

EXECUTIVE SESSION
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
JOINT WITH THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: NELLIE OHR

Friday, October 19, 2018

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in 2141 Rayburn House Office Building, commencing at 10:10 a.m.

Present: Representatives Meadows, Jordan, Ratcliffe, Gaetz, Raskin, and Krishnamoorthi.

Mr. Somers. Good morning.

This is a transcribed interview of Nellie Ohr. Chairman Goodlatte and Chairman Gowdy requested this interview as part of a joint investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform into decisions made and not made by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the 2016 Presidential election.

Would the witness please state her name and the name of her current employer for the record.

Ms. Ohr. Nellie Ohr. I work for Accensure iDefense.

Mr. Somers. On behalf of the chairman, I want to thank you for appearing today, and we appreciate your willingness to appear voluntarily. My name is Zack Somers, I'm the majority general counsel for the House Judiciary Committee. I will now ask everyone else who is here in the room to introduce themselves for the record, starting with Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Jordan. Jim Jordan.

Mr. Meadows. Mark Meadows, North Carolina.

Mr. Ratcliffe. John Ratcliffe, Texas.

Mr. Gaetz. Matt Gaetz, Florida.

Mr. Breitenbach. Ryan Breitenbach, senior counsel, House Judiciary, majority.

Mr. Baker. Arthur Baker, investigative counsel, House Judiciary Committee, majority staff.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Raja Krishnamoorthi.

Mr. Castor. Steve Castor with the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, majority.

Ms. Doocy. Mary Doocy.

Mr. Buddharaju. Deep Buddharaju, House Oversight, Mr. Gowdy's staff.

Ms. Greene. Emily Greene, with Mr. Jordan's staff.

Mr. Hiller. Aaron Miller, House Judiciary.

Ms. Hariharan. Arya Hariharan, House Judiciary, counsel, minority.

Ms. Sachsman Grooms. Susanne Sachsman Grooms, House Oversight Democrats.

Mr. Somers. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply in this setting, but there are some guidelines that we follow that I'd like to go over. Our questioning will proceed in rounds. The majority will ask questions for -- first for an hour, and the minority will have an opportunity to ask questions for an equal period of time. We'll go back and forth in this manner until there are no more questions and the interview is over.

Typically we take a short break at the end of each hour of questioning, but if you need to take a break apart from that, just let us know. We may also take a break for lunch at the appropriate point. As I noted earlier, you are appearing today voluntarily. Accordingly, we anticipate that you will answer -- that our questions will receive complete responses. To

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the extent that you decline to answer our questions or if counsel instructs you not to answer, we will consider whether a subpoena is necessary.

As you can see, there is an official reporter taking down everything that is said to make a written record. So we ask that you give verbal responses to all questions. Do you understand that?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Somers. So that the reporter can take down a clear, it is important that we don't talk over one another or interrupt each other, if we can help it. Both committees encourage witnesses who appear for transcribed interviews to freely consult with counsel, if they so choose. And you are appearing today with counsel.

If counsel would please state their names for the record.

Mr. Berman. Joshua Berman for Ms. Ohr, from the Clifford Chance law firm.

Mr. Hekman. Rebecca Hekman from Ms. Ohr from Clifford Chance.

Mr. Somers. We want you to answer our questions in the most complete and truthful manner possible, so we will take our time. If you have any questions or if you do not understand one of our questions, please let us know. If you honestly don't know the answer to a question or do not remember it, it is best not to guess. Please give us your best recollection, and it is okay to tell us if you learned the information from someone else. If

there are things that you don't know or can't remember, just say so, and please inform us who, to the best of your knowledge, might be able to provide a more complete answer to the question.

You should also understand that although this interview is not under oath, you are required by law to answer questions from Congress truthfully.

Do you understand that?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Somers. This also applies to questions posed by congressional staff in an interview. Do you understand this?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Somers. Witnesses who knowingly provide false testimony could be subject to criminal prosecution for perjury or for making false statements. Do you understand this?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Somers. Is there any reason you're unable to provide truthful answers to today's questions?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Somers. Finally, we ask that you not speak about what we discuss in this interview with anyone outside of who is here in the room today in order to preserve the integrity of our investigation. That is the end of my preamble. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Mr. Berman. Could I take a moment. So the last part, you just mentioned a confidentiality. Does that agreement govern

everybody in this room?

Mr. Somers. It does.

Mr. Gaetz. This is Matt Gaetz, Judiciary member from Florida. I'm unaware of any House rule that requires confidentiality in these proceedings, and I do not consider myself bound by it at all.

Mr. Hiller. And, Zack, I think we'd like to point out that information has routinely been leaking from these proceedings, sometimes while the interview is ongoing, I'd note that for the record, it's important to know that.

Mr. Somers. I will just say if there's something you feel you need to respond to that came out of the interview, I think you would not be bound by that. But I think if --

Mr. Meadows. And since, counselor, since you asked, I think that it was a bipartisan initiative in a public hearing with Mr. Strzok that both Democrats and Republicans suggested that these transcripts be made available publicly after individual personal items are scrubbed so that there's no personal embarrassment. And so in answering that, I think consistent with that theme, I fully anticipate all transcripts will be released after scrubbing the personal information because there's many on the Democrat and Republican side that wants -- wants that to happen. And if that's a mischaracterization -- mischaracterization from my Democrat colleagues, you correct the record, but I believe that's where we were. Is that correct?

Mr. Hiller. Yes, sir.

Mr. Meadows. All right. And so with that in mind, obviously, speaking to it in generic terms is something that happens on a regular basis, but obviously there's been a few more specifics that have come out of these hearings. But from a personal standpoint, if there are personal confidences that, relationship-wise, we want to be sensitive to that to make sure that those are protected.

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir. Thank you. I've let Mrs. Ohr know that if she needs a break, a nature break, I appreciate you reiterating that. She will just tap me on the shoulder or let one of you know. I'd like to just put on the record, thank you, Mr. Baker, for being patient with us as we found time, a date for this hearing or this interview, I know we went back and forth, but I appreciated the courtesy on the various scheduling.

And thank you for pointing out, she's here voluntarily, unlike others who have needed to be subpoenaed, haven't showed. She from the absolute get-go has been willing to come in and answer questions. And that's why she's here voluntarily. There was no need and there will be no need for a subpoena at any point with her.

And, finally, as Mr. Baker and I have discussed many times over the weeks, and we talked the last time I was here with another client, she wants to answer every single possible question. She's not going to be waiving any privileges. So

doctor/patient, attorney/client, marital or things along those lines, so I recommend -- the House may have a different view of privileges. So to the extent questions can be asked, she wants to answer them. That's the goal.

Mr. Meadows. Well for the record, I just want to say thank you, and Ms. Ohr, thank you. One of the things that -- we may see things differently, and I don't know that we do because I'm not -- this is my first time meeting you. But I can tell you that I've seen things differently with some of the other witnesses, and yet I've found that their transparency has actually made a difference with me, and so I thank you for voluntarily showing up today, Ms. Ohr.

Mr. Somers. All right. The time is now 10:19. We'll begin our first round of questioning. Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Jordan. Thank you, Zack. Ms. Ohr, thank you again for being here. I want to ask you -- start by asking some of the some things about how you came to work for Fusion GPS, and then get into certain people that you may or may not have had contact with and what took place in those meetings or conversations.

So what were the dates that you worked for Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. Approximately, October of 2015, give or take a couple weeks, and into the end of September, 2016.

Mr. Jordan. And do you recall how much money you were -- your compensation for that, it looks like almost a year, working for Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah, I was paid \$55 an hour, and I worked variable amounts, somewhere around 30 hours a week. And I don't recall the exact total.

Mr. Jordan. Do you work from your home or do you work from an office space or where did you work?

Ms. Ohr. From home. From home.

Mr. Jordan. From home.

Ms. Ohr. Can you hear me all right?

Mr. Jordan. I can.

Ms. Ohr. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. Can you hear me?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And what did you do?

Ms. Ohr. I did online open source research using Russian sources, media, social media, government, you know, business registers, legal databases, all kinds of things.

Mr. Jordan. To what end? What was the objective?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. At what time period are you talking?

Mr. Jordan. That year you worked for Fusion.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. I mean, I did a couple of different projects for them.

Mr. Jordan. Can you tell me what those projects were?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. The first project, the initial project had to do with looking into a particular Russian firm that was suspected of being involved in sex trafficking.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Can you tell me the name of that firm?

Ms. Ohr. Vlad Models.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And what else did you work on?

Ms. Ohr. I worked on a project looking into the relationship of Donald Trump with organized crime, a Russian organized crime.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And was that work at all related to the now famous dossier?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. What was it related to then -- walk me through what that work entailed?

Ms. Ohr. What it entailed in what sense?

Mr. Jordan. Describe what you were doing and what the objective was?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah, I would write occasional reports based on the open source research that I described about Donald Trump's relationships with various people in Russia.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. I want to come back to that. So, who approached you?

Ms. Ohr. Nobody approached me.

Mr. Jordan. You approached Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. And how did that happen?

Ms. Ohr. I believe it was in September of 2015 that I read an article in the paper that mentioned Glenn Simpson. And I remembered because he had been a Wall Street Journal reporter

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

working on things like Russian crime and corruption, so I recognized the name. I was underemployed at that time and I was looking for opportunities.

Mr. Jordan. So you called him up?

Ms. Ohr. I sent an email.

Mr. Jordan. All right, and then what happened?

Ms. Ohr. He said, come in and we'll meet.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And you met and --

Ms. Ohr. Then they agreed to have me do some project for them.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So it was all on your initiative?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And tell me about what transpired in that first meeting then with you and Mr. Simpson.

Ms. Ohr. I met with --

Mr. Jordan. Well, first of all, did you know Glenn Simpson prior to that? You said you read his name in the press and you knew he worked for the Wall Street Journal, so had you met with him prior?

Ms. Ohr. I had been at a conference that he was at. I don't recall directly talking with him at that conference, and I don't know whether he knew who, you know, who I was other than the fact that I attended that conference.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And did he know at the time that he hired you that your husband worked for the Department of Justice?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Was Glenn Simpson acquainted with your husband, Bruce? Did they have a friendship or relationship prior to you going to work for Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. They were acquainted, yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And what did he specifically tell you he wanted you to do?

Ms. Ohr. Initially, the project that I first described regarding the company that was suspected of involvement in sex trafficking.

Mr. Jordan. And who was the client that wanted that information, do you know?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. So you were asked to get information on this trafficking issue by Mr. Simpson, and you didn't know who you were working for?

Ms. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. On the second project, the second -- refresh my memory on the second project again. The second project was what?

Ms. Ohr. Looking into the relationship of Donald Trump with Russian organized crime figures.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And who was financing that operation?

Ms. Ohr. I didn't know.

Mr. Jordan. You didn't know?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. All right. Talk to me about your interactions that you may have had with Christopher Steele.

Ms. Ohr. I met with him -- I mean, Bruce brought me along to meals on, I believe, as I recall, three occasions with Christopher Steele.

Mr. Jordan. So you had three in-person meetings with Mr. Steele?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. Do you recall those dates? I mean, I know of one, but do you recall the dates of all those meetings?

Ms. Ohr. One of them was shortly after his first wife died. I don't recall what -- exactly what date that was.

Mr. Jordan. Let me back up. Were they all here in D.C. or where were the meetings?

Ms. Ohr. All in D.C.

Mr. Jordan. All right. And the first one was, you said, after Mr. Steele's wife had passed?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. And you met here in D.C.?

Ms. Ohr. D.C.

Mr. Jordan. Were all these meetings between the -- did all these meetings take place at the time you were working for Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So how many of them took place between

October 2015 and September 2016?

Ms. Ohr. Just the final -- yeah, I think just the final one. I don't remember the date of the second one.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And the final one is what date, do you know?

Ms. Ohr. The final one, July 30, 2016.

Mr. Jordan. And that's the one at the Mayflower Hotel?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

Mr. Jordan. And that's the one at the Mayflower Hotel?

Ms. Ohr. That made what?

Mr. Jordan. I'm sorry. That's the one that took place at the Mayflower Hotel? I'll speak into the mike. Is that right?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And who was at that meeting?

Ms. Ohr. Myself, Bruce, Chris Steele, and an associate of Chris Steele.

Mr. Jordan. Do you know that individual's name?

Ms. Ohr. No, I'm sorry, I don't remember it.

Mr. Jordan. So four people at the meeting.

Ms. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. What did you talk about?

Ms. Ohr. His suspicions that Russian Government figures were supporting the candidacy of Donald Trump.

Mr. Jordan. Did you get any information at that meeting?

Ms. Ohr. Mainly that.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. No, I mean, did they actually physically give you any documents, any electronic communications, anything at that meeting --

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall receiving anything, no.

Mr. Jordan. And what did Mr. Steele say about Mr. -- then candidate Donald Trump and involvement in Russia and what Russia may be doing? Do you recall what was said?

Ms. Ohr. He was very concerned that his research had led him to the conclusion that Russian government figures had for a number of years been promoting the potential -- a potential presidency of Donald Trump.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So was the information given at that meeting, would you say that was what became part of, again, the now well-known document called the dossier.

Ms. Ohr. When I eventually read the dossier, I recognized that argument in there.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So you did read the dossier?

Ms. Ohr. When it became public.

Mr. Jordan. Not before?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Did you know why Mr. Steele was in town? Why he was in D.C. that particular weekend?

Ms. Ohr. I don't.

Mr. Jordan. Did you talk with -- did you have conversations with your employer, Mr. Simpson, about Christopher Steele in the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

course of your work for Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. After meeting Christopher Steele, we mentioned it to each other that I had had breakfast with him.

Mr. Jordan. You say you mentioned it to Glenn Simpson?

Ms. Ohr. Glenn Simpson. Or there was some chitchat about the fact that we had had breakfast.

Mr. Jordan. Okay how often did you talk with Mr. Simpson? You're working from home --

Ms. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. You got these two projects you're working on. You said that they weren't directly involved in the dossier. Did you talk to him on a daily basis, weekly basis? Did you send information to him? How did the work relationship operate?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. I didn't meet directly with him. I would go in every few weeks, and I would -- I only met with him, not every one of those meetings, and I would in between send my reports in. So every few weeks.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Tell me your background prior to working for Fusion? Tell me your employment background?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. I started out in academia. I taught Russian history at Vassar College, and then when we came to Washington, I did -- I was an independent contractor doing contract work for various -- in support of U.S. Government clients in general, and --

Mr. Jordan. Walk me through --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Ms. Ohr. Sorry?

Mr. Jordan. Walk me through the clients you did contract work for. Was this U.S. Government?

Ms. Ohr. U.S. Government.

Mr. Jordan. Various agencies in the United States Government.

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Tell me the agencies?

Mr. Berman. I'm not sure how to address this. I'm not sure what the U.S. Government agencies' positions are, given various agreements she signed as parts of her independent contracting relationships. So she's willing to answer questions, I just don't know -- don't want to put her at risk of violating employment agreements she had at the time, especially with U.S. Government agencies.

Mr. Jordan. Is it fair to say you worked with some of the intelligence-based agencies in the United States Government.

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Did you work for the CIA?

Mr. Berman. Again, I would raise the same concerns, sir, if we're going to get into specifics.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And for how long did you do that and how many different contracts did you have?

Ms. Ohr. Starting in 2000, I did some part-time contracting for Mitre, which is a contract --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.

Ms. Ohr. Mitre. Mitre Corporation, which in turn had contracts with U.S. Government clients.

Mr. Jordan. Got it.

Ms. Ohr. Through most of 2008. And then starting in 2008, I worked for Open Source Works.

Mr. Jordan. Okay.

Mr. Berman. Sir, can I just consult with my client?

Mr. Jordan. Sure.

Mr. Berman. Sir, may I ask a question, just as a follow-up?

