

From: Byron York (b) (6)

To: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

Cc: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Re: do you have examples

Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2017 17:40:01 -0400

Importance: Normal

What about August 2 1982 ted Olsen memo on ag confidentiality?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 13, 2017, at 5:33 PM, Byron York (b) (6) > wrote:

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 13, 2017, at 5:12 PM, Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Attached Reagan Memo is what the longstanding policy is based on

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: New Byron York (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 4:16 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Re: do you have examples

also...any doj policy involved?

On Jun 13, 2017, at 4:04 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Jack Lew, White House Chief of Staff to President Obama, said: "There has to be the ability for a president to get confidential advice." (CNN, 7/1/12)

· **Lew cited the long history of president's using executive privilege to justify their decision not to release documents relating to Fast and Furious.** CNN's CANDY CROWLEY: Is there something so important about these papers that you had to invoke executive privilege from a president that had previously said, what is the point here? LEW: Candy, this administration has been the most transparent ever. Taxpayers can go online and find out more about the way their government works than

ever before. Every president since George Washington has taken executive privilege seriously. Every Republican president has. ([CNN](#), 7/1/12)

· **After the Obama administration invoked executive privilege, Lew declined to discuss any “documents that involved consultation with the president.”** LEW: There has to be the ability for a president to get confidential advice. There has to be an ability for Congress to use its speech and debate clause. There are constitutional issues that this Congress should pay some more attention to, because they are hurting the very institutions. CROWLEY: **Were there things in the documents that involved consultation with the president? Is that why you invoked executive privilege?** LEW: You know, Candy, I'm not going to speak to the specific documents. ([CNN](#), 7/1/12)

Ben Rhodes, Deputy National Security Adviser to President Obama, refused to testify before the House Oversight Committee regarding how he and President Obama “sold the Iran nuclear deal to the public.” “On Monday, three Republican senators called on President Barack Obama to fire his deputy national security adviser, saying Rhodes had been ‘disrespectful,’ ‘deceptive’ and ‘destructive’ in how he had sold the Iran nuclear deal to the public. The White House, meanwhile, said Rhodes will not testify about the deal before a House committee, calling it a ‘separation of powers’ issue.” ([Politico](#), 5/16/16)

· **The Obama White House cited “significant constitutional concerns.”** “House Oversight Committee Chairman Jason Chaffetz invited Rhodes to appear before his panel on Tuesday for a session titled ‘White House Narratives on the Iran Nuclear Deal.’ But in a letter to Chaffetz, White House counsel W. Neil Eggleston writes that Rhodes will not appear before the committee because it would raise ‘significant constitutional concerns.’” ([Politico](#), 5/16/16)

· **Obama’s White House counsel said Rhodes appearing before Congress “threatens the independence and the autonomy of the president, as well as his ability to receive candid advise...”** “The appearance of a senior presidential adviser before Congress threatens the independence and the autonomy of the president, as well as his ability to receive candid advice and counsel in the discharge of his constitutional duties,” Eggleston writes. ([Politico](#), 5/16/16)

Note: While Obama’s White House counsel did not specifically cite ‘executive privilege,’ it had become standard practice for Obama aides not to do so without further legal steps being taken. “The letter does not say the Obama administration is invoking ‘executive privilege’ in keeping Rhodes away, but the administration prefers to avoid that term whenever possible. Generally speaking, Obama aides won’t say they are asserting the privilege unless further legal steps are involved, such as a subpoena being issued.” ([Politico](#), 5/16/16)

On Jun 13, 2017, at 4:03 PM, New Byron York **(b) (6)** wrote:

of former attorneys general refusing to discuss conversations with president during appearances before congress?

also...any written policy about that?

thanks

byron

<reaganmemo.pdf>

From: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: New Byron York (b) (6), "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6), Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6)

Subject: RE: do you have examples

Date: Tue, 13 Jun 2017 18:29:36 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Olson.pdf; reaganmemo.pdf

Olson Memo and Reagan Memo

This is what Im giving reporters

From a DOJ official: "Declining to answer questions at a congressional hearing about confidential conversations with the President is long-standing executive-branch-wide practice. The basis for this historical practice is laid out in the 1982 memos from President Reagan and then-Assistant Attorney General Olson."

Ian D. Prior
Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs
Office: (b) (6)
Cell: (b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: New Byron York (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 4:03 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) >; Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) >; Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: do you have examples

of former attorneys general refusing to discuss conversations with president during appearances before congress?

also...any written policy about that?

thanks

byron

From: "Singman, Brooke" (b) (6)
To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)
Cc: "Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)" (b) (6), "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)
Subject: FARA - Sidney Blumenthal
Date: Thu, 27 Jul 2017 14:10:59 -0400
Importance: Normal

Hi Sarah,

Hoping for a comment on something Sen. Grassley raised yesterday, questioning why Sidney Blumenthal was not required to register under FARA.

Does the Justice Department have a comment on this? Or a comment in regards to potential tighter enforcement of FARA?

Deadline is as soon as possible—hoping before 3:30p EST.

Thank you !

Brooke Singman
Politics Reporter, Fox News Channel

(b) (6)
(b) (6)
(b) (6)

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Goldman, Adam" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Question

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2017 09:44:54 -0400

Importance: Normal

Do you have a minute to chat? We have a question: Was the attorney general in any way involved with bringing Carter Page to the campaign.

Adam

--

Adam Goldman

Reporter

The New York Times

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: "Triay, Andres" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6), "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: CBS News question

Date: Wed, 31 May 2017 16:06:13 -0400

Importance: Normal

Got it - Thanks.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 3:38 PM

To: Triay, Andres (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: CBS News question

No comment

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Triay, Andres (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 2:59 PM

To: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6); Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: CBS News question

Sarah and Ian,

We are working on a story for tonight about how Carter Page became an advisor to the Trump campaign. We are told by several sources that policy director Sam Clovis put together a list of 8 names. Page's name was on the list – which was sent to (then) Senator Sessions. Mr. Sessions then passed on a list of 15 names (he ostensibly added to the list) to the Trump campaign. Carter Page's name was on that list as well.

Does AG Sessions, or your office, have any comment or guidance? Did he received a list of 8 names of potential advisors from Sam Clovis? Did he add to the list and pass on a list of 15 names to the Trump campaign?

We are hoping to air this story tonight – so my deadline is about 5p.

Thanks,

Andy

Andres (Andy) Triay
Producer, *CBS Evening News*
Newsroom (b) (6)

Mobile (b) (6)
(b) (6)
@AndyTriay

From: kelly cohen (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Re: AG before sen jud

Date: Wed, 26 Jul 2017 18:38:03 -0400

Importance: Normal

ah yes i just talked to senate judiciary spox... my mind got all confused so ignore me! thanks though!

-kelly cohen

(b) (6)

(sent from [REDACTED], pardon typos)

On Jul 26, 2017, at 6:06 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Yeah and I thought Grassley responded that hed come for the oversight hearing which is usually in sept.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: kelly cohen (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 5:42 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Re: AG before sen jud

ok! thought maybe he was talking about this: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/dianne-feinstein-jeff-sessions-should-go-before-senate-judiciary-committee-to-answer-obstruction-of-justice-questions/article/2625605>

-kelly cohen

(b) (6)

(sent from [REDACTED], pardon typos)

On Jul 26, 2017, at 5:28 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Decline

Off the record: I assume this is just about the usual oversight hearing?

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: kelly cohen (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 5:21 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: AG before sen jud

Hi Sarah- Just saw this tweet from Manu Raju, and was wondering if you could confirm to me! ↓

Sessions (assuming he's still AG then) will appear before Judiciary in Sept, Grassley told me. Manafort, he said, may still appear in public

Thanks in advance!

-kelly cohen

(b) (6)

(sent from 📱, pardon typos)

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Carrie Johnson" (b) (6), "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Transcripts: Comey Drafted Conclusion in Clinton Probe Prior to Interviewing Key Witnesses

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2017 13:40:32 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png

decline

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Carrie Johnson (b) (6)

Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 1:07 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Transcripts: Comey Drafted Conclusion in Clinton Probe Prior to Interviewing Key Witnesses

You all have anything to say about this from AG Sessions or the DAG?

Not sure, but thought I should ask just in case.

THANKS

Carrie Johnson

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 12:58 PM

To: Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep)

Subject: Transcripts: Comey Drafted Conclusion in Clinton Probe Prior to Interviewing Key Witnesses



COMMITTEE *on the* **JUDICIARY**
CHAIRMAN CHUCK GRASSLEY WWW.JUDICIARY.SENATE.GOV

-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Thursday, August 31, 2017

Transcripts: Comey Drafted Conclusion in Clinton Probe Prior to Interviewing Key Witnesses

Grassley, Graham seek documents linked to Hatch Act investigation of former FBI head

WASHINGTON Transcripts reviewed by the Senate Judiciary Committee reveal that former FBI Director James Comey began drafting an exoneration statement in the Clinton email investigation before the FBI had interviewed key witnesses. Chairman Chuck Grassley and Senator Lindsey Graham, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, requested all records relating to the drafting of the statement as the committee continues to review the circumstances surrounding Comey's removal from the Bureau.

"Conclusion first, fact-gathering second—that's no way to run an investigation. The FBI should be held to a higher standard than that, especially in a matter of such great public interest and controversy," the senators wrote in a letter today to the FBI.

Last fall, following [allegations](#) from Democrats in Congress, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) began investigating whether Comey's actions in the Clinton email investigation violated the Hatch Act, which prohibits government employees from using their official position to influence an election. In the course of that investigation, OSC interviewed two FBI officials close to Comey: James Rybicki, Comey's Chief of Staff, and Trisha Anderson, the Principal Deputy General Counsel of National Security and Cyberlaw. OSC provided transcripts of those interviews at Grassley's request after it closed the investigation due to Comey's termination.

Both transcripts are heavily redacted without explanation. However, they indicate that Comey began drafting a statement to announce the conclusion of the Clinton email investigation in April or May of 2016, before the FBI interviewed up to 17 key witnesses including former Secretary Clinton and several of her closest aides. The draft statement also came before the Department entered into immunity agreements with Cheryl Mills and Heather Samuelson where the Department agreed to a very limited review of Secretary Clinton's emails and to destroy their laptops after review. In an extraordinary July announcement, Comey exonerated Clinton despite noting "there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information."

In their letter, the two chairmen requested all drafts of Comey's statement closing the Clinton investigation, all related emails and any records previously provided to OSC in the course of its investigation.

OSC is the permanent, independent investigative agency for personnel matters in the federal government and is not related to Robert Mueller's temporary prosecutorial office within the Justice Department.

Full text of the [letter](#) from Grassley and Graham follows.

August 30, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Christopher Wray
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20535

Dear Director Wray:

The Senate Judiciary Committee has been investigating the circumstances surrounding Director Comey's removal, including his conduct in handling the Clinton and Russia investigations. On June 30, 2017, the Committee wrote to the Office of Special Counsel (OSC)^[1] requesting transcripts of OSC's interviews with then-Director Comey's Chief of Staff, Jim Rybicki, and the Principal Deputy General Counsel of National Security and Cyberlaw, Trisha Anderson. OSC investigators had interviewed them as part of the OSC's investigation into whether then Director Comey's actions in the Clinton investigation violated the Hatch Act.^[2] OSC closed its inquiry after Mr. Comey's removal pursuant to its standard policy of not investigating former government employees. On August 8, 2017, the OSC provided transcripts of those interviews at the Committee's request.^[3] Since then, Committee staff has been asking the Department informally to explain the reasons for the extensive redactions to the transcripts.

According to the unredacted portions of the transcripts, it appears that in April or early May of 2016, Mr. Comey had already decided he would issue a statement exonerating Secretary Clinton. That was long *before FBI agents finished their work*. Mr. Comey even circulated an early draft statement to select members of senior FBI leadership. The outcome of an investigation should not be prejudged while FBI agents are still hard at work trying to gather the facts.

OSC attorneys questioned two witnesses, presumably Mr. Rybicki and Ms. Anderson, about Mr. Comey's July 5, 2016, statement exonerating Secretary Clinton. The transcript of what appears to be Mr. Rybicki's interview contains the following exchanges:

Q: ... We talked about outcome of the investigation, ... how did

the statement – I guess the idea of the statement come about?

A: Sure. We're talking about July 5th, correct?

Q: Yes. I'm sorry. July 5th.

A: The – so in the – **sometime in the spring** – again, I don't remember exactly when, I – early spring I would say, **the Director emailed a couple folks** – I can't remember exactly; I know I was on there, probably the Deputy Director, **not the full, what I'll call the briefing group**, but a subset of that – **to say, you know, again knowing sort of where – knowing the direction the investigation is headed, right, what would be the most forward-leaning thing we could do**, right, information that we could put out about it...And-- and, you know, by that-- you know, so that-- and **he sent a draft around** of, you know what- what it might look like. . . .

A: ...So that was the early spring.

Q: Yeah. And I think we've seen maybe that email where he sent it out, it was early May of 2016; does that sound about right?

A: That sounds right. That-- quite honestly, that strikes me as a little late, but may--

Q: Okay.

A: -- but again, I definitely remember spring. I had in my head like the April timeframe, but May doesn't seem out of the-- out of the realm.

Q: And so at that point in time, whether it was April or early May, the team hadn't yet interviewed Secretary Clinton –

A: Correct.

Q: – but was there – I guess, based on what you're saying, it sounds like there was an idea of where the outcome of the investigation was going to go?

A: **Sure.** There was a – right, there was – based on – [redacted section].

Similarly, the transcript of what appears to be Ms. Anderson's interview states:

Q: So moving along to the first public statement on the case or Director Comey's first statement the July 5, 2016 statement. **When did you first learn that Director Comey was planning to make some kind of public statement about the outcome of the Clinton email investigation?**

A: The idea, I'm not entirely sure exactly when the idea of the public statement um first emerged. Um it was, I just, I can't put a precise timeframe on it um but [redaction]. And then I believe **it was in early May of 2016 that the Director himself wrote a draft of that statement ...**

Q: So when you found out in early May that there was, that the Director had written a draft of what the statement might look like, how did you learn about that?

A: [Redacted] gave me a hard copy of it...

Q: So what happened next with respect to the draft?

A: I don't know for sure um, I don't know. **There were many iterations, at some point there were many iterations of the draft that circulated...**

As of early May 2016, the FBI had not yet interviewed Secretary Clinton. Moreover, it had yet to finish interviewing sixteen other key witnesses, including Cheryl Mills, Bryan Pagliano, Heather Samuelson, Justin Cooper, and John Bentel.^{[\[4\]](#)}

These individuals had intimate and personal knowledge relating to Secretary Clinton's non-government server, including helping her build and administer the device. Yet, it appears that the following key FBI interviews had not yet occurred when Mr. Comey began drafting his exoneration statement:

1. May 3, 2016 – Paul Combetta
2. May 12, 2016 – Sean Misko
3. May 17, 2016 – Unnamed CIA employee^{[\[5\]](#)}
4. May 19, 2016 – Unnamed CIA employee^{[\[6\]](#)}
5. May 24, 2016 – Heather Samuelson

6. May 26, 2016- Marcel Lehel (aka Guccifer)
7. May 28, 2016 – Cheryl Mills
8. June 3, 2016 – Charlie Wisecarver
9. June 10, 2016 – John Bentel
10. June 15, 2016 – Lewis Lukens
11. June 21, 2016 – Justin Cooper
12. June 21, 2016 – Unnamed State Dept. Employee^[7]
13. June 21, 2016 Bryan Pagliano
14. June 21, 2016 Purcell Lee
15. June 23, 2016 Monica Hanley
16. June 29, 2016 Hannah Richert
17. July 2, 2016 Hillary Clinton

Conclusion first, fact gathering second – that’s no way to run an investigation. The FBI should be held to a higher standard than that, especially in a matter of such great public interest and controversy.

Mr. Comey’s final statement acknowledged “there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information” but nonetheless cleared Secretary Clinton because he claimed there was no intent or obstruction of justice. Yet, evidence of destruction of emails known to be under subpoena by the House of Representatives, and subject to congressional preservation requests, was obtained in interviews around the time that Mr. Comey began drafting his exoneration statement.^[8] Moreover, the Justice Department entered into highly unusual immunity agreements with Cheryl Mills and Heather Samuelson in June 2016 – after Mr. Comey began drafting his exoneration statement—to review Clinton email archives on their laptops.^[9]

The immunity agreements limited the FBI’s ability to review Clinton email archives from Platte River Networks that were created after June 1, 2014, and before February 1, 2015, and which had been sent or received from Secretary Clinton’s four email addresses during her tenure as Secretary of State.^[10] These limitations prevented the FBI from reviewing records surrounding a March 2015 conference call that Paul Combetta, an employee of Platte River Networks, had with David Kendall and Ms. Mills, the attorneys for Secretary Clinton.^[11] After having been initially untruthful and then receiving his own immunity agreement, Mr. Combetta admitted in his third FBI interview, in May 2016, that after a March 2015 conference call with Secretary Clinton’s attorneys, he used BleachBit to destroy any remaining copies of Clinton’s emails.^[12]

The limitations in the immunity agreements with Ms. Mills and Ms. Samuelson also kept the FBI from looking at emails after Secretary Clinton left office—the period in which communications regarding destruction or concealment of federal records would have most likely taken place.^[13] And finally, the agreements provided that the *Department would destroy* any records which it retrieved that were not turned over to the investigative team and *would destroy* the laptops.^[14] Despite public claims by the FBI that the laptops were not in fact destroyed,

the purpose of that promise to destroy them has not been explained.^[15] However, Judiciary Committee staff reviewed the immunity agreements as part of their oversight work, so there is no question that the terms of the agreement called for the Department to destroy evidence that had not been fully and completely reviewed.^[16]

It is unclear whether the FBI agents actually investigating the case were aware that Mr. Comey had already decided on the investigation's outcome while their work was ongoing. However, it appears that the answer to that question may be underneath some of the extensive redactions that the Department made to the transcripts.^[17] In testimony before Congress, Mr. Comey was asked whether his decision to not recommend charges "was [a] unanimous opinion within the FBI..." to which he responded, "[w]ell, the whole FBI wasn't involved, but the team of agents, investigators, analysts, technologists, yes."^[18] Seeing under the redactions is necessary for the Committee to assess Mr. Comey's testimony before Congress.

