
From: Kathy Ruemmler [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2014 7:40 PM
To: jeffrey E.
Subject: Fwd:

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

From: <[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]>
Date: Oct 17, 2014 3:39 PM
Subject:
To: <[REDACTED]>
Cc:

My draft response below. I tweaked the points slightly.

</pan>

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 that an individual associated with the White House advance team, Jonathan Dach, may have also had an 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 investigation 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 staff or volunteers may have engaged in inappropriate conduct on the trip.=C2◆

</=>

(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 a volunteer, NOT an employee of the White House, who

</=>

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

--had no responsibility for Presidential security, and,

--was not subject to any disciplinary action by the White House because he was 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 as a rumor -- from the USSS and to do so thoroughly and expeditiously:

</=>

--every person who went on the trip was separately interviewed regardless of whether they were White House employees or volunteers, 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 denied bringing a guest to his room. Dach agreed to be interviewed and answer questions, even though he was under no legal obligation to 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 security/personnel investigation relating to its own personnel, they agreed to share anything relevant to White House personnel with the White House. The

USSS did not share any of its own investigative work product with the White House (i.e., interview memoranda), which is standard and appropriate protocol.

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

</=>

The Evidence about each

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 apparently 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.=C2◆

</=>

(1) The 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 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.

</=>

◆=A0 (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 identified 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 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 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 non-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:

♦=AO

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 reference to the White House advance volunteer, nor did anyone from the White House give advice as to how other officials should answer questions about the matter.

Kathryn H. Ruemmler

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304



This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Latham & Watkins LLP
