



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Office of Legal Counsel

---

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

December 15, 2017

Charlie Savage  
The New York Times  
savage@nytimes.com

**Re: FOIA No. FY17-070; N.Y. Times, et al. v. DOJ, No. 17 Civ. 1946 (S.D.N.Y.)**

Dear Mr. Savage:

This letter partially responds to your January 28, 2017 Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") request to the Office of Legal Counsel ("OLC"), seeking "all e-mails, memos, and other documents related to[:] 1. Office of Legal Counsel review of proposed Trump administration executive orders for form and legality, including during the transition period[;] and 2. Office of Legal Counsel review of other proposed Trump White House matters, including during the transition period," through January 28, 2017. As you know, the request is also the subject of the above-captioned litigation, and the request has been narrowed in certain ways pursuant to agreement through counsel.

Since the last partial response, we have processed 213 pages of responsive records. We have enclosed 28 pages with material redacted as exempt from disclosure pursuant to FOIA Exemption Five, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5), and pursuant to FOIA Exemption Six, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). For your information, Exemption Five exempts material protected by the attorney-client, deliberative process, and presidential communications privileges, as well as the attorney work product doctrine and other privileges. Exemption Six exempts material the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. We have withheld the remaining 185 pages in full pursuant to Exemption Five, and in part pursuant to Exemption Six. We are continuing to process responsive records.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

You may contact Assistant U.S. Attorney Rebecca Tinio, at 212-637-2774, for any further assistance and to discuss any aspect of your request. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services ("OGIS") at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, Room 2510, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001,

e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.

Although your request is the subject of ongoing litigation, and administrative appeals are not ordinarily acted upon in such situations, I am required by statute and regulation to inform you of your right to file an administrative appeal. You may administratively appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy ("OIP"), United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP's FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: <https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home>. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within 90 days of the date of my response to your request. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Sincerely,



Paul P. Colborn  
Special Counsel

Enclosures

cc: Rebecca S. Tinio  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York

Benjamin H. Torrance  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Southern District of New York

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 05, 2016 8:23 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5).doc

(b) (6)

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 10:00 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

Thanks, Rosemary.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 10:00 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** FW: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

First batch. As we discussed, all of these are a close-hold.

Thanks.

(b) (5)



**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 12:02 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

Terrific! Thanks.

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 11:47 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

Rosemary, I'm attaching my comments on the (b) (5) and (b) (5) orders. I'm turning to (b) (5) next but thought you might want to have these two for whenever you were available to review.

Thank you,  
(b) (6)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 10:00 AM

duplicate

# duplicate

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 3:24 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6) + rh  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6) + rh.docx

One down! But we probably need to talk about a couple items tomorrow.

Thanks so much!

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 3:47 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

I'll be working from home. Happy to talk whenever.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 3:46 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

Thanks! I'll take a look. Are you here tomorrow? Or at home? (Doesn't matter, as we can email or call each other.)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 3:41 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

Here are two. I didn't have any comments on the (b) (5) I'm still working on the (b) (5) one.  
I'm happy to discuss!

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 3:53 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** FW: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)

(b) (6) Your 4 EOs are attached.

Rosemary

duplicate

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 7:21 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6).docx

I agree with both of your comments (b) (5)  
(b) (5) and made corresponding changes and deleted the comments.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 14, 2016 8:19 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6)

Thanks for taking the first shot at this! A few nits and a couple of questions, in the attached.

RH

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 12:00 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) +  
(b) (6) + rh  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) +  
(b) (6) + rh.docx

(b) (6) This looks great. I had a couple of tweaks, and also noted an issue that could benefit from follow-up with Dan.

I gave this to Paul to look at, given the language in (b) (5). He wants to meet on this and I told him we'd do that after you got in.