Pursuant to the Committee's responsibility and authority to review the circumstances of the Director's removal, please provide the following without redactions by September 13, 2017:

1. All drafts of Mr. Comey's statement closing the Clinton investigation, from his original draft in April or May to the final version.
2. All records related to communications between or among FBI officials regarding Comey's draft statement closing the Clinton investigation, including all memoranda or analyses of the factual or legal justification for the announcement.
3. All records previously provided to the Office of Special Counsel in the course of its now-closed Hatch Act investigation of Mr. Comey.

We anticipate that your written response and most of the responsive documents will be unclassified. Please send all unclassified material directly to the Committee. In keeping with the requirements of Executive Order 13526, if any of the responsive documents do contain classified information, please segregate all unclassified material within the classified documents, provide all unclassified information directly to the Committee, and provide a classified addendum to the Office of Senate Security. The Committee complies with all laws and regulations governing the handling of classified information. The Committee is not bound, absent its prior agreement, by any handling restrictions or instructions on unclassified information unilaterally asserted by the Executive Branch.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. Transparency is essential to restoring the public's trust in the FBI. If you have questions, please contact Josh Flynn-Brown of Chairman Grassley's staff at (202) 224-5225 or Lee Holmes of Chairman Graham's staff at (202) 224-5972.

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary

Lindsey O. Graham
Chairman
Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism
Committee on the Judiciary



From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Josh Gerstein" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Senate Judiciary Democrats Request Sessions Testimony on False Statements, Russia Contacts

Date: Fri, 03 Mar 2017 18:19:07 -0500

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png

Will have letter tonight

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Josh Gerstein (b) (6)]

Sent: Friday, March 3, 2017 4:58 PM

To: Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Senate Judiciary Democrats Request Sessions Testimony on False Statements, Russia Contacts

Hi Sarah

Anything on this?

And where do we stand on the letter?

Thanks

--Josh

From: Feinstein Press (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 4:57 PM

Subject: Senate Judiciary Democrats Request Sessions Testimony on False Statements, Russia Contacts



For Immediate Release
March 3, 2017

Contact: Ashley Schapitl
(b) (6)

**Senate Judiciary Democrats Request Sessions
Testimony on False Statements, Russia Contacts**

Washington All nine Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats today requested that Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) call Attorney General Jeff Sessions to appear before the committee to answer questions about false statements during his confirmation process and contacts with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak.

The senators wrote, **“The Attorney General’s responses to our questions during his confirmation process were, at best, incomplete and misleading. Given the seriousness of this matter, we do not believe that a written submission to correct the record is sufficient. Members need to hear directly from the Attorney General as well as have the opportunity to ask him questions in public.”**

[Full text of the letter follows:](#)

March 3, 2017

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
224 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Grassley:

The Attorney General’s recusal announcement is a welcome first step, but it leaves many significant questions unanswered.

The Attorney General’s responses to our questions during his confirmation process were, at best, incomplete and misleading. Unfortunately, he has not explained why he failed to come forward and correct the record before reports of his contacts with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak became public, why there was a delay in recusing himself until those public disclosures, and why he only recused himself with respect to campaign-related investigations and not Russian contacts with the Trump transition team and administration. Given the seriousness of this matter, we do not believe that a written submission to correct the record is sufficient.

Members need to hear directly from the Attorney General as well as have the opportunity to ask him questions in public. We therefore ask that you schedule a hearing for Attorney General Sessions to appear before the Committee.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

Patrick Leahy
United States Senator

Richard J. Durbin
United States Senator

Sheldon Whitehouse
United States Senator

Amy Klobuchar
United States Senator

Al Franken
United States Senator

Christopher A. Coons
United States Senator

Richard Blumenthal
United States Senator

Mazie Hirono
United States Senator

###

From: "Reilly, Stephen" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

Date: Tue, 14 Mar 2017 20:14:50 -0400

Importance: Normal

Thanks a lot for circling back and letting me know your status. I appreciate it.

Steve

Steve Reilly

Investigative Reporter
USA TODAY

(b) (6)

Office: (b) (6) | Cell: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2017 8:08 PM

To: Reilly, Stephen (b) (6)

Subject: RE: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

We're going to decline to comment.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Reilly, Stephen (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, March 13, 2017 11:07 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for being in touch on Friday. Because time was a consideration in you declining to comment and we held publication over the weekend, I wanted to circle back to see if you wanted to respond today in any way to our questions for our story on Attorney General Sessions' role in selecting the Trump campaign's national security advisory committee members.

Our piece will discuss multiple public statements from 2016 which indicate Attorney General Sessions had the primary role in selecting the members of the Trump campaign's national security advisory committee, which included Carter Page, George Papadopoulos and other advisers who have made public statements critical of U.S. sanctions against Russia.

Statements we will quote from in the piece include:

- Stephen Miller on March 16: "I can tell you that Donald Trump has chosen Jeff Sessions and Jeff Session has been meeting for hours now putting together a team of foreign policy advisers, military experts, intelligence experts."
- Attorney General Sessions on March 17, 2017, in response to a reporter's question on his progress in selecting members of the national security advisors for the committee: "I'm talking to a lot of good people, and I'll be talking to Mr. Trump today to report on those calls, and just to try to make sure that I'm sharing with him honestly."

The questions I wanted to ask if you could address are:

- What role did Attorney General Sessions play a role in selecting the members of the National Security Advisory Committee last year?
- How did Attorney General Sessions come to know Carter Page and George Papadopoulos before they were named as members of the committee? Did he speak with them before they were named to the committee on March 21, 2016?
- Has Senator Sessions received correspondence from the Senate Intelligence Committee requesting that he preserve records potentially related to the Committee's investigation into alleged Russian government intervention in the 2016 presidential election?
- Are there any other comments you'd wish to provide on this matter?

Thanks again,

Steve

Steve Reilly

Investigative Reporter
USA TODAY

(b) (6)

Office: (b) (6) | Cell: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 6:05 PM

To: Reilly, Stephen (b) (6)

Subject: RE: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

Apologies. This got lost in my inbox because of the us attorney story and im just seeing it. Given the late time and I know you have a deadline, I'll just decline to comment for now. But didn't want you to think I was ignorin you!

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Reilly, Stephen (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 6:03 PM

To: (b) (6)

Subject: RE: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

Good evening,

I just wanted to circle back with your office since I have not received a response and we may soon publish our piece. Do you intend to respond?

It is typically our practice to describe to our readers the questions which were not answered.

Thanks again,

Steve

Steve Reilly

Investigative Reporter
USA TODAY

(b) (6)

Office: (b) (6) | Cell: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Reilly, Stephen

Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 2:22 PM

To: (b) (6) - Sarah Isgur Flores email; (b) (6)

Subject: USA Today media inquiry: AG Sessions' role in selecting Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee members

Good afternoon Sarah,

USA TODAY is planning to publish a story as soon as this evening describing Attorney General Sessions' role in selecting the membership of the Trump campaign's National Security Advisory Committee, on which he served as chairman.

The story discusses several public statements from Attorney General Sessions and other Trump campaign officials last year describing Attorney General Sessions' role in speaking with and selecting the committee's membership in coordination with President Trump.

I wanted to ask if you might be able to address the following by close-of-business today:

- Did Attorney General Sessions play a role in selecting the members of the National Security Advisory Committee last year?
- Has Senator Sessions received correspondence from the Senate Intelligence Committee requesting that he preserve records potentially related to the Committee's investigation into alleged Russian government intervention in the 2016 presidential election?
- Are there any other comments you'd wish to provide on this matter?

If you could circle back by 5 p.m. today, I would certainly appreciate it.

Thanks a lot,

Steve

Steve Reilly

Investigative Reporter
USA TODAY

(b) (6)

Office: (b) (6) | Cell: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Josh Gerstein (b) (6)

To: "Sarah Isgur Flores" (b) (6),
(b) (6) - Ian Prior (b) (6)

Subject: Sounds like meeting on SJC FBI subpoenas didn't go well

Date: Wed, 20 Sep 2017 11:45:32 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.jpg

Can you guys shed any light?

--Josh (b) (6)



[Manu Raju @mkraju](#)
[35m](#)

GRASSLEY just told us Senate counsel is preparing subpoenas for two FBI officials the DOJ is preventing from being intwd over Comey firing

Grassley said he will make a final decision after talking to Feinstein. Here's our story from last week:
google.com/amp/s/amp.cnn...

- [Reply](#)
- [Retweet](#)
- [Like](#)
- [More options](#)

From: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: Josh Gerstein (b) (6), "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny

Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2017 11:23:59 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png

[Decline comment](#)

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Josh Gerstein (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, June 9, 2017 11:07 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny

Morning, guys.....

Curious if you have anything on this....

thanks

--Josh

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, June 09, 2017 10:41 AM

To: Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Subject: Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny



COMMITTEE *on the* **JUDICIARY**
CHAIRMAN CHUCK GRASSLEY WWW.JUDICIARY.SENATE.GOV

-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Friday, June 09, 2017

Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny

WASHINGTON – Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley called on President Donald Trump to “drain the swamp” and rescind an opinion by the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) that attempted to insulate unelected government bureaucrats from questions by the people’s elected representatives in Congress.

In his [letter to the President](#), Grassley excoriates the OLC opinion for its claim that congressional committees and committee chairmen are the only “constitutionally authorized” requests for information originating in the legislative branch.

To that, Grassley said, “This is nonsense.”

Grassley lays out a thorough case for the constitutional need for every member of Congress to request and receive information from the executive bureaucracy regardless of committee membership, chairmanship. Grassley also emphasizes the importance of oversight and inquiry regardless of partisan affiliation.

“I know from experience that a partisan response to oversight only discourages bipartisanship, decreases transparency, and diminishes the crucial role of the American people’s elected representatives,” Grassley said in his letter.

He further notes that the Obama administration continuously relied on “tenuous claims of privilege” to avoid scrutiny, leading to increased brinksmanship between the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch.

Grassley has long advocated for transparency in government and strong congressional oversight. Earlier this week, Grassley testified to the importance of unobstructed Congressional oversight in a hearing before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The hearing covered the continuously obstructed and still-pending investigation into *Operation Fast and Furious* at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, a sad example of obstruction when oversight could make for better governance and improved accountability.

Full text of [the letter](#) follows.

June 7, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

-
The Honorable Donald J. Trump
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

In February, I wrote to you about the importance of empowering whistleblowers to help you “drain the swamp.”^[1] Today, I write to urge you to encourage cooperation with congressional oversight as another key way to accomplish that goal and to alert you to a bureaucratic effort by the Office of Legal Counsel to insulate the Executive Branch from scrutiny by the elected representatives of the American people.

Our Constitutional system of separation of powers grants to Congress all legislative authority.^[2] The Supreme Court has recognized time and again that the power of congressional inquiry is inherent in these vested legislative powers.^[3] That is because without access to information held by the Executive Branch, Congress

cannot legislate effectively or help assure the American people that their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent wisely.

Every member of Congress is a Constitutional officer, duly elected to represent and cast votes in the interests of their constituents. This applies obviously regardless of whether they are in the majority or the minority at the moment and regardless of whether they are in a leadership position on a particular committee. Thus, *all* members need accurate information from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional function to make informed decisions on all sorts of legislative issues covering a vast array of complex matters across our massive federal government.

Unfortunately, the May 1, 2017 Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opinion authored by Acting Assistant Attorney General Curtis E. Gannon on this topic completely misses the mark. It erroneously rejects any notion that individual members of Congress who may not chair a relevant committee need to obtain information from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional duties. It falsely asserts that only requests from committees or their chairs are “constitutionally authorized,”^[4] and relegates requests from non Chairmen to the position of “non oversight” inquiries whatever that means.^[5]

This is nonsense.

The Constitution does not mention committees or committee Chairmen at all. The committee structure in Congress is simply how the Legislative Branch has chosen to internally organize itself. It works through committees “[b]ecause of the high volume and complexity of its work,” not for the purpose of cutting off the flow of information to members who do not chair those committees.^[6] Unless Congress explicitly tells the Executive Branch to withhold information based on committee membership or leadership position, there is no legal or Constitutional basis for the Executive Branch to do so.

For OLC to so fundamentally misunderstand and misstate such a simple fact exposes its shocking lack of professionalism and objectivity. Indeed, OLC appears to have utterly failed to live up to its own standards. You are being ill-served and ill-advised. OLC’s best practice guidance states:

[R]egardless of the Office’s ultimate legal conclusions, it should strive to ensure that it candidly and fairly addresses the *full range* of relevant legal sources and *significant arguments on all sides* of a question.

* * *

The Office must strive in our opinions for clear and concise analysis and a *balanced presentation of arguments on each side* of an issue.^[7]

The most recent OLC opinion is anything but balanced. For example, it fails to cite and analyze any authority that challenges its conclusion.

As a result, the opinion takes an unduly restrictive and unsupported view of the responsibilities of Members of Congress and the nature of congressional oversight. In so doing, the opinion equates requests from individual members to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests from unelected members of the public. But the powers vested in the Congress both explicitly and inherently by the Constitution impose significant and far reaching responsibilities on the people’s elected representatives. They include the authorization and appropriation of federal funds, the organization of federal departments, the enactment of laws executing the enumerated powers, the confirmation of nominees, the impeachment and removal of officers, and the investigation of the execution

of the laws and of waste, fraud, and abuse in federal programs. These responsibilities are all forms of oversight, all mechanisms that support the legislative check and balance of the executive power.^[8] All members participate in deciding whether, when, and how Congress will exercise these authorities.

The United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit recognized in *Murphy v. Dep't of the Army* that, “[a]ll Members [of Congress] have a constitutionally recognized status entitling them to share in general congressional powers and responsibilities, many of them requiring access to executive information.”^[9] Each member “participates in the law-making process; each has a voice and a vote in that process; and each is entitled to request such information from the executive agencies as will enable him to carry out the responsibilities of a legislator.”^[10] Yet, the OLC opinion ignores these points and authorities. It avoids good faith presentation of any significant arguments contrary to its conclusion. It utterly fails to acknowledge or respond to anything supporting the notion that a request from a Member of Congress might be entitled to greater weight than a FOIA request.

The OLC opinion also inexplicably asserts that this responsibility of congressional “oversight” is restricted to only certain inquiries made by Chairmen or full committees on the grounds that only those responses can be compelled. As the OLC opinion notes, the rules of the House and the Senate authorize its standing committees to conduct oversight. And that authority, as the Supreme Court has recognized time and again, is extremely broad.

It is true that through this process Congress can compel the production of witnesses and documents. However, the scope of information Members of Congress need from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional duties is far broader than merely what is obtained through compulsory process. The vast majority of information Congress obtains, even through a Chairman’s requests, is obtained voluntarily, not by compulsion. Yet, reading the OLC opinion, it would seem oversight is only “oversight” if it’s mandatory.

Simply put, that’s just not how it works.

First, by declaring that non-Chairman requests are not “authorized,” OLC purports to speak for the Legislative Branch, an act which itself lacks any authority. It simply is not the province of another branch of government to say which information gathering activities by Members of Congress are “authorized” or not. Voluntary requests for information from the Executive Branch by members or groups of members without regard to committee chairmanship or membership have occurred and have been accommodated regularly since the beginning of the Republic.

As the court further recognized in *Murphy*:

It would be an inappropriate intrusion into the legislative sphere for the courts to decide without congressional direction that, for example, only the chairman of a committee shall be regarded as the official voice of the Congress *for purposes of receiving such information*, as distinguished from its ranking minority member, other committee members, or other members of the Congress.^[11]

It is just as inappropriate for the Executive Branch as it would be for the Courts. Receiving information in response to voluntary requests is completely different from compelling information, and Members of Congress need access to both in order to do their jobs effectively. But the OLC opinion unnecessarily conflates the two in order to reach its conclusions.

Second, as noted above, nothing in the committee structure or in our internal rules suggests that Congress meant to stifle the flow of information to non-Chairmen. In fact, the consideration of compulsory process

generally requires the consent or other participation of non-Chairmen. That process almost always begins with voluntary requests and negotiations with the Executive Branch. Non-Chairmen need to, and often do, participate in receiving information voluntarily in the course of that process in order to determine whether, and when, compulsory process becomes necessary. And, the decision to enforce that process through contempt belongs to the whole body—a decision in which every Member participates.

Even a cursory review of House and Senate committee rules, which the OLC apparently did not perform, plainly shows that most committees' rules envision or require the participation of the minority ranking member or even the full committee in the issuance of a subpoena.^[12] Only a handful of committees have delegated the authority to a Chairman to unilaterally issue a subpoena without even consulting or notifying the Ranking Member. Thus, OLC's distinction between Chairmen as "authorized" to seek information because such oversight can be compelled by a Chairman acting alone is mostly false. The Executive Branch's so called "longstanding" practice of responding only to Chairmen plainly does not, and cannot, depend on the voluntariness of such a response. The actual practice in almost every case, whether made to a Chairman or not, is that responses are fully voluntary.

The Executive Branch has in fact been *voluntarily* responding to requests from individual members for the entirety of its existence, whether or not those members did or had the power to unilaterally issue a subpoena. In most cases, congressional requests—even from Chairmen—never reach the compulsory stage precisely *because* of this process of voluntary accommodation. Traditionally, a subpoena has been used as a last resort, when the voluntary accommodation process has already failed. Thus that process begins, or at least ought to begin, well before a Chairman or a committee issues a subpoena or a house issues a contempt citation. OLC offers no authority indicating that courts expect the other two branches to cooperate with each other only when compelled to do so. Such a position would itself undermine the very purpose of comity and cooperation between the branches.

Moreover, in recent years, particularly under the Obama administration, the Executive Branch has sought to rely on increasingly tenuous claims of privilege and force congressional investigators to seek compulsory process and avoid scrutiny in the absence of a subpoena. The OLC opinion's refusal to recognize a voluntary request as a legitimate, constitutionally grounded part of the each Member's participation in the legislative powers will only feed this unfortunate trend. It risks increased brinksmanship in Executive Legislative relations and will result in less, not more, "dynamic . . . furthering [of] the constitutional scheme."^[13]

Imagine if the Congress took a similar position and refused to voluntarily disclose any information to an Executive Branch official unless the official was capable of compelling an answer. Imagine Congressional legal opinion instructing Members and staff to withhold all information about bills, nominations, or appropriations from most Executive Branch officials on the grounds that Congress has "no constitutional obligation to accommodate information requests from the Deputy Undersecretary of Legislative Affairs." It's absurd. It would never happen, but that is analogous to what this OLC opinion says. Members of Congress simply do not treat Executive Branch officials with such contempt and they do not deserve such treatment in return. This is especially true given that, unlike virtually all Executive Branch officials, Members are elected to Constitutional positions. Instead, the Executive Branch should work to cooperate in good faith with all congressional requests to the fullest extent possible.

Finally, the practical implications of the policy that this opinion is reportedly designed to support are extremely troublesome for the effective and efficient functioning of our constitutional democracy. Notably, leaving aside the fact that the contrived distinction between "oversight" and "non oversight" requests makes little sense, the opinion does *not* say that determinations whether to comply voluntarily with an individual request depend or

should depend upon the party of the requester. Nonetheless, I know that bureaucrats in the Executive Branch sometimes choose to respond only to the party in power at the moment. I also encountered significant problems in gaining answers to my requests from the Obama administration, whether I was in the majority or the minority.

I know from experience that a partisan response to oversight only discourages bipartisanship, decreases transparency, and diminishes the crucial role of the American people's elected representatives. Oversight brings transparency, and transparency brings accountability. And, the opposite is true. Shutting down oversight requests doesn't *drain* the swamp, Mr. President. It *floods* the swamp.

I also know from long experience that, even in a highly charged political environment, most requests for information—by majority and minority members—are not “partisan” or at least not intended to be so. Many requests simply seek information to help inform Members as they perform their Constitutional duty to legislate and fix real problems for the American people. That is the kind of information Republicans *and* Democrats in Congress need to be able to do our jobs on behalf of the people we all represent.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the White House rescind this OLC opinion and any policy of ignoring oversight request from non-Chairmen. It harms not just the Members who happen to be in the minority party at the moment, but also, Members in the majority party who are not currently Chairmen. It obstructs what ought to be the natural flow of information between agencies and the committees, which frustrates the Constitutional function of legislating.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Ranking Member

-30-



[1] Letter from Charles E. Grassley, Chairman, U.S. Sen. Comm. on the Judiciary to Donald J. Trump, President of the United States (Feb. 8, 2017).

[2] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 1.

[3] *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 177, 181-182 (1927).

[4] OLC opinion at 2 (citing Congressional Oversight Manual at 65); *id.* at 3 (noting that requests from individual members do not “trigger any obligation to accommodate congressional needs and is not legally enforceable through a subpoena or contempt proceedings”).

[5] *Id.* at 3.

[6] See Judy Schneider, Cong. Research Serv., RS20794, *The Committee System in the U.S. Congress* 1 (Oct. 14, 2009) (“Because of the high volume and complexity of its work, Congress divides its legislative, oversight, and internal administrative tasks among committees and subcommittees.”).

[7] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, “Best Practices for OLC Legal Advice and Written Opinions” (Jul. 16, 2010) (emphasis added), at 1-2, 4; available at <http://www.justice.gov/olc/pdf/olc-legal-advice-opinions.pdf>.

[8] Elaine Halchin et al., Cong. Research Serv., RL30240, *Congressional Oversight Manual* 4-5 (Dec. 19, 2014).

[9] 613 F.2d 1151, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (emphasis added).

[10] *Id.*

[11] 613 F.2d 1151, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

[12] <http://gibsondunn.com/publications/Documents/HouseSenateCommitteeRulesChart-2015.pdf>.

[13] OLC opinion at 3 (quoting *United States v. AT&T*, 567 F.2d 121, 130-31 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).

From: Burgess Everett (b) (6)

To: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6), "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Grassley letter

Date: Fri, 09 Jun 2017 11:25:51 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png

[Got it. thanks](#)

From: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, June 09, 2017 11:24 AM

To: Burgess Everett (b) (6); Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: Grassley letter

[Decline comment.](#)

Thx

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Burgess Everett (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, June 9, 2017 11:06 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Grassley letter

[Let me know if you all want to respond to this](#)

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, June 09, 2017 10:41 AM

To: Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Subject: Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny



COMMITTEE *on the* **JUDICIARY**
CHAIRMAN CHUCK GRASSLEY WWW.JUDICIARY.SENATE.GOV

-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Friday, June 09, 2017

Grassley Calls on President to Rescind OLC Opinion Shielding Bureaucrats from Scrutiny

WASHINGTON – Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley called on President Donald Trump to “drain the swamp” and rescind an opinion by the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) that attempted to insulate unelected government bureaucrats from questions by the people’s elected representatives in Congress.

In his [letter to the President](#), Grassley excoriates the OLC opinion for its claim that congressional committees and committee chairmen are the only “constitutionally authorized” requests for information originating in the legislative branch.

To that, Grassley said, “This is nonsense.”

Grassley lays out a thorough case for the constitutional need for every member of Congress to request and receive information from the executive bureaucracy regardless of committee membership, chairmanship. Grassley also emphasizes the importance of oversight and inquiry regardless of partisan affiliation.

“I know from experience that a partisan response to oversight only discourages bipartisanship, decreases transparency, and diminishes the crucial role of the American people’s elected representatives,” Grassley said in his letter.

He further notes that the Obama administration continuously relied on “tenuous claims of privilege” to avoid scrutiny, leading to increased brinksmanship between the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch.

Grassley has long advocated for transparency in government and strong congressional oversight. Earlier this week, Grassley testified to the importance of unobstructed Congressional oversight in a hearing before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The hearing covered the continuously obstructed and still-pending investigation into *Operation Fast and Furious* at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, a sad example of obstruction when oversight could make for better governance and improved accountability.

Full text of [the letter](#) follows.

June 7, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

-
The Honorable Donald J. Trump
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

In February, I wrote to you about the importance of empowering whistleblowers to help you “drain the swamp.”^[1] Today, I write to urge you to encourage cooperation with congressional oversight as another key way

to accomplish that goal and to alert you to a bureaucratic effort by the Office of Legal Counsel to insulate the Executive Branch from scrutiny by the elected representatives of the American people.

Our Constitutional system of separation of powers grants to Congress all legislative authority.^[2] The Supreme Court has recognized time and again that the power of congressional inquiry is inherent in these vested legislative powers.^[3] That is because without access to information held by the Executive Branch, Congress cannot legislate effectively or help assure the American people that their hard earned tax dollars are being spent wisely.

Every member of Congress is a Constitutional officer, duly elected to represent and cast votes in the interests of their constituents. This applies obviously regardless of whether they are in the majority or the minority at the moment and regardless of whether they are in a leadership position on a particular committee. Thus, *all* members need accurate information from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional function to make informed decisions on all sorts of legislative issues covering a vast array of complex matters across our massive federal government.

Unfortunately, the May 1, 2017 Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opinion authored by Acting Assistant Attorney General Curtis E. Gannon on this topic completely misses the mark. It erroneously rejects any notion that individual members of Congress who may not chair a relevant committee need to obtain information from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional duties. It falsely asserts that only requests from committees or their chairs are “constitutionally authorized,”^[4] and relegates requests from non-Chairmen to the position of “non-oversight” inquiries—whatever that means.^[5]

This is nonsense.

The Constitution does not mention committees or committee Chairmen at all. The committee structure in Congress is simply how the Legislative Branch has chosen to internally organize itself. It works through committees “[b]ecause of the high volume and complexity of its work,” not for the purpose of cutting off the flow of information to members who do not chair those committees.^[6] Unless Congress explicitly tells the Executive Branch to withhold information based on committee membership or leadership position, there is no legal or Constitutional basis for the Executive Branch to do so.

For OLC to so fundamentally misunderstand and misstate such a simple fact exposes its shocking lack of professionalism and objectivity. Indeed, OLC appears to have utterly failed to live up to its own standards. You are being ill served and ill advised. OLC’s best practice guidance states:

[R]egardless of the Office’s ultimate legal conclusions, it should strive to ensure that it candidly and fairly addresses the *full range* of relevant legal sources and *significant arguments on all sides* of a question.

* * *

The Office must strive in our opinions for clear and concise analysis and a *balanced presentation of arguments on each side* of an issue.^[7]

The most recent OLC opinion is anything but balanced. For example, it fails to cite and analyze any authority that challenges its conclusion.

As a result, the opinion takes an unduly restrictive and unsupported view of the responsibilities of Members of Congress and the nature of congressional oversight. In so doing, the opinion equates requests from individual members to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests from unelected members of the public. But the powers vested in the Congress—both explicitly and inherently by the Constitution—impose significant and far-reaching responsibilities on the people’s elected representatives. They include the authorization and appropriation of federal funds, the organization of federal departments, the enactment of laws executing the enumerated powers, the confirmation of nominees, the impeachment and removal of officers, and the investigation of the execution of the laws and of waste, fraud, and abuse in federal programs. These responsibilities are all forms of oversight, all mechanisms that support the legislative check and balance of the executive power.^[8] All members participate in deciding whether, when, and how Congress will exercise these authorities.

The United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit recognized in *Murphy v. Dep’t of the Army* that, “[a]ll Members [of Congress] have a constitutionally recognized status entitling them to share in general congressional powers and responsibilities, many of them requiring access to executive information.”^[9] Each member “participates in the law-making process; each has a voice and a vote in that process; and each is entitled to request such information from the executive agencies as will enable him to carry out the responsibilities of a legislator.”^[10] Yet, the OLC opinion ignores these points and authorities. It avoids good faith presentation of any significant arguments contrary to its conclusion. It utterly fails to acknowledge or respond to anything supporting the notion that a request from a Member of Congress might be entitled to greater weight than a FOIA request.

The OLC opinion also inexplicably asserts that this responsibility of congressional “oversight” is restricted to only certain inquiries made by Chairmen or full committees on the grounds that only those responses can be compelled. As the OLC opinion notes, the rules of the House and the Senate authorize its standing committees to conduct oversight. And that authority, as the Supreme Court has recognized time and again, is extremely broad.

It is true that through this process Congress can compel the production of witnesses and documents. However, the scope of information Members of Congress need from the Executive Branch in order to carry out their Constitutional duties is far broader than merely what is obtained through compulsory process. The vast majority of information Congress obtains, even through a Chairman’s requests, is obtained voluntarily, not by compulsion. Yet, reading the OLC opinion, it would seem oversight is only “oversight” if it’s mandatory.

Simply put, that’s just not how it works.

First, by declaring that non-Chairman requests are not “authorized,” OLC purports to speak for the Legislative Branch, an act which itself lacks any authority. It simply is not the province of another branch of government to say which information gathering activities by Members of Congress are “authorized” or not. Voluntary requests for information from the Executive Branch by members or groups of members without regard to committee chairmanship or membership have occurred and have been accommodated regularly since the beginning of the Republic.

As the court further recognized in *Murphy*:

It would be an inappropriate intrusion into the legislative sphere for the courts to decide without congressional direction that, for example, only the chairman of a committee shall be regarded as the official voice of the Congress *for purposes of receiving such information*, as distinguished from its ranking minority member, other committee members, or other members of the Congress.^[11]

It is just as inappropriate for the Executive Branch as it would be for the Courts. Receiving information in response to voluntary requests is completely different from compelling information, and Members of Congress need access to both in order to do their jobs effectively. But the OLC opinion unnecessarily conflates the two in order to reach its conclusions.

Second, as noted above, nothing in the committee structure or in our internal rules suggests that Congress meant to stifle the flow of information to non-Chairmen. In fact, the consideration of compulsory process generally requires the consent or other participation of non-Chairmen. That process almost always begins with voluntary requests and negotiations with the Executive Branch. Non-Chairmen need to, and often do, participate in receiving information voluntarily in the course of that process in order to determine whether, and when, compulsory process becomes necessary. And, the decision to enforce that process through contempt belongs to the whole body—a decision in which every Member participates.

Even a cursory review of House and Senate committee rules, which the OLC apparently did not perform, plainly shows that most committees' rules envision or require the participation of the minority ranking member or even the full committee in the issuance of a subpoena.^[12] Only a handful of committees have delegated the authority to a Chairman to unilaterally issue a subpoena without even consulting or notifying the Ranking Member. Thus, OLC's distinction between Chairmen as "authorized" to seek information because such oversight can be compelled by a Chairman acting alone is mostly false. The Executive Branch's so called "longstanding" practice of responding only to Chairmen plainly does not, and cannot, depend on the voluntariness of such a response. The actual practice in almost every case, whether made to a Chairman or not, is that responses are fully voluntary.

The Executive Branch has in fact been *voluntarily* responding to requests from individual members for the entirety of its existence, whether or not those members did or had the power to unilaterally issue a subpoena. In most cases, congressional requests—even from Chairmen—never reach the compulsory stage precisely *because* of this process of voluntary accommodation. Traditionally, a subpoena has been used as a last resort, when the voluntary accommodation process has already failed. Thus that process begins, or at least ought to begin, well before a Chairman or a committee issues a subpoena or a house issues a contempt citation. OLC offers no authority indicating that courts expect the other two branches to cooperate with each other only when compelled to do so. Such a position would itself undermine the very purpose of comity and cooperation between the branches.

Moreover, in recent years, particularly under the Obama administration, the Executive Branch has sought to rely on increasingly tenuous claims of privilege and force congressional investigators to seek compulsory process and avoid scrutiny in the absence of a subpoena. The OLC opinion's refusal to recognize a voluntary request as a legitimate, constitutionally grounded part of the each Member's participation in the legislative powers will only feed this unfortunate trend. It risks increased brinksmanship in Executive Legislative relations and will result in less, not more, "dynamic . . . furthering [of] the constitutional scheme."^[13]

Imagine if the Congress took a similar position and refused to voluntarily disclose any information to an Executive Branch official unless the official was capable of compelling an answer. Imagine Congressional legal opinion instructing Members and staff to withhold all information about bills, nominations, or appropriations from most Executive Branch officials on the grounds that Congress has "no constitutional obligation to accommodate information requests from the Deputy Undersecretary of Legislative Affairs." It's absurd. It would never happen, but that is analogous to what this OLC opinion says. Members of Congress simply do not treat Executive Branch officials with such contempt and they do not deserve such treatment in return. This is especially true given that, unlike virtually all Executive Branch officials, Members are elected to Constitutional positions. Instead, the

Executive Branch should work to cooperate in good faith with all congressional requests to the fullest extent possible.

Finally, the practical implications of the policy that this opinion is reportedly designed to support are extremely troublesome for the effective and efficient functioning of our constitutional democracy. Notably, leaving aside the fact that the contrived distinction between “oversight” and “non-oversight” requests makes little sense, the opinion does *not* say that determinations whether to comply voluntarily with an individual request depend or should depend upon the party of the requester. Nonetheless, I know that bureaucrats in the Executive Branch sometimes choose to respond only to the party in power at the moment. I also encountered significant problems in gaining answers to my requests from the Obama administration, whether I was in the majority or the minority.

