

Transcript of Patrick Daniel Scholl

Date: October 29, 2019

Case: Judicial Watch, Inc. -v- U.S. Department of State

Planet Depos

Phone: 888.433.3767

Email:: transcripts@planetdepos.com

www.planetdepos.com

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                                                                                    APPEARANCES
              FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
                                                                      2
                                                                           ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:
   - - - - - - x
                                                                      3
                                                                               RAMONA COTCA, ESQUIRE
   JUDICIAL WATCH, INC., :
                                                                              LAUREN M. BURKE, ESQUIRE
          Plaintiff,
                                                                              JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.
                         : Case No.
                                                                              425 Third Street, SW
   U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, : 14-cv-1242 (RCL)
                                                                               Suite 800
          Defendant.
                                                                               Washington, DC 20024
   - - - - - - - X
                                                                               (202) 646-5172
10
11
      Videotaped Deposition of PATRICK DANIEL SCHOLL
                                                                      11 ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT:
                     Washington, DC
                                                                               STEPHEN M. PEZZI, ESQUIRE
12
                                                                       12
13
                Tuesday, October 29, 2019
                                                                      13
                                                                               UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
14
                       9:53 a.m.
                                                                              FEDERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH
15
                                                                               1100 L Street, NW
                                                                       16
                                                                              Washington, DC 20005
17
                                                                       17
                                                                               (202) 305-7583
19
20 Job No.: 262569
21 Pages 1 - 207
22 Reported by: Debra A. Whitehead
        Videotaped Deposition of PATRICK DANIEL SCHOLL,
                                                                           APPEARANCES CONTINUED
   held at the offices of:
                                                                          ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT:
                                                                              ELIZABETH GROSSO, ESQUIRE
                                                                              UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE
           PLANET DEPOS - DC
           1100 Connecticut Avenue, NW
                                                                              2201 C Street, NW
            Suite 950
                                                                              Washington, DC 20520
            Washington, DC 20036
                                                                               (202) 647-6371
            (888) 433-3767
                                                                       10 ALSO PRESENT:
                                                                       11
                                                                               JEREMY DINEEN, Video Specialist
12
                                                                       12
        Pursuant to notice, before Debra A. Whitehead,
13 an Approved Reporter of the United States District
                                                                       13
14 Court and Notary Public of the District of Columbia.
15
16
17
                                                                       17
18
19
20
                                                                      21
22
```

Conducted on Condu	October 29, 2019
5	PROCEEDINGS 7
1 CONTENTS 2 EXAMINATION OF PATRICK DANIEL SCHOLL PAGE	
	2 VIDEO SPECIALIST: Here begins Disk
3 By Ms. Cotca 8	3 Number 1 in the videotaped deposition of Patrick
	4 Daniel Scholl in the matter of Judicial Watch,
5 EXHIBITS	5 Inc., V the United States Department of State, in
6 (Attached to the Transcript) 7 SCHOLL DEPOSITION EXHIBIT PAGE	6 the U.S. District Court for the District of
	7 Columbia; Case Number 14-CV-1242.
8 Exhibit 1 Office of Information Programs 30 9 and Services, A/GIS/IPS.	8 Today's date is October 29, 2019. The
10 Exhibit 2 12/6/12 Letter from Ms. Weismann 99	9 time on the video monitor is 9:53. The
11 to Office of Information Programs	10 videographer today is Jeremy Dineen, representing
12 and Services, with Attachment, US	11 Planet Depos. This video deposition is taking
13 Department of State Document No.	12 place at the offices of Planet Depos, 1100
14 C06071676	13 Connecticut Avenue, Northwest, in Washington, DC.
15 Exhibit 3 E-mail String, Bates 106	Would counsel please voice-identify
16 DOS_00000899_0001 - 00000899_0004	15 themselves and state whom they represent.
17 Exhibit 4 E-mail String, US Department of 112	1 1
18 State Document No. C06125549	16 MS. COTCA: Ramona Cotca, representing 17 Judicial Watch.
19 Exhibit 5 E-mail String, US Department of 117	
20 State Document No. C06125550	18 MS. BURKE: Lauren Burke, representing
21 Exhibit 6 E-mail String, US Department of 120	19 Judicial Watch.
22 State Document No. C06105336	MR. PEZZI: Stephen Pezzi from the
	21 Department of Justice, representing the Department
	22 of State. And the witness reserves the right to
6	8
1 EXHIBITS CONTINUED	1 read and sign.
2 SCHOLL DEPOSITION EXHIBIT PAGE	2 MS. GROSSO: Elizabeth Grosso, for the
3 Exhibit 7 E-mail String, US Department of 137	3 State Department.
4 State Document No. C06125546	4 VIDEO SPECIALIST: The court reporter
5 Exhibit 8 E-mail String, US Department of 146	5 today is Debbie Whitehead, representing Planet
6 State Document No. 06104350	6 Depos.
7 Exhibit 9 US Department of State No. 148	7 Would the reporter please swear in the
8 C06125574	8 witness.
9 Exhibit 10 Search Tasker, S/ES-CR, US 167	9 PATRICK DANIEL SCHOLL,
Department of State Document No.	10 having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
11 C06125556	11 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF
12 Exhibit 11 Search Tasker, IRM, US Department 175	12 BY MS. COTCA:
of State Document No. C06125562	13 Q Good morning, Mr. Scholl.
14 Exhibit 12 E-mail String, US Department of 177	14 Could you please state your name and
15 State Document No. C06125565	15 spell it, for the record.
16 Exhibit 13 E-mail String, US Department of 180	16 A Patrick Daniel Scholl. P-A-T-R-I-C-K,
17 State Document No. C06105353	17 D-A-N-I-E-L, S-C-H-O-L-L.
18 Exhibit 14 E-mail String 184	18 Q Okay. Thank you very much.
19 Exhibit 15 Defendant's Responses and 200	19 And are you familiar with this lawsuit,
20 Objections to Plaintiff's	20 Judicial Watch versus the State Department?
21 Supplemental Requests for	21 A Yes.
	22 Q Okay. And just for background, you're
22 Production of Documents	22 Q Okay. And just for background, you it

1 familiar that it's relating to a FOIA request

- 2 Judicial Watch submitted back in 2014 to the State
- 3 Department for records from the Secretary's office
- 4 pertaining to talking points that were provided to
- 5 Ambassador Susan Rice prior to her appearance on
- 6 Sunday to discuss the Benghazi attacks back in
- 7 2012? Is that your understanding?

A That's what I understand now, yes.

Q Okay. What did you mean by, that's what 10 you understand now?

A The --11

12 Q Did you have a different understanding 13 before?

A No. I mean, I didn't know about the -15 the lawsuit, I wasn't really aware of it until it 16 came up as a -- a subject -- when I was visited by 17 the attorneys to let me know that there's a 18 possibility there was going to be a deposition. 19 That was the first time I was aware of it.

Q Okay. And so the reason I wanted to give 21 you the background is to kind of explain to you 22 why you're here today.

Your name had come up in previous

2 depositions in this case, where you -- you were

3 named as having potential relevant information, so

4 that is why we've asked you to come here today.

Before we move on, have you ever been deposed before?

A No.

O Okay. Let me just go over a few ground 9 rules for the deposition.

10 Obviously, as you know, you were just 11 sworn in. And you're required to tell the truth. 12 Is there any reason that you would not be able to 13 answer the questions truthfully today?

14 A No.

15 Q Okay. There's a court reporter here who 16 is transcribing everything that's being said. So 17 to have a clean transcript, I would just ask that 18 you let me finish asking the questions, and that I 19 will let you finish answering the questions so we 20 don't speak over each other.

21 A Yes.

22 Okay. You're doing very well by 1 providing verbal responses, because obviously

2 heads of the nods do not transcribe.

If you don't understand a question or if

4 you need clarification, please let me know.

5 That's important because if you don't, I will

6 assume that you had understood the question that's

7 being asked and that you answered it as it was --

8 as it was asked.

Is that fair?

10 A Yes.

Q Okay. Also, your -- the attorney here 12 representing you, he may have objections for the 13 record that he may raise. Make sure to let him 14 finish his objection before answering the 15 question.

Unless he instructs you not to answer, 16 17 you are still required to answer the question.

18 Okay?

19 A I understand.

20 Q Okay. All right. So let's move on.

Could I just get some background 21

22 information from you as to your employment with

the State Department.

10

When did you begin at the State

Department?

4 A I started at the State Department in 1984. 5

Q Okay. And I don't really want to go in 7 too much detail that far back. But what did you 8 start as in 1984?

9 A I started out as a passport examiner.

10 Q Okay. Was that here in Washington, DC?

11

12 Q Okay. And then how long were you a 13 passport examiner?

14 A I don't recall totally. Probably three 15 years.

16 Q Okay. And what office was that in?

17 The Bureau of Consular Affairs.

O Okay. And how long were you in the 18

19 Bureau of Consular Affairs?

20 A I'm not sure, but probably around five 21 years.

Q Five years or so? Okay.

3 (9 to 12)

Conducted on October 29, 2019 15 And then in -- after that, around 1989 or 1 exactly when the position changed into a different 2 so, where did you move? A I think it was '88 that I moved to the 3 Okay. What do you mean "the position FOIA office. changed into a different series"? O FOIA office. A They called it -- it switched to a And what's the FOIA office, if you can be 6 program analyst position later on. I don't know 6 more specific? when that happened. 8 The State Department is so big. Q Okay. But as a program analyst, did you 9 A At the time? 9 still remain within the --10 O Yes. Yes. 10 A Yes. A Back then? 11 11 Q -- FOIA office? Q Yes. Back then. 12 12 And did your duties and responsibilities 13 remain basically the same? 13 A I can't remember what it was called back 14 then. FPC, perhaps, was the acronym. 14 A Yes. Q Was that --15 Q Okay. 15 A FOIA privacy classification review. 16 Okay. And how long did you remain as a 16 Q Was that within the A bureau? 17 17 program analyst in the FOIA office? A I don't recall. A I don't remember how long. 18 18 19 Q Okay. And what were your duties in the 19 Okay. Did you change your position since 20 FOIA office? 20 then? A As an analyst, processing information 21 A Yes. 22 access requests. 22 Okay. And what was the next position you 14 Q So what -- your day-to-day, what -- what 1 held? does that entail? Or what did that entail at the 2 A I became a team leader. 3 time? 3 Q Still in the FOIA office? A Processing, sending out search taskers 4 A Yes. Q Okay. And how did your duties change at and processing responses. Administrative 5 6 that point? processing. 7 A I started to clear the work of others. Q Okay. Q Okay. And the individuals that you were 8 A For the requests. Q Did you -- as part of your duties did you 9 managing, were they basically doing the same tasks 10 have the responsibility to review records to 10 that you had done before as a program analyst? 11 determine if they're responsive or if information 11 A Yes. 12 needed to be redacted from them? 12 Q Okay. Just let me back up. As a program analyst, in reviewing or 13 13 A No. 14 administratively processing FOIA requests, did you MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 14 15 process FOIA requests that were both in litigation Q Okay. What was your title back then? 15 A Paralegal specialist. 16 and not in litigation? Or --16 Q Okay. All right. And how long did you 17 A I don't recall.

22

18 remain employed as a paralegal specialist in the

A As an analyst, for -- I -- I don't

22 specialist for a few years. I don't remember

21 remember how many years it was. I was a paralegal

19 FOIA office?

Q Okay. And then how long did your

21 chief at the time, it was called a section chief.

O Section chief. And is that still within

A I became a branch chief -- or a section

19 position change from being a team leader?

19 1 the FOIA office? 1 reorganization, I believe. So it -- it was a 2 section chief for quite some time, until it was 2 A Yes. 3 Okay. And when did you become a section 3 determined that it was - they were authorized, I 4 chief? guess, to make it a - a branch. Q Okay. So just to briefly understand, A I don't recall the date. Q Do you have a time frame? Or whose 6 then. Basically is it your testimony that your 7 responsibilities and duties pretty much stayed the administration it was? 8 same when you were a branch chief from when you A In the '90s. 8 9 Q '90s. Okay. Thank you. 9 were section chief? 10 And as section chief, how had your 10 A Yes. 11 responsibilities changed at that point? O Okay. Who reported to the branch chief? 11 A You mean the section chief, from an 12 A I don't --13 analyst to a section chief? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 Q Yes. From a team leader to a section Q And I don't mean necessarily --14 14 15 chief. A I don't recall. 15 A Can you repeat the question, because I O -- names. 16 16 17 was an information - I was a paralegal. 17 But if you can describe sort of the 18 individuals or officials, and the type of 18 O Yes. 19 positions who reported to the branch chiefs. 19 A And as far as the management of the MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 20 office, I was a team leader, and then a section 20 21 chief. So then I was responsible for the team A They were - they were team leaders. 21 22 leaders at the time. The nomenclature changed all 22 O Okay. 20 1 the time because we were being reorganized A I believe. I don't recall. It's a long 1 2 constantly. time ago. O Okay. So there are multiple team 3 Q Sure. And is this still in the '90s? 4 leaders? 4 A Yes. Okay. How many team leaders, do you A Right. O Q Okay. All right. And that's still 6 remember? 7 within the FOIA office. Correct? 7 A I don't remember. Okay. Who did you report to at that A Yes. 8 Q Okay. And then after being a section 9 point? 10 chief, when did your -- did you move on to a 10 A At that time I reported to Ann Snuggs. 11 different position? Q And what was her title? 11 12 A I became a branch chief. 12 A She was a chief. Q Okay. And a branch chief of the FOIA 13 Q So you as the branch chief reported to a 13 14 office or --14 chief? 15 A Branch chief of part of the FOIA office, A Right. I reported to her. I was a 15 16 section chief -16 yes. Q Okay. And let me ask you, what's the 17 Q Okay. 18 difference between section chief and branch chief? 18 A -- myself. A I think they weren't allowed to call it a 19 She was the branch chief when I think 20 positions went up, her — I'm not sure what they 20 branch at the time, so they called it a section. Q Okay. 21 called her position. 21 22 A I think eventually -- it was part of Q Okay.

Conducted on October 29, 2019 23 A But I reported to Ann. 1 Q I understand. Q Okay. And how long have you remained as 2 A - I think in 2005 I was put in as the a branch chief at the State Department? branch chief for systematic review. A I don't recall exactly. 4 O Still within the FOIA office? 5 Q Or when was the next sort of position --5 A Within the overall FOIA office, yes. A Probably --Q Okay. What is the systematic review? Q -- that you held? A It deals with declassification, automatic A - into the early '00s. declassification, 25-year declass of records. Q I'm sorry? Q And how long did you remain in that 10 A So 2001 or '2, that I recall, yes. 10 position? Q Okay. And what did you --11 A I don't - probably - probably two 12 A Or '3. 12 years. I don't remember - recall exactly. Q Okay. 13 Q And between 2001, 2003, what was your 13 14 position then? A A year or two. I'm not sure. 14 O Okay. And then what was your position A It was as a branch chief. 15 15 Q Okay. And after that? 16 after that? 16 17 A I still remained a branch chief, but I 17 A After that, I became the division chief 18 was detailed to projects, different projects. 18 for requester liaison. Q How long were -- did that happen? Q What is a division chief for requestor 20 A How long? Excuse me? 20 liaison? Q Yeah. So you remained as branch chief in 21 A They deal with the intake of the new 21 22 2003? 22 requests, and they also have staff, basically a 22 A Uh-huh. 1 call center for requestors' questions. Q But you were detailed for different Q Okay. And this is requestor liaison for FOIA requests. Right? 3 projects. A Right. 4 A Correct. Correct. 5 So I'm curious, are you still a branch Q All right. And then how long did you 5 6 chief? 6 remain as a division chief? A I remained the division chief there A No, I'm not. O Okay. So I just want to know what your 8 until – I don't remember the years. 2011, 2010. 9 next position was --9 I believe, I'm not sure. 10 A Okay. Q Okay. So I want to back up to 2009, when Q -- at the State Department. 11 Secretary Clinton began her tenure. 11 Do I have it right then at that time you 12 A Okay. The position I think remained the 12 13 same. I was detailed to a project to reduce the 13 were the branch chief for systematic review? 14 backlog. 14 A When? 15 Q Okay. 15 Q In two thousand -- January of 2009, when 16 Secretary Clinton began her tenure at the State A For a period of, if I can recall, about 17 Department. Is it right that you were the branch 17 two years. So about 2005. 18 chief for systematic review? Q Okay. And then in 2005 --

19

A I believe so.

22 2010, 2011, you believe?

Q Okay. And then how long -- okay. So you

21 were a division chief for requestor liaison from

A 2005 --

Q -- what was your position?

A I'm not sure exactly of the timing of all

19

20

21

22 this, but --

25	27
1 A I believe it was about a year, yes, I	1 A Division chief.
2 was.	2 Q You were the chief of the division.
3 Q Okay.	3 Okay.
4 A I'm not sure.	So what was your what were your duties
5 Q And then who did you report to as	5 and responsibilities?
6 division as the division chief?	6 A I was the supervisor of three branch
7 A Margaret Grafeld.	7 chiefs, whose branches were responsible for
8 Q Was she your direct supervisor?	8 processing information access requests.
9 A I believe at the time.	9 Q And who were the branch chiefs that
10 Q Okay.	10 reported to you in 2011?
11 A There might have also been a deputy	11 A I'm not sure, but I believe at the time
12 director, but I reported to Ms. Grafeld.	12 Jeff Hermesman, Terry –
13 Q Ms. Grafeld. Okay.	13 Q I'm sorry. Go ahead.
How about as branch chief systematic	14 A Terry Gordon. And I believe Melody
15 reviewer?	15 Adams.
16 A Uh-huh.	16 Q Can you spell Jeff's last name?
17 Q Who did you report to?	17 A H-E-R-M-E-S-M-A-N.
18 A Two thousand – as a branch chief – I	18 Q You mentioned that the requests included
19 don't remember who the division chief was back	19 FOIA. Were there other types of requests that
20 then.	20 were
21 Q What was the division called?	21 A It would it would
22 A Systematic review.	22 Q that your division was responsible
26	28
1 Q Okay.	1 for?
2 A I my portion of this was electronic	2 A The statutory compliance would process
3 review, so I was a let me back up and say I	3 mandatory requests. Basically, 25 year in
4 was I was the branch chief of the electronic	4 requests from researchers under the executive
5 review of systematic review. And I don't remember	5 order.
6 who the division chief for systematic review was.	6 Q By the 25 years, you mean the
Q Okay. Prior to 2010, did you report to	7 declassification?
8 Ms. Grafeld in any of your other previous	8 A Yes.
9 positions?	9 Q Okay. And as the division chief in 2011,
10 A So that would be prior to no, I	10 who did you report to?
11 didn't. Not until I became a division chief did I	11 A Margaret Grafeld.
12 report to Ms. Grafeld.	12 Q Okay.
13 Q Okay. And then in 2011, what was the	13 A And there might have been a deputy
14 position that you moved into?	14 director at the time it was formed. I'm not sure
15 A It was the division chief for statutory	15 if it existed at the time. I don't recall.
16 compliance and research.	16 Q Okay. And how long did you remain in
17 Q And what is that division?	17 that position?
18 A That division is responsible for the	18 A In that position as a division chief?
19 administrative processing of requests, information	19 Q Yes.
20 access requests, including FOIA.	20 A Until until October of 2017.
Q So what was your so, I'm sorry, what	21 Q Okay. And what is your position now?
22 was your title?	22 A Technically I'm still in the position,

31 1 but I was detailed in 2017. A Yes. 1 2 Q What was your detail? Q And that's when you were the division 2 3 A I was detailed to assist the office chief. director with the project to reduce the backlog. 4 A I believe so, yes. Q Okay. Who was the office director? Q Okay. Did you report at all -- well, was Sheryl Walter the director of IPS at the time? A In '17? Eric Stein. 6 Q Are you still working for Eric Stein now? 7 A I believe so, as indicated in this org 8 A Yes. chart. Q Okay. And you report to him directly? 9 Q Okay. Did you report to Ms. Walter at 10 A Yes. 10 all? O Okay. Did you, back in 2000 -- and I 11 12 want to focus on the time frame of during 12 Q So did you report to Ms. Walter as well 13 Secretary Clinton's tenure. 13 as Ms. Grafeld? Did you work with Eric Stein in various 14 A No. 15 positions you had? 15 Q Who did you report to, I guess? A I don't believe so. A I report to Ms. Walter, Mr. – primarily 16 16 17 Q Okay. How about in 2014? 17 reported to Mr. Hackett. A No, I don't -- I don't really remember. Q Okay. When did you begin working with 18 19 Q Okay. 19 Mr. Hackett? 20 Okay. And did I ask you, in 2011 when 20 A I don't remember. 21 you were the division chief -- no, I'm sorry. In Okay. You can put that aside. Thank 21 Q 22 2010 to 2011, when you were the division chief for 22 you. 30 32 Actually, can -- do you mind if you do me 1 requestor liaison, did you have individuals you 2 were managing at that point? a favor and just mark the box that -- and I can 3 A Yes. give you my pen, or your counsel. Q And who were they? 4 A Mark the box? A Mary Casto and Audrey Holton. The box that indicates where your office 5 6 was at the time. Within -- or circle it. Q Okay. A And there was a chain. So it might have 7 A Is that good? been Wilma Manning as well. 8 Q Yes. Thank you. 9 Q Okay. 9 Now, I want to focus on 2009 when 10 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 1 marked for 10 Secretary Clinton began her tenure at the State 11 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 11 Department. Q Mr. Scholl, I show you what's already 12 Did you have any involvement in any way 13 been marked as Exhibit 1. 13 with respect to her transition team coming to the 14 State Department? 14 A Uh-huh. 15 Q And this is an organization chart of IPS A No, not that I recall. 15 Q Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Going back to 16 from 2013. 16 17 Do you see your office listed in here in 17 Exhibit 1? 18 this chart? 18 A Uh-huh. 19 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q I see there's an office that's titled A It indicates on this that, yes, Statutory 20 FOIA Program Manager? 21 Compliance and Research Division. 21 A At the bottom here? 22 Okay. 22 Q Yes.

35 What is that? Q Yeah. 2 2 A That person was the person responsible A The picture? Yeah. 3 for establishing the -- from my understanding, 4 because that wasn't my division. But my A That I saw on media. Q Okay. And what did you do as a -- did 5 understanding was this person was responsible for 6 you discuss that picture with anybody --6 putting out the regs and guidance as regards to 7 processing, the administrative processing, and the A No. Q -- at the State Department? 8 review. Partially responsible. 9 Did you have any discussions with Q Do you know who that person was? 10 Mr. Hackett about the photograph or her e-mail use 10 A In '13? I don't really recall. Marianne 11 Manheim might have been the person that was there, 11 at that point? 12 but I don't recall these dates. 12 A Not that I recall. 13 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 O Okav. 14 Okay. Now, I want to focus on one of the 14 A Not that I recall. 15 Q Okay. Do you recall in 2013 when that 15 issues that Judge Lamberth had permitted discovery 16 in this case, which deals with Secretary Clinton's 16 photograph was published Mr. Hackett inquiring 17 e-mail use --17 within IPS what the State Department knew about 18 the BlackBerry that was shown in the photograph or 18 A Uh-huh. 19 about her e-mail use? 19 O -- while she was at the State Department. 20 Let me just ask you, when did you first 20 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 21 Foundation. 21 learn of Secretary Clinton's e-mail? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. A I don't recall anything about it. 34 36 A I don't recall when. So you just saw the photograph, and O Was it while she was still at the State did -- that was it? 3 Department? 3 A Yes. MR. PEZZI: Same objection. Q What did you think when you saw the A It could have been. I don't -- I don't 5 photograph? recall. 6 A I really didn't have any opinion either Q Okay. Can you tell me what you knew 7 way. about her e-mail? Q Well, why does -- why does it stand in 9 A What I read on the news. 9 your mind, I guess, at this point, so many years 10 Q What did you read on the news? I'm 10 later, that you saw this photograph in the 11 newspaper of her holding a BlackBerry? 11 trying to get a time frame of --12 A That, I guess, from what I recall – I 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 don't recall clearly. That there was an issue A It seems — seems to be a rather iconic 14 with her use of a device, a mobile device. 14 photograph that I've seen lots of times. But to 15 Q Is that -- was that a photograph --15 me it really had no import. A Yes. Q Okay. I want to focus your attention on 16 Q -- of her holding a black -- or what 17 a FOIA request that was submitted to the State 18 looked to be like a BlackBerry device? 18 Department in December of 2012. And the requester A Yes, I believe it was. 19 is CREW, that's the acronym. The name is Citizens 19 20 20 For Responsibility and Ethics in Washington. Q Okay. And tell me, how did you learn of Are you familiar with the organization? 21 that? 21

22

A I've heard the name, yes.

A How did I learn of it?

22

39 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the request A From - any requests? 1 2 that CREW had sent to the State Department in Q Any -- FOIA requests specifically. 2 December of 2012? A Yes. 3 A No. 4 Q Okay. And what was the process for how 5 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. they were -- the process for handling FOIA Q Okay. CREW had sent a -- well, CREW had requests that came in at the time? 7 sent a FOIA request to the State Department, I A In our area, we would receive it from the 8 believe on December 6 of 2012, asking for records 8 other division. They would take the request. 9 pertaining to Secretary -- any e-mail accounts Q And which division would intake --10 that Secretary Clinton may have used while at the 10 A It would come from the requestor liaison 11 State Department. 11 division. 12 Are you familiar at all with that 12 Q Okay. So the request when it initially 13 request? 13 comes in goes into the requestor liaison division. MR. PEZZI: Same objections. 14 And then they send it -- send it up to your 14 A I don't recall. I'm not familiar with 15 division? 15 16 it. no. 16 A Yes. 17 Q Okay. Do you remembering -- do you 17 Q Okay. And what did they -- why did they 18 remember handling that FOIA request? 18 send it up to your division? A No, I don't recall handling that request. A Well, at the request of their own scope 20 Q Have you discussed any requests from --20 and deal with the administrative issues. And then 21 that you received from -- or that the State 21 when it's determined to be a valid request, they 22 Department received from CREW back in 2012 with 22 send it to our division for processing. 38 40 1 anybody within IPS in the last several years, Q Okay. And then what did your division do 2 since 2014? with the request? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Generally? 3 A A Do I recall any request coming -4 Q Yes. 5 O No. 5 We would determine which offices to 6 A - from CREW? search, and send taskers to these offices. Q Any discussions that you had from anybody Q Okay. And how would you send the with IPS for a request that came from CREW back in taskers? 9 2012. A I don't remember back in '13. But 10 A No. 10 generally we would send a form tasker, which would Q Let's focus then on the processing of 11 ask them to provide information about their 12 FOIAs back in 2012, when that request --12 search, how much time they spent, and provide us 13 A Sure. 13 with details. And -- and to return the documents 14 Q -- was sent to the State Department. 14 to us, if there were any documents, with the form. 15 So based on my notes, I believe you were Q Okay. And would you do that yourself, or 16 the division chief for statutory compliance. 16 did you -- would you have somebody else do that 17 Right? 17 within your division? A Yes. 18 18 A Myself as -- no. 19 Q At that time? 19 Q As the division chief.

20

21

22

A

O

No, I wouldn't do that.

Generally it would be done by an analyst

Who would?

Okay. So would your office have been

21 responsible for any of the FOIA requests that came

22 in at the State Department?

43 1 working for one of my three branch chiefs. 1 bureaus, and offices, such as that, things like Q Okay. And those were the three that you named earlier. Right? 3 Q I'm sorry, I can't hear the last part. 4 A Right. 4 A Bureaus and offices. Q Okay. And then how would the responses 5 Q Okay. And how -- who determined what with the search results come back to -- to your requests go on the significant FOIA report? office? A That generally would have come from the requestor liaison division, intake. 8 A How? 9 Q Once the searches were complete. 9 The intake. And who was the intake 10 A How would they be sent? 10 again? Who was the division of that division --Q Yes. 11 11 A At that time? 12 A Physically, usually would be sent as a 12 Q Yes. 13 package back to our office. A I don't recall. It could have been 13 Q Okay. Is -- never mind. 14 14 Rosemary Reid. 15 During that time --Q Rosemary Reid. Okay. 15 A What time was that? A But I'm not -- I'm not really sure. 16 16 17 Q Two thousand -- late 2012, early 2013, 17 Q And are the significant FOIA reports 18 what we're -- we're focusing on around the time of 18 something that would have been discussed during 19 this FOIA request --19 the meetings? 20 20 A Okay. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. Q -- from CREW. 21 21 A It's possible. 22 Did your division or Ms. Walter or John 22 Okay. 42 44 1 Hackett, did -- were there any regular meetings A But I don't know. 1 that were held to discuss the FOIA requests? Q And how about during these meetings; 3 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. would the leadership of IPS, meaning Ms. Walter at A There were meetings. I'm not sure who the time or her deputy, John Hackett, would they 5 was in attendance. But there -- from what I attend the meetings? 6 recall, there were meetings to discuss requests, 6 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 7 but I don't remember which requests or who was Foundation. there exactly. A I would think so, yes. 8 9 Q Sure. And that's understandable. 9 Q Okay. And how about Ms. Grafeld? 10 How often were the meetings held? 10 MR. PEZZI: Same objections. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 11 A I don't recall. I don't recall her A I don't recall. 12 12 attending the meetings, but I don't remember. Q I don't believe I've asked you this, but Q Were they weekly? 13 14 what was Ms. Grafeld's position during this time? 14 A They could have been, but I don't recall. Q Okay. Do you know what a significant 15 A She might - I don't recall the timing. 16 FOIA report is? Does that ring a bell? 16 But she became the deputy assistant secretary. So 17 A Yes, it does. 17 I believe during this period she was DAS. 18 O Okay. Can you explain to me what that She was deputy assistant secretary for 19 is? 19 what? A I believe those are requests from -20 A I don't remember. Deputy assistant

21 those are requests for listing of requests that 22 are of significant importance to the department,

21 secretary for -- I don't remember what it was

22 called back then. But I think now it's called

47 1 global publishing – I don't remember what it 1 create the significant -- significant FOIA report, and you did not review it? stood for. Well, let me just point you to Exhibit 1. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q Uh-huh. A Yes. And then that would be sent over to -- to Q Is it -- would it have been GIS? 5 0 6 whom? A It would be GIS. Q Okay. Who -- and GIS oversaw IPS? 7 A I believe it was sent to the office 8 director, but I don't recall exactly. A Yes. Q Okay. And Mr. Hackett and Sheryl Walter O The office director of what? 10 were the leadership of IPS at the time? 10 A Of IPS. Oh, okay. Sheryl Walter in 2013? 11 A Yes. 11 12 Q Okay. When you were the division chief 12 A Yes. 13 of the requestor liaison, I believe you said 13 O Okay. 14 somewhere -- somewhere around 2010, 2011, did you 14 A Yes. 15 generate significant FOIA reports? 15 Q Why was the significant FOIA reports, why A I may have. We may have, yes. 16 were they created? Q Okay. And how did you go about 17 A I believe they were created because 18 generating those, or determining what FOIA 18 bureaus needed to be aware of the requests that 19 requests --19 were coming in, so they prepared to – to collect 20 A I think there were --20 documents and to respond. Q Okay. But you were -- not all requests 21 Q -- to include on the reports? 22 MR. PEZZI: Just give her a chance to 22 that the State Department received or all the 46 1 finish, if you can. bureaus received went onto the significant FOIA --THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. A No. 3 MR. PEZZI: That's okay. Q -- report? 4 A Go ahead, I'm sorry. A I don't believe so. 5 MS. COTCA: Can you read it. O Are you familiar with Tasha Thian? 6 (Pending question read.) A Yes. Q Okay. Let me ask it again, since it's Q Okay. And who is Tasha Thian? A She was the division chief of requestor interrupted. 8 When you were the division chief of 9 liaison, I believe. 10 requestor liaison division, how did you go about 10 I'm sorry, what? 11 determining what FOIA requests to include in the A She was the division chief for requestor 11 12 significant FOIA reports? 12 liaison. Q Did she attend the meetings that were A I don't recall. That was generated by 14 held within IPS? 14 one of my branch chiefs, the branch chief who was 15 responsible for -- for intake. 15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q But is -- did you -- would you have 16 Foundation. 17 reviewed what they would have provided to be 17 A I don't recall. 18 included in the significant FOIA report as the Q Do you recall the White House having an 19 division chief? 19 interest in following the request that was 20 submitted by CREW? 20 A Not that I recall. Q So was it your practice then for you to MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 21 22 have your branch chief, whomever reported to you, 22 Foundation.

1 Clinton's tenure about FOIA requests pertaining to A I don't recall, no. Q Do you recall any discussions about or Secretary Clinton's e-mails? 3 any communications about White House calling the MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 4 State Department to inquire about this -- about 4 A Not that I recall. 5 the CREW request? Q Okay. In processing FOIA requests, does 6 the term to treat the request as a complex case, A I don't recall, no. Q Okay. Do you recall any time that the does that sound familiar? 8 White House had called about any other FOIA A Yes. 9 request? 9 Q Okay. And what does that mean? 10 A I don't recall. 10 A Its definition – definition changed Q Have you had any -- and this is during 11 several times. But I believe that a complex 12 Secretary Clinton's tenure at the State 12 request generally meant a request that required 13 Department, so 2009 to end of January 2013. 13 going outside of our central file searches, so Do you recall Cheryl Mills following any 14 that required going to bureaus or posts. 15 FOIA request that was submitted to the State The definition's changed. 15 16 Department that wasn't necessarily sent to the 16 Q So if a request were to ask for records 17 Secretary's office? 17 from the Secretary's office or pertaining to MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 18 Secretary Clinton's e-mails, would that have been 18 19 Foundation. 19 deemed complex? 20 20 A I don't. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q You know who Cheryl Mills is? 21 21 Foundation. A Yes, I do. A I don't know. 22 50 52 Q Okay. Chief of Staff for Secretary Q Okay. Let me ask it this way: If a --Clinton. Correct? if a FOIA request asked for records from the 3 A Uh-huh. Secretary's office, who was still -- the same Secretary who's still in office --Q Okay. How about Brock Johnson; do you know who Brock Johnson is? A Uh-huh. 5 6 Q -- would that request be deemed complex 6 A No, I don't know who he is. Q Okay. Do you know that Brock Johnson 7 because it's being tasked to the Secretary's worked for Ms. Mills? office? A Did I know that? 9 MR. PEZZI: Same objections. 10 O Uh-huh. 10 A Yes, I believe it would. But that 11 determination is made in the intake division, 11 A No. 12 Q Okay. 12 requestor liaison. Q And are complex cases treated differently 13 A I don't recall. Q Okay. Did you ever interact with 14 from other FOIA requests? 15 Mr. Johnson in regards to any FOIA requests 15 MR. PEZZI: Same objections. 16 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails? Q And I'm sorry, I want to ask time frame 17 of -- still focusing on the same time frame. 17 A No. Q How about Heather Samuelson; do you know 18 18 A 2013. 19 who she is? 19 Q Yes. A Sure. They would be processed along with 20 A Don't know who she is. 20 Q Okay. Do you recall interacting with 21 all the other requests. 21 22 Ms. Samuelson at any point during Secretary What specifically do you mean? I'm not 22

55 1 sure I understand. 1 in statutory compliance. O What branch? Q Well, how would they -- I understand that A The – the NEA branch, the Near East they're termed as complex cases. 3 4 A Uh-huh. Asia, South Asia, Near East South Asia. Q How many branches are within the Q What's the difference in how you would statutory compliance division? process a complex cases, as opposed to an ordinary A At the time? FOIA request? Q Yes. 8 A I believe that became a management issue 9 9 with the branches. Then they would determine how A There were three. 10 to allocate the request based on, you have this 10 Q Okay. And it was NEA, and what were the 11 number of complex requests, and you have this 11 other two? 12 number of simple or -- simple requests. So that A Well, it was EAN, which included NEA and 12 13 was left up to the branch chiefs to determine how 13 Africa. There was WEP, which is western 14 hemisphere primarily. And there was management 14 to distribute the work as managing the staff, as 15 and public diplomacy, which is MPD. 15 far as managing the staff is concerned. Q And what is MPD? Q Did -- did your division have any input 16 17 into that? 17 A They would handle most of the privacies, A It was within our -- our division. So it 18 the privacy type requests and -Q Meaning dealing with Privacy Act? 19 would be the branch chief that would -- you're 20 talking about --20 A Yeah, primarily. But also with FOIA. 21 Q Okay. Q Your branch chief. So you're -- when 22 you're saying branch chief, that's the person 22 Okay. Was -- okay. Never mind. 54 56 1 under you --Did you, as the division chief, did you have -- and again same time frame -- any A Correct. 3 Q -- as a division chief? responsibility or was it your practice to partake 4 Okay. Sorry about that. in processing any of the FOIA requests? 5 And when your branch chief determined 5 A No. that a case would be treated as a complex case, is 6 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. that something that you would review --7 A No. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q Why is that? 8 9 Q -- or approve? A It's not -- it's not something that I 10 A That wasn't determined by my branch 10 did. It was the branch chiefs that process, the 11 chief; that was determined by the requestor 11 analysts on the branch chief staff. 12 liaison division who intook -- intake the case. 12 It's possible I got involved with some, 13 Q Thank you for the clarification. 13 I'm sure I did, but I don't recall specifically Do you know who Edgar -- and I'm not sure 14 14 anymore. 15 if I'm spell -- if I'm pronouncing his last name Q Okay. Would it be an anomaly for you to 15 16 correctly, but Jaramillo? Does that --16 get involved in a FOIA request? 17 A Yes. 17 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. O -- ring a bell? 18 18 A Involved? Did I pronounce his last name correctly? 19 19 Q In help -- in processing a FOIA request. A In processing? It's possible. 20 A Perfectly. 20 Q Okay. Great. Who is he? Q Okay. So what was your -- what was your 21 21 22 A He is an employee in one of the branches, 22 role then as the division chief?

59 A As a division chief? 1 at the time they were set up. And that would Q Yes. 2 include also functional bureaus. 3 A Providing oversight over the three So the acronyms came from the geographic branches that processed the requests. 4 to identify them. But their responsibilities were O And what does that mean? 5 more than just the -- more than just the A That means managing them. geographic responsibilities. Q Can you be more specific? So I believe something concerning the A Evaluations, time and attendance. 8 Secretary possibly would have come through that --Q Did you assist in day-to-day processing 9 through that bureau. 10 of any of the requests? 10 Q Why? 11 A Not that I recall, no. A Because I believe, though I'm not sure, 12 Q So when FOIA requests were sent over from 12 that the Secretary's -- S was, I think, under the 13 the intake --13 EAN branch. 14 A Yes. 14 Q Thank you. 15 Q -- they would be sent to your division. 15 As part of your duties as the division Correct? 16 chief, did you partake in tasking any bureaus to 16 17 A They would sent -- be sent to the 17 search in response to any FOIA requests? 18 individual branches, yes. 18 A Not that I recall. Q Oh, directly to the individual branches? 19 Q Okay. Would that be something unusual, 20 A Yes. 20 if you did -- if you had done that? 21 Q Okay. Why would it by -- why would they MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 21 22 bypass you? 22 A Yes. 58 A That's just the way the system was set 1 Q Okay. Who -- do you know Yvette Jacks? up, because the volume was so large. Q Okay. And would they be sent, depending 3 Q How about, are you familiar with the 4 on -- because of the subject matter of the office of S/ES-IRM? request? 5 A No. Q Are you familiar with the office, 6 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. And Edgar Jaramillo, he was in S/ES-CR? which branch? A I believe so. 9 A The EAN branch. 9 Q What was that office? 10 Q And that had dealt -- that was dealing --A I believe that's the Secretary's — the 10 11 that dealt with FOIA requests pertaining to? 11 Secretary's office for records. 12 A Near East, South Asia, Africa. 12 Q Right. Are you familiar with Clarence Q Okay. Do you know why a request that 13 Finney? 14 pertained to Secretary Clinton's e-mails would be 14 A Yes. 15 assigned to Mr. Jaramillo --Q Okay. And do you know that Mr. Finney 15 16 A The --16 was the -- or deputy director of S/ES-CR? Q -- and the NEA division, rather than the 17 A I wasn't sure what his title was. 18 WPD -- or, no, MPD division? Q Okay. Did you interact with MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 19 Mr. Finney -- with Mr. Finney? 19

20

21

A I believe I did.

22 would you interact with Mr. Finney?

Q Okay. For what purpose, or what context

20 Foundation.

A They had -- each of the branches were set

22 up to reflect the organization of the department

Conducted on	October 29, 2019
61	63
1 A I think he would contact us concerning	1 the State Department?
2 requests, perhaps. But that was pretty much it.	2 A No, she is not.
3 Q Did you ever contact Mr. Finney's office	3 Q When did she leave, if you know?
4 in regards to requests?	4 A I don't recall.
5 A I'm not sure. I don't remember.	5 Q Are you familiar with the term "Oglesby
6 Q Okay. Are you familiar with John Bentel?	6 letter"?
7 A John? Excuse me?	7 A Yes.
8 Q John Bentel?	8 Q Okay. Can you explain to me what that
9 A No.	9 means?
10 Q Okay. Bear with me one moment.	10 A It's – I think it was a Army Oglesby
Who's Karen Finnegan?	11 court decision, that's what we termed it, but I
12 A Karen Finnegan was the division chief for	12 think most agencies call it a no-record response.
13 policy and plans within IPS.	13 Q A what?
14 Q Can you look, if you don't mind, at	14 A A no-record response.
15 Exhibit 1, and let me know if you see her?	15 Q And that's so is that a letter that
16 A Her division?	16 the State Department would generate after the
17 Q Her division, yes.	17 searches were complete and there were no records
•	18 that were located in response to a particular FOIA
	19 request?
19 Q Okay. Is that the Programs and Policies 20 Division?	
	20 A Yes.
21 A Yes.	21 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
22 Q Okay. She was the division chief.	22 Q Is that when when would that
1 A I believe she was, yes.	1 typically be drafted, or prepared?
2 Q Okay.	2 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
	3 Foundation.
_	. O T 11. 1 20 T
4 believe she was, but I don't really recall. She 5 was eventually.	
•	
Q Okay. Fair enough.What was her her role or as far as	6 the process of administrating or handling that
	7 request from the time that the State Department
8 you understood them, and duties and	8 received it, to the time that the letter was
9 responsibilities?	9 actually issued, where in that process would the
10 A Well, I'm not sure about her duties and	10 letter be prepared?
11 responsibilities. But I have to recall.	11 A At the very end when the searches were
12 Again, a lot of this I don't remember.	12 completed.
But programs and policies was responsible	13 Q Would it ever be drafted or prepared
14 for providing us guidance as far as administrative	
15 processing and review for the reviewers.	15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation.
16 Q And what does that mean, "guidance as far	16 A I don't believe so.
17 as administrative processing"?	17 Q Why?
18 A Well, administrative processing as far as	18 A It would normally not be completed until
19 how to process. They're also responsible for	19 the search was completed.
20 providing guidance with regard to the application	
21 of exemptions to the reviewers.	21 search results were before
22 Q Okay. And do is Ms. Finnegan still at	22 A Correct.

Conducted on C	October 29, 2019
65	67
1 Q preparing it.	1 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
2 Is that correct?	2 Foundation.
3 A Yes.	3 A I don't recall.
4 Q Okay. And which branch or division	4 Q Have you ever discussed the State
5 prepared the the letter?	5 Department's response to the CREW request from
6 A All three branches were responsible for	6 2012 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mail
7 creating the Oglesby letters.	7 accounts with John Hackett?
8 Q And that's all three branches within your	8 A I don't recall.
9 division?	9 Q Same question, but with Sheryl Walter?
10 A Correct.	10 A I don't recall.
11 Q Okay. So was it strictly your division	11 Q And the same question, how about Karen
12 that was responsible for preparing the Oglesby	12 Finnegan?
13 letters?	13 A I don't recall.
14 A I believe so.	14 Q Were you interviewed by the State
15 Q Or okay.	15 Department's IG, inspector general, with respect
16 A Yeah.	16 to Secretary Clinton's e-mail use?
17 Q Was that something that you would review	17 A No.
18 as the division chief?	18 Q How about with respect to the State
19 A No, I don't believe.	19 Department's processing of FOIA requests during
20 Q Would there be any oversight for your	20 Secretary Clinton's tenure?
21 branch chiefs prior to them responding to a	21 A I believe there was an OIG investigation.
22 requestor?	22 It may have been a routine investigation, so I
66	68
1 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.	1 might have spoken to the investigators or — not
2 A Could you explain what you mean,	2 investigators, but the people from OIG as part of
3 "oversight"?	3 a routine review of the process.
4 Q Meaning was there a process for you to	4 But specifically I don't remember
5 approve or	5 anything specifically. It was just general.
6 A Me?	6 Q When did you speak with the OIG?
7 Q For you.	7 A I don't I don't
8 A Oh, for me?	8 MR. PEZZI: Objection to form.
9 Q Yes. Yes.	9 A I don't recall.
10 A Generally, no.	10 Q And I'm not asking for a specific date.
11 Q Anybody else that oversaw their responses	11 But if you can narrow the time frame by year?
12 prior to it them going out from the State	12 A I can't.
13 Department?	13 Q Or it would have been after Secretary
14 A Of the division chief?	14 Clinton's tenure?
15 Q Yes.	15 A I don't recall.
16 A No. Generally not.	16 Q But it was about a FOIA processing?
17 Q Are you aware of any discussions in	MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
18 regards to the CREW request that was sent to the	18 A Yes, I believe so.
19 State Department in 2012 about Secretary Clinton's	19 Q Okay. Do you recall reading the
20 e-mails, or e-mail accounts, about concerns of any	20 Inspector General's report at the completion of
21 State Department officials that the State	21 that investigation and whether there was anything
22 Department's response was incorrect?	22 in the report that you discussed with the IG or

Q How about more generally speaking? When that you disagreed with? 2 a Secretary's no longer in office, so her staff's 2 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 3 A I recall reading it, but I really don't no longer in the Secretary's office, would the remember much of what was said, with the exception process -- the tasking process change in any way because at that time the officials were no longer of processing, general processing. 6 there, from the time when they were physically, Q Was there a time frame of the processing obviously, in the office? that was focused on? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. A I don't recall. 9 Foundation. Q Okay. And by "processing" you mean 10 A I would think that the -- Mr. Finney 10 processing of the FOIA requests? 11 would still be tasked. But would have probably A Generally. 12 12 tasked Central Files to try to find retired Q Okay. 13 records, or whatever Secretary had left behind. A Generally. 13 Q Okay. So it would be Mr. Finney, as well Q By your division, or even more general 14 15 as Central Files? 15 than that? A Correct. And usually Mr. Finney would be 16 A By our -- by our division. 17 the one who provides the information as to Q Okay. I want to get into the processing 17 18 of FOIA requests, and how they were tasked if 18 location as to retired files. 19 Q Okay. 19 records were requested from Secretary Clinton's 20 office during her tenure. 20 MR. PEZZI: We've been going a little 21 over an hour now. I don't know if this is a good Can you explain to me how they would be 22 tasked from your -- from your division? 22 time for you to take a break, or if you've got a 70 A They would be tasked in the manner I good time coming up? Just let us, like --MS. COTCA: We can take a break or we can 2 mentioned before. A tasking, a form requesting 3 information, providing them with information, keep going, whatever. Up to Mr. Scholl. 4 asking that they search their records. 4 MR. PEZZI: You all right? 5 Q Okay. And would that be done by you, or THE WITNESS: I'm fine. 6 would that be done by your branch chief, one of MR. PEZZI: Okay. 6 your branch chiefs? MS. COTCA: Okay. BY MS. COTCA: A The taskers --8 9 MR. PEZZI: Object to form. 9 Q I've asked you about a photograph that 10 THE WITNESS: Sorry. 10 you mentioned earlier about Secretary Clinton A The taskers went out - were sent out by 11 holding a BlackBerry, or what looked to be like a 12 the analysts who worked for the branch chiefs. 12 BlackBerry device. Q Okay. So during Secretary Clinton's In 2013 do you recall a review by IPS --14 tenure, would the tasker go directly to Secretary 14 and your division was within IPS -- of all FOIA 15 Clinton's office if -- and specifically for 15 requests pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails 16 records pertaining to records from her office, for 16 in the summer of 2013? 17 requests pertaining to records from her office? 17 A Could you explain what you mean, "a 18 review"? A I don't know exactly where they went. I

19

22

Q Do you recall a request by Ms. Grafeld

21 Secretary Clinton's e-mails in the summer of 2013?

20 for a list of all FOIA requests pertaining to

A No, I don't recall.

19 would think that they would go to Mr. Finney.

21 Clinton left; did that process change at all?

A I don't recall.

22

Q Okay. And how about after Secretary

73	75
1 Q Do you recall any discussions or any	1 Q Okay. Do you recall Ms. Grafeld ever
2 reviews of all FOIA requests pertaining to	2 requesting a list of all FOIA requests, whether
3 Secretary Clinton's e-mails	3 they were in litigation or not, pertaining to any
4 MR. PEZZI: Objection.	4 other Secretary of State's e-mails during your
5 Q during that time frame?	5 time at the State Department?
6 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.	6 A I don't recall.
7 A I don't recall, no.	7 Q Is it your position that it was not
8 Q Do you recall Secretary Clinton's e-mail	8 significant that Secretary Clinton's e-mails were
9 becoming an issue within IPS in	9 an issue back in 2013?
10 A Yes.	10 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
11 Q Okay. Can you tell me more about that?	11 A I have no opinion either way.
When? When did that become an issue	12 Q Well
13 and	13 A Whether it was significant or not.
14 A I don't remember.	14 Q Was it significant to you?
15 Q Okay. Can you tell me what you recall	15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
16 about that?	16 A No.
17 A I think it was just concern about	17 Q I couldn't hear you.
18 requests that had come in, and just because of the	18 A No.
19 significance I guess of the picture.	19 Q Thank you.
20 Q And why would the picture be significant	Back in and I want to focus on the
21 with respect to the requests that had come in?	21 summer of 2013, when you were the division chief.
22 A I don't really know.	22 A Uh-huh.
74	76
1 Q Would it be because there would be a	1 Q Who did you report to at that was it
2 an e-mail associated to the BlackBerry, and if	2 Ms. Grafeld or
3 requests asked for records pertaining to Secretary	3 A I don't recall. If perhaps your
4 Clinton's e-mails?	4 the the
5 A I don't know.	5 Q You have I mean, you may look at it,
6 Q You don't know?	6 if you need to.
7 A No.	7 A I really don't, because there were a lot
8 Q Aren't you I mean, you've worked in	8 of – there was a lot of turnover, so
9 FOIA for decades. You don't	9 Q Sure.
10 A Not of significance to me. We had	10 A Did I report to Sheryl Walters?
11 thousands and thousands of requests, and this is	11 Is that what you're asking?
12 just, you know, several requests we got.	12 Q I'm asking who are the individuals you
But we had a tremendous backlog, and was	13 reported to?
14 just scrambling to get cases processed, so	14 A In '13?
15 Q Do you agree with me that requests	15 Q Yes.
16 pertaining to a Secretary of State are would	16 A I would have reported to Mr. Hackett and
17 normally take would get more attention because	17 Ms. Walter.
18 it deals with the Secretary of State, as opposed	18 Q Okay. And I and did you also report
19 to other officials and other employees?	19 to Ms. Grafeld at the time?
20 A Generally –	20 A No.
MR. PEZZI: Objection to form.	21 Q You did not?
22 A Generally I would agree	22 A No.

Q Did you interact with Ms. Grafeld in 1 either as your previous supervisor or superior or 2 2013? as the deputy assistant secretary, for a list of 3 A Interact as in? 3 all FOIA requests pertaining to Secretary 4 Q In your day-to-day duties and --4 Clinton's e-mails, would that have sparked special 5 attention from you? A No. Q -- doing your job --A A request to me? A Generally. Q In -- in an e-mail in which you were Q -- at the State Department? 8 included on, yes. A Generally, no. 9 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 10 Q Okay. When did you begin reporting to 10 A Particular interest? Yes. 11 Ms. Grafeld? 11 Q I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. A When I became a division chief back in 12 A Particular interest? Yes. 13 20 – well, I became a division chief in 2007. 13 O It would have? Okay. Q Division chief of the statutory And it was your practice to read 14 15 Ms. Grafeld's e-mails during this time period? 15 compliance? 16 A Yes. A Yes. 16 17 Q Okay. And when did you stop reporting to 17 Q Okay. And the same with Ms. Walter or 18 Ms. Grafeld, as the division chief to statutory 18 Mr. Hackett, who were your superiors? 19 compliance? A Yes. 19 20 A I don't recall exactly. Q Okay. Were there any discussions within 21 IPS when Mr. Hackett was within IPS that no --21 Q Did you report to her for a number of 22 years? 22 that the Oglesby letters should not be sent out 78 A Two thousand – whenever I was the anymore, or no-records-located responses shouldn't be sent out anymore pertaining to Secretary -division chief until, I believe -- I don't 3 remember the timing, I really don't. 3 FOIA requests relating to Secretary Clinton's Q I guess I'm just trying to get a sense of e-mails? 5 how much you interacted with Ms. Grafeld during 5 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 6 your position at division chief. Foundation. A For? I was division chief twice. So one 7 A I don't recall. Q Would that be of significance? 8 was with requestor liaison, one was statutory 8 9 compliance. 9 A Would what be of --Q I'm sorry, with statutory compliance. Or 10 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 11 with -- with either of them, actually. A Would what be of significance? 11 A Okay. So I would have interacted with 12 Q A request or a directive by Mr. Hackett 13 that the State Department should not issue -- your 13 her, I believe, or the - or the deputy at the 14 division shouldn't issue any further 14 time, when I was requestor liaison division chief. Q Okay. And then when you became the 15 no-records-located responses to FOIA requestors 16 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails. 16 statutory compliance, is that when you began 17 reporting to Mr. --17 A Yes. MR. PEZZI: Objection. A I – I don't remember who was the 18 Q Would that have been of significance? 19 director at the time. Because Ms. Grafeld became 19

20

21

Q Okay. Do you recall such a directive

22 from Mr. Hackett in 2013?

20 the - the DAS, Office of the Secretary. So I'm

Q Okay. Would a request from Ms. Grafeld,

21 not really sure of the timing of all of this.

22

83 Q Go ahead. I'm sorry. A No, I do not. 1 Q Do you recall such a directive from 2 A That relate to State Department business, 3 Mr. Hackett at any time during your tenure at the 3 no. 4 State Department? 4 O How about --A Any type of directive? 5 A I delete junk mail. Q No. This particular directive --Q Sure. 6 How about in 2013; what was your practice A No. 8 O -- from Mr. Hackett? 8 in how you maintained your e-mail? A It was no different than what I just said A I do not. 10 Q Do you recall any discussions about such 10 to you, that -- I would be referring to whether I 11 a directive -- and again I'm focusing on the 11 delete e-mails, no, I don't delete generally 12 directive from Mr. Hackett -- that 12 department e-mails. 13 no-records-located responses should no longer be Q Do you recall there being a print and --14 sent out to requestors pertaining to Secretary 14 and file policy at the State Department for 15 Clinton's e-mails with anyone else within IPS? 15 e-mails relating to State Department business, or A I do not recall, no. 16 for records relating to State Department business? 16 17 Q Did you ever send any e-mails about such 17 A I seem to recall, yes. 18 a directive, or any communications? Q Okay. Do you recall that being the 18 19 policy back in 2013? 19 A Not that I recall. 20 Q Did you ever search, have you searched 20 A I don't recall. 21 your e-mails about such a directive? Okay. Did you have a practice of 21 A No. 22 printing and saving your e-mails relating to State 82 84 Q Were you asked to search your e-mails 1 Department business? about Mr. Hackett's directive? A Back then? 3 A No. Q Yes. Q What is your practice on how you maintain A No. O I'm sorry? your e-mail? A Specifically... A Not that I recall. Q Yes. How do you store your e-mail? Q How did you save or archive your e-mail A Store my e-mail? I – I'm not sure back in 2013? exactly what you mean. 9 A I wouldn't save or archive. I would pull Q What is your -- how do you maintain your 10 records from - from - from my mail. I wouldn't 11 inbox and your outbox at the State Department? 11 save them. 12 A Who do I maintain it? 12 Q Would you delete them? Q Yes. A No. 13 13 Q Okay. Do you have e-mail going back to 14 A I'm not sure I understand your question. 14 15 Q Do you delete e-mails? 15 2013 in your e-mail account? 16 A No. 16 A I don't recall. 17 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 17 Q Would they still exist? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. A No. 18 18 19 Q That --19 A I don't know. O Who would know? 20 A I-20 That relate to State Department business. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 21 Q 21 22 A No. I --22 A I don't know.

87 Q Okay. And you were not asked to search Q How about in 2015? 1 2 your office for any communications or records 2 A Not that I recall. Did you have any involvement with respect 3 about the directive from Mr. Hackett in 2013 4 pertaining to the no-records-located responses in to the State Department's request to Secretary 5 connection with Secretary Clinton's e-mails? Clinton to return her records to the State MR. PEZZI: And you can answer that 6 Department? 7 question other than with respect to any 7 A Could you repeat? 8 communications you might have had with department Q Yes. Did you have any involvement in the 9 State Department's request to Secretary Clinton to 10 A So repeat the question, please? 10 return her records to the State Department? Q I'm not asking for communications. I'm 11 A Not that I recall, no. 12 asking have you searched your office for any 12 Q Is that something you would recall? 13 records pertaining -- and by "your office" I mean A Yes. 13 14 electronic or paper records -- for any records Q Did you have any involvement with respect 14 15 pertaining to Mr. Hackett's directive in 2013 --15 to the State Department's collection of Secretary 16 Clinton's e-mails in December 2014? 16 A Not that I recall, no. 17 Q Okay. Do you know if anyone, anybody 17 A Not that I recall. Q Is that something that you would recall? 18 else has? 18 19 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 19 A Yes. 20 A I don't know. 20 Q Okay. What about the review process of Q Do any of your branch chiefs or anybody 21 Secretary Clinton's e-mails that she returned to 21 22 else within the State Department have access to 22 the State Department in December of '14; did you 86 1 your office without you knowing about it? have any involvement in that process? MR. PEZZI: Same objection. 2 A Not that I recall. Not that I recall. 3 A I don't know. 3 Q Is that something that you would recall? Q If -- if you searched your own records 4 \mathbf{A} Something that I — would I remember with respect to Mr. Hackett's directive, that's 5 that? something that you would recall here today. Q Yes. 6 Correct? Yes. 7 A A Right. Q Okay. In the many years and some decades 8 9 Q Okay. 9 that you've been at the State Department, has any 10 Do you recall any discussions in the 10 other former Secretary of State returned records 11 to the same degree that Secretary Clinton did? 11 meetings that were held with Mr. Hackett, 12 Ms. Walter, Ms. Grafeld, in which -- in which 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 Tasha Thian would have been aware a 13 Foundation. 14 no-records-located-response issue was discussed? 14 A I don't recall. 15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 15 O Okay. 16 A I don't recall, no. 16 MR. PEZZI: Why don't we take a break, if Q Did you have any discussions with 17 that's okay with you guys? 18 Mr. Hackett about Secretary Clinton's e-mails in 18 MS. COTCA: Sure. 19 2013 that you recall here today? 19 MR. PEZZI: Thanks. VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are going off the 20 A Not that I recall. 20 Q How about in 2014? 21 record at 11:19. 21

(A recess was taken.)

22

A Not that I recall.

91 VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are back on the A Yes. 2 record at 11:34. O Okay. There's a notation in at least one 3 BY MS. COTCA: of the interview notes that the FBI had -- had Q Mr. Scholl, before moving on, I have a 4 released that makes a notation with respect to few more questions. 5 weekly meetings held in which -- about FOIA After Secretary Clinton's e-mails were 6 requests pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails 7 collected by the State Department in December of 7 in which Patrick Kennedy, perhaps Mr. Stein, may 8 2014, were you aware or heard any concerns that 8 have sat in on. 9 were raised with respect to interference in the Do you know anything about these 10 review process of Secretary Clinton's e-mails? 10 meetings? A I don't recall. 11 11 A I don't know anything about those 12 Q Okay. You don't recall any such 12 meetings. 13 communication -- I'm trying to understand what Q Did you ever attend any of those 14 meetings? 14 you --15 A I don't recall such communications. 15 A No. Q Okay. Do you recall -- I mean, were 16 Okay. I guess I just -- I want to go 17 you -- recall any concerns that was raised by 17 back a little bit and maybe get some clarification 18 anybody else? 18 with respect to meetings that were held within 19 IPS. A I don't recall any concerns raised by 20 anybody else. 20 And I guess I'm -- did you as the Q Were you aware or did you have any 21 division chief hold regular meetings with your 22 knowledge with respect to the process that was 22 branch chiefs? 90 92 1 undertaken for the review of Secretary Clinton's A Yes. 1 2 e-mails? Q Okay. And can you tell me about those meetings? How -- how often were they held? 3 A No. Q Okay. Since the State Department had 4 A It was a weekly meeting. 5 collected Secretary Clinton's e-mails in December 5 Q Weekly meeting. 6 of 2014, did you have any concerns with respect to And who -- who attended those meetings? 6 interference in the review process of her e-mails? 7 A My branch chiefs. A I don't recall. I don't know - I don't 8 Q Okay. And you? 9 know the date or anything about the collection of 9 A And me. 10 her records. 10 Q Okay. And what was the purpose of those Q I guess I'm asking if you have had, since 11 meetings? 12 then, any concerns about the review process and an 12 A Just to find out what's been going on, 13 interference there may have been in the review 13 are there any issues dealing with processing of 14 process of her e-mails. 14 requests, staffing, staffing issues. 15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 15 Q Okay. How about if a request or an A I don't have concerns. It's really not 16 inquiry had been made from the White House about a 16 17 particular request; would that have been something 17 an issue for me. 18 to be addressed during those meetings? O There's a notation in at least one

19

20 think, yes.

A It would have been brought up, I would

Q Okay. And I'm focusing, just to make

22 sure we're focusing, on 2013. Correct?

19 interview that -- well, let me back up.

22 Department. Correct?

21 into Secretary Clinton's e-mail at the State

You're aware of the FBI's investigation

95 A Sure. Yes. Q If issues were raised that required 2 O Okay. All right. 2 following up during those meetings --And other than -- were there any notes or 3 A Uh-huh. agendas --O -- how would those issues be noted or documented to make sure that they were followed up A No. Q -- that were taken during those meetings? on? 7 A No. A I don't really recall notes being taken. Q Okay. Were significant FOIA reports 8 Individuals would take notes of the import. But I 9 raised during those meetings? 9 don't -- there was no formal process for taking 10 A I don't believe so, no. 10 notes. O Okay. Were there any other meetings, O Okay. Did you ever take notes during 12 weekly meetings, that you attended? 12 those meetings? A Routine meetings? Would be with my A I don't recall taking notes of those 14 branch chiefs once a week. 14 meetings necessarily. Q What do you mean, "necessarily"? Q Okay. And then how about between the 15 16 various divisions and the director of IPS; would A I don't remember taking notes. 16 17 there be any regular meetings? 17 Q Okay. And if you would have taken notes, A There - there was a meeting, I believe, 18 what would your practice have been in 2013 with 19 once a week with the division chiefs. 19 respect to the notes that you -- your -- your Q Okay. And would Mr. Hackett or 20 notes? 21 Ms. Walter attend those meetings as well? 21 A Right. What would I -A I believe so, yes. 22 O Do with them? 94 96 Q Okay. And what was the purpose of those A Do with them? 1 2 meetings? O Yes. 3 A I guess to discuss what's going on in the 3 A I would have just taken them back to my 4 other divisions, so you would know what the other office and left them in the notebook. divisions were up to. Q Okay. Is that something you would throw out? Q And when were those usually held? 6 6 A I don't recall. It could have been 7 A I don't believe so. Q Okay. Is that something you would file Thursday morning or Thursday afternoon. Q Okay. And how long were those meetings 9 away in your paper files? 10 usually? 10 A Yes. Q Okay. Are those paper files in your A I don't recall. Hour. 11 12 Q Okay. Were there agendas that were 12 office? 13 typically sent out for those meetings? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 A Are – you mean if there were any notes? A I don't recall agendas. 14 15 Q How about any notes that were taken Q Yes. 15 16 during the meetings? 16 A But would they be there? 17 A I don't recall notes being taken. 17 Q Yes. Q How about, like, if there were issues 18 A I don't know. 19 that were raised during the meetings that required 19 Q Do you keep your paper files in your 20 following up; how would -- was -- how would that 20 office -- do you keep any paper files in your 21 be documented? 21 office? A I'm not sure I understand. 22 A I have some paper files in my office. 22

99 Q Okay. Do you have any paper files from 1 division in regards to Secretary Clinton's 2 2013 in your office? e-mails? A I don't know. Possibly. 3 A I don't recall. Q Okay. How are the paper files that you 4 Q Okay. I want to move to some exhibits have in your office organized? that I'm going to have some questions on. A They're in a box, organized by subject. A Sure. Q Okay. And then if they're not in your --7 MS. COTCA: While the court reporter is in your office, is there any other place where 8 marking it ... 9 your paper files would be stored? 9 (A discussion was held off the record.) 10 A No. 10 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 2 marked for Q Okay. So --11 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 11 12 A Not that I -- not that I know of. Q Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's 13 been marked as Exhibit 2 in this case, and what's 13 Q Okay. So all of your records from 2013 14 to the present, paper files particularly, are held 14 previously marked as Hackett Exhibit 6 and also 15 within your office. Is that right? 15 Exhibit 7, the two exhibits from Mr. Hackett's 16 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 16 deposition are combined. 17 A It - yes. 17 If you can take a look at these. You Q Okay. 18 don't have to read them line by line, but I want 18 19 to give you an opportunity to review them. 19 A All that are significant. Q I'm sorry? 20 20 You have had a chance to review it? 21 A All that are significant. 21 A Uh-huh. Yes. 22 O And what about those that are not 22 Q Thank you. 100 98 1 significant or that you deemed not significant? For the record, these are copies of the A I don't know. Those would be my notes, December 6, 2012, FOIA request submitted by CREW 3 if I kept the notes, if I still have the notes, that we've been discussing pertaining to Secretary 4 would be there. But I don't recall if I -- I Clinton's e-mail account, and the State 5 don't remember -- remember taking notes at any of 5 Department's response to CREW dated May 10, 2013, copies of which the State Department has publicly 6 these meetings. Q Is it your testimony that you did not for produced in response to a separate FOIA request. certain or that you don't have memory of it? Have you reviewed any documents in 9 A I don't have memory of it. 9 preparation for your deposition today? A Yes. 10 Q Okay. For the division chief weekly 10 11 meetings that occurred on Thursdays, was Tasha Q Okay. Have -- did you review these 11 12 documents in preparing for today? 12 Thian one of the individuals who would sit in on MR. PEZZI: And you can answer that 13 the meetings? 14 question other than with respect to any meetings 14 A I would think she would be as a -- as a 15 division chief. 15 you had with government lawyers. Q Okay. 16 A So repeat the question, please? 16 17 A During that period, I – I guess so. 17 Q Yes. Have you seen, have you reviewed Q Okay. Did you ever discuss with 18 these two documents in preparation for your 19 Ms. Thian Secretary Clinton's e-mails? 19 testimony today?

