To: Senator Grassley, Chairman, Finance Committee
Senior Member, Judiciary Committee
Senator Johnson, Chairman, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee
From: Majority Staff, Finance Committee
Majority Staff, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee
Date: August 14, 2019
Re: Investigation of the DOJ’s and FBI’s Handling of the Clinton Investigation

Dear Chairman Grassley and Chairman Johnson:

We write to provide you with information that we developed as part of your investigation into the mishandling of highly classified information and operation of a non-government server for official business by Secretary Clinton and her associates. Statements made in a joint bipartisan staff interview by intelligence community officials involved in the classification review raise particular concerns that senior State Department officials sought to downgrade classified material found on the server.

Your investigation began in March 2015 with an initial focus on whether State Department officials were aware of Secretary Clinton’s private server and the associated national security risks, as well as whether State Department officials attempted to downgrade classified material within emails found on that server. For example, in August 2015, Senator Grassley wrote to the State Department about reports that State Department FOIA specialists believed some of Secretary Clinton’s emails should be subject to the (b)(1), “Classified Information” exemption whereas attorneys within the Office of the Legal Advisor preferred to use the (b)(5), “Deliberative Process” exemption. Whistleblower career employees within the State Department also reportedly notified the Intelligence Community that others at State involved in the review process deliberately changed classification determinations to protect Secretary Clinton.1 Your inquiry later extended to how the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) managed their investigation of the mishandling of classified information.

A current focus of the investigation is the highly classified appendix to the DOJ Inspector General’s report on these matters, which DOJ provided to Congress on July 11, 2018. That appendix raised a number of serious questions because, as explained on page 154 of the unclassified DOJ IG report, the FBI decided not to seek access to certain highly classified

---

information potentially relevant to the investigation despite members of the FBI case team referring to the review as a “necessary” part of the investigation.”2 As a result of the findings in that appendix, Senator Grassley wrote a classified letter to DOJ on October 17, 2018, which remains unanswered. On January 15, 2019, at Mr. Barr’s nomination hearing, Senator Grassley asked Mr. Barr if he would answer the letter, if confirmed, to which he attested, “Yes, Senator.” On April 16, 2019, Senators Grassley, Johnson, and Graham sent a letter to Attorney General Barr reiterating the need for a written response to that letter.

In August 2018, news articles alleged that a Chinese state-owned company hacked former Secretary Clinton’s non-government server and inserted code that forwarded nearly all of her emails to the foreign company.3 The reporting indicated that two Intelligence Community Inspector General (ICIG) officials – Frank Rucker and Jeanette McMillian – discovered the code and brought the possible intrusion to the attention of the FBI.4

We pursued this issue by requesting interviews with the two ICIG officials. On December 4, 2018, your staff, along with staff from Senators Feinstein and McCaskill, interviewed ICIG employees Mr. Rucker and Ms. McMillian. On December 20, 2018, you transmitted a copy of an interview summary of the Majority’s questions and the witness’s answers to the ICIG for a classification review. On January 30, 2019, the ICIG provided classified and unclassified versions of the interview summary, and the Office of Senate Security redacted the classified information. On February 28, 2019, the ICIG provided documentary evidence including copies of emails and notes from meetings. On April 9, 2019, the DOJ IG and ICIG provided a summary of their findings related to these Chinese hacking allegations.

We would like to bring to your attention two pieces of information that we learned during those interviews. First, according to one ICIG official, some members of the FBI investigative team seemed indifferent to evidence of a possible intrusion by a foreign adversary into Secretary Clinton’s non-government server. The interview summary makes clear exactly what information Mr. Rucker and Ms. McMillian knew regarding the alleged hack of the Clinton server, as well as the information they shared with the FBI team, including Peter Strzok, the Deputy Assistant Director of the FBI’s Counterintelligence Division in charge of the Clinton investigation.

Second, the interview summary provides additional information about the internal process the State Department undertook to determine the classification of emails from Secretary Clinton and her associates. Ms. McMillian explained that, “at first, State fought back against the

---

2 A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election. Unclassified Inspector General Report, p. 154. “In addition, as we describe in the classified appendix to this report, the OIG learned near the end of our review that the FBI had considered obtaining permission from the Department to review certain classified materials that may have included information potentially relevant to the Midyear investigation. Although the Midyear team drafted a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General in late May 2016 stating that review of the highly classified materials was necessary to complete the investigation and requesting permission to access them, the FBI never sent this request to the Department. FBI witnesses told us that they did not seek access to these classified materials for various reasons, including that they believed this information would not materially impact the conclusion. The classified appendix describes in more detail the highly classified information, its potential relevance to the Midyear investigation, the FBI’s reasons for not seeking access to it, and our analysis.”

3 Adam Shaw, Chinese company reportedly hacked Clinton’s server, got copy of every email in real-time, Fox News (Aug. 29, 2018); Richard Pollock, Sources: China Hacked Hillary Clinton’s Private Email Server, The Daily Caller (Aug. 27, 2018).

4 Id.
intelligence community being involved” but eventually agreed. She also explained that, during the course of their review, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency had “significant equities” in the Clinton emails. Also, during the interview, Mr. Rucker stated that he was told that two State Department employees, Austin Evers and Catherine Duval, took steps to downgrade classified emails by arguing that they should be withheld from disclosure for deliberative process reasons, rather than classification reasons, under the Freedom of Information Act. Mr. Rucker also observed then-Ambassador Patrick Kennedy questioning whether certain emails should be provided to the intelligence community for review and fighting against classifying other emails.

This information should serve as an addition to your investigative record. Accordingly, we have attached an unclassified copy of the Majority’s questioning and the corresponding witness answers to this memorandum (Exhibit 1). We have also included an October 25, 2018 document production from the ICIG (Exhibit 2), a February 26, 2019 document production from the ICIG (Exhibit 3), and an April 9, 2019, letter from the IC and DOJ IG summarizing their findings related to the alleged hack into Secretary Clinton’s non-government server (Exhibit 4).
EXHIBIT 1
United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510  
December 20, 2018

VIA CLASSIFIED COURIER  
The Honorable Michael K. Atkinson  
Inspector General  
Office of the Inspector General for the Intelligence Community  
Washington, DC 20511

Dear Inspector General Atkinson,

On December 4, 2018, the majority and minority staff on the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs interviewed two former Intelligence Community Inspector General employees, Jeanette McMillian and Frank Rucker. Attached please find a summary of the majority’s questioning and the respective answers provided by each interviewee. We request that you provide a classification review of the information no later than January 15, 2019.

Should you have questions, please contact Josh Flynn-Brown of Chairman Grassley’s staff at (202) 224-5225 or Brian Downey of Chairman Johnson’s staff at (202) 224-4751.

Sincerely,

Ron Johnson  
Chairman  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Charles E. Grassley  
Chairman  
Committee on the Judiciary

cc: The Honorable Claire McCaskill  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein  
Ranking Member  
Committee on the Judiciary

Enclosures

S-1

(UNCLASSIFIED when separated from attachments)

**NOT APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE**
IC IG Interviews

Tuesday, December 04, 2018
Approximately 1:00 pm to 5:45 pm

Participants:

Jeanette McMillian
Melissa Wright
Michael Atkinson
Frank Rucker
Congressional Staff:
Josh Flynn-Brown (SJC-Grassley)
David Brewer (HSGAC-Johnson)
Andy Hromyak (SJC-Grassley)
Heather Sawyer (SJC-Feinstein)
Annie Owens (SJC-Feinstein)
Julie Kline (Sen. McCaskill)

Jeanette McMillian (Majority questioning started at 1PM)

Majority:

When did you begin working with ICIG, and when did you leave?

McMillian:

Ms. McMillian said she started working at ICIG when it was created in 2011 and she had been with its predecessor ODNI-IG in 2010. Previously, she worked at the CIA Office of General Counsel (CIA-OGC). She left the ICIG in June 2018 to work at another counterintelligence related entity.

Majority:

What was the role of the ICIG during the Clinton email investigation?
McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that ICIG worked in a supporting role to State-IG. She said that State IG Steve Linick received a letter from Senators Johnson, Corker and Burr (in March 2015, regarding the investigation to examine email usage among recent former Secretaries of State), and in response IG Linick was told he could receive assistance from the ICIG which would help in identifying classified material.

Majority:

(U) Can you describe the contacts you and ICIG had with the FBI in early 2016 regarding the anomaly found in Secretary Clinton’s emails?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that the original 811c referral was made by ICIG to the FBI in July 2015. When the anomaly was later discovered, she said it was appended to the existing referral. She does not remember whether a document was created which memorializes this.

(U//FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that she worked with departments and agencies within the IC who identified classified information at the time it was sent (in the emails). She said that ICIG needed to protect additional equities which started around August 2015. She said they identified classified information, attempted to figure out where all it went and who received it, and how it was handled so as to make sure there would be no issues going forward. She said that it was during this review that ICIG Inspector Frank Rucker found an anomaly in the particular email data. At the time of the discovery, she said they didn’t know whether FBI had seen this yet already or not.

Majority:

(U) Was it a two-prong process?

McMillian:

(U//FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that it was different. She said that after they identified it, it was not a “one and done.” She said that in the second part of the review, Mr. Rucker looked through the metadata to find out where classified information was sent. It was a static forensic analysis. He worked with a copy of a copy (of the emails). She said that she has no technical experience on the metadata side, so Mr. Rucker will be able to explain better.

(U) Ms. McMillian said that the anomaly was not found or specifically looked for during the original review. She said they got into it once they learned that classified information existed on Secretary Clinton’s emails.

Majority:

(U) What was the significance of anomaly?

