MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI)

From: MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 1:51 PM
To: PRIESTAP, E W. (CD) (FBI)
Cc: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Midyear Exam --- UNCLASSIFIED

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

Thanks very much Bill . Great feedback.

Andrew G. McCabe
Deputy Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Work:
Mobile:

From: PRIESTAP, E W. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 7:17 PM
To: MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Midyear Exam --- UNCLASSIFIED

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

Sir:

I will be out of town next week, and so wanted to provide you my initial thoughts.

- The piece is superb.
- If anything, the Director may wish to add a sentence or two in his conclusion about the FBI's obligations more generally. In other words, something not specifically about this case, but about what the FBI aims to do in all of our cases. He could do this after the first sentence in his last paragraph. For example, something like:

  "The American people entrust the FBI with impartially investigating all matters of crime involving people from all walks of life. We take that obligation extremely seriously, and" I can assure you that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear. I know there were many opinions expressed by people who were not part of the investigation -- including people in government – but none of that mattered to us. Opinions are irrelevant, and they were all uninformed by insight into our investigation, because we did the investigation in a professional way. Only facts matter, and the FBI found them here in an entirely apolitical and professional way. I couldn't be prouder to be part of this organization.

  I suggest this only to emphasize the point that this investigation was conducted in a manner consistent

with the fairness aims of all of our investigations, (i.e., no one is above the law, etc.).

- The piece contains information that indicates the Secretary did not meet federal record requirements. Before deciding on the final wording of such information, the Director may wish to have someone study the impact his statements could have on any/all administrative inquiries relative to federal record obligations. I suggest this only so he's aware of any potential fallout in that regard. I assume such administrative inquiries aren't really a big deal, but if I was him I'd just want to be certain before deciding on the final wording.

- I saw two typos on page 4, which I highlighted in red and yellow.

Thank you for sharing the below with me.
Bill

From: MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 5:32 PM
To: PRIESTAP, E W. (CD) (FBI); STRZOK, PETER P. (CD) (FBI); MOFFA, JONATHAN C. (CD) (FBI) (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: FW: Midyear Exam --- UNCLASSIFIED
Importance: High

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

Folks:

The Director composed the below straw man in an effort to compose what a "final" statement might look like in the context of a press conference. This was really more of an exercise for him to get his thoughts on the matter in order, and not any kind of decision about venue, strategy, product, etc.

The Director asked me to share this with you four, but not any further. The only additional people who have seen this draft are Jim Rybicki and Jim Baker. Please do not disseminate or discuss any further.

I do not know if the boss will want to discuss this at the Monday update but please review it before the meeting just in case.

Thanks

Andrew G. McCabe
Deputy Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Work:
Mobile:

From: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2016 7:15 PM
To: MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI); BAKER, JAMES A. (OGC) (FBI); RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)
Cc: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: Midyear Exam --- UNCLASSIFIED

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

TRANSITORY RECORD

RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)

From: RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 1:14 PM
To: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: MYE --- UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
Attachments: MYE thoughts 06-10-16.docx

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO
DELIBERATIVE PROCESS PRIVILEGED DOCUMENT
==========

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

I've been trying to imagine what it would look like if I decided to do an FBI only press event to close out our work and hand the matter to DOJ. To help shape our discussions of whether that, or something different, makes sense, I have spent some time crafting what I would say, which follows. In my imagination, I don't see me taking any questions. Here is what it might look like:

Good afternoon folks. I am here to give you an update on our investigation of Secretary Clinton's use of a private email system, which began in ~~late August~~mid-July.

After a tremendous amount of work, the FBI has completed its investigation and has referred the case to the Department of Justice for a prosecutive decision. What I would like to do today is tell you three things: (1) what we did; (2) what we found; (3) what we have recommended to DOJ.

But I want to start by thanking the many agents, analysts, technologists, and other FBI employees who did work of extraordinary quality in this case. Once you have a better sense of how much we have done, you will understand why I am so grateful and proud of their efforts.

So, first: what we have done over the last eight months.

The investigation began as a referral from the Intelligence Community Inspector General in connection with Secretary Clinton's use of a private email server during her time as Secretary of State, focused on whether classified information was transmitted on that private system.

Commented [p1]: Consider whether it is more appropriate to call this a "personal" or "privately-owned" email server. "Private" may denote a commercial email service, such as gmail or hotmail. Use of these private commercial services was widespread at State before and during her tenure.

Our investigation focused on whether there is evidence that classified information was improperly stored or transmitted on that private system, in violation of a federal statute that makes it a felony to mishandle classified information either intentionally or in a grossly negligent way, or a second statute that makes it a misdemeanor to knowingly remove classified information from appropriate systems or storage facilities.

Consistent with our counterintelligence responsibilities, we have also investigated to determine whether there is evidence of computer intrusion in connection with

the private email server by any foreign power, or hackers on behalf of a foreign power.

I have so far used the singular term, "email server," in describing the referral that began our investigation. It turns out to have been more complicated than that. Secretary Clinton used several different servers and ~~providers~~ administrators of those servers during her four years at the State Department, and used numerous mobile devices to view and send email on that private domain. As new servers and equipment ~~s and providers~~ were employed, older servers were taken out of service, stored, and decommissioned in various ways. Piecing all of that back together to gain as full an understanding as possible of the ways in which private email was used for government work has been a painstaking undertaking, requiring thousands of hours of effort.

For example, when one of Secretary Clinton's original private servers was decommissioned in 2013~~xx~~, the email software was removed. Doing that didn't remove the email content, but it was like removing the frame from a huge finished jigsaw puzzle and dumping the pieces on the floor. The effect was that millions of email fragments end up unsorted in the server's un-used – or "slack" – space. We searched~~went~~ through all of it to see what was there, and what parts of the puzzle could be put back together.

Commented [p2]:

FBI investigators have also read all ~~34,000~~of the approximately 30,000 emails provided by Secretary Clinton to the State Department in ~~spring 2015~~December 2014. Where an email was assessed as possibly containing classified information, the FBI referred the email to ~~the~~ any U.S. government agency that was ~~the~~ a likely "owner" of the information in the email so that agency could make a determination as to whether the email contained classified information at the time it was sent or received, or whether there was reason to classify the email now, even if its content was not classified at the time it was sent (this is the process sometimes referred to as "up classifying").

Commented [p3]: Some emails were sent to multiple agencies.

Commented [p4]: Ultimately, the number of emails determined to be classified will be a small percentage of those sent for review. We think this point will need to be addressed by explaining that we took an overly expansive and generous position in deciding what to send out for review.

From that group of ~~34,000~~30,000 emails that had been returned to the State Department in late 2014~~5~~, ~~the FBI sent xxxx emails to agencies for classification determinations. Of those,~~ xxxx have been determined by the owning agency to contain classified information at the time they were sent or received. Xxxx of those contained information that was Top Secret at the time they were sent; xxxx contained Secret information at the time; and xxxx contained Confidential information. Separate from those, a total of xxxx additional emails were "up

classified" to make them Secret or Confidential; the information in those had not been classified at the time the emails were sent.

The FBI also discovered ~~xxxx~~ several thousand work-related emails that were not in the group of ~~34,000~~30,000 that were returned by Secretary Clinton to State in 201~~5~~4. We found those additional emails in a variety of ways. Some had been deleted over the years and we found traces of them on devices that supported or were connected to the private email domain. Others we found by reviewing the archived government email accounts of people who had been government employees at the same time as Secretary Clinton, including high-ranking officials at other agencies, with whom a Secretary of State might naturally correspond. This helped us recover work-related emails that were not among the ~~34,000~~30,000 produced to State. Still others we recovered from the laborious review of the millions of email fragments dumped into the slack space of the server decommissioned in 2013~~xx~~.

All told, we found ~~xxxx~~ thousands of emails that were not among those produced to the State Department ~~last year~~in late 2014. ~~Of those, we assessed that xxxx possibly contained classified information at the time they were sent or received and so we sent them to other government agencies for classification determinations.~~ To date, agencies have concluded that xxxx of those were classified at the time they were sent or received, xxx at the Secret level and xxxx at the Confidential level. There were no additional Top Secret emails found. Finally, xxxx ~~none~~ of those we found have since been "up classified."

I should add here that we found no evidence that any of the additional work-related emails ~~we found~~ were intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them. Our assessment is that, like many users of private email accounts, Secretary Clinton periodically deleted emails or emails were purged from the system when devices were changed. Because she was not using a government account, there was no archiving of her emails, so it is not surprising that we discovered emails that were not on Secretary Clinton's system in 201~~5~~4, when she produced the ~~34,000~~30,000 emails to the State Department.

It could also be that some of the additional work-related emails we recovered were among those deleted as "personal" by Secretary Clinton's lawyers when they reviewed and sorted her emails for production in 201~~5~~4. We have conducted interviews and done technical examination to attempt to understand how that sorting was done. Although we do not have complete visibility because we are not

fully able to reconstruct the electronic record of that sorting, we believe our investigation has been sufficient to give us reasonable confidence there was no intentional misconduct in connection with that sorting effort.

The lawyers doing the sorting for Secretary Clinton in 2014~~5~~ did not individually read the content of all of her ~~tens of thousands of~~ emails, as we did for those available to us; instead, they used search terms to try to find all work-related emails among the reportedly more than 60,000 total emails remaining on Secretary Clinton's private system in 201~~5~~4. It is highly likely their search terms missed some work-related emails, and that we found them, for example, in the mailboxes of other officials or in the slack space of a server. It is also likely that there are other work-related emails that they did not produce to State and that we did not find elsewhere, and that are now gone because they deleted all emails they did not return to State, and the lawyers cleaned their devices in a such a way as to preclude forensic recovery.

And, of course, in addition~~al~~ to our technical work, we interviewed many people, from those involved in setting up and maintaining the various iterations of Secretary Clinton's private server to staff members with whom she corresponded on email, to those involved in the email production to State, and finally, Secretary Clinton herself.

Lastly, we have done extensive work ~~with the assistance of our colleagues elsewhere in the Intelligence Community~~ to understand what indications there might be of compromise by hostile actors in connection with the private email operation.

That's what we have done. Now let me tell you what we found.

Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information. ~~There is evidence to support a conclusion that Secretary Clinton, and others, used the private email server in a manner that was grossly negligent with respect to the handling of classified information.~~ For example, seven email chains concern matters that were classified at the TS/SAP level when they were sent and received. These chains involved Secretary Clinton both sending emails about those matters and receiving emails from others about the same matters. There is evidence to support a conclusion that any reasonable

Formatted: Highlight

person in Secretary Clinton's position, or in the position of those government employees with whom she was corresponding about these matters, should have known that an unclassified system was no place for such an email conversation. ~~Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.~~

~~Similarly,~~ In addition to this highly sensitive information, we also found ~~the sheer volume of~~ information that was properly classified as Secret by the U.S. Intelligence Community at the time it was discussed on email (that is, excluding the "up classified" emails). This is especially concerning because all of these emails were housed on servers not supported by full-time security staff, like those found at Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government. ~~supports an inference that the participants were grossly negligent in their handling of that information.~~

While not the focus of our investigation, we also developed evidence that the security culture of the State Department in general, and with respect to use of unclassified email systems in particular, was generally lacking in the kind of care for classified information found elsewhere in the government.

With respect to potential computer intrusion by hostile actors, we did not find direct evidence that Secretary Clinton's personal email system, 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. We do assess that hostile actors gained access to the private commercial email accounts of individuals with whom Secretary Clinton was in regular contact from her personal ~~private~~ account. We also assess that Secretary Clinton's use of a ~~private~~ personal email domain was both known by a large number of people and readily apparent. Given that combination of factors, we assess it is ~~reasonably likely~~ possible that hostile actors gained access to Secretary Clinton's ~~private~~ personal email account.

Commented [p5]:

So that's what we found.

Finally, with respect to our recommendation to the Department of Justice. In our system, the prosecutors make the decisions about whether charges are appropriate based on evidence the FBI has helped collect. Although we don't

normally make public our recommendations to the prosecutors, we frequently make recommendations and engage in productive conversations with prosecutors about what resolution may be appropriate, given the evidence. In this case, given the importance of the matter, I think unusual transparency is in order.

In looking back at our investigations in similar circumstances, we cannot find a case that would support bringing criminal charges on these facts. All the cases prosecuted involved some combination of: (1) clearly intentional mishandling of classified information; (2) vast quantities of materials exposed in such a way as to support an inference of intentional misconduct; (3) indications of disloyalty to the United States; or (4) efforts to obstruct justice. All charged cases of which we are aware have involved the accusation that a government employee intentionally mishandled classified information. We see none of that here.

Commented [p6]: We changed none of this text, we simply reordered it. The original text is below , struck-out.

Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information, my judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case. Prosecutors necessarily weigh a number of factors before bringing charges. There are obvious considerations, like the strength of the evidence. But they must be balanced against things like the intent and context of the person's actions. To be clear, this is not to suggest that in similar circumstances, an individual who engaged in this activity would face NO consequences. To the contrary, such individuals are often subject to security or administrative sanctions. But that decision is not what is before me now.

~~Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statute proscribing gross negligence in the handling of classified information and of the statute proscribing misdemeanor mishandling, my judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case. At the outset, we are not aware of a case where anyone has been charged solely based on the "gross negligence" prohibition in the statute. In looking back at our investigations in similar circumstances, we cannot find a case that would support bringing criminal charges on these facts. All the cases prosecuted involved some combination of: (1) clearly intentional misconduct; (2) vast quantities of materials exposed in such a way as to support an inference of intentional misconduct; (3) indications of disloyalty to the United States; or (4) efforts to obstruct justice. We see none of that here.~~

Commented [p7]:

Accordingly, although the Department of Justice makes final decisions on matters such as this, I am completing the investigation by expressing to Justice my view that no charges are appropriate in this case.

I know there will be intense public disagreement in the wake of this result, as there was throughout this investigation. What I can assure the American people is that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear. I know there were many opinions expressed by people who were not part of the investigation – including people in government – but none of that mattered to us. Opinions are irrelevant, and they were all uninformed by insight into our investigation, because we did the investigation in a professional way. Only facts matter, and the FBI found them here in an entirely apolitical and professional way. I couldn't be prouder to be part of this organization.

# # #

COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)

From: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 9:50 AM
To: RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: Current draft --- UNCLASSIFIED
Attachments: MYE JBC June 30 2016.pdf

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

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

Good morning. I'm here to give you an update on the FBI's investigation of Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email system during her time as Secretary of State.

After a tremendous amount of work over the last year, the FBI has finished its investigation and referred the case to the Department of Justice for a prosecutive decision. What I would like to do today is tell you three things: what we did; what we found; and what we have recommended to the Department of Justice.

This will be an unusual statement in at least a couple ways. First, I am going to include more detail than I ordinarily would, because I think the American people deserve those details in a case of intense public interest. Second, I have not coordinated or reviewed this statement in any way with the Department of Justice or any other part of the government. They do not know what I am about to say.

But I want to start by thanking the many FBI employees who did remarkable work in this case. Once you have a better sense of how much we have done, you will understand why I am so grateful and proud of their efforts.

So, first, what we have done:

The investigation began as a referral from the Intelligence Community Inspector General in connection with Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email server during her time as Secretary of State. The referral focused on whether classified information was transmitted on that personal system.

Our investigation looked at whether there is evidence that classified information was improperly stored or transmitted on that personal system, in violation of a federal statute that makes it a felony to mishandle classified information either intentionally or in a grossly negligent way, or a second statute that makes it a misdemeanor to knowingly remove classified information from appropriate systems or storage facilities.

Consistent with our counter-intelligence responsibilities, we have also investigated to determine whether there is evidence of computer intrusion in connection with the personal email server by any foreign power, or other hostile actors.

I have so far used the singular term, "email server," in describing the referral that began our investigation. It turns out to have been more complicated than that. Secretary Clinton used several different servers and administrators of those servers during her four years at the State Department, and used numerous mobile devices to view and send email on that personal domain. As new servers and equipment were employed, older servers were taken out of service, stored, and decommissioned in various ways. Piecing all of that back together -- to gain as full an understanding as possible of the ways in which personal email was used for government work -- has been a painstaking undertaking, requiring thousands of hours of effort.

For example, when one of Secretary Clinton's original personal servers was decommissioned in 2013, the email software was removed. Doing that didn't remove the email content, but it was like removing the frame from a huge finished jigsaw puzzle and dumping the pieces on the floor. The effect was that millions of email fragments end up unsorted in the server's un-used – or "slack" – space. We searched through all of it to see what was there, and what parts of the puzzle could be put back together.

FBI investigators have also read all of the approximately 30,000 emails provided by Secretary Clinton to the State Department in December 2014. Where an email was assessed as possibly containing classified information, the FBI referred the email to any U.S. government agency that was a likely "owner" of information in the email, so that agency could make a determination as to whether the email contained classified information at the time it was sent or received, or whether there was reason to classify the email now, even if its content was not classified at the time it was sent (that is the process sometimes referred to as "up-classifying").

From the group of 30,000 emails returned to the State Departmen emails i email chains have been determined by the owning agency to contain classified information at the time they were sent or received. Eight of those chains contained information that was Top Secret at the time they were sent; 36 chains contained Secret information at the time; an contained Confidential information, which is the lowest level of classification. Separate from those, about 2,000 additional emails were "up-classified" to make them Confidential; the information in those had not been classified at the time the emails were sent.

The FBI also discovered several thousand work-related emails that were not in the group of 30,000 that were returned by Secretary Clinton to State in 2014.

We found those additional emails in a variety of ways. Some had been deleted over the years and we found traces of them on devices that supported or were connected to the private email domain. Others we found by reviewing the archived government email accounts of people who had been government employees at the same time as Secretary Clinton, including high-ranking officials at other agencies, people with whom a Secretary of State might naturally correspond. This helped us recover work-related emails that were not among the 30,000 produced to State. Still others we recovered from the laborious review of the millions of email fragments dumped into the slack space of the server decommissioned in 2013.

With respect to the thousands of emails we found that were not among those produced to State, agencies have concluded that **xx** of those were classified at the time they were sent or received, x at the Secret level and **xx** at the Confidential level. There were no additional Top Secret emails found. Finally, **xx** of those we found have since been "up-classified."

I should add here that we found no evidence that any of the additional work-related emails were intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them. Our assessment is that, like many email users, Secretary Clinton periodically deleted emails or emails were purged from the system when devices were changed. Because she was not using a government account – or even a commercial account like Gmail – there was no archiving at all of her emails, so it is not surprising that we discovered emails that were not on Secretary Clinton's system in 2014, when she produced the 30,000 emails to the State Department.

It could also be that some of the additional work-related emails we recovered were among those deleted as "personal" by Secretary Clinton's lawyers when they reviewed and sorted her emails for production in 2014.

The lawyers doing the sorting for Secretary Clinton in 2014 did not individually read the content of all of her emails, as we did for those available to us; instead, they relied on header information and used search terms to try to find all work-related emails among the reportedly more than 60,000 total emails remaining on Secretary Clinton's personal system in 2014. It is highly likely their search terms missed some work-related emails, and that we later found them, for example, in the mailboxes of other officials or in the slack space of a server. It is also likely that there are other work-related emails that they did not produce to State and that we did not find elsewhere, and that are now gone because they deleted all emails they did not return to State, and the lawyers cleaned their devices in such a way as to preclude complete forensic recovery.

We have conducted interviews and done technical examination to attempt to understand how that sorting was done by her attorneys. Although we do not have complete visibility because we are not fully able to reconstruct the electronic record of that sorting, we believe our investigation has been sufficient to give us reasonable confidence there was no intentional misconduct in connection with that sorting effort.

And, of course, in addition to our technical work, we interviewed many people, from those involved in setting up and maintaining the various iterations of Secretary Clinton's personal server, to staff members with whom she corresponded on email, to those involved in the email production to State, and finally, Secretary Clinton herself.

Last, we have done extensive work to understand what indications there might be of compromise by hostile actors in connection with the personal email operation.

That's what we have done. Now let me tell you what we found:

Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.

For example, seven email chains concern matters that were classified at the Top Secret/Special Access Program level when they were sent and received. These chains involved Secretary Clinton both sending emails about those matters and receiving emails from others about the same matters. There is evidence to support a conclusion that any reasonable person in Secretary Clinton's position, or in the position of those government employees with whom she was corresponding about these matters, should have known that an unclassified system was no place for that conversation. In addition to this highly sensitive information, we also found information that was properly classified as Secret by the U.S. Intelligence Community at the time it was discussed on email (that is, excluding the later "up-classified" emails).

None of these emails should have been on any kind of unclassified system, but their presence is especially concerning because all of these emails were housed on unclassified personal servers not even supported by full-time security staff, like

those found at Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government – or even with a commercial service like Gmail.

Separately, it is important to say something about the marking of classified information. Only a very small number of the emails containing classified information bore markings indicating the presence of classified information. But even if information is not marked "classified" in an email, participants who know or should know that the subject matter is classified are still obligated to protect it.

While not the focus of our investigation, we also developed evidence that the security culture of the State Department in general, and with respect to use of unclassified email systems in particular, was generally lacking in the kind of care for classified information found elsewhere in the government.

With respect to potential computer intrusion by hostile actors, we did not find direct evidence that Secretary Clinton's personal email system, 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. We do assess that hostile actors gained access to the private commercial email accounts of people with whom Secretary Clinton was in regular contact from her personal account. We also assess that Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email domain was both known by a large number of people and readily apparent. She also used her personal email extensively while outside the United States, including from the territory of sophisticated adversaries. That use included an email exchange with the President while Secretary Clinton was on the territory of such an adversary. Given that combination of factors, we assess it is possible that hostile actors gained access to Secretary Clinton's personal email account.

So that's what we found. Finally, with respect to our recommendation to the Department of Justice:

In our system, the prosecutors make the decisions about whether charges are appropriate based on evidence the FBI has helped collect. Although we don't normally make public our recommendations to the prosecutors, we frequently make recommendations and engage in productive conversations with prosecutors about what resolution may be appropriate, given the evidence. In this case, given the importance of the matter, I think unusual transparency is in order.

Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information, our judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case. Prosecutors necessarily weigh a number of factors before bringing charges. There are obvious considerations, like the strength of the evidence, especially about intent. Responsible decisions also consider the context of a person's actions, and how similar situations have been handled in the past.

In looking back at our investigations into mishandling or removal of classified information, we cannot find a case that would support bringing criminal charges on these facts. All the cases prosecuted involved some combination of: clearly intentional and willful mishandling of classified information; or vast quantities of materials exposed in such a way as to support an inference of intentional misconduct; or indications of disloyalty to the United States; or efforts to obstruct justice. We do not see those things here.

To be clear, this is not to suggest that in similar circumstances, a person who engaged in this activity would face no consequences. To the contrary, those individuals are often subject to security or administrative sanctions. But that is not what we are deciding now.

As a result, although the Department of Justice makes final decisions on matters like this, we are completing the investigation by expressing to Justice our view that no charges are appropriate in this case.

I know there will be intense public debate in the wake of this recommendation, as there was throughout this investigation. What I can assure the American people is that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear.

I know there were many opinions expressed by people who were not part of the investigation – including people in government – but none of that mattered to us. Opinions are irrelevant, and they were all uninformed by insight into our investigation, because we did the investigation the right way. Only facts matter, and the FBI found them here in an entirely apolitical and professional way. I couldn't be prouder to be part of this organization.

# # #

COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)

From: COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 4:24 PM
To: RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: Most recent 4:22 pm --- UNCLASSIFIED
Attachments: MYE JBC June 30 2016 1622.pdf

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

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

Good morning. I'm here to give you an update on the FBI's investigation of Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email system during her time as Secretary of State.

After a tremendous amount of work over the last year, the FBI has finished its investigation and is referring the case to the Department of Justice for a prosecutive decision. What I would like to do today is tell you three things: what we did; what we found; and what we are recommending to the Department of Justice.

This will be an unusual statement in at least a couple ways. First, I am going to include more detail than I ordinarily would, because I think the American people deserve those details in a case of intense public interest. Second, I have not coordinated or reviewed this statement in any way with the Department of Justice or any other part of the government. They do not know what I am about to say.

I want to start by thanking the many FBI employees who did remarkable work in this case. Once you have a better sense of how much we have done, you will understand why I am so grateful and proud of their efforts.

So, first, what we have done:

The investigation began as a referral from the Intelligence Community Inspector General in connection with Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email server during her time as Secretary of State. The referral focused on whether classified information was transmitted on that personal system.

Our investigation looked at whether there is evidence that classified information was improperly stored or transmitted on that personal system, in violation of a federal statute that makes it a felony to mishandle classified information either intentionally or in a grossly negligent way, or a second statute that makes it a misdemeanor to knowingly remove classified information from appropriate systems or storage facilities.

Consistent with our counter-intelligence responsibilities, we have also investigated to determine whether there is evidence of computer intrusion in connection with the personal email server by any foreign power, or other hostile actors.

I have so far used the singular term, "email server," in describing the referral that began our investigation. It turns out to have been more complicated than that. Secretary Clinton used several different servers and administrators of those servers during her four years at the State Department, and used numerous mobile devices to view and send email on that personal domain. As new servers and equipment were employed, older servers were taken out of service, stored, and decommissioned in various ways. Piecing all of that back together -- to gain as full an understanding as possible of the ways in which personal email was used for government work -- has been a painstaking undertaking, requiring thousands of hours of effort.

For example, when one of Secretary Clinton's original personal servers was decommissioned in 2013, the email software was removed. Doing that didn't remove the email content, but it was like removing the frame from a huge finished jigsaw puzzle and dumping the pieces on the floor. The effect was that millions of email fragments end up unsorted in the server's un-used – or "slack" – space. We searched through all of it to see what was there, and what parts of the puzzle could be put back together.

FBI investigators have also read all of the approximately 30,000 emails provided by Secretary Clinton to the State Department in December 2014. Where an email was assessed as possibly containing classified information, the FBI referred the email to any U.S. government agency that was a likely "owner" of information in the email, so that agency could make a determination as to whether the email contained classified information at the time it was sent or received, or whether there was reason to classify the email now, even if its content was not classified at the time it was sent (that is the process sometimes referred to as "up-classifying").

From the group of 30,000 emails returned to the State Departmen emails i email chains have been determined by the owning agency to contain classified information at the time they were sent or received. Eight of those chains contained information that was Top Secret at the time they were sent; 36 chains contained Secret information at the time; an contained Confidential information, which is the lowest level of classification. Separate from those, about 2,000 additional emails were "up-classified" to make them Confidential; the information in those had not been classified at the time the emails were sent.

The FBI also discovered several thousand work-related emails that were not

in the group of 30,000 that were returned by Secretary Clinton to State in 2014. We found those additional emails in a variety of ways. Some had been deleted over the years and we found traces of them on devices that supported or were connected to the private email domain. Others we found by reviewing the archived government email accounts of people who had been government employees at the same time as Secretary Clinton, including high-ranking officials at other agencies, people with whom a Secretary of State might naturally correspond. This helped us recover work-related emails that were not among the 30,000 produced to State. Still others we recovered from the laborious review of the millions of email fragments dumped into the slack space of the server decommissioned in 2013.

With respect to the thousands of emails we found that were not among those produced to State, agencies have concluded that **xx** of those were classified at the time they were sent or received, x at the Secret level and **xx** at the Confidential level. There were no additional Top Secret emails found. Finally, **xx** of those we found have since been "up-classified."

I should add here that we found no evidence that any of the additional work-related emails were intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them. Our assessment is that, like many email users, Secretary Clinton periodically deleted emails or emails were purged from the system when devices were changed. Because she was not using a government account – or even a commercial account like Gmail – there was no archiving at all of her emails, so it is not surprising that we discovered emails that were not on Secretary Clinton's system in 2014, when she produced the 30,000 emails to the State Department.

It could also be that some of the additional work-related emails we recovered were among those deleted as "personal" by Secretary Clinton's lawyers when they reviewed and sorted her emails for production in 2014.

The lawyers doing the sorting for Secretary Clinton in 2014 did not individually read the content of all of her emails, as we did for those available to us; instead, they relied on header information and used search terms to try to find all work-related emails among the reportedly more than 60,000 total emails remaining on Secretary Clinton's personal system in 2014. It is highly likely their search terms missed some work-related emails, and that we later found them, for example, in the mailboxes of other officials or in the slack space of a server. It is also likely that there are other work-related emails that they did not produce to State and that we did not find elsewhere, and that are now gone because they

deleted all emails they did not return to State, and the lawyers cleaned their devices in such a way as to preclude complete forensic recovery.

We have conducted interviews and done technical examination to attempt to understand how that sorting was done by her attorneys. Although we do not have complete visibility because we are not able to fully reconstruct the electronic record of that sorting, we believe our investigation has been sufficient to give us reasonable confidence there was no intentional misconduct in connection with that sorting effort.

And, of course, in addition to our technical work, we interviewed many people, from those involved in setting up and maintaining the various iterations of Secretary Clinton's personal server, to staff members with whom she corresponded on email, to those involved in the email production to State, and finally, Secretary Clinton herself.

Last, we have done extensive work to understand what indications there might be of compromise by hostile actors in connection with the personal email operation.

That's what we have done. Now let me tell you what we found:

Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.

For example, seven email chains concern matters that were classified at the Top Secret/Special Access Program level when they were sent and received. These chains involved Secretary Clinton both sending emails about those matters and receiving emails from others about the same matters. There is evidence to support a conclusion that any reasonable person in Secretary Clinton's position, or in the position of those government employees with whom she was corresponding about these matters, should have known that an unclassified system was no place for that conversation. In addition to this highly sensitive information, we also found information that was properly classified as Secret by the U.S. Intelligence Community at the time it was discussed on email (that is, excluding the later "up-classified" emails).

None of these emails should have been on any kind of unclassified system, but their presence is especially concerning because all of these emails were housed on unclassified personal servers not even supported by full-time security staff, like those found at Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government – or even with a commercial service like Gmail.

Separately, it is important to say something about the marking of classified information. Only a very small number of the emails containing classified information bore markings indicating the presence of classified information. But even if information is not marked "classified" in an email, participants who know or should know that the subject matter is classified are still obligated to protect it.

While not the focus of our investigation, we also developed evidence that the security culture of the State Department in general, and with respect to use of unclassified email systems in particular, was generally lacking in the kind of care for classified information found elsewhere in the government.

With respect to potential computer intrusion by hostile actors, we did not find direct evidence that Secretary Clinton's personal email 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. We do assess that hostile actors gained access to the private commercial email accounts of people with whom Secretary Clinton was in regular contact from her personal account. We also assess that Secretary Clinton's use of a personal email domain was both known by a large number of people and readily apparent. She also used her personal email extensively while outside the United States, including from the territory of sophisticated adversaries. That use included an email exchange with another senior government official while Secretary Clinton was in the territory of such an adversary. Given that combination of factors, we assess it is possible that hostile actors gained access to Secretary Clinton's personal email account.

So that's what we found. Finally, with respect to our recommendation to the Department of Justice:

In our system, the prosecutors make the decisions about whether charges are appropriate based on evidence the FBI has helped collect. Although we don't normally make public our recommendations to the prosecutors, we frequently make recommendations and engage in productive conversations with prosecutors

about what resolution may be appropriate, given the evidence. In this case, given the importance of the matter, I think unusual transparency is in order.

Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information, our judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case. Prosecutors necessarily weigh a number of factors before bringing charges. There are obvious considerations, like the strength of the evidence, especially about intent. Responsible decisions also consider the context of a person's actions, and how similar situations have been handled in the past.

In looking back at our investigations into mishandling or removal of classified information, we cannot find a case that would support bringing criminal charges on these facts. All the cases prosecuted involved some combination of: clearly intentional and willful mishandling of classified information; or vast quantities of materials exposed in such a way as to support an inference of intentional misconduct; or indications of disloyalty to the United States; or efforts to obstruct justice. We do not see those things here.

To be clear, this is not to suggest that in similar circumstances, a person who engaged in this activity would face no consequences. To the contrary, those individuals are often subject to security or administrative sanctions. But that is not what we are deciding now.

As a result, although the Department of Justice makes final decisions on matters like this, we are completing the investigation by expressing to Justice our view that no charges are appropriate in this case.

I know there will be intense public debate in the wake of this recommendation, as there was throughout this investigation. What I can assure the American people is that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear.

I know there were many opinions expressed by people who were not part of the investigation – including people in government – but none of that mattered to us. Opinions are irrelevant, and they were all uninformed by insight into our investigation, because we did the investigation the right way. Only facts matter, and the FBI found them here in an entirely apolitical and professional way. I couldn't be prouder to be part of this organization.

# # #

COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)

From:	COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Sent:	Monday, May 02, 2016 7:15 PM
To:	MCCABE, ANDREW G. (DO) (FBI); BAKER, JAMES A. (OGC) (FBI); RYBICKI, JAMES E. (DO) (FBI)
Cc:	COMEY, JAMES B. (DO) (FBI)
Subject:	Midyear Exam --- UNCLASSIFIED

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
==========
TRANSITORY RECORD

I've been trying to imagine what it would look like if I decided to do an FBI only press event to close out our work and hand the matter to DOJ. To help shape our discussions of whether that, or something different, makes sense, I have spent some time crafting what I would say, which follows. In my imagination, I don't see me taking any questions. Here is what it might look like:

Good afternoon folks. I am here to give you an update on our investigation of Secretary Clinton's use of a private email system, which began in late August.

After a tremendous amount of work, the FBI has completed its investigation and has referred the case to the Department of Justice for a prosecutive decision. What I would like to do today is tell you three things: (1) what we did; (2) what we found; (3) what we have recommended to DOJ.

But I want to start by thanking the many agents, analysts, technologists, and other FBI employees who did work of extraordinary quality in this case. Once you have a better sense of how much we have done, you will understand why I am so grateful and proud of their efforts.

So, first: what we have done over the last eight months.

The investigation began as a referral from the Intelligence Community Inspector General in connection with Secretary Clinton's use of a private email server during his time as Secretary of State, focused on whether classified information was transmitted on that private system.

Our investigation focused on whether there is evidence that classified information was improperly stored or transmitted on that private system, in violation of a federal statute that makes it a felony to mishandle classified information either intentionally or in a grossly negligent way, or a second statute that makes it a misdemeanor to remove classified information from appropriate systems or storage facilities.

Consistent with our counterintelligence responsibilities, we have also investigated to determine whether there is evidence of computer intrusion in connection with the private email server by any foreign power, or hackers on behalf of a foreign power.

I have so far used the singular term, "email server," in describing the referral that began our

I have so far used the singular term, "email server," in describing the referral that began our investigation. It turns out to have been more complicated than that. Secretary Clinton used several different servers and providers of those servers during her four years at the State Department, and used numerous mobile devices to view and send email on that private domain. As new servers and providers were employed, older servers were taken out of service, stored, and decommissioned in various ways. Piecing all of that back together to gain as full an understanding as possible of the ways in which private email was used for government work has been a painstaking undertaking, requiring thousands of hours of effort.

For example, when one of Secretary Clinton's original private servers was decommissioned in 20xx, the email software was removed. Doing that didn't remove the email content, but it was like removing the frame from a huge finished jigsaw puzzle and dumping the pieces on the floor. The effect was that millions of email fragments end up unsorted in the server's un-used – or "slack" – space. We went through all of it to see what was there, and what parts of the puzzle could be put back together.

FBI investigators have also read all 34,000 emails provided by Secretary Clinton to the State Department in spring 2015. Where an email was assessed as possibly containing classified information, the FBI referred the email to the U.S. government agency that was the likely "owner" of the information in the email so that agency could make a determination as to whether the email contained classified information at the time it was sent or received, or whether there was reason to classify the email now, even if its content was not classified at the time it was sent (this is the process sometimes referred to as "up classifying").

From that group of 34,000 emails that had been returned to the State Department in 2015, the FBI sent xxxx emails to agencies for classification determinations. Of those, xxxx have been determined to contain classified information at the time they were sent or received. Xxxx of those contained information that was Top Secret at the time they were sent; xxxx contained Secret information at the time; and xxxx contained Confidential information. Separate from those, a total of xxxx additional emails were "up classified" to make them Secret or Confidential; the information in those had not been classified at the time the emails were sent.

The FBI also discovered xxxx work-related emails that were not in the group of 34,000 that were returned by Secretary Clinton to State in 2015. We found those additional emails in a variety of ways. Some had been deleted over the years and we found traces of them on devices that supported or were connected to the private email domain. Others we found by reviewing the archived government email accounts of people who had been government employees at the same time as Secretary Clinton, including high-ranking officials at other agencies, with whom a Secretary of State might naturally correspond. This helped us recover work-related emails that were not among the 34,000 produced to State. Still others we recovered from the laborious review of the millions of email fragments dumped into the slack space of the server decommissioned in 20xx.

All told, we found xxxx emails that were not among those produced to the State Department last year. Of those, we assessed that xxxx possibly contained classified information at the time they were sent or received and so we sent them to other government agencies for classification determinations. To date, agencies have concluded that xxxx of those were classified at the time they were sent or received, xxx at the Secret level and xxxx at the Confidential level. There were no additional Top Secret emails found. Finally, none of those we found have since been "up classified."

I should add here that we found no evidence that any of the additional work-related emails we found were intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them. Our assessment is that, like many users of private email accounts, Secretary Clinton periodically deleted emails or emails were purged from the

system when devices were changed. Because she was not using a government account, there was no archiving of her emails, so it is not surprising that we discovered emails that were not on Secretary Clinton's system in 2015, when she produced the 34,000 emails to the State Department.

It could also be that some of the additional work-related emails we recovered were among those deleted as "personal" by Secretary Clinton's lawyers when they reviewed and sorted her emails for production in 2015. We have conducted interviews and done technical examination to attempt to understand how that sorting was done. Although we do not have complete visibility because we are not fully able to reconstruct the electronic record of that sorting, we believe our investigation has been sufficient to give us reasonable confidence there was no intentional misconduct in connection with that sorting effort.

The lawyers doing the sorting for Secretary Clinton in 2015 did not individually read tens of thousands of emails, as we did; instead, they used search terms to try to find all work-related emails among the more than 60,000 total emails remaining on Secretary Clinton's private system in 2015. It is highly likely their search terms missed some work-related emails, and that we found them, for example, in the mailboxes of other officials or in the slack space of a server. It is also likely that there are other work-related emails that they did not produce to State and that we did not find elsewhere, and that are now gone because they deleted all emails they did not return to State, and the lawyers cleaned their devices in a such a way as to preclude forensic recovery.

And, of course, in additional to our technical work, we interviewed many people, from those involved in setting up and maintaining the various iterations of Secretary Clinton's private server to staff members with whom she corresponded on email, to those involved in the email production to State, and finally, Secretary Clinton herself.

Lastly, we have done extensive work with the assistance of our colleagues elsewhere in the Intelligence Community to understand what indications there might be of compromise by hostile actors in connection with the private email operation.

That's what we have done. Now let me tell you what we found.

There is evidence to support a conclusion that Secretary Clinton, and others, used the private email server in a manner that was grossly negligent with respect to the handling of classified information. For example, seven email chains concern matters that were classified at the TS/SAP level when they were sent and received. These chains involved Secretary Clinton both sending emails about those matters and receiving emails from others about the same matters. There is evidence to support a conclusion that any reasonable person in Secretary Clinton's position, or in the positon of those government employees with whom she was corresponding about these matters, should have known that an unclassified system was no place for such an email conversation. Although we did not find clear evidence that Secretary Clinton or her colleagues intended to violate laws governing the handling of classified information, there is evidence that they were extremely careless in their handling of very sensitive, highly classified information.

Similarly, the sheer volume of information that was properly classified as Secret at the time it was discussed on email (that is, excluding the "up classified" emails) supports an inference that the participants were grossly negligent in their handling of that information.

We also developed evidence that the security culture of the State Department in general, and with respect to use of unclassified email systems in particular, was generally lacking in the kind of care for classified information found elsewhere in the government

classified information found elsewhere in the government.

With respect to potential computer intrusion by hostile actors, we did not find direct evidence that Secretary Clinton's personal email system, 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. We do assess that hostile actors gained access to the private email accounts of individuals with whom Secretary Clinton was in regular contact from her private account. We also assess that Secretary Clinton's use of a private email domain was both known by a large number of people and readily apparent. Given that combination of factors, we asses it is reasonably likely that hostile actors gained access to Secretary Clinton's private email account.

So that's what we found.

Finally, with respect to our recommendation to the Department of Justice. In our system, the prosecutors make the decisions about whether charges are appropriate based on evidence the FBI has helped collect. Although we don't normally make public our recommendations to the prosecutors, we frequently make recommendations and engage in productive conversations with prosecutors about what resolution may be appropriate, given the evidence. In this case, given the importance of the matter, I think unusual transparency is in order.

Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statute proscribing gross negligence in the handling of classified information and of the statute proscribing misdemeanor mishandling, my judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case. At the outset, we are not aware of a case where anyone has been charged solely based on the "gross negligence" prohibition in the statute. All charged cases of which we are aware have involved the accusation that a government employee intentionally mishandled classified information. In looking back at our investigations in similar circumstances, we cannot find a case that would support bringing criminal charges on these facts. All the cases prosecuted involved some combination of: (1) clearly intentional misconduct; (2) vast quantities of materials exposed in such a way as to support an inference of intentional misconduct; (3) indications of disloyalty to the United States; or (4) efforts to obstruct justice. We see none of that here.

Accordingly, although the Department of Justice makes final decisions on matters such as this, I am completing the investigation by expressing to Justice my view that no charges are appropriate in this case.

I know there will be intense public disagreement in the wake of this result, as there was throughout this investigation. What I can assure the American people is that this investigation was done competently, honestly, and independently. No outside influence of any kind was brought to bear. I know there were many opinions expressed by people who were not part of the investigation -- including people in government – but none of that mattered to us. Opinions are irrelevant, and they were all uninformed by insight into our investigation, because we did the investigation in a professional way. Only facts matter, and the FBI found them here in an entirely apolitical and professional way. I couldn't be prouder to be part of this organization.

###

==========

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Date UTC	Date Correction	Internal Phone Number	Type of Message	From	To	RECIPIENTS_JSON	Body	Type	Attachment file type
2015-08-16 20:52:54, Sun		20[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		Love this line in the article: "the fbi and dhs are in charge of tracking the activities of foreign govt agents inside the US..." Uh, in what universe is that dhs's job?!	sms	
2015-08-16 20:53:26, Sun		20[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		You are wildly wrong.	sms	
2015-08-16 20:54:36, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			Well, I'm sure Jeh Johnson said it is...gotta assume it's some wildly liberal interpretation of immigration responsibilities..	sms	
2015-08-16 21:31:37, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		Finally, and related to nothing, but I just saw my first Bernie Sanders bumper sticker. Made me want to key the car.	sms	
2015-08-16 21:37:53, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			He's an an idiot like Trump. Figure they cancel each other out.	sms	
2015-08-30 18:18:49, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		Not related, but this is also outrageous. I mean, come on. The woman needed all this outside employment? \n\nAn article to share: How Huma Abedin operated at the center of the Clinton universe\nHow Huma Abedin operated at the center of the Clinton universe\nhttp://wapo.st/1JAqfVk	sms	
2015-10-14 01:11:52, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			And Martin OMalley's a douche	sms	
2015-10-14 01:14:29, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		I'm not watching. I can't tell you how little I care right now.	sms	
2015-10-14 01:17:12, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			Kind of a foregone conclusion but so much more substantive than the Rep debates	sms	
2015-10-14 02:22:05, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			Ooh hillary Bernie throw down on 215	sms	
2015-11-01 23:19:31, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		Hey, I assume going forward that it's okay to send entirely innocuous news articles, right?	sms	

PS = inbox
LP = outbox

2015-11-01 23:21:36, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		+1 202-[redacted]		Anyway, I sent one. And I hope Paul Ryan fails and crashes in a blaze of glory.	sms		
2015-11-01 23:23:04, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	+1 202-[redacted]			Yes. And, me too. At some point the Rep party needs to pull their head out of their *ss. Shows no sign of occurring any time soon.	sms		
2015-12-13 01:36:54, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		202[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1449970617159,"uniqueId":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"202[redacted],"emails":[[redacted]	And funny re [redacted] husband, bc Kasich has long been suspected of being gay. Lived with his campaign manager for a looooong time, until maybe 10+ years ago when he married a supermodel wife and immediately popped out kids, twins even, I think.	sms		[redacted]
2015-12-21 01:19:26, Mon		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		202[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1450660766726,"uniqueId":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"202[redacted]emails":[[redacted]	What an utter idiot.\n\nAn article to share: Donald Trump on Putin: \u2018Nobody has proven that he\u2019s killed anyone\u2019\nDonald Trump on Putin: \u2018Nobody has proven that he\u2019s killed anyone\u2019\nhttp://wapo.st/1PjfMkv	sms		[redacted]
2015-12-21 01:47:08, Mon		202[redacted]	INBOX	202[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1450662429240,"uniqueId":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"202[redacted]'emails"[redacted]	No doubt. \U0001f612\n\nOk to gmail some pics?	sms		[redacted]
2015-12-28 18:26:22, Mon		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		202[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1451327183340,"uniqueId":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"202[redacted],"emails":[[redacted]	It's sick, but I really like policy issues. And having tight deadlines. Sigh...	sms		[redacted]

2015-12-28 19:18:11, Mon		202	INBOX	202 ;202		[{"modified":1451330292169,"uniqueid":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","202 "],"emails":	Is that what doj wanted?	sms	
2015-12-28 19:18:32, Mon		202	INBOX	202 ;202		[{"modified":1451330314011,"uniqueid":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","202 "],"emails":	You get all our oconus approved? ;)	sms	
2015-12-28 19:19:41, Mon		202	OUTBOX	202 ;202		[{"modified":1451330382934,"uniqueid":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","202 "],"emails":	No, it's just implicated a much bigger policy issue. I'll explain later. Might even be able to use it as pretext for a call... :)	sms	
2016-01-18 03:13:35, Mon		202	INBOX	202 ;202		[{"modified":1453086817192,"uniqueid":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","202 "],"emails":	Martin O'Malley's a freakshow	sms	
2016-01-18 03:14:59, Mon		202	OUTBOX	202 ;202		[{"modified":1453086901168,"uniqueid":299,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","202 "],"emails":	Yikes baby!\n\nYeah, that's what everyone says.\n\nOkay, really going to bed now	sms	

2016-01-22 17:50:34, Fri		202	OUTBOX		202 202	[{"modified":14534850 36202,"uniqueid":299," firstName":"Peter","las tName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"orga nizations":[],"numbers" :["202 "202 'emails":[	Yeah, some extremely offensive video screens set up in front of dist ct. Thank goodness D can't read and wasn't paying attention. Blood and guts and gore. I truly hate these people. No support for the woman who actually has to spend the rest of her life rearing this child, but we care about "life." Assholes.	sms		
2016-01-26 00:16:54, Tue		202	INBOX	202 202		[{"modified":14537674 15196,"uniqueid":299," firstName":"Peter","las tName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"orga nizations":[],"numbers" :["202 "202 'emails":[	And J*sus Martin O'Malley, just pack it in and go home!	sms		
2016-02-19 02:17:26, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":14558482 46411,"uniqueid":109," firstName":"Peter","las tName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"orga nizations":[],"numbers" :["202 "(202) "emails":	NOW HOW THE F CAN HE BE A REPUBLICAN? !?!?	sms		
2016-02-19 02:17:59, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":14558482 79516,"uniqueid":109," firstName":"Peter","las tName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"orga nizations":[],"numbers" :["202 "(202) emails":[	I have absolutely no idea. Still, he is so very interesting.	sms		

2016-02-19 02:20:26, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1455848426170,"uniqueid":109,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Gotta get that promotion party so you can meet him.	sms		
2016-02-19 02:20:55, Fri		20	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1455848455252,"uniqueid":109,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	And find the right moment to introduce you to N about the Apple pclob Lisa buckets stuff...	sms		
2016-03-02 01:19:48, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1456881588769,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	He IS proud. And therefore me, too. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\n\nVoted for Bernie, of course. As young idealistic kids should.	sms		
2016-03-02 01:20:01, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1456881601603,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	He asked me who I'd vote for, guessed Kasich	sms		

2016-03-02 01:20:11, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1456881611411,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Yes, they should.	sms		
2016-03-02 01:20:29, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1456881629803,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	Seriously?! Would you not D?	sms		
2016-03-02 01:20:39, Wed		202	INBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1456881640024,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	I don't know. I suppose Hillary.	sms		
2016-03-02 01:20:46, Wed		202	INBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1456881646521,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	I would D	sms		

2016-03-02 01:21:00, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1456881661132,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails" [redacted]	He's doesn't think you're an R, does he?	sms		[redacted]
2016-03-02 01:21:04, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202) [redacted] ;202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1456881665043,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails" [redacted]	VA's going to go to her anyway.	sms		[redacted]
2016-03-02 01:21:17, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1456881677261,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] ,"emails": [redacted]	He thinks I wouldn't vote for her right now	sms		[redacted]
2016-03-02 01:21:24, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202) [redacted] ;202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1456881684732,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails" [redacted]	He's knows I'm a conservative Dem	sms		[redacted]

2016-03-02 01:21:37, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1456881697711,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	But now I wonder.	sms		
2016-03-02 01:21:45, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1456881705622,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Got it.	sms		
2016-03-04 02:10:50, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457057450611,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	God trump is a loathsome human.	sms		
2016-03-04 02:11:26, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457057487127,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Yet he may win	sms		

2016-03-04 02:11:35, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1457057495877,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "emails":	Good for Hillary	sms		
2016-03-04 02:11:51, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1457057511998,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	It is.	sms		
2016-03-04 02:12:46, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1457057566651,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Would he be a worse president than cruz?	sms		
2016-03-04 02:13:14, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1457057594254,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Trump? Yes, I think so.	sms		

2016-03-04 02:13:37, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1457057618013,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":	I'm not sure	sms		
2016-03-04 02:20:04, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1457058004250,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":	Omg he's an idiot	sms		
2016-03-04 02:20:33, Fri		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1457058034165,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	He's awful.	sms		
2016-03-04 02:21:02, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1457058063039,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	America will get what the voting public deserves	sms		

2016-03-04 02:21:36, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1457058097168,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":	That's what i'm afraid of.	sms	
2016-03-04 02:22:11, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1457058131427,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	Department of Environmental Protection? !?!	sms	
2016-03-04 02:22:33, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1457058153325,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Yup.	sms	
2016-03-04 02:24:25, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1457058265613,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202) ,"emails"	God Hillary should win 100,000,000 - 0.	sms	

2016-03-04 02:25:16, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457058317156,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	I know.	sms	
2016-03-04 02:34:56, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457058897140,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	Also did you hear him make a comment about the size of his d*ck earlier? This man can not be president.	sms	
2016-03-04 02:37:06, Fri		202	INBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457059027021,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	Yes I did. In relation to the size of his hands.\n\nAnd all the "Little Marco" blah blah blah	sms	
2016-03-04 02:38:08, Fri		202	INBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457059088809,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	And God, Detroit used to be SO beautiful and shining and elegant. \U0001f61e Sigh.	sms	

