From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 7:57 PM
To: Kathy Ruemmler
Subject: Re:

does dach still deny it? important point.

=div class="gmail_extra">

On Fri, Oct 17, 2=14 at 3:39 PM, Kathy Ruemmler [redacted] wrote:

----=----- Forwarded message ----------
From: [redacted]
Date= Oct 17, 2014 3:39 PM
Subject:
To: [redacted]
Cc:

My draft response belo=. I tweaked the points slightly.

</=pan>

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

</=>

The Comprehensivene=s of the Review:

</=>

On the morning of Apri= 20, 2012, the USSS informed the White House that an individual asso=iated with the White House advance team, Jonathan Dach, may have also had =n overnight guest at his hotel room. The USSS characterized this information as a "rumor" that USSS=personnel who were in Cartagena had learned during the course of the inves=igation into improper conduct of USSS personnel.

</=>

In response, the White=House Counsel requested that USSS provide her with any information that the USSS uncovered suggesting that White House =taff or volunteers may have engaged in inappropriate conduct on the trip.=C2

</=>

(1) T=e White House Counsel immediately initiated an internal review of the enti=e White House advance team (both staff and volunteers) that had traveled t= Colombia, including Jonathan Dach.

</=>

(2)Th= White House included Dach in the internal review even though he was a vol=nteer, NOT an employee of the White House, who

</=>

--had no security clearance or access to sensitive or classified informatio=,

--had no responsibility for Presidential security, and,

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

</=>

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

</=>

</=>

(2) T=e 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, =/22. The White House Counsel believed that it was important to conduct the review immediately upon receiving the info=mation – again, at that time, characterized as a rumor -- from the=USSS and to do so thoroughly and expeditiously:

</=>

--every person who went on the trip was separately interviewed regardless o= whether they were White House employees or volunteers, including Dach;=/u>

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

--the White House Counsel further requested that the USSS continue to provi=e any information relevant to White House staff or volunteers.</=>

--Dach was interviewed by attorneys in the White House Counsel's Of=ice and denied bringing a guest to his room. Dach agreed to be inter=iewed and answer questions, even though he was under no legal obligation t= do so, and the White House had no legal authority to compel him to answer the questions.

-- As the USSS was conducting the investigation in Columbia, which was a se=urity/personnel investigation relating to its own personnel, they agreed t= share anything relevant to White House personnel with the White House.=A0 The USSS did not share any of its own investigative work product with the White House (i.e., interview memor=nda), which is standard and appropriate protocol.

-- The White House Counsel's office collected and evaluated a=l of the evidence that it could obtain within its legal authorities.

</=>

The Evidence about =ach

Several weeks after th= White House review was concluded, the USSS provided the White House Couns=l with a handwritten, redacted document that the USSS had apparently obtai=ed from someone at the Hilton Hotel. The USSS represented that a hotel witness said that the log showed when ov=rnight guests had stayed at the hotel and in which room they had stayed.=C2=

</=>

(1) T=e log indicated only that a guest had visited a certain room number. =The log did not contain Jonathan Dach's name or signature. =C2= The White House determined separately by cross-reference to the hotel manifest that the room number was assigned to Dach. =/u>

=A0 (2) In light of this new info=mation, attorneys from the White House Counsel's office re-intervi=wed Dach and confronted him with the hotel log. Dach continued to de=y having a guest in his room, and his denials were deemed credible.

</=>

=A0 (3) The White Hou=e was aware of no information corroborating the hotel log, and it was awar= that on at least one other occasion, the USSS had determined that a simil=r hotel log had falsely implicated a USSS agent. The was the only information that the USSS every=provided to the White House related to Jonathan Dach or any other person a=sociated with the White House advance team.

</=>

White House and DHS=Public Disclosures

</=>

The White House was fo=thcoming about the review it conducted and its conclusion.

</=>

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

</=>

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

</=>

(3) =C2�2012, the DHS Inspector General made clear in a letter sent to then-C=airman Lieberman that the USSS was aware of a hotel log potentially implic=ting someone affiliated with the White House advance team:

�=A0

While=the scope of the investigation was limited to the conduct of the DHS perso=nel in Cartagena, we did find a hotel registry that suggests that two non-=SSS 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 =mployees is a Department of Defense employee affiliated with the White Hou=e Communication Agency and the other, whose employment status was not verified, may have been a=filiated with the White House advance operation."

</=>

(4) T=e DHS IG Report itself states:

�=A0

Based=on our interviews and review of records, we identified 13 USSS employees, =ne White House Communications Agency employee (an officer with the Departm=nt 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 mis=onduct reported.

</=>

Allegations of Impr=per White House Interference

</=>

At no time, did anyone=from the White House suggest to anyone in the USSS, DHS, or the DHS OIG th=t the DHS IG's report should not include reference to the White Ho=se advance volunteer, nor did anyone from the White House give advice as to how other officials should answer questions =bout the matter.

Kathryn H. Ruemmler=/b>

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
[redacted]
http://www.lw.com <http://www.lw.com/>

--

=C2&#65533; please note

The information co=tained in this communication is
confidential, may be attorney-client pr=vileged, may
constitute inside information, and is intended only for

JEE
Unauthorized use= disclosure or copying of this
communication or any part thereof is str=ctly prohibited
and may be unlawful. If you have received this
commu=ication in error, please notify us immediately by
return e-mail or by e=mail to jeevaca=ion@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> , and
destroy this communication and all copies thereo=,
including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</=iv>