Mr. Jordan. Yes.

Mr. Berman. Mrs. Ohr, have you ever worked for a U.S. Government agency?

Ms. Ohr. Not directly.

Mr. Jordan. Not directly, but --

Ms. Ohr. As an independent contractor.

Mr. Jordan. As an independent contractor -- so you were basically a subcontractor for entities who did have contracts with the United States Government?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Yes. But you know that the folks you were contracted to provide work for, that you had a working relationship for, you know that they were working for various intelligence-based agencies in the United States Government?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Got it. All right.

Mr. Meadows. So I have one follow-up. Have you ever submitted a resume that would list any of those agencies on that resume?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. So no resume that would indicate that you did work for those agencies on a resume?

Ms. Ohr. My resume stated that I was an independent contractor doing work in support of U.S. Government.

Mr. Meadows. But normally there is a sentence or two right after it on what they did. And so what I'm saying is, did -- in those resumes, and for example, like with Mitre, we do work with the CIA, NSA whoever --

Ms. Ohr. I do not explicitly name those agencies in a resume.

Mr. Meadows. All right.

Mr. Jordan. Earlier you mentioned that had -- that you communicated your work with emails to Fusion, your employer. Do you still have those emails if we needed to get access to those and see those? Do you still have those records?

Ms. Ohr. I have them.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. I am going to go back a second. You saw Glenn Simpson's name. You remembered that you had seen him at some kind of conference. You knew your husband had a relationship with him. You sought him out because you were looking for work.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

At that meeting, did he say -- was it like, well, you know, we're looking for someone who's an expert on Russia?

Tell me exactly when you approach him, and he says, as a matter of fact, we actually need someone just like, with your skills. How did that first meeting where you're trying to get employment, how did that go?

Ms. Ohr. I should mention that on a very important aspect of my recollection of him was that he was very -- he had done some very important work as a Wall Street Journal journalist on exactly Russian corruption, and organized crime, and oligarchs and things like that. So I knew we had a shared interest in that topic. So that was kind of the context for our discussion.

And in terms of, you know, we need someone, whether he said something like that, you know, it's my -- my sense is that he was saying, you know, we can always use someone who has those kinds of skills?

Mr. Berman. I think that Mr. Jordan is asking you what you remember actually from the conversation.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. And I don't remember the specifics of the conversation.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. What did your husband know about your work? Particularly --

Ms. Ohr. He knew that I was --

Mr. Jordan. Again, I'm focused on your work from 2015 to 2016 at Fusion.

Ms. Ohr. What did he know about it? He knew that I was working there.

Mr. Jordan. I mean, did you talk about the work you were doing?

Mr. Berman. Again, Ms. Ohr is not going to talk about her communication with Mr. Ohr, given that it's protected under the marital privilege.

Mr. Meadows. So, counselor, so in the spirit of transparency where you started out with this, a big part, as you surely anticipated, is what communication happened between Glenn Simpson, Nellie Ohr, and ultimately, her husband, Bruce Ohr. And what you're telling me is that any communication she's had with her husband she's going to claim privilege, marital spouse privilege, to not answer that. Is that correct? Because that's not consistent with what you told me at the beginning.

Mr. Berman. Ms. Ohr is more than willing to answer questions about her communications with Glenn Simpson. This committee certainly can bring Mr. Simpson in here and answer similar questions. They have had Mr. Ohr in here. She like, hopefully, no U.S. citizen, is going to be compelled to discuss her private conversations with her husband.

Mr. Meadows. I would not ever ask for private conversations, nor would I share mine. However, there is a much different venue when you look at a July 30th meeting where Mr. Ohr brings his wife to a meeting with Christopher Steele, and obviously she was part

of a conversation there. Those kinds of things have to be -- and it would certainly include communication with her husband. I'm not asking for bedroom talk. Okay?

Mr. Berman. Mr. Meadows, totally fair. At any conversation in which anybody else is present, Glenn Simpson, Chris Steele, a third party associate, a person on the subway, she will answer those questions, there is no privilege if it is not exclusively between her and her husband, at least for today's conversation.

Mr. Meadows. So, but let me be clear because I want to make sure we are clear. Those conversations that she may have had with her husband that then were communicated with a third party are no longer just private conversations between her and her husband. For example, if she has a conversation with her husband and then ends up talking to Glenn Simpson or Christopher Steele, even at a later date, they are no longer private conversations, as much as they are shared with a third party. Would you agree?

Mr. Berman. Sir, so if she's asked the question: Did you ever share with Mr. Simpson a conversation you had with your husband? Obviously, there's a yes/no answer to that. And if the answer is yes, then I recognize there isn't a privilege. What did you tell Mr. Simpson about your conversation with your husband? I think that's squarely, sir, in what you're asking, and I would not -- I would instruct my client to answer that question because she's talking about what she told Mr. Simpson. Different than, what did you and Mr. Ohr -- what did you and Bruce talk about

over --

Mr. Meadows. So we just need to be a little more specific with some of our questions?

Mr. Gaetz. And, counselor, let me ask this question, it is your view of the privilege that it covers the existence of the conversation beyond just the substance of it?

Mr. Berman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Gaetz. For the purpose of this discussion?

Mr. Berman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Gaetz. All right. Thanks.

Mr. Meadows. While he's looking at his notes, let me go back to that July 30th meeting at the Mayflower Hotel at approximately 10 a.m. It was in the morning. Is that correct?

Ms. Ohr. It was in the morning.

Mr. Meadows. Okay. Why were you included in that meeting?

Ms. Ohr. Because I'm interested in Russia.

Mr. Meadows. So it was totally an academic exercise for you to go and be with a DOJ official? I mean, I'm interested in a lot of things, too, but I don't normally get to go in and sit in on a meeting between an informant and a DOJ official just because I have an interest. So you're saying it was totally academic? You were just interested in Russia?

Ms. Ohr. Could you rephrase the question?

Mr. Meadows. Okay. You took no role, and you had no anticipated role, and that you just asked to attend the meeting

just for curiosity?

Ms. Ohr. Well, I mean, I know that I view myself as part of a community of people who are interested in Russia, and Chris Steele was part of that community. And we had interesting discussions about Russia before, and so I viewed --

Mr. Meadows. So why didn't you set up the meeting with Christopher Steele? Why was it a meeting that your husband sets up and you up and then you come along? You obviously -- you're a very learned and intelligent individual, your know where I'm going with this. How do you get to be in a room with a DOJ official and a potential informant, and you happen to work for someone who has hired that same informant?

Ms. Ohr. I didn't know that.

Mr. Meadows. When did you learn that?

Ms. Ohr. At the breakfast.

Mr. Meadows. So at the breakfast you learned that you and Mr. Steele are working for the same company?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. And so, again, you went because you thought he could tell you things about Russia?

Ms. Ohr. As I said, my view is of being part of a community of people who are interested in Russia, that we have a back and forth discussion, we try to mutually understand what is going on, and it's by no means clear what is going on in the minds of some elite --

Mr. Meadows. But Mr. Steele is not the most learned when it comes to matters of the Russia community. He may be an informant. He may have obviously connections. But I wouldn't say that when you look at all the academics that are out there on Russia, that Christopher Steele's name is even in the top 20. So why all of a sudden was there this interest in meeting with Christopher Steele on that particular day?

Ms. Ohr. I mean, all I can do is repeat what I've said.
I --

Mr. Meadows. So did you take part in the conversation letting him know about the open source work that you were doing with Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall specifically what I said to him --

Mr. Meadows. I didn't ask specifically, I said generally, did you talk about your work with Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall telling him the content of what I was researching, but I'm not sure about that. The fact that I was doing work for GPS, clearly, he was aware of that.

Mr. Jordan. So he knew that before the meeting? You said you didn't know he was working for your employer when you got to the meeting, but did Christopher Steele --

Ms. Ohr. I don't know if he knew before or not, I'm not sure.

Mr. Jordan. Your husband knew that you worked for Fusion and your husband knew that Chris Steele worked for Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know whether he knew that he worked for Fusion.

Mr. Jordan. You don't know whether your husband knew?

Ms. Ohr. I don't. I don't.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. I'm sorry Mark. Go ahead and question.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Ms. Ohr, you're saying that at that early July, 2016, meeting with Christopher Steele is when you learned that you and Mr. Steele were both doing work for Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. In that moment when you realized that at the breakfast, did it cross your mind that maybe the work that you were doing for Fusion GPS, as it pertained to Donald Trump in your reports, had been communicated to Christopher Steele?

Ms. Ohr. I probably didn't think that through. I mean, I didn't think about it.

Mr. Ratcliffe. At some point in time, based on your husband's prior testimony, did it dawn on you that the work that you had been doing maybe had been part of the information upon which Mr. Steele was relying or using in preparation of the dossier?

Ms. Ohr. Judging from the content of the dossier, it seems to be quite separate, but I don't know for sure.

Mr. Ratcliffe. But at some point didn't you come to the conclusion that the research that you had been doing should be made known to the FBI because it had a connection to Christopher

Steele?

Ms. Ohr. There's kind of two questions there, could you separate them out?

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did you request that the research that you had been doing on behalf of Fusion GPS be provided to the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. Request --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did Bruce Ohr take your research and provide it to the FBI?

Mr. Berman. I'm not sure -- I'm not sure. Are you asking about a communication between her and Mr. Ohr?

Mr. Ratcliffe. I'm asking about an action between her and Mr. Ohr. I want to know whether in the chain of custodial evidence her research on behalf of Fusion GPS was taken through Mr. Ohr to the FBI or to the Department of Justice?

Mr. Berman. But that's communication between --

Mr. Ratcliffe. It's not communication, it's an action.

Mr. Berman. An action is viewed as communication, sir.

Mr. Somers. No, no. He's asking if Bruce Ohr gave information to the FBI, a third party, that came from Ms. Ohr. I don't understand how there's a spousal communication problem there.

Mr. Ratcliffe. There isn't.

Mr. Berman. Well if you're asking about a link in the chain between, hypothetically, Ms. Ohr giving something to Mr. Ohr, which you are, then that is communication.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I'm ask about her role in connection with the custodial chain of evidence for the Steele dossier that went from Christopher Steele to the FBI. I'm asking if she played a role in that with her husband.

Mr. Berman. Did you play any role with regards to the dossier and Christopher Steele?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Berman. Or Mr. Ohr? Anything with the dossier?

Ms. Ohr. I first saw the dossier when it became public.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So did your research go from you to the FBI? Was the FBI provided with your research for Fusion GPS?

Mr. Berman. Did you give the FBI your research?

Ms. Ohr. I did not directly give the FBI my research.

Mr. Somers. Did you ask anyone else to give the FBI your research?

Mr. Berman. Again, hypothetically, if that engaged a conversation between her and her husband, she can't answer that.

Mr. Somers. I'm not asking her who she asked, that might be a follow-up question where there would be an objection, but the basic question, did you ask anyone to give the FBI your research doesn't necessarily call for a spousal communication. I asked a follow-up, it may.

Mr. Berman. Fair enough. I'm going to instruct her not to answer that question.

Mr. Breitenbach. So let me ask it a different way. Are you

aware that your research was provided to the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. I'm not aware of whether it was provided to the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me go back to July 30th, because there's something that's just not connecting, and maybe help me understand this a little bit. Because you said that you were unaware that he was working for Fusion GPS, and you were unaware -- you had no knowledge whether your husband knew he was working for GPS. Is that correct?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Meadows. So when he mentioned he was working for Fusion GPS, did you have this unbelievable "aha" moment. Oh my goodness, you're working for the same firm I am. Help me understand that.

Ms. Ohr. Yeah, more or less.

Mr. Meadows. Okay. Did your husband have an "aha" moment?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall.

Mr. Meadows. What do you mean you don't recall?

Ms. Ohr. I was having my own "aha" moment, so I wasn't watching his --

Mr. Meadows. Well, here is the whole thing, Ms. Ohr. And, again, I appreciate you being here voluntarily, but there are key questions, and the premise of how you're characterizing the conversation with other testimony that we have is a little inconsistent, and so I want to give you a chance to really clarify where you are because, I'm not trying to trap you. I'm honestly

just trying to get to the truth.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

Mr. Meadows. It is our understanding that your husband knew of both connections, yours and Mr. Steele's, to Fusion GPS. And there would be an "aha" moment where your husband would say, hold on, just a minute, you're working for the same firm as my wife. I believe you would have recalled that. Did that happen?

Ms. Ohr. Not in my recollection, but as I said, I was having my own "aha" moment.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So the context of that conversation. You said it was basically more about your interest in Russia. Obviously, the conversation didn't stay there because the conversation focused a great deal on Carter Page at that point. Is that correct?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall. I mean, I don't recall whether it was or not.

Mr. Meadows. Do you recall Carter Page's name coming up?

Ms. Ohr. There's a lot about that that I don't recall. I mean, I had been doing research on my own, and so if there was something he said --

Mr. Meadows. So as an academic -- here is my concern. As an academic, you're paid for your ability to recall.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

Mr. Meadows. I mean, that's what a professor gets paid for.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

Mr. Meadows. And what you're saying is is that here in this particular situation you can't recall whether Carter Page's name was brought up?

Ms. Ohr. As I was saying, there were, you know, a number of things discussed, but I had been doing things in my own research. And so if something chimed with what I had been independently finding through my own open source research, then I kind of -- it didn't stick in my memory, it didn't jump out.

Mr. Berman. Were you present for the entire breakfast?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Berman. Was there a time where you walked away from the table to go to the bathroom?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. Counselor, I would ask you -- if you're going to coach her -- here is the problem. We've got sworn -- well, it's not sworn, we have transcribed interviews that would indicate that Carter Page and many of his associates met with different people, that that was the topic, a main topic of the conversation at your breakfast meeting, and we got that from your husband, so would that surprise you to know that there were multiple conversations that morning about Carter Page that you cannot recall?

Ms. Ohr. It would not surprise me if he was discussed.

Mr. Meadows. Okay.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I want to try to clarify one point that I had

asked you earlier. Your husband testified under oath that you, quote, provided me with a memory stick that included research, she, meaning you, had done for Fusion GPS on various Russian figures. And the reason she provided that information to me is, my understanding was, it related to some of the same, it related to the FBI's Russia investigation, and she gave me that stick to give to the FBI. End quote.

Do you have any reason to question the veracity of your husband's testimony under oath?

Ms. Ohr. I do not.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Thank you.

Mr. Jordan. That was the same thing I was going to go to -- let me go back 1 second. Who did you give your information to at Fusion? Did you report directly to Glenn Simpson or someone else.

Ms. Ohr. I reported to someone else.

Mr. Jordan. Who was that individual?

Ms. Ohr. Jake Berkowitz.

Mr. Jordan. Excuse me.

Ms. Ohr. Jake Berkowitz.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Thank you. Did you in the course of your work at Fusion, did you ever interact or talk with anyone in the press about your work?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Did you ever communicate with anyone at the

Perkins Coie law firm.

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Anyone associated with the Clinton campaign or the Democrat National Committee?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. All right. I'm going to switch here. If you want to stay on the July 30th meeting, I have a few more there but -- go ahead.

Mr. Meadows. So going back, and since it's the only meeting that you recall having with Mr. Steele, and that's why we keep coming back to that date, and obviously, you're aware from reports that the investigation was opened up on Mr. Trump the following day?

Ms. Ohr. Subsequently. More recently I learned of this.

Mr. Meadows. Right. So you're characterizing this conversation as being a Russian intellectual conversation, and yet, your husband's notes would indicate that you, and Mr. Steele, and I guess this fourth person -- who was the fourth person?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall the person's --

Mr. Meadows. Male or female?

Ms. Ohr. Male.

Mr. Meadows. Male. Where were they from?

Ms. Ohr. If I recall correctly, he had a British accent, so I'm guessing he was from the UK.

Mr. Meadows. But you didn't mind him being part of a meeting

and you didn't know where he was from? I mean, you were discussing personal work-related stuff, and you're doing that with somebody that came with Christopher Steele, and you didn't know who they were?

Ms. Ohr. Well, he introduced them as an associate.

Mr. Meadows. I understand that, but, I mean, wouldn't you want to know whether the information you're sharing while you're under contract with Fusion GPS is being shared in an appropriate manner?

Ms. Ohr. As I understood, I mean, I would take appropriate precautions with anybody, but to -- you know -- but to adhere to my NDA to the extent that I viewed it as necessary, and in this case once I learned, I guess, that he was working for Fusion GPS, I didn't -- I mean, I didn't provide that much information. I didn't talk that much.

Mr. Meadows. So this gentleman was an associate with Mr. Steele at Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. No, I'm sorry -- I --

Mr. Meadows. I knew the answer to that, but go ahead. I mean, I guess what I'm saying is.

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Meadows. Where was any associate of Mr. Steele's?

Ms. Ohr. As I recall, he was, he worked for Mr. Steele's company?

Mr. Meadows. So he worked for which company?

Ms. Ohr. Well, subsequently, I recall that the name was Orbis at the time, I did not remember.

Mr. Meadows. And so he worked for Orbis, and he didn't say anything about his background?

Ms. Ohr. The associate?

Mr. Meadows. Yeah. Who he used to work for?

Ms. Ohr. No. Nope.

Mr. Meadows. So you lacked curiosity there. You didn't really care who -- did he talk much, the associate?

Ms. Ohr. Not that I recall.

Mr. Meadows. Did he say anything of significance?

Ms. Ohr. Not that I recall.

Mr. Meadows. All right. In your husband's notes it talked that you had extensive conversations about Donald Trump, candidate Donald Trump at that point. Did you recall that?

Ms. Ohr. We had conversations about him. As I said, as I said, I left partway through the conversation.

Mr. Meadows. Well, just for a bathroom break, is what your counselor said. So you left through the conversation and you came back. How long was the total conversation?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall how long it was.

Mr. Meadows. How long were you absent? How long did you go to the -- well, I don't want to ask that. How long were you absent from the conversation?

Ms. Ohr. Well, I then went elsewhere.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Meadows. So you're saying the meeting went on after you --

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. -- after you left. Why did you excuse yourself?

Ms. Ohr. I understood that they wanted to talk.

Mr. Meadows. Talk about what?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Meadows. So you excuse yourself and you're not sure what they wanted to talk about?

Ms. Ohr. I assumed it was a continuation of the conversation, that it was not my place to be there.

Mr. Meadows. So do you recall when they talked about having Trump over the barrel?

Ms. Ohr. No. Huh-uh.

Mr. Meadows. So did you say anything derogatory about Mr. Trump in that meeting?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall.

Mr. Jordan. Ms. Ohr, have you ever met or had conversations with personnel in the FBI, specifically Andy McCabe?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry, what was the second half of your question?

Mr. Jordan. Have you ever had any conversations or meetings with Andy McCabe, former deputy director of the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. No.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Lisa Page, former FBI counselor?

Ms. Ohr. I met her but before she was at the FBI.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And did you have conversations with her during the time period you worked at Fusion regarding the work you were doing or any work that is Fusion was doing?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. How about Peter Strzok?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Did you know about some of the other -- were you kept abreast of other work that Fusion may have been engaged in, like the other clients they had, other work they were doing?

Ms. Ohr. What do you mean by kept abreast of?

Mr. Jordan. Did you know some of the other projects that Fusion GPS and Mr. Simpson were working on?

Ms. Ohr. I was aware of another project.

Mr. Jordan. Can you tell me what that project was?

Ms. Ohr. It had to do with -- now the name of the company escapes me. But it was Veselnitskaya, the lawyer who was involved in a case.

Mr. Jordan. Did you say Veselnitskaya?

Ms. Ohr. That was the name of the lawyer.

Mr. Jordan. Yeah. I'm familiar with her, but talk to me more.

Ms. Ohr. I just knew that he was working on it.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Are you aware of any efforts by Fusion

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

GPS to uncover negative facts about Members of Congress?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall.

Mr. Meadows. I'd ask you to think about that more. You don't recall any work with Fusion GPS about doing negative work on Members of Congress?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall being asked to do work on --

Mr. Jordan. We're not asking you that.

Mr. Meadows. Not that you were asked, that were you aware of it.

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry. That I was aware of independent projects that they were doing on Members of Congress?

Mr. Jordan. Yes.

Ms. Ohr. I'm not aware of any project -- I was not informed of any such projects.

Mr. Meadows. Were you -- excuse me, Jim.

Mr. Jordan. Okay.

Mr. Meadows. It's critical, and if you want to confer with your counselor, you need to do that.

Mr. Berman. You're encouraging a moment. I understand the question, I believe.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir.

Ms. Ohr. Can you repeat the question?

Mr. Berman. I think the question is, and if I rephrase it

inappropriately, please tell me. Are you aware of any work that Fusion GPS was doing, whether or not you worked on it, whether or not you were asked about it, having to do with Members of Congress?

Mr. Jordan. Yes.

Ms. Ohr. No, I'm not.

Mr. Jordan. What about congressional staff?

Ms. Ohr. No, I don't think so.

Mr. Jordan. Specific the name Jason Foster?

Ms. Ohr. What was the last part?

Mr. Jordan. Jason Foster.

Ms. Ohr. Jason Foster. No, I'm not aware of --

Mr. Jordan. Mr. Ratcliffe.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So, Ms. Ohr, one of the concerns had to do with the connection between, obviously, you being seen as the go-between between Fusion GPS and your husband, Mr. Ohr, Bruce Ohr, and by go-between, either directly or indirectly communicating information or transferring information. How many times did a communication, either directly or indirectly, either from your husband to Mr. Simpson or from Mr. Simpson through you to your husband occur?

Ms. Ohr. Wouldn't that involve my communications with my husband?

Mr. Berman. Did Mr. Simpson ever ask you to pass anything along to your husband?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Berman. Is that --

Mr. Meadows. That's part of it, sure.

Mr. Berman. Break it down so we avoid the marital thing.

Ms. Ohr. Okay. He sent an email saying, call me, and I assumed it was for --

Mr. Meadows. We have a copy of that. Obviously, we're talking about something more substantial than that.

Mr. Berman. Did Mr. Simpson ever ask you to pass along anything to your husband?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. Did Mr. Simpson ever expect you to do that?

Ms. Ohr. Not that I'm aware, no.

Mr. Meadows. In your communication, did Mr. Simpson ask you about your meeting with Mr. Steele on July 30th?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall that he asked about it.

Mr. Meadows. Did you report on it?

Ms. Ohr. If I recall correctly, I simply mentioned that we had had this breakfast together and --

Mr. Meadows. And there was no written document that was included with that?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. Were you aware that your husband was having multiple conversations with your boss?

Ms. Ohr. What time period are you talking about?

Mr. Meadows. From November of 2016 -- it would actually be

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

prior to that -- prior to that prior -- to the November election, that he had conversations with your boss. Were you aware of that?

Mr. Berman. Other than whether or not your husband shared that with you? You're not asking did she learn it from her husband. Outside of any conversations with your husband, were you aware that -- you're talking about Mr. Simpson when you say her boss?

Mr. Meadows. Mr. Simpson or associates of Mr. Simpson at a high level, yes.

Ms. Ohr. Who was no longer my boss after September.

Mr. Meadows. Right.

Ms. Ohr. As I said, there was that one email where Glenn said --

Mr. Meadows. So you're saying only one time?

Ms. Ohr. That's the only time that I specifically am aware from Glenn Simpson --

Mr. Meadows. Well, you prepped for this hearing, so obviously you saw that email. But are you saying that there was only one time that that happened because that is not consistent with some of the other information that we have?

Ms. Ohr. Well, anything that my husband directly told me about I would not --

Mr. Berman. She's not answering questions about that.

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Even the existence of a meeting?

Mr. Meadows. Again, counselor, we're not asking for bedroom talk here. What we're asking for is -- obviously, the whole reason for this -- and I'm going to turn it over to my -- to a lawyer.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So, Ms. Ohr, you said that after you and your husband met with Mr. Steele at the Mayflower Hotel that you had a conversation with Glenn Simpson who was still your boss. Correct?

Ms. Ohr. At that time, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You said you had chitchat about it?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Ratcliffe. What do you mean by chitchat?

Ms. Ohr. With Glenn, what I recall is simply, yes, I had breakfast with them or, you know, something like that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did he fill in the details there that you had previously been unaware of about Mr. Christopher Steele being a client of GPS and doing work relating to Russia?

Ms. Ohr. It was understood by that point because I hadn't learned it.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did Mr. Simpson indicate to you that he was going to or wanted to meet with your husband, Bruce Ohr, subsequent to that breakfast?

Ms. Ohr. At that time I don't recall him saying that, but I'm not 100 percent sure.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you know in the fall of 2016 before the election whether or not your husband did in fact meet with Glenn

Simpson?

Ms. Ohr. The only specific date, which I don't remember the specific date, is that email, so --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Tell me about the email?

Ms. Ohr. It just said, call me.

Mr. Ratcliffe. How do you know about the email?

Ms. Ohr. Because we share an email address. My husband and I do, that is.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So I want to ask you about this. Let me give this to your lawyer and I want you to follow along with me.

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Glenn Simpson testified under oath before the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. Berman. Sir, that's what we're looking at, Mr. Simpson's testimony?

Mr. Ratcliffe. It is an excerpt from Glenn Simpson's publicly available testimony before the House Intelligence Committee. On page 78, he was asked a question: You never heard from anyone in the U.S. Government in relation to these matters, either the FBI or the Department of Justice. His answer: After the election. I mean, during the election, no. Read along with me, if you would.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

Mr. Ratcliffe. What did you hear after and from whom and when? His answer: I was asked to provide some information to the

Justice Department. Question: By whom and when? Answer: It was a prosecutor named Bruce Ohr who was following up. You know, I can't remember when, it was some time after Thanksgiving, I think.

And then on the following page, again, halfway down, the top of the paragraph, Mr. Simpson again clarifies under oath. The context of this was that it was after the election. All right.

Have you able to review that testimony?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry. What was the question?

Mr. Ratcliffe. Were you able to review that testimony?

Ms. Ohr. Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Does testimony appear to be accurate to you? Are you aware of facts which indicate that Glenn Simpson did hear from members of either the FBI or the Justice Department before the election of 2016?

Ms. Ohr. Whatever meetings he had with my husband, I don't recall the dates.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Didn't you just tell me you had an email?

Ms. Ohr. Yes, and I don't recall the date of it.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You don't know the timing of that? Whether it was before or after the election?

Ms. Ohr. Not right now, I don't have a recollection of that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do we have a copy of that email? Well, I was going -- what I want to ask you is, Ms. Ohr, was -- this testimony from Mr. Simpson is very much at odds with your husband's sworn testimony before this Joint Task Force. Your husband testified

that he spoke with and met with Mr. Simpson to discuss a Russia-related investigation, including the dossier in August of 2016.

Do you have any reason to doubt that?

Ms. Ohr. To doubt my husband?

Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes.

Ms. Ohr. I have no reason to doubt that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you have any reason to doubt your husband's testimony under oath that during that meeting in August of 2016 that Glenn Simpson gave a memory stick of information to be given to the FBI that your husband believed included the dossier?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know anything about --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Any reason to question your husband's testimony under oath?

Ms. Ohr. If you have that testimony to show me, I would look at it.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I do. Your husband's testimony -- let me read it to you.

Mr. Berman. Could we see a copy -- we're working with one copy, sorry.

Mr. Ratcliffe. The only copy, I assumed -- actually, let me read it to you and I'll show it to you.

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Quote: The rest of the conversation had to

do with additional information that he had gathered about the possible connections between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign, and he gives me a thumb drive. I think the natural assumption at that point, I had not seen the dossier, I had heard there was such a thing as the dossier, but I hadn't seen it, so he gives me a thumb drive. I assume that this was the dossier. End quote.

Ms. Ohr. Who is that referring to? He?

Mr. Ratcliffe. That's your husband referring to Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Berman. What is the timeframe? I don't have the transcript so I don't know when Mr. Ohr -- I don't have my notes either.

Mr. Ratcliffe. It was his testimony that you and I were both present for before the subcommittee.

Mr. Berman. Oh, no, no, I understood when he said that, and you keep saying he was under oath, I can't remember that part. But putting that aside for a moment, what was the time period that he allegedly got this flash drive?

Mr. Ratcliffe. August of 2016.

Mr. Berman. That's what the testimony was? You obviously have transcripts of prior testimony. I would love to see the transcripts. But what is your question for Ms. Ohr? And that is not a transcript, those are your notes, sir.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I'll represent that this is an excerpt of the

transcript.

Mr. Berman. And I will say I have no reason to doubt you on that, I just don't have the transcript in front of me.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I guess my point -- if you take me at my word, counselor and Ms. Ohr, there seems to be a clear contradiction in testimony under oath between what your husband said under oath and what Glenn Simpson said under oath before congressional investigators. I'm trying to find out who is telling the truth. Can you shed any light on who is telling the truth?

Ms. Ohr. I can't.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. I want to go back where Mr. Meadows was just a few minutes ago and go in the other direction. Did Glenn Simpson ever talk to you, encourage you to talk to your husband about certain information, or ask you about conversations you had had with your husband about projects you were working on and things Fusion was working on?

Ms. Ohr. Did he -- can you repeat the question, please?

Mr. Jordan. Did Glenn Simpson ever ask you or talk to you about the work that your husband was doing?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. How about Mr. Steele, did he ever talk to you about work that your husband was doing at DOJ?

Ms. Ohr. Did Mr. Steele talk -- no, I never spoke

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

independently with Mr. Steele except at that breakfast.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[11:10 a.m.]

Mr. Jordan. Are you aware of the fact that after each and every conversation or meeting that your husband Bruce had with Mr. Steele, that he would then go to the FBI and talk to the FBI about those conversations? Were you aware of that fact?

Ms. Ohr. I subsequently learned that.

Mr. Jordan. And when did you learn that?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall when.

Mr. Jordan. Did Glenn --

Mr. Meadows. So you were unaware of that when it was happening?

Ms. Ohr. I mean, I knew that he was close to the FBI, so I would not be surprised.

Mr. Jordan. Did Mr. Simpson ever ask you to talk with anyone at the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?

Mr. Jordan. Did Glenn Simpson ever ask you to meet with anyone at the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Did anyone accompany your husband when he met with the FBI to convey Fusion information?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know. And I'm not -- the two parts of your question are assuming that he did, and I would say that I do not know that.

Mr. Jordan. Well, we know that he did.

Ms. Ohr. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. He's testified to that. And just to be clear, you never went with your husband when he spoke with anyone at the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. And you've never attended any meetings at the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Or with the FBI, I should say. Okay.

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. Let me do one real quick follow-up. The email that you've obviously reviewed or you recall -- so I don't know if you've reviewed it. We're getting you a copy of this -- where actually Glenn Simpson calls in, you respond and you share an email, and you say, Glenn wants you to call, and you basically say, This is for you. You send it to your husband, and it says, This is for you, as I recall it. How would you know that Glenn Simpson calling in was for your husband and not for you?

Ms. Ohr. That's a good question. I guess because I was having regular meetings with -- I mean, actually the time period -- I'm not sure what time period it was, so if it was after I ended work with him, there would be no reason. So --

Mr. Meadows. But even after -- so assuming that you had ended your official response --

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Meadows. -- why -- previous employer sends you an email, says give me a call, and you automatically assume it's your husband? Why would you do that?

Ms. Ohr. Because I was very busy on a new job.

Mr. Meadows. No. No. No. No. Oh, so that's the reason you were -- you were very busy on other jobs, and so you told your husband that I assume it's for you, because you're so busy because you couldn't call him back because -- that doesn't seem to line up, Ms. Ohr.

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. Well, my work for them was done and so --

Mr. Meadows. But you get an email that says --

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Meadows. -- please call me, and you say, This must be for you, referring to your husband. How would you know?

Ms. Ohr. Because I couldn't think of a reason that he would need me to talk to him because I had finished working for him.

Mr. Meadows. So you do recall the email?

Ms. Ohr. Excuse me? What was that question?

Mr. Meadows. You do recall the email?

Ms. Ohr. I do recall the email.

Mr. Meadows. When was that email?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall the date.

Mr. Meadows. But it was after you were terminated?

Ms. Ohr. If I recall correctly.

Mr. Meadows. All right. And so --

Mr. Berman. Just to be clear, I mean, she wasn't terminated. She left work, yeah.

Mr. Meadows. Your relationship was terminated, yeah. We don't want a bad resume report here, I get it. So but here is the curious part: For you to act like you have no knowledge of a relationship between Glenn Simpson and Bruce Ohr, and then to make the assumption in an email that when he calls in it is for your husband, those two are incompatible.

Ms. Ohr. I didn't say no knowledge that a relationship existed, because when we met with Chris Steele, he said Glenn knows that I'm here. So clearly, they --

Mr. Meadows. Well --

Mr. Berman. Can I speak with the witness for a second, sir?

Mr. Meadows. Yeah.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Berman. Sorry about that, sir.

Mr. Meadows. So those are inconsistent. So how do you make -- how do you reconcile those for me?

Ms. Ohr. Can you repeat what --

Mr. Meadows. What I'm saying is, is that you've testified this morning that you were unaware of ongoing communication between Glenn Simpson and your husband, and yet, you get an email that says, please ring me. I have got a copy. I'll give you a copy of it. Please ring me. And your response is, I assume Glenn means you, not me.

Ms. Ohr. Oh, thank you.

Mr. Berman. We now have in front of us a copy of what we think is this email. Can she look at this for a moment, sir?

Mr. Meadows. Sure.

Mr. Berman. Thank you.

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. So, I mean, I knew that they had spoken off and on, so -- and since I was no longer working for him --

Mr. Meadows. So characterize off and on for me. I mean, because that's different than what you've testified earlier today, so let's get it clear. What is off and on?

Ms. Ohr. I mean, over the years. I mean, they had spoken many years before, so my understanding --

Mr. Meadows. But, again, I want to caution you, I mean, there -- if they've spoken over the years, Ms. Ohr, and you get an email and you were the one that was -- had just previously worked for Mr. Simpson, and for you to suggest that, oh, it must be for you, that those two are not consistent. That line of reasoning is not consistent.

If they're having regular conversation, it would -- it would be consistent, and that's what I'm trying to get at. Were you aware that they were having regular communication, yes or no?

Ms. Ohr. Glenn had just, as you can see from this email, had just forwarded an article --

Mr. Meadows. From Think Progress?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Meadows. But it was Russia related, so how -- and you're a Russian scholar, so how would you know that it is not for you and instead for him?

Ms. Ohr. I just remember that, you know, when this article arrived, Bruce showed it to me, so I just sort of assumed that it was -- that he had taken note of it. So I filed it away as a --

Mr. Meadows. So let me get this straight. Bruce shows you the article that Glenn Simpson gave him about NRA connections with the Trump campaign from Think Progress, and that on the same thread, you see that and you automatically assume that he is calling for that?

Mr. Berman. Can I ask -- can I -- in the second email from the bottom, Sunday, December 11, 2016, at 1:08 p.m., the words are written "thank you." They come from the Nellie Ohr email account. Do you know who wrote that, you or Bruce, on this shared account?

Ms. Ohr. I don't know. I don't know which one of us.

Mr. Meadows. So it could have been you?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry. What was that question?

Mr. Meadows. So it could have been you?

Ms. Ohr. It could have been me.

Mr. Meadows. So you could have been exchanging back and forth with the Think Progress article?

Ms. Ohr. It could have been.

Mr. Meadows. Okay. So then it really makes my question a lot more relevant. If this -- you and him going back and forth,

then why when he said please ring me would you refer to it your husband?

Ms. Ohr. It could have been Bruce, yeah. I don't know which one of us wrote it. It was -- he was clearly writing -- letting both of us know.

Mr. Meadows. But that is your communication to your husband. I mean, that is your communication to your husband saying, I think -- I mean, we know that. So what I'm saying is, how did you know? Obviously, you knew about an ongoing relationship between your husband and Glenn Simpson that was occurring. Is that correct?

We have time because of the -- I've been keeping track because of the referrals. I get it.

So is that correct?

Ms. Ohr. As I understand, any communications between my husband and myself are privileged.

Mr. Meadows. As I understand, this was a third party. There was a third party involved. Counselor, let me just tell you, we're going to keep going down this. We will subpoena you if we have to. I'm all about protecting your privacy, but this is not about privacy. This is about a relationship between Bruce Ohr, Glenn Simpson, and the knowledge that Ms. Ohr had of that when, indeed, there was a third party involved in that communication.

Mr. Berman. Mr. Meadows, she's answering your questions about these communications with a third party. She's answering

questions. She has -- I believe you've asked her why did she flip the December 12, 2016, 10:05 a.m. email to her husband's, what appears to be, Department of Justice account. And I believe she said she doesn't recall exactly why she did it.

Mr. Meadows. No. No. That's not what she said. I asked a specific question that she did not answer just a few minutes ago, and that question is, was she aware of ongoing communication between Mr. Simpson and her husband because of the type of communication that was -- actually involved three people? Was she aware of that, yes or no?

Mr. Berman. So outside of any communications you may have had with your husband.

Mr. Meadows. I'm not asking you to rephrase my question, Counselor. I'm getting frustrated because I think both of us know where I'm going with this, and at this point she needs to answer the question. And if she's not, then we'll come back in a different purview and make sure that she does answer it.

Mr. Berman. Well, I would say, we understand the subpoena power that this committee has, and we don't want to get there.

Mr. Meadows. I don't want you to get there either. So just answer the -- I mean, obvious --

Mr. Berman. She can't answer a question if it's based on communications with her husband. So if I know, sir, that -- if you know your wife or -- your wife knows you went to a particular grocery store, and I am asking questions about the grocery store

based on that information, that's intruding on the marital communications.

So that's all -- I wasn't trying to rephrase your question, sir. I was simply saying outside of any communications you may have had with Ms. Ohr, because you're clearly not asking for her communications between them. As you said, you wouldn't want people doing that to you. Outside of that, are you aware there was an ongoing relationship? But if you're asking her based on communications she had with Ms. Ohr, she can't answer that.

Mr. Meadows. So, again, I'll come back and we'll close with this, and hopefully we can get a better answer. What in your mind triggered the fact that when "please ring me" came across, that it had to be for your husband and not for you? I mean, what -- I mean, obviously, if he didn't have an ongoing relationship, why would you refer it to him? Is there any reason you would refer a phone call from your previous boss to your husband if he didn't have an ongoing relationship without him explicitly asking for it?

Ms. Ohr. Since I had finished working for him, it seemed logical that it would be for --

Mr. Meadows. So you have had no communication with Mr. Simpson since you terminated your relationship?

Ms. Ohr. I think I sent a couple of emails with --

Mr. Meadows. So that didn't hold up, then?

Ms. Ohr. I'm sorry?

Mr. Meadows. I mean, why would it hold up? Why would that

stand a reason? If you continued to have communication after you terminated your relationship, why would that assumption be accurate then?

Ms. Ohr. I just didn't see a reason why he would want to talk to me on the phone.

Mr. Meadows. I think we're out of time.

[Discussion off the record.]

Ms. Hariharan. All right. So we are back on the record. It is 11:43. My name is Arya Hariharan. I represent Mr. Nadler from the Judiciary Committee, and I'm going to ask questions on behalf of the minority.

I just want to quickly state for the record, the transcript for Bruce Ohr does not represent that the memory stick was submitted in August. In fact -- this is on page 85, or whenever you have the chance to review it. In fact, it represents that Bruce Ohr's meetings with the FBI started in around November of 2016, according to the 302s. And that's generally speaking when he started submitting that information in terms of the various memory sticks, so just for the record to reflect that based on what was said in the previous hour.

Mr. Berman. And this is responsive to Mr. Ratcliffe's representations based on his notes --

Ms. Hariharan. Exactly.

Mr. Berman. -- from 40 minutes ago or so?

Ms. Hariharan. Exactly.

Mr. Berman. Thank you.

Ms. Hariharan. I believe Mr. Raskin has a question he'd like to ask.

Mr. Raskin. I do. I actually have just a couple questions. One is, would you kindly review for me what your academic background and general professional trajectory has been. Forgive me, I missed the earlier questioning.

Ms. Ohr. Yes. I have a degree in Russian history and literature from Harvard, and I have a Ph.D. in Russian history from Stanford. And I was in academia for a number of years, and then moved to D.C. and was an independent contractor doing work mostly in support of various U.S. Government clients.

Mr. Raskin. Okay. So in the course of your academic and professional pursuits, did you have occasion to find out information about the relationship between Donald Trump and Russian organized crime?

Ms. Ohr. In my academic pursuits, you mean, when I was in academia in the 1990s?

Mr. Raskin. Yeah. Either -- yeah.

Ms. Ohr. Well, at some point he sold a mansion to Dmitri Rybolovlev, who is -- in mysterious circumstances, so that certainly piqued my interest. But I don't recall the exact date of that.

Mr. Raskin. Okay. And then in your professional work since arriving in Washington, what did you find out about the

relationship between Donald Trump and the Russian mob?

Ms. Ohr. What time period are you talking about?

Ms. Hariharan. When you worked for Fusion or anytime?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. Yeah. When I worked for Fusion was when I started paying attention to it, and I learned a lot about contacts that were questionable with people who have been suspected of various relationships with Russian organized crime, some of it from my own research, some from reading that I did in pursuit of that project in terms of crime figures who bought apartments in Trump Towers or other properties, and a gambling ring in Trump Tower and things like that.

Mr. Raskin. So it was -- you found at a number of different points that there were contacts between Donald Trump and various Russian organized crime figures?

Ms. Ohr. From my reading, people who U.S. law enforcement has identified as Russian organized figures, such as Vyacheslav Ivankov, had either spent time in Trump properties, or people of that -- type of people bought properties. I'm not saying that Donald Trump, you know, personally knew every single one of them. I don't know about that.

Mr. Raskin. But it created the possibility that there might have been money laundering going on through Trump real estate properties?

Ms. Ohr. Certainly the types of transactions raised that suspicion.

Mr. Raskin. Yeah. Can you just characterize generally the relationship between Russian organized crime and Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. Certainly, Vladimir Putin and members of the Russian government are not wholeheartedly seeking to prosecute organized crime, we'll put it that way. Instead, there are personal relationships that might involve bribery, that might involve people doing favors in return for being able to operate, people being caught and having a little talking-to at the police station and being let go with the implication being that the police were -- either received a bribe or were encouraging the person to cooperate in some way, to help out, do favors.

Mr. Raskin. How deep does the relationship go? Would it be inaccurate to say that the organized crime syndicates in Russia operate under the protection of Vladimir Putin?

Ms. Ohr. Protection is a good word because it does imply not necessarily, you know, that they were a boss, or that Putin was a boss, but rather they had to make some kind of deals or understandings.

And there's certainly a very well-documented argument, for example, made by Karen Dawisha in her book "Putin's Kleptocracy." For -- in the 1990s, some pretty well-documented evidence of Putin being sort of a go-between with a local St. Petersburg organized crime group, and then involvement with various dealings that appeared to be sort of robbing the Russian treasury in various

jobs that Putin held, and that people around him held.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Good morning.

Mr. Raskin. Thank you very much, Ms. Ohr.

Ms. Ohr. Thank you.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Good morning. I'm Congressman Raja Krishnamoorthi.

Let me back up for a second. I apologize if this was already asked, but what was the genesis of the work that you originally did with regard to the relationship between Trump and organized crime, like what actually prompted that line of research?

Ms. Ohr. I had started working for Glenn Simpson and Fusion GPS, and I had already done one project for them. And they gave me a choice of a couple -- you know, they gave me a choice of what to do next, and there was one that was non-Russia related, and I said I really want to study -- I want to, you know, do Russia-related research, and so they said, Well, how about this one?

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. And did they tell you who the client was for that particular issue?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. And how did you go about doing that research?

Ms. Ohr. I did open source online research, you know, all kinds of media, social media, government -- Russian government documents, legal documents, society pages, all kinds of different

things.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And did Fusion GPS give you suggestions on different queries to make, or did they just say, Go ahead and, you know, have at it?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah, they gave me suggestions, uh-huh.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Okay. And I know that you answered a couple of questions related to this for Congressman Raskin, but, I guess, what about that research surprised you, if anything?

Ms. Ohr. I suppose the depth -- it was the fact that, as I said, there was some already suspicion due to Trump's transaction with Rybolovlev some years ago, and so, I received very strong confirmation that there were deep and widespread ties with apparently unscrupulous people.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. And how far back did that go and time, I should say?

Ms. Ohr. Did the ties, I mean, he was seeking to do business in the Soviet Union back into the '80s. And along the way, he -- some of his deals were with people who have been suspected of organized crime.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Go ahead.

Ms. Hariharan. Can you share what some of the names of those unscrupulous organized you crime folks were or who they were?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. There was a hotel deal that he thought about that was -- the hotel deal ended up involved with Umar

Jabregulov,(ph) who's a Chechen and is suspected in the murder of an American businessman whose name slips my mind right now. Yep.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Anybody else?

Ms. Ohr. Anybody else, there were numerous people -- in terms of hotel deal -- in terms of deals in Moscow, or do you mean anybody else? How --

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Any organized crime figures is what I'm referring to. Anybody that was, you know -- I can't pronounce that name exactly. I should be, given my own name, but like who are some of the other organized crime figures that, you know, you researched and found ties to Donald Trump?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh. Tokhtakhounov, who has been suspected of -- I can't remember if he was convicted or tried for -- or suspected of trying to fix the Olympics a long time ago. And certainly, Trump's campaign chair, Manafort had close -- had ties with Oleg Derepaska.

Rinat Akhmetov is someone who also was associated with Manafort. Now, he's Ukrainian, and right now, I can't remember whether people explicitly, you know, pointed to particular organized crime activity that he's suspected of.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. So going back to Donald Trump, setting aside Paul Manafort for a moment or any of the other members of the Trump Organization, when you found these ties to exist, or through open source research to exist, did that -- was there anything remarkable about those ties? Did you find that they

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

continued into today, or into the time period -- I think you worked for GPS through September 2016. Did you find that those ties were longstanding, and did they continue into the present time at the time that you were researching those ties?

Ms. Ohr. Let's see. I mean, certainly the -- for example, the Miss Universe Pageant, that was a few years before that. I think Mr. Tokhtakhounov attended, you know, was in the VIP gallery, if I remember correctly, suggesting that there was some acquaintance or tie. And in terms of more recently than that, I mean, there -- yeah, I can't name any specific transactions or anything like that that come to my mind right now.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Okay. And these particular ties that Donald Trump had to these groups, or these individuals, have you done similar research before about any other Americans with ties to organized crime in Russia? What I'm trying to get at is, did you develop kind of an expertise in this particular area that you would be able to tell like, you know, what are -- what's just a photo opportunity between two people versus, you know, looking at something bigger than that?

Ms. Ohr. Yeah. Good question, yes. I certainly followed Russian organized crime figures for a number of years. In terms of Americans' associations with them probably would be limited to what's in the press. I'm not -- at the moment, my recollection -- I don't recall doing deep research on any of those, but I'm a -- yeah, I'm -- I may misremember.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Got it. Now, the research that you ended up doing on these ties between Donald Trump and these organized crime figures, what did you do with that?

Ms. Ohr. What did I do with my research?

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Yeah.

Ms. Ohr. I wrote it up in reports and emailed them to Fusion GPS.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And do you know what happened with them after that?

Ms. Ohr. Some of the material appeared in the press. I don't know what their relationship is with the press.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Do you want to take the next line?

EXAMINATION

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Quickly, just going back to the scope of your research, you mentioned it was mostly open source, and it was what you found online. So you were not involved in reviewing classified or highly sensitive materials?

A No.

Q And to go back to the Congressman's point with regards to your reports, were you, at any point, told that your research was going to support anti-Trump clients?

A I don't know if I was told that. I suppose along the way I assumed that it was somebody who didn't want Trump

to -- yeah.

Q So you were never told this is for the DNC?

A No, as I recall.

Q Okay. At any point prior to the 2016 election, were you asked to provide research on Russian election interference?

A At any point prior to what?

Q To November 2016.

A Was I asked to provide information, I believe I was and I just didn't have time to really get in depth in it, so I relied mainly on what's in the press.

Sorry, was your question election interference?

Q Yeah.

A In general? Oh, okay, I'm sorry. I thought you were talking about the DNC hack.

Q Oh, no, I'm sorry. Just Russian involvement in general.

A In general.

Q Yeah.

A I certainly did research on social media themes that were supportive of Trump and that also echoed Russian messaging, so -- and that seemed to indicate Russian support for extreme groups, both on the far right and far left, that were divisive. So in that sense, yes. Yeah.

Q And that was included in the reports you provided to Fusion?

A I wrote a report that had to do with that subject,

uh-huh.

Q So I apologize if some of these are repetitive to earlier, but it's just to be clear for the record.

The report you just mentioned on Russian election interference, did that -- that occurred before the election or after?

A All my reports are before the election.

Q Before the election, okay.

So I want to walk through what has come up before, and that is the Steele dossier. So on Tuesday, the President tweeted -- this Tuesday: "Is it really possible that Bruce Ohr, whose wife Nellie was paid by Simpson and Fusion GPS for work" -- excuse me, he wrote GPS Fusion, "for work done on the fake dossier and who was used as a pawn in this whole scam witch hunt, is still working for the Department of Justice? Can this really be so?" There's a lot of question marks in there.

Did you work with Christopher Steele at all as part of your contract for Fusion GPS?

A No.

Q Did you work with Christopher Steele to develop what is now called the Steele dossier?

A No.

Q And did any aspect of your work for Fusion GPS involve firsthand gathering of facts for this -- for the dossier?

A No.

Q Outside of the three meetings you mentioned with Christopher Steele and your husband, the more social gatherings it sounds like, did you attend meetings with Christopher Steele and sources of his?

A No.

Q Did you communicate with confidential sources or source networks as part of your own work?

A No.

Q And were you ever a source for Christopher Steele?

A No.

Q So you have no reason to believe that the research or work product that you provided to Fusion GPS became part of the series of reports known as the Steele dossier?

A I have no reason to believe that.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 1

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So I'm going to introduce as, I guess, exhibit 1, because I don't know if they introduced theirs as exhibits, this is the Steele dossier as published by BuzzFeed. I'm going to read a couple different sections from it, just really quickly, to get a sense if, you know, you were the source for that information.

So this is from the Steele dossier, and it is on what is labeled as page 17, but isn't actually a page 17. The page number is on the bottom right. It says August 10, 2016, on the bottom.

A Okay.

Q Got it, okay. So, quote: "Speaking in confidence on 9th August, 2016, an ethnic Russian associate of Republican U.S. presidential candidate Donald Trump discussed the reaction inside his camp and revised tactics therein resulting from negative publicity concerning Moscow's clandestine involvement in the campaign. Trump's associate reported that the aim of leaking the DNC's emails to WikiLeaks during the Democratic Convention had been to swing supporters of Bernie Sanders away from Hillary Clinton and across to Trump. This objective had been conceived and promoted inter alia by Trump's foreign policy adviser, Carter Page who was discussed" -- "who had discussed it directly with the ethnic Russian associate," end quote.

Is that the result of any of your research?

A No.

Q And turning to -- oh, there's no page number. It would say September 14, 2016, at the bottom.

A Uh-huh.

Q Quote, local business -- so Steele is -- I'm sorry. Did you need another second?

Mr. Berman. We do have page numbers.

Ms. Ohr. Is there a paragraph number?

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Number two.

A Detail number two.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q It doesn't have a page number at the bottom.

Mr. Berman. Here it is, 27 is the --

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So in this, Steele is speaking to a -- he's quoting a trusted compatriot. I'll just read it.

A Okay.

Q It says, quote: "The local business slash political elite figure reported that Trump had paid bribes further there to interests" -- "to further his interests but very discreetly, and only through affiliated companies making it very hard to prove. The local service industry source reported that Trump had participated in sex parties in the city, too, but that all direct witnesses to this recently had been silenced, i.e., bribed or coerced to disappear."

Is that the result of your research?

A No.

Q So this would be on page 33, October 19, 2016, quote: "According to the Kremlin insider, this had meant that direct contact between the Trump team and Russia had been farmed out by the Kremlin to trusted agents of influence working in pro-government policy institutes like the law and comparative jurisprudence. Cohen, however, continued to lead for the Trump team."

Is that the result of your research?

A No.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Last one. This is the second-to-last page at the bottom: "Cohen had been accompanied to Prague by three colleagues and the timing of the visit was either in the last week of August or the first week of September. The agenda comprised questions on how deniable cash payments were to be made to hackers who had worked in Europe and under Kremlin direction against the Clinton campaign and various contingencies for covering up these operations and Moscow's secret liaison with the Trump team more generally."

Is that the result of your research?

A No.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. I have a question actually. Ms. Ohr, between October of 2015 and September of 2016, did you have any other clients besides GPS Fusion?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And when you would report to GPS -- or Fusion GPS with your findings, was it Jake Berkowitz all the time?

Ms. Ohr. Yes, I think all the time, yeah.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And --

Ms. Ohr. Except for the first unrelated project that I did. The Trump-related project was all Jake.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Okay. Okay.

Ms. Hariharan. The trafficking project was not?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And did Jake tell you why he wanted you to do this?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Did you ask him?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Another question, I want to just go to this Mayflower meeting, July 30, 2016. How long did that meeting occur, if you recall?

Ms. Ohr. How long did it last?

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Yeah.

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall. The length of a breakfast. I don't know.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And you were gone for a substantial portion of that breakfast, right?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. And did you excuse yourself, or how did that --

Ms. Ohr. I excused myself, yeah.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And after that July 30, 2016 meeting, there were no other meetings that you had with your husband and Mr. Steele at the same time?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. You didn't have any other meetings with Mr. Steele, period?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And you haven't had any meetings with Mr. Steele since your employment ended with Fusion GPS on September 2016, correct?

Ms. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. When was the first time that you learned of something called the Steele dossier?

Ms. Ohr. That term first came out in -- when BuzzFeed published it.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. You don't remember when that was?

Ms. Ohr. I thought it was January of, what would that be, 2017, I guess.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. And you've never seen this -- you never saw this particular document or excerpts of it during the time that you were employed?

Mr. Berman. Referring to exhibit 1?

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Yes.

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir.

Ms. Ohr. At the breakfast, I -- if I recall correctly, they may have shown pieces --

Mr. Berman. The question is, have you seen this document?

Ms. Ohr. Not as an entire document, no.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And you hadn't seen it or its portions during the time that you were employed, correct?

Ms. Ohr. I -- if I recall correctly, I may have seen a -- maybe a page or something of it at the breakfast.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. That was the first time you learned of it?

Ms. Ohr. I didn't know that there was going to be something called the dossier. What was subsequently known was not known to me at that time.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. And you had nothing to do with -- when you were at that breakfast, there was no talk about an investigation opening up into Donald Trump the next day or any other day by DOJ?

Ms. Ohr. Not by DOJ.

Mr. Krishnamoorthi. Okay. Go ahead.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So to build on -- actually, super quickly, before I move onto what the Congressman was referencing, when we were reading through the dossier, how did you know that those particular pieces of information weren't what you had provided to Fusion, like you weren't the source for them?

A Because the subject matter was very different from the kind of -- yeah.

Q So at this -- just both at this breakfast, and just generally speaking, did you have any personal knowledge that the -- about the FBI's investigation into whether there was any coordination between people associated with the Trump campaign and the Russian Government?

A News of an investigation came to me subsequently through

the press, most recently.

Q But there was no discussion of an FBI investigation at the breakfast?

A I didn't hear the word "investigation."

Q So before or around October 2016, were you aware of any effort by the U.S. Government to surveil persons associated with the Trump campaign?

A Can you repeat the question?

Q Before or around October 2016, were you aware that the U.S. Government was planning to surveil U.S. persons associated with the Trump campaign?

A No.

Q And at that time, were you aware that there was a FISA application for the surveillance of Trump's former foreign policy adviser Carter Page?

A No.

Q During his interview, your husband Bruce Ohr told us that he had no involvement with the Trump/Russia collusion investigation. Is that consistent with your understanding?

A Can you define the Trump/Russia collusion investigation?

Q DOJ has, in these interviews, asked us to -- there is a broader sort of across government Russian investigation into any activity that they may be doing in the United States and then there's the very specific election interference investigation. And when I asked if Mr. Ohr had no involvement, besides turning

over information to the FBI, as he's testified?

A I'm not aware of his having any involvement.

It -- yeah.

Q You've never worked for the Department of Justice, correct?

A Correct.

Q You don't currently work for them?

A Correct.

Q So you would not have any knowledge of what is going on in an ongoing investigation?

A Correct.

Ms. Sachsman Grooms. Just to make that one crystal clear, did you, at the time, that you were working for Fusion GPS have any knowledge of the Department of Justice's investigations on Russia?

Ms. Ohr. No.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q President Trump was quoted as saying, quote: "They should be looking at Bruce Ohr and his wife Nellie for dealing with, by the way, indirectly Russians," end quote.

To be very clear, have you or Ms. Ohr ever engaged in a conspiracy to interfere in the U.S. election process with Russian individuals or entities or individuals associated with the Russian Government?

A No.

Q Do you know what the President is referring to when he accuses both of you of that, directly or indirectly?

A No.

Q On August 20, the President tweeted the following: "Will Bruce Ohr, whose family received big money for helping to create the phony, dirty, and discredited dossier, ever be fired from the Jeff Sessions' Justice Department? A total joke," end quote.

Did your family, in fact, receive big money in exchange for your work doing open source research for Fusion GPS?

A How does -- is big money defined?

Q That is a very good question.

Mr. Berman. How much were you paid by hour?

Ms. Ohr. \$55 an hour.

Mr. Berman. And just in a roughest of ballpark, how much do you think you made over your 11 months, 10 months with Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. A few tens of thousands.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Going back to -- and I know in the previous hour that your relationship with Mr. Simpson was sort of addressed, but I wanted to drill down a little bit more on that. You first came to know Mr. Simpson through his work at The Wall Street Journal, correct?

A I did not personally meet him at that time, but I became aware of him at that time.

Q Okay. And so is it fair to characterize your relationship with him as purely professional?

A Yes.

Q When testifying before this Senate Judiciary Committee earlier this year, Mr. Simpson stated that he had discussions with Mr. Steele about sharing Fusion's research with the FBI because it, quote, "represented a national security threat, a security issue about whether a presidential candidate was being blackmailed," end quote. This is on page 159 through 161.

Mr. Simpson then stated that he believed Fusion's research revealed, quote, "law enforcement issues about whether there was an illegal conspiracy to violate the campaign laws, and then somewhere in this time, the whole issue of hacking also surfaced," end quote.

Did Mr. Simpson ever share concerns with you that laws may have been broken by the Trump campaign?

A The fact that we were investigating Trump relationships with crime figures certainly suggest that there was that possibility that was worth investigating.

Q Did you, at any point, recommend to him that he should share Fusion's research related to Donald Trump and organized crime with either -- with the FBI?

A I did not make recommendations along those lines.

Q Did you have direct knowledge that Glenn Simpson was communicating with your husband in the fall or winter of 2016?

A There's an email that we discussed, so that -- it led me to think that they might be. I, you know, outside of our -- I have no separate knowledge except for personal conversations with my husband.

Q Did Mr. Steele ever contact you directly in the summer or fall of 2016, not Mr. Ohr, but you directly?

A No.

Q At any point prior to fall of 2016, did you discuss your research on organized crime and Donald Trump with individuals outside of Fusion GPS, outside of this Mayflower breakfast meeting?

A No.

Q Did Mr. Steele, at any point, provide you with information related to your research with Fusion GPS, you directly?

A No.

Q I'm going to switch gears.

A Okay.

Q Public reporting indicates that since news broke of Mr. Ohr's communications with Mr. Steele, that he has been demoted twice within the Department of Justice. Do you know if they've provided any formal explanation as to why he lost his positions?

Mr. Berman. I'll just remind you, she's not going to answer questions about communications she's learned from her husband. I mean, the same rules apply, from my perspective, from the majority

and the minority here. So outside of any private communications you have had with your husband.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Is it fair to say -- let me rephrase this.

In your view, were your husband's demotions unfair? I'm not asking for the conversations you have had with him, just in your personal view. What was the impact it has had on your family and this whole ordeal for that matter?

A There's two different things, the demotions and the ordeal.

Q Start with the demotions.

A Demotions, he is less stressed than he was before. The ordeal, the impact has been very negative. We have to watch what we do, what we say, and there's a lot of things out there in the -- online, which are false.

Q Has it impacted your ability to find work?

A I'm currently employed, so I don't know whether it would in the future.

Q While on a trip to the Hamptons on August 17, President Trump was asked about your husband, and specifically, his security clearance, and he said, quote, "I think Bruce Ohr is a disgrace. I suspect it will be taken away very quickly."

Has -- are you aware if his security clearance has been revoked by the Department of Justice?

A I'm not aware.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Based on your understanding, generally speaking, of the work he did for the Department, specifically related to organized crime and drug enforcement cases, is it fair to say that he would need a security clearance to effectively do his job?

A I don't really know if there's anything he could do without one or not.

Mr. Berman. Can we take a one-minute break?

Ms. Hariharan. Actually, I was about to say that, you know, we're good for this round. It is 12:22. We'll go off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[1:38 p.m.]

Mr. Baker. The time is 1:38, and we are back on the record.

Mr. Berman. Mr. Baker, it is Joshua Berman. Do you mind if I say something briefly?

Mr. Baker. Go ahead, counsel.

Mr. Berman. In the morning session the issue of the marital and spousal privilege came up. I just want to be clear that this is a privilege that has ramifications beyond today's proceedings. As one can imagine, Ms. Ohr has this privilege in future proceedings in front of other bodies. So, hypothetically, if she were in a civil lawsuit, if she were in a criminal matter, if she was in front of the Senate, if she was in front of DOJ, if she was in front of an employment hearing, she would want to retain these same privileges.

As such the assertion today is in no way directed at the minority or the majority in this proceeding alone, it is a recognition of a privilege she holds and by asserting it, Ms. Ohr, or, as her counsel, mean no disrespect to Mr. Meadows, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Jordan, or anyone, or -- or Mr. Ratcliffe or Mr. Raskin or anybody else. And I just wanted to make sure nobody thought there was any game-playing or disrespect.

Mr. Baker. Thank you very much.