2016-03-04 02:38:35, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) ;202	[{"modified":1457059115246,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ","emails":	I know. Detroit is really a beautiful city. Camden was too.	sms	
2016-03-04 02:56:09, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457060170175,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["20 ","(202) "emails"	Ok I may vote for Trump \n\n;)	sms	
2016-03-04 02:57:00, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457060221215,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	"And look, I'M OLD"	sms	
2016-03-04 02:58:39, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457060319786,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202)],"emails":	What?!\n\nPoor Kasich. He's the only sensible man up there.	sms	

2016-03-04 02:59:53, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457060394063,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[":["202 (202) "emails":	He was pretty much calling for death for Snowden. I'm a single issue voter. ;)\n\nEspionage Machine Party	sms	
2016-03-04 03:00:23, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457060423340,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[":["202 "(202) ,"emails":	Exactly re Kasich. And he has ZERO appeal	sms	
2016-03-12 20:58:35, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457816315583,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[":["202 "(202) "emails"	What the f is wrong with people?\n\nA Texas Candidate Pushes the Boundary of the Far Right http://nyti.ms/1QTqBqj	sms	
2016-03-12 21:05:11, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457816711329,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[":["202 "(202) "emails"	That Texas article is depressing as hell. But answers how we could end up with President trump	sms	

2016-03-12 21:07:50, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457816870461,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202}],"emails"	Wasn't it? Seriously, how are people so incredibly ignorant?	sms		
2016-03-12 21:12:46, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1457817166608,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	I have no idea, but it depresses me. Same people who drive more when they get extra daylight from daylight savings, I'm guessing.	sms		
2016-03-12 21:21:03, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1457817664195,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	\U0001f621\nTrump Clarifies, and It\u2019s Worse - NYTimes.com\nhttp://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/03/12/opinion/trump-clarifies-and-its-worse.html?_r=0	sms		
2016-03-14 11:53:08, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457956388413,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	Don't listen to npr this morning - Richard Clarke is an uninformed douche. \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621	sms		

2016-03-14 11:53:43, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202 4		[{"modified":1457956423620,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024371838","(202) 324-4552"],"emails":["Peter.Strzok@ic.fbi.gov"]}]	Yeah, I really don't like him. What did he say?	sms		
2016-03-14 11:54:39, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457956480005,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Totally unnecessary. He's awful.	sms		
2016-03-14 11:58:38, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202 4		[{"modified":1457956718953,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	You can tell me about and we can get indignant together.	sms		
2016-03-14 12:11:09, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1457957470357,"uniqueId":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	It is not boring or weak. It is life, and I am happy to help.\n\nHe is a blowhard who doesn't know what he is talking about anymore, if he ever did. \n\nI will when I can. Not sure what his schedule is like this am.	sms		

2016-03-16 04:11:51, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1458101511904,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	I can not believe Donald Trump is likely to be an actual, serious candidate for president.	sms		
2016-04-02 01:19:29, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1459559970236,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ","emails":"	So look, you say we text on that phone when we talk about hillary because it can't be traced, you were just venting bc you feel bad that you're gone so much but it can't be helped right now.	sms		
2016-04-02 01:20:30, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1459560030794,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "],"emails":"	Right. But did you say anything other than work? I did, but may have only gotten smiles or blushes back	sms		
2016-04-09 01:18:28, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1460164708322,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[	All this from N:\nwww.greenpeace.org/usa/campaign-updates/hillary-clintons-connections-oil-gas-industry\n\nEverything sanders said about Clinton is true. If you ready through their fact check they don't state a single thing of his is "false", however they argue that it is completely false because 1.4 million from fossil fuel lobbyists and 3.3 million directly from large donors connected to the fossil fuel industry, a total of 4.5 million alone in 2016 as "not much" compared to her total raising a	sms		

2016-04-09 01:18:35, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1460164716071,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) emails":	This is clear and utter bias by the media specifically the NYTIMES, WAPO, and CNN who if you look at all of them have large donors for Clinton	sms		
2016-04-09 01:18:45, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1460164725920,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	The fact citing source they used is owned by a newspaper which publically endorsed Clinton	sms		
2016-05-04 00:40:51, Wed		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1462322452120,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	nd holy shit Cruz just dropped out of the race. It's going to be a Clinton Trump race. Unbelievable.	sms		
2016-05-04 00:41:24, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1462322484639,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) emails":	What?!?!??	sms		

2016-05-04 00:41:37, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted];202[redacted]	[{"modified":1462322497801,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails"[redacted]	You heard that right my friend.	sms		[redacted]
2016-05-04 00:41:37, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202)[redacted]202[redacted]	[{"modified":1462322497753,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails"[redacted]	I saw trump won, figured it would be a bit	sms		[redacted]
2016-06-12 01:49:47, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202)[redacted]202[redacted]	[{"modified":1465696188957,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	They fully deserve to go, and demonstrate the absolute bigoted nonsense of Trump	sms		[redacted]
2016-06-12 01:49:47, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202[redacted]202[redacted]	[{"modified":1465696188893,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails"[redacted]	Truly	sms		[redacted]

2016-06-17 21:56:15, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1466200576312,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 "(202)	'emails":	Now we're talking about Clinton, and how a lot of people are holding their breath, hoping.	sms		
2016-06-22 16:39:25, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1466613565908,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 "(202)	"emails"	Hi. Just leaving my meeting now. How we make law in this country is offensive and irresponsible. \U0001f621	sms		
2016-06-22 16:41:56, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1466613717529,"uniqueid":211,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 "(202)	"emails":	I know it is. Its why I LOATHE congress. Can't wait to hear the story.	sms		
2016-07-07 10:36:34, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1467887796027,"uniqueid":497,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 "(202)	","emails":	Thought this was spot on.\n\nHillary Clinton: Ma\u2019am Survivor http://nyti.ms/29zO0ku	sms		

2016-07-08 22:45:38, Fri		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1468017939983,"uniqueid":497,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	And meanwhile, we have Black Lives Matter protesters, right now, chanting "no justice no peace" around DoJ and the White House...	sms		
2016-07-08 23:15:13, Fri		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468019714390,"uniqueid":497,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["20 ,"(202) "emails":	That's awful.	sms		
2016-07-10 01:22:24, Sun		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1468113745048,"uniqueid":497,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	I didn't get the chance to ask about the 88s. But I did sit and stare at the portrait of Elliot Richardson staring at me.	sms		
2016-07-10 01:22:44, Sun		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1468113765919,"uniqueid":497,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202) "emails":	It's next to the portrait of Eric Holder, which is wildly offensive.	sms		

2016-07-14 01:33:53, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468460034702,"uniqueid":672,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Have you read this? It's really frightening. \n\nFor Whites Sensing Decline, Donald Trump Unleashes Words of Resistance http://nyti.ms/29WCu5l	sms		
2016-07-14 01:35:35, Thu		20	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468460136245,"uniqueid":672,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	I have not. But I think it's clear he's capturing all the white, poor voters who the mainstream Republicans abandoned in all but name in the quest for the almighty $$$$	sms		
2016-07-14 01:36:32, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468460193390,"uniqueid":672,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Yeah, it's not good.\n\nAnyway,	sms		
2016-07-14 11:04:45, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468494286367,"uniqueid":672,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Poll Finds Emails Weighing on Hillary Clinton, Now Tied With Donald Trump http://nyti.ms/29RV5gf	sms		

2016-07-14 11:05:15, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468494316437,"uniqueId":672,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	It is.	sms		
2016-07-19 00:12:19, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) :202		[{"modified":1468887140729,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	And are you kidding me? Duck Dynasty now Scott Baio? RIdiculous.	sms		
2016-07-19 00:27:05, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468888026599,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	Walt, is that who is speaking at the convention?!	sms		
2016-07-19 00:27:24, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468888045751,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202) "emails"	Yes!!!!!!	sms		

2016-07-19 00:27:27, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1468888048697,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]"emails"[redacted]	Charles in Charge?! That's the best they can do?! Lmfao	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-19 00:27:37, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1468888058539,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted](202)[redacted]"emails":[redacted]	It's PATHETIC!	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-19 00:27:59, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1468888080131,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]"emails"[redacted]	That unbelievable. My god. Thank god it's not on.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-19 00:28:44, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1468888124979,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted](202)[redacted]"emails":[redacted]	It's on! PBS!	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-19 00:29:56, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468888197543,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	What did you do? Republican snark. \U0001f636	sms		
2016-07-19 00:36:18, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468888579696,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	AND COME ON!!!! TURN ON THE CONVENTION!!!!	sms		
2016-07-19 00:37:52, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468888673925,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	NO! I WILL NOT BE SUCKED IN!	sms		
2016-07-19 00:43:55, Tue		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1468889036511,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	TURN IT ON. PBS.	sms		

2016-07-19 00:44:39, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1468889080677,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":		sms		
2016-07-19 00:45:03, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468889104289,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Well Christ. YOU got me there. :D	sms		
2016-07-19 00:45:25, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468889126065,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	likely to come down shortly so we can bust through more of this sh*t. Just fyi.	sms		
2016-07-19 00:57:55, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468889876249,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Oooh, TURN IT ON, TURN IT ON!!! THE DOUCHEBAGS ARE ABOUT TO COME OUT. \n\nYou can tell by the excitable clapping.	sms		

2016-07-19 01:04:46, Tue		20[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1468890287450,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails"[redacted]	My god, I'm so embarrassed for them. These are like second-run stars. Nothing the B-list to relate to the kids these days...	sms	[redacted]
2016-07-19 02:23:29, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1468895010321,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails":[redacted]	And wow, Donald Trump is an enormous d*uche.	sms	[redacted]
2016-07-19 10:16:23, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1468923384188,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] ,"emails":[redacted] }]	Hi. How was Trump, other than a douche? Melania? And any luck with home purchases? \n\nI have[redacted] this morning. \U0001f61d	sms	[redacted]
2016-07-19 10:18:31, Tue		20[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1468923512571,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted] "emails"[redacted]	Trump barely spoke, but the first thing out of his mouth was "we're going to win soooo big." The whole thing is like living in a bad dream.	sms	[redacted]

2016-07-19 10:19:41, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468923582708,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) 'emails'	Jesus	sms		
2016-07-19 10:20:06, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468923607407,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails	Melania was perfectly fine, except the whole point of the spouse talking is to reveal those peesonal stories, what a lind human the candidate is. There was none of that.	sms		
2016-07-19 10:21:20, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468923681261,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) emails":	That was her job! What the hell did she talk about? Winning vuuuge?	sms		
2016-07-19 10:22:12, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202 02	[{"modified":1468923733422,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) emails"	I don't know. Lots of my husband is great, but no description to back it up.	sms		

2016-07-19 11:18:46, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468927127581,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) "emails"	Omg. You listening to npr? Apparently Melania's speech had passages lifted from Michele Obama's....unbelievable	sms		
2016-07-19 11:19:25, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468927166021,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 ,"(202) "emails"	NO WAY!	sms		
2016-07-19 11:20:06, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1468927207666,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 ,"(202) "emails"	God, it's just a two-bit organization. I do so hope his disorganization comes to bite him hard in November.	sms		
2016-07-19 11:21:13, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1468927274701,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) "emails"	It HAS to, right? Right?!? Panicked \U0001f628	sms		

2016-07-20 00:14:02, Wed		202 [redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1468973644056,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 [redacted] "(202) [redacted] "emails [redacted]	Hopefully you get home in time for crazy - ass grain storage pyramid Ben Carson tonight.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-20 00:14:10, Wed		202 [redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1468973651767,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 [redacted] "(202) [redacted] ,"emails": [redacted]	Pence being introduced	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-20 01:12:03, Wed		202 [redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1468977124001,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 [redacted] (202) [redacted] ,"emails": [redacted]	Mitch McConnell always reminds me of a turtle.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-20 01:14:54, Wed		20 [redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1468977295503,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 [redacted] "(202) [redacted] ,"emails" [redacted]	My god, the crowd looks sooooooo bored.	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-20 01:15:04, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1468977305381,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]]}]	Droopy dog	mms		[redacted]
2016-07-20 01:22:23, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1468977744340,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Amd Paul Ryan's a jerky	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-21 08:52:19, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469091140788,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]"]}]	This is really shocking.\n\nDonald Trump Sets Conditions for Defending NATO Allies Against Attack http://nyti.ms/2ai4u3g	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-21 09:09:58, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469092199358,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "],"emails":[[redacted]"]}]	This campaign is like watching a train wreck happen over and over and over again.\n\nHow Donald Trump Picked His Running Mate http://nyti.ms/2a8aCJ9	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-26 23:54:42, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1469577284264,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	And hey. Congrats on a woman nominated for President in a major party!\n\nAbout damn time! Many many more returns of the day! \U0001f60a	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-26 23:56:57, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1469577418480,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	\U0001f60a That's cute. Thanks. \U0001f636	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-26 23:57:51, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1469577472858,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] 4[redacted]emails":[[redacted]]}]	\U0001f60a That's cute. Thanks. \U0001f636	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-26 23:58:20, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1469577501197,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":[[redacted]"]}]	I had to hold [redacted] hand when Bernie just now moved for her nomination. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-26 23:58:48, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469577529824,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[[redacted]]}]	I'm not watching. What happened?	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:02:08, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469577729469,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]r[redacted]]}]	They went thru roll call, she got enough votes about an hour ago. Vermont went last, they cast their votes. Then introduced Bernie, who called for some procedural things then moved for HRC to become the Democratic Nominee.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:02:41, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469577762238,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Chills, just because I'm a homer for American democracy that way. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:03:06, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469577787947,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[[redacted]]}]	If they played patriotic music or did something with the flag and an honor guard, I probably would have teared up.....	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-27 00:05:18, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469577919880,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted]"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Turn on pbs!	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:07:14, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469578035248,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]4[redacted]emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Oh God, Holder! Turn it off turn it off turn it off!!!!	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:11:47, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469578308875,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Yeah, I saw him yesterday and booed at the tv. \U0001f60a	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:11:56, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469578317546,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted]"emails":[[redacted]"]}]	Sigh. Thank you. \U0001f636	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-27 00:21:39, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469578900402,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] 4[redacted]emails":[[redacted]]}]	Yeah, it is pretty cool. She just has to win now. I'm not going to lie, I got a flash of nervousness yesterday about trump. The sandernistas have the potential to make a very big mistake here...	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 00:32:09, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469579530708,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]],"emails":["[redacted]r[redacted]]}]	I'm not worried about them. I'm worried about the anarchist Assanges who will take fed information and disclose it to disrupt.[redacted]	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 02:54:17, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] 4[redacted]		[{"modified":1469588058703,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":["[redacted]]}]	So sad, the comment about more yesterdays than tomorrows. \U0001f622\n\nAnd i don't like Chelsea! Her husband even less...\U0001f612	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-27 02:57:07, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] [redacted]	[{"modified":1469588228690,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "],"emails":["[redacted]]}]	I like Chelsea fine. Why not?	sms		[redacted]r[redacted]

2016-07-27 03:00:18, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1469588419329,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":{},"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted] 4[redacted]emails":[[redacted]}]	Self entitled. Feels she deserves something she hasn't earned	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-28 00:59:03, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1469667543952,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] 4[redacted]emails":["[redacted]"}]}	Stupid*ss Bernie supporters shouting no more war so that he couldn't be heard hardly at all. I'm sorry, they're idiots.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-28 01:01:27, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] 4[redacted]		[{"modified":1469667688232,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"}]}	They really are.	sms		[redacted]
2016-07-28 01:18:01, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] [redacted]	[{"modified":1469668682102,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"}]}	I really really like Joe Biden.	sms		[redacted]

2016-07-28 01:24:09, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1469669050983,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "emails":["]}]	Was literally grabbing phone to say Joe's doing great!	sms		
2016-07-28 01:26:14, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1469669175210,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "emails":["]}]	He's just a really sincere guy.	sms		
2016-07-28 01:29:15, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1469669356281,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "emails":["]}]	said he was absolutely beloved by Delaware State Police. And funny story about him and gtwn basketball team in China a few years ago. Too long for here.	sms		
2016-07-28 01:51:10, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1469670675744,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) emails":["]}]	Opened on Trump? If Hillary did, you know 5 field offices would...	sms		

2016-07-28 01:54:20, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1469670861681,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "emails":["	This article highlights the thing I mentioned to you earlier, asking if Bill had noted it to 7th floor. I'm going to send it to him	sms		
2016-08-01 01:38:23, Mon		20	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1470015504253,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) emails":[	I mean seriously. What in the hell is this guy talking about? \n\nDonald Trump Gives Questionable Explanation of Events in Ukraine http://nyti.ms/2arMCyV	sms		
2016-08-06 14:38:09, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1470494290616,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) emails":["	Jesus. You should read this. And Trump should go f himself. \n\nMoment in Convention Glare Shakes Up Khans\u2019 American Life http://nyti.ms/2aHuLE0	sms		
2016-08-06 14:53:36, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1470495217938,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024","(202) emails":[	God that's a great article. \U0001f621\U0001f61e\U0001f61e\u2764\n\nThanks for sharing. \n\nAnd F Trump.	sms		

2016-08-06 14:55:00, Sat		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] 4[redacted]	[{"modified":1470495301312,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]]}]	And maybe you're meant to stay where you are because you're meant to protect the country from that menace. To that end, read this:	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-06 14:55:19, Sat		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] 4[redacted] 4[redacted]	[{"modified":1470495320283,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] emails":["[redacted]]}	Trump\u2019s Enablers Will Finally Have to Take a Stand http://nyti.ms/2aFakry	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-06 15:04:43, Sat		202[redacted]	INBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1470495884167,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]]}]	Thanks. It's absolutely true that we're both very fortunate. \n\nAnd of course I'll try and approach it that way. I just know it will be tough at times.\n\nI can protect our country at many levels, not sure if that helps...	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-06 15:05:51, Sat		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted] 4[redacted]	[{"modified":1470495952221,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] 4[redacted] emails":["[redacted]]}	I know it will too. But it's just a job. It's not a reflection of your worth or quality or smarts.	sms		[redacted]

2016-08-06 15:28:50, Sat		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1470497332107,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"emails":[[redacted]]}]	I really like this:\nHe appears to have no ability to experience reverence, which is the foundation for any capacity to admire or serve anything bigger than self, to want to learn about anything beyond self, to want to know and deeply honor the people around you.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-06 15:30:59, Sat		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1470497460415,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted]"emails":["[redacted]]}]	Sigh. That's the paragraph, upon reading, that caused me to want to send it to you. \U0001f635	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-09 03:26:25, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1470713187285,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]4[redacted]emails":["[redacted]	He's not ever going to become president, right? Right?!	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-09 21:56:09, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1470779771230,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]4[redacted]emails":[[redacted]]}]	OMG did you hear what Trump just said?	sms		[redacted]

2016-08-11 00:53:46, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1470876827378,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Why Latitude? (other than it sounds badass, and you came up with it \U0001f636)	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-11 00:54:24, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1470876865859,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Trying to think of something loosely military, without being obvious.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-11 00:56:56, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1470877018143,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]	[redacted] YUUUUGE.\n\nThough we may save that for the man, if we ever open on him ;)	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-11 00:57:27, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1470877048774,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted] "emails":[[redacted]"]}]	OMG I CANNOT BELIEVE WE ARE SERIOUSLY LOOKING AT THESE ALLEGATIONS AND THE PERVASIVE CONNECTIONS	sms		[redacted]

2016-08-11 00:57:41, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1470877062689,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	What the hell has happened to our country!?!?!??	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-14 10:55:22, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1471172124580,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":["[redacted]"]}]	God this makes me so angry.\n\nDonald Trump Is Making America Meaner http://nyti.ms/2b6gG38	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-14 11:00:46, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1471172447765,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] 4[redacted] emails":[[redacted]"]}]	And I am worried about what Trump is encouraging in our behavior. The things that made me proud about our tolerance for dissent - what makes us different from Sunnis and Shias losing each other up - is disappearing.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-14 11:01:54, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1471172515367,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted] "emails":[[redacted]"]}]	I'm worried about what happens if HRC is elected. \n\nAnd perfect, another excessive heat warning day.	sms		[redacted]

2016-08-15 10:29:55, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1471256996237,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "],"emails":["}]}	I want to believe the path you threw out for consideration in Andy's office - that there's no way he gets elected - but I'm afraid we can't take that risk. It's like an insurance policy in the unlikely event you die before you're 40...	sms		
2016-08-17 10:28:37, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 20 2) ;(20 2) ;202	[{"modified":1471429717586,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) "emails":[" "]},{"modified":1471429717778,"uniqueid":892,"firstName" ","lastName":" ","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) ","(202) "],"emails":[]}]	An article to share: Trump shakes up campaign, demotes top adviser\nTrump shakes up campaign, demotes top adviser\nhttp://wapo.st/2bzAUGD	mms		
2016-08-17 10:29:25, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 20 2) ;(20 2) ;202		[{"modified":1471429766248,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202) emails":[" "]},{"modified":1471429766534,"uniqueid":892,"firstName" ","lastName":" ","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) ","(202) "],"emails":[]}]	Just reading it	mms		

2016-08-17 11:02:31, Wed		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1471431752558,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	[redacted]	sms		
2016-08-26 16:42:40, Fri		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1472229762697,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Just went to a southern Virginia Walmart. I could SMELL the Trump support....	sms		
2016-08-26 16:54:18, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] :202[redacted]	[{"modified":1472230461303,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Yup. Out to lunch with [redacted] We both hate everyone and everything.	sms		
2016-08-26 17:02:52, Fri		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1472230973957,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	I want to be there and hate with you, or charm you back to happy \n\nLooked for the two trump yard signs I saw on the way out to take a picture, but couldn't see them	sms		

2016-08-26 20:51:12, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1472244673868,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Just riffing on the hot mess that is our country.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-26 20:52:28, Fri		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1472244749866,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Yeah....it's scary real down here	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-30 09:44:50, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1472550291743,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Here we go:\nHarry Reid Cites Evidence of Russian Tampering in U.S. Vote, and Seeks F.B.I. Inquiry\n\nhttp://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/08/30/us/politics/harry-reid-russia-tampering-election-fbi.html	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-30 09:45:20, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1472550320865,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	But Mr. Reid argued that the connections between some of Donald J. Trump\u2019s former and current advisers and the Russian leadership should, by itself, prompt an investigation. He referred indirectly in his letter to a speech given in Russia by one Trump adviser, Carter Page, a consultant and investor in the energy giant Gazprom, who criticized American sanctions policy toward Russia.\n\n\u201cTrump and his people keep saying the election is rigged,\u201d Mr. Reid said. \u201cWhy is he saying that? Because people are telling him the election can be messed with.\u201d Mr. Trump\u2019s advisers say they are concerned that unnamed elites could rig the election for his opponent, Hillary Clinton.	mms		[redacted]

2016-08-30 09:45:44, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1472550345614,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[[redacted]]}	[redacted] called him and told him he would be sending a le t ter.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-30 09:46:15, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1472550377291,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[[redacted]]}	Trying isn't enough! \n\nOr rather, it may be, but I'm not content with trying. \n\nSeriously. I'm walking over and paying for it today. You need to tell me a time.	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-30 09:46:29, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1472550390383,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	Bill didn't mention it \U0001f612	sms		[redacted]
2016-08-30 09:51:55, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1472550717103,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	And holy cow, let me send you the Reid letter!	sms		[redacted]

2016-08-31 03:27:14, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) :202	[{"modified":1472614037482,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202)],"emails":	Did you ever look at this? It's incredibly powerful. And really, really depressing. \n\nAt Least 110 Republican Leaders Won\u2019t Vote for Donald Trump. Here\u2019s When They Reached Their Breaking Point. http://nyti.ms/2bTNAbb	sms		
2016-08-31 11:37:05, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) ;202	[{"modified":1472645427118,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202)	Re the case, Jim Baker honks you should have it. But I'm sure andy would defer to bill. I won't mention.	sms		
2016-08-31 11:39:54, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1472645595656,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)		sms		
2016-09-03 14:28:55, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1472912936384,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202)],"emails":	I've been busy distracting myself, waiting on N to get up, not wanting to spin, reading the Federalist Papers looking for a great foreign influence quote. Yeah, I'm a nerd.	sms		
2016-09-12 11:25:13, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1473679514885,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":]}]	Npr says Trump hotel opens today. It doesn't look ready...	sms		

2016-09-12 11:26:16, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1473679577884,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":[	That's one place I hope I never stay in.	sms		
2016-09-12 11:29:23, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1473679764099,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails":	Agreed. Hope it fails horribly. It wont, but still.	sms		
2016-09-27 00:40:23, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1474936825368,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails":	Did you read this? It's scathing. And I'm scared.\n\nWhy Donald Trump Should Not Be President http://nyti.ms/2dbQPuR	sms		
2016-09-27 00:40:43, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1474936844910,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024 ,"(202) "emails":	Man, I should have started drinking earlier. I'm genuinely stressed about the debate.	sms		

2016-09-27 10:37:52, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202[redacted]202[redacted]		[{"modified":1474972675375,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]],"emails":[redacted]}]	Can I ask you a question about yesterday's discussion? Why rule out a job at DoJ. Not NSD or ODAG?	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-27 10:38:13, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202[redacted]202[redacted]		[{"modified":1474972694689,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]],"emails":[redacted]}]	Too political?	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-27 10:39:43, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted]202[redacted]	[{"modified":1474972785351,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]}]	No way. I don't see what I get out of that, and I'd have to deal with all the political BS.	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-27 10:40:32, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted]202[redacted]		[{"modified":1474972834476,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]}]	Political connections. Better entree into other jobs? Maybe not the latter.	sms		[redacted]

2016-09-29 01:10:28, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1475111430732,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[[redacted]]	And suddenly I'm realizing, they're like Trump demographic people, just democrats. \U0001f612	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-29 01:10:29, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1475111430837,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	Like [redacted]!!!!!!!!\n\nOh sweet jes*s I need to send you what [redacted] has been sending. The liberal media is all in the tank for Hillary. Because, you know, Trump isn't batsh*t crazy for our country...	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-29 01:11:38, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1475111500556,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	Please don't. I really don't want to know what is out there.	sms		[redacted]
2016-09-29 01:13:46, Thu		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1475111627478,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted],"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]	[redacted] is crazy, btw	sms		[redacted]

2016-09-29 01:14:28, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475111670034,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails": }	EVERYTHING about him is a dem. Except maybe string national defense (except Hillary is that but she can't be, because, you know, CLINTON!).	sms		
2016-09-29 01:17:46, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475111868092,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails"]	I know. His political affiliation is truly baffling. He's a HUGE D.	sms		
2016-09-29 01:18:16, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475111897651,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails": }	I know!	sms		
2016-09-29 01:18:29, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1475111910415,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails": }	I WANT YOU TO MEET HIM AND CONVINCE HIM!	sms		

2016-09-29 01:19:06, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475111948073,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "emails"	You're very persuasive. \n\nWe'll have to stay here as my iPhone is apparently syncing and downloading for the rest of the night \U0001f612	sms		
2016-09-29 01:53:27, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475114009697,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":[	"Found it hard to focus"?\n\n"Found it hard to focus"?!?!??!\n\nAre you f*cking kidding me?!??!!\n\nDonald Trump got too much debate advice, so he took none of it.\nhttp://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2016/09/28/donald_trump_got_too_much_debate_advice_so_he_took_none_of_it.html	sms		
2016-10-06 23:11:14, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475795476385,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":	So, I think \U0001f628	sms		
2016-10-06 23:18:44, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475795927018,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":	What?!?! Why?\n\nInvite and Giacalone to your housewarming! That'll be fun!	sms		

2016-10-06 23:20:17, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475796019053,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":	We got a list of kids with their parents' names. How many Matt Apuzzo's could there be in DC? Showed J a picture, he said he thinks he has seen a guy who kinda looks like that, but always really schlubby. I said that sounds like every reporter I have ever seen.	sms		
2016-10-06 23:21:08, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1475796069964,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers": "(202)],"emails":	Found what I think might be their address too.	sms		
2016-10-06 23:21:37, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1475796098778,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":	He's TOTALLY schlubby! Dont you remember?	sms		
2016-10-06 23:22:31, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475796152840,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails"	Wife is Found address looking for her. Lawyer.	sms		

2016-10-06 23:24:01, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475796243928,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":	Address?	sms		
2016-10-06 23:24:34, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475796276810,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":[	They met at Good on him, he started writing at the school paper.	sms		
2016-10-06 23:24:58, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475796299437,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":[	I think.	sms		
2016-10-06 23:26:39, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475796402856,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024 "(202) ","emails	Just have to look up if it is inbounds for	sms		

2016-10-06 23:26:41, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475796402938,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails"	I wouldn't search on your work phone....no idea what that might trigger in shop.... ;)	sms		
2016-10-06 23:27:31, Thu		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475796452727,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[	Oops. Too late.	sms		
2016-10-07 10:02:33, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475834554849,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":	Yeah and I made the mistake of reading some stupid NY Post article about how agents are ready to revolt against D because of MY...now I'm really angry....	sms		
2016-10-07 10:03:33, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475834614778,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails"	There are a bunch of really ignorant people out there blinded by their politics	sms		

2016-10-07 10:03:56, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475834637703,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 '(202) "emails":	You can't read that sh*t. And honestly, let them. The bu would be better off without them.	sms		
2016-10-07 10:04:02, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475834644319,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":"202 ,"(202) ,"emails"	There are.	sms		
2016-10-07 10:04:37, Fri		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1475834680120,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Sadly reminds me how deeply politics, like religion, can sometimes blind objectivity.	sms		
2016-10-07 10:04:38, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475834680207,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 '(202) "emails"	I can't help it. It's click bait. I emailed it to you.	sms		

2016-10-08 12:35:47, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475930149130,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "emails"	Currently reading about Trump. Wondering if he stepped down if Pence could actually get elected.	sms		
2016-10-08 12:36:20, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1475930182229,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "emails":	That's probably more likely than Trump getting elected.	sms		
2016-10-08 12:37:10, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1475930232123,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) 'emails":['	I agree. I think it would actually energize the Republican vote.\n\nAnd no, not really re path forward.	sms		
2016-10-09 21:07:51, Sun		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1476047273354,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) emails":	And funny quote from my cousin-in-law: "No way Trump will drop out. Hey Republicans: how does it feel to carry something to term?"	sms		

2016-10-10 01:23:55, Mon		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted]	[{"modified":1476062637553,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]'emails[redacted]	Trump saying agents at FBI are furious at the MYE outcome and he's getting a special prosecutor.	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-12 03:04:57, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX	(202)[redacted]	[{"modified":1476241499223,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]emails":[redacted]	Hot damn. Big news day.\n\nBuffett Calls Trump\u2019s Bluff and Releases His Tax Data http://nyti.ms/2dSIOM5	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-12 03:16:35, Wed		202[redacted]	OUTBOX	(202)[redacted]	[{"modified":1476242197719,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024[redacted],"(202)[redacted]'emails":[redacted]	Wow, more forceful than I have seen him. Wonder what [redacted] would say about it. \n\nDonald Trump\u2019s Sad, Lonely Life http://nyti.ms/2dTCZxP	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-14 00:40:26, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX	(202)[redacted]	[{"modified":1476405629904,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails[redacted]	Not sure why I thought this was so neat. Suppose it's just [redacted]he law nerd in me.\n\nThe Times\u2019s Lawyer Responds to Donald Trump http://nyti.ms/2e0WNza	sms		[redacted]

2016-10-14 00:40:28, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1476405630136,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) 'emails"	God, she's an incredibly impressive woman. The Obamas in general, really. While he has certainly made mistakes, I'm proud to have had him as my president. \n\nVoice Shaking, Michelle Obama Calls Trump Comments on Women \u2018Intolerable\u2019 http://nyti.ms/2e0MtqY	sms	
2016-10-14 00:48:08, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) (20 2) 20 2) 202	[{"modified":1476406089208,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) 'emails":{" modified":1476406089432,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) "(202) 'emails":[]}]	Ugh. More of the same.\n\nDonald Trump, Slipping in Polls, Warns of \u2018Stolen Election\u2019 http://nyti.ms/2e07imx	mms	
2016-10-14 00:51:26, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) (20 7) :(20 2) 202	[{"modified":1476406286385,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails": },{" modified":1476405286442,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) "(202) ,"emails":[]}]	Nope. Full of dog whistles too: "We do not want this election stolen from us. Everybody knows what I'm talking about." The racism is barely even veiled anymore.	mms	

2016-10-14 00:53:52, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202) 20 2) 20 2) 202	[{"modified":1476406432962,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) emails" {" modified":1476406433020,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) '(202) emails":[]}]	The Roger Stone comments are scary as sh*t.	mms		
2016-10-14 01:00:59, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) (20 2) 20 2) 202		[{"modified":1476406860248,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails": 1 modified":1476406860298,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202) '(202) "emails":[]}]	Roger Stone is horrible.	mms		
2016-10-15 01:26:22, Sat		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1476494784621,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. Il Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) 'emails":	Stone \u2018happy to cooperate\u2019 with FBI on WikiLeaks, Russian hacking probes - POLITICO\nhttp://www.politico.com/story/2016/10/roger-stone-fbi-wikileaks-russia-229821	sms		

2016-10-15 21:25:48, Sat		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1476566751121,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	That didn't take long \U0001f621	sms		
2016-10-15 21:28:10, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1476566892312,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ,"emails":	At least we made the f-ers work on the weekend...	sms		
2016-10-15 21:30:09, Sat		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1476567011583,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails"	Uh, and, yeah - like they're doing to us.\n\nI HATE this case. \n\nAnd a LOT to tell you about my convo with JG...	sms		
2016-10-15 22:04:26, Sat		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1476569067977,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails	Very nice work on that initial statement. Maybe we can talk tomorrow re JG..	sms		

2016-10-17 23:58:22, Mon		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted]		[{"modified":1476748703061,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted]{"modified":1476748709097,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202)[redacted]"(202)[redacted]"emails":[]}]	I'm seriously thinking one of us needs to host election night party.	mms		[redacted]
2016-10-18 00:00:22, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted]	[{"modified":1476748822470,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]"emails":[redacted],{"modified":1476748822564,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202)[redacted](202)[redacted]ails":[]}]	I nominate [redacted]	mms		[redacted]

2016-10-18 00:02:35, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] (20[redacted] 2)[redacted] (20[redacted] 2)[redacted] 202[redacted]		[{"modified":1476748955524,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted],{"modified":1476748955589,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202)[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[]}]	I'll probably have to write talking points (likely for CyD) so I won't be able to make it.	mms		[redacted]
2016-10-18 00:05:39, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] (20[redacted] 2)[redacted] (20[redacted] 2)[redacted] 202[redacted]	[{"modified":1476749139291,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[redacted],{"modified":1476749139382,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["(202)[redacted]"(202)[redacted],"emails":[]}]	You don't have to write talking points for Cyber if they don't tell you about the tasking!	mms		[redacted]

2016-10-18 00:28:47, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 20 2) 20 2 202	[{"modified":1476750527678,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails": ,{"modified":1476750527778,"uniqueid":892,"firstName":"Jon","lastName":"Moffa","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"(202) ,{"(202) ,"emails":[]}]	CyD prepping for election day on November 35th....	mms		
2016-10-19 09:55:26, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476870928349,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":[	You see Tim Cook made the list of potential HRC running mates?	sms		
2016-10-19 09:57:48, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476871070223,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":[	It was a big list, but still, he was on there. From Podesta email.	sms		
2016-10-19 13:04:19, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476882261564,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ,"emails"	Came up with election night plan - we should all hit HH somewhere. Figure this damn thing better be called early. \U0001f612\n\nYou watching the debate tonight?	sms		

2016-10-20 01:15:44, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1476926146054,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":[	I am riled up. Trump is a fucking idiot, is unable to provide a coherent answer.	sms		
2016-10-20 01:22:36, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1476926558535,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails	I CAN'T PULL AWAY. WHAT THE FUCK HAPPENED TO OUR COUNTRY ??!?!	sms		
2016-10-20 01:24:19, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1476926651270,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	I don't know. But we'll get it back. We're America. We rock.	sms		
2016-10-20 01:28:22, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1476926920673,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202)],"emails":[	Donald just said "bad hombres"\n\n\U0001f612	sms		

2016-10-20 01:30:00, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476927009539,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Chris Wallace is a turd	sms		
2016-10-20 01:30:02, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476927009658,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	Hillary: Russia and WikiLeaks and highest levels of Russian Government and Putin!!!\n\nDrink!!!!	sms		
2016-10-20 01:32:40, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476927161622,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":["	Oh hot damn. HRC is throwing down saying Trump in bed with russia	sms		
2015-10-20 01:50:50, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1476928251695,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) 'emails":	She could do SO MUCH BETTER \n\nBut she's just not getting traction. \n\nJesus. \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621	sms		

2016-10-20 02:02:43, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 :202		[{"modified":1476928965079,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202],"emails"	Maybe. I have to watch this. \n\nAnd I'm so damn mad \n\nAnd disgusted. And disappointed.	sms	
2016-10-20 02:12:37, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1476929558602,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	Trump just said what the fbi did is disgraceful	sms	
2016-10-20 09:56:27, Thu		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1476957389790,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":	Hi. Watching the post-debate commentary. Vaguely satisfying to see Megyn Kelley (who had botox and looks HORRIBLE) utterly going after Trump.	sms	
2016-10-24 00:00:15, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267217767,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails"	Article is out, but hidden behind paywall so can't read it.	sms	

2016-10-24 00:02:22, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477267344520,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. ll Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202)","emails":[	Wsj? Boy, that was fast.\n\nNo word from Should I "find" it and tell the team?	sms		
2016-10-24 00:03:38, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267420072,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. ll Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 202)","emails":[	No, I think not. Maybe he didn't get a chance, or decided not to say anything until tomorrow.	sms		
2016-10-24 00:04:04, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477267446757,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. ll Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202)","emails":[	Not behind a pay wall. I need to send	sms		
2016-10-24 00:04:32, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267474615,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. ll Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202)","emails":["	Huh?	sms		

2016-10-24 00:04:59, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477267501133,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ","emails":["	The article is not behind a paywall\n\nWe get several hours of warning about every other email, but not this, arguably more important than most...	sms		
2016-10-24 00:05:30, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267591729,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails"	Jesus then fine. Send it to everyone you know. Or I can not tell you about it at all and you can just come across it given all the time you spend reading the Journal. \U0001f621	sms		
2016-10-24 00:05:50, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267613378,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ","emails":[	What difference does it make to send it to the team Sunday night vs monday morning?	sms		
2016-10-24 00:07:37, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1477267659418,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":["	Thanks dude. Appreciate it. \U0001f621	sms		

2016-10-24 00:08:15, Mon		202	INBOX	(202)		[{"modified":1477267697679,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) "emails":	Or I can get it like I do every other article that hits my Google news alert. Seriously.	sms		
2016-10-24 00:09:00, Mon		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477267742065,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) ,"emails":[	Send me the Google alert.	sms		
2016-10-24 00:10:31, Mon		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477267833336,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) "emails":[	Give me a break. Go look at EVERY article I've sent the team. \n\nCount them.\n\nThen count every Godd*mn heads up I get from ut NOT this one.\n\nThen tell me I should sit on THIS one and let them hear from someone else. You're not being fair about this.	sms		
2016-10-24 00:12:17, Mon		202	INBOX	(202 02		[{"modified":1477267939206,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":[{"202 (202) "emails":[	I really cannot believe you're taking this position and it angers me. I'm going to hope your anger about getting dragged into this is clouding things.	sms		

2016-10-24 00:12:28, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477267949525,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":[	I AM being fair about this. I asked you not to. I don't care that sucks. 1) This is about trust, and 2) WHAT THE F DIFFERENCE DOES IT MAKE TO ANYONE ON THE TEAM? Is there some investigative step to take? Some mitigation measure?	sms		
2016-10-25 00:46:57, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477356419838,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202} "emails":	I hate this case. \U0001f621	sms		
2016-10-25 00:52:31, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477356753464,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202} ,"emails":[	Why? What happened?	sms		
2016-10-25 00:54:08, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477356849764,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202} "emails":[	Nothing more. Just all of it.	sms		

2016-10-25 00:55:02, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477356904370,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":["	I asked and to meet tomorrow morning. Please let me just meet with them alone. Please.	sms		
2016-10-25 00:59:55, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477357197782,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202)],"emails":[	Sure	sms		
2016-10-25 10:11:46, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477390308623,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) emails":["	Christ. Make sure you scroll down and read that guy's comment about the polls.\n\nDonald Trump Dismisses Latest Accuser: \u2018Oh, I\u2019m Sure She\u2019s Never Been Grabbed Before\u2019 http://nyti.ms/2eyZhVL	sms		
2016-10-26 11:39:00, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477481942626,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":["	Let's talk about this later.\n\n\u2018We Need to Clean This Up\u2019: Clinton Aide\u2019s Newly Public Email Shows Concern http://nyti.ms/2dG6zal	sms		

2016-10-26 12:58:14, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477486695907,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) ","emails":[	And yup, me and at drop-off today...	sms		
2016-10-26 13:06:37, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477487199140,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":	Nice!!!	sms		
2016-10-26 13:06:46, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477487208331,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":[	Hit piece on Andy from VA GOP in Hampton newspaper	sms		
2016-10-26 13:13:47, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477487629511,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ","emails":[	That sucks. I can talk btw.	sms		

2016-10-27 00:06:05, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477526767600,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":["	Interesting - one of the Podesta emails talks about him hosting Peter Kadzik at his house for dinner in Oct, 2015. And in May, 2015, Kadzik's son asked Podesta for a job on the campaign	sms		
2016-10-27 00:29:59, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477528201330,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":["	Not announced, but they all know. Calls actually happened yesterday.\n\nAnd I feel (hopefully don't look as old) like Keith Richards. oining via call? There's nothing classified....	sms		
2016-10-27 21:08:58, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477602540672,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":[	On with till.	sms		
2016-10-27 21:09:48, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477602590638,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 (202) "emails":["	Hope it's going well...	sms		

2016-10-27 21:21:08, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1477603270110,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails"	I'm done.	sms		
2016-10-28 17:19:06, Fri		202	OUTBOX		(202 202	[{"modified":1477675148408,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":[	Still on with hone is ON FIRE.	sms		
2016-10-28 17:19:38, Fri		202	INBOX	(202 202		[{"modified":1477675179843,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":[	It's on news	sms		
2016-10-28 17:29:58, Fri		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477675799869,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) "emails":[	You may wanna tell e should turn on CNN , there's news going on ; (	sms		

2016-10-28 17:30:17, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1477575818932,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	He knows. He just got handed a note.	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-28 17:33:54, Fri		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1477676036676,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Ha. He asking about it now?	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-30 13:50:53, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1477835455458,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) 324-[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	This is all Matt\n\nJustice officials warned FBI that Comey\u2019s decision to update Congress was not consistent with department policy - The Washington Post\nhttps://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/justice-officials-warned-fbi-that-comeys-decision-to-update-congress-was-not-consistent-with-department-policy/2016/10/29/cb179254-9de7-11e6-b3c9-f662adaa0048_story.html?hpid=hp_hp-top-table-main_campaignprint-810pm%3Ahomepage%2Fstory	sms		[redacted]
2016-10-30 13:56:06, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1477835769535,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II [redacted]trzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":[redacted]}]	Yeah, I saw it. Makes me feel WAY less bad about throwing him under the bus in the forthcoming CF article.	sms		[redacted]

2016-10-30 13:57:24, Sun		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1477835847944,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[" "}]	Yep the whole tone is anti Bu. Just a tiny bit from us. And serves him right. He's gonna be pissed....	sms		
2016-10-30 17:27:31, Sun		202	OUTBOX		(202) ;202	[{"modified":1477848454009,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[" "}]	An article to share: FBI agents knew of Clinton-related emails weeks before director was briefed\nFBI agents knew of Clinton-related emails weeks before director was briefed\nhttp://wapo.st/2f2EhEO	sms		
2016-10-30 18:32:07, Sun		202	OUTBOX		(202) ;202	[{"modified":1477852329933,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "emails":[" "}]	Okay now I'm getting angry.	sms		
2016-10-30 19:06:48, Sun		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1477854413603,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[" "}]	What - opening comments?	sms		

2016-10-30 19:30:47, Sun		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1477855849188,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024 ","(202) "],"emails":["	Sorry, utterly terrible day. I'm not sure I can identify one single redeeming thing about it.	sms		
2016-11-03 00:50:57, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478134260864,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	Sorry. Rybicki called. Time line article in the post is super specific and not good. Doesn't make sense because I didn't have specific information to give.	sms		
2016-11-03 00:55:50, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478134555136,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	What post article?!?	sms		
2016-11-03 00:56:28, Thu		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478134591208,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["2024 ","(202) "],"emails":["	Just went up. WaPo.	sms		

2016-11-03 00:57:08, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478134630188,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202)],"emails":["	Goddamn bills opaque comments.....	sms		
2016-11-03 00:57:45, Thu		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1478134667507,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202) emails":[ ]]	Can I send to team?	sms		
2016-11-03 00:57:54, Thu		202	OUTBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1478134676874,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ,"(202)],"emails":["]	Yes	sms		
2016-11-03 11:29:46, Thu		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478172593910,"uniqueId":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 "(202) ,"emails":[']}	The nyt probability numbers are dropping every day. I'm scared for our organization.	sms		

2016-11-04 03:19:04, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478229547468,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]"(202) [redacted],"emails":["[redacted]@[redacted]"]}]	Dude. On Inauguration Day, in addition to our kegger we should also have a screening of the Weiner documentary! \U0001f60a	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-06 20:33:54, Sun		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1478464437353,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	Trump about to get off his plane	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-06 20:52:54, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478465576928,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted](202) [redacted],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	I'm on fox. Trump is talking about her.	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-06 20:53:42, Sun		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478465627785,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}]	He's talking about cartwright and Petraeus and how they're not protected. She's protected by a rigged system.	sms		[redacted]

2016-11-07 01:43:03, Mon		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478482985168,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]]	Good lord...\n\nInside Donald Trump\u2019s Last Stand: An Anxious Nominee Seeks Assurance http://nyti.ms/2esuTs3	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-08 01:56:33, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] ;202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1478570196912,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) 324-[redacted]","emails":["[redacted]]	OMG THIS IS F*CKING TERRIFYING:\nA victory by Mr. Trump remains possible: Mrs. Clinton\u2019s chance of losing is about the same as the probability that an N.F.L. kicker misses a 38-yard field goal.	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-08 02:05:51, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] ;202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478570755112,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]","emails":["[redacted]@[redacted]"]}]	Yeah, that's not good.	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-08 02:42:33, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1478572955529,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]","emails":["[redacted]]	Oh god [redacted].	sms		[redacted]

2016-11-08 02:42:40, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478572963173,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	What is she saying?	sms		
2016-11-08 02:43:40, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478573023453,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[	She does realize you've been in EVERY conversation that has been had about this case, right?	sms		
2016-11-08 02:44:54, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478573096222,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	That we should have gone on the record saying Kallstrom and others are not credible (which may be valid), but then saying we could pull his tolls if we wanted to. Because she knows all about our policy regarding investigations of members of the media. \U0001f621	sms		
2016-11-08 02:45:31, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478573135026,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	Yes. But she's an expert who knows everything. \n\nI'm telling you, it's wildly infuriating. She has good points but then assumes wildly impossible understanding of things to make groundless assertions.	sms		

2016-11-08 02:45:59, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478573163985,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[	Told her twice she was either calling me stupid or a liar. \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621	sms		
2016-11-08 02:46:06, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478573169391,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[	Uh, what crime are we investigating?\n\nAnd I'm sorry, that's a terrible idea. Go to war with the formers?	sms		
2016-11-08 02:47:14, Tue		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478573238072,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":["	Jesus, . I'm sorry. That would make me blind with rage.	sms		
2016-11-08 02:47:53, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478573276586,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[	Leaking information about ongoing investigations. Which is incorrect information. By agents who don't know about things talking to him. \n\nSee? That's the thing. Her initial point, that we should have gone after the agents talking harder and sooner, is not unreasonable. But the subsequent discussion falls into uninformed assertions.	sms		

2016-11-09 01:06:45, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1478653609293,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":[" }]	\U0001f60a\n\nHsppy Election geekdom here.	sms		
2016-11-09 04:06:58, Wed		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1478664421088,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":[" }]	Trump won NC	sms		
2016-11-09 04:20:14, Wed		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1478665217060,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":["	PBS is projecting Florida as well.	sms		
2016-11-09 09:34:14, Wed		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202	[{"modified":1478684056364,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":["	And there it is.	sms		

2016-11-09 09:58:18, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) ;202 ;	[{"modified":1478685501504,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202)],"emails":[" }]	Analogous to the public editor article Bill handed out. \n\nNews Media Yet Again Misreads America\u2019s Complex Pulse http://nyti.ms/2eCqXVM	sms		
2016-11-09 12:11:02, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1478693465045,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202)],"emails":[" }]	Just woke up. We fought on and off all night.	sms		
2016-11-09 12:13:37, Wed		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1478693620024,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202)],"emails":[" }]	Too hard to explain here. Election related. Which is also godawful bad. \n\nSure	sms		
2016-11-09 12:43:13, Wed		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1478695395236,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202","(202)],"email":["	Are you even going to give out your calendars? Seems kind of depressing. Maybe it should just be the first meeting of the secret society.	sms		

2016-11-13 19:11:15, Sun		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1479064277728,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":[' (	bought all the president's men. Figure I needed to brush up on watergate. \U0001f615	sms		
2016-11-14 13:51:27, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1479131504565,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) "],"emails":['	God, being here makes me angry. Lots of high fallutin' national security talk. Meanwhile, we have OUR task ahead of us...	sms		
2016-11-14 20:08:18, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1479154100955,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":["]	It's making me very angry.	sms		
2016-11-14 20:08:40, Mon		202	OUTBOX		(202) 202	[{"modified":1479154123935,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202) ","emails":['	BBC News: Trump and Putin hold telephone talks\nTrump and Putin hold telephone talks - http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-37981770	sms		

2016-11-15 01:43:02, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) ;202		[{"modified":1479174184541,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[}]	"CNN: Source says naming a Trump national security team a 'knife fight' "	sms		
2016-11-15 01:43:43, Tue		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1479174226236,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[ ]	Christ. What does that mean?!	sms		
2016-11-15 01:46:21, Tue		202	INBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1479174383921,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[ ]	I can only guess difference of opinion between Trump and Republican establishment?	sms		
2016-11-15 01:47:05, Tue		202	OUTBOX	(202) 202		[{"modified":1479174430262,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202 ","(202)],"emails":[ ]	I get it. I'm just exclaiming how f-ed it all is.	sms		

2016-11-15 01:50:30, Tue		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 02 [redacted]	[{"modified":1479174633444,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]","emails":[[redacted]	My god, Sessions for DoD or AG.	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-15 01:51:43, Tue		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1479174705703,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]],"emails":[" [redacted]	Which is the f-ed uppedness of it	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-18 12:40:45, Fri		2026[redacted]	INBOX	(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1479472848812,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted]],"emails":[" [redacted]	Sessions for AG	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-18 12:49:19, Fri		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202) [redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1479473361848,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II trzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202) [redacted],"emails":[" [redacted]	Good god.	sms		[redacted]

