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PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Somers: This is a transcribed interview of Stephen Laycock. Chairman Graham requested this interview as part of an investigation by the Senate Judiciary Committee into matters related to the Justice Department's and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's handling of the Crossfire Hurricane investigation, including applications for and renewals of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Warrant on Carter Page.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Would the witness please state his name and current position at the FBI for the record.


Q Thank you. On behalf of Chairman Graham, I want to thank you for appearing today and we appreciate your willingness to appear voluntarily.

My name is Zachary Somers. I'm majority chief investigative counsel for the Judiciary Committee. I'd now like to ask everyone else here in the room to introduce themselves for the record except for your personal counsel who I'll get to in a few moments.

Mr. Baker: Arthur Baker, senior investigative
counsel, majority staff, Chairman Graham.

Ms. Zdeb: Sara Zdeb, senior counsel for Ranking Member Feinstein.

Mr. Charlet: Joe Charlet, counsel for Ranking Member Feinstein.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply in this setting, but there are some guidelines that we follow that I would like to go over.

Our questioning will proceed in rounds. The majority will ask questions for the first hour and then the minority will have the opportunity to ask questions for an equal period of time. We will go back and forth in this manner until there are no more questions and the interview is over.

Typically we take a short break at the end of each hour of questioning, but if you would like to take a break apart from that, please let us know.

As I noted earlier, you're appearing today voluntarily. Accordingly, we anticipate that our questions
will receive complete responses. To the extent that you decline to answer our questions or if counsel instructs you not to answer, we will consider whether a subpoena is necessary.

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

A     Yes, I do.

Q     So if the reporter can take down a clear record, it is important that we don't talk over one another and/or interrupt each other if we can help it. The committee encourages witnesses who appear for transcribed interviews to freely consult with counsel if they so choose. And you're appearing here today with counsel.

Mr. Somers: Would counsel please state his name for the record.

Mr. Swick: Richard Swick.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     We want you to answer our questions in the most complete and truthful manner possible so we will take our time. If you have any questions or if you do not understand one of our questions, please let us know.

If you honestly don't know the answer to a question, do not remember it, it is best not to guess. Please give
us your best recollection and it is okay to tell us if you learned the information from someone else.

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

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

Do you understand that?

A     Yes, I do.

Q     This also applies to questions posed by congressional staff in the interview. Do you understand this?

A     Yes, I do.

Q     Witnesses who knowingly provide false testimony can be subject to criminal prosecution for perjury for making false statements. Do you understand this?

A     Yes, I do.

Q     Is there any reason you are unable provide truthful answers to today's questions?

A     No.

Q     Finally, we ask that you not speak about what we discuss in this interview with anyone outside of who is
here in the room today so that we can preserve the
integrity of our investigation. That's the end of my
preamble.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

A     No, I don't.

Q     It's now 10:02. We'll begin our first round
of questioning. Have you had a chance to review or read
the December 2019 report, IG report on the Carter Page FISA
application?

A     Portions of it.

Q     Other than your attorney, did you speak with
anyone in preparation for today's interview?

A     No.

Q     What we're mainly interested in -- and I'm
assuming FBI counsel talked to you about this today -- is
discussing your interactions with Kathleen Kavalec relating
to Christopher Steele that occurred presumably in the fall
of 2016, although we do have some other areas that I think
we'll go into.

What position did you hold at the FBI in the fall of
2016?

A     I was the section chief for the
counterintelligence division, Eurasia program.

Q     And who did you report to in that position?

A     During my time there, I reported to the
deputy assistant director. My first one was William
Johnson, second one was Jen Boone.

Q And when did that division between the two of
them occur, roughly?

A I don't remember. One got promoted and -- I
don't remember.

Q Do you recall if it was Jen Boone throughout
the relevant time period, the fall of 2016?

A Yes, it was.

Q And what were your responsibilities in your
position as the section chief of the Eurasia division?

A So I -- as the section chief, I covered the
traditional counterintelligence work relating to Russia,
Eurasia countries, Belarus, Ukraine. I was the national
program manager for the FBI.

Q And those responsibilities, those would be
counterintelligence responsibilities for Eurasia, they
don't extend -- it's not Eurasia generally. It's
counterintelligence for Eurasia?

A Yes.

Q So in the criminal division, there may also
be a Eurasia specialist section chief?

A Yes.

Q Could you briefly walk us through your career
progression up to becoming the section chief for Eurasia?
A From the very beginning?

Q From the beginning. You can be brief, but I would just like to get a little bit of a picture of your FBI progression.

A Sure. I first entered on duty with the FBI around April 1992 as a physical science technician in the laboratory division. In 1995 November, I reported to Quantico new agents class. Upon graduation in March '96, I went to San Francisco and I was an agent in San Francisco until the fall of 2003.

I returned to headquarters in the counterintelligence division in 2003 working in China matters. I worked down at Quantico as a program manager in crisis management, a unit chief in counterintelligence after that, reported to the Norfolk, Virginia Field Office where I was the counterintelligence supervisor for about five years. And I was in the Richmond, Virginia division as an assistant special agent in charge overseeing national security program and intelligence.

And that led me to -- in August of 2015 was when I reported to FBI counterintelligence division to be the section chief of the Eurasia program.

Q And how long did you stay in that position?

A I was in that position until April of 2017.

Q And where did you go in April 2017?
A     I was assigned to special agent in charge, counterintelligence program for the Washington Field Office.

Q     And that was the last job you held before this job?

A     No, sir. In April of 2018, I was promoted as assistant director for the director of intelligence at FBI headquarters. And I served in that role from April of 2018 until approximately October of 2019 where I assumed the current role that I'm in right now.

Q     And then in your role as the section chief of the Eurasia section, how many people were you supervising?

A     Approximately 50.

Q     Fifty. Is that a combination of agents and analysts or is it --

A     Agents, analysts, professional staff.

Q     Were any of those people experts on Russia?

A     It depends on how you define experts.

Q     Did anyone specialize in Russia versus other countries in Eurasia?

A     They probably had more knowledge of Russia than other countries. We've got people determined to be an expert and they do a little bit more on the Russia program than analysts working in the China program or non-Eurasian country.
Q     Did any of them speak Russian?
A     No.
Q     Have you worked on FISAs in your career at the FBI?
A     Yes.
Q     How many, approximately?
A     Twenty to 25.
Q     In what type of roles did you work on FISAs?
A     I was an author of FISAs. I was -- and I say that meaning as a case agent in the field, obviously office of intelligence, OIPR at the time. The DOJ writes the actual FISAs and we provide the input and the information for it.