Mr. Berman. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Baker. Thank you.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Ms. Ohr, I would like to go -- I would like to rewind a little bit and go back to just some basic questions. You had indicated earlier in this session, I believe, that your initial employment, or awareness of employment, with Mr. Simpson, you were looking in the newspaper, maybe -- you said something, maybe underemployed; you were looking for work; that caught your eye. You went, applied, interviewed. What would make you unique amongst maybe many other people that saw the same ad in the newspaper and went and applied or interviewed? What skills do you --

A And I should clarify there was no ad in the newspaper, I just saw the name. And I was looking for -- for work. And I have studied Russia all my life. I am fluent in, you know -- read fluently in Russian. I have research skills as a -- you know, trained as an academic. So those skills come in handy for all kinds of research. And I have an interest in the types of things that I knew Glenn Simpson was interested in, because of his work for the Wall Street Journal. So it seemed to me a very good fit.

Q So you indicate you have language skills in --

A Yes.

Q -- Russian? Reading and writing?

A Yeah, I mean, obviously reading is the strongest and -- yes.

Q And speaking? So I meant speaking, reading?

A Yeah, yeah. I am -- I am rusty speaking, but -- but,

yeah, I read all the time in Russian.

Q And you have academic credentials in --

A Yes, I have a Ph.D. in Russian history and my undergraduate degree from Harvard was in Russian history and literature.

Q Where is your Ph.D. degree from?

A Stanford.

Q Okay. So in very simplistic terms for non-Ph.D. people, you are pretty conversant in things Russian?

A Yes.

Q So if someone similar to Mr. Simpson were looking for someone skilled to scour, research, look at public-source information regarding things Russian, your name would probably come up on a short list, if someone were looking for people with a particular set of credentials?

A I would be competitive.

Q Okay, thank you. I want to jump a little forward from that point. You indicated, I think, earlier, that your initial assignment or portfolio at Fusion GPS, I think you said there were three projects you were working on, and two of them, I think, were identified. I don't remember the third one being elaborated on. And maybe --

A I didn't work on it. They -- they offered, you know, and I said I wasn't interested in it.

Q And what was that project?

A I don't know if you remember, they were involved in a case involving a video made by -- that involved Planned Parenthood and --

Q Okay.

A Yeah, so that was a topic that wasn't related to Russia, and I figured that wasn't my area where I could be the most use.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Were you at all involved -- I reviewed Glenn Simpson's transcript before Senate Judiciary and there was a lot of discussion of the Prevezon. Is that -- am I pronouncing it --

A Yeah, that was the one with Veselnitskaya. I had forgotten the name of the company.

Q Okay. Were you involved at all in that for Fusion GPS?

A No.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Would it be fair to say, just for clarity, that this product, or services, that Fusion GPS provides, it is not just, for lack of a better word, and this is my term, opposition research? It sounds to me like, and what I have read, they do litigation support, maybe helping businesses answer a question or define a problem based on public source?

A I am not aware of the full scope of their work, but I understand that they do, yeah, research, investigation, that sort of thing.

Q And I think you have indicated that primarily what you

would do is public-source information?

A Yes.

Q Why would someone like Mr. Simpson, or a business like Fusion GPS, why would they need to hire someone to do that on behalf of a client? Why wouldn't a client be able to Google, or whatever, public-source information themselves?

A Well, the language would be, I think, the main thing, but also sort of general understanding of how the system works.

Q And separate and apart from the language or the culture or the system of a particular government or country, I think it is fair to say, based on your academic credentials -- and I believe you indicated earlier, you also taught?

A Yes, I taught.

Q You probably have better than the average person's research skills?

A I would like to think so.

Q And you could compile and synthesize a large amount of information to a -- to a manageable issue or paper or summary?

A That is what I aim to do.

Q Okay. I want to jump -- I don't know if this is jump back or jump ahead. I don't think this issue has been addressed. Do you have, or are you familiar with, a shortwave radio or a Ham radio?

A I own a Ham radio.

Q And you own it for what purpose?

A Emergency communication in case of a storm, that sort of thing. If the cell towers go out, uh-huh.

Q How long have you had a Ham radio?

A Well, I bought it shortly after I got my Ham license and I got -- yeah, I -- I -- I am guessing it is 2015, but I don't remember exactly. It was -- you know, in 2014, I was underemployed, and I had some time, and I took a citizens emergency -- community emergency response team training. And, you know, it was just something sponsored by the DHS and the local fire department, you know, taught these courses and then they said, hey, if you are going to be helping with community response in case of an emergency, why don't we have -- you know, some people take Ham radio lessons in case the communications towers go out. And so I took the Ham radio class. I passed the test.

Q That is a difficult test, isn't it or --

A Sixteen questions, something like that. I squeaked past it.

Q And are there different levels of licensure?

A There are. I was the lowest level.

Q Do you have any desire to reach a higher level for your purposes?

A No.

Q So your obtaining of a radio, and your taking the class, and your sitting for the exam and ultimately passing and receiving the license, it had nothing to do with your employment at Fusion

GPS?

A It was well before.

Q Well before?

A Yeah.

Q And it was -- you had time on your hands, something to do -- was this something you were always interested in doing and this is an opportunity that you had to pursue it?

A I saw an ad for the community emergency response training, and I thought, now is a good time for me to do it since I have a little bit of time.

Q Have you ever communicated with anyone in Russia using your Ham radio?

A No.

Mr. Somers. Did you monitor any broadcasts from Russia using the Ham radio?

Ms. Ohr. No.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q You indicated that most of your work for Fusion GPS was done from home?

A Yes.

Q Did you ever have occasion to visit a brick-and-mortar office where Glenn Simpson had facilities?

A Yes.

Q And how often would that be?

A Once every several weeks, probably.

Q What was the -- what kind of office was it? Was it in a commercial building? Is it in a residence? Your description of the facilities where the official office was?

A I mean, I guess they rented space in a building. I am not sure if anyone lives there or not.

Q So commercial or --

A I guess. I don't really know what you mean by commercial building. It is not like a huge, you know, faceless commercial building.

Q Was it a private residence --

A No.

Q -- where there was an office set up in?

A No. It was -- it was a building where people rented offices --

Q Oh, okay.

A -- as I understand it. People -- yeah.

Q And when you would go into this building or this particular office, was there anything in there that would make you think the general tone of the owners of the office, or the atmosphere of the people that worked at that facility, was anti-Trump or anti-anything, or was it neutral, or --

A I mean, they have been involved in projects that have been partisan, and, so, you know, they may have been involved in projects that might tend to favor one or the other. My impression was that they took on a variety of projects.

Q But nothing in the office that would give away a hint of a bias or a leaning to one side of an issue? I mean, your -- your last answer indicates they would take on a variety of projects. You know, a client, whoever, could pay the fee or whatever; they wouldn't turn business away necessarily. But was there anything that gave you the impression that they favored one type of research or one type of client over another?

A Well, I really don't know the full scope of their projects.

Mr. Berman. I think he is asking, the initial question, is there anything in the physical -- sort of the physical office space. I don't know what is in his head. It could be posters, it could be colors --

Mr. Baker. Yes, that is exactly what --

Ms. Ohr. Oh, sorry.

Mr. Baker. Thank you, Counselor.

Ms. Ohr. The physical office space, no.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Okay.

A I wouldn't not say -- I would -- no.

Q There is nothing when you walk in, there is not a poster of Trump that says "Down with Trump" --

A No.

Q -- or anything like that? It is --

A Yeah.

Q -- kind of neutral, but you know, you have knowledge, that they take on a variety of clients for a variety of causes, for a variety of purposes?

A That is my understanding.

Q Okay. Was there any -- was there any talk or any thought on your part, or anything you overheard that Mr. Simpson, himself, was uncomfortable, for whatever reason, in going directly to the FBI for any -- for any business he might have with the FBI?

A I wouldn't know.

Q Okay.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q So you discussed earlier three meetings, I believe over a course of years, with Christopher Steele.

A Yes.

Q What was your understanding in -- let's go back to the Mayflower meeting. You know, walk into that meeting, you are going to meet with Christopher Steele. What was your understanding of who Christopher Steele was?

A A private investigator who knew a lot about Russia.

Q Do you have any knowledge of his previous work for the British Government?

A Not specifically, but in general.

Q But you knew he worked for -- I believe he worked for MI6. Is that correct?

A I had a general understanding. Something along those

lines.

Q Do you have any knowledge of his reputation?

A As I understood it, I mean, the fact that Bruce met with him made me think that he probably had something good to say -- you know, that he had -- he knew things.

Q So he had -- I am just trying to see, did he have a solid reputation, is that your understanding?

A That is my understanding.

Q Did you have any knowledge of his reputation, or who he was, from Glenn Simpson?

A No.

Q Okay, after the meeting, did you have any impression of --

A No additional talk about him besides what I mentioned earlier.

Q All right. So he was -- you assumed he had a good reputation because of your husband, but you -- would deal with him, but you didn't have an independent knowledge of his --

A Correct.

Q -- reputation?

And you may have known that he worked for MI6, but --

A I knew something -- that he had some kind of intelligence background or something, yeah.

Q Okay. And then at that meeting, at the Mayflower Hotel, did Christopher Steele say at any point in time, I am going to

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

take this -- take information to the FBI?

A I don't remember him saying that he would take information to the FBI.

Q That he, Christopher Steele, would take information to the FBI?

A I don't recall him saying that in my presence.

Q It is our understanding that he was at that time, or shortly thereafter, taking information from the -- that ultimately became the dossier, to the FBI. I just didn't know if that came up.

A I later learned that he had, himself, taken it to them. You know, way later.

Q And the intent of the meeting, I mean, was this a friendly get-together, or was Christopher Steele trying to convey, did you think, information to your husband at the meeting?

A By the end of the meeting, I understood that he was trying to convey to Bruce his concern.

Q And he was trying to convey it to him as an official at the Department of Justice? This was to raise an official flag about this information?

A I think that can be -- yes, I would say that.

Q And switching -- switching subjects for a second. Were you -- so you worked for Fusion GPS, I think you said for -- it was almost a year, I think was the period you described. And you were out gathering information. Were you ever asked to verify

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

information that someone brought to you?

A No.

Q Like someone from Fusion GPS gave you information, were you ever asked to verify the veracity of it?

A I wouldn't say verify.

Q Or did Glenn Simpson ever -- you obviously gave information to Fusion?

A Yes.

Q You researched information. Did information ever come the other way, from Fusion to you?

A Yes.

Q What sort of information?

A Well, they gave some material pages that talked about some of Manafort's travels.

Q Any information related to Carter Page?

A I don't think so. I don't seem to recall that.

Q You are -- I think you testified you are somewhat familiar with the Steele dossier. Were you -- any information that you saw in the Steele dossier, had you seen any of that information before?

A Not in the material that they gave me.

Q Not in the material that Fusion had given you?

A Right.

BY MR. BREBBIA:

Q If i could -- can I follow up, quick?

Similar to that point, did you communicate to anyone with Fusion GPS that your husband, Bruce Ohr, was going to provide any documents or information you had gathered to the FBI?

A No.

Q Did anyone at the FBI follow-up with you after they received those documents?

A No. I am not even sure they -- I have no direct knowledge of their having --

Q What form was the -- what form did the information take that you -- that was provided to the FBI? Was it a memo? Was it a list of open sources?

Mr. Berman. I think she just said she has no information that it was provided to the FBI. I think it was the second part of her answer just now. So you are presuming that there was information that went to the FBI.

BY MR. BREBBIA:

Q Didn't you say you had no reason to doubt your husband's testimony that he took, I believe you called it a flash drive, from you, and provided it to the FBI?

A I have no reason to doubt his testimony.

Q So do you know the flash drive that we are talking about?

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Berman. If this is a continuing way to ask her about communications with her husband --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Brebbia. No, I am asking her -- did you --

Mr. Berman. What was the question then? Sorry.

Mr. Brebbia. Did you compile information on Russia and put that onto a flash drive that you then gave your husband?

Mr. Berman. Providing her husband, whether she did or didn't, that is a form of communication. We have --

Mr. Brebbia. The hand-to-hand interaction from her to her husband is covered by the marital privilege?

Mr. Berman. To the extent that there was such a -- such a transmission, or a handing over, or a communication by physical act, yes.

Mr. Somers. Did you ever put information on a flash drive to give to someone other than Fusion GPS?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Brebbia. Just so we are clear, the marital privilege covers non-testimony -- in your view, non-testimony -- non-testimony but the actual transaction of handing a physical object to her husband, the physical object which was then handed off to a third party, the FBI? So the contents, we agree whatever the contents are, are not privileged?

Mr. Berman. I am simply suggesting that the act, the hypothetical act, of handing a flash drive, or something that you are suggesting, to her husband -- would be covered by the marital privilege. What some other person, in your hypothetical, Mr. Ohr or someone else, does with it, it isn't covered by the privilege.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

It is just what goes on between Ms. Ohr and Mr. Ohr --

Mr. Brebbia. Okay.

Mr. Berman. -- that is the privilege. I have no problem with the after -- the before and the after.

Mr. Jordan. You said you -- there was a flash drive or maybe flash drives prepared that you gave to someone other than Fusion. Who did you give them to?

Mr. Berman. Again, to the extent that may implicate the marital privilege --

Mr. Brebbia. Other than Bruce --

Mr. Berman. -- she is instructed not to answer that question.

Mr. Brebbia. Other than your husband?

Ms. Ohr. No one.

Mr. Brebbia. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. Can I jump in?

Mr. Brebbia. Yeah.

Mr. Jordan. Just a few minutes. Thank you. And then I will let you guys come back. Because I got to run.

You said Fusion gave you information a little while ago. What information did they give you?

Ms. Ohr. A sheet with some flights that Mr. Manafort had taken.

Mr. Jordan. So a -- is that like a timesheet or a schedule or an agenda? What would you call it?

Ms. Ohr. A list.

Mr. Jordan. A list of Manafort flights?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay, did they give you any other information?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall. I mean, that is -- that is the only substantive thing they gave me.

Mr. Jordan. So in your working relationship there was information you were putting together on the two cases you talked about earlier this morning with me, that you were putting together to give to Mr. Berkowitz -- I think you said at Fusion was your direct contact -- but there was also information flowing from Fusion to you to help you do your work?

Ms. Ohr. Okay, I am sorry. I misunderstood the question. Not in the term -- form of physical documents. I thought you were talking about physical documents. Yes, they gave me, you could say, leads and suggestions of names.

Mr. Jordan. Things they wanted you to do; they were your employer?

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. And who was that person giving you the information? Who was -- who was saying, here is a lead, here is -- who gave you -- well, let's go back.

Who gave you the timesheet about Manafort's flights?

Ms. Ohr. Most of my communication was with Jake Berkowitz.

Mr. Jordan. Jake Berkowitz?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Ms. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. But that is not what I asked you. Who gave you the timesheet? Was it Jake Berkowitz?

Ms. Ohr. I can't remember who physically gave it to me. I was meeting with him and Glenn.

Mr. Jordan. Were there occasions where Mr. Simpson passed information to you, and in particular, could Mr. Simpson have passed you the Manafort flight schedule or timesheet or whatever we are calling it?

Ms. Ohr. It is possible. I don't remember who physically handed it to me. He was there, if I recall correctly.

Mr. Jordan. Back when you started, did anyone at the Department of Justice or FBI encourage you to contact Mr. Simpson?

Ms. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. It was all done -- did anyone encourage you to contact Mr. Simpson --

Ms. Ohr. It was my initiative.

Mr. Jordan. -- when you first started your employment? It was all on your initiative?

Ms. Ohr. Uh-huh.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Do you have any knowledge that your experience as a contractor for various Federal agencies was marketed to Simpson ahead of your employment?

Ms. Ohr. I gave them a resume.

Mr. Jordan. So he knew about that. But do you think

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

they -- any knowledge that he knew about even prior to you handing him or submitting your resume to him?

Ms. Ohr. Well, he knew that -- we had been at a conference together, so -- and at the time of the conference, my name was listed as open -- as working for open-source work.