2016-11-21 01:14:10, Mon		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]	[{"modified":1479690854537,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}	This is really disgusting. \n\nNYTimes: White Nationalists Celebrate \u2018an Awakening\u2019 After Donald Trump\u2019s Victory\nWhite Nationalists Celebrate \u2018an Awakening\u2019 After Donald Trump\u2019s Victory http://nyti.ms/2fc6vve	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-21 01:19:38, Mon		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1479691183147,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[redacted]}	Im worried racial tension is going to get really bad...	sms		[redacted]
2016-11-26 12:45:01, Sat		202[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1480164304831,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[redacted]}	You see Trump chose a Fox News analyst as his Dep Ntnl Security advisor?	sms		[redacted]
2016-12-01 01:52:01, Thu		20[redacted]	INBOX	(202)[redacted] 202 [redacted]		[{"modified":1480557123895,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers":["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted]"],"emails":["[redacted]"]}	And I keep thinking about what the D said, what was it, sick to one's stomach? Want to talk with you about it more. And in would like to talk to Jim and Andy too. Jim may be too much a true believer though.	sms		[redacted]

2016-12-01 01:52:23, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202	[{"modified":1480557146601,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers"-["202[redacted]","(202)[redacted],"emails":["[redacted]	Mildly nauseous, he said.	sms		[redacted]
2016-12-01 01:52:48, Thu		202[redacted]	OUTBOX		(202)[redacted] 202	[{"modified":1480557171109,"uniqueid":804,"firstName":"Peter","lastName":"P. II Strzok","notes":[],"organizations":[],"numbers"-["202[redacted]"(202)[redacted]"],"emails":[[redacted]	Technically not sure you can talk to andy about it. \U0001f621	sms		[redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-21 17:30:50, Fri	INBOX	Hi. Just got done with meeting now to working lunch. Starting working out of hq on Mon. Not kidding. Much more later of course
2015-08-21 17:34:45, Fri	OUTBOX	Whoa. What?!
2015-08-21 17:39:01, Fri	INBOX	Yeah, surprise to me to. Taking over special. Sorry can't text now, should be able to in about an hour. Met Trisha.
2015-08-21 17:45:25, Fri	OUTBOX	special you mean? Understood re timing. Sorry for all the questions.
2015-08-21 18:20:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Maybe we can talk in the car when you are free. So long as it is 100% work since he'll be right next to me.
2015-08-21 19:25:32, Fri	INBOX	Still meetings. Sorry. Not The one I griped about hq running. Sure will call in a bit, will check here first.
2015-08-21 19:30:38, Fri	OUTBOX	I know it's a total s-show, but still, I'm proud of you. \U0001f636
2015-08-21 19:35:41, Fri	OUTBOX	Kind of ridiculously hugely so. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-08-21 19:41:18, Fri	INBOX	\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-08-21 19:42:57, Fri	OUTBOX	Just call when you do get free. I'll just act surprised to hear from you.
2015-08-21 19:43:49, Fri	INBOX	Why am I calling? See if you want to work on it when you get back?
2015-08-21 19:49:42, Fri	OUTBOX	Just to give the news? right?
2015-08-21 20:22:27, Fri	INBOX	Hi there. Good to call?
2015-08-21 20:59:03, Fri	OUTBOX	Truly. Soooo proud. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-08-22 14:25:55, Sat	OUTBOX	
2015-08-22 14:29:29, Sat	OUTBOX	And of course send me articles that you find helpful/illuminating to learn about the topic. \U0001f636
2015-08-23 00:16:16, Sun	INBOX	Sigh. Hi. Sitting here reading affidavits. Happy to be engaged in work again...\u263a
2015-08-23 00:17:18, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm soooo happy for you. \U0001f60a Who's affidavit,
2015-08-23 00:18:18, Sun	INBOX	\U0001f636\n\nNo. Who's
2015-08-23 00:19:34, Sun	OUTBOX	Swore out I have it, I can forward. NY agent, I met him in Cyprus.
2015-08-23 00:20:29, Sun	INBOX	Blech. ;)\n\nSure. \n\nNo, this is ours.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-23 17:08:09, Sun	INBOX	I do too!!!! I want you back from and TDYed to the team sc and can get back to their regular work, you can interface with and all these other ahole lawyers.
2015-08-23 17:08:24, Sun	INBOX	
2015-08-23 18:09:19, Sun	INBOX	Hi there! Yes, though he's not an "excited" sort of guy
2015-08-23 18:10:26, Sun	OUTBOX	How do you know him again? Was he on your squad back in the day?
2015-08-23 18:13:04, Sun	INBOX	Dang that's a long drive.\n\n Pretty much knew him by reputation only he was a crim agent and then on for a while.
2015-08-23 18:14:47, Sun	OUTBOX	That's a lot of confidence to pull as your ssa, although I guess you've seen him as a supervisor for a few months now. \n\r
2015-08-23 18:17:05, Sun	INBOX	Yeah, though more important is his agent and analytic corps and they are solid. He's got the right personality to herd a bunch of detailees/TDYers, though I don't know that we'll have to do that.
2015-08-23 18:17:38, Sun	INBOX	
2015-08-23 21:33:15, Sun	OUTBOX	Excited about work tomorrow? Are you going into your office or just straight to HQ?
2015-08-23 21:39:09, Sun	INBOX	Some, also some apprehension, of course.\n\nWf first, do 8:30 with Andy then to HQ. Pick up a billion people and drive to State for 10:30 meeting with AS of DS
2015-08-23 21:42:25, Sun	OUTBOX	Oh man, that's right, you're acting SAC. Are you still?
2015-08-23 21:47:21, Sun	INBOX	No. Gregg was willing to go either way. I told him I thought I needed to be focused at HQ. Might end up being able to do both but I think probably not. \n\nI'm doing tomorrow's 8:30 (essentially to brief and ask for a couple of analysts and a couple of cyber people), then Aaron has the helm.
2015-08-23 23:12:20, Sun	OUTBOX	Got it. Makes sense.
2015-08-23 23:52:38, Sun	INBOX	I know I can't tomorrow, but I'll do my darndest the next two days. Currently there are no meetings I'm aware of on either Tues or Wed.
2015-08-24 00:02:45, Mon	INBOX	I have a briefing from 2 till likely 4/4:30\n\nImsg?
2015-08-24 00:03:57, Mon	INBOX	And a 4:20 with Randy,

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-24 00:04:31, Mon	OUTBOX	Yes, I can imsg.
2015-08-24 00:05:55, Mon	INBOX	Ok. May have time depending on when State mtg gets done, before my 2...but that's not at all certain.
2015-08-24 11:02:56, Mon	OUTBOX	Hi there. No dawdling for you this morning! Sorry for the delay, went for a walk with [redacted]
2015-08-24 11:15:13, Mon	INBOX	Already driving. How was the walk with [redacted]? I like having her on the team, but I was discouraged that she was so busy she was going to have [redacted] or somebody else start covering for her sometimes.\n\nDespite my personal interaction with him, I'm just not sure about his temperament in this project.
2015-08-24 11:17:53, Mon	OUTBOX	No you're right. He's a petulant baby (remind me to tell you his latest fit with her). She's being told that this new case (that's all she would say to me), [redacted] followed by dead people. So I'd be surprised if she hands off too much to him. More that she's going to have to let him handle more of [redacted] which she doesn't really want to do.
2015-08-24 11:19:44, Mon	OUTBOX	She told me he wasn't read in to it yet, though he was aware of it.
2015-08-24 11:23:21, Mon	INBOX	Yeah, and he already spilled the beans to my people. That's how I first found out.\n\nThe light blue tie with this thin dark blue stripe running across it
2015-08-24 11:24:43, Mon	OUTBOX	Ah, yes. I didn't know it had a name. :)\n\nThat's aggravating. You should say something to [redacted]
2015-08-24 11:52:23, Mon	INBOX	Rgr. At work, going to be 100mph for a while
2015-08-25 11:34:59, Tue	OUTBOX	What do you have after your briefing this morning?
2015-08-25 11:48:30, Tue	INBOX	The bulk of my day is going to be spent trying to scratch up resources. Particularly personnel outside of CD.
2015-08-25 11:59:20, Tue	OUTBOX	You ID your cyber and cart agents yet?
2015-08-25 12:01:15, Tue	INBOX	I have. Wf cyber may not agree. I get to play the escalate it up the chain of command game today
2015-08-25 12:08:08, Tue	OUTBOX	Will Andy side with you you think?
2015-08-25 12:13:40, Tue	INBOX	Oh, he has and he will. This is just foot dragging by [redacted] And nothing angers an asac more than going to an sac, and nothing angers an SAC more than going to his adic. So I need to try and finesse it but my time to piss off is sjort...
2015-08-25 14:18:40, Tue	INBOX	[redacted]n\nAlso, heading to wf to shake the resource tree. \n\nStill good for lunch?
2015-08-25 23:13:09, Tue	INBOX	No but stills!\n\nLeaving Jeh now...sigh...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-25 23:13:53, Tue	OUTBOX	Boo for you. \U0001f615 Why so late?
2015-08-25 23:14:56, Tue	INBOX	Affidavit and housekeeping
2015-08-26 01:30:51, Wed	OUTBOX	Your stupidass 8:30 meeting means and I have to go back to meeting at 5:45 for our walk. \U0001f61b
2015-08-26 01:40:59, Wed	OUTBOX	No, stupidass is your meeting, I've already explained that. Do I need to go slower? \U0001f618
2015-08-26 01:41:27, Wed	OUTBOX	Dumb work.
2015-08-26 01:41:50, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-08-26 01:50:54, Wed	INBOX	I will reserve my sad pathetic petulant inappropriate response for elsewhere. \n\nOr, better yet, have the dignity not to at all. \U0001f614\n\nWill be up for a while with affidavit if you can imsg
2015-08-27 11:35:59, Thu	OUTBOX	Aargh. I just called the BOC for a temp pass and the dude said I needed a UC to send the request. Sigh, the inconsistency...
2015-08-27 11:38:01, Thu	INBOX	I'll try...what info, just name and number, right? What time?
2015-08-27 11:38:33, Thu	OUTBOX	I can just park on the street. Just annoying, that's all.
2015-08-27 11:48:14, Thu	INBOX	You can also probably try calling in two hours and I bet you get a different answer. Also, feel free to iMessage anytime you want.
2015-08-27 12:00:47, Thu	OUTBOX	\n\nYeah, it's just super annoying. It's such a short meeting I'll just find street parking, will try again next week when I have lunch with Jim.
2015-08-27 12:01:59, Thu	OUTBOX	Figure I won't be able to meet up with you either, since my meeting is from 2:30 to 3, and then you have your mtgs.
2015-08-27 12:13:44, Thu	INBOX	What about 2? [redacted]
2015-08-27 12:13:50, Thu	INBOX	And heading into sioc now...
2015-08-27 12:20:22, Thu	OUTBOX	I'll try. But I'll try.
2015-08-27 15:05:02, Thu	INBOX	NP. Sounds like DD going to stop by our space around 2:30 so just as well. Ok to imsg?
2015-08-27 19:12:04, Thu	OUTBOX	Mtg with andy
2015-08-27 19:58:08, Thu	OUTBOX	Hilariously, Andy's suggestion was that I should be tdyed to the thing you're working on. Totally his idea.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-27 20:23:26, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] Of course I want to talk all about it. Will end up ok...\n\nI have 430 with Randy, will let you know when done\n\nAnd Holy sh*t yes!!! [redacted] is way.way burdened. Only thing I don't know is what workload will look like I'm a month. \u263a
2015-08-27 21:04:45, Thu	INBOX	Hey there. I'm done
2015-08-27 21:07:50, Thu	INBOX	Heading back into sioc for a bit
2015-08-27 21:57:05, Thu	OUTBOX	Hi there. Dad HH, so probably can't talk tonight. I sent Jim and Trisha a couple of extra thoughts, maybe I shouldn't have but I did. Will forward.
2015-08-27 22:15:24, Thu	INBOX	Given that all I want to do is sit and talk with you about the conversation and the path ahead.
2015-08-27 23:15:48, Thu	OUTBOX	Hi. Thanks for listening. Really don't know what to do.
2015-08-27 23:21:59, Thu	INBOX	Of course. Would have killed me not to hear it. Something will come. It's not going to be a happy comfortable time until it does, but things work out for really talented people like you. \U0001f636
2015-08-28 00:03:40, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] still at work. And can't walk tomorrow bc she's going in early.
2015-08-28 01:50:56, Fri	OUTBOX	Sorry about the delay. Had a long conversation with the woman (seems really promising), [redacted]
2015-08-28 02:13:16, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Promised everyone, especially [redacted] a Bullfrog bagel for staying so late on our stuff.
2015-08-28 11:14:05, Fri	OUTBOX	Meh. Not really. I am just 100% positive that nothing is going to get resolved before I am back to work. I mean, there are only 5 weeks left before I'm back. :(
2015-08-28 11:17:06, Fri	INBOX	I'm sure something interesting will come up. If not what I'm doing, there will be something that emerges between now and then. That's not much comfort for you though.
2015-08-28 11:17:47, Fri	INBOX	Plus, I'm willing to bet that Andy can identify something for you to do between now and then. Did you two talk about that at all? I mean you working for him in his current capacity?
2015-08-28 11:19:26, Fri	OUTBOX	No. I hoped that he would, but he didn't bring it up and I'm not going to ask again. I guess it's still early - there's not even a computer in his office.
2015-08-28 11:26:26, Fri	INBOX	Yeah. Look, he hasn't even started the job. And it's tough to slot you again something when you're not back yet. Having you in house is absolutely going to make it easy to say hey plug you into this project.
2015-08-28 11:26:41, Fri	INBOX	Where is he sitting? I still haven't had a chance to talk to him about the 3:02s

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-28 11:36:20, Fri	OUTBOX	He's not yet. But I met up with him in [redacted]old office yesterday. Think he just comes over for mtgs.
2015-08-28 11:57:55, Fri	INBOX	Just ran into JB and chatted a bit.
2015-08-28 12:00:29, Fri	OUTBOX	Did you tell him [redacted]needs help?
2015-08-28 12:02:59, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]n\nAnd started laying the foundation. Said Trisha and [redacted]had been great. Next step is they're overworked...;)
2015-08-28 12:03:49, Fri	OUTBOX	\U0001f621 for including [redacted]
2015-08-28 12:03:53, Fri	INBOX	Heading Heading into sioc. Ttyl
2015-08-28 12:05:02, Fri	INBOX	Yeah I know re [redacted]
2015-08-29 15:06:38, Sat	OUTBOX	Did you get laid yesterday? I didn't, am concerned that someone forgot to validate my time or something. \U0001f621
2015-08-29 15:06:59, Sat	OUTBOX	Ha. That is funny. Paid, not laid. \U0001f60a
2015-08-29 15:23:19, Sat	OUTBOX	And suddenly I'm in a really sour mood. Not sure why exactly. Maybe the prospect of calling [redacted]re my paycheck on Monday. [redacted]
2015-08-29 15:43:30, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] Not sure why as it normally hits on Friday. Sometimes it shows up later in the weekend as having arrived on Fri, but nothing there now. [redacted]got hers as normal on Thurs. Because we (Bu) suck.
2015-08-29 15:47:13, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-08-29 18:05:14, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]\n\nAnd hi. Just got back from [redacted]. [redacted]was there; saw him but didn't meet him.
2015-08-30 14:31:36, Sun	INBOX	Also, irritatingly, my unet password just expired so I can't get emails until I update it tomorrow. \U0001f62c so either text me or hit me on gtwn...
2015-08-30 18:18:49, Sun	OUTBOX	Not related, but this is also outrageous. I mean, come on. The woman needed all this outside employment? \n\nAn article to share: How Huma Abedin operated at the center of the Clinton universe\nHow Huma Abedin operated at the center of the Clinton universe\nhttp://wapo.st/1JAqfVk
2015-08-30 19:32:25, Sun	INBOX	And blah, sitting on hold with 1500 trying to get my 324 email pin reset...
2015-08-30 22:07:09, Sun	OUTBOX	Never mind. All my emails failed.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-08-30 22:09:16, Sun	INBOX	Send to gtwn? I think my unet password expired. At least it hasn't been working all day...
2015-08-30 22:09:59, Sun	OUTBOX	Nope, can't send from my samsung, pics are on here.
2015-08-30 22:11:17, Sun	INBOX	You might be able to text them. Mms is back to being enabled.
2015-08-30 22:11:40, Sun	INBOX	If they're in Knox I believe you can downdraft them but not sure
2015-08-30 22:23:07, Sun	INBOX	Nope, you can't. Just tried. \n\nIs your email working,
2015-08-30 22:23:34, Sun	OUTBOX	Oh well that's annoying. I specifically took them in Knox so I could email them.
2015-08-30 22:23:45, Sun	OUTBOX	Yeah, just think I'm over my limit.
2015-08-30 22:58:10, Sun	OUTBOX	Resent them in smaller sizes. I think it worked. You'll have to let me know tomorrow.
2015-08-31 11:44:15, Mon	INBOX	Heading into sioc. Hope you get some rest. I'll check in later.
2015-08-31 11:48:05, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] And please call [redacted] today.
2015-08-31 12:27:49, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] And hi. Stupid 8:30 mtg. I want to talk with you. \U0001f636
2015-09-01 00:36:38, Tue	OUTBOX	It's fine. Getting up early to walk with [redacted] anyway.
2015-09-01 11:21:32, Tue	OUTBOX	Went walking with [redacted]. Told her I asked you about [redacted] in case it ever comes up. (Just talking about people getting work done).
2015-09-01 11:24:40, Tue	INBOX	How on earth did you associate [redacted] with the idea of getting work done?
2015-09-01 11:29:21, Tue	INBOX	And yuck, heading into Jeh. DO NOT like my new schedule. ..:(
2015-09-01 15:19:15, Tue	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-01 21:04:07, Tue	INBOX	Just got done with a non stop meeting since returning. I find I'm very tired...
2015-09-01 21:41:23, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] That's a lot of meetings. \U0001f61d I'm sorry.
2015-09-02 00:13:49, Wed	INBOX	If I'm permanently back at hq, I'm sure I'll be willing to drive you..
2015-09-02 21:07:44, Wed	INBOX	So I do want to know the answer to what you expect from lunch tomorrow.
2015-09-02 21:09:47, Wed	OUTBOX	Don't know. This was scheduled before the disastrous convo with he and Trisha two weeks ago, but yes presumably a follow-up talk. He thinks we've got tons of time but it's only four more weeks.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-02 21:21:38, Wed	INBOX	A)I'm glad you're doing it, keep the pressure on. I think his spec ass is the best option. Actually, [redacted] special is the BEST option, he's #2. ;)\nB) [redacted]
2015-09-02 21:24:49, Wed	OUTBOX	A) yeah, pretty demoralized by the whole thing.
2015-09-02 21:25:46, Wed	OUTBOX	Not sure if Trisha will be there or not. Kind of hoping not, I can be more frank if she's not.
2015-09-02 21:26:13, Wed	OUTBOX	I might possibly maybe doubtful work for you someday, but definitely NOT as your special assistant.
2015-09-02 21:26:21, Wed	INBOX	Don't think she would be, right?
2015-09-02 21:27:20, Wed	OUTBOX	Well I sort of invited it last time only bc I want this resolved and it's clear Jim won't decide without her. Understandably, but still.
2015-09-02 21:28:04, Wed	OUTBOX	She's not formally on the invite so she or Jim would have to remember.
2015-09-02 21:29:12, Wed	INBOX	Then she won't be there...
2015-09-02 21:29:25, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah okay we'll see.
2015-09-02 21:30:12, Wed	INBOX	Don't you brush me off! I'm wildly good at being a persistent pain in the ass too! ;)
2015-09-02 21:31:24, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes but I don't need you to be on this!
2015-09-02 21:31:25, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:31:25, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:32:27, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:32:58, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:33:17, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:34:45, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:39:12, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:42:29, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:54:27, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-02 21:59:37, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-02 21:59:52, Wed	OUTBOX	I am so proud of you. \u2764
2015-09-02 22:02:30, Wed	INBOX	But thanks \U0001f636
2015-09-03 11:45:26, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] Heading in to sioc, ttyl.
2015-09-03 13:55:56, Thu	INBOX	Np. I've got meeting at State IG at 11, going over with [redacted] around 10:30. Should be back around 12:30, I'll hit you up then (I know you'll still be at lunch) but we can coordinate then.
2015-09-03 16:39:17, Thu	INBOX	Hey I know you're at lunch. I'm back at hq, grabbing &pizza
2015-09-03 17:43:10, Thu	INBOX	This is a serious meeting fatigue zone
2015-09-03 17:43:37, Thu	INBOX	Heading into a 2 conference call. ..
2015-09-03 17:44:17, Thu	OUTBOX	Oof. I know it is. :(
2015-09-03 19:24:41, Thu	INBOX	Hi there. Have I mentioned ces can be frustrating?
2015-09-03 19:25:03, Thu	INBOX	On a positive note, wrap was cancelled
2015-09-03 19:25:11, Thu	OUTBOX	Wow, that's shocking to hear.\U0001f612
2015-09-03 19:25:32, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes, I stand by my initial contention that they suck.
2015-09-03 22:13:01, Thu	INBOX	Remind me to tell you the [redacted] story about the 302s. Aggravating.
2015-09-03 22:13:41, Thu	OUTBOX	More?
2015-09-03 22:52:48, Thu	INBOX	Hi there. Omg completely forgot it was Andys farewell tonight, just went by there. Me[redacted] talked about her campaign.
2015-09-03 22:53:26, Thu	OUTBOX	She's lovely, no?
2015-09-03 22:54:01, Thu	INBOX	Of course. \U0001f636\n\nYes, she is.
2015-09-04 11:39:31, Fri	INBOX	Hi. Headed into sioc. [redacted] I have my 830, then a briefing immediately afterwards at 930. Should be out by 1015 or 1030, I'll text you when I am....
2015-09-09 11:01:22, Wed	INBOX	And unrelated, did you see the pics of the guy who accompanied the KY county clerk who wouldn't issue gay marriage licenses when she was released from jail? Total caraciture of what you'd expect.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-10 11:36:15, Thu	OUTBOX	Her column was pretty funny today.\n\nA Presidential Primary Cheat Sheet http://nyti.ms/1QpSJCE
2015-09-10 11:38:49, Thu	OUTBOX	Where are you meeting Aaron? Wilmer is close to Foggy Bottom, no?
2015-09-10 12:19:02, Thu	INBOX	And yuck, almost at hq...
2015-09-10 12:21:21, Thu	INBOX	Heading in, I'll text you when I'm done with my morning session...
2015-09-10 13:34:15, Thu	INBOX	Hi there. Headed over to wf to yell at some people to stop sniveling. \U0001f621
2015-09-10 14:25:15, Thu	OUTBOX	How fun for you. Who's complaining?
2015-09-10 15:07:11, Thu	INBOX	K. Aaron just had to cancel lunch, so I'm flexible
2015-09-10 15:08:06, Thu	OUTBOX	Bummer. That stinks. Sorry. But yeah that we'll be able to talk.
2015-09-10 19:42:48, Thu	INBOX	Convo with Randy to tell you about...
2015-09-10 19:55:16, Thu	OUTBOX	Imsg, maybe in 10?
2015-09-11 00:31:06, Fri	INBOX	Remind me about Jeh roof, am and jg
2015-09-11 00:42:44, Fri	INBOX	And arghh. Really having a tough time with the decision we discussed earlier. Really wish we could sit and talk. \U0001f636\n\n
2015-09-11 00:56:41, Fri	INBOX	If I had to pick now. I'd say no thanks. Let me continue the current project I have and put in for 3 or 4 when they come open. Why do I want to be in a hurry to go anywhere for ?
2015-09-11 01:45:54, Fri	OUTBOX	Didn't realize it would mean moving off current project - thought they would just tdy you over. We'll talk.
2015-09-11 10:12:43, Fri	INBOX	I think I could probably negotiate with Randy to stay on the team for a while, at least until it finally transitions to wfo. I think that'll happen before Xmas, though. So really want to talk...
2015-09-11 12:23:28, Fri	INBOX	Headed into sioc...hopefully a quiet morning here. Ttyl.
2015-09-11 23:31:51, Fri	INBOX	Fwiw, Moffa thinks I should take it.
2015-09-11 23:32:59, Fri	OUTBOX	You should. We can't both be wrong. ;)
2015-09-11 23:35:54, Fri	INBOX	You the two smartest people I know in the fbi ;)

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-12 09:19:44, Sat	OUTBOX	You have any idea this was coming?\n\nJustice Dept. Says Hillary Clinton Had Authority to Delete Certain Emails http://nyti.ms/1MhHPA3\n\n
2015-09-12 10:57:28, Sat	INBOX	No idea about doj statement. We're trying to get a copy of original filing. We think it says she was requires to preserve copies of things that were records and could delete the rest but that the filing is being taken out of context and spun. But who knows.
2015-09-12 10:59:31, Sat	INBOX	What isn't clear from the article is whether or not they (doj) speak to the issue of whether or not she had authority to be operating off of a private server.
2015-09-12 22:23:29, Sat	INBOX	B) is very nice but she's no Lisa Page. JG wanted something on Fri, So i sent an email this morning at 830 to her and proposing how to handle it...crickets...
2015-09-13 14:02:06, Sun	OUTBOX	So I think I've decided that I'm not going to start until Thursday my first week back, then the following week has a fed holiday so it's only a 4 day week, so I might take that Monday off as well, just so I can ease back in. Especially if it's still not clear what I'll be doing. \U0001f612
2015-09-13 14:05:51, Sun	OUTBOX	Or in the alternative, maybe I'll start on Wednesday but just work half days thru that friday.
2015-09-13 14:11:21, Sun	INBOX	Or, log into eras and do your mandatory training and milk another week. \n\nBefore you start working with ... ;)
2015-09-14 23:19:19, Mon	INBOX	Talked to Gregg about Randy's offer. His advice is take what I'll enjoy, as I have options...plus a ton of more detail about upcoming personnel moves....
2015-09-14 23:19:22, Mon	OUTBOX	Be, not me.
2015-09-14 23:19:47, Mon	INBOX	Yep. Seems like I want my cake and eat it, too...
2015-09-14 23:20:26, Mon	OUTBOX	So that's a no cpc move? I still say start your ses clock, although there's no doubt you will have options.
2015-09-15 22:03:40, Tue	INBOX	Np. Briefing to D we thought was on the 28th is now tomorrow at 2....glad we're so prepared...we will be, but still
2015-09-15 22:07:45, Tue	OUTBOX	Yikes, but you'll be completely great...
2015-09-15 22:08:38, Tue	OUTBOX	Honestly, I thought it was weird that he would let you brief clapper before he got a recent update...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-15 22:19:33, Tue	INBOX	I think he more wants insight now that Cornyn has called for a special prosector...anyway, should be able to imsg from 7-8 or so, [redacted]
2015-09-15 22:20:17, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, it is, but I'll try. :(
2015-09-15 22:34:13, Tue	INBOX	No worries. I feel badly even mentioning because I don't want you to change a thing. Only letting you know in case you ordinarily would find yourself free...\U0001f636
2015-09-15 23:25:10, Tue	INBOX	Yep. Until work Conf call at 815
2015-09-15 23:29:04, Tue	OUTBOX	I hit you there.
2015-09-16 12:22:46, Wed	OUTBOX	You still have your 830?
2015-09-16 13:05:08, Wed	OUTBOX	Called Jim baker 30 minutes ago. Still haven't heard anything from him. [redacted]
2015-09-16 14:39:00, Wed	OUTBOX	And even more \U0001f621, just went to log into eras and discovered some certificate was expired. So now I need to bring it in today. \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621
2015-09-16 15:21:58, Wed	INBOX	Although I know you're p*ssed about the eras stuff. Sorry about that. :(
2015-09-16 15:22:18, Wed	OUTBOX	Super annoying, yes.
2015-09-16 15:22:59, Wed	INBOX	Jims heading up to Harvard now. So he can't talk to you. Or the Director at 2:00. \U0001f612
2015-09-20 22:26:48, Sun	INBOX	I know. I'm being awfully weak and needy. \n[redacted]
2015-09-20 22:27:29, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-21 11:16:42, Mon	OUTBOX	I can't get my eras to play sound. Going to be a real impediment to getting my trainings done. \U0001f621
2015-09-21 11:38:51, Mon	INBOX	You don't need the sound. Will take you longer to read, anyway. ;)\n\nLet me know when I can imsg something
2015-09-21 13:29:14, Mon	OUTBOX	Emailed eras lady, got sound working.
2015-09-21 13:29:41, Mon	OUTBOX	Procurement training is fascinating! And so relevant!
2015-09-21 13:59:30, Mon	OUTBOX	Was looking at the directors award winners. What was [redacted] ?\n\nAnd did you notice that there is an agent with the last name of '[redacted]' I found that somewhat spectacular. \U0001f60a
2015-09-21 14:02:37, Mon	INBOX	Will till you at lunch. And you're showing as "away" - are you pulling a [redacted] trick?
2015-09-21 14:03:06, Mon	INBOX	And I did not know that re SA [redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-21 14:07:37, Mon	INBOX	Np. Hit me on email, heading back into sioc. Got you a headset for eras
2015-09-21 14:08:14, Mon	OUTBOX	Don't think I need it now, I got sound working. But thanks.
2015-09-21 20:33:14, Mon	INBOX	Waiting on Randy to see if there's wrap - he's ead today and has a 4:45 upstairs.
2015-09-21 23:56:26, Mon	INBOX	Just got done sending an email to Randy and everyone...God what I would do to have you on the team. \n\nOf course that might just scuttle our plans for reform entirely....
2015-09-22 00:03:35, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Your point? \n\n;) ...(I win)\n\nMy God I so much prefer being busy and engaged. And that's why I don't think I can ultimately take the job, better to wait for the one that will be that way.
2015-09-22 00:04:45, Tue	OUTBOX	You wouldn't be busy there?\n\nI'm glad you're alpy.
2015-09-24 11:33:24, Thu	INBOX	Downtown traffic also super light. Email me if you want a ride as I'm heading into sioc now. ..
2015-09-24 12:14:48, Thu	INBOX	Hi there. Just shot the sh*t with Randy for 30 minutes. Going to get Peets.. it's dead quiet here...
2015-09-24 12:37:08, Thu	OUTBOX	[redacted] How was your convo with randy? Can you talk?
2015-09-24 12:42:15, Thu	INBOX	Yes! I can also give you a ride if you want...
2015-09-24 20:04:12, Thu	INBOX	Have to head into sioc for Conf call, will be an hour, I'll hit you here when done.
2015-09-24 20:08:44, Thu	OUTBOX	Whoa! Now I want to talk! Gordon? Johnson? For sac?
2015-09-24 21:36:24, Thu	INBOX	Hi. I'm done. Can you talk?
2015-09-25 23:25:03, Fri	INBOX	Hi ;)\n\nI hate DoJ.. [redacted]
2015-09-25 23:59:16, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] And I hate DoJ. Literally they have pulled me away from half of dinner. \U0001f620\n\nAnd hi
2015-09-26 00:10:56, Sat	OUTBOX	What's their issue now?
2015-09-26 00:23:32, Sat	OUTBOX	No email, btw. At least for once it wasn't the stupid phone's fault. [redacted]
2015-09-26 01:02:30, Sat	INBOX	I'm betting I have an unsent email sitting on my unet desktop. Sorry about that. 50 things came crashing in at once at the end of the day.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-26 01:03:50, Sat	INBOX	DoJ wants to [redacted] I get they want to scope as narrowly as possible but they're creating a ton of extra work for everyone. [redacted] nAnyway, now I have to go in tomorrow so they can look thru emails.
2015-09-26 01:04:39, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-26 04:16:26, Sat	OUTBOX	.I know, me too. It completely sucks.\n\nWho is coming in to read emails? That also totally sucks. [redacted]
2015-09-26 08:31:14, Sat	OUTBOX	What a joke: \nStill, there was progress. Never before had China agreed with Mr. Obama\u2019s fundamental premise that the theft of intellectual property for commercial gain was off limits. After weeks of behind-the-scenes negotiations with the Chinese leadership, first in Beijing in late August and then with a delegation of nearly 50 senior Chinese officials who came to Washington quietly two weeks ago, Beijing agreed to wording that read: \u201cNeither country\u2019s government will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property, including trade secrets or other confidential business information, with the intent of providing competitive advantages to companies or commercial sectors.\u201d\n\nLimiting Security Breaches May Be Impossible Task for U.S. and China http://nyti.ms/1LchlQD
2015-09-26 08:38:23, Sat	OUTBOX	Zuckerberg, Cook, Natella all seated at the the head table with potus. No surprise we lost. \U0001f621\n\nState Dinner for Xi Jinping Has High-Tech Flavor http://nyti.ms/1iR8KXb
2015-09-26 08:57:41, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-09-26 11:35:45, Sat	INBOX	And God, that's an awful sequence of time stamps on your texts. :(I'm sorry. [redacted]ans [redacted]are coming in. Not sure that they need to read them, but we're asking them to jump through their ass to act quickly, so not in much of a position to argue if they want to come in.
2015-09-26 11:36:57, Sat	INBOX	And now have to prep Randy for Laufman because even though [redacted] Randy called him after he couldn't reach Toscas. So now Laufman is calling him all the time. [redacted] \U0001f621
2015-09-26 11:39:46, Sat	OUTBOX	Act quickly to do what? And yes, I also hate hate hate when we take anyone's call. Hopefully you'll be better about that practice when you are AD.
2015-09-26 12:42:17, Sat	INBOX	Talked to [redacted] for 45 minutes. So so much better than [redacted]
2015-09-26 12:43:11, Sat	OUTBOX	That's because he's actually done cases, owned them, from start to finish.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-26 13:27:15, Sat	INBOX	Sorry for delay, been on calls. Bothered [redacted] on vacation then talked to Randy. \n\nAnd no problem. I will try, too. Hope you enjoy your day...and huge deep sigh. [redacted]
2015-09-26 18:28:58, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] I otherwise love me some hating on [redacted]
2015-09-27 01:17:59, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] We work 60-70 hours, easily, when we're cranking. I'm reviewing DoJ draft to W&c now...\n\r [redacted]
2015-09-27 01:24:22, Sun	OUTBOX	Yeah, but when I worked 8 to 7 with andy, I almost never worked on weekends. But yes, I get it.\n\n [redacted]
2015-09-27 13:41:24, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] and reading work product (how do you do what we do without a law degree or at least deep knowledge of same?).\n\n [redacted]
2015-09-27 23:43:49, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] \n\nNp. We can play it by ear, [redacted] \n\nPutin is very good. We're kind of suckers....
2015-09-27 23:47:45, Sun	OUTBOX	He totally is. Makes some sense too given his training.
2015-09-27 23:50:34, Sun	INBOX	Yeah, but also a little crazy. He already threw out the "if I may use a term of intelligence professionals, these are active measures" (re alleged disinformation about Russia)\n\nI think the fundamental Russian character wants an oppressive showy slightly crazy strong man...
2015-09-28 00:40:34, Mon	OUTBOX	100% right. And plays to it excellently. [redacted]
2015-09-28 01:50:35, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] I'm doing infosec training while we wait to go back out. \U0001f612
2015-09-28 10:58:45, Mon	OUTBOX	Sigh. And I just "failed" my veterans employment training. God they are so profoundly useless.
2015-09-28 10:59:27, Mon	INBOX	Yay. More time on eras....yes, it's awful
2015-09-28 11:01:39, Mon	OUTBOX	I put in 11 hours total last week, so that should help.
2015-09-28 11:06:26, Mon	INBOX	That's great. God. I am SO behind this morning...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-28 12:17:32, Mon	INBOX	Hey heading into hq. Hit me on imsg later, I'll try to get a pass and figure out where to meet.
2015-09-28 12:25:26, Mon	OUTBOX	Will do. I called and left yet another message for Jim baker. I think I'm just going to have to tell tomorrow - I think we are planning on walking, no doubt she is going to ask when I returning and what in going to be doing. I am quite frustrated. \U0001f612
2015-09-29 10:11:53, Tue	INBOX	Funny feeling to have a PT test. It was such a regular part of the Army, it brings back memories, mostly not positive. Oh well.
2015-09-29 10:47:31, Tue	OUTBOX	You're going to be fine.
2015-09-29 10:50:01, Tue	OUTBOX	Walked and talked with Went okay I suppose. Will have to talk to you about it later, but if I had to bet, I'd guess I'm going back to nslb. Apparently Trisha has spoken to her and about it, is clearly where she is leaning too.
2015-09-29 10:52:45, Tue	INBOX	Well, it's good in this instance. Of course I want to talk about it, not even sure if I can make it to lunch!
2015-09-29 10:53:31, Tue	INBOX	Hopefully she has some ideas about what happens if you leave in 4 months....or less....
2015-09-29 10:55:04, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, I guess. But still, it's not the first time.
2015-09-29 10:55:41, Tue	OUTBOX	If I leave soon I think she just readjusts clients again. Whatever.
2015-09-29 10:56:57, Tue	OUTBOX	What time does your fit test start? And seriously, don't be nervous. You've totally got this.
2015-09-29 10:57:03, Tue	INBOX	Well not going to. \U0001f612\n\nAs for that way, right? And maybe the convo was recent, after or around your last talk with Jim
2015-09-29 10:58:39, Tue	INBOX	8
2015-09-29 11:00:28, Tue	OUTBOX	She is. Convo with Trisha definitely happened after the

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-09-29 11:01:10, Tue	OUTBOX	Also, told her I was in the ofc briefly yesterday but didn't mention that I saw you, so don't say anything.
2015-09-29 11:05:27, Tue	INBOX	Didn't others on longer tdys keep their offices?
2015-09-29 11:07:03, Tue	OUTBOX	Yup.
2015-09-29 11:08:06, Tue	INBOX	It really is. Can imsg if you prefer
2015-09-29 11:09:48, Tue	INBOX	K. I'll hit you when test is done. Sorry about bullsh*t
2015-09-29 14:50:01, Tue	INBOX	Hey I'm going to head in to sioc to check in. Will come out around 11:30 assuming nothings on fire. You can always email, too...ttyl
2015-09-30 13:32:44, Wed	INBOX	I should be free around 11:30 then have at 1:45 conference call...
2015-09-30 22:27:17, Wed	INBOX	Aaaaand it turns out I'm not done. Stupid DoJ. Going to talk to ...
2015-09-30 23:00:29, Wed	OUTBOX	What did doj want?
2015-09-30 23:05:43, Wed	INBOX	Essentially, something to provide them the ability to not have to take a hard stand and say no to something defense counsel wants us to do.
2015-09-30 23:06:13, Wed	OUTBOX	They're awful. I'm sorry.
2015-09-30 23:33:20, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, when you deny the massacre of a million people over a hundred years after it happened as a matter of state policy and by every average citizen it's just sort of offensive.
2015-10-01 11:43:43, Thu	OUTBOX	Hey what's our zip at hq, 20535?
2015-10-01 11:43:45, Thu	INBOX	That's true. \n\nI DON'T want to go to work today. I don't want to fight at DOJ, & I don't want to fight the screaming people at headquarters who don't understand the subtleties of everything we have to do...
2015-10-01 11:43:45, Thu	INBOX	Yes. 20535.
2015-10-01 21:42:24, Thu	INBOX	Hi. To ces for proliferation portfolio
2015-10-01 22:34:31, Thu	INBOX	And holy sh*t destroyed ces and nsd at a meeting this afternoon. Remind me to tell you.\n\nAnd hi.
2015-10-01 22:40:09, Thu	OUTBOX	Ooh. I can't believe you didn't tell me! Can you still talk?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-02 00:12:51, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Been on the phone with [redacted] so just as well. Going to start cooking in earnest now.
2015-10-02 00:15:26, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] Everything cool re [redacted]
2015-10-02 00:18:52, Fri	INBOX	Yes\n\nAnd yeah, he just wanted to vent about main justice being dicks
2015-10-02 00:18:57, Fri	INBOX	Political dicks
2015-10-02 00:19:38, Fri	OUTBOX	Got it. \n\nCan imsg now, but it's okay if you can't.
2015-10-04 20:23:09, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted] I don't want to go back to work. I feel lost in a way. I've truly never felt this way before. I work, that's who I am, what I do. God. :(
2015-10-04 21:13:01, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] n\nRe work, that will come. Once you figure out what you're going to be doing, you'll throw yourself into it like you always have and you'll be fine. Trust me on that. There's enough complex work for good attorneys, and you'll get it.
2015-10-04 22:32:40, Sun	OUTBOX	Hey also heads up if you've emailed me today, I haven't been able to get it. I'm guessing my unet password has expired.
2015-10-04 22:52:06, Sun	INBOX	It's going to be ok at work. And haven't emailed you here, although I just did on gmail
2015-10-05 14:17:52, Mon	OUTBOX	My unet not working. [redacted]
2015-10-05 18:09:02, Mon	INBOX	K, then I'm going to walk into sioc quickly
2015-10-05 18:16:34, Mon	OUTBOX	Leaving now. Also, play dumb with [redacted] he's going to schedule lunch for tomorrow.
2015-10-05 18:53:26, Mon	INBOX	You clearly haven't read the email repartee yet. You update your password on samsung?
2015-10-05 18:54:10, Mon	OUTBOX	I did. I don't give a hoot about the email repartee. [redacted]
2015-10-05 22:29:50, Mon	INBOX	No, just long. JG wants to go to mtg at State tomorrow...certainly changes dynamic. \n\n[redacted]
2015-10-05 22:35:00, Mon	OUTBOX	Who was going to be ranking? Randy? Jg certainly tougher, may be a good thing.\n\nK.\n\n[redacted]
2015-10-05 22:38:11, Mon	INBOX	Yep. He's doing whatever here with dd. I guess, but hope we're not over playing our hand. [redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-05 23:03:53, Mon	OUTBOX	Whatever here with DD? Not sure what that means. [redacted] 'll probably try to leave around 2 again if I can...
2015-10-05 23:06:58, Mon	INBOX	I have to be back early to get to State by 2. Let's leave early (does [redacted] have something keeping him from departing until noon) [redacted]
2015-10-06 00:50:53, Tue	INBOX	Btw, went down rundown of who's going where with [redacted] She asked if I had any leads on who replaces [redacted] I said I didn't. \n\nSigh. No idea where I feel like I should go on this. It's not an obvious, oh, Pete should go for that job.
2015-10-06 15:30:11, Tue	INBOX	Hey [redacted] doesn't know I saw you earlier, right?
2015-10-06 17:50:51, Tue	INBOX	Sitting waiting at State...
2015-10-06 19:31:26, Tue	INBOX	Boooooooooo. I do not like your absence as a result of your so-called "work."
2015-10-06 20:10:24, Tue	OUTBOX	Sorry for the insane amount of absence. I spoke to jim, [redacted] trisha, so at least that is all handled.
2015-10-06 20:11:15, Tue	OUTBOX	Talked one substantive issue with trisha too, so that's good. At least I hope.
2015-10-06 20:26:01, Tue	INBOX	Hey heading into sioc, if you can talk, email me and I'll step out
2015-10-06 21:55:39, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-10-07 15:42:46, Wed	INBOX	Headed back into sioc. Hit me on email or lync
2015-10-08 15:28:11, Thu	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-10-09 12:11:12, Fri	OUTBOX	Am also quite bummed about missing [redacted] bc I was hoping to get a sense of what I'll be doing/whether I can start moving boxes over (again). God, moving sucks.
2015-10-09 12:21:02, Fri	INBOX	Heading into sioc. Insg whenever, think about where we can link up. I have an 11-12 then lunch with [redacted] 12-1
2015-10-10 22:22:18, Sat	OUTBOX	Article on [redacted] in the times. Just sent
2015-10-10 22:25:46, Sat	INBOX	Yep just read it. Good thing they draw parallels of cases WHERE CHARGES ARE DROPPED as being the same as an uncharged individual. \U0001f621
2015-10-12 22:29:11, Mon	INBOX	Again, I think work will actually help. Who are you checking in with? [redacted] You get to set up your office. [redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-12 22:29:32, Mon	INBOX	And I'll get to return all the stuff I've been holding for safe keeping...more :)....
2015-10-12 22:33:13, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] whoever I see first. So probably [redacted] \n\nMaybe. Depends on what my lock options are. I'm going to resist getting locks changed on my safe, etc. until I gave some sense of duration. You do still need to slip yourself some cash though.
2015-10-12 22:35:28, Mon	OUTBOX	I'll definitely take my pen though. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-10-12 22:37:24, Mon	INBOX	We'll see. You need to go exchange before it's too late. Though I can obviously live quite happily with what's there now. \U0001f60a
2015-10-12 22:38:27, Mon	OUTBOX	Yes, still need to muster the courage...\U0001f612
2015-10-12 22:40:39, Mon	INBOX	Sigh. I suppose you can keep them at work indefinitely...
2015-10-12 22:42:43, Mon	OUTBOX	They're home, just need to reveal them finally. \n\n[redacted] Will hit you back here [redacted]
2015-10-13 19:30:13, Tue	OUTBOX	Crap. I'm sorry. I didn't have this on me. [redacted] Had a good convo with [redacted] And yes, I'm assigned to cpc. [redacted] \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-10-13 19:33:40, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] \U0001f60a Obviously have to get the job first.\n\n So Randy is late, waiting on him...happy to give you a ride up tonight if timing works.
2015-10-13 19:34:24, Tue	INBOX	Btw, "for me," but we can cross that bridge if I get the job. :D\n\nJoking, joking....
2015-10-13 19:34:51, Tue	OUTBOX	I'm not too worried about that. Was VERY hard not to say anything to [redacted]
2015-10-13 19:35:31, Tue	OUTBOX	Maybe I should ask to be reassigned... ;)
2015-10-13 19:44:22, Tue	INBOX	Ha! You better not!!!\n\nStill waiting on Randy. \U0001f615
2015-10-14 00:18:07, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] just invited me to watch the Democratic debates. \U0001f636\n\nHopefully he'll forgive me if I start screaming about some email question...
2015-10-14 00:31:26, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm glad he did. \U0001f636
2015-10-14 00:31:36, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, there's not one. :(
2015-10-14 01:01:36, Wed	OUTBOX	Funny, emailing [redacted] now to tell her I'm going to be late. We had a brief convo about being friends/her being my boss. Went well, neither one of us are worried about it, but remind me to tell you about it.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-14 01:06:37, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] Giacalone wasn't in again today - I REALLY need to talk to him about getting a temp pass.
2015-10-14 01:09:09, Wed	INBOX	JG said he's out this week. Let me see what I can do
2015-10-14 01:11:52, Wed	INBOX	And Martin OMalley's a douche
2015-10-14 01:13:59, Wed	OUTBOX	Out the whole week?! Wtf?\n\nDon't worry about it [redacted] If you can get one for just tomorrow, great. But no big deal if not.
2015-10-14 01:14:26, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm not watching. I can't tell you how little I care right now.
2015-10-14 01:16:09, Wed	INBOX	Yeah not sure what he's doing. But just saw a six month Mission Need pass for a CD4 UC.
2015-10-14 01:17:12, Wed	INBOX	Kind of a foregone conclusion but so much more substantive than the Rep debates
2015-10-14 01:18:00, Wed	OUTBOX	Which one? \n\nThat's nice to hear at least. \n\n[redacted]
2015-10-14 01:21:15, Wed	INBOX	Which one what? [redacted]
2015-10-14 01:21:15, Wed	INBOX	JG. Don't know what's going on this week
2015-10-14 01:21:27, Wed	OUTBOX	Which uc?
2015-10-14 01:25:50, Wed	OUTBOX	Oh wait, I do. Going to Canada I think. Maybe randy joining? That ring a bell?
2015-10-14 01:26:13, Wed	INBOX	4C. Not at all a mission need. Good initiative but not mission need. \n\nDon't think Randy is going. Is it wrong of me to think this [redacted] is largely a waste of time?
2015-10-14 01:27:57, Wed	OUTBOX	It totally is. Andy NEVER traveled in that gig unless he had to. But whatever.
2015-10-14 02:22:05, Wed	INBOX	Ooh hillary Bernie throw down on 215
2015-10-15 12:13:24, Thu	INBOX	Gregg got cirg AD
2015-10-15 12:20:17, Thu	OUTBOX	Good for him.
2015-10-15 12:59:06, Thu	INBOX	Also remind me Baker WH story
2015-10-15 15:39:44, Thu	OUTBOX	[redacted] Bc SOC is at Columbia Law School at some GDark symposium. \U0001f612

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-15 16:47:40, Thu	OUTBOX	Still in the Onp.
2015-10-15 16:49:22, Thu	INBOX	Oh. Misread your lunch email. Why is SOC at Columbia and not [redacted] or an attorney like [redacted] or ANYONE who can speak substantively to the matter?
2015-10-16 00:43:54, Fri	INBOX	And re your last imsg, where does everyone think [redacted] is going? Clearly I'd love 4 but it needs to be open
2015-10-16 00:49:16, Fri	OUTBOX	Okay.\n\nNo clue.
2015-10-16 00:52:37, Fri	INBOX	And I'm sorry, [redacted] and I just don't get along? No. He insists on different investigative paths and encourages another field office to reopen a case (of [redacted], we closed. Promptly leading to discussion in OI about whether the new office made material misrepresentations in their FISA application, leading to the case to be closed.
2015-10-16 00:53:23, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]"
2015-10-16 00:54:01, Fri	INBOX	He is unprofessional, he actively bears a grudge and looks to find ways to highlight that when he can, and generally vastly wildly over steps his role
2015-10-16 00:54:57, Fri	INBOX	He precipitates a formal meeting from Toscas to [redacted] in which [redacted] has to calm down DOJ.
2015-10-16 00:55:08, Fri	INBOX	So yeah, I guess we just don't get along
2015-10-16 00:55:17, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] she just wasn't going to get into it. But you're right about all of it, I know.
2015-10-16 00:56:19, Fri	OUTBOX	We also talked about what a blowhard douchy [redacted] is and how she likes a lot of the agents and SSAs at wfo but that they seem to be going off the rails with you gone.
2015-10-16 00:56:30, Fri	OUTBOX	I'm fine.
2015-10-16 00:57:02, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, he hates [redacted] with an unbridled passion.
2015-10-16 01:01:34, Fri	INBOX	Sorry to vent. My point is short of [redacted] douchyness you shouldn't hate so hard
2015-10-16 01:02:05, Fri	OUTBOX	Vent all you want. Doesn't bother me.
2015-10-16 01:05:20, Fri	OUTBOX	So. Guess I'm going to go now, unless you think you're going to free up or have more you want to say.
2015-10-16 01:10:05, Fri	INBOX	Just freed up. How come you didn't mention all this earlier?!?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-16 01:10:26, Fri	OUTBOX	What a douche. And love that he got a secutity clearance - very rigourous review of his background obviously.\n\nAn article to share: He claimed to be ex-CIA and was quoted as an expert on Fox News. Prosecutors say it was a lie.\nHe claimed to be ex-CIA and was quoted as an expert on Fox News. Prosecutors say it was a lie.\nhttp://wapo.st/1OFfROb
2015-10-16 01:10:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Forgot.
2015-10-16 01:12:37, Fri	INBOX	I'm really worried about wf. Yes, there have been a couple of issues since I left. Some of this is jackals haters hating (Hi \n\nBut it pains me because you want to be replaceable. Everybody thinks being irreplaceable is great. The opposite is true. You want to get everyone good enough that it doesn't matter if you're there
2015-10-16 10:05:32, Fri	INBOX	Spinning in my head, of course. Probably just going to go in. I have to get Gregg bullets for my PAR plus write 8 others.
2015-10-17 00:15:43, Sat	OUTBOX	Was thinking about it more, I think you could totally start the poem tomorrow by saying "Reading poetry, out loud, before a room full of people isn't exactly what FBI agents excel at, so we ask your forgiveness for any stumbles along the way" or something like that.
2015-10-17 00:17:52, Sat	OUTBOX	And just realized, never came. Not sure what happened. As I was leaving he said he'd see me there...
2015-10-17 00:18:35, Sat	INBOX	Yeah, nor Andy or the DD.
2015-10-17 00:19:07, Sat	OUTBOX	Andy is down in southern VA. Ironman is tomorrow.
2015-10-17 00:19:10, Sat	INBOX	I don't know if I want to say that...too cute/familiar? Especially in front of jg, Randy
2015-10-17 00:19:50, Sat	OUTBOX	Think it would be fine, but either way.
2015-10-17 00:21:35, Sat	INBOX	Oh. Thought it was local. better drag his sorry ass down tomorrow. \n\nAnd if this keeps up we might as well imsg. \n\r