McMillian:

(U//FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that it was found by Mr. Rucker in the batch of 30,000 emails. She said that what ICIG received is basically a copy of the email. She said there was concern over the
carterheavyindustries@Gmail.com email address that was observed in the metadata. It appeared that this email address was essentially a live "dropbox" for all of Secretary Clinton’s sent and received emails.

Majority:

(U) Can you describe the meeting you and Mr. Rucker had with the FBI?

McMillian:

(U/FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that the meeting with Peter Strzok was wide-ranging in topics because he just took over his new assignment as Section Chief. She said that she and Mr. Rucker brought this Clinton email to his attention but could not explain whether it had significance. She said that they only drew attention to its existence which they could not explain or account for. She said that it seemed like a strange thing to have on her email (the Carter Heavy Industries email address).

(U/FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that she doesn’t recall trying to identify the source or owner of the Carter Heavy Industries email address. She said that they provided the information to Mr. Strzok who found it strange. Even before their meeting with Mr. Strzok, Dean Chappell of the FBI informed them that he was aware of the Carter Heavy Industries email address. She said that she doesn’t know whether Mr. Chappell knew before they dropped off the original packet in January 2016, or if he learned of it afterward. News of this email address being found on Secretary Clinton’s emails wasn’t shocking to them, she said, but they took it seriously. She said that the FBI seemed impressed with their ability to find it and with Mr. Rucker’s technical abilities. Sometime after the meeting with Mr. Strzok, she said that ICIG provided detailed spreadsheets of Clinton’s emails and that the spreadsheets were likely classified at the Top Secret level with compartments. She said that she doesn’t know what the current classified level is for the respective emails.

(U/FOUO) Ms. McMillian estimated that the meeting lasted approximately 45 minutes. She said that there were maybe 6 or 7 people including her and Mr. Rucker who did most of the talking for ICIG. Mr. Rucker and the FBI talked in technical terms regarding the anomaly.

Majority:

(U) Did the FBI express any reaction to the ICIG finding the anomaly?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said no, and that the FBI employees in attendance were “poker faced.” She said that they wanted to figure out how ICIG found it. She said that they let the FBI know that ICIG was not trying to do the FBI’s job and that they only found it by means of protecting ICIG assets and sources.

Majority:

(U) Other than the FBI, did you notify anyone else of the anomaly on Secretary Clinton’s emails?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that they notified ODNI, NCTC, and security officials within the agencies that owned the information. She said that the agencies that had equitie included CIA and NGA. She said that it is up to the individual agencies that owned the information to conduct their due diligence as far as any damage assessment is concerned.
Do you recall who was at the February 2016 meeting with the FBI?

McMillian:

Ms. McMillian said that it was her, Mr. Rucker, Mr. Strzok, Mr. Chappell, and a few other men in “white shirts and dark suits” from the FBI. She said that she cannot remember their names.

I want to provide you with a few names to see if they sound familiar and whether they might also have attended the meeting. Was Jon Moffa there?

McMillian:

Ms. McMillian said that the name sounds familiar and that she remembers that a John/Jon was there, but she doesn’t know for certain whether he was.

Was Trisha Anderson there?

McMillian:

Ms. McMillian said that her name “rings a bell and I remember her name being mentioned in relation to this matter, but I cannot say for certain whether she attended the meeting.”

Was David Laufman there?

McMillian:

“I don’t think so.”

Was George Toscas there?

McMillian:

“I don’t think so.”

Was Matt Axelrod there?

McMillian:

“That name sounds familiar, but I don’t know.”

Where did the “hot” emails go?
Ms. McMillian said that it was their understanding that they went to this "drop box" live, as the emails were being sent and received. She believes they went to this email address just like they would go to the intended email recipients. She said "even if you didn’t address an email to this address, the email went to it anyway." She said they explained this to the FBI.

Ms. McMillian said that they kept ODNI and the individual agencies in the loop as to what they found and what they were doing. She said that it was up to each individual agency to conduct their own damage control. She said that she doesn’t know if this outreach took place before or after the meeting with FBI, but it was within the same timeframe.

Ms. McMillian said that the ICIG didn’t see it as its role to conduct their own investigation, but to rather pass the information to the FBI and move on and let them handle it. She said that they made the referral to the FBI and let them investigate it, and that she doesn’t know that ICIG even had jurisdiction to investigate it. She said that ICIG shared the information with State, IG to IG. She said she doesn’t know what State did if anything, but State was happy ICIG made the referral to the FBI.

Majority:

The 811c referral is an official government request, so should the ICIG receive a formal conclusion in return from the FBI?

Ms. McMillian said, "No, Mr. McCullough was a former FBI Special Agent and he didn’t feel we should participate in anything once we made notification to the FBI." She said it was a "one-way street" of information flow to the FBI.

Majority:

Is it possible that hackers could have gotten into Secretary Clinton’s emails through the carter heavy industries email account?

Ms. McMillian said that she doesn’t think the intelligence community had jurisdiction to look into whether hostile actors accessed or compromised Secretary Clinton’s email account, and she felt that they did not have jurisdiction at ICIG.

Majority:

Did you ask the FBI to find out whether hostile actors had accessed Secretary Clinton’s emails and to let you know the outcome of their findings?

Ms. McMillian said no and that their meeting with the FBI wasn’t an “ask,” it was just a referral. She said the first time she heard any follow-up on this matter was by listening to then-FBI Director Comey’s Congressional testimony that summer (2016) where he said the FBI found no evidence of hostile
intrusion. To this day, she said that ICIG has no definitive answer on what Carter Heavy Industries is or who runs it.

Majority:

(U) Which agencies had equities in regards to the classified emails sent by Secretary Clinton on her private server?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that NGA and CIA had significant equities and provided ICIG with declarations as such. She said that NSA conducted a review, but they didn't have SIGINT equities.

Majority:

(U) Did the ICIG make any classification determinations regarding the emails Secretary Clinton sent and received on her private server?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that the ICIG does not have classification authority. She said that their declaration asked for the classification level at the time a given email was sent, and for the current classification level considering it had been over three years since they were sent.

Majority:

(U//FOUO) Was the only documentation passed to the FBI in early 2016 the original packet of sensitive information delivered by Mr. Rucker?

McMillian:

(U) "I think so."

Majority:

(U) What did the packet of sensitive material consist of?

McMillian:

(U//FOUO) Ms. McMillian said that she believes it contained copies of the classified emails they identified as part of their first review. She said that they later made a very large and detailed spreadsheet of the classified emails and where they went. She said this was separate from the original packet delivered by Mr. Rucker. She said that the records containing the spreadsheets were delivered sometime after the face-to-face meeting with the FBI.

Majority:

(U) I assume you are familiar with the DOJ-IG report on the Clinton email investigation?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that she saw it, but she was not interviewed as part of their report. She said that to her knowledge, they were aware of all aspects of our referral. She acknowledged that DOJ-IG did
interview her after Rep. Gohmert had the exchange with Mr. Strzok during the joint House hearing in July 2018 about the alleged China hack. She said that she told them the same things she discussed during today's interview. She said that she didn’t tell them anything additional that she didn’t tell the Committee today.

Majority:

(U) Was the DOJ-OIG interview tethered to their ongoing FISA investigation?

McMillian:

(U) “I don’t think so. It was a Congressional ask triggered by the Congressional hearing followed by media reports.”

Majority:

(U) Did you see evidence of intentional classification downgrading of emails at State?

McMillian:

(U) “I don’t know if that was the case. If anything, there were problems at State with upgrading of information. The State Department uses this process a lot.”

(U) Ms. McMillian said that their original ask to IG Linick was to hire or get assistance from people who can identify intelligence community equities. She said that at first, State fought back against the intelligence community being involved, but they needed the expertise and people skilled to do it in order to meet court demands. She said that after contacting ODNI, State eventually did agree to bring in experts to assist with the review process and ODNI agreed to provide personnel to assist. She said they looked at a small sampling, 296 emails going forward.

Majority:

(U) Were you interviewed by the FBI and when?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said yes, that the FBI took 302s or reports from both her and Mr. McCullough around the time of their original referral in July 2015. She said the FBI interviewed her and Mr. McCullough one week, and then interviewed Mr. Rucker the following week. She said that these 302s have been released in redacted form on the FBI’s website.

Majority:

(U) What were the contacts you had with the FBI in early 2016?

McMillian:

(U) Ms. McMillian said that first, they gave a packet of information to the FBI which contained all classified emails identified to date or during the first review. Then, she said, they had the in-person meeting. She said that lastly, they produced a high-side communication regarding passing along spreadsheets which documented all classified emails identified to date and who they came from, where they went, the names of all recipients.
Note: ICIG Michael Atkinson arrived around 1:45 p.m.

Majority:

(U) Is it your understanding that Secretary Clinton’s private-to-private emails contained the Carter Heavy Industries anomaly?

McMillian:

"Yes."

[Interview of Ms. McMillian ended at 2:40 PM]

Frank Rucker (Majority questioning started at 2:50 p.m.)

Majority:

(U) Can you provide us with a brief career overview and tell us how you came to work at ICIG and whether you are still employed there?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that he began his job as an inspector with ICIG in February 2013 and that he left in June 2017 when it was “time for a rotation.” He explained that he is not an IG person by trade, but rather comes from an intelligence background. He said he currently works in the field of intelligence regarding weapons of mass destruction. Previously, he served in the U.S. Navy for 21 years and worked in naval intelligence. He said he retired from the Navy in 2002 and that since then, he has done work for NGA, NCIP, and then joined ICIG. He said that he is self-taught in computers, that he has built his own firewalls, and that he has completed several courses in computers.