Thanks!  
Rosemary



**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:11 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-14-2016).docx; ATT00002.htm; (b) (5) (12-12-16).docx; ATT00003.htm; (b) (5) (12-12-2016).docx; ATT00004.htm; ATT00005.htm

(b) (6): Please review the three attached orders. It would be great if you could have redlines back to me by next Tuesday. I'll stop by this afternoon to have a preliminary discussion about them.

Thanks,  
Rosemary









**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:12 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** New EOs  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-13-16).docx; ATT00005.htm

(b) (6) Would you please review the attached proposed EO?

Thanks!

Rosemary





(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:43 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Yes—they're fine.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:37 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

On (b) (5), did you (b) (5)?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:35 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

One more question-- (b) (5)  
(b) (5)?

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Dec 15, 2016, at 1:32 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Right-- (b) (5)  
(b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 10:48 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5)

Here's the last one. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

<< File: (b) (5) (12-11-2016)+(b) (6) docx  
>>

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:53 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Only if it would be reasonably quick. I'll ask Steve next time we talk.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:44 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

(b) (5) is it something I should spend time running to ground if I'm not sure?

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Dec 15, 2016, at 1:37 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

# duplicate

# duplicate

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:54 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** RE: EOs for OLC

Thanks! I'll check with Dan and Paul on schedules.

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:52 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: EOs for OLC

Yes, happy to review. I've also had a chance to look at your edits to the (b) (5) order and am ready to talk with Dan and Paul whenever it's convenient for you.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:15 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** FW: EOs for OLC

(b) (6): I would appreciate it if you could review the first of these – the one (b) (5) I've assigned the next three to (b) (6) and the (b) (5) to (b) (6).

Thanks!

Rosemary

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 4:55 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- another redline  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016)  
+ (b) (6) (003) + rh 230 pm.docx

These look good. I deleted the internal comments.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 4:38 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) -- another redline

(b) (6): Sorry for the delay. I got interrupted several times.

When talking with Dan about a couple of other things, (b) (5)  
(b) (5) (b) (5)  
(b) (5) Feel free to tweak.

I will be tied up for another hour, so no rush to get this back to me. We can send it tomorrow along with the others.

Thanks so much -- (b) (5)

RH



(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 4:57 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments** (b) (5) (12-13-16) (b) (6).docx

Here are my comments on this one (b) (5)

---

■.

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

(b) (6)

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 4:58 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Executive Orders for OLC Review (Part 1)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016) + (b) (6).docx

Rosemary: Here's the (b) (5) order. I have a number of questions highlighted, some of which I could probably nail down with just a little more research (or a conversation with you or Dan). I can focus on those tomorrow morning but wanted to give you this draft in case you're planning to review tonight.

(b) (5)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, December 12, 2016 10:00 AM

duplicate

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 7:31 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Cc:** Koffsky, Daniel L (OLC)  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) (12-11-2016)  
+ (b) (6) (003) + rh 230 pm

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Dec 15, 2016, at 6:25 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

---

**From:** Koffsky, Daniel L (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 6:16 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) (12-11-2016)+ (b) (6) (003) + rh 230 pm

From a different perspective: (b) (5)  
(b) (5) ?

---

**From:** Koffsky, Daniel L (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 6:12 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) (12-11-2016)+ (b) (6) (003) + rh 230 pm

Thanks.

Does it make sense to say:

Document ID: 0.7.13767.48160

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

**Sent:** Thursday, December 15, 2016 5:52 PM

**To:** Koffsky, Daniel L (OLC)

**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC)

**Subject:** (b) (5) (12-11-2016)-(b) (6) (003) + rh  
230 pm

Dan: Here is what (b) (6) and I have come up with. Please let us know if you have anything to add or change.

Rosemary



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Office of Legal Counsel

---

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

November 30, 2017

Ian Bassin  
Executive Director  
The Protect Democracy Project  
FOIA.protectdemocracy@gmail.com

**Re: FOIA No. FY17-135;  
Protect Democracy Project v. DOJ, No. 1:17-cv-815 (D.D.C.)**

Dear Mr. Bassin:

This letter partially responds to your February 15, 2017 Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") request in which you sought five categories of "records created between January 20, 2017 and the present" regarding Executive Order 13769. As you know, the request is also the subject of the above-captioned litigation.


Since the last partial response, we have processed 285 pages of responsive records. We have enclosed 123 pages of, with material redacted as exempt from disclosure pursuant to FOIA Exemption Five, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5), and pursuant to FOIA Exemption Six, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). For your information, Exemption Five exempts material protected by the attorney-client, deliberative process, and presidential communications privileges, as well as the attorney work product doctrine and other privileges. Exemption Six exempts material the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. We have withheld the remaining 162 pages in full pursuant to Exemption Five, and in part pursuant to Exemption Six. We are continuing to process responsive records.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

You may contact Matthew Berns of the Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch, at 202-616-8016, for any further assistance and to discuss any aspect of your requests. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services ("OGIS") at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, Room 2510, 8601 Adelphi Road, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov); telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.

Although your requests are the subject of ongoing litigation, and administrative appeals are not ordinarily acted upon in such situations, I am required by statute and regulation to inform you of your right to file an administrative appeal. You may administratively appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy ("OIP"), United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP's FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: <https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home>. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within 90 days of the date of my response to your request. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Sincerely,

  
for Paul P. Colborn  
Special Counsel

Enclosures

cc: Matthew Berns, Trial Attorney  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch



Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 1:07 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6)  
**Subject:** FW: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 4:54 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (1-13-2017)--Clean (b) (6).docx

Here it is. Good luck!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 12:31 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** FW: (b) (5)

I'm sorry to drag you in on this. The hope is to get it to Rosemary today. Can we discuss how to divide up?

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 10:47 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Cc:** (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** FW: (b) (5)

(b) (6) (b) (5) Let me know if you need help on this. (Should we pull (b) (6) in on this?)

RH

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 13, 2017 6:21 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) (1-13-2017)--  
Clean+(b) (6).docx

FYI, (b) (5) Thanks to (b) (6)  
for jumping in on this.

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 1:36 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- Update!!

Thanks! Will be able to look at it fairly soon.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 1:35 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- Update!!

Here are comments on the revised version.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 12:16 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- Update!!

Excellent. Thanks.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 12:02 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) -- Update!!

Yes, I can do this shortly.

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 14, 2017, at 10:14 AM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (6): See new redline from Steve. Please use this one – sorry. I hope it won't take too long to transfer your comments – and maybe some have been addressed in the attached version. Would you be able to turn this around today?

Thanks,  
Rosemary

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 4:20 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- Update!!

Thanks for checking. I had to do a conference call on something else but have turned back to this and am now inputting my edits. I'm about halfway through. (b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 4:18 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) - Update!!

I'm assuming you got tied up on other matters, but I wanted to be sure I hadn't missed this.

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 14, 2017, at 2:46 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Am preparing a redline back, which I should be able to send in the next 15-20 minutes.

duplicate



# duplicate



**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 5:20 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh  
**Attachments:** Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh.docx

Here it is, just as you are getting ready for dinner and (b) (6)

SORRY! Everything is going more slowly than I'd like, and I kept getting interrupted with (b) (5)  
(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 5:23 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** Re: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)-(b) (6)(002) + rh

Don't worry! I know you are slammed!

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 5:37 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) 002) + rh

I'm sorry for not having this straight, but (b) (5) ?

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:01 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6)(002) + rh  
**Attachments:** Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6)(002) + rh+(b) (6) docx

Here is a revision. I've deleted the internal comments that required no follow up, and have otherwise highlighted in yellow my responses/edits. I'm happy to discuss.

(b) (5)

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:05 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh

Ok. I had just started—caught me in time!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:04 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh

Ok--don't look at the doc I just sent. I will fix this and resend.

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 14, 2017, at 6:02 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:12 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh  
**Attachments:** Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh+(b) (6) docx

With that change made. Sorry about that!

# duplicate

duplicate



Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:17 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Copy of (b) (5) (1-14-2017)+(b) (6) (002) + rh

Got it. Thanks for looking at this so quickly!

# duplicate

- duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:39 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: question.....

Got it. Thanks!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:36 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: question.....

(b) (5)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 14, 2017 6:29 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** question.....

Question: Not sure I understand this addition:

(b) (5)

I am here at (b) (6) if a call is easier.

duplicate

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 1:49 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Immigration EO  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6).docx

Sorry for all the confusion. Rosemary said she was going to ask you to look at a question while (b) (6)

(b) (6)

I'm back working, but if you have a few minutes to look at the question (b) (5), I'd be exceedingly grateful. (b) (5)

When I finish the (b) (5) issue (feel free to weigh in on that if you want), I'll let you know, and I can hopefully take this back off your plate.  
Feel free to call if you want to discuss.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 1:42 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: Immigration EO

Not right now, no.

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
Department of Justice  
(b) (6)

On Jan 16, 2017, at 1:39 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Are you working on something else now?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 1:40 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: Immigration EO

Ok. Let me know if you need help!

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
Department of Justice

(b) (6)

On Jan 16, 2017, at 1:39 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Nope; if you're not, don't worry about it.

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 1:38 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Re: Immigration EO

Hey, I'm not sure if I missed an email, but this is the first I've heard about it. Should I be working on it?

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser

Office of Legal Counsel

Department of Justice

(b) (6)

On Jan 16, 2017, at 1:37 PM, (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (6) and am back to focusing on this. Are you working on it? If so, should we chat about where things stand?  
I'm at (b) (6)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:08 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Immigration EO

Yeah. Can you also (b) (5) ?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:05 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Immigration EO

Calling you shortly. (b) (5)  
(b) (5) is that the relevant question?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 1:51 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Immigration EO

Oh, I would also check (b) (5)  
(b) (5)

# duplicate

# duplicate



(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:41 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Sounds good.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:39 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Give me 5 minutes. I'm going to send you the doc back with a draft comment.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:39 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Exactly.

And, yeah, I was just thinking that. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:36 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Oddly, though, (b) (5)

This raises the question— (b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 2:26 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

And, so you have it, this is (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 2:18 PM

To: (b) (6) OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: (b) (5)

I believe the attached are all (b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 3:56 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)-(b) (6).docx

Rosemary—

I didn't hear back from you, so I hope it's ok that I asked (b) (6) to look at (b) (5). In the course of our discussion, (b) (5), as reflected in the attached comments. (b) (5), again as reflected in the draft.

-- (b) (6)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 3:58 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** Read: (b) (5)

Your message

To: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Subject: (b) (5)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 8:55:47 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik  
was read on Monday, January 16, 2017 8:57:07 PM (UTC+00:00) Monrovia, Reykjavik.

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 4:10 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Got it. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 4:08 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 16, 2017, at 4:04 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Yeah. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 3:59 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

Yeah. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 16, 2017, at 3:57 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

FWIW. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:48 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5)  
consultation

Got it; thanks!

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:47 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5)  
consultation"

I accidentally left a pasted in (b) (5) after the text, please ignore it.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:46 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5)

This looks great (b) (5). I made a few edits in yellow. Let me know if they make sense.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:30 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5)

Feel free to do more:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:19 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:17 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5)



I think that's all fair, and I'll made edits accordingly.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 3:10 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

I have made some edits in yellow bellow that are totally up to you whether or not to include, as they do make it longer. I didn't touch (b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 2:59 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5)

Thanks! Take a look?



From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 2:47 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5)

This may be relevant—(b) (5):

(b) (5)

duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 4:11 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Definitely.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 4:07 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

Yes. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

# duplicate

■ duplicate ■

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate



# duplicate

■ duplicate

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 6:43 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6).docx

Thanks for continuing to work on this. I have added some internal comments and questions. See attached. And call if it is easier to discuss.

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:00 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 7pm.docx

I will give you a call,

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

I'll call you in 5 minutes; I need to relocate.

duplicate

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:03 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** Read: RE: (b) (5) -Near  
Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6)

Your message

To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6)  
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 7:00:02 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)

was read on Monday, January 16, 2017 7:03:25 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:18 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -Near Final  
(1.16.16)4 (b) (6)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) -Near Final  
(1.16.16)4 (b) (6) 7pm.docx

# duplicate

(b) (6) OLC

---

**From:** (b) (6) OLC  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:29 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm.docx

Here, with hopefully the things we've discussed addressed for tonight's purposes.

# duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:29 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6)

Thanks. Will read now.

# duplicate



Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Monday, January 16, 2017 7:45 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) OLC  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)-(b) (6)

This is good. I can clean up and send. Thanks!

# duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:21 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017).docx  
**Importance:** High

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Does this work? (b) (6) Do you have time to look into this question from home today? (b) (6) is tied up until around noon.

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:23 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Yeah, that I don't know. It's a good question. (b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:23 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 12:16 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (5)

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:14 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

Am

jumping on a call on another matter, but I can call you when I'm done.

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 12:04 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Hey, I just tried calling you.

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:54 AM  
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I agree with (b) (6) that (b) (5)

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 11:36 AM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

OK. Thanks. Dan should be back soon, and I can ask him for his ideas on this.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:22 AM  
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:47 AM

To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

That could work, I think. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

---

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:45 AM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5) See what we can come up to  
make this work. (b) (5)

[REDACTED]

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:43 AM  
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I see. OK.

I'll see what I can find.

(b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:37 AM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (6); (b) (5)

[REDACTED]

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 10:28 AM  
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I can try to look into this, (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

duplicate



(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:26 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) - PLEASE READ

I believe (b) (6) wrote the comment, so I'm sure he would know.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:25 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) - PLEASE READ

From something (b) (6) sent me earlier:

(b) (6) If you need a sample comment, here's one of (b) (6)'s that might be helpful:

(b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)



Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:24 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Is there a cite for (b) (5) I should look at?

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser

Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 12:22 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

But, yeah, feel free to call me when you are free at (b) (6)

# duplicate

- duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:53 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Let's talk. I chatted with (b) (6).

(b) (5)

But, I think might be easier to talk about this on the phone, or for you to discuss with (b) (6) in person and explain the actual issue we are dealing with. There does seem something different here in that the (b) (5).

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:36 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I would just ask him the question generally- (b) (5)

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 12:32 PM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Sorry, what do you want me to ask? (b) (5)

Can we discuss this EO with him? I'm still not sure how close hold this all is.

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:28 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

Can you ask (b) (6)?

(b) (6)

# duplicate

# duplicate



# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate



(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:29 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Oh no!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:28 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Ack! I have (b) (5) with a similar problem!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:26 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Got it. Right.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:25 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Yes, please! (b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:24 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I can send them (b) (5)

Sorry, we should send them (b) (5) or not?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:23 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Do you want me to draft an email to them or do you want to? I want to send them (b) (5) After I'm off my call, perhaps (b) (6) and I could give you a call from his office?

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:03 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)  
I'm not very familiar with that issue, but I figured (b) (6) would know—(b) (6) might as well.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:01 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)  
Can we loop in (b) (6) on this issue?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:57 PM

To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 12:49 PM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

OK. Spoke quickly with Dan. (b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:49 AM

To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:35 AM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

I was wondering that, too.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:25 AM

To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Cc: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>

Subject: Re: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

(b) (6)

(b) (5)

Could you see if you could find out anything about (b) (5)

(b) (6)

Attorney-Adviser

Office of Legal Counsel

(b) (6)

On Jan 17, 2017, at 11:22 AM, (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

duplicate

# duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:21 PM  
**To:** (b) (6); (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) question for you

(b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:32 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Cc:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) question for you

(b) (6) and (b) (6).

We have (b) (5) question that we would love your views on.

Basically, the question is (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 1:22 PM

To: (b) (6) OLC <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)

<(b) (6)>

Subject: RE: (b) (5) -- PLEASE READ

Sure, loop him in. And (b) (6) too.

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate



# duplicate

# duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:14 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6)  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Tremendous thanks, (b) (6) for your help on all this.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:08 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

Short answer: (b) (5)

Long answer:

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:38 PM  
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

This is super helpful. Thank you!

Can I ask, however, (b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:30 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

I was in the middle of an email saying that (b) (6) would be in a much better position than me to answer, but that it seemed like (b) (5) So count this as a "me too," with gratitude that we have an in-house (b) (5) wizard.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:25 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

What follows is my quick take.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate



# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

- duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:54 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6)  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

OK; I'm going to send it on.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:53 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>;  
(b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

This works from my perspective.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:47 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>;  
(b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

To accommodate (b) (5)  
we could add the following (b) (5):

(b) (5)

Although, this makes it more cumbersome.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:44 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)  
<(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)  
<(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

I like (b) (6)'s approach also because (b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:43 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

I like the simpler version. Works for me

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:42 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>;  
(b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

(b) (5) I wonder if we could just state  
something like the following:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:32 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6)  
(b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

So I've drafted (b) (5) If you all are ok, I'll send it on to Rosemary.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:15 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC)  
<(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

That is correct. (b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:08 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>;  
(b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

Sounds good. (b) (5)

(b) (5)

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:05 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

(b) (6) and I are thinking (b) (5). I'm going to try to draft some placeholder language on this.

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:56 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

I did find this from (b) (5)

(b) (5)

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:51 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

No, it isn't working for me either, and it wasn't working for (b) (6) this morning.

---

From: (b) (6) (OLC)  
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:50 PM  
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) question for you

Am I the only one for whom Perceptive Search is not working?

duplicate

# duplicate



# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

# duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:57 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.17).docx

With thanks to (b) (6), we've proposed a solution to run by Steve. (b) (5)  
(b) (5)



(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 4:07 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC); (b) (6)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) F&L  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) -Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.17).docx; (b) (5)  
(b) (5) 1-17-2017)+(b) (6)+rh.docx

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 4:25 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** (b) (5) notes etc.

(b) (5)

[https://\(b\) \(5\)](https://(b) (5))

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 6:12 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)

Looking at this now.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:57 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5)

duplicate

**Gannon, Curtis (OSG)**

---

**From:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:48 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: Signing schedule

Even better!

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:48 PM  
**To:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Signing schedule

And they will follow up (b) (5)

---

**From:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:47 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: Signing schedule

Excellent. Thanks!

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 8:43 PM  
**To:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Signing schedule

Just got off a long call with Steve and Scott. We now have a list re: issuance plan for the first week. This will help us focus our resources during the next several days.

Note: We only issue paperwork for the EOs, but we approve via email on all the others. I've highlighted the EOs for the first couple of days. Need to turn to more immediate stuff, but will send you an update later tonight or tomorrow.

Friday:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Monday

(b) (5)

Tuesday: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

Wednesday:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Thursday: (b) (5)

Friday: (b) (5)

(b) (5)

Monday:

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:10 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) (1.18).docx

(b) (5)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 17, 2017 3:57 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5)

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:33 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) -Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm - (b) (6) 1.18) + rh  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) -Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.18) + rh.docx

(b) (5)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:30 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) -Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm  
+(b) (6) 1.18) + rh

Looks good. See my tweaks to (b) (5) Accurate? Please edit as necessary.

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:27 PM  
**To:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16) + OLC (1 18 2017)

Will do. Thanks for responding.

---

**From:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:22 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16) + OLC (1 18 2017)

And I won't have more time to look at it this afternoon, so please proceed as you see fit with Steve. (I'm on my way to his office to interview a DAAG candidate.)

On Jan 18, 2017, at 1:18 PM, Gannon, Curtis (OSG) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Thanks, Rosemary. I haven't done any research, but your proposal makes sense to me.

On Jan 18, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Curtis: As discussed,

(b) (5)

Do you want to take a look at this? If so, see page 4 of this document. Or we can just go ahead.

(b) (5)

Let me know what you feel comfortable doing on this.

Thanks,  
Rosemary

<(b) (5)> --Near Final (1.16.16) + OLC (1 18 2017).docx>



Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:28 PM  
**To:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Subject:** RE: [REDACTED] (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16) + OLC (1 18 2017)

thanks

---

**From:** Gannon, Curtis (OSG)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:18 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <[REDACTED] (b) (6)>  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED] (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16) + OLC (1 18 2017)

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:29 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Cc:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** F&Ls  
**Attachments:** EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5)

(b) (5).docx; EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx; (b) (5)  
(b) (5).docx

I think, but am not sure, that this is all my remaining F&Ls except the one on (b) (5)  
(b) (5) If I'm missing any, please  
let me know.

(b) (6)

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:34 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: F&Ls

Awesome—thanks very much!

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:29 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) <(b) (6)>  
**Cc:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** F&Ls

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 1:50 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.18) + rh  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.18) + rh+(b) (6) 145p).docx

Getting closer, I hope!

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:30 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm  
+ (b) (6) 1.18) + rh

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:17 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm +(b) (6) 1.18) + rh+(b) (6) 145p)  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm +(b) (6) 1.18) + rh+(b) (6) 145p).docx

Ugh! I keep having version problems. I'd added something to that effect, but I must not have sent you the right one. What you wrote seems good. I've also fixed a weird highlighting glitch in another comment.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:13 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm  
+(b) (6) 1.18) + rh+(b) (6) 145p)

I thought we should flag (b) (5) See attached.

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:38 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) (1.18) + OLC  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) (1.18) + OLC\_ (b) (6) 230pm).docx

(b) (5) (which I've highlighted in blue just so you can see it).

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:32 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm  
+ (b) (6) 1.18) + OLC

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 18, 2017 8:57 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** Read: (b) (5) --Near  
Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6) 1.18) + OLC

Your message

To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
Subject: RE: (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+(b) (6) 730pm + (b) (6)  
(1.18) + OLC  
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 2:37:56 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)  
was read on Wednesday, January 18, 2017 8:55:51 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).

(b) (6) (OLC)

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2017 11:09 PM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Subject:** Re: (b) (5)

It sounds like we are waiting for (b) (5)

(b) (6)  
Attorney-Adviser  
Office of Legal Counsel  
(b) (6)

On Jan 19, 2017, at 10:50 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (5)

(b) (5)



(b) (5)

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 19, 2017 11:34 PM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** FW: (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017) (1).docx  
**Attachments:** (b) (5) --Near Final  
(1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017) (1).docx

If you are awake....

(b) (5)

**Hart, Rosemary (OLC)**

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2017 8:43 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017) (1) + RH

Thanks!

He had been working from an earlier version, I think.

---

**From:** (b) (6) (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2017 8:06 AM  
**To:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** RE: (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017) (1) + RH

The version Steve et al reviewed was not our previous final version, so I've added in the changes we had previously discussed. I also added comments/edits in response to this round, and tried to clean things up a bit where possible.

---

**From:** Hart, Rosemary (OLC)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 20, 2017 12:28 AM  
**To:** (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>  
**Subject:** (b) (5) --Near Final (1.16.16)+ OLC again (1 16 2017) (1) + RH

(b) (6) started a redline in response to this, but would appreciate your review and input. Maybe we could talk tomorrow at some point?

Thanks,  
Rosemary