As a case agent in San Francisco and then as a supervisor, I was part of the approval process. All the way up until my role as a special agent in charge, I was a part of the approval process for FISAs.
Q     So you've obviously signed a Woods form before then?
A     Yes.
Q     How familiar are you with the Woods procedures?
A     Pretty familiar.
Q     How did you learn or gain that familiarity?
A     It's part of the training when you're working
in counterintelligence and FISA, you are aware of the
different processes and steps that are required as an
affiant as well as an approver, you are ensuring that
correct information is in the FISA packages. So you're
aware of the different steps that are involved in the
approval.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     Is that training you would get as soon as you
enter into a counterintelligence role? Is it something you
get as just basic training as a new agent before you even
know what your assignment might be? When in the process do
you become familiar with Woods requirements?

A     It depends on the person and the time.

There's specific training you get at Quantico. There's a
basic counterintelligence course that you would take where
you learn steps along the way.

Some of it you learn -- I had not had a -- when I
first did a FISA in the field, I had not had formalized
training. I had a training agent who would help me who had
seniority in the counterintelligence program who showed me
the way.

Q     So this training agent is somebody that
themselves was versed in counterintelligence, actually had
a practical knowledge of what you had to do with Woods
procedures and other counterintelligence nuances?
A: Actually, I don't recall when Woods procedures first came into play in the FBI. I can't remember specifically when that happened.

Q: In addition to your experience with counterintelligence matters from a field agent and then in your executive management roles at headquarters, did you ever have occasion as an assistant inspector, as an inspector to go around and audit other counterintelligence investigations that you were not directly involved in as an auditor from the inspection division to check on compliance?

A: Specific to counterintelligence or just did I do inspections?

Q: Both. I assume you did inspections based on your rank now; is that correct?

A: Yes.

Q: Do you have any recollection of specifically doing counterintelligence audits? And I guess the follow-up would be any training related to that, what you were supposed to look for as an assistant inspector or an inspector.

A: In my experience of doing inspections, on one occasion, there's six inspection credits required for promotion at the time. One of those inspections involved another division's counterintelligence program. I don't
recall the number of FISAs that may or may not have been looked at for that division at that time.

Q     I don't want to spend a lot of time on it, but what is the goal of these audits? I'm familiar -- we've heard testimony in addition to the structured audits that you would have done as an inspector or an assistant inspector that the counterintelligence program is subject to a lot of other audits.

I think OGC sends people out with DOJ lawyers and there's some files and cases that are randomly selected for compliance. I'm just curious, what is the goal of either the inspection type that you do or this other type -- and you may or may not be familiar with them -- what do you do when you leave a field office? You have findings, there's deficiencies? What happens post audit and what is it that you're ultimately looking for?

A     I think -- well, there's two different ways of looking at that. In inspection, you're looking at how the division, a program or a subprogram, is performing throughout a specific range of time. And you're looking at -- and that can take different forms and fashions if you lead, either state a specific program or the entire division or field office. So you're evaluating performance on how they are doing based off this set of guidelines and metrics that the inspection division will put forth.
In those you could have findings of compliance issues, following guidelines or not following guidelines. You will find some deficiencies and you will find some positive recommendations or feedback that have happened in the field office.

And specifically for FISA, there are some national security reviews, I think they're called, and FISA reviews where the FBI with DOJ randomly picks a FISA to go through and audit it to make sure that it satisfied all the compliance rules for that FISA.

Q Separate and apart from anything we're talking about today with Crossfire Hurricane, are you aware either on inspections that you did or compliance audits that you may have done or just discussion amongst inspectors or assistant inspectors about deficiency issues in the FISA process in general?

A How do you mean?

Q Are you aware of any trend of the findings?

I think they were ineffective/inefficient was the worst finding you could come out of an inspection with.

Was there a trend in the FISA audits of compliance issues, not necessarily related to this, just a trend in general where somewhere for some reason the training wasn't getting out or there was a misunderstanding that there was a trend of a lot of deficiencies, a lot of errors,
omissions in the FISA process?

    : Are you asking to his personal knowledge?
Did any of the inspections he was involved in? Or are you asking if he knows of any trend at the Bureau writ large?

    Mr. Baker: Both.

    : To the extent you know.

    The Witness: I'm not aware of, no.

    Mr. Baker: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:

    Q Did you look at the Inspector General's recent audit of the Woods procedures?

    A I haven't read it. I know about them, but I haven't read it.

    Q The division you currently head, do they apply for FISAs?

    A No.

BY MR. BAKER:

    Q I would be curious to back up just a bit. You went through your work history and you're obviously very versed or seem to be very versed in counterintelligence matters.

    Could you just generally explain the setup of a division? We would be curious to know -- you know, obviously the director's at the top of the pyramid and as far as agents are concerned, SSA would be at the bottom.
But some of the other ranks for the record would be beneficial. And like how many? You talked about section chief. How many section chiefs might be under a DAD. How many DADs would be under a division.

And I guess it's going to depend on the size of the division or whatnot. So I guess for our purposes, counterintelligence division, to the best if you know.

A So when you say division, you mean headquarters division, not a field office?

Q Yes, sir. A headquarters division.

A How about if we start with this. I'll explain my division when I was assistant director. So you have the director of the FBI, you have a deputy director of the FBI and associate deputy director of the FBI. And then the next level is where I'm at, the executive assistant director. There's dotted lines to other folks in there, general counsel, public affairs, congressional affairs on how that works and they have their own respective divisions.

Under my purview right now, I have three divisions, the director of intelligence, which I was assistant director for, Office of Partner Engagement and Office of Private Sector. I'll describe to you, because I was the assistant director, how my division was set up for the director of intelligence.
So I was the assistant director. I had three deputy assistant directors and below their branches, I had eight section chiefs and each section chief was responsible for a different set of programs. Under the section chiefs, you would have a varying amount of unit chiefs or units that were run by a unit chief, a GS-15 unit chief.

The size and scope of the individual units, depending on what their primary focus was, some could be very small, some could be much larger depending on the number of employees that you would have. And then within there, you would have supervisory special agents, management program analysts or intelligence analysts or contractors that are working to support that.

Each division generally is the same makeup. The counterintelligence division today is different than where it was when I was as a section chief in there. They have reorganized. And I don't know in detail, but they have mission centers now versus sections for Eurasia. It's a little bit different. So I can't speak to exactly how that's set up right now, but usually my division that I was an AD over, that's generally how that is set up.

Q     Now, was your division bigger or smaller than counterintelligence?

A     That's a good question. I don't know.

Q     And when we started this question, you wanted
to know if I was talking about a field or headquarters.

Just generally, how does the field interact with the	headquarter division, specifically in relation to the
counterintelligence agent that's out in the field? How do
they interact with headquarters? How does headquarters
communicate with an agent assigned a counterintelligence
matter in a field office?

