
From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 7:53 PM
To: Kathy Ruemmler

Thanks, Carol, for letting me know what the second phase of your story will emphasize. I wanted to share the below points with you on background which I hope will help provide you with the proper factual context for your story. If you have specific questions after reviewing this material, would you please send them to me by email?

The Comprehensiveness of the Review:

On the morning of April 20, 2012, the USSS informed the White House of what they characterized as a "rumor" that an individual associated with the White House advance team, Jonathan Dach, may have also had an overnight guest at his hotel room.

In response, the White House Counsel requested that USSS provide her with any information that the USSS uncovered suggesting that White House staff or volunteers may have engaged in inappropriate conduct on the trip.

(1) The White House Counsel immediately initiated an internal review of the entire White House advance team (both staff and volunteers) that had traveled to Colombia, including Jonathan Dach.

(2) The White House included Dach in the internal review even though he was only a volunteer, NOT an employee of the White House, he:

--had no security clearance or access to sensitive or classified information,

--had no responsibility for Presidential security, and,

--was not subject to any potential disciplinary action by the White House because he was merely a private citizen and not an employee.

By contrast, the USSS personnel, full-time federal employees, had significant and defined duties to protect the President and to ensure that they did not make themselves vulnerable to security risks presented by foreign nationals.

(2) The White House review was conducted pursuant to by-the-book protocols, and took place over three days, Friday, 4/20, Saturday, 4/21, and Sunday, 4/22. The White House Counsel believed that it was important to conduct the review immediately upon receiving the information – again, at that time, characterized only as a rumor – from the USSS and to do so thoroughly and expeditiously:

--every person who went on the trip was interviewed including Dach;

--e-mails, hotel manifests, and any other relevant information in the White House's possession were reviewed and analyzed to see whether the documentary evidence corroborated or contradicted the people who were interviewed

--the White House Counsel further requested that the USSS continue to provide any information relevant to White House staff or volunteers.

--Dach was interviewed by attorneys in the White House Counsel's Office and repeatedly denied bringing a guest to his room. Although Dach agreed to be interviewed and answer questions, he was under no legal obligation to do so, and the White House had no legal authority to question him under oath.

-- As the USSS was conducting the investigation in Columbia, which was a security/personnel investigation relating to its own personnel, they agreed to share anything relevant to White House personnel with the White House. The USSS, as standard protocol dictates, did not share any of its own investigative work product with the White House (i.e., interview memoranda),

-- The White House Counsel's office collected and evaluated all of the evidence that it could legally obtain

The Evidence about Dach

Several weeks after the White House review was concluded, the USSS provided the White House Counsel with a handwritten, redacted document that the USSS had purportedly obtained from someone at the Hilton Hotel. The USSS represented that a hotel witness said that the log showed when overnight guests had stayed at the hotel and in which room they had stayed.

(1) The log indicated only that a guest had visited, with a room number on the side. The log did not contain Jonathan Dach's name or signature. The White House determined separately by cross-reference to the hotel manifest that the room number had been assigned to Dach.

(2) In light of this new information, attorneys from the White House Counsel's office re-interviewed Dach and confronted him with the hotel log. Dach continued to deny having a guest in his room, and his denials were deemed credible.

(3) The White House was aware of no information corroborating the hotel log, and it was aware that on at least one other occasion, the USSS had determined that a similar hotel log had falsely implicated a USSS agent. This was the only information that the USSS ever provided to the White House related to Jonathan Dach or any other person associated with the White House advance team.

White House and DHS Public Disclosures

The White House was forthcoming about the review it conducted and its conclusion.

(1) Press Secretary Jay Carney made clear that the White House Counsel conducted a review and had not confirmed any inappropriate behavior on the part of the White House advance team.

(2) White House Counsel Kathryn Ruemmler reiterated that conclusion in a letter to Chairman Darrell Issa in November 2012, making specific reference to the very hotel document that had been provided by the USSS.

(3) In 2012, the DHS Inspector General made clear in a letter sent to then-Chairman Lieberman that the USSS was aware of a page in a hotel log potentially implicating someone affiliated with the White House advance team:

AO

While the scope of the investigation was limited to the conduct of the DHS personnel in Cartagena, we did find a hotel registry that suggests that two non-USSS personnel may have had contact with foreign nationals. Although allegations

related to the no-USSS personnel were outside the scope of the investigation, one of these employees is a Department of Defense employee affiliated with the White House Communication Agency and the other, whose employment status was not verified, may have been affiliated with the White House advance operation."

(4) The DHS IG Report itself states:

=A0

Based on our interviews and review of records, we identified 13 USSS employees, one White House Communications Agency employee (an officer with the Department of Defense), and one reported member of the White House staff and/or advance team who had personal encounters with female Colombia nationals consistent with the misconduct reported.

Allegations of Improper White House Interference

At no time, did anyone from the White House suggest to anyone in the USSS, DHS, or the DHS OIG that the DHS IG's report should not include a reference to the White House advance volunteer, nor was anyone from the White House asked to give advice regarding how other officials should answer questions about the matter.

-- <=r>

please note<=r>

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE. 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 e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <<mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>>, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved