



Federal Bureau of Investigation
 Washington, D.C. 20535

September 27, 2019

MR. WILLIAM F MARSHALL
 JUDICIAL WATCH
 SUITE 800
 425 THIRD STREET, SOUTHWEST
 WASHINGTON, DC 20024

FOIPA Request No.: 1391365-000
 Civil Action No.: 18-cv-154
 Subject: Communications between Peter Strzok and
 Lisa Page (February 1, 2015 – Present)

Dear Mr. Marshall:

The enclosed documents were reviewed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), Title 5, United States Code, Section 552. Below you will find check boxes under the appropriate statute headings with indicate the types of exemptions asserted to protect information which is exempt from disclosure. The appropriate exemptions are noted on the enclosed pages next to redacted information. In addition, a deleted page information sheet was inserted to indicate where pages were withheld entirely and identify which exemptions were applied. The checked exemption boxes used to withhold information are further explained in the enclosed Explanation of Exemptions.

Section 552		Section 552a
<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(1)	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(A)	<input type="checkbox"/> (d)(5)
<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(2)	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(B)	<input type="checkbox"/> (j)(2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (b)(3)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(C)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(1)
<u>50 U.S.C., Section 3024 (i)(1)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(D)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(2)
_____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(E)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(3)
_____	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(7)(F)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(4)
<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(4)	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(8)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (b)(5)	<input type="checkbox"/> (b)(9)	<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (b)(6)		<input type="checkbox"/> (k)(7)

500 pages of potentially responsive records were reviewed.
 144 pages are being released in whole or in part.
 31 pages are being withheld in full per exemptions.
 174 pages are being withheld duplicate.
 67 pages are being withheld referral/consult.
 84 pages were determined to be non-records/non-responsive to the FOIA request.

Below you will also find additional informational paragraphs about your request. Where applicable, check boxes are used to provide you with more information about the processing of your request. Please read each item carefully.

- Document(s) were located which originated with, or contained information concerning, other Government Agency (ies) [OGA].
- This information has been referred to the OGA(s) for review and direct response to you.

We are consulting with another agency. The FBI will correspond with you regarding this information when the consultation is completed.

In accordance with standard FBI practice and pursuant to FOIA exemption (b)(7)(E) and Privacy Act exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. § 552/552a (b)(7)(E)/(j)(2)], this response neither confirms nor denies the existence of your subject's name on any watch lists.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV (2010)). This response is limited to those records subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Explanation of Exemptions.

You may file an appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), United States Department of Justice, Sixth Floor, 441 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP's FOIA online portal by creating an account on the following website: <https://www.foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home>. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within ninety (90) days from the date of this letter in order to be considered timely. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal." Please cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so it may be easily identified.


You may seek dispute resolution services by contacting the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS). The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769. Alternatively, you may contact the FBI's FOIA Public Liaison by emailing foipaquestions@fbi.gov. If you submit your dispute resolution correspondence by email, the subject heading should clearly state "Dispute Resolution Services." Please also cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so it may be easily identified.

Please direct any further inquiries about this case to the Assistant United States Attorney representing the Government in this matter. Please use the FOIPA Request Number and/or Civil Action Number in all correspondence or inquiries concerning your request.

You may direct any further inquiries to the attorney representing the Government in this matter.

See additional information which follows.

Sincerely,



David M. Hardy
Section Chief
Record/Information
Dissemination Section
Information Management Division

Enclosure(s)

In response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, enclosed is a processed copy of Bates Stamped documents, FBI(18-cv-154)-7036 through FBI(18-cv-154)-7535. The enclosed documents represent the sixteenth interim release of information responsive to your request.

The FBI conducted email searches for any email communication between Peter Strzok and Lisa Page. This search located both official government records and non-record personal communications between these two individuals.

The FBI reviewed 500 pages of these emails. While conducting this review, the FBI individually analyzed the emails to determine whether they pertained to official government business constituting records under the FOIA or whether they consisted of purely personal communications between the two individuals. As a result of the FBI's review, it determined 84 pages were non-record, personal communications not subject to the FOIA; and 416 pages consisted of responsive FBI records.

As previously indicated, document(s) were located which originated with, or contained information concerning another agency (ies). We are consulting with the other agency (ies) and are awaiting their response. Our office has processed all other information currently in our possession. The FBI will correspond with you regarding those documents when the consultation is completed.

To minimize costs to both you and the FBI, duplicate copies of the same document were not processed.

EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTIONS

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552

- (b)(1) (A) specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and (B) are in fact properly classified to such Executive order;
- (b)(2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;
- (b)(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than section 552b of this title), provided that such statute (A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld;
- (b)(4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential;
- (b)(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;
- (b)(6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;
- (b)(7) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that the production of such law enforcement records or information (A) could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings, (B) would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication, (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, (D) could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution which furnished information on a confidential basis, and, in the case of record or information compiled by a criminal law enforcement authority in the course of a criminal investigation, or by an agency conducting a lawful national security intelligence investigation, information furnished by a confidential source, (E) would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law, or (F) could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual;
- (b)(8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; or
- (b)(9) geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552a

- (d)(5) information compiled in reasonable anticipation of a civil action proceeding;
- (j)(2) material reporting investigative efforts pertaining to the enforcement of criminal law including efforts to prevent, control, or reduce crime or apprehend criminals;
- (k)(1) information which is currently and properly classified pursuant to an Executive order in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy, for example, information involving intelligence sources or methods;
- (k)(2) investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than criminal, which did not result in loss of a right, benefit or privilege under Federal programs, or which would identify a source who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;
- (k)(3) material maintained in connection with providing protective services to the President of the United States or any other individual pursuant to the authority of Title 18, United States Code, Section 3056;
- (k)(4) required by statute to be maintained and used solely as statistical records;
- (k)(5) investigatory material compiled solely for the purpose of determining suitability, eligibility, or qualifications for Federal civilian employment or for access to classified information, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;
- (k)(6) testing or examination material used to determine individual qualifications for appointment or promotion in Federal Government service the release of which would compromise the testing or examination process;
- (k)(7) material used to determine potential for promotion in the armed services, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished the material pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA)
 DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
 FOIA Request No.:1391365-000 Civil
 Action No.: 18-cv-154

Total Withheld Page(s) = 356

Bates Page Reference	Reason for Withholding (i.e., exemptions with coded rationale, duplicate, sealed by order of court, etc.)
FBI(18-cv-154)- 7038	b5-1
FBI(18-cv-154)-7039 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7041	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7036 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7038
FBI(18-cv-154)-7051 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7056	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7059 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7060	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7057 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7058
FBI(18-cv-154)-7063 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7064	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7061 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7062
FBI(18-cv-154)-7067 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7072	b5-1, 3
FBI(18-cv-154)-7073 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7080	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7065 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7072
FBI(18-cv-154)-7081 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7082	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1936
FBI(18-cv-154)-7083 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7087	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7091 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7093	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7095 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7096	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7097	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7098	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7100 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7101	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1955 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-1956
FBI(18-cv-154)-7104 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7107	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1958 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-1962
FBI(18-cv-154)-7109 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7112	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1963 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-1968
FBI(18-cv-154)-7117 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7120	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7138 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7140
FBI(18-cv-154)-7127 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7130	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7123 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7126
FBI(18-cv-154)-7131 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7137	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7138 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7140
FBI(18-cv-154)-7143 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7144	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7141 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7142
FBI(18-cv-154)-7146 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7148	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7149 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7151	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7146 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7148
FBI(18-cv-154)-7154 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7157	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7162 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7164
FBI(18-cv-154)-7158 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7159	Referral/Consult

FBI(18-cv-154)-7160 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7161	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7158 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7159
FBI(18-cv-154)-7165 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7174	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7178 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7179	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1994 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-1995
FBI(18-cv-154)-7180 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7181	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-1998 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-1999
FBI(18-cv-154)-7185 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7187	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7182 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7184
FBI(18-cv-154)-7190 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7191	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7188 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7189
FBI(18-cv-154)-7195 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7197	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7192 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7194
FBI(18-cv-154)-7201 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7203	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7198 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7200
FBI(18-cv-154)-7205 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7206	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2002 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2003
FBI(18-cv-154)-7208	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2006
FBI(18-cv-154)-7210 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7211	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7212	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7213 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7217	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7218	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7219 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7221	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7222	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7223 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7227	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7228	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7230 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7235	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7241	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7242 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7243	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2013 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2015
FBI(18-cv-154)-7244 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7246	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2016 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2018
FBI(18-cv-154)-7247 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7254	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7255 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7259	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2022 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2024
FBI(18-cv-154)-7261	b6 -1, 2; b7C -1, 2; b7E -1, 4, 6
FBI(18-cv-154)-7262	b6 -1; b7C -1; b7E -4
FBI(18-cv-154)-7263	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7264 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7275	b6- 1; b7C- 1; b7E- 1, 6
FBI(18-cv-154)-7276	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2025
FBI(18-cv-154)-7279 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7280	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7281	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request

FBI(18-cv-154)-7282	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7283 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7284	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7285	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7286
FBI(18-cv-154)-7286 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7288	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7289 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7290	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2037 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2039
FBI(18-cv-154)-7294 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7295	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7296 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7297	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2043 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2044
FBI(18-cv-154)-7300	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2051
FBI(18-cv-154)-7301	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2049 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2050
FBI(18-cv-154)-7306 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7315	b5-1, 3
FBI(18-cv-154)-7316 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7327	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7304 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7315
FBI(18-cv-154)-7328 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7329	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2057 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2059
FBI(18-cv-154)-7332	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7334	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7335 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7336
FBI(18-cv-154)-7335 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7338	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7343	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7348	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7349	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7356 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7357
FBI(18-cv-154)-7352 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7353	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7354 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7355
FBI(18-cv-154)-7362 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7363	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7364	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7368	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7370	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7370
FBI(18-cv-154)-7372 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7373	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2082 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2084
FBI(18-cv-154)-7374 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7375	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7378	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7380 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7381	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7382 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7383	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7384 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7386
FBI(18-cv-154)-7384 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7386	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7387 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7393	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2089 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2091
FBI(18-cv-154)-7394 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7396	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2095 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2098

FBI(18-cv-154)-7397 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7403	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7404	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7405 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7406	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7409
FBI(18-cv-154)-7407	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7408	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7409
FBI(18-cv-154)-7412	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7410
FBI(18-cv-154)-7413	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2104
FBI(18-cv-154)-7416 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7419	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7420 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7423	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7416 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7419
FBI(18-cv-154)-7424	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7426	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7428 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7429	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7430
FBI(18-cv-154)-7431 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7436	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7437	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2119
FBI(18-cv-154)-7438 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7445	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7447 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7454	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7456	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7457 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7459	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7460 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7467	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2150 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2153
FBI(18-cv-154)-7468	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7469 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7470	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2157 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2158
FBI(18-cv-154)-7473 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7474	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7471 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7472
FBI(18-cv-154)-7483 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7486	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2159 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2162
FBI(18-cv-154)-7487	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7489	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7490 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7491	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2163 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2164
FBI(18-cv-154)-7498 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7502	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2170 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2174
FBI(18-cv-154)-7503	Referral/Consult
FBI(18-cv-154)-7504	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request
FBI(18-cv-154)-7510 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7512	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7507 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7509
FBI(18-cv-154)-7513 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7516	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-7517 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7518
FBI(18-cv-154)-7519 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7525	Other - Non-records/Non-responsive to the FOIA request

FBI(18-cv-154)-7526 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-7535	Duplicate to FBI(18-cv-154)-2220 thru FBI(18-cv-154)-2224

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 6:56 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: DRAFT - GC Baker's Letter to DOS
Attachments: [Redacted]

b5 -1

Fysa

----- Original message -----

From: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [Redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 6:17 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [Redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [Redacted]
Subject: FW: DRAFT - GC Baker's Letter to DOS

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

FYI, here is the draft in progress.

[Redacted]
Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch
[Redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 6:16 PM
To: [Redacted] (CIV); [Redacted] (CIV); [Redacted] (CIV); [Redacted] (NSD) (JMD); [Redacted] (NSD) (JMD)
Cc: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: DRAFT - GC Baker's Letter to DOS

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

UNCLASSIFIED
ATTORNEY CLIENT WORK PRODUCT/DELIBERATIVE PROCESS PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT

All,

Attached, please find a draft copy of the letter we intend to sign tomorrow morning to be sent to DOS. This letter has been reviewed by GC Jim Baker, DGC Trisha Anderson, and DGC Greg Brower. As such, please consider making only edits that are critical and necessary, as we're all up against a tough timeline tomorrow.

Please send your comments to us by the end of the day for consideration and/or incorporation.

Thank you,

[Redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[Redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[Redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 6:59 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz
Attachments: Criminal Referral Letter 7-11-2016.pdf

WHAT DO I HAVE TO DO TO GET ON KELLY'S DISTRO?

Bill is out of town. If you're including the OGC UC, include the SCs running the thing, for f*cks sake.

I want to have the neve fit of any comments which comes from it.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 6:55 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 6:46 PM
To: McCabe, Andrew D. (CG) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI); Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI); Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1

The Hill has sent a formal referral on Clinton's testimony to the US Attorneys Office for the District of Columbia (see attached). It is signed by the Chairmen Chaffee and Goodlatte.

Stephen

----- Original message -----

From: "Dockham, Andrew" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 5:23 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Phillips, Channing (USADC)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

b6 -2
b7C -2
b7E -6

[redacted]

[Redacted]
[Redacted] (OLA) (JMD)"
[Redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [Redacted]
[Redacted] (USADC)" [Redacted]

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

Subject: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

Mr. Phillips:

Please see the attached letter from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz.

Thanks,
Andy Dockham

Andrew Dockham
General Counsel
Chairman Jason Chaffetz
Oversight & Government Reform
[Redacted]

b6 -2
b7C -2

Obtained via FOIA by Judicial Watch, Inc.

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

July 11, 2016

The Honorable Channing D. Phillips
U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia
555 Fourth Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Phillips:

We write to request an investigation to determine whether former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton committed perjury and made false statements during her testimony under oath before congressional committees.

While testifying before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on July 7, 2016, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Director James Comey stated the truthfulness of Secretary Clinton's testimony before Congress was not within the scope of the FBI's investigation. Nor had the FBI even considered any of Secretary Clinton's testimony. Director Comey further testified the Department of Justice requires a criminal referral from Congress to initiate an investigation of Secretary Clinton's congressional testimony. We are writing for that purpose.

The evidence collected by the FBI during its investigation of Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email system appears to directly contradict several aspects of her sworn testimony. In light of those contradictions, the Department should investigate and determine whether to prosecute Secretary Clinton for violating statutes that prohibit perjury and false statements to Congress, or any other relevant statutes.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.



Jason Chaffetz
Chairman
Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform

Sincerely,



Bob Goodlatte
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary

The Honorable Loretta E. Lynch
Attorney General of the United States

The Honorable James B. Comey, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 7:35 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Referral from Charmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

Two control freaks who need to learn to let go....;)

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:30 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I feel like we're really close to that scenario too.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:25 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I just worry in a couple weeks time, between whatever OCA and OPA are doing, coupled with whatever OGC comes up with, we'll have no idea whats going on....

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:24 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Maybe. I don't have a lot of experience in perjury cases (happily in this instance) so I have no idea how this usually works...

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:09 PM (GMT-05:00)

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:04 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 7:00 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks.

Until I figure out the magic answer of how to get Jon and me on Kelly and Kortans distro, please forward me any follow up discussion to below.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 6:55 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 6:46 PM
To: McCabe, Andrew D. (CG) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI); Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI); Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

b6 -1
b7C -1

The Hill has sent a formal referral on Clinton's testimony to the US Attorneys Office for the District of Columbia (see attached). It is signed by the Chairmen Chaffee and Goodlatte.

Stephen

--

----- Original message -----

From: "Dockham, Andrew" [redacted]

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

Date: 07/11/2016 5:23 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Phillips, Channing (USADC)" [redacted]

Cc: [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] C (OLA) (JMD)"

[redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

[redacted] (USADC) [redacted]

Subject: Referral from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz

Mr. Phillips:

Please see the attached letter from Chairmen Goodlatte and Chaffetz.

Thanks,
Andy Dockham

Andrew Dockham
General Counsel
Chairman Jason Chaffetz
Oversight & Government Reform
[redacted]

b6 -2
b7C -2

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 6:28 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Comey's Testimony as Precedent - Lawfare

----- Original message -----

From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/11/2016 9:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Comey's Testimony as Precedent - Lawfare

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete: Just so you're aware, I sent the below article to the DD, EAD, and GC tonight - simply advising them that it raises some points worth considering as we make decisions going forward.

As always, thank you for highlighting potential issues for me.

Bill

--

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/08/2016 4:23 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Comey's Testimony as Precedent - Lawfare

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Blessedly quiet. We went thru testimony, will mark up relevant portions and send up on Mon.

----- Original message -----

From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/08/2016 4:14 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Comey's Testimony as Precedent - Lawfare

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks Pete. How have things gone today?

--

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Date: 07/08/2016 4:12 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Priestap, E.W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"

[redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]

Subject: Fwd: Comey's Testimony as Precedent - Lawfare

<https://www.lawfareblog.com/comeys-testimony-precedent>

Comey's Testimony as Precedent

Let me start by saying that I do not dissent from FBI Director James Comey's decision to give the remarkably fulsome account we saw this week of the Hillary Clinton email investigation, both in his lengthy statement Tuesday and, particularly, in his marathon testimony yesterday. Jack has discussed his reasons for doing so. And Comey has too. In his testimony yesterday, he made clear that the extraordinary nature of a criminal investigation of a person who is about to be nominated for President by a major party demanded a degree of transparency that is atypical and that would satisfy reasonable people that the bureau had followed the regular order. That seems right. He was in an impossible position, made far more so by the almost mind-boggling decision of Bill Clinton to publicly compromise the attorney general. Comey's testimony was extraordinary in its candor, both as to his reasoning on his decision not to recommend prosecution and as to the often-minute details of the FBI's findings. To my mind, it was also entirely persuasive.

That said, I think it's important to stress that this is really not the way we want major investigations to be closed out in the future.

There is something horrible about watching a senior government official, who has used the coercive investigative capacities of the federal government, make public judgments about a subject's conduct which the Justice Department is not prepared to indict. There is something even more horrible about a hearing in which individual members of Congress feel entitled to pick over the details of that conduct, asking about whether specific questions were asked by the FBI of specific witnesses and subjects and asking whether specific lines of inquiry were followed.

As a general matter, when prosecutors and investigators decline to indict someone, we don't want a report, much less congressional oversight of the unindicted conduct. We want them to shut the heck up.

This point is rooted in important civil liberties concerns. We don't give the FBI the power to investigate people so that it can report on their characters or behavior, so that the FBI director can pronounce on the truthfulness of their public utterances (which Comey endeavored not to do and yet inevitably did repeatedly simply by reporting his findings). And we don't give congressional committees the power of oversight, generally speaking, so that they can review individual prosecutorial decisions by flyspecking the details of the conduct of particular investigations *vis a vis* individual subjects. We give the FBI these powers so that it can investigate crimes. And if the Justice Department is not going to prosecute someone, it generally has no business talking about the conduct of that person's affairs.

Public officials have always tested this norm because we have sometimes used criminal investigations as a proxy to make determinations beyond the strictly prosecutorial: Is the subject fit for office? How should voters think about what this person did? The independent counsel law, as a result, had a

provision for a "final report"—a report which often explained non-prosecution decisions. The Justice Department has sometimes issued similar reports in other matters of great public interest. But I can think of no case in which a chief investigator has gone up to Congress to discuss the details of his investigation, *and investigative findings concerning unindicted individuals*, and spent many hours discussing what conduct was found, what conduct was not found, why he decided not to proceed, and what facts would have had to be different for him to decide otherwise.

As I say, this may well be justified in the specific, extraordinary context of a major party presidential nominee whose conduct was really bad but against whom an indictment would be wrong in an investigation taking place during a presidential campaign in which she is asking for a further investment of public trust. But it is emphatically not the way you want the FBI generally to do business—even in high profile cases involving public figures. Imagine, for example, that the Justice Department had decided not to indict Senator Bob Menendez or former Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell. It would be grossly wrong to issue a major statement on their conduct or about the investigative findings made concerning them. It would be even more wrong for Congress to demand an hours-long Q&A on the juicy details or for the FBI to oblige.

Imagine, conversely, that the FBI and the Justice Department had, after a senator disclosed the contents on 9/11 of US government signals intelligence intercepts concerning the attacks, had sent an investigator up to the Hill to discuss in detail the decision not to bring a criminal case against that senator (who is still in office, by the way). It would be very wrong. Once the Justice Department decides it's not going to prosecute someone for something, it has no business talking about that person's behavior.

Comey himself acknowledged the potential slippery slope at one point, noting that his testimony and transparency in this instance was a precedent he hoped to confine to similar circumstances in the future—and that he expected those to be rare, if not a null set. I hope very much he and his successors are able to do that. It would be a terrible thing if the costs of FBI investigation for the unindicted were a kind public truth commission in which the conduct of those not prosecuted gets publicly judged by the executive branch and any committee with jurisdiction to demand answers from it.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 3:55 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

I'm fine with this version. Thanks, Pete

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 9:20 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT/DELIBERATIVE PROCESS PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT

Here's a revised version of the TPs. I worked from the draft that included visible comments and edits from both Pete and [redacted]. Adding Pete and Moffa to this chain so they can also review if they wish.

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

I welcome any and all edits – let me know if you want me to make further changes, or if you want to take the pen, please advise the group so we're not working on competing documents. Once we have a final draft, we will need to show it to the GC and then the EAD/DD for approval.

Thanks,

[redacted]

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 7:56 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Makes sense. I haven't updated the TPs since Pete provided comments. I defer to everyone else here on how to handle incorporating the comments. Thanks.

...

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6
FBI (18-cv-154)-7057

Date: 07/12/2016 7:47 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"

Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

Subject: TPs

Lisa and [redacted]

Have either of you made further revisions to the TPs I circulated on Friday? I know we have comments from Pete (which he sent on Sunday night) and that [redacted] has sent comments to Pete and Moffa, which may or may not have been included in the version Pete sent out on Sunday.

At tonight's wrap up with the EAD, Steinbach announced that the DD had instructed the EADs that they would be receiving hard copies only of the TPs, which were to be used only in response to questions from the workforce. Steinbach also indicated that the DD would be handing out said hard copies tomorrow. I'm happy to incorporate Pete's comments (and [redacted] which she sent to me just now), but I wanted to make sure that I wasn't duplicating efforts that you've already completed.

Hopefully this makes sense. Please let me know if you'd like me to take a stab at them, or if I should stand down.

Also, FYI, Jim Baker asked [redacted] if he could see a copy of the TPs before they are given to the EADs. I also assume we will want to clear them one more time with Pete and Moffa before even giving them to Jim.

Thanks,
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 4:13 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Hey I have at least one comment, please standby

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 9:20 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT/DELIBERATIVE PROCESS PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT

Here's a revised version of the TPs. I worked from the draft that included visible comments and edits from both Pete and [redacted]. Adding Pete and Moffa to this chain so they can also review if they wish.

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1



I welcome any and all edits – let me know if you want me to make further changes, or if you want to take the pen, please advise the group so we're not working on competing documents. Once we have a final draft, we will need to show it to the GC and then the EAD/DD for approval.

Thanks,
[redacted]

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 7:56 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Makes sense. I haven't updated the TPs since Pete provided comments. I defer to everyone else here on how to handle incorporating the comments. Thanks.

...

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Date: 07/12/2016 7:47 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Page Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"

Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

Subject: TPs

Lisa and [redacted]

Have either of you made further revisions to the TPs I circulated on Friday? I know we have comments from Pete (which he sent on Sunday night) and that [redacted] has sent comments to Pete and Moffa, which may or may not have been included in the version Pete sent out on Sunday.

b6 -1
b7C -1

At tonight's wrap up with the EAD, Steinbach announced that the DD had instructed the EADs that they would be receiving hard copies only of the TPs, which were to be used only in response to questions from the workforce. Steinbach also indicated that the DD would be handing out said hard copies tomorrow. I'm happy to incorporate Pete's comments (and [redacted] which she sent to me just now), but I wanted to make sure that I wasn't duplicating efforts that you've already completed.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Hopefully this makes sense. Please let me know if you'd like me to take a stab at them, or if I should stand down.

Also, FYI, Jim Baker asked [redacted] if he could see a copy of the TPs before they are given to the EADs. I also assume we will want to clear them one more time with Pete and Moffa before even giving them to Jim.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks,
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 4:29 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs
Attachments: MYE TPs 13 July 2016 pps edits.docx

b6 -1
b7C -1

Here you go. Changes made to [redacted]

b5 -1

Thanks,
Pete

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 9:20 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT/DELIBERATIVE PROCESS PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT

Here's a revised version of the TPs. I worked from the draft that included visible comments and edits from both Pete and [redacted]. Adding Pete and Moffa to this chain so they can also review if they wish.

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

I welcome any and all edits --let me know if you want me to make further changes, or if you want to take the pen, please advise the group so we're not working on competing documents. Once we have a final draft, we will need to show it to the GC and then the EAD/DD for approval.

Thanks,
[redacted]

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 7:56 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Makes sense. I haven't updated the TPs since Pete provided comments. I defer to everyone else here on how to handle incorporating the comments. Thanks.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]

Date: 07/12/2016 7:47 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"

Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

Subject: TPs

Lisa and [redacted]

Have either of you made further revisions to the TPs I circulated on Friday? I know we have comments from Pete (which he sent on Sunday night) and that [redacted] has sent comments to Pete and Moffa, which may or may not have been included in the version Pete sent out on Sunday.

At tonight's wrap up with the EAD, Steinbach announced that the DD had instructed the EADs that they would be receiving hard copies only of the TPs, which were to be used only in response to questions from the workforce. Steinbach also indicated that the DD would be handing out said hard copies tomorrow. I'm happy to incorporate Pete's comments (and [redacted] which she sent to me just now), but I wanted to make sure that I wasn't duplicating efforts that you've already completed.

Hopefully this makes sense. Please let me know if you'd like me to take a stab at them, or if I should stand down.

Also, FYI, Jim Baker asked [redacted] if he could see a copy of the TPs before they are given to the EADs. I also assume we will want to clear them one more time with Pete and Moffa before even giving them to Jim.

Thanks,

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 9:51 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs - Clean copy

Thanks for these...

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 9:14 AM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: TPs - Clean copy

----- Original message -----

From: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/14/2016 9:01 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted]
Subject: RE: TPs - Clean copy

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I just talked to the D, DD, ADD, Mike S. and Jim R. about the TPs. They are all ok with them in concept

[redacted]

b5 -3

They also asked us to prepare a one-page, very high level version for internal use by the SACs-- can someone take a crack at that?

Thanks.

jim

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 8:13 AM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: TPs - Clean copy

b6 -1
b7C -1

Here are my comments on top of Trisha's. Thanks.

jim

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 7:20 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Subject: FW: TPs - Clean copy
Importance: High

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted] - Jim passed these along to me late last night. I have some specific comments/edits reflected in the attached.

Thanks,
Trisha

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 10:01 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: TPs - Clean copy

b6 -1
b7C -1

I will review but I assume that you have seen this.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Date: 07/13/2016 6:53 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)"
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: FW: TPs - Clean copy

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Jim,

Please find attached the clean version of the MYE talking points, which incorporates edits from the team. I welcome any and all comments or edits you may have.

I have also copied Lisa and [redacted] so they can provide them to the DD when you clear. FYI, as noted below, EADs Steinbach and Skule are anxious to have them ASAP, but we want the DD to clear first.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 6:49 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: TPs - Clean copy

b6 -1
b7C -1

All,

Here is a clean draft of the talking points, with all of Pete and [redacted] edits included, and with the DD's caveat at the top. Please take a look and let me know if you see any issues.

b6 -1
b7C -1

I will also send these to Jim Baker for his awareness, per his request. If you all need to clear me

I will also send these to JIM BAKER for his awareness, per his request. If you do not see any, my understanding is that the DD will provide these to the EADs for use consistent with the caveat.