Majority:

(U) How did ICIG come to be involved with the Secretary Clinton email investigation?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that on March 12, 2015, the Senate sent a letter to ICIG requesting assistance regarding a Russian hacker who allegedly broke into Sidney Blumenthal’s email account. He said that the Sidney Blumenthal emails looked legitimate and were not at the SSRP level. He said that a former CIA employee who worked with Blumenthal, was the author of most of the material. That was determined in part, he said, based on his writing style. Shortly afterwards, he said, ICIG received another Senate request for assistance, this time in relation to the email practices of several former Secretaries of State including Secretary Clinton. He said that through ICIG, he was brought in to assist State in reviewing the email information in June 2015.

Majority:

(U) Can you describe your interactions with the FBI regarding the anomaly?
Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that his first interaction was dropping off a packet of information which contained a single printed email that he told the FBI was "not a good sign." In this email, he said, Secretary Clinton replied to an email that she never received. He said that he found this data point and reported it to the FBI. He said that he found the Carter Heavy Industries Gmail address which he had not seen before and that it appeared to be hidden data.

Majority:

(U/FOUO) What was the significance of this find, the Carter Heavy Industries email account?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said, "I'm not qualified to say, but it wasn't normal to see and we felt it needed to be reported." He said that they found that all but four of the more than 30,000 emails reviewed contained the Carter Heavy Industries email address.

Majority:

(U/FOUO) What's your guess as to what the Carter Heavy Industries email address is or why it exists?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that by example, they saw an email exchange between Anthony Weiner and his wife and Clinton aide Huma Abedin where Weiner said that his email was hacked and he learned that all of his emails were going or being routed to his opposition candidate. Mr. Rucker said that he assumed the anomaly in Secretary Clinton's emails might be something similar, but he can't say for sure.

Majority:

(U) Were there any follow-up discussions with the FBI in which they revealed what they found in regards to the anomaly?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he asked Dean Chappell at the FBI to tell him what Carter Heavy Industries means and how it was inserted into Secretary Clinton's emails, but he never found out from him or anyone else at the FBI. He cited page 9 of the recent ICIG document production to the Senate and pointed out how he asked Mr. Chappell, "If there is a point in all of this when you (or someone on the team) could explain it to me further, I'd appreciate it."

Majority:

(U) What software did you use in examining the Secretary Clinton's emails which you received from the FBI?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that IntellaPro was used on the disc once they received it from the FBI. He said that it helps sort data and is used by most major law firms.
Did you have any concerns that the Carter Heavy Industries email was associated with a foreign actor?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that he didn't until he brought it to Mr. McCullough's attention who recommended that they use Google to look up the email address. He said that they did not find an exact match, but they found that "Carter Heavy Industry" came back listed as the name of a Chinese trucking company. He said that Mr. McCullough told him that they need to report the anomaly to the FBI as soon as possible. He said that's when he reached out to Mr. Chappell.

Can you describe your meeting at the FBI with Peter Strzok?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that Mr. Chappell was normal and professional as he had come to know him to be, but that he didn't know anything about Mr. Strzok prior to the meeting. Mr. Rucker said that Mr. Strzok seemed to be "aloof and dismissive." He said it was as if Mr. Strzok felt dismissive of the relationship between the FBI and ICIG and he was not very warm. He said that Mr. Strzok didn't ask many questions including any about SAP related issues. He said the meeting lasted approximately 30 to 60 minutes and that only people from the FBI attended; there were no employees from DOJ. Mr. Rucker said that he knows that an FBI attorney was present, but he cannot remember the person's name or even whether it was a man or a woman.

Can you list all of the people who attended the meeting?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that besides himself, it was Ms. McMillian, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Strzok, an attorney from FBI-OGC, and maybe one other person.

Do you recall whether a woman named Trisha Anderson attended?

Rucker:

"No."

What about George Toscas?

Rucker:

"The name sounds familiar, but I don't recall."
Majority:

(U) How about Matt Axelrod?
Rucker:

(U) "No."

Majority:

(U) David Laufman?
Rucker:

(U) "No."

Majority:

(U) Lisa Page?
Rucker:

(U) "I don't know."

Majority:

(U) Bill Priestap?
Rucker:

(U) "I don't know."

Majority:

(U) What did you discuss during the meeting with the FBI?
Rucker:

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he discussed SAP with the FBI. He said he discussed another of Secretary Clinton's emails that they were never able to quite figure out. He said he verbally presented this information to Mr. Strzok which lasted only for a minute or so. He said that he doesn't think he mentioned Carter Heavy Industries by name, but only the appearance of a Gmail address that seemed odd. He said that Mr. Strzok seemed "nonplusked" by the info, and that he didn't ask any follow-up questions. He said that Mr. Chappell seemed familiar with the discovery and he felt like Mr. Chappell was walling Mr. Rucker off intentionally as an investigator would, to protect the investigation.

Majority:

(U) Were there any other issues discussed?
Rucker:

(U) Mr. Rucker said that they discussed some classification issues that he cannot discuss with the Committee, but that they were issues that caused him concern. He said that they asked that copies of every email sent to the FBI and to be apprised of FBI classification decisions.
Majority:

(U) Is the exhibit from pages 44 to 47 ("Mexico Trip Report" email) of the document production in the same format as when it was produced by FBI for the ICIG?

Rucker:

(U) "No, this is how it looks after it goes through IntellaPro."

Majority:

(U//FOUO) Can you tell from the metadata in this document when the Carter Heavy Industries Gmail address received Secretary Clinton’s emails?

Rucker:

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he doesn’t know from this document that Carter Heavy Industries received her emails instantly, or whether there was a delay in receipt.

Majority:

(U//FOUO) What was the difference between the four emails that did not contain the Carter Heavy Industries email address and the more than 30,000 emails that did?

Rucker:

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that there was nothing unique about the four Secretary Clinton emails that did not contain the Carter Heavy Industries email address.

Majority:

(U) What was the timeframe of the emails reviewed?

Rucker:

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that they reviewed the entire available data produced to the State Department.

Majority:

(U//FOUO) When you first identified the Carter Heavy Industries email address, did you assume Secretary Clinton’s emails were directed to it in real-time?

Rucker:

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said yes and that based on his reading of the metadata and of his reading of the Anthony Weiner and Huma Abedin email exchange regarding hacking that he referenced earlier, it appears as though the Carter Heavy Industries email address was inserted into Secretary Clinton’s server.

Majority:

(U) Have you since found evidence to change this view?
Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he didn’t find any evidence in the remainder of the email review they conducted, but that based on the subpoena issued by the FBI in June 2016 which he learned about this year through a news article, it decreased his confidence level from 90% to 80%.

Majority:

(U) Did you share your findings about the anomaly with any other agencies?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he did not present this information to anybody but the FBI.

Majority:

(U/FOUO) Besides conducting a Google search on the Carter Heavy Industries email address, did you conduct any additional research into the anomaly?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that he did additional research on his own later in 2016, a few months after he made the referral of information to the FBI, and he found that a common tactic of hackers is to get the emails of a target forwarded or routed to them. He said that the Carter Heavy Industries email address isn’t somebody Secretary Clinton intentionally communicated with, but it appears in the metadata of almost all of her emails.

Majority:

(U/FOUO) Based on your expertise and study, was the Carter Heavy Industries email address inserted into the routing table of Clinton’s server?

Rucker:

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that it appears so, but that he doesn’t know for certain because he never had access to Secretary Clinton’s server in order to confirm this. He said that there could be another explanation that he’s not aware of.

Majority:

(U) Considering the 811c referral made to the FBI by ICIG, did you ever get a formal conclusion or explanation?

Rucker:

(U) Mr. Rucker said that he never did. He said he believes that out of professional courtesy it would have been nice if the FBI gave them an update on whether they were on to something, or whether it was nothing. He said that he knows Mr. McCullough received a note of thanks from Director Comey for ICIG’s work, but he doesn’t know the content of the note.

Majority:

(U) What was contained within the spreadsheets produced and given to the FBI?
Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that they contained a tracking of the emails sent for classification review and that they tracked families of emails.

Majority:

When you were implanted in the State Department's FOIA review, did you come across any evidence that State Department officials were intentionally downgrading classified emails?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that he talked to State officials about some employees who were doing this. He said that he was told that Austin Evers and Catherine Duval were two attorneys who took steps to downgrade classified emails from B1 to B5.

Majority:

Do you believe Ambassador Patrick Kennedy was trying to do the same?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said yes and that Mr. McCullough was present during some of these meetings, so he has knowledge as well. Mr. Rucker said that at one such meeting, Ambassador Kennedy provided packets of information that were ready to go out to the intelligence community. He said that Ambassador Kennedy threw documents from the packet at him across table during one of the meetings and yelled, “Why does this need to be classified?” He said that Ambassador Kennedy fought against classifying emails but that he was not as aggressive in his actions as compared with the steps taken by Mr. Evers and Ms. Duval.

Majority:

Were you ever interviewed by DOJ-IG?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker said that he was interviewed in August 2018, and that they asked him the same questions that he was being asked today by the Committee.

Majority:

Did you tell them anything that you haven’t told us yet?

Rucker:

Mr. Rucker asked for a moment to consult with counsel. After conferring for a minute or so, he said that raised several other issues during his interview with DOJ-OIG, including whether somebody from ICIG was leaking to the media. Mr. Rucker said that it was a small group at ICIG that was working on the Clinton email issue, so it was a concern for Mr. McCullough that somebody was leaking. He said that Mr. McCullough considered pulling and examining everybody’s phone records. During the time of the Podesta hack, Mr. Rucker said that there was an email to Clinton attorney [David] Kendall referencing [redacted] and a “favorite son.” He said that Paul Wogerman, who was then a counsel at ICIG and whose father was allegedly a pastor to the Clintons, was the only male employee on leave at the following
day when a meeting with [REDACTED] was supposed to take place according to the email. Therefore, he said, it was believed that Mr. Wogerman was leaking to [REDACTED]. He said that Mr. McCullough made a decision not to confront Mr. Wogerman. Mr. Rucker said that he does not believe that ICIG ever did an official assessment on whether Mr. Wogerman leaked classified information. He said that Mr. Wogerman pushed very hard to be included on the investigation, but he was NOT part of it. He said that Mr. Wogerman now works at ODNI in the mission integration department. Mr. Rucker said that to his knowledge, nobody ever confronted Mr. Wogerman about it. He said that they all signed non-disclosure agreements or NDAs regarding their work at ICIG.

(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that a few odd things were happening that were also discussed. He said that a Jeep once followed the ICIG (McCullough) from the State Department to the door of house. Mr. Rucker said that he himself had a Jeep following him at odd hours. He said that for two weeks, the same Jeep followed him on Route 50. Mr. Rucker said that he cannot recall the exact timeframe of when this occurred, nor did he record the Jeep’s license plate. He said that Mr. Hackett had a burglary at his home and all of his computers were stolen. He said that Mr. McCullough discovered that someone was sorting through his recycling bin at home and leaving separate stacks of items outside of the bin as if they were looking for papers.

Majority:
(U) Who made the classification determinations regarding the emails?
Rucker:
(U/FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that ICIG didn’t make any classification determinations. He said that CIA made most of them and that they utilized a special panel of experienced agents to reach their conclusions.

Majority:
(U) Who hacked Jacob Sullivan’s emails state.gov and gmail?
Rucker:
Mr. Rucker said that according to classified reporting, it was [REDACTED].

Majority:
(U) It would be helpful if in the near future you are able to provide the Committee with the following:

1. The Clinton email which contains her reply to an email that didn’t exist or that she did not receive, and which was provided to the FBI by the ICIG in January 2016.
2. The specific email provided to Mr. Chappell.
   o ICIG Atkinson: We provided the one and only copy we had to the FBI. I think it was an email from Secretary Clinton to Cheryl Mills and it was the metadata that was concerning, not the content of the email. We’ve already spent 2 days looking for it and couldn’t find it.
   o The Majority cancelled the request.
3. Examples of private-to-private emails between Secretary Clinton’s email server and others which show the metadata for Carter Heavy Industries.
Rucker: 

(U//FOUO) Mr. Rucker said that it should be noted that the server itself is needed to definitively say that Carter Heavy Industries received all of Secretary Clinton’s emails in question.

END

Classification Summary:

* U//FOUO paragraphs protect IC employee names (Rucker) and privacy of US company (Carter Heavy Industries)
EXHIBIT 2
The Honorable Ron Johnson  
Chairman  
Committee on Homeland Security  
and Governmental Affairs  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Charles E. Grassley  
Chairman  
Committee on the Judiciary  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Johnson and Chairman Grassley:

(U//FOUO) I have enclosed the records requested in your letter, dated September 14, 2018, addressed to the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (ICIG). Your letter referenced recent news articles alleging that a Chinese state-owned company hacked former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s non-government server and inserted code that forwarded many, if not all, of her emails to a foreign company. As noted in your letter, the articles referenced two former ICIG employees, Frank Rucker and Jeanette McMillian. As requested in your letter, enclosed are the records of Mr. Rucker and Ms. McMillian relating to their communications with the Justice Department and the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) about the alleged intrusion. Please note that the email identified as “Raw Data of Email” is illustrative of and contains the identical email metadata as an email that Mr. Rucker hand carried to the FBI in January 2016.

(U) Please contact me or the IC IG Legislative Counsel, Melissa Wright, at [REDACTED] with any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Michael K. Atkinson  
Inspector General  
of the Intelligence Community
Enclosures:

Email: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff (Thursday, January 14, 2016 – 7:59 am)
Email: RE: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff (Thursday, January 14, 2016 – 11:48 am)
Email: RE: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff (Wednesday, January 20, 2016 – 9:15 am)
Email: Meeting Request (Tuesday, February 9, 2016 – 11:18 am)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Wednesday, February 10, 2016 – 8:39 am)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Wednesday, February 10, 2016 – 12:43 pm)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Wednesday, February 10, 2016 – 3:02 pm)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Thursday, February 11, 2016 – 2:52 pm)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Friday, February 12, 2016 – 8:29 am)
Email: RE: Meeting Request (Friday, February 12, 2016 – 12:06 pm)
Raw Data of Email: Mexico trip report

cc: The Honorable Daniel Coats
    The Honorable Richard Burr
    The Honorable Mark Warner
    The Honorable Claire McCaskill
    The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
September 14, 2018

The Honorable Michael K. Atkinson
Inspector General
Office of the Intelligence Community Inspector General
Washington, D.C. 20511

Dear Inspector General Atkinson:

Recent news articles have alleged that a Chinese state-owned company hacked former Secretary Clinton’s non-government server and inserted code that forwarded many, if not all, of her emails to the foreign company. The company is reportedly a front for Chinese intelligence. Further, the Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG) reportedly discovered the code, and two IC IG employees, Frank Rucker and Jeanette McMillian, reportedly briefed the FBI on the alleged intrusion. It is not clear what information the IC IG provided to the FBI or what, if anything, the FBI did with the information. Former FBI Director James Comey said, “With respect to potential computer intrusion by hostile actors, we did not find direct evidence that Secretary Clinton’s personal e-mail domain, in its various configurations since 2009, was successfully hacked. But given the nature of the system and of the actors potentially involved, we assess that we would be unlikely to see such direct evidence.”

To better understand what information Mr. Rucker and Ms. McMillian may have shared with their FBI counterparts, as well as the steps each agency took to determine the veracity of the alleged intrusion, the Committees request all records of Mr. Rucker and Ms. McMillian relating to their communications with the Justice Department and FBI about the alleged intrusion. Please provide the records no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 28, 2018.

If you have any questions about this request, please ask your staff to contact Josh Flynn-Brown of Chairman Grassley’s staff at (202) 224-5225, or Brian Downey or Kyle Brosnan of Chairman Johnson’s staff at (202) 224-4751. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Ron Johnson
Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Charles E. Grassley
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary

---

2 Id.
3 Id.
cc:  The Honorable Claire McCaskill  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein  
Ranking Member  
Committee on the Judiciary
Good morning, Dean

(U) I hope this finds you and the team doing well!

(U/FOOU) As you probably know, we are in the process of closing out our work on the State Department FOIA review of former-Secretary Clinton's email. As part of that, IG McCullough has asked me to deliver a package of sensitive material to you and your team. Additionally, he wanted me to run something that I found in my research of the email metadata past you or someone on the team. It's probably nothing, but we would rather be safe than sorry.

(U) Tentatively, I am available to drive down today (Thursday) from 10am-3pm or tomorrow from 8am-noon. Is there a day/time that works best for you?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION
This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
Hi, Dean -

Between 10 and 11am tomorrow works great. I doubt it will take more than 15 minutes and even then, you'll probably have time left over. I have an IC badge, so getting in won't pose a problem. I'll see you in room 4865 tomorrow! Thank you!

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG
Good morning, Dean -

(U) I hope this finds you and the team doing well!

(U//FOUO) As you probably know, we are in the process of closing out our work on the State Department FOIA review of former Secretary Clinton's email. As part of that, IG McCullough has asked me to deliver a package of sensitive material to you and your team. Additionally, he wanted me to run something that I found in my research of the email metadata past you or someone on the team. It's probably nothing, but we would rather be safe than sorry.

(U) Tentatively, I am available to drive down today (Thursday) from 10am-3pm or tomorrow from 8am-noon. Is there a day/time that works best for you?

Best,
Frank
W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

--

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
-----------------------------
INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.

==================================
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

==================================
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

==================================
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
Hi, Dean -

Sorry I missed you as well! If there is a point in all of this when you (or someone on the team) could explain it to me further, I'd appreciate it.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2016 1:05 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. McMillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff

Frank, sorry I missed you. I did get your information and we were aware of the one thing you found.

Dean

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 11:48 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. McMillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff
Hi, Dean -

Between 10 and 11am tomorrow works great. I doubt it will take more than 15 minutes and even then, you'll probably have time left over. I have an IC badge, so getting in won't pose a problem. I'll see you in room 4865 tomorrow! Thank you!

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

---Original Message---
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 11:38 AM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI [redacted]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI [redacted]
Subject: RE: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff --- UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

I am open at 3pm today or between 10 and 11am tomorrow. I can meet you at the curb if that is OK. Do you have an IC badge? If so you should be able to get into the building. I am in room 4865.

---Original Message---
From: William F. Rucker-DNI [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 7:58 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [redacted]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI [redacted]
Subject: Quick Brief and Material Dropoff

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

Good morning, Dean -
(U) I hope this finds you and the team doing well!

(U//FOUO) As you probably know, we are in the process of closing out our work on the State Department FOIA review of former-Secretary Clinton's email. As part of that, IG McCullough has asked me to deliver a package of sensitive material to you and your team. Additionally, he wanted me to run something that I found in my research of the email metadata past you or someone on the team. It's probably nothing, but we would rather be safe than sorry.

(U) Tentatively, I am available to drive down today (Thursday) from 10am-3pm or tomorrow from 8am-noon. Is there a day/time that works best for you?

