From: Kathy Ruemmler [redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 8:25 PM
To: jeffrey E.
Subject: Re:

The whole thing is ridiculous -- they had to obtain the re=ord "under the table" because the last thing the Hilton wanted t= do is to voluntarily give over info implicating the privacy of their gues=s. The procedure for checking in prostitutes is hardly rigorous.=A0

On Fri,=Oct 17, 2014 at 4:20 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

could have b=en the prostitute is pretty strong mitigation

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 4:19 PM, Kathy Ruemmler <<= href="[redacted] target="_blank[redacted] wrote:

We don=;t know -- could have been the prostitute, could have been the hotel clerk=

On Oct 17, 2014 4:09 PM, "jeffrey E." =lt;jeevacation@=mail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

hey, the lawyer letter said it was the prostitute that wrote down =he room number. ? ? thats a totally different spin=on the story , if it wasn't the hotel clerk who wrote it, =e how often do prostitutes lie as to which room they are head=d??

On =ri, Oct 17, 2014 at 4:07 PM, Kathy Ruemmler[redacted]rote:

Looking now.

On Oct 17, 2014 4:04 PM, "jeffrey E." =lt;jeevacation@=mail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

did you look at my edits?

=div class="gmail_quote">On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 4:03 PM, Kathy Ruemmler =span dir="ltr"><kathyruemmler@gmail.com[redacted]wrote:

=p dir="ltr">Yes, he does. Making some more tweaks.

On Oct 17, 2014 3:56 PM, "jeffrey E." =lt;jeevacation@=mail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

does dach still deny it? important point.

On Fri, Oct 17, 2014 at 3=39 PM, Kathy Ruemmler [redacted] > wrote=

---------- Forwarded messa=e ----------
From: <Kathryn.Ruemmler@lw.com <mailto:[redacted] > >
Date: Oct 17, 2014 3:39 PM=br>Subject:
To: [redacted]
Cc:

My draft respon=e below. I tweaked the points slightly.

Thanks, Carol, =or letting me know what the second phase of your story will emphasize.=A0 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 =aterial, would you please send them to me by email?

The Comprehensiveness of the Review:=u>

On the morning of April 20, 2012, the US=S informed the White House that an individual associated with the White Ho=se advance team, Jonathan Dach, may have also had an overnight guest at hi= 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) The White House Counsel immediately initia=ed an internal review of the entire White House advance team (both staff a=d volunteers) that had traveled to Colombia, including Jonathan Dach.=A0

(2)The White House included Dach in the intern=l review even though he was a volunteer, NOT an employee of the White Hous=, 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 personnel, full-time fed=ral employees, had significant and defined duties to protect the President=and to ensure that they did not make themselves vulnerable to security ris=s presented by foreign nationals.

(2) The White House review was conducted =ursuant to by-the-book protocols, and took place over three days, Friday, =/20, Saturday, 4/21, and Sunday, 4/22. The White House Counsel belie=ed 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 Dach</=>

Several weeks after the White House review was=concluded, the USSS provided the White House Counsel with a handwritten, r=dacted document that the USSS had apparently obtained from someone at the =ilton 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) The log indicated only that a guest had vi=ited a certain room number. The log did not contain Jonathan Dach=80=s name or signature. The White House determined separatel= by cross-reference to the hotel manifest that the room number was assigned to Dach. =/u>

=A0 (2) In light of this new information, attorneys from =he 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.

=A0 (3) The White House was aware of no infor=ation corroborating the hotel log, and it was aware that on at least one o=her occasion, the USSS had determined that a similar 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 forthcoming about the revi=w it conducted and its conclusion.

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

(2) White House Counsel Kathryn Ruemmler reite=ated that conclusion in a letter to Chairman Darrell Issa in November 2012= making specific reference to the hotel document that had been provi=ed by the USSS.

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

=A0

While the scope of the investigation was limit=d to the conduct of the DHS personnel in Cartagena, we did find a hotel re=istry 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 =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) The DHS IG Report itself states:=/u>

=A0

Based on our interviews and review of records,=we identified 13 USSS employees, one White House Communications Agency emp=oyee (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 mis=onduct reported.

Allegations of Improper White House Interfe=ence

At no time, did anyone from the White House su=gest to anyone in the USSS, DHS, or the DHS OIG that the DHS IG's =eport should not include reference to the White House advance volunteer, n=r did anyone from the White House give advice as to how other officials should answer questions =bout the matter.

Kathryn H. Ruemmler</=>

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304
Direct Dial: +1.202.637.2179 <tel:%2B1.202.637.2179>
Fax: +1.202.637.2201 <tel:%2B1.202.637.2201>
Email: kathryn.ruemmler@lw.com <mailto:kathryn.ruemmler@lw.com>
http://www.lw.com <http://www.lw.com/>

--

=C2  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>

--

=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>

--

=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>

--

=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>