FYI, EAD Steinbach has asked for these ASAP on behalf of EAD Skule, who is apparently visiting the Tampa FO tomorrow.

Thank you all for your help with these.



b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 12:01 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: SVTC

Hey just heard from Brian Brooks about a 3:00PM SVTC. I told [redacted] same via email just now and asked if it would make sense for me to attend as CD rep...I don't know if Brian is attending, I'm calling him now.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 8:22 AM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: New confirmed classified numbers

b6 -1
b7C -1

Yeah i think that's fine. We anticipated and i think everyone is aware that number would shift as the process went forward.

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/15/2016 8:17 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: New confirmed classified numbers

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I just talked to [redacted] Yesterday she reviewed some additional USDS classification determinations (which I'm not sure we've received via email) and identified additional confirmed classified emails beyond the numbers presented in the Director's statements.

[redacted]

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4

I assume you guys may want to get that info up the chain at some point, but I would recommend waiting a couple of hours so we can really lock down the details. This is going to be an ongoing thing I guess since there are still determination requests out there...

3

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 5:51 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd [redacted]

b7E -4

Below is from SDNY

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/15/2016 5:38 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

Gentlemen,
As per our conversation earlier - below is the impression SDNY received from yesterday's meeting.
Thanks,

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] USANYS [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 6:26 PM
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted] (NY) (FBI)" [redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
Cc: [redacted] (NY) (FBI)" [redacted] (NY) (FBI)" [redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

Hi guys - great news, our understanding is that FBIHQ gave us the green light [redacted]

[redacted]

b5 -1
b7E -4

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 5:57 PM
To: [redacted] (NY) (FBI)" [redacted] (USANYS) [redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
Cc: [redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

[redacted]

Good evening.

[redacted]

b5 -1
b7E -4

Have a good night.

Best,

[Redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 6:54 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: NY CD evidence questions

Thank you for this. I did.

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/15/2016 6:03 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: NY CD evidence questions

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Please remove me from the chain, then feel free to forward if necessary.

----- Original message -----

From: "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/15/2016 5:59 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Toscas, George (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted]
Cc: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Hess, Amy S. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: NY CD evidence questions

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

George:

I understand that despite my best efforts, there is still some confusion about my final decision regarding the evidence question in the NY CD case. To be clear, I have given you my final approval to use the evidence, in unreacted form if necessary, to support the most rigorous prosecution of this case. If we end up going to trial, I expect that we will make some effort to protect a few sensitive facts from the slide deck. However, if those efforts fail, we will go forward utilizing the evidence in the prosecution as necessary, consistent with all relevant judicial orders.

Please convey this along to your team to ensure nothing has been lost in translation. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks

Andrew G. McCabe
Deputy Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
W [redacted]
M [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:01 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

Thank you

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:00 AM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

No. I emailed Andy about it about 20 minutes ago.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/18/2016 8:54 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
[redacted]
Subject: FW: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Do you know if anyone got her an answer?

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 5:05 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thank you, sir.

To all, should we provide any additional information to FactCheck.org or would any updates more appropriately be give directly to Congress?

Thank you.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 4:27 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

The answer to the reporters two questions follows. Again, I defer to 7th floor as to whether to release to this reporter or in another manner.

[redacted]

b5 -1
b7E -4

Any questions, please let us know.

Thanks,
Pete

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
 Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 2:02 PM
 To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
 Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
 Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Understood. I did go back to the writer and told him we wouldn't be able to get back to him by midday today but are looking at his inquiry.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
 Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 1:58 PM
 To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
 Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
 Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

We're looking in to it and will get back to you this afternoon; the answer may require some tweaking, the question is whether this is the forum to do it.

Thanks,
Pete

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted]
 Date: 07/13/2016 10:41 AM (GMT-05:00)
 To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted]
 Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)"; [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] (NY) (FBI) [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Subject: FW: Media questions/Clinton's emails

Hello all,

We got a media inquiry from FactCheck.org. [redacted]

b5 -1

[redacted] but is there anything we want to clarify about the Director comments he mentions?

The writer asked to hear back by midday today. I have had some major IT issues so unfortunately I am slow getting this to you.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Eugene Kiely [mailto:eugene.kiely@factcheck.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 3:29 PM
To: NFO
Subject: Media questions/Clinton's emails

I'm hoping that you can clear up some inconsistencies in two statements made by Director Comey at his July 7 House testimony and statements made by others regarding Secretary Clinton's emails.

First, I'm trying to determine if the director misspoke when he said that Clinton did not give her lawyers any instructions on deleting emails, because she has said that it was her decision to delete her personal emails.

I'm referring to this exchange with Rep. Jim Jordan:

Jordan: Did Secretary Clinton know her legal team deleted those emails that they kept from us?

Comey: I don't believe so.

Jordan: Did Secretary Clinton approved those emails being deleted?

Comey: I don't think there was any specific instruction or conversation between the secretary and her lawyers about that.

Jordan: Did you ask that question?

Comey: Yes.

I believe that he may be wrong, or perhaps there is another explanation. I ask because Clinton has said that she decided not to keep the emails. In her March 10, 2015, press conference, she said: "We went through a thorough process to identify all of my work-related emails and deliver them to the State Department. At the end, I chose not to keep my private personal emails — emails about planning Chelsea's wedding or my mother's funeral arrangements, condolence notes to friends as well as yoga routines, family vacations, the other things you typically find in inboxes. No one wants their personal emails made public, and I think most people understand that and respect that privacy."

Later in that same press conference she said again, "In going through the e-mails, there were over 60,000 in total, sent and received. About half were work-related and went to the State Department and about half were personal that were not in any way related to my work. I had no reason to save them, but that was my decision because the federal guidelines are clear and the State Department request was clear."

On its website, the Clinton campaign says:

Why did Clinton decide not to keep her personal emails?

As Clinton has said before, these were private, personal messages, including emails about her

daughter's wedding plans, her mother's funeral services and condolence notes, as well as emails on family vacations, yoga routines, and other items one would typically find in their own email account, such as offers from retailers, spam, etc.

Did Clinton delete any emails while facing a subpoena?

No. As noted, the emails that Clinton chose not to keep were personal emails—they were not federal records or even work-related—and therefore were not subject to any preservation obligation under the Federal Records Act or any request. Nor would they have been subject to the subpoena—which did not exist at the time—that was issued by the Benghazi Select Committee some three months later.

I know he said "I don't think" and "I don't believe so" when answering the questions, suggesting he wasn't sure. Can you check and get me a definitive answer?

Secondly, Director Comey said he thinks that there were three emails with "portion markings" indicating classified information. The State Department says it knows of two, not three, but that may be because the FBI had access to emails that the State Department did not. The director told Rep. Trey Gowdy, "There were a small number of portion markings on **I think** three of the documents." Later, he seemed more definitive when he spoke to Rep. Cartwright and he said, "There were three e-mails, the 'C' was in the body, in the text, but there was no header on the email or in the text." I just want to confirm the actual number of emails with such markings.

As for my deadline, I would appreciate getting a response by midday tomorrow.

Thank you,

Eugene Kiely
Director, FactCheck.org
202 South 36th Street,
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215-898-2372
@factcheckdotorg

[Help us hold politicians accountable. Donate to FactCheck.org](#)

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:07 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

Thanks. I see he f*cking figured out to add Trisha but Jon and I are still elusive...I mean, c'mon.

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

----- Original message -----

From: "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/18/2016 8:59 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted], "Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted], "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted], "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted], "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted], [redacted] (OGC) (FBI), [redacted] (DO) (FBI), "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted], [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

We received the attached letter for Chairman Ron Johnson of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee seeking additional details regarding the email matter. The letter has 13 specific questions and asks for significant details about the investigation, nearly all of which would be answered by disclosure of the LHM and the classified e-mails. I expect we can respond consistent with the plan for other letters. Please let me know if you have any questions.

- Stephen
Stephen D. Kelly
Assistant Director
Office of Congressional Affairs
Federal Bureau of Investigation
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:17 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

Thank you

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI); Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

b6 -1
b7C -1

Adding Jon and Pete.

----- Original message -----

From: "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/18/2016 8:59 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: HRC Letter from Chairman Johnson

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

We received the attached letter for Chairman Ron Johnson of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee seeking additional details regarding the email matter. The letter has 13 specific questions and asks for significant details about the investigation, nearly all of which would be answered by disclosure of the LHM and the classified e-mails. I expect we can respond consistent with the plan for other letters. Please let me know if you have any questions.

- Stephen
Stephen D. Kelly
Assistant Director
Office of Congressional Affairs
Federal Bureau of Investigation
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 10:02 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Lisa Caroline? Very [redacted] sounding. Fits right in at the country club. ☺

Separately, do you have a tentative time this week that the DD might want to meet to go through the proposed redactions? I know Wed was discussed. The (superstar [redacted] OGC atty wants to know how much time she has to go through the 302s.

b7E -4

Thanks

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:27 AM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

I emailed Andy about 45 minutes ago about it. Figured it wasn't worth bothering him over the weekend.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted]
Date: 07/18/2016 9:21 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"; [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm not sure if anyone cleared an answer for her. Lisa Caroline may know more.

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 8:55 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Do you know if anyone got her an answer?

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 5:05 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thank you, sir.

To all, should we provide any additional information to FactCheck.org or would any updates more appropriately be give directly to Congress?

Thank you.

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 4:27 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

The answer to the reporters two questions follows. Again, I defer to 7th floor as to whether to release to this reporter or in another manner.

[Large redacted area]

b5 -1
b7E -4

Any questions, please let us know.

Thanks,
Pete

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 2:02 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

Understood. I did go back to the writer and told him we wouldn't be able to get back to him by midday today but are looking at his inquiry.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 1:58 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CTD) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

We're looking in to it and will get back to you this afternoon, the answer may require some tweaking, the question is whether this is the forum to do it.
Thabks

b6 -1
b7C -1

Pete

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
 Date: 07/13/2016 10:41 AM (GMT-05:00)
 To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
 Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
 (CTD) (FBI) [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
 [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (NY) (FBI)" [redacted]
 Subject: FW: Media questions/Clinton's emails

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hello all,

We got a media inquiry from FactCheck.org. [redacted]
 [redacted] but is there anything we want to clarify about the Director comments he mentions?

b5 -1

The writer asked to hear back by midday today. I have had some major IT issues so unfortunately I am slow getting this to you.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

 From: Eugene Kiely [mailto:eugene.kiely@factcheck.org]
 Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2016 3:29 PM
 To: NPO
 Subject: Media questions/Clinton's emails

I'm hoping that you can clear up some inconsistencies in two statements made by Director Comey at his July 7 House testimony and statements made by others regarding Secretary Clinton's emails.

First, I'm trying to determine if the director misspoke when he said that Clinton did not give her lawyers any instructions on deleting emails, because she has said that it was her decision to delete her personal emails.

I'm referring to this exchange with Rep. Jim Jordan:

- Jordan:** Did Secretary Clinton know her legal team deleted those emails that they kept from us?
- Comey:** I don't believe so.
- Jordan:** Did Secretary Clinton approved those emails being deleted?
- Comey:** I don't think there was any specific instruction or conversation between the secretary and her lawyers about that.
- Jordan:** Did you ask that question?
- Comey:** Yes.

I believe that he may be wrong, or perhaps there is another explanation. I ask because Clinton has said that she decided not to keep the emails. In her March 10, 2015, press conference, she said: "We went through a thorough process to identify all of my work-related emails and deliver them to the State Department. At the end, I chose not to keep my private personal emails — emails about planning Chelsea's wedding or my mother's funeral arrangements, condolence notes to friends as well as vlogs

routines, family vacations, the other things you typically find in inboxes. No one wants their personal emails made public, and I think most people understand that and respect that privacy."

Later in that same press conference she said again, "In going through the e-mails, there were over 60,000 in total, sent and received. About half were work-related and went to the State Department and about half were personal that were not in any way related to my work. **I had no reason to save them, but that was my decision** because the federal guidelines are clear and the State Department request was clear."

On its website, the Clinton campaign says:

Why did Clinton decide not to keep her personal emails?

As Clinton has said before, these were private, personal messages, including emails about her daughter's wedding plans, her mother's funeral services and condolence notes, as well as emails on family vacations, yoga routines, and other items one would typically find in their own email account, such as offers from retailers, spam, etc.

Did Clinton delete any emails while facing a subpoena?

No. As noted, the emails that Clinton chose not to keep were personal emails—they were not federal records or even work-related—and therefore were not subject to any preservation obligation under the Federal Records Act or any request. Nor would they have been subject to the subpoena—which did not exist at the time—that was issued by the Benghazi Select Committee some three months later.

I know he said "I don't think" and "I don't believe so" when answering the questions, suggesting he wasn't sure. Can you check and get me a definitive answer?

Secondly, Director Comey said he thinks that there were three emails with "portion markings" indicating classified information. The State Department says it knows of two, not three, but that may be because the FBI had access to emails that the State Department did not. The director told Rep. Trey Gowdy, "There were a small number of portion markings on **I think** three of the documents." Later, he seemed more definitive when he spoke to Rep. Cartwright and he said, "There were three e-mails, the 'C' was in the body, in the text, but there was no header on the email or in the text." I just want to confirm the actual number of emails with such markings.

As for my deadline, I would appreciate getting a response by midday tomorrow.

Thank you,

Eugene Kiely
Director, FactCheck.org
202 South 36th Street,
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215-898-2372
@factcheckdotorg

[Help us hold politicians accountable. Donate to FactCheck.org](#)

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 6:21 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Berger was suit left breast pocket. Socks story was speculation by NARA personnel. Still tracking down original JJ/Katrina info.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/20/2016 5:20 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hi Pete,

Just checking to see if you are good with the Berger and JJ Smith facts - any updates?

We have a request from EAD Coleman for a copy of the TPs in advance of a trip to the Dallas FO. I'd like to get these back to Jim Baker so we can clear them for EAD use as needed.

Also, if anyone else on the team has any comments on the EAD talking points of the SAC one-pager, please let me know ASAP.

Thanks,

[redacted]

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 10:24 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

b6 -1
b7C -1

Will do. Petraeus is accurate, still tracking down Berger and JJ/Katrina

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/18/2016 9:20 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

(OGC) (FBI)
Cc: (DO) (FBI) (DO) (FBI)

Subject RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

Thanks, Pete.

That language includes an edit from Jim Baker [redacted] so I think [redacted]

b5 -1, 3

One follow-up question from the longer (EAD) version of the TPs – can you please confirm that the facts listed under the Berger, Petraeus and JJ Smith cases are correct? Jim specifically asked about that (even though we told him that the document had been cleared by the team). A simple “yes” is all I need.

Thanks,

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 9:04 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1

Looks good. Only question I have – which is minor – is the final statement [redacted]
Do we [redacted] I think [redacted]

Thanks, Pete

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 4:20 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points - one pager for SACs

b6 -1
b7C -1

All,

Attached is the draft one-pager for SACs. Please review and let me know what you think.

Thanks,

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 4:15 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points (again)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Ugh. This time with the attachment. Sorry.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 4:14 PM

b6 -1
b7C -1

To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: Talking Points (again)

b6 -1
b7C -1

All,

Please see the attached (and hopefully) final version of the MYE talking points, which includes some edits from Trisha and Jim. Please make one last review for accuracy, and clear as soon as possible.

Also, to satisfy a question from Jim Baker, could you please confirm that the facts listed under the Berger, Petraeus, and JJ Smith cases are correct?

Finally, FYI, Jim also asked (per a conversation this morning with the D, DD, ADD, Steinbach and Rybicki) that we prepare a one-pager appropriate for use by SACs (again, to answer questions from their FOs, and not for external engagement). [redacted] has taken a crack at that, which I am reviewing now and will share with this group later today. (Sorry)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks so much.

[redacted]

[redacted]

Special Counsel to the EAD
National Security Branch
Federal Bureau of Investigation

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 12:34 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points (again)

b6 -1
b7C -1

OK, we're good with Petraeus and Berger as of last night. Only change I'd make on JJ/Katrina is that [redacted]

b5 -1

[Large redacted block]

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 4:15 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Talking Points (again)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Ugh. This time with the attachment. Sorry.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: Talking Points (again)

b6 -1
b7C -1

All,

Please see the attached (and hopefully) final version of the MYE talking points, which includes some edits from Trisha and Jim. Please make one last review for accuracy, and clear as soon as possible.

Also, to satisfy a question from Jim Baker, could you please confirm that the facts listed under the Berger, Petraeus, and JJ Smith cases are correct?

Finally, FYI, Jim also asked (per a conversation this morning with the D, DD, ADD, Steinbach and Rybicki) that we prepare a one-pager appropriate for use by SACs (again, to answer questions from their FQs, and not for external engagement). [redacted] has taken a crack at that, which I am reviewing now and will share with this group later today. (Sorry)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks so much.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

Special Counsel to the EAD
National Security Branch

Federal Bureau of Investigation



b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:38 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Yep

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/21/2016 2:33 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hey guys. Could we find some time to meet tomorrow to check in on where things are, and talk about the latest referral? I can do pretty much any time beside 3:30-4:30. Would 2:00 work?

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:45 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Let's do yours. Mine tends to get to 100 degrees in the afternoon. Unless you all want warm. If you want warm, I've got warm...

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/21/2016 2:43 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete's office? Mine?

From: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

I'll make it work, so 2pm it is...

1

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:39 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Well if 2:00 also works for Jon let's plan on meeting then and you can join us (or not) when you return. That work?

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:37 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

That should work. I have an MOU meeting at DOS tomorrow at 11:30 so hopefully I'm back by 2.

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:33 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Hey guys. Could we find some time to meet tomorrow to check in on where things are, and talk about the latest referral? I can do pretty much any time beside 3:30-4:30. Would 2:00 work?

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 8:04 AM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Perfect thanks.

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 7:29 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I just sent you guys (on fbinet) the table I built containing all of the relevant references in the testimony I identified from all of the transcripts for the latest referral. Hopefully everyone can take a look before we meet since there may be additions from your perspectives and I think it can be a framework for us to talk about it.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:57 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Me, too.

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:55 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Fine w/ me

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/21/2016 5:49 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hi, sorry for the delay, just got out of wrap. I have a meeting at 3:30. Want to split the difference, move up to 1:36? Then hopefully Moffa can be there for the first half [redacted] or the second?

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:27 PM

To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

I have late duty so I'm here till 7. Whatever you guys wanna do is fine with me.

From: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:27 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

I defer to you guys. I should be good after 3pm, but I realize late in the day on a Friday is never a good time to talk, so if you guys can only do it at 2pm, please don't hesitate to push on without me...

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:23 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

My morning is booked, afternoon is free...

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/21/2016 5:03 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted], "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted], "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm flexible. The only thing I have is the 11:30 meeting at State.

From: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 5:01 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

I apologize but the AD just scheduled an hour long meeting with me (and DAD Corsi) from 2pm-3pm tomorrow, so now I can't do 2pm. Do we have flexibility to try to readjust for another time? If not, I'll forward an email with what I have tomorrow morning on the latest referral and the status on the things I was tracking and you guys can carry on without me. I don't want to hold you up...

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:46 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Mine is fine.

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:45 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1

Let's do yours. Mine tends to get to 100 degrees in the afternoon. Unless you all want warm. If you want warm, I've got warm...

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/21/2016 2:43 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted], "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete's office? Mine?

From: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Meet tomorrow?

b6
b7C

I'll make it work, so 2pm it is...

;

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: Accepted: Meet re referral
Location: Lisa's office

Start: Monday, July 25, 2016 2:30 PM
End: Monday, July 25, 2016 3:30 PM

Recurrence: {none}

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

When: Jul 25, 2016 2:30:00 PM
Where: Lisa's office

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:04 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call next week

b6 -1
b7C -1

is high level participation necessary? is George planning on participating? My sense is you're quite able to represent the FBI.

FYI, I tried calling George on NSTS and open line, no luck

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:44 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Call next week

b6 -1
b7C -1

FYI

From: [redacted] (NSD) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:38 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)
Subject: FW: Call next week

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

[redacted]

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

See below. I am flexible on Monday and Tuesday. [redacted] can chime in with her availability. It is my understanding that Toscas may have called over to Jim or Trisha regarding some high-level participation for at least the first few such calls. I am happy to discuss further but wanted to send you this so you could raise within OGC and give me a sense of scheduling options. I am around if you want to talk.

Thanks

[redacted]

b6 -2, 3
b7C -2, 3

From: Hal Brewster [mailto:hbrewster@wilkinsonwalsh.com]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:18 PM
To: [redacted] (NSD); [redacted] (NSD)
Cc: Beth Wilkinson; Alexandra Walsh [redacted]
Subject: Call next week

[redacted] and [redacted]

b6 -1, 2, 3
b7C -1, 2, 3

We wanted to follow up on our conversation from a few days ago. We would like to schedule a time to speak with both you and [redacted] early next week. Is there a time on Monday or Tuesday that could work on your end?

Thanks-
Hal

Hal Brewster | Associate

WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP
1900 M Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Direct: (202) 847-4037 | Fax: (202) 847-4005
hbrawster@wilkinsonwalsh.com
www.wilkinsonwalsh.com

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged and constitute protected work product, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Wilkinson Walsh + Eskovitz LLP. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 5:52 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Call next week

Fyi below. Well at a minimum I take that as a sanction to call George

----- Original message -----

From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:39 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call next week

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete: Thank you, and I agree with you on both fronts. My guess is that George will not change his behavior, but thank you for trying. Let me know if it continues, as I can always again try to get the DD to refer the issues to us. Bill

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:13 PM
To: Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Call next week

b6 -1
b7C -1

Bill, FYI below. [redacted]

[redacted]

b5 -2, 3
b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

Pete

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:10 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call next week

b6 -1
b7C -1

You are perfectly competent to speak to the legal obligations and FBI policy/procedures. We should NOT be treating opposing counsel this way. We would not in any other case.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:09 PM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Subject: FW: Call next week

More....I guess this is [redacted] rationale for why we need to have the GC on the call to discuss the fact that we will be following all of our legal obligations and FBI policies/procedures with regard to the disposition of the materials in this case.

b6 -2
b7C -2

From: [redacted] (NSD) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:54 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)
Subject: RE: Call next week

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

Got it. If you can check in with them, I would appreciate it.

In the meantime, I'll tell Hal that we will certainly schedule a call and will get back to him as to timing. Since he knows Beth personally, it could be useful to have Jim on the phone if she is going to be haranguing us re: the laptops.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:46 PM
To: [redacted] (NSD)
Cc: [redacted] (NSD)
Subject: RE: Call next week

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

Thanks [redacted] I will be leaving around 4 on Monday, but other than that, I can make myself available. If we need to have Trisha and/or Jim on this call, it will certainly make scheduling more difficult.

b6 -2
b7C -2

From: [redacted] (NSD) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:38 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)
Subject: FW: Call next week

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

[redacted]

See below. I am flexible on Monday and Tuesday. [redacted] can chime in with her availability. It is my understanding that Toscas may have called over to Jim or Trisha regarding some high-level participation for at least the first few such calls. I am happy to discuss further but wanted to send you this so you could raise within OGC and give me a sense of scheduling options. I am around if you want to talk.

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

Thanks,
[redacted]

b6 -2
b7C -2

From: Hal Brewster [mailto:hbrewster@wilkinsonwalsh.com]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 2:18 PM
To: [redacted] (NSD) [redacted] (NSD)
Cc: Beth Wilkinson; Alexandra Walsh; [redacted]
Subject: Call next week

b6 -2, 3
b7C -2, 3

[redacted] an [redacted]

We wanted to follow up on our conversation from a few days ago. We would like to schedule a time to speak with both you and [redacted] early next week. Is there a time on Monday or Tuesday that could work on your end?

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

Thanks-

Hal

Hal Brewster | Associate
WILKINSON WALSH + ESKOVITZ LLP
1900 M Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Direct: (202) 847-4037 | Fax: (202) 847-4005
hbrewster@wilkinsonwalsh.com
www.wilkinsonwalsh.com

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged and constitute protected work product, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Wilkinson Walsh + Eskovitz LLP. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return email and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 6:10 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Good; I called him earlier and we talked as well, he told me the same, I can fill you in. Sorry you've got late duty....

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 6:02 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Just talked to [redacted] He's telling me that George dreamed this up, and he thinks it's probably better to have a call at our level. He's more concerned about the message than the people on the call. We're going to touch base on Monday after we've both had a chance to get more info from Jim/George.

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 5:30 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

I might mention to Jim. I continue to strongly disagree with his participation.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:27 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Sigh....

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Got it. George asked me to participate if possible, so maybe I can join this one and then see where we are at.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:54 PM

To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Also, we may want to discuss whether it really makes sense for you to participate (instead of holding you in reserve in case it's necessary). The call is not with Beth but with a different lawyer at her firm.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Yes, we are aware of it. [redacted] and [redacted] have been discussing with CES and Fed Programs. We can discuss further Monday.

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:45 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Trisha, Greg, and [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

I forgot to mention today that George Toscas called me last night to ask me to participate in a call with counsel on Mid-Year early next week. The counsel want to discuss with us the disposition of the materials from the investigation. Are you all aware of this issue? Apparently there was a call with Fed Programs earlier this week on this topic.

Let's discuss early Monday.

Thanks.

Jim

From: Toscas, George (NSD) [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 3:49 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)
Subject: [POSSIBLE-THREAT] Call with counsel

b6 -2
b7C -2
b7E -6

Jim: As discussed last night, I am looping you in with [redacted] directly. Sounds like the first call(s) with counsel could occur on Monday or Tuesday. If you could loop in your assistant for scheduling [redacted] can work with them to schedule a time for the call(s), with a little lead-time for prep. Thanks again.

b6 -2
b7C -2

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 9:02 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Priestap, E. W. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

I will tell George categorically that [redacted] was aware in advance of the production to State. I reminded [redacted] of that this evening.

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 8:58 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I spoke with Jim a little earlier. I explained [redacted]

[Large redacted block]

b5 -1, 3
b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

Anyway, he said he appreciated the call and would give it some thought. I also offered that if he felt badly about backing down from what he told George, Trisha would be acceptable, but still was entirely unnecessary. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Lisa

----- Original message -----

From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:42 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Lisa: When you speak to him, please tell him that I also believe it is unnecessary, and please let me know the outcome of your conversation. Thx, Bill

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 6:07 PM

SENT: Friday, July 22, 2016 5:37 PM

To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

I'm planning to. I agree, I find his participation wholly unnecessary.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:30 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Lisa/Bill, can you talk to him? This is wrong.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:27 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Got it. George asked me to participate if possible, so maybe I can join this one and then see where we are at.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:54 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Also, we may want to discuss whether it really makes sense for you to participate (instead of holding you in reserve in case it's necessary). The call is not with Beth but with a different lawyer at her firm.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Yes, we are aware of [redacted] and [redacted] have been discussing with CES and Fed Programs. We can discuss further Monday.

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)

Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:45 PM

To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)

Cc: [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI)

Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Trisha, Greg, and [REDACTED]

I forgot to mention today that George Toscas called me last night to ask me to particip

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 9:55 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

I know; it's very frustrating. I talked at length with [redacted] and as best I can tell it was his feeling out of the loop (following a week he was on leave, in an environment where a lot of new actors we don't control are participating), coupled with a strong desire not to be yelled at by opposing counsel. Truly,

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

I called George without success this afternoon and will try again on Monday. Maybe I'll just call [redacted]

[redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 9:33 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

(-Bill)

We spend entirely too much time in this case soothing [redacted] hurt feelings. I cannot believe that a grown man, a professional adult, continues to tattle. AND IT WORKS. Seriously....I am completely bewildered that this goes on in a professional workplace. And then he calls MY professionalism (and the FBI's) into question.

b6 -2
b7C -2

Alright, rant over.