Best,
Frank
W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION
This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or
attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
Good morning, Dean—

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION
This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
Good morning, Dean:

Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)  
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI  
Subject: Meeting Request

Good morning, Dean -

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank
W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or confidential, sensitive, work product or
attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
Yes, I will be coming to you. Right now, I think it will be only me.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

OK, you will be coming here then? Who else should we expect to come?

Good morning, Dean:
Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 3:54 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 11:18 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Good morning, Dean -

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute
window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker

Inspector

Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
No, Sir. Primary purpose is to brief you on our next steps to ensure we don't cause you unnecessary problems.

Best,
Frank
W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 9:24 AM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmilian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request -- UNCLASSIFIED

I there anything in particular we should prepare for?

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmilian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Good morning, Dean:
Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 3:54 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 11:18 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Good morning, Dean -

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your
convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector

Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
Hi Dean,

Would it be okay if Jeanette tagged along so she could meet the new Section Chief?

Best,

Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 4:30 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

OK, sounds good.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 3:02 PM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
No, Sir. Primary purpose is to brief you on our next steps to ensure we don't cause you unnecessary problems.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

---Original Message---
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 9:24 AM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request -- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
=====================================================================

I there anything in particular we should prepare for?

---Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
=====================================================================

Good morning, Dean:

Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

---Original Message----

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.

-----Original Message-----
Good morning, Dean -

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)
INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Melissa H. Wright-DNI-

From: Jeanette J. McMillian DNI
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 8:29 AM
To: Chappell Dean FBI USA GOV; William F. Rucker DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Categories: Red Category

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Thanks Dean,

I think that Frank is out of the office today. But I confirmed with him that Tuesday, 16 Feb @2pm works for his schedule. Thanks for taking the time.

Have a good weekend,

Jeanette J. McMillian, Esq.
General Counsel
Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION
This email including any attachments is intended only for authorized recipients. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC §552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies.

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

Disclosure Authorized by Chairmen Grassley and Johnson
of the e-mail received in error.

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2016 4:17 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI- [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE : Meeting Request -- UNCLASSIFIED

Sure, no problem. Also, something just popped up on the schedule for Peter. Can we move the meeting to 2pm on the 16th instead?

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI- [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 11, 2016 2:52 PM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Hi Dean,

Would it be okay if Jeanette tagged along so she could meet the new Section Chief?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 4:30 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI- [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI- [REDACTED]

UNCLASSIFIED/FOUO
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

OK, sounds good.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 3:02 PM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

No, Sir. Primary purpose is to brief you on our next steps to ensure we don't cause you unnecessary problems.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 9:24 AM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

I there anything in particular we should prepare for?

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
Good morning, Dean:

Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 3:54 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI- [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI- [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI- [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 11:18 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI) [REDACTED]
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI- [REDACTED]
Subject: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector
Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
From: Jeanette J. Mcmillian DNI
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 12:06 PM
To: Chappell Dean FBI USA GOV; William F. Rucker-DNI
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Thanks Dean,

We understand the need to be flexible. We will make Thursday (2/18) at 2:00pm work.

Cheers,

Jeanette J. McMillian, Esq.
General Counsel
Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community

---

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION
This email including any attachments is intended only for authorized recipients. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC §552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the e-mail received in error.
-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 9:23 AM
To: Jeanette J. McMillian-DNI-; William F. Rucker-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

I just met with Pete this AM and reviewed his schedule with him for next week. It turns out he will be out on Tuesday afternoon. Can we move this to 2pm next Thursday (2/18)? His schedule is crazy since he started his new job on Monday. He is finding out how busy being an SES level employee is! Can you check with Frank for next Thursday @ 2pm?

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanette J. McMillian-DNI-
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2016 8:29 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI); William F. Rucker-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request
Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Thanks Dean,

I think that Frank is out of the office today. But I confirmed with him that Tuesday, 16 Feb @2pm works for his schedule. Thanks for taking the time.

Have a good weekend,

Jeanette J. McMillian, Esq.
General Counsel
Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community
Sure, no problem. Also, something just popped up on the schedule for Peter. Can we move the meeting to 2pm on the 16th instead?

Hi Dean,

Would it be okay if Jeanette tagged along so she could meet the new Section Chief?
Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 4:30 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

OK, sounds good.

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 3:02 PM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

No, Sir. Primary purpose is to brief you on our next steps to ensure we don't cause you unnecessary problems.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 9:24 AM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED
I there anything in particular we should prepare for?

-----Original Message-----
From: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2016 8:39 AM
To: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request

Good morning, Dean:

Thank you for the quick reply. I'm sure the new Section Chief is getting the fire hose treatment this week and I would hate to add to it! Let's do next Tuesday at 10am.

Best,
Frank

W. Frank Rucker
Inspector, IC IG

-----Original Message-----
From: Chappell III, Dean W (CD)(FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 3:54 PM
To: William F. Rucker-DNI-
Cc: Jeanette J. Mcmillian-DNI-
Subject: RE: Meeting Request --- UNCLASSIFIED

The timing is good since our new Section Chief, Peter Strzok, just reported for duty on Monday. Next Tuesday at either 10am or 11am works for both of us.

Also, 3:30 either this Wednesday or Friday works too.

Dean.
Good morning, Dean-

IG McCullough would like me to meet with you, at your convenience, to discuss our ongoing project. Do you have a 15-30 minute window available this week or next for me to come down to your office?

Best,

Frank

W. Frank Rucker

Inspector

Intelligence Community Inspector General (IC IG)

ICIG Hotline

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION

This email, including any attachments, is intended for authorized recipients only. Recipients may not further disseminate this information without the

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
express permission of the sender or other Office of Inspector General of the Intelligence Community personnel. This email may contain Inspector General sensitive information that is confidential, sensitive, work product or attorney-client privileged, or protected by Federal law, including protection from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC § 552. Accordingly, the use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this information to or by unauthorized or unintended recipients may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email, and please destroy all copies of the email received in error.
RE: Mexico trip report
Disclosure Authorized by Chairmen Grassley and Johnson
From: H [mailto:hdr22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 1:08 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: Mexico trip report

Thx. I won’t get you revisions until tomorrow.

--

From: "Sullivan, Jacob J"
Date: Sun, 29 Mar 2009 11:36:58 -0400
To: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>
Subject: Mexico trip report

Attached is a draft of your Mexico trip report to POTUS. I’m also sending it by fax. I look forward to incorporating your edits.

PR_RTF_COMPRESSED:

From: H [mailto:hdr22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 1:08 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: Mexico trip report

Thx. I won’t get you revisions until tomorrow.

--

From: "Sullivan, Jacob J"
Date: Sun, 29 Mar 2009 11:36:58 -0400
To: <hdr22@clintonemail.com>
Subject: Mexico trip report

Attached is a draft of your Mexico trip report to POTUS. I’m also sending it by fax. I look forward to incorporating your edits.
From: H [mailto:hdr22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 1:08 PM
To: Sullivan, Jacob J
Subject: Re: Mexico trip report

Thx. I won't get you revisions until tomorrow.

From: "Sullivan, Jacob J"

PR_PROFILE_AUTH_PACKAGE:

Sounds good.
EXHIBIT 3
VIA ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

The Honorable Ron Johnson
Chairman
Committee on Homeland Security
and Governmental Affairs
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Lindsey Graham
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Johnson and Chairman Graham:

(U//FOUO) On December 4, 2018, two Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) employees met with committee staff in response to a letter sent to the Director of National Intelligence dated September 14, 2018. The subject matter discussed during the meeting related to the work of these individuals while they were employees of the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (ICIG). During the meeting, committee staff requested specific follow-up items from the ICIG. Specifically, the staff requested:

- Copies of four documents one individual had in his possession during the meeting;

- An example of an email in which former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton replied to an email in which she was neither included on the To: or From: lines in the email; and

- An example in which the email address: carterheavyindustries@gmail.com was present in the metadata on an email that was not transmitted on a government system (i.e., an email evidencing a .com to .com exchange).

(U//FOUO) Based on the above, the ICIG is providing the enclosed documents in response to the committee staff’s requests.
(U/FOUO) In addition to the December 4, 2018 staff request, the ICIG received a subsequent request, through the Office of Senate Security, from a member of Senator Grassley’s staff for a properly redacted, for official use only, version of the majority staff’s summary of the December 4, 2018 meeting with the ODNI employees. Based on that request, the ICIG provides the requested document as a separate attachment.

(U) Please contact me, or the ICIG Acting General Counsel, Melissa Wright, at with any questions.

Sincerely yours,

Michael K. Atkinson
Inspector General
of the Intelligence Community

Enclosure:
(U) SHSGAC_SJC_Response_02/26/2019_001-027

Attachment:
(U) ICIG_Response_20December2018_SJC-SHSGAC_Letter_24January2019.FOUO_Redacted

cc: The Honorable Richard Burr
     The Honorable Mark Warner
     The Honorable Gary Peters
     The Honorable Dianne Feinstein
     The Honorable Charles Grassley
William Rucker

From: John Podesta
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2016 3:55 PM
To: Phil Schiliro
Cc: Cheryl Mills; Miguel E. Rodriguez; Heather Samuelson; Brian Fallon
Subject: Re: Have you heard?

+ Brian actually

On Tuesday, February 9, 2016, John Podesta wrote:

+ Brian

On Tuesday, February 9, 2016, Phil Schiliro wrote:

Have not heard that.

On Feb 9, 2016, at 11:55 AM, Cheryl Mills wrote:

Miguel/Phil

(1) See below - any hill sugestion to this effect?

best.

cdm

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Kendall, David
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 2016 at 1:51 PM
Subject: Have you heard?
To: Cheryl Mills

(1) Just talked to — about our favorite son. He’s meeting with OSC today, which is good and a step in the right direction, but nothing yet public. said she’d heard—but second/third hand (and not from son) that IC IG was handing out anti-HRC clips to journalists. Have we gotten any inkling of that happening? I certainly haven’t, and it seems weird.