22

A No.

MR. PEZZI: Outside the context of any

21 meetings you had with government lawyers.

A I don't recall, no.

Do you ever recall Ms. Thian

22 communicating or contacting anybody within your

20

21

103 Q Okay. Do you recall this FOIA request? 1 were searched by professional employees familiar with the contents" or -- "and organization." 2 A No. 3 Q How about the response that the State Are those -- who are -- are those Department sent out? professional employees within the -- each particular office --5 A No. 6 Q No? Okay. 6 MR. PEZZI: Object. 7 7 Is this an Oglesby letter that you were O -- that would have conducted the search? 8 referring to earlier in your testimony? And by 8 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 9 "this" I mean the last two pages of the exhibit. 9 A Yes. 10 A Yes. 10 Q Okay. Q Let me ask you, do you see here in the 11 A I believe so. 12 letter, in the response letter of May 10 --12 Q Okay. A Uh-huh, yes. 13 13 From reviewing the request from CREW and Q -- there's a notation -- in the last 14 also the response that the State Department sent, 15 did CREW make a request that the FOIA request be 15 paragraph on the first page of the May 10 letter, 16 there's a notation of the offices that were 16 processed on an expedited basis? 17 searched. And one is the Bureau of Information 17 A It appears so, yes. 18 Resource Management. O Where? 18 19 Do you see that? 19 A Is it expedite? I'm not sure. 20 A Yes. 20 It doesn't appear to. 21 Q Are you familiar with that office? 21 Q I'm sorry? I didn't hear you. A It's an office within the department. A It doesn't appear to. 22 22 102 104 Q Okay. What is -- what is -- what does 1 Q It does not appear to? that office do? 2 Is that what you said? 3 A I'm not sure exactly. 3 A Yes. Q How about the Executive Secretariat's Q Okay. Can you explain what expedited Information Resource Management Office; do you see basis requests are, what that refers to? that? 6 A Expedited requests would be a request A Yes, I see it. But I don't know what it 7 that would be taken out of queue and put in a 8 is they do. 8 queue with other requests, expedition --9 Q Are you aware with any office that 9 expeditious processing requests that we had 10 handled all the information management and tech 10 previously received. So it would be in the queue 11 support, IT support for the Secretary's office 11 of expedited cases. 12 during Secretary Clinton's tenure? 12 Q Okay. And do all requests that are --13 that come into the State Department requesting 13 A Am I aware of it? Q Yes. 14 expedited review, do they all get approved to be 14 15 expedited? 15 A No, I'm not. Q Okay. And then how about the Executive 16 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 17 Secretariat's Office, Correspondence and Records? 17 A I don't know. Q Who determines whether a request --A So I believe that's the office you 19 whether a requestor's request for expedited review 19 referred to before, about Clarence Finney. 20 will be granted or not? 20 Q Mr. Finney? 21 A Yes. 21 A The requestor liaison division. 22 Okay. And the notation, "These files 22 Q Okay. When you were the chief for that

105 107 1 division, did you receive requests asking for 1 DOS 899, previously marked as Walter Exhibit 2. 2 expedited reviews? O Mr. Scholl, have you ever seen this A Yes. document before? Q Okay. Did you grant all those requests 4 MR. PEZZI: And again, outside the for expedited reviews? 5 context of any meetings you may have had with A All of them? 6 government lawyers. Q Yes. MS. COTCA: Okay. So the question is 8 8 actually if he has ever seen this document before. A I don't recall. Q Is that something that is normally 9 I'm not asking at all whether it was with 10 granted, or is that more of an unusual 10 attorneys or nonattorneys. I'm just asking him if 11 circumstance, for it to be taken out of queue and 11 he's seen this document before. 12 expedited? 12 MR. PEZZI: And I --A You mean is it routine for us to grant 13 MS. COTCA: So I don't think it goes to 13 14 expeditious processing? 14 any attorney-client privilege here. Q Correct. MR. PEZZI: I will offer the same 15 A There's really no routine. There's no --16 instruction. 16 17 there's no set policy. 17 You can answer outside the context of any Q Okay. As the division chief in the 18 meetings you had with any government lawyers. 19 requestor liaison's division, did you ever A I've never seen this before. 20 expedite a request, even though the requestor did 20 Q Okay. I want to point you to the bottom 21 not ask for it to be expedited? 21 of the third page of the exhibit. The last page A Not that I recall. I don't recall either 22 is just a signature block, I believe, from 108 106 1 way. Because those decisions were generally made 1 Ms. Walter. It's an e-mail from Sheryl Walter, looks 2 by the branch chief. Q As the division chief, you wouldn't like to Rosemary D. Reid, and Patrick D. Scholl, dated December 20th, 2012; with the subject, "Need 4 oversee or that wouldn't be something that would to track down a FOIA request from CREW." 5 normally be discussed during your weekly meetings? 6 Do you see that? 6 A I don't recall. 7 A Yes, I do. Q And just for the record, to make sure Q I just want to make sure that we have the 8 we're talking about the same request, the response 8 9 letter from the State Department dated May 10, is 9 right parties here. 10 it accurate that I'm stating that this request was 10 That's Ms. -- is that Ms. Walter, the 11 director of IPS in 2012, 2013? 11 assigned Request Number F-2012-40981? 12 A It appears from the document, yes. A I believe it is, yes. 12 O Okay. And Patrick Scholl, was that you? Q Yes. Thank you. I think that's all I 13 14 have on that. Okay. The next one. 14 A Yes. (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 3 marked for 15 O Okay. And how about Rosemary Reid; who 16 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 16 was she? Q Just let me know once you've had a chance A She was the - I believe she was the 18 division chief for requestor liaison who does the 18 to review. A Sure. Okay. 19 intake.

22 from Ms. Walter?

20 Q Okay. Back in 2012 -- well, do you 21 recall seeing this e-mail, receiving this e-mail

19 20

21

Q Okay. Thank you.

MS. COTCA: And, for the record, this is

22 a four-page document Bates-stamped at the bottom

Conducted on Condu	October 29, 2019
109	111
1 A No.	1 Q Are you looking at the top of this sheet?
2 Q Okay. Was your practice to read	2 A Yes.
3 Ms. Walter's e-mails when you received any?	3 Q Okay. That is in regards to the
4 A Yes.	4 A The location?
5 Q Okay. And that's because she was the	5 Q a different FOIA request which State
6 director of IPS.	6 Department produced these documents.
7 A Yes.	7 But I believe the FOIA request assigned
8 Q Right? Okay.	8 to the CREW request is on the second-to-the-last
9 Do you see where it says, "WH called,	9 page of the exhibit, and the State Department's
10 have we received" WH for White House	10 response to CREW.
11 "called. Have we received a FOIA request from	11 A I see it here.
12 CREW."	Yes, it seems – appears to be.
Do you see that?	13 Q Okay. And once more, did you know that
14 A Yes.	14 Ms. Samuelson was the White House liaison for the
15 Q Okay. And then later in the paragraph	15 State Department during this time frame?
16 she says, "If we have it can you give me the	16 A No.
17 details so I can call the White House back. I	17 Q Okay. Have you ever worked with
18 think they'd like it on quick turnaround. Thanks,	18 Ms. Samuelson?
19 Sheryl."	19 A Not that I recall.
20 A Well, do I see that? Yes. WH, that she	20 Q Okay. Was it unusual that the White
21 wants the information so she can pass the	21 House liaison's office would be involved in
22 information to WH.	22 following a FOIA request?
110	112
1 Q Okay. And what do you think WH is?	1 A I don't know if it's unusual or not.
2 A I don't know.	2 Q Well, you were the division the
Q Do you have any reasons to say it	3 division chief for all FOIA requests that were
4 wouldn't be the White House?	4 sent to the State Department. As the division
5 A Not really, no.	5 chief for all this time, did you have any other
6 Q Okay. Do you recall any discussions with	6 cases in which the White House liaison's office
7 Ms. Reid or Ms. Walter about any inquiries from	7 for the State Department was involved in a FOIA
8 the White House with respect to any FOIA request	8 case?
9 back during this time frame?	9 A Not that I recall.
10 A I don't recall, no.	10 Q Okay. That's all I have. You can put
11 Q Do you see up above the same page, the	11 that away.
12 request is assigned Case Number F-2012-40981.	12 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 4 marked for
13 Where it's an e-mail from Ms. Walter to Heather	13 identification and is attached to the transcript.)
14 Samuelson, dated January December 20, 2012, the	14 A Okay.
15 same date.	MS. COTCA: Okay. And just for the
Is that the same FOIA request as the CREW	16 record, this is Exhibit 3. Right? Exhibit 4.
	17 Comm. Whatle bean moderal or Eulelleit 4 is a
17 request that we've been talking about?	17 Sorry. What's been marked as Exhibit 4 is a
17 request that we've been talking about? 18 A I would assume so. Is this the same 19 number? I don't have it.	18 two-page document with the State Department's 19 Document Number C06125549.

20

21

22

Is that what you have?

What do you mean? Where?

The State Department's document numbers I

20

22

21 to you.

Q Well, I just -- oh, it's right there next

It doesn't appear to be the same.

115 1 believe --1 Q Okay. Do you see your e-mail at the top, the 2 2 A I got it. 3 Q -- start with a C? 3 same e-mail. "Terry, has this case been A Yes, it is. 4 assigned?" It looks like you are asking him. 5 Question mark. And then you tell him. "Probably Q Okay. Thank you. Have -- which looks, appears to be an 6 should be assigned pronto," with two exclamation 7 e-mail string, again dated December 20, 2012, in 7 marks. regards to this request from CREW. 8 Do you see that? Have you seen this document before? 9 A Yes. 10 A Not that I recall. 10 Q Okay. And just for the record, that is 11 the same FOIA request number as the CREW request MR. PEZZI: I will give the same 11 12 number identified on Exhibit 2. 12 instruction. Q Okay. Just make sure you let your 13 Is that right? I just want you to --14 attorney --14 A Yes, it is. A I'm sorry. Q I just want you to confirm. 15 15 O -- finish his objection on the record A Yes, it is. 16 16 17 before answering. 17 Q Okay. Thank you. Okay. MR. PEZZI: Thanks. Do you know why you asked Mr. Gordon to 18 19 assign this case -- well, what do you mean by 19 MS. COTCA: Sure. 20 "pronto"? I mean, right away? Q You see the top of the document, the 21 first e-mail, it appears to be an e-mail from you, 21 A Yes. 22 Patrick Scholl, to Terry Gordon. Is that right? 22 Q Okay. Why did you ask Mr. Gordon to 114 116 A Yes. 1 assign this case right away? Q Okay. And Terry Gordon I believe you've A Because Ms. Walter had asked about it. identified before as one of your branch chiefs? 3 O Does the fact that the White House had an A Yes. 4 interest and called in regards to this FOIA 5 Q Okay. Which division or section? request affect the speed with which and the manner 6 with which a FOIA request is handled and A He was the branch chief for management and public diplomacy, MPD. processed? Q And again, what did the MPD do? A No. I think we were scrambling to try to A Mostly administrative or privacy type 9 process requests as quickly as possible. And I 10 requests, including some FOIAs. They also dealt 10 wanted to make sure this wasn't -- didn't fall 11 with the decentralized offices that did their own 11 through the track -- the cracks. 12 reviews. Q Well, I believe in Ms. Walter's earlier Q What -- what do you mean by 13 e-mail she stated, I'd like -- something to the 14 "decentralized offices"? 14 effect that I'd like a quick turnaround on this A Certain bureaus do searches and reviews. 15 because she believes the White House wanted a 15 Q Okay. And which bureaus are those? 16 quick turnaround on that with --16 17 A The Bureau of Consular Affairs. 17 A My understanding is that -- go ahead. Q How about any of the offices pertaining Q Why don't you go ahead and take a look at 18 19 to Secretary Clinton? 19 the e-mail. A Pertaining to? 20 20 MR. PEZZI: Exhibit 3? 21 Q Her office. MS. COTCA: Exhibit 3, yes. 21 22 A No. 22 Q Ms. Walter's December 20, 2012, e-mail.

117 1 I believe it's on the third page of the exhibit. 1 with a cc to you and Rosemary Reid. Same date, 2 December 20th, 2012. A It's in here, too. Right? Right? Or 2 3 not. Do you agree that it states that this 4 I believe she's asking for a quick 4 request was processed or treated as a complex case? 5 turnaround in response to whether we received it. Q Okay. Does the fact that the White House A That's what it says, yes. have an interest in the request, would that have 7 Okay. Do you have any reason to believe had any effect on how this request was handled? that it wasn't treated as such? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 9 A I have no reason -10 A No. 10 Q Okay. O Okay. I think that's all I have on that 11 11 A - to believe otherwise. 12 one. 12 Q Okay. And again just to make sure we 13 (A discussion was held off the record.) 13 have everything accurate, do you agree that this (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 5 marked for 14 e-mail references the same FOIA case number that 14 15 is referenced in Exhibit 2? 15 identification and is attached to the transcript.) A Okay. A Yes. 16 16 17 MS. COTCA: Okay. And again for the 17 Q Okay. Thank you. 18 record, what's been marked as Exhibit 5 is a Were all FOIA requests that related to 18 19 three-page document with -- bearing the document 19 Secretary Clinton's e-mail in 2012 treated as 20 name -- number from the State Department 20 complex cases? 21 C06125550. 21 A I don't recall. O Is that accurate? 22 You don't know or -- I'm trying to 118 120 1 understand what you mean by you don't recall. A Yes. Q Okay. Thank you. Because, I mean, the question is yes or no. And This again is another e-mail chain in if you don't know, that's fine. regards to this FOIA request, the CREW request. 4 A I don't know. 5 Have you seen this document before? You don't know? 6 MR. PEZZI: And I give the same A I don't know whether it was or not. instruction as before. Q Okay. Do you know if FOIA requests for Secretary Clinton, if there was a practice to A Not that I recall. 9 Q Okay. Let me ask you, in Ms. Walter's treat them as complex cases by the State 10 e-mail dated December 20th, 2012, and then also in 10 Department while she was in office? 11 the e-mail appearing on the bottom of the first 11 A I don't recall. 12 page of the document, from IPS-staff-assistants. 12 Q That's fine. You can put that aside for 13 Do you see that? 13 now. 14 A Yes, I do. 14 Actually, hold on. Q Okay. Who -- who are the IPS staff 15 15 Okay. 16 assistants? Who has that e-mail address? 16 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 6 marked for A I don't know. I do believe - they 17 identification and is attached to the transcript.) Q Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's 18 probably work for Sheryl Walter. Q Okay. And on the e-mail at the bottom of 19 been marked as Exhibit 6. Just for the record, do

20 you read that it's -- it's actually been marked as 21 DOS document 901 at the bottom. This is a

22 document that was produced by the State

20 the first page of the exhibit.

From IPS staff assistants, to Ms. Walter,

A Uh-huh.

21

22

123 1 Department, to Judicial Watch, in this, in the 1 Mr. Jaramillo is in the EAN branch and Mr. Gordon discovery of this case. 2 was in the, I think you said PBD, or -- what was A It is marked DOS --3 the branch for Mr. Gordon? Q Okay. A Mr. Gordon at this time was a branch A -901 0001. 5 chief for EAN. He is currently the branch chief Q Thank you. 6 for MPD. Go ahead. I want to give you an 7 Q Oh. Okay. 8 opportunity to review this. At the time of the CREW request, was A Okay. 9 Mr. Gordon branch chief for EAN the entire time? 10 Q Okay. Have you seen this document 10 A I believe so. 11 before? Q Okay. Thank you. 11 12 MR. PEZZI: Same instruction. 12 Then do you see the e-mail above that? Is that an e-mail from you to Ms. Walter, 13 A Not that I recall. 13 14 letting her know that the -- you believe that the Q Okay. I want to point you to the bottom 15 of Page 4 of the exhibit, in the e-mail chain. 15 White House was tracking these cases? Okay. Where it's an e-mail from Edgar A Yes. 16 17 Jaramillo, to -- it looks like to you and Terry 17 Q Okay. What did you mean by "these 18 Gordon. 18 cases"? 19 Do you see that? A I would think there are probably multiple 20 A Yes. 20 requests for the same subject. Q Okay. Is this an e-mail that you Q Okay. And what do you mean by "the same 21 22 received from Mr. Jaramillo? 22 subject"? 122 124 A It appears to be, yes. A In this particular case, there's - I Q Okay. And -- I'm sorry, did I cut you don't really recall exactly why I would say 3 off? I didn't mean to. 3 "multiple." Because I don't recall if there were A I'm sorry. many, or this particular request was the only one. Q And again, just for the record, I want to Q Okay. But I'm asking what the subject 6 make sure this is in regards to the same FOIA 6 matter is as you understand it. 7 request number for the CREW request of 2012-40981, A Yeah. I don't recall. 8 that appears on Exhibit 2. Q Well, from this document can you tell 9 You may just want to leave that out. 9 that it's about Secretary Clinton's e-mail? A Yes. 10 A Yes, this is the same number. 10 Q Okay. Did Mr. Jaramillo inform you that Q Okay. And from reviewing the CREW 12 request and the State Department's response, do 12 the White House has -- had an interest in knowing 13 from FOIA about the CREW request back in March of 13 you agree that it -- the subject matter is about 14 2013? 14 Secretary Clinton's e-mail? 15 A Not that I recall. A It appears to be, ves. 15 Q Okay. Thank you. Q According to this document that --16 17 Mr. Jaramillo inform you that the White House had 17 And Mr. Jaramillo's e-mail to you and 18 an interest in knowing --18 Terry Gordon, why did he include you in his e-mail 19 to report with the tasking of SC -- SCR and IRM 19 A In this instance, yes, he did.

21

22

20 and their search results?

MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.

A He included me as a division chief.

Q Okay. Let me ask you, Mr. Jaramillo is

21 assigned to a different branch than Mr. Gordon.

22 Is there a reason? Mr. -- it looks like

127 Q Okay. So did you normally receive 1 request at this point? 2 communications from officials within your division A All that's stated in the documents here 3 with respect to the search results and how the 3 is all that refreshes — that's all I know, what I 4 State Department would proceed? see here in front of me. I don't - it doesn't A I'd receive - sometimes I was included 5 cause me to think of anything further. Q Does -- does it refresh your recollection 6 in e-mails regarding the processing of some 7 with respect to any communications or discussions 7 requests. Q Okay. Because I thought earlier you 8 you may have had with Ms. Walter about the White 9 testified that you were not involved in the 9 House's interest in this FOIA request? 10 processing of any requests during your time as 10 A No. 11 division chief. Q Does it help refresh your recollection 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 12 with respect to any communications you had with A I don't -- I -- involved in the 13 Ms. Walter about this FOIA request in general? 13 14 processing, being made aware of an issue or 14 Α No. Q How about with Mr. Hackett? 15 dealing with an issue as part of - as a manager, 15 16 yes, I would be involved. But processing the A No. 16 17 actual requests, no. 17 Q How about with Mr. Gordon? Q What do you mean -- what do you 18 Your branch chief. No? Same? Same 19 understand processing to mean? 19 O A Processing requests would mean search, 20 answer? 21 sending out search taskers and processing the 21 A No. 22 reviews, contacting the bureaus that have been 22 Yeah. Okay. On the second -- no, I'm 126 128 1 tasked, doing searches, like of central files. sorry, third page of the exhibit. Do you agree Q What about how the State Department would that there's an e-mail from you to Mr. Jaramillo, 3 respond; is that part of the processing? telling him to hold off on this request and to let MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Sheryl take the lead and coordinate? 5 Q As you understand it. 5 A Do I -- do I see that? 6 A I'm not sure I understand your question. 6 Q Yes. Q Well, with respect to being informed what 7 A Yes. 8 the search results are and how the State Q Do you agree that that's your e-mail? 9 Department would respond to a FOIA request, do you 9 Is that your e-mail? 10 understand that as being part of processing a FOIA 10 A It appears to be, ves. 11 request?

- 12 A In this --
- 13 MR. PEZZI: Objection to form.
- 14 A In this context, yes.
- 15 Q Okay. Thank you.
- Sitting here today, after -- well, after
- 17 reviewing this e-mail chain, this document, does
- 18 this help refresh your recollection at all about
- 19 the CREW FOIA request and the handling of the
- 20 request and the response sent out to CREW?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Okay. And what do you recall about the

- Q Okay. And is Sheryl, does that refer to 11
- 12 Sheryl Walter, the director of IPS?
- A Yes, it does. 13
- Q Okay. Why did you inform Mr. Jaramillo 14
- 15 for Sheryl to take lead and to coordinate the --
- 16 MR. PEZZI: Objection to form.
- 17 Q -- this FOIA request?
 - MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- 19 A Because it's a – it appears to be a
- 20 significant request, because it's a concern to the
- 21 White House.
- 22 Q Do you recall any other FOIA requests

18

131 1 that concerned the White House during Secretary A I don't --1 2 Clinton -- well, during your time as division 2 Q I'm sorry. Go ahead. 3 chief? 3 A There might have been other people to 4 A No, I don't. 4 look – who would have looked at this before Q What would normally have been the 5 sending it out. So it is I think pending. But I process? 6 don't think the decision had been made. Q Okay. Do you see where you in the same A I don't understand. 8 e-mail to Ms. Walter, you say, "Neither SESCR nor MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q So you asked Mr. Jaramillo to let Sheryl 9 IRM retrieved responsive documents." 10 take the lead and coordinate. 10 Does this help refresh your recollection What would have been the process, had you 11 at all as to what IRM is? 12 not -- had Sheryl not taken the lead to 12 A No, it doesn't. 13 coordinate? 13 Q I can point you to Page 3. And this is Mr. Jaramillo's e-mail to MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 14 14 15 you, dated March 29, 2013, time-stamped 11:31 a.m. A I'm not really sure. 15 Q Well, according to the e-mail string in 16 Do you see that? 16 17 this document, is it fair to say that the normal 17 A Yes, I do. 18 process would have been for the State Department Q Okay. Is that an e-mail from 19 at that point to sent an Oglesby letter? 19 Mr. Jaramillo to you, and also a copy to Terry MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 20 20 Gordon? Q And I'm looking on Page 4 of the exhibit. 21 21 A It appears to be, yes. 22 A Yeah, that's a hypothetical. I really 22 Okay. In there he indicates, Should I --130 132 "Pat, should I follow up with Karen and Jonathan 1 couldn't tell you. Q I don't think it's a hypothetical, on this one." 3 because I'm reading directly from your e-mail to 3 Do you see that? 4 Ms. Walter, dated March 28, 2013, time-stamped A Yes. 5 9:04, on Page 4 of the document. O Okay. Who's Karen? 5 6 Do you see that? A That would be I think Karen Finnegan. 6 Q Okay. And how about Jonathan? A Which one? Which page was it? 8 Q Page 4. 8 A I – I don't recall. 9 A Okay. Q Okay. And Karen Finnegan, she was the 10 Q E-mail from you to Ms. Walter, dated 10 division for the requestor liaison's office? 11 March 28, 2013, time-stamped 9:04. A No. Ms. Finnegan was the division chief 12 Do you see that? 12 for the policy and plans division. Q Why would Mr. Jaramillo ask to follow up A Yes, I see that. 13 Q Okay. Is that your e-mail to Ms. Walter? 14 with Ms. Finnegan? 14 15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 15 A Yes, it is. Q Okay. So you agree that it's not a A I don't know. 16 16 17 hypothetical? 17 Q Do you know Jonathan Davis? 18 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 18 A I don't recall. A If – if it didn't go to Ms. Walter, I do 19 Q Does the name ring a bell at all? 20 not know whether it had been processed in course. The name rings a bell, yes. 20 Q Okay. And who is Mr. Davis? 21 I don't know that. 21 22 Okay. Well, according --22 A I think he worked in L.

133 1 Q What is L? 2 A Office of Legal Advisor. 3 Q Okay. And he was an attorney in the 4 Office of Legal Advisor? 5 A I believe so. 6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 14 Do you see that? 1 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 2 A I don't think I was following it. 3 Q Well, how would you describe it? 4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 wasn't actively — I wasn't actively checking on 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this — 14 A Inquiring. Inquiring, yes. I'm sorry.
2 A I don't think I was following it. 3 Q Okay. And he was an attorney in the 4 Office of Legal Advisor? 4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 A I believe so. 6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 2 A I don't think I was following it. 3 Q Well, how would you describe it? 4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 wasn't actively — I wasn't actively checking on 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this —
3 Q Well, how would you describe it? 4 Office of Legal Advisor? 5 A I believe so. 6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 3 Q Well, how would you describe it? 4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 wasn't actively — I wasn't actively checking on 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this —
4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 A I believe so. 6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 4 A I was included in some e-mails, but I 5 wasn't actively - I wasn't actively checking on 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
5 A I believe so. 6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 5 wasn't actively — I wasn't actively checking on 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this —
6 Q Okay. Is he still there now? 7 A I don't know. 8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 6 the status as far as that I can recall. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 7 Q Well, what about this April from April 4, 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
8 Q Okay. I want to point you on Page 2, the 9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 8 2013, where you wrote, "Sheryl, anything new on 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
9 bottom of Page 2. 10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 9 this one"? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
10 It looks like there's an e-mail from you 11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 10 Do you see that? 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
11 to Ms. Sheryl, again about the same FOIA request 12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 11 A Uh-huh. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
12 from CREW, pertaining to Secretary Clinton's 13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 12 Q Would you not describe that as following 13 or inquiring about the status of this
13 e-mail, dated April 4, 2013. 13 or inquiring about the status of this
15 A Yes. 15 Q Okay.
16 Q Okay. And there it states, Sheryl, 16 A But that was in response to the inquiry
17 anything new on this one? I think it says "on 17 from Mr. Jaramillo. But I didn't, from what I
18 this one." Or, "this one." 18 recall, actively follow this.
19 A Yes. 19 Q Why were you following up on the status
20 Q Okay. You agree that this is an e-mail 20 of this FOIA request, when you previously
21 you sent to Ms. Walter about this FOIA request? 21 testified that you weren't typically involved in
22 A It appears to be, yes. 22 the processing of FOIA requests as the division
134
1 Q Okay. Was this a request that you were 1 chief?
2 following? 2 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
3 A Only since I received, as far as I can 3 A As you said, that I had recounted, I said
4 tell, notification from Mr. Jaramillo. And I 4 typically. You know, there would be instances
5 think it had come up also from Ms. Walter. 5 such as this where I would be involved.
6 Q Back in December of 2012? 6 Q And wouldn't but wouldn't that then,
7 A Yeah. 7 because it would be a rare instance, wouldn't that
8 Q Okay. 8 mean that you would that it would stand out in
9 your memory, and that you would recall
10 Q Yes. 10 MR. PEZZI: Objection.
11 Q information about such requests?
12 Q You were not? 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
13 A Not that I can recall. 13 A I can't say that, based on your
14 Q Okay. 14 characterization, I would remember this, no.
15 A You mean follow as in daily dealing with 15 MR. PEZZI: I think we've been going for
16 the status of it? No, I don't recall that at all. 16 just over an hour now. It's 12:40. You know, I
17 Q With respect to the status of the 17 don't know whether it would be a good time to take
18 request, do you agree that these documents and 18 a break for lunch or we're approaching a time
19 these e-mail chains indicate that you were 19 MS. COTCA: Let's go off the record.
20 following this request from December 20th, 2012, 20 VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are going off the
21 when Ms. Walter first e-mailed you about it, to 21 record at 12:38.
22 until at least April 4, 2013? 22 (A recess was taken.)

139 VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are back on the Q Is that Gene Smilansky? 1 2 record at 13:45. 2 A It appears to be, yes. (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 7 marked for 3 Q Okay. Are you familiar with 4 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 4 Mr. Smilansky? A Finished with this one? 5 5 A Familiar? Yeah, I am familiar with him. 6 Q Yes. For now. 6 Q Okay. And who is he? What's his Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's 7 position? 8 been marked as Exhibit 9 -- oh, Exhibit 7. Sorry A I believe he was an attorney in -- in the 9 about that. And it is a six-page e-mail chain, 9 Office of Legal Advisor. 10 bearing the State Department Document Number 10 Q Okay. And, again, going back to trying 11 to understand your role with respect to the CREW 11 C06125546. 12 request dated from December 2012 regarding 12 Do you see that either at the top or the 13 bottom of each page? 13 Secretary Clinton's e-mails. So I'm looking at 14 this e-mail to Mr. Jaramillo from you. A Yes, I do. 14 Q Okay. And you agree with me that this is Why did you ask Mr. Jaramillo to 15 16 an e-mail chain again between you and 16 incorporate language into the Oglesby letter? 17 Mr. Jaramillo and others within IPS, with respect 17 A I don't recall. 18 to the CREW request? Q Why were you involved in the process of 19 preparing an Oglesby letter with respect to this 19 A Yes. 20 request? 20 Q Okay. Thank you. Have you seen this document before? 21 21 A I don't recall. 22 A No. 22 Q And you agree that, based on your prior 140 138 Q Okay. 1 testimony with respect to your responsibilities 2 and activities as the division chief, it was A Not that I recall. Q Okay. And, again, are these -- do you unusual for you to get involved to this detail in agree that some of -- this is an e-mail chain that a particular FOIA request? includes e-mails to and from you? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. A Yes. A I don't recall whether this is unusual or 6 Q Okay. Do you see, I want to point you to 7 not. My characterization, I really don't -- I the first e-mail on the first page. 8 don't really recall. 9 A Uh-huh. Yeah. 9 Q You don't recall your characterization 10 Q Appearing from the top of this exhibit. 10 with respect to your involvement in FOIA requests That looks to be like an e-mail from you 11 from earlier this morning? 12 to Edgar Jaramillo. Stating, "Edgar, incorporate 12 A With - with regard to what? 13 the language below in the Oglesby and have Gene Q With regard to how you were involved in 14 clear on the letter." 14 processing FOIA requests at the State Department 15 while you were the division chief. 15 Do you see that? 16 A Yes. 16 A So --Q Okay. You agree that that's an e-mail 17 Q In 2013. 18 that you sent to Mr. Jaramillo on May 1st, 2013? A So - could you repeat the question, 18 A Yes, it appears to be. 19 please? 19 20 Q Okay. Who is Gene? Q Sure. I'm trying to understand why, A Gene? I think he's one of the addressees 21 based on your testimony earlier today, that as the 21

22 division chief you were not -- I believe your

22 from down below.

144

Conducted on October 29, 2019

3

7

1 testimony was that you were not typically involved

- 2 in the processing of FOIA requests; that it was
- 3 your branch chiefs who were involved in that
- 4 process, and you didn't really oversee that.
- Why were you involved to this degree in
- processing the CREW request?
- MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- Q As indicated in this -- this e-mail, and
- in the e-mails we've reviewed.
- 10 MR. PEZZI: Same objection. A I don't recall. Though, as you said 11
- 12 before, typically.
- 13 Q What's typically?
- A Typically means not -- not as a rule I
- 15 would be involved. There might be occasions where 16 I was involved.
- Q Do you recall any other circumstance 18 where you were involved in the drafting of an
- 19 Oglesby letter from your department?
- 20 A I don't recall.
- 21 Q Do you agree that that's unusual, that
- 22 you would be involved in drafting such a letter as
- 1 the division chief?
- 2 A I don't think it's unusual or complex. I
- don't think it really was an issue either way.
- Q I don't know what you mean by "is an 5 issue either way."
- 6 A You think – you're asking me, again, is it unusual for me to be involved, when I said
- typically not -- I'm not involved.
- 9 Q Okay.
- 10 A So ...
- Q But you don't remember why you were
- 12 involved for this -- for this particular --
- A For this particular case? 13
- 14 Q Yes.
- 15 A No. No.
- 16 Q Can you just speak -- thank you.
- 17 Was that part of the normal process in 18 your division, for you to draft Oglesby letters or 19 provide input with respect to Oglesby letters?
- 20 A I didn't draft, nor did I provide input 21 in this case, or so it appears.
- Q Do you agree that you informed

- 1 Mr. Jaramillo to incorporate the language below in
- the Oglesby letter?
 - A That's what it says, yes.
- 4 Q Okay. Do you -- you don't believe that
- that indicates that you provided input into the
- Oglesby letter that was sent out to CREW?
 - MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- A The only input was the instruction to
- 9 incorporate the language into the letter.
- 10 Q Okay. And my question then, is, was that 11 part of the normal process in your division when
- 12 Oglesby letters were sent out?
- 13 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- 14 A Not typically, no.
- 15 Q Okay. After reviewing this e-mail, in
- 16 the e-mails we've -- you've seen that were marked
- 17 as exhibits in this case relating to the CREW FOIA
- 18 request, do any of these refresh your recollection
- 19 with respect to the CREW request that was sent to
- 20 the State Department regarding Secretary Clinton's
- 21 e-mails?
- A No. 22

- Q Can you tell me why Ms. -- why would
- Ms. Finnegan provide input as to language to be
- inserted in the Oglesby letter, who is in a
- different division from yours?
- MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- 6 Foundation.
- A Well, according to the org charts, she is
- 8 policy and plans. And she would be perhaps
- 9 involved with the formation of language to use.
- Q Was Ms. Finnegan typically involved in 11 your branch chief's drafting of Oglesby letters
- 12 when responding to FOIA requests?
- A Typically? I don't know. 13
- Q Do you know of any other circumstance
- 15 back in 2013 when Ms. Finnegan would have provided
- 16 language to be inserted in an Oglesby letter?
- 17 A Not that I recall.
- And that was not part of your normal 18
- 19 procedures within your division. Correct?
- 20 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- 21 A Correct.
- 22 Q Does it surprise you that you were

147

148

Transcript of Patrick Daniel Scholl Conducted on October 29, 2019

1 involved or aware of this request to this degree

- 2 from December 20th, 2012, when Ms. Walter
- 3 initially e-mailed you, all the way through May
- 4 1st, 2013, when you sent this e-mail, and that you
- 5 have no memory of it?

6 A I'm not sure I understand. You asked me 7 am I surprised that I don't remember?

- 8 O Yeah.
- 9 A No.
- 10 Q Why?

11 A I don't remember what I don't remember.

- 12 Q No, I understand you don't remember what
- 13 you don't remember. I'm asking you, the fact that
- 14 these records and all these e-mails show that you
- 15 were involved to a more significant degree than
- 16 you typically were ever involved as the division
- 17 chief in any FOIA request, does it surprise you
- 18 that you would be involved to this degree and that 19 you have no memory of it?
- 20 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.

21 A I have no memory of it. Am I surprised?

22 I have no opinion either way.

- 1 Q Do you remember any discussions within
- 2 any of the weekly meetings within your division
- 3 during this time frame, up to May 1, 2013, about
- 4 the CREW request and the State Department's
- 5 response to the CREW request?

6 A No, I don't recall.

- 7 Q How about do you recall any -- this
- 8 request being brought up in any of the division
- 9 meetings, weekly meetings?

10 A Not that I recall.

- 11 Q Okay.
- MS. COTCA: I think we can move on to the
- 13 next one.
- 14 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 8 marked for
- 15 identification and is attached to the transcript.)

16 A Okay.

- 17 Q Just for the record, Mr. Scholl, this has
- 18 been marked as Exhibit 8. And do you agree with
- 19 me it's marked as Document Number C06104350 at the
- 20 top, or the bottom, of the page?
- 21 A Yes, it is.
- 22 Q Okay. Thank you.

- 1 And again, for the record, do you agree
- 2 with me that this relates to the CREW request and
- 3 the State Department's Case Number F-2012-40981
- 4 that was assigned to the CREW request by the State
- 5 Department as marked in Exhibit 2?

6 A Yes, it appears to be.

- Q Okay. I want to point you to the e-mail
- 8 appearing from the bottom of the page, from Edgar
- 9 Jaramillo to Gene Smilansky, dated May 8, 2013,
- 10 to -- time-stamped 2:48.
- Do you see that?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 O Okay. Mr. Jaramillo informs
- 14 Mr. Smilansky that the Oglesby letter has been
- 15 drafted and is being forwarded for clearance per
- 16 Karen Finnegan and Pat Scholl from FOIA.
- Do you agree with that statement?
- 18 Is that accurate?

19 A It appears to say that, yes.

- 20 Q Okay. Did you approve the Oglesby letter
- 21 that was sent to CREW on May -- well, it was sent
- 22 on May 10, 2013?

A I don't recall.

- Q Was it part of your normal process within
- 3 your division for you to approve Oglesby letters
- 4 that were sent to FOIA requestors?
- 5 A No.

146

1

- 6 Q Okay. Do you know why Karen Finnegan was
- 7 involved in the process of approving this letter?

A I don't know.

- 9 Q Was that part of the normal process
- 10 within your division when responding to FOIA
- 11 requestors and sending Oglesby letters, for
- 12 Ms. Finnegan to approve such letters going out?

13 A Not that I recall.

- 14 Q Also, just at the bottom of that e-mail.
- 15 Well, the -- the bottom e-mail, but the beginning,
- 16 where Mr. Jaramillo says, "I'm the FOIA case
- 17 manager for the FOIA request below."
- Is that the same as the case analyst, I
- 19 believe, you identified?

20 A Yes.

- 21 Q Okay. Thank you. Okay.
- 22 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 9 marked for

151 1 identification and is attached to the transcript.) And if you can -- I just kind of want to Q Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's 2 walk through with some of these items with you. 3 been marked as Exhibit 9. It's a three-page So if you can provide some explanation. 4 document. And I want to make sure you have time 4 In the headings, there's Comment Type, 5 to review it. Let me know once you're done and there's the comment, which appears to be the 6 information that was inputted into the system. reviewing it. 7 And then the date. Is that the date that it was A Sure. 8 8 put into the system? Or what does the date Okay. Q Same question again: Have you seen this 9 reflect? 10 document before? 10 A It would appear to be the date it was 11 A Not that I recall. 11 entered into the system. Q Okay. How about the Updated By, what 12 Q Okay. 13 13 does that reflect? MS. COTCA: And, for the record, this is 14 a three-page document. And at the top corner of A It appears to be the person who - who 15 the first page it says -- well, it's Document 15 made the entry. 16 Number, State Document Number C06125574. Okay. And when -- how are -- are these 17 entries made in a timely fashion, contemporaneous 17 Q Is that accurate? 18 with the actions that are being taken? 18 A That's what it appears here. 19 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. Q Okay. 20 A Yes. 20 A Usually. Q Okay. Is that something that would be 21 Q Thank you. 21 22 Do you know what this document is? 22 discussed with your branch chiefs and the analysts 150 152 A What do you mean what -- what is it? 1 who work under your branch chiefs, to make sure Q What does it represent to be? that information is inserted into the system in a 3 A It's – appears to be case comments. timely manner, to make sure you have accurate Q Can you explain what case -- are you information for the tracking? 5 familiar with case comments? 5 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 6 A Would that be a subject of discussions 6 A Yes. Q Okay. Let me just ask, is this case with the branch chief and the analyst? 8 comments for the CREW request? And again, I just Q Yeah. 9 want to make sure we have the same FOIA Request 9 A It could possibly be, yes. 10 Number --10 Q Okay. Is it part of the training that 11 they receive? 11 A Yes, it appears to be. 12 Q Thank you. 12 A Yes. Okay. Thank you. Okay. And can you explain what case 13 13 14 comments is? The second comment on the first page, 15 where it says, "Tasker sent to SESCR & IRM with A At different levels, people will put 16 comments into the system about the processing. 16 expedited priority." 17 Q Of the particular FOIA request? 17 Do you see that? A Yes. 18 A Of the -- of the request, yes. 18 Q Okay. All right. And this is some form 19 Q Okay. And what is the date of that?

20

21

A 12/26/12.

22 document, entered that?

Q Okay. And who, according to this

20 of database that the State Department has to --

A For tracking of cases.

Okay. Thank you.

21

155 A J Aramillo. 1 seen this written and I've never seen this 2 Q Was that Mr. Jaramillo? 2 document. So I don't know if this was typical of 3 3 what was taking place. A I believe so, yes. Q Now, going back to the CREW request that Well, you oversaw Mr. Jaramillo, did you 4 initially was sent to the State Department. 5 not? You testified earlier that it appears 6 A Oversaw? that the request was not made on an expedited 7 Yes. He worked in your division, didn't 8 basis. 8 he? 9 Why was the task to SESCR and IRM sent 9 A Yes. He worked for Terry Gordon. 10 with expedited priority? 10 Q Okay. And Mr. Gordon worked for you. MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 11 Correct? 12 Foundation. 12 A Yes. Q Okay. And as the division chief, weren't A I wouldn't be able to address that. It 13 14 you responsible for Terry Gordon and Mr. Jaramillo 14 would normally say, This request meets the 15 to make sure they do what they're supposed to do? 15 requirements for expeditious processing. I don't 16 know. Expedited priority, I don't know what that 16 A Yes. 17 means. 17 Q Okay. And as the division chief, weren't 18 you aware of what the normal practice and Q Do you have any reason to believe that 19 Mr. Jaramillo's insert in this comment line was 19 procedures was within your division? 20 incorrect, in that it wasn't sent with expedited 20 A Yes. 21 priority? 21 Q Okay. So my question is, then, was it 22 normal practice within your division for a tasker A I have no idea whether it's correct or 154 156 1 to be sent with expedited priority when the 1 not. Q Do you have any reason, sitting here requestor did not ask for the request to be today, to believe that it is incorrect? expedited? A I have no opinion either way. 4 A I don't know what "expedited priority" Q I'm asking if you have any reason to 5 means. believe that it's incorrect. Q What do you think it means? 6 7 A I have no reason to believe it's A I'm not sure. Q You wouldn't -- you would disagree with incorrect. Q Do you know why Mr. Jaramillo would send 9 me that that means that the search should be done 10 it with expedited priority, when the requestor 10 on an expedited basis? 11 didn't request that? A I don't disagree or agree either way. I 12 A I don't --12 just don't know what he meant by that. Q And you don't know -- but I'm asking you 13 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 14 how do you interpret that here, sitting today? 14 A I don't know. Q Was that something that was typically A I really have no opinion. 15 16 done within your division? 16 Q Okay. 17 A I don't know. I don't remember. 17 Are you aware of any other FOIA requests Q Was that part of normal practice within 18 from your division that were tasked out with 19 your division, for taskers to be sent with 19 expedited priority when the requestors didn't ask

21

22

20 for that?

A I don't remember. I don't know.

Okay. I want to point you to the last

20 expedited priority when the requestors didn't ask

A I don't really know, because I've never

21 for that?

157 159 Q Who tasked the office of S/ES-IRM with 1 comment on this sheet. the CREW request? 2 A First page? 3 Q First page, yes. A Who tasked this? 3 Where it says, "Per P. Scholl, task sent 4 O Yes. to S/ES-IRM." 5 A To S/ES-IRM? I would think 6 Do you see that? 6 Mr. Jaramillo. O And how would that be tasked? A Yes. 7 Q Okay. And P. Scholl, is that you, A In paper form. 9 Mr. Scholl? Q Okay. 9 A It would appear to be. 10 A I believe. It might have been 10 O Okay. And what's the date of that? 11 electronic, but I think paper form back then. 11 12 A 4/29/13. Q Okay. And what do you mean by 13 "electronic"? Via database? Q Okay. Time-stamped 11:04 a.m. Correct? 13 A That's what it appears, yes. 14 14 A Scan it. Q Okay. Why did you ask Mr. Jaramillo to 15 15 Q Okay. 16 task S/ES-IRM? A And send it to them as a PDF. 16 17 A I don't recall. 17 Q Okay. But there was -- there's a form --Q Do you agree with me that, according to 18 19 this document, you asked Mr. Jaramillo to task Q -- that would have been submitted? 19 20 S/ES-IRM? 20 A Yes. Okay. Who was the contact at S/ES-IRM A That's what it appears on the document, 21 O 21 22 who Mr. Jaramillo would have been in touch with 22 yes. 158 160 Q Okay. Do you know who -- what office 1 with respect to the tasking at this request? S/ES-IRM is? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. A Did you ask me that before? Foundation. Q I did. 4 A I don't recall. Don't -- I don't know. A Yeah. Not really. 5 5 O Who would know? Q Why would you task an office that you A I would - don't know. don't know? 7 Q Okay. I want to point you to the second MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 8 8 page. 9 A Don't recall. 9 First comment on the second page of this 10 Q If I were to tell you that S/ES-IRM 10 exhibit, where it says, "S/ES-IRM reports zero 11 handles the technology and information management 11 docs found." 12 for the Secretary's office, does that ring a bell? 12 Do you see that? 13 A No. A Yes, I do. 13 Q Okay. And when was that entered? 14 Q Okay. How did you know to task the 14 15 S/ES-IRM if you didn't know what it does? A It appears to have been entered 5/8/13. 15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 16 Q Okay. And who was that entered by? 16 17 A I don't -- I don't recall. 17 A It appears to be Mr. Jaramillo. Q Okay. Let me ask you, why was an Oglesby Q Did you have discussions with 18 19 Ms. Finnegan, Ms. Walter, or John Hackett, or 19 letter drafted in the CREW request before S/ES-IRM 20 Ms. Grafeld, anybody within IPS, about tasking the 20 responded with a search results? 21 CREW request to S/ES-IRM? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 22 A I don't recall. 22 Foundation.

Conducted on	October 29, 2019
161	163
1 A I don't know.	1 A That's accurate, yes.
2 Q You agree with me that an Oglesby letter	2 Q Okay. So then would you agree with me
3 was drafted in the CREW request on May 1.	3 that it was premature for your office to be in the
4 MR. PEZZI: Same objections.	4 process of drafting an Oglesby letter in response
5 Q Do you agree with that?	5 to the CREW request before the office of S/ES-IRM
6 A I don't know if I agree with that.	6 completed its search?
7 Where is that?	7 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
8 Q Okay. Why don't you take a look at the	8 Foundation.
9 first page of Exhibit 7 that we just went through.	9 A I don't know. Because I would think this
10 MR. PEZZI: This is Exhibit 7?	10 is a draft. It hasn't gone out. So it could be
11 MS. COTCA: No.	11 draft that hasn't gone anywhere.
MR. PEZZI: Mine are not numbered.	12 Q Yes. But my question is, it's in the
MS. COTCA: I believe it's Exhibit 7.	13 process of being prepared.
14 MR. PEZZI: Okay.	14 A Yes.
15 MS. COTCA: May I see it?	15 Q Why would your office be in the process
16 MR. PEZZI: This was Exhibit 7?	16 of preparing an Oglesby letter before receiving
17 MS. COTCA: Yes.	17 the search results?
18 A So repeat your question, if you would,	18 MR. PEZZI: Same objections.
19 please?	19 A I don't know.
20 Q You agree with me that an Oglesby letter	20 Q Wouldn't that be premature?
21 was drafted and or in the process of being	21 MR. PEZZI: Same objections.
22 prepared, in response to the CREW request, as of	22 A I can't - I can't say whether it was
162	164
1 May 1, 2013.	1 premature or not. I can't say I agree with you.
2 Do you agree with me?	2 Q Well, it contradicts your testimony from
3 A That's what it says here, yes.	3 this morning.
4 Q Okay. Do you have any reason to doubt	4 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. And I'd
5 it?	5 ask that you ask questions of the witness rather
6 A No.	6 than trying to characterize his testimony in
7 Q Okay. So my question is, why would an	7 statements.
8 Oglesby letter be in the process of being drafted	8 Q Do you not agree that it contradicts your
9 before search results were provided by the Office	9 testimony from this morning?
10 of S/ES-IRM to IPS in response to the CREW	10 A I'm not sure if it contradicts my
11 request?	11 testimony for this morning because I don't
12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.	12 remember the question you asked me that I had to
13 Foundation.	13 respond to that provided you with this
14 A I don't know.	14 information.
15 Q Do you agree with me that it would be	15 Q Your testimony this morning is that
16 premature to draft such a letter when all the	16 Oglesby letters would not be drafted prior to all
17 searches have not been completed?	17 the searches being completed.
18 A I can't agree with you either way.	18 Do you remember that?
19 Q I believe your testimony earlier this	19 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
20 morning was that Oglesby letters are drafted after	20 A I don't remember that characterization
21 all the searches have been completed.	21 exactly. Formation — or the drafting of an
_	22 Oglesby letter is a process. So if there are
22 Is that accurate?	22 Ogicsby ieuer is a process. So ii there are

167 1 additional searches that needed to go out, they A Today? 1 2 would go out before the Oglesby was sent out to 2 Q Sitting here today, do you have memory of any particular request that had been tasked to 3 the requestor. 4 Q Why would your division work on something S/ES-IRM? 5 that may not be used in the long run? If S/ES-IRM 5 A No. 6 would have found responsive records, would you 6 And do you know -- and I'm not asking for 7 a particular name, but perhaps position or where 7 have sent an Oglesby letter? 8 in the chain within S/ES-IRM who would have 8 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 9 A I can't recall. 9 received a task from your division? 10 Q Does the State Department send Oglesby 10 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 11 letters when responsive records are located in Q And this is back in 2013. 11 12 response to a FOIA request? 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 13 A This is -- does the department send 13 Foundation. 14 Oglesby letters out to requestors in response to 14 A I don't know. 15 requests to provide the results of the search in 15 Q We can move on. 16 the — in searches where there are no records? (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 10 marked for 16 17 Q Right. 17 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 18 A Yes, we do that. 18 A Okay. 19 Q So as of May 1, 2013, you agree with me 19 Q Okay. Thank you. 20 that there was a search pending from S/ES-IRM. 20 Actually, Mr. Scholl, before we move on, 21 I just want to ask with respect to Exhibit 9, the 21 Correct? 22 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 22 Case Comments, is that something that's created 168 166 A Is there? Was there? 1 for all FOIA requests that come into the State 1 Q Well, according to the first page of this Department? exhibit, it was tasked on April 29, 2013. 3 A I believe so. Do you see that? 4 Q Okay. 5 A First page of which? 5 A Should be. Q Exhibit 9. 6 6 Q Yes. Okay. Thank you. MS. COTCA: Exhibit 10, for the record, A Yes, it was sent. Q Okay. So you agree with me that a search 8 is a compilation of -- well, it looks to be four was pending from S/ES-IRM. 9 documents. The first one, State Department 10 A At which time? 10 Document Number 0612556, appearing on the first Q May 1st, 2013? 11 page --11 12 A It would appear so. 12 A Yes. Q Okay. Thank you. 13 13 O -- of the exhibit? Sitting here today, have you tasked or 14 A Yes. 15 have you been aware of any FOIA requests tasked to O And then the second document is the third 15 16 S/ES-IRM? 16 page, actually, of the exhibit, C06125555. 17 A Any requests tasked --17 Do you agree with that? Q Any requests. 18 18 A Yes. A - to S/ES-IRM? 19 Q Okay. And then the fourth page being the 19 Q Yes. Yes. 20 20 third document, C06125553? A Now? 21 21 A Yes. 22 Q Yes. 22 Q Okay. And then the last document,

169 171 1 appearing on the fifth page, is C06125561. Q Okay. And is it search -- so walk me Yes. through this a little bit. 2 3 Okay. Thank you. I'm just going to Is this tasker sent to each particular 4 refer to this as one exhibit. I'll try not to say office that is being tasked with a search in one document so we don't get confused. response to the FOIA request? Have you seen or -- these documents A Yes, generally. 7 marked as Exhibit 10 prior to today? Q Okay. So in the line where it says, 8 "Office tasked with search" on this particular MR. PEZZI: Outside the context of any 9 meetings with government attorneys. 9 tasker, that -- was that S/ES-CR? 10 A I've never seen this. 10 A Yes. O Okay. And that's the correspondence and 11 Q Okay. 12 A That I can recall. 12 records office for the Secretary's office? Q Okay. Do you recognize what the first A I believe so. 13 14 document appearing as part of Exhibit 10 is? Q Okay. And when was this task sent? 14 A The document indicates it was tasked on A It appears to be a search tasker. 15 15 Q Okay. Can you explain to me what that 16 16 12/21/12. 17 is? 17 Q Okay. And how was this sent to S/ES-CR Are you familiar with search taskers? 18 18 at the time? 19 A Yes. A I don't recall exactly. It would have 20 Q Okay. Can you explain to me what that 20 gone interoffice mail, or office mail. O Okay. Okay. But it's fair to say it 21 is. A A search tasker is a manner in which we 22 either would have gone interoffice mail in hard 170 172 copy or scanned in --1 would task a search -- search systems for records. A Yes. O Okay. And I think earlier you mentioned that Mr. Jaramillo would have sent the task O -- as an attachment via e-mail. 4 through a form to S/ES-IRM. 4 A Correct. 5 5 A Correct. O Okay. And then on the second page, you see Q Is this the type of form that you were 6 Jonathon Wasser. 7 referring to? A Yes. Do you see that? Q Okay. And is this a form that comes from 9 A Yes, I do. 10 your division? 10 Q Okay. Are you familiar with Mr. Wasser? A I know who he is. A It's used -- it was used by our -- my 11 12 division, yes. 12 O Who is he? A He works - I believe he works for 13 Q Okay. And what's the purpose of the 13 14 Clarence Finney. 14 form? Q Okay. So is this Mr. Wasser's response 15 A It's to go to offices that we feel might 16 have documents and provide them with a copy of the 16 to the original task that was sent? 17 letter and request that they conduct a search, 17 A It appears to be. Q Okay. And what does the search time on 18 provide us information, return a response to us. 18 Q Okay. And just to make sure we're still 19 the same line where his name appears indicate? 20 20 talking about the CREW request, you agree with me What does that represent? 21 that this is the same case number, F-2012-40981? 21 A It looks like one hour. 22 Q For the search for records in response to 22 Yes.

175 1 this request? 1 memorandum from Mr. Finney to Mr. Jaramillo. Is 2 that something that was normally received when 2 A Yes. 3 Okay. And then does this -- well, that's the -- Mr. Finney's office was tasked during this fine. 4 time frame? 5 And when did he return this to your 5 A I don't know. division? Q Okay. All right. Let's move on to the 6 7 next one. A I don't know when he returned it, but he dated it the 14th of February, 2013. 8 I'm going to hand you what's marked as Q Okay. Okay. And the second document 9 Exhibit 11 in just a second. 10 appearing in this exhibit. 10 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 11 marked for A Uh-huh. 11 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 11 12 Q Which is actually the third page of the 12 A Okay. 13 exhibit. Is a memorandum from Mr. Finney to 13 O Okay. 14 Mr. Wasser, with a copy to Mr. Jaramillo. MS. COTCA: And, for the record, this is 14 15 Do you see that? 15 State Department Document Number C06125562. 16 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. Q Do you see that on the top corner? 17 A Do I see that? Yes, I see that's what it 17 A Yes. Q Okay. And what is this document? 18 says. 18 19 Q Okay. A It's a search tasker requesting that IRM 19 20 MS. COTCA: Did I misstate? 20 search their records in response to the numbered 21 MR. PEZZI: I think you swapped 21 request, the case number. 22 Mr. Wasser and Mr. Finney, but ... Q Okay. That's the CREW request we've been 174 176 MS. COTCA: Oh, I'm sorry. talking about today. Right? 2 MR. PEZZI: But we all have the document, A Right. Correct. 3 3 so ... O Okay. Q Okay. All right. It's a memorandum from A I don't know what's attached, but it Mr. Wasser to Mr. Finney. I apologize. references a number. Usually it would accompany a A From Jonathon Wasser, S/ES-CR, to copy of the requestor's letter. Clarence Finney, Director -Q Okay. Right. This is just the search Q Yes. Okay. tasker form. Correct? 9 A - S/ES-CR. 9 A Yes. 10 Q Thank you. 10 Q Okay. And then do you normally receive these 11 A This is a transmittal. 12 memorandums with the search tasker when they're Q Okay. Thank you. 12 13 returned to your office after the search is And when was this tasker sent out? 13 14 completed? A The document indicates it was sent out 14 A Do I? 15 15 12/13/2012. Q Not you; your division. Q Okay. And when did IRM respond? 16 16 17 A The analyst would -- it depends on the 17 A I don't know. 18 bureau. It depends on the office. Sometimes the 18 Q Okay. In your experience as the division 19 bureaus include additional information, in 19 chief, and again around the same time frame, late 20 addition to the response on the tasker. 20 2012, two thousand -- early 2013, to mid 2013, Q Okay. And how about the third document, 21 21 would IRM, as part of their response to search 22 which is the fourth page? Now, that is a 22 taskers, provide any additional documentation with

179 1 respect to the search they conducted? A No. 1 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 2 2 O Does the name sound -- ring a bell? 3 A They may or may not. I didn't know 3 A No. typically what they did. Q Okay. I just want to make sure I have Q If you know. 5 this correct. I believe your testimony is that a 6 6 search tasker should have also been sent to A No, I don't know. Q Okay. But, I mean, providing back to 7 S/ES-IRM, according to the comment, the case your division. 8 comments that we reviewed earlier. Correct? A Yes, if they had something to include, A I'm not sure I understand your question. 10 they would. 10 Q Do you know if a search tasker was sent 11 to S/ES-IRM? Q Okay. 12 A Outside of this. 12 A Do I know if? 13 Q I -- I guess I'm asking for the normal Q Yes. 13 14 process. 14 A I think there's one - the one that If no records were located by IRM, if you 15 you're holding? 16 know, during this time frame did IRM include any 16 Q No. This is S/ES-CR. 17 additional documentation as S/ES-CR did in 17 A S/ES-CR? 18 response to a search -- search tasker? Q Yes. I'm asking about the search tasker 19 19 that was sent to S/ES-IRM. A I don't know. 20 Q Okay. 20 A And you're asking? 21 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 12 marked for 21 Q Have you ever seen it before? 22 identification and is attached to the transcript.) A I've never seen it before. 22 180 178 Q Mr. Scholl, if you can look what's been Q Has your office ever been asked to search 2 marked as Exhibit 12, which is a two-page e-mail for records relating to CREW -- for records 3 chain, bearing Document Number C06125565 at the relating to the CREW request? 4 top corner. 4 A I don't recall. A Yes. Have you ever been asked to search your records relating to the CREW request we've been Q Have you had a chance to look at it? 6 talking about here today? 7 Q Okay. You agree with me it appears to be A I don't recall ever. 9 an e-mail from Mr. Jaramillo to a Renate Benham, 9 Q You don't recall ever being asked to 10 in regards to IRM's search results for the CREW --10 search for your own records. 11 the CREW request we've been talking about? 11 12 A It appears so. 12 Q Okay. Sorry. Bear with me for a moment. O Okay. And what's the date of the -- of A Sure. 13 14 the completed search results from IRM? 14 Q Thank you. A I'm sorry? 15 Actually, before we move on to the next 15 16 Q Let me rephrase. 16 exhibit. Again I want to ask you if reviewing any

20 A Ms. Benham indicates here that they 21 provided an answer on January 18th of 2013.

19 locate any responsive records?

What's the date of the e-mail when

18 Ms. Benham informed Mr. Jaramillo that IRM did not

17

22 Q Okay. Do you know Bryan Pagliano?

21 A No.

20 subject.

22 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 13 marked for

17 of these documents relating to the CREW request

18 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails, if they 19 refreshed your recollection in any way about the

181 1 identification and is attached to the transcript.)	183 1 A Yes.
2 Q Mr. Scholl, you you've been handed	1 A Yes. 2 Q Okay. And is this something that you
3 what's been marked as Exhibit 13, which was	would have discussed with Mr. Hermesman back in
4 previously marked as Walter Exhibit 6, and is a	4 August of 2013?
5 is the State Department's Document Number	5 MR. PEZZI: Objection to form.
1000 1	
6 Bates-stamped 902 that was produced to Judicial 7 Watch in discovery of this case.	
	7 Perhaps. Don't know. 8 Q How about with Ms. Walter?
8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. Have you had a chance to look	9 MR. PEZZI: Same objection.
10 through it?	
	10 A Perhaps.11 Q Do you recall any other time that
	12 Ms. Walter requested copies of all FOIA requests
	1
13 A Okay.	13 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails?
14 Q Okay. Thank you.	 14 A No, I don't. 15 Q Okay. Based on the fact that you were
Have you seen this document before? MR. PEZZI: Outside the context of	16 included in this e-mail and Ms. Walter's request
	17 was sent to your subordinate, Mr. Hermesman, is
17 meeting with government attorneys. 18 A No.	1
1	18 this something that you would have followed to
19 Q I want to point you to the 20 second-to-the-last page of this exhibit, on Page	19 make sure that Ms. Walter's request is responded
21 4. Which is an e-mail continuing from the bottom	20 to and to follow the subject matter of this? 21 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
22 of Page 3 from Ms. Grafeld to Sheryl Walter and	MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 22 A I don't – again, I don't know what you
182	184
1 John Hackett, asking for copies of FOIA requests	1 mean by "followed."
2 pertaining to Secretary Clinton's e-mails.	2 Q Follow with respect to the status of
3 Do you see that?	3 Ms. Walter's request to make sure that Ms. Walter
4 A Yes.	4 received a response to her request.
5 Q Okay. And do you agree that you were	5 MR. PEZZI: Same objection.
6 forwarded that e-mail that same day at 10:51 a.m.?	6 A I would typically, as a general rule,
7 A Yes.	7 would follow up, as you put it. In this
8 Q Okay. Do you recall why Ms. Grafeld on	8 particular case whether I did or not I don't know.
9 August 7, 2013, requested copies of all requests	9 I don't remember.
10 related to Secretary Clinton's e-mails?	10 Q Did you have any discussions with anybody
11 A No.	11 regarding Ms. Walter's request for a list of all
12 Q Okay. Who is Jeff Hermesman?	12 FOIA requests relating to Secretary Clinton's
Was he one of your branch chiefs?	13 e-mails within IPS in 2013 and 2014?
14 A Yes.	14 A Not that I recall.
15 Q Okay. And which branch?	15 Q How about ever? And I'm asking outside
16 A The WEP branch. Western Hemisphere, East	16 any conversations you had with your attorneys.
17 Asia Pacific.	17 A I don't recall.
18 Q Okay. Now, do you recall receiving this	18 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 14 marked for
19 e-mail?	19 identification and is attached to the transcript.)
20 A I don't recall, no.	20 Q Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's

22 paid attention to back in August of 2013?

22 document that was produced in discovery of this

187 1 case by the State Department to Judicial Watch. 1 communications in connection with any FOIA Give you a chance to look at it. 2 requests that were received by the State 2 3 A Okay. Yes. 3 Department in the time frame of late 2013, early 4 2014, in which Secretary Clinton's e-mail use was Q Okay. Have you had a chance to look at 5 discussed? it? 6 A Yes, I have. A So the question was? Have I seen them? 7 Q Thank you. 7 Have I – am I familiar? Do I – am I aware of 8 8 them? Have you seen this document before? 9 MR. PEZZI: Outside the context of Q Did you review -- did you -- do you 10 conversations with government attorneys. 10 recall reviewing any e-mails back in late 2014 --11 2013, excuse me, early 2014, that discuss MS. COTCA: And, Steve, just to make 12 Secretary Clinton's e-mail? 12 sure, in preparation for today's deposition. Right? 13 A No. 13 MR. PEZZI: I'm not sure I understand the Q Okay. 14 14 15 question. Or why you're asking me the question. 15 MS. COTCA: Can we go off the record? MS. COTCA: Well, outside of the context 16 VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are going off the 17 record at 14:54. 17 of discussions with attorneys is a pretty general 18 objection, I mean. There's -- it doesn't 18 (A recess was taken.) 19 necessarily mean it's attorney-client privilege. VIDEO SPECIALIST: We are back on the 19 20 If you're objecting to it with respect to this 20 record at 15:19. 21 case, then I understand. 21 BY MS. COTCA: MR. PEZZI: I'm asking him to limit his Q Mr. Scholl, just a few followup 186 188 1 answer to the context of anything but 1 questions. 2 conversations with government attorneys. In regards to the CREW request from 2012 3 A I have never seen this before. 3 that we've been talking about today, how did 4 S/ES-IRM inform your office that it located no 4 Q Okay. 5 Are you familiar with a FOIA request that 5 records? 6 was sent to the State Department in 2013 in 6 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 7 regards to WikiLeaks? A Well, it -- it appears that it would have 8 come back as a response to the transmittal that A No. 9 Q Okay. Does that ring a bell at all? 9 was sent. 10 A No. Q And you're assuming the transmittal that 11 was sent, the search tasker form? Q Okay. Are you familiar with a FOIA 12 request that the State Department received in 2013 12 A Yes. 13 from Gawker regarding communications between Q Okay. Do you know if in fact a search 14 Secretary Clinton's e-mails -- or Secretary 14 tasker was sent to S/ES-IRM? 15 Clinton and Sidney Blumenthal? A For this case? 15 16 A No, I don't recall. 16 Q For the CREW request. 17 Q Does that request sound -- or ring a bell 17 A I think is that the one - one of the 18 in any way? 18 ones you showed me? Q The two I showed you are for S/ES-CR and A Not really. 19 19 20 Q What do you mean by "not really"? 20 IRM. A No, it doesn't. 21 21 A Right. So you're asking about? 22 Okay. Do you recall reviewing any e-mail 22 Q A search tasker -- now, I'll represent to

191 1 you the case in which those documents were MR. PEZZI: Same objection. 1 2 produced related to the processing of those 2 A I don't know. I would think it's -- in 3 requests from CREW. 3 IRM, I don't know. I don't know who the person, A Okay. 4 the contact, was. Q And the only search task forms that were Q Do you know the official title or produced in that case are from S/ES-CR and IRM. 6 positions as to who may have been his point of So I'm asking if you in fact know whether 7 contact? a search tasker was actually sent to S/ES-IRM. A No, I don't. A I don't know. Q Okay. Is it reasonable to say that Q Who would know that? 10 10 Mr. Jaramillo may be a person who would have that 11 information? 11 A I don't know. 12 Q Is Mr. Jaramillo still in your division? 12 A It would be reasonable. A He is, yes, still works in my division. Q Okay. Did your division handle FOIA 13 13 14 requests that were also, once they were -- they Q What is his position? 14 A I believe he's a team leader. The 15 entered litigation, did they continue to be 15 16 organization is being - we're being reorganized 16 handled by your division? 17 so we're in a state of flux at this time. So he 17 A No. Q Okay. Can you walk me through the 18 was a team leader. 19 process of what happened to the FOIA requests once Q Is he still within the same branch? 20 A I'm not sure. 20 they entered litigation phase? Q Do you still have the same branches that 21 A I'm not sure of the specifics of how it 22 you had back in 2013 within your division? 22 was done. But basically the litigation staff 190 192 A Yes; but they don't report to me anymore. 1 takes over the processing of the requests. Q Does Mr. Jaramillo still report to you? Q Okay. And if you don't mind looking at A No. He reported to -- at one time to Exhibit 1. 4 Terry Gordon, and then to I believe Jeanie Miller, Can you identify the litigation staff who took over the branch from Mr. Gordon. that you just referred to who would start handling Q Okay. So does he still report to the FOIA requests in litigation? 7 Ms. Miller? A I believe it would be the litigation and A I don't know. 8 appeals branch. Q Okay. But he's still an employee at the Q Okay. And that's under, in the division 10 State Department? 10 for Karen Finnegan back in 2013. Right? A Yes. A I believe so, ves. 12 Q Okay. Would Mr. Jaramillo know whether 12 Q Okay. Did Ms. Finnegan's division handle 13 he sent a search tasker form as indicated in the 13 any FOIA requests that were not in litigation --14 comment sheet for the CREW request? 14 A I don't --15 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 15 Q -- or was that -- I'm sorry. Let me --16 go ahead and answer. A Would he know whether he sent a - a16 17 tasker? 17 A I don't know. Q Correct. As indicated in the comment O Okay. The process that I understood is,

22

19 the FOIA requests, once they went to the requestor

20 liaison's office -- liaison division, they would

21 be sent over to your division for processing?

A In most cases, yes.

19 sheet for the CREW request.

A I don't know.

Q Do you know who his point of contact was

20

21

22 at S/ES-IRM?

195

196

Transcript of Patrick Daniel Scholl Conducted on October 29, 2019

1 Q Okay. I believe you testified that you

- 2 started in the FOIA office at the State Department
- 3 back in 1988, or around that time?
- 4 A Around that time.
- 5 Q Okay. Have you -- and from 1988 to
- 6 today, have you received FOIA training while you
- 7 have been at the State Department?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Okay. When did you first start begin -10 start receiving FOIA training at the State
- 11 Department?
- 12 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Scope.
- 13 A The first day I started in the office.
- 14 Q Okay. And did you continue to receive 15 that training in -- as you moved into the various 16 positions that you were in within IPS?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 MR. PEZZI: Same objection.
- 19 Q And did the FOIA training include
- 20 information to make sure that you were aware of
- 21 legal obligations under FOIA to ensure that the
- 22 department complied with FOIA?
- 194
- A I don't remember specifically, but I'm 2 sure that was included at one point.
- 3 Q At one point, or --
- 4 A Or at many points.
- 5 Q Okay. How often have you received this
- 6 type of training, the FOIA training?
- 7 A What type of training, though? There's
- 8 administrative processing, there's there's on
- 9 exemptions. Would have been at least once or 10 twice a year.
- 11 Q And that's been since your entire career, 12 since 1988 to the present?
- 13 A For the most part, yes.
- 14 Q Okay. Are you aware that an S/ES-IRM
- 15 official testified in this case that S/ES-IRM was
- 16 made aware Secretary Clinton's Clintonemail.com
- 17 account as soon as she came to the State
- 18 Department or shortly after she came to the State
- 19 Department?
- 20 A Was I aware that someone I'm sure 21 I'm not sure I understand your question.
- 22 Q Are you aware of the testimony given in

- 1 this case by an S/ES-IRM official that the office,
- 2 the S/ES-IRM office, was made aware of Secretary
- 3 Clinton's e-mail account shortly after she started
- 4 at the State Department in 2009?
- 5 A No.
- 6 Q Does that surprise you?
- 7 A Does it surprise me or -- no.
- 8 Q Well, in light of --
- 9 A I have no opinion.
- 10 Q In light of the CREW request that we've
- 11 talked about quite at length today pertaining to
- 12 Secretary Clinton's e-mail accounts, does it
- 13 surprise you that S/ES-IRM was tasked with
- 14 searching for responsive records, and yet,
- 15 according to the Case Comments sheet, said that
- 16 they provided a no-records response?
- 17 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
- 18 A I don't understand what you mean by "a 19 surprise."
- 20 Q Well, does that raise any concerns for
- 21 you that they were -- that S/ES-IRM knew about
- 22 Secretary Clinton's e-mail account in 2009, and
- 1 yet in May of 2013 it informed your office the
 - 1 yet in May of 2013 it informed your office that it
 - 2 didn't have any records with respect to Secretary
 - 3 Clinton's e-mail account?
 - 4 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.
 - 5 Foundation.
 - 6 A I really I really have no opinion 7 either way.
 - 8 Q Well, didn't that response go from your 9 division?
 - 10 A When?
 - 11 Q In 2013, in May of 2013. We're speaking 12 specifically to the CREW request.
 - 13 A You're talking about the tasker that we 14 sent, and you're surprised that they came back 15 with no records? Am I surprised that they came 16 back with no records?
 - 17 Q That's not the question.
 - 18 The -- the question is, are you surprised
 - 19 they came back with no records, even though
 - 20 S/ES-IRM knew about Secretary Clinton's e-mail as
 - 21 early as 2009?
 - 22 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form.

199 1 Foundation. 1 your expectation and understanding that the State 2 Department must conduct, must -- is obligated 2 A I'm not surprised, no. 3 Q Why not? 3 under FOIA to respond accurately in responding to 4 MR. PEZZI: Same objections. 4 a requestor? A I just don't - it's not an issue that 5 A Yes. I'm surprised by one way or another. Q Did you discuss your deposition today with anybody else outside of your attorneys? Q Do you -- I'm sorry. Do you expect that the bureau's A No. 9 responding to the search taskers that were sent 9 Q Okay. Have you been in contact with 10 out from your division, that those responses are 10 Mr. Hackett since he left the State Department? 11 accurate and true? A I ran into him at Tysons Corner. 11 12 A Do I expect them to be accurate and true? 12 Q Did you discuss anything relating to --Yes. 13 A No. 13 Q Okay. Do you agree that is the Q -- Secretary Clinton's e-mails or --14 15 S/ES-IRM's response was not accurate and true in A Definitely not. 15 16 informing your office, your division, that there O -- anything about this case? 16 17 were no responsive records? 17 A We just talked about his new job. Q Okay. How about with Ms. Walter? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 18 19 Foundation. 19 A No. 20 A I -- you're asking me for my opinion? 20 Q Okay. Did you -- have you had any role Q No. I'm asking you as a matter of fact. 21 in the processing of Judicial Watch's FOIA request 21 22 There's testimony in this case that as early as 22 in this case? 198 200 1 2009 S/ES-IRM knew about Secretary Clinton's A Role as - as a division chief, over --2 e-mail account. According to the documents in with oversight over the -- or managing the three 3 this case that we've talked about, S/ES-IRM 3 branches. Q Okay. 4 informed your division that there were no records 4 5 relating to Secretary Clinton's e-mail account in A That's my role. 5 6 responding to the CREW request in 2013. Q Okay. Any direct involvement in Does it concern you that their response processing this FOIA request? 8 was inaccurate? A Not that I recall. 9 MR. PEZZI: Objection. Form. 9 Q Okay. 10 Foundation. And I would ask you to keep your 10 (Scholl Deposition Exhibit 15 marked for 11 questions to matters within the witness' 11 identification and is attached to the transcript.) 12 knowledge. This is not an opportunity for you to Q Mr. Scholl, you've been handed what's 13 be testifying. The witness is here to answer your 13 been marked as Exhibit 15. And I'll represent to 14 you these are responses the State Department has 14 questions. 15 15 produced to Judicial Watch in this -- in the MS. COTCA: Well, I disagree with your 16 characterization. 16 discovery of this case to plaintiff's supplemental 17 Q But, go ahead. 17 request for production of documents. A I guess we depend on the bureaus to do a 18 18 A What does that mean, I mean? 19 thorough search and provide us with their 19 Q Judicial Watch sent supplemental requests 20 for documents, and this is the State Department's 20 responses.

22

21 written response. Okay?

A In litigation?

Q Right. And as the division, and having

22 worked with FOIA for over 20-plus years, is it

203 Q In this, in the discovery in this MR. PEZZI: Okay. 1 2 litigation. 2 MS. COTCA: But this is a --3 A Right. 3 MR. PEZZI: Well, then why don't we let 4 Q Yes. Correct. him finish reading it, and you can ask whatever And do you agree with me that the date on questions you want. 6 this document appearing on Page 10 is September MS. COTCA: And I would appreciate you 12, 2019? letting me finish my statement on the record. 8 A That's what it appears. 8 MR. PEZZI: Absolutely. 9 Q Okay. Thank you. 9 MS. COTCA: And not interrupting me. 10 I just want to point you to one request, 10 BY MS. COTCA: 11 one particular request in which your name is O Okay. Have you had a chance to review 11 12 referenced. And that is on Page 8, Supplemental 12 it? 13 Request For Production 2. A Yes, I have. 13 Have you seen this document before? Q Thank you. So, again, I just want to 14 14 15 focus your attention on the request. 15 A No. Q Okay. Have -- I want to give you an 16 Have you seen this request before? 16 17 opportunity to read the request. Let me know once 17 A No. 18 you've had a chance. Q Okay. Have you conducted any searches of 19 any of your e-mails or records in response to this 19 A This portion here? 20 request? 20 Q Yes. MR. PEZZI: And the response continues 21 21 A No. 22 onto the top of Page 9. 22 Q Okay. That's all I have. 202 204 THE WITNESS: Okay. MR. PEZZI: That's all you have for this MS. COTCA: I'm just asking for the -document, or that's all you have, period? 3 I'm focusing on the request. 3 MS. COTCA: For this document. I just Q Okay. Have you had a chance to review need a minute. the request? 5 MR. PEZZI: Take your time. A Not yet. 6 BY MS. COTCA: 6 Q I'm only asking you to focus on the Q Oh, one more question. Supplemental Request for Production 2. Mr. Scholl, were you involved -- did you 9 MR. PEZZI: Well, he can --9 have any direct involvement in the State 10 Q Appearing on Page 8. 10 Department's search for records in response to any 11 of the requests pertaining to the Benghazi MR. PEZZI: And he can read the response 12 to the request, if he'd like to understand the 12 attacks? MR. PEZZI: Objection. Foundation. 13 context of the document you put in front of him, I 13 A Direct involvement? 14 14 mean --O Uh-huh. 15 MS. COTCA: I'm not asking about further 15 16 context. If you want to ask any questions about 16 A Inasmuch as my branches were involved 17 any other portion of the document, feel free to do 17 with the production and review. 18 so, Steve. But --Q Okay. Let me focus you on summer of 19 2014. In responding to congressional requests for MR. PEZZI: Are you -- are you objecting 20 to allowing the witness an opportunity to review 20 documents relating to the Benghazi attack in 2012, 21 the entirety of the response to production 2? 21 did you have any direct involvement? MS. COTCA: Not at all. 22 A Not that I recall. 22

Conducted on	October 27, 2017
205 1 Q Are you familiar with Jamie Bair? 2 A Familiar with? I've heard his name. 3 Q Okay. And who is he? 4 A He was an attorney from the Office of 5 Legal Advisor, from what I recall. 6 Q Okay. Did you have any discussions with 7 Mr. Bair about Secretary Clinton's e-mails? 8 A Not that I recall. 9 Q Were you ever informed or advised by 10 Mr. Bair or anyone else back in 2014 that the 11 State Department may receive public attention with 12 respect to Secretary Clinton's e-mails? 13 A Not that I recall. 14 MS. COTCA: That's all I have. 15 MR. PEZZI: Nothing from the government. 16 VIDEO SPECIALIST: If there are no 17 further questions then this ends the deposition, 18 and we are going off the record at 15:39. 19 (Off the record at 3:39 p.m.) 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC I, Debra Ann Whitehead, the officer before whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record of the testimony given; that said testimony was taken by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that reading and signing was requested; and that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor mo employed by any of the parties to this case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in its outcome. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day of October, My commission expires: September 14, 2023 My commission expires: September 14, 2023 NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
1 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT 2 I, PATRICK DANIEL SCHOLL, do hereby 3 acknowledge that I have read and examined the 4 foregoing testimony, and the same is a true, 5 correct and complete transcription of the 6 testimony given by me, and any corrections appear 7 on the attached Errata sheet signed by me. 8 9 10 (DATE) (SIGNATURE) 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	

A	actively	affixed	161:20, 162:2,
able	-\big 135:5, 135:18	207:13	162:15, 162:18,
	activities	africa	163:2, 164:1,
10:12, 153:13	140:2	55:13, 58:12	164:8, 165:19,
above	actual	after	166:8, 168:17,
110:11, 123:12	125:17	13:1, 18:9,	170:20, 178:8,
absolutely	actually	21:16, 23:16,	182:5, 197:14,
203:8	32:1, 64:9,	23:17, 63:16,	201:5
access	78:11, 107:8,	68:13, 70:20,	ahead
13:22, 26:20,	120:14, 120:20,	89:6, 126:16,	27:13, 46:4,
27:8, 85:22	167:20, 168:16,	143:15, 162:20,	83:1, 116:17,
accompany	173:12, 180:15,	174:13, 194:18,	116:18, 121:7,
176:5	189:8	195:3	131:2, 192:16,
according	adams	afternoon	198:17
122:16, 129:16,	27:15	94:8	all
130:22, 144:7,	addition	again	11:20, 14:17,
152:21, 157:18,	174:20	43:10, 46:7,	17:22, 18:6,
166:2, 179:7,	additional	56:2, 62:12,	22:21, 24:5,
195:15, 198:2	165:1, 174:19,	81:11, 107:4,	31:5, 31:10,
account	176:22, 177:17	113:7, 114:8,	37:12, 47:21,
84:15, 100:4,	address	117:17, 118:3,	47:22, 52:21,
194:17, 195:3,	118:16, 153:13	119:12, 122:5,	65:6, 65:8,
195:22, 196:3,	addressed	133:11, 137:16,	70:21, 72:4,
198:2, 198:5	92:18	138:3, 139:10,	72:14, 72:20,
accounts	addressees	142:6, 147:1,	73:2, 75:2,
37:9, 66:20,	138:21	149:9, 150:8,	78:21, 79:3,
67:7, 195:12	administrating	176:19, 180:16,	93:2, 97:13,
accurate	64:6	183:22, 203:14	97:19, 97:21,
106:10, 117:22,	administration	agencies	102:10, 104:12,
119:13, 147:18,	17:7	63:12	104:14, 105:4,
149:17, 152:3,	administrative	agendas	105:6, 106:13,
162:22, 163:1,	14:5, 26:19,	93:4, 94:12,	107:9, 112:3,
197:11, 197:12, 197:15	33:7, 39:20,	94:14	112:5, 112:10,
accurately	62:14, 62:17,	ago	117:11, 119:18,
199:3	62:18, 114:9,	20:2	126:18, 127:2,
acknowledge	194:8	agree	127:3, 131:11,
206:3	administratively	74:15, 74:22,	132:19, 134:16,
acknowledgment	16:14	119:3, 119:13,	145:3, 145:14,
206:1	advised	124:13, 128:1,	150:19, 162:16,
acronym	205:9	128:8, 130:16,	162:21, 164:16,
13:14, 36:19	advisor	133:20, 134:18,	168:1, 174:2,
·	133:2, 133:4,	137:15, 138:4,	174:4, 175:6,
acronyms 59:3	139:9, 205:5	138:17, 139:22,	182:9, 183:12,
act	affairs	141:21, 142:22,	184:11, 186:9,
55:19	12:17, 12:19,	146:18, 147:1,	202:22, 203:22,
actions	114:17	147:17, 156:11,	204:1, 204:2, 205:14
	affect	157:18, 161:2,	allocate
151:18	116:5	161:5, 161:6,	
			53:10

		20001 20, 2019	
allowed	113:17	142:21, 147:6,	11:8, 44:13,
18:19	anybody	147:19, 149:18,	52:2, 72:9,
allowing	35:6, 38:1,	150:3, 150:11,	74:3, 82:1,
202:20	38:7, 66:11,	151:5, 151:14,	85:1, 115:18,
along	85:17, 85:21,	153:6, 157:14,	116:2, 129:9,
52:20	89:18, 89:20,	157:21, 160:15,	145:6, 157:19,
already	98:22, 158:20,	160:17, 169:15,	164:12, 180:1,
30:12	184:10, 199:7	172:17, 172:19,	180:5, 180:9
also	anymore	178:8, 178:12,	asking
4:10, 11:11,	56:14, 80:1,	188:7, 201:8	10:18, 37:8,
23:22, 25:11,	80:2, 190:1	application	68:10, 70:4,
55:20, 59:2,	anyone	62:20	76:11, 76:12,
62:19, 76:18,	81:15, 85:17,	appreciate	85:11, 85:12,
99:14, 103:14,	205:10	203:6	90:11, 105:1,
114:10, 118:10,	anything	approaching	107:9, 107:10,
131:19, 134:5,	35:22, 68:5,	136:18	115:4, 117:4,
148:14, 179:6,	68:21, 90:9,	approve	124:5, 142:6,
191:14	91:9, 91:11,	54:9, 66:5,	145:13, 154:5,
ambassador	127:5, 133:17,	147:20, 148:3,	156:13, 167:6,
9:5	135:8, 186:1,	148:12	177:13, 179:18,
analyst	199:12, 199:16	approved	179:20, 182:1,
13:21, 14:20,	anywhere	2:13, 104:14	184:15, 185:15,
15:6, 15:8,	163:11	approving	185:22, 188:21,
15:17, 16:10,	apologize	148:7	189:7, 197:20,
16:13, 17:13,	174:5	april	197:21, 202:2,
40:22, 148:18,	appeals	133:13, 134:22,	202:7, 202:15
152:7, 174:17	192:8	135:7, 166:3	assign
analysts	appear	aramillo	115:19, 116:1
56:11, 70:12,	103:20, 103:22,	153:1	assigned
151:22	104:1, 110:22,	archive	58:15, 106:11,
ann	151:10, 157:10,	84:7, 84:9	110:12, 111:7,
20:10, 21:1,	166:12, 206:6	area	115:4, 115:6,
207:2	appearance	39:7	122:21, 147:4
anomaly	9:5	aren't	assist
56:15	appearing	74:8	29:3, 57:9
another	118:11, 138:10,	army	assistant
118:3, 197:6	147:8, 168:10,	63:10	44:16, 44:18,
answer	169:1, 169:14,	around	44:20, 79:2
10:13, 11:16,	173:10, 201:6,	12:20, 13:1,	assistants
11:17, 85:6,	202:10	41:18, 45:14,	118:16, 118:22
100:13, 107:17,	appears	176:19, 193:3,	associated
127:20, 178:21,	103:17, 106:12,	193:4	74:2
186:1, 192:16,	111:12, 113:6,	asia	assume
198:13	113:21, 122:1,	55:4, 58:12,	11:6, 110:18
answered	122:8, 124:15,	182:17	assuming
11:7	128:10, 128:19,	aside	188:10
answering	131:21, 133:22,	31:21, 120:12	attached
10:19, 11:14,	138:19, 139:2,	asked	5:6, 30:11,
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10:4, 11:7,	·
		1 - 0 - 1 / 1 1 - 1 / /	

Conducted on October 25, 2015			
99:11, 106:16,	avenue	11:21	130:3, 136:7,
112:13, 117:15,	2:5, 7:13	backlog	154:22, 163:9,
120:17, 137:4,	aware	22:14, 29:4,	164:11
146:15, 149:1,	9:15, 9:19,	74:13	become
167:17, 175:11,	47:18, 66:17,	bair	17:3, 73:12
176:4, 177:22,	86:13, 89:8,	205:1, 205:7,	becoming
181:1, 184:19,	89:21, 90:20,	205:10	73:9
200:11, 206:7	102:9, 102:13,	based	been