Mr. Jordan. How often do you think in your typical week of work, or month of work, for Fusion, how often did you communicate with Glenn Simpson?

Ms. Ohr. Relatively rarely. Probably once every 6 to 8 weeks, I am guessing. Roughly.

Mr. Jordan. What were those communications typically like? Was he -- was he giving information to you, you passing on your work product to him? Or was that just something that was done electronically on a regular basis? How did it work?

Ms. Ohr. He would sit in when I was having my regular check-in, you might say, with Jake, and he might, you know, add some additional information or leads or just listen. I don't --

Mr. Jordan. So when were those regular check-ins with Jake that he would sit in on? How often were they?

Ms. Ohr. Every few weeks, every -- say, approximately 3 weeks on average, I would say.

Mr. Jordan. So every 3 weeks you were meeting with Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Berman. I think she was answering often were the check-ins with Jake.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Every 3 weeks.

Ms. Ohr. Exactly, yes. So -- so --

Mr. Jordan. And Mr. Simpson would sit in on some of those or all of those or --

Ms. Ohr. Occasional, yeah. Occasionally. Not -- not by far. Not by far all of them.

Mr. Jordan. And in all this time, you had -- you had -- so every 3 weeks, you are checking in with your direct contact at Fusion, Mr. Berkowitz, and on some of those occasions, Mr. Simpson is there. You never once learned who, in fact, was paying them for the work you were doing, who they were contracting with?

Ms. Ohr. I don't recall whether they explicitly named who was paying them.

Mr. Jordan. Okay, okay.

I got to run guys, I am sorry. Thank you.

Mr. Breitenbach. Ms. Ohr, just following up on Mr. Jordan's question there, you don't --

Mr. Jordan. Ms. Ohr, thank you, too. I apologize, I do have to run, thank you.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q You don't explicitly recall who was paying for the research, but I think in the prior round you had indicated that you assumed that your research was going for the purposes of anti-Trump, or somebody that is engaged in anti-Trump or Trump opposition?

A I thought it was logical that that might be the case.

Q Can you just talk a little bit more about why you were making that assumption?

A I guess I figured that the premise of people looking for material about Trump's relationships with Russian organized crime were probably not people who supported his candidacy.

Q So by that answer, I think it is by extension, you would agree. I know Mr. Baker had initially asked about how you portrayed -- or how you felt that research was -- could be -- could be portrayed, and I think you said it was investigative-type research, but in the sense of research going to somebody who is opposing Trump, another term could be "opposition research"?

A I am not sure how "opposition research" is defined. It was research.

Q But if it was going to oppose Trump -- and this was during the election, correct?

A Yes.

Q Can you talk about your feelings as to performing research that was then going to be used against the Trump candidacy?

A I thought it was worthwhile to -- to, you know, look into.

Q Why was it worthwhile, in your opinion?

A Because, as I had mentioned earlier, when I first heard

many, many years ago, that he had had this transaction with Mr. Rybolovlev, who had -- under suspicious circumstances, I had already been curious about what -- what Mr. Trump might be involved in. And so when the opportunity came up, it was a way to satisfy my curiosity.

Q I cannot say that name you just said, so, in terms of that gentleman, woman, I don't --

A Yes. It is a man.

Q -- it is a man -- can you just explain a little bit more about your prior understanding of that man and his connections -- or alleged connections, I suppose, with President Trump?

A All I know is remembering reading in the press many years ago that he had bought a mansion in Florida from Trump, and it -- I mean any time -- you know, any time a Russian oligarch just plops down a lot of money for a mansion from somebody, my antennae go up. And so I was curious --

Q Based on -- this is based off of your prior research --

A Well, I --

Q -- you were made aware of this connection?

A Well, it was just -- in the press. It was in the press, yeah, a long time ago. And I don't remember the year. So it was, you know, I -- because I am -- I tried to stay on top of things of that nature, it was something that caught my attention way back, when it first happened.

Q Okay. So I suppose, would it be fair to characterize that you were not opposed to performing opposition research on then Candidate Trump?

A That is fair.

Q Would you have been opposed on performing research against Candidate Clinton?

A I guess it depends on what research.

Q Let's suppose if the research was directly within your -- your expertise on Russia, would that have been something that you would have been comfortable in doing, in performing opposition research? Because I think when you are an opposition researcher, you fully understand what your opposition research is going towards.

So is it fair to characterize your understanding of where your opposition research was going, that you were comfortable with the idea that that research was going towards opposition of then Candidate Trump?

A I would probably have been less comfortable doing opposition research that would have gone against Hillary Clinton.

Q And why is that?

A Because I favored Hillary Clinton as a Presidential candidate.

Q Okay. You said earlier, I believe, in so many words, in the minority's questioning, that you had no reason to believe that your research had ended up in the dossier. Is that correct?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A That is correct.

Q Knowing what you know now, I think you also indicated that there may have been some of your research that did end up in the dossier. Is that correct?

A I am not sure what you are referring to.

Q I am only referring to what I believed part of your prior explanation in a prior round may have indicated.

A Uh-huh. I may have said something that gave you a wrong impression. So if you have a specific, I would like to hear --

Q No, no, no, not at all. I think -- my impression was that you had indicated that your research may have, in part --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- based off of your reading of the dossier, after learning of the dossier and after knowing about it, it was -- there were similarities of what was in the dossier based on --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- based off of what you had been performing as opposition research?

A My recollection of what I said was that when I eventually read the dossier in January of 2017, I believe, I did not recognize any of my research in the dossier. So your impression may come from my -- our July 30th meeting where we talked about some things that each of us had independently found.

Q No, I appreciate that. I think that clarifies things.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Uh-huh.

Q Because I think prior testimony had indicated, at least to me, that you recognized some of what was in the dossier.

A Yeah, no, I am -- I am sorry if there was any miscommunication. I very clearly did not. It was very distinct in my mind.

Q Sure. Well, let me just ask you generally, did you recognize, based off of your own independent research, any of the actual research that was located in the dossier?

A Not the research. I mean the -- some of the --

Q Any of the facts?

A -- were similar but totally independently derived. Does that make sense?

Q So when you say "facts" --

A Yeah, okay, I would say --

Q -- are you --

A I am sorry, I am sorry. Okay.

Q Sure. When you say "facts," are you referring to prior knowledge that you had concerning the substance of the dossier?

A Let me correct myself first by -- I realize that the dossier is entirely allegations. So can you rephrase your -- in other words, that is what is said in the dossier is allegations and not facts. So can you -- can you restate your question? I am sorry.

Q Sure. So based off of your prior research or just

expertise on Russia, and knowing what you had known based off your prior research, was there anything in the dossier that seemed familiar to you?

A I mean, some of the things looked believable, you could say, to the extent that they -- I could envision them happening within what I know about the system, but I won't -- I will not vouch for the veracity of anything that I did not independently research myself.

Q Totally understand. I am just wondering if there were any allegations in the dossier that you had independently come across in your prior research.

A Partially. Yeah.

Q Now, I know the minority had put this in, I believe, as Exhibit No. 1 --

A Yeah, yeah.

Q -- can you point to anything directly in the exhibit that you are referring to, as having been -- as having been --

A So that you are saying coincided with what I had independently found?

Q Thank you.

A Is that what you are asking about?

Q That is exactly what I am asking.

A Okay. It would take me some time to --

Q Offhand, do you recall after having read the dossier --

A Uh-huh.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q -- is there anything that stands out to you as coinciding with research that you had previously performed?

A The fact that Carter Page went to Moscow in July of 2016, I guess, is something that I independently found through my research. However, many of the details about -- that are claimed in the dossier are not something that I found in my research.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Can I just ask you a question about that. Because you said something a moment ago that confused me a little bit. You said there are things you recognize in the dossier, and you said there were other things -- I believe you said they were independently verified, there were things in there that --

A Okay, I did not recognize my research, that is, the way that I, you know, the things that I found and the way that I expressed them. So I did not -- I came to the conclusion after reading this, that it was a totally independent research endeavor.

Q So it was another -- it was another source of information?

A Yes, I think, if I understand you correctly, yes.

Q I thought you said verify before. So I just want -- you are saying that there are things that you researched, that appear in the dossier, but you don't believe they came directory from you?

A Right. That is -- right.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q So you mentioned Carter Page. Why were you independently researching Carter Page?

A I was asked to.

Q By whom?

A By Jake Berkowitz.

Q Did he ever indicate to you the reason for researching Carter Page?

A I think he said because Carter Page is an advisor to Trump.

Q And can you explain some of the results from your research concerning Carter Page?

A I found that -- well, he went to Moscow, he spoke at this university, and he talked about better relations between Russia and the United States, and he gave interviews where he advocated better relations between Russia and the United States.

Q And this is based off of all open-source --

A Yeah.

Q -- research?

A Uh-huh.

Q Were you ever aware previously of the name Carter Page?

A Not before he was announced as a Trump advisor.

Mr. Somers. Was there any public source information on Carter Page that he had had a prior relationship with the FBI?

Ms. Ohr. I am not aware of it until very recently.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q Are you aware of the Papadopoulos name that has been in the news?

A I became aware of it as a result of press coverage in the recent months.

Q Were you ever asked to perform research on Mr. Papadopoulos?

A Not that I recall.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Michael Flynn?

A Yes.

Q What were you asked to research on Michael Flynn?

A Just about any relationship he might have with Russia.

Q Other countries -- other countries or just Russia?

A Yeah, now I am trying to sort out what I -- what happened at the time, with what happened later. I mean, at some point, it became evident that he had a relationship with Turkey as well. I don't recall whether that was brought up at all.

Q But that wasn't in the purview of your research?

A Not that I recall.

Q Paul Manafort, cover that a little bit?

A Yeah.

Q Were you asked to research him or --

A Yes.

Q Specifically?

A Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q In regards to Russia or regards to --

A Russia -- Ukraine, mostly.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q Were you asked to research anybody else in Mr. Trump's family?

A Certain -- I mean, you know, I was -- I was asked to research Trump's family broadly in connection with any -- any Russian connections.

Q So broadly, but in terms of actually performing the research, did you begin to break out President Trump's family in terms of Melania Trump, all of his children? Were you doing independent research based off of each family member?

A I did some.

Q On which family members, do you recall, or all of them?

A As I recall, I did some research on all of them, but not in much depth.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q How about Donald Junior, did you do more in-depth research on Donald Trump Junior than some of the others?

A I am afraid it was relatively superficial. It was --

Q Nothing related to --

A -- time pressure.

Q Nothing related to travels or business dealings he may have had in Europe?

A I looked into some of his travels and, you know, I am

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

not sure how much detail I remember, at this point.

Q Ivanka Trump?

A I looked into some of her travels.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q And what were you trying to find with regard to each of these individuals? What was the purpose of looking into the family members?

A Yeah, to see whether they were involved in dealings and transactions with people who had suspicious pasts, or suspicious types of dealings.

Q Was there indication from Mr. Berkowitz or Mr. Simpson that they had any inside information as to whether there were suspicious connections with any of President Trump's orbit of individuals including his family?

A What do you mean by "inside information"?

Q I would say any information that they specifically gave you, in terms of your employment with Fusion GPS, that would indicate that there were some level of connections with President Trump's family and Russia?

A They would give me leads based on their open-source research and, you know, legal documents and other things.

Q Did they ever indicate that any of their leads were based off of sources of theirs?

A I don't remember get- -- regarding the Trump family, no.

Q Regarding any of the research during this year, 10-,

11-month period, was any -- was any research based off of sources of theirs that you were aware of?

A Yes.

Q And who were the sources?

A I recall a -- they were mentioning someone named Serhiy Leshchenko, a Ukrainian.

Q And did they give you any indication as to Leshchenko's connections with them, how they got to know him? Were they doing work for him?

A With Fusion GPS?

Q Correct.

A I am not aware of how they --

Q Were you aware of how they had a connection with him?

A I am not aware.

Q But you were aware that he was a source of information that was leading to information that they had, that they were then presenting to you as reasons for following up on opposition research or what research --

A Yes.

Q -- that is, on President Trump or his family?

A My understanding is that some -- yes. And -- yes, it was not necessarily on his family that Leshchenko's research was on.

Q Are you aware of what his research, or what his source information included?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A His source information, I am not aware.

Q You are just aware that he was a source of --

A Yes.

Q -- Glenn Simpson? Or was it a source of Mr. Berkowitz?
Or both?

A I am not aware of a differentiation between them. Just a source for Fusion GPS.

Q That is one source. Were there any other sources that you were aware of?

A I don't think so. I don't recall that there were.

Q And were you aware of Mr. Leshchenko prior to him being mentioned to you as a potential source of their information?

A Yes.

Q In what way?

A He is very well-known, Ukrainian, anti-corruption activist. So I had read about him in the press.

Q Had you studied him before?

A What do you mean by "studied"?

Q Performed independent research for any prior employer.

A No. I followed him in the -- you know, if I saw him mentioned in the press, I read -- I read about it.

Q And previous to this particular incoming knowledge from Mr. Simpson or just from Fusion GPS, were you aware of any connections between Mr. Leshchenko -- am I saying that name, by the way?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Yes.

Q -- Mr. Leshchenko and President Trump, or anyone in President Trump's familial orbit or even friendly orbit?

A I was unaware of any connections before that.

Q I think in the news, I am sure you have seen that there have been emails between your husband and Mr. Steele. Is that correct?

A In the news, emails?

Q That you had seen.

A I don't recall emails -- messages --

Q Him being mentioned?

A I remember communications being mentioned. I don't remember emails, messages.

Q So previously you said you had a shared email account.

A With my husband.

Q Are you aware whether -- because it is shared, a shared email account, when emails come in, are you then both reading emails that are arriving in the same email account?

A We usually kind of can tell who it is intended for. Whether it is from my friend, then it is probably for me. So he is not likely to read it. That sort of thing.

Q Okay, so emails that were coming in from Mr. Steele, were you reading emails that were coming in from Mr. Steele to your husband?

A I don't recall any emails coming into our joint email

account from Mr. Steele.

Q You said, in the prior round of questioning, that you didn't hear the word "investigation" mentioned at the breakfast at the Mayflower. Is that accurate?

A To the best of my recollection.

Q Was there any corollary to the word "investigation" that you may have heard during that discussion? Meaning, let's say -- or synonym of "investigation"?

You were very specific, I noticed, in saying that you did not hear the actual word "investigation" at that discussion.

But did you ever hear any other terms? I can just try to think of some, like "inquiry," or was there any indication that the research that was being discussed at that meeting concerning President Trump, was -- were you aware, based off of a word that was used, that that information was going somewhere for some type of, quote, investigation or other similar term?

A My understanding was that Chris Steele was hoping that Bruce would put in a word with the FBI to follow-up on the information in some way.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q When did you become aware that the FBI was investigating Trump and the Trump/Russia connections?

A Much more recently. When it came out in the press.

Q Okay, so Glenn Simpson testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that he became aware, or he was aware in the

October 2016 sort of timeframe. You were not aware around that timeframe that the FBI was investigating Trump/Russia connections?

A I was aware that it was a possibility, whatever was in the press, about, you know, oh, they might be investigating, that sort of thing. But I never was explicitly aware.

Q Any knowledge you had was from press reports?

A As I recall.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q Let me just go back to that breakfast meeting. So you were aware that information, according to that discussion, was going to potentially be given to the Department of Justice or the FBI? I know they are both part of DOJ, but what did you understand?

A I guessed that it was going to the FBI.

Q And when we say "it," can you say once again, what "it" is?

A Yeah, that is a good question. I didn't know the extent of his research, but I understood that whatever it was he was finding, that he was concerned about -- that he was hoping that this information would go to the FBI.

Q He was hoping. So did he formally ask, based off of your understanding of the conversation, for your husband to give Mr. Steele's research to the FBI?

Or to the Department of Justice, or to any other Government agency?