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 8:58 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I spoke with Jim a little earlier. I explained to him our collective concerns, [redacted]

b5 -1
b6 -2
b7C -2

b5 -1
b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

Anyway, he said he appreciated the call and would give it some thought. I also offered that if he felt badly about backing down from what he told George, Trisha would be acceptable, but still was entirely unnecessary. Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks.

Lisa

----- Original message -----

From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:42 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Lisa: When you speak to him, please tell him that I also believe it is unnecessary, and please let me know the outcome of your conversation. Thx, Bill

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 5:37 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

I'm planning to. I agree, I find his participation wholly unnecessary.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:30 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Lisa/Bill, can you talk to him? This is wrong.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/22/2016 5:27 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:55 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Got it. George asked me to participate if possible, so maybe I can join this one and then see where we are at.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:54 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Also, we may want to discuss whether it really makes sense for you to participate (instead of holding you in reserve in case it's necessary). The call is not with Beth but with a different lawyer at her firm.

From: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:52 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Yes, we are aware of it [redacted] and [redacted] have been discussing with CES and Fed Programs. We can discuss further Monday.

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2016 4:45 PM
To: Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Brower, Gregory (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Call with counsel

b6 -1
b7C -1

Trisha, Greg, and [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

I forgot to mention today that George Tascas called me last night to ask me to particip

Microsoft Outlook

Subject: Meeting Forward Notification: Meet re referral
Location: Lisa's office

Start: Monday, July 25, 2016 2:30 PM
End: Monday, July 25, 2016 3:30 PM

Recurrence: {none}

Organizer: Microsoft Outlook
Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. {OGC} {FBI}

Your meeting was forwarded

{OGC} {FBI} has forwarded your meeting request to additional recipients.

Meeting

Meet re referral

Meeting Time

Monday, July 25, 2016 2:30 PM-3:30 PM.

Recipients

{OGC} {FBI}

All times listed are in the following time zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)

Sent by Microsoft Exchange Server 2013

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: Accepted: Chatty chat about CD
Location: Moffa's office

Start: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 11:30 AM
End: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 12:00 PM

Recurrence: {none}

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

When: Jul 27, 2016 11:30:00 AM
Where: Moffa's office

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 5:07 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: AG defensive brief

Hey has the AG defensive brief been scheduled? Probably smart to do that soon in the event it leaks out via Wiki or others....

Peter P. Strzok II
Section Chief
Counterespionage Section (CD4)
FBIHQ

(C)
 (C)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 9:25 AM
To: [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: 10

b6 -1
b7C -1

Can we meet in my office instead?

Peter P. Strzok II
Section Chief
Counterespionage Section (CD4)
FBIHQ

[REDACTED] (O)
[REDACTED] (C)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 7:30 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Chun plea Monday

Aside from the grammar, note info on [redacted] below. Andy's response to that was funny...

b7E -4

----- Original message -----

From: "Evanina, William R. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 6:32 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Chun plea Monday

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -4, 6

Super Tha KS Pete. Much appreciate. Also, spoke to Boone tel [redacted] She gave heads up. Soon after [redacted] called my office. I won't return call till mid next week.

Also, DNI all good with potential Principles on Monday. I will most likely attend with.

Cheers

William Evanina
National Counterintelligence Executive
Director, National Counterintelligence and Security Center (NCSC)

[redacted] work cell

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 29/07/2016 5:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Evanina, William R. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: FW: Chun plea Monday

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Bill, heads up re attached, the plea and attached press release may go as early as this next Monday. Wanted to get you a heads up so you could inform DNI. We have briefed him on this case in the past. There is a chance it doesn't go Monday.

Thanks,
Pete

Peter P. Strzok II

Section Chief
Counterespionage Section (CD4)
FBIHQ



(S)
(S)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 8:09 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

He's funny....

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Date: 07/29/2016 7:48 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm looking into whether this is actually happening. We don't have an invite yet. Please have your folks send the TPs so I have them when needed. Good luck next week. I hope you rise to the occasion. I know it will be a tremendous stretch for you to act as a DAD.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Date: 07/29/2016 7:32 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [REDACTED] (DO) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Subject: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm acting dad next week and am told we have TPs for you if you need them. Also heard from Evanina that Clapper is on board to go and Evanina would likely be his +1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2016 8:57 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 8:56 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

He quoted Lincoln at his farewell. Granted, it's not Churchill, but I give extra marks for the Buy America aspect of it.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 8:42 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Probably smart to include Bob Jones too. I bet he has a lot of wisdom.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 8:08 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I will re TPs. And I've already set up a session with Dina and [redacted] to do a walk thru of my responsibilities on Monday morning.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 7:48 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm looking into whether this is actually happening. We don't have an invite yet. Please have your folks send the TPs so I have them when needed. Good luck next week. I hope you rise to the occasion. I know it will be a tremendous stretch for you to act as a DAD

NOTE: It may be a best practice to check for you to access a link.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/29/2016 7:32 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Potential PC on Mon 3-5

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm acting dad next week and am told we have TPs for you if you need them. Also heard from Evanina that Clapper is on board to go and Evanina would likely be his +1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, July 30, 2016 2:56 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: POC

Yes, probably more relevant

b3 -2
b7E -11

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/30/2016 2:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: POC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] Couldn't hurt, you're there anyway.

b7E -4

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/30/2016 2:19 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: POC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yeah, me too. Think since we're there, we should [redacted]

b3 -2
b7E -11

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/30/2016 2:12 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: POC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I'm pretty excited for you. Jealous, but mostly just excited.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/30/2016 12:58 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: POC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Fyi

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/30/2016 12:55 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
Subject: Fwd: POC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 31, 2016 4:32 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Opening EC

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks. So:

[redacted]

b5 -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/31/2016 4:16 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Opening EC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I like Jon's additions and subtraction.

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/31/2016 3:58 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Opening EC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I would recommend [redacted]

b5 -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/31/2016 3:49 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Opening EC

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hey just realized I need a succinct statement for the opening EC.

To: [redacted]



Comments, please.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:27 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1
b7C -1

I agree [redacted]

b5 -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 2:24 AM (GMT+00:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted], "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

That seems reasonable to me.

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:18 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1
b7C -1

This is FBI only.

[Large redacted block]

b5 -1, 3

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/02/2016 9:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Tosca, George (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted], "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted], "Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted]
[redacted] (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted]
[redacted] (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted], "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

****Deliberative Process Privileged Document****

So, we went from:

[Redacted]

b5 -1, 3

To:

[Redacted]

George, I think I captured your edits, but there were cross-outs that I thought probably needed to be included, so I have the original document if you ultimately need to take a look at it. Just let me know. Thanks all.

Lisa

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 2:21 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: LHM "disclaimer"

Well God, that was easy....)

----- Original message -----

From: "Toscas, George (NSD) [REDACTED]"
Date: 08/03/2016 4:35 AM (GMT+00:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Cc: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [REDACTED]; "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI); [REDACTED] "Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD)" [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] (NSD) (JMD)" [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] (NSD) (JMD)" [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

Looks good. This is consistent with our discussion this afternoon. Thanks.

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

On Aug 2, 2016, at 9:36 PM, Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI) [REDACTED] wrote:

****Deliberative Process Privileged Document****

Actually, looking at this more closely, we think we should change [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] So it would read, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Let us know what you think. Thanks.

b5 -1, 2, 3

Lisa

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2016 9:05 PM
To: Toscas, George (NSD) (JMD); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI); Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD); [REDACTED] (NSD) (JMD); [REDACTED] (NSD) (JMD); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: LHM "disclaimer"

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

****Deliberative Process Privileged Document****

So, we went from [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b5 -1, 3

George, I think I captured your edits, but there were cross-outs that I thought probably needed to be included, so I have the original document if you ultimately need to take a look at it. Just let me know. Thanks all.

Lisa

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: Accepted: MYE congressional response
Location: 7426

Start: Thursday, August 04, 2016 10:30 AM
End: Thursday, August 04, 2016 11:30 AM

Recurrence: {none}

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

When: Aug 4, 2016 10:30:00 AM
Where: 7426

Microsoft Outlook

Subject: Meeting Forward Notification: MYE congressional response
Location: 7426

Start: Thursday, August 04, 2016 10:30 AM
End: Thursday, August 04, 2016 11:30 AM

Recurrence: {none}

Organizer: Microsoft Outlook
Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. {OGC} (FBI)

Your meeting was forwarded

{OGC} (FBI) has forwarded your meeting request to additional recipients.

Meeting

MYE congressional response

Meeting Time

Thursday, August 4, 2016 10:30 AM-11:30 AM.

Recipients

Brower, Gregory {OGC} (FBI)

All times listed are in the following time zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)

Sent by Microsoft Exchange Server 2013

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 7:53 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: FYI

I don't know...give him rope...he already had that Fox News "Sandy Kable, tough but fair is in charge of the investigation" piece. If he does one iota of research on Leopold, he won't seek him out.

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 7:44 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FYI

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Do we need to remind him that the DD has been explicit that media inquiries in this matter are to be routed thru OPA?

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 7:39 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: FYI

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

It's Justin Leopold....

----- Original message -----

From: "Kable, Charles H. (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 7:36 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
Subject: RE: FYI

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Rgr, thanks for the heads up. I'd appreciate it if NSLB/OGC would send me a copy of the FOIA request from Mr. Leopold so I understand the context and tenor of his request.

Thanks,

SK
WFO - Cj
Desk: [redacted]
Mobile: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 6:04 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] >, "Kable, Charles H. (WF) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]

Subject: FYI

Pete and Sandy,

Just FYI - I wanted to inform you both that your names will be released in a FOIA disclosure to Justin Leopold (Vice News) this Friday (08/05/16) in connection to Midyear Exam.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 8:02 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Revised Congressional Letter
Attachments: [Redacted]

b5 -1

[Redacted]

b5 -1

I will try and edit the word doc, since the red lines are in the ineditible pdf

----- Original message -----

From: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [Redacted]
Date: 08/03/2016 6:19 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [Redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
[Redacted] "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [Redacted] "Strzok, Peter P.
(CD) (FBI)" [Redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[Redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [Redacted] "Page, Lisa C.
(OGC) (FBI)" [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Revised Congressional Letter

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

All,

Apologies for the possible second e-mail. It appears several didn't receive the original email and we want to ensure everyone sees the revisions.

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch

[Redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2016 4:06 PM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [Redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Revised Congressional Letter

b6 -1
b7C -1

All,

Attached is a copy (Word and PDF) of the revisions to the Congressional letter template. We are scheduled to meet and discuss a response strategy late tomorrow morning; if possible, please provide any last comments and suggestions to Lisa Page and me by OOB tomorrow morning

(08/04).

Thank you,

[Redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[Redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[Redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 7:25 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: More DNC information to come, says WikiLeaks founder | PBS NewsHour

[redacted] Jon and [redacted] Well I want it to serialize it to the file. Ideally before it breaks publicly. If it's not ready, it's not ready. And we sure as hell better try to get the AG brief done before this breaks.

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/04/2016 7:22 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: More DNC information to come, says WikiLeaks founder | PBS NewsHour

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yes. She wanted [redacted] to have one more look, but there's no reason you couldn't ask her for it.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/04/2016 7:20 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]; [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: More DNC information to come, says WikiLeaks founder | PBS NewsHour

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

A lot of interesting quotes in here. Is Trisha's write up done?

JULIAN ASSANGE, Founder, WikiLeaks: I'm afraid I must correct you, Judy. I didn't say that we would be releasing information that has been hacked from the DNC.

We said that we have a significant amount of information, and the information itself is significant, and it pertains to Hillary Clinton's campaign. And we will be releasing it in several batches as we are finished with the journalistic work on each batch.

<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/dnc-information-come-says-wikileaks-founder/>

More DNC information to come, says WikiLeaks founder

in the aftermath of a devastating email-hacking incident involving top Democratic party officials, WikiLeaks is preparing to release new information "on a range of important issues." According to organization founder Julian Assange, WikiLeaks is now immersed in formatting the information to be easily accessible to journalists and the general public. Judy Woodruff interviews Assange for details.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 8:03 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Let's stick with 10:30

b6 -1
b7C -1

OK. Just as well because I'm damn pokey slow this morning....

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/04/2016 7:49 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Let's stick with 10:30

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I think Trisha may be coming, so I don't want to move the time around given her challenging schedule. See you at 10:30.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 12:51 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Attachments: David Laufman.vcf

David Laufman

Chief, Counterespionage Section
SMO

(Cell)
(Work)

b6 -2
b7C -2
b7E -6

Version

2.1

Name

Family: Laufman
First: David
Middle:
Prefix:
Suffix:

Formatted Name

David Laufman

Telephone Number (Cell)

b6 -2
b7C -2
b7E -6

Telephone Number (Work)

Electronic Mail Address

Organization

SMO

Title

Chief, Counterespionage Section

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 12:52 PM
To: Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Pickup

David, just left you a vm. I was just pulled into a meeting with Bill. Lisa Page is walking over now. Would you be able to meet her in your lobby by security?

Thanks,
Pete

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 7:46 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: D.N.C. Hack Raises a Frightening Question: What's Next? - NYTimes.com

saw this, I had not noted it

http://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/07/30/world/europe/dnc-hack-russia.html?_r=0

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 6:29 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] (CD) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

The new PRN 302s do not. All of the rest do need to be redacted.
Thanks

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:19 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] to the best of my knowledge, yes, they will. When Pete identified for [redacted] the DOJ edits that needed to be made to the 302s [redacted] discovered that there were four (I think) 302s that had never been written. What I don't know is whose 302s they are, but unless Pete or Jon are able to respond in short order, I would throw them on the pile for redactions. Thanks so much.