attachment	125:14, 145:1,	38:15, 53:10,	8:10, 10:5,
5:12 , 172:3	155:18, 156:17,	136:13, 139:22,	25:11, 28:13,
attack	166:15, 187:7,	140:21, 183:15	30:8, 30:13,
204:20	193:20, 194:14,	basically	33:11, 34:5,
attacks	194:16, 194:20,	15:13, 16:9,	38:20, 42:14,
9:6, 204:12	194:22, 195:2	19:6, 23:22,	43:13, 43:18,
attend	away	28:3, 191:22	45:5, 51:18,
44:5, 48:13,	96:9, 112:11,	basis	67:22, 68:13,
91:13, 93:21	115:20, 116:1	103:16, 104:5,	71:20, 80:19,
attendance	В	153:8, 156:10	86:13, 88:9,
42:5, 57:8	back	bates	90:13, 92:12,
attended	9:2, 9:6, 12:7,	5:15	92:16, 92:17,
92:6, 93:12	13:11, 13:12,	bates-stamped	92:19, 94:7,
attending	13:11, 13:12, 13:13, 14:15,	106:22, 181:6	95:18, 99:12,
44:12	16:12, 24:10,	bear	99:13, 100:3,
attention	25:19, 26:3,	61:10, 180:12	110:17, 112:17,
36:16, 74:17,	29:11, 32:16,	bearing	115:3, 117:18,
79:5, 182:22,	37:22, 38:8,	117:19, 137:10,	120:18, 120:19,
203:15, 205:11	38:12, 40:9,	178:3	120:20, 125:22,
attorney	41:6, 41:13,	became	129:5, 129:11,
11:11, 113:14,	44:22, 75:9,	16:2, 16:20,	129:18, 130:20,
133:3, 139:8,	75:20, 77:12,	18:12, 23:17,	131:3, 131:6,
205:4	83:19, 84:2,	26:11, 44:16,	136:15, 137:7,
attorney-client	84:8, 84:14,	53:8, 77:12,	137:8, 146:18,
107:14, 185:19	89:1, 90:19,	77:13, 78:15,	147:14, 149:2,
attorneys	91:17, 96:3,	78:19	149:3, 159:10,
9:17, 107:10,	108:20, 109:17,	because	159:19, 159:22,
169:9, 181:17,	110:9, 122:13,	11:1, 11:5,	160:15, 162:17,
184:16, 185:10,	134:6, 137:1,	17:16, 18:1,	162:21, 166:15,
185:17, 186:2,	139:10, 144:15,	33:4, 47:17,	167:3, 175:22,
199:7	153:4, 159:11,	52:7, 58:2,	178:1, 178:11,
audrey	167:11, 177:7,	58:4, 59:11,	179:6, 180:1,
30:5	182:22, 183:3,	64:20, 71:5,	180:5, 180:6,
august	187:10, 187:19,	73:18, 74:1,	181:2, 181:3,
182:9, 182:22,	188:8, 189:22,	74:17, 76:7,	184:20, 184:21,
183:4	192:10, 193:3,	78:19, 106:1,	188:3, 191:6,
authorized	196:14, 196:16,	109:5, 116:2,	193:7, 194:9,
19:3	196:19, 205:10	116:15, 120:2,	194:11, 199:9,
automatic	background	124:3, 125:8,	200:12, 200:13
23:7	8:22, 9:21,	128:19, 128:20,	before
			2:12, 9:13,

	Conducted on Oc	2019	50
10:5, 10:6,	24:9, 24:19,	143:1, 148:17	21:15, 21:17,
11:14, 16:10,	24:22, 25:1,	benghazi	21:21, 22:5,
64:21, 70:2,	25:9, 27:11,	9:6, 204:11,	23:3, 24:13,
89:4, 102:19,	27:14, 29:16,	204:20	24:17, 25:14,
107:3, 107:8,	31:4, 31:7,	benham	25:18, 26:4,
107:11, 107:19,	34:19, 37:8,	178:9, 178:18,	27:6, 27:9,
113:9, 113:17,	38:15, 42:20,	178:20	41:1, 46:14,
114:3, 118:5,	44:13, 44:17,	bentel	46:22, 53:13,
118:7, 121:11,	45:13, 47:7,	61:6, 61:8	53:19, 53:21,
131:4, 137:21,	47:17, 48:4,	between	53:22, 54:5,
141:12, 149:10,	48:9, 51:11,	18:18, 21:13,	54:10, 55:2,
158:3, 160:19,	52:10, 53:8,	93:15, 137:16,	55:3, 56:10,
162:9, 163:5,	59:7, 59:11,	186:13	56:11, 58:8,
163:16, 165:2,	60:8, 60:10,	big	58:9, 59:13,
167:20, 179:21,	60:20, 62:1,	13:8	65:4, 65:21,
179:22, 180:15,	62:4, 64:16,	bit	70:6, 70:7,
181:15, 185:8,	65:14, 65:19,	91:17, 171:2	70:12, 85:21,
186:3, 201:14,	67:21, 68:18,	black	91:22, 92:7,
203:16, 207:2	78:2, 78:13,	34:17	93:14, 106:2,
began	93:10, 93:18,	blackberry	114:3, 114:6,
24:11, 24:16,	93:22, 96:7,	34:18, 35:18,	122:21, 123:1,
32:10, 78:16	102:18, 103:11,		123:3, 123:4,
begin	107:22, 108:12,	36:11, 72:11,	123:5, 123:9,
12:2, 31:18,	108:17, 111:7,	72:12, 74:2 block	127:19, 141:3,
77:10, 193:9	113:1, 114:2,		144:11, 151:22,
beginning	116:12, 117:1,	107:22	152:1, 152:7,
148:15	117:4, 118:17,	blumenthal	182:13, 182:15,
begins	119:7, 119:11,	186:15	182:16, 189:19,
7:2	123:10, 123:14,	both	190:5, 192:8
behalf	133:5, 139:8,	16:15	branches
3:2, 3:11, 4:2	140:22, 143:4,	bottom	27:7, 53:9,
behind	148:19, 153:3,	32:21, 106:22,	54:22, 55:5,
71:13	153:18, 154:3,	107:20, 118:11,	57:4, 57:18,
being	154:6, 154:7,	118:19, 120:21,	57:19, 58:21,
	159:10, 161:13,	121:14, 133:9,	65:6, 65:8,
10:16, 11:7,	162:19, 168:3,	137:13, 146:20,	189:21, 200:3,
16:19, 18:1, 18:9, 52:7,	171:13, 172:13,	147:8, 148:14,	204:16
64:14, 83:13,	179:5, 189:15,	148:15, 181:21	break
83:18, 94:17,	190:4, 192:7,	box	71:22, 72:2,
95:7, 125:14,	192:11, 193:1	32:2, 32:4,	88:16, 136:18
126:7, 123:14,	believes	32:5, 97:6	briefly
	116:15	branch	19:5
146:8, 147:15, 151:18, 161:21,	bell	3:14, 16:20,	brock
162:8, 163:13,	42:16, 54:18,	18:12, 18:13,	50:4, 50:5,
164:17, 168:19,	132:19, 132:20,	18:15, 18:18,	50:7
171:4, 180:9,	158:12, 179:2,	18:20, 19:4,	brought
189:16	186:9, 186:17	19:8, 19:11,	92:19, 146:8
believe	below	19:19, 20:13,	bryan
19:1, 20:1,	138:13, 138:22,	20:19, 21:3,	178:22
19.1, 20.1,]		1,0.22

humanu	I	chain	141.2 151.22
bureau	case	chain	141:3, 151:22,
12:17, 12:19,	1:6, 7:7, 10:2,	30:7, 118:3,	152:1, 182:13
13:17, 59:9,	33:16, 51:6,	121:15, 126:17,	circle
101:17, 114:17,	54:6, 54:12,	137:9, 137:16,	32:6
174:18	99:13, 110:12,	138:4, 167:8,	circumstance
bureau's	112:8, 115:3,	178:3	105:11, 141:17,
197:8	115:19, 116:1,	chains	144:14
bureaus	119:5, 119:14,	134:19	citizens
43:1, 43:4,	121:2, 124:1,	chance	36:19
47:18, 48:1,	142:13, 142:21,	45:22, 99:20,	clarence
51:14, 59:2,	143:17, 147:3,	106:17, 178:6,	60:12, 102:19,
59:16, 114:15,	148:16, 148:18,	181:9, 185:2,	172:14, 174:7
114:16, 125:22,	150:3, 150:4,	185:4, 201:18,	clarification
174:19, 198:18	150:5, 150:7,	202:4, 203:11	11:4, 54:13,
burke	150:13, 167:22,	change	91:17
3:4, 7:18	170:21, 175:21,	15:19, 16:5,	classification
business	179:7, 181:7,	16:19, 70:21,	13:16
82:21, 83:2,	184:8, 185:1,	71:4	clean
83:15, 83:16,	185:21, 188:15,	changed	10:17
84:1	189:1, 189:6,	15:1, 15:4,	clear
bypass	194:15, 195:1,	17:11, 17:22,	16:7, 138:14
57:22	195:15, 197:22,	51:10, 51:15	clearance
<u>C</u>	198:3, 199:16,	characterization	147:15
	199:22, 200:16,	136:14, 140:7,	clearly
call	207:10	140:9, 164:20,	34:13
18:19, 24:1,	cases	198:16	clinton
63:12, 109:17	52:13, 53:3,	characterize	24:11, 24:16,
called	53:6, 74:14,	164:6	32:10, 37:10,
13:13, 15:5,	104:11, 112:6,	chart	50:2, 70:21,
16:21, 18:20,	119:20, 120:9,	30:15, 30:18,	72:10, 87:5,
20:21, 25:21,	123:15, 123:18,	31:8	87:9, 88:11,
44:22, 49:8,	150:21, 192:22	charts	114:19, 120:8,
109:9, 109:11,	casto	144:7	
116:4	30:5	checking	129:2, 186:15
calling	cause	135:5	clinton's
49:3	127:5		29:13, 33:16,
came	cc	cheryl	33:21, 49:12,
9:16, 38:8,	119:1	49:14, 49:21	50:16, 51:1,
38:21, 39:6,	center	chief's	51:2, 51:18,
59:3, 194:17,	24:1	144:11	58:14, 66:19,
194:18, 196:14,	central	chiefs	67:6, 67:16,
196:15, 196:19	51:13, 71:12,	19:19, 27:7,	67:20, 68:14,
can't	71:15, 126:1	27:9, 41:1,	69:19, 70:13,
13:13, 43:3,	certain	46:14, 53:13,	70:15, 72:15,
68:12, 136:13,	98:8, 114:15	56:10, 65:21,	72:21, 73:3,
162:18, 163:22,	certificate	70:7, 70:12,	73:8, 74:4,
164:1, 165:9	207:1	85:21, 91:22,	75:8, 79:4,
career	certify	92:7, 93:14,	80:3, 80:16,
194:11	207:4	93:19, 114:3,	81:15, 85:5,
	207:4		

	I	<u> </u>	
86:18, 87:16,	152:14, 153:19,	78:9, 78:10,	107:5, 107:17,
87:21, 89:6,	157:1, 160:9,	78:16	126:14, 169:8,
89:10, 90:1,	179:7, 190:14,	complied	181:16, 185:9,
90:5, 90:21,	190:18	193:22	185:16, 186:1,
91:6, 98:19,	comments	concern	202:13, 202:16
99:1, 100:4,	150:3, 150:5,	73:17, 128:20,	continue
102:12, 119:19,	150:8, 150:14,	198:7	191:15, 193:14
124:9, 124:14,	150:16, 167:22,	concerned	continues
133:12, 139:13,	179:8, 195:15	53:15, 129:1	201:21
143:20, 180:18,	commission	concerning	continuing
182:2, 182:10,	207:16	59:7, 61:1	181:21
183:13, 184:12,	communicating	concerns	contradicts
186:14, 187:4,	98:22	66:20, 89:8,	164:2, 164:8,
187:12, 194:16,	communication	89:17, 89:19,	164:10
195:3, 195:12,	89:13	90:6, 90:12,	conversations
195:22, 196:3,	communications	90:16, 195:20	184:16, 185:10,
196:20, 198:1,	49:3, 81:18,	conduct	186:2
198:5, 199:14,	85:2, 85:8,	170:17, 199:2	coordinate
205:7, 205:12	85:11, 89:15,	conducted	128:4, 128:15,
clintonemail	125:2, 127:7,	103:7, 177:1,	129:10, 129:13
194:16	127:12, 186:13,	203:18	copies
collect	187:1	confirm	100:1, 100:6,
47:19	compilation	115:15	182:1, 182:9,
collected	168:8	confused	183:12
89:7, 90:5	complete	169:5	сору
collection	41:9, 63:17,	congressional	131:19, 170:16,
87:15, 90:9	206:5	204:19	172:1, 173:14,
columbia	completed	connecticut	176:6
1:2, 2:14, 7:7,	64:12, 64:14,	2:5, 7:13	corner
207:21	64:18, 64:19,	connection	149:14, 175:16,
com	162:17, 162:21,	85:5, 187:1	178:4, 199:11
194:16	163:6, 164:17,	constantly	correct
combined	174:14, 178:14	18:2	18:7, 24:4,
99:16	completion	consular	50:2, 54:2,
come	68 : 20	12:17, 12:19,	57:16, 64:22,
10:1, 10:4,	complex	114:17	65:2, 65:10,
39:10, 41:6,	51:6, 51:11,	contact	71:16, 86:7,
43:7, 59:8,	51:19, 52:6,	61:1, 61:3,	90:22, 92:22,
73:18, 73:21,	52:13, 53:3,	159:21, 190:21,	105:15, 144:19,
104:13, 134:5,	53:6, 53:11,	191:4, 191:7,	144:21, 153:22,
168:1, 188:8	54:6, 119:4,	199:9	155:11, 157:13,
comes	119:20, 120:9,	contacting	165:21, 170:5,
39:13, 170:9 coming	142:2	98:22, 125:22	172:4, 176:2,
	compliance	contemporaneous	176:8, 179:5,
32:13, 38:4,	26:16, 28:2,	151:17	179:8, 190:18,
47:19, 72:1	30:21, 38:16,	contents	201:4, 206:5, 207:5
comment	55:1, 55:6,	103:2	corrections
151:4, 151:5,	77:15, 77:19,	context	206:6
		60:21, 100:20,	200:0
	1	1	

correctly	create		92:13, 125:15,
54:16, 54:19	47:1	d-a-n-i-e-l	134:15
correspondence	created	8:17	deals
102:17, 171:11	47:16, 47:17,	daily	23:7, 33:16,
cotca	167 : 22	134:15	74:18
3:3, 5:3, 7:16,	creating	daniel	dealt
8:12, 46:5,	65 : 7	1:11, 2:1, 5:2,	58:10, 58:11,
72:2, 72:7,	crew	7:4, 8:9, 8:16,	114:10
72:8, 88:18,	36:19, 37:2,	206:2	debbie
89:3, 99:7,	37:6, 37:22,	das	8:5
106:21, 107:7,	38:6, 38:8,	44:17, 78:20	debra
107:13, 112:15,	41:21, 48:20,	database	1:22, 2:12,
113:19, 116:21,	49:5, 66:18,	150:20, 159:13	207:2
117:17, 136:19,	67:5, 100:2,	date	decades
146:12, 149:13,	100:5, 103:13,	7:8, 17:5,	74:9, 88:8
161:11, 161:13,	103:15, 108:5,	68:10, 90:9,	december
161:15, 161:17,	109:12, 110:16,	110:15, 119:1,	36:18, 37:3,
168:7, 173:20,	111:8, 111:10,	151:7, 151:8,	37:8, 87:16,
174:1, 175:14,	113:8, 115:11,	151:10, 152:19,	87:22, 89:7,
185:11, 185:16,	118:4, 122:7,	157:11, 178:13,	90:5, 100:2,
187:15, 187:21,	122:13, 123:8,	178:17, 201:5,	108:4, 110:14,
198:15, 202:2,	124:11, 126:19,	206:10	113:7, 116:22,
202:15, 202:22,	126:20, 133:12,	dated	118:10, 119:2,
203:2, 203:6,	137:18, 139:11,	100:5, 106:9,	134:6, 134:20,
203:9, 203:10,	141:6, 143:6,	108:4, 110:14,	139:12, 145:2
204:3, 204:6,	143:17, 143:19,	113:7, 118:10,	decentralized
205:14	146:4, 146:5,	130:4, 130:10,	114:11, 114:14
could	147:2, 147:4,	131:15, 133:13,	decision
8:14, 11:21,	147:21, 150:8,	139:12, 147:9,	63:11, 131:6
34:5, 42:14,	153:4, 158:21,	173:8	decisions
43:13, 66:2,	159:2, 160:19,	dates	106:1
72:17, 87:7,	161:3, 161:22,	33:12	declass
94:7, 140:18,	162:10, 163:5,	davis	23:8
152:9, 163:10	170:20, 175:22,	132:17, 132:21	declassification
couldn't	178:10, 178:11,	day	23:7, 23:8,
75:17, 79:11,	180:2, 180:3,	182:6, 193:13,	28:7
130:1	180:6, 180:17,	207:13	deemed
counsel	188:2, 188:16,	day-to-day	51:19, 52:6,
7:14, 8:11,	189:3, 190:14,	14:1, 57:9,	98:1
32:3, 207:9	190:19, 195:10,	77:4	defendant
course	196:12, 198:6	dc	1:8, 3:11, 4:2
130:20	curious	1:12, 2:4, 2:7,	defendant's
court	22:5	3:8, 3:16, 4:6,	6:19
1:1, 2:14, 7:6,	currently	7:13, 12:10	definitely
8:4, 10:15,	123:5	deal	199:15
63:11, 99:7	cut	23:21, 39:20	definition
cracks	122:2	dealing	51:10
116:11	CV	55:19, 58:10,	definition's
	1:7, 7:7	1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	51:15

		<u> </u>	
degree	44:4, 44:16,	204:9, 204:14,	discussions
88:11, 141:5,	44:18, 44:20,	204:21	35:9, 38:7,
145:1, 145:15,	60:16, 78:13,	direction	49:2, 66:17,
145:18	79:2	207:8	73:1, 79:20,
delete	describe	directive	81:10, 86:10,
82:15, 83:5,	19:17, 135:3,	80:12, 80:21,	86:17, 110:6,
83:11, 84:12	135:12	81:2, 81:5,	127:7, 146:1,
department's	detail	81:6, 81:11,	152:6, 158:18,
66:22, 67:5,	12:7, 29:2,	81:12, 81:18,	184:10, 185:17,
67:15, 67:19,	140:3	81:21, 82:2,	205:6
87:4, 87:9,	detailed	85:3, 85:15,	disk
87:15, 100:5,	21:18, 22:2,	86:5	7:2
111:9, 112:18,	22:13, 29:1,	directly	distribute
112:22, 124:12,	29:3	29:9, 57:19,	53:14
146:4, 147:3,	details	70:14, 130:3	district
181:5, 200:20,	40:13, 109:17	director	1:1, 1:2, 2:13,
204:10	determination	25:12, 28:14,	2:14, 7:6,
depend	52:11	29:4, 29:5,	207:21
198:18	determine	31:6, 47:8,	divisions
depending	14:11, 40:5,	47:9, 60:16,	93:16, 94:4,
58:3	53:9, 53:13	78:19, 93:16,	94:5
depends	determined	108:11, 109:6,	docs
174:17, 174:18	19:3, 39:21,	128:12, 174:7	160:11
deponent	43:5, 54:5,	disagree	document
206:1	54:10, 54:11	156:8, 156:11,	5:13, 5:18,
depos	determines	198:15	5:20, 5:22, 6:4,
2:4, 7:11,	104:18	disagreed	6:6, 6:10, 6:13,
7:12, 8:6	determining	69 : 1	6:15, 6:17,
deposed	45:18, 46:11	discovery	106:12, 106:22,
10:6	device	33:15, 121:2,	107:3, 107:8,
deposition	34:14, 34:18,	181:7, 184:22,	107:11, 112:18,
1:11, 2:1, 5:7,	72:12	200:16, 201:1	112:19, 112:22,
6:2, 7:3, 7:11,	difference	discuss	113:9, 113:20,
9:18, 10:9,	18:18, 53:5	9:6, 35:6,	117:19, 118:5,
30:10, 99:10,	different	42:2, 42:6,	118:12, 120:21,
99:16, 100:9,		94:3, 98:18,	120:22, 121:10,
106:15, 112:12,	9:12, 15:1, 15:4, 18:11,	187:11, 199:6,	122:16, 124:8,
117:14, 120:16,	21:18, 22:2,	199:12	126:17, 129:17,
137:3, 146:14,	83:9, 111:5,	discussed	130:5, 137:10,
148:22, 167:16,	122:21, 144:4,	37:20, 43:18,	137:21, 146:19,
175:10, 177:21,	150:15	67:4, 68:22,	149:4, 149:10,
180:22, 184:18,	differently	86:14, 106:5,	149:14, 149:15,
185:12, 199:6,	52:13	151:22, 183:3,	149:16, 149:22,
200:10, 205:17,	dineen	183:6, 187:5	152:22, 155:2,
207:3	4:11, 7:10	discussing	157:19, 157:21,
depositions	diplomacy	100:3	168:10, 168:15,
10:2	55:15, 114:7	discussion	168:20, 168:22,
deputy	direct	99:9, 117:13	169:5, 169:14,
25:11, 28:13,	25:8, 200:6,	·	
,	[23.0, 200.0,		

		<u> </u>	
171:15, 173:9,	147:15, 160:19,	82:1, 82:15,	either
174:2, 174:21,	161:3, 161:21,	83:11, 83:12,	36:6, 75:11,
175:15, 175:18,	162:8, 162:20,	83:15, 83:22,	78:11, 79:1,
176:14, 178:3,	164:16	85:5, 86:18,	105:22, 137:12,
181:5, 181:15,	drafting	87:16, 87:21,	142:3, 142:5,
184:22, 185:8,	141:18, 141:22,	89:6, 89:10,	145:22, 154:4,
201:6, 201:14,	144:11, 163:4,	90:2, 90:5,	156:11, 162:18,
202:13, 202:17,	164:21	90:7, 90:14,	171:22, 196:7
204:2, 204:3	duly	91:6, 98:19,	electronic
documentation	8:10	99:2, 109:3,	26:2, 26:4,
176:22, 177:17	during	125:6, 135:4,	85:14, 159:11,
documented	29:12, 41:15,	138:5, 139:13,	159:13
94:21, 95:5	43:18, 44:2,	141:9, 143:16,	elizabeth
documents	44:14, 44:17,	143:21, 145:14,	4:3, 8:2
6:22, 40:13,	49:11, 50:22,	180:18, 182:2,	else
40:14, 47:20,	67:19, 69:20,	182:10, 183:13,	40:16, 66:11,
100:8, 100:12,	70:13, 73:5,	184:13, 186:14,	81:15, 85:18,
100:18, 111:6,	75:4, 78:5,	187:10, 199:14,	85:22, 89:18,
127:2, 131:9,	79:15, 81:3,	203:19, 205:7,	89:20, 199:7,
134:18, 168:9,	92:18, 93:6,	205:12	205:10
169:6, 170:16,	93:9, 94:16,	each	employed
180:17, 189:1,	94:19, 95:2,	10:20, 58:21,	14:18, 207:10
198:2, 200:17,	95:11, 98:17,	103:4, 137:13,	employee
200:20, 204:20	102:12, 106:5,	171:3	54:22, 190:9
doing	110:9, 111:15,	ean	employees
10:22, 16:9,	125:10, 129:1,	55:12, 58:9,	74:19, 103:1,
77:6, 126:1	129:2, 146:3,	59:13, 123:1,	103:4
done	175:3, 177:16	123:5, 123:9	employment
16:10, 40:22,	duties	earlier	11:22
59:20, 70:5,	13:19, 14:9,	41:3, 72:10,	end
70:6, 149:5,	15:12, 16:5,	101:8, 116:12,	49:13, 64:11
154:16, 156:9,	19:7, 27:4,	125:8, 140:11,	ends
191:22	59:15, 62:8,	140:21, 153:6,	205:17
dos	62:10, 77:4	162:19, 170:2,	enough
107:1, 120:21,	E	179:8	62:6
121:3	e-mailed	early	ensure
dos_	134:21, 145:3	21:8, 41:17,	193:21
5:16	e-mails	176:20, 187:3,	entail
doubt	50:16, 51:2,	187:11, 196:21,	14:2
162:4	51:18, 58:14,	197:22	entered
down	66:20, 72:15,	east	151:11, 152:22,
108:5, 138:22	72:21, 73:3,	55:3, 55:4,	160:14, 160:15,
draft	74:4, 75:4,	58:12, 182:16	160:16, 191:15,
142:18, 142:20,	75:8, 79:4,	edgar	191:20
162:16, 163:10,	79:15, 80:4,	54:14, 58:7,	entire
163:11	80:16, 81:15,	121:16, 138:12,	123:9, 194:11
drafted	81:17, 81:21,	147:8	entirety
64:1, 64:13,	<u> </u>	effect	202:21
		116:14, 117:8	

entries	even	5:15, 5:17,	expect
151:17	69:14, 105:20,	5:19, 5:21, 6:2,	197:8, 197:12
		6:3, 6:5, 6:7,	
entry	196:19	6:9, 6:12, 6:14,	expectation
151:15	eventually	6:16, 6:18,	199:1
eric	18:22, 62:5	6:19, 30:10,	expedite
29:6, 29:7,	ever	30:13, 32:17,	103:19, 105:20
29:14	10:5, 50:14,		expedited
errata	61:3, 64:13,	45:3, 61:15,	103:16, 104:4,
206:7	67:4, 75:1,	99:10, 99:13, 99:14, 99:15,	104:6, 104:11,
es-cr	81:17, 81:20,	101:9, 106:15,	104:14, 104:15,
6:9, 60:7,	91:13, 95:11,	107:1, 107:21,	104:19, 105:2,
60:16, 171:9,	98:18, 98:21,	111:9, 112:12,	105:5, 105:12,
171:17, 174:6,	105:19, 107:2,	112:16, 112:17,	105:21, 152:16,
174:9, 177:17,	107:8, 111:17,	115:12, 116:20,	153:7, 153:10,
179:16, 179:17,	145:16, 179:21,		153:16, 153:20,
188:19, 189:6	180:1, 180:5,	116:21, 117:1, 117:14, 117:18,	154:10, 154:20,
es-irm	180:8, 180:9,	118:20, 119:15,	156:1, 156:3,
60:4, 157:5,	184:15, 205:9	120:16, 120:19,	156:4, 156:10,
157:16, 157:20,	everything	121:15, 122:8,	156:19
158:2, 158:10,	10:16, 119:13	128:1, 129:21,	expedition
158:15, 158:21,	exactly	137:3, 137:8,	104:8
159:1, 159:5,	15:1, 21:4,	138:10, 146:14,	expeditious
159:21, 160:10,	22:21, 23:12,	146:18, 147:5,	104:9, 105:14,
160:19, 162:10,	42:8, 47:8,	148:22, 149:3,	153:15
163:5, 165:5,	70:18, 77:20,	160:10, 161:9,	experience
165:20, 166:9,	82:9, 102:3,	161:10, 161:13,	176:18
166:16, 166:19,	124:2, 164:21,	161:16, 166:3,	expires
167:4, 167:8,	171:19	166:6, 167:16,	207:16
170:4, 179:7,	examination	167:21, 168:7,	explain
179:11, 179:19,	5:2, 8:11	168:13, 168:16,	9:21, 42:18,
188:4, 188:14,	examined	169:4, 169:7,	63:8, 66:2,
189:8, 190:22,	206:3	169:14, 173:10,	69:21, 72:17,
194:14, 194:15,	examiner	173:13, 175:9,	104:4, 150:4,
195:1, 195:2,	12:9, 12:13	175:10, 177:21,	150:13, 169:16,
195:13, 195:21,	exception	178:2, 180:16,	169:20
196:20, 198:1, 198:3	69:4	180:22, 181:3,	explanation
es-irm's	exclamation	181:4, 181:20,	151:3
	115:6	184:18, 184:21,	F
197:15	excuse	192:3, 200:10,	f-
esquire	21:20, 61:7,	200:13	106:11, 110:12,
3:3, 3:4, 3:12, 4:3	187:11	exhibits	147:3, 170:21
	executive	99:4, 99:15,	fact
establishing	28:4, 102:4,	143:17	116:3, 117:6,
33:3	102:16	exist	145:13, 183:15,
ethics 36:20	exemptions	84:17	188:13, 189:7,
evaluations	62:21, 194:9	existed	197:21
	exhibit	28:15	fair
57:8	5:7, 5:8, 5:10,		11:9, 62:6,

	Conducted on Oc	,	
129:17, 171:21	96:11, 96:19,	160:9, 161:9,	formed
fall	96:20, 96:22,	166:2, 166:5,	28:14
116:10	97:1, 97:4,	168:9, 168:10,	former
familiar	97:9, 97:14,	169:13, 193:9,	88:10
8:19, 9:1,	102:22, 126:1	193:13	forms
36:21, 37:1,	financial	five	189:5
37:12, 37:15,	207:11	12:20, 12:22	forwarded
48:5, 51:7,	find	flux	147:15, 182:6
60:3, 60:6,	71:12, 92:12	189:17	found
60:12, 61:6,	fine	focus	160:11, 165:6
63:5, 101:21,	72:5, 120:3,	29:12, 32:9,	foundation
103:1, 139:3,	120:12, 173:4	33:14, 36:16,	35:21, 43:20,
139:5, 150:5,	finish	38:11, 75:20,	44:7, 48:16,
169:18, 172:10,	10:18, 10:19,	202:7, 203:15,	48:22, 49:19,
186:5, 186:11,	11:14, 46:1,	204:18	51:21, 58:20,
187:7, 205:1,	113:16, 203:4,	focused	64:3, 64:15,
205:2	203:7	69:7	67:2, 71:9,
far	finished	focusing	80:6, 84:18,
12:7, 17:19,	137:5	41:18, 52:17,	84:21, 85:19,
53:15, 62:7,	finnegan	81:11, 92:21,	88:13, 103:8,
62:14, 62:16,	61:11, 61:12,	92:22, 202:3	104:16, 144:6,
62:18, 134:3,	62:22, 67:12,	foias	151:19, 153:12,
135:6	132:6, 132:9,	38:12, 114:10	160:3, 160:22,
fashion	132:11, 132:14,	follow	162:13, 163:8,
151:17	144:2, 144:10,	132:1, 132:13,	167:13, 188:6,
favor	144:15, 147:16,	134:15, 135:18,	196:5, 197:1,
32:2	148:6, 148:12,	183:20, 184:2,	197:19, 198:10,
fbi	158:19, 192:10	184:7	204:13
91:3	finnegan's	followed	four
fbi's	192:12	95:5, 183:18,	168:8
90:20	finney	184:1	four-page
february	60:13, 60:15,	following	106:22
173:8	60:19, 60:22,	48:19, 49:14,	fourth
federal	70:19, 71:10,	94:20, 95:2,	168:19, 174:22
3:14	71:14, 71:16,	111:22, 134:2,	fpc
feel	102:19, 102:20,	134:9, 134:20,	13:14
170:15, 202:17	172:14, 173:13,	135:2, 135:12,	frame
few	173:22, 174:5,	135:19	17:6, 29:12,
10:8, 14:22,	174:7, 175:1	follows	34:11, 52:16,
89:5, 187:22	finney's	8:10	52:17, 56:2,
fifth	61:3, 175:3	followup	68:11, 69:6,
169:1	first	187:22	73:5, 110:9,
file	9:19, 33:20,	foregoing	111:15, 146:3,
51:13, 83:14,	101:15, 113:21,	206:4, 207:3,	175:4, 176:19,
96:8	118:11, 118:20,	207:4	177:16, 187:3
files	134:21, 138:8,	formal	free
71:12, 71:15,	149:15, 152:14,	95:9	202:17
71:18, 96:9,	157:2, 157:3,	formation	front
		144:9, 164:21	127:4, 202:13

		1	
functional	207:5	government	35:10, 35:16,
59:2	global	100:15, 100:21,	42:1, 44:4,
further	45:1	107:6, 107:18,	45:9, 67:7,
80:14, 127:5,	go	169:9, 181:17,	76:16, 79:18,
202:15, 205:17	10:8, 12:6,	185:10, 186:2,	79:21, 80:12,
G G	27:13, 43:6,	205:15	80:22, 81:3,
	45:17, 46:4,	grafeld	81:8, 81:12,
gawker	46:10, 70:14,	25:7, 25:12,	85:3, 86:11,
186:13	70:19, 83:1,	25:13, 26:8,	86:18, 93:20,
gene	91:16, 116:17,	26:12, 28:11,	99:14, 127:15,
138:13, 138:20,	116:18, 121:7,	31:13, 44:9,	158:19, 182:1,
138:21, 139:1,	130:19, 131:2,	72:19, 75:1,	199:10
147:9	136:19, 165:1,	76:2, 76:19,	hackett's
general	165:2, 170:15,	77:1, 77:11,	82:2, 85:15,
67:15, 68:5,	187:15, 192:16,	77:18, 78:5,	86:5, 99:15
69:5, 69:14,	196:8, 198:17	78:19, 78:22,	hand
127:13, 184:6,	goes	86:12, 158:20,	175:8, 207:12
185:17	39:13, 107:13	181:22, 182:8	handed
general's	going	grafeld's	99:12, 120:18,
68:20	9:18, 32:16,	44:14, 79:15	137:7, 149:2,
generally	51:13, 51:14,	grant	181:2, 184:20,
40:3, 40:10,	66:12, 71:20,	105:4, 105:13	200:12
40:22, 43:7,	72:3, 84:14,	granted	handle
51:12, 66:10,	88:20, 92:12,	104:20, 105:10	55:17, 191:13,
66:16, 69:11,	94:3, 99:5,	great	192:12
69:13, 71:1,	136:15, 136:20,	54:21	handled
74:20, 74:22,	139:10, 148:12,	grosso	102:10, 116:6,
77:7, 77:9,	153:4, 169:3,	4:3, 8:2	117:8, 191:16
83:11, 106:1,	175:8, 187:16,	ground	handles
171:6	205:18	10:8	158:11
generate	gone	quess	handling
45:15, 63:16	163:10, 163:11,	19:4, 31:15,	37:18, 37:19,
generated	171:20, 171:22	34:12, 36:9,	39:5, 64:6,
46:13	good	73:19, 78:4,	126:19, 192:5
generating	8:13, 32:7,	90:11, 91:16,	happen
45:18	71:21, 72:1,	91:20, 94:3,	21:19
geographic	136:17	98:17, 177:13,	happened
59:3, 59:6	gordon	198:18	15:7, 191:19
gis	27:14, 113:22,	quidance	hard
5:9, 45:5,	114:2, 115:18,	33:6, 62:14,	171:22
45:6, 45:7	115:22, 121:18,	62:16, 62:20	headings
give	122:21, 123:1,	quys	151:4
9:20, 32:3,	123:3, 123:4,	88:17	heads
45:22, 99:19,	123:9, 124:18,	H	11:2
109:16, 113:11,	127:17, 131:20,		hear
118:6, 121:7,	155:9, 155:10,	h-e-r-m-e-s-m-a-n	43:3, 75:17,
185:2, 201:16	155:14, 190:4,	27:17	79:11, 103:21
given	190:5	hackett	heard
194:22, 206:6,		31:17, 31:19,	36:22, 89:8,
			33.22, 33.3,
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

205:2	126.16 172.21	inbox	12.21 14.11
heather	136:16, 172:21 house		13:21, 14:11,
		82:11	17:17, 26:19,
50:18, 110:13	48:18, 49:3,	inc	27:8, 40:11,
held	49:8, 92:16,	1:4, 3:5, 7:5	70:3, 71:17,
2:2, 16:1,	109:10, 109:17,	include	101:17, 102:5,
21:7, 42:2,	110:4, 110:8,	45:21, 46:11,	102:10, 109:21,
42:10, 48:14,	111:14, 111:21,	59:2, 124:18,	109:22, 136:11,
86:11, 91:5,	112:6, 116:3,	174:19, 177:9,	151:6, 152:2,
91:18, 92:3,	116:15, 117:6,	177:16, 193:19	152:4, 158:11,
