

b3 per ODNI

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 12:27 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: ~~SBU~~: Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

As discussed.

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

From: Chuck McCullough
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 11:16 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: ~~SBU~~: Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b3 per ODNI

[REDACTED]
Need you plugged in on this. Need to coordinate w/ State's WB person.

Chuck

I. Charles McCullough, III
Intelligence Community Inspector General
[REDACTED]

b3 per ODNI

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

From: Linick, Steve A (OIG) [mailto:linicksa@state.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2015 6:13 AM
To: Chuck McCullough
Subject: Fw: ~~SBU~~: Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

See below

From: [REDACTED] (OIG) [REDACTED]
Date: June 28, 2015 at 9:40:17 PM EDT
To: [REDACTED] (OIG) [REDACTED] Linick, Steve A (OIG) <linicksa@state.gov> [REDACTED] (OIG)
Subject: Fw: ~~SBU~~: Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

b3 per ODNI

Fyi, see bottom email on [REDACTED] assessment over the weekend. I will draft an MA to go out prior to Tuesday's release and will circulate in the am.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 09:30 PM
To: [REDACTED] (OIG); [REDACTED] (OIG)
Subject: Fw: ~~SBU~~: Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 05:05 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: Barr, Joyce A; Grafeld, Margaret P
Subject: Re: ~~SDU~~ Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

For your awareness [REDACTED] and I just spoke about Tuesday's release. He was in the office and raised the following issue with me. The White House is asking the Department to potentially remove a few emails before we publish them on Tuesday. I asked him to let me know which ones. I did not raise [REDACTED] email as I know that one of you are going to raise it with M.

Based on my conversation with [REDACTED] there appears to still be an expectation that we will release emails on Tuesday. I agree with Peggy that we should get confirmation (preferably in writing) about releasing on Tuesday.

From: Barr, Joyce A
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 04:57 PM Eastern Standard Time
To: Grafeld, Margaret P
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: ~~SDU~~ Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

Ok got stuck behind an accident at gas station now. Will come back when I get home in 20 minutes.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

From: Grafeld, Margaret P
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 16:42
To: Barr, Joyce A
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: ~~SDU~~ Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

I've been thinking about the best approach to K2 (or to PK himself). For a number of reasons, I think it is better coming from you, if you don't mind. I believe [REDACTED] shared some related background with you Friday at the 1x1. Happy to talk, if you would like.

BTW, thanks to a Herculean effort of a number of people working long hours yesterday (doing time consuming and labor intensive quality control), we'll be ready to post/release for sure early Tuesday. That said, I'd really like someone (M?) to actually give us the word to do it - and when. Additionally, this effort provides some insight vis a vis Congressional Document Production - that it is not an easy, fully automated process when done right.

From: Barr, Joyce A
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 2:32 PM
To: Grafeld, Margaret P
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: ~~SDU~~ Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

I am not an expert on this stuff but this seems to be a pretty in-depth analysis of issues that warrant a closer look. I definitely think it needs to be raised with M. Let M pass it to L. I would forward [REDACTED] e-mail to K-2 without his comment at the end, he is entitled to his opinion but the blame game doesn't always follow facts. I'm heading out but let me know if you want me to forward this or call K-2. I'll keep checking.

b6
b7C

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.
From: Grafeld, Margaret P
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2015 11:46
To: Barr, Joyce A
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: ~~SBU~~ Fw: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

~~Sensitive But Unclassified~~
~~(Deliberative and Predecisional Information)~~

Joyce,

I am forwarding [REDACTED] message for your informational awareness, as he requested. I have not reviewed the documents he has, so I cannot affirm his concerns - nor would I presume to do so. Indeed, the multi-level review process for this collection was established to ensure that a wide variety of SME's (including those in bureaus and offices with the most contemporary knowledge of current sensitivities, not to mention referral to other agencies for review of their respective equities). That said, I would appreciate your consideration of raising this with M and L - or whether we should proceed with Tuesday's scheduled court-ordered release/posting based on review by Department experts and L's final review.

b6
b7C

With thanks in advance for your guidance regarding how we proceed.
Peggy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2015 2:46 PM
To: Grafeld, Margaret P
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Concerns about the HRC Review...

b6
b7C

Peggy,

A quick note from the office on a rainy Saturday with some concerns about the HRC review. I ask that you pass this note on to Joyce.

At the request of the State Department OIG, we have been providing access to the HRC collection to an inspector from the IC's OIG. This person was here late last night, and is here again today. We are providing him documents to review based on searches of Freedom2; he is providing us the search terms. So far this work has not interfered with our production schedule.

While working with this inspector, I have personally reviewed hundreds of documents in the HRC collection. I can now say, without reservation, that there are literally hundreds of classified emails in this collection; maybe more. For example, there are comments by Department staff in emails relating to the WikiLeaks unauthorized disclosures; many of the emails relating to this actually confirm the information in the disclosures. This material is the subject of FOIA litigation, and the emails will now have to be found, reviewed and upgraded. Under the EO 13526, it would be in our right to classify the entire HRC collection at the Secret level because of the "mosaic effect." While there may be IC equities in the collection, I am very concerned about the inadvertent release of State Department's equities when this collection is released in its entirety -- the potential damage to the foreign relations of the United States could be significant.

I think the State Department's management is unaware of how unique this review and release project is. This project is one of a kind--of the prior nine Secretaries of State, NONE have made their personal papers available to the public so

close to their departure from office. There is probably a reason for this—the information is too sensitive. In addition, none of the previous nine Secretaries have had their papers exposed to FOIA requests; and only one, Warren Christopher, released his papers without restrictions. The opening of his collection in 2014 was done 17 years after the papers were first donated to the Hoover Institution. Of the last nine Secretaries, either they have not made their papers available; or they have closed them to the public; or they have placed restrictions on their access. In the case of Alexander Haig and Edmund Muskie, the government had to remove hundreds of boxes of papers that contain classified materials.

Regarding the current review, given the content and scope of the collection, and the speed in which the review is being conducted, I am concerned that possible classified material will be posted in Tuesday's release. While the Department cannot be held responsible for the decision by the Court to release this material so soon, we do have the opportunity to push back on the schedule in order to make a proper review. In my opinion, more material needs to be referred to other agencies for consultation; and more material needs to be upgraded. Since we are not being given enough time by Department management to do this, the A Bureau and IPS, cannot be held responsible for the overall damage to U.S. foreign policy that may occur with this release.

[REDACTED]

b6
b7C

[REDACTED]

Office of Information Programs and Services (IPS) Bureau of Administration Department of State
Washington, DC 20520

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

07/22/2015

- They have a different set of e-mails from them and Cheryl Mills not all in box of DVDs acquired by USDS/16 b3 per ODNI b6 per FBI b7C per FBI
- When somebody leaves they take .pst file (snapshot of day)
- 5 state executive secretaries in boxes
- Two BlackBerry accounts AT&T/cingular telephone separate email accounts
- IC/16 is going to do a congressional notification tonight - we can have copy
- 5 classified documents now. [redacted] was mistaken in one b6 b7C
- IC/16 is going to get an index of what they have in boxes of DVDs
- Briefing Grayson on Friday and going to bring up CI referral
- Last Thursday as part of Benghazi review committee IC/16 and USDS/16 referred, IC/16
- Kennedy/USDS: - request their jurisdiction no formal notification - .pst file
- Telly Cantelero they make request for e-mails
- Accepted recommendations: 1) IC FOIA officials on review.
- [redacted] are Williams and Connolly attorneys
- [redacted] is one of State FOIA officials b6 b7C
- For AD in the meeting: A couple of examples.