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:06 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
Subject: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete/Jon,

Today [redacted] brought over additional 302s from WFO. Are those supposed to go through the redaction process for production to DOJ on Monday? We're trying to figure out what needs to be completed this weekend.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks,

[redacted]

[Redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[Redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 6:45 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4

One may have [redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:43 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

Assuming they don't involve the [redacted] if you send them my way, I will tackle them first thing tomorrow. Then I'll finish up the LHM and the 302s that [redacted] already reviewed.

[redacted]
ACTING UNIT CHIEF / FOIA LITIGATION UNIT
OFFICE: [redacted] MOBILE [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT:

This message is transmitted to you by the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The message, along with any attachments, may be confidential and legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please destroy it promptly without further retention or dissemination (unless otherwise required by law). Please notify the sender of the error by a separate e-mail or by calling [redacted]

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 5:19 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted] to the best of my knowledge, yes, they will. When Pete identified for [redacted] the DOJ edits that needed to be made to the 302s [redacted] discovered that there were four (I think) 302s that had never been written. What I don't know is whose 302s they are, but unless Pete or Jon are able to respond in short order, I would throw them on the pile for redactions. Thanks so much. ----- Original message -----

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:06 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

[redacted] (CD) (FBI)"

[redacted] (WF) (FBI)"

[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

Subject: 302s

Pete/Jon,

Today [redacted] brought over additional 302s from WFO. Are those supposed to go through the redaction process for production to DOJ on Monday? We're trying to figure out what needs to be completed this weekend.

Thanks,

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]
Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 8:07 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

I know last night I said the new PBN emails don't need to be done. That is accurate. To my recollection those include [redacted]

b6 -3
b7C -3

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

Assuming they don't involve the [redacted] if you send them my way, I will tackle them first thing tomorrow. Then I'll finish up the LHM and the 302s that [redacted] already reviewed.

[redacted]
ACTING UNIT CHIEF : FOIA LITIGATION UNIT
OFFICE: [redacted] MOBILE: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT:

This message is transmitted to you by the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The message, along with any attachments, may be confidential and legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please destroy it promptly without further retention or dissemination (unless otherwise required by law). Please notify the sender of the error by a separate e-mail or by calling [redacted]

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 5:19 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted] to the best of my knowledge, yes, they will. When Pete identified for [redacted] the DOJ edits that needed to be made to the 302s, [redacted] discovered that there were four (I think) 302s that had never been written. What I don't know is whose 302s they are, but unless Pete or Jon are able to respond in short order, I would throw them on the pile for redactions. Thanks so much ----- Original message -----

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)* [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:06 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (WE) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]

Subject: 302s

Pete/Jon,

Today [redacted] brought over additional 302s from WFO. Are those supposed to go through the redaction process for production to DOJ on Monday? We're trying to figure out what needs to be completed this weekend.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 8:52 AM
To: [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

OK thanks. My Samsung will now neither send nor receive. If you need me, text or call me

From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 8:44 AM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I am here at my desk working on the remaining 302's and the LHM if anyone needs anything [redacted]

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 8:08 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1

Also, Samsungs are messed up and Jon and I are unable to send. If you need to reach us, call me (or text) at [redacted] and Jon at [redacted] Thanks

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 5:44 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

Assuming they don't involve the [redacted] if you send them my way, I will tackle them first thing tomorrow. Then I'll finish up the LHM and the 302s that [redacted] already reviewed.

[redacted]
ACTING UNIT CHIEF - FOIA LITIGATION UNIT
OFFICE: [redacted] MOBILE: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT:

This message is transmitted to you by the Office of the General Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The message, along with any attachments, may be confidential and legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please destroy it promptly without further retention or dissemination (unless otherwise required by law). Please notify the sender of the error by a separate e-mail or by calling [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 5:19 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: 302s

[redacted] to the best of my knowledge, yes, they will. When Pete identified for [redacted] the DOJ edits that needed to be made to the 302s [redacted] discovered that there were four (I think) 302s that had never been written. What I don't know is whose 302s they are, but unless Pete or Jon are able to respond in short order, I would throw them on the pile for redactions. Thanks so much.----- Original message -----

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/05/2016 5:06 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]; "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: 302s

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete/Jon,

Today [redacted] brought over additional 302s from WFO. Are those supposed to go through the redaction process for production to DOJ on Monday? We're trying to figure out what needs to be completed this weekend.

Thanks,

[redacted]

[redacted]

Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 10:32 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE:

b6 -1
b7C -1

Got it, thanks. Will be here as needed. Appears I'm receiving emails again. Will see if this goes through.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 10:26 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE:

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks, Pete. I think we've covered everything necessary; I was able to answer the other questions they had. I'll be in and out this weekend to check on how things are going. They are just getting a little too fired up on all the details, so I thought it was best to let everyone know.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 8:00 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE:

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks. Do you have specifics? I had some late back and forth with [redacted] about the [redacted] 802s, which [redacted] has already done. I think that task being completed may have been lost in translation. Also [redacted] mentioned there was one ODS interview in the pack he dropped off yesterday. I haven't seen them. I would guess - but don't know - that it would contain [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4

[Large redacted block]

b5 -1

Is there anything else going on that needs clarification/fixing?

Finally, both Jon and I are unable to send any email from our Samsung. We can both (for now) receive email. I can send and receive from [redacted] (where I am now) but Jon can't even there due to a licensing issue. I think he's in his backyard burning both his laptop and his Samsung.

b7E -3

Bottom line, safest to text or call us if you need us.

Thanks,
Pete

From [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 12:06 AM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Subject:

All, if there are things that need to be done, let's be clear this weekend.

We have a A+ team that isn't ready to let go of what they have been working for a year. And they are planning their weekend to work on what we need for Monday.

I'm trying to limit what they need to do to our needs. Any minor points are seen as a huge deal to them though. I just don't want them to waste their time.

Just remember that.

-

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 7:05 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns - CNNPolitics.com

See first link. You want these, or just notable articles?

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 2:10 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (CD) (FBI) [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (CG) (FBI)"
[redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CV) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns - CNNPolitics.com

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Passing along some more... (in case you need a break from the Olympics)

<http://www.businessinsider.com/russia-internet-trolls-and-donald-trump-2016-7>

<http://talkingpointsmemo.com/edblog/trump-putin-russia-connections>

<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/hack-trump-tax-returns-julian-assange-226751>

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 2:02 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (CD) (FBI) [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (CG) (FBI)"
[redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CV) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns - CNNPolitics.com

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted]
FBI Washington Field Office

b6 -1
b7C -1

ID-7 / 01-1
Desk: [redacted]
Cell: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

----- Original message -----
From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 1:59 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns - CNNPolitics.com

----- Original message -----
From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/06/2016 1:49 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns - CNNPolitics.com

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

"Why haven't we seen anything hacked from the Trump campaign?" Maher asked Assange, who was speaking via satellite from the Ecuadorian embassy in London, where he faces extradition over sexual assault allegations. "I mean, obviously we know these {files} came from Russia. It looks like you are working with a bad actor, Russia, to put your thumb on the scale, and basically, f--- with the one person who stands in the way of us being ruled by Donald Trump."

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/06/politics/julian-assange-wikileaks-donald-trump-tax-returns/>

WikiLeaks walks back Assange claim on hacking Trump tax returns

Washington (CNN) WikiLeaks on Saturday walked back a claim made by its founder, Julian Assange, that it was "working on" obtaining Donald Trump's undisclosed tax returns.

Assange's remark came at the end of a contentious interview Friday with "Real Time" host Bill Maher, during which the two discussed WikiLeaks' recent disclosure of Democratic National Committee emails and voicemails. Assange, who has vowed to release more information to damage Hillary Clinton's campaign, was asked by Maher, a Clinton supporter, whether he plans to similarly disrupt Trump's presidential prospects.

"Why don't you hack into Donald Trump's tax return?" Maher asked.

"Well, we're working on it," responded Assange, who did not provide further information.

But a message from WikiLeaks' official Twitter account Saturday morning dismissed Assange's statement, claiming it was meant in jest.

"WikiLeaks isn't 'working on' hacking Trump's tax-returns. Claim is a joke from a comedy show. We are 'working on' encouraging whistleblowers."

WikiLeaks isn't 'working on' hacking Trump's tax-returns. Claim is a joke from a comedy show. We are 'working on' encouraging whistleblowers

— WikiLeaks (@wikileaks) August 6, 2016

Trump has repeatedly refused to release his tax returns to the public, a common practice for modern presidential candidates, saying he's under audit.

The bucking of the decades-long tradition has fueled considerable criticism and speculation over what the documents might contain, including whether Trump has any business dealings with Russia.

The US rival has been accused of being behind the hacked DNC emails, and the resulting controversy led to the resignation of DNC Chairwoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz and the ouster of several other top DNC officials. Assange told CNN last week his organization has "more material related to the Hillary Clinton campaign."

 Julian Assange responds to Hillary Clinton

Julian Assange responds to Hillary Clinton 05:09

"Why haven't we seen anything hacked from the Trump campaign?" Maher asked Assange, who was speaking via satellite from the Ecuadorian embassy in London, where he faces extradition over sexual assault allegations. "I mean, obviously we know these (files) came from Russia. It looks like you are working with a bad actor, Russia, to put your thumb on the scale, and basically, f--- with the one person who stands in the way of us being ruled by Donald Trump."

Assange pushed back, saying, "Everyone knows the source of what we published. The source is the Democratic Party."

Assange also swiped at National Security Agency whistleblower Edward Snowden, who recently criticized WikiLeaks for its "hostility to even modest curation" of its document dumps. The WikiLeaks founder said he "saved (Snowden's) ass," and implied Snowden's recent criticism of WikiLeaks' tactics was in pursuit of a pardon from President Barack Obama.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2016 7:35 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Democrats fear 'October surprise' as White House ponders hack response - POLITICO

Carlin?

A senior Justice Department official told POLITICO that recent realignments within the DOJ and FBI were helping the administration accelerate breach investigations. Previously, the official said, the DOJ National Security Division wasn't necessarily talking to FBI digital investigators. In the past few years, the teams have become more integrated.

Read more: <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/clinton-democrats-hacking-dnc-october-surprise-226743#ixzz4Gb9Udx4a>

Follow us: @politico on Twitter | Politico on Facebook

<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/08/clinton-democrats-hacking-dnc-october-surprise-226743>

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2016 12:47 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: LHM redactions

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/13/2016 4:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)"
[redacted] (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted]
[redacted] (USAVAE)" [redacted] (USAVAE)"
Cc: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: LHM redactions

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

All,

We are preparing for FOIA/Congressional production of various items we anticipate will be required to be released. By next Monday, would you please identify those items you believe need to be protected pursuant to 6e within the LHM?

Thanks,

Pete

Peter P. Strzok II

Section Chief

Counterespionage Section (CD4)

FBIHQ

[redacted] (D)
[redacted] (C)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2016 1:39 PM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] OGC (FBI)
Subject: RE: re my last email

b6 -1
b7C -1

Nope. And you would have been THRILLED to hear my convo with David right now where he asserted that a) he didn't know we expected to do this and b) we (the FBI) were not going to take a first cut at it. Unbelievable.

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/07/2016 1:36 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] OGC (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: re my last email

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I just saw [redacted] email.

How is it she doesn't have a good sense and still wants to involve us in this 6E debate? Didn't we already have the meeting to talk with them about 6E? I could have sworn that took place already (although I wasn't there). [redacted] may have been there (o [redacted]). Regardless, they've read the lhm 10 times and sent us plenty of happy to glad changes but somehow didn't think about this?

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2

I think they need to just tell us what is 6E like we asked them to do a month ago . We put an endnote on every sentence to help them understand sourcing and none of our agents or analysts are equipped to help them anyway. The 4 of them just need to get in a room and tell us. This habit of wanting to meet all the time is crippling...

Am I overreacting?

J

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/07/2016 12:55 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] OGC (FBI)"
[redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: re my last email

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yes, I know the answer to that question. But rather than worrying about checking our work, I'm PISSED that we still don't have the work for which they were actually responsible. We'll see what kind of response we get.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 07, 2016 1:44 PM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC)
Subject: Fwd: LHM redactions

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/13/2016 4:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Laufman, David (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted] (NSD) (JMD)"
[redacted] (NSD) (JMD)" [redacted]
[redacted] (USAVAE) [redacted] (USAVAE)"
Cc: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
Subject: LHM redactions

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

All,

We are preparing for FOIA/Congressional production of various items we anticipate will be required to be released. By next Monday, would you please identify those items you believe need to be protected pursuant to 6e within the LHM?

Thanks,

Pete

Peter P. Strzok II

Section Chief

Counterespionage Section (CD4)

FBIHQ

[redacted] (O)
[redacted] (C)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: MYE production/coordination/final sh*tshow extravaganza meeting
Location: 4869
Start: Monday, August 08, 2016 4:00 PM
End: Monday, August 08, 2016 5:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Not yet responded
Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Required Attendees: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI);
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI);
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

If everyone is free, would like to get together (hopefully with the complete set of material we're giving to DOJ today) to go through timetable and actions for this week, e.g., LHM edits, incorporation of DOJ edits, hanging OGC/FOIA things, mechanics of getting to the Hill, control paperwork for [redacted]

b7E -4

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: MYE production/coordination/final sh*tshow extravaganza meeting
Location: 4869
Start: Monday, August 08, 2016 4:00 PM
End: Monday, August 08, 2016 5:00 PM
Recurrence: (none)
Meeting Status: Accepted
Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Required Attendees: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] OGC (FBI);
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI);
[redacted] OGC (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

If everyone is free, would like to get together (hopefully with the complete set of material we're giving to DOJ today) to go through timetable and actions for this week, e.g., LHM edits, incorporation of DOJ edits, hanging OGC/FOIA things, mechanics of getting to the Hill, control paperwork for [redacted]

b7E -4

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted]
Subject: RE: MYE Production

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Echoing Jon - thanks VERY much.
Pete

----- Original message -----

From: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/08/2016 7:52 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted]
Subject: RE: MYE Production

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks very much for all of the work today...

J

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI); [redacted]
Date: 08/08/2016 7:50 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted]
Subject: MYE Production

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -4, 6

[redacted] and I just finished up the two binders on our end with everything but the [redacted] 302's.