94:6, 97:14,	122:12, 122:17,	included	164:14, 170:18,
99:9, 117:13	123:15, 128:21,	27:18, 46:18,	174:19, 191:11,
help	129:1	55:12, 79:8,	193:20
56:19, 126:18,	house's	124:22, 125:5,	informed
127:11, 131:10	127:9	135:4, 183:16,	126:7, 142:22,
hemisphere	hypothetical	194:2	178:18, 196:1,
55:14, 182:16	129:22, 130:2,	includes	198:4, 205:9
here	130:17	138:5	informing
7:2, 9:22,	I	including	197:16
10:4, 10:15,	iconic	26:20, 114:10	informs
11:11, 12:10,	36:13	incorporate	147:13
30:17, 32:21,	idea	138:12, 139:16,	initially
86:6, 86:19,	153 : 22	143:1, 143:9	39:12, 145:3,
101:11, 107:14,	identification	incorrect	153:5
108:9, 111:11,	30:11, 99:11,	66:22, 153:20,	input
117:2, 126:16,	•	154:3, 154:6,	53:16, 142:19,
127:2, 127:4,	106:16, 112:13, 117:15, 120:17,	154:8	142:20, 143:5,
149:18, 154:2,	137:4, 146:15,	indicate	143:8, 144:2
156:14, 162:3,	149:1, 167:17,	134:19, 172:19	inputted
166:14, 167:2,	175:11, 177:22,	indicated	151:6
178:20, 180:7,	181:1, 184:19,	31:7, 141:8,	inquire
198:13, 201:19	200:11	190:13, 190:18	49:4
hereby	identified	indicates	inquiries
206:2, 207:3	114:3, 115:12,	30:20, 32:5,	110:7
hereunto	148:19	131:22, 143:5,	inquiring
207:12	identify	171:15, 176:14,	35:16, 135:13,
hermesman	59:4, 192:4	178:20	135:14
27:12, 182:12,	i g	individual	inquiry
183:3, 183:17	67:15, 68:22	57:18, 57:19	92:16, 135:16
hold	•	individuals	insert
91:21, 120:14,	<pre>import 36:15, 95:8</pre>	16:8, 19:18,	153:19
128:3		30:1, 76:12,	inserted
holding	importance	95:8, 98:12	144:3, 144:16,
34:17, 36:11,	42:22	inform	152:2
72:11, 179:15	important	122:11, 122:17,	inspector
holton	11:5 inaccurate	128:14, 188:4	67:15, 68:20
30:5		information	instance
hour	198:8	5:8, 5:11,	122:19, 136:7
71:21, 94:11,	inasmuch	10:3, 11:22,	instances
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	204:16		136:4
			<u> </u>

	Conducted on Oc		
instruction	involved	177:16, 178:14,	159:22, 160:17,
107:16, 113:12,	56:12, 56:16,	178:18, 188:20,	170:3, 173:14,
118:7, 121:12,	56:18, 111:21,	189:6, 191:3	175:1, 178:9,
143:8	112:7, 125:9,	irm's	178:18, 189:12,
instructs	125:13, 125:16,	178:10	190:2, 190:12,
11:16	135:21, 136:5,	issue	191:10
intake	139:18, 140:3,	34:13, 53:8,	jaramillo's
23:21, 39:9,	140:13, 141:1,	73:9, 73:12,	124:17, 131:14,
43:8, 43:9,	141:3, 141:5,	75:9, 80:13,	153:19
46:15, 52:11,	141:15, 141:16,	80:14, 86:14,	jeanie
54:12, 57:13,	141:18, 141:22,	90:17, 125:14,	190:4
108:19	142:7, 142:8,	125:15, 142:3,	jeff
interact	142:12, 144:9,	142:5, 197:5	27:12, 182:12
50:14, 60:18,	144:10, 145:1,	issued	jeff's
60:22, 77:1,	145:15, 145:16,	64:9	27:16
77:3	145:18, 148:7,	issues	jeremy
interacted	204:8, 204:16	33:15, 39:20,	4:11, 7:10
78:5, 78:12	involvement	92:13, 92:14,	job
interacting	32:12, 87:3,	94:18, 95:1,	1:20, 77:6,
50:21	87:8, 87:14,	95:4	199:17
interest	88:1, 140:10,	items	john
48:19, 79:10,	200:6, 204:9,	151 : 2	41:22, 44:4,
79:12, 116:4,	204:14, 204:21		61:6, 61:7,
117:7, 122:12,	ips	jacks	61:8, 67:7,
122:18, 127:9,	5:9, 30:15,	60:1	158:19, 182:1
207:11	31:6, 35:17,	jamie	johnson
interference	38:1, 38:8,	205:1	50:4, 50:5,
89:9, 90:7,	44:3, 45:7,	january	50:7, 50:15
90:13	45:10, 47:10,	24:15, 49:13,	jonathan
interoffice	48:14, 61:13,	110:14, 178:21	132:1, 132:7,
171:20, 171:22	72:13, 72:14,	jaramillo	132:17
interpret	73:9, 79:21,	54:16, 58:7,	jonathon
156:14	81:15, 91:19,	58:15, 121:17,	172:7, 174:6
interrupted	93:16, 108:11,	121:22, 122:11,	judge
46:8	109:6, 118:15,	122:17, 122:20,	33:15
interrupting	118:22, 128:12,	123:1, 128:2,	judicial
203:9	137:17, 158:20,	128:14, 129:9,	1:4, 3:5, 7:4,
interview	162:10, 184:13, 193:16	131:19, 132:13,	7:17, 7:19,
90:19, 91:3	193:16 ips-staff-assist-	134:4, 135:17,	8:20, 9:2,
interviewed	, -	137:17, 138:12,	121:1, 181:6,
67 : 14	ants	138:18, 139:14,	185:1, 199:21,
intook	118:12 irm	139:15, 143:1,	200:15, 200:19
54:12		147:9, 147:13,	junk
investigation	6:12, 124:19, 131:9, 131:11,	148:16, 153:2,	83:5
67:21, 67:22,	152:15, 153:9,	154:9, 155:4,	justice
68:21, 90:20	175:19, 176:16,	155:14, 157:15,	3:13, 7:21
investigators	176:21, 177:15,	157:19, 159:6,	K
68:1, 68:2	110.21, 111.10,		karen
			61:11, 61:12,

Conducted on October 29, 2019 6/				
67:11, 132:1, 132:5, 132:6, 132:9, 147:16, 148:6, 192:10	lawyers 85:9, 100:15, 100:21, 107:6, 107:18	144:16, 147:14, 147:20, 148:7, 160:19, 161:2, 161:20, 162:8,	litigation 16:15, 16:16, 75:3, 191:15, 191:20, 191:22,	
<pre>keep 72:3, 96:19, 96:20, 198:10 kennedy 91:7</pre>	lead 128:4, 128:15, 129:10, 129:12 leader 16:2, 16:19,	162:16, 163:4, 163:16, 164:22, 165:7, 170:17, 176:6 letters	192:4, 192:6, 192:7, 192:13, 200:22, 201:2 little 71:20, 91:17,	
<pre>kept 98:3 kind 9:21, 151:1 knew</pre>	17:14, 17:20, 189:15, 189:18 leaders 17:22, 18:4, 19:21, 20:5	65:7, 65:13, 79:22, 142:18, 142:19, 143:12, 144:11, 148:3, 148:11, 148:12,	171:2 locate 178:19 located 63:18, 165:11,	
34:7, 35:17, 195:21, 196:20, 198:1 knowing 86:1, 122:12, 122:18	<pre>leadership 44:3, 45:10 learn 33:21, 34:20, 34:22 least</pre>	162:20, 164:16, 165:11, 165:14 letting 123:14, 203:7 levels 150:15	177:15, 188:4 location 71:18, 111:4 long 12:12, 12:18,	
knowledge 89:22, 198:12 L lamberth 33:15	90:18, 91:2, 134:22, 194:9 leave 63:3, 122:9 left	liaison 23:18, 23:20, 24:2, 24:21, 30:1, 39:10, 39:13, 43:8,	14:17, 15:16, 15:18, 16:18, 20:1, 21:2, 21:19, 21:20, 23:9, 24:5, 24:20, 28:16,	
language 138:13, 139:16, 143:1, 143:9, 144:2, 144:9, 144:16	53:13, 70:21, 71:13, 96:4, 199:10 legal 133:2, 133:4,	45:13, 46:10, 48:9, 48:12, 52:12, 54:12, 78:8, 78:14, 104:21, 108:18, 111:14, 192:20	94:9, 165:5 longer 71:2, 71:3, 71:5, 81:13 look	
large 58:2 last 27:16, 38:1, 43:3, 54:15, 54:19, 101:9,	139:9, 193:21, 205:5 length 195:11 let's 11:20, 38:11,	liaison's 105:19, 111:21, 112:6, 132:10, 192:20 light	61:14, 76:5, 99:17, 116:18, 131:4, 161:8, 178:1, 178:6, 181:9, 185:2, 185:4	
101:14, 107:21, 156:22, 168:22 late 41:17, 176:19, 187:3, 187:10	136:19, 175:6 letter 5:10, 63:6, 63:15, 64:8, 64:10, 65:5,	195:8, 195:10 limit 185:22 line 99:18, 153:19,	looked 34:18, 72:11, 131:4 looking 111:1, 129:21,	
later 15:6, 36:10, 109:15 lauren 3:4, 7:18 lawsuit	101:7, 101:12, 101:15, 106:9, 129:19, 138:14, 139:16, 139:19, 141:19, 141:22, 143:2, 143:6, 143:9, 144:3,	171:7, 172:19 list 72:20, 75:2, 79:2, 184:11 listed 30:17 listing	139:13, 192:2 looks 108:2, 113:6, 115:4, 121:17, 122:22, 133:10, 138:11, 168:8, 172:21	
8:19, 9:15	113.3, 111.3,	42:21		

	T	<u> </u>	100 10 101 15
lot	57:6, 200:2	mary	93:18, 181:17
62:12, 76:7,	mandatory	30:5	meetings
76:8	28:3	matter	42:1, 42:4,
lots	manheim	7:4, 58:4,	42:6, 42:10,
36:14	33:11	124:6, 124:13,	43:19, 44:2,
lunch	manner	183:20, 197:21	44:5, 44:12,
136:18	70:1, 116:5,	matters	48:13, 86:11,
М	152:3, 169:22	198:11	91:5, 91:10,
made	manning	maybe	91:12, 91:14,
52:11, 92:16,	30:8	91:17	91:18, 91:21,
106:1, 125:14,	many	mean	92:3, 92:6,
131:6, 151:15,	14:21, 20:5,	9:9, 9:14,	92:11, 92:18,
151:17, 153:7,	36:9, 55:5,	15:3, 17:12,	93:6, 93:9,
194:16, 195:2	88:8, 124:4,	19:14, 28:6,	93:11, 93:12,
mail	194:4	51:9, 52:22,	93:13, 93:17,
83:5, 84:10,	march	57:5, 62:16,	93:21, 94:2,
171:20, 171:22	122:13, 130:4,	66:2, 69:9,	94:9, 94:13,
maintain	130:11, 131:15	72:17, 74:8,	94:16, 94:19,
82:4, 82:10,	margaret	76:5, 82:9,	95:2, 95:12, 95:14, 98:6,
82:12	25:7, 28:11	85:13, 89:16,	98:11, 98:13,
maintained	marianne	95:15, 96:14,	100:14, 100:21,
83:8	33:10	101:9, 105:13,	106:5, 107:5,
make	mark	112:21, 114:13,	107:18, 146:2,
11:13, 19:4,	32:2, 32:4,	115:19, 115:20,	146:9, 169:9
92:21, 95:5,	115:5	120:1, 120:2,	meets
103:15, 106:7,	marked	122:3, 123:17, 123:21, 125:18,	153:14
108:8, 113:13,	30:10, 30:13,	125:21, 125:10,	melody
116:10, 119:12,	99:10, 99:13,	134:15, 136:8,	27:14
122:6, 149:4,	99:14, 106:15,	142:4, 150:1,	memorandum
150:9, 152:1,	107:1, 112:12,	159:12, 177:7,	173:13, 174:4,
152:3, 155:15,	112:17, 117:14,	184:1, 185:18,	175:13, 174:4,
170:19, 179:4,	117:18, 120:16,	185:19, 186:20,	memorandums
183:19, 184:3,	120:19, 120:20,	195:18, 200:18,	174:12
185:11, 193:20	121:3, 137:3,	202:14	memory
makes	137:8, 143:16,	meaning	98:8, 98:9,
91:4	146:14, 146:18, 146:19, 147:5,	44:3, 55:19,	136:9, 145:5,
management	148:19, 147:5,	66:4	145:19, 145:21,
17:19, 53:8,	167:16, 169:7,	means	167:2
55:14, 101:18,	175:8, 175:10,	57:6, 63:9,	mentioned
102:5, 102:10,	177:21, 178:2,	141:14, 153:17,	27:18, 70:2,
114:6, 158:11	180:22, 181:3,	156:5, 156:6,	72:10, 170:2
manager	181:4, 184:18,	156:9	mid
32:20, 125:15,	184:21, 200:10,	meant	176:20
148:17	200:13	51:12, 156:12	might
managing	marking	media	25:11, 28:13,
16:9, 30:2,	99:8	35 : 4	30:7, 33:11,
53:14, 53:15,	marks	meeting	44:15, 68:1,
	115:7	92:4, 92:5,	
		, , , ,	

85:8, 131:3,	moved	108:4, 204:4	105:9, 106:5,
141:15, 159:10,	13:3, 26:14,	needed	125:1, 129:5,
170:15	193:15	14:12, 47:18,	153:14, 174:11,
miller	moving	64:20, 165:1	175:2
190:4, 190:7	89:4	neither	northwest
mills	mpd	131:8, 207:9	7:13
49:14, 49:21,	55:15, 55:16,	never	notarial
50:8	58:18, 114:7,	41:14, 55:22,	207:13
mind	114:8, 123:6	107:19, 154:22,	notary
32:1, 36:9,	much	155:1, 169:10,	2:14, 207:1,
41:14, 55:22,	8:18, 12:7,	179:22, 186:3	207:20
61:14, 192:2	19:7, 40:12,	new	notation
mine	61:2, 69:4, 78:5	23:21, 133:17,	90:18, 91:2,
161:12	multiple	135:8, 199:17	91:4, 101:14,
minute	18:3, 123:19,	news	101:16, 102:22
204:4	124:3	34:9, 34:10	notebook
misstate	must	newspaper	96:4
173:20	199:2	36:11	noted
mobile	myself	next	95:4
34:14	20:18, 40:18	15:22, 21:5,	notes
moment		22:9, 106:14,	38:15, 91:3,
61:10, 180:12	name	110:20, 146:13,	93:3, 94:15,
monitor	8:14, 10:1,	175:7, 180:15	94:17, 95:7,
7:9	27:16, 36:19,	no-record	95:8, 95:10,
more	36:22, 54:15,	63:12, 63:14	95:11, 95:13,
13:7, 57:7,	54:19, 117:20,	no-records	95:16, 95:17,
59:5, 64:4,	132:19, 132:20,	195:16	95:19, 95:20,
69:14, 71:1,	167:7, 172:19,	no-records-locat-	96:14, 98:2,
73:11, 74:17,	179:2, 201:11,	ed	98:3, 98:5
89:5, 105:10,	205:2	80:1, 80:15,	nothing
111:13, 145:15,	named	81:13, 85:4	205:15
204:7	10:3, 41:3	no-records-locat-	notice
morning	names	ed-response	2:12
8:13, 94:8,	19:16	86:14	notification
140:11, 162:20,	narrow	nods	134:4
164:3, 164:9,	68:11	11:2	number
164:11, 164:15	nea	nomenclature	7:3, 7:7,
most	55:3, 55:10,	17:22	53:11, 53:12,
55:17, 63:12,	55:12, 58:17	nonattorneys	77:21, 106:11,
192:22, 194:13	near	107:10	110:12, 110:19,
mostly	55:3, 55:4,	normal	112:19, 115:11,
114:9	58:12	129:17, 142:17,	115:12, 117:20,
move	necessarily	143:11, 144:18,	119:14, 122:7, 122:10, 137:10,
10:5, 11:20,	19:14, 49:16,	148:2, 148:9,	146:19, 147:3,
13:2, 18:10,	95:14, 95:15,	154:18, 155:18,	149:16, 150:10,
99:4, 146:12,	185:19	155:22, 177:13	168:10, 170:21,
167:15, 167:20,	need	normally	175:15, 175:21,
175:6, 180:15	11:4, 76:6,	64:18, 74:17,	1 1 3 . 1 3 , 1 1 3 . 2 1 ,
	l		

	T	<i>,</i>	
176:5, 178:3,	officials	91:2, 98:12,	27:19, 39:8,
181:5	19:18, 66:21,	101:17, 106:14,	49:8, 52:14,
numbered	71:5, 74:19,	114:3, 117:12,	52:21, 55:11,
161:12, 175:20	125:2	124:4, 130:7,	74:19, 75:4,
numbers	often	132:2, 133:17,	85:7, 88:10,
112:22	42:10, 92:3,	133:18, 135:9,	93:3, 93:11,
nw	194:5	137:5, 138:21,	94:4, 97:8,
2:5, 3:15, 4:5	oglesby	146:13, 168:9,	100:14, 104:8,
	63:5, 63:10,	169:4, 169:5,	112:5, 128:22,
0	65:7, 65:12,	172:21, 175:7,	131:3, 141:17,
object		179:14, 182:13,	144:14, 156:17,
70:9, 103:6	79:22, 101:7,	188:17, 190:3,	183:11, 202:17
objecting	129:19, 138:13,	194:2, 194:3,	others
185:20, 202:19	139:16, 139:19,		
objections	141:19, 142:18,	197:6, 201:10,	16:7, 137:17
6:20, 11:12,	142:19, 143:2,	201:11, 204:7	otherwise
37:14, 44:10,	143:6, 143:12,	ones	119:11, 207:11
52:9, 52:15,	144:3, 144:11,	188:18	out
161:4, 163:18,	144:16, 147:14,	only	12:9, 14:4,
163:21, 197:4	147:20, 148:3,	124:4, 134:3,	33:6, 66:12,
obligated	148:11, 160:18,	143:8, 189:5,	70:11, 79:22,
199:2	161:2, 161:20,	202:7	80:2, 81:14,
obligations	162:8, 162:20,	opinion	92:12, 94:13,
1 -	163:4, 163:16,	36:6, 75:11,	96:6, 101:4,
193:21	164:16, 164:22,	145:22, 154:4,	104:7, 105:11,
obviously	165:2, 165:7,	156:15, 195:9,	122:9, 125:21,
10:10, 11:1,	165:10, 165:14	196:6, 197:20	126:20, 131:5,
71:7	oh	opportunity	136:8, 143:6,
occasions	32:16, 47:11,	99:19, 121:8,	143:12, 148:12,
141:15	57:19, 66:8,	198:12, 201:17,	156:18, 163:10,
occurred	110:20, 123:7,	202:20	165:1, 165:2,
98:11	137:8, 174:1,	opposed	165:14, 176:13,
october	204:7	53:6, 74:18	176:14, 197:10
1:13, 7:8,	oig	order	outbox
28:20, 207:13	67:21, 68:2,	28:5	82:11
offer	68:6	ordinary	outcome
107:15	once	53:6	207:11
officer	41:9, 93:14,	org	outside
207:2	93:19, 106:17,		51:13, 100:20,
offices	111:13, 149:5,	31:7, 144:7	107:4, 107:17,
2:2, 7:12,	191:14, 191:19,	organization	169:8, 177:12,
40:5, 40:6,	•	30:15, 36:21,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
43:1, 43:4,	192:19, 194:9, 201:17	58:22, 103:2,	181:16, 184:15,
101:16, 114:11,		189:16	185:9, 185:16,
114:14, 114:18,	one	organized	199:7
170:15	33:14, 41:1,	97:5, 97:6	over
official	46:14, 54:22,	original	10:8, 10:20,
191:5, 194:15,	61:10, 70:6,	172:16	47:5, 57:3,
195:1	71:17, 78:7,	other	57:12, 71:21,
1 2 3 • 1	78:8, 90:18,	10:20, 26:8,	136:16, 190:5,

Conducted on October 29, 2019 /1			
192:1, 192:21,	pagliano	passport	72:20, 73:2,
198:22, 200:1,	178:22	12:9, 12:13	74:3, 74:16,
200:2	paid	pat	75:3, 79:3,
overall	182:22	132:1, 147:16	80:2, 80:16,
23:5	paper	patrick	81:14, 85:4,
oversaw	85:14, 96:9,	1:11, 2:1, 5:2,	85:13, 85:15,
45:7, 66:11,	96:11, 96:19,	7:3, 8:9, 8:16,	91:6, 100:3,
155:4, 155:6	96:20, 96:22,	91:7, 108:3,	114:18, 114:20,
oversee	97:1, 97:4,	108:13, 113:22,	133:12, 180:18,
106:4, 141:4	97:9, 97:14,	206:2	182:2, 183:13,
oversight	159:8, 159:11	pbd	195:11, 204:11
57:3, 65:20,	paragraph	123:2	phase
66:3, 200:2	101:15, 109:15	pdf	191:20
own	paralegal	159:16	photograph
39:19, 86:4,	14:16, 14:18,	pen	34:15, 35:10,
114:11, 180:10	14:21, 17:17	32 : 3	35:16, 35:18,
	- part	pending	36:1, 36:5,
P	$- _{14:9, 18:15}^{\text{part}}$	1-	36:10, 36:14,
p-a-t-r-i-c-k	18:22, 43:3,	46:6, 131:5,	72:9
8:16	59:15, 68:2,	165:20, 166:9	physically
pacific	125:15, 126:3,	people	41:12, 71:6
182:17	126:10, 142:17,	68:2, 131:3,	picture
package	143:11, 144:18,	150:15	35:2, 35:6,
41:13	148:2, 148:9,	perfectly	73:19, 73:20
page	152:10, 154:18,	54:20	place
5:2, 5:7, 6:2,	169:14, 176:21,	perhaps	7:12, 97:8,
101:15, 107:21,	194:13	13:14, 61:2,	155:3
110:11, 111:9,	partake	76:3, 91:7,	plaintiff
117:1, 118:12,	56:3, 59:16	144:8, 167:7,	1:5, 3:2, 8:11
118:20, 121:15,	•	183:7, 183:10	plaintiff's
128:1, 129:21,	<pre>partially 33:8</pre>	period	6:20, 200:16
130:5, 130:7,		22:16, 44:17,	planet
130:8, 131:13,	particular	79:15, 98:17,	_
133:8, 133:9,	63:18, 64:5,	204:2	2:4, 7:11, 7:12, 8:5
137:13, 138:8,	79:10, 79:12,	permitted	plans
146:20, 147:8,	81:6, 92:17,	33:15	61:13, 132:12,
149:15, 152:14,	103:5, 124:1,	person	144:8
157:2, 157:3,	124:4, 140:4, 142:12, 142:13,	33:2, 33:5,	
160:8, 160:9,		33:9, 33:11,	please
161:9, 166:2,	150:17, 167:3,	53:22, 151:14,	7:14, 8:7,
166:5, 168:11,	167:7, 171:3, 171:8, 184:8,	191:3, 191:10	8:14, 11:4,
168:16, 168:19,	201:11	pertained	85:10, 100:16,
169:1, 172:6,	l l	58:14	140:19, 161:19,
173:12, 174:22,	particularly	pertaining	181:12
181:20, 181:22,	97:14	9:4, 37:9,	plus
201:6, 201:12,	parties	50:16, 51:1,	198:22
201:22, 202:10	108:9, 207:10	51:17, 58:11,	point
pages	pass	67:6, 70:16,	16:6, 17:11,
1:21, 101:9	109:21	70:17, 72:15,	20:9, 30:2,

	e enautitu en e t	<u> </u>	
35:11, 36:9,	potential	139:22, 164:16,	74:14, 103:16,
45:3, 50:22,	10:3	169:7	116:7, 119:4,
107:20, 121:14,	practice	priority	130:20
127:1, 129:19,	46:21, 56:3,	152:16, 153:10,	processing
131:13, 133:8,	79:14, 82:4,	153:16, 153:21,	13:21, 14:4,
138:7, 147:7,	83:7, 83:21,	154:10, 154:20,	14:5, 14:6,
156:22, 160:7,	95:18, 109:2,	156:1, 156:4,	16:14, 26:19,
181:19, 190:21,	120:8, 154:18,	156:19	27:8, 33:7,
191:6, 194:2,	155:18, 155:22	privacies	38:11, 39:22,
194:3, 201:10	premature	55:17	51:5, 56:4,
points	162:16, 163:3,	privacy	56:19, 56:20,
9:4, 194:4	163:20, 164:1	13:16, 55:18,	57:9, 62:15,
policies	preparation	55:19, 114:9	62:17, 62:18,
61:19, 62:13	100:9, 100:18,	privilege	67:19, 68:16,
policy	185:12	107:14, 185:19	69:5, 69:6,
61:13, 83:14,	prepared	probably	69:9, 69:10,
83:19, 105:17,	47:19, 64:1,	12:14, 12:20,	69:17, 92:13,
132:12, 144:8	64:10, 64:13,	21:6, 23:11,	104:9, 105:14,
portion	65:5, 161:22,	71:11, 115:5,	125:6, 125:10,
26:2, 201:19,	163:13	118:18, 123:19	125:14, 125:16,
202:17	preparing	procedures	125:19, 125:20,
position	65:1, 65:12,	144:19, 155:19	125:21, 126:3,
15:1, 15:3,	100:12, 139:19,	proceed	126:10, 135:22,
15:6, 15:19,	163:16	125:4	140:14, 141:2,
15:22, 16:19,	present	process	141:6, 150:16,
18:11, 20:21,	4:10, 97:14,	16:15, 28:2,	153:15, 189:2,
21:5, 21:14,	194:12	39:4, 39:5,	192:1, 192:21,
22:9, 22:12,	pretty	53:6, 56:10,	194:8, 199:21,
22:20, 23:10,	19:7, 61:2,	62:19, 64:6,	200:7
23:15, 26:14,	185:17	64:9, 66:4,	produced
28:17, 28:18,	previous	68:3, 70:21,	100:7, 111:6,
28:21, 28:22,	10:1, 26:8,	71:4, 87:20,	120:22, 181:6,
44:14, 75:7,	79:1	88:1, 89:10,	184:22, 189:2,
78:6, 139:7,	previously	89:22, 90:7,	189:6, 200:15
167:7, 189:14	99:14, 104:10,	90:12, 90:14,	production
positions	107:1, 135:20,	95:9, 116:9,	6:22, 200:17,
19:19, 20:20,	181:4	129:6, 129:11,	201:13, 202:8,
26:9, 29:15,	primarily	129:18, 139:18,	202:21, 204:17
191:6, 193:16	31:16, 55:14,	141:4, 142:17,	professional
possibility	55:20	143:11, 148:2,	103:1, 103:4
9:18	print	148:7, 148:9,	program
possible	83:13	161:21, 162:8,	15:6, 15:8,
43:21, 56:12,	printing	163:4, 163:13,	15:17, 16:10,
56:20, 116:9	83:22	163:15, 164:22,	16:13, 32:20
possibly	prior	177:14, 191:19,	programs
59:8, 97:3,	9:5, 26:7,	192:18	3:14, 5:8,
152:9	26:10, 64:14,	processed	5:11, 61:19,
posts	65:21, 66:12,	52:20, 57:4,	62:13
51:14			
	•	-	

		0000001 25, 2015	
project	120:12, 150:15,	89:19, 93:9,	reasons
22:13, 29:4	151:8, 184:7,	94:19, 95:1	110:3
projects	202:13	ramona	receive
21:18, 22:3	putting	3:3, 7:16	39:7, 105:1,
pronounce	33:6	ran	125:1, 125:5,
54:19	Q	— _{199:11}	152:11, 174:11,
pronouncing	question	rare	193:14, 205:11
54:15	11:3, 11:6,	136:7	received
pronto	11:15, 11:17,	rather	37:21, 37:22,
115:6, 115:20	17:16, 46:6,	36:13, 58:17,	47:22, 48:1,
provide	67:9, 67:11,	164:5	64:8, 104:10,
40:11, 40:12,	82:14, 85:7,	rcl	109:3, 109:10,
142:19, 142:20,	85:10, 100:14,	1:7	109:11, 117:5,
144:2, 151:3,	100:16, 107:7,	read	121:22, 134:3,
165:15, 170:16,	115:5, 120:2,	8:1, 34:9,	167:9, 175:2,
170:18, 176:22,	126:6, 140:18,	34:10, 46:5,	184:4, 186:12,
198:19	143:10, 149:9,	46:6, 79:14,	187:2, 193:6,
provided	155:21, 161:18,	99:18, 109:2,	194:5
9:4, 46:17,	162:7, 163:12,	120:20, 201:17,	receiving
143:5, 144:15,	164:12, 179:9,	202:11, 206:3	108:21, 163:16,
162:9, 164:13,	185:15, 187:6,	reading	182:18, 193:10
178:21, 195:16	194:21, 196:17,	68:19, 69:3,	recess
provides	196:18, 204:7	130:3, 203:4,	88:22, 136:22,
71:17	questions	207:8	187:18
providing	10:13, 10:18,	really	recognize
11:1, 57:3,	10:19, 24:1,	9:15, 12:6,	169:13
62:14, 62:20,	89:5, 99:5,	29:18, 33:10,	recollection
70:3, 177:7	164:5, 188:1,	36:6, 36:15,	126:18, 127:6,
public	198:11, 198:14,	43:16, 62:4,	127:11, 131:10,
2:14, 55:15,	202:16, 203:5,	69:3, 73:22,	143:18, 180:19
114:7, 205:11,	205:17	76:7, 78:3,	record
207:1, 207:20	queue	78:21, 90:16,	8:15, 11:13,
publicly	104:7, 104:8,	95:7, 105:16,	88:21, 89:2,
100:6	104:10, 105:11	110:5, 124:2,	99:9, 100:1,
published	quick	129:15, 129:22,	106:7, 106:21,
35:16	109:18, 116:14,	140:7, 140:8,	112:16, 113:16,
publishing	116:16, 117:4	141:4, 142:3,	115:10, 117:13,
45:1	quickly	154:22, 156:15,	117:18, 120:19,
pull	116:9	158:5, 186:19,	122:5, 136:19,
84:9	quite	186:20, 196:6	136:21, 137:2,
purpose	19:2, 195:11	reason	146:17, 147:1,
60:21, 92:10,	R	9:20, 10:12,	149:13, 168:7,
94:1, 170:13	raise	— 119:7, 119:9,	175:14, 187:15,
pursuant		122:22, 153:18,	187:17, 187:20,
2:12	11:13, 195:20 raised	154:2, 154:5,	203:7, 205:18,
put	l l	154:7, 162:4	205:19, 207:5
23:2, 31:21,	89:9, 89:17,	reasonable	records
104:7, 112:10,		191:9, 191:12	9:3, 14:10,
	-	-	-

23:8, 37:8,	refresh	released	rephrase
51:16, 52:2,	126:18, 127:6,	91:4	178:16
60:11, 63:17,	127:11, 131:10,	relevant	report
69:19, 70:4,	143:18	10:3	20:8, 25:5,
70:16, 70:17,	refreshed	remain	25:17, 26:7,
71:13, 74:3,	180:19	14:18, 15:9,	26:12, 28:10,
83:16, 84:10,	refreshes	15:13, 15:16,	29:9, 31:5,
85:2, 85:13,	127:3	23:9, 24:6,	31:9, 31:12,
85:14, 86:4,	regard	28:16	31:15, 31:16,
87:5, 87:10,	62:20, 140:12,	remained	42:16, 43:6,
88:10, 90:10,	140:13	21:2, 21:17,	46:18, 47:1,
97:13, 102:17,	regarding	21:21, 22:12,	48:3, 68:20,
145:14, 165:6,	125:6, 139:12,	24 : 7	68:22, 76:1,
165:11, 165:16,	143:20, 184:11,	remember	76:10, 76:18,
170:1, 171:12,	186:13	13:13, 14:21,	77:21, 124:19,
172:22, 175:20,	regards	14:22, 15:18,	190:1, 190:2,
177:15, 178:19,	33:6, 50:15,	20:6, 20:7,	190:6
180:2, 180:6,	61:4, 66:18,	23:12, 24:8,	reported
180:10, 188:5,	99:1, 111:3,	25:12, 24:5, 25:19, 26:5,	1:22, 19:11,
195:14, 196:2,	113:8, 116:4,	29:18, 31:20,	19:19, 20:10,
196:15, 196:16,	118:4, 122:6,	37:18, 40:9,	20:13, 20:15,
196:19, 197:17,	178:10, 186:7,	42:7, 44:12,	21:1, 25:12,
198:4, 203:19,	188:2	44:20, 44:21,	27:10, 31:17,
204:10	regs	45:1, 61:5,	46:22, 76:13,
recounted	33:6	62:12, 68:4,	76:16, 190:3
136:3	regular	69:4, 73:14,	reporter
redacted	42:1, 91:21,	78:3, 78:18,	2:13, 8:4, 8:7,
14:12	93:17	88:4, 95:16,	10:15, 99:7,
reduce	reid	98:5, 136:14,	207:1
22:13, 29:4	43:14, 43:15,	142:11, 145:7,	reporting
reduced	108:3, 108:15,	145:11, 145:12,	77:10, 77:17,
207:7	110:7, 119:1	145:13, 146:1,	78:17
refer	relate	154:17, 156:21,	reports
128:11, 169:4	82:21, 83:2	164:12, 164:18,	43:17, 45:15,
referenced	related	164:20, 184:9,	45:21, 46:12,
119:15, 201:12	119:18, 182:10,	194:1	47:15, 93:8,
references	189:2, 207:9	remembering	160:10
119:14, 176:5	relates	37:17	represent
referred	147:2	renate	7:15, 150:2,
102:19, 192:5	relating	178:9	172:20, 188:22,
referring		reorganization	200:13
83:10, 101:8,	9:1, 80:3,	19:1	representing
170:7	83:15, 83:16,	reorganized	7:10, 7:16,
refers	83:22, 143:17,	18:1, 189:16	7:18, 7:21, 8:5,
104:5	180:2, 180:3, 180:6, 180:17,	repeat	11:12
reflect	180:6, 180:17, 184:12, 198:5,	17:16, 85:10,	requested
58:22, 151:9,	•	87:7, 100:16,	69:19, 182:9,
151:13	199:12, 204:20 relation	140:18, 161:18	183:12, 207:8
101.10		140.10, 101.10	100.12, 207.0
	64:5		

Conducted on October 25, 2015				
requester	100:14, 110:8,	66:11, 80:1,	25:22, 26:3,	
23:18, 36:18	125:3, 126:7,	80:15, 81:13,	26:5, 26:6,	
requesting	127:7, 127:12,	85:4, 197:10,	33:8, 47:2,	
70:2, 75:2,	134:17, 137:17,	198:20, 200:14	54:7, 62:15,	
104:13, 175:19	139:11, 139:19,	responsibilities	65:17, 68:3,	
requestor	140:1, 140:10,	15:12, 17:11,	72:13, 72:18,	
23:19, 24:2,	142:19, 143:19,	19:7, 27:5,	87:20, 89:10,	
24:21, 30:1,	160:1, 167:21,	59:4, 59:6,	90:1, 90:7,	
39:10, 39:13,	177:1, 184:2,	62:9, 62:11,	90:12, 90:13,	
43:8, 45:13,	185:20, 196:2,	140:1	99:19, 99:20,	
46:10, 48:8,	205:12	responsibility	100:11, 104:14,	
48:11, 52:12,	respond	14:10, 36:20,	104:19, 106:18,	
54:11, 65:22,	47:20, 126:3,	56:3	121:8, 149:5,	
78:8, 78:14,	126:9, 164:13,	responsible	187:9, 202:4,	
104:21, 105:19,	176:16, 199:3	17:21, 26:18,	202:20, 203:11,	
