go in the primary. The Des Moines Register’s Jennifer Jacobs, (no relation we presume) provided a passably balanced article regarding the matter. To her credit she exposed Bruce Braley’s special interest support from trial lawyers. But consider the following stark excerpt from the article, emphasis ours:

*The vast majority of self-funded candidates for federal office, both Democrats and Republicans, ultimately lose.*

“Two overarching themes are their frequent lack of a political track record and inability to overcome doubts in some voters’ minds that they’re trying to ‘buy’ elections,” said Dave Levinthal of the Center for Public Integrity.

Many self-funders also miss out on the multiplier effect, which isn’t measured in dollars and cents, from people who make small- and medium-sized donations, and then become a candidate’s advocate in conversations with friends, family and colleagues, Levinthal said.

Here are the top-spending millionaire candidates from last election cycle, according to the Campaign Finance Institute:

- Republican Linda McMahon lost the general election for an open seat in Connecticut. McMahon self-financed $49 million of her $51 million campaign.

- Republican Tom Smith of Pennsylvania lost the general election to incumbent Democratic U.S. Sen. Bob Casey. Smith funded $33 million of his $38 million campaign.

- Republican David Dewhurst of Texas lost the primary race to Ted Cruz. Dewhurst self-financed $25 million of his $34 million campaign.


- Republican Wil Cardon lost a U.S. Senate primary battle in Arizona. Cardon self-financed $9 million of his $9.9 million campaign.

The Iowa Republican made a similar point over two months ago which we added to. We also referenced that the donations to Jacobs’ campaign, at least at that time, were high dollar and few in number . . . and largely from out of state.

Image wise it just astounds us that having gone through what Democrats successfully did to Mitt Romney, that supposed political elites think that the winning image is another Mitt Romney – only less articulate.

Jacobs is definitively, not merely a one-percenter, but a point one percentor. He is a Goldman Sachs alum. He has supported legislation anathema to Republicans, independents and many Democrats and for the most unprincipled of reasons. He is a lobbyists best friend – a guy who gets that monied people buy seats at the table.

http://www.veritaspac.com/2014/04/26/mark-jacobs-most-vulnerable-candidate/
Mark Jacobs – Most Vulnerable Candidate?

Braley has made himself very vulnerable. His trial lawyer money won’t help him either. It will be an albatross, easily referenced to remind people what he said about Chuck Grassley.

Perhaps all is not lost for Jacobs. We are sure Victory Enterprises will be in touch with Jacobs in the morning, telling this poorer candidate by their graces, to spend less time writing checks to them and more time developing his depth on issues and debate skills.  

R Mall

MARK JACOBS BRINGS MORE BAGGAGE TO THE PRIMARY THAN, WELL, MARC JACOBS.  
(Image not Marc Jacobs).
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Gus says:

April 27, 2014 at 10:43 am

Jacobs sounds like the ideal GOP Establishment candidate. For them, he’s a win-win. If he wins, they can be assured that he won’t do anything to offend Democrats and their perceptions of “moderates”. If he loses, at least he kept a conservative from threatening the "world order" (as seen by Rove and the US Chamber of Commerce).
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Kochs launch new super PAC

By DARREN GOODE and KENNETH P. VOGEL | 06/16/14 08:20 PM EDT | Updated 06/17/14 07:16 PM EDT

During a closed-door gathering of major donors in Southern California on Monday, the political operation spearheaded by the Koch brothers unveiled a significant new weapon in its rapidly expanding arsenal — a super PAC called Freedom Partners Action Fund.

The new group aims to spend more than $15 million in the 2014 midterm campaigns — part of a much larger spending effort expected to total $290 million, sources told POLITICO.
It’s an evolution for billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch. The vast network of political nonprofit groups they helped build has mostly funneled its unprecedented political spending into issue-based campaigns that usually slam Democrats for supporting big government but seldom explicitly ask voters to support GOP candidates.

(Also on POLITICO: Inside the money wars)

That’s expected to change under Freedom Partners Action Fund, according to Marc Short, president of Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce, an increasingly powerful force in the Koch network that will operate in association with the new super PAC.

“The Freedom Partners Action Fund will support candidates who share our vision of free markets and a free society and oppose candidates who support intrusive government policies that push the American Dream out of reach for the American people,” Short told POLITICO after a presentation to donors at the St. Regis Monarch Beach resort in Dana Point, California.

The gathering is the latest in a series of twice-annual so-called seminars that the Kochs started holding in 2003 to raise cash from wealthy donors after treating them to a series of slickly produced presentations from handpicked politicians, conservative media stars and operatives from Koch-backed groups.

(Also on POLITICO: Hobby Lobby aims for Obamacare win, Christian nation)

Freedom Partners, which was created in 2011, now organizes and hosts the seminars. The theme of the St. Regis seminar — “American Courage; Our commitment to a free society” — was printed on massive posters evoking an idyllic turn-of-the-century immigration motif. The posters, which depicted an immigrant family gazing in awe at the Statue of Liberty in the distance, were displayed throughout the St. Regis. A photo of one was provided upon request to POLITICO by Freedom Partners spokesman James Davis, who explained that the purpose of the seminar was “continued discussions about advancing a free society with the theme of American Courage.”
Among the dignitaries who was scheduled to address the crowd was Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), whose office declined to comment on his appearance. It was initially reported by the Daily Beast, which also first reported the $290 million overall spending goal.

Democrats are sure to seize on the new Freedom Partners super PAC as yet more fodder in their mounting campaign to caricature the brothers as evil puppeteers manipulating Republicans. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee sent a fundraising missive Sunday declaring the Daily Beast’s report “AWFUL NEWS” and pleading “if we can’t start closing this gap TODAY, the Koch brothers WILL buy the election for John Boehner and the GOP.”

A spokesman for Koch Industries, the Koch brothers’ privately held industrial conglomerate, referred all questions to Freedom Partners. A Koch Industries website entry posted before Freedom Partners took over responsibility for the seminars describes them as an opportunity for “America’s greatest philanthropists and most successful business leaders” to “discuss solutions to our most pressing issues and strategies to promote policies that will help grow our economy, foster free enterprise and create American jobs.”
EXHIBIT S
Koch Brothers’ Budget of $889 Million for 2016 Is on Par With Both Parties’ Spending

By NICHOLAS CONFESSORE  JAN. 26, 2015

The political network overseen by the conservative billionaires Charles G. and David H. Koch plans to spend close to $900 million on the 2016 campaign, an unparalleled effort by coordinated outside groups to shape a presidential election that is already on track to be the most expensive in history.

The spending goal, revealed Monday at the Kochs’ annual winter donor retreat near Palm Springs, Calif., would allow their political organization to operate at the same financial scale as the Democratic and Republican Parties. It would require a significant financial commitment from the Kochs and roughly 300 other donors they have recruited over the years, and covers both the presidential and congressional races. In the last presidential election, the Republican National Committee and the party’s two congressional campaign committees spent a total of $657 million.

Hundreds of conservative donors recruited by the Kochs gathered over the weekend for three days of issue seminars, strategy sessions and mingling with rising elected officials. These donors represent the largest concentration of political money outside the party establishment, one that has achieved
enormous power in Republican circles in recent years.

Now the Kochs’ network will embark on its largest drive ever to influence legislation and campaigns across the country, leveraging Republican control of Congress and the party’s dominance of state capitols to push for deregulation, tax cuts and smaller government. In 2012, the Kochs’ network spent just under $400 million, an astonishing sum at the time. The $889 million spending goal for 2016 would put it on track to spend nearly as much as the campaigns of each party’s presidential nominee.

The Kochs’ efforts will put enormous fund-raising pressure on Democrats and liberal outside groups. Allies of Hillary Rodham Clinton, who appears to be preparing for a likely presidential campaign in 2016, expect that she will need to bring in more money than President Obama, the most successful fund-raiser in presidential history, and a “super PAC” supporting her is seeking to raise as much as $300 million in the coming months.

“It’s no wonder the candidates show up when the Koch brothers call,” said David Axelrod, a former senior adviser to Mr. Obama. “That’s exponentially more money than any party organization will spend. In many ways, they have superseded the party.”

The group’s budget, disclosed by a conference attendee, reflects the rising ambition and expanded reach of the Koch operation, which has sought to distinguish itself from other outside groups by emphasizing the role of donors over consultants and political operatives.

While the Koch’s expansive network houses groups with discretely political functions — a data and analytics firm, a state-focused issue-advocacy group and affinity groups aimed at young voters and Hispanics — it also includes groups like Freedom Partners, a trade organization overseen by Koch advisers that plans the retreat and helps corral contributions; Americans for Prosperity, a national grass-roots group; and Concerned Veterans for America, which organizes conservative veterans
While almost no Republican Party leaders were invited to the Koch event, it has become a coveted invitation for the party’s rising stars, for whom the gathered billionaires and multimillionaires are a potential source of financing for campaigns and super PACs. Officials said this year’s conference was the largest ever.

At least five potential presidential candidates were invited this year, and four attended, including Gov. Scott Walker of Wisconsin. On Sunday evening, three of them — Senators Marco Rubio of Florida, Rand Paul of Kentucky and Ted Cruz of Texas — took part in a candidate forum on economic issues.

The Kochs are longtime opponents of campaign disclosure laws. Unlike the parties, their network is constructed chiefly of nonprofit groups that are not required to reveal donors. That makes it almost impossible to tell how much of the money is provided by the Kochs — among the wealthiest men in the country — and how much by other donors.

The two brothers and their aides have begun to take steps to relax the strict secrecy that has long surrounded much of their political efforts. After spending the 2012 campaign as the Democrats’ favored punching bags, Charles and David Koch have each granted a series of interviews to explain their views and philosophy. Their privately held firm, Koch Industries, has mounted a soft-focus advertising campaign called “We Are Koch,” featuring the company’s employees.

Last summer, Freedom Partners established the network’s first super PAC, allowing it to run more openly political advertising in the run-up to the 2014 midterm election. The move also required disclosing some of the network’s other donors. Trusts controlled by the Kochs provided about $4 million of the super PAC’s $25 million budget.

This year, Koch aides also provided — for the first time — limited access to the winter conference events and allowed reporters to view live video of the candidate forum on Sunday night.
As the three senators addressed the audience of rich donors — effectively an audition for the 2016 primary — they dismissed a question about whether the wealthy had too much influence in politics. At times they seemed to be addressing an audience of two: the Kochs themselves, now among the country’s most influential conservative power brokers.

Mr. Cruz gave an impassioned defense of his hosts as job creators and the victims of unfair attacks by Democrats, while Mr. Rubio suggested that only liberals supported campaign finance restrictions, so as to empower what he said were their allies in Hollywood and the news media.

A version of this article appears in print on January 27, 2015, on page A1 of the New York edition with the headline: ‘16 Koch Budget Is $889 Million.

© 2016 The New York Times Company
EXHIBIT T
Koch Political Network Expanding 'Grass-Roots' Organizing

Updated October 14, 2015 · 1:54 PM ET
Published October 12, 2015 · 12:09 PM ET

Koch Political Network Takes A Deep Dive Into Community Organizing

A volunteer with the Koch-funded Libre Initiative directs people in 2014 as groceries are distributed at a food bank it partially sponsors in San Antonio.

Eric Gay/AP
The political network led by billionaires David and Charles Koch is building what's meant to be a seamless system of grass-roots groups, designed to advance the network's conservative and libertarian goals year in and year out, while also helping like-minded politicians.

This strategy could have come straight out of a labor union's handbook, or an Obama campaign memo: community organizing.

"This isn't just about an election cycle," Pete Hegseth, CEO of Concerned Veterans for America, told a group of activists at an August conference. "What makes this network different ... is that we've been in these communities now for three, four years and we're going to be in them in 2017, 2018, 2019."

Concerned Veterans is one of the Koch grass-roots groups, and Hegseth was speaking at a session titled "Community Organizing — Life Past November."

It's a stark contrast to media campaigns that have absorbed millions of dollars from the Koch network. In 2012, the network spent nearly $400 million overall, including extensive TV attack ads. Other big-budget outside groups, including Crossroads GPS and American Action Network, have also favored TV. They are aiming to spend more than double that for the 2016 election.

Joining Hegseth at the community organizing session were representatives of the broad-based Americans for Prosperity; Generation Opportunity, targeting millennials; and the Libre Initiative, which is working to build ties in Latino communities.

Libre Executive Director Daniel Garza said his organization is putting down roots in neighborhoods where progressive groups have been active for years. "They're embedded," he said. "I mean, they run the institutions in the community. They've gained the trust of the Latino community."

The session was part of the 2015 Defending the American Dream Summit, sponsored by the Americans for Prosperity Foundation in Columbus, Ohio. NPR obtained audio of the session from a liberal activist who bought a ticket to the conference. The activist said the recorder was in plain view as the participants spoke.

"The strategy has not changed since Day 1," Garza told NPR in a phone interview of his group, which was founded in 2011 and which Garza says now has 15,000 supporters in nine states. "Control the message in media, both in Spanish and English language. Second, was working with the communities, at the community level. And third, was to mobilize an army of advocates and activists and volunteers who could drive our message at the community level."