David E. Kendall
Williams & Connolly LLP
725 Twelfth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005
This message and any attachments are intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please do not read, use, copy, distribute, or disclose the contents of the message and any attachments. Instead, please delete the message and any attachments and notify the sender immediately. Thank you.
From: John Podesta  
Subject: Have you heard?

- Brian actually

On Tuesday, February 9, 2016, John Podesta wrote:

- Brian

On Tuesday, February 9, 2016, Phil Schiliro wrote:

Have not heard that.

On Feb 9, 2016, at 11:55 AM, Cheryl Mills wrote:

Miguel/Phil

See below - any hill sugstion to this effect?

best.

cdm

Forwarded message

From: Kendall, David  
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 2016 at 1:51 PM  
Subject: Have you heard?  
To: Cheryl Mills

Just talked to — about our favorite son. He's meeting with OSC today, which is good and a step in the right direction, but nothing yet public. said she'd heard—but second/third hand (and not from son) that IC IG was handing out anti-HRC clips to journalists. Have we gotten any inkling of that happening? I certainly haven't, and it seems weird.

Reference to Paul J. Wogaman  
Son of  
Rev. J. Philip Wogaman  
Foundry United Methodist Church and Clinton advisor.

David E. Kendall  
Williams & Connolly LLP  
725 Twelfth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005
This message and any attachments are intended only for the addressee and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please do not read, use, copy, distribute, or disclose the contents of the message and any attachments. Instead, please delete the message and any attachments and notify the sender immediately. Thank you.
The Weekly Standard, March 16, 1998 at 12:00 AM

(U) CLINTON'S MAN IN THE PULPIT

BILL AND HILLARY CLINTON have found themselves an awfully sympathetic minister -- the Rev. J. Philip Wogaman, who presides at a Methodist church a few blocks from the White House. Wogaman has recently sounded less like a clergyman than a purveyor of the Clinton line. Shortly after the Monica Lewinsky scandal broke, he was complaining to the New York Daily News of a "concerted effort to bring [the president] down" and accusing Kenneth Starr of "personal interest and bias." Wogaman hoped that "the American people" would not "succeed to hysteria."

A few weeks later, he was on Nightline, explaining that character meant infinitely more than sexual morality: Clinton's "commitments to poor people and to persons of ethnic minorities" were also "issues of character," a fact that those looking at the president "in a more narrow and sometimes more sanctimonious way don't quite catch." Wogaman perceived "deep well-springs of morality and love" in Clinton and could not imagine that the country would turn on him, saying, "I don't think the American people really want to see him suffer."

Then, only last week, Wogaman gave an interview to the New York Times, warning again of an elevation of marital fidelity over other virtues, such as a concern for world peace. He also used the occasion to take another swipe at Starr: "The whole purpose in having a special prosecutor is to ensure that there will be no hint of partisanship or self-interest infecting the professional decisions made." Starr, according to Wogaman, had failed in his duty.

Wogaman is clearly delighted to have the Clintons in his flock, and they are equally delighted with him. Wogaman is an ethicist of some renown and a veteran political enthusiast. As his friend and congregation member George McGovern says, the reverend is "interested in the whole of society; he does not compartmentalize." Wogaman has been a faithful advocate of nationalized health care, environmentalism, gay marriage, the power of labor unions, and what may roughly be called social democracy. Of legal abortion -- even the partial-birth variety -- he is a firm defender. He is a founder of a group dedicated to countering the religious Right. And, when it comes to the Scriptures, he is an interpreter of startling elasticity. In short, Wogaman may be the most Clinton-friendly pastor in all of Christendom.

Bill Clinton is a lifelong Southern Baptist -- his wife is the Methodist -- but he has found a home at Wogaman's Foundry Methodist Church. On a typical Sunday, the president arrives with a Bible in hand, which he waves at cheering onlookers, photographers, and TV cameras. (Methodists, however, ordinarily do not bring their own Bibles. At Foundry, Bibles are provided in the pew racks.) McGovern guesses that the congregation is "Republican in complexion -- an older, more conservative crowd." Indeed, Elizabeth Dole used to belong, but she left in 1994.
after finding herself uncomfortable with the church over what she describes as "a wide range of philosophical issues."

At about the same time, Cal Thomas used his syndicated column to publicize Wogaman's political and theological beliefs. Wogaman denounced Thomas in his next sermon, along with Mark Toolely, a researcher at the Institute on Religion and Democracy who had made a thorough study of the minister's career. In a subsequent newspaper article, Wogaman, a la Clinton, drew a connection between the terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City and "corrosive words and destructive actions": "People in the media don't plant bombs. But if they plant hatred and division, doesn't that affect the behavior of unstable hearers or readers?" As for the Doles (Bob had attended occasionally with Elizabeth), Wogaman "grieved over their departure -- I have to confess that. I thought it would have been wonderful... to have both candidates worshiping together."

In many ways, Wogaman is a model of the contemporary mainline clergyman. He was born in 1932, the son of a midwestern minister and his wife. An eager student, he distinguished himself at the College of the Pacific and Boston University's theology school, which he entered months after Martin Luther King had left. In 1964, he ran for the California legislature on the Democratic ticket, losing, but securing a place on the Democratic State Central Committee, where he stayed for two years.

Thereafter, he devoted himself to teaching, writing, and political causes. He marched with King in the South and protested the Vietnam War in Washington ("I still remember being tear gassed... near Lafayette Park"). He was not exactly a Cold Warrior, writing in 1967, "The U.S.S.R. is characteristic of the more tolerant Communist arrangements for religion," and, "It is highly questionable whether Christians in Russia or China are treated any worse than Marxists are treated in the United States." In 1974, he authored a pamphlet defending the Supreme Court's ruling in Roe v. Wade: "It will do no good to argue that it is possible to affirm the sanctity of life in the presence of even the most miserable of circumstances... That is romantic sentimentality." Wogaman also cautioned against "a theological over-valuing of early embryonic life," opining that "abortion may be faithful obedience to the God of life and love."

Throughout the '70s and '80s, Wogaman taught at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, eventually becoming its dean. (Ken Starr, incidentally, sits on the seminary's board.) Wogaman also increased his reputation as a theologian-radical -- joining Jesse Jackson, Harvey Cox, and the Belligan brothers in blasts against Israel, serving as chairman of an infantformula task force, and so on. All the while, he was pushing the-frontiers of the sexually permissible, claiming, for example, that "it is quite possible that some people have... received considerable human fulfillment and enhancement of self-esteem on the basis of short, never-to-be-repeated sexual encounters" (which laymen refer to as "one-night stands"). He was also casting it pox on both "Marxist communism" and "laissez-faire capitalism," judging them "not suitable" for "Christian economic thinking," but counting capitalism as the greater offender against the environment.

It was in 1992 that Wogaman left Wesley and assumed the pulpit of Foundry Methodist (which had dismissed its previous minister for sexual indiscretions with church members). When Bill Clinton fought off "bimbo eruptions" during the Democratic primaries, Wogaman spoke up for
him, pointing out that the governor and his wife had remained married, which was "not
unimportant." Wogaman made no apologies for his forays into politics: "To ignore the issues
would be a dereliction of duty." Did Scripture require universal access to health care? Yes, just
as Jesus fed the entire multitude, not merely a portion of it. In 1994, Wogaman helped launch the
Interfaith Alliance, hoping to offset the influence of Pat Robertson and other conservatives. Two
years later, he signed a letter in support of partial-birth abortion, agreeing that "none of us . . .
can discern God's will as well as the woman herself."

Wogaman has been particularly emphatic in his embrace of gays -- their right to be ordained as
ministers, their right to marry. The national Methodist church maintains that homosexuality is
'incompatible with Christian teaching," but Wogaman has made Foundry a "reconciling church,"
meaning that it looks with favor on gay relationships and marriages. A year ago, he lent his name
to a "statement of conscience" arguing that "to withhold rituals of support for committed
relationships is unconscionable." "A lot of good people have been injured by the church," he told
a reporter, "and it's time we called attention to that."

Wogaman is a devoted left-liberal, but he is no flake: His writings and conversation exhibit a
wide-ranging intelligence, solid learning, and -- for the most part -- fair-mindedness toward his
adversaries. He is a modern-day proponent of the old Social Gospel, which George McGovern
locates at "the heart of the Christian message." McGovern contends that Wogaman, while in
robes, "never says anything partisan, never gets into specific political actions." Still, the reverend
finds it hard to resist the political arena, dashing off a column, for instance, on the desirability --
on the morality -- of portraying Franklin Roosevelt seated in a wheelchair.

For Clinton, he is perfect. The president no doubt sits comfortably as Wogaman preaches. In a
1994 interview, Clinton said that Christianity "frees you of all the guilt that you would otherwise
carry around from all the mistakes you make. I mean, the important thing to me about my life
and my faith is that every day I get to get up and try again" -- because "the God I believe in is a
God of second chances." Wogaman surely concurs, being -- as he and his admirers constantly
avow -- "non-judgmental."

Yet Wogaman is not completely without severity, not completely unwilling to condemn. Starr's
taping of Monica Lewinsky at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel? That, Wogaman insists, was "a moral
outrage."