A Typically, it depends. I mean, really based
off -- I mean, headquarters' job is to program manage from
a national strategic perspective for all 56 field offices
and to some extent the lead attaches. They will send the
principles of that strategy out to the different field
offices.

Typically, depending on the level you are at at
headquarters will determine your level of normal
interaction. As a section chief, I would not talk to an
agent in the field or an analyst. It's just from a
hierarchical standpoint not the normal thing to do. You
would hit your commensurate level, an ASAC or maybe an SAC
in the field office, on any kind of discussions.

Program managers, management program analysts, and
intelligence analysts at headquarters would interact with
the various squads and supervisors and street agents or
analysts in the field office on a day to day -- not that
they speak day to day, but the day-to-day activities of
what they are working on in terms of guidance, instruction, awareness, especially when there's operations involved.

Q    So for a CI investigation in the field that would result in the FISA technique, that agent in the field would interact with a counterpart in the counterintelligence division at FBI headquarters? Is that the first place they interact or are there also places that FISA flows in the field office before it leaves the field office and gets to headquarters?

A     The initial discussions would be from the field office agent to a headquarters program manager, maybe a supervisor or to a supervisor. But that's typically the starting point for discussing whether a FISA is warranted or whether we should go down that investigative technique to apply for, and then you'll start engaging other parties within your field office, your legal counsel and so forth. And then, depending on where you're at, the approval process will kick in as soon as you start your application process.

Q    And somewhere in that infancy, there is somebody that's looking to make sure that this investigation, that this technique is consistent with whatever the Bureau has identified as goals or objectives or -- I mean, a field agent can't just open a case on anything and they can't employ any technique they want on
2. I'm assuming there's national goals, objectives, priorities based on current threat trends and intelligence reporting that helps the Bureau decide where they're going to put their resources at; is that correct?

A. Correct.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q. And then you mentioned a program manager. What type of rank is he? Where do they fit in the rankings there?

A. So program manager, typically a supervisory special agent, GS-14, in headquarters. Different divisions might have -- you might use a management program analyst who's also considered a program manager that's just interacting with the field. It typically is a GS-14 supervisory special agent.

Q. So that SSA could shut down a request from the field to seek a FISA when they're initially consulted?

A. Yeah. Yes.

Q. Let's turn specifically to Crossfire Hurricane. When did you become aware that the FBI had opened the Crossfire Hurricane investigation?

A. Around the fall of 2016.

Q. So it was open when you first learned of it?

A. I found out after it was opened that it was
opened.

Q So you were not consulted on the decision to open it?

A No, sir.

Q Were you generally aware in the summer of 2016 about allegations or -- I'm not sure of the exact word -- but threats that Russia was trying to interfere in the 2016 election?

A I don't know the exact time frame of when I learned of that. Sometime between late summer and fall of 2016.

Q Were threats, Russian threats to the integrity of the 2016 election, is that something in the purview of the Eurasia section?

A It was not at that time.

Q And so when you learned of Crossfire Hurricane sometime in the fall of 2016, what was your understanding of what the investigation was when you learned of it?

A I had learned that the counterintelligence division had a team of folks that were looking at Crossfire Hurricane as an umbrella investigation and they were looking at threats from Russia or allegations or reviewing allegations of Russia tampering with the election process.

Q In what context did you learn about Crossfire
Hurricane?

A     Through meetings with my superiors.

Q     So did you just pick it up on the side or were you specifically sort of told, hey, we're doing this Crossfire Hurricane investigation, what's it about?

A     I can't remember exactly how it transpired that I learned about the investigation. So, again, for context, sometimes I might be an acting DAD. My boss is out of town or away and in that capacity, I might pick up on things in that capacity to learn about different things that are happening within the division.

Q     As I mentioned at the beginning, obviously, one of the specific things we want to ask you about is -- you know, you had interactions with Kathleen Kavalec regarding her meeting with Christopher Steele. That meeting occurred on October 11th, 2016.

Do you know whether you had knowledge of Crossfire Hurricane prior to October 11th, 2016?

A     Yes.

Q     And did you take any investigative steps, have any input, any involvement in Crossfire Hurricane other than knowing about it prior to October 11, 2016?

A     I did not.

Q     So you're just picking up -- prior to that, you just have an understanding there's an investigation?
A    Correct.

Q    And then after October 11th, 2016, we have what we want to talk to you about with Kathleen Kavalec. But other than the relaying of information from Kathleen Kavalec to you related about her meeting to Christopher Steele, did you have any involvement going forward after October 11 with Crossfire Hurricane other than the sort of general knowledge that it existed?

A    General knowledge it existed.

Q    So you had no investigative steps, no -- you weren't consulted, you weren't asked questions about, hey, we're looking at this, can you -- what's your opinion on that?

A    Nope. Nope.

Q    Do you know if any of the agents, analysts or other employees in your section had any involvement in Crossfire Hurricane?

A    I -- can I talk to him?

Q    Yes, please.

(Witness confers with counsel.)

The Witness: So during that time, I had a GS-15 unit chief as an interlocutor between my section and the Crossfire Hurricane team.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q    Who was that?
A: I don't think I should -- am I able to tell that?

Mr. Somers: Do you know if it was someone identified by an identifier in the report? We could get the answer that way.

_: I'm not aware that this individual is identified in the org charts on the OIG's report because I don't believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- that that person was a member of the Crossfire Hurricane team. But they would be non-SES.

Mr. Somers: I understand that.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q: So they were not -- this unit chief, they were not a member of the Crossfire Hurricane team?

A: No.

Q: But you're saying they did -- they had more involvement than you did in terms of the actual investigation; is that right?

A: I wouldn't characterize it that way. In the event there was information sharing required if they came up, that was the interlocutor between my section and the Crossfire Hurricane team.

Q: Could you -- I mean, it's kind of like -- I guess we're asking questions -- it's kind of a long way to get at. Maybe you can answer it this way.
I read that you're the Eurasia section chief and Russia is in Eurasia, a huge investigation of Russia. So I'm just trying to get an understanding within counterintelligence why there's not more involvement from the Eurasia section in a major investigation involving Russia. Maybe that's a better way to just ask the question.

A     I wasn't part of the decision process to create the team, Crossfire Hurricane team, nor why it needed to be separated from the Eurasia program.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     Who did decide that it was going to be separate from the Eurasia program?

A     Assistant director for counterintelligence.

Q     And that was who at the time?

A     Bill Priestap.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     And when Crossfire Hurricane began, Peter Strzok was also a section chief, also of the same rank that you hold?

A     He did serve as a section chief, which is the same rank. I can't remember at which point he transitioned from section chief to deputy assistant director.

Q     And he transitioned in September of 2016,
September 4th, 2016.

A     Okay.

Q     How many -- at the time, how many sections were there in counterintelligence?

A     They were numbered at the time. So I'm thinking ☐☐.

Q     Maybe ☐☐?

A     They went through CD ☐. And then there was -- I stand corrected. ☐☐ sections. ☐☐ sections.

Q     So you had like a geographic section, meaning Eurasia section chief. Were there other geographic sections? I mean, I'm not expecting you to tell me all 10 of them. I'm just trying to get a sense of is it Eurasia? You know, is it -- just if you can just give me some sense of the other sections.

     Again, this is my trying to understand why the Eurasia section is not involved in the investigation of Russia.

A     There were a few sections that covered geographic areas and then there were issue threat countries for like espionage -- or I'm sorry, issue threats out there, espionage, that would cover all countries. Counter-proliferation, that would cover all countries. And then you had some specialized programs, intelligence programs, and then you had the geographic sections.
Q      But even within Eurasia -- and I think you
answered this earlier, but just to be clear, it's still
Eurasia counterintelligence. Does that include
counterespionage? Is that part of counterintelligence?
A      It does not.
Q      It does not?
A      It's part of counterintelligence, but
estionage is its own section. But, I mean, if you had
Eurasia espionage, it would be run out of a different
section.
Q      Okay.
BY MR. BAKER:
Q      So was there just a section that was more
finely tuned to be the section where the case was worked
out of based on everything that was known about the case
and that's why your section was not the one chosen? There
was just one that was better based on the totality of what
the investigators knew?
A      Yeah. I don't know the reason why they
decided to separate that. I wasn't part of that
discussion.
BY MR. SOMERS:
Q      Do you know -- and I'm guessing you probably
answered this more generally in some of your previous
responses. Do you know if anyone in the Eurasia section
tried to verify any facts in the Steele dossier?

A     I'm not aware.

Q     Do you know if they tried to help identify or locate any of Steele's sources or sub-sources?

A     No, I'm not aware.

Q     So Kathleen Kavalec meets with Christopher Steele on October 11th. Sometime thereafter, I think she contacts you to relay that she met with Steele. Prior to your discussion with Kathleen Kavalec where she relays her October 11th meeting, did you know anything about Christopher Steele?

A     I had heard the name before.

Q     Who did you think he was prior to that?

A     I knew he was somebody that was associated with the Crossfire Hurricane investigation.

Q     You didn't have any knowledge of him apart from Crossfire Hurricane in general?

A     No.

Q     How regularly did you have contact with Kathleen Kavalec just in general in your role as the Eurasia section chief?

A     Probably a couple of times a month.

Q     And by contacts, is that email, telephone, you would see her at meetings? What are we talking about?

A     All of the above.
Q    And just generally -- I don't want to get
into any specific cases, concerns, anything like
that -- what did your contacts consist of other than this
Steele contact?
A    All of our contacts that we had related to
she was overseeing the Eurasia/Russia program as part of
her portfolio at the State Department. And I was her
natural counterpart for the FBI to work with her on things
that deal with Russia or Eurasian countries in terms of
information sharing, actions from a diplomatic standpoint.
That would be our normal course of interaction.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q    Did you have standing meetings with her --
A    Yes.
Q    -- or sort of ad hoc -- so you had regularly
scheduled meetings?  Okay.
A    It might not have been the same day each
month, but they were pretty regular.
Q    But it was an established liaison channel?
A    Correct.
Q    It was not just something that came up.
A    Correct.

Mr. Baker: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:
Q    So she had knowledge of other investigations
the FBI was conducting?

A     Yes.

Q     What about Victoria Nuland. Did you have contact with Victoria Nuland?

A     Yes.

Q     What did those contacts consist of?

A     Those were very infrequent. Probably a handful of times. Maybe 10 to 12 times I had contact with her. Again, it was just -- most of the time it was in relation to Kathleen Kavalec and our meetings. There might be something that needed to be clarified or something we asked approval for that might get moved up to Victoria Nuland that she would be made aware of and I would be involved in that discussion.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     Did the FBI have any detailees over at State in the Kavalec area, section or whatever?

A     Yes, they had detailees over there. Not in Kavalec's section per se.

Q     Would those detailees answer to you or report to you in any way or you to them with requests for information or your official channel was Kavalec or how did that work?

A     Yes. At that time, there was two detailees assigned from the FBI to State Department Office of Foreign
Missions, I believe. Although those detailees reported to me, they handled FBI and counterintelligence matters across the multiple divisions, not just the Russia program.

Q Would you have learned about Christopher Steele from them?

A I might have. I don't know. I can't remember.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Did you have any contact with Jonathan Winer?

A No.

Q Did Ms. Kavalec contact you about Christopher Steele prior to her October 11th, 2016 meeting?

A I don't remember.

Q So you don't know if she bounced the name off of you prior to meeting with him, asked if you knew anything about him? Just trying to jog your recollection.

A One meeting I had over there is my normal liaison meeting. She told me we needed to talk afterwards. Probably she really said I need to share some information. I don't know the timeline and how that relates to October/November. It's all in that timeline.

I just don't know specifically what happened before in that sequence unless, you know, I know there were some emails that were forwarded in there. I just don't know the
timeline accurately enough to say it happened right before or during the same exact time.

Q     Let's talk about the actual interaction regarding Christopher Steele. So what happens? She meets with Steele and I gather she tells you about it.

When did she tell you about it?

A     Again, I don't know specifically when. It was during one of my normal liaison meetings over there. We had our meetings. The liaison that I have assigned over there was part of those meetings. We finished, went out and had a conversation. She goes, I have information you probably need to be made aware of. Because of my peripheral understanding of Crossfire, and I had heard of Mr. Steele's name before, when something was brought up, it triggered my memory. I know people that are working on this. I will put you in touch with the right people to make sure that information is passed.

Q     And what did she convey to you in this --

A     I don't remember exactly what she said.

Q     But she definitely made clear Christopher Steele and Christopher Steele --

A     I don't know if it was about Christopher Steele or I just can't recall specifically what that information was that she had to mention. I know there was a contact. Whether it was Mr. Steele, I don't remember
that. And she wanted to share some information.

Q     So you're told, you say, in your mind, at
least, there's other people that are handling this. So
what did you do with the information, whatever it was that
Kavalec tells you in this meeting?

A     I gave that information, whatever it was, and
informed the folks in the Crossfire Hurricane team about
it, made them aware of it.

Q     Did you tell her who to contact or did you
take care of that on your end, like I'm just going to
convey this information and tell them to reach out?

A     I told her that there's a team that's working
on this and that I will put them in contact with you for
follow-up.

Q     So you didn't give her a name and say,
contact John Smith --

A     I don't remember if I gave her a name.

Q     -- and he'll take care of it?

A     Yeah. I don't remember if I said a name or
if I said I know some people that are working on it that
probably should get this information.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     And how soon did you relay the information
internally?

A     That day.
Q     That day?
A     The day that -- whatever the day we had that sidebar meeting.
Q     And you gave that instruction to the team that they should reach out to her?
A     I gave them the option that they needed to do follow-up, that that would be up to their discretion however they wanted to proceed.
Q     Do you know if they did?
A     I don't know.
Q     Just for the record, these two detailees, they're below the SES rank?
A     Correct.
Mr. Baker:  Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. SOMERS:
Q     So who did you give the information to at FBI?
A     I informed Peter Strzok and another supervisor.
Q     Would you clarify if that was SSA 1? Do you know who was SSA 1 as identified in the --
A     I don't know.
Mr. Somers:  Can you tell him who SSA 1 is so I can --
(Witness confers with counsel.)
The Witness: It seems that's SSA 1.

Mr. Somers: And you are using SSA as it relates to SSA 1 in the IG report?

Mr. Somers: In the IG report, yes.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q So Peter Strzok and SSA 1 are the two people you relayed the Kavalec/Steele information to?

A Correct.

Q But you didn't give them an instruction. You just said take it, here's the information if you want it?

A I sent it to him in an email. I'm sure there's words in there that I put in my email, but --

Q I'm not --

A -- here's the information, if there's anything you need me to do. I'm sure that's my normal follow-up is here's the information pertaining, you let me know; otherwise, it's in your care and custody now.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Did I either of them follow up with you for any clarification or --

A There might have been some back and forth initially and then I don't remember exactly what it was.

Q But nothing that you recall about, well, who should I call over at State or --

A No.
Mr. Baker: Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     And then the IG report also mentions there's an FBI liaison at the State Department, I assume it's like some sort of permanent position of some sort, and that Kavalec was at some point told to relay information to the FBI liaison.

Did you give that instruction to her or did that come from somewhere else?

A     So to clarify, the liaison you're talking about now is the same one I was speaking about before.

Q     Okay.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     It's one of the two agents.

A     There's one agent, one in MAPA that's over there.

Q     Okay.

Can you repeat the question?

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     I want to know, did you suggest to Ms. Kavalec that she contact this FBI liaison?

A     I advised -- yes. For any logical follow-up, they could go through the liaison who sits over her at the State Department.

I want to clarify things. We're using
the term, I think, "liaison" and "detailee" interchangeably. Are you talking about the detailee from FBI over the State Department?

The Witness: Yes.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q The agent detailee?

A Yes.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q As to how to describe this person, the FBI liaison/detailee, did you ever speak to them -- to him or her about the Kavalec/Steele interaction? Did you say, hey, she may reach out to you with some information?

A I spoke to the liaison detailee assigned there to follow up with Kavalec as need be to share information she has back to the Hurricane Crossfire team.

Q Did you ever inquire later of Strzok or SSA 1 or anyone else on the Crossfire Hurricane team and say, you know, hey, whatever happened to that information we got from the State Department?

A Kavalec reached out to me for a follow-up that I followed up with the Crossfire team, is there anything more that you need, something to that effect. Those aren't the exact words, but just a general follow-up. And then I followed up and basically left it back in the hands of the Crossfire team for anything further.
BY MR. BAKER:

Q     So the Crossfire team could then have gone
directly to the liaison/detailee and vice versa. You would
not have necessarily been a conduit either way?

A     Correct, correct.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     Have you ever heard impression, demeanor
regarding this information? Was this really urgent? Was
it time sensitive, very important? I mean, I don't -- I'm
just --

A     Not really. Just -- not really.

Q     You don't really recall or you don't really
recall if that was your attitude?

A     I don't recall a sense of urgency other than
the fact that I just shared the information -- or what I
knew the day I received it to the right team so they could
make the determination on how they wanted to follow up.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     And you're not aware of any follow-up that
the Crossfire team did with her?

A     I don't recall any.

Q     But you probably would have heard either from
her, in your normal standing meetings or your
liaison/detailee, that Crossfire came over, there was a
call -- you probably would have heard if there was
something; is that correct?

A Not necessarily. It depends on the nature of how that proceeded. Again, I was separated from the Crossfire team, so I might not have necessarily been made aware of every discussion or communication they had.

Q This liaison/detailee, they were, on the org chart, assigned to your section back at the Bureau?

A Yes.

Q Would you have had regular -- not necessarily operational contact with them -- would you have had any managerial contact with them --

A Yes.

Q -- when they came in for a period -- I mean, it was never specifically mentioned in any of those contacts that there had been any follow-up from the Crossfire team?

A Not that I recall.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q If I could just read a passage here and ask you about an email, read a passage from the IG report. Page 119 of the IG report, it says, "Two days after the meeting with Steele, Kavalec emailed an FBI CD section chief a document that Kavalec received from Winer discussing allegations about a linkage between Alpha Bank
and the Trump Campaign, a topic that was discussed in the October 11th meeting. Kavalec advised the FBI section chief in the email that the information related to an investigation that Steele's firm had been conducting. The section chief forwarded the document to SSA 1 the same day."

And I assume you're that section chief?

A  Yes.

Q  Any reaction from SSA 1 regarding that document?

A  Not that I recall.

Q  And you didn't do anything further with the document?

A  No.

Q  Other than forward it on?

A  Correct.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q  Was there any reaction at all from the Crossfire team about the information that you channeled in their direction?

A  I don't remember.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q  What was your reaction to it, what Kavalec told you when you heard it? Did you think it was a matter of urgent concern or anything else?
A: I don't think it was a matter of like imminent urgency, but just information that needed to be passed to the right people. That's what I normally would do. You get information that's out of your control to act upon, you get it to the right people so they can make the determination from there.

Q: Do you recall if you were already familiar with anything she relayed to you? I mean, I think she had a meeting with Steele. We can tell from her notes that he basically went over things in the dossier.

Was there any familiarity with what she told you that you already knew from meetings or anything?

A: The only thing that was familiar to me was she had mentioned something about something in [redacted]. And I had heard that as part of the discussion that happened with the Crossfire Hurricane team during a daily meeting that they would have and that's why I put the connection together and said I know who you needed to be talking to for this information.

Q: And then Strzok and the SSA 1 were the only two people you had -- and this FBI liaison/detailee -- but on the Crossfire team, only Strzok and SSA 1, those were the only two people you had contact with about the information you received?

A: From what I recall, yes.
Q    Did they tell you, you know, do you recall, this is no big deal, we already know about this, any sort of reaction like that from them?
A    Not that I remember.
Q    And I think you mentioned one conversation. Were there any -- it was just the one conversation with her where she followed up later? So you have this initial conversation -- she meets on October 11th. You have an initial conversation with her. You also receive an email from her all on this -- the email is dated October 13th -- so all in a short period of time.
A    We might have. I don't remember specifically.
Q    So nothing huge?
A    Nothing that stands out.
Q    Did she ever ask you why she was not interviewed by the FBI regarding --
A    No.
Q    -- her interactions with Steele?
A    No.
Q    Did you bring up the possibility with her that the FBI -- somewhere she got the impression that the FBI was going to interview her.
Did you at all raise the prospect when you initially
met with her or at some other time that, hey, the FBI may
want to interview you about this?

A     I don't know -- once the information was
passed and they could make the determination whether a
logical follow-up or an interview would be required, I
wasn't part of that decision-making. So I don't know what
led her to believe -- there could have been conversations
that had happened that I'm not privy to or said she might
be in, but I don't know.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     So what would be -- you wouldn't necessarily
think it was unusual if there wasn't follow-up because you
were the conduit. The team had the specifics of what they
were looking for, what they needed to look for, whatever.
It was in their hands whether they needed to follow up?

A     Yes.

Mr. Baker:  Okay.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q     Would that be an unusual step for the FBI to
interview a State Department employee about information
conveyed about a criminal investigation?

A     Say that again.

Q     I'll ask it another way. Would it be a
logical step, a State Department employee gets information
about an ongoing -- I'm sorry, I should say
counterintelligence investigation. Would it be a logical
step to interview that employee?
A     Interviewing folks is a logical step to do an
investigation.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q     Did you say a few moments ago you were at a
Crossfire Hurricane meeting?
A     Yes.

Q     Would you have been regularly in attendance
at those meetings or --
A     Yes.

Q     And how often did they have meetings?
A     There was a period of time, I don't know the
exact window, that led up to the election in 2016 where we
had a daily meeting.
Q     And was it just one meeting for Crossfire
Hurricane team or were there other meetings where the
attendees were narrowed?
A     That was the only meeting for Crossfire
Hurricane that I'm aware of. Whether there were other
meetings, I don't know.
Q     So who else -- at what rank would people have
attended this? Was this a section chief meeting or higher,
a roundtable about what cases were going on?
A It was sometimes attended by the
counterintelligence division assistant director. Sometimes
the deputy assistant director for counterintelligence and
the section chiefs from both the counterintelligence and
cyber division. And the Office of General Counsel would be
a part of it.

Q So would this meeting have just been for that
case or was it by cases in the division and that would be
one that was presented?

A It was relating to Crossfire Hurricane and
other -- some few tangential cases that were associated
too.

Q So the primary focus was Crossfire Hurricane?

A Yes.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Do you recall -- just trying to jog your
memory here in case you do recall -- Ms. Kavalec conveying
information to you that Steele conveyed to her information
about a Russian consulate being located in Miami and that
was an inaccurate assessment on Steele's part?

A I recall a conversation about a consulate in
Miami independent of the -- what she had mentioned
regarding what Mr. Steele said to her.

Q But you don't -- do you recall how that came
up?
A: During our normal meetings, our liaison meetings. It could have been -- I don't know how -- I don't know if she knew that through other channels in terms of her -- because she runs the diplomatic aspect of countries here in the United States. It came up in some other discussion regarding if there was a consulate in Miami, which we both knew is not true because we know where all the consulates and embassies are around the country. That's where I would handle normally in my purview as the section chief of the Eurasia program. So when it came up in a discussion, it was like, we don't have a consulate in Miami.

Q: That came up in a discussion in headquarters, with FBI personnel?

A: Yes. Independent of the Mr. Steele piece in here, it came up through other discussions.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q: Would that have been at this standing Crossfire Hurricane meeting?

A: It might have been mentioned there, but it would have also been mentioned through my interaction with Ms. Kavalec in our normal liaison relationship, our normal relationship that we have.

Q: Was Christopher Steele discussed at this standing meeting?
A    Yes.
Q    And his reporting, was that discussed?
A    Yes.
Q    Could it have been at that meeting that someone pointed out that there was an issue about a consulate that didn't exist in the city that perhaps he said did?
A    It might have. I don't recall specifically what was discussed in those meetings.
Mr. Baker: Thank you.
BY MR. SOMERS:
Q    Another person that Ms. Kavalec had interactions with, I wonder if you also had interaction with them is Bruce Ohr.
Do you know Bruce Ohr?
A    I know the name.
Q    But you don't know him?
A    Never met him.
Q    Never met him. I assume you're not part of the Russian Malign Influence Group that Kavalec established in the summer of 2016?
A    I was initially.
Q    You were initially?
A    Uh-huh.
Q    Ohr was not part of that group?
A: Not that I recall.

Q: And what was the purpose of that group, the Russian Malign Influence Group?

A: Initially it was to bring together the community, being the intelligence community and government agencies, to discuss ways to identify and counter-malign foreign influence.

Q: So election interference, is that a malign influence?

A: It was a category of, yeah.

Q: Did Russia interference in the 2016 election, did that come up as part of the Russian Malign Influence Group discussions?

A: I'll say the allegation of Russian influence came up.

Q: Did coordination, collusion, anything along those lines regarding the Trump Campaign and Russia come up as part of the Russian Malign Influence Group discussions?

A: I don't recall.

Q: Do you recall whether the Crossfire Hurricane, maybe by code number, investigating the Trump Campaign, did that come up as part of the Russian Malign Influence Group?

A: No.

Q: Let me just read another passage here from
the IG report, just ask your awareness of this and the facts in there. This is footnote 238 on page 107. It says, "SSA 1 had forwarded an email on September 30th from the State Department's Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs indicating that senior staff there, including Assistant Secretary Nuland, were aware of a planned meeting between Steele and the FBI in early October in a European city, and that FBI officials from headquarters were flying to Europe to participate in the meeting."

Were you aware of the October meeting between FBI and Steele?

A     I was -- if you take that statement, that footnote, I was aware of a meeting in a foreign European country. Whether it was Steele or not, I don't know if it was specifically about him.

Q     Could you have been the one that informed the State Department's Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs about the meeting?

A     Yes.

Q     Do you know if you were? So I asked if you could have been. Ultimately you were or not.

A     The European country was where I made a connection where they advised me they had information about something that dealt with Rome. And I knew from the Crossfire Hurricane team about something in Rome. And I
put that connection together and said I know who I need you
to issue a contact with.