I know from experience that a partisan response to oversight only discourages bipartisanship, decreases transparency, and diminishes the crucial role of the American people’s elected representatives. Oversight brings transparency, and transparency brings accountability. And, the opposite is true. Shutting down oversight requests doesn’t *drain* the swamp, Mr. President. It *floods* the swamp.

I also know from long experience that, even in a highly charged political environment, most requests for information—by majority and minority members—are not “partisan” or at least not intended to be so. Many requests simply seek information to help inform Members as they perform their Constitutional duty to legislate and fix real problems for the American people. That is the kind of information Republicans *and* Democrats in Congress need to be able to do our jobs on behalf of the people we all represent.

Therefore, I respectfully request that the White House rescind this OLC opinion and any policy of ignoring oversight request from non-Chairmen. It harms not just the Members who happen to be in the minority party at the moment, but also, Members in the majority party who are not currently Chairmen. It obstructs what ought to be the natural flow of information between agencies and the committees, which frustrates the Constitutional function of legislating.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Ranking Member

-30-



^[1] Letter from Charles E. Grassley, Chairman, U.S. Sen. Comm. on the Judiciary to Donald J. Trump, President of the United States (Feb. 8, 2017).

[2] U.S. CONST. art. I, § 1.

[3] *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 177, 181-182 (1927).

[4] OLC opinion at 2 (citing Congressional Oversight Manual at 65); *id.* at 3 (noting that requests from individual members do not “trigger any obligation to accommodate congressional needs and is not legally enforceable through a subpoena or contempt proceedings”).

[5] *Id.* at 3.

[6] See Judy Schneider, Cong. Research Serv., RS20794, *The Committee System in the U.S. Congress* 1 (Oct. 14, 2009) (“Because of the high volume and complexity of its work, Congress divides its legislative, oversight, and internal administrative tasks among committees and subcommittees.”).

[7] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, “Best Practices for OLC Legal Advice and Written Opinions” (Jul. 16, 2010) (emphasis added), at 1-2, 4; available at <http://www.justice.gov/olc/pdf/olc-legal-advice-opinions.pdf>.

[8] Elaine Halchin et al., Cong. Research Serv., RL30240, *Congressional Oversight Manual* 4-5 (Dec. 19, 2014).

[9] 613 F.2d 1151, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (emphasis added).

[10] *Id.*

[11] 613 F.2d 1151, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 1979).

[12] <http://gibsondunn.com/publications/Documents/HouseSenateCommitteeRulesChart-2015.pdf>.

[13] OLC opinion at 3 (quoting *United States v. AT&T*, 567 F.2d 121, 130-31 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).

From: "Nakashima, Ellen" (b) (6)

To: "Sarah Flores - Sessions spokesman (b) (6)"
(b) (6)

Subject: Sessions/Carter Page

Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2017 11:45:41 -0400

Importance: Normal

Hi, Sarah,

We're posting a story soon about a FISA order obtained on Carter Page as part of the FBI's Russia investigation.

We're including a line that cites a former campaign adviser saying that then Sen. Sessions met with a group of campaign volunteer foreign policy advisors that included Page in late summer.

Give a shout if you have any comment or if you believe it to be inaccurate.

Thanks much,
Ellen

(b) (6)

From: "Reinhard, Beth" (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: Fwd: Witness List for a Committee Hearing on Tue., May 2 at 10:30 a.m.

Date: Mon, 01 May 2017 08:42:56 -0400

Importance: Normal

Beth Reinhard

Staff Writer

The Wall Street Journal.

(b) (6) office

(b) (6) cell

Follow me @BethReinhard

[IAPE Local 1096: *We Power Dow Jones.*](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Date: Fri, Apr 28, 2017 at 4:03 PM

Subject: Witness List for a Committee Hearing on Tue., May 2 at 10:30 a.m.

To: "Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep)" (b) (6)

Witness List

Hearing before the

Senate Committee on the Judiciary

On

“Responses to the Increase in Religious Hate Crimes”

Tuesday, May 2, 2017

Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 226

10:30 a.m.

Panel I

-

Mr. Thomas E. Wheeler, II
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Panel II

Mr. Jonathan A. Greenblatt
CEO and National Director
Anti-Defamation League
New York, NY

Dr. Prabhjot Singh, MD, PhD
Chair

Department of Health System Design and Global Health
Mount Sinai Health System
New York, NY

Ms. Vanita Gupta
Incoming President and CEO
Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights
Washington, DC

Chief Will D. Johnson
Chair
International Association of Chiefs of Police Human and Civil Rights Committee
Chief of Police

Arlington Police Department

Arlington, TX

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Singman, Brooke" (b) (6) >, "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6), "Pettit, Mark T. (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Fox News request: Sen. Grassley letter to Deputy AG Rosenstein re: FARA

Date: Tue, 25 Jul 2017 12:54:17 -0400

Importance: Normal

Nothing right now

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)]

Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 11:50 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6); Pettit, Mark T. (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Fox News request: Sen. Grassley letter to Deputy AG Rosenstein re: FARA

Hi All,

Following up on this request.

Thank you,

Brooke Singman
Politics Reporter, Fox News Channel

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke

Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2017 9:16 AM

To: 'Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)' (b) (6); 'Prior, Ian (OPA)' (b) (6)

Subject: Fox News request: Sen. Grassley letter to Deputy AG Rosenstein re: FARA

Good morning Sarah and Ian,

Hoping for a comment on behalf of the Deputy Attorney General in regards to the letter he received from Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee Chuck Grassley, who wrote a letter to Mr. Rosenstein on Monday evening requesting information on actions the DOJ took to enforce FARA requirements regarding DNC consultant Alexandra Chalupa and her contacts on behalf of the Ukrainian government?

Grassley asked why the DOJ did not require her to register under FARA, and asked if the DOJ has sent a letter of inquiry to Chalupa.

Grassley questioned why the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC were required to register under FARA but Chalupa wasn't.. and whether the DOJ is investigating the Ukrainian government and individuals associated with the campaign

of Hillary Clinton or the DNC.

He provided a deadline of August 3.

Are you able to comment on any of his requests at this point? Will the Deputy Attorney General meet the August 3 deadline?

Thank you!

My deadline is 10:30a EST.

Brooke Singman
Politics Reporter, Fox News Channel

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Josh Gerstein" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: titles

Date: Wed, 26 Jul 2017 10:20:05 -0400

Importance: Normal

Its been a long week;)

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Josh Gerstein (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2017 10:19 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: titles

Grassley can't even get the titles right and he heads SJC. Just called Hickey deputy attorney general.

Maybe just number everyone.

From: Nicole Presley (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: Re: Rachel Brand

Date: Fri, 26 May 2017 13:35:51 -0400

Importance: Normal

Hey Sarah,

I just have a few quick follow up questions that I'll need your help with.

I wondered if Rachel would be okay with me interviewing her parents as a part of this story? I don't have their contact information or anything yet, since I didn't know how comfortable they would be with an interview. I'd be asking them general questions about their time in Pella, and general comments about how they're proud of her successful career, etc.

The second question would be photos. We have some photos from her hearing in March, and Sen. Chuck Grassley has sent us a photo from some statements he's sent out, and we have a professional photo of her from the George Mason University Directory. We planned to use some of those, but didn't know if she had any other photo that she'd prefer we use.

Otherwise, I think I should have everything I need.

Thank you,

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On May 24, 2017, at 8:29 AM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <(b) (6)> wrote:

No prob!

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Nicole Presley (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 9:27 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Re: Rachel Brand

Sounds great. When you do call, would you be able to call my cell? That'll allow me to use my ear piece so I can type at the same time.

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On May 24, 2017, at 8:25 AM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Great! We'll give you a call.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Nicole Presley (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 9:08 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Re: Rachel Brand

Hey Sarah,

Sorry, I didn't see this email yesterday evening. Yes, Friday at 10 a.m. Central Time will work for me.

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On May 23, 2017, at 6:12 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

Would Friday at 10am CT work for you?

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Nicole Presley (b) (6)
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2017 4:43 PM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)
Subject: Re: Rachel Brand

Not a problem!

Thanks,

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On May 18, 2017, at 3:27 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

Yes! Let's get her sworn in and then set something up for next week.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
(b) (6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Nicole Presley (b) (6) >
Date: Thu, May 18, 2017 at 1:22 PM
Subject: Re: Rachel Brand
To: Sarah Isgur Flores <(b) (6)>

Hey Sarah,

This is Nicole Presley with the Pella Chronicle newspaper in Pella, Iowa again. Just checking in. Rachel Brand was confirmed this morning as the associate attorney general. I wondered if she would still be open to the possibility of an interview for a feature story on her for the Pella paper?

If you have any questions, feel free to call.

Thank you,

Nicole

Nicole Presley

Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On Feb 6, 2017, at 4:39 PM, Nicole Presley (b) (6) wrote:

Sounds great. I'll be in touch.

Thank you again,

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On Feb 6, 2017, at 4:27 PM, Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) wrote:

Well that's something to look forward to in 4 or 8 years:)

Email me when Rachel has been confirmed (or nearing confirmation) and we'll set up an interview and folks who can talk about her as well.

S

On Mon, Feb 6, 2017 at 5:26 PM, Nicole Presley (b) (6) wrote:

Awesome. I'm glad you enjoyed your time here.

Smokey Row sometimes sells them, but Jaarsma Bakery (Just down the street from Smokey Row) makes them and sells them. If you ever find yourself in Pella again, check out the bakeries and meat markets around the square (all near Smokey Row).

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On Feb 6, 2017, at 3:51 PM, Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) wrote:

I didnt get one--did they have those at Smokey Row and I just missed it?! But we did get to stay at (b) (6) which was this fantastic respite for all of us. And we went to the applebees because it was open late:)

On Mon, Feb 6, 2017 at 3:21 PM, Nicole Presley (b) (6) wrote:

Hey Sarah,

Thank you for reaching out. That would be great if we'd be able to set up a profile of her if she is confirmed. I'll look forward to your email.

Also, I'm glad you like Pella. I hope you sampled a dutch letter when you visited?

Thank you,

Nicole

Nicole Presley
Managing Editor
Pella Chronicle

O: (b) (6)

C: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

On Feb 6, 2017, at 2:04 PM, Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) > wrote:

Nicole--

Rachel forwarded me your email. At the moment, she isn't doing any press but if she is confirmed, I'd love to set up a profile for your paper. (I traveled in the 2016 cycle with Carly Fiorina to Pella and am a big fan!)

Does that work?

S

--

Sarah Isgur Flores
(b) (6)
@whignewtons

--

Sarah Isgur Flores

(b) (6)

@whignewtons

--

Sarah Isgur Flores

(b) (6)

@whignewtons

--

Sarah Isgur Flores

(b) (6)

@whignewtons

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Seung Min Kim" (b) (6), "Carr, Peter (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: DOJ briefing for Senate Judiciary Committee

Date: Tue, 14 Mar 2017 19:47:13 -0400

Importance: Normal

Decline to comment at this point

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Seung Min Kim (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, March 14, 2017 6:55 PM

To: (b) (6) - Sarah Isgur Flores; Carr, Peter (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: DOJ briefing for Senate Judiciary Committee

Hey Peter and Sarah –

Grassley told a bunch of reporters on the Hill just now that he won't hold a committee vote for Rosenstein as deputy AG until committee members have had a briefing with Comey (in connection with this letter

[https://www.grassley.senate.gov/sites/default/files/judiciary/upload/2017-02-](https://www.grassley.senate.gov/sites/default/files/judiciary/upload/2017-02-15%20CEG%20DGBF%20to%20DOJ%20FBI%20(Flynn%20Resignation).pdf)

[15%20CEG%20DGBF%20to%20DOJ%20FBI%20\(Flynn%20Resignation\).pdf](https://www.grassley.senate.gov/sites/default/files/judiciary/upload/2017-02-15%20CEG%20DGBF%20to%20DOJ%20FBI%20(Flynn%20Resignation).pdf) he and Feinstein sent in February), and he said that was communicated to DOJ legislative affairs last week.

Just wanted to check in and see if DOJ had a comment about Rosenstein getting held up, or anything along those lines.

Thanks,
Seung Min

Seung Min Kim
Congressional Reporter
POLITICO

(b) (6)

@seungminkim

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Reinhard, Beth" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: Eric Dreiband

Date: Mon, 01 May 2017 08:39:41 -0400

Importance: Normal

Hey there! Good morning!!

Let's see—first on the letter. I don't have a good sense of who would know Eric. But Cleta might know who would know at least since she's a practitioner here in town.

On the Tuesday hearing, I haven't been following very closely. Who is testifying?

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Reinhard, Beth [mailto:(b) (6)]

Sent: Sunday, April 30, 2017 4:45 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Eric Dreiband

Hey there, missed you last night at the WHCD but I found another good-looking blonde to go with me :)

I want to write a mini profile of Eric, probably tmrw, and I was going to mention this letter below from conservatives concerned about the civil rights division. Wondering which signatory you think might either know that he's in the running for the job or having something interesting to say about him. Is there anything you can tell me on background as to what in his record appealed to the AG?

Also - what do you make of Grassley holding a hearing Tuesday on religious hate crimes and calling the former civil rights chief who has been so critical of Trump and Sessions to testify?

Belated thanks for arranging the interview with Rod and I am sorry I couldn't be there. Spent last week visiting jails in Louisiana (!) for a story on their criminal justice reform effort.

If you could call me or respond to this e-mail tmrw I'd be grateful. Bourbon Steak one night after work this week?

Beth Reinhard
Staff Writer
The Wall Street Journal.

(b) (6) office

(b) (6) cell

Follow me @BethReinhard

IAPE Local 1096: We Power Dow Jones.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Logan Churchwell (b) (6) >

Date: Tue, Mar 28, 2017 at 11:15 AM

Subject: Conservative Attorneys Urge Sessions to Clean Up Civil Rights Division

To: (b) (6) " <(b) (6) >

Aruna:

Here's an advanced heads up at a letter signed by a variety of organizations and leaders urging Gen. Sessions to select a fitting AAG for Civil Rights. No embargo for you.

Three primary points in the letter:

- The Civil Rights Division needs to reclaim its leadership role from the political activists it was cozy with under Obama.
- Clear out the "ideological rot" found by the DOJ Inspector General.
- Stop the unethical behavior carried out by DOJ personnel in litigation.

Much of the letter speaks to [now DNC CHAIR] Tom Perez's time as Division head. Signatories of note:

Hon. Kris Kobach

J. Christian Adams/PILF

Roger Clegg/Center for Equal Opportunity

Hans von Spakovsky/Heritage

Pete Hutchison/Landmark Legal Fdn.

Tim Wildmon/American Family Association

Cleta Mitchell/PILF

Dr. John C. Eastman/Claremont Institute

Susan Carleson/American Civil Rights Union

Joel Mandelman/Fmr. U.S. Comm. on Civil Rights

Logan Churchwell

Communications & Research Director

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: "Dominick, Katie Ross" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Cc: "Reid, Paula" (b) (6) >, "Burnham, Julia Kimani" (b) (6) >, "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: CBS News

Date: Mon, 15 May 2017 13:34:09 -0400

Importance: Normal

Thank you.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 1:19 PM

To: Dominick, Katie Ross (b) (6) >

Cc: Reid, Paula (b) (6); Burnham, Julia Kimani (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: CBS News

We'll decline to comment

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Dominick, Katie Ross (b) (6)]

Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 1:16 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) <(b) (6)>

Cc: Reid, Paula <(b) (6)>; Burnham, Julia Kimani (b) (6) >

Subject: CBS News

Hi Sarah –

We were wondering if you had a response to the attached letter from Carter Page sent to the Deputy AG.

Thank you in advance for your help,

Katie Dominick

Katie Ross Dominick

Justice & Homeland Security Producer, CBS News

(b) (6), office

(b) (6), cell

(b) (6)

GLOBAL ENERGY CAPITAL LLC

May 14, 2017

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL AND REGISTERED MAIL

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

SUBJECT: RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE FBI, PART 2 - REQUEST FOR
FISA WARRANT APPLICATIONS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

Dear Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein:

I have been working to help the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence get to the bottom of potential government meddling in the 2016 election. I am thus writing to request the assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice with the immediate release of all documents held by DoJ and other U.S. agencies associated with the Obama Administration's interference in the 2016 election. Specifically, any documents related to their alleged wiretapping of me.

If FISA warrants indeed exist as has been extensively reported, wide-ranging false evidence will be inevitably revealed in light of the fact that I have never done anything remotely unlawful in Russia or with any Russian person at any point in my life. In helping to expose the continued divergence between fact and fiction, the documents that the U.S. Department of Justice must now provide are crucial to repairing the integrity of your organization following last year's events. Your unbiased leadership in authorizing the release of this information can manifestly help prove how completely unjustified this entire witch hunt organized by the Clinton campaign and the Obama Administration has been all along.

Your letter of May 9, 2017 focused on the indefensible conduct of James Comey in the earlier case of Mrs. Clinton's emails.¹ This marked Part 1 of the necessary process of restoring public confidence in the F.B.I. Given the alleged involvement of the former F.B.I. Director in compounding the civil rights abuses of the Clinton campaign and their associate Christopher Steele against me and other Trump campaign supporters², it is now also essential to get to the

¹ Rod J. Rosenstein, "RESTORING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE FBI," Memorandum for the Attorney General, May 9, 2017.

² As per the relevant leak regarding the 2016 Dodgy Dossier author: "Mr. Steele met his F.B.I. contact in Rome in early October, bringing a stack of new intelligence reports... The agent said that if Mr. Steele could get solid corroboration of his reports, the F.B.I. would pay him \$50,000 for his efforts, according to two people familiar with the offer." Matt Apuzzo, Michael S. Schmidt, Adam Goldman and Eric Lichtblau, "Comey Tried to Shield the F.B.I. From Politics.

bottom of these later offenses as well. By simply revealing these illegitimate court documents, your help with Part 2 of this closely interrelated process surrounding government influence in the 2016 election should now achieve precisely that end.

In your May 9, 2017 memorandum, you also astutely noted: “When federal agents and prosecutors quietly open a criminal investigation, we are not concealing anything; we are simply following the longstanding policy that we refrain from publicizing non-public information.” Based both on James Comey’s testimony on March 20, 2017 and multiple leaks in the weeks since regarding my unjustified FISA warrant, this represents the polar opposite of how my so-called “case” has been handled. These recent events have remained particularly outrageous given their basis on false evidence from Clinton campaign associates, as well as longstanding political biases of Comey.

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) Chairman Richard Burr has proactively and equitably pledged to, “Follow the evidence where it leads, and we will continue to be guided by the intelligence and facts as we compile our findings.”³ As part of my vigorous quest to help the SSCI and in the interest of belatedly setting the record straight regarding the completely fact-free allegations that have been lawlessly hurled since the final months of the Clinton/Obama regime’s term in office, this letter thus constitutes a request under the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a to obtain that indispensable information. Of particular importance, I seek an immediate release of any § 1804 FISA applications for wiretapping of myself in the possession of the Department of Justice. The American people were severely misled with falsehoods throughout the past year, so the information that the Department of Justice can now make public should play a critical role in ending this facade and the disgrace to our democracy it represents.

In the event that this request is not granted, and the requested information not released, the nation would undoubtedly be subjected to many more hours of misleading Congressional testimony where honest answers are avoided. Per Comey on March 20, 2017, repeating a standard refrain which protected him as well as other Obama Administration appointees from effective oversight on countless other occasions while permitting the perpetuation of complete misperceptions prior to subsequent felonious leaks: “Because it is an open ongoing investigation and is classified, I cannot say more about what we are doing and whose conduct we are examining.”⁴ Prolonging today’s unjustified status quo is completely unacceptable given the breadth of lies, leaks and resultant civil rights abuses this whole travesty has created since its inception.

Then He Shaped an Election.” *New York Times*, April 22, 2017.

[<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/22/us/politics/james-comey-election.html>]

³ “Senate Intel Chairman Burr Statement on Committee’s Ongoing Investigation into Russian Intelligence Activities,” Senator Richard Burr website, March 4, 2017.

⁴ “Full transcript: FBI Director James Comey testifies on Russian interference in 2016 election,” *Washington Post*, March 20, 2017. [<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/03/20/full-transcript-fbi-director-james-comey-testifies-on-russian-interference-in-2016-election/>]

A song from popular culture accurately describes many of the matters usurping a vast proportion of your time and America's attention given the primary focus of the mainstream media today: "Like a little girl who cries in the face of a monster that lives in her dreams".⁵

Accordingly, Mrs. Clinton made remarks on May 2, 2017 which dodged responsibility for her campaign by instead pointing fingers at two illusory monsters: Comey and Russia.⁶ While you set the record straight regarding the first monster in your letter of last Thursday given Comey's misconduct, the disclosure requested here in this letter will help get to the bottom of the second set of hallucinations.

As reported in an unfortunate front-page *Washington Post* article about the civil rights abuses committed against me: "Applications for FISA warrants, Comey said, are often thicker than his wrists, and that thickness represents all the work Justice Department attorneys and FBI agents have to do to convince a judge that such surveillance is appropriate in an investigation."⁷ If this thickness is indeed the case for my FISA warrant, it will inevitably be filled with a potpourri of falsehoods from the Clinton/Obama regime which fabricated this travesty from the outset. For the United States to end the continued delusional charade regarding Russia, it is essential to gain public access to these related documents as a matter of the highest urgency.

In President Trump's commencement speech at Liberty University yesterday, he correctly noted:

"Following your convictions means you must be willing to face criticism from those who lack the same courage to do what is right — and they know what is right, but they don't have the courage or the guts or the stamina to take it and to do it. It's called the road less traveled. I know that each of you will be a warrior for the truth, will be a warrior for our country, and for your family. I know that each of you will do what is right, not what is the easy way, and that you will be true to yourself, and your country, and your beliefs. In my short time in Washington I've seen firsthand how the system is broken."⁸

In stark contrast, the severely broken Obama Administration allowed one of the most cowardly and deceptive civil rights abuses in recent U.S. election history under a protective cloak of secrecy. After presiding over some of the worst setbacks in the history of America's bilateral relationship with Moscow, the former Administration's desperate attempt to make an illegitimate story out of Russia occurred after I took the road less travelled on a personal trip there in July

⁵ Maroon 5, "Harder To Breathe," YouTube, June 16, 2009.

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rV8NHsmVMPE>]

⁶ "Full transcript of Hillary Clinton interview with Christiane Amanpour," May 2, 2017.

[<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1705/02/cnnt.02.html>]

⁷ Ellen Nakashima, Devlin Barrett and Adam Entous, "FBI obtained FISA warrant to monitor Trump adviser Carter Page" *Washington Post*, April 12, 2017.

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/fbi-obtained-fisa-warrant-to-monitor-former-trump-adviser-carter-page/2017/04/11/620192ea-1e0e-11e7-ad74-3a742a6e93a7_story.html]

⁸ "Read President Trump's Liberty University Commencement Speech," Time, May 13, 2017.

[<http://time.com/4778240/donald-trump-liberty-university-speech-transcript/>]

2016 that had absolutely nothing to do with the Trump campaign. Your future steps in providing the documents requested herein can play an essential role in resolving these complete falsehoods.

Under such a legacy of mismanagement and in the wake of unprecedented crimes surrounding an illegal email server in 2016, the Comey “monster” spectacle lingered for the better part of a year until decisive action was finally taken which marked Part 1 in this process. Your potential forthcoming disclosure of the FISA warrants and associated materials to the American public this week could mark a proactive and conclusive end to this continued, seemingly incessant Russia madness which some still have in their heads.

In addition to the collusion between Clinton campaign associates and the Dodgy Dossier author Christopher Steele, another factor seems to have been in play based under Comey’s earlier mismanagement of the F.B.I. Illegal leaks to news organizations have hinted that the help I provided to federal agents in U.S.A. v. Evgeny Buryakov, Igor Sporyshev, and Victor Podobnyy might have potentially played a role in last year’s unjustified, politically-motivated FISA warrant(s). On April 3, 2017, reporters at ABC News⁹ and BuzzFeed News¹⁰ requested to meet in order to inform me that some U.S. government operatives had unlawfully disclosed my identity as the “Male-1” witness in this 2015 case. It all relates to my brief interactions in 2013 with Victor Podobnyy, a junior attaché assigned to the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations. This particular incident follows an increasing series of similar revelations about other political unmaskings in 2016.¹¹

During my prior meeting with F.B.I. agents at New York’s Plaza Hotel in June 2013 in support of their ongoing investigation, I spoke with them at length about my research on international political economy which I had been completing as a Fellow at the Center for National Policy in Washington. I brought this up because it seemed to me that the resources of the U.S. Department of Justice and the F.B.I. might be better allocated towards addressing real national security threats, particularly given the recent Boston Marathon bombing of April 15, 2013. Without question, the harsh retribution subsequently taken against me suggests a possible direct retaliation against my dissenting positions, some of which I shared with the agents that day.

Per an article I had recently written and discussed with the U.S. agents at the time, the Clinton/Obama regime had been, “Reflecting the highest principles of cronyism rather than democracy,” in many of their policy decisions. In my writings, I had also cited a recent quote from Maya Angelou which seemed of particular relevance given a range of ineffective policy approaches by Washington at the time: “The philosophers tell us that power corrupts and

⁹ Brian Ross and Matthew Mosk, “Trump campaign adviser Carter Page targeted for recruitment by Russian spies,” ABC News, Apr 4, 2017. [<http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-campaign-advisor-carter-page-targeted-russian-spies/story?id=46557506>]

¹⁰ Ali Watkins, “A Former Trump Adviser Met With A Russian Spy,” BuzzFeed News, April 3, 2017. [<https://www.buzzfeed.com/alimwatkins/a-former-trump-adviser-met-with-a-russian-spy>]

¹¹ Kristina Wong, “Lindsey Graham: 'We Will Continue' to Look into Susan Rice's Unmasking,” Breitbart News, May 4, 2017. [<http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/05/04/lindsey-graham-we-will-continue-to-look-into-susan-rices-unmasking/>]

absolute power corrupts absolutely.”¹² This corruption, as I noted in my writings at the time, had marked an earlier instance of an influence campaign and related domestic political intelligence operations in support of failed policies abroad, which would eventually be repeated with the civil rights violations based on complete fabrications spread by many of the same people during the 2016 election.

In the wake of the civil rights abuses and outright lies promulgated by the Clinton/Obama regime last year, we must get to the bottom of these questions that have ridiculously remained at the top of the national attention and which your leadership in disclosure can facilitate. Based in large part on the widely promulgated misinformation from the Clinton campaign and their other associates, Clinton campaign surrogate¹³ and Ranking Member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Adam B. Schiff suggested in an article on the front page of yesterday’s *New York Times*: “For a president who baselessly accused his predecessor of illegally wiretapping him, that Mr. Trump would suggest that he, himself, may have engaged in such conduct is staggering.”¹⁴

Based on revelations thus far, I was the primary known person allegedly put under the most intensive surveillance by the Obama Administration as part of their 2016 domestic political intelligence operation. Assuming the FISA reports in the *Washington Post*, *New York Times* and other publications about me are correct, the facts should help dispel the misinformation that Congressman Schiff and others have been given and continue to repeat. To the contrary, each of the President’s tweets of March 4, 2017 were entirely correct as described in the analysis of his four related statements that day, below:

"TERRIBLE! JUST FOUND OUT THAT OBAMA HAD MY 'WIRES TAPPED' IN TRUMP TOWER JUST BEFORE THE VICTORY. NOTHING FOUND. THIS IS MCCARTHYISM!"

Although I stepped away from my role as an informal, unpaid campaign volunteer in the wake of the Clinton campaign’s lies based on the 2016 “Dodgy Dossier”, like many millions of Americans I continued my support as a member of the Trump movement which I had maintained since June 2015.

The key defense that former Obama Administration appointees including James Comey have made apparently centers on the word “my”.

¹² Maya Angelou, “The 2013 Time 100: Icons,” *Time*, April 18, 2013.

[<http://time100.time.com/2013/04/18/time-100/slide/michelle-obama/>]

¹³ “It is both painful and disturbing to see her surrogates peddle half-truths and insult our intelligence. On ‘Fox News Sunday,’ Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.) fared poorly against an experienced interviewer like Chris Wallace...” Jennifer Rubin, “Clinton surrogates serve up thin gruel,” *Washington Post*, May 30, 2016. [<https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/wp/2016/05/30/clinton-surrogates-serve-up-thin-gruel/>]

¹⁴ Peter Baker and Michael D. Shear, “Trump Stirs a New Question: Are There Tapes?” *New York Times*, May 13, 2017, Page A1. [<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/12/us/politics/trump-threatens-retaliation-against-comey-warns-he-may-cancel-press-briefings.html>]

In the English language, the word “my” is defined as: “belonging to or **ASSOCIATED WITH** the speaker” (emphasis added).¹⁵ Although I previously served as a very junior member of the Trump movement who didn’t actually have any direct one-on-one discussions or meetings with our candidate, I have been labelled as a “Trump associate” in literally thousands of media articles and television programs. This labeling largely stemmed from consistent mischaracterizations by the Clinton campaign which tried to smear the Trump campaign with false allegations of improper relationships with Russian officials which never actually occurred.

Furthermore, in order to properly understand his personal lexicon which stems from the altruistic management philosophy of President Trump, it is useful bearing in mind his core campaign philosophy. Per his Election Day victory speech:

"As I've said from the beginning, ours was not a campaign but rather an incredible and great movement, made up of millions of hard-working men and women who love their country and want a better, brighter future for themselves and for their family..... This was tough. This political stuff is nasty, and it is tough.... **You've all given me such incredible support, and I will tell you that we have a large group of people. You know, they kept saying we have a small staff. Not so small.** Look at all of the people that we have. Look at all of these people."¹⁶

Additionally, then-candidate Donald J. Trump also previously explained how his movement was not about him but about us on countless other occasions last year. Again, in his final speech at the end of the campaign after victory had been declared, President-elect Trump noted: “I’ve just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us — it’s about us — on our victory.”¹⁷

"IS IT LEGAL FOR A SITTING PRESIDENT TO BE ‘WIRE TAPPING’ A RACE FOR PRESIDENT PRIOR TO AN ELECTION? TURNED DOWN BY COURT EARLIER. A NEW LOW!"

Based on the actual facts in my case rather than the false information provided by the Clinton campaign and their surrogates in the U.S. Government last year, members of my legal team have informed me that the alleged actions by the Obama Administration are certainly not legal. In order to prove this and rather than continuing the current cover-up, access to the information that I am requesting here is essential.

¹⁵ “My,” Oxford Dictionaries, Oxford University Press, 2017.

[<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/my>]

¹⁶ “Transcript: Donald Trump’s Victory Speech,” *New York Times*, November 9, 2016.

[<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/10/us/politics/trump-speech-transcript.html>]

¹⁷ “Transcript: Donald Trump’s Victory Speech,” *New York Times*, November 9, 2016.

[<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/10/us/politics/trump-speech-transcript.html>]

"I'D BET A GOOD LAWYER COULD MAKE A GREAT CASE OUT OF THE FACT THAT PRESIDENT OBAMA WAS TAPPING MY PHONES IN OCTOBER, JUST PRIOR TO ELECTION!"

My legal team has confirmed that great cases can be made. However, in order to do so, the information requested here would be very helpful.

"HOW LOW HAS PRESIDENT OBAMA GONE TO TAPP MY PHONES DURING THE VERY SACRED ELECTION PROCESS. THIS IS NIXON/WATERGATE. BAD (OR SICK) GUY!"

Having previously spoken in favor of some of Mr. Trump's policies on other Fox News Group programs during the 2016 campaign¹⁸ and given the peaceful relationship I have had with Russian citizens since my years in the U.S. Navy, it may be understandable why I would be the primary associated political target if such sick activities had indeed been committed as alleged in the previously cited media reports. Although I have never had any direct relationship or meetings with President Trump despite previously serving as an informal, unpaid member of one of his campaign committees, I had frequently dined in Trump Grill, had lunch in Trump Café, had coffee meetings in the Starbucks at Trump Tower, attended events among other visits in 2016. As a sister skyscraper in Manhattan, my office at the IBM Building (590 Madison Avenue) is literally linked to the Trump Tower building by an atrium. So if prior media reports are proved to be correct that surveillance was indeed undertaken against me and other Trump supporters according to the FISA documentation you can provide, it will essentially be deemed as a proven fact that the American people's concerns that Trump Tower was under surveillance last year is entirely accurate. Please note that my mobile phone is always turned on and with me 24-hours a day, except when I am in airplane-mode during flights. As an early Trump campaign supporter since June 2015 and a proud member of the historic Make America Great Again movement, yet another attack against me of this sort may well have been a de facto attack against the citizen who would eventually become our current President of the United States. Clearly, such potential abuses will be proven or disproven based on the information regarding the alleged illegal wiretapping of me and any associated FISA warrants that you can help provide.

While a September 23, 2016 news article stated that, "U.S. intelligence agencies have also received reports that Page met with another top Putin aide while in Moscow,"¹⁹ it wasn't until several months later in January 2017 that the source of this false evidence became fully known: the Dodgy Dossier prepared on behalf of the "Hillary for America" campaign. As a potential severe case of election fraud, any FISA warrant would help ascertain whether criminal obstruction of justice in the form of false evidence may be the case. After the report by Yahoo

¹⁸ For example: Fox Business, August 16, 2016 [<http://finance.yahoo.com/video/jan-brewer-obama-not-concerned-224534142.html>]; Fox Business, "Varney & Co.," September 8, 2016.

¹⁹ Michael Isikoff, "[U.S. intel officials probe ties between Trump adviser and Kremlin](#)," Yahoo News, September 23, 2016.

News, the Clinton campaign put out an equally false press release just minutes after the article was released that afternoon.²⁰

Compounding this disinformation initiative, even the U.S. Government-funded propaganda outlets echoed the lies advanced by the Clinton campaign's Dodgy Dossier (again, in contrast to what Steele himself said was "never supposed to be made public"²¹). As dutifully recited by the Obama Administration-sponsored Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty news network in September 2016: "Yahoo News cited the same Western intelligence source as saying that U.S. intelligence officials have received reports that Page has also met with Igor Diveikin, a right-hand man of Vyacheslav Volodin, Putin's first deputy chief of staff and a key architect of Russia's political landscape during Putin's third term."²²

Just days before the election, the same U.S. Government-funded sources repeated these fabrications: "Another adviser, Carter Page, reportedly met with top Kremlin officials including those under U.S. sanctions."²³

The propagation of these falsehoods was indeed truly state-sponsored by our taxpayer dollars with Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's FY 2016 budget of \$108.4 million in direct federal subsidies.

My request for disclosure here echoes recent loud cries from across America's political spectrum including the American Civil Liberties Union ("With just the stroke of a pen, President Trump could provide the public with the information necessary to assess his claims that the Obama administration improperly surveilled him and his associates.")²⁴ and Judicial Watch ("Hillary Clinton's national security crimes included running the most highly classified material the U.S. possesses across her outlaw server without legal consequence. If Communications Intelligence is used as a partisan political weapon without people going to jail, we will have crossed the point

²⁰ Hillary for America, "Hillary for America Statement on Bombshell Report About Trump Aide's Chilling Ties To Kremlin," September 23, 2016. [<https://www.hillaryclinton.com/briefing/statements/2016/09/23/hillary-for-america-statement-on-bombshell-report-about-trump-aides-chilling-ties-to-kremlin/>]

²¹ Rowan Scarborough, "Ex-spy admits anti-Trump dossier unverified, blames BuzzFeed for publishing," *Washington Times*, April 25, 2017. [<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/apr/25/christopher-steele-admits-dossier-charge-unverifie/>]

²² "Report: U.S. Intelligence Officials Examining Trump Adviser's Russia Ties," Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty, September 24, 2016. [<http://www.rferl.org/a/report-us-intelligence-probes-trump-advisers-russia-ties-kremlin/28010062.html>]

²³ Mike Eckel, "Reset To Overload: Russia-U.S. Ties Have Changed, No Matter Who Wins The Election," Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty, November 6, 2016. [<http://www.rferl.org/a/u-s-election-trump-clinton-relations-russia/28100058.html>]

²⁴ Neema Singh Guliani, "How Trump Can Show Us Whether He Was Spied On," ACLU Washington Markup Blog, April 13, 2017.

of no return for institutional corruption in our government, our intelligence services and law enforcement.”).²⁵

The final report of my 1993 Trident Scholar research at the U.S. Naval Academy concluded: “When information is leaked by other than official sources, the act may undermine the overall integrity of an administration's policy.”²⁶ The veil of secrecy heretofore concealing these potential criminal actions by the Clinton/Obama regime in 2016 has in turn undermined the Trump Administration and our country. Your leadership in expeditiously authorizing this release of the information requested herein will help resolve this detrimental and unjustified problem for our nation.

Overstepping his realm of responsibility once again, Comey pontificated on Russia, “Certainly in my view, the greatest threat of any nation on earth, given their intention and their capability.”²⁷ This displayed a completely unfounded statement and reflected a bias from the former F.B.I. Director which may have contributed to or at least exacerbated the aforementioned misdeeds of the Obama Administration and the Clinton campaign.

The documents I am requesting include all applications made pursuant to 50 U.S.C. § 1804 directed against me, and all related materials.

I am entitled to expedited processing of this request. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii). There is an “urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged federal government activity,” and the request is made by myself as a person who currently “is primarily engaged in disseminating information” in fulfillment of my ongoing voluntary support of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s investigation. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii).

While lawyers working on my behalf as well as civil rights organizations are currently pursuing this information through the appropriate channels via the federal bureaucracy as well, the typically slow administrative timelines for such release would only prolong the continued state of affairs. I am therefore contacting you directly given the realization that an immediate resolution of this injustice through these disclosures of the actual facts surrounding last year’s misdeeds would facilitate your efforts to restore confidence in the F.B.I. and DoJ which have been badly damaged by Obama Administration appointees.

²⁵ Chris Farrell, “On Watch: Episode 11 – ‘Corrupt Weaponizing of Intelligence Collection’,” Judicial Watch, March 28, 2017. [<http://www.judicialwatch.org/press-room/press-releases/watch-episode-11-corrupt-weaponizing-intelligence-collection/>]

²⁶ Carter W. Page, “Balancing Congressional Needs for Classified Information: A Case Study of the Strategic Defense Initiative,” Defense Technical Information Center, U.S.N.A. Trident Scholar project report, no. 206, 1993, p. 11. [<http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a271110.pdf>]

²⁷ “Read the full testimony of FBI Director James Comey in which he discusses Clinton email investigation,” *Washington Post*, May 3, 2017. [<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/05/03/read-the-full-testimony-of-fbi-director-james-comey-in-which-he-discusses-clinton-email-investigation/>]

The story of the 2016 election was to a large extent a battle between powerful political and business interests on an epic scale vs. average citizens who simply want to see improvements in our country. It is unfortunate that a small fish like me has been severely damaged based primarily on completely false allegations in a dossier commissioned and used by killer whales that is 100% inaccurate in every way as it relates to me. Your assistance with this requested disclosure can resolve these stark injustices while assisting your Department return attention to more important matters.

By all indications, your letter from Tuesday which began the first step in the process of restoring public confidence in the FBI and rehabilitating justice in America seems to be the most consequential correspondence of your life. My letter to you today continues the second giant leap in the process of restoring public confidence in the FBI and rehabilitating justice in America and might similarly be the most consequential communication of my life. Let us please build upon your new momentum by moving forward together in helping to restore America's justice system. Thank you in advance for your help with this vital national security matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carter', written in a cursive, fluid style.

Carter Page, Ph.D.

From: Josh Gerstein (b) (6) >

To: "Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6)" (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Grassley Raises Further Concerns over Foreign Agent Registration

Date: Mon, 24 Jul 2017 15:54:34 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png

Hi Sarah

Any response on this to Rod?

Also any answer from earlier re beleaguered?

Thanks

--Josh

Josh Gerstein

Reporter

POLITICO

(b) (6) (w)
(b) (6) (c)

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:52 PM

To: Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Subject: Grassley Raises Further Concerns over Foreign Agent Registration



COMMITTEE *on the* **JUDICIARY**
CHAIRMAN CHUCK GRASSLEY WWW.JUDICIARY.SENATE.GOV

-
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Monday, July 24, 2017

Grassley Raises Further Concerns over Foreign Agent Registration

Report Alleges DNC Consultant Involved in Presidential Election Worked with Ukraine

WASHINGTON – Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley wrote to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein raising concerns over yet another instance of deficient enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) as it relates to the 2016 presidential election.

Media reports suggest that Ukrainian “political leadership” opposed the candidacy of Donald Trump for president of the United States and worked with a Democratic National Committee consultant to undermine his campaign. This consultant allegedly had various meetings with Ukrainian government officials, including embassy staff, to coordinate the dissemination of incriminating information about Trump campaign officials.

It appears that this consultant was operating to advance the interests of both the Democratic National Committee, the Clinton campaign, and a foreign government, which would have required registration under FARA.

In his [letter](#), Grassley requests information on any actions taken by the Justice Department pursuant to FARA in this case, the differences between this case and similar cases in which the Justice Department required registration and whether the Department is investigating links and coordination between the Ukrainian government and individuals associated with the campaign of Hillary Clinton or the Democratic National Committee.

On July 26, the Judiciary Committee will [convene a hearing](#) to examine enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and attempts to influence U.S. elections.

Full text of the [letter](#) follows.

July 20, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Rosenstein,

According to news reports, during the 2016 presidential election, “Ukrainian government officials tried to help Hillary Clinton and undermine Trump” and did so by “disseminat[ing] documents implicating a top Trump aide in corruption and suggested they were investigating the matter...”^[1] Ukrainian officials also reportedly “helped Clinton’s allies research damaging information on Trump and his advisers.”^[2] At the center of this plan was Alexandra Chalupa, described by reports as a Ukrainian-American operative “who was consulting for the Democratic National Committee” and reportedly met with Ukrainian officials during the presidential election for the express purpose of exposing alleged ties between then-candidate Donald Trump, Paul Manafort, and Russia.^[3] *Politico* also reported on a Financial Times story that quoted a Ukrainian legislator, Serhiy Leschenko, saying that Trump’s candidacy caused “Kiev’s wider political leadership to do something they would never have attempted before: intervene, however indirectly, in a U.S. election.”^[4]

Reporting indicates that the Democratic National Committee encouraged Chalupa to interface with Ukrainian embassy staff to “arrange an interview in which Poroshenko [the president of Ukraine] might discuss Manafort’s ties to Yanukovich.”^[5] Chalupa also met with Valeriy Chaly, Ukraine’s ambassador to the U.S., and Oksana Shulyar, a top aid to the Ukrainian ambassador in March 2016 and shared her alleged concerns about Manafort. Reports state that the purpose of their initial meeting was to “organize a June reception at the embassy to promote Ukraine.” However, another Ukrainian embassy official, Andrii Telizhenko, told *Politico* that Shulyar instructed him to assist Chalupa with research to connect Trump, Manafort, and the Russians. He

reportedly said, “[t]hey were coordinating an investigation with the Hillary team on Paul Manafort with Alexandra Chalupa” and that “Oksana [Shulyar] was keeping it all quiet...the embassy worked very closely with” Chalupa.^[6]

Chalupa’s actions appear to show that she was simultaneously working on behalf of a foreign government, Ukraine, and on behalf of the DNC and Clinton campaign, in an effort to influence not only the U.S. voting population but U.S. government officials. Indeed, Telizhenko recalled that Chalupa told him and Shulyar, “[i]f we can get enough information on Paul [Manafort] or Trump’s involvement with Russia, she can get a hearing in Congress by September.”^[7] Later, Chalupa did reportedly meet with staff in the office of Democratic representative Marcy Kaptur to discuss a congressional investigation. Such a public investigation would not only benefit the Hillary Clinton campaign, but it would benefit the Ukrainian government, which, at the time, was working against the Trump campaign. When *Politico* attempted to ask Rep. Kaptur’s office about the meeting, the office called it a “touchy subject.”

Aside from the apparent evidence of collusion between the DNC, Clinton campaign, and Ukrainian government, Chalupa’s actions implicate the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA). As you know, the Committee is planning a hearing on FARA enforcement. Given the public reporting of these activities in support of a foreign government, it is imperative that the Justice Department explain why she has not been required to register under FARA.

FARA requires individuals to register with the Justice Department if they act, even through an intermediary, “as an agent, representative, employee, or servant” or “in any other capacity” at the behest of a foreign principal, including a foreign political party, for purposes of engagement with a United States official.^[8] The registration applies to anyone who attempts to influence a U.S. government official on behalf of a foreign principal in an effort to “formulat[e], adopt[], or chang[e] the domestic or foreign policies of the United States.”^[9] As such, the focus of FARA is to require registration for individuals engaged in political or quasi-political activity on behalf of a foreign government. Likewise, an individual whose activities are subject to registration under FARA and who sends informational material “for or in the interest of [a] foreign principal” with the intent or belief that such material will be circulated among at least two persons must transmit the material to the Attorney General no later than 48 hours after actual transmission.^[10] Notably, an ongoing failure to register is an ongoing offense.^[11]

According to documents provided to the Committee, the Justice Department required the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC to register under FARA for working on behalf of the Ukrainian government.^[12] Their registration was required even though the client, the European Centre for the Modern Ukraine (ECFMU), wrote a letter saying it was not directly or indirectly controlled by the Ukrainian government. That did not matter to the Justice Department because their lobbying activity was not to “benefit commercial interests” of the ECFMU but instead to promote the “political or public interests of a foreign government or foreign political party.” The Justice Department made clear that an individual acting in the political or public interests of a foreign government must register under FARA. As such, because Podesta and Mercury were effectively working on behalf of Ukrainian government interests, they were required to register.

Unlike that situation where the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC worked for the middleman (ECFMU) and not the Ukrainian government, here Chalupa reportedly worked directly with Ukrainian government officials to benefit Ukraine, lobbying Congress on behalf of Ukraine, and worked to undermine the Trump campaign on behalf of Ukraine and the Clinton campaign. Accordingly, these facts appear to be exactly the type of activity Congress intended to reach with FARA. Please answer the following:

1. What actions has the Justice Department taken to enforce FARA's requirements regarding Chalupa given the public reporting of her actions on behalf of the Ukrainian government?
2. Why has the Justice Department not required her to register under FARA?
3. Has the Justice Department sent a letter of inquiry to Chalupa? If so, please provide a copy. If not, why not?
4. Under 28 C.F.R. § 5.2, any present or prospective agent of a foreign entity may request an advisory opinion from the Justice Department regarding the need to register. Has Chalupa ever requested one in relation to her work on behalf of the Ukrainian government? If so, please provide a copy of the request and opinion.
5. Please differentiate the facts that required the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC to register with Chalupa's.
6. Are you investigating the Ukrainian government's intervention in the 2016 presidential election on behalf of the Clinton campaign? If not, why not?
7. Are you investigating links and coordination between the Ukrainian government and individuals associated with the campaign of Hillary Clinton or the Democratic National Committee? If not, why not?

I anticipate that your written response and the responsive documents will be unclassified. Please send all unclassified material directly to the Committee. In keeping with the requirements of Executive Order 13526, if any of the responsive documents do contain classified information, please segregate all unclassified material within the classified documents, provide all unclassified information directly to the Committee, and provide a classified addendum to the Office of Senate Security. The Committee complies with all laws and regulations governing the handling of classified information. The Committee is not bound, absent its prior agreement, by any handling restrictions or instructions on unclassified information unilaterally asserted by the Executive Branch.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this request. Please respond no later than August 3, 2017. If you have questions, contact Josh Flynn-Brown of my Judiciary Committee staff at (202) 224-5225.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Senate Committee on the Judiciary



From: Carrie Johnson (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)" (b) (6) >

Cc: "'Hornbuckle, Wyn (OPA)' (b) (6)" >

Subject: Mucho noise from Hill

Date: Wed, 15 Mar 2017 14:42:13 -0400

Importance: Normal

On Comey, "wiretapping," cooperation from DOJ and FBI. I saw AG Sessions' comments from the gaggle in Richmond.

Will you have more today? Grassley has come out hard against Comey. And Lindsey Graham says Congress is flying blind on a matter of such public import.

THANK YOU

Carrie Johnson

(b) (6)

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Carrie Johnson" (b) (6)

Cc: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: FW: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 11:53:03 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: 2017-9-11_Grassley-Feinstein_Response.pdf

Heres the letter. No finger prints that you got it from DOJ. Just a source familiar.

From: "Gibson, Jake" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Cc: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: Re: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 11:56:42 -0400

Importance: Normal

Copy that.

Thanks!

On Sep 13, 2017, at 11:54 AM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

No DOJ finger prints—just source familiar as to where you got the letter.

No comment from us. Refer you to special counsel's office.

<2017-9-11 Grassley-Feinstein Response.pdf>

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Tucker, Eric" (b) (6)

Cc: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 11:58:13 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: 2017-9-11_Grassley-Feinstein_Response.pdf

From: "Tucker, Eric" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 11:59:15 -0400

Importance: Normal

Absolutely, thanks so much.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 11:58 AM

To: Tucker, Eric; Prior, Ian (OPA)

Subject: RE: Letter to Judiciary

Will do. Not from DOJ—source familiar. That work?

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Tucker, Eric (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 11:55 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Letter to Judiciary

Shoot, that is a letter that I actually don't have. Are you able to send that to me, pretty please?

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 11:51 AM

To: Tucker, Eric; Prior, Ian (OPA)

Subject: RE: Letter to Judiciary

If you have the letter he sent today, we'll leave it at that and refer you to the special counsel's office.

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Tucker, Eric (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 11:49 AM

To: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6); Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) >

Subject: Letter to Judiciary

Hi there guys, just checking to see if the department plans to change its position on testimony from Ghattas and Rybicki. I have a copy of the letter from Ramer back to Grassley and Feinstein, and just wanted to see if the department plans to change its view and permit them to testify now that the scope of the questioning has been narrowed. Thanks so much.

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at (b) (6) and delete this email. Thank you.

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at (b) (6) and delete this email. Thank you.

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at (b) (6) and delete this email. Thank you.

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Reid, Paula" (b) (6)

Subject: FW: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 12:47:31 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: 2017-9-11_Grassley-Feinstein_Response.pdf

Not from DOJ. Source familiar.



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Legislative Affairs

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

SEP 11 2017

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman and Senator Feinstein:

The Department of Justice is in receipt of your August 25, 2017, letter requesting interviews with Carl Ghattas, Executive Assistant Director of the FBI National Security Branch, and James Rybicki, the Chief of Staff and Senior Counselor to the FBI Director.

As a threshold matter, the scope of the Committee's inquiry has not been de-conflicted with Special Counsel Mueller's investigation. Therefore, in order to protect the integrity of the Special Counsel's investigation, as we have previously indicated, we will not be able to provide Mr. Ghattas or Mr. Rybicki for interviews at this time.

We hope this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may provide additional assistance regarding this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stephen E. Boyd", written over a large, stylized blue ink flourish.

Stephen E. Boyd
Assistant Attorney General

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: (b) (6) - Rebecca Ruiz (NYT)" (b) (6)

Subject: Fwd: Letter to Judiciary

Date: Fri, 15 Sep 2017 17:16:08 -0400

Importance: Normal

Attachments: 2017-9-11_Grassley-Feinstein_Response.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Not from DOJ. Source familiar.

From: "Gibson, Jake" (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)
(b) (6)

Subject: FW:

Date: Mon, 24 Jul 2017 15:56:24 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image004.png

[You know anything about this?](#)

From: Donner, Jason

Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 3:55 PM

To: 194 -FOX DC Assign; 164 -NationalDesk; 069 -Politics; 050 -Senior Producers

Subject:

Subject: Grassley Raises Further Concerns over Foreign Agent Registration



COMMITTEE *on the* **JUDICIARY**
CHAIRMAN CHUCK GRASSLEY WWW.JUDICIARY.SENATE.GOV

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Monday, July 24, 2017

Grassley Raises Further Concerns over Foreign Agent Registration

Report Alleges DNC Consultant Involved in Presidential Election Worked with Ukraine

WASHINGTON – Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley wrote to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein raising concerns over yet another instance of deficient enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) as it relates to the 2016 presidential election.

Media reports suggest that Ukrainian “political leadership” opposed the candidacy of Donald Trump for president of the United States and worked with a Democratic National Committee consultant to undermine his campaign. This consultant allegedly had various meetings with Ukrainian government officials, including embassy staff, to coordinate the dissemination of incriminating information about Trump campaign officials.

It appears that this consultant was operating to advance the interests of both the Democratic National Committee, the Clinton campaign, and a foreign government, which would have required registration under FARA.

In his [letter](#), Grassley requests information on any actions taken by the Justice Department pursuant to FARA in this case, the differences between this case and similar cases in which the Justice Department required registration and whether the Department is investigating links and coordination between the Ukrainian

government and individuals associated with the campaign of Hillary Clinton or the Democratic National Committee.

On July 26, the Judiciary Committee will [convene a hearing](#) to examine enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act and attempts to influence U.S. elections.

Full text of the [letter](#) follows.

July 20, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Rod J. Rosenstein
Deputy Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Rosenstein,

According to news reports, during the 2016 presidential election, “Ukrainian government officials tried to help Hillary Clinton and undermine Trump” and did so by “disseminat[ing] documents implicating a top Trump aide in corruption and suggested they were investigating the matter...”^[1] Ukrainian officials also reportedly “helped Clinton’s allies research damaging information on Trump and his advisers.”^[2] At the center of this plan was Alexandra Chalupa, described by reports as a Ukrainian-American operative “who was consulting for the Democratic National Committee” and reportedly met with Ukrainian officials during the presidential election for the express purpose of exposing alleged ties between then-candidate Donald Trump, Paul Manafort, and Russia.^[3] *Politico* also reported on a Financial Times story that quoted a Ukrainian legislator, Serhiy Leschenko, saying that Trump’s candidacy caused “Kiev’s wider political leadership to do something they would never have attempted before: intervene, however indirectly, in a U.S. election.”^[4]

Reporting indicates that the Democratic National Committee encouraged Chalupa to interface with Ukrainian embassy staff to “arrange an interview in which Poroshenko [the president of Ukraine] might discuss Manafort’s ties to Yanukovych.”^[5] Chalupa also met with Valeriy Chaly, Ukraine’s ambassador to the U.S., and Oksana Shulyar, a top aid to the Ukrainian ambassador in March 2016 and shared her alleged concerns about Manafort. Reports state that the purpose of their initial meeting was to “organize a June reception at the embassy to promote Ukraine.” However, another Ukrainian embassy official, Andrii Telizhenko, told *Politico* that Shulyar instructed him to assist Chalupa with research to connect Trump, Manafort, and the Russians. He reportedly said, “[t]hey were coordinating an investigation with the Hillary team on Paul Manafort with Alexandra Chalupa” and that “Oksana [Shulyar] was keeping it all quiet...the embassy worked very closely with” Chalupa.^[6]

Chalupa’s actions appear to show that she was simultaneously working on behalf of a foreign government, Ukraine, and on behalf of the DNC and Clinton campaign, in an effort to influence not only the U.S. voting population but U.S. government officials. Indeed, Telizhenko recalled that Chalupa told him and Shulyar, “[i]f we can get enough information on Paul [Manafort] or Trump’s involvement with Russia, she can get a hearing in Congress by September.”^[7] Later, Chalupa did reportedly meet with staff in the office of Democratic representative Marcy Kaptur to discuss a congressional investigation. Such a public investigation would not only benefit the Hillary Clinton campaign, but it would benefit the Ukrainian government, which, at the time, was

working against the Trump campaign. When *Politico* attempted to ask Rep. Kaptur's office about the meeting, the office called it a "touchy subject."

Aside from the apparent evidence of collusion between the DNC, Clinton campaign, and Ukrainian government, Chalupa's actions implicate the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA). As you know, the Committee is planning a hearing on FARA enforcement. Given the public reporting of these activities in support of a foreign government, it is imperative that the Justice Department explain why she has not been required to register under FARA.

FARA requires individuals to register with the Justice Department if they act, even through an intermediary, "as an agent, representative, employee, or servant" or "in any other capacity" at the behest of a foreign principal, including a foreign political party, for purposes of engagement with a United States official.^[8] The registration applies to anyone who attempts to influence a U.S. government official on behalf of a foreign principal in an effort to "formulat[e], adopt[], or chang[e] the domestic or foreign policies of the United States."^[9] As such, the focus of FARA is to require registration for individuals engaged in political or quasi-political activity on behalf of a foreign government. Likewise, an individual whose activities are subject to registration under FARA and who sends informational material "for or in the interest of [a] foreign principal" with the intent or belief that such material will be circulated among at least two persons must transmit the material to the Attorney General no later than 48 hours after actual transmission.^[10] Notably, an ongoing failure to register is an ongoing offense.^[11]

According to documents provided to the Committee, the Justice Department required the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC to register under FARA for working on behalf of the Ukrainian government.^[12] Their registration was required even though the client, the European Centre for the Modern Ukraine (ECFMU), wrote a letter saying it was not directly or indirectly controlled by the Ukrainian government. That did not matter to the Justice Department because their lobbying activity was not to "benefit commercial interests" of the ECFMU but instead to promote the "political or public interests of a foreign government or foreign political party." The Justice Department made clear that an individual acting in the political or public interests of a foreign government must register under FARA. As such, because Podesta and Mercury were effectively working on behalf of Ukrainian government interests, they were required to register.

Unlike that situation where the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC worked for the middleman (ECFMU) and not the Ukrainian government, here Chalupa reportedly worked directly with Ukrainian government officials to benefit Ukraine, lobbying Congress on behalf of Ukraine, and worked to undermine the Trump campaign on behalf of Ukraine and the Clinton campaign. Accordingly, these facts appear to be exactly the type of activity Congress intended to reach with FARA. Please answer the following:

1. What actions has the Justice Department taken to enforce FARA's requirements regarding Chalupa given the public reporting of her actions on behalf of the Ukrainian government?
2. Why has the Justice Department not required her to register under FARA?
3. Has the Justice Department sent a letter of inquiry to Chalupa? If so, please provide a copy. If not, why not?

4. Under 28 C.F.R. § 5.2, any present or prospective agent of a foreign entity may request an advisory opinion from the Justice Department regarding the need to register. Has Chalupa ever requested one in relation to her work on behalf of the Ukrainian government? If so, please provide a copy of the request and opinion.
5. Please differentiate the facts that required the Podesta Group and Mercury LLC to register with Chalupa's.
6. Are you investigating the Ukrainian government's intervention in the 2016 presidential election on behalf of the Clinton campaign? If not, why not?
7. Are you investigating links and coordination between the Ukrainian government and individuals associated with the campaign of Hillary Clinton or the Democratic National Committee? If not, why not?

I anticipate that your written response and the responsive documents will be unclassified. Please send all unclassified material directly to the Committee. In keeping with the requirements of Executive Order 13526, if any of the responsive documents do contain classified information, please segregate all unclassified material within the classified documents, provide all unclassified information directly to the Committee, and provide a classified addendum to the Office of Senate Security. The Committee complies with all laws and regulations governing the handling of classified information. The Committee is not bound, absent its prior agreement, by any handling restrictions or instructions on unclassified information unilaterally asserted by the Executive Branch.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation with this request. Please respond no later than August 3, 2017. If you have questions, contact Josh Flynn-Brown of my Judiciary Committee staff at (202) 224-5225.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Senate Committee on the Judiciary

-30-



This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox

Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Date, Jack V." (b) (6) >

Subject: Re: WP FISA story

Date: Tue, 11 Apr 2017 22:44:19 -0400

Importance: Normal

Nope

> On Apr 11, 2017, at 5:37 PM, Date, Jack V. <(b) (6)> wrote:

>

> Hi Sarah -

>

> Does DOJ have any reaction or statement to make regarding the WP story that FBI obtained a FISA warrant to monitor Carter Page?

>

> Thanks,

>

> Jack Date

> Senior Justice Producer

> ABC News

> (b) (6) c

> (b) (6) c

> (b) (6) o

> (b) (6)

>

>

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Andrea Noble" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: DOJ responses to Congress

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 16:08:08 -0400

Importance: Normal

1. I'd refer to you to the OSC
2. Refer you to FBI
3. "Conversations with the committee are ongoing, and the subpoenas that had compliance dates for tomorrow are on hold during that process."
4. We are cooperating fully.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Andrea Noble (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 2:27 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: DOJ responses to Congress

Hey Sarah,

Following up on a couple pending requests from Congress to see whether DOJ is providing responses.

1. Grassley and Feinstein asked to interview FBI agents, the letter out indicates that is being denied because of issues deconflicting the Senate Judiciary investigation with the special counsel's.

Can you say what is behind that deconfliction issue between the investigations?

2. On the Grassley/Graham request to get transcripts of interviews and James Comey's drafts of statements related to the closure of the Clinton email investigation, their offices indicate they have not received anything as of the deadline today. Does DOJ/FBI plan to offer responses or is it also withholding information as a result of deconfliction issues?

3. Tomorrow is the deadline Devin Nunes imposed for his request on information regarding subpoenas sent to DOJ and the FBI seeking documents related to the agencies' relationship with Christopher Steele. Will DOJ comply with that request or does the AG intend to provide an explanation for why that information was not provided?

4. Given some of these examples creating issues for the congressional investigations, how would DOJ characterize its cooperation with congressional investigators looking into Russia-related matters?

Andrea Noble
The Washington Times
Phone: (b) (6)
Twitter: anobleDC

The information contained in this electronic transmission is intended for the exclusive use of the individuals to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential, the disclosure of which is prohibited by law. If the reader of this transmission is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. In addition, any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail and any attachments is strictly forbidden.

From: Carrie Johnson (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)" (b) (6) >, "Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)" (b) (6) > (b) (6) > (b) (6) >

Cc: Ryan Lucas (b) (6) >

Subject: FBI officials and Senate judiciary committee

Date: Wed, 13 Sep 2017 11:41:21 -0400

Importance: Normal

Hi there

Trying to confirm a Manu Raju report on CNN that DOJ is preventing Senate Judiciary from interviewing Carl Ghattas and Jim Rybicki at FBI because they're needed as part of the special counsel probe. Are you saying anything about this?

Did your Leg folks send a letter to Grassley?

THANKS

Carrie Johnson

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: "Helderman, Rosalind" (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Re: WaPo inquiry

Date: Fri, 05 May 2017 16:38:54 -0400

Importance: Normal

Okay, thank you for that. You should know that as we do our reporting, as I mentioned, we've heard from a number of people who have mentioned Gen. Sessions as among those involved with this process. That was one reason I had thought he might appreciate the opportunity to clarify his role.

In any case, we'll be finishing this up next week--perhaps I'll circle back one more time before deadline.

Take care,

Roz

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, May 5, 2017 4:29:04 PM

To: Helderman, Rosalind

Subject: RE: WaPo inquiry

We'll decline to comment. Thanks.

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Helderman, Rosalind (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, May 5, 2017 4:28 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Fw: WaPo inquiry

Sarah--I wanted to ping you about the following inquiry? We'll be working on this story next week too, if you're still working on it. But I wanted to be sure you had seen it and ask if you had any questions about it?

Many thanks,

Rosalind Helderman

From: Helderman, Rosalind

Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 4:39 PM

To: (b) (6) - Sarah Isgur Flores

Subject: WaPo inquiry

Hi Sarah--

I'm working on a Washington Post story and wanted to reach out for your help. We're attempting to recreate how the list of informal campaign foreign policy advisers that President Trump announced in March 2016 came together. Carter Page, whose name appeared on that list, seems to have injected some perhaps unnecessary mystery into discussions of that process by continually refusing to disclose who was his first contact at the campaign. Our guess is that the process was actually far less mysterious than his reticence would suggest, so we're trying to reach out to everyone who was involved with the campaign at that time and ask their memories.

General Sessions was, of course, a newly named campaign adviser around that time. A few people have told us that they believe he played a role in helping to compile that list. Can you help me understand if that's true? Can you walk me through his memories of who at the campaign discussed the naming of that group before President Trump publicized it? Does he recall if members of the informal group were interviewed or otherwise vetted? I know Gen. Sessions joined President Trump at the first meeting of that group, held that same day in Washington. What does he remember about that meeting? Specifically, as it relates to Carter Page, had Gen. Sessions ever heard of him prior to his appointment to the group? Who at the campaign had met him and how did he land on the list?

I'm at (b) (6) in the office and (b) (6) by cell.

Thank you so much!

Rosalind Helderman

Staff writer

From: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Singman, Brooke" (b) (6) >, "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: Grassley letter to Rosenstein re: Alexandra Chalupa registering under FARA

Date: Thu, 10 Aug 2017 16:55:51 -0400

Importance: Normal

You can say a Justice Department official confirmed that we responded but declined to comment further.

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Department of Justice

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)

Sent: Thursday, August 10, 2017 1:54 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6); Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Grassley letter to Rosenstein re: Alexandra Chalupa registering under FARA

Hi Sarah and Ian,

Hope you're having a great day.

Sen. Chuck Grassley wrote a letter to the Deputy Attorney General last month questioning whether the Justice Department would investigate former DNC consultant Alexandra Chalupa and her interactions with Ukrainian government officials.

Grassley gave the Deputy Attorney General a deadline of August 3 to respond.

Has he responded to Grassley's letter? If so, what did he say? Can you provide me with a copy of that response?

Deadline is ASAP.

Thank you!

Brooke Singman

Politics Reporter, Fox News Channel

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

To: "Jarrett, Laura" (b) (6)

Cc: "Ehram, Lauren (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Re: UPDATED Witness List for a Committee Hearing on Wed., September 6 at 10:00 a.m.

Date: Thu, 31 Aug 2017 10:01:02 -0400

Importance: Normal

We don't do media w nominees. But Lauren can get you some folks who know him.

On Aug 31, 2017, at 9:48 AM, Jarrett, Laura (b) (6) > wrote:

Sarah –

I'd love a chance to interview Dreiband for a story before next week's confirmation hearing. I'm sure he's busy, but don't think it would take long and happy to do off camera if more comfortable that way.

Laura

From: Chairman Grassley (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 9:31 AM

To: Foy, Taylor (Judiciary-Rep) (b) (6)

Subject: UPDATED Witness List for a Committee Hearing on Wed., September 6 at 10:00 a.m.

UPDATED Witness List

Hearing before the
Senate Committee on the Judiciary

On

“Nominations”

Wednesday, September 6, 2017
Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 226
10:00 a.m.

Panel I

Amy Coney Barrett, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit

Joan Louise Larsen, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit

Panel II

Eric S. Dreiband, to be Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division

William L. Campbell, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee

Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: (b) (6) - Todd Spangler (Detroit Free Press/USA Today) (b) (6)

Cc: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: FW: from detroit free press

Date: Fri, 12 May 2017 14:13:14 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image002.jpg; image001.gif

The recommendation to remove Director Comey was a personnel decision based on concerns about the effectiveness of his leadership as set forth in the Attorney General's letter. The recommendation had nothing to do with the substance of any investigation.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Spangler, Todd (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 1:48 PM

To: Press <(b) (6)>

Subject: re: from detroit free press

Looking for any response to this, thanks

Todd Spangler

Washington correspondent

Detroit Free Press
www.freep.com



Mobile: (b) (6)

Office: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

freep.com

From: Reddick-Smith, Shadawn (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 10:33 AM

To: Reddick-Smith, Shadawn (b) (6)

Subject: RELEASE: Top House Dems Raise "Grave Concerns" About Attorney General Violating Recusal Law on Comey Firing



For Immediate Release:

May 12, 2017

Contact: Shadawn Reddick-Smith

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Top House Dems Raise “Grave Concerns” About Attorney General Violating Recusal Law on Comey Firing

Letter to Deputy AG Seeks Report on Removing Sessions or Other Discipline

Washington, D.C. (May 12, 2017) Today, Rep. Elijah E. Cummings, the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rep. John Conyers, Jr., the Ranking Member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, sent a [letter](#) to Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein raising “grave concerns” about Attorney General Jeff Sessions’ direct participation in President Trump’s decision to fire FBI Director James Comey despite the fact that he previously recused himself from any actions involving the investigations of the Trump and Clinton presidential campaigns.