Jay Nordlinger is associate editor of THE WEEKLY STANDARD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Documents</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Letter</td>
<td>Letter from Burr, Corker, Johnson</td>
<td>12-Mar-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State IG letter to Main State</td>
<td>Review announcement letter</td>
<td>15-Apr-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State IG letter to Main State</td>
<td>Advising State of IC IG involvement</td>
<td>4-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC IG letter to State IG</td>
<td>Recommendations for FOIA improvement</td>
<td>15-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email IC IG to IC Security</td>
<td>Notifying of unauthorized disclosure in State FOIA process</td>
<td>18-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st CN</td>
<td>Update to IC IG support to State Department</td>
<td>19-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo to Pat Kennedy</td>
<td>4 IG recommendations</td>
<td>19-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd CN</td>
<td>Classified Material on Personal Electronic Storage Devices</td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo from Pat Kennedy</td>
<td>Response to IG recommendation</td>
<td>25-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo to Pat Kennedy</td>
<td>Potential issues concerning FOIA - 2nd notification</td>
<td>29-Jun-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Referral</td>
<td>Section 811(c) referral</td>
<td>6-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo from Pat Kennedy</td>
<td>Refusal of access to emails</td>
<td>22-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd CN</td>
<td>Summary of IC IG Support to State</td>
<td>23-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT Article by Michael Schmidt</td>
<td>Criminal Inquiry is Sought in Clinton Email Account</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Public Statement</td>
<td>Statement from the Inspectors General of the IC and the Department of State Regarding the Review of Former Secretary Clinton's Emails</td>
<td>24-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCI letter to DNI</td>
<td>SSCI concerns over 3rd CN</td>
<td>27-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from IC IG to State IG</td>
<td>Request to notify State FOIA officials of classified emails</td>
<td>28-Jul-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th CN</td>
<td>Update to IC IG support to State Department</td>
<td>11-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Referral to HIll</td>
<td>Provided referral upon request</td>
<td>20-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo from CMO to Pat Kennedy</td>
<td>Classification Review of State Email</td>
<td>8-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to IC IG / State OIG from Grassley</td>
<td>Questions regarding our efforts in obtaining thumb drives/servers information</td>
<td>24-Sep-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC IG response to Grassley</td>
<td>Obtained files through other means</td>
<td>2-Oct-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politico Article - Josh Gerstein</td>
<td>&quot;Clinton's emails did not contain highly classified secrets, inquiry finds&quot;</td>
<td>6-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Burr and Corker to IC IG and State OIG</td>
<td>Follow-up review of classification process</td>
<td>15-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC IG response SSCI/SFRC</td>
<td>IC IG response to 16 November 2015 letter</td>
<td>20-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politico Article - Josh Gerstein</td>
<td>&quot;State Department clears Hillary Clinton email that intelligence agencies wanted withheld.&quot;</td>
<td>30-Nov-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYT Article - Michael Schmidt</td>
<td>&quot;Clinton Email Is Released After Security Concern is Dismissed&quot;</td>
<td>1-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations delivered - Set 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17-Dec-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarations delivered - Set 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter from Burr and Corker to IC IG and State OIG</td>
<td>Request an unclassified response</td>
<td>13-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC IG Response to Burr and Corker</td>
<td>Unclassified response to November 16 letter</td>
<td>14-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline extension request</td>
<td>State department requests deadline extension of one month to 29 Feb 16</td>
<td>22-Jan-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclosure Authorized by Chairmen Grassley and Johnson
Aponte/Eisen Votes

From: Adams, David S <AdamsDS@state.gov>
To: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>, Kennedy, Patrick F <KennedyPF@state.gov>, Gordon, Philip H <GordonPH@state.gov>, Jacobson, Roberta S <JacobsonRS@state.gov>, Sullivan, Jacob J <SullivanJJ@state.gov>, Macmanus, Joseph E <MacmanusJ@state.gov>
Cc: Macmanus, Joseph E <MacmanusJ@state.gov>
Sent: December 12, 2011 6:34:54 PM EST
Received: December 12, 2011 6:34:57 PM EST

(U) All - The Senate voted for cloture on Norm Eisen 70-16 and voice voted his nomination. The Senate failed to invoke cloture on Mari Carmen Aponte 49-39. The only Republican's we picked up were Brown (MA) and Collins. Dave
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Mills, Cheryl D
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EXHIBIT 4
April 9, 2019

The Honorable Ron Johnson  
Chairman  
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
United States Senate  
340 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Charles Grassley  
Member and Former Chairman  
Committee on the Judiciary  
United States Senate  
224 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairmen Johnson and Grassley:

We are writing in response to your letter to the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Michael K. Atkinson, dated September 14, 2018, about media reports containing unsourced allegations that a Chinese state-owned company hacked former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s private email server and inserted code that forwarded her emails to the foreign company. Your letter requested information from the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (ICIG) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) regarding whether the FBI personnel conducting the investigation of former Secretary Clinton’s use of a private email server considered this alleged intrusion information in connection with its investigation.

The ICIG and the Department of Justice (Department) Office of the Inspector General (DOJ OIG) worked together to identify and obtain information responsive to your request. We reviewed pertinent documents and interviewed relevant personnel. Below we provide the information that we learned.

Background Information from the DOJ OIG Pre-Election Report

In June 2018, the DOJ OIG issued a report entitled, “A Review of Various Actions by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Department of Justice in Advance of the 2016 Election” (Pre-Election Report). In the Pre-Election Report, DOJ OIG addressed various allegations concerning the FBI’s and the Department’s investigation of former Secretary Clinton’s use of a private email
server, known as the Midyear investigation, including the FBI’s efforts to identify cyber intrusions into former Secretary Clinton’s servers.¹

As we discuss in detail below, the allegation in the media reports from August 2018 of potential hacking of former Secretary Clinton’s private email server by a Chinese state-owned company is the result of an email address that a former ICIG analyst observed in late 2015 or early 2016 during his work-related review of emails from former Secretary Clinton’s private email server. The Pre-Election Report described the information gathered by the Midyear investigation regarding the creation and use of that particular email address. Specifically, as detailed on pages 78 to 80 of the Pre-Election Report, this email address was created by Paul Combetta, who worked for Platte River Networks (PRN), the company that administered Clinton’s third email server (PRN server).² Combetta told the FBI, as discussed on pages 102 to 107 of the Pre-Election Report, that he created and then used this “dummy” email account to transfer emails that had been archived from former Secretary Clinton’s second private email server into a mailbox entitled “HRC archive” on the PRN server. As further described in the Pre-Election Report, other evidence gathered by the FBI, including emails, PRN business records, and the testimony of other witnesses, corroborated Combetta’s account that he had transferred former Secretary Clinton’s emails from an archive laptop to the PRN server in early 2014. The Pre-Election Report did not identify the name of this Combetta email address (or any other private email address), instead referring to it as Combetta’s “dummy email account.”³

Additionally, on pages 75 and 76, the Pre-Election Report stated that the FBI conducted forensic analysis of various servers and devices used by former Secretary Clinton, including the PRN server, and did not identify any cyber intrusions into former Secretary Clinton’s email accounts. The Pre-Election Report summarized the results of the FBI’s forensic analysis as follows:

- The FBI identified one successful compromise of an account belonging to one of former President Clinton’s staffers on a different domain within the same server used by former Secretary Clinton, but was unable to identify the individual responsible for the compromise;

- The FBI confirmed compromises to email accounts belonging to certain individuals who communicated with former Secretary Clinton by email, such as Jake Sullivan and Sidney Blumenthal; and

---

¹ The ICIG did not participate in the review by the DOJ OIG underlying the Pre-Election Report. Further, although Inspector General Atkinson served in the Department’s National Security Division from April 2016 through April 2018, he was not involved in the Midyear investigation.

² The PRN server became active in June 2013, after Clinton’s tenure as Secretary of State. See Pre-Election Report at 77.

³ The Midyear investigation, as outlined on pages 79 and 80 of the Pre-Election Report, obtained court orders for subscriber information and metadata for private email accounts used by five individuals associated with former Secretary Clinton, including the dummy email account created by Combetta. The Midyear investigation also obtained a search warrant for the contents of Combetta’s dummy email account. The court order and search warrant for the Combetta dummy email account were unsealed by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia on June 5, 2018. However, the username portion of the email address (i.e., the information to the left of the @ symbol) remained redacted in the unsealed order.
• The FBI identified vulnerabilities in former Secretary Clinton’s server systems and found that there had been numerous unsuccessful attempts by potential malicious actors to exploit those vulnerabilities.

As stated on page 76 of the Pre-Election Report, the FBI agent who conducted the forensic analysis told the DOJ OIG that, although he did not believe there was “any way of determining...100%” whether former Secretary Clinton’s servers had been compromised, he felt “fairly confident that there wasn’t an intrusion.” When asked whether a sophisticated foreign adversary could cover its tracks to avoid detection, he stated, “They could. Yeah. But I, I felt as if we coordinated with the right units at headquarters...for those specific adversaries.... And the information that was returned back to me was that there was no indication of a compromise.”

Information Concerning the Chinese Hacking Allegations

Following the issuance of the Pre-Election Report, several Members of Congress raised concerns that the FBI had reportedly ignored information provided to it by the ICIG showing that former Secretary Clinton’s email server may have been compromised by a Chinese company or the Chinese government. We understand that these concerns were based on information received by at least one Member of Congress relating to observations reportedly made by a former ICIG analyst, who had reviewed emails obtained from former Secretary Clinton’s private server before and during the Midyear investigation as part of coordinating the Intelligence Community’s classification review process.