Q  So they may have learned this from somewhere
else, but it may have also been from you?

A  True.

Q  Did you ever consider going to the meeting in
October?

A  No.

Q  Do you know why an acting section chief was
sent to the meeting instead of you as the Eurasian section
chief?

A  No.

Q  Do you recall any consternation, something
along those lines among section chiefs as to why this
particular acting section chief was given the task of going
to [ ] to meet with Steele?

A  No.

Mr. Baker:  I think we're done for this round.

We'll see if we have any follow-up.

(Recess.)

EXAMINATION

BY MS. ZDEB:

Q  It is 11:09 and we can go back on the record.

Good morning, Mr. Laycock.

A  Good morning.
Thanks for being here. As we mentioned earlier, my colleague, Mr. Charlet and I, work for Senator Feinstein's staff on the committee and we just have a couple of questions for you.

So you were asked a couple of questions about the Inspector General's report. On page Roman I of the report, the inspector general notes that his office examined more than a million documents and interviewed more than 100 witnesses during the course of their investigation which took around two years.

Did you cooperate with the Inspector General's investigation?

A Did I what?

Q Did you cooperate with the Inspector --

A Yes.

Q And were you interviewed as part of the Inspector General's investigation?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall, was it once, more than once that you were interviewed?

A Once.

Q And did you provide truthful answers to the Office of Inspector General?

A Yes.

Q And did you, to the best of your ability,
provide complete answers to the Inspector General's investigation?

A     Yes.

Q     Did you or to your knowledge, did the FBI provide any documents to the Inspector General as part of his investigation?

A     Did I or did the FBI?

Q     Either one.

A     I did not provide any documents.

Q     And --

A     I'm pretty certain the FBI has turned over some documents to the Inspector General.

Q     Did the Office of Inspector General ever complain that it needed more information or more documents related to your involvement?

A     My involvement?  No.

Q     I think you said earlier that you had reviewed portions of the Inspector General's report. Did you have an opportunity to do that before he finalized the report last December?

A     Yes.

Q     And did you provide any comments to the Inspector General after you reviewed those portions?

A     I did not.

Q     If there had been any errors or
mischaracterizations in the portions of his draft report that you reviewed, would you have called those to the Inspector General's attention?

A     I would have called them to the FBI, the person in charge of that, the relationship with the Inspector General, for them to then share with the Inspector General.

Q     So the fact that you didn't call any errors or mischaracterizations about your testimony to the IG to the attention of the FBI liaison who was working with the Inspector General's office, is it fair to say that's a reflection of the fact that you didn't have any concerns about the way the draft report characterized your testimony to the IG?

A     Correct.

Q     So back in December of last year, our committee held a hearing with Inspector General Horowitz that took about six hours. We have since held additional hearings on Crossfire Hurricane and notwithstanding the fact that the Inspector General concluded that there was no documentary or testimonial evidence of political bias impacting the decision to open Crossfire Hurricane or particular investigative steps that were taken during the investigation, we have continued to hear a number of allegations against the FBI during the course of the
hearings I just mentioned. So I want to ask you just a
couple of questions about some of those allegations.

So as I just mentioned, the Inspector General found
that there was no documentary or testimonial evidence of
bias impacting the FBI's work in Crossfire Hurricane.
Nonetheless, we've continued to hear that there is, quote,
"tons of evidence of bias."

So I think you just said a moment ago that your
involvement in Crossfire Hurricane was limited to the role
you played in passing along an email from Kathleen Kavalec
to the Crossfire Hurricane team as well as perhaps one,
potentially, potentially two conversations with Kathleen
Kavalec; is that right.

A     Correct.

Q     And did political bias or anti-Trump bias
influence those steps that you took as part of these series
of events?

A     No.

Q     And are you sitting here today personally
aware of any evidence that anyone else involved in
Crossfire Hurricane acted with political bias or other
improper motivation?

A     No.

Q     It has also been alleged that the FBI engaged
in, quote, "a massive criminal conspiracy over time to
1 defraud the FISA court."
2
3 Do you personally have any evidence that the FBI
4 engaged in a massive criminal conspiracy to defraud the
5 FISA court?
6
7 A     No.
8
9 Q     It has also been alleged that Crossfire
10 Hurricane was a hoax and a witch hunt intended to hurt
11 President Trump politically.
12
13 Was your goal to hurt President Trump or then
14 Candidate Trump politically?
15
16 A     No.
17
18 Q     And do you have any evidence that Crossfire
19 Hurricane was part of a deep state effort to take down
20 President Trump?
21
22 A     No.
23
24 Q     There have recently been allegations that
25 Crossfire Hurricane was composed of, quote, "people who
26 hated Trump" and who had, quote, "an agenda to destroy him
27 before he was elected and after he was elected."
28
29 Again, recognizing that you were not personally a
30 part of the Crossfire Hurricane team, did you personally
31 have an agenda to destroy candidate Trump before he was
32 elected or President Trump after he was elected?
33
34 A     No.
35
36 Q     And do you have any evidence that the goal of
Crossfire Hurricane was to destroy Trump before and/or after he was elected?

A No.

Ms. Zdeb: I think those conclude our questions. It is 11:15 and we can go off the record.

(Pause.)

EXAMINATION

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q It's now 11:16. We'll go back on the record. I just had a quick follow-up.

You mentioned that your section in the last round didn't have a lot of involvement and maybe no involvement for the most part in the Crossfire Hurricane investigation.

In general, do sections like the Eurasia section and the counterespionage section within counterintelligence, do they work investigations together?

A They can, yes.

Q So there's no prohibition on two sections working the same investigation?

A They will collaborate. They can collaborate.

There will be one section that will own the investigation from a program management standpoint so as not to create confusion. But they would collaborate or continue working together in terms of in furtherance of just working all together for the field's purposes.
Q    And what you just described in terms of collaboration, that's not what occurred on Crossfire Hurricane? You wouldn't say you collaborated in any significant manner between the Eurasia section and the counterespionage section?

A     To clarify that, Crossfire Hurricane wasn't part of the counterespionage section. Would you repeat your question again?

Q     Okay. So which section was Peter Strzok the section chief of?

A     At the time, he was the section chief of counterespionage.

Q     Your section did not -- let's leave sections out of it. Your section did not coordinate in the way you just described, when I asked you about coordination between sections, with another section or more generally the Crossfire Hurricane team?

A     Two different areas again. I would collaborate with the counterespionage section as a normal course of business. The Crossfire Hurricane team was a separate team put together for the purposes of the Crossfire Hurricane program, case. I did not collaborate with the Crossfire Hurricane team like I would the counterespionage team in normal practice.

Q     Was anyone from the Eurasia section assigned
to the Hurricane Crossfire team?

A     No.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     And just to clarify something, the reason that you would collaborate with the counterespionage section is, I think, based on something you said earlier. That was a specialty section for that type of investigation and that would have gone across other sections?

A     Correct.

Q     In the last round, you indicated that there was a standing meeting or a regularly scheduled meeting for Crossfire Hurricane and you would be there?

A     Correct.

Q     Would all sections have been there or only certain section chiefs represented at the meeting? Who would come to these meetings?

A     Typically those that were involved in the Crossfire Hurricane matter. I would, myself or my assistant section chief would sometimes attend. Tried to be at almost every one of those meetings. And a representative from the cyber division would be part of that meeting.

Q     Were any other sections regular attendees to the Crossfire Hurricane meetings?

A     The intelligence section for
counterintelligence would be represented by either a deputy assistant director or a section chief or a delegate, depending on the day and people's attendance.

And the leadership for counterintelligence division would be there, too. Not every day, just depending on the schedules for the day.

Q And would people at a rank higher than just counterintelligence division be there? Would the director be there? Would the deputy director be there?

A I never saw him. Anybody above the assistant director, I never saw anyone in any of those meetings.

Q And who conducted the meetings?

A Typically run by -- initially it was run by the assistant director for counterintelligence and cyber division. And at various times one or the other or both may or may not be there, but typically a deputy assistant director or a section chief level would be there on those meetings.

Q So the AD for counterintelligence would have been Mr. Priestap?

A Yes.

Q And who for the cyber division?

A At that time, I believe it was Mr. Trainor.

Q And that's James Trainor?

A James Trainor, yes.
Q And who were the deputies that would have substituted for either of them?

A Peter Strzok would have been one for counterintelligence. Dina Corsi was in those meetings sometimes. She ran the intelligence branch. Eric Sporre was the deputy assistant director in cyber division. He would have been part of them.

Q Would they have ever been led by anybody less than a DAD rank? Would a section chief ever --

A Some of them. In the course of having a meeting every day, schedules might have gotten in the way where some of the assistant directors or deputies couldn't make it and then there might have been a section chief that was running it. I don't recall exactly the attendees for each meeting.

Q Were they the same attendees or was there a core of common attendees that made it more often than not?

A Yeah, there was a core group that would attend.

Q Do you recall -- or did a designee on your behalf that attended the meeting ever report back that the discussion of that particular meeting was that Mr. Steele's credibility had been called into question?

A I don't recall that.

BY MR. SOMERS:
Q     Were the Crossfire Hurricane team members
also in this meeting or was this pretty much section chief
and above?
A     For some of the meetings, it would have been
members of the Crossfire Hurricane investigative team
there.
Q     And you mentioned different section chiefs
sometimes and DADs and they weren't -- certain people
weren't able to attend. So in general, did Bill Priestap
lead these meetings?
A     Yes.
Q     And then if he wasn't there, Peter Strzok
would be the next logical person to lead?
A     Correct.
Q     So someone like Dina Corsi, you mentioned she
would not have run these meetings in the absence of Strzok
or Priestap, it would have gone to someone else on the
Crossfire Hurricane team?
A     She might have. I don't remember
specifically the days where she might have been the most
senior person there. I just don't recall that.
Q     And what generally was discussed at these
meetings? What's the purpose of the meetings?
A     Status updates of what's going on with their
investigation. Cyber division would provide an update on
information they might have. My section might brief on things that are just general atmospheres for the Russia program writ large.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q But you don't have any recollection of a discussion where Mr. Steele's credibility was called into question?

A I don't recall any.

Q Any recollection of excitement that he had provided some interesting information that would be logical lead material?

A No.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Did these meetings begin before the Carter Page FISA application on October 21st, 2016?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q Was verification of the Steele allegations discussed in these meetings? What steps were being taken to verify the information?

A I don't recall specifically any steps. It was more just status updates of kind of where things were.

Q Did the topic of primary sub-source ever come up? Steele's primary sub-source?

A I don't recall.

Q Do you recall whether the topic of any
excitement or the topic of the team discovering who
Steele's primary sub-source was and then interviewing him
in January of 2017?

Do you know if that ever came up?

A     No.

Q     Did the topic of whether Carter Page was
affiliated in some way or collaborated with another
government agency ever come up?

A     Not that I recall.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q     Do you have a recollection of the deputy
director or director ever coming to any of these meetings
even just to stick their head in to say hello to the team?

A     I remember on one occasion the deputy
director came down, we had a meeting in that same room. I
don't know if it was during that meeting or not. And I
don't remember the timeline when that would have occurred.
Might have been far after the election time frame. Deputy
McCabe at the time came down and just met with folks and
said hi.

Q     You say that's Andrew McCabe?

A     Correct.

Q     But nothing of substance you recall?

A     No.

BY MR. SOMERS:
Q       Did the topic of who paid for the Steele
dossier or Steele's work, I should say, ever come up?
A       Not that I -- not with me.
Q       Do you recall having any awareness of who
paid Steele for his work?
A       No.

BY MR. BAKER:
Q       Did you ever hear from any of your
subordinates or anybody really grumbling or griping about
anybody that wanted to be on the Crossfire team and for
whatever reason they weren't selected?
A       No.
Q       Was it ever clear in your mind how people
were chosen to be on the Crossfire team?
A       No.

BY MR. SOMERS:
Q       Did the investigation into Michael Flynn ever
come up in these meetings?
A       I can't recall that specific case coming up
in these meetings. I don't recall. Very well may have. I
just don't recall.
Q       Would that have been -- the meetings began
before October 21st. Do you recall exactly when they began
roughly?
A       My recollection, they were started in the
fall, on or about September-ish, October, early October.

And I think they ended after the election. So early November. At least the ones that I participated in.

Whether those meetings continued after that, I don't know.

Q So you were not going to meetings in December of 2016 related to Crossfire Hurricane?

A No.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Was Lisa Page at these meetings?

A She was at some of them, yes.

Q And what was her role in the meetings that she was present?

A Attorney.

Q Did she present anything, discuss anything, was just in attendance or --

A I don't know. I didn't even know her at the time.

Q So she's not an attorney that your section would have normally interacted with?

A No.

BY MR. SOMERS:

Q Were there other representatives of the general counsel's office in these meetings?

A Yes.

Q Did you get the impression whether she was
there on behalf of the general counsel's office or on behalf of the deputy director's office?

A     I honestly did not know her at the time, nor what her role was.

Mr. Somers: I think that's all we have.

Mr. Baker: Thank you.

Mr. Somers: That concludes the interview and I thank you for coming here today and coming voluntarily.

The Witness: Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)
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