I am connecting with [redacted] at BARI for binder brigade part 1 to hand these off and get them over to
DOI.

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 4:51 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Pete is Internet Famous

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 4:50 PM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Pete is Internet Famous

b6 -1
b7C -1

<https://news.vice.com/article/hillary-clinton-emails-fbi-investigation-section-811>

[redacted]

**Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch**

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 10:56 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Email production to the Hill

b6 -1
b7C -1

OK I will

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

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 10:49 AM
To: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Email production to the Hill

b6 -1
b7C -1

Pete [redacted] says he wears both OGC and Leg Affairs hats. If you're available to join the 12:30, it would probably be helpful.

b6 -3
b7C -3

[redacted]
Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

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

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 10:18 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Email production to the Hill

b6 -1
b7C -1

Hey based on the response from Kennedy, it may make sense to have a larger call to incorporate the various elements at State who have concerns; if we do that, I'd like to participate. If their leg affairs forwards all their concerns and it remains a legal-legal dialogue, I'll defer. Thanks

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: State conference call re Legal and Leg MYE LHM

Start: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 12:30 PM

End: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 1:00 PM

Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Not yet responded

Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

There's a 12:30 scheduled between OGC/OGC and maybe Fed Programs.

I will check and see if Leg Affairs will be involved. Either way, here is the call in information:

Dial-in number: [redacted]
Int'l dial-in number: [redacted]
Access code: [redacted]

b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Subject: State conference call re Legal and Leg MYE LHM

Start: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 12:30 PM

End: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 1:00 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Accepted

Organizer: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

Required Attendees: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)

There's a 12:30 scheduled between OGC/OGC and maybe Fed Programs.

I will check and see if Leg Affairs will be involved. Either way, here is the call in information:

Dial-in number: [redacted]
Int'l dial-in number: [redacted]
Access code [redacted]

b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 7:49 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Seth Rich

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 7:09 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Just FYSA. I squashed this with [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 1:25 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thanks [redacted] will do.

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 1:00 PM
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hi [redacted]
[redacted]

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -9

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 12:54 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding [redacted] for real. Stupid Samsung.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 12:53 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding [redacted] I'm aware of this reporting from earlier this week but not any specific involvement in any related case. [redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 10:32 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted] (WF) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Subject: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

I hope you are well. I heard from the front office that you are covering for [redacted] this week. Various news outlets are reporting today that Julian Assange suggested during a recent overseas interview that DNC Staffer, Seth Rich was a Wikileaks source, and may have been killed because he leaked the DNC e-mails to his organization, and that Wikileaks was offering \$20,000 for information regarding Rich's death last month. Based on this news, we anticipate additional press coverage on this matter. I hear that you are in a class today; however, when you have a moment, can you please give me a call to discuss what involvement the Bureau has in the investigation.

Thanks,

[redacted]
FBI Washington Field Office
Public Affairs
Des [redacted]
Cell [redacted]
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 10:31 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: AD Meeting

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 10:30 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: AD Meeting

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yes I'm available

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 10:12 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Mcgonigal, Charles F. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: "Archey, David W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: AD Meeting

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Pete/Charlie:

Are you two available and in the building? Ad wants to meet with the 3 of you either now or after the 1pm. Please advise.

Thank You.

[redacted]
Executive Assistant/ MAPA
Counterintelligence Division
Desk [redacted]
Cell [redacted]
Unclass [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 2:35 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Follow up to yesterday's briefing

At 4

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 12:56 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Follow up to yesterday's briefing

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

But now you have the mtg with doj, right?

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 12:50 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Follow up to yesterday's briefing

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Perfect. Thanks

----- Original message -----

From: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 12:46 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Follow up to yesterday's briefing

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

430pm at my office?

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 11:42 AM
To: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Follow up to yesterday's briefing

Jim, I was wondering if you have 15 minutes for a follow up question I didn't get a chance to ask during the briefing yesterday.
Thanks,
Pete

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 6:12 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -3
b7C -3

K

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 6:11 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -6

Come up.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 6:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -6

You done or going back to wrap/Andy?

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 6:04 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -6

No. We didn't reach her.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 6:00 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -6

Want me to come up?

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 5:59 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
Subject: Jim and I are calling [redacted] right now

b6 -1, 3
b7C -1, 3
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2016 8:41 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: In exile, Edward Snowden rakes in speaking fees while hoping for a pardon

Ridiculous. CES used to have a second SES slot, they pulled it to NSD front office

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 8:28 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Automatic reply: In exile, Edward Snowden rakes in speaking fees while hoping for a pardon

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yes. They're typically SES, too.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 8:06 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Automatic reply: In exile, Edward Snowden rakes in speaking fees while hoping for a pardon

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

So a SECTION at DoJ gets a "Principal Deputy Chief"?

----- Original message -----

From: "Laufman, David (NSD)" [redacted]
Date: 08/11/2016 8:04 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Automatic reply: In exile, Edward Snowden rakes in speaking fees while hoping for a pardon

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -6

I am out of the office and may be delayed in responding to e-mail. For case-related matters, please contact Principal Deputy Chief Katie Kedjan at [redacted]

b6 -2
b7C -2
b7E -6

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 7:03 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Name Requested

Yep. The system worked. ☺

Thank you

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 6:38 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Name Requested

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

It just means that we're all tracking for the 17th.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 6:37 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Name Requested

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I don't know what this means. [redacted] called me...

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 6:24 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Name Requested

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Phew.

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 6:24 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Grigg, Gervais C. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Name Requested

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Yes! Perfect! The system worked! ? Have a wonderful weekend.

----- Original message -----

From: "Grigg, Gervais C. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 6:22 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

TO: [redacted] (UAC) (P)

Subject: Name Requested

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

SC Peter P. Strzok

G. (Gurvais) Clayton Grigg
Deputy Assistant Director

Presidential Transition Lead
FBI Director's Office
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Office: [redacted]
Cell: [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

This communication is UNCLASSIFIED but may contain information that is Law Enforcement Sensitive and/or For Official Use Only. The contents of this communication are considered to be draft, deliberative, and pre-decisional in nature and are intended solely for the personal review of the captioned recipients.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Hacker Publishes List Of Cell Phone Numbers, Private E-Mails For Most House Democrats | The Smoking Gun

<http://thesmokinggun.com/buster/democratic-national-committee/guccifer-dccc-hack-645891>

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Tsg

Pasted the text below because I don't trust all these links

AUGUST 12—The e-mail from Google arrived at 4:09 AM on March 22 and contained an ominous alert for its recipient, William Rinehart, a staffer with Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign.

"Someone has your password," the e-mail's subject line declared. "Someone just used your password to try to sign in to your Google Account," warned the message, which reported that the incursion attempt came from an IP address in Ukraine.

While the "Gmail Team" advised Rinehart that the sign-in attempt was stopped, he was told, "You should change your password immediately."

When he received the message—which carried the address no-reply@accounts.googlemail.com—Rinehart was in Hawaii preparing for the March 26 Democratic presidential caucus. An experienced organizer, Rinehart, 33, has previously worked for the United Nations Foundation, Barack Obama's presidential campaigns, and Organizing for America, which was formed to build grass roots support for Obama's legislative agenda.

In a bid to thwart any future Ukrainian hijacking attempts, Rinehart followed Google's suggestion and clicked on a red box marked "CHANGE PASSWORD." He was then taken to a Gmail log-in page where, as directed, he keyed in his credentials.

Until he was contacted this month by The Smoking Gun, Rinehart had not given that Google alert a second thought. It sat buried in his inbox, just one of tens of thousands of messages he had never bothered to delete.

Armed with evidence that Rinehart's Gmail account had been hacked in late-March—likely as part of the suspected Russian intelligence operation that targeted the Democratic National Committee—a reporter asked Rinehart to search for any messages he received that month from Google.

In short order, Rinehart located the March 22 e-mail and shared the message—along with its full header information—with TSG.

An analysis of that e-mail—which was part of a larger "spear phishing" effort aimed at Clinton campaign staffers—has revealed new details about the illegal operation, which is now the subject of an FBI probe.

Additionally, a TSG investigation has unearthed new details about the hacking spree, which recently prompted Obama to cite suspects who have tied Russia to the illegal incursions. For its part, the Clinton

prompted Obama to cite experts who have tied Russia to the illegal intrusions. For its part, the Clinton campaign has insinuated that the hacking was a Russian attempt to influence the presidential election (in favor of Donald Trump, a Vladimir Putin stan).

And while Democrats may appear to be the only crime victims, TSG has learned that numerous prominent Republicans and GOP groups have also been targeted. These hacking victims include John McCain, Lindsey Graham, Michele Bachmann, various state Republican parties, as well as assorted GOP candidates, PACs, and consultants.

As with Rinehart, none of the Republican victims contacted by TSG was aware that their web sites and e-mail servers had been compromised at some point in the past year.

* * *

Rinehart was one of scores of Clinton campaign staffers and DNC employees targeted in a "spearphishing" effort that was flagged--after the fact--by researchers with SecureWorks, the security firm hired by the DNC to investigate the hacking of its computer systems.

While the illegal gambit's success rate is unknown, it appears likely that several targets were duped by the Gmail scam. In late-June, TSG reported that Sarah Hamilton, a Clinton campaign press aide, had her Gmail account breached. Like Rinehart, Hamilton was tricked by a spoofed Google alert warning of an overseas log-in attempt.

TSG learned of the Hamilton hack from "Guccifer 2.0," the purported "hacker" who first contacted the site on June 15 to claim credit for the DNC attack and share an assortment of purloined Democratic Party documents.

In the initial e-mail--which came a day after the Washington Post reported the DNC intrusion--"Guccifer 2.0" said that he had "been in the DNC's networks" for nearly a year and had provided the "main part of the papers, thousands of files and mails, I gave to Wikileaks." On July 22, Wikileaks posted nearly 20,000 stolen DNC e-mails, a disclosure that triggered the resignation of the party's chairman, CEO, CFO, and communications director.

In e-mails, "Guccifer 2.0" has claimed to be a Romanian national and has bristled when a TSG story referred to him as a thief. "Stop calling me the vandal," he wrote. "I'm not a criminal I'm a freedom fighter."

Several security groups have theorized that "Guccifer 2.0" is a Russian invention, a hype man tasked with publicizing criminal acts that were actually committed by skilled government hacking groups. While he has described himself in e-mails as an "unknown hacker with a laptop" and a foe of "all the illuminati and rich clans which try to rule the governments," "Guccifer 2.0" has acted more like a press flack, promising "exclusives" and pushing journalists to do stories based on stolen documents carrying little news value.

In reviewing e-mails sent by "Guccifer 2.0"--including 25 messages provided by TSG--researchers with ThreatConnect, a Virginia-based cybersecurity firm, determined that he usually connected to a series of burner e-mail accounts via a Russian virtual private network (VPN) as a way of masking his identity. On three occasions, "Guccifer 2.0" made contact with TSG via a Miami, Florida IP address connected to the Russia-based Elite VPN service. ThreatConnect, which has investigated the recent hacking spree,

today published a new analysis of developments on that felonious front.

Though "Guccifer 2.0" regularly provided documents swiped during the DNC breach, he wrote from an AOL France account on June 27 offering "exclusive access to some leaked emails" from Clinton's staff. In a follow-up message, the vandal—whose e-mail account carries the name "Stephan Orphan"—offered a collection of material that was "part of the big archive that includes Hillary Clinton's staff correspondence."

But instead of attaching the documents to an e-mail or providing a download link to a file sharing site (as he had previously done), "Guccifer 2.0" told TSG that the material would be available through DC Leaks, a web site he described as a "sub project" of Wikileaks. In fact, DC Leaks has no connection at all with Wikileaks or Julian Assange.

"Guccifer 2.0" wrote that he had "asked the DCleaks" to "release a part" of the staff correspondence, but "with a closed access." After offering to provide TSG a password with which to access the material on DC Leaks, "Guccifer 2.0" claimed that DC Leaks "asked me not to make any announcements yet." He added, "So I ask you not to make links to my blog. Ok?"

After TSG accepted his offer, "Guccifer 2.0" e-mailed a password that provided access to the e-mails and documents stolen from Sarah Hamilton's Gmail account three months earlier. "Let me know your opinion. to be continued..." he wrote.

The Hamilton records posted on DC Leaks provided a largely inconsequential look at the logistical details of the Clinton campaign and its press operation. In a June 28 article about the "spear phishing" attack on Hamilton, TSG noted that a reporter learned of the Hamilton hack from "Guccifer 2.0." The story did not mention DC Leaks or that "Guccifer 2.0" had provided a password to the newborn web site.

On June 29, "Guccifer 2.0" wrote seeking a correction. "It seems people think it was me who hacked Hamilton," he stated. "That's not correct. I just sent you a link. I don't claim it's my work! I don't need another person's glory."

In subsequent correspondence, "Guccifer 2.0" did not push further for a correction and he ignored questions about who hacked Hamilton (pictured below) and how he became aware of the stolen e-mails that had mysteriously appeared on an obscure web site.

TSG's contact with "Guccifer 2.0" ended on July 4, when he e-mailed two DNC documents along with the greeting "happy independence day!"

When "Guccifer 2.0" wrote in late-June to introduce TSG to DC Leaks, the web site had barely been online for three weeks, according to tracking data. The DC Leaks Twitter and Facebook accounts debuted on June 8, the day that the site itself appears to have launched. While nobody else had heard of DC Leaks, "Guccifer 2.0" had somehow not only discovered the site, but had privileges that allowed him to provide TSG with access to a password-protected section of the site.

On its "About" page, DC Leaks describes itself as a "new level project" committed to exposing "Wall Street fat cats, industrial barons and multinational corporations' representatives who swallow up all resources and subjugate all markets." At launch, the site's sparse offerings included documents hacked from George Soros's Open Society Foundation and e-mails stolen from the Gmail account of Philip Breedlove, a recently retired U.S. General who served as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander.

DC Leaks notes that Soros is "named as the architect and sponsor of almost every revolution and coup around the world for the last 25 years." In a Facebook post, the site reported that the hacked documents revealed Soros's plans to support opposition movements in Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, Armenia, and other countries "where the United States desire to promote their interests."

The most newsworthy Breedlove e-mails focused on the military commander's back-channel attempts to gather support for a more aggressive U.S. stance against Russia in light of the military crisis in Ukraine. The balance of Breedlove's e-mails, however, involve him exchanging correspondence with old Air Force buddies with call signs like Ghost, Cobra, Maggot, Tuna, and Horndog.

While the DC Leaks proprietors claim to be "American hacktivists," the site includes some odd phrasings. Hillary Clinton is identified as "the most probable candidate for the President of the Democratic Party," while a collection of campaign newsclips is described as "media reports from Hillary Clinton's electoral staff."

According to domain records, the dcleaks.com address was registered in mid-April via a small web hosting company in Romania. The site itself traces back to an IP address in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. In a series of e-mails over the past week, DC Leaks has corresponded with TSG via a Gmail account in the name of "Steve Wanders."

Since being provided a password by "Guccifer 2.0," TSG has monitored DC Leaks for further evidence that the site is being used as a cut-out for the cabal behind the DNC hacking and the "spear phishing" directed at Clinton campaign workers.

Late last month, DC Leaks added a new entry to its "Portfolio" of "latest leaks." Next to a portrait of Hamilton, a photo of Rinehart appeared. Upon mousing over the image, the words "Protected: William E. Rinehart" emerged. Clicking on the photo brought a visitor to a sign-in page requiring a password

In an August 1 direct message to the DC Leaks Twitter account, TSG sought an opportunity to preview the Rinehart collection. In a reply two days later, DC Leaks wrote, "we could give you a password but we would like to have an article in TSG when the materials are published." DC Leaks provided a password after TSG responded that it would do a story if a review of the documents proved them to be newsworthy.

An examination of the Rinehart e-mails showed that they spanned several years and contained the kind of mundane campaign details seen in the stolen Hamilton correspondence. The extent of campaign dirt, as it were, was limited to a March e-mail with the subject line "FYI-Oreos are now a political issue." In the message, a Clinton staffer reported that a journalist visiting the campaign's Honolulu office "noticed the Oreos in our office and brought this up to me." This was an issue since Nabisco was moving its Oreo production from a 600-employee Chicago plant to Mexico. Since Clinton had criticized the plan, the e-mail noted, "let's fall in line and pls refrain from keeping Oreos in plain sight in our office. #optics Mahalo!"

While the targeting of Rinehart (seen at right) and Hamilton apparently did not yield valuable e-mails or documents, the cyberthieves would have been able to copy scores of e-mail addresses--many for Clinton campaign workers. Those fresh addresses likely would have been sent "spear phishing" e-mails like the ones that tricked Rinehart and Hamilton.

When TSG contacted Rinehart earlier this month, he was unaware of the Gmail hack. Nor did he know that his photo was on DC Leaks and that the site had staged his stolen e-mails for future publication.

At Rinehart's request, TSG gave him the password provided to us by DC Leaks so that he could review the material lifted from his e-mail account.

While the spoofed March 22 alert looked on its face like a legitimate communication from Google, a TSG examination of the e-mail's full header--a jumble of nearly 6000 characters--revealed that it had actually been sent to Rinehart from an e-mail account on Yandex.com, a Moscow-based e-mail provider.

The e-mail's header also contained a shortened bit.ly link that took Rinehart to a phony Gmail log-in page when he clicked on the red "CHANGE PASSWORD" box in the message. The bit.ly link had condensed a 305-character url that included this string: "myaccount.google.com-securitysettingpage."

The lengthy url included the .ml suffix, indicating that the domain used in the "spear phishing" operation was registered in the Republic of Mali. A review of the header by ThreatConnect found that the spoofed Gmail page was linked to an IP address in Germany. When the company's researchers examined the German host, they found several other domains that were similar in structure to the one buried in the Rinehart e-mail. But instead of Mali, suffixes for Equatorial Guinea, the Central African Republic, and Tokelau, a remote group of South Pacific atolls, were seen.

As of this writing, the Rinehart e-mails on DC Leaks remain password protected. The site's anonymous operators appear preoccupied with plans to upload additional Soros documents. In an e-mail sent yesterday from the DC Leaks Gmail account, the site gave TSG a Trumpian assurance about the new material: "it's gonna be huge."

Asked last week whether DC Leaks had any connection with the actors responsible for the DNC and Clinton campaign hacks, "Steve Wanders" replied, "We have our own sources. We have no connection to those leaks." He also denied any ties to Wikileaks and declared that, "The wish to make our country better is our motivation. We are not afraid of being prosecuted. Let them try to find us :)."

In response to a TSG question about "Guccifer 2.0," "Wanders" said, "We have no ties with this guy."

In an August 8 exchange, TSG asked how DC Leaks could have no ties to "Guccifer 2.0" since he provided TSG with a password to the DC Leaks site. Not to mention the hacker's account of providing DC Leaks with the Hamilton e-mails and the directions to maintain a "closed access" to the material.

The DC Leaks response was not convincing.

"We don't know how Guccifer got this pass," claimed "Wanders." "But he is a hacker, you know. Maybe we need to change our passwords now :)." He later added, "Sure, we've heard about Guccifer's activity but we aren't in touch with this guy."

* * *

While the e-mails and documents stolen from Soros and Breedlove have gotten some press coverage for DC Leaks, the site houses a hodgepodge of stolen e-mails offering fresh evidence of the scope and targets of the recent political hacking campaign.

A "portfolio" titled "The United States Republican Party" contains about 300 e-mails that were sent during a five-month period ending in late-October 2015.

A review of that correspondence shows that a wide variety of GOP e-mail accounts have been

A review of that correspondence shows that a wide variety of GOP e-mail accounts have been breached. The victims range from staffers for Senator John McCain's campaign committee to a candidate running for State Senate in Virginia. Officials with four state Republican party organizations--Wyoming, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Illinois--had correspondence stolen. E-mails to the campaign committees of Senator Lindsey Graham, Rep. Robert Hurt, and former Rep. Michele Bachmann were also swiped. E-mails from Campaign Solutions, a leading Republican consulting firm, and the Stop Hillary PAC were pilfered.

None of the victims contacted by TSG--including the McCain campaign and the Connecticut GOP, were aware of the e-mail hacking.

Since it seemed unlikely that hackers would target such a wide array of individual Republican web sites and e-mail servers, TSG reviewed the DC Leaks "portfolio" in search of a common thread. That analysis revealed that the victimized campaigns, state parties, PACs, and businesses all contracted with the same Tennessee web hosting outfit.

The firm, Smartech, and its parent, AirNet Group, are major providers of data services, call centers, and web hosting for scores of Republican clients. Since the 2008 federal election cycle, the Republican National Committee has paid the companies more than \$10.5 million, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. The firms have done work for a Who's Who of GOP figures, including Karl Rove, Mitt Romney, George W. Bush, Newt Gingrich, and the Koch brothers.

A review of the domains on a single Smartech server in Chattanooga shows that nine of the sites whose e-mails were compromised are housed on that server. Oddly, that server also includes the web site for comedian Stephen Colbert's

super PAC. Defunct since 2012, Americans for a Better Tomorrow, Tomorrow still maintains a home page with a photo of "Ham Rove," its late "advisor and chief strategist."

Jeff Averbeck, Airnet's CEO, did not respond to voicemail messages left by TSG, as well as an e-mail seeking comment on what seems to be a significant security breakdown at the company.

The firm's web site notes that it understands "the delicacy of your data and importance of meeting your security comfort levels." That delicate data is safeguarded, the company assures, with "security features including triple layered authentication, 24X7 monitoring, and re-enforced concrete walls, redundant power grids."

It appears that "Guccifer 2.0" and his shadowy cohorts were not deterred by those really thick walls.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (CD) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/13/2016 7:29 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Tsg

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] may add this to today's round-up, so you may get double.

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED] (CD) (FBI) [REDACTED]
Date: 08/13/2016 12:14 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI) [REDACTED] (CD) (FBI)"
[REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Tsg

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

This article is surprisingly detailed. More than it should be.

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED]
Date: 08/12/2016 11:37 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [REDACTED] (CD) (FBI) [REDACTED]
Subject: Tsg

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

<http://thesmokinggun.com/documents/investigation/tracking-russian-hackers-638295>

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 10:33 AM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Suit warns of Russian 'back door' into U.S. fingerprint systems

Saw this on today's CT roundup. ...

<http://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/suit-warns-of-russian-%e2%80%98back-door%e2%80%99-into-us-fingerprint-systems/ar-BBvzVMR>

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 5:52 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] OGC) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI); Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1

+ Bill

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/14/2016 6:49 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)"
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] huge, huge thanks to you and your team. I know you guys have been killing yourselves the last several weeks to get this done.

For the rest of the folks on the email, I understand from [redacted] that [redacted] despite several EXPLICITLY CLEAR conversations and emails indicating that we needed them by 8:00 am. Depending on how many they have, the time it takes us to review them, and any executive input we may need about whether to accept or reject their proposed redactions, a noon drop-off likely will not be enough time to make the production by tomorrow [redacted]

b5 -1, 3
b6 -1
b7C -1

Lisa

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/14/2016 6:28 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)"
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
 [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)"
 [redacted] Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

V. (CD) (FBI) [redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

The Congressional production is essentially complete (14 binders). We will need about three hours tomorrow AM to finalize a few remaining items and do quality control.

[redacted]

Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

b5 -1, 3

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 1:50 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Andy, Jim:

As we discussed on the phone [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] The original plan was as follows:

b7E -7

[redacted]

b5 -1, 3

In light of their concerns, we are contemplating the following compromise:



b5 -1, 3

If folks are okay with the compromise position, please let us know so that we can re-organize our many, many binders and let both agencies know. Thanks.

Lisa

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 7:10 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1

I skinned down recipients. [redacted]

b5 -1

Regarding the production of reactions, and whether we let that change our production timetable to Congress [redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/14/2016 6:49 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI)"
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] huge, huge thanks to you and your team. I know you guys have been killing yourselves the last several weeks to get this done.

For the rest of the folks on the email, I understand from [redacted] that [redacted] despite several EXPLICITLY CLEAR conversations and emails indicating that we needed them by 8:00 am. Depending on how many they have, the time it takes us to review them, and any executive input we may need about whether to accept or reject their proposed redactions, a noon drop-off likely will not be enough time to make the production by tomorrow. [redacted]

b5 -1, 3
b6 -1
b7C -1

Lisa

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/14/2016 6:28 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted] mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Herring, Jason
V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

The Congressional production is essentially complete (14 binders). We will need about three hours tomorrow AM to finalize a few remaining items and do quality control.

[redacted]
Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI); Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted]

b5 -1, 3

----- Original message -----

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/12/2016 1:50 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted], "McCabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: "Baker, James A. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Herring, Jason
V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Proposed change to our production to Congress

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Andy, Jim:

As we discussed on the phone, [redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted] The
original plan was as follows:

b7E -7

[redacted]

b5 -1, 3

In light of their concerns, we are contemplating the following compromise:

If folks are okay with the compromise position, please let us know so that we can re-organize our many, many binders and let both agencies know. Thanks.

Lisa

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 6:12 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding Lisa, as I did not notice she was on the cc line. I think I may blame the entirety of my DAD tenure on inferior Korean technology

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 6:08 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Jes's. Thanks Samsung.

Just trying to live up to Jones' standards

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 6:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Now that's a DAD word!

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 6:02 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson,
Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (CTD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Works for investigativery team but defer to 7th floor

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]

Date: 08/15/2016 5:10 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"

[redacted] Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]

[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"

[redacted] Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"

[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]

(CTD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)"

[redacted] "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

[redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"

[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]

(DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]

Subject: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

Just to put this on a chain with all concerned....

Here's possible press comment language suggested by Trisha Anderson earlier today:

[Large redacted block]


b5 -1

[redacted]

FBI National Press Office

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1



----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]

Date: 08/15/2016 6:12 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

"Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"

[redacted]

Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding Lisa, as I did not notice she was on the cc line. I think I may blame the entirety of my DAD tenure on inferior Korean technology

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]

Date: 08/15/2016 6:08 PM (GMT-05:00)

To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Jes*s. Thanks Samsung.

Just trying to live up to Jones' standards

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 6:06 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Now that's a DAD word!

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 6:02 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson,
Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
(CTD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
(DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Works for investigatory team but defer to 7th floor

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 5:10 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Anderson, Trisha B. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: "Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
(CTD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Beers, Elizabeth R. (DO) (FBI)"
[redacted] (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
(DO) (FBI)" [redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Possible statement on emails for tomorrow use

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Just to put this on a chain with all concerned...

Here's possible press comment language suggested by Irisba Anderson earlier today:

[Redacted]

b5 -1

[Redacted]

FBI National Press Office

b6 -1

b7C -1

[Redacted]

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 7:13 AM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI); Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI); [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI); Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1

Awesome! Thank you

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/16/2016 6:39 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

I have all the receipt slips necessary for signing, etc, to transfer too. Worked with the special file room to for that yesterday.

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/16/2016 6:30 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Great, thanks

----- Original message -----

From: "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/16/2016 6:26 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

CC: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] MOFFA, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Subject: RE: FBI Package

[redacted] has graciously agreed to accompany OCA, so we should be good.

Jason

----- Original message -----

From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/16/2016 6:09 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Herring, Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Do we need someone [redacted] to accompany OCA for delivery? Should we check with [redacted] at DoJ or [redacted] upstairs about whether or not there is any weird transport protocol (I'm thinking classified routing slips, etc)

b6 -1, 2
b7C -1, 2
b7E -4

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 08/15/2016 4:09 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)"
[redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI) [redacted] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
[redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Herring,
Jason V. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: RE: FBI Package

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Boxes are currently being wrapped and sealed for delivery. Discussed logistics with Jason and we have the required paperwork for signature [redacted]

b7E -4

[redacted]
Assistant General Counsel
National Security Law Branch
[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1