The ICIG and DOJ OIG separately interviewed the former ICIG analyst (hereinafter referred to as the “former ICIG analyst”). The former ICIG analyst stated that upon reviewing the electronic copies of former Secretary Clinton’s emails received by the ICIG from the FBI, he observed that the emails’ routing information included an embedded email address. The embedded email address was the dummy email address discussed above, which the Midyear investigation had determined was created and used by Combetta. The former ICIG analyst further told our Offices that he noticed that the email address was embedded in the middle of the email strings. The former ICIG analyst referred to the embedded email address as an “anomaly.” Additionally, the former ICIG analyst said he found this “anomaly” in all but four of the 30,490 copies of former Secretary Clinton’s emails received by the ICIG. The former ICIG analyst said he believed the dummy email address may have forwarded former Secretary Clinton’s emails to an unauthorized recipient based on other information the former ICIG analyst observed during his review of former Secretary Clinton’s emails. Specifically, the former ICIG analyst stated that, during his review of former Secretary Clinton’s emails, he saw an email exchange between one of Secretary Clinton’s aides and the aide’s spouse in which the spouse claimed that the spouse’s emails had been routed to an unauthorized recipient through an embedded code in the spouse’s emails. The former ICIG analyst believed the dummy email address in former Secretary Clinton’s emails might have had a similar effect, but he could not say for sure.

4 As described on pages 79 and 80 of the Pre-Election Report, the FBI determined that the dummy email account contained 820 of former Secretary Clinton’s emails, dated between October 25, 2010, and December 31, 2010.

5 The dummy email address and the “anomaly” refer to the identical username portion of the dummy email account address. For ease of reference, they are referred to hereinafter as the dummy email address.
The former ICIG analyst brought his concerns to the attention of the then-Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, I. Charles McCullough, III. According to the former ICIG analyst, former Inspector General McCullough and the former ICIG analyst conducted a Google search of the dummy email address. The Google search returned results that included a company named "Shandong Carter Heavy Industry Machinery CO., Ltd.,” located in the Shandong Province of China. This company name was similar, but not identical, to the username of the dummy email address, though no part of the dummy email address username referenced Shandong or any other Chinese province. Based on the Google search result showing the similarity between the dummy email address username and the name of the Chinese company, together with the presence of the dummy email address in all but four of the 30,490 copies of former Secretary Clinton’s emails received by the ICIG, the former ICIG analyst stated that he believed Clinton’s private email server may have been hacked by a Chinese company or the Chinese government. The former ICIG analyst had no further information connecting the dummy email address with any Chinese entity.

The former ICIG analyst further stated that, at the direction of former Inspector General McCullough, the ICIG analyst reported the information to the FBI team conducting the Midyear investigation in early 2016. Specifically, the former ICIG analyst stated that he contacted an Assistant Special Agent in Charge in the FBI’s Washington Field Office (WFO ASAC), with whom the ICIG had interacted with previously on its review of former Secretary Clinton’s emails, to provide the information in January 2016. In an email to the WFO ASAC dated January 14, 2016, the former ICIG analyst stated the following:

As you probably know, we are in the process of closing out our work on the State Department FOIA review of former-Secretary Clinton’s email. As part of that, [former] IG McCullough has asked me to deliver a package of sensitive material to you and your team. Additionally, he wanted me to run something that I found in my research of the email metadata past you or someone on the team. It’s probably nothing, but we would rather be safe than sorry.

The former ICIG analyst told the DOJ OIG that he scheduled a meeting with the WFO ASAC to discuss the email metadata issue, but the meeting did not occur. The former ICIG analyst said that he instead dropped off the information at the WFO ASAC’s office. The information consisted of a paper copy of a sample email from former Secretary Clinton evidencing the dummy email address. Emails obtained by the ICIG and DOJ OIG show that the former ICIG analyst dropped off the information at the WFO ASAC’s office on January 15, 2016. The former ICIG analyst said that the WFO ASAC responded to the information and informed him that the FBI was aware of the dummy email address. Specifically, emails obtained by the ICIG and DOJ OIG show a response on January 15, 2016, from the WFO ASAC stating, “I did get your information and we were aware of the one thing you found.” In a follow-up response, the former ICIG analyst asked the WFO ASAC “if there is a point in all of this when you (or someone on the team) could explain it to me further, I’d appreciate it.” However, the former ICIG analyst said that no one from the

---

6 Information obtained by the DOJ OIG during the Pre-Election review indicated that the FBI knew about the dummy email address embedded in former Secretary Clinton’s emails and that it was associated with Combetta before January 14, 2016.
FBI subsequently explained to him how the dummy email address had been inserted into the emails to or from former Secretary Clinton.\(^7\)

The former ICIG analyst said that he and the ICIG’s then-General Counsel subsequently met with FBI officials involved in the Midyear investigation, including the WFO ASAC as well as former Deputy Assistant Director Peter Strzok. Emails obtained by the ICIG and DOJ OIG show that this meeting took place on February 18, 2016. The former ICIG analyst said that at this meeting he mentioned the dummy email address that he observed in the emails from former Secretary Clinton’s server. According to the former ICIG analyst, the WFO ASAC seemed familiar with the dummy email address.\(^8\)

We also interviewed the ICIG’s former General Counsel, who was present with the former ICIG analyst at the meeting with the FBI on February 18, 2016. The former General Counsel said that she recalled a meeting at the FBI that took place sometime in early 2016, and that Strzok may have been among those at the meeting, but she could not specifically recall. The former General Counsel said that she recalled the former ICIG analyst expressing frustration sometime after the meeting that the FBI was not getting back to him to explain the dummy email address, but that her reaction was that it was “typical” for communications with the FBI regarding an ongoing criminal investigation to be “a one-way street,” in which the ICIG would provide information to the FBI about an ongoing FBI investigation and the FBI would not respond.

The former General Counsel recalled that the former ICIG analyst identified an email “dropbox” in former Secretary Clinton’s emails that the analyst believed might resolve to a foreign company. (The “dropbox” referred to the dummy email address.) The ICIG’s former General Counsel stated that her reaction to the information the former ICIG analyst discovered was that they needed to let the FBI know about it, but that she never saw evidence — and was unaware the ICIG ever concluded — that a foreign company inserted code into the copies of former Secretary Clinton’s emails reviewed by the ICIG.

During a DOJ OIG interview in early June 2018, the WFO ASAC was asked about his interactions with the ICIG. He told the DOJ OIG that he primarily dealt with the former ICIG analyst regarding the classification review process and did not remember receiving anything from him related to evidence of hostile intrusions or email routing data. In an interview with the DOJ OIG on April 20, 2018, Strzok was asked about news articles containing unsourced allegations that he had ignored evidence of a compromise of former Secretary Clinton’s server, and told DOJ OIG that the allegations were “not accurate” and he did not know “where that could come from.”

Additionally, the DOJ OIG reviewed business records concerning the Combetta dummy email account that were obtained by the Midyear investigation pursuant to court order. Those

---

\(^7\) As described above and on pages 79 and 80 of the Pre-Election Report, the FBI obtained a court order and a search warrant for Combetta’s dummy email account. Both remained under seal until the conclusion of the DOJ OIG review, when the Department sought a court order authorizing the release of sealed information that did not otherwise affect individual privacy interests, permitting DOJ OIG to include this information in the report.

\(^8\) On the same day, February 18, 2016, the FBI interviewed Combetta for the second time. As described on page 80 of the Pre-Election Report, Combetta told the FBI during this interview that he created the dummy email account to transfer former Secretary Clinton’s archived emails from the archive laptop to the PRN Server.
records reflect that the dummy email account was created by Combetta on August 20, 2012, about two years after the date of the Clinton emails that the FBI found in that dummy email account.\(^9\)

Thus, because Combetta’s dummy email account did not exist until 2012, emails from 2010 could not have been auto-forwarded to the dummy email address at that time. Further, the DOJ OIG did not identify any information obtained by the FBI during the Midyear investigation reflecting that Combetta’s dummy email account was associated with a Chinese company or the Chinese government. In addition, based on the evidence the DOJ OIG reviewed, the FBI did not find evidence during its Midyear investigation that Combetta (or anyone else) forwarded classified emails from the dummy email account to a foreign or domestic entity.

The DOJ OIG sought to interview Combetta regarding the dummy email account. However, through counsel, Combetta declined the DOJ OIG’s interview request, and neither the DOJ OIG nor the ICIG have the authority to compel non-agency individuals to provide testimony.

In response to a DOJ OIG document subpoena to Combetta seeking, among other things, any records regarding the creation or establishment of the username for the dummy email account and any relationship between Combetta and Shandong Carter Heavy Industry Machinery CO., Ltd., Combetta’s counsel responded that Combetta had no documents responsive to the subpoena. Counsel further informed the DOJ OIG that the dummy email account address was a made-up name, and that Combetta had no connection to, and had never heard of, “Shandong Carter Heavy Industry Machinery CO., Ltd.” The DOJ OIG did not identify any evidence during its review of the FBI’s Midyear investigation to contradict the information provided by Combetta’s counsel. Accordingly, other than the similarity discussed above between the dummy email address and the name of a Chinese company identified by the former ICIG analyst and former Inspector General McCullough during a Google search, the ICIG and the DOJ OIG are unaware of any information that links Combetta or the dummy email address that he created with the Chinese government or a Chinese-owned company.

We hope that you find this information useful, and we appreciate your continued support for our Offices. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Michael K. Atkinson
Inspector General of the
Intelligence Community
Reston 3 Room E220
Washington DC, 20511

Michael E. Horowitz
Inspector General
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 4076
Washington, D.C. 20530

---

\(^9\) Subscriber and login information obtained by the FBI confirmed that the dummy email account was Combetta’s. Business records show that the account was created by a subscriber whose phone number was registered to Combetta, and account logins in 2015 and 2016 were from an IP address linked to the location where Combetta lived and worked remotely for PRN.
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