“If the facts now being reported are accurate, it appears that the Attorney General’s actions in recommending that President Trump fire Director Comey may have contradicted his sworn testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee at his confirmation hearing, breached the public recusal he made before the American people, and violated the law enacted by Congress to prevent conflicts of interest at the Department of Justice,” Cummings and Conyers wrote.

Cummings and Conyers cited Section 528 of title 28 of the United States Code which is entitled, [“Disqualification of Officers and Employees of the Department of Justice,”](#) which directs the Department to establish regulations to “require the disqualification of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice ... from participation in a particular investigation or prosecution if such participation may result in a personal, financial, or political conflict of interest, or the appearance thereof.”

The penalty for any Justice Department official who violates such a recusal could be termination. The statute states: “Such rules and regulations may provide that [a willful violation of any provision thereof shall result in removal from office.](#)”

“Since the Attorney General previously recused himself from these matters and since he may not sit in judgment on his own failure to comply with the law we request that you, as the Acting Attorney General in this matter, report to us on the steps that must now be followed to address this apparent abuse,” the Ranking Members wrote.

“We recognize that the Attorney General’s actions have thrust you into a very delicate position with respect to enforcing the law of the land against your superior,” Cummings and Conyers wrote. “In this case, however, the Attorney General previously recused himself from these matters, leaving you with the solemn obligation to fulfill your responsibilities to the Department of Justice and the nation.”

The Ranking Members also requested a wide range of documents and information relating to the Attorney General’s involvement in the President’s recommendation to fire Director Comey.

Click [here](#) to read today's letter.

###

From: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Scanlon, Katherine" (b) (6) >, "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: request for comment

Date: Wed, 10 May 2017 10:29:40 -0400

Importance: Normal

We have received the letter and are reviewing it.

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Scanlon, Katherine (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 10:03 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) >

Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: Re: request for comment

Thanks! Hi Ian, My deadline is at noon. I can be reached at (b) (6)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 11:19:53 PM

To: Scanlon, Katherine

Cc: Prior, Ian (OPA)

Subject: RE: request for comment

Adding ian

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Scanlon, Katherine (b) (6)]

Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 5:34 PM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: request for comment

Hi Sarah,

My name is Kate Scanlon and I'm a reporter for TheBlaze. I'm working on a story about Sen. Grassley's criminal referral of Planned Parenthood — among other organizations — to the Department of Justice and the FBI.

Grassley recently asked Attorney General Sessions if any steps have been taken in response to his referral (link below) and my understanding is that he has yet to receive a response, although he requested one by May 8.

I was wondering if you might be able to comment on the status of that referral?

Thanks,
Kate

[https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017-04-24%20CEG%20to%20DOJ%20FBI%20\(follow-up%20on%20fetal%20tissue%20investigation%20referrals\)%20with%20original%20referral.pdf](https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017-04-24%20CEG%20to%20DOJ%20FBI%20(follow-up%20on%20fetal%20tissue%20investigation%20referrals)%20with%20original%20referral.pdf)

From: "Gibson, Jake" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Re: Question....

Date: Fri, 01 Sep 2017 16:38:32 -0400

Importance: Normal

Fair enough...

On Sep 1, 2017, at 4:36 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) wrote:

I'm not sure what this has to do with us--sounds like it's special counsel right?

On Sep 1, 2017, at 3:20 PM, Gibson, Jake <(b) (6)> wrote:

The Grassley letter refers to transcripts of the OSC's interviews with then director Comey's Chief of Staff Jim Rybicki and the Principal Deputy General Counsel of Marional Security and CyberLaw, Trisha Anderson.

Can we get access to the unredacted portions of those transcripts?

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 1, 2017, at 4:01 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

I'm not sure I follow. What transcripts?

On Sep 1, 2017, at 2:48 PM, Gibson, Jake <(b) (6)> wrote:

Sorry meant to include...

The footnote on the letter says OSC provided to the DOJ

3 OSC first provided the transcripts to the Justice Department, which redacted significant portions of the transcripts without explanation. It redacted the names of the witnesses, even though those names were in the Committee's request.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 1, 2017, at 3:42 PM, Gibson, Jake (b) (6) wrote:

From a colleague...

Do you happen to know if the transcripts as part of this Grassley/Graham letter are publicly available? Would prefer to show the actual transcripts provided to the DOJ in Herridge pkg if possible. Thanks!

<https://www.grassley.senate.gov/sites/default/files/constituents/2017-08-30%20CEG%20%2B%20LG%20to%20FBI%20%28Comey%20Statement%29.pdf>

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.

From: "Date, Jack V." (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: RE: ABC News...

Date: Fri, 03 Mar 2017 20:00:22 -0500

Importance: Normal

Thanks!

Have a good weekend.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 7:59 PM

To: Date, Jack V.

Subject: Re: ABC News...

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Carr, Peter (OPA)" (b) (6)

Date: March 3, 2017 at 7:46:50 PM EST

To: "Carr, Peter (OPA) (JMD)" (b) (6)

Cc: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

Subject: Statement on AG letter to Judiciary Committee

You may attribute the following to me: "In light of the letter received from Senators late this afternoon, the Attorney General will respond to their questions along with his amended testimony on Monday."

The letter can be found here: http://www.feinstein.senate.gov/public/_cache/files/9/2/925043af-4aa3-4051-83ec-237664663d7f/BB3984AD5F556EB3B6FDDAFD07CC80AC.2017.03.03-feinstein-et-al.to-grassley-re-ag-recusal.pdf.

Have a good weekend,

Peter Carr
Spokesman
U.S. Department of Justice

On Mar 3, 2017, at 6:08 PM, Date, Jack V. (b) (6) > wrote:

Hi Sarah –

It was good to talk with you today. I wanted to check back to see if the letter to Sen. Grassley has been sent.

Also, we are holding off on the story I discussed with you earlier. I think it would only come back if/when any action is undertaken by the bar. It seems unlikely at this point. In any event I will keep you posted, but for now, no story.

Many thanks,

Jack Date

Senior Justice Producer

ABC News

(b) (6) o

(b) (6) c

(b) (6) c

(b) (6)

From: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >, "Woodruff, Betsy" (b) (6) >, "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: Feinstein, Grassley Urge Justice Department to Prioritize Religious Hate Crimes

Date: Tue, 02 May 2017 10:39:07 -0400

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.jpg

I'd also point you on background to the language below from our recent Task Force Memo announcing Hate Crimes Subcommittee:

We must also protect the civil rights of all Americans, and we will not tolerate threats or acts of violence targeting any person or community in this country on the basis of their religious beliefs or background. Accordingly, the Hate Crimes Subcommittee will develop a plan to appropriately address hate crimes to better protect the rights of all Americans. As with many other areas of the Task Force's work, we are already making significant progress toward our goal of a safer America. Recently, the Federal Bureau of investigation, working with law enforcement partners in Israel and elsewhere, helped secure the arrest of a man believed to be responsible for the recent surge in threats of violence against Jewish community centers and synagogues. I commend their outstanding efforts.

<https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/955476/download>

Ian D. Prior

Principal Deputy Director of Public Affairs

Office: (b) (6)

Cell: (b) (6)

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 10:36 AM

To: Woodruff, Betsy (b) (6) >; Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Feinstein, Grassley Urge Justice Department to Prioritize Religious Hate Crimes

We'll leave to Eric's testimony today

Sarah Isgur Flores

Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Woodruff, Betsy (b) (6)

Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 10:33 AM

To: Prior, Ian (OPA) (b) (6); (b) (6) - Sarah Isgur Flores

Subject: Fw: Feinstein, Grassley Urge Justice Department to Prioritize Religious Hate Crimes

Hey there, do you all have any comment on this?

Betsy Woodruff

Politics Reporter, The Daily Beast

c: (b) (6)

(b) (6)

From: Feinstein Press (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2017 10:31 AM
Subject: Feinstein, Grassley Urge Justice Department to Prioritize Religious Hate Crimes

UNITED STATES SENATE



NEWS RELEASE

For Immediate Release
May 2, 2017

Contacts:
Ashley Schapitl (Feinstein), (b) (6)
Taylor Foy (Grassley), (b) (6)

Feinstein, Grassley Urge Justice Department to Prioritize Religious Hate Crimes

Washington—Senators Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) and Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), ranking member and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, last week [urged the Justice Department to prioritize its response to the increase in religious hate crimes.](#)

The letter was also signed by Senators Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.), Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Chris Coons (D-Del.) and Mazie Hirono (D-Hawaii).

The senators wrote: **“Given the fundamental constitutional protection of the free exercise of religion and vindication of civil rights, the federal government has long played a role in investigating and prosecuting religious hate crimes. Where state or local officials cannot or will not act, the federal government must do so. We also believe that the federal government should continue its traditional supporting role to state and local law enforcement agencies that investigate these crimes, including awarding grants and providing services such as forensics.”**

[Full text of the letter follows:](#)

April 28, 2017

The Honorable Jeff Sessions
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

We write to request that the Department of Justice undertake effective action to address the increasing number of religious hate crimes in the United States. In 2017 alone, Jewish gravesites have been desecrated, mosques vandalized, and Muslims and people perceived as Muslims have been killed, attacked, and threatened by virtue of their status. The increase in such crimes is documented best by the 2015 FBI Hate Crimes Statistics Report, released last November. According to the report, the fastest-growing category of religious hate crimes, those against Muslims, rose by 67% over 2014. The most common religious hate crimes, against Jews, increased by 9% according to the report between 2014 and 2015.

Although all violent crimes are worthy of condemnation and law enforcement response, religious and other hate crimes differ in that the extent of the victimization extends beyond the individual harmed to an entire community. To the extent that they create a sense of fear, a chilling effect will take effect against public gatherings, religious or otherwise, harming various institutions. These crimes also are an affront to the liberty of all Americans, even if they are not members of the particular group that has been harmed.

Given the fundamental constitutional protection of the free exercise of religion and vindication of civil rights, the federal government has long played a role in investigating and prosecuting religious hate crimes. Where state or local officials cannot or will not act, the federal government must do so. We also believe that the federal government should continue its traditional supporting role to state and local law enforcement agencies that investigate these crimes, including awarding grants and providing services such as forensics.

We also encourage the Justice Department to work with state and local law enforcement to provide accurate information concerning hate crime incidents. It is our understanding that 27% of police and sheriffs reported no hate crimes in the past six years. However, other agencies lacked adequate data on hate crimes. We think the Department should work with state and local officials to improve their participation in the Hate Crime Statistics Act's requirements for reporting for crimes directed against people of faith and other hate crimes.

The Department can also assist religious institutions with victim assistance and grant funding focused on safety and preparedness programs for houses of worship and other targeted religiously-affiliated institutions. Reaching out to entities that may be unfamiliar with the assistance that the Department makes available would be beneficial.

We appreciate the work the Department has done to assist local law enforcement and to trace the individual who allegedly made so many threats against various Jewish community institutions. We commend the priority the Department has given to address these crimes and to bring perpetrators to justice. We work in partnership with you on these issues, and look forward to your response on how the Department plans to foster prosecution and reporting of religious hate crimes at the state and local levels, as well as ensuring that appropriate federal prosecutions are commenced as well.

Sincerely,

Dianne Feinstein
United States Senator

Charles Grassley
United States Senator

Orrin Hatch
United States Senator

Richard J. Durbin
United States Senator

Sheldon Whitehouse
United States Senator

Amy Klobuchar
United States Senator

Christopher A. Coons
United States Senator

Mazie Hirono
United States Senator

###

From: "Raju, Manu" (b) (6) >

To: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Cc: "Prior, Ian (OPA)" (b) (6) >

Subject: Re: Comment?

Date: Wed, 20 Sep 2017 13:41:18 -0400

Importance: Normal

Thanks

Manu Raju, CNN

Twitter: @mkraju

(b) (6)

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 20, 2017, at 1:37 PM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

We'll decline

On Sep 20, 2017, at 10:15 AM, Raju, Manu (b) (6) wrote:

Hi there - Sen. Grassley said today that he's preparing to subpoena for these two men to come before his committee. Any comment?

Manu Raju, CNN

Twitter: @mkraju

(b) (6)

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 13, 2017, at 10:22 AM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

It's a question for special counsel

On Sep 13, 2017, at 8:39 AM, Raju, Manu <(b) (6)> wrote:

Hi Sarah,

Reaching out because I'm writing a story about the Senate Judiciary Committee, which is trying to interview two senior FBI officials -- Carl Ghattas and James Rybicki -- over the Comey firing but DOJ and Mueller's team is blocking the committee's request. Here's the initial letter.

[https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017-07-27%20DOJ%20to%20CEG%20DF%20\(Rybicki%20Ghattas%20Interview%20Invitation\).pdf](https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2017-07-27%20DOJ%20to%20CEG%20DF%20(Rybicki%20Ghattas%20Interview%20Invitation).pdf)

The committee says it has since narrowed its request and asked them to appear at the beginning of September, but has not received cooperation from DOJ or Mueller's team.

Giving you a chance to comment if you want to.

Thanks!

Manu Raju, CNN

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6) Diane Bartz (Reuters) (b) (6) >

To: (b) (6) - Sarah Isgur Flores (b) (6) >

Subject: Re: Makan Delrahim

Date: Wed, 26 Apr 2017 10:34:21 -0400

Importance: Normal

I'll call you. I have more....

Sent from my iPhone

> On Apr 26, 2017, at 10:24 AM, Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6) > wrote:

>

> I think Grassley addressed this in the hearing correct? Theyre waiting on one piece of paperwork is what he said I believe.

>

> ***

> Sarah Isgur Flores

> Director of Public Affairs

> (b) (6)

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: (b) (6) Diane Bartz (Reuters) [mailto:(b) (6)]

> Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2017 10:01 AM

> To: (b) (6) Sarah Isgure Flores

> Subject: Makan Delrahim

>

> Is not at hearing. Can I call you on why?

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

From: "Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA)" (b) (6)

To: "Singman, Brooke" (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

Date: Wed, 31 May 2017 11:49:45 -0400

Importance: Normal

Not sure who you're talking to—but I know our OLA team has been in consistent contact with grassleys staff and Sen Grassley himself about all of this in the last several weeks. So maybe they just mean there hasn't been a formal letter in response? At this point, I'd imagine anything related to the Russia investigation would have to run through Mueller's team anyway.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)]

Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:44 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

That was my thinking. Waiting to hear from Judiciary as to when they requested. I think Mr. Rosenstein met with Senate Intel on May 11, so it could have been before or after that meeting- either way, both would have been before the full Senate briefing.

Judiciary told me today that they are still waiting, however, for a response, to that request—even despite their members' attendance to the full Senate briefing.

Thank you, Sarah.

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:38 AM

To: Singman, Brooke (b) (6) >

Subject: RE: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

Yeah but I guess I'm asking whether the request was before the larger 100 briefing the DAG gave and before the special counsel was named? Which would sort of change it since they were all in that 100 person briefing. And the special counsel obviously changes who is briefing on the Russia investigation to begin with.

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs

(b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)

Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:31 AM

To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)

Subject: RE: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

Yes – Judiciary said they requested a briefing before their committee, but have yet to receive a response... Same for Acting FBI Director McCabe

From: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:29 AM
To: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

Are you talking about since he briefed all 100 members of the senate?

Sarah Isgur Flores
Director of Public Affairs
(b) (6)

From: Singman, Brooke (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 11:10 AM
To: Flores, Sarah Isgur (OPA) (b) (6)
Subject: Fox News request- Re: Deputy AG Rosenstein at Senate Judiciary

Hi Sarah,

Hope you're well.

Wondering if you can provide me with a comment on whether Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein will brief the Senate Judiciary Committee? If reports are accurate, Mr. Rosenstein met with the Senate Intelligence Committee, but Judiciary tells me they have yet to get a response to whether the Deputy Attorney General will comply with their request.

If this is accurate, why would Mr. Rosenstein comply with Intel's request and not Judiciary's?

I'm on deadline for 1p EST.

Thank you,

Brooke Singman
Politics Reporter, Fox News Channel
(b) (6)

(b) (6)

This message and its attachments may contain legally privileged or confidential information. It is intended solely for the named addressee. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee), you may not copy or deliver this message or its attachments to anyone. Rather, you should permanently delete this message and its attachments and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Any content of this message and its attachments that does not relate to the official business of Fox News or Fox Business must not be taken to have been sent or endorsed by either of them. No representation is made that this email or its attachments are without defect.