

EXECUTIVE SESSION  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
JOINT WITH THE  
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERVIEW OF: BRUCE OHR

Tuesday, August 28, 2018

Washington, D.C.

The interview in the above matter was held in Room 2141,  
Rayburn House Office Building, commencing at 9:05 a.m.

Mr. Parmiter. Good morning. This is a transcribed interview of Bruce Ohr. Chairman Goodlatte and Chairman Gowdy requested this interview as part of a joint investigation by the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform regarding decisions made and not made in 2016 and 2017 by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the 2016 Presidential election.

Would the witness please state his name and position at the Department of Justice for the record.

Mr. Ohr. Good morning. My name is Bruce Ohr. I am a senior counsel in the Office of International Affairs in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Parmiter. Thank you. On behalf of the chairman, I want to thank you for appearing today, and we appreciate your willingness to appear voluntarily. My name is Robert Parmiter, and I am the Majority Chief Counsel for Crime and Terrorism at the House Judiciary Committee.

I will now ask everyone else who is here in the room to introduce themselves for the record, starting to my right with Art Baker.

Mr. Baker. Arthur Baker, Investigative Counsel, Majority Staff, House Judiciary.

Mr. Gowdy. Trey Gowdy, South Carolina.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Jim Ratcliffe, Texas

Mr. Issa. Darrell Issa, California.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Biggs. Andy Biggs, Ohio.

Mr. Gaetz. Matt Gaetz, Florida.

Mr. Lasseter. David Lasseter, Department of Justice.

Ms. Hekman. Rebecca Hekman, Clifford Chance.

Mr. Berman. Joshua Berman, Clifford Chance.

Mr. Weinsheimer. Brad Weinsheimer, Department of Justice.

Ms. Hariharan. Arya Hariharan, Judiciary minority.

Ms. Shen. Valerie Shen, Oversight and Government Reform minority staff.

Mr. Ventura. Christopher Ventura, legal clerk, majority.

Mr. Castor. Steve Caster, Oversight staff, majority.

Mr. Buddharaju. Anudeep Buddharaju, House Oversight majority.

Ms. Green. Meghan Green, House Oversight, majority.

Mr. Parmiter. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not apply in this setting, but there are some guidelines that we will follow that I will go over.

Our questioning will proceed in rounds. The majority will ask questions first for an hour, and then the minority will have an opportunity to ask questions for an equal period of time if they choose. 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. We will also take a break for lunch at the appropriate

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

point.

As I noted earlier, you are appearing today voluntarily. Accordingly, we anticipate that our questions will receive complete responses. To the extent you decline to answer our questions or if counsel instructs you not to answer, we will consider whether a subpoena is necessary. We also have the ability to go into classified setting, but it was represented to us that there is going to be very little that is classified today.

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

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Parmiter. So that the reporter can take down a clear record, it is important that we don't talk over one another or interrupt each other if we can help it.

Both committees encourage witnesses who appear for transcribed interviews to freely consult with counsel if they so choose, and you are appearing today with counsel.

Could counsel please state your name and current position for the record.

Mr. Weinsheimer. My name is Brad Weinsheimer. I'm an Associate Deputy Attorney General at the Department of Justice.

Mr. Berman. My name is Josh Berman. I am Mr. Ohr's personal counsel, and I am a partner of Clifford Chance.

Ms. Hekman. My name is Rebecca Hekman. I am Mr. Ohr's

personal counsel. I'm an associate of Clifford Chance.

Mr. Parmiter. 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 or do not remember, it is best not to guess. Please give us your best recollection, and it is okay to tell us if you learned of 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.

Mr. Ohr, 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?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Parmiter. This also applies to questions posed by congressional staff in an interview. Do you understand this?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Parmiter. Witnesses who knowingly provide false testimony could be subject to criminal prosecution for perjury or for making false statements. Do you understand this?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

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

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Parmiter. Finally, I'd like to note that, as Chairman Goodlatte stated at the outset of our first transcribed interview in this investigation, the content of what we discuss here today is confidential. Chairman Goodlatte and Gowdy ask that you not speak about what we discuss in this interview to anyone not present here today to preserve the integrity of our investigation. This confidentiality rule applies to everyone present in the room today. That is the end of my preamble.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Mr. Ohr. No, I don't. Thanks.

Mr. Parmiter. The time is now 9:10 a.m. and we'll get started with the first round of questions, and Chairman Gowdy.

#### EXAMINATION

Mr. Gowdy. Good morning, Mr. Ohr. I'm one of a handful of members that will be asking you questions, and I'll kick it off. To the extent I ask you a question that is vague or you think it's a trick question, it's not. I'm really trying to understand what role, if any, you played in the two major investigations in 2016, that being the investigation into what Russia did and with whom, if anyone, did they do it, and if you know anything or had any role in the Clinton Espionage Act investigation, we want to know that too. So not trying to trick you, not trying to -- I just simply want to know. I've read a lot, but here's our opportunity to ask you directly what role, if any, did you play in those two investigations, official or otherwise.

Did you ever provide information to Fusion GPS employees or contractors during 2016 or 2017?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe so, no.

Mr. Gowdy. When you say you don't believe so, it makes me, as a recovering lawyer, wonder why you would use that phrase instead of yes or no.

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall everything I said, but it's certainly not my practice, it's never been my practice to provide information to outsiders about any Department of Justice business.

Mr. Gowdy. Did anyone employed at or by Fusion GPS -- and by that, I mean employees, contractors, anyone by any definition of employment you can think of -- provide information to you in 2016 or 2017 with respect to either the Russia investigation, the investigation into what the Trump campaign did, if anything, or the Clinton investigation?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Who?

Mr. Ohr. Chris Steele, as I understand it, was hired by Fusion GPS to do research or gather information. He provided information to me. Glenn Simpson, who is, as I understand it, a principal of Fusion GPS, on a couple of occasions, he provided information to me. And on one occasion my wife, who was a contractor with Fusion GPS, provided some information to me.

Mr. Gowdy. Let's take those in reverse order. You said on one occasion your wife. And just for purposes of those who don't

know, your wife's name is Nellie Ohr. Is that right?

Mr. Ohr. That is correct.

Mr. Gowdy. And she began working for Fusion GPS in what, March of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I believe it was late 2015.

Mr. Gowdy. Late 2015?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And what role did she have at Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. She was a Russia analyst, and she would research people and companies that Fusion GPS asked her to look into. She would do her research on the internet, open sources; and she would report her findings to Fusion GPS, usually I think -- I don't remember exactly the names.

Mr. Gowdy. Was she hired specifically to work on an investigation into then-candidate Trump, or was it a broader portfolio than that?

Mr. Ohr. My understanding is that it was a broader portfolio. She began, as I said, I believe in late 2015.

Mr. Gowdy. What did she do before she began working for Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. She was a contractor with other companies that were doing Russia-related work.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. If I heard you correctly, there was one occasion where she provided information to you.

Mr. Ohr. That is correct.

Mr. Gowdy. What was that one occasion?

Mr. Ohr. So the -- what she -- at one point -- and I don't remember the exact date, I think it was in 2016 -- she provided me with a memory stick that included research she had done for Fusion GPS on various Russian figures.

And the reason she provided that information to me is, my understanding was, it related to some of the same -- it related to the FBI's Russia investigation. And she gave me that stick to give to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Why would she not give it to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. She wasn't talking with the FBI. She gave it to me, and I provided it to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Was Chris Steele talking to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. At various times, Chris Steele was talking with the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. He was talking to them a good bit until they discharged him as a source, wasn't he?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know exactly when he spoke with them.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, all marriages are different, so I'm trying to envision this cold start to a conversation with Here, honey, here's a thumb drive. There were no conversations before that?

Mr. Ohr. Well, Nellie was present with me in the end of July, when I first heard Russia information -- information relating to the Russia investigation from Chris Steele. So she was present for some of that conversation. So she was certainly

aware at that point that Chris Steele was giving me some information about Russia.

At some point, I don't remember when, I became aware that she was looking at some of the same figures as part of her work for Fusion GPS. And so it came up -- again, I don't remember the exact date -- where basically she was concerned that maybe the FBI might want her information as well, and so provided the information to me.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. This is where I need you to help me, because you were working at the Department of Justice?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Which means you, depending on what division you're working in, you have the ability, if appropriate, to charge people.

Mr. Ohr. Well, at the time I was working as the director of OCDEF, so I did not have any line attorney responsibilities or command, chain of command responsibilities. But yes, I was working for the Department of Justice.

Mr. Gowdy. Right. And the Department of Justice can file informations or seek indictments. Fusion GPS cannot. So when you say you were working on the same thing, it couldn't have necessarily been for the same reasons, because she wasn't investigating criminal conduct, was she?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. What was she investigating?

Mr. Ohr. She was investigating names and companies that Fusion GPS asked her to look into.

Mr. Gowdy. For what purpose?

Mr. Ohr. To provide it to Fusion GPS. My understanding is that Fusion GPS was, in turn, providing it to other people.

Mr. Gowdy. Were they a contractor of the Department of Justice? Were they launching criminal investigations?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm trying to figure out why Fusion GPS is investigating Russian oligarchs and potential criminality and how that might overlap with what you did at the Department.

Mr. Ohr. My understanding is that Fusion GPS was hired by private individuals to look into possible contacts between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign.

Mr. Gowdy. See. That's what I thought. I don't know why it took us three questions to get there. Fusion GPS was hired by whom?

Mr. Ohr. I did not know at the time.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you know now?

Mr. Ohr. I've seen it in the paper. It sounds like, from the paper, that there were a couple of different people that were paying Fusion GPS to do this at different times. My understanding is that some of these people were connected to the Clinton campaign in some way. I don't know the -- I don't recall the names.

Mr. Gowdy. So Fusion GPS were looking at potential Russian contacts with the Trump campaign.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And that's what your wife was working on?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. At some point, I became aware that some of the people she was invest -- she was researching were some of the same people that I had heard about from Chris Steele and Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Gowdy. And when did she provide, I call it a thumb drive, you called it something else.

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the exact date.

Mr. Gowdy. Give me a month.

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the month either. I think it was in late 2016, but I don't know for sure.

Mr. Gowdy. After the Russia investigation began by the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. I --

Mr. Gowdy. That would have been late July?

Mr. Ohr. I would assume it would -- I'm pretty sure it was after that.

Mr. Gowdy. After the election?

Mr. Ohr. That I don't recall.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, I need you to help me there. The election is a pretty big pivot point. Most people remember what they were doing before that and after that. Do you remember getting

information from anyone at Fusion GPS before the election?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. From whom?

Mr. Ohr. Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Gowdy. We'll come back to Mrs. Ohr. Tell me about Glenn Simpson providing you information.

Mr. Ohr. As I recall, and this is after checking with my notes, Mr. Simpson and I spoke in August of 2016. I met with him, and he provided some information on possible intermediaries between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm sure my colleagues are wondering this also. Why would Glenn Simpson give you information about Russian oligarchs?

Mr. Ohr. Well, my job, for a long time, included responsibility for the organized crime program at the Department of Justice. And so for many years, I had been overseeing investigations and meeting with people, talking about organized crime.

In the course of this many years, I met with both -- I had become acquainted with both Chris Steele, Glenn Simpson, and other people. And from time to time, these people would give me information about Russian oligarchs and other Russian organized crime figures, and then I would pass that to the FBI, or introduce people to the FBI so that they could continue. And so what happened in August was I heard from Glenn Simpson that he had some

information.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, you also strike me as being smart enough not to make yourself a fact witness if you didn't have to. So why take the information? Chris Steele already had a relationship with the Bureau. Why not just connect Glenn Simpson with the Bureau? Why put yourself in the middle of that?

Mr. Ohr. My recollection is that I tried to get Glenn Simpson to speak with the Bureau, but I don't recall the exact conversation. So he was willing to meet with me and give me some information. So I took the information and passed it to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Who at the FBI did you pass it on to?

Mr. Ohr. Well, at that point I had -- I believe I met with Peter Strzok, Lisa Page, and some people from the Department's -- Justice Department's Criminal Division, and I gave them the information that I had received.

Mr. Gowdy. Was either Peter Strzok or Lisa Page, were they working on a Russian oligarch fraud investigation in addition to the Trump campaign, or was it just the Trump campaign investigation that you remember them working on at the time?

Mr. Ohr. I think my recollection is that they were looking at different parts, not just one part. I don't remember the exact details, but --

Mr. Gowdy. Can you see how it might be troubling? You just called the names of two people, neither of whom I think are with the Bureau, one who was mentioned unfavorably in an IG report,

both of whom had, at least from my standpoint, an unprecedented amount of animus or bias towards one of the candidates, and you are getting information from someone hired by the DNC and funneling it to the lead agent on the Russia investigation. Can you possibly see how that might be troubling to people?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. And what would your response to that troublement be?

Mr. Ohr. At the time, they were the people who could use, you know, or look at the information. They were the ones that I was told to pass it to. They also told me that they would arrange for me to be in contact with a line agent, a regular agent, and that in the future, my contacts would be with that agent rather than with higher officials at the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Who was handling Chris Steele, who at the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know who was officially his handler. I know one of the people he was talking with who may have been his handler was Special Agent Mike Gaeta.

Mr. Gowdy. So why not tell Steele and Simpson to go talk to the Bureau directly?

Mr. Ohr. I believe Steele was talking to the Bureau directly. My recollection is that at least initially -- well, no. Let me cancel that.

I -- I don't think -- I think Glenn Simpson was willing to talk with me. I'm not sure that -- my recollection is I'm not

sure he was willing to talk with the FBI, although that was where obviously it would be better to --

Mr. Gowdy. Why not? Why talk to a prosecutor who does not investigate crime? Were you assigned to the Russia investigation?

Mr. Ohr. I was not.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you have any connection with the Russia investigation at all?

Mr. Ohr. Aside from passing this information, no.

Mr. Gowdy. So why would Glenn Simpson go through you and not go directly to the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what was in his head. I know he was willing to talk --

Mr. Gowdy. I'm sure you asked him.

Mr. Ohr. I think I tried to get him to talk with the FBI, but I don't recall the exact conversation.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, Mr. Ohr, a couple of people around the table have worked for the Department at various points. You really try hard, as an attorney, not to involve yourself in chains or facts that could warrant you being pretty much exactly where you are today, which is a fact witness. Surely this is not the first time you thought about that?

Mr. Ohr. That's right.

Mr. Gowdy. So why allow yourself to be a conduit?

Mr. Ohr. I thought the -- I wanted to get the information, whatever information they had. I wanted to get it to the FBI, and

I wanted to try to create the situation for people like Glenn Simpson to talk to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you believe, as I do, that the FBI is the world's premier law enforcement agency?

Mr. Ohr. If I say yes, I might make people at the DEA very unhappy, but yes, I am very -- I have a great admiration for the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. I don't think it's going to make them unhappy. They don't have as much jurisdiction as the Bureau has. The Bureau has broad jurisdiction. I mean, DEA can't look at Title 18 cases, can they?

Mr. Ohr. That's right, except for money laundering, I believe, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. So you've got what, with your caveat noted, you don't want to offend anyone else, you got the world's premier law enforcement agency investigating a fact pattern. Chris Steele already has a handler, already is in contact with the FBI; and you allow the person hired by the DNC to dig up dirt on a Presidential candidate to talk to you directly and use you as a conduit. We're just trying to figure out why you let that happen?

Mr. Ohr. I took the information. I thought the information might be important, and I wanted to get it to the FBI. It seemed the only way to do it.

Mr. Gowdy. What information would Glenn Simpson have that the Bureau couldn't get or already have?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know exactly what the FBI had access to, and I know Glenn Simpson was also gathering information. So more information is better. The FBI is in a position to decide whether the information is useful or credible. My job, as I saw it, was just to get the information over there and let them figure it out.

Mr. Gowdy. So when Glenn Simpson gave you information, what information did he give you?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the exact facts he gave me in August. I believe I made some notes at the time, and I believe it had to do with possible intermediaries between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign.

Mr. Gowdy. Such as?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the exact names.

Mr. Gowdy. That's a serious allegation, Mr. Ohr.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. To allege that a hostile foreign government is in cahoots with members of a campaign is a pretty serious allegation.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And you don't remember who it was?

Mr. Ohr. There were many names mentioned over a period of time.

Mr. Gowdy. Tell me the ones you remember.

Mr. Ohr. I don't know if it came up in the conversation with Glenn Simpson, but certainly one of them was Sergei Millian.

Mr. Gowdy. How about on the Trump campaign side?

Mr. Ohr. Again, I don't recall if this was a name that Glenn Simpson mentioned, but I remember the name Michael Cohen coming up.

Mr. Gowdy. Cohen? Okay. Who else?

Mr. Ohr. I remember -- and, again, I don't think -- I don't remember if -- I think this name came from Chris Steele originally, was Carter Page. And the name Paul Manafort was also mentioned, and I think that came from Chris Steele originally.

Mr. Gowdy. And what precisely, as best you can recall, was the nature of this collaboration/conspiracy/coordination?

Mr. Ohr. That there were communications back and forth between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign.

Mr. Gowdy. Is there anything inherently criