

April 22nd, 2023

Dear Kris,

I have been forwarded the letter you sent to Jodie in response to the letter she sent to you on March 28th, 2023. I feel the need to reply to your letter, because quite frankly, the information in it is inaccurate and outright false. I was the person in the room with Kaitlin and Amber during the entire discussion about RWC. I was the person in Greg's office during a 2 hour 11 minutes and 8 seconds long conversation, where I told Greg what was said about RWC's owners. I know how long it was because I have the recording. I do not know why Greg chose to ignore my account of the events, but the account that you provided in your response is not what I told Greg, far from it.

I asked Greg if I could record our meeting because I wanted to have a record of what was said. He gave his full permission. I asked to record the meeting because I did not want to have a he-said-she-said situation, about what was said and discussions. I do not intend to summarize my meeting with Greg in this letter. Suffice to say, everything that I am telling you in this letter was told to Greg in that meeting.

I have chosen to address the inaccuracies in your letter point by point, as they occur in the letter.

Your first paragraph: "Late in February, a volunteer (Cindy) participated in a discussion between two employees (Amber and Kait) related to a potential partner, Real World Canine. Staff and the volunteer were looking at having Real World Canine possibly assist an NHS dog named Punchy and perhaps establishing an ongoing relationship between NHS and Real World Canine."

The date of said conversation was February 24th, 2023. Kaitlin and myself were having the conversation that consisted of these key points:

1. At this time Punchy would not be able to go up to RWC because in reporting her findings to NHS higher ups there were two issues:
 - a. The use of e-collars - NHS as an organization did not condone the use of them – Kait's words: That's a hard no.
 - b. No barking - Amber disagreed with this. Kait's words: Amber says this is the way dogs communicate.

Amber came in during our conversation and just stood there on the other side of the partition. She only engaged when I explained to her use of E-collars was up to the owner, and RWC would abide by their wishes.

I also explained dogs up at RWC or anywhere for that matter communicate just fine without barking and asked her if she preferred and thought the frenzied, anxiety filled aggressive barking out in the pods was dogs communicating in a friendly or healthy manner? And wasn't she the one who always says to her dog staff: Click for quiet?

At this point, I'd like to point out that Amber has a history of being combative when someone disagrees with her. Greg stated as such during our recorded meeting, and informed me that he

is working with her on this issue. I would also like to point out that Amber has two “tells” when she is trying to recover from someone that has a reasonable response that counters her point:

1. Her eyes start darting back and forth
2. She comes up with completely out of left field statements that are always negative

After I countered these 2 points, Amber made the following statements about RWC.

Amber: A former employee of RWC who came to work at NHS, but no longer works here, said the owners have swastikas on the back of their vehicle

My Response: I just followed them home last night when I left RWC from picking up Lumi, I can assure you there were no swastikas on the back of their vehicle, but I will make it my priority to find out Tuesday when I take Lumi to RWC to go to school.

NOTE: There was NO mention of a man in shorts with a swastika on his calf. This was a complete fabrication. The first time I heard of such a thing was when I was talking to Greg and he told me that is what Amber and David told him. I immediately informed Greg that a man in shorts was never mentioned.

Amber: The owners tried to adopt a dog from NHS last summer and couldn't so they had someone else adopt it for them, and we were told they are abusing it.

My Response: I know their dog, Kaitlin you saw it, it is clearly not being abused. Why would they need someone else to adopt it for them? What dog are you referring to?

Amber: Nico.

My response: Nico? My Nico? I know exactly which dog you are talking about, I walked him every single day while he was here, and I can tell you Nico is not their dog. I started describing Nico and yes, Amber's eyes started darting back and forth. I asked Kaitlin to look him up, she did and as I knew, it was the Nico that I walked, and Kaitlin said the person who adopted him was a lady from Carson.

Amber: We've heard RWC doesn't treat the dogs well.

My response: Kaitlin, you were up there, you saw all the dogs, did any of them act like they aren't treated well? Amber, we could hardly walk because of the pack of dogs surrounding us and especially Angela, they followed her like a pack of lap dogs.

At this point, Amber again displayed her tell, eyes darting back and forth. Then she said:

Amber: Well, actually it was David who put two and two together.

I could almost audibly hear the big bump, and see the hair flying up, as Amber desperately threw David under the bus to win an argument.

This is the conversation that happened. This is the conversation that I discussed with Jodie. This is the conversation that I told Greg about. My points in reciting the above conversation to you are:

1. This is not the conversation that you relayed in your response to Jodie. I do not know if Amber or Kaitlin told Greg the tale that ended up in your response, but I know for sure

(and have recorded proof) that the above account of the conversation is what I told Greg and he/you chose to ignore it.

2. Of all parties involved in the conversation, I am the only one with nothing to gain or lose by telling the truth about what was said. I do not draw a salary from NHS, so I have no financial ties that would make me want to lie about events. I was not trying to avoid any additional work. I am not the one who said things that weren't true, and now need to change the narrative. The same cannot be said for the others involved in the conversation. I have agreed to take a lie detector test to demonstrate that I am telling the truth.

I would also like to add, that Kaitlin and Amber both knew I intended to speak to RWC owners about what was said because **I told them I would for the following reasons.**

1 – My Lumi goes to school at RWC and if there were any truth to any of it (and I knew there wasn't), then it would behoove me to find out.

2 - Punchy, I was very fond of (still am), and was doing everything in my power to get him up to RWC. And again, if there were any truth to any of it (and I knew there wasn't), then it would behoove me to find out.

3 - Angela and Jodie had **that very day** told Kaitlin and I that they would start with Punchy, but were already wanting to expand their offer to 3-4 more dogs. So yet again, if there were any truth to any of it (and I knew there wasn't), then it would behoove me to find out.

Your second paragraph: "The discussion involved staff recall of a guy in shorts who had a swastika tattoo on his calf, possible stickers on his car, and who they believed had been denied adoption by NHS at some point. The context of the conversation was whether or not the person being discussed worked for or had any affiliation with your business. During their discussion and upon researching NHS records, they determined that the person they were thinking of had nothing to do with Real World Canine or any individuals involved in the business. Upon determining that this was a case of mistaken identity, both employees felt comfortable recommending that we pursue the vetting process with Real World Canine as a potential NHS partner."

Let me say emphatically that "a guy in shorts" was NEVER mentioned, discussed, or hinted at, much less "A guy in shorts who had a swastika tattoo on his calf, possible stickers on his car and who they believed had been denied adoption by NHS at some point. The context of the conversation was whether or not the person being discussed worked for or had any affiliation with your business." On this point I want to be perfectly clear:

1. Amber said swastikas on the vehicles of owners of RWC.
2. Amber said RWC owners were denied adoption.

I find it hard to believe that any reasonable person would hear such a thing and not ask follow-up questions. What was the reason that Amber and David would believe that the "guy in shorts" worked at RWC? By their own admission, neither have ever been there, so they couldn't have had first hand knowledge of who worked there. Did the person fill out a form stating that they worked at RWC? In which case most reasonable people would want to see the form, as it

bolsters this rather shaky and unbelievable statement. There must be some reason why this “guy in shorts with swastika tattoo on his calf” was connected to RWC in David/Amber’s mind. Or did they think this “guy in shorts” was either Jodie or Angela in disguise? Given the extreme nature of this individual, there must have been a good reason for the initial connection. Why wouldn’t you or Greg provide the basis for Amber/David’s assumption that this individual was connected to RWC in your letter? Surely, reasonable people would want to understand how that connection was made? Your lack of transparency, and casual mentioning of this “guy in shorts” seems more suspicious because you provide no reasonable basis for the assertion that there might have been a connection.

You state “during their discussion and upon researching NHS records, they determined that the person they were thinking of had nothing to do with Real World Canine or any individuals involved in the business” – Again, this was never discussed.

You state that NHS records were used to determine this person did not work at RWC. What records were reviewed? Did Amber or Kaitlin call the individual during the discussion and confirm employment (the answer is no, I was there)? What information did they have at their fingertips that would prove so rapidly that someone denied adoption did not work for RWC? More importantly, why would Amber repeat such a wild story before she looked at these records that were so readily available? Most reasonable people, upon hearing this, would realize that the “guy in shorts” story is not plausible. I find it interesting that neither you, nor anyone else on the board questioned the sequence of events, nor asked for the data that was used to verify the accusation or its fabricated status.

To be 100% clear, the only thing that was looked up during the meeting was who adopted Nico, the dog that Amber falsely said was adopted by Jodie and Angela.

You state “Upon determining that this was a case of mistaken identity, both employees felt comfortable recommending that we pursue the vetting process with Real World Canine as a potential NHS partner.” Neither Amber nor Kaitlin stated they were comfortable recommending the pursuit of the vetting process.

As a matter of fact, my last words to Kaitlin and Amber were that if they failed Punchy, that will be enough to make me walk away from NHS and never come back. I told them we are supposed to be here for the dogs and clearly you are not, you are more interested in coming up with lame-assed hurdles such as the ones Amber has produced just now. Does that sound like something that would be said by someone that has just heard that NHS was going to move forward with an initiative to help Punchy?

Your third paragraph: “Amber exchanged e-mails with you on March 15 indicating that we would like to make another site visit and explained that we would have to create an SOP (standard operating procedure) and speak to upper management to determine if anything else was needed to move this forward. I believe that you responded on March 19 and I don’t believe that NHS has responded to that message. Unfortunately, staff has been shorthanded due to the season and an untimely death of a team member. In addition, the dog in question, Punchy, was adopted out on March 22, NHS does have a number of partners we are currently evaluating in addition to your business and the process does not always move quickly.”

You state “Amber exchanged e-mails with you on March 15 indicating that we would like to make another site visit and explained that we would have to create an SOP (standard operating

procedure) and speak to upper management to determine if anything else was needed to move this forward.”

I find it interesting that you seem to cherry pick one email sent from Amber, vs all the other emails that were exchanged. Following is a sequence of events and correspondence between RWC and NHS, for your information:

- 1- On February 24th, Kaitlin and I toured RWC. Kaitlin sent an email to Jodie, February 24th, including questions from Amber and David.
- 2- Jodie responded February 25th with very detailed answers – 20 hours and 41 minutes later.
- 3- Amber requested she and David be provided a site visit on March 15th- 18 days later.
- 4- On March 15th Jodie replied asking Amber to provide possible dates and times, and stated she (Jodie) would make it happen - 10 minutes after Amber’s email.
- 5- On March 16th I saw Jodie at RWC, while picking up Lumi. Jodie mentioned she had replied to Amber’s email and the ball was in her court.

On March 17th I approached Amber in her office (regarding Yoshi), and mentioned that Jodie had not yet heard back from her on times for her and David’s visit. Amber looked at her computer and responded that Jodie still had not replied to her email, sent March 15th. Amber acted a bit annoyed. I remember thinking Amber was being disparaging of Jodie for (supposedly) not responding in two days, yet Amber took 18 days to respond to Jodie.

On March 19th, I told Jodie that Amber is claiming that she did not receive her email. Jodie resent the email that same day, and requested that Amber confirm receipt.

I also find it interesting that in my recorded conversation with Greg, Greg made a disparaging comment about the owners of RWC because they were responding so quickly to NHS emails.

Greg “See, I feel bad because I feel like the folks at Real World Canine, who are probably great people, from what I can tell, they are great people maybe. **And please don’t tell them that I said this, because I’m not trying to defame them but maybe they’re a little pushy,** because I don’t think they understand what it takes for us to get programs together. I mean, I will tell you, just yesterday, we spent an hour on the phone with the pups program.” Time stamp: 1:22:01

I find it interesting that Greg takes issue with people who respond to email quickly, but has no issue with Amber taking 18 days to initiate contact for help with a dog in immediate need. Nor does he have an issue with Amber falsely asserting that she did not get a quick response from Jodie.

You state " Unfortunately, staff has been shorthanded due to the season and an untimely death of a team member."

What is the “season” you refer to as the reason you don’t believe NHS has gotten back to Jodie’s email of March 19th? I go in every single day, and from the 19th of March to present there has been no special season or event that would justify Amber’s inability to respond to email.

With regard to the “untimely death of a team member,” I had to read that a few times before I could muster a response. The person that you are referring to is Jay, and he does not deserve to be used as your excuse for Amber not doing her job, especially after his death. Just because Punchy was adopted on March 22nd does not release Amber from doing her job and following basic rules for social interaction and best business practices, such as responding to emails. Just

because Punchy was adopted that did not mean the offer was withdrawn by RWC to help other dogs. I would reiterate my previous question, was there ever really any intent on Amber's part to follow through so Punchy could get the help/enrichment from RWC? RWC offered to provide these services to him or any other dog. I believe the answer to that question is glaringly obvious. I truly believe that the ONLY reason and time everyone REALLY became engaged in building a partnership with RWC was AFTER, and BECAUSE of Jodie's letter to the board.

You state "NHS does have a number of partners we are currently evaluating in addition to your business."

If NHS has a number of partners, then why did Staci tell me (when we originally spoke about Punchy going to RWC) that in the past there had been partnerships but there were none at present?

You state "and the process does not always move quickly."

Interestingly enough, I was told by Staci and Kaitlin this was an easy thing to put in place. Kaitlin herself told me everyone who needed to say yes had said yes, she just wanted to see the facilities at RWC before sending Punchy up there for his evaluation on March 2nd.

Your fourth paragraph: "There was no defamation, slander or unethical behavior from our employees or any intent to harm you or your business. This was simply a business discussion in a private office between two employees and a volunteer. The mistaken identity was cleared in the moment and that was the end of the discussion."

Everything that I have previously identified in this email, shows that this statement is incorrect. The rationale that you use to justify this conclusion is erroneous. The lack of thought or questioning of the obvious gaps in your response undermine your credibility and the credibility of NHS.

This was not just a case of **mistaken identity that was cleared in the moment and that was the end of the discussion**. The facts that I present in this letter, along with the obvious gaps in logic, show that your response is not the truth. The truth is that Amber made the statements that she is accused of against RWC and the owners, and she attributed them to David. Period!!

I pose one more question to you. In my recorded conversation with Greg, he states that Amber came to him and offered to apologize. If she did nothing wrong, as you state, why did she offer to apologize? Are the points in your letter correct or has she done something wrong and needs to apologize to RWC? Both cannot be correct, and one must be false.

I would also like to make it clear that Amber's behavior during the meeting was in no way anomalous to the general behavior of personnel at NHS. Gossip, name calling, bullying, screaming, holding grudges, personal vendettas, are all commonplace at NHS, against people and dogs. A person on dog staff said, "You're going to die, you're going to die, you're going to die", to a dog that was on its way to be euthanized. People being told, "you can quietly resign or be terminated." Greg was hiding in his office listening to the Advisory Board's committee meeting, when he was supposed to be there to present. NHS suffers from a lack of ethical behavior across all levels of personnel. No one would be surprised to hear that Amber said untrue things about RWC and its owners, and David was the source of this information.

I stand by what I told Greg during our recorded meeting.

1. Amber stated very clearly: the owners have swastikas on the back of their vehicle, the owners tried to adopt a dog from NHS last summer and couldn't so they had someone else adopt it for them, and RWC doesn't treat the dogs well. I did not misunderstand or misinterpret what Amber said. Amber in no way indicated that she was investigating these as allegations. She stated them as facts, and even after I countered each point, she provided no indication that the matter was resolved (as you erroneously state in your letter). I left the meeting with an ultimatum that I was going to stop supporting NHS, which would not have been necessary if everything was resolved during the meeting (as you falsely state in your letter).
2. I am not beholden to NHS or Greg for a paycheck or evaluation. So, I have nothing to lose by telling the truth. I told Greg the truth during our recorded meeting, and he/you chose to ignore my account in your letter to Jodie.
3. I was not wrong to tell Jodie what Amber said about RWC. NHS personnel frequently do not behave in a manner that "business discussions in a private office" stays private, and what she and David said would have been spread by word of mouth throughout the organization and beyond. A favorite quote of mine: "A lie can get half way around the world before the truth can even get out of bed and get its boots on." – Admiral Chegwiggon – JAG. Had I not told Jodie, and had she not written the letter, who else would have heard those false accusations, which were not resolved during the meeting.
4. It is not my responsibility to assist NHS to "repair the relationship we had with RWC" as Greg requested in our recorded meeting. First of all, there was no relationship with RWC prior to this incident. Their offer to provide free services for dogs that might need extra help was brokered by me, and was RWC's first attempt to partner with NHS. Amber's unprofessional statements about them personally, and your false response to their letters have done irreparable damage to any relationship that could have been established.
5. I am a very good volunteer at NHS. Both Kaitlin and Staci have been heard to say: Cindy's all the dogs' favorite, even if she doesn't walk them, they know her and love her. I am VERY good with the dogs, especially the challenging ones. I love them all, and they all know it. I realize that NHS management may decide to take punitive action against me for telling the truth, which contradicts the information in your letter. I would ask that you consider the fact that I am going to take a lie detector test to verify what I have said in this letter. I am 100% certain that it will validate what I have said in this letter. Please ask yourself, is NHS an organization that will punish people for telling the truth? If so, then it doesn't deserve good people like myself. I will add that should NHS take retaliatory actions against people who tell the truth, I am certain that the public and donors will not react well.

Should you have any questions or need any clarifications please feel free to contact me.

Cindy Hansen