A Yeah. My recollection of the specific words was -- is cloudy. So the most -- what I can say is that my understanding was that he wanted to -- Bruce to put in a -- put in a word with the FBI and that may have involved information. It is -- I don't have direct knowledge of what that involved.

Q Okay. And, again in the prior round, you answered in answer to a question that in so many words was, you didn't believe there was any discussion about opening an investigation on Donald Trump at that breakfast. And you answered, quote, not by DOJ. At least that is what I had written down. So something to the effect of, you answered, not by DOJ. It just raised in the question in my mind, by whom, if it wasn't by DOJ?

A Yeah, and formally maybe I was mistaken because obviously FBI is part of the DOJ. But my understanding was that it would be the FBI that might begin -- if there were an investigation, they would be the ones who would logically begin it. It wasn't something the DOJ would initiate.

Q Were you aware whether -- or do you recall any indication where Christopher Steele may have indicated that the research would also be beneficial to be passed on to any other government agency?

A I am not aware of any --

Q Other than the FBI?

A -- discussion of that. I don't recall any discussion of that.

Q Okay, and then also going back to that breakfast meeting, you indicated that you may have seen a page of the dossier at the breakfast. So can you just explain, this is based off of your subsequent understanding and viewing and reading the dossier that you mentioned had been first produced on your understanding by BuzzFeed, correct?

A Oh, okay. Are you asking multiple questions?

Q Maybe. The -- when you said in the prior round that you may have seen a page of the dossier, that is based off of your subsequent understanding of having read the dossier following the production by, first BuzzFeed, publicly?

A I recognized the type of information when I saw the dossier. Does that answer your question?

Q I think so. So can you, again, recall off of top of your mind -- off the top of your head, what exactly the portion of the dossier that you believe you saw at that breakfast meeting that eventually became the final product, so to speak?

A I don't recall what I saw on the page, but it -- because of his talking about that point, about being very concerned about the Russian Government, for many years, having favored, or supported a Trump candidacy, my understanding was, it was along those lines.

Q Along the lines of Russia supporting a Trump candidacy in the past?

A Supporting a Trump candidacy at that time. Or, yes, in

the past, and up until 2016.

Q So it was -- so you do recall seeing something at that meeting -- and again, I just want to try to -- I am trying to figure out what part of the dossier that you --

A Yeah.

Q -- believe you may have seen. First you have testified that you believe it was part of the dossier, or at least a page of the dossier. Was there -- was it only one page, or how many pages do you believe you saw?

A I just seem to recall seeing sort of a -- you know, probably a page. And I don't recall specifically what I saw on it.

Q Okay. And I am trying to understand, too, how did you know -- or how do you know, reflecting back on that time, that it was part of the dossier?

A Good question. I am guessing that -- I mean, just the look of it, looked similar, the way the headers were and everything else. And the tenor of the type of arguments that were made, looked similar. But I don't have specific recollections of what was on that particular page.

Q So Director Comey has previously testified to the salacious and unverified character of -- or the substance of the dossier. Did anything immediately stand out to you, when you saw what you saw? Even though you don't recall exactly the substance of that page of the dossier, did anything stand out to you as

salacious?

A No.

Q What exactly, again -- and I know you have already explained in part, but what exactly again stood out to you based off of that one page of the dossier that you saw?

A I am sorry, I don't recollect the specifics that were on that page. It was along the same tenor of what he was saying verbally.

Q And you understand that that was -- the page that you saw was the result of Christopher Steele's research?

A That was my understanding at the time, yeah.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Can I just ask you a couple and -- and I apologize before I ask these questions whether they were asked before because they are kind of basic questions.

Are you currently doing any research on Trump and Russia?

A Why don't you --

Q Paid research on Trump -- currently doing any paid research on Trump --

A The reason I am hesitating is because it is hard to do anything without mentioning Trump, if you will excuse me. I am doing -- I am doing cyber -- cyber threat intelligence research. That is my current job. And I will do things like, you know what is being said in the Russian press and by Russian officials about the latest round of sanctions, for example. And so I will

summarize and analyze what I see as Russian responses. And naturally it involves their understanding of how Trump will enforce the sanctions, their discussions of the midterm elections, and what effect that might have on the sanctions and things like that.

Q But nothing specific to connections between Trump and Russia?

A I don't -- I don't think so, no.

Q And you testified before that I believe the dates were October 2015, roughly, September 2016, you did work for Fusion GPS on Trump/Russia connections. Did you do any work after September 2016 for someone other than Fusion GPS on Trump and Russia?

A I mean as part of my cyber threat intelligence research, I wrote about Russian information operations in connection with their -- their hacking of the DNC.

Q But no direct research on Trump and Russia -- Russian connections between Trump and those in the Trump campaign, or Trump family and Russia?

A I mean, I wrote about people who expressed support for Trump, Russians who expressed support but not Trump's direct dealings with them. Does that distinction make sense?

Q I think I understand what you are saying.

A Uh-huh.

Q Have you ever done any work for the Penn Quarter Group?

A No.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Daniel Jones?

A No.

BY MR. BREBBIA:

Q Can I -- little bit related.

This might make you happy. Leaving out the Fusion work of 2016 --

A Okay.

Q -- setting that aside, during the course of your career working for private-sector entities, had there come a time when you obtained information during your work that you thought I should share this with the FBI? Had that ever occurred?

A I -- I mean, no. I would say not.

Q Leaving out the vehicle by which you would have transmitted it, had you ever provided information to the FBI?

A No.

Q Okay. But in the fall of 2016, there did come a time when you decided the information you had obtained in the course of your work with Fusion GPS, that that should go to the FBI?

A Yes.

Q Thank you.

Mr. Somers. Again, I am going to apologize again if this was already asked earlier. Did you ever talk to any journalists about the Trump/Russia research you were doing?

Ms. Ohr. No.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Had you ever done, to your knowledge, any other opposition research on other Republican candidates?

A No.

Q Had you ever done any oppo research on Democrat candidates?

A No.

Q Going to the actual research product that you performed during that year, can we sort of narrow down and try to understand what exactly the results of your research product include. So you had indicated that you -- you broadly reviewed family members of President Trump and President Trump, and those that we have mentioned, like General Flynn and Manafort, people within the Trump orbit. What were the eventual results once you handed -- was there a final product that you handed over to Fusion GPS, once you completed your time employed by that company?

A There were ongoing products. So, small reports every few weeks, and ongoing chronologies.

Q Are you aware whether it was ever compiled into one single report?

A I am not aware of what happened to it after.

Q Can you talk a little bit about the substance of what you found?

A I did research on a lot of different people. So I -- I, for example, did a report on Trump's various visits to the Soviet Union and Russia over the years and the deals that he tried to

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

undertake, and with whom and what the background of those people were, things about the Miss Universe Pageant and who was there.

Q I suppose, was there anything in your research that -- beyond -- beyond open-source research that you found, was there anything in the research that raises a red flag for you?

A What do you mean "beyond open-source research" that I found?

Q Well, let me rephrase.

Based off of your research, was there anything that raised a red flag for you?

A As I said, many of the transactions and business relationships appeared to have the kinds of hallmarks that, you know, others have said could be hallmarks of money laundering, and not that I am an expert on money laundering, but suspicious transactions, for example, the Rybolovlev thing which happened many years before.

If I recall correctly, Mr. Trump bought it for a -- a very small amount of money and relatively quickly resold it to Mr. Rybolovlev for a large amount of money, which seemed suspicious.

Q Okay. So you are getting -- you are giving, every 3 weeks or so, final, interim products, I would say, it sounds like.

A Yeah, yes.

Q Is that a good characterization?

A Yeah.

Q So based off the interim products, you were consistently getting more and more research performed. In terms of a red flag, so to speak, your -- do you have a final impression, based off of all of those interim products?

A A final impression --

Q A final impression of your own research?

A I came to the conclusion that -- that Mr. Trump's dealings with Russian business people were very concerning, that they seemed to show a disregard for -- disregard for staying within the law, I guess I could say. I don't have any evidence to -- that would stand up in court. I am not, you know, a legal person. So by saying they are concerning, that is about as far as I could go with my open-source research.

Q Okay, and was any of the -- were any of those concerns -- you indicated you are not aware whether those concerns -- you are not aware of the entity to whom those concerns were passed? Meaning, somebody hiring Fusion GPS for that particular research performed by you?

A I was -- I don't recall being told explicitly who was funding my research at any given time.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q What would you do in your research if you found something that said, this happened, fact one, and then something that contradicted that, a fact two? How would you reconcile or test each other against the other for purposes of your reporting?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Yeah, good question. Yeah, I mean, that is obviously something that happens all the time for anyone who does investigations, right? And I would look at the -- first of all, try to trace any story or claim back to its source, and that often takes a lot of time, evaluate the source, see if they seem to be believable, if they had research to know what they were talking about, had direct evidence, and in the end, you know, have to make assessments about which is more believable.

Q Would you assign a degree of confidence to a particular reporting that you provided?

A I know that there are these degrees of confidence that are often applied. I am not sure I ever explicitly said with moderate confidence, or whatever, but I hope it was clear that, you know, while this is -- I may not have used a word, confidence, but I hope that I clarified the degree to which I had any confidence in what I was finding.

Q You indicated very early on that you had worked under the general umbrella of U.S. Government jobs. Have you ever worked for a U.S. Government organization in a capacity other than a research capacity, where you are looking at past events? Did you ever work for a government entity where you were providing realtime information on things?

A And you -- when you say "working for a government entity," you were understanding that I was an independent contractor, right?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Yes.

A Yes. And my -- yes, my independent contractor work involved at times doing current research.

Q In addition to the shared email account, did you have an email account that was uniquely yours?

A I had a Gmail account but very rarely used it.

Q How did you bill for your time?

A I would add up -- I mean, I would just keep notes to myself of how many hours I spent, and then I turned in an invoice.

Q And you said you got leads sent to you?

A Mostly verbally when I was meeting with Jake or --

Q Are there any email records that still exist that have particular leads on them that you were assigned, or records that indicate particular things you billed for?

A Or records that indicate particular things I billed for? I mean, I have records of my research. Is that what you mean?

Q I would be interested in any records that exist, either particular assignments you got, or leads you got, via email and, therefore, created a record, or billing that you sent in for particular projects or time spent on a particular fact you were verifying.

A Yeah, yeah. I still have the emails where I sent in the invoices, and usually I would just say "latest report for Jake," you know, that sort of thing.

Q And does Jake still work at Fusion GPS?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A As far as I know.

Q Okay.

BY MR. PARMITER:

Q Ms. Ohr, thank you for coming today. Just one final question. Do you know who Christopher Steele reported to at Fusion GPS?

A No.

Q Thank you.

Mr. Breitenbach. I actually have one more final question.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[2:40 p.m.]

Mr. Breitenbach. I actually have one more final question.

BY MR. BREITENBACH:

Q Who owns the research that you performed for Fusion GPS?

A I guess they own it.

Q Fusion GPS or their client?

A Oh, that's a good question. I don't recall signing anything that explicitly said who owns it.

Q Do you still possess the research that you performed?

A Yes.

Q Would you be willing to share that with the committee?

A I guess so.

Mr. Breitenbach. Thank you. I think we're up on time.

(Recess.)

Ms. Sachsman Grooms. All right. Thank you. Let's go back on the record. The time is 2:50.

BY MS. SACHSMAN GROOMS:

Q I just wanted to go back through something that I think you've touched on in a number of different rounds a little bit piecemeal, and it got a little confusing to me, and so I just wanted to walk through and clarify it. It's about the Mayflower meeting. So you went to the Mayflower meeting with your husband to meet up with Christopher Steele and his associate. Is that right?

A Yes.

Q And it was a breakfast?

A Yes.

Q And you left the breakfast at some point so that Christopher Steele and your husband could speak privately. Is that right?

A Yes.

Q And you were gone for some period of time. Do you have an understanding of how long that was or --

A I don't know, 15-20 minutes maybe, I don't know. I don't know.

Q Do you recall what you did at that point?

A I went to the restroom and then I went out into the lobby and waited.

Q Was it at the end or the beginning?

A End.

Q And during that meeting, it was my understanding, that Christopher Steele expressed to you -- Christopher Steele expressed to you that he had deep concerns about Donald Trump's relationship with Russia. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q And that he wanted that to be communicated in some way to the FBI, I assume. Is that right?

A That was my understanding.

Q Do you recall if he explicitly said that, or if that was just your understanding?

A I don't recall what was explicitly said.

Q I think at some point you explained that there was a page of a piece of paper that he showed to you. Is that accurate?

A Yeah, a page of a document. And I don't remember if it was paper, or on a laptop.

Q Do you recall why he was showing a page of a document?

A My understanding, which I don't know if this is why his intention was just to show that he's been doing research, and that his research had led him to these concerns.

Q Do you recall whether you stopped and read the document when he showed it to you or if he was sort of flashing you a piece of paper to show you that he was doing research?

A I wouldn't make any guesses about his intentions. My recollection is seeing very briefly something like one page. I can't -- I don't remember exactly how many lines I saw, but yeah.

Q Do you remember whether you read it at the time?

A I recall looking at it, but as from my previous discussion, I don't currently recall what happened to be on that page.

Q I understand, but do you recall whether at the time you actually read the document, or you just looked at it and sort of skimmed it over?

A As I recall, it was more skimming than reading.

Q And I think you explained that you had seen, essentially, the formatting of the document?

A Yeah. Yes.

Q And that the formatting of the document looked similar to the formatting of Christopher Steele's other work product that you later saw in the dossier. Is that accurate?

A If I recall correctly. Yes.

Q I think you've said that that page might have ended up in the dossier. Is it also possible that that document that he showed you is just the way he formats his work product?

A It's very possible, because I don't have any clear understanding of whether that particular page ended up as-is in the dossier, whether it was a first draft, it could have been.

Q And did he give you the document to take?

A I don't recall receiving anything. I personally did not receive anything, and I don't recall Bruce receiving -- whether he received anything.

Q Okay. At that meeting?

A At that meeting.

Q Okay. So he just showed you something, you skimmed it, and then you gave it back?

A To the best of my recollection.

Q And you don't recall whether he was showing you a piece of paper in a hard copy or a computer screen?

A Right.

Ms. Sachsman Grooms. Thank you. That helps. That's all I had. Oh, I'm sorry, let me do one more.

BY MS. SACHSMAN GROOMS:

Q You mentioned that, at some point, somebody from Fusion GPS told you that they were giving you a tip that was based off of a source that was a Ukrainian source, Serhiy Leshchenko. Is that right?

A Yes. That they were -- that they were giving me some information that had originated with him in some way.

Q Do you recall whether that information related to Mr. Manafort?

A What I'll say is that at the time -- at the same meeting, if I recall correctly, that his name came up, this piece of paper that lists Mr. Manafort's flights was given to me, and I'm not -- I don't recall exactly right now whether they said this particular piece of paper comes from Mr. Leshchenko or not.

Q Okay. I think in the previous round, you said that you weren't reading emails from Mr. Steele that came to your husband through the joint email account, but obviously, you read this one email. So I just wanted to clarify what you were talking about?

A Yeah, there is a distinction here because from Mr. Steele, no messages came to our joint account, from Mr. Simpson occasionally messages came to our joint account.

Q I apologize, that's my mistake between two different people.

A Uh-huh.

Q And I think in the last round, someone may have

described that you worked for Fusion GPS until December of 2016, and as part of a question, it was my understanding that you ended your work in September 2016. Is that right?

A And if someone did say that, and I didn't catch it, I apologize, I ended in September of 2016.

Q Great.

Ms. Sachsman Grooms. Thank you. I think that's all we have. Thank you.

Mr. Somers. I think that's all we have. Thank you for coming in and coming in voluntarily. We appreciate your time today.

Ms. Ohr. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:00 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

I have read the foregoing ____ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

Witness Name

Date