At the community-organizing session, Garza went through some of Libre's activities. In Nevada, where immigrants in the country illegally can get driver's licenses, it helps
Latinos prepare for the Department of Motor Vehicles.

In Florida, a new program covers the costs and helps people study for GED exams—which it also pays for.

As Libre volunteers work in a community, they tell people about low taxes, small government and libertarianism, Garza told the session.

"And, of course, they've now become part of our database," he said. "Over 100,000 people that we've touched one-on-one at these community events."


"What we're doing with the Latino outreach, well, nobody had done it before at the scale we're doing it," Garza told NPR. "So, there's no playbook."

At the community-organizing session, Hegseth said he put the basic message—less government and regulation, more unfettered free enterprise—and framed it in military terms.

"It's fighting for the freedom and prosperity here at home that we fought for overseas or in uniform," he said. "It's when you raise your right hand to defend the Constitution. There's no reason why when you come home that service should stop."

Concerned Veterans is currently promoting legislation to simplify the firing of employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

As Concerned Veterans volunteers talk about the legislation with veterans and military families, Hegseth said, "then they also pick up an iPad and knock on some doors and make some phone calls and remind veterans to vote."

The iPads may be new, but community organizing is old-fashioned American politics. In the 1800s and early 1900s political parties were often involved in local communities.

More recently, however, those connections have withered, Harvard professor Theda Skocpol told NPR, and "parties have mainly been about raising money and running election campaigns."

Skocpol is a sociologist and political scientist who leads the Scholars Strategy Network, a group of progressive academics. She's been studying the Koch network for several years and says it is emulating what political parties and labor unions used to do.

In fact, the Koch network perhaps can do it better. The network can persuade donors
to keep giving in non-election years, while progressive efforts struggle to maintain a
presence. In other words, progressive groups and unions cannot keep pace with the
Koch network.

"No. Not even close," Skocpol said.

Besides cash-flow problems, the progressive infrastructure is fragmented, with
hundreds of groups targeting their own specific issues.

"That's not what you see on the right," Skocpol said. "You see much more of an effort
to create an overall strategy."

It's a strategy meant to last for many elections to come.

The Koch Political Network

The Koch political network has branched out and put significant amounts of money into trying to win over
various voter groups, including Hispanics, on the ground. In all, the groups have been funded with more than
$570 million and almost 4,000 official volunteers.

Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce

Financial hub of Koch network, distributing money to other groups. Also does TV advertising. Supported largely by donor dues.
Legal status: 501(c)(6) business association, some political activity allowed. Formed 2011.
Revenue: $255.7 million in 2012, $57.5 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 0

Americans For Prosperity

Best-known for multimillion-dollar TV blitzes, is also building ground operations in several states. Campaigned unsuccessfully this summer
for anti-union legislation in Missouri.
Legal status: 501(c)(4) social welfare group, some political activity allowed. Formed 2004.
Revenue: $115.1 million in 2012, $44.2 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 1,500

Freedom Partners Action Fund

Only fully political group in Koch network. SuperPAC donors have no contribution limits, can give via shell companies to protect identity.
Corporate contributions are legal.
Legal status: SuperPAC. Formed 2014.
Revenue: $29.1 million in 2014
Donor disclosure: Mostly yes
Volunteers reported: 0

http://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/2015/10/12/447999852/koch-political-network-expanding-grassroots-organizing
The Libre Initiative

Active in Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Texas, Colorado, four other states, building libertarian grass-roots infrastructures in Latino communities.

Revenue: $5.0 million in 2012, $9.5 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 180

Americans for Prosperity Foundation

Runs Bridges To Wellbeing workshops, teaching young parents topics including family budgets, couponing to lower grocery bills, citizen activism. Active in Florida, North Carolina, Virginia.

Revenue: $22.5 million in 2012, $13.3 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 500

Generation Opportunity

Officially labeled YEM Trust. Target audience is millennials facing weak job market and costly college loans. Active in Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia.

Revenue: $4.1 million in 2012, $7.9 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 150

Concerned Veterans for America

Created as Vets for Economic Freedom. Focused on swing states Florida, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia.

Revenue: $2.0 million in 2012, $3.8 million in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 1,500

The Libre Initiative Institute

Began operating late 2012. Goals include research on effects of government policies in Hispanic communities.

Legal status: 501(c)(3). Formed 2011
Revenue: None in 2012, $976,000 in 2013
Donor disclosure: No
Volunteers reported: 0

Sources: IRS and Federal Election Commission records, groups’ websites, interviews and statements of group leaders
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