105:20, 108:18,	responded	27:7, 27:22,	204:17	
132:10, 154:10,	160:20, 183:19	33:2, 33:5,	reviewed	
156:2, 165:3,	responding	33:8, 38:21,	46:17, 100:8,	
192:19, 199:4	65:21, 144:12,	46:15, 62:13,	100:17, 141:9,	
requestor's	148:10, 197:9,	62:19, 65:6,	179:8	
104:19, 176:6	198:6, 199:3,	65:12, 155:14	reviewer	
requestors	204:19	responsive	25:15	
24:1, 80:15,	response	14:11, 131:9,	reviewers	
81:14, 148:4,	59:17, 63:12,	165:6, 165:11,	62:15, 62:21	
148:11, 154:20,	63:14, 63:18,	178:19, 195:14,	reviewing	
156:19, 165:14	66:22, 67:5,	197:17	16:13, 103:13,	
required	100:5, 100:7,	results	124:11, 126:17,	
10:11, 11:17,	101:3, 101:12,	41:6, 64:21,	143:15, 149:6,	
51:12, 51:14,	103:14, 106:8,	124:20, 125:3,	180:16, 186:22,	
94:19, 95:1	111:10, 117:5,	126:8, 160:20,	187:10	
requirements	124:12, 126:20,	162:9, 163:17,	reviews	
153:15	135:16, 146:5,	165:15, 178:10,	73:2, 105:2,	
research	161:22, 162:10,	178:14	105:5, 114:12,	
26:16, 30:21	163:4, 165:12,	retired	114:15, 125:22	
researchers	165:14, 170:18,	71:12, 71:18	rice	
28:4	171:5, 172:15, 172:22, 174:20,	retrieved	9:5	
reserves	175:20, 176:21,	131:9	right	
7:22	177:18, 184:4,	return	7:22, 11:20,	
resource	188:8, 195:16,	40:13, 87:5,	14:17, 18:5,	
101:18, 102:5	196:8, 197:15,	87:10, 170:18,	18:6, 20:15,	
respect	198:7, 200:21,	173:5	22:4, 24:3,	
32:13, 67:15,	201:21, 202:11,	returned 87:21, 88:10,	24:5, 24:12, 24:17, 38:17,	
67:18, 73:21,	202:21, 203:19,	173:7, 174:13	41:3, 41:4,	
85:7, 86:5,	204:10	review	60:12, 72:4,	
87:3, 87:14,	responses	13:16, 14:10,	86:8, 93:2,	
89:9, 89:22,	6:19, 11:1,	23:3, 23:6,	95:21, 97:15,	
90:6, 91:4, 91:18, 95:19,	14:5, 41:5,	24:13, 24:18,	108:9, 109:8,	
91:10, 90:19,	<u> </u>	27.10, 27.10,		
	l	l		

Conducted on October 29, 2019			
110:20, 112:16,	142:7, 195:15,	124:2, 129:17,	scr
113:22, 115:13,	207:5	131:8, 136:13,	124:19
115:20, 116:1,	same	147:19, 153:14,	scrambling
			_
117:2, 150:19,	15:13, 16:9,	163:22, 164:1,	74:14, 116:8
165:17, 174:4,	19:8, 22:13,	169:4, 171:21,	seal
175:6, 176:1,	34:4, 37:14,	191:9	207:13
176:2, 176:7,	44:10, 52:3,	saying	search
185:13, 188:21,	52:9, 52:15,	53:22	6:9, 6:12,
192:10, 198:21,	52:17, 56:2,	says	14:4, 40:6,
201:3	67:9, 67:11,	109:9, 109:16,	40:12, 41:6,
ring	79:17, 86:2,	119:6, 133:17,	59:17, 64:14,
42:16, 54:18,	88:11, 106:8,	143:3, 148:16,	64:19, 64:21,
132:19, 158:12,	107:15, 110:11,	149:15, 152:15,	70:4, 81:20,
179:2, 186:9,	110:15, 110:16,	157:4, 160:10,	82:1, 85:1,
186:17	110:18, 110:22,	162:3, 171:7,	103:7, 124:20,
rings	113:11, 115:3,	173:18	125:3, 125:20,
132:20	115:11, 118:6,		
	119:1, 119:14,	SC	125:21, 126:8,
role	1 '	124:19	156:9, 160:20,
56:22, 62:7,	121:12, 122:6,	scan	162:9, 163:6,
139:11, 199:20,	122:10, 123:20,	159:14	163:17, 165:15,
200:1, 200:5	123:21, 127:19,	scanned	165:20, 166:8,
rosemary	131:7, 133:11,	172:1	169:15, 169:18,
43:14, 43:15,	141:10, 148:18,	scholl	169:22, 170:1,
108:3, 108:15,	149:9, 150:9,	1:11, 2:1, 5:2,	170:17, 171:1,
119:1	161:4, 163:18,	5:7, 6:2, 7:4,	171:4, 171:8,
routine	163:21, 170:21,	8:9, 8:13, 8:16,	172:18, 172:22,
67:22, 68:3,	172:19, 176:19,	30:10, 30:12,	174:12, 174:13,
93:13, 105:13,	182:6, 183:9,	72:3, 89:4,	175:19, 175:20,
105:16	184:5, 189:19,	99:10, 99:12,	176:7, 176:21,
rule	189:21, 191:1,	106:15, 107:2,	177:1, 177:18,
141:14, 184:6	193:18, 197:4,	108:3, 108:13,	178:10, 178:14,
rules	206:4	112:12, 113:22,	179:6, 179:10,
10:9	samuelson	117:14, 120:16,	179:18, 180:1,
	50:18, 50:22,		180:5, 180:10,
run	110:14, 111:14,	120:18, 137:3,	188:11, 188:13,
165:5	111:18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
S	sat	146:17, 147:16,	188:22, 189:5,
s		148:22, 149:2,	189:8, 190:13,
17:8, 17:9,	91:8	157:4, 157:8,	197:9, 198:19,
20:3, 21:8,	save	157:9, 167:16,	204:10
160:10	84:7, 84:9,	167:20, 175:10,	searched
s-c-h-o-l-l	84:11	177:21, 178:1,	81:20, 85:12,
8:17	saving	180:22, 181:2,	86:4, 101:17,
said	83:22	184:18, 184:20,	103:1
	saw	187:22, 200:10,	searches
10:16, 45:13,	35:4, 36:1,	200:12, 204:8,	41:9, 51:13,
69:4, 83:9,	36:4, 36:10	206:2	63:17, 64:11,
104:2, 123:2,	say	scope	114:15, 126:1,
136:3, 141:11,	26:3, 110:3,	39:19, 193:12	162:17, 162:21,
		,	

164:17, 165:1,	119:19, 120:8,	147:11, 152:17,	103:14, 112:4,
165:16, 203:18	124:9, 124:14,	157:6, 160:12,	126:20, 129:19,
searching	129:1, 133:12,	161:15, 166:4,	133:21, 138:18,
195:14	139:13, 143:20,	172:6, 172:8,	143:6, 143:12,
second	180:18, 182:2,	173:15, 173:17,	143:19, 145:4,
	182:10, 183:13,	175:16, 182:3	147:21, 148:4,
127:22, 152:14,	184:12, 186:14,	seeing	152:15, 153:5,
160:7, 160:9,	187:4, 187:12,	108:21	153:9, 153:20,
168:15, 172:6,			
173:9, 175:9	194:16, 195:2, 195:12, 195:22,	seem	154:19, 156:1,
second-to-the-la-		83:17	157:4, 165:2,
st	196:2, 196:20,	seems	165:7, 166:7,
111:8, 181:20	198:1, 198:5,	36:13, 111:12	170:3, 171:3,
secretariat's	199:14, 205:7,	seen	171:14, 171:17,
102:4, 102:17	205:12	36:14, 100:17,	172:16, 176:13,
secretary	secretary's	107:2, 107:8,	176:14, 179:6,
24:11, 24:16,	9:3, 49:17,	107:11, 107:19,	179:10, 179:19,
29:13, 32:10,	51:17, 52:3,	113:9, 118:5,	183:17, 186:6,
33:16, 33:21,	52:7, 59:12,	121:10, 137:21,	188:9, 188:11,
37:9, 37:10,	60:10, 60:11,	143:16, 149:9,	188:14, 189:8,
44:16, 44:18,	71:2, 71:3,	155:1, 169:6,	190:13, 190:16,
44:21, 49:12,	102:11, 158:12,	169:10, 179:21,	192:21, 196:14,
50:1, 50:16,	171 : 12	179:22, 181:15,	197:9, 200:19
50:22, 51:2,	section	185:8, 186:3,	separate
51:18, 52:4,	16:20, 16:21,	187:6, 201:14,	100:7
58:14, 59:8,	16:22, 17:3,	203:16	september
66:19, 67:6,	17:10, 17:12,	send	201:6, 207:16
67:16, 67:20,	17:13, 17:14,	39:14, 39:18,	series
68:13, 69:19,	17:20, 18:9,	39:22, 40:6,	15:2, 15:4
70:13, 70:14,	18:18, 18:20,	40:7, 40:10,	services
70:20, 71:13,	19:2, 19:9,	81:17, 154:9,	5:9, 5:12
72:10, 72:15,	20:16, 114:5	159:16, 165:10,	sescr
72:21, 73:3,	see	165:13	131:8, 152:15,
73:8, 74:3,	30:17, 32:19,	sending	153:9
74:16, 74:18,	61:15, 101:11,	14:4, 125:21,	set
75:4, 75:8,	101:19, 102:5,	131:5, 148:11	58:1, 58:21,
78:20, 79:2,	102:7, 108:6,	sense	59:1, 105:17,
79:3, 80:2,	109:9, 109:13,	78:4	207:12
80:3, 80:16,	109:20, 110:11,	sent	several
81:14, 85:5,	111:11, 113:20,		
86:18, 87:4,	115:2, 115:8,	37:2, 37:6,	38:1, 51:11,
	118:13, 121:19,	37:7, 38:14,	74:12
87:9, 87:15,	123:12, 127:4,	41:10, 41:12,	sheet
87:21, 88:10,	128:5, 130:6,	47:5, 47:7,	111:1, 157:1,
88:11, 89:6,	130:12, 130:13,	49:16, 57:12,	190:14, 190:19,
89:10, 90:1,	131:7, 131:16,	57:15, 57:17,	195:15, 206:7
90:5, 90:21,	132:3, 133:14,	58:3, 66:18,	sheryl
91:6, 98:19,	135:10, 137:12,	70:11, 79:22,	31:6, 45:9,
99:1, 100:3,	138:7, 138:15,	80:2, 81:14,	47:11, 67:9,
102:12, 114:19,	150.7, 150.15,	94:13, 101:4,	76:10, 108:2,

		<u> </u>	
109:19, 118:18,	128:20, 145:15	167:22, 175:2,	187:19, 205:16
128:4, 128:11,	signing	177:9, 182:21,	specific
128:12, 128:15,	207:8	183:2, 183:18	13:7, 57:7,
129:9, 129:12,	simple	sometimes	64:4, 68:10
133:11, 133:16,	53:12	125:5, 174:18	specifically
135:8, 181:22	since	somewhere	39:2, 52:22,
shorthand	15:19, 38:2,	45:14	56:13, 68:4,
207:1	46:7, 90:4,	soon	68:5, 70:15,
shortly	90:11, 134:3,	194:17	82:6, 194:1,
194:18, 195:3	194:11, 194:12,	sorry	196:12
should	199:10	21:9, 26:21,	specifics
79:22, 80:13,	sit	27:13, 29:21,	191:21
81:13, 115:6,	98:12	32:16, 43:3,	speed
131:22, 132:1,	sitting	46:2, 46:4,	116:5
156:9, 168:5,	126:16, 154:2,	48:10, 52:16,	spell
179:6	156:14, 166:14,	54:4, 70:10,	8:15, 27:16,
shouldn't	167:2	78:10, 79:11,	54:15
80:1, 80:14	six-page	83:1, 84:5,	spent
show	137:9	97:20, 103:21,	40:12
30:12, 145:14	smilansky	112:17, 113:15,	spoken
showed	_	122:2, 122:4,	68:1
188:18, 188:19	139:1, 139:4,	128:1, 131:2,	
shown	147:9, 147:14	135:14, 137:8,	staff
	snuggs	174:1, 178:15,	23:22, 50:1,
35:18	20:10	180:12, 192:15,	53:14, 53:15,
sidney	some	197:7	56:11, 118:15,
186:15	11:21, 19:2,	sort	118:22, 191:22,
sign	56:12, 88:8,	19:17, 21:5	192:4
8:1	91:17, 96:22,	sound	staff's
signature	99:4, 99:5,	51:7, 179:2,	71:2
107:22, 206:10	114:10, 125:6,	186:17	staffing
signature-p1kal	135:4, 138:4,	south	92:14
207:17	150:19, 151:2,	55:4, 58:12	stand
signed	151:3	1	36:8, 136:8
206:7	somebody	sparked	start
significance	40:16	79:4 speak	12:8, 113:3,
73:19, 74:10,	someone	-	192:5, 193:9,
80:8, 80:11,	194:20	10:20, 68:6,	193:10
80:19	something	142:16	started
significant	43:18, 54:7,	speaking	12:4, 12:9,
42:15, 42:22,	56:9, 59:7,	71:1, 196:11	16:7, 193:2,
43:6, 43:17,	59:19, 65:17,	special	193:13, 195:3
45:15, 46:12,	86:6, 87:12,	79:4	state's
46:18, 47:1,	87:18, 88:3,	specialist	75:4
47:15, 48:1,	88:4, 92:17,	4:11, 7:2, 8:4,	stated
73:20, 75:8,	96:5, 96:8,	14:16, 14:18,	116:13, 127:2
75:13, 75:14,	105:9, 106:4,	14:22, 88:20,	statement
93:8, 97:19,	116:13, 151:21,	89:1, 136:20,	147:17, 203:7
97:21, 98:1,	154:15, 165:4,	137:1, 187:16,	statements
			164:7

	T	1	
states	stored	20:3, 20:20,	swear
1:1, 2:13,	97:9	22:21, 23:14,	8:7
3:13, 4:4, 7:5,	street	24:9, 25:4,	switched
119:3, 133:16	3:6, 3:15, 4:5	27:11, 28:14,	15:5
stating	strictly	38:13, 42:4,	sworn
106:10, 138:12	65:11	42:9, 43:16,	8:10, 10:11
status	string	52:20, 53:1,	system
134:16, 134:17,	5:15, 5:17,	54:14, 56:13,	58:1, 150:16,
135:6, 135:13,	5:19, 5:21, 6:3,	59:11, 60:17,	151:6, 151:8,
135:19, 184:2	6:5, 6:14, 6:16,	61:5, 62:3,	151:11, 152:2
statutory	6:18, 113:7,	62:10, 76:9,	systematic
26:15, 28:2,	129:16	78:21, 82:8,	23:3, 23:6,
30:20, 38:16,	subject	82:14, 83:6,	24:13, 24:18,
55:1, 55:6,	9:16, 58:4,	88:18, 92:22,	25:14, 25:22,
77:14, 77:18,	97:6, 108:4,	93:1, 94:22,	26:5, 26:6
78:8, 78:10,	123:20, 123:22,	95:5, 99:6,	systems
78:16	124:5, 124:13,	102:3, 103:19,	170:1
stayed	152:6, 180:20,	106:7, 106:19,	<u>T</u>
19:7	183:20	108:8, 113:13,	
stein	submitted	113:19, 116:10,	take
29:6, 29:7,	9:2, 36:17,	119:12, 122:6,	39:8, 71:22,
29:14, 91:7	48:20, 49:15,	126:6, 129:15,	72:2, 74:17,
stenographically	100:2, 159:19	140:20, 145:6,	88:16, 95:8,
207:6	subordinate	149:4, 149:7,	95:11, 99:17,
stephen	183:17	150:9, 152:1,	116:18, 128:4,
3:12, 7:20	suite	152:3, 155:15,	128:15, 129:10,
steve	2:6, 3:7	156:7, 164:10,	136:17, 161:8,
185:11, 202:18	summer	170:19, 179:4,	204:5
still	72:16, 72:21,	179:9, 180:13,	taken
	75:21, 204:18	183:19, 184:3,	88:22, 93:6,
11:17, 15:9,	sunday	185:12, 185:14,	94:15, 94:17,
16:3, 16:22,	9:6	189:20, 191:21,	95:7, 95:17,
18:6, 20:3,		193:20, 194:2,	96:3, 104:7,
21:17, 22:5,	superior	194:20, 194:21	105:11, 129:12,
23:4, 28:22,	79:1	surprise	136:22, 151:18,
29:7, 34:2, 52:3, 52:4,	superiors	144:22, 145:17,	187:18, 207:3,
52:17, 62:22,	79:18	195:6, 195:7,	207:6
71:11, 84:17,	supervisor	195:13, 195:19	takes
98:3, 133:6,	25:8, 27:6,	surprised	192:1
170:19, 189:12,	79:1	145:7, 145:21,	taking
189:13, 189:19,	supplemental	196:14, 196:15,	7:11, 95:9,
189:21, 190:2,	6:21, 200:16,	196:18, 197:2,	95:13, 95:16,
190:6, 190:9	200:19, 201:12,	197:6	98:5, 155:3
stood	202:8	susan	talked
45:2	support	9:5	195:11, 198:3,
stop	102:11	sw	199:17
_	supposed	3 : 6	talking
77:17	155:15	swapped	9:4, 53:20,
store	sure	173:21	
82:7, 82:8	11:13, 12:20,		

Conducted on October 29, 2019			
106:8, 110:17,	71:4, 124:19,	testifying	86:13, 98:12,
170:20, 176:1,	158:20, 160:1	198:13	98:19, 98:21
178:11, 180:7,	tasks	testimony	things
188:3, 196:13	16:9	19:6, 98:7,	43:1
tasha	team	100:19, 101:8,	think
48:5, 48:7,	16:2, 16:19,	140:1, 140:21,	13:3, 18:19,
86:13, 98:11	17:14, 17:20,	141:1, 162:19,	18:22, 20:19,
task	17:21, 18:3,	164:2, 164:6,	22:12, 23:2,
153:9, 157:4,	19:21, 20:5,	164:9, 164:11,	36:4, 44:8,
157:16, 157:19,	32:13, 189:15,	164:15, 179:5,	44:22, 45:20,
158:6, 158:14,	189:18	194:22, 197:22,	59:12, 61:1,
167:9, 170:1,	tech	206:4, 206:6,	63:10, 63:12,
170:3, 171:14,	102:10	207:5, 207:6	70:19, 71:10,
172:16, 189:5	technically	th	73:17, 92:20,
tasked	28:22	108:4, 118:10,	98:14, 106:13,
52:7, 69:18,	technology	119:2, 134:20,	107:13, 109:18,
69:22, 70:1,	158:11	145:2, 173:8,	110:1, 116:8,
71:11, 71:12,	tell	178:21, 207:13	117:11, 123:2,
126:1, 156:18,	10:11, 34:7,	thank	123:19, 127:5,
159:1, 159:3,	34:20, 73:11,	8:18, 17:9,	130:2, 131:5,
159:7, 166:3,	73:15, 92:2,	31:21, 32:8,	131:6, 132:6,
166:14, 166:15,	115:5, 124:8,	54:13, 59:14,	132:22, 133:17,
166:17, 167:3,	130:1, 134:4,	75:19, 99:22,	134:5, 135:2,
171:4, 171:8,	144:1, 158:10	106:13, 106:20,	136:15, 138:21,
171:15, 175:3,	telling	113:5, 115:17,	142:2, 142:3,
195:13	128:3	118:2, 119:17,	142:6, 146:12,
tasker	tenure	121:6, 123:11,	156:6, 159:5,
6:9, 6:12,	24:11, 24:16,	124:16, 126:15,	159:11, 163:9,
40:10, 70:14,	29:13, 32:10,	137:20, 142:16,	170:2, 173:21,
152:15, 155:22,	49:12, 51:1,	146:22, 148:21,	179:14, 188:17,
169:15, 169:22,	67:20, 68:14,	149:21, 150:12,	191:2
171:3, 171:9,	69:20, 70:14,	150:22, 152:13,	third
174:12, 174:20,	81:3, 102:12	166:13, 167:19,	3:6, 107:21,
175:19, 176:8,	term	168:6, 169:3,	117:1, 128:1,
176:13, 177:18,	51:6, 63:5	174:10, 176:12,	168:15, 168:20,
179:6, 179:10,	termed	180:14, 181:14,	173:12, 174:21
179:18, 188:11,	53:3, 63:11	185:7, 201:9,	thorough
188:14, 188:22,	terry	203:14	198:19
189:8, 190:13,	27:12, 27:14,	thanks	thought
190:17, 196:13	113:22, 114:2,	88:19, 109:18,	125:8
taskers	115:3, 121:17,	113:18	thousand
14:4, 40:6,	124:18, 131:19,	themselves	24:15, 25:18,
40:8, 70:8,	155:9, 155:14,	7:15	41:17, 78:1,
70:11, 125:21, 154:19, 169:18,	190:4	thereafter	176:20 thousands
176:22, 197:9	testified	207:7	74:11
tasking	8:10, 125:9,	they'd	three
59:16, 70:2,	135:21, 153:6,	109:18	12:14, 27:6,
33.10, 70.2,	193:1, 194:15	thian	12:14, 2/:0,
		48:5, 48:7,	

	Conducted on Oc	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	01
41:1, 41:2,	112:5, 123:4,	115:2, 137:12,	197:15, 206:4,
55:9, 57:3,	123:8, 123:9,	138:10, 146:20,	207:4
65:6, 65:8,	125:10, 129:2,	149:14, 175:16,	truth
200:2	136:17, 136:18,	178:4, 201:22	10:11
three-page	146:3, 149:4,	totally	truthfully
117:19, 149:3,	166:10, 171:18,	12:14	10:13
149:14	172:18, 175:4,	touch	try
through	176:19, 177:16,	159:22	71:12, 116:8,
59:8, 59:9,	183:11, 187:3,	track	169:4
116:11, 145:3,	189:17, 190:3,	108:5, 116:11	trying
151:2, 161:9,	193:3, 193:4,	tracking	34:11, 78:4,
170:4, 171:2,	204:5	123:15, 150:21,	89:13, 119:22,
181:10, 191:18	time-stamped	152:4	139:10, 140:20,
throw	130:4, 130:11,	training	164:6
96:5	131:15, 147:10,	152:10, 193:6,	tuesday
thursday	157:13	193:10, 193:15,	1:13
94:8	timely	193:19, 194:6,	turnaround
thursdays	151:17, 152:3	194:7	109:18, 116:14,
98:11	times	transcribe	116:16, 117:5
time	36:14, 51:11	11:2	turnover
7:9, 9:19,	timing	transcribing	76:8
13:9, 14:3,	22:21, 44:15,	10:16	twice
16:21, 17:6,	78:3, 78:21	transcript	78:7, 194:10
17:22, 18:1,	title	5:6, 10:17,	two
18:20, 19:2,	14:15, 20:11,	30:11, 99:11,	22:17, 23:11,
20:2, 20:10,	26:22, 60:17,	106:16, 112:13,	23:14, 24:15,
24:12, 25:9,	191:5	117:15, 120:17,	25:18, 41:17,
27:11, 28:14,	titled	137:4, 146:15,	55:11, 78:1,
28:15, 29:12,	32:19	149:1, 167:17,	99:15, 100:18,
31:6, 32:6,	today	175:11, 177:22,	101:9, 115:6,
34:11, 38:19,	7:10, 8:5,	181:1, 184:19,	176:20, 188:19
39:6, 40:12,	9:22, 10:4,	200:11, 207:4	two-page
41:15, 41:16,	10:13, 86:6,	transcription	112:18, 178:2,
41:18, 43:11,	86:19, 100:9,	206:5	184:21
44:4, 44:14,	100:12, 100:19,	transition	type
45:10, 49:7,	126:16, 140:21,	32:13	19:18, 55:18,
52:16, 52:17,	154:3, 156:14,	transmittal	81:5, 114:9,
55:7, 56:2,	166:14, 167:1,	176:11, 188:8,	151:4, 170:6,
57:8, 59:1,	167:2, 169:7,	188:10	194:6, 194:7
62:3, 64:7,	176:1, 180:7,	treat	types
64:8, 68:11,	188:3, 193:6,	51:6, 120:9	27:19
69:6, 71:5,	195:11, 199:6	treated	typewriting
71:6, 71:22,	today's	52:13, 54:6,	207:7
72:1, 73:5,	7:8, 185:12	119:4, 119:8,	typical
75:5, 76:19,	took	119:19	155:2
78:14, 78:19,	190:5	tremendous	typically
79:15, 81:3,	top	74:13	64:1, 94:13,
110:9, 111:15,	111:1, 113:20,	true	135:21, 136:4,
		197:11, 197:12,	

	Conducted on Oc	2017	02
141:1, 141:12,	192:18	187:16, 187:19,	24:10, 29:12,
141:13, 141:14,	undertaken	205:16	32:9, 33:14,
142:8, 143:14,	90:1	videographer	36:16, 52:16,
144:10, 144:13,	united	7:10	69:17, 75:20,
145:16, 154:15,	1:1, 2:13,	videotaped	91:16, 99:4,
177:4, 184:6	3:13, 4:4, 7:5	1:11, 2:1, 7:3	99:18, 107:20,
tysons	unless	visited	108:8, 115:13,
199:11	11:16	9:16	115:15, 121:7,
U	until	voice-identify	121:14, 122:5,
uh-huh	9:15, 19:2,	7:14	122:9, 133:8,
22:1, 25:16,	24:8, 26:11,	volume	138:7, 147:7,
30:14, 32:18,	28:20, 64:18,	58 : 2	149:4, 150:9,
33:18, 45:4,	78:2, 134:22		151:1, 156:22,
50:3, 50:10,	unusual	walk	160:7, 167:21,
52:5, 53:4,	59:19, 105:10,		179:4, 180:16,
75:22, 95:3,	111:20, 112:1,	151:2, 171:1,	181:19, 201:10,
99:21, 101:13,	140:3, 140:6,	191:18	201:16, 202:16,
118:21, 135:11,	141:21, 142:2,	walter	203:5, 203:14
•	142:7	31:6, 31:9,	wanted
138:9, 173:11,	updated	31:12, 31:16,	9:20, 116:10,
204:15	151:12	41:22, 44:3,	116:15
under		45:9, 47:11,	wants
28:4, 54:1,	use	67:9, 76:17,	109:21
59:12, 152:1,	33:17, 34:14,	79:17, 86:12,	washington
192:9, 193:21,	35:10, 35:19,	93:21, 107:1,	1:12, 2:7, 3:8,
199:3, 207:7	67:16, 144:9,	108:1, 108:2,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
understand	187:4	108:10, 108:22,	3:16, 4:6, 7:13,
9:8, 9:10,	usually	110:7, 110:13,	12:10, 36:20
11:3, 11:19,	41:12, 71:16,	116:2, 118:18,	wasser
19:5, 23:1,	94:6, 94:10,	118:22, 123:13,	172:7, 172:10,
53:1, 53:2,	151:20, 176:5	127:8, 127:13,	173:14, 173:22,
82:14, 89:13,	v	128:12, 130:4,	174:5, 174:6
94:22, 120:1,	valid	130:10, 130:14,	wasser's
124:6, 125:19,	39:21	130:19, 131:8,	172:15
126:5, 126:6,	various	133:21, 134:5,	watch
126:10, 129:7,		134:21, 145:2,	1:4, 3:5, 7:4,
139:11, 140:20,	29:14, 93:16,	158:19, 181:4,	7:17, 7:19,
145:6, 145:12,	193:15	181:22, 183:8,	8:20, 9:2,
179:9, 185:14,	verbal	183:12, 184:3,	121:1, 181:7,
185:21, 194:21,	11:1	199:18	185:1, 200:15,
195:18, 202:12	versus	walter's	200:19
understandable	8:20		watch's
42:9	via	109:3, 116:12,	199:21
	159:13, 172:3	116:22, 118:9,	way
understanding	video	183:16, 183:19,	32:12, 36:7,
9:7, 9:12,	4:11, 7:2, 7:9,	184:3, 184:11	52:1, 58:1,
33:3, 33:5,	7:11, 8:4,	walters	71:4, 75:11,
116:17, 199:1	88:20, 89:1,	76:10	106:1, 142:3,
understood	136:20, 137:1,	want	142:5, 145:3,
11:6, 62:8,	,	12:6, 22:8,	1442:0, 140:0,
	i e		

	Conducted on C	Ctooci 27, 2017	03
145:22, 154:4,	whether	154:18, 155:19,	127:22, 129:22,
156:11, 162:18,	68:21, 75:2,	155:22, 158:20,	134:7, 138:9,
180:19, 186:18,	75:13, 83:10,	167:8, 184:13,	139:5, 145:8,
196:7, 197:6	104:18, 104:19,	189:19, 189:22,	152:8, 158:5,
we're	107:9, 117:5,	193:16, 198:11	159:18
41:18, 92:22,	120:6, 130:20,	without	year
106:8, 136:18,	136:17, 140:6,	86:1	23:8, 23:14,
170:19, 189:16,	153:22, 163:22,	witness	25:1, 28:3,
189:17, 196:11	184:8, 189:7,	7:22, 8:8,	68:11, 194:10
we've	190:12, 190:16	46:2, 70:10,	years
10:4, 71:20,	white	72:5, 164:5,	12:15, 12:21,
100:3, 110:17,	48:18, 49:3,	198:11, 198:13,	12:22, 14:21,
136:15, 141:9,	49:8, 92:16,	202:1, 202:20,	14:22, 22:17,
143:16, 175:22,	109:10, 109:17,	207:12	23:12, 24:8,
178:11, 180:6,	110:4, 110:8,	work	28:6, 36:9,
188:3, 195:10,	111:14, 111:20,	16:7, 29:14,	38:1, 77:22,
198:3	112:6, 116:3,	53:14, 118:18,	88:8, 198:22
week	116:15, 117:6,	152:1, 165:4	yourself
93:14, 93:19	122:12, 122:17,	worked	40:15
weekly	123:15, 127:8,	50:8, 70:12,	yvette
42:13, 91:5,	128:21, 129:1	74:8, 111:17,	60:1
92:4, 92:5,	whitehead	132:22, 155:7,	
93:12, 98:10,	1:22, 2:12,	155:9, 155:10,	z
106:5, 146:2,	8:5, 207:2	198:22	zero
146:9	whomever	working	160:10
	46:22		0
weismann	wikileaks	29:7, 31:18,	00
5:10		41:1	21:8
went	186:7	works	00000899
20:20, 48:1,	wilma	172:13, 189:13	5:16
70:11, 70:18,	30:8	wouldn't	0001
161:9, 192:19	within	40:20, 84:9,	5:16, 121:5
wep	13:17, 15:9,	84:10, 106:3,	0004
55:13, 182:16	16:22, 18:7,	106:4, 110:4,	5:16
weren't	23:4, 23:5,	136:6, 136:7,	04
18:19, 135:21,	32:6, 35:17,	153:13, 156:8,	130:5, 130:11,
155:13, 155:17	38:1, 40:17,	163:20	157:13
western	48:14, 53:18,	wpd	06071676
55:13, 182:16	55:5, 61:13,	58:18	5:14
wh	65:8, 72:14,	written	06104350
109:9, 109:10,	73:9, 79:20,	155:1, 200:21	6:6, 146:19
109:20, 109:22,	79:21, 81:15,	wrote	06105336
110:1	85:22, 91:18,	135:8	- 5:22
whatever	97:15, 98:22,	Y	06105353
71:13, 72:3,	101:22, 103:4,	yeah	6:17
203:4	125:2, 137:17,	21:21, 35:1,	
	144:19, 146:1,	35:3, 55:20,	06125546
whenever	146.2 140.2	33:3, 33:20,	C-1 127.11
78:1	146:2, 148:2,	65:16, 124:7,	6:4, 137:11
78:1 whereof	146:2, 148:2, 148:10, 154:16,		6:4, 137:11
78:1	•		6:4, 137:11
78:1 whereof	•		6:4, 137:11

	Conducted on Oc		04
06125549	119:2, 134:20,	1988	45:14
5:18, 112:19	136:16, 136:21,	193:3, 193:5,	2011
06125550	145:2, 152:20,	194:12	24:8, 24:22,
5:20, 117:21	171:16, 176:15,	1989	26:13, 27:10,
06125553	177:21, 178:2,	13:1	28:9, 29:20,
168:20	201:7	1st	29:22, 45:14
06125555	120		2012
	5:21	138:18, 145:4, 166:11	9:7, 36:18,
168:16	1242		37:3, 37:8,
06125556	1:7, 7:7	2	37:22, 38:9,
6:11	13	2	38:12, 41:17,
0612556		21:10, 147:10	66:19, 67:6,
168:10	6:16, 33:10,	2/6/12	·
06125561	40:9, 76:14,	5:10	100:2, 106:11,
169:1	137:2, 157:12,	20	108:4, 108:11,
06125562	176:15, 180:22,	77:13, 108:4,	108:20, 110:12,
6:13, 175:15	181:3	110:14, 113:7,	110:14, 113:7,
06125565	137	116:22, 118:10,	116:22, 118:10,
6:15, 178:3	6:3	119:2, 134:20,	119:2, 119:19,
06125574	14	145:2, 176:15,	122:7, 134:6,
6:8, 149:16	1:7, 6:18, 7:7,	198:22	134:20, 139:12,
07	87:22, 173:8,	200	145:2, 147:3,
77:13	184:18, 184:21,	6:19	170:21, 176:15,
1	187:17, 207:16	2000	176:20, 188:2,
10	146	29:11	204:20
6:9, 100:5,	6:5	20005	2013
101:12, 101:15,	148	3:16	30:16, 35:15,
106:9, 147:22,	6:7	2001	41:17, 47:11,
167:16, 168:7,	15	21:10, 21:13	49:13, 52:18,
169:7, 169:14,	6:19, 187:20,	20024	72:13, 72:16,
182:6, 201:6	200:10, 200:13,	3:8	72:21, 75:9,
106	205:18	2003	75:21, 77:2,
5:15	167	21:13, 21:22	80:22, 83:7,
11	6:9	20036	83:19, 84:8,
	17	2:7	84:15, 85:3,
6:12, 88:21,	29:6	2: /	85:15, 86:19,
89:2, 131:15, 157:13, 175:9,	175	22:17, 22:18,	92:22, 95:18,
•	6 : 12		97:2, 97:13,
175:10	177	22:19, 23:2	100:5, 108:11,
1100	6:14	2007	122:14, 130:4,
2:5, 3:15, 7:12	18	77:13	130:11, 131:15,
112	178:21	2009	133:13, 134:22,
5:17	180	24:10, 24:15,	135:8, 138:18,
117	6:16	32:9, 49:13,	140:17, 144:15,
5:19	184	195:4, 195:22,	145:4, 146:3,
12	6:18	196:21, 198:1	147:9, 147:22,
6:14, 108:4,	19	2010	162:1, 165:19,
110:14, 113:7,	88:21, 187:20	24:8, 24:22,	166:3, 166:11,
116:22, 118:10,	1984	26:7, 29:22,	167:11, 173:8,
	12:5, 12:8		
	12.0, 12.0		

	85		
176:20, 178:21,	3	646	
182:9, 182:22,	3	3:9	
183:4, 184:13,	_	647	
186:6, 186:12,	21:12, 205:19	4:7	
187:3, 187:11,	30	7	
189:22, 192:10,	5:8		
196:1, 196:11,	305	7583	
198:6	3:17	3:17	
2014	31	8	
	131:15	800	
9:2, 29:17,	34	3:7	
38:2, 86:21,	89:2	88	
87:16, 89:8,	3767	13:3	
90:6, 184:13,	2:8	888	
187:4, 187:10,	38		
187:11, 204:19,	136:21	2:8	
205:10	39	899	
2015	205:18, 205:19	107:1	
87:1		9	
2017	4	9	
28:20, 29:1	40	1:14, 7:9,	
2019	136:16	130:5, 130:11	
1:13, 7:8,	40981	90	
201:7, 207:14	106:11, 110:12,	17:8, 17:9,	
202	122:7, 147:3,	20:3	
3:9, 3:17, 4:7	170:21	901	
2023	425		
207:16	3:6	120:21, 121:5 902	
20520	433		
4:6	2:8	181:6	
207	45	950	
1:21	137:2	2:6	
21	48	99	
	147:10	5:10	
171:16			
2201	5		
4:5	5/8/13		
25	160:15		
23:8, 28:3,	51		
28:6	182:6		
26	5172		
152:20	3:9		
262569	53		
1:20	1:14, 7:9		
28	54		
130:4, 130:11	187:17		
29	6		
1:13, 7:8,			
131:15, 157:12,	6371		
166:3, 207:13	4:7		
	L		