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-18 19:08:16, Sun	INBOX	Easy when your ENTIRE country is the size of Oregon. And when your colonial policies are largely to blame for the Israeli-Palesinian conflict, the India -Pakistani conflict, pretty much every place your colonial empire touched.\n\nAnd finally the why can't the US have an MI5, they're soooo much better than us debate has died. Pretty much every bss or sb guy I've ever talked to wished they could be us. \n\nI have a real problem with Anglophiles and the whole perception of bringing intellectual greatness to the world.\n\nAnyway. Hi. \u263a
2015-10-19 11:39:39, Mon	OUTBOX	Can't talk, did you get my text? Of course [redacted]et AL have had these briefs for god knows how long, I'm going to need to scramble to review them this am and figure out what we need to provide to doj.
2015-10-19 11:42:17, Mon	INBOX	Yes, was just checking in case you might have hit traffic. \U0001f636\n\nWhen's the deadline to doj? Today?
2015-10-19 11:54:03, Mon	OUTBOX	Of course the deadline is today. [redacted]said mid-morning. \U0001f612\n\nYeah, it was damn cold out this morning. Totally need your shirt, and thin gloves, and something for my ears...
2015-10-19 11:54:38, Mon	INBOX	And just re -read [redacted] comments. Looks like mid morning.
2015-10-19 11:55:59, Mon	INBOX	Selfishly, the only good news in all of that is it may mean we can grab lunch, assuming you don't have plans. And I certainly know the comments do doesn't mean that they won't be calling long after that. When is DoJ's deadline?
2015-10-19 11:56:50, Mon	OUTBOX	No clue. And yes, if I can work-wise, OF COURSE we're getting lunch.
2015-10-19 11:57:04, Mon	OUTBOX	Okay, got to put this down and hustle now. Sorry. :(
2015-10-20 22:43:48, Tue	OUTBOX	About my meeting tomorrow? Well whatever you did I didn't notice it.
2015-10-20 23:29:14, Tue	INBOX	I'm not. [redacted]\n\nNothing but sweet re [redacted]
2015-10-20 23:40:09, Tue	OUTBOX	So tell me!
2015-10-21 00:02:32, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] said all the stuff you were describing, she would be no good and have no desire to do. I told her that what you said was that you were largely the same. She said yeah, but seemed also to worry about it some.
2015-10-21 20:14:34, Wed	INBOX	Hi. \n\nOMG THAT WAS HORRIBLE. AN UTTER WASTE OF TIME AND TAXPAYER MONEY. \n\nWHAT IN THE HELL IS [redacted] DOING? WHO IS SUPERVISING THEM?\n\nThere. I feel better, thanks

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-21 22:50:25, Wed	INBOX	You still.get more done than 90%:of ogc'
2015-10-22 13:09:50, Thu	INBOX	That stinks. I'd love to meet you but I can't. Have to talk to then 10 with then 1030 with ces then 11 with jg and toscas
2015-10-22 13:10:16, Thu	INBOX	Riding down elevator with and us atty, leans over and whispers, "so I hear you may not be coming back."
2015-10-22 13:37:41, Thu	OUTBOX	Wow, talk about the word getting out. That's great
2015-10-22 13:40:40, Thu	INBOX	Saddest conversation with So many topics of general interest when we don't even need them!
2015-10-24 12:03:02, Sat	INBOX	Justice Department Wants Court To Force Apple To Decrypt iPhones Because Apple Licenses, Not Sells, iOS : BIZ TECH : Tech Times\nhttp://www.techtimes.com/articles/99132/20151024/justice-department-wants-court-to-force-apple-to-decrypt-iphones-because-apple-licenses-not-sells-ios.htm
2015-10-24 12:03:09, Sat	INBOX	" "Apple cannot reap the legal benefits of licensing its software in this manner and then later disclaim any ownership or obligation to assist law enforcement when that same software plays a critical role in thwarting execution of a search warrant,"
2015-10-24 12:07:31, Sat	INBOX	To be clear, that's the govt's brief, not the article. Still, i like the reasoning. Yay imsg
2015-10-24 12:08:19, Sat	OUTBOX	Totally understood. My impressed was simply that we were taking it on. Clever reasoning too.
2015-10-26 23:31:54, Mon	INBOX	Sorry, was talking to then WH. Just got done but need to call Moffa and
2015-10-26 23:37:05, Mon	OUTBOX	Np. Hope everything is okay.
2015-10-26 23:43:19, Mon	INBOX	Yeah. DoJ are putzes, man.
2015-10-26 23:44:07, Mon	OUTBOX	Sounds awesome
2015-10-27 00:52:14, Tue	INBOX	Awesome not the word I would use. Just people needing to posture.
2015-10-27 00:53:30, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah that was a joke.\n\nFine, but kind of odd.
2015-10-27 00:58:24, Tue	INBOX	Yeah i was kind of cranky, sorry i missed the humor. \n\nHmm.
2015-10-27 01:36:09, Tue	OUTBOX	No problem. \n\n

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-27 22:33:58, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 22:42:49, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 22:44:27, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 22:47:58, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 22:54:38, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 22:56:05, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 22:56:11, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 22:56:35, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 22:58:27, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 22:59:56, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:00:31, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:02:08, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:02:25, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:02:53, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:03:23, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:03:44, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:05:11, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:05:47, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:06:30, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:06:45, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:07:13, Tue	INBOX	

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-27 23:07:43, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-10-27 23:09:37, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:11:16, Tue	INBOX	
2015-10-27 23:11:38, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-27 23:12:25, Tue	OUTBOX	
2015-10-28 00:57:19, Wed	INBOX	Based on your prior representations to me that this group is entirely women, I can only assume my inclusion on this group text was in the context of cancelling the 8:30 so as to free [redacted] to attend with you, not at the prospect of me attending.
2015-10-28 00:57:34, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-10-28 00:58:40, Wed	INBOX	And yes, apparently [redacted] is in OKC. I don't understand why she doesn't send [redacted] I spent 8 months near there at my officer basic course and there is NOTHING to recommend it
2015-10-29 19:01:21, Thu	OUTBOX	Hi. Remind me conversation about you with andy. All good...
2015-10-30 00:44:15, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] In this case, totally deficient NSL non-disclosure procedures. \U0001f621
2015-10-30 00:45:56, Fri	INBOX	Yeah somehow I'm not surprised that they suck. [redacted]
2015-10-30 00:50:57, Fri	OUTBOX	Reading this definitely sucks worse.
2015-10-30 00:51:46, Fri	INBOX	You have a sofrcopy? Will read it while I wait
2015-10-30 00:52:26, Fri	OUTBOX	I wish. Just on red side. (Not class, just written there).
2015-10-30 00:58:52, Fri	OUTBOX	And god, these are so bareboned I'm not even sure where to start.
2015-10-30 01:43:12, Fri	INBOX	Hi. JG just called...
2015-10-30 02:36:45, Fri	OUTBOX	He did? That's good. [redacted]
2015-10-30 10:07:30, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Got a tiny hint of some more info this morning. Will tell you later. [redacted]
2015-10-31 20:20:32, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-10-31 20:36:08, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-10-31 21:22:59, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-01 23:21:36, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted] And I hope Paul Ryan fails and crashes in a blaze of glory.
2015-11-01 23:23:04, Sun	INBOX	Yes. And, me too. At some point the Rep party needs to pull their head out of their *ss. Shows no sign of occurring any time soon.
2015-11-02 16:54:33, Mon	INBOX	Hi. Forgot I have lunch today with Iris and [redacted] So that's nice.
2015-11-02 17:44:50, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-02 18:20:09, Mon	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-02 18:23:57, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] \n\nHow was lunch?
2015-11-03 00:48:13, Tue	INBOX	No. Lazy entitlement. \n\nTold her she should go and we could tell her about the meetings afterwards. And re[redacted]ust that I hadn't realized you and [redacted] didn't like her either (a lie, obviously)\n\nAnd sorry, I can't. [redacted]
2015-11-03 13:13:37, Tue	OUTBOX	That's stinky. \U0001f621 Yes, 9:30, and lunch with Andrew. And need to rewrite the nsl procedures TODAY. When do you think you'll be back?
2015-11-03 14:13:25, Tue	OUTBOX	Lucky day - Andrew just canceled on me. :)
2015-11-04 11:17:02, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] lost. What a f-ing disappointment.
2015-11-04 11:27:43, Wed	OUTBOX	52/47. I'm really so disappointed. What is wrong with people?
2015-11-04 11:48:51, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] \nB) I saw. Disappointing, but look at the district map. Loudon is being gentrified, but it's still largely ignorant hillbillys. Good for her for running, but curious if she's energized or never again.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-11-05 17:28:19, Thu	INBOX	Btw, just saw [redacted] has a six month Mission Need pass...
2015-11-05 17:29:09, Thu	OUTBOX	Yeah, but she's an acting SC like [redacted] so that's not so unreasonable... Though I appreciate your attempt to find fault. :)
2015-11-06 12:49:15, Fri	OUTBOX	Hi there. I am both late and slow this morning. Seems unreasonable to have to go to work today.
2015-11-06 17:29:16, Fri	INBOX	He have a 1 hard stop?
2015-11-06 17:30:39, Fri	OUTBOX	Nope were going now. No clue how long.
2015-11-06 18:34:11, Fri	OUTBOX	Walking back now
2015-11-06 18:42:58, Fri	INBOX	K. Need to meet the Aussies real fast then free till 3. Jones wants closeout. \U0001f612
2015-11-06 18:43:29, Fri	OUTBOX	L, let me see of I can get my card fixed quickly. Going in to ofc now
2015-11-06 19:03:31, Fri	INBOX	Hi. Free...
2015-11-06 22:20:44, Fri	OUTBOX	Sorry got caught with [redacted] Can call you from the car.
2015-11-07 16:56:35, Sat	OUTBOX	K. [redacted] coming over in a second, but don't expect she'll stay very long. Just fyi if I am delayed.
2015-11-07 17:11:25, Sat	INBOX	Hi [redacted] !\n\nDont know if you're interested but [redacted] going to need help...not full time...
2015-11-07 17:43:55, Sat	OUTBOX	Hi there. I'm sorry. She stayed longer than I thought she would. I can imsg now if you still can.
2015-11-07 17:44:31, Sat	OUTBOX	As I've told [redacted]. I'll do whatever she wants me to.
2015-11-07 22:30:10, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-08 15:14:42, Sun	OUTBOX	Going into the office I'm about an hour [redacted] and send the procedures. (I just went direct with Trisha - [redacted] is fairly useless). [redacted] but realize there's no reason for you to come to HQ this morning.
2015-11-08 15:18:55, Sun	INBOX	And [redacted] is ENTIRELY worthless. Remind me [redacted] story from 14.
2015-11-08 15:26:33, Sun	OUTBOX	The thing I most dislike - and even [redacted] confirmed - is that if he screws something up, like he was supposed to tell me x at noon but didn't until 5, you absolutely know he will retell the story to a boss in the light most favorable to him.
2015-11-08 16:36:19, Sun	OUTBOX	I guess. [redacted]
2015-11-09 12:59:28, Mon	INBOX	Can you at least take your phone inside of the conferences? If it's oi, I doubt it. And that really sucks.
2015-11-09 13:00:08, Mon	OUTBOX	Nope I can't. It's in oi.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-11-09 13:01:12, Mon	INBOX	God that sucks. [redacted]
2015-11-09 13:01:51, Mon	OUTBOX	I wish. Would have been the highlight of the day.
2015-11-09 13:04:31, Mon	INBOX	\U0001f606 and \U0001f61e
2015-11-09 13:06:42, Mon	INBOX	What time do you start?
2015-11-09 13:07:56, Mon	OUTBOX	9:00. But have to go to nslb first [redacted]
2015-11-09 13:10:01, Mon	INBOX	That stinks. Heading into headquarters now. Should you suddenly want to run off for lunch, let me know. Although I may have to speak at WFO over lunch.
2015-11-09 22:20:37, Mon	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-11 13:41:24, Wed	INBOX	A) didn't get anything. Assume you mean unet email.\n\nB) ok. Then will plan on going in, hopefully it works out. 2-4 is best bet, obviously no guarantees?
2015-11-11 13:43:30, Wed	OUTBOX	B) yes
2015-11-11 20:14:17, Wed	OUTBOX	Hey heads up [redacted] in the ofc, just walking out now.
2015-11-11 20:15:04, Wed	OUTBOX	I texted her earlier to see if she wanted to join is to EM, is just leaving now so just getting it.
2015-11-12 01:40:07, Thu	OUTBOX	Well I also paused bc I didn't want you to freak out since it's a really remote chance anyway.
2015-11-12 01:42:12, Thu	INBOX	I am of course going to encourage you to do it...
2015-11-12 01:42:36, Thu	OUTBOX	Sure it is. And seriously, you couldn't to worry for a year about something that is very unlikely to happen?
2015-11-12 01:54:45, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] You should tell me - only makes it worse. I'm glad you did. And I'm going to keep trying to persuade you to do it.
2015-11-12 01:56:22, Thu	OUTBOX	It's not even a point of persuasion. [redacted]
2015-11-12 01:57:16, Thu	INBOX	And I told you about [redacted] right? And we'll be having similar convos whenever I hit 12-18 months at HQ...\n\nWould you get some sort of housing help? TDY-type $
2015-11-12 01:57:49, Thu	INBOX	He would love SF more than you even, right?
2015-11-12 01:58:22, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes he would.
2015-11-12 01:59:54, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes, he would. Have no clue about tdy money or housing. Obviously a big issue.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-11-12 02:01:19, Thu	INBOX	You should go to SF. I'll set a reminder to bring it up in April.
2015-11-12 02:25:33, Thu	INBOX	Of course. I'm going to drag you by Peregrine...When's your meeting with Trisha?
2015-11-12 02:27:20, Thu	OUTBOX	Yeah, might not be able to. Mtg is at 10. Let me see if I can get on unet email - I never remember how. 324mail.com?
2015-11-12 02:37:14, Thu	INBOX	Yep re 324
2015-11-12 03:03:47, Thu	INBOX	[redacted]What are you trying to check, btw? DoJ comments?
2015-11-12 03:06:42, Thu	OUTBOX	Is it .com?
2015-11-12 03:07:15, Thu	OUTBOX	Have to meet with trisha at 10, need to at least know what they say.
2015-11-12 03:07:47, Thu	INBOX	Make sure you get the "s"\nHttps://www.324mail.com
2015-11-12 03:09:44, Thu	OUTBOX	So weird. I couldn't type it directly into the browser but could follow a link.
2015-11-12 03:16:41, Thu	INBOX	Yay. So it worked?
2015-11-12 03:17:27, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes. And sigh, DOJ. Questions, questions, questions.
2015-11-12 03:18:37, Thu	INBOX	Of course. We're dumb - even retarded - and Not To Be Trusted. \n\nWho's providing comment from DoJ?
2015-11-12 03:19:02, Thu	OUTBOX	Oh, about 600 people. Nsd and civ.
2015-11-12 03:20:10, Thu	INBOX	Civ = crim? Olc? Oia?
2015-11-12 03:20:52, Thu	OUTBOX	No, the civil division at doj. The folks who defend us when we get sued, like over nondisclosure of an nsl.
2015-11-12 03:21:12, Thu	INBOX	You can always sh*t can all of their comments - after you tell Trisha [redacted]
2015-11-12 03:22:25, Thu	OUTBOX	Some are okay.\n[redacted]
2015-11-12 03:37:13, Thu	INBOX	Oh. Well that makes sense. \n\nMaybe. Don't trust DoJ. No reason, and that's unreasonable because most of them are just trying to do a good job.\n\n[redacted]
2015-11-12 03:37:40, Thu	INBOX	Oh. OK, good.
2015-11-12 03:37:55, Thu	INBOX	But not really.
2015-11-12 23:10:13, Thu	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-13 14:04:16, Fri	INBOX	Headed to Wf for a meeting on NATs...back around 10...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-11-13 14:10:50, Fri	INBOX	Q
2015-11-13 23:49:58, Fri	OUTBOX	Happy to. I have about 600 emails to respond to, which just isn't possible
2015-11-14 00:12:00, Sat	INBOX	Yeah. Listening to the news, France's state of emergency allows the state to exercise censorship across all media and suspends requirements for warrants to enter private spaces. How's that transparency and privacy rights for you, EU?
2015-11-14 00:14:39, Sat	OUTBOX	Yeah, no shit.
2015-11-14 00:24:45, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-11-14 15:28:48, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] I'm just emailing with [redacted] on this mandatory transparency scheme, just like the old days. [redacted]
2015-11-14 15:30:00, Sat	INBOX	Hop to it! Stupid [redacted]
2015-11-14 15:30:53, Sat	INBOX	Somebody needs to ask how mandatory transparency balances against 127 dead in Paris.
2015-11-14 15:33:17, Sat	OUTBOX	Yeah, no joke. And thanks for the sitrep.
2015-11-15 21:34:48, Sun	OUTBOX	And check out the balls on France. Just like that and they're conducting airstream on Syria.
2015-11-15 21:35:03, Sun	OUTBOX	Airstrikes, nor airstream.
2015-11-15 21:35:26, Sun	INBOX	Yrah, but, France. They're probably dispensing leaflets with insults.
2015-11-16 23:15:36, Mon	OUTBOX	Sorry been having to restart to get coverage everybday. \U0001f621
2015-11-16 23:17:21, Mon	INBOX	Sent. \n\nAnd I know. These are awful. I'm willing to bet it's the software we put on there.
2015-11-19 11:50:48, Thu	INBOX	:(I'm sorry. \n\nYou could do what a third of ogc does and just nap in your office... ;)
2015-11-24 14:10:35, Tue	INBOX	Boo. Going alone to Peets. :(\n\nGood news other than Conf call with OTD at 11 and lunch with Bill at noon, I'm free...
2015-11-26 00:20:54, Thu	OUTBOX	Spent about two hours shooting the sh*t with [redacted] today. Was a nice time. The problem with [redacted] is he is just so damn likeable...
2015-11-26 00:26:05, Thu	OUTBOX	Hey have you told [redacted] that you're likely about to join the ses? You should. [redacted] will be very proud. \U0001f60a
2015-11-26 18:17:00, Thu	OUTBOX	Have you told him about work yet? I'm going to be very angry if you don't. \U0001f621

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-11-26 19:30:00, Thu	INBOX	C) not yet.
2015-11-28 22:38:23, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] And what does [redacted] have to say?
2015-11-28 22:39:54, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] just wanted to shoot the shit. Talked about [redacted] and everyone leaving, catching hell about trying to get in to his place in CT, etc
2015-11-29 13:18:26, Sun	INBOX	And my unet password expired, this is buzzing every 15 minutes saying login failure. Highly annoying. Also aggravating because I keep thinking it's you...\U0001f636
2015-11-30 13:16:26, Mon	INBOX	Yay. \u263a\n\nJust heard from [redacted] D is coming down at 11:30, so won't be able to leave for lunch until noon.
2015-11-30 22:22:26, Mon	INBOX	So IOD Ops 2 SC just posted as well....
2015-11-30 22:32:42, Mon	OUTBOX	You're telling me. \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636
2015-11-30 22:36:37, Mon	INBOX	You didn't say anything!!\U0001f636
2015-12-01 22:31:52, Tue	INBOX	Sent you an article on Gmail
2015-12-01 22:40:41, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Talk about \U0001f61d\U0001f61d\U0001f61d\U0001f61d!
2015-12-01 23:05:11, Tue	INBOX	So there's my serious proposal: figure out when you can and want to go, and I'll set it up...
2015-12-01 23:05:38, Tue	INBOX	'Cause that's not future doing it wrong insurance....
2015-12-01 23:52:33, Tue	INBOX	Sorry. And got a 20 minute call from Gregg to come work for him and "run the Bureau's 140 airplane Air Force."\n\nThen dealing with stupid doj hesitancy to get us SW
2015-12-02 13:21:14, Wed	INBOX	\U0001f636\n\nHeading into sioc for 8:30. Hit me on email or I will check back here as soon as I'm done.
2015-12-02 23:16:15, Wed	INBOX	Omg have a [redacted] story. Let me know if you can talk. It can also wait until tomorrow.
2015-12-02 23:27:05, Wed	INBOX	Also remind me about Harbachs replacement
2015-12-02 23:45:42, Wed	OUTBOX	He's not a mountain man looking guy, is he? \n\nAnd sorry, just got home.
2015-12-02 23:47:44, Wed	OUTBOX	Harbach's replacement. Saw [redacted] and Rybicki with a huge strange man today. No introductions were made, but he was clearly with them.
2015-12-02 23:49:15, Wed	INBOX	Hmm. No, I don't think so. But that discussion not for here. [redacted] so I can imsg, too.
2015-12-02 23:50:04, Wed	OUTBOX	So who is his replacement? What do you know?
2015-12-02 23:50:52, Wed	INBOX	I just told you, not for here! \u263a\n\nAnd cone of silence, obviously.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-02 23:51:25, Wed	OUTBOX	So imsg me then!
2015-12-03 12:13:11, Thu	INBOX	Hi there. \U0001f60a Same here. Woke at 5, realized I'm at Quantico until 10 tonight, and went back to sleep. Of course now I'm scrambling.
2015-12-04 21:44:45, Fri	INBOX	If you are, Moffa's job goes Monday - any plug for him would be appreciated.
2015-12-04 23:36:20, Fri	INBOX	And to confirm - you said it was ok to forward to [redacted]your email to Andy?
2015-12-05 00:10:20, Sat	INBOX	Done; check email. Thank you. [redacted]
2015-12-05 00:31:18, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] And I cannot think of a more qualified person. You will be awesome. \u263a\n\nAnd I forgot to mention, Randy is taking [redacted] upstairs with him. [redacted]
2015-12-05 00:35:23, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] And thank you. \U0001f636 \U0001f636 \U0001f636 I'm suddenly really excited. Scared, but very happy. \U0001f60a
2015-12-05 00:36:35, Sat	INBOX	Don't be scared. I get it, but you're SO ready. You've already done the job, and worked with him...
2015-12-05 00:39:45, Sat	OUTBOX	It's not the job I'm scared about, but I am really scared about balance.
2015-12-05 00:46:08, Sat	INBOX	Make a pact more serious than the dedication [redacted] Andy, I'll be here every day going 110%, and I'm going to want to stay late every night, but you MUST make me leave each day by x:xx.
2015-12-05 00:46:47, Sat	INBOX	I get it. I would be, too. [redacted]
2015-12-05 01:12:49, Sat	OUTBOX	Re your first, I just don't know. Of course Andy will be fine, it's me I'm worried about. It might work if I have the discipline to work [redacted] but it's soooooo hard. And yeah, there goes [redacted]
2015-12-05 01:14:26, Sat	INBOX	I'm glad. [redacted] Would there be an expectation that you would travel with Andy? That you wouldn't?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-05 01:15:30, Sat	INBOX	Oh, I meant exactly that - that Andy would be fine [redacted] I meant youd have to apply that discipline to keeping a work schedule.
2015-12-05 01:15:41, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:17:12, Sat	OUTBOX	No clue re travel. I doubt it. Maybe if I really wanted to he'd do me the favor, but mostly you don't need a lawyer for anything.\n\nAnd last time with andy was different. [redacted]
2015-12-05 01:18:23, Sat	INBOX	A) I think that's right. And consistent with past practice. \nB) that's exactly my point.
2015-12-05 01:25:13, Sat	INBOX	Omg sent an email to Jon I meant to send to you. Not bad except for the odd emoticon. \U0001f62e\U0001f62e\U0001f62e
2015-12-05 01:26:53, Sat	OUTBOX	Just blame fat fingers
2015-12-05 01:27:05, Sat	OUTBOX	Send it!
2015-12-05 01:27:26, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:28:28, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:32:05, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:32:32, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:34:47, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:38:39, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 01:40:38, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-05 13:59:08, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] hope [redacted] comes, too. She stayed yesterday for a Cyber guy that showed up 45 minutes late (and that we cancelled on due to end of day meetings). Hope that didn't keep her from leaving as early as she wanted to. And CyD is WILDLY disfunctional. I mean really bad. They can do individual investigations but there is NO coherent program management. And this whole Strat/Tac model has just served to further balkanize their efforts. I mean it's REALLY bad.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-05 14:03:58, Sat	OUTBOX	Don't know much about CyD, really. Haven't worked with them since I was a prosecutor.\n\nLots of socializing, but all constantly accompanied,
2015-12-05 15:35:10, Sat	INBOX	Also, had a dark moment of not being able to go to sleep last night, thinking I wouldn't get the job and having to save my pride by stepping down if that happened...
2015-12-05 15:40:44, Sat	OUTBOX	You're going to get the job. Randy made that clear, for like the 100th time again yesterday. And truly, if something truly freakish happens there are a) other jobs, and b) you love being an agent and can always do casework. Not a sole who works with you would fault you being you being totally wronged and saying f it, I'm going back to street work. But truly, stop worrying. You're going to get the job.
2015-12-05 15:42:17, Sat	INBOX	It didn't feel that way at 10:50 last night...lots of well, what if puts in and talks to Bill, etcs...
2015-12-05 15:44:04, Sat	OUTBOX	That would be a grave injustice and it would seriously suck. But you'd get through it, people would know it was utter bs, life would go on, and you'd be stronger for it.
2015-12-05 15:48:33, Sat	INBOX	I suppose. I am very good at reveling in insecurity. Did I send you response to my email last night?
2015-12-05 15:52:27, Sat	INBOX	It's always nice to have outside confirmation of what you think. Of course, hardly an unbiased observer.
2015-12-06 18:36:17, Sun	OUTBOX	
2015-12-06 18:42:15, Sun	INBOX	
2015-12-07 19:28:40, Mon	INBOX	Moffa is on standby for his job interview. If he's not done I'm going to have to go at 3:10 or so. :(
2015-12-07 19:43:33, Mon	OUTBOX	Np. I don't expect it will be done. But thank you for coming.
2015-12-07 21:16:42, Mon	INBOX	I have to go get Jim around 5:15.
2015-12-07 21:18:11, Mon	INBOX	Sorry was calling to see if I could catch you walking back. Headed back in to SIOC

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-08 13:06:47, Tue	INBOX	There's about to be an interview on NPR that I know is going to irritate me a Muslim leader who says it's not their community's job to look after itself because they're not quote law enforcement quote
2015-12-08 13:18:01, Tue	INBOX	Heading in to hq soon. Will reach out after 8:30
2015-12-08 14:14:55, Tue	INBOX	Hi there. Done with mtg.
2015-12-09 14:17:51, Wed	INBOX	K I'm going to go back to sioc hit me on lync ,
2015-12-09 22:51:03, Wed	INBOX	Hi. Leaving now
2015-12-09 22:51:48, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm still walking over.
2015-12-09 22:53:25, Wed	INBOX	Yeah saw from lync you left late. And stupid stood you up
2015-12-09 22:53:47, Wed	OUTBOX	As always...
2015-12-09 22:55:32, Wed	INBOX	Well he's an idiot. \U0001f636 I'm at Centrale
2015-12-10 02:10:16, Thu	INBOX	And in the "I'm awful" category, just explained I drew the intervening week and will likely have a ton tondo, including overnight (s).
2015-12-10 15:44:53, Thu	OUTBOX	This is painful. Annual ethics training.
2015-12-10 15:58:46, Thu	OUTBOX	Oh boy. Sec D is doing a mock court for their training. Scripts and everything. Apparently they have waaaaaaaaaaaay too much time on their hands.
2015-12-10 16:08:54, Thu	OUTBOX	Oh good, now is doing a CI brief on the OPM breach.
2015-12-10 16:17:59, Thu	INBOX	Who the f is It sounds HORRIBLE
2015-12-10 16:18:17, Thu	OUTBOX	Sec D guy.
2015-12-10 16:19:34, Thu	OUTBOX	Now eap training. This is so painful. Stressors over the holiday season? You have got to be kidding me. This is a considerable waste of time.
2015-12-10 20:09:38, Thu	INBOX	You should start shouting at them. Liven things up. ;)
2015-12-11 13:53:48, Fri	INBOX	And damn, Bowdich came across poorly in the most recent press conference...
2015-12-11 14:01:44, Fri	OUTBOX	That sucks. I've thought he's otherwise been doing a pretty good job.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-11 14:15:09, Fri	INBOX	Yeah I guess. There seems to be a very conscious decision from the D down to manage expectations, which I guess is good, but it's now threatened by appearing that we're losing our sense of urgency. [redacted] Probably driving in 20 or so. Going by WF on the way in.
2015-12-11 17:58:54, Fri	INBOX	Just walked into JEH behind [redacted] - one of my pet peeves - actually care about your fellow man enough to push open/hold the door for the person behind you rather than just scooting thru as it closes. \U0001f612\n\nGuess they don't teach that at Aspen...
2015-12-11 22:11:16, Fri	INBOX	And double sigh. Now I'm going to stop pathetically sitting in the break room. Going back into SIOC, so won't get texts. Have email, of course.
2015-12-11 22:15:42, Fri	INBOX	Obama just gave us a half day off on the 24th.
2015-12-16 20:37:31, Wed	OUTBOX	Hey I'm done. Going to start walking back, but may be with a colleague.
2015-12-16 20:44:06, Wed	INBOX	K. Just got done with Conf call, walking in to wrap
2015-12-16 21:00:59, Wed	OUTBOX	Obviously. Meet up before I go back to my ofc? Walking in now.
2015-12-17 10:02:31, Thu	INBOX	Aaaaand up early. To much exciting and important running through my head. Sent you a draft of email to Bill; I'd appreciate your review and comments. \n\nGotta get in and go through material for briefing. Shouldn't be hard but want to get my head around it. [redacted]
2015-12-17 11:44:54, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] See you in a while. Your 9 in cpc?
2015-12-17 11:46:24, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes, 5096 or something. Everyone and their mother going. [redacted] think Moffat too. Whatever.\n\nEmail looks perfect. Could substitute distribution for devolution, but both work. Perfect tone, otherwise totally excellent.
2015-12-17 11:49:05, Thu	INBOX	\U0001f636 thanks. [redacted] n\nWow. Yeah, Jon's analysts have been the ones going to the meetings, I think. And/or Dina got him involved. Not sure if he'll go since we have 10 with D.
2015-12-17 12:04:55, Thu	OUTBOX	Ah, forgot about that re jon. \n\nK, gotta hustle. Ttyl.
2015-12-17 22:10:17, Thu	INBOX	Almost to jeh...let me know if you need that ride

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-18 21:39:14, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]\n\nIn answer to your Lync question, no contact. Didn't pick up call to work or cell, and no response to my VMs on both. Whatever. [redacted]
2015-12-18 22:00:08, Fri	OUTBOX	Missed the cute Christmas singing, but just couldn't get out of the office until 4:00. Oh well. [redacted] No worries about [redacted] I didn't show her the one in the box, I just didn't want you to show the actual ornament. No problems there.
2015-12-18 22:17:40, Fri	INBOX	Sorry, we were (/are) battling ces on stupid sh*t. [redacted]
2015-12-18 22:28:12, Fri	OUTBOX	Why doubly sour? Bc you had to fight with ces? [redacted]
2015-12-18 22:52:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Wow, I hadn't heard this.\n\nSystemic Change Needed After Faulty Times Article http://nyti.ms/22ef11a
2015-12-18 23:01:05, Fri	INBOX	Sigh. Never argue with a lawyer. ;)\n\nReading the mea culpa nyt piece...
2015-12-19 00:23:00, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2015-12-19 00:27:19, Sat	INBOX	
2015-12-19 00:30:38, Sat	OUTBOX	
2015-12-20 19:04:54, Sun	INBOX	Want to give [redacted] her gift before she goes and hit HH tomorrow eve.
2015-12-20 22:55:16, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted] Just want to email [redacted] now to let her know that I need to take some leave tomorrow. [redacted]
2015-12-20 23:20:11, Sun	INBOX	Still doing something to keep them occupied. [redacted]
2015-12-20 23:20:37, Sun	INBOX	I will be in tomorrow mid-afternoon ish
2015-12-20 23:37:53, Sun	OUTBOX	Oh right, forgot they're off tomorrow.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-20 23:42:29, Sun	INBOX	Yeah and they slip into slugitude without oversight \U0001f612
2015-12-20 23:44:34, Sun	OUTBOX	Didn't you say you had to be in the ofc for something on Monday?
2015-12-20 23:53:24, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] I hope not otherwise....
2015-12-20 23:54:36, Sun	INBOX	Oh sh*t. And the meeting between the Office of Partner Engagement and CD at 10.
2015-12-20 23:54:53, Sun	INBOX	I can miss that without a big problem
2015-12-21 00:01:21, Mon	OUTBOX	So why not switch it around? [redacted] Go into the office then head back home midday.
2015-12-21 00:58:52, Mon	INBOX	What's better for you?
2015-12-21 01:19:12, Mon	OUTBOX	What an utter idiot.\n\nAn article to share: Donald Trump on Putin: \u2018Nobody has proven that he\u2019s killed anyone\u2019\nDonald Trump on Putin: \u2018Nobody has proven that he\u2019s killed anyone\u2019\nhttp://wapo.st/1PjfMkv
2015-12-21 01:47:08, Mon	INBOX	No doubt. \U0001f612\n\nOk to gmail some pics?
2015-12-21 01:57:34, Mon	OUTBOX	Yeah right no blech! Especially the last, likely initiated by her... \U0001f61d\U0001f61d\U0001f61d\U0001f61d\U0001f61d
2015-12-21 18:09:20, Mon	INBOX	At hq..dropping off [redacted] present
2015-12-21 18:19:52, Mon	INBOX	Done. Just did TWO things to your office. \n\nThats what you get for your long executive lunches.... :D
2015-12-22 01:44:42, Tue	INBOX	Serious question, is that a bad thing? \n\nAlso, remind me best quote ever from [redacted] at his SSA meeting
2015-12-22 15:46:44, Tue	OUTBOX	Ho boy. We are SUPER early. Been wandering the 7th floor for like 20 minutes.
2015-12-22 16:50:40, Tue	INBOX	Wow...there's a pretty cool hallway that I think may be the Secretary's corridor. AS [redacted] couldn't get Giacalone in. \n\nIs there a snackbar?
2015-12-22 16:59:03, Tue	OUTBOX	Yup, we saw it, though we didn't try to get in, obviously.\n\nAnd jesus, we need thr next section chief engaged, and frankly the dad. Those folks care about rank, and we are definitely not sending the right level folks.
2015-12-22 17:29:29, Tue	INBOX	Sounds about right...
2015-12-22 18:31:17, Tue	OUTBOX	And [redacted] with with me now. \U0001f621

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-23 11:59:48, Wed	INBOX	And I'm sorry, all these troubles because of the move from Treasury to DHS? That's why all these senior managers with 15+ years are getting DUIs and not enforcing any rules? That suddenly sprang up over night?
2015-12-23 12:47:40, Wed	OUTBOX	Jim cancelled lunch. May be getting coffee at 11 with him, he offered but I think he was just being nice. Will let you know.
2015-12-23 12:52:15, Wed	INBOX	No, I'm driving in. I have no desire to spend anymore time on this bullshit.\n\nOf course I'm thrilled g that your lunch is not open. I'm sorry you don't get to see Jim, but selfishly, I'm happy.
2015-12-23 12:58:16, Wed	OUTBOX	Meeting him for coffee at 11. Other than 2:00 with moffa, I'm free.
2015-12-23 14:47:46, Wed	OUTBOX	You want a coffee? I'm going to skip since I'm meeting Jim at 11
2015-12-23 14:47:57, Wed	INBOX	\U0001f621 stupid [redacted]
2015-12-23 17:02:32, Wed	OUTBOX	Your call. Am done with jim, where should I meet you?
2015-12-23 17:07:04, Wed	INBOX	JG here don't come in
2015-12-27 21:41:25, Sun	OUTBOX	I think the doj attorney in that story is with ccips. His name is familiar. \n\nThen I read this other article. Man, people are stupid.\n\nhttps://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2015/11/05/maryland-family-faces-harsh-criticism-after-adopted-daughter-featured-in-american-girl-magazine/?tid=hybrid_experimentrandom_3_na
2015-12-27 23:36:45, Sun	INBOX	And re the article, yeah, Manassas, shocker. Same people who elected that knucklehead [redacted] ran against....
2015-12-28 18:26:14, Mon	OUTBOX	It's sick, but I really like policy issues. And having tight deadlines. Sigh...
2015-12-28 19:18:11, Mon	INBOX	Is that what doj wanted?
2015-12-28 19:18:32, Mon	INBOX	You get all our oconus lures approved? ;)
2015-12-28 19:19:41, Mon	OUTBOX	No, it's just implicated a much bigger policy issue. I'll explain later. Might even be able to use it as pretext for a call... :)
2015-12-29 13:22:48, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] Email from [redacted] further aggravates me.
2015-12-29 13:23:26, Tue	OUTBOX	Obviously you can't know anything about the cpc issue yet.
2015-12-29 13:30:01, Tue	INBOX	Got it. See my response.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2015-12-29 14:03:50, Tue	INBOX	Truly, wouldn't worry too much about involvement. A) she's in your chain of command (and I know attys are much more flat than agents about that) B) realistically not anything you're going to be able to do about it C) you're out of office without access to high side D) not hurting you (other than your ego). You're plenty talented. Everyone knows that. And you want to own your issue. Thats good and normal and everyone knows that, too.\n\nI know you know all this. Just trying to help you not let this be aggravating... \U0001f60a
2015-12-29 14:07:21, Tue	OUTBOX	Yup, nothing I can do about it. It's aggravating because I'm not one of the lumpies so I can handle my own sh*t.
2015-12-29 14:13:15, Tue	INBOX	I'm certain knows that.
2015-12-29 14:13:23, Tue	INBOX	Andy knows that
2015-12-29 14:13:52, Tue	OUTBOX	All the more aggravating then.
2015-12-29 14:17:34, Tue	INBOX	Look at the big picture though. It's less aggravating. You're fine.
2015-12-29 14:20:48, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, when Mark finally finds a job 19 months from now. \U0001f612
2015-12-29 14:35:09, Tue	INBOX	Well you can blow the sh*t out of some CP stuff in the meantime. ;)\n\n(I'm NOT letting you be cranky thus morning - can you tell? Yes, I know I'm wildly ineffective so far...)
2015-12-29 14:45:27, Tue	OUTBOX	So long as you realize it...
2015-12-29 16:52:04, Tue	INBOX	Just ran into leaving some meeting with
2015-12-29 20:21:43, Tue	OUTBOX	Hey heads up I called your desk but someone answered. I didn't leave a message but just fyi in case someone says a woman called for you but didn't leave a name.
2015-12-29 21:03:16, Tue	INBOX	K. Just got done briefing Bill. Scheduled for 1 hour, took two. How long is your flight delayed?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-01-02 14:49:01, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]nI feel like my calendar is pretty full this week, have a vague sense of "better busy yourself up this week" if I recall correctly. I'll probably just go in and check email, but I'm not sure there's much else fun to do down there.
2016-01-02 15:12:55, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]\U0001f636\n\nHigher up work people (the ones you mentioned, Mark and JG, or Randy, for that matter) wouldn't. And yes, I'm TOTALLY the same. I may unnecessarily care what people think way more than you. I'm trying to get a comfort with sense of self where I don't care. It's not so much on the professional work side (I know I'm good enough that I can be confident and humble there) buy on the interpersonal side.
2016-01-04 23:22:16, Mon	OUTBOX	One sec. In with John g
2016-01-04 23:22:34, Mon	INBOX	Hob-knobbing on 0? ;)
2016-01-04 23:23:50, Mon	OUTBOX	No. Briefing on cpc issue
2016-01-04 23:24:45, Mon	INBOX	Whatever. Can't fool me. :D\n\nCall me though. Have a work question to ask you.
2016-01-04 23:38:50, Mon	OUTBOX	Sorry still free to talk in 5?
2016-01-04 23:39:33, Mon	INBOX	Sheesh. Yes. \U0001f636
2016-01-05 00:06:13, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-01-06 23:07:34, Wed	OUTBOX	Andy called. All good. [redacted]
2016-01-06 23:13:21, Wed	OUTBOX	And of course I want to know what Bill wanted.
2016-01-07 02:32:48, Thu	INBOX	[redacted]Guess we should wait until job is official official. [redacted]
2016-01-07 03:05:50, Thu	INBOX	Oh. Ok. I'll take it. What happens when you actually get the job? :D` [redacted]

2016-01-07 03:08:02, Thu	OUTBOX	Guess we'll find out. ;)
2016-01-07 23:44:24, Thu	INBOX	Hope you have a peaceful evening. Happy to talk if you talk with Andy but of course can wait. In that event I'll see if I can live up to my resolution not to hound you tomorrow.
2016-01-07 23:45:16, Thu	OUTBOX	He hasn't called, but in my sheepishness, I told him tomorrow was fine too.
2016-01-07 23:46:53, Thu	INBOX	And respecting your family time (and probably driving you crazy) he'll wait...
2016-01-07 23:48:00, Thu	OUTBOX	He just texted me to hit him up tomorrow, so that's good.
2016-01-07 23:57:07, Thu	INBOX	Ha. \n\nProbably right. \n\nJust call him now? J*sus, get it over with.
2016-01-07 23:57:26, Thu	INBOX	At a minimum he's got the drive home.
2016-01-08 00:15:11, Fri	OUTBOX	No, he said tomorrow. I need to respect that. It's okay. I just meant it wouldn't help/hurt my sleep any more or less than it usually does.
2016-01-08 00:23:11, Fri	INBOX	It's just you have a very ready stable of people to schedule into the void to stay busy. Me, not so much.
2016-01-08 00:25:42, Fri	OUTBOX	You do as well. You're just not tapping them. Moffa, RJ, Boone, etc etc etc.\n\nAnd soon, very soon, you will be just as busy as I am and only able to run out for a quick bite between meetings. It's going to be okay.
2016-01-08 17:48:49, Fri	INBOX	I am staring at Jim Bakker, very animated, eating lunch at a window table at pq. Can't tell who the gentleman is that he's eating with.
2016-01-08 18:50:56, Fri	OUTBOX	I can find out...
2016-01-08 19:28:26, Fri	INBOX	Hi. News from Bill...
2016-01-08 22:11:48, Fri	INBOX	Good lord I'm dying! Hurry up!!!!! \U0001f636
2016-01-09 00:10:17, Sat	INBOX	going APOPLECTIC over the idea of us calling
2016-01-09 01:02:50, Sat	OUTBOX	D) I'm not kidding, I feel like punching in the face. You're now being too nice. You can inform him ahead of time or after the fact of your investigative steps, but you're not asking permission to speak to someone at DOJ for fuck's sake. God I hate them.
2016-01-09 01:17:47, Sat	INBOX	D) finally talked to him. I will dial back my judgment, he found stuff which makes it less likely we need to talk to her. Will explain next week.

2016-01-09 15:49:58, Sat	INBOX	And I had a sudden sad and true realization. You're going to leave the Bu after Andy leaves. As hard as it was to go back to ogc last time, how do you ever go do something outside of (and below) that level? \n\nAnd that makes me deeply sad. \U0001f61f
2016-01-09 15:54:48, Sat	OUTBOX	I know That's what I've been trying to tell you. Let's pretend for a moment that they didn't all hate me. Even without that, it would be hard to go back. But with it, it's pretty impossible. I won't be gone forever, you never know.
2016-01-09 15:55:43, Sat	INBOX	Damn right if I make it to DD I'll bring you back as GC.
2016-01-12 22:33:58, Tue	INBOX	THAT SUCKS!!!!!\n\nKeep your head up though, it will work itself out in a few months. Plus remember, job is going to be AWESOME.
2016-01-12 23:17:45, Tue	OUTBOX	I know. It will. It just sucks when it's otherwise so undeserving. [redacted]
2016-01-14 03:23:16, Thu	INBOX	And remind me what said about what she needs to do for herself - detail, special assistant, etc
2016-01-14 15:59:03, Thu	INBOX	Andy (he chaired it, he was there), Mark, Randy,
2016-01-14 15:59:25, Thu	OUTBOX	Wow that that was quick
2016-01-14 15:59:26, Thu	INBOX	Others maybe offscreen but I didn't see.
2016-01-14 15:59:44, Thu	INBOX	15 minutes top. No idea how I did. Don't feel like I was a total idiot, so I guess that's good.
2016-01-14 15:59:56, Thu	INBOX	I know. Makes me worried too quick. ..
2016-01-14 16:00:08, Thu	INBOX	Of course they got started late so maybe they're hurrying.
2016-01-14 16:00:36, Thu	INBOX	Talked about figured that was something of personal interest and discomfort to four of them...
2016-01-14 16:00:43, Thu	OUTBOX	No chance. They have their decision. That's a good sign..
2016-01-15 10:53:29, Fri	OUTBOX	The Brutalism of Ted Cruz http://nyti.ms/1mSbi92
2016-01-15 11:55:15, Fri	OUTBOX	And I was thinking, don't you think the D will tell you in person, since you're meeting with him anyway? Ooh, I really hope he does.\U0001f60a\U0001f60a\U0001f60a
2016-01-15 12:00:45, Fri	OUTBOX	And oh holy sh*t, I forgot I had huge single source reporting that I was going to mention in the car! Remind me, though it may have to wait until this afternoon.
2016-01-15 12:09:12, Fri	INBOX	Ooh. Can you imsg it? I will tell you what I was going to imsg, scrambling to get out the door right now.\n\nAnd yeah, I thought about that with D. Don't know if it will travel that fast.
2016-01-15 12:12:10, Fri	OUTBOX	Nope, too much detail, better to tell. But it involves \U0001f60a

2016-01-15 23:23:16, Fri	OUTBOX	\n\nI will. \U0001f636
2016-01-16 22:09:48, Sat	INBOX	I'm getting aggravated with work. I need to realize that I'm not there, have a limited amount of the total info, and need to step back.
2016-01-16 22:11:34, Sat	OUTBOX	And it's not even going to be your job in about two weeks. Still, I'm sorry. Would it help put your mind at ease if you went in?
2016-01-16 22:12:48, Sat	INBOX	But it will be my job at HQ. No, I'm not going to achieve anything at work. If I were on the ground it might help but I'm not.
2016-01-17 01:14:23, Sun	INBOX	Oh. Yay. You may need to head into work on Mon for some unexpected issues on all this Iran stuff...
2016-01-17 21:59:38, Sun	OUTBOX	Hi. Just replied. That fox website has some amazing stuff.
2016-01-17 22:15:09, Sun	INBOX	Yes. Yes it does. Out for 5 if you want to email or imsg your favs....
2016-01-18 01:04:39, Mon	INBOX	Oh Jesus Carlin is on 60 Minutes. Talking about Chinese theft of trade secrets. may be on there, too. God almighty.
2016-01-18 01:30:00, Mon	INBOX	wasn't on it.
2016-01-18 03:13:35, Mon	INBOX	a freakshow
2016-01-18 03:14:59, Mon	OUTBOX	Yeah, that's what everyone says
2016-01-22 02:59:39, Fri	INBOX	Hey am I good to know that Jason is interested? He sent me a congrats email
2016-01-22 03:02:25, Fri	OUTBOX	I told him you got the job like not even an hour ago. :) I told him that you were looking, was definitely interested. I don't see why not.
2016-01-22 03:03:52, Fri	OUTBOX	Not that you were looking, but that you might be. Told him bc I didn't want him to foreclose a possible opportunity in case you had a job and it worked out. So yes, he can know we talked. Only makes sense.
2016-01-22 03:06:01, Fri	INBOX	He emailed me this afternoon. I told him i wanted to grab coffee.
2016-01-22 17:48:36, Fri	INBOX	F*cking marchers making traffic problems ....\U0001f621
2016-01-22 17:50:34, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, some extremely offensive video screens set up in front of dist ct. I truly hate these people. No support for the woman who actually has to spend the rest of her life rearing this child, but we care about "life." Assholes.
2016-01-22 17:52:59, Fri	INBOX	And literally I'm the last car thru 4 lights as they shut down Pennsylvania Ave. Hey, I have an idea! Snow emergency, cancel the permit

2016-01-23 14:48:41, Sat	INBOX	Anyway. Terry McAuliffe just said VA is focusing on primary roads today and tomorrow and will try and get to secondary roads on Mon. What that means for tertiary roads like mine I have no idea. \n\nOh, btw, most of the Rep candidates still say it's not clear climate change is real. \U0001f612
2016-01-24 21:38:51, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] My sense is stay in ogc. It's what Trisha wants - does JB has a preference? - and I'm guessing but not certain it will be easier from a HR Source admin perspective as well. And as long as they get plussed up fsl, they shouldn't care, right?
2016-01-24 21:53:27, Sun	OUTBOX	No, you misunderstand. I got this email, muckities from other agencies were on it, as were Trisha and Jim, but couldn't decide whether to forward it and went back and forth bc I didn't want to step on toes or overstep if Jim had already forwarded, but Jim also isn't great at checking email over the weekend so I ended up text andy rather than just forwarding the email to him to ask whether he had received it or not. If I'm not in ogc, I don't think I'll have the same what's my role, am I overstepping stress. I just really want to be called his special counsel and not just special assistant, and I'm not sure Jim will let me.
2016-01-24 21:57:26, Sun	INBOX	B) fortunately there will still be snow tomorrow. \nA) special counsel implies an ogc position, though, right? And would you get those emails if you weren't in OGC? Regardless, that worry about lane will resolve itself out once you get a chance to start working. One of those impossible to know now. But it will be fine. I promise.
2016-01-24 21:59:19, Sun	INBOX	Is your title that big a deal to you at the end of the day? Not saying it shouldn't be, just trying to understand where it ranks within your priorities.
2016-01-24 22:01:53, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm not sure I agree. If trisha's whole point of putting [redacted] here is to ensure more reliance on ogc, I'm not sure she's embrace me acting pretty independently, which is the only way I know how to be. Will forward a couple of emails - not a perfect example but maybe a little demonstrative. There are other "special counsels", the D's, one in OCA. I'm sure they're grandfathered, but I don't think Jim or especially trisha will want me to suggest I'm a lawyer if I'm not in ogc.
2016-01-24 22:05:23, Sun	OUTBOX	Pretty important to me, actually. Especially if I plan to leave the bureau, I want my title to reflect the work I'm doing. Wtf is a special assistant to the private sector? Chief of staff would be fine, but 1) that's not the job I'll be doing and 2) Rybicki has made pretty clear he's opposed to me using that title. I'm a lawyer, it's my identity, it's what I'd like to call myself.
2016-01-24 22:12:54, Sun	INBOX	Completely understand. So stay in OGC and be special counsel. Why does JB not want that? Particularly if that means they have some connection to your job? A lot of OGC are dummies but Jim and Trisha are not and you can work with both of them...

2016-01-24 22:13:55, Sun	INBOX	And you won't be COS...not worth fighting that for all the reasons you mention.
2016-01-24 22:14:41, Sun	INBOX	And you can act independently and have weekly meetings with her and/or Jim
2016-01-24 22:17:18, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm not sure you're following me. I imagine JB and TA WILL want me to stay in ogc. What I'm saying is I don't want to second guess or worry about whether I am stepping on their toes, especially trisha bc she's so hard to read, and is still developing her relationships with our execs, especially andy.
2016-01-24 22:21:59, Sun	INBOX	Oh, I've got you. I don't have an easy answer, particularly if you want the special counsel title. If you do, I think you likely need to be in OGC, and you're going to have to feel out the relationships. JB will be much easier than Trisha.
2016-01-24 22:23:32, Sun	INBOX	Because in some ways you are going to step on Trisha's toes. But I think if Andy is clear with what he wants (amd i think he will be) that will help tremendously.
2016-01-24 22:24:48, Sun	OUTBOX	Yes, she is entirely my worry. I've done this job with Jim as GC, and he is the least egotistical and most secure/non- threatened guy. We get each other. It's trisha who will feel threatened. Plus woman thing.
2016-01-24 22:25:52, Sun	OUTBOX	I guess re Andy. But he respects hierarchy a lot too.
2016-01-24 22:37:47, Sun	INBOX	Well but HE wants you to work for him. So let him take the lead on role and expectations, and have that dialogue with JB, maybe without you there.
2016-01-25 02:16:32, Mon	INBOX	Hi. Been thinking a lot about you, your new job, jb, and Trisha. No spectacular insights, but looking forward to talking to you about it.
2016-01-25 03:43:31, Mon	OUTBOX	Oh good, me too, because I'm stressed. [redacted]
2016-01-25 12:02:13, Mon	OUTBOX	Hi there. Appreciate your email. If history is any guide, Jim will include me on most emails to the DD, so I realize that will help. How to navigate Trisha, especially if I'm still tied to ogc, and especially with [redacted] in his position (and presumably still TIGHT with her), just has me stressed.\n\nAnd that's cool re [redacted] I totally want to hear that story. And sheesh, SO military that both days he's sending emails by 5:30. Please do not share, obviously.
2016-01-25 23:52:15, Mon	OUTBOX	By Adam Goldman, no surprise. \n\nAn article to share: How David Petraeus avoided felony charges and possible prison time\nHow David Petraeus avoided felony charges and possible prison time\nhttp://wapo.st/1Nvlhph
2016-01-26 00:11:44, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] You need to read the article. A lot of inside information in there. And jesus, why is [redacted] on every big case?! [redacted] just not that good!
2016-01-26 00:13:35, Tue	INBOX	Yes, and i did. Who's talking? [redacted] I'm guessing. But also [redacted]
2016-01-26 00:14:47, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes to both, but we also both know a soon to be departing exec happy to stick it to DOJ...

2016-01-26 00:15:46, Tue	INBOX	Yeah but was he that intimately involved? Was that on his watch? I guess the resolution was, right?
2016-01-26 00:16:29, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, just the end of it all.
2016-01-26 00:16:54, Tue	INBOX	And J*sus just pack it in and go home!
2016-01-26 00:19:36, Tue	OUTBOX	And remind me convo with e tdy vs permanent position. She agrees go permanent, thinks I'm right to be nervous about navigating TA.
2016-01-26 00:20:27, Tue	INBOX	Ooh. Def want to hear about that. How was her attitude about it?
2016-01-26 00:21:03, Tue	INBOX	If you weren't OGC and couldn't have special counsel title, what would you take? You sure JB wouldn't let you?
2016-01-26 00:22:11, Tue	INBOX	Not sure the ins and outs of position creation. Think Jon went thru that when working for Bob. I can ask him in a general, non attributable way.
2016-01-26 00:22:36, Tue	OUTBOX	Attitude about what? \n\nTA not thrilled about my keeping the title, not sure Jim will care. also suggested special advisor, which I could live with...
2016-01-26 00:23:07, Tue	OUTBOX	Don't ask yet. Will let you know.
2016-01-26 00:27:18, Tue	INBOX	attitude towards you about you going to work for Andy. Special Advisor is what all the RPO folks were to various ADs. I think it's for example. \n\nOh, I could bring it up in no way related to you. Have talked about it a few times already, just in the context of him and Randy.
2016-01-26 00:28:21, Tue	INBOX	Also, you notice looks good in that article?
2016-01-26 00:50:15, Tue	OUTBOX	Didn't see a pic.\n\nShe seemed genuinely supportive and wanting to help me resolve my conflict. Think she's fine with me working for Andy, obviously it's been known/expected to her since the beginning.
2016-01-26 00:52:25, Tue	OUTBOX	And what is there to talk about with Moffa? I'm not concerned about Andy's ability to get me a permanent gig with him. He's the DD. Plus he's been ADD, so he likely already knows what he needs to do.
2016-01-26 00:54:26, Tue	OUTBOX	Oh is characterized positively. Yeah, I noticed that. The likelihood that he was some strong advocate seems like revisitionist history.
2016-01-26 00:58:05, Tue	INBOX	Just the actual physical steps of creating a position. I know it can be done. Just the step 1 step 2 stuff.
2016-01-26 00:58:59, Tue	INBOX	Agreed re And makes me dislike all bitchy don't talk to the media implications.
2016-01-26 00:59:30, Tue	INBOX	Sorry if I missed you, this thing buzzed once with your last text. I hate these things...
2016-01-26 01:03:55, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, hold off for now re the position.\n\nRe suppose it could also be the usao. likes to tell people what they want to hear, could be they thought was on their side.

2016-01-26 01:07:18, Tue	INBOX	Maybe. You don't think [redacted] would talk?
2016-01-26 01:08:09, Tue	OUTBOX	I totally do! Just saying it's another possibility.
2016-01-27 23:39:46, Wed	INBOX	Of course I'm sitting here thinking about you and your new job and want to talk about it...
2016-01-27 23:48:21, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]\n\nAnd yes, realized I haven't yet discussed my ogc fsl issue at all with [redacted] Not being a lawyer is a fairly big deal. I need to do that tonight.\n\nAnd still nothing from Andy... \U0001f615
2016-01-28 00:18:13, Thu	INBOX	Oh god, that's horrible. I'm so sorry. \n\nAndy is super busy - I know it's no consolation, but he's sudden facing a three (or two and a half, with dmv trip) day week. It's going to be OK.
2016-01-28 00:19:13, Thu	OUTBOX	Yeah, I know. I get all of that. I just need 10 minutes to put my damn mind at rest.
2016-01-28 00:27:22, Thu	INBOX	I know. I truly do. And i know i cant say anything that's going to fix that.
2016-01-28 01:51:32, Thu	OUTBOX	Sigh. And Andy just texted me the following:\n\nSo sorry I missed this. Crazy day. Trying to move our lunch to Friday?\n\nI told him that [redacted] had told me and that I appreciated it very much. Sigh. Maybe one day I'll actually engage in a little less self-doubt...
2016-01-28 11:58:00, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] Supposed to meet Bill this morning at 9, trying to make it, not sure about his schedule or roads. [redacted] And yay on office. \U0001f636\n\nAnd was thinking Andy may be entirely consumed by Oregon thing right now. Mark was when I last briefed D, and they hadn't even gone overt yet....
2016-01-28 12:08:47, Thu	OUTBOX	I know, I know. He's super busy. Sounds like he and [redacted] had a good convo though, and now he's anxious (in a good way) to hear what we have to say. So hopefully lunch with him actually sticks tomorrow.
2016-01-28 12:58:50, Thu	INBOX	Unrelated, re [redacted] you think I should talk to [redacted] or [redacted] first? Or together?
2016-01-28 13:03:18, Thu	OUTBOX	Thank you. \U0001f636\n\nI think you should talk to [redacted] and [redacted] together first, and just recount what you intend to say. I mentioned what we had talked about to [redacted] when she came over, but only briefly. Then ask them whether you talk to [redacted] alone or with [redacted]
2016-01-28 13:06:53, Thu	INBOX	Ok thanks. \[redacted].
2016-01-29 00:41:27, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Did you milkshake with [redacted] Talked and prepped anyway? Are you sneaking in lunch tomorrow EVEN THOUGH YOU HAVE BEEN PROHIBITED FROM EATING?!?!?!? (or is that just Andy?)

2016-01-29 00:50:30, Fri	OUTBOX	We didn't get milkshake but we did prep our list, and we are going to sneak in lunch (no joke). Why is your day so full now?
2016-01-29 00:56:20, Fri	INBOX	Meeting [redacted] agents in town on some [redacted] investigation, CD all hands was earlier on snow day rescheduled for tomorrow. [redacted]
2016-01-29 14:07:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Remind me, I remember the Rybicki story and I have an andy car story.
2016-01-29 15:51:12, Fri	INBOX	Hi. I like my new job. \U0001f60a
2016-01-29 17:29:24, Fri	OUTBOX	Yay. And DD thing is at 1:00. Still in with andy.
2016-01-29 17:54:07, Fri	OUTBOX	Hey, just finished with andy, this is going to be great. \U0001f60a\n\nWalking down with [redacted] in 2, hopefully see you there.
2016-01-30 08:08:18, Sat	INBOX	Hi there. Wide, wide awake. 13,742 things to worry about in my new job. \U0001f61e Nothing like self-doubt in the dead of the night... [redacted]
2016-01-30 10:42:18, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] You were born to do this job. *I* have zero doubt. You're going to be amazing.
2016-01-30 12:10:58, Sat	INBOX	Sigh. I've got to figure out staffing. I need a squared away assistant SC, and that's assuming I can move along the current one. Plus UCs. [redacted] hasn't said anything, which is easy enough, I'll reach out to him, although he can be wishy washy about what he wants. \n\nAnyway. Hi. Doing it wrong, so I'll try and dial back now, having failed three and a half hours ago....
2016-01-30 12:13:34, Sat	OUTBOX	You are smart and good. People will want to work for you. \n\nAs.for Jason, he's wildly sensitive to hierarchy and people's time. I'm sure he's just waiting for you to reach out.
2016-01-30 12:41:09, Sat	INBOX	And hey, what was the upshot of where you're sitting for the next 30 days. Where you are now?
2016-01-30 12:46:32, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] \U0001f633\n\nStaying where I am for 30 days. I offered it, he was grateful bc the politics of space are super jacked up there right now.
2016-01-30 12:47:46, Sat	INBOX	Does he want the CMS room up there? Too late now?
2016-01-30 12:48:16, Sat	OUTBOX	Didn't ask bc it's too late now anyway.
2016-01-30 12:50:30, Sat	INBOX	And.God, other than the head of Partner engagement, get all those other assorted a holes out of there. ..Truly. Time to say, sorry, it's tight, and it's important. No, the CIO doesn't need to be there. Sorry [redacted] Shut up [redacted] This is where Rybicki could help. Be a COS - or gell, let the DCOS do it. But someone's got to be a heavy.
2016-01-30 12:51:13, Sat	INBOX	There are some hard calls here, but also some easy ones. Too bad, so sad. Got great space for you 100' this way...

2016-01-30 12:52:30, Sat	INBOX	And sorry [redacted] we need your "war room." \U0001f621\n\nYou KNOW that was a okay to make that HER office, right? Move her on to the zero?
2016-01-30 12:53:27, Sat	OUTBOX	Yeah, that's not going to happen. I just have to be gracious and patient. Not my strong suits, but I'll survive. \U0001f612
2016-01-30 12:56:51, Sat	INBOX	Oh, you can't say sh*t. At all. Andy will eventually become so exasperated about having to wait 5 minutes for you to walk down while all the worthless lumpies are RIGHT THERE that he'll blow his top and have someone do it.
2016-01-30 12:59:17, Sat	INBOX	Remind me to discuss interviews with you - who does certain ones
2016-01-30 13:06:47, Sat	OUTBOX	Interviews for what?
2016-01-30 13:08:14, Sat	OUTBOX	Oh, and you came up very briefly during chat with [redacted]nd andy. Remind me.
2016-01-30 13:09:32, Sat	INBOX	Will explain elsewhere. And a Q for you I'll send elsewhere. And what?!?!?!? Now I'm TOTALLY curious.
2016-01-30 13:18:28, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] \n\n Nothing big. Just talking about getting [redacted] his 15, being an agent came up, andy said to me I thought you were supposed to take care of this! I exclaimed that I tried, [redacted] said yeah, she and pete, and I told him how you and I would take turns harassing [redacted] He chuckled.
2016-01-31 04:06:13, Sun	OUTBOX	I know it is. I'll definitely be in at some point, have to consolidate comments for another [redacted] paper. Probably around 2:00? I will let you know as soon as I have a sense of it.
2016-01-31 18:12:48, Sun	OUTBOX	No, I can't bc the IOB I'm adjudication relates to a TS docket. And I need the application in front of me to explain what the order allowed, why it's an iob.
2016-02-03 00:34:54, Wed	INBOX	Also, fYI, I just hit up [redacted] and [redacted]bout the matter we talked about briefly just now. They owe me detail about what we're going to tell the D, & I wanted to remind them it was still outstanding for our brief on Thursday.
2016-02-03 00:36:11, Wed	INBOX	Just wanted you to be aware of it in case you brought it up with her and conversation, that it didn't seem too coincidental. In fact, I guess it's fine, because it really is coincidental. Great minds thinking alike.\U0001f636
2016-02-03 00:36:55, Wed	OUTBOX	It is, but I won't bring it up.
2016-02-03 00:50:33, Wed	OUTBOX	And I know who I'm going to ask about whether I should say something to Trisha - Jason Herring.
2016-02-03 01:13:08, Wed	INBOX	Good idea. Even with him in the Caribbean? Or when he gets back?
2016-02-03 01:27:19, Wed	OUTBOX	Will just email, say I have an interpersonal work question, not urgent.\n\nThought the more I think about it, the more I want to simply ask trisha to remove me from future requests, just have them come from her.

2016-02-03 01:29:11, Wed	INBOX	The problem with that is if whoever gets the tasking has questions, you want them to go to you. And if Trisha does that (cuts you out), it creates additional work for her to be the intermediary, right?\n\nAnd, F
2016-02-03 01:45:19, Wed	OUTBOX	I really do hate him. Of course I'm swirling around and around and around in my head about what to do.
2016-02-03 01:50:11, Wed	OUTBOX	I really truly hate He is good at nothing, ineffective at nearly everything he does, and phenomenally lacking in self-awareness.
2016-02-03 01:51:49, Wed	INBOX	I of course forgot it. Will need to ask when I'm not obviously on my phone. She didn't remember his last name...\n\nAnyway... is an ahole. Always will be. There is literally nothing you can do to change him or his opinion. And people realize he's a d*ck - so it truly becomes an issue of judging someone by their enemies. While it may drive you CRAZY, may be best simply to rise above this (never forget it) and take the higher road
2016-02-03 01:51:57, Wed	INBOX	Agreed. So why do you give him any power over you?
2016-02-03 01:53:19, Wed	INBOX	He is inconsequential. His opinion holds no value to anyone worth a damn. He is one of the unfortunate dregs of society, and the fact that he behaves this way towards you does nothing but speak well of you.
2016-02-03 01:53:39, Wed	INBOX	Haters gonna hate. Shake it off. ;)
2016-02-03 01:55:16, Wed	OUTBOX	Honest to god, I'm not this time. F him. The Deputy Director picked ME to work for him, and I goddamn earned it, and he will never be asked to manage anything important for the rest of his career at the FBI. The swirl is whether to say anything to trisha. Of course now I'm leaning back toward no...
2016-02-03 02:01:04, Wed	OUTBOX	Good summary of Not sure why they leave Snowden entirely out of it, but that's why that DB max schrems sued...
2016-02-03 02:02:21, Wed	INBOX	Lisa, that's all true. And if you want to rub his nose in it and destroy him, you can. This is not the moment. But honest to God I think that's the wrong choice. \n\nWhy do you think he's such a little prick? Exactly BECAUSE he will never be asked to manage anything important at the FBI. Feel sorry for him, not angry at him. He is displaying HIS weakness, his flaws, his shortcomings. Nothing else. Float past it unperturbed like the all star you are. Success is the best revenge.
2016-02-03 02:06:48, Wed	INBOX	And the higher you are, the more visible. The greater the number of fans. And the greater number of dB haters. This is a good baptism by fire. Because he's such an ass, hopefully it's easier to move past. If the thought of him gets you down, then think of the response you got from and Randy and John and Andy. He will never get that. Ever.
2016-02-03 02:07:54, Wed	OUTBOX	I know. I know, I know, I know. \U0001f636

2016-02-03 02:10:09, Wed	OUTBOX	Okay. I'm not going to say anything. I know this is going to spin out of control (I'd bet any amount of money that he is going to tell KDM, who is going to feel obligated to say something to trisha, who I hope and pray will have my back and not assume I've done something to bring it on myself).
2016-02-03 02:10:53, Wed	OUTBOX	God, it's very hard for me not to want to get in front of this.
2016-02-03 02:14:35, Wed	INBOX	Trisha knows you are imminently capable. She knows he's a d*ck. It will be ok.
2016-02-03 02:16:12, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes, but my reputation is that I have "sharp elbows." So yes, I'm capable, but she doesn't necessarily know whether I played a role in this going south.
2016-02-03 02:17:10, Wed	INBOX	One data point. She will have a thousand. And she already has many with you. \U0001f636 \U0001f636 \U0001f636
2016-02-03 02:17:47, Wed	INBOX	Kill him with kindness. You have far, far - wildly so - more power.
2016-02-03 02:17:58, Wed	INBOX	Why does HE bother you so?
2016-02-03 02:23:07, Wed	OUTBOX	They all do. It's not just him. Honestly, because I'm painted unfairly. And I KNOW it's because of jealousy and I KNOW there's nothing I can do about it. But my sense of fairness is as foundational a part of me as literally any single trait I can think of. It's why I'm in government, why public service is a calling for me. So I think it is just very hard for me to let go when something is unfair.
2016-02-03 02:52:37, Wed	INBOX	Yeah there's no good answer to the fairness thing. \n\nI lovehate him. I get it.
2016-02-03 02:52:59, Wed	INBOX	Well, mostly hate. Shame\U0001f61e
2016-02-03 12:24:26, Wed	INBOX	That sucks. I'm sorry. How are you feeling about [redacted] after a night of admittedly poor sleep?
2016-02-03 12:48:07, Wed	OUTBOX	I don't know. Whatever. Angry. Resolved to leave ogc after this. Probably not going to say anything and will just steam inside instead.
2016-02-03 12:55:42, Wed	INBOX	Well at a minimum, I think you should talk to Jason. Even if it doesn't change anything decision wise, it's another voice to confirm that you're doing the right thing, even if that's not particularly satisfying.
2016-02-04 00:37:26, Thu	INBOX	Just had a great convo with one of the two new agents that the section picked up today. I knew her from WFO, public corruption agent. She's very excited and told me that she wouldn't let me down and that I wouldn't regret it. So that makes me happy.\U0001f60a
2016-02-04 00:46:23, Thu	OUTBOX	Picked up as an ssa?
2016-02-04 00:48:25, Thu	OUTBOX	And I know you're super busy, but you need to spend some time down there with them every week or two. It's your responsibility to start identifying and cultivating the next generation of leaders in CD...

2016-02-04 00:53:18, Thu	INBOX	Yes. I had nothing to do with the pick, so glad she's good. Don't know the guy from NY but the unit chief likes him and he's done decent cases in NY, so that's good. Need to get some people who actually know our work, though.
2016-02-04 11:19:17, Thu	OUTBOX	I am really tired of these feckless international bodies having opinions about sh-t they truly know nothing about. \n\nBBC News: UN panel 'rules in Julian Assange's favour'\nUN panel 'rules in Julian Assange's favour' - http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-35490910
2016-02-04 11:39:26, Thu	INBOX	Add it to the list of why to hate the UN...I mean, c'mon. Thats infuriating.\n\nSorry about all the sick. Depending on when my 11 with DoJ and ead finishes, may be able to give you a ride.
2016-02-04 11:43:21, Thu	OUTBOX	It's just utter bs. HE IS NOT DETAINED THERE. He is CHOOSING to remain there bc he doesn't want to be arrested. Then he'd be goddamn detained. F-er.
2016-02-04 12:21:17, Thu	INBOX	And, to be clear, detained if he leaves because he allegedly raped someone. An alleged violent sexual assault.
2016-02-04 12:24:24, Thu	OUTBOX	Yes. Poor Julian. [redacted] Also two stories, remind me: 1) Andy's Porsche is parked in the garage (he doesn't want to drive it home until the roads are less nasty) so let's go find it. 2) Figured out why [redacted] s different - he's both very mature and wildly immature at the same time. Have the perfect story to demonstrate this, re Steinbach.
2016-02-05 00:06:36, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Just leaving, talked with JR just now and was able to answer Qs he had for D ssci tomorrow.
2016-02-05 13:16:43, Fri	INBOX	And damn these 12 hours days are ROUGH
2016-02-05 13:31:41, Fri	OUTBOX	It's good preparation for when you're DD. \U0001f60a
2016-02-05 17:33:53, Fri	INBOX	Only if you'll be the GC...
2016-02-05 17:34:41, Fri	INBOX	Or DGC. That would work, too
2016-02-05 23:23:22, Fri	INBOX	Have got a STORY for you. \U0001f620
2016-02-05 23:55:01, Fri	OUTBOX	What?!!
2016-02-06 00:04:32, Sat	INBOX	Work, but not for here. Agency F'ed uo big. Will get to Andy, prob Mon. Not telling you in that capacity, want to vent as a friend. Better to talk around it - how long are you at dinner? I can do a work call later or tomorrow....
2016-02-06 15:36:05, Sat	OUTBOX	Hee hee, Andy is funny. He sent me his gmail, and said "Don't sent me anything classified, especially TS/SAP. Thanks."

2016-02-09 00:18:58, Tue	OUTBOX	Could you resend that judicial watch thing please?
2016-02-09 00:22:10, Tue	INBOX	Is your mailbox full or something? My resend attempt is hanging in the outbox
2016-02-09 00:22:45, Tue	OUTBOX	Crap. Could be.
2016-02-09 00:23:31, Tue	INBOX	Just sent a third time. Looks like it went thru
2016-02-09 00:23:57, Tue	OUTBOX	Got it. Thank you.
2016-02-09 00:24:32, Tue	INBOX	Not a big deal re the letter, I can give you background on discussion about it between D and JB if you want. Was during the second to last D brief
2016-02-09 01:34:37, Tue	INBOX	Really interesting convo with [redacted] from edva. Remind me to tell you.
2016-02-09 02:21:19, Tue	INBOX	He was an associate deputy director. Because we let those assholes into our organization without reciprocity. Because it's so great for us. Witness what you're watching. Thanks [redacted]
2016-02-09 02:22:01, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] talking like [redacted] one of us. It's offensive.
2016-02-09 02:24:40, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] a douche. Another win for Kortan and the OPA machine...
2016-02-09 12:09:42, Tue	OUTBOX	I Miss Barack Obama http://nyti.ms/1moVWIF\n\nHaven't been thrilled with him, but David Brooks is right.
2016-02-09 12:12:13, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] [redacted]n\nSanctions Lifted, American Tourists Head to Iran http://nyti.ms/1LbGwxR
2016-02-09 12:58:43, Tue	OUTBOX	Okay and now I'm sick to my stomach. Andy is having us meet at 915 to talk about the D's brief yesterday.
2016-02-09 13:00:10, Tue	INBOX	Lisa - it's going to be OK. Who's meeting - just the two of you?
2016-02-09 13:00:26, Tue	OUTBOX	Everyone who was there minus [redacted]
2016-02-09 13:01:35, Tue	OUTBOX	With a disclaimer at the bottom that it was mandatory and no substitutions.
2016-02-09 13:02:06, Tue	INBOX	So why are you sick to your stomach? If he had any issue with what you did, he'd talk to you alone...
2016-02-09 13:09:41, Tue	OUTBOX	Could be a finger wag for all of us? Or me and Mike, but didn't want to just single us out?
2016-02-09 13:10:46, Tue	OUTBOX	Me, baker, Steinbach, beers, [redacted] and [redacted] What else is it?
2016-02-09 13:27:06, Tue	INBOX	Finish arguing out what you should have but couldn't because it was in front of the D. Worst case (and I think it's unlikely), he says hey let's get the debate done BEFORE we prep the D. Even that's not bad.
2016-02-09 13:27:26, Tue	INBOX	And [redacted]? Sheesh.

2016-02-09 13:29:41, Tue	OUTBOX	I should have said something to him yesterday about knowing I misplayed it.
2016-02-09 17:03:47, Tue	INBOX	It's going to be ok. You're in the club.
2016-02-09 23:51:22, Tue	INBOX	And what makes me really angry about that Apple thing? The fact that Tim Cook plays such the privacy advocate. Yeah, jerky, your entire OS is designed to track me without me even knowing it.
2016-02-09 23:59:59, Tue	OUTBOX	I know. Hypocrite.
2016-02-10 00:02:58, Wed	INBOX	And ha, I had mine already turned off. Apparently I'm paranoid.
2016-02-10 00:06:16, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-02-11 00:15:37, Thu	INBOX	Oh, and remind me to talk to you about talking to Jim Baker about David.
2016-02-12 00:53:37, Fri	INBOX	And remind me Trisha (and I don't know who else) had the idea of [redacted] sitting in on all these final interviews. Apparently she briefed Jim and they decided no. Rubbed me the wrong way - if we're going to throw a third FBI person in there, put me in there, as the SESer, much like an SAC might participate.
2016-02-12 00:54:01, Fri	INBOX	Or at least ask the investigative team rather than being the good idea faries from on high
2016-02-12 01:25:51, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, that's fair. You should say something politely to trisha. [redacted]
2016-02-12 01:33:52, Fri	INBOX	Well, except Trisha works with Bill and JG. Though this all explains JG's "you and Jon should go, split them up, with [redacted] at all of them." Because he's got Jim and Trisha pushing her (as they did with [redacted] at State, in front of the Deputy and the D, without raising it before hand - I agreed to it, because I thought they were right, though I was a little cranky about being put into a spot where I would potentially have to argue otherwise in that group), and JG's experience is having a senior guy there. \n\nBecause it's a great spot for me to be in to be telling doj "fewer people " while I simultaneously argue for two more for us. \U0001f621
2016-02-12 01:35:41, Fri	OUTBOX	Well it's an investigation, not a prosecution. So there might be more agents. I didn't totally follow your first paragraph.
2016-02-12 12:54:44, Fri	INBOX	There are a billion in the gym. Easy day. \n\nYep, also one of my SSAs stepped down to be a pilot and works out if Manassas. \n\nWhat IS [redacted] doing about his SA application?
2016-02-12 12:56:21, Fri	OUTBOX	I'm SURE he left the car here while he is on vacation so we can do it today.\n\nNothing. Not harassing him about it now. I get that he's struggling with the decision.

2016-02-12 13:28:43, Fri	INBOX	Should I talk to him about it? It's just that there's such a fine line between struggling and succumbing to inertia...
2016-02-12 13:29:31, Fri	OUTBOX	No, not right now. Andy just started...
2016-02-13 03:27:02, Sat	OUTBOX	I'm no prude, but I'm really appalled by this. So you don't have to go looking (in case you hadn't heard), Trump called him the p-word. The man has no dignity or class. He simply can not be president. \n\nWith a Slur for Ted Cruz, Donald Trump Further Splits Voters http://nyti.ms/1XoICkO
2016-02-13 03:28:49, Sat	INBOX	Oh, he's abysmal. I keep hoping the charade will end and people will just dump him. The problem, then, is Rubio will likely lose to Cruz. The Republican party is in utter shambles. When was the last competitive ticket they offered?
2016-02-15 00:05:34, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] arguing about how great Bernie Sanders is and the evils of a two-party system. \n\nSigh
2016-02-15 00:17:45, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] YOU can explain how Bernie isn't electable in a general election and it's more important to field a competitive candidate....
2016-02-15 00:19:41, Mon	OUTBOX	Yeah, I'd be fighting the urge to be rude and dismissive and tell him he'll realize he was wrong when he gets older.
2016-02-15 00:21:57, Mon	OUTBOX	Hell, at least be happy he's arguing for Bernie Sanders and not Ted Cruz.
2016-02-15 00:24:02, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] ,nC) true re Cruz. THAT would be enough to put him on the street entirely.
2016-02-16 23:00:04, Tue	OUTBOX	Are you still at work? I'm so sorry if you are... :(
2016-02-16 23:38:15, Tue	INBOX	Yep been talking with Bill. Just got done.
2016-02-17 22:37:00, Wed	INBOX	I'm sorry. That stinks. Just pulled out of HQ. [redacted] sent me an email explaining she lives 100 miles (!) from the airport and has ALWAYS used a car service based on cost comparison. \U0001f612
2016-02-17 22:37:24, Wed	INBOX	Well, yes. Except your cost comparison is wrong.
2016-02-17 22:38:10, Wed	OUTBOX	Oh sweet jesus.
2016-02-17 22:39:54, Wed	INBOX	She stopped by earlier but [redacted] and [redacted] were there. I am going to have her grab her UC and stop by. I'm in the process of deciding whether or not I talk to the unit chief, who approved it, before I talk to both of them
2016-02-17 22:40:57, Wed	OUTBOX	I probably would talk to the uc first. Just get a sense of it all.
2016-02-17 22:41:36, Wed	INBOX	And I'm sorry, where the F do you live that is 100 miles from the airport? How much do you want to bet bwi is about 70 miles closer?

2016-02-17 22:42:14, Wed	OUTBOX	Can't you look up her address?
2016-02-17 22:42:53, Wed	INBOX	For sure. I'm going to have the UC do that. Good learning experience. \U0001f612
2016-02-17 22:47:16, Wed	INBOX	May also have him research the various costs of parking at Dulles, to ensure the cost comparison is right (it isnt) as well as the airfare from BWI to BJ...
2016-02-19 02:17:26, Fri	INBOX	NOW HOW THE F CAN HE BE A REPUBLICAN? !?!?
2016-02-19 02:17:59, Fri	OUTBOX	I have absolutely no idea. Still, he is so very interesting.
2016-02-19 12:13:50, Fri	OUTBOX	Still really want to hear about how it went with Laufman, and with Bill. I'm sorry I couldn't talk about it last night.
2016-02-19 13:06:40, Fri	INBOX	And of course I can't wait to tell you about Laufman convo, and Bill, [redacted]
2016-02-20 00:09:22, Sat	OUTBOX	Oh god. And [redacted] is trying to explain/defend apple's position. Based entirely on the misinformation apple and privacy groups are spewing.
2016-02-20 11:59:31, Sat	OUTBOX	I have a copy of you're interested.\n\n Justice Department Calls Apple\u2019s Refusal to Unlock iPhone a \u2018Marketing Strategy\u2019 http://nyti.ms/1oPZDsi
2016-02-20 12:08:24, Sat	OUTBOX	In Nod to Law Enforcement in Apple Case, Obama Ends Attempt to Straddle Privacy Divide http://nyti.ms/1QooMH6
2016-02-20 12:30:52, Sat	OUTBOX	The times, for once, does a decent job of explaining our position, for once.
2016-02-20 23:50:46, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-02-21 02:04:35, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] What was the Apple thing? You can tell me on imsg, or it can wait.
2016-02-21 02:05:44, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-02-21 02:07:04, Sun	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-02-21 22:52:01, Sun	OUTBOX	And I still have to do the D's talking points, [redacted]
2016-02-22 11:32:38, Mon	OUTBOX	Man, you know it's a bad day when you beat [redacted] and rybicki into the office.
2016-02-22 23:25:21, Mon	INBOX	And Jones is out so I need to be in at 715 to cover. \U0001f61d\n\nAlso remind me [redacted] gossip about [redacted]
2016-02-23 01:50:18, Tue	INBOX	Sorry. Spent the last 45 minutes talking with [redacted] a REAL prosecutor I'm edva - about this DOJ silliness.

2016-02-23 01:50:41, Tue	OUTBOX	What does he think?
2016-02-23 01:51:05, Tue	INBOX	It's interesting, I've got and David and him and everyone calling me to survey the terrain. I guess that's good.
2016-02-24 11:48:15, Wed	INBOX	8:30. I will arrive right about then and will be free until 910 when my midyear brief starts.
2016-02-24 23:54:20, Wed	INBOX	Hey I know your evening sucks. I need to talk to you tonight about work. Things went sideways with Andy and Bill. \n\nAt my desk, calling to see if he is still here.
2016-02-24 23:57:18, Wed	INBOX	Sorry, I'm busy. Call back later.
2016-02-24 23:57:51, Wed	OUTBOX	He is I just got off the phone with him. He told me about wrap.
2016-02-24 23:59:51, Wed	INBOX	I'm talking to him now
2016-02-25 00:06:26, Thu	OUTBOX	Yup. Though truthfully, I'm not sure I understand what the problem is.
2016-02-25 00:15:04, Thu	INBOX	Sorry still on phone. Issue is if Laufman makes himself one of the two DoJ, do I send the two case agents or insert myself. Andy told Bill send the best two. And what "best" means isn't clear to me in this context.
2016-02-25 00:15:28, Thu	OUTBOX	Best means best. It's not a trick.
2016-02-25 00:15:52, Thu	OUTBOX	If Laufman does that, then that's doj's loss. And I think warrants a call to his superiors.
2016-02-25 01:00:20, Thu	INBOX	Hi. Just leaving. Trisha still there (or at least her car is). Saw leaving, too, though be didn't see me
2016-02-25 01:02:07, Thu	INBOX	We talked about it, but "best" was not in terms of agents (though that's what I wrote). It's about what the best outcome is.
2016-02-25 02:20:31, Thu	OUTBOX	Do you or Bill fundamentally believe that 3 and 3 is the RIGHT thing for the case? If the answer is no, then you call back and say we're good as is. You have never wavered from saying 2 and 2 is best. I don't get what the hesitation is now.
2016-02-25 02:52:46, Thu	OUTBOX	One more thing: she might be our next president. The last thing you need us going in there loaded for bear. You think she's going to remember or care that it was more doj than fbi?
2016-02-25 02:56:28, Thu	INBOX	Agreed. I called Bill and relayed what we discussed. He agrees. I will email you and same.
2016-02-25 02:57:29, Thu	OUTBOX	Cool. You going to call back? I have one more thing to say, so long as you are out of earshot of folks.
2016-02-25 15:14:23, Thu	INBOX	Sorry meeting went long with Bill. So is covering 10 and my 11 just cancelled.

2016-02-26 00:33:39, Fri	OUTBOX	Hi. Just left andy and the scif is closed. \U0001f621
2016-02-26 01:53:19, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] And I'm reading the apple motion. [redacted]
2016-02-26 01:55:22, Fri	OUTBOX	I wrote the following to andy: "Hey I'm sorry. It's just wildly aggravating how much churn has gone on this. Have a good night."\n\nAnd he just wrote back: "Agree. Strongly."\n\nSo I guess it's all good.
2016-02-26 01:56:05, Fri	OUTBOX	I know. It shouldn't, but it's killing me too. I'm really angry but I'm trying to calm down.
2016-02-26 01:56:18, Fri	INBOX	It IS all good.
2016-02-26 01:56:37, Fri	INBOX	I sent you the email and DoJ's response.
2016-02-26 01:56:59, Fri	INBOX	This is what [redacted] texted back:
2016-02-26 01:57:06, Fri	OUTBOX	I saw. I LOATHE the man.
2016-02-26 01:57:14, Fri	INBOX	Weak. Not surprised though.
2016-02-26 01:57:21, Fri	OUTBOX	Damn.
2016-02-26 01:57:25, Fri	INBOX	I think it is disgusting. I'll have to hear how we ended up totally losing on everything. I've been around long enough to not be surprised, but just confirms we have no say over our own case.
2016-02-26 01:57:51, Fri	OUTBOX	I know. [redacted] I know. I'm sorry.
2016-02-26 01:58:00, Fri	INBOX	So I look forward to that conversation
2016-02-26 01:58:18, Fri	OUTBOX	Does he know I'm working this behind the scenes too?
2016-02-26 01:58:19, Fri	INBOX	To be clear, those both were from Jon to me
2016-02-26 01:58:40, Fri	INBOX	No. Unless you want me to tell him
2016-02-26 01:58:51, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, I think you should.
2016-02-26 01:58:51, Fri	INBOX	He knows we're good friends
2016-02-26 01:59:39, Fri	OUTBOX	I don't even have an argument for you. I mean, you know everything I do. And Andy did fight, but at some point, to what end?
2016-02-26 01:59:45, Fri	OUTBOX	I don't know [redacted]
2016-02-26 01:59:48, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\n\nHe knows you put a word in for him with Andy after we talked.

2016-02-26 02:00:17, Fri	OUTBOX	I'm stuck between two men I hugely respect.
2016-02-26 02:00:51, Fri	INBOX	Picking your battles, with a view from the very top of the agency. Because most big bureaucratic fights are never clear wins.
2016-02-26 02:01:18, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, I'd tell him. Because truly, I've done very little else the last couple of days.
2016-02-26 02:01:29, Fri	INBOX	This isn't a huge loss. We'll get a good interview. And if it isn't, we'll adjust.
2016-02-26 02:01:41, Fri	OUTBOX	And at the end of the day, it IS hard hill to die on to fight between 6 and 7.
2016-02-26 02:02:14, Fri	INBOX	And for the rest of the time we deal with DoJ, we'll hear about "how we did it that time in 2016."
2016-02-26 02:02:36, Fri	INBOX	Yes, hence Andy's 4 vs 7 argument
2016-02-26 02:02:52, Fri	INBOX	Anyway. We BOTH need to move on for our sanity.
2016-02-26 02:03:06, Fri	OUTBOX	Yes, I was just about to say the same thing.
2016-02-26 02:22:21, Fri	OUTBOX	Hey, help me tomorrow to remember to order business cards. I'll need the link again...
2016-02-26 02:26:25, Fri	OUTBOX	Trying to let it go, but has Bill responded?
2016-02-26 02:28:06, Fri	INBOX	I think Andy would tell him (or rather than not at all because he knew you were relaying to me, right?
2016-02-26 02:28:14, Fri	INBOX	What's never happening again?
2016-02-26 02:29:05, Fri	OUTBOX	I specifically asked if I should tell you and he said yes.
2016-02-26 02:29:07, Fri	INBOX	Andy WILL travel...maybe not a whole day then, but a good chunk..
2016-02-26 02:29:18, Fri	OUTBOX	
2016-02-26 02:30:52, Fri	OUTBOX	So, re my cards, should I wrote Counsel to the DD or Special Counsel?
2016-02-26 02:36:46, Fri	INBOX	Sorry, was on phone with . He is immensely relieved he doesn't have to choose between himself or . \U0001f612
2016-02-26 02:37:10, Fri	INBOX	I don't like just Special Counsel
2016-02-26 02:37:31, Fri	INBOX	Although wait, I'm not sure about that
2016-02-26 02:37:37, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah well his is a cocksucker, he should still be stressed about that.
2016-02-26 02:37:51, Fri	INBOX	He is
2016-02-26 02:38:07, Fri	INBOX	Stressed that his is the face of the section
2016-02-26 02:38:39, Fri	OUTBOX	I also think I prefer just counsel. That's why I asked. But think about it.

2016-02-26 02:40:04, Fri	INBOX	I will. Don't think either of those is quite right. What's your agreed upon title?
2016-02-26 02:40:50, Fri	OUTBOX	Special Counsel. But truly, I can put whatever I want on them
2016-02-26 11:05:09, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] Mtg with the d is 3-3:30, but I think there's a high chance that it will go over. Normally I would just bail, but it's the d and an important legal issue.
2016-02-26 11:21:57, Fri	INBOX	And I get three hours of Laufman and [redacted] n two consecutive meetings this morning. Gosh, today's going to be great
2016-02-26 11:26:05, Fri	INBOX	There won't be. Bill has MYE wrap at 230, just like he did for DD's function. And if like the one for DD, for which I was late, I won't have time. [redacted]
2016-02-26 20:58:36, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] ..hope you didn't mind me busting your balls in front of Trisha. You certainly didn't mind giving me the finger in front of her. \U0001f609
2016-02-27 21:30:05, Sat	INBOX	I know! I left it till the last second. Just spent an hour on conference call with Jon and [redacted] giving them a dump and discussing path forward. \n\nAnd hi. \U0001f636
2016-02-29 12:55:21, Mon	INBOX	So [redacted] called JB on Sat night to complain about leaks. I need to talk to him today....
2016-02-29 12:56:25, Mon	OUTBOX	And how the hell does [redacted] have Jb's cell phone number?
2016-02-29 12:57:55, Mon	INBOX	That's the way Washington works. JB told Bill they've known each other for a long time.
2016-02-29 12:58:24, Mon	OUTBOX	Oh. I would run by his ofc now - he'd almost always there by now.
2016-02-29 13:11:36, Mon	INBOX	Ok getting coffee - no time this morning - I will try on the way back.
2016-02-29 13:21:58, Mon	INBOX	Jim in morning brief with D
2016-02-29 13:28:51, Mon	OUTBOX	Then I would try him again right before 9 if you can.
2016-02-29 13:42:26, Mon	INBOX	Will try. Just shot him an email asking for 15
2016-02-29 13:42:44, Mon	OUTBOX	Talk in 2?
2016-02-29 13:43:04, Mon	INBOX	Also I have your notebook. Nope sorry headed into dad mtg.
2016-03-01 03:07:31, Tue	INBOX	Just spoke with Bill, he's emailing [redacted] and JB to get together first thing. I need to give you details. [redacted]
2016-03-01 03:20:03, Tue	OUTBOX	Will try. Need to talk to [redacted] then andy about [redacted]
2016-03-01 03:20:16, Tue	OUTBOX	What details?

2016-03-01 03:23:04, Tue	INBOX	What I told Bill about you seeing jg
2016-03-01 03:23:29, Tue	OUTBOX	Ah. What'd he say?
2016-03-01 03:24:00, Tue	INBOX	And about me (actually us, again) seeing them months ago
2016-03-01 03:24:16, Tue	INBOX	He wanted to know if there were specifics rather than rumor and innuendo
2016-03-01 03:24:43, Tue	INBOX	All this makes me weary, [redacted]
2016-03-01 03:24:57, Tue	OUTBOX	No specifics, just interesting timing.
2016-03-01 03:25:15, Tue	OUTBOX	I know, [redacted] I know.
2016-03-01 03:25:32, Tue	INBOX	That's what we meant by specifics. Specifics about him meeting them.
2016-03-01 03:26:21, Tue	OUTBOX	Not following. It's not rumor, we/I saw them!
2016-03-01 03:28:05, Tue	INBOX	We're saying the same thing. I told him jg was close to them. He asked if I had specifics. I said I had seen him with one a few months ago, and that you had seen the three of them together last week.
2016-03-01 11:52:41, Tue	INBOX	[redacted]. \U0001f61e\n\nYou think wraps are generally going to go this late, or is this just a busy time?\n\nAnd that reminds me, I had wanted to ask you about your response to Andy's little dig on [redacted] about having all kinds of free time in the [redacted]
2016-03-01 11:56:10, Tue	OUTBOX	We stayed behind to try to talk to andy about [redacted] but then that didn't even work.\n\nYeah, don't think he totally meant it as a dig, but of course it was.
2016-03-01 12:01:14, Tue	INBOX	That stinks. But at least it's an outlier in staying late. \n\nI wasn't sure. It had an edge.
2016-03-01 12:02:18, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, I'm not so sure it is. I'm getting more convinced that the last few weeks of ease were the anomaly. :(
2016-03-01 12:12:44, Tue	INBOX	Yeah it sucks, no question about it. Hopefully Andy and everyone will find a rhythm and it will get a *little* better.
2016-03-01 12:59:39, Tue	INBOX	Hi. Bill going to brief Andy. [redacted] knew not to mention yet, right?
2016-03-01 13:01:46, Tue	INBOX	Also need to talk to you before you talk to Andy on topic
2016-03-01 13:02:55, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, he will not mention. [redacted]
2016-03-01 16:32:55, Tue	INBOX	Hey got summoned to Bills
2016-03-01 23:20:39, Tue	INBOX	Ces called wanting to know what if anything Baker had done and Beth's response
2016-03-02 01:19:48, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]

2016-03-02 01:20:01, Wed	INBOX	He asked me who I'd vote for, guessed Kasich
2016-03-02 01:20:11, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes, they should.
2016-03-02 01:20:29, Wed	OUTBOX	Seriously?! Would you not D?
2016-03-02 01:20:39, Wed	INBOX	I don't know. I suppose Hillary.
2016-03-02 01:20:46, Wed	INBOX	I would D
2016-03-02 01:21:00, Wed	OUTBOX	He's doesn't think you're an R, does he?
2016-03-02 01:21:04, Wed	INBOX	VA's going to go to her anyway.
2016-03-02 01:21:17, Wed	INBOX	He thinks I wouldn't vote for her right now
2016-03-02 01:21:24, Wed	INBOX	He's knows I'm a conservative Dem
2016-03-02 01:21:45, Wed	OUTBOX	But now I wonder.
2016-03-02 12:34:34, Wed	INBOX	I sent the email and my comments to Bill. Going to call him in 5 to ensure he got it
2016-03-02 12:36:00, Wed	OUTBOX	Good. [redacted] is too much of a pleaser - I'm concerned he won't see how wrong her demand is.
2016-03-02 13:20:08, Wed	INBOX	Sorry. Thats aggravating. I'd probably cut him a little slack though. Bill apparently fired up a little bit, not in a good way.
2016-03-02 13:23:49, Wed	OUTBOX	How do you mean not in a good way?
2016-03-02 13:24:20, Wed	INBOX	Can you talk or imsg?
2016-03-02 13:24:34, Wed	INBOX	Worrying by nature
2016-03-02 13:25:15, Wed	INBOX	It can wait, and of course I'll tell you later.
2016-03-02 13:35:54, Wed	OUTBOX	Sorry. Leaving now.
2016-03-02 14:07:59, Wed	INBOX	Np. Just try and keep everyone calm and measured up therr
2016-03-02 15:01:10, Wed	INBOX	Sorry no was in my mye morning brief
2016-03-03 01:31:55, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] Nyt article out. Not horrible.
2016-03-03 01:32:38, Thu	OUTBOX	Yeah, it seemed like much ado about nothing. Shall I send to andy?
2016-03-03 01:33:24, Thu	INBOX	As you wish. \U0001f636
2016-03-03 01:36:09, Thu	OUTBOX	Texted it. Though I expect Kortan already has.

2016-03-03 11:29:41, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] We're hosting a conference all day in Bonaparte - I have to give the opening at 845 but have a lot of flexibility in the morning after that.
2016-03-03 11:31:31, Thu	OUTBOX	I'm not sure if I'm coming in [redacted] but I'll let you know. If not, probably won't be free until after lunch.
2016-03-03 11:35:41, Thu	INBOX	Oh, that's right. Np. Steinbach wants to meet his SCs and up from 2-3, and I've got to talk to my DS counterpart whenever the conference wraps up.
2016-03-04 02:10:50, Fri	OUTBOX	God trump is a loathsome human.
2016-03-04 02:11:26, Fri	INBOX	Yet he may win
2016-03-04 02:11:35, Fri	INBOX	Good for Hillary
2016-03-04 02:11:51, Fri	OUTBOX	It is.
2016-03-04 02:12:46, Fri	INBOX	Would he be a worse president than cruz?
2016-03-04 02:13:14, Fri	OUTBOX	Trump? Yes, I think so.
2016-03-04 02:13:37, Fri	INBOX	I'm not sure
2016-03-04 02:20:04, Fri	INBOX	Omg he's an idiot
2016-03-04 02:20:33, Fri	OUTBOX	He's awful.
2016-03-04 02:21:02, Fri	INBOX	America will get what the voting public deserves
2016-03-04 02:21:36, Fri	OUTBOX	That's what I'm afraid of.
2016-03-04 02:22:11, Fri	INBOX	Department of Environmental Protection? !?!
2016-03-04 02:24:25, Fri	INBOX	God Hillary should win 100,000,000 - 0.
2016-03-04 02:35:16, Fri.	OUTBOX	I know.
2016-03-04 02:26:19, Fri	INBOX	What was that weird shiny thing on his lip?
2016-03-04 02:27:58, Fri	OUTBOX	I know. It was like a piece of food! [redacted] says this keeps getting better every minute.
2016-03-04 02:34:56, Fri	OUTBOX	Also did you hear him make a comment about the size of his d*ck earlier? This man can not be president.
2016-03-04 02:37:06, Fri	INBOX	Yes I did. In relation to the size of his hands.\n\nAnd all the "Little Marco" blah blah blah
2016-03-04 02:38:08, Fri	INBOX	And God, Detroit used to be SO beautiful and shining and elegant. \U0001f61e Sigh.
2016-03-04 02:38:35, Fri	OUTBOX	I know. Detroit is really a beautiful city. Camden was too.

2016-03-04 02:43:17, Fri	INBOX	His flag is f*cked up
2016-03-04 02:43:53, Fri	OUTBOX	Yes it is.
2016-03-04 02:54:35, Fri	OUTBOX	Stupid f*ck.
2016-03-04 02:54:35, Fri	INBOX	\U0001f620
2016-03-04 02:55:04, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] God we're the same.
2016-03-04 02:56:09, Fri	INBOX	Ok I may vote for Trump \n\n;)
2016-03-04 02:57:00, Fri	INBOX	"And look, I'M OLD"
2016-03-04 02:58:39, Fri	OUTBOX	What?!\n\nPoor Kasich. He's the only sensible man up there.
2016-03-04 02:59:53, Fri	INBOX	He was pretty much calling for death for Snowden. I'm a single issue voter. ;)\n\nEspionage Machine Party
2016-03-04 03:00:23, Fri	INBOX	Exactly re Kasich. And he has ZERO appeal
2016-03-04 03:00:33, Fri	OUTBOX	Ah. Got it. Was re-reading the article so I stopped paying attention.
2016-03-04 03:01:08, Fri	OUTBOX	That's so sad. He's an adult who can be trusted. Why are we so superficial.
2016-03-04 03:01:46, Fri	INBOX	What article? Steve's?
2016-03-04 03:02:08, Fri	INBOX	We like spectacle and combat. Our monkey ancestors
2016-03-04 03:02:29, Fri	OUTBOX	I can't accept that.
2016-03-04 03:04:50, Fri	INBOX	Why do you think we're so superficial?
2016-03-04 03:05:30, Fri	OUTBOX	I think because we're largely undereducated?
2016-03-04 03:08:13, Fri	INBOX	But that proves my point. There's some basic instinct it appeals to.
2016-03-04 04:01:45, Fri	INBOX	So just understand you don't get a fair and balanced (hey, it's Fox's night) viee
2016-03-04 04:01:52, Fri	INBOX	View
2016-03-07 03:09:32, Mon	OUTBOX	Okay, I guess I'm going to kill the light and try to sleep. Though right now I'm reading the latest draft in the apple litigation.
2016-03-08 00:50:03, Tue	OUTBOX	Hey, andy has [redacted] in the morning so if you're going to need early answers you won't be able to get them. He won't be at morning meeting either. Randy has the stick.

2016-03-08 00:51:51, Tue	INBOX	Waiting to hear back from Bill. I'm fine not having early answers - State may not be, but that's their issue. I don't think we want to push the issue thru Randy.
2016-03-08 11:02:55, Tue	OUTBOX	Hey ust told me about having to meet with Bill and Trisha this am. Okay if I tell her we talked (that you called to get some insight about what went sideways?)
2016-03-08 11:11:25, Tue	INBOX	Yes re Tell her I called you after I saw the email from Steinbach
2016-03-08 11:11:48, Tue	OUTBOX	Yup, that's what I was going to do.
2016-03-08 11:13:23, Tue	INBOX	I sent her what I sent Bill, can forward to you if you want, but she can tell you as well. Talked to last night as well, he was again changing it, and thought he would need to run up through NSD if we wanted to make the change
2016-03-08 12:48:04, Tue	INBOX	Trisha apparently trying to grab Bill and Mike at 745. So I have no 9 with Bill.
2016-03-08 13:03:29, Tue	OUTBOX	Yup, that's what said
2016-03-09 02:26:40, Wed	INBOX	Emailing
2016-03-09 15:44:03, Wed	INBOX	K. Lync me when you get to desk, I'll finish. Re oca and briefing requirements
2016-03-09 23:03:25, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes. But need to try to fix a HUGE who f-up.
2016-03-09 23:03:52, Wed	INBOX	Who or wfo?
2016-03-09 23:04:04, Wed	INBOX	Have info.for you...
2016-03-09 23:05:46, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-09 23:10:27, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-09 23:10:37, Wed	OUTBOX	Wfo.
2016-03-09 23:15:34, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm still here.
2016-03-09 23:17:21, Wed	OUTBOX	Need to go meet with andy again now.
2016-03-09 23:18:16, Wed	INBOX	Ok I need to be back at hq at 630 anyway
2016-03-09 23:30:51, Wed	INBOX	Heading back to hq
2016-03-09 23:40:42, Wed	OUTBOX	You here? I need to leave soon.
2016-03-09 23:40:50, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-09 23:41:09, Wed	OUTBOX	In scif. One sec

2016-03-09 23:41:44, Wed	INBOX	Pulling in now will drop off in garage
2016-03-09 23:41:52, Wed	INBOX	Meet me in my office in 3?
2016-03-10 02:31:31, Thu	INBOX	Though I'm exhausted. Talked with [redacted] for a while about half an hour ago. He does give a shit, and he's not a bad atty.
2016-03-10 02:39:54, Thu	OUTBOX	Both are absolutely true.' [redacted]
2016-03-12 20:58:35, Sat	OUTBOX	What the f is wrong with people?\n\nA Texas Candidate Pushes the Boundary of the Far Right http://nyti.ms/1QTqBqj
2016-03-12 21:05:11, Sat	INBOX	That Texas article is depressing as hell. But answers how we could end up with President trump
2016-03-12 21:07:50, Sat	OUTBOX	Wasn't it? Seriously, how are people so incredibly ignorant?
2016-03-12 21:12:46, Sat	INBOX	I have no idea, but it depresses me. Same people who drive more when they get extra daylight from daylight savings, I'm guessing.
2016-03-12 21:21:03, Sat	INBOX	\U0001f621\nTrump Clarifies, and It\u2019s Worse - NYTimes.com\nhttp://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/03/12/opinion/trump-clarifies-and-its-worse.html?_r=0
2016-03-14 11:34:46, Mon	INBOX	I don't know how you tell [redacted] to check her email, but I cancelled the 900 due to Jones scheduling a career board for his special assistant. \U0001f612
2016-03-14 11:53:08, Mon	OUTBOX	Don't listen to npr this morning - [redacted] is an uninformed douche. \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621
2016-03-14 11:53:28, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] I'm in a bad mood. I'm really angry [redacted] is taking up three section Chiefs time to do interviews for his gs-15 Special Assistant. A job which is entirely unnecessary.
2016-03-14 11:53:43, Mon	INBOX	Yeah, I really don't like him. What did he say?
2016-03-14 11:54:39, Mon	OUTBOX	Totally unnecessary. He's awful.
2016-03-14 11:55:14, Mon	OUTBOX	I'll tell you later. He sucks.
2016-03-14 11:58:38, Mon	INBOX	You can tell me about [redacted] and we can get indignant together.
2016-03-14 12:03:11, Mon	INBOX	Also, if you can, please don't forget to ask Andy about his plans this Friday. Fingers crossed...\U0001f636
2016-03-14 12:46:52, Mon	INBOX	Crank crank crank. Went back to my office to do stupid epas for job ratings. Now back to Jones
2016-03-14 15:04:48, Mon	INBOX	The new career board process is awful...
2016-03-14 15:05:14, Mon	OUTBOX	I can only imagine.
2016-03-14 15:06:52, Mon	INBOX	Geez no lie. Just looked at calendar. Your afternoon went to sh*t.
2016-03-14 15:09:54, Mon	INBOX	Going to talk to [redacted] I will make sure to extricate myself by 11:30.
2016-03-14 17:51:09, Mon	INBOX	[redacted]

2016-03-14 17:55:03, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-15 15:10:46, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] speaking on DT. Very effective speaker.
2016-03-15 15:34:43, Tue	INBOX	Yeah, he's great. I love [redacted] Fantastic search stories with him from back in the day. \u263a
2016-03-15 15:35:01, Tue	INBOX	He and his wife [redacted] are the basis for the Jamie Fox movie The Kingdom.
2016-03-15 15:35:28, Tue	OUTBOX	That's neat. Yeah, he was a phenomenal public speaker.
2016-03-15 15:37:21, Tue	INBOX	How long does your thing go?
2016-03-15 15:37:23, Tue	INBOX	Noon?
2016-03-15 15:37:55, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, though Andy is speaking at 11:45, but it looks like they're going to run over.
2016-03-15 15:40:24, Tue	INBOX	\U0001f615\n\nYou still have something fairly early during lunch with Trisha? I ask because I can't check because of course unet is still f'ed up...
2016-03-15 15:41:06, Tue	OUTBOX	I probably will wait to eat between 1 and 2. Have a 12:45 with Trisha.
2016-03-15 15:44:00, Tue	INBOX	Boo. ;)\n\nI have my cd staff meeting...which Bill informed us may go extra long today. \U0001f612
2016-03-15 16:09:16, Tue	INBOX	And scrubbed my business cards, no mystery dot. Betting they'll do another run for you.
2016-03-15 16:23:58, Tue	INBOX	Just ran into [redacted] Told him he got rave reviews...he related leaving his cell up near the podium while Andy spoke. ..
2016-03-15 16:24:53, Tue	INBOX	And no unet stinks
2016-03-15 16:26:47, Tue	OUTBOX	He did. Andy did awesome with it too. "Either there's a backpack bomb up here or someone is getting a phone call."
2016-03-15 16:32:39, Tue	INBOX	Stupid unet forcing me to do all kinds of work-arounds. How hard can this be?
2016-03-15 16:33:36, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] said he had some rejoinder back - something about not being able to get in...he said he realized he left his phone up there 19 minutes before it actually rang
2016-03-15 16:34:45, Tue	OUTBOX	W
2016-03-15 16:40:31, Tue	INBOX	Who is Greg Brower? He's getting his SES certificate with me on Thurs morning.
2016-03-15 16:41:18, Tue	OUTBOX	He's the new Tom Bondy. Head of Lit Branch. Former US Attorney of Nevada.
2016-03-15 16:41:46, Tue	INBOX	Damn. Impressive enough. Good guy?
2016-03-15 16:43:44, Tue	OUTBOX	Seems to be. Was also at (head of) EOUSA and GC at GPO I think?
2016-03-15 16:55:44, Tue	INBOX	Wow. And government printing office?

2016-03-15 19:04:54, Tue	OUTBOX	I'm in a call with andy and [redacted] when I'm done [redacted] then grab food.
2016-03-16 04:11:51, Wed	OUTBOX	I can not believe Donald Trump is likely to be an actual, serious candidate for president.
2016-03-16 09:49:34, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]\nhttp://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/03/16/technology/apple-court-filing-iphone-case.html
2016-03-16 11:06:13, Wed	INBOX	And already driving to get info to Bill.
2016-03-16 11:45:04, Wed	INBOX	Complaint delivered, with copy for [redacted] and Andy. [redacted]
2016-03-16 12:05:35, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]\nB) I'll wait regardless. 830 with Jones then 910 mye. Should be done but 940 or so.
2016-03-16 19:44:56, Wed	INBOX	K. Finishing up call with [redacted] hit me on lync or desk
2016-03-16 21:06:34, Wed	INBOX	Done?
2016-03-16 21:06:50, Wed	OUTBOX	Just waiting for baker, then done.
2016-03-16 21:11:39, Wed	INBOX	Our guy us talking...
2016-03-16 21:11:42, Wed	INBOX	Is
2016-03-16 21:25:55, Wed	OUTBOX	Rock on.
2016-03-16 21:26:45, Wed	INBOX	How'd your mtgs go? Still crushing the interagency policy process? \u263a
2016-03-16 21:33:05, Wed	OUTBOX	Damn straight. ;)
2016-03-16 21:34:11, Wed	OUTBOX	Headed to desk just to check email then will pop down on my way out.
2016-03-17 12:18:33, Thu	INBOX	Just sent you calendar invite. Other option is the 30 minutes after your ET guidelines brief. (11-ish, I think?)
2016-03-17 13:00:06, Thu	INBOX	And hi. Kind of wish you could have been there. \U0001f636\n\nRandy and JB both came over afterwards to sat congrats. Jim said, I guess I assumed you had been (ses) for a while." :)
2016-03-17 13:09:42, Thu	OUTBOX	Wish I could have too.
2016-03-17 13:10:27, Thu	OUTBOX	My 4 30 just moved to 9 30 so now I'm scrambling. \U0001f612
2016-03-17 13:22:08, Thu	OUTBOX	Andy leaving at 2 today so afternoon hopefully more free.
2016-03-18 00:27:19, Fri	INBOX	I can wait...\n\nBill mentioned he came in late to the mtg

2016-03-18 01:38:11, Fri	INBOX	Finally leaving. As I think about going away, I remember that we have moved around interviews so that I can be there for them. Those are the things I need to be present for.\n\nThe question remains whether I need to be here for this, or not need to, but should. [redacted]
2016-03-18 01:49:16, Fri	OUTBOX	Drive safely. \n\nThis case is fungible, possibly sooner than later. Your family is not. You need to go.
2016-03-18 01:52:09, Fri	INBOX	Yeah, but you know what bugs me? If you weren't in there, who is supposed to point out all the doubts and qualifications about the reporting, all the potential misinterpretations and exaggerations? that person needs to be in the room. I understand it could be you, but it could be me or somebody else at that level. They should have the benefit of that type of nuance and information, and clearly they don't, or at least they don't enough. They're certainly not getting it out of the so-called senior leaders who are sitting round that table beside Andy.
2016-03-18 02:05:04, Fri	OUTBOX	Jim does nuance. I'm not the only one in the room.
2016-03-18 02:16:17, Fri	INBOX	But Jim doesn't get the reporting, does he? Saying hey this isn't a raw cut, all the opportunities for error/exaggeration?
2016-03-18 11:31:26, Fri	INBOX	Thought of the perfect person D can bounce this off of
2016-03-18 11:31:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Who?
2016-03-18 11:37:51, Fri	INBOX	Pat\n\nYou gotta give me credit if we go with him. \n\nAnd delay briefing him on until I can get back and do it. Late next week or later.
2016-03-18 11:38:49, Fri	OUTBOX	We talked about him last night, not for this, but how great he is. He's in private practice though, right? Suppose you could still bring him back. And yes, I'll hold.
2016-03-18 11:57:54, Fri	INBOX	Yes, he's at Skadden in Chicago. I haven't talked to him for a year or two. Don't forget that Dag Comey appointed him as special counsel in the Plame matter, and that he was there for Comey's investiture.
2016-03-18 11:58:33, Fri	INBOX	I could work with him again \u263a\n\nAnd damn we'd get sh*t DONE
2016-03-18 11:58:39, Fri	OUTBOX	I know. Like I said, we discussed boss and him yesterday.
2016-03-18 12:05:54, Fri	INBOX	And it frustrates me, because Bill, at his 7:15, brings up the whole matter in front of his DADs. One who is acting for Dina. Who immediately goes to John and tell him how Bill is stressed because all the stuff is going on about a special prosecutor. Bill needs to learn to not talk to everybody about this when he's upset about it. And I guarantee that agent, while discreet, is certainly going to tell at least a few other people.\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621

2016-03-18 12:06:06, Fri	INBOX	I'm sending [redacted] to the 8:30 with Jones so that I can meet with John.
2016-03-18 12:46:19, Fri	OUTBOX	Did he go so far as to talk about why we started talking special prosecutor?!
2016-03-18 12:47:24, Fri	INBOX	Don't think so. In my office talking to Jon
2016-03-18 16:32:08, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-18 16:32:45, Fri	INBOX	K. I'm waiting on [redacted]...\U0001f612
2016-03-18 21:13:53, Fri	OUTBOX	If door is closed, probably okay to knock if his secretary is gone.
2016-03-18 21:14:36, Fri	INBOX	Ok. You sure? And if she is, I'll just hang...
2016-03-18 21:16:19, Fri	OUTBOX	She leaves at 530. I just asked. Jim behind closed doors with Trisha now, so I'm waiting. \U0001f612
2016-03-18 21:18:08, Fri	INBOX	Is it going to be weird if I show up, given Trishas email to you last night?
2016-03-18 21:18:27, Fri	INBOX	And let me know when you go in, I'll wait 10 then walk up
2016-03-18 21:18:39, Fri	OUTBOX	Yes, but remember, you're here to back brief on touhy.
2016-03-18 21:19:02, Fri	INBOX	Totally got it
2016-03-18 21:19:16, Fri	OUTBOX	I'm going in now.
2016-03-18 21:21:16, Fri	OUTBOX	Come soon
2016-03-18 21:22:38, Fri	INBOX	30 sec out
2016-03-18 21:31:31, Fri	INBOX	Hit me before you go, obviously. And J*sus how embarrassing I can't believe how out of breath I was. \U0001f628
2016-03-18 21:31:45, Fri	INBOX	I mean that was weird....
2016-03-18 21:56:57, Fri	INBOX	Hey, do you know if you're close?
2016-03-18 21:57:39, Fri	OUTBOX	Walking to my ofc now
2016-03-18 21:57:59, Fri	OUTBOX	You didn't need to run!
2016-03-18 21:58:38, Fri	INBOX	You said come soon!\n\nI was mortified!
2016-03-18 21:59:01, Fri	OUTBOX	It wasn't that bad.
2016-03-18 21:59:14, Fri	OUTBOX	Soon, now now! Or immediately!
2016-03-18 21:59:59, Fri	INBOX	Ha. I AM responsive.

2016-03-18 21:59:59, Fri	INBOX	Yes it was.
2016-03-18 22:00:40, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-18 22:01:01, Fri	INBOX	That and I better up my aerobic activity....
2016-03-19 00:42:58, Sat	INBOX	Thinking about earlier, I regret not saying more to you and Jim. I should have said, I know Bill is out, but we talked last night. I'm out next week. Since I have you both, here are my thoughts because I know the message doesn't always make it cleanly to the top. Will do that next time.
2016-03-19 00:44:35, Sat	INBOX	Of course I might have still been so out of breath that I sounded like an asthmatic without his inhaler. \U0001f612
2016-03-19 01:07:44, Sat	OUTBOX	Yeah, would have been a totally reasonable approach. I didn't think of it either.
2016-03-19 01:14:18, Sat	INBOX	Sigh. Missed opportunity. Good news is I think the right message got through. Have it in hand for next time.
2016-03-19 02:22:25, Sat	OUTBOX	Sorry, have been on with Bill P for the last 45 or so. He hadn't received any back brief from Mike, which I figured, so I emailed him to let him know I was happy to chat with him on the dl.
2016-03-19 02:23:30, Sat	OUTBOX	I do like him. He gets nuance. I wonder if he gets intimidated/nervous around Andy, or the bluster of the guys, bc he's much more normal just discussing an issue back and forth.
2016-03-19 02:27:23, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] I had intended to talk to Bill this weekend or Monday and be in bed already, but when if I was free now there was no way I could leave him to wonder like that.
2016-03-19 02:31:35, Sat	INBOX	Re bill
2016-03-19 02:32:14, Sat	INBOX	I think some of it is his personality. I think he's naturally sort of old fashioned gentlemanly in a Midwestern sort of way
2016-03-19 02:32:48, Sat	OUTBOX	He is. I think he was pretty offended by my back and forth with randy.
2016-03-19 02:33:33, Sat	INBOX	It's not intimidation. Which is why I get a little angry at [redacted] doing the imitation thing. He's not weak - to the extent he has a weakness, it's the over thinking earnestness, maybe thinking it's a tad bit more thoughtful than it is. But it is genuine without guile.
2016-03-19 02:33:55, Sat	INBOX	You told him? He should be.
2016-03-19 02:34:28, Sat	INBOX	He is paying the price for a number of aggressive but unthoughtful decisions by [redacted]
2016-03-19 02:34:36, Sat	OUTBOX	I did. I gave him the same readout as you, full and complete.
2016-03-19 02:35:27, Sat	INBOX	I'm sorry I didn't tell you and Jim what I thought. Made the mistake of thinking you knew what I knew and therefore didn't want to repeat. Should have treated you both as an opportunity.

2016-03-19 02:35:51, Sat	INBOX	Good and thank you. Not that it's my place to thank you, but hopefully you know what I mean.
2016-03-19 02:36:32, Sat	INBOX	So. Where does [redacted] go next? Given Andy's preference, [redacted] clearly replaces Eric. And [redacted] is [redacted] done?
2016-03-19 02:36:54, Sat	OUTBOX	Yes, I think so. :(
2016-03-19 02:37:41, Sat	OUTBOX	Stb? What's his background? Science - at all?
2016-03-19 02:38:07, Sat	INBOX	I don't think so.
2016-03-19 02:38:23, Sat	OUTBOX	Adic? I could see that
2016-03-19 02:38:53, Sat	INBOX	Who knows. Depends on Andy and Andy and D.
2016-03-19 02:39:02, Sat	INBOX	I'm worried about Andy's response to him.
2016-03-19 02:39:22, Sat	INBOX	And if they leave him in CD AD for four years I'm done. [redacted] is kma after me.
2016-03-19 02:39:39, Sat	INBOX	They won't, because that's too long.
2016-03-19 02:39:52, Sat	INBOX	But he'd do a better job than [redacted].
2016-03-19 02:40:35, Sat	INBOX	I actually think [redacted] would be better than [redacted] as Intel ead. But that's a weird call about what that job needs.
2016-03-19 02:40:41, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] is young too
2016-03-19 02:41:13, Sat	OUTBOX	I know. I don't think andy meant to be mean. But you know I'll keep an eye out, and will say something if I need to.
2016-03-19 02:41:47, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted] is good simply because he can bust heads. And division is in desperate need of that.
2016-03-19 02:43:04, Sat	INBOX	You shouldn't, other than maybe the specific behavior. Don't think you're going to change anyone's perception. It's just unfortunate, because Andy is behaving towards him exactly as [redacted] and JG and everyone behaved towards Andy.
2016-03-19 02:43:17, Sat	INBOX	Yep re [redacted]. Thats not [redacted]
2016-03-19 02:44:28, Sat	OUTBOX	I know re Andy. But he is not naturally a mean person, not like [redacted] or someone, so I do think it is an anamoly. But like I said, I'll keep an eye out.
2016-03-19 02:44:47, Sat	INBOX	Did you tell Bill you told me as well?
2016-03-19 02:44:55, Sat	OUTBOX	I didnt.
2016-03-19 02:45:33, Sat	OUTBOX	Didn't want to get you "in trouble" for not reaching out, since I reached out for him on my own.
2016-03-19 02:45:33, Sat	INBOX	Is [redacted] mean?\n\nAnd yes re imsg. Promise I won't keep you long.
2016-03-19 02:45:47, Sat	OUTBOX	Yes, he is. He's a bully.

2016-03-19 02:56:25, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-19 02:57:16, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted].
2016-03-19 07:14:54, Sat	INBOX	I 'm WIDE awake thinking about work. Processing what the team told me yesterday afternoon. I should have told you yesterday, I hadn't processed the significance of it until now. I will need to call this weekend.
2016-03-19 10:24:12, Sat	OUTBOX	So why the need for to be so decisive all of a sudden? You need to tell so she can start pushing this while you're gone.
2016-03-19 10:26:33, Sat	OUTBOX	Does his decision include no we're not going to ask for a waiver?
2016-03-19 10:29:02, Sat	INBOX	I'm not sure about any of this. Because often muddles things
2016-03-19 15:52:18, Sat	INBOX	That's fine. I don't know what, if anything, Bill will provide me over the week. Jones will have nothing. I don't think you'll have the time or desire to rehash next weekend what happened on the case over the course of the week. I'll go crazy without an ability to know what's going on, so I'd appreciate it if you would keep me posted if there are case updates /developments.
2016-03-19 16:01:18, Sat	OUTBOX	Yes, of course I will keep you updated re the things I have visibility into, though will likely be in a better position to report more granular case updates.
2016-03-19 16:25:31, Sat	INBOX	Thank you. I appreciate it, obviously. You know i, like you, go insane being out of the loop. And I won't abuse it,
2016-03-20 20:15:00, Sun	OUTBOX	Did she know about the reporting?
2016-03-20 21:05:21, Sun	INBOX	@ / @Whatever. It's passed. Just perennially irritating. \n\nDid call you?
2016-03-20 21:06:50, Sun	INBOX	Funny. She's stubborn that way. I could almost feel the couple of times I encouraged her to do so that she wasn't going to.
2016-03-20 21:38:37, Sun	OUTBOX	Yeah, I would have put a grand down saying she wouldn't.
2016-03-20 21:40:07, Sun	INBOX	Why? Not wanting to be reliant on you? Ego? Competition? \n\nI mean it was funny, I could literally sense it.
2016-03-20 22:04:44, Sun	OUTBOX	No, probably not wanting to bother. I hope it's not anything else. Though she will surely not like how involved I've been this week.
2016-03-20 22:12:08, Sun	INBOX	Well it was the right decision (your involvement). I told her you were since Bill was out. She'll understand, at least, right?
2016-03-20 22:13:42, Sun	OUTBOX	I'd hope so.
2016-03-20 22:29:08, Sun	INBOX	@ / @an't be on vacation while on vacation...

2016-03-20 22:29:08, Sun	INBOX	@ / \n\nI'm so so sorry. Hoping to call Bill tonight and therefore generate another conversation that I c
2016-03-20 22:29:39, Sun	OUTBOX	Why do you have to call him?
2016-03-20 22:36:07, Sun	INBOX	\u0500\u03f5\u0402 a very bad idea. To tell him this isn't the same as or
2016-03-20 22:36:07, Sun	INBOX	\u0500\u03f5\u0401A) to update him on what I just forwarded you. To tell him the IG's
2016-03-20 22:36:13, Sun	INBOX	\u0500\u03f5\u0403Petraeus or whatever else gets thrown out there. \nB) oh, God. My ca
2016-03-20 22:36:13, Sun	INBOX	\u0500\u03f5\u0404pacity for blech trumps yours a hundred times over. \U0001f615
2016-03-20 22:36:17, Sun	INBOX	C) you'd think.
2016-03-20 22:37:21, Sun	OUTBOX	A) here's the thing re your ig point though: it isn't about accountability. Can you talk for 30 seconds?
2016-03-20 23:44:00, Sun	OUTBOX	And Eric Smith just called me to tell me two executives (and had complained to him about me. I am so goddamn pissed about It was not an easy conversation for him to have, and I'm grateful that he did it. And now I want to curl up in a ball and die. Yet again, it's Lisa out of her lane.
2016-03-20 23:53:16, Sun	OUTBOX	I am so angry. And so upset.
2016-03-21 00:12:47, Mon	OUTBOX	Honestly, I should just step down. Why the fuck am I working my tail off and missing my family just to have people criticize my involvement in things?
2016-03-21 00:13:37, Mon	OUTBOX	And the worst part is that even if he agreed with me would never say anything to "Agent code" and all.
2016-03-21 00:25:45, Mon	INBOX	\U0001f615 What happened?
2016-03-21 00:26:31, Mon	INBOX	Who's criticizing anything? I'm not following
2016-03-21 00:26:44, Mon	OUTBOX	What do you mean what happened? I sent you four text messages. Did you not get them?
2016-03-21 00:27:07, Mon	OUTBOX	This was the first text:\n\nAnd Eric Smith just called me to tell me two executives (and , had complained to him about me. I am so goddamn pissed about It was not an easy conversation for him to have, and I'm grateful that he did it. And now I want to curl up in a ball and die. Yet again, it's Lisa out of her lane.
2016-03-21 00:27:25, Mon	INBOX	No. None.
2016-03-21 00:27:58, Mon	OUTBOX	But you got the one about me saying I should just step down?
2016-03-21 00:30:22, Mon	INBOX	@ 0/ @'m mid-dinner. I can step out right now, or can text freely a bit later. \n\nThey're wrong. And ' being a jerk.

2016-03-21 00:30:22, Mon	INBOX	@ 0/ @\nI just got the one you sent, and the one about stepping down. Not the one you just sent about Eric. [redacted] That sucks. And it's wrong and inaccurate. I
2016-03-21 00:30:41, Mon	INBOX	You need to talk talk to Andy tomorrow early if you can
2016-03-21 00:31:08, Mon	INBOX	And don't you DARE step down. What in the F is [redacted] upset about?
2016-03-21 00:32:32, Mon	OUTBOX	I asked a lot ("too many") pointed questions during Brekke's DDPI. Again, when I'm on their side, everyone loves Lisa. But God forbid I disagree...
2016-03-21 00:33:55, Mon	OUTBOX	I'll be damned if I say anything to Andy. I am going to say something to [redacted] Let's see him say I overstepped to my face, when I've had his back sooo many times.
2016-03-21 00:36:48, Mon	INBOX	I think you should talk to Andy. Talk to [redacted], but Andy needs to know. Ultimately he's the guy your working for.
2016-03-21 00:38:14, Mon	OUTBOX	I will not have this conversation with him again. And as I said above (maybe you didn't get it), And the worst part is that even if he agreed with me, Andy would never say anything to [redacted] "Agent code" and all.
2016-03-21 00:45:32, Mon	INBOX	@ 8? @I got that one. It's not so much about him saying anything to [redacted] (though he should - I would). It's making sure he's aware and supports it. After all,
2016-03-21 00:45:34, Mon	INBOX	@ 8? @ Andy is the one who asked you if you had it and told you to brief rather than calling me or Jon up. So he needs to own the impact of that and support yo
2016-03-21 00:45:34, Mon	INBOX	@ 8? @u. Or at a minimum understand how that plays out in the mind of his subordinates.
2016-03-21 00:49:04, Mon	OUTBOX	If I talk to [redacted] maybe I'll tell Andy the results of that conversation. I'm not doing more. But I am taking this week and giving serious thought to stepping down. I can save face, say it was too hard on my family. I'm doing this job for two years fearful of speaking up.
2016-03-21 00:54:49, Mon	INBOX	@ / @Fine. And you have an easy way out, which would save face. But you can't do that.\n\nDoing the job two years fearful of speaking up IS an option, but there
2016-03-21 00:54:55, Mon	INBOX	@ / @ are many - better - other ones. Talk to Randy, then talk to Baker. Then talk to Andy. He wants you there because of who and how you are.
2016-03-21 00:55:27, Mon	INBOX	Trust yourself.
2016-03-21 00:56:24, Mon	OUTBOX	I don't have confidence that Andy has my back. He should, but I never operate with full confidence that he does.
2016-03-21 00:58:46, Mon	OUTBOX	My god, I am so hurt and so angry. [redacted]
2016-03-21 01:00:46, Mon	OUTBOX	Like we need another reason to dismiss the UN...\n\nI Love the U.N., but It Is Failing http://nyti.ms/1Vj35sn
2016-03-21 01:07:41, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0601This is part of the job that sucks. Moderately powerful men with li

2016-03-21 01:08:23, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0602mited ability. I promise everything will look better in the morning
2016-03-21 01:08:47, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0603. And I'm going to go find a Jake Sullivan quote I found when I was
2016-03-21 01:09:59, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0604 prepping for him. \n\nHang in there. You're not wrong. You deserve t
2016-03-21 01:10:04, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0606e even more effective because of it. \U0001f636
2016-03-21 01:10:04, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u03f9\u0605o be there. You can learn to negotiate all this sh*t and you will b
2016-03-21 01:33:50, Mon	INBOX	Hi. Home from dinner. Off to find that Sullivan quote. Missed Bill, so I'm just going to email him.
2016-03-21 03:08:51, Mon	OUTBOX	Where was [redacted] outrage when I got the cyber PPD thrown out? F-cking hypocrite.
2016-03-21 10:18:43, Mon	INBOX	@ P? @Damn. Wrote below last night and thought I sent:\n\n Ok. Hope you can. I'm sorry about earlier. I'd be livid, and crushed. Good on Eric for calling. I want
2016-03-21 10:18:46, Mon	INBOX	@ P? @ to hear if he had any solution.\n\nBut if there's one thing I would tell you, it's to trust yourself. You're excellent at your job, and bright, and deserv
2016-03-21 11:44:53, Mon	INBOX	@ P? @e to be there. Don't you dare step down. I won't hear of it, and wont let you do it.
2016-03-21 11:46:03, Mon	OUTBOX	Yeah, his solution was essentially roll back, know my place.
2016-03-21 11:46:49, Mon	OUTBOX	It's not your call. I'm talking to randy today, and jim. Maybe Andy. I'll decide at the end of the week.
2016-03-21 11:51:06, Mon	INBOX	F roll back. \n\nLisa of course I know it's not my call. I just don't want you making a hasty decision, particularly when you're angry and hurt.
2016-03-21 11:58:51, Mon	OUTBOX	I'm not. I'm giving it a week.
2016-03-21 22:38:44, Mon	OUTBOX	Hi. Was in one meeting after another starting at 12:30 and ending now. Spoke to neither Andy nor Randy. Leaving hq now. Still hate this place.
2016-03-21 22:47:38, Mon	INBOX	And damn that's a full day...
2016-03-21 22:49:28, Mon	OUTBOX	To be clear, I had a meeting from 11-1145 as well, it just wasn't sequential like the rest of them.
2016-03-21 22:57:52, Mon	INBOX	You work far too hard and too effectively to have to put up with the sh*t you're dealing with.
2016-03-21 22:59:01, Mon	OUTBOX	That is correct. And I STILL f-ing left later than I wanted to, doing work for the FBI. Walking in the door now.
2016-03-21 23:03:07, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0320\u0401The Bu is lucky to have you. I'll never forget that. \n\nDon't forget
2016-03-21 23:03:10, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0320\u0402 what you're doing is independent from these a-holes and makes a re
2016-03-21 23:03:13, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0320\u0404\ufffd

2016-03-21 23:03:13, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0320\u0403al difference for the country. I mean that, in a sappy big R way.
2016-03-21 23:15:25, Mon	OUTBOX	Yeah, Jim said the same thing. He knows he can get me with sap.
2016-03-21 23:26:10, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0321\u0301He and I know we can get you with the truth of how important what w
2016-03-21 23:26:15, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0321\u0302e do is \U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\n\nReason 442 (actually, it would be in the top 5)
2016-03-21 23:26:35, Mon	INBOX	\u0500\u0321\u030[redacted]. \U0001f636
2016-03-21 23:47:39, Mon	OUTBOX	JM clearly spoke to andy about it tonight - I left it up to him whether to. JM wants to talk tonight.
2016-03-21 23:51:36, Mon	INBOX	What did he think/say about it? Forgot he would have been in there as well.
2016-03-21 23:52:19, Mon	OUTBOX	He wasn't. He was on A/L.
2016-03-21 23:54:41, Mon	INBOX	Oh. You talked to him about it? What did he think,
2016-03-22 00:24:25, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0322\u0301And hey, apparently I can't send email. \U0001f621\n\nI wrote back about Andy
2016-03-22 00:24:27, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0322\u0302's, said that was good news, and asked you not to parse it out and
2016-03-22 00:24:30, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0322\u0303spin unnecessarily negatively about it
2016-03-22 00:37:38, Tue	OUTBOX	He just called me. We had a very good, very clear conversation that I am, generally speaking, not to change anything about the way I am engaging on issues.
2016-03-22 00:46:41, Tue	INBOX	@ " @Yay!!\n\nI'm so happy. Thats what I hoped but things get weird. \n\nI'm so so glad. You have to be hugely relieved. \n\nSo are you still going to talk to Randy
2016-03-22 00:46:44, Tue	INBOX	@ " @? Andy C? Eric? And if so, what approach? I kind of think Randy is the easiest, just straightforward.
2016-03-22 01:08:38, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0324\u0201And arghh. I'm frustrated I can't email out. \n\nI'm so happy, and so
2016-03-22 01:08:43, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0324\u0202 glad he reaffirmed everything you are. Makes me like him more. \U0001f60a
2016-03-22 01:57:11, Tue	OUTBOX	He is going to talk to Randy and Andy C. separately, then address the other EADs more broadly. (Apparently Steinbach has been inquiring about my role too).
2016-03-22 01:59:57, Tue	INBOX	Good. A nice stern cup of stfu would go a long way.
2016-03-22 02:00:16, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, he was very clear that particularly in that small group, he values my views as much as theirs (at a minimum), and that he fully expects/demands that I speak freely. He apologized for not saying something to Randy at the time, said he was so stunned he thought it was a joke at first. We talked too about strategies for the bigger group, which I had already given thought too.

2016-03-22 02:01:08, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, I hope he is as clear and direct with them as he was with me. There's always that risk, but at least I know where I stand.
2016-03-22 02:04:04, Tue	INBOX	@ (" @Wow. Sounds like a really good conversation. I wouldn't hold out too much hope for a perfect resolution, but like you said, at least you clearly know whe
2016-03-22 02:04:06, Tue	INBOX	@ (" @re you stand.
2016-03-22 02:04:38, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0326\u0201And I'm sorry I'm not there. \n\nI want to talk all about this with y
2016-03-22 02:04:38, Tue	INBOX	\u0500\u0326\u0202ou. \U0001f615
2016-03-22 02:07:31, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, same here.
2016-03-23 00:46:04, Wed	INBOX	Yes. Still there...\n\nYou being all fired up on the call certainly didn't improve matters...
2016-03-23 00:47:02, Wed	OUTBOX	Ha. Meanwhile I just feel like throttling DOJ...
2016-03-23 00:51:58, Wed	INBOX	Not to worry. I'm impressively, even stunningly, effective at redirection.
2016-03-23 01:51:47, Wed	INBOX	I WAS TALKING WITH MOFFA! Sheesh. \U0001f60a
2016-03-23 22:50:26, Wed	INBOX	I am getting aggravated at Laufman. If I ever get a data connection back, you'll see why.
2016-03-23 23:37:43, Wed	INBOX	@ H! @m [redacted] but whatever. It's just that nagging question of whether Mike knows/appreciates who does and knows what.
2016-03-25 18:33:55, Fri	OUTBOX	K. Still in Andy's ofc, be down soon.
2016-03-25 18:35:08, Fri	INBOX	Bill wants to talk some more. 5 minutes. I can also meet you up there
2016-03-26 19:08:19, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] sent me an article about an Israeli company an Israeli news outlet is claiming is helping us. Meant to follow up with you on your note last week. \n\nSigh. Just for a few extra hours in each day...\U0001f636
2016-03-26 19:09:28, Sat	OUTBOX	I read it. [redacted]
2016-03-26 19:10:12, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-26 19:12:43, Sat	OUTBOX	And "they" (DOJ, the hill, IC) don't like when we ask them to justify their "need to know."
2016-03-26 19:13:02, Sat	INBOX	Yeah well that doesn't exactly change my point...\U0001f615
2016-03-26 19:13:31, Sat	INBOX	Did you see the Hayden article from The Hill that I sent? Jackass...
2016-03-26 19:14:04, Sat	OUTBOX	Yup. All these former intel guys just trying to make money. Forget when they came from.
2016-03-26 19:14:51, Sat	INBOX	Oh he's all about foreign spying still. Just wants to be the simultaneous champion of domestic privacy liberties...

2016-03-26 21:53:52, Sat	INBOX	Just talked to Moffa. He's solid. Andy needs to start grooming him to be AD Intel one day....
2016-03-26 21:57:51, Sat	OUTBOX	K. Will tell him eventually.
2016-03-28 00:45:44, Mon	INBOX	When are you going to talk to him? Are you?
2016-03-28 00:46:14, Mon	OUTBOX	Still waiting until Andy has spoken to them. And yes, I will. I have to.
2016-03-28 00:49:11, Mon	INBOX	The longer it goes, the harder it is for Andy to say anything. \n\nSorry.
2016-03-28 00:49:47, Mon	OUTBOX	I know. But he has to. I'll make him.\n\nRemind me convo re he and. baker.
2016-03-28 00:50:10, Mon	INBOX	I just want some time. Let's please hopefully fingers crossed try and take advantage of these days Andy is away...
2016-03-28 00:50:39, Mon	INBOX	Ok. Of course I want to hear it, particularly in light of what Bill said about Trisha.
2016-03-28 00:50:54, Mon	INBOX	Andy and Baker or Randy and Baker?
2016-03-28 00:54:44, Mon	OUTBOX	Andy and baker.
2016-03-28 09:21:36, Mon	INBOX	Hi. Forgot I'm acting dad today. 7:15 with Bill. \U0001f61e
2016-03-28 10:01:24, Mon	OUTBOX	Yuck. That stinks. Where's [redacted] now?
2016-03-28 10:32:11, Mon	INBOX	Who knows. Working on his United Platinum status? [redacted]
2016-03-28 16:11:56, Mon	INBOX	Just got done with Bill \U0001f612
2016-03-28 23:20:01, Mon	INBOX	Talked to Brian Brooks got answers to Andy's Qs about whether we could do anything forensically to accommodate DoJs questions at meeting. Short answer no, I can fill you in tomorrow if you want more detail or just let Bill brief it up.
2016-03-28 23:29:49, Mon	OUTBOX	Of course I will want info directly. And good. We shouldn't be. [redacted] can just get over herself.
2016-03-28 23:34:32, Mon	INBOX	Yeah that was my feeling, too. Brian offered several times to ask again and i told him that answer was perfectly fine, just needed to be able to say we did an honest ask at an executive level. Besides, I got him to tell me the whole story of the Apple thing. [redacted]
2016-03-28 23:37:14, Mon	OUTBOX	Hey, I was just following directions to keep it quiet. Everyone and their mother wants to know how we did it and who the third party is. Hope he didn't tell you for former as that is likely classified by now...

2016-03-28 23:37:32, Mon	INBOX	Also, the more I thought about the meeting this morning and what you're waiting on from [redacted] it made me angry. I want - the team needs - your thoughts and input. I get you work for and advise him, but he's not going to relay to anyone, let alone me, your thoughts as the meeting is going on. You're smart and your a good attorney and what you think makes a difference to more than just Andy. Anyway, I value your input and opinion and I'm disappointed i didn't get it at the meeting
2016-03-28 23:39:16, Mon	OUTBOX	Yup. And it just makes me that much more angry that apparently now I'm supposed to add Bill and Trisha to the list. Whatever. Is what it is I guess.
2016-03-28 23:42:16, Mon	INBOX	Not Bill I don't think. I really think he was relying what he heard, not what he saw.
2016-03-28 23:42:47, Mon	INBOX	And you know I defended you without reservation, and I believe he trusts my judgment.
2016-03-28 23:50:18, Mon	INBOX	And I'm not commenting on Trisha because I simply don't know. I'm not saying I think you do. \n\nAnd dammit I know [redacted] super busy but I worry she has too much going on. I'm going to ask her to have someone in OGC do the atty opinion process research along the lines of what you suggested. I fear too much of what we want and need to ask is going to be construed by DoJ as "opinion." I don't want to ask about each of the 1500, but I do want to say, who gave you guidance about what constituted a record? Who did you ask or rely on to make a decision? Who and under what circumstances would you seek guidance from State? All "opinion," right?
2016-03-28 23:57:53, Mon	INBOX	Also - and you have to reply to each of these (this and above), dammit, don't skimp responses - where did Mike have to go? He left the last brief to the D 45 minutes early as well. Whatever. \n\nWhat points did you make to Andy in the meeting? I assume you'd relay to me at some point as you did the final one but I am curious as to your thoughts along the way.
2016-03-29 00:05:13, Tue	INBOX	Finally, what is Andy/your understanding of what happens next after the meeting today? That we charge ahead with the two scheduled interviews provided doj tells Beth we aren't done and intend to interview about sort?
2016-03-29 00:07:27, Tue	OUTBOX	I do not agree that all are opinion. Opinion is about the attorneys IMPRESSIONS, strength of the case, etc. Understanding what criteria they used to determine whether something was work-related, and whether someone applied those criteria re a particular email, is not opinion. I'll do some research. And yes, [redacted] is much, much too busy.
2016-03-29 00:08:06, Tue	OUTBOX	To brief the D. He had a CT Homeland session with POTUS.

2016-03-29 00:10:58, Tue	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:11:08, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:12:04, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]. \U0001f612
2016-03-29 00:12:42, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:16:35, Tue	INBOX	[redacted]. \u263a
2016-03-29 00:18:35, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:21:01, Tue	OUTBOX	B) yeah, I wanted to push on that, since uh, they all already know each other George, but again, don't know my place.
2016-03-29 00:21:21, Tue	OUTBOX	C) You know I'll look at whatever whenever you want.
2016-03-29 00:24:32, Tue	INBOX	A) sounds right. How much you want to bet I'll be pulling teeth cone Thursday?\nB) I know I can't speak for Mike or Trisha, but as far as everyone else in the room, on this case, it's your place. '[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:26:08, Tue	OUTBOX	So I would like to suggest the following to andy, but it depends on how important it really is to you: I really think [redacted] should be present for all future calls with D counsel. Enough that I'd be willing to tell Andy, hey, this is a "look George, now I'm coming to you with an ask. We need a person in that room to ensure a trust - filled relationship moving forward. Bc it's starting to deteriorate." Or whatever.
2016-03-29 00:26:54, Tue	OUTBOX	A) Then you'd better tell them first thing tomorrow morning. By email.\n'[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:29:02, Tue	INBOX	I don't think we're there yet, re having [redacted]on all calls. Maybe if they keep up these asinine proffers. But if they agree to get us interviews, then I think we can let them have their attorney discussions. Let's see how this week unfolds before you do.
2016-03-29 00:30:10, Tue	OUTBOX	Okay. [redacted]

2016-03-29 00:30:50, Tue	OUTBOX	No more proffers. Period. God, I need to let this go. I can actually feel my blood pressure rising.
2016-03-29 00:32:42, Tue	OUTBOX	And btw, it's all well and good that you like [redacted] but I think he's an arrogant *sshole. [redacted] agrees, which makes it dispositive for me. I get he's the best you've got on that team, and maybe he's in fact good, but that doesn't change my fundamental read on him.
2016-03-29 00:33:48, Tue	OUTBOX	And I swear [redacted] that it has nothing to do with our exchange at the end. I actually thought that was quite reasonable.
2016-03-29 00:35:52, Tue	INBOX	A) me either. Let's see how this week goes. And I'll send something via email tomorrow. \n[redacted]\nD) he may be an asshole. I like some assholes. But he has experience and talks sense. If it wasn't your exchange at the end, what was it?
2016-03-29 00:36:55, Tue	OUTBOX	I can't put my finger on it. His demeanor the whole time. I don't think he is used to or likes to be disagreed with.
2016-03-29 00:37:12, Tue	INBOX	And I GUARANTEE they will proffer more with Beth! Nothing was said today that they wouldnt, in fact, my take away was they were pretty clear they intended to!
2016-03-29 00:38:35, Tue	OUTBOX	No more proffers! We made clear that we needed an exchange with the witnesses. It doesn't matter what she proffers.
2016-03-29 00:39:30, Tue	OUTBOX	And what is this I like some as shoes bullshit. Name me one. Not someone funny snarky and can be a d*ck. I mean an arrogant asshole.
2016-03-29 00:39:56, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, I just wanted to make sure you understood it was not about that in any way.
2016-03-29 00:40:10, Tue	INBOX	They will want to do both. You HEARD them say they wanted to follow up the proffer with her. Do you think Andy/Jim have the same hard no proffer line/understanding?
2016-03-29 00:40:38, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] apparently.
2016-03-29 00:41:03, Tue	OUTBOX	I'll ask, but probably no. I don't think they care if they continue, so long as we get in front of the witnesses.
2016-03-29 00:41:17, Tue	OUTBOX	No, you make excuses for people you like. Name me one.
2016-03-29 00:42:00, Tue	OUTBOX	I don't actually think you do like assholes. We're too similar, care too much about fairness and equity and kindness.
2016-03-29 00:42:19, Tue	INBOX	I like [redacted] I can see him being an asshole. And you and [redacted] both think so. Ergo, he's an asshole, who I like.
2016-03-29 00:42:35, Tue	OUTBOX	NAME ME ONE.
2016-03-29 00:43:02, Tue	INBOX	He has said a number of things to me in confidence which make me believe he believes strongly in all three. So then he's not an asshole, right?
2016-03-29 00:44:42, Tue	INBOX	In that case, you're right. I don't like assholes. \n\nThere. That was easy enough. \U0001f609

2016-03-29 00:44:46, Tue	OUTBOX	Perhaps not, but he comes off as one. This is my first ever meeting with him, and he came off as one. [redacted] has met with him many many more times, and she also regards him as one. And I'm sorry, I probably have no better skill than reading people on first blush. I will always trust my gut.
2016-03-29 00:45:17, Tue	INBOX	You read me wrong!
2016-03-29 00:45:33, Tue	OUTBOX	You're making me angry. Either tell me I'm right and you were talking crap or point out another asshole you like.
2016-03-29 00:45:53, Tue	OUTBOX	No, not when it comes to someone's fundamental nature I didn't. [redacted]
2016-03-29 00:46:22, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-03-29 00:49:34, Tue	INBOX	Look. I think he very much believes in equity and fairness (notice in didn't say kindness - that may be, but i dont know him that well). I think he has a fundamental mistrust of headquarters. DOJ, mainly, but FBI too. I think he can be arrogant and doesn't like being disagreed with until he's measured you up and decided he's OK with you. That may make him arrogant, or rebellious. But I don't think it makes him an asshole.
2016-03-29 00:50:02, Tue	INBOX	And no. I guess I don't like assholes. And I don't think he's one.
2016-03-29 00:50:56, Tue	OUTBOX	I suppose we can agree to disagree re him. You obviously know him better, I trust my gut.
2016-03-29 00:52:56, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Can someone who believes in equity and fairness be an asshole?
2016-03-29 00:54:54, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, of course! Someone is weak, insecure, threatened, whatever, and act like an asshole as a defense mechanism. I'm just telling you, everything about him, from jump, read that way to me. Even his posture was agressive, like he couldn't believe he had to justify himself again.
2016-03-29 00:55:05, Tue	OUTBOX	You did. And they will.
2016-03-29 00:57:00, Tue	INBOX	Well I like him, as far as I can tell. I'm not going to argue any more whether or not he's an asshole.
2016-03-29 00:57:18, Tue	OUTBOX	Deal.
2016-03-29 01:15:24, Tue	INBOX	God. You KNOW I would....\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636\n\nJust emailed [redacted] to ask what the plan and timing was re Beth.
2016-03-29 02:37:14, Tue	INBOX	Sorry was on phone with [redacted]
2016-03-29 02:41:16, Tue	INBOX	As expected, [redacted] couldn't hear Andy or Jim and wasn't clear that we felt we must interview on sort and get on laptops.
2016-03-29 02:41:38, Tue	INBOX	And whatever discussion he had with [redacted] this evening that wasn't conveyed. \U0001f612
2016-03-29 02:41:43, Tue	INBOX	So I did.

2016-03-29 02:41:46, Tue	OUTBOX	Well he should be able to call anyone else in that room and get that message.
2016-03-29 02:42:06, Tue	INBOX	We both agree we need a united FBI-DOJ decision and position before he calls Beth.
2016-03-29 02:42:28, Tue	INBOX	I'm telling you, DoJ is miraculous about hearing what they want to hear.
2016-03-29 02:42:42, Tue	OUTBOX	No, they're just better than we are.
2016-03-29 02:43:14, Tue	INBOX	Ok. I'll tell you the worst news. Per atty proffer, Combetta says he used BleachBit (a wiping program) when he deleted the psts from the laptops.
2016-03-29 02:43:37, Tue	INBOX	\U0001f621\n\nNo one on the team knows that yet so you have to wait to tell Andy.
2016-03-29 02:43:40, Tue	OUTBOX	The ones m and s used?
2016-03-29 02:44:17, Tue	OUTBOX	Still have to get them to confirm that. Doesn't change anything. You would never just take some attys word for it.
2016-03-29 02:44:17, Tue	INBOX	Doesn't mean they're not somewhere else, but if true, and done properly, makes this much harder.
2016-03-29 02:49:01, Tue	INBOX	Apr 18 I'm in nz...although I wonder if I should cancel with the case where it is....
2016-03-29 02:49:50, Tue	OUTBOX	You should go. It's important to meet these folks too. You will someday have your other job back.
2016-03-29 09:04:43, Tue	OUTBOX	Aargh. [redacted] and now I can't stop thinking about your stupid case. The whole thing really makes me angry. \U0001f621
2016-03-29 11:15:08, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Trisha scheduled a meeting from noon until 1. \U0001f612
2016-03-29 11:19:24, Tue	INBOX	Grassley letter about reporting we had people sign NDAs. Still. Not. Done. [redacted]
2016-03-29 11:46:00, Tue	INBOX	So. Changing topics so I stop wallowing in regret. Why is [redacted] so low? Trisha? Or everything?
2016-03-29 11:54:30, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, mostly Trisha and working way way too hard and not feeling like Trisha is satisfied with anything [redacted] is doing.
2016-03-29 11:55:22, Tue	OUTBOX	But you can't say anything to her!
2016-03-29 11:56:28, Tue	INBOX	I won't. But I can be sweet, and appreciative
2016-03-29 11:56:49, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, that would be good.
2016-03-29 11:57:01, Tue	INBOX	) and what is Tricia doing? [redacted] the only competent person she has...
2016-03-29 11:58:36, Tue	OUTBOX	I know. I'm sure she doesn't know she's doing it and would be appalled. I've been talking to [redacted] every day about needing to say something to Trisha. Or to talk to Jim about getting advice about how to address her concerns. It's bad enough that she's been thinking about going back to the line...

2016-03-29 12:05:42, Tue	INBOX	And Jesus I'm late. Just now entering dc...
2016-03-29 12:08:30, Tue	INBOX	definitely needs to say something. That's no good having to work that way, feeling that way.
2016-03-29 12:57:50, Tue	INBOX	Yay. I'm ready when you are. Bill is stopping by my office at 9:45, something from upstairs this morning
2016-03-29 15:46:43, Tue	INBOX	Hey Trisha pushed the noon meeting. Call or stop by if you can before lunch re email drafting.
2016-03-29 23:30:56, Tue	INBOX	Also said he would send the draft email on to Andy tonight. Don't know why, but if you talk to him, want you to give me some credit in the drafting of that thing. Doesn't make a big difference I guess. \n\nAlso, Tricia email to apologize for changing yesterday to Monday. She said she had convinced herself that today was already Wednesday. I told her not to worry about it, that some weeks were like that, and that it was probably better to put the day of the week in there anyway.
2016-03-29 23:37:02, Tue	OUTBOX	I will. Was going to say pete and I drafted it so it should be good to go. \n\nPoor Trisha. That's rough.
2016-03-30 01:04:24, Wed	INBOX	Been talking to about you. I will show you tomorrow.
2016-03-30 01:04:58, Wed	OUTBOX	Also, andy responded, said he would read email tonight.
2016-03-30 01:08:21, Wed	OUTBOX	And more info re
2016-03-30 01:11:51, Wed	INBOX	We emailed. I want to show you tomorrow. Any chance in hell you let me wait?
2016-03-30 01:17:14, Wed	INBOX	Ok. Are you going to trust me to believe you'd feel the same way, roles reversed?
2016-03-30 01:17:34, Wed	INBOX	And our cone of silence/circle of trust?
2016-03-30 01:22:03, Wed	OUTBOX	I don't know what the first question means, but yes, of course to the second question.\n\nI'm not going to like this, am I? \U0001f615
2016-03-30 01:23:20, Wed	INBOX	You're going to be fine once you read it a second time and understand he knows nothing about you and lumps you into the HQ good idea fairy collective.
2016-03-30 01:32:28, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm not sure how I can be a "former prosecutor" and have never defended my position before a judge, but whatever, I don't give a shit. Really, the person who should be most offended is She's done nothing but as reasonable questions of them, him in particular, and instead been cross-examined for having the temerity to question "the most aggressive prosecutor agents have ever seen." But yup, you're right. Not arrogant or an asshole.
2016-03-30 01:36:18, Wed	INBOX	Sigh. How is he to know you from Adam? Compared to the and other people he's encountered along the way?

2016-03-30 01:36:52, Wed	INBOX	You both react so strongly because there is (good, positive) similarity between you.
2016-03-30 01:37:10, Wed	INBOX	I'm going to once get you to understand your first impression was incorrect.
2016-03-30 01:38:45, Wed	INBOX	And stop with the don't give a shit, of course you do. But understand he's judging improperly based on ignorance. And be strong enough in your own skin and character to know he's wrong about you. Because of his insecurities and prejudgments.
2016-03-30 01:38:51, Wed	OUTBOX	How about he just explain the intricacies to the group of people at the table who inquired of him in the first place? \n\nOn this guy? Don't waste your f-cking breath.
2016-03-30 01:40:22, Wed	OUTBOX	I know he's wrong about me. I don't need his validation to know I'm good at what I do. I'm not interested in engaging in a dick measuring contest, thanks.
2016-03-30 01:40:46, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes, poor [redacted] He knows all the answers. If only everyone would just do as he said.
2016-03-30 01:41:11, Wed	INBOX	Please - if you got summoned from Trenton to appear before the US Atty or the new Head of OCRS, you'd feel the same contempt. "The suits at main (/front office) have never done it, have no idea what it really takes." It's the same for him.
2016-03-30 01:43:37, Wed	OUTBOX	But you've said I've done it. Apparently your word doesn't carry much weight either. \n\nAnd yes, you have the luxury, like all prosecutors, of being myopic about everything about the case in front of you. We have an institution to protect. Go fuck yourself, [redacted]
2016-03-30 01:48:32, Wed	OUTBOX	And frankly, it shows how much weight he gives your opinion too. She's competent and has character and knows what she's talking about gets met with I can explain to her the intricacies of privileges she has never actually litigated. Quite the charmer.
2016-03-30 01:49:24, Wed	INBOX	Stop!\nA) you want his validation, because if he's half of what he says, he's a good prosecutor. I want his validation.\nA) 1) he doesn't know you\nB) put yourself in his shoes. He's an AUSA in Richmond. He's not the AAG, or DAAG, even though he's wildly more qualified. That gives rise to a complicated mix of contempt and envy and impatience and disrespect. \nC) he's had to fight harder than he should for justice (sound familiar?). That breeds distrust of authority. \nD) you're welcome re my defense. Even though he isn't willing to drop decades of experience for an acquaintance he's had for 6 months, I hope I'm and trust it counts for something.
2016-03-30 01:51:14, Wed	INBOX	And dammit maybe people's opinions aren't perfect but are shaped by their insecurities. Where does your expectation of perfect people come from? Good people can be limited by their flaws. \n\nAnd their flawed opinion of you doesn't make it true (about you).

2016-03-30 02:00:38, Wed	OUTBOX	I have zero confidence at this time that he is a good prosecutor. Lots of inflated ego blowhards actually think they are, doesn't make it so. Pony up a comprehensive memo on work product, teach us all what we don't know, and I'd be happy to change my opinion.\n\nYou want everyone's validation. \n\nI do appreciate your defense of me. I should have thanked you earlier. Thank you.\n\nI do not believe that I am perfect, nor do I expect others to be - that's entirely unfair.
2016-03-30 02:02:48, Wed	INBOX	A) he convicted MacDonald. I don't know the rest of his trial record but I know he has a great reputation \nB) I do. It's a fault of mine. I'm working on it. \nC) always. \U0001f636
2016-03-30 02:03:14, Wed	INBOX	D) you misunderstand me. I'm saying HE'S imperfect
2016-03-30 02:03:24, Wed	OUTBOX	I haven't seen a whole lot of "doing" from him. But I've certainly heard a whole lot of talk. He's litigated it 7000 times, should be no problem to explain the law then. Hell, he can pull it out of the 7000 filings he's had to make on the topic.
2016-03-30 02:03:51, Wed	OUTBOX	D) I'm not looking for perfect from anyone. What I'm looking is humility.
2016-03-30 02:04:14, Wed	INBOX	D) consequently his beliefs and impulses and reactions (to you, in this specific instance) are fkawed.
2016-03-30 02:04:32, Wed	OUTBOX	A) And that's legit. And from everything I know, a tough case. So kudos to him. Doesn't change the rest of it.
2016-03-30 02:05:31, Wed	INBOX	A) bullshit of course it does. There is work behind that success. And unlike the [redacted]poseurs, [redacted] actually did the lift.
2016-03-30 02:06:15, Wed	OUTBOX	I know they are. I do not take the comments of someone who has known me for a grand total of one hour to heart. I'm a lot more confident than that. You don't have to believe me, but I'm not looking for his validation. I'd simply take not being prejudiced and just a *smidge* less arrogance.
2016-03-30 02:06:15, Wed	INBOX	Who amongst us is humble? Andy? You? Me? Let's be brutally honest.
2016-03-30 02:06:33, Wed	OUTBOX	A) I believe that! I meant that that was impressive!
2016-03-30 02:06:59, Wed	INBOX	And I'm telling you it's wrong to read it as arrogance.
2016-03-30 02:07:11, Wed	OUTBOX	Oh stop with the philosophical discussion. No. But do we make a point of rubbing everyone's nose in it?
2016-03-30 02:07:26, Wed	OUTBOX	Then me, [redacted] and Andy are all wrong. So be it.
2016-03-30 02:07:30, Wed	INBOX	I'd say - reduced to its core - it's inferiority and contempt and doubt.
2016-03-30 02:09:11, Wed	INBOX	Jesus. You're not all wrong. His assumption is you are Giuliano and [redacted] and Giacalone. [redacted] Lisa Monaco. Same-same. Why should he trust this is any different.\n\n\nWhy are you responding so damn hard?!?!?
2016-03-30 02:09:39, Wed	OUTBOX	Which I dislike even more. It's the very trait I most loathe. Instead of a modicum of humility, self-awareness, men in particular self-aggrandize to make up for their own inferiority.

2016-03-30 02:10:26, Wed	INBOX	And same question you're not arrogant? Andy's not? I'm not? The Director?\n\nThe only person I can honestly say no to is
2016-03-30 02:12:33, Wed	OUTBOX	Am I confident in my abilities? Yes. Do I have to cut people down or rub someone's nose in it to prove it to them, myself, or to feel good about myself? No, I do not.
2016-03-30 02:12:47, Wed	INBOX	I don't think he's self-aggrandizing. I think he's earned his chops and is engaging in behavior to minimize the devastating past impact of politically motivated assholes torpedoing justice for their own advancement. There's a difference.
2016-03-30 02:14:17, Wed	INBOX	He didn't cut you down! He didn't say anything until prompted by me. And his (misinformed - wrong in this instance but usually right) opinion was informed by repetitive past experience.
2016-03-30 02:14:34, Wed	OUTBOX	So show me the fight for justice in this case. Not just the sweet nothings he whispers in your ear alone, but the truth to power that he's speaking every day.
2016-03-30 02:16:04, Wed	INBOX	After he's been told by George and to hat their job is to get process? That they are to be seen but not heard, like children? Why on earth would he be cynical?
2016-03-30 02:18:30, Wed	INBOX	And the fact that you don't need to cut people down or run their nose in it doesn't diminish my point. Most people are flawed. See past their problems - those problems are theirs, not yours - to let you see the good and noble in them.
2016-03-30 02:26:07, Wed	INBOX	I guess I'd say assume good intent. Whatever the pitfalls, assume good intent.
2016-03-30 12:17:28, Wed	INBOX	Hi. 830 with Jones cancelled
2016-03-30 19:33:07, Wed	INBOX	Yep. But I don't know her schedule. She was talking desk search policy change with Trisha at 3 then calling Fort now.
2016-03-30 22:12:43, Wed	INBOX	Need to talk later just got pulled into briefing tomorrow with ces, toscas, briefing chief of crim div on internal.
2016-03-31 00:07:09, Thu	OUTBOX	Hey, was thinking, don't you think DD should get a brief on that case for tomorrow before doj does? Or at least at about the same time? Maybe mention to bill?
2016-03-31 00:10:35, Thu	INBOX	Briefed Bill, he intended to tell Mike to brief Andy. Gave him enough copies.
2016-03-31 00:11:39, Thu	OUTBOX	I get that, but maybe an actual brief since that's what doj is getting and I don't think you'd want your DD not to know everything they do right?
2016-03-31 00:27:52, Thu	INBOX	Sorry called.
2016-03-31 00:28:52, Thu	INBOX	Sounds smart to me but Bill/Mike need to raise it. And truly it's not that big a deal.

2016-03-31 00:59:57, Thu	INBOX	Here's the thing re case brief - I don't know how to stress importance without Jones deciding to invite himself. \n\nAnd truly, I think Bill will convey enough detail. And if Andy/Mike want more, they can ask. \n\nInterestingly, we'd brief internals somewhat regularly to EAD. Haven't with Mike. Also, he's sat down for big briefs with 1 and 3 (not sure about 2). Not us. Maybe he figures he'll hear about them if he needs to. I may also suggest to Bill that he my want to get a section significant case briefing.
2016-03-31 15:43:12, Thu	INBOX	Talked with Bill and Trisha and [redacted] Will tell you on the way to lunch - call me when you're clear.
2016-03-31 16:18:28, Thu	INBOX	Thanks for stepping out to make the call/ heads up about lunch, I appreciate it. :)\n\nI am grumbly Bill is not going. Jim wasn't tracking on all the various sources of ambiguity in the reporting. \U0001f612
2016-03-31 16:20:52, Thu	INBOX	And I am grumbly about Trisha. Will explain.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-01 14:38:39, Fri	INBOX	Just read your last lync - that's REALLY frustrating. \n\nBecause it's ok for Mike and Randy to have multiple people like [redacted] and [redacted], but because Andy is HIGHER, he needs LESS. \n\nMakes no sense whatsoever.
2016-04-01 14:47:51, Fri	OUTBOX	Not just less, but no disagreement.
2016-04-01 21:05:54, Fri	OUTBOX	Calling George now. I'm sure this is in your interest
2016-04-01 21:07:21, Fri	INBOX	I spoke with [redacted] and got an update about where they are if you want it (nowhere, though they have spoken then written to prao)
2016-04-01 21:07:50, Fri	OUTBOX	Talk to [redacted] yet?
2016-04-01 21:08:16, Fri	INBOX	No decision on where or how to tell [redacted], other than she will be called next week . No decision on what if anything to litigate.
2016-04-01 21:08:37, Fri	INBOX	No (that he could produce to me) analysis of fact vs opinion product
2016-04-01 21:10:06, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] told the working level today she thought the Sat interview would only be State time....
2016-04-01 21:16:03, Fri	OUTBOX	Steinbach walked in. Calling George now
2016-04-01 21:16:31, Fri	INBOX	Sigh. Ok. Of course I'm waiting to hear all about it.
2016-04-01 21:17:29, Fri	OUTBOX	Oh christ. Doesn't seem like it is about the case. \U0001f612
2016-04-01 23:20:46, Fri	INBOX	Just got done talking with Bill
2016-04-01 23:21:45, Fri	INBOX	Went in when I got back, gave him the dump from you. \n\nI'm sorry about the disappearing. \U0001f636
2016-04-01 23:24:20, Fri	OUTBOX	No problem. Hope you told him I'd be happy to share directly, just totally confused by the (non)rules going on in this case.
2016-04-01 23:26:30, Fri	INBOX	Yes!\u263a
2016-04-01 23:58:52, Fri	INBOX	Yay. I told you Rich Quinn called, they're getting a ton of questions about State saying they stopped investigation at FBI request...
2016-04-01 23:59:51, Fri	OUTBOX	Really. No, you didn't mention.
2016-04-02 00:00:36, Sat	INBOX	Standby will email article

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-02 01:19:29, Sat	OUTBOX	So look, you say we text on that phone when we talk about hillary because it can't be traced, you were just venting bc you feel bad that you're gone so much but it can't be helped right now.
2016-04-02 01:20:30, Sat	INBOX	Right. But did you say anything other than work? I did, [redacted]
2016-04-02 11:20:10, Sat	INBOX	Btw, he got neither of the two asac jobs he was in for earlier, and [redacted] said [redacted] (who sits on the asac board) said he wasn't getting Milwaukee, coming up. Talked about him with Bill, too. He's of the same mind I am. \n\nGotta figure out what to do with [redacted].
2016-04-02 11:53:01, Sat	OUTBOX	That sucks about [redacted]. Do they have any suggestions?
2016-04-02 12:29:03, Sat	INBOX	[redacted] No idea what to do about [redacted]. Probably suggest he try a different division (ct? Iod?) to expand his experience.
2016-04-02 20:56:08, Sat	INBOX	I told you the story from [redacted] about Andy getting his number?
2016-04-02 21:22:02, Sat	OUTBOX	No, don't think I know the andy [redacted] story. Or if I do I don't remember.
2016-04-02 21:24:34, Sat	INBOX	Pretty sure I told you - Mike heimbach lamenting how bad it was and what they'd have to do to get him selected for wfo. Anyway, I can tell you again. [redacted]
2016-04-03 11:08:36, Sun	OUTBOX	I woke up thinking about [redacted] and now I'm f-ing pissed and can't fall back asleep. \U0001f620\U0001f620\U0001f620
2016-04-03 12:35:05, Sun	INBOX	And yeah, [redacted] behavior was inappropriate. I need to talk to him.
2016-04-03 12:52:43, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted] And then at 6:30 I got all mad again about the fact that [redacted] is now talking to DOJ about my question. Because it is THAT offensive that I would dare question him. Asshole.
2016-04-03 12:53:47, Sun	OUTBOX	And then I get mad because I too can let rip all sorts of smart remarks, but because I'm a girl younger my position whatever I'm expected to remain above the fray.
2016-04-03 12:54:08, Sun	INBOX	You get you're not the part that's objectionable to him, right? It's the while thing
2016-04-03 12:54:33, Sun	OUTBOX	Uh huh. I'm just the part that keeps coming up.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-03 12:55:06, Sun	INBOX	No. You're a professional and someone who works in the office of the highest ranking agent in the FBI. You behave professionally and appropriately.
2016-04-03 12:55:49, Sun	INBOX	You remain above the fray because that's the right thing to do, not because you're a woman or young or anything else.
2016-04-03 12:55:58, Sun	INBOX	Everyone gets [redacted] was out of line.
2016-04-03 12:56:31, Sun	OUTBOX	I don't believe that for a second.
2016-04-03 12:56:58, Sun	OUTBOX	And he was perfectly fine in the meeting. Which means the "out of line" has been happening since then.
2016-04-03 12:57:26, Sun	INBOX	And remember - I didn't tell this to [redacted] because I had forgotten - you whispered it to me, and only after George said "share your wisdom with the group" did you mention it.
2016-04-03 12:58:32, Sun	INBOX	He wasn't perfectly fine in the meeting. I thought he was angry and you were leaving. \n\nWhich part of what I said don't you believe? And what do you mean by out if line has been happening since the meeting*
2016-04-03 12:59:33, Sun	OUTBOX	That everyone gets he was out of line.
2016-04-03 13:00:29, Sun	INBOX	It's the part that keeps coming up with [redacted]. I have not heard anything from anyone else in the meeting (other than [redacted] talking ABOUT [redacted]). Because, I suspect, that was on him to research/speak to and he didn't and it was questioned.
2016-04-03 13:00:58, Sun	INBOX	Everyone on our side does. I can't speak to DoJ. I told you what I told [redacted].
2016-04-03 13:01:04, Sun	OUTBOX	And no, I don't have a problem with how he was in the meeting at all. I have a problem with the amount it has been a point of controversy since then, the amount that "that girl with the question" has clearly been discussed.
2016-04-03 13:02:00, Sun	OUTBOX	Our side equals you and Jon and maybe [redacted]. Give me a break Pete. If you guys don't have my back I've got real problems.
2016-04-03 13:02:43, Sun	OUTBOX	Whatever. We don't need to talk about it. [redacted]
2016-04-03 13:04:13, Sun	INBOX	He was angry and talked to me - after I brought it up - and with [redacted]. He may have spoken to [redacted] after I brought it up with him. \n\nI think - and I may wrong - you are conflating the motives behind Randy Andy and [redacted] with the ones at the meeting. The former is more along the lines of what you're saying. The meeting wasn't a function of yur age or gender. [redacted] would have responded exactly the same way to a 45 year old male from the DD's office saying what you did.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-03 13:06:07, Sun	INBOX	A) we have your back. Strongly and forever. So you'll be good. \U0001f636\nB) Bill had no problem with what you said. \nC) there were no other FBI in the room at that point. \nD) Andy needs to f*cking say something to his crew.
2016-04-03 13:09:37, Sun	OUTBOX	You don't know that, re [redacted]. But whatever, it really doesn't matter.
2016-04-03 13:10:20, Sun	INBOX	It's true that I don't.
2016-04-03 13:11:04, Sun	INBOX	And i do believe there's an inherent sexism in most people. So I can't argue too strongly. Just my suspicion.
2016-04-03 13:11:21, Sun	OUTBOX	A) You have my back. Maybe [redacted]. Bill who knows, [redacted] only if she's not threatened.
2016-04-03 13:12:31, Sun	INBOX	Truly, I'm going to talk to him. I think my main message is what I told [redacted] you've got a bunch of very good, bright attorneys in that room, and you're going to get a ton more bees with honey rather than vinegar. And then reinforce you're a superstar. Is that the right path?
2016-04-03 13:13:22, Sun	INBOX	A) [redacted] that's life. I think most people can only count on one hand the number of people who truly have their back, no matter what. \U0001f636+H466
2016-04-03 13:20:38, Sun	OUTBOX	I guess. I would probably be more direct - they don't know you from adam, why are they supposed to take your word for it? Especially when they're all used to the no brigade at DOJ. And if it is that straightforward and obvious an answer, it shouldn't take much work to demonstrate that to everyone.
2016-04-03 13:22:21, Sun	INBOX	Makes sense.
2016-04-03 13:23:07, Sun	INBOX	Do you have any desire to meet him - meeting about privilege or lunch or HH? (I strongly suspect i know the answer)
2016-04-03 13:24:58, Sun	OUTBOX	You do know the answer. He can act all big and "sure I'll get a drink with anyone" but at the end of the day that meetup is going to go no better.
2016-04-03 13:26:53, Sun	OUTBOX	And truly, I'm not sure why you're going to say more to him in the first place. [redacted] what do you think you're going to accomplish?
2016-04-03 13:29:25, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] it's also defending a friend, a colleague, who I have immense respect for. Whose back I have.\n\nWhat I hope to accomplish is to understand his perspective on privilege, tell him he's been an ass, and defend you.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-03 13:32:03, Sun	OUTBOX	And I'm just telling you it's pointless. Because he's not going to care what you have to say about me, or [redacted] or baker or whomever, and he's not going to care or listen to the notion that he's been an ass. He's the most aggressive prosecutor any agent has ever worked with. \n\nRe the understanding his view on privilege, he's going to have to explain that - to lawyers, not agents - whether you say anything or not.
2016-04-03 13:36:04, Sun	INBOX	Not sure I agree with your first point, but I understand it. And I agree with your second. I just want to know what it is.
2016-04-04 20:35:09, Mon	INBOX	You on your call? [redacted] ambushed me...30 minutes later...\U0001f612
2016-04-04 20:37:09, Mon	INBOX	He literally followed me down the hallway arguing for [redacted] ...he does care, just a little TOO zealous sometimes.
2016-04-04 20:37:45, Mon	OUTBOX	I know. He just doesn't know how to let go. But it is because he just Cares So Much.
2016-04-04 20:56:43, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] stopped by give me 3
2016-04-05 11:28:11, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Just realized you probably go from your meeting at doj straight into wrap. [redacted]
2016-04-05 11:52:42, Tue	INBOX	Hey are you going to need your UC policy working folder?
2016-04-05 12:22:20, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah, I will. Will get it at some point.
2016-04-05 12:35:36, Tue	INBOX	Ok. I'm leaving for wf around 9 - want me to leave it someplace? If you're en route to [redacted] before then I could maybe meet you up there+H730
2016-04-05 22:23:32, Tue	INBOX	And sorry about Andy...I'm sure he eventually well, but you shouldn't have had to wait this long. \U0001f615
2016-04-05 22:24:51, Tue	OUTBOX	Yeah well I'm such a valued player...
2016-04-05 22:25:23, Tue	INBOX	And truly have 30 things to tell you (some or all of which can wait till tomorrow), including an interview Bill is stressing about and wants me to do in NY. \n\nYou are!
2016-04-05 22:25:33, Tue	INBOX	This is a weak spot for Andy
2016-04-07 01:44:04, Thu	INBOX	Couple of things. Same thing [redacted] called about (timing of getting Combetta and judges at edva) plus disagreement with [redacted] on interview topic for Mills ([redacted] is right)
2016-04-07 15:40:29, Thu	INBOX	Hey got a very cimplete answer from Bill just now.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-08 00:19:35, Fri	OUTBOX	Maybe it is a friend thing. I gotta say, when he sent the email, and then was so concerned by my reaction that he followed up with that call, my overall feeling was "oh good, he cares!" I'm even okay with him caring out of a selfish desire because he really wants me to keep working for him. And so now I just feel like a suckered maybe? Guess he didn't care enough.
2016-04-08 00:19:43, Fri	OUTBOX	I don't know. That's the best I can come up with.
2016-04-08 00:32:06, Fri	INBOX	I'd feel that way. No doubt about it. \n\nBut see what I just imsged. I don't know if "friendship" changes when it's a superior - subordinate relationship, particularly when it's an advisor - high ranking dynamic (in other words, I think it's different - some - from my relationship with [redacted])
2016-04-08 00:34:14, Fri	INBOX	And interesting how elusive it is (for me, too!) to put ones finger on. \n\nI guess for me it's the thought (hope) that he's a stand up guy. And this is not stand up behavior. And when it's about YOU that's extra hard.\n\nLet me ask this (though maybe it doesn't translate). What would Giacalone do?
2016-04-08 00:47:29, Fri	OUTBOX	I do think it's because he's my friend too. And honestly, I know he's my vast superior, but he's never treated me like that. Nor I him. So mostly I do just consider him my friend.
2016-04-08 00:49:36, Fri	OUTBOX	Re giacalone, I really don't know. I think he would have taken it head on and addressed it, but he's such a different person, he would have done it in an awkward shucks-y way. Andy's not like that, just has to be earnest and direct, which is harder. John would say, "hey c'mon go easy on her. She's helping me out, means no harm, etc." I think? But what do I know.
2016-04-08 00:51:49, Fri	OUTBOX	Remind me to tell you what came up st the end of convo with toscas. Punchline is it ends with andy telling Toscas that he is going to ask me to follow up with Stu on that joint venture stuff.
2016-04-08 00:52:15, Fri	INBOX	Good!!!!
2016-04-08 00:54:35, Fri	INBOX	That's gotta make you happy. [redacted]
2016-04-08 20:21:07, Fri	INBOX	Were you able to talk to Andy about Randy?
2016-04-08 20:26:58, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] Sort of. Will explain.
2016-04-08 20:27:31, Fri	INBOX	Sort of?!?!?! What?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-08 20:28:38, Fri	INBOX	Oh. Talking to Randy. Got it.
2016-04-08 20:29:26, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] We sort of talked about Randy.
2016-04-08 20:45:16, Fri	INBOX	Of course I can't wait to hear...
2016-04-08 22:28:32, Fri	INBOX	Just talked with [redacted]. Sounds like there was guidance received...
2016-04-08 22:29:23, Fri	OUTBOX	Good!
2016-04-08 22:29:45, Fri	OUTBOX	What was the guidance?
2016-04-08 22:30:28, Fri	INBOX	Talk briefly?
2016-04-08 22:31:00, Fri	OUTBOX	Sure, but everyone close by
2016-04-08 22:59:45, Fri	OUTBOX	Andy just called. Will try to call if I can. He spoke to randy. Randy says everything all good
2016-04-08 23:21:38, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] do want to hear what Andy said.
2016-04-09 01:18:28, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-09 01:18:35, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-09 01:18:45, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-09 01:37:25, Sat	OUTBOX	Whew! Ho boy.
2016-04-09 02:17:10, Sat	INBOX	You think I should pull the whole doj contingent, or just [redacted], or [redacted]?
2016-04-09 02:40:47, Sat	INBOX	So. Should I pull [redacted] aside and tell just him first?
2016-04-09 02:41:03, Sat	OUTBOX	Oh, sorry, I never answered that!
2016-04-09 02:41:33, Sat	OUTBOX	I would tell [redacted] and [redacted].

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-09 02:42:37, Sat	INBOX	That's what I'm thinking, too. [redacted] will be a calming influence.
2016-04-09 02:42:47, Sat	OUTBOX	That's a real f-u to laufman though.
2016-04-09 02:42:53, Sat	INBOX	And we have a long relationship.
2016-04-09 02:43:39, Sat	INBOX	Yep. Which he deserves, frankly. Funny, despite my various feelings, I'm not at all worried about that.
2016-04-09 02:44:42, Sat	OUTBOX	And jesus, did you just see the Times update?
2016-04-09 02:45:27, Sat	OUTBOX	Did he come for the prep?
2016-04-09 02:47:53, Sat	INBOX	Yes I did and yes he did. But he's literally doing nothing other than sitting in on the big interviews.
2016-04-09 02:47:56, Sat	OUTBOX	Wow. This is quite interesting. Jaffar is THE privacy guy at the ACLU.\n\nWhy Apple\u2019s Stand Against the F.B.I. Hurts Its Own Customers http://nyti.ms/1WiZafn
2016-04-09 02:48:21, Sat	OUTBOX	I know. He's such a douche wad.
2016-04-09 02:49:15, Sat	INBOX	And sigh. His underlying emotional terrain certainly complicates it. And kudos to you for being sensitive to it \n\nYou're a good woman, Charlie Brown. ;)
2016-04-09 02:49:35, Sat	INBOX	I know who [redacted] is. ;)
2016-04-09 02:50:25, Sat	INBOX	Stupid autocorrect undermined my gentle snark. [redacted]...
2016-04-09 02:51:46, Sat	INBOX	I have had correspondence from him to me explaining how I was undermining his clients God and Constitutionally given rights.
2016-04-09 02:52:05, Sat	OUTBOX	You should really stop doing that.
2016-04-09 02:52:05, Sat	INBOX	Not following - he needs a softer touch?
2016-04-09 02:52:48, Sat	INBOX	I know. I am The Man. \n\nBernie loving [redacted] would hate me
2016-04-09 03:01:52, Sat	INBOX	Do you think I'm misplaying not having David there with [redacted] and [redacted]?
2016-04-09 03:04:53, Sat	OUTBOX	If you do [redacted] then just do the whole team. 3 out of the 4 is ridiculous. So yeah, then I would just do the whole team.
2016-04-09 03:06:06, Sat	INBOX	No, would just be [redacted] and [redacted]. \n\nOr add David and [redacted]
2016-04-09 03:06:39, Sat	OUTBOX	Just add them both, do it all at once. Then there's no grounds for complaint about that.
2016-04-09 12:33:09, Sat	INBOX	Gotta go get Laufman

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-09 12:52:13, Sat	INBOX	They are p*ssed. Just oh so slightly
2016-04-09 12:53:28, Sat	OUTBOX	Oh well.
2016-04-09 12:54:35, Sat	OUTBOX	They can take it up with the D. [redacted]
2016-04-09 12:55:20, Sat	OUTBOX	Did you have to invoke the D/Dd?
2016-04-09 12:59:19, Sat	INBOX	,yep
2016-04-09 16:37:32, Sat	INBOX	Done, but I need to call Bill with the storm that's coming
2016-04-09 19:12:07, Sat	INBOX	Found a way thru convo with [redacted] to subsequently suggest to Bill he needed to follow up with JB.
2016-04-09 21:09:58, Sat	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-09 21:12:06, Sat	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-09 21:13:47, Sat	INBOX	
2016-04-09 21:14:08, Sat	INBOX	
2016-04-09 23:58:52, Sat	INBOX	And Bill just said he and JB missed each other, and the JB has an event tonight. Guess they'll talk tomorrow...
2016-04-10 01:20:08, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] I find I'm increasingly profoundly bothered by JBs call and the lack of ANY heads up. Deeply. It was wrong given what I had already been asked to do. Gonna sleep on it and see where I am in the morning.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-10 02:09:14, Sun	INBOX	Because you know where I was on Thursday or Friday night - when I was complaining about everyone expecting me to deliver the hard message while they vacillated in discussing with their counterparts. About how my sense of justness and character was at odds with waiting until Sat to say something. \n\nAnd rightfully, you point out stop being so prima donna-ish and just do it. \n\nAnd i do. \n\nAnd then I find out an hour later that in addition to what I was asked to do, JB went to counsel and had the discussion he did. And I'm the one facing the music. From some who I have known for a long time. Nobody else pays the price. Nobody else will have the same straight hard discussion. Yet I'm the only one who violated his sense of integrity to swallow hard and deliver the message.
2016-04-10 02:09:52, Sun	INBOX	I'm not sure if I want to be part of this
2016-04-10 05:51:15, Sun	OUTBOX	You are a part of this and that's not going to change. But I think you have every right to be angry and frustrated about being left out of the loop on your investigation, especially when you're going to be left holding the bag. And I think you're entitled to say something to Baker about that, though on this one I would probably discuss with Bill first.
2016-04-10 05:52:00, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm sorry [redacted] Big big case, big big problems. But God knows you're still the right guy to do it.H1133
2016-04-10 11:33:08, Sun	INBOX	Gmailed you two drafts of what I'm thinking of sending Bill, would appreciate your thoughts. Second (more recent) is updated so you can skip the first.
2016-04-11 13:56:15, Mon	OUTBOX	Andy just called to make sure I had heard everything. Call when you're free
2016-04-11 15:52:27, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] Bill wants to talk to me at 1215...
2016-04-11 22:19:37, Mon	INBOX	[redacted]Just talked with Bill, who spoke with everyone this morning. Will fill you in tonight or tomorrow. \n\nAlso, he was under the impression Andy wanted the meeting and a prebrief with FBI only just before. I think [redacted] may have screwed up that scheduling. Can you check? Obviously want to confirm with him before going to [redacted]
2016-04-11 22:19:40, Mon	INBOX	We talked for 45 minutes...
2016-04-11 22:20:43, Mon	OUTBOX	Wow. Can you talk now?
2016-04-11 23:00:05, Mon	OUTBOX	Sent email to andy re pre-brief. Will let you know what he says. Will wait to reach out to [redacted] re call-in line until I hear from him.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-11 23:13:06, Mon	INBOX	Oof. Laufman just left me a minute long message. Don't think I'm going to listen tonight. \n\nAnd it's weird. CES always shows as "restricted" when the call is coming in but then shows true name afterwards on the call list. Needless to say, I screen all restricted calls...
2016-04-13 00:40:33, Wed	INBOX	Talked with [redacted] for a while. She couldn't remember who said the D was going to talk to the AG on Sun night or Mon about this.
2016-04-13 02:21:03, Wed	INBOX	My point in forwarding the email was to talk about how we get to a productive place
2016-04-13 02:22:07, Wed	OUTBOX	We'll get there, but for this meeting I'd solely just be taking [redacted] lead.
2016-04-13 02:29:48, Wed	INBOX	Well sure, but would be nice to know what that lead is in advance rather than, I don't know, f*ck me in the *ss wirhout saying anything, kinda like [redacted] calling counsel the night before. \n\nToo much negative done to expect benefit of the doubt.
2016-04-13 10:55:35, Wed	INBOX	[redacted]Maybe we can find some time to talk today about the MYE thing? Really need to put it to rest. Certainly before the meeting tomorrow, if I can.
2016-04-13 11:00:08, Wed	OUTBOX	I will. I promise.
2016-04-13 21:54:09, Wed	INBOX	Btw, forgot to mentiom, Bill had me forward invite tomorrow to [redacted] \U0001f612
2016-04-13 21:58:34, Wed	OUTBOX	Are you serious?
2016-04-13 21:59:00, Wed	INBOX	Yep. Came up in the meeting.
2016-04-14 00:02:03, Thu	INBOX	Spoke to [redacted] need to talk to you at some point. Not urgent, so can certainly wait [redacted] so free to talk.
2016-04-14 00:20:20, Thu	OUTBOX	Hi. I can talk now.
2016-04-14 00:37:11, Thu	INBOX	Thank you. \U0001f636 \n\nWas obviously constrained on my comments. What I identified IS what bothers me the most. And the rest is nonsense.
2016-04-14 00:39:56, Thu	OUTBOX	And I think that frustration is fair. But it doesn't change the fundamental okay-ness of the prior two decisions (the summation and the call to her). It just means it would be best to handle it differently in the future. And Jim WILL understand that. Just talk to him, one on one. You don't need to get Bill's permission, clear through him, just go talk to him. It will all be fine.
2016-04-14 01:11:35, Thu	INBOX	I will. He told Bill on Monday he'd be happy to talk to me any time.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-14 01:12:09, Thu	INBOX	And I'm kinda sad about going to NZ...but it's the right decision. [redacted] \U0001f612
2016-04-14 01:34:16, Thu	INBOX	Oh. Boo...I'll talk to her. If Jon and I are here, she doesn't need to. Unless there is privilege research going on. She said she had already done some.
2016-04-14 19:59:45, Thu	INBOX	JM got funny about telling Carl first...that his standard presentation?
2016-04-14 20:02:03, Thu	OUTBOX	No clue. That's just how he gets when he really wants something to go a certain way but he doesn't like confrontation.
2016-04-14 23:30:32, Thu	OUTBOX	Still here. \U0001f612\n\nForgot to tell you that randy asked if we could talk and get a cup of coffee next week. Which is good, I suppose.
2016-04-14 23:34:44, Thu	INBOX	And yeah, that's good about randy. Hopefully a very different character of convo than whatever Castor wanted to say.
2016-04-15 00:45:28, Fri	OUTBOX	Hi. [redacted] Good qt with andy. Got to talk about a lot of substantive stuff.
2016-04-15 00:48:39, Fri	INBOX	I'm glad - look forward to hearing about it i figured you left late after I got an email from him at 7:45...
2016-04-15 00:49:52, Fri	OUTBOX	Oh did he respond to yours? He didn't say anything. [redacted]
2016-04-15 10:32:23, Fri	INBOX	Hi. Well you're good for a late start, at least, Andy's out. [redacted]
2016-04-15 22:09:10, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] And sorry about delay, I was talking to Bill. Interesting Apple story if you have time to talk this weekend. Nothing urgent, it can certainly wait until Monday.
2016-04-15 22:27:15, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-15 22:35:57, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-15 22:37:13, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-15 22:59:25, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-15 23:01:05, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-16 00:41:38, Sat	INBOX	And how much should I reach out to [redacted]? He's still genuinely hurt. I may have been a bit callous this afternoon. Or at least, tough love.
2016-04-16 01:11:12, Sat	OUTBOX	You should not reach out to [redacted]. Jesus, he's an adult. He should act like one.
2016-04-16 01:13:56, Sat	INBOX	Sigh. Agreed. My soft heart feels badly.
2016-04-19 22:20:24, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] And still in with andy. [redacted]
2016-04-19 22:33:36, Tue	INBOX	Hi going to try and catch Bill
2016-04-19 22:41:32, Tue	OUTBOX	Still in with andy
2016-04-20 10:59:04, Wed	INBOX	Hey are you ok if I pass to team (including doj) that as of last eve, JB has not talked with [redacted]?\n\nAlso, thinking about setting up meeting with Brooks and you, [redacted], Moffa. Want him to hear legal reasons why we need extraordinary measures, see interest of office of DD, and give him a little prep time for his folks to get him options (if any)
2016-04-20 11:00:35, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes. Just so you know, he waited to call her until Monday (on purpose, wanted to resist the she calls and we jump), as of yesterday afternoon she hadn't responded. \n\nThat's fine too.
2016-04-20 11:13:29, Wed	INBOX	Ok re JB. What's the best way for the team to intetact/coordinate with him? I was thinking [redacted] I really just want to get control over the investigation.\n\nAlso, remind me brief to Bill on [redacted]
2016-04-20 11:27:24, Wed	OUTBOX	Maybe you should reach out to him? Just swing by his ofc before 8 and ask for an update?
2016-04-20 11:28:29, Wed	INBOX	Won't be in until 8...stupid non-hov commute ..\U0001f615+H1721
2016-04-20 11:32:10, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] won't ask him direct, she'll feel the need to go thru trisha.
2016-04-20 11:32:28, Wed	OUTBOX	You can tell them I told you, it's fine.
2016-04-20 11:35:59, Wed	OUTBOX	Randy sent me an invite for 1:30-2.
2016-04-20 11:36:38, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] ood, re Randy, right?+H1728
2016-04-20 11:39:05, Wed	INBOX	In addition to [redacted], remind me convo about OIA at 1:00 yesterday
2016-04-20 12:53:07, Wed	OUTBOX	Hey check your vm before you talk to your MYE team. Jim spoke to beth this am, nfi.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-20 13:21:46, Wed	INBOX	Yep heard same with more detail from Bill via JB and dd, need to talk to you
2016-04-20 13:24:17, Wed	OUTBOX	Feel free to call
2016-04-20 13:58:23, Wed	INBOX	Hey just left vm. I'm done/free....
2016-04-20 13:58:53, Wed	OUTBOX	Vm at desk or cell?
2016-04-20 14:02:33, Wed	INBOX	Cell
2016-04-20 14:10:56, Wed	INBOX	You have a rough eta?
2016-04-20 14:11:19, Wed	OUTBOX	It hasn't come up yet. Nor did it ring.
2016-04-20 14:11:32, Wed	OUTBOX	Hopefully 15. Service was REALLY slow.
2016-04-20 14:11:50, Wed	INBOX	Want me to call again? It can also wait
2016-04-20 14:14:44, Wed	OUTBOX	Yes, let's tall now
2016-04-20 19:54:31, Wed	INBOX	Hi there. I'm done.
2016-04-20 19:57:34, Wed	OUTBOX	Waiting outside Andy's office now, and then I'm leaving. Randy is in his office now.
2016-04-20 20:35:40, Wed	INBOX	Also, Bill said he would email JB and cc you and JM the white paper you reviewed earlier.
2016-04-20 21:12:40, Wed	INBOX	Good talk with Jb, will tell you all about that tomorrow.
2016-04-25 23:54:32, Mon	OUTBOX	Andy texted again:\n\nI heard this morning at the DOJ brief. GT and I discussed the strategy. I think they have it lined out.
2016-04-26 12:53:53, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] But I have a 15 minute meeting with Trisha at 9:15 now. \U0001f612
2016-04-26 21:21:18, Tue	OUTBOX	And forgot to tell you that I spoke to Andy. Went well. Hope it is truly behind us.
2016-04-26 21:22:09, Tue	INBOX	That was it! You'll have to tell me tomorrow.
2016-04-26 21:23:06, Tue	INBOX	Im glad. I think it is (behind you). Thats the good part in that he couldn't have been more crystal clear.
2016-04-26 21:59:42, Tue	INBOX	Talked with [redacted] She said she thought the DC Bar limitations made sense, but I asked her to verify and that I'd appreciate understanding/her take on the matter, before brief to D on Thurs. Mike is supposed to send her a case.
2016-04-26 22:01:18, Tue	OUTBOX	I don't understand why a taint team isn't sufficient...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-26 22:01:31, Tue	OUTBOX	I wish Steve was alive. He would absolutely know this answer.
2016-04-26 22:03:06, Tue	INBOX	\U0001f61e\n\nHow much do bar regs vary?
2016-04-26 22:03:44, Tue	OUTBOX	Some, but this big of a difference would be really anomalous.
2016-04-26 22:06:30, Tue	INBOX	Talking with [redacted]. [redacted] specifically asked him NOT to talk to me until AFTER he talked to Andy
2016-04-26 22:07:09, Tue	OUTBOX	Uh okay. And he waited three days because?...
2016-04-26 22:08:11, Tue	INBOX	No. Just now. Tonght. About this afternoons covo
2016-04-26 22:08:16, Tue	INBOX	Conversation.
2016-04-26 22:08:42, Tue	OUTBOX	The 2:00 you mean?
2016-04-26 22:08:42, Tue	INBOX	Tell you what, [redacted] can come lead this fucking case with [redacted]. I'll go work cases and get my car back
2016-04-26 22:09:14, Tue	OUTBOX	I'll mention to andy. Why did George insist on that?
2016-04-26 22:11:26, Tue	INBOX	Read the email I just sent, note bcc
2016-04-26 22:12:00, Tue	INBOX	Because [redacted] is playing the "[redacted] you're not getting accurate information" game and [redacted] is allowing it to happen.
2016-04-26 22:12:22, Tue	INBOX	Fuck thid
2016-04-26 22:12:28, Tue	OUTBOX	That's not okay.
2016-04-26 22:12:29, Tue	INBOX	This. Thanks Samsung
2016-04-26 22:12:43, Tue	INBOX	Hell no it's not.
2016-04-26 22:13:23, Tue	OUTBOX	We will fix this.
2016-04-26 22:14:37, Tue	INBOX	Bullshit. We will puss out. If I got a quarter of the support [redacted] blindly gives his guys, we might, but we won't. \n\nAnd I don't want to burn our relationship with this and [redacted]
2016-04-26 22:14:41, Tue	INBOX	Jesus I'm maf
2016-04-26 22:14:45, Tue	INBOX	Mad
2016-04-26 22:14:46, Tue	INBOX	Fuck

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-26 22:16:11, Tue	OUTBOX	You should be. 100% Enraged.
2016-04-26 22:16:16, Tue	OUTBOX	I called you.
2016-04-26 22:40:06, Tue	INBOX	Just talked to Bill and qualified the fact vs my assumption in the email. Also told him about [redacted] "did you talk to Andy" comment last night. He is going to talk to Andy tomorrow morning.
2016-04-26 22:40:31, Tue	OUTBOX	Cool.
2016-04-26 22:41:16, Tue	INBOX	Still \U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621\U0001f621
2016-04-26 22:42:01, Tue	INBOX	Want to tell at [redacted]. Scars motherf*cker? You want to see scars?
2016-04-26 22:42:57, Tue	OUTBOX	I know [redacted] I know. It isn't right. But it's not worth burning your relationship with the [redacted] over. Let's take his temperature first. Even better, let him do your dirty work.
2016-04-27 00:10:23, Wed	OUTBOX	God I'm really angry with [redacted] If he had any dignity at all, he'd give you, us, some credit for the persistence in this area. They just suck so much. I hope [redacted] has the self-awareness and character to do so.
2016-04-27 00:31:42, Wed	INBOX	Talked to him just now, too. More info about George go if direct with Andy - concern about info JB didn't have about the case in the context of his discussion with [redacted], and the implication of the faulty telephone process going on with info flow in the fbi \U0001f612
2016-04-27 00:49:51, Wed	OUTBOX	Can you talk now?
2016-04-27 00:58:23, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] I'll of course give you a complete dump about what [redacted] said, whenever you want.H2010
2016-04-27 01:22:25, Wed	INBOX	Thanks for observations about JB. Cost of doing business if D and DD are going to use him.
2016-04-27 01:22:58, Wed	OUTBOX	And also, he's not "the team." This is all a red herring.
2016-04-27 01:23:33, Wed	OUTBOX	Pisses me off a little that Andy hasn't called back. I guess it's possible he's still at dinner...
2016-04-27 01:25:16, Wed	INBOX	Who's not the team - JB? Fine, but D and dd decided to use him. And if [redacted] accurate, was the cause of wondering what info is or isnt passed up. After all, of JB doesn't know that, what doesn't Andy know?
2016-04-27 01:26:35, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah I get it, but George KNOWS jb. This is all bs. Whatever, I'm just irritated.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-27 01:31:29, Wed	INBOX	I am too. This also plays into "Georges special relationship" with Andy
2016-04-27 01:32:54, Wed	INBOX	Think we should touch topic of [redacted] during D brief?
2016-04-27 01:33:57, Wed	OUTBOX	Hmm. Let me get to you about that one. [redacted] talked to me this am about jb and ta's position re [redacted], just haven't had a chance to dig in yet.
2016-04-27 01:34:07, Wed	INBOX	And please re Andy don't go too far. He (and [redacted]) knows we are close, right? And while what you're saying is exactly right, would you say it for any schmuck?
2016-04-27 01:34:36, Wed	OUTBOX	Probably not, but you're not any schmuck.
2016-04-27 01:37:04, Wed	INBOX	\U0001f636\U0001f636\U0001f636 (damn right \U0001f609)\n\nI think we mention that part (specifically that we're cleared to go back to task). I was talking about the specific allegation. We haven't discussed with him in a briefing we've given. I almost want to do it so 1) he knows we're aware 2) demonstrate that to Trisha and whoever else is deep in the "secret secret, ive got a secret" mindset and 3) get a sense of what he's thinking.
2016-04-27 01:38:34, Wed	OUTBOX	I just think andy is probably keeping him appraised of this, but we can talk about it.
2016-04-27 01:42:03, Wed	INBOX	Agree. It is substantive in that it is relevant to the case, just not sure if there is a decision point or information he would want in the context if his thinking about the issue.
2016-04-27 01:52:01, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, can maybe have bill ask andy, but otherwise don't think it's probably necessary.
2016-04-27 02:05:41, Wed	INBOX	Ha. Want to talk to you about [redacted] and her comment, too...
2016-04-27 02:06:41, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] stupid comment, and whether you want me to say anything to her
2016-04-27 02:07:08, Wed	OUTBOX	What would you say?
2016-04-27 02:08:37, Wed	OUTBOX	So, it looks like there is a networking/break starting at 2, then kerry sleeper from 2:15 to 2:45, then homicide trends at 2:45-3:15, then another networking/break. I would schedule for 2:00.
2016-04-27 02:09:07, Wed	OUTBOX	Then 3:30 is Oregon standoff/managing relationships.
2016-04-27 02:09:37, Wed	INBOX	Just reinforce that you're good people, experienced, credible. Not "little" anything. Not sure it would make a difference but willing to.
2016-04-27 02:10:34, Wed	OUTBOX	I'd be more interested in finding out why she said it. "What was up with little counsel girl? Do you not like her?"

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-27 02:10:54, Wed	OUTBOX	I don't need her to like me. I need to to treat me with respect around others.
2016-04-27 02:11:05, Wed	INBOX	Ok. Will aim for then with JM. Thats the same time we have blocked for mye wrap with Bill
2016-04-27 02:12:25, Wed	OUTBOX	So then I would go direct with her and not thru jm.
2016-04-27 02:12:34, Wed	INBOX	Want me to grab you at 5? Also, see email, I think I just gave [redacted] reason to skip
2016-04-27 02:13:04, Wed	OUTBOX	I know. I saw email. Hence my :(for [redacted]. She invited me to it. \U0001f636
2016-04-27 02:13:15, Wed	INBOX	Have confirmation thru Andy he wants a meeting? All I have is George via [redacted]
2016-04-27 02:13:30, Wed	OUTBOX	Nope, I'd rely on that.
2016-04-27 02:13:40, Wed	OUTBOX	He wants to go thru George, so be it
2016-04-27 02:13:40, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] I'll cancel the brief. [redacted]
2016-04-27 02:13:58, Wed	OUTBOX	Don't cancel the brief, obviously.
2016-04-27 03:25:04, Wed	OUTBOX	Forgot to mention, I asked Trisha about embedding [redacted] with a squad at WFO for a few days, and she thought it was a great idea. Need to clear it through [redacted] chain first \U0001f612, but please give a little thought to where it might make sense to stick [redacted] for a couple of days. Thanks for the excellent idea. [redacted]
2016-04-27 11:54:31, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] Just got done with Bill, grabbing breakfast with [redacted] and Jon
2016-04-27 12:50:30, Wed	INBOX	Just got done with [redacted]
2016-04-27 12:50:36, Wed	INBOX	Who is worthless
2016-04-27 12:53:37, Wed	INBOX	Re [redacted] embedding, what area (s) is [redacted] going to be working?
2016-04-27 12:54:58, Wed	OUTBOX	Trisha doesn't know yet. But I suggested maybe a CI squad, and she was fine with that. Just don't make any moves yet though please.
2016-04-27 15:04:19, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] Going to try and find out if DD in fact wants a meeting today with Toscas et al, as well as Bill's convo with him.
2016-04-27 15:04:59, Wed	OUTBOX	He didn't get my text until this am, so I haven't spoken to him either.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-27 22:55:04, Wed	INBOX	Hey just talked to Bill. He has not talked to Andy yet about Toscas but says he still intends to. He said Andy was in a really bad mood this morning about a news article, plus in a rush.
2016-04-27 22:55:39, Wed	OUTBOX	He was. Kortan majorly screwed up.
2016-04-27 22:56:25, Wed	INBOX	Nothing related to us (mye or cd)?
2016-04-27 23:00:14, Wed	OUTBOX	No. Not at all.
2016-04-27 23:00:51, Wed	INBOX	Whew [redacted]
2016-04-27 23:57:23, Wed	INBOX	Hey while I'm thinking about it please send me the name of the forfeiture guy re [redacted] Thanks
2016-04-28 00:45:52, Thu	OUTBOX	[redacted] Forfeiture guy is
2016-04-28 00:49:05, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] hank you. I'm sure the "experts" in nsd will be happy I call him. \n\nBtw, how utterly f*cked up is it that George was by far and away the most aggressive DoJ person in the room today?
2016-04-28 23:13:42, Thu	INBOX	Dude, your wrap is loooong. Waiting on Bill before reaching out to CES, also curious as to your thoughts about revised statement - Bill really wants to write something.\n\nYou have a while to go yet?
2016-04-29 00:30:35, Fri	INBOX	Sorry one work Q I forgot - D mentioned [redacted] Do you think that was something someone inside related to him or his outside checking up?
2016-04-29 00:32:13, Fri	OUTBOX	He no doubt called [redacted]
2016-04-29 00:33:29, Fri	INBOX	Makes sense. Wasn't sure if it was something he heard from JB or Andy via the team
2016-04-29 00:44:50, Fri	OUTBOX	My guess is complaints from jb and Andy about the low levels of engagement at doj led to discussions of who is on the team...
2016-04-29 00:47:44, Fri	INBOX	I regret not saying (though I have in the past) is eah, [redacted] might be ok, but edva is clearly second fiddle to nsd.
2016-04-29 13:04:06, Fri	INBOX	This sucks already. ..team walking to Woodward Table for farewell breakfast for [redacted] he took a job at HQ) [redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-29 16:50:52, Fri	INBOX	Toscas showed up. Just like Thurs meeting, he was by far the most aggressive DoJ in the room. Literally siding with us and fighting back against [redacted] et al's concerns. \U0001f621\n\nI literally said, twice, stop framing your facts to them simply in terms of PC for an affidavit. Frame your argument in terms of what is most compelling in the big picture to achieve what we want, then narrow down to show how it links specifically to our case/pc/etc. \n\nI think George got it, but jeez. It's not so hard, is it?
2016-04-29 16:51:39, Fri	OUTBOX	It's not. They're just not very good. Can you call George, ask him to attend?
2016-04-29 16:54:49, Fri	INBOX	\U0001f60a D. \n\nHe's not. Already thought to myself, Jesus George, why can't you have this conversation. He got immediately what I was saying (granted, he may already have had the benefit of Andy telling him). It's a smart play. It's not complicated.
2016-04-29 16:55:44, Fri	INBOX	Will have to tell you my convo with [redacted] earlier and what [redacted] said. After I left, he apparently said he was "tired of taking sh*t from the Bureau." \U0001f612
2016-04-29 16:56:02, Fri	INBOX	Gotta go have career counseling with Bill...should be done before you get there, though.
2016-04-29 16:57:07, Fri	OUTBOX	Taking sht from the Bureau?! Poor [redacted] It's so hard to be him.
2016-04-29 16:58:21, Fri	INBOX	Especially gratifying that Toscas then tells him exactly the same thing
2016-04-29 18:01:20, Fri	OUTBOX	How'd the talk go with Bill? What'd he say?
2016-04-29 18:06:10, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-29 18:06:10, Fri	INBOX	In any event, he said he thought the world of me and couldn't imagine me being anywhere other than the top quadrant.
2016-04-29 18:07:31, Fri	INBOX	Asked what I wanted to do and any geographic limitations. [redacted] In essence said I'd [redacted]
2016-04-29 18:08:08, Fri	OUTBOX	What'd he say to that?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-29 18:10:33, Fri	INBOX	He didnt, directly. Certainly didn't say no way, but nor did he say, "I think you'll be able to do that." Two reasons, at least. Much easier for him to argue to advance me if he can say "Pete's willing to go to the east coast" or even mid-atlantic than it is to say "Pete's limited to HQ and WFO."
2016-04-29 18:10:48, Fri	INBOX	Second reason is he went to NY and left his family here.
2016-04-29 18:12:32, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] Always better to at least say "look, I'm open to the needs of the Bureau, just be aware of these factors" rather than "I must stay here"
2016-04-29 18:14:32, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] Especially if you do a gig as dad first. Or be like andy and be willing to not ever be promoted further because of your geographic limitations.
2016-04-29 18:24:00, Fri	INBOX	I did tell him I'd be interested in being a DAD, he said good, some people aren't interested in that. I did caveat that later to CD by saying if Jones or Gordon left. I suppose I'd think hard about CYD or Crim or even CTD. Not Intel or other divisions.
2016-04-29 18:24:03, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-04-29 18:24:04, Fri	INBOX	We talked about the impact of succession on 7th floor, eg [redacted] asking to go out as an SAC. He's also not thrilled with the idea of [redacted] though hopefully [redacted] would help temper that. A whole lotta CTD guys being put everywhere, that's for sure.
2016-04-29 20:30:36, Fri	INBOX	Hey also, mye brief to Bowdich on 5/10. [redacted] on the invite (just the four of us).
2016-04-29 21:02:18, Fri	INBOX	And what is [redacted] deal with [redacted] ? Told [redacted] "whatever you do, DON'T pick him. He will stay for 6 months and move on." So now I've got to fight through that
2016-04-29 21:10:59, Fri	OUTBOX	He's resentful of [redacted] from the [redacted] fights. Feels sold out by him.
2016-04-29 21:16:01, Fri	INBOX	Ah. Got it. Going to have to fight back what he told [redacted] Dummies
2016-04-29 21:39:46, Fri	OUTBOX	That's just my guess. [redacted]
2016-04-29 21:40:53, Fri	INBOX	And sounds right re [redacted] We can talk later.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-04-29 22:14:25, Fri	INBOX	Just got off the phone with [redacted] (who seems suddenly fine and not upset \U0001f612). Can give you update on phone or on Monday. Not a lot of substantive movement.
2016-04-30 02:04:49, Sat	INBOX	And now we've switched from the Patriot Act to a wire carrying current. [redacted]
2016-05-01 12:31:06, Sun	INBOX	Btw, they've all decided in person mtgs are much better for us than [redacted] and [redacted] separate and dialing in. \U0001f612
2016-05-01 12:33:08, Sun	INBOX	I suppose [redacted] getting the background won't kill us, though I'm certain it will be shared with the SpecAss community up there. I've never heard of him - what's his background?
2016-05-01 12:33:20, Sun	OUTBOX	Boy, they are just strategic geniuses arent they?
2016-05-01 12:34:45, Sun	INBOX	That was my response. \n\nBut not just that, SOO very smart that you mustn't doubt or question them.
2016-05-01 12:35:11, Sun	OUTBOX	Yeah, that's probably part of, him going to your meeting. No clue his story. But was thinking it might be better for more lumpies like that to hear there's nothing there - don't know if he's smart enough to understand, but it probably doesn't hurt anything and is not worth trying to kick him out.
2016-05-01 12:36:43, Sun	INBOX	I laughed when [redacted] said he got asked about the investigation weekly. I get it daily. Maybe that's an agent - analyst difference.
2016-05-01 23:09:09, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] check out Obama's remarks to the W+H2632ash Press Association last night. Just watched it - pretty damn funny.
2016-05-02 12:02:03, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] I have my standing Midyear at 9:10, but should be fast. 9:30 work? [redacted]
2016-05-04 00:02:13, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] Have been dealing with [redacted] f*ck up
2016-05-04 00:40:51, Wed	OUTBOX	And holy shit Cruz just dropped out of the race. It's going to be a Clinton Trump race. Unbelievable.
2016-05-04 00:41:24, Wed	INBOX	What?!?!??
2016-05-04 00:41:37, Wed	OUTBOX	You heard that right my friend.
2016-05-04 00:41:37, Wed	INBOX	I saw trump won, figured it would be a bit
2016-05-04 00:41:57, Wed	INBOX	Now the pressure really starts to finish MYE...
2016-05-04 00:42:32, Wed	OUTBOX	It sure does. We need to talk about follow up call tomorrow. We still never have.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-04 00:43:59, Wed	INBOX	Schedule is open 9:45 until around 2:30. Let me know when I can pencil you in. ;)
2016-05-04 00:49:17, Wed	OUTBOX	My schedule is utter sh*t tomorrow. I will let you know. :(
2016-05-04 09:53:33, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] You still on track for [redacted] at 7? And are you going to hit the AM briefs?
2016-05-04 09:53:57, Wed	OUTBOX	Meeting with [redacted] at 7, not going to morning briefs.
2016-05-04 11:20:54, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] Have to meet [redacted] shortly
2016-05-04 21:31:14, Wed	INBOX	Going back to that [redacted] memo, just remembered Jones wants something soon (tonght or tomorrow). I don't know that Bill will read it before he gets back from London next week, but last thing I want is him launching it upstairs with 3rd party review in there.
2016-05-04 21:31:46, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, I would.
2016-05-04 21:32:08, Wed	INBOX	Would what?
2016-05-04 21:32:27, Wed	OUTBOX	Take it out
2016-05-04 21:33:00, Wed	OUTBOX	Or talk to [redacted] about it. Just say since we hate the third party option, take it out.
2016-05-04 21:33:23, Wed	INBOX	K. I should probably tell [redacted] no. [redacted]
2016-05-04 21:35:50, Wed	INBOX	I'll call her then. Will say I don't like it and want to take it out
2016-05-04 21:36:17, Wed	OUTBOX	I would at least start with it out
2016-05-04 21:38:01, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] I just want [redacted] to know in advance since it's her product+H2810
2016-05-04 21:55:17, Wed	INBOX	Talked to [redacted] took it out, taking it to Jones
2016-05-04 22:36:12, Wed	INBOX	Bill is super stressed about the new Fox report
2016-05-04 22:36:35, Wed	OUTBOX	Why? What's he going to do about it?
2016-05-04 22:37:10, Wed	OUTBOX	Why not just have him send an email to [redacted] and Andy explaining what he think actually happened? Is it classified?
2016-05-04 22:51:16, Wed	INBOX	K. Anyway, I asked [redacted] if it could have been DD...she wasn't sure. She didn't mention [redacted]

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-05 11:56:03, Thu	INBOX	Talked to [redacted] last night, will update you at some point today - from your schedule, sounds like the morning, while hard, is much better than the afternoon, which will be impossible
2016-05-05 13:57:53, Thu	INBOX	And damn. You see weekly odate with D?
2016-05-05 15:24:52, Thu	OUTBOX	Hey good news, re that [redacted] stuff, you should talk to [redacted]. For sure, [redacted] has been informed of the situation in the past.
2016-05-05 15:25:24, Thu	INBOX	Nice. At lunch with [redacted]...
2016-05-05 15:29:05, Thu	INBOX	I'll call him this afternoon. [redacted] \U0001f636+H2865
2016-05-05 16:54:23, Thu	OUTBOX	Racing to my desk, grab lock bag, then off to wh.
2016-05-05 16:58:06, Thu	INBOX	Ooh. Fancy fancy. ;)
2016-05-05 17:00:28, Thu	INBOX	May have to wait until wrap to hear all your stories. \U0001f636
2016-05-05 18:41:52, Thu	INBOX	[redacted] How was the WH?
2016-05-05 18:42:58, Thu	OUTBOX	It was good. Regulatory options for [redacted]
2016-05-05 18:43:34, Thu	INBOX	Talked with [redacted], good info from him, thank you. Also advancing [redacted] travel, will try in the next month or so. Need to coordinate as options with you all in a joint trip FAR better than without.
2016-05-05 18:43:47, Thu	INBOX	Sit room or oeob?
2016-05-05 18:44:06, Thu	OUTBOX	Oeob. Just a lawyer group meeting.
2016-05-05 18:44:27, Thu	INBOX	You going straight to DoJ?
2016-05-05 18:45:30, Thu	OUTBOX	Yup. In ODAG'S car now.
2016-05-05 18:46:01, Thu	INBOX	Wow!! Double fancy fancy. ;)
2016-05-05 18:46:45, Thu	INBOX	You realize you could have been in the CD4 SC's car...not as pretigious but nicer.
2016-05-05 18:47:49, Thu	OUTBOX	It is a lovely car.
2016-05-05 20:27:31, Thu	INBOX	Do you have 5 secs for a call on MYE?
2016-05-05 20:48:03, Thu	OUTBOX	No. In with andy

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-05 20:48:21, Thu	OUTBOX	Also, andy going to want to meet with just you and Bill tomorrow. Will explain later.
2016-05-05 20:52:14, Thu	INBOX	Ok. Bill now going to wrap at request of [redacted]. He has the info - CNN breaking fbi has interviewed aides quietly at fbi building, specifically Huma
2016-05-05 20:52:29, Thu	INBOX	Ok re mtg
2016-05-05 20:53:13, Thu	OUTBOX	Just saw it on cnn.
2016-05-05 20:53:33, Thu	OUTBOX	Also be by the phone btwn 530 and 6. Andy wants to meet with you and bill.
2016-05-05 20:54:02, Thu	INBOX	That's what I was wanting to call and tell you
2016-05-05 20:54:18, Thu	INBOX	Ok. Bill will be there at wrap
2016-05-05 20:54:19, Thu	OUTBOX	All the same stuff we have been talking about. Ec, letter to icig, etc
2016-05-05 20:54:51, Thu	INBOX	Ok - thinking through what we need to do?
2016-05-05 20:56:46, Thu	INBOX	Bill just stopped by and told me same. \n\nYou're good at your job. \u263a
2016-05-05 23:04:19, Thu	INBOX	Chat before you go?
2016-05-05 23:07:48, Thu	OUTBOX	I haven't been to my desk in like 9 hours. Let me just quickly check email and try to get out of here.
2016-05-05 23:08:18, Thu	INBOX	Talking to Bill in the hall
2016-05-05 23:10:25, Thu	OUTBOX	Np. Needed a phone number, just found it.
2016-05-05 23:10:48, Thu	INBOX	K. Just finished. [redacted]
2016-05-05 23:13:44, Thu	OUTBOX	Jim locked himself out, I've been waiting with him. Headed to my office now.
2016-05-05 23:16:16, Thu	INBOX	K. Hit me on lync
2016-05-06 00:36:08, Fri	INBOX	[redacted] called so need to call him back.
2016-05-06 00:37:51, Fri	INBOX	Oh. Called [redacted], Huma's atty called just afterwards, he's talking to her and calling back.
2016-05-06 00:38:08, Fri	OUTBOX	Fun
2016-05-06 00:41:00, Fri	INBOX	Yeah. Wonder if they're raising hell about the media stuff. All seemed very pro-Clinton camp
2016-05-06 00:42:11, Fri	OUTBOX	Agreed.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-06 00:42:35, Fri	OUTBOX	Not gonna be charged isn't anyone at the fbi, that's for sure
2016-05-06 00:42:56, Fri	INBOX	I might disagree slightly
2016-05-06 00:44:39, Fri	OUTBOX	Okay. Not anyone informed at the fbi.
2016-05-06 01:15:15, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-06 01:17:03, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-06 01:19:16, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-06 01:19:45, Fri	INBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-06 02:26:14, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] is a wussy with a p.
2016-05-06 02:52:58, Fri	INBOX	Ha re your first 1026
2016-05-06 03:14:49, Fri	INBOX	Also, Andy's conference room is too big. Way too big. [redacted] \n\nLeave the monitor wall in place. Too expensive to change. Move where he was sitting 15-20 closer to the screens. Liberate the remaining space. \n\nIt's too big. \n\nAnd it may be $$, but it's ridiculously too big. [redacted]
2016-05-06 08:52:58, Fri	OUTBOX	No way to change the room. The table alone was [redacted]. (You can't repeat that!) No, instead it just means we now have to get a small conference table for his actual office, so that he can actually have a meeting that is intimate.
2016-05-06 09:01:30, Fri	INBOX	Does [redacted] go to all the wraps, or was he sitting in for Eric?
2016-05-06 09:06:19, Fri	OUTBOX	Sitting in for Eric now.
2016-05-06 09:08:13, Fri	INBOX	Eric essentially done?
2016-05-06 09:08:18, Fri	OUTBOX	And yes, re the room. But [redacted] an idiot.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-06 09:08:29, Fri	OUTBOX	Yes. Leaves next week.
2016-05-06 09:09:01, Fri	INBOX	Ridiculous re the room. A wildly costly mistake.
2016-05-06 09:09:18, Fri	INBOX	NO one with sense questioned it?
2016-05-06 09:10:04, Fri	OUTBOX	I have no idea. Claim was something big enough for the weekly sac svtc. So for one 30 minute mtg a week.
2016-05-06 10:31:19, Fri	OUTBOX	Ooh, and my office is cleared out. Need to ask my IT friends to put a computer in there for me...
2016-05-06 10:35:38, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted] There's a meeting at 1:30 I'd really like to attend.
2016-05-06 10:36:51, Fri	OUTBOX	*Might* go in on Saturday. Will have to see.
2016-05-06 10:37:54, Fri	INBOX	I've gotta go in this weekend, if only for a couple of hours
2016-05-06 12:12:21, Fri	INBOX	War gaming with Moffa. Much to run past you.
2016-05-06 12:16:14, Fri	OUTBOX	Have a 10, but after that I'm free. Maybe we can grab a cup then powwow in your ofc.
2016-05-06 12:26:36, Fri	INBOX	How long is your 10? have a 10 as well. Probably 45 min, def over by 11. [redacted]
2016-05-06 12:29:10, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, probably 45 for me too.
2016-05-06 12:30:48, Fri	OUTBOX	Possibly. Just depends on what time I get in.
2016-05-06 13:01:12, Fri	INBOX	Ok. I have a 9 anyway, would have to be fast at 9:40. No worries either away. [redacted]
2016-05-06 21:07:29, Fri	OUTBOX	Andy on the phone with Bill right now permanently kicking Jones out of the meeting. You're welcome.
2016-05-06 21:09:16, Fri	INBOX	And buttressing the decision, remind me side comments from him.
2016-05-06 21:09:31, Fri	INBOX	Did.you show the [redacted] email?
2016-05-06 21:09:31, Fri	OUTBOX	And you're about to be sent the D's press statement. Just to you bill and moffa.
2016-05-06 21:10:39, Fri	OUTBOX	I did. He chuckled. And said you're the only person I'm the Bureau who could successfully use jaunty.
2016-05-06 23:22:55, Fri	OUTBOX	Just had a better idea. I'll ask andy this weekend, and if it's okay with him, I'll sent up the question for you. Will check this whole strategy with andy.
2016-05-06 23:25:58, Fri	INBOX	Not following

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-06 23:33:37, Fri	OUTBOX	I'll ask you, in front of the D, "Pete, I apologize for putting you on the spot, but I know you shared with andy some of the comments you've been hearing from folks, I think it would be valuable for the D to know them."
2016-05-06 23:41:14, Fri	OUTBOX	Can't right now but will shortly.
2016-05-06 23:41:44, Fri	INBOX	Np. Have some time on all this.
2016-05-07 01:17:14, Sat	OUTBOX	And hey [redacted] call the field office. HQ isn't going to be able to draft a damn search warrant, the field is. Call an ausa on duty for chrissake.
2016-05-07 01:24:49, Sat	INBOX	No kidding...but he never knew shit about the Bu anyway
2016-05-07 02:20:39, Sat	INBOX	Talked to Bill just now
2016-05-07 10:39:32, Sat	INBOX	Think I'm going to call Laufman this morning. Want details specifically on WHO is making these calls. Then call [redacted] and talk about what they did in PC investigation land.
2016-05-07 10:41:02, Sat	OUTBOX	Good plan.
2016-05-07 10:46:34, Sat	OUTBOX	Don't let that pompous boob push you around either.
2016-05-07 10:48:51, Sat	INBOX	I won't - he hasn't really tried to do that. He's largely absent.
2016-05-07 14:07:33, Sat	INBOX	Work call?
2016-05-07 14:07:43, Sat	INBOX	(Me with you, now? (
2016-05-07 14:07:52, Sat	INBOX	Just got done talking to Bill
2016-05-08 13:43:35, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] check out the wp articles I emailed.
2016-05-08 13:45:46, Sun	OUTBOX	Read a Clinton one.
2016-05-08 14:34:30, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] When is Andy out next?
2016-05-08 23:04:31, Sun	INBOX	Turn on nbc
2016-05-08 23:21:28, Sun	OUTBOX	[redacted] What was it?
2016-05-08 23:27:24, Sun	INBOX	Guccifer. Sleazy Romanian...
2016-05-08 23:50:01, Sun	OUTBOX	They ALL are.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-09 00:02:52, Mon	INBOX	Funny to watch and think of [redacted] No wonder he's a brusque as he is...and those Romanians aren't even the gypsies...
2016-05-09 00:23:58, Mon	OUTBOX	Seriously, I kind of hate them. (I'm sure [redacted] fine). But they have the crookedness of the Russians with the entitledness of the Italians. Yuck.
2016-05-09 00:25:41, Mon	INBOX	Ha. Never really dealt with them. [redacted]
2016-05-09 10:41:42, Mon	INBOX	Hey, work related, with Bill out, does Andy want Jones bringing MYE daily bullets? Or email from us to you [redacted] I don't see how we don't include him. And I think I def bootleg you in case he Fs it up
2016-05-09 10:42:52, Mon	OUTBOX	I'm sure he doesn't care, plus I can't imagine that Jones will sit in wrap. Will probably just give it to Steinbach.
2016-05-09 10:47:00, Mon	INBOX	I guess. Another thing to add to the to do list....
2016-05-09 11:10:54, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] Don't have anything until my 910 mye staff meeting.
2016-05-09 14:32:20, Mon	INBOX	Jones moved wrap to right before D brief, so 2:30 is open...
2016-05-09 22:01:27, Mon	OUTBOX	Walking to desk
2016-05-09 22:03:04, Mon	INBOX	I'm at my desk, hiding behind the yellow "away" light
2016-05-09 22:03:31, Mon	INBOX	Jon got an eras machine last week. Wondering if I want to do the same. \U0001f615
2016-05-10 00:09:03, Tue	INBOX	When are you free tomorrow lto talk with Jon about speech? 1?
2016-05-10 00:20:16, Tue	OUTBOX	Not sure. Will let you know. [redacted]
2016-05-10 01:13:54, Tue	INBOX	And talked to [redacted]. Banner evening. \n\nConcluded by saying I cannot overstate to you the sense of urgency about wanting to logically and effectively conclude this investigation.
2016-05-10 01:40:20, Tue	OUTBOX	Meet with Jon at 2 tomorrow?
2016-05-10 01:41:58, Tue	INBOX	We have Bowdich at 2:30. Can you do earlier? Or any time after 3:45. And/or come to Bowdich with us
2016-05-10 01:44:36, Tue	OUTBOX	Don't want to do that. Let me look.
2016-05-10 01:45:23, Tue	OUTBOX	I could do 1:30-2:30. Do you guys need to prep for that at all?
2016-05-10 01:48:58, Tue	OUTBOX	Wait but you both have your 1:00.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-10 01:49:37, Tue	OUTBOX	Could also do 330 to 430
2016-05-10 01:49:43, Tue	INBOX	Prep? Please. :D\n\n1:30 works. We're skipping 1 and sending our ASCs
2016-05-10 01:50:28, Tue	INBOX	Told you if the D is stressed he's got the goddamn Allstars behind him.
2016-05-10 01:51:04, Tue	INBOX	330 I'll [redacted] tell you my impressions of the ADD... ;)+H3342
2016-05-10 01:54:45, Tue	OUTBOX	Ha. We'll see. 1:30 it is then.
2016-05-10 01:54:50, Tue	OUTBOX	Tell jon?
2016-05-10 02:10:59, Tue	INBOX	I did, see invite.
2016-05-10 09:01:11, Tue	OUTBOX	And I never got an invite for today.
2016-05-10 09:17:36, Tue	INBOX	Hi. Really? Let me go check. [redacted]
2016-05-10 09:20:45, Tue	INBOX	Get it just now?
2016-05-10 09:31:36, Tue	OUTBOX	[redacted] And yes, I did.
2016-05-10 13:30:37, Tue	INBOX	Going to go do my 4B career board
2016-05-10 15:35:18, Tue	OUTBOX	Are you still going to LV next week? You know [redacted] and Laufman are going, right?
2016-05-10 16:22:13, Tue	INBOX	No and yes. \U0001f621
2016-05-10 16:23:04, Tue	INBOX	Because they're dedicated to this case. \U0001f612 How did that come uo?
2016-05-10 17:00:39, Tue	OUTBOX	Overheard [redacted]. Plan to tell Dd as grist for his call to Carlin to get them to take it seriously.
2016-05-10 18:30:00, Tue	INBOX	I neither told nor invited Jones
2016-05-10 18:41:49, Tue	OUTBOX	I know. #1: you need to find out how he knew. #2: I talked to Andy about it. He's out. Permanently. He will discuss with Bill.
2016-05-10 20:26:51, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Convo with Jon went badly in that I'm not sure he understood me a+H3379nd three people walked up etc et. \n\n\n Writing bullets for Jones to give to EAD for Andy. Unless you think there's a better routing for it.
2016-05-10 20:30:24, Tue	OUTBOX	I really don't know.
2016-05-10 20:30:51, Tue	INBOX	I'm happy to send straight to you...

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-10 20:31:36, Tue	OUTBOX	I wouldn't for now. Wait for andy to reset...
2016-05-10 20:33:01, Tue	INBOX	These will all generate Qs from Jones
2016-05-10 20:33:38, Tue	OUTBOX	Let me ask andy. Hold please.
2016-05-10 20:34:02, Tue	INBOX	Thx
2016-05-10 20:35:38, Tue	OUTBOX	Direct to me per DD
2016-05-10 20:36:52, Tue	INBOX	Done. On the way, call me with Qs. On high side, you want unet instead?
2016-05-10 21:18:31, Tue	INBOX	Wp article out
2016-05-11 00:00:30, Wed	INBOX	Just talked to Eric with Q from Andy/D (maybe D)
2016-05-11 00:09:18, Wed	OUTBOX	Eric Smith?
2016-05-11 00:10:12, Wed	OUTBOX	Can you tell me the q?
2016-05-11 00:11:05, Wed	OUTBOX	Got it. Wonder where that is coming from?...
2016-05-11 00:11:45, Wed	INBOX	Andy or D
2016-05-11 00:12:05, Wed	INBOX	I didn't respond with my immediate answer, "of course we did"
2016-05-11 00:12:41, Wed	INBOX	I don't know where it's coming from. Assume Andy either read update and/or discussed with D
2016-05-11 00:13:41, Wed	INBOX	Your mission, Agent Page, should you choose to accept it...
2016-05-11 00:14:24, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] Obviously I'll find out what I can tomorrow…
2016-05-11 00:49:01, Wed	OUTBOX	Forgot to ask, did that [redacted] issue come up at wrap? Because Paarman (acting ead) asked andy for a status update, saying Bob had inquired, but I could have sworn Andy mentioned to Bill...
2016-05-11 00:50:52, Wed	INBOX	A) not tracking - I don't attend any cd wraps (Jones does both jobs). Not my section, I don't think? \n\n(and Paarman is acting ead?!?!)
2016-05-11 00:51:16, Wed	OUTBOX	Just covered wrap.
2016-05-11 00:51:55, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, my q didn't make sense. Disregard.
2016-05-11 01:09:01, Wed	INBOX	Sorry, a cia buddy called looking for me to put in a good word with Jen

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-11 01:11:28, Wed	INBOX	Your q made sense, I've just missed Jones' meetings today.
2016-05-11 01:17:54, Wed	OUTBOX	Yeah, no kidding. Except I have like a thousand page litigation outline that [redacted] put together that I need to review tonight.
2016-05-11 01:18:51, Wed	OUTBOX	And among the list of 1000 things I need to do is call 1500 or whomever to figure how to work 324 mail...
2016-05-11 01:26:14, Wed	INBOX	Is your 324mail password messed up? Or you just need a tutorial?
2016-05-11 01:27:14, Wed	OUTBOX	I never set up an account. Think I need them to do something to link my token to the account. But I don't really know how to do it.
2016-05-11 01:31:48, Wed	INBOX	Oh. They do. And I have no idea what that is. I think it's already linked to your rsa, but you've got to set up a PIN.
2016-05-11 01:32:27, Wed	OUTBOX	I figure it's probably not the same as my eras pin. Maybe I should just try tomorrow...
2016-05-11 01:32:52, Wed	INBOX	It's not
2016-05-11 01:33:06, Wed	INBOX	I've got to get am eras. \n\nProbably\n\nMaybe
2016-05-11 09:39:48, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] And reading a NYT article on State placing classified in unclassified systems reminded me of my irritation about the brief yesterday.
2016-05-11 18:10:03, Wed	INBOX	Have to go write MYE bullets for Jones \U0001f612\n\nYour end of day ones will be better...
2016-05-11 21:34:06, Wed	INBOX	Hey def have Andy talk to John/George about urgency if he hasn't. I spoke to David,can explain later, tried to communicate the same thing to him. Got a "we're waiting on next version of affidavit from you." I am certain there are other things that can be getting prepped.
2016-05-11 21:41:43, Wed	OUTBOX	Dd calling state now
2016-05-11 21:42:41, Wed	INBOX	Ooh. Want to hear about it! You already talk to [redacted]?
2016-05-11 21:43:21, Wed	INBOX	And crap I've got to go in 30 or so
2016-05-11 21:44:06, Wed	OUTBOX	Cancelled [redacted] to sit in on this.
2016-05-11 21:46:31, Wed	INBOX	Nice. Call me, obviously. The MOA is done/final (State OGC is good), just need Jones to sign it tomorrow morning.
2016-05-11 21:47:23, Wed	INBOX	No word re anything from [redacted]
2016-05-11 21:48:14, Wed	OUTBOX	Are the two cds identified in any other way?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-11 21:48:18, Wed	OUTBOX	I'm not going.
2016-05-11 21:48:27, Wed	OUTBOX	So they haven't heard from her yet?
2016-05-11 21:51:02, Wed	INBOX	Just by date of delivery
2016-05-11 21:51:38, Wed	INBOX	With a cover LHM from me
2016-05-11 21:51:53, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] is calling us back tomorrow.
2016-05-11 21:52:14, Wed	INBOX	Not clear if they have heard from her. David was unaware of any contact as of 4:30
2016-05-11 21:52:40, Wed	INBOX	After he researches, or you weren't able to talk to him?
2016-05-11 21:53:00, Wed	INBOX	I left [redacted] an email but he is returning from twin cities.
2016-05-11 21:53:03, Wed	OUTBOX	We spoke to him. He will have answers tomorrow.
2016-05-11 21:53:20, Wed	INBOX	I hope to hear later tonight, def tomorrow at 11 mtg with them
2016-05-11 21:53:41, Wed	INBOX	Nice. Send thanks to Andy
2016-05-11 21:53:51, Wed	INBOX	And call me re Laufman
2016-05-11 21:53:57, Wed	OUTBOX	Oh he's going to ask for update before then.
2016-05-11 21:54:02, Wed	OUTBOX	I will when I can.
2016-05-11 21:54:39, Wed	INBOX	That's fine. I will call [redacted] now as well
2016-05-11 21:55:01, Wed	INBOX	And re call, got it. Just atmospherics on different perspective.
2016-05-11 21:55:30, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] phone went straight to vm. Left message
2016-05-11 21:57:48, Wed	OUTBOX	Dd wants email direct to him when/if you hear about [redacted]. Cc me obviously.
2016-05-11 21:58:43, Wed	INBOX	Will do. [redacted]
2016-05-11 21:59:57, Wed	OUTBOX	Great.
2016-05-11 22:00:36, Wed	INBOX	Hey just sent you short email, can you check for tone?
2016-05-11 22:00:42, Wed	OUTBOX	He called usss today, will call Cia tomorrow. Have much to discuss with you later. But will probably be much later.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-11 22:00:45, Wed	OUTBOX	10-4
2016-05-11 22:01:37, Wed	INBOX	Why USSS?
2016-05-11 22:02:23, Wed	INBOX	Ok. [redacted] Before or after is fine.
2016-05-11 22:07:07, Wed	OUTBOX	Gotta run
2016-05-11 22:11:06, Wed	INBOX	K. Me too. Will be on cell
2016-05-11 23:27:28, Wed	INBOX	Can answer Qs here if urgent or will be 8:30 (!) when done
2016-05-11 23:27:31, Wed	OUTBOX	Andy is PISSED. Can't believe (even though he can) that doj is just going along with it all. Tried calling John and George but no answer.
2016-05-11 23:27:55, Wed	INBOX	[redacted] is refusing
2016-05-11 23:28:18, Wed	OUTBOX	[redacted] is the only real prosecutor.
2016-05-11 23:54:20, Wed	OUTBOX	I am. Going out with [redacted] now to get food.
2016-05-12 02:30:36, Thu	OUTBOX	BTW fwiw, [redacted] still in the ofc with me.
2016-05-12 11:08:54, Thu	OUTBOX	Totally off topic, but I'm kind of bummed: Randy offered to take Andy to the offsite using a Blackhawk on Monday. It's easier for him to have [redacted] drive, bc it's relatively closer from here. Wah wah.
2016-05-12 11:11:37, Thu	INBOX	And I'll start percolating [redacted] up next week. Figure a week or two to discuss, then calendar. Though honestly I wonder if it's stupid to even consider before the 15th
2016-05-12 11:12:08, Thu	INBOX	Two days is doable, though, assuming it's not the week he wants to make the speech
2016-05-12 11:14:20, Thu	OUTBOX	Yeah, it probably is. And there's a strong risk andy will say you're too important to the case and need to stay here.
2016-05-12 11:18:04, Thu	OUTBOX	Re [redacted], yeah, but it might end up being him and I and a hunch of others too, and I don't really want that. That's what happened last time.
2016-05-12 12:32:52, Thu	INBOX	I think I need to excuse my team and talk to doj, again, his morning at 11 about timeliness
2016-05-12 13:06:57, Thu	INBOX	Talking with Jon about DoJ. Would like you here - how far out are you?
2016-05-12 13:09:40, Thu	OUTBOX	Probably be in the ofc by 9:30 or so.
2016-05-12 13:10:45, Thu	INBOX	Ok. Let me know. I've got a hard stop (for Jones \U0001f612) at 10

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-12 13:28:09, Thu	OUTBOX	Want me to come straight there?
2016-05-12 16:07:24, Thu	OUTBOX	Hey need to go meet with NCOS on the uco stuff, [redacted]
2016-05-12 16:10:02, Thu	INBOX	Updates for you
2016-05-12 16:15:35, Thu	INBOX	Will be in my office (just above you, I think) - sending a UC to 1:00 so I have a bit more flexibility
2016-05-12 20:57:57, Thu	INBOX	Hi. [redacted] coming through
2016-05-12 21:03:50, Thu	OUTBOX	With what?
2016-05-12 21:05:48, Thu	INBOX	Sitting in CES with them overnight writing the PSEU form so it's ready tomorrow morning for Dana and George to sign. Dana is ready.
2016-05-12 21:08:34, Thu	OUTBOX	Good. F-ing finally.
2016-05-12 22:28:44, Thu	OUTBOX	Holy cow are you still talking?!
2016-05-12 22:46:24, Thu	INBOX	Just finished. Will call. On the way out Eric asked (he suggested no) if we needed the meeting tomorrow afternoon
2016-05-12 22:48:06, Thu	OUTBOX	Did you ask Andy if he still wanted to meet tomorrow?
2016-05-12 22:49:41, Thu	INBOX	I did not. I had left when Eric caught me. I told Eric I deferred to Andy about whether or not we needed to meet. We did not talk about what we planned to tell the D on Mon.
2016-05-12 23:39:39, Thu	INBOX	Spoke to [redacted] and relayed Andy's message. Told him Andy was relaying to Carlin. Richard said he'd wait to hear from on high. Carlin and George are definitely going to have to message down
2016-05-12 23:50:01, Thu	OUTBOX	Can I send that to Andy.
2016-05-12 23:53:23, Thu	INBOX	Think I need an eras....
2016-05-12 23:54:25, Thu	INBOX	And just got a mtg cancel for mtg tomorrow afternoon with Andy
2016-05-12 23:59:27, Thu	INBOX	Remind me [redacted] story
2016-05-13 00:00:36, Fri	OUTBOX	Yup. And Eric cancelling cve mtg too.
2016-05-13 00:01:11, Fri	OUTBOX	Tried [redacted] tonight but didn't reach him. Will try in am.
2016-05-13 00:24:35, Fri	OUTBOX	Hey forgot to ask if you mentioned the whole special counsel thing to andy?

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-13 00:37:41, Fri	INBOX	Sleeper was in there when I arrived
2016-05-13 00:38:12, Fri	OUTBOX	Yup. I'm pissed. Especially bc he knows Eric and [redacted] are tight.
2016-05-13 00:39:29, Fri	INBOX	Soft power.
2016-05-13 00:39:59, Fri	OUTBOX	Yeah, I know. I already called Jim and sent an email to trisha. \U0001f612
2016-05-13 00:40:35, Fri	INBOX	See?!? Perfect
2016-05-13 00:41:11, Fri	INBOX	I walked through my convo with DoJ. Got more info from [redacted] about Laufman. It's a problem. Told Andy that, too.
2016-05-13 00:41:31, Fri	OUTBOX	What info?
2016-05-13 10:41:31, Fri	INBOX	Who was your poc to get an eras? Or did you just get JG's?
2016-05-13 10:42:36, Fri	OUTBOX	I did just get [redacted] I wonder what they asked him when he went to turn in his property. Just ask jon, no?
2016-05-13 10:43:13, Fri	INBOX	Yeah, that's what I'm going to do.
2016-05-13 10:44:12, Fri	INBOX	Talked to [redacted] last night, btw. He spoke to [redacted]. Shockingly, she did not sound surprised about the subpoenas, said she would accept service. \U0001f612
2016-05-13 10:46:03, Fri	INBOX	Still saying no about the laptops, but focused on Mills'. He said they were moving forward on that front as well. Helpfully, obliquely told/reminded her pet her prior conments that if she was going to call anyone, to do that soon. \U0001f612 Because we're just THAT bad.
2016-05-13 10:46:06, Fri	INBOX	Of, not pet
2016-05-13 10:52:59, Fri	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-13 12:38:25, Fri	INBOX	Your calendar isn't SO bad today....Jones has his meeting scheduled over Eric's farewell. Are you going to that?
2016-05-13 12:38:42, Fri	OUTBOX	I am going, yes.
2016-05-13 12:42:36, Fri	INBOX	Let me see what Jones is thinking. Suppose I cam show up late. There will be more than 30 minutes of speechifying, I'm sure
2016-05-13 12:42:52, Fri	OUTBOX	I'm sure.
2016-05-13 14:36:20, Fri	INBOX	Talking in my office with [redacted]
2016-05-13 14:57:44, Fri	OUTBOX	Just finished. Need to catch andy.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-15 18:30:50, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm thinking about not going with Andy tomorrow, going into to work but only working on uco policy and house stuff. I'm very torn. \U0001f612
2016-05-15 18:32:07, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] You should definitely go before Andy leaves. You'll have another chance, but the irons hot now. Flip side, I really want you (and him, but at least one of you) at D brief.
2016-05-15 18:32:43, Sun	INBOX	Work-wise, probably smarter to go in, I guess.
2016-05-15 18:32:52, Sun	INBOX	Take the helicopter next time. ;)
2016-05-15 20:21:14, Sun	OUTBOX	Yes. [redacted] just texted. Dd flying with the DAG on the bird. So he'll be back for mye. So if there are extra seats, I'll join, if not, I'll come in.
2016-05-15 20:24:05, Sun	INBOX	[redacted] That's totally cool. Where do you leave from, Reagan?
2016-05-15 20:26:09, Sun	INBOX	Troop configuration sits 11 (if you're taking the Blackhawk) but no idea how configured. 8, no problem. Take out seats and you can cram about 20 all soothed together (but that's SUPER tight). Is [redacted] going?
2016-05-15 20:26:45, Sun	INBOX	Scootched not soothed. It is NOT soothed.
2016-05-15 20:27:28, Sun	INBOX	First time in a blackhawk? Helicopter?
2016-05-15 20:33:11, Sun	OUTBOX	Never been in a blackhawk, or any helicopter at all [redacted]
2016-05-15 20:40:03, Sun	INBOX	Well, I really hope you can go. There's got to be enough room - even if the DAG takes +2, +2 detail guys, and Andy, that's only 6. When will you know?
2016-05-15 20:58:05, Sun	OUTBOX	Tonight? Not sure
2016-05-15 20:59:49, Sun	INBOX	Saw your email. Waiting to do something until I get it "officially" - or can I use your email for that? We're going to have to go to NSD. I think Bill calling George is the right place to start, then I can follow up with [redacted]
2016-05-15 21:03:33, Sun	OUTBOX	Wait. Bill said cd will take the lead.
2016-05-15 21:07:38, Sun	INBOX	Sigh. I suppose he'll relay that eventually. \U0001f612
2016-05-15 21:10:17, Sun	OUTBOX	He will.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-15 21:22:31, Sun	INBOX	And I'm going to ping Jim R tomorrow (or whenever I get it) to say hey, per D's request, we've put quite a bit of thought into it, including coming up with this, Andy noted you were collecting comments, how would you like them.
2016-05-15 21:38:52, Sun	INBOX	Well, he hasn't. I'm just going to email him and see if he wants an update from last week either tonight or tomorrow morning before he goes upstairs.
2016-05-15 22:46:18, Sun	OUTBOX	I'm over my email limit so can't send right now. It's utterly freezing outside. Sucks.
2016-05-15 22:46:44, Sun	OUTBOX	DAG detail saying only room for Andy. [redacted] is checking with her staff.
2016-05-15 22:55:06, Sun	INBOX	Oof. That sucks. And bullsh*t, unless it's a smaller helicopter. Is it DOJ's or ours? If you cant go, I'll take you to lunch and make helicopter noises. ;)\n\nI just did a mass cull down on 324mail. [redacted] Talking to Bill at 7:45. Did some open source research, no way we get that data on our own.
2016-05-15 22:56:05, Sun	OUTBOX	I know. It has to be nsd.
2016-05-15 23:00:39, Sun	INBOX	I need some clarifying data - just retention, right? While it might be helpful to put in Petraeus, Hitselberger, that's only to show they are different, ie, involve transmittal to another person. He just wants fact patterns where it was only retention, not disclosure, right? And taking graviman literally, list will not include more serious cases/disclosures which are more than retention.
2016-05-15 23:59:40, Sun	OUTBOX	Yes, that's what I would say.
2016-05-16 00:49:01, Mon	INBOX	Just finished with Bill. [redacted]
2016-05-16 01:06:08, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] Talked to Bill for about an hour. He mentioned email, said he would send (though he hasn't yet). He had a slightly different take than I did but we'll get there. His primary concern is asking DoJ in such a way that they respond straight to the D (which I can see happening) without us getting a chance to review for accuracy / spin.
2016-05-16 01:07:10, Mon	OUTBOX	Insist it go through the DD. Then I'll give it to you.
2016-05-16 01:08:56, Mon	INBOX	Well I think we start by trying to insist it go thru CD. We'll see. I just envision them being whiny about it unless they have something already written.
2016-05-16 01:09:21, Mon	OUTBOX	They won't. I guarantee it.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-16 01:10:10, Mon	INBOX	Hope springs eternal. I suppose I could ask [redacted] on the DL
2016-05-16 01:10:33, Mon	OUTBOX	And yes, obviously I agree about it going thru cd first. Was just saying if they balk, there's no way rybicki wouldn't insist on it coming to us first.
2016-05-16 01:11:00, Mon	INBOX	Is that something doj would ordinarily keep good records of? Or will this be a lift?
2016-05-16 01:11:09, Mon	OUTBOX	If there are so few that someone like [redacted] would literally be able to recall them then you have much bigger problems.
2016-05-16 01:11:42, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-16 01:12:06, Mon	OUTBOX	Description might be hard. But I guess we'll see.
2016-05-16 01:12:48, Mon	INBOX	The fbi can come up with description
2016-05-16 01:13:08, Mon	INBOX	20 years is a long time...
2016-05-16 01:13:17, Mon	OUTBOX	I'd like to make a suggestion though. I DO NOT think you should ask [redacted]. I think Bill should ask George. [redacted] is just going to bitch and moan. George sees the d three times a week. He is not going to say no.
2016-05-16 01:14:00, Mon	OUTBOX	They won't be able to do that. No way. But let THEM come back to rybicki about what they can or can't do.
2016-05-16 01:14:38, Mon	INBOX	Fine but then George tasks them and they ask me...when am I supposed to mention it? Seeing as how I own this program and all.
2016-05-16 01:16:04, Mon	OUTBOX	Pete. I'm trying to save you some crap from them. Don't get your back up about it. When they ask you, you talk about it. What's the big deal? All they are going to do when you tell them is wait to hear from on high. So all I'm saying is start there.
2016-05-16 01:16:27, Mon	INBOX	Look, I totally get what you're saying and agree with you. Just trying to figure out how best to own my program
2016-05-16 01:17:16, Mon	INBOX	Ha. \U0001f60a See, my back's not up. Just trying to find the best way to play this.
2016-05-16 01:17:19, Mon	OUTBOX	With this one, coming from the d, just let it trickle down from higher. Hell, I wouldn't be surprised if George hears it from andy in the morning.
2016-05-16 01:20:02, Mon	INBOX	Sounds smart
2016-05-16 01:23:51, Mon	OUTBOX	Haven't heard from [redacted] Looks like I'm coming to work tomorrow. \U0001f612

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-16 01:25:24, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] Also, remind me story Bill had about Bob Anderson. \n\nThat really sucks. I'm sorry. You'll have more chances, for sure. [redacted]
2016-05-16 01:36:26, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] (Though in think I'm leaving "coop site" on my wipe board and just working out of [redacted] ofc tomorrow.
2016-05-16 01:37:48, Mon	INBOX	[redacted] is out. You can also work out of PS's office tomorrow.
2016-05-16 01:41:42, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted] your phone rings off the hook. I need some uninterrupted work and Internet research time.
2016-05-16 01:43:55, Mon	INBOX	I'll unplug my phone\U0001f636
2016-05-16 01:44:12, Mon	INBOX	Is [redacted] out tomorrow?
2016-05-16 01:44:36, Mon	OUTBOX	Yes. Though I presume [redacted] will be there.
2016-05-16 01:45:16, Mon	INBOX	Your call. You're welcome to it.
2016-05-16 01:54:01, Mon	OUTBOX	[redacted]
2016-05-16 02:15:08, Mon	INBOX	And I'm regretting letting ALL of my UCs go to LV. Trusted [redacted] to check that but my mistake for not double checking.
2016-05-16 12:19:55, Mon	INBOX	And finally almost to HQ. I'll double check.my calendar (an OCA mtg this morning i think got moved) but truly I think my office will be open all day if you want to use it.
2016-05-16 12:45:19, Mon	INBOX	Done with 830....will call from desk if you'll be in car for 5
2016-05-16 13:00:41, Mon	OUTBOX	Pulling in in 4
2016-05-16 16:19:43, Mon	INBOX	Hey done with staff mtg. [redacted]
2016-05-16 21:22:22, Mon	INBOX	Calling [redacted] to get info. Just got vm. You in wrap?
2016-05-16 21:24:03, Mon	INBOX	Thought it went well.
2016-05-16 21:24:27, Mon	OUTBOX	Just left.
2016-05-16 21:24:40, Mon	OUTBOX	Be down in a minute.

Date UTC	Type of Message	Body
2016-05-17 00:50:47, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] otta talk to [redacted] shortly. Haven't heard from Mike. Curious to see what Andy and George's convo is about same topic.
2016-05-17 01:27:44, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] Don't read email then. It's [redacted] response citing USAM 9-19.220
2016-05-17 02:01:23, Tue	OUTBOX	I'm not following his email at all. Whatever, will just deal with it tomorrow.
2016-05-17 02:03:24, Tue	INBOX	I think your initial cite may have misdirected to 9-19.221 rather than 9-19.220...
2016-05-17 02:06:22, Tue	INBOX	Nevermind, I'm wrong. We're interested in documentary materials, not privileged ones. \n\nAnd I'M not even an atty
2016-05-17 10:17:24, Tue	INBOX	[redacted] I need DoJ and NSLB to get me an answer, because I'm briefing everyone there are different options available. And the 28 CFR guidance seems problematic from a warrant perspective.
2016-05-17 10:25:03, Tue	OUTBOX	I don't think it is. Plus, it's just policy. [redacted]
2016-05-17 10:27:26, Tue	INBOX	28 CFR is not just policy. But I think there's a path through it as you noted [redacted]
2016-05-17 10:35:58, Tue	OUTBOX	Yes, this is true. But let's be honest, it's not like they've pointed to the cfr as the reason. So let them come up with something.
2016-05-17 10:43:03, Tue	INBOX	They haven't pointed to it because they haven't done the research!!! But when they finally do, presumably before a meeting, they will, and we need to have a response lined up.\n\nAnd hi. I hate this case. [redacted]
2016-05-17 10:43:47, Tue	OUTBOX	I also hate this case. And it's not even mine.
2016-05-17 10:44:39, Tue	OUTBOX	I have all of the stress and will get none of the acknowledgement for being on the team. But whatever.
2016-05-17 10:47:08, Tue	INBOX	Ok that last statement isn't fair.
2016-05-17 10:48:05, Tue	INBOX	You are on the team, you do a tremendous amount of work on it.
2016-05-17 10:49:17, Tue	INBOX	When Andy called last week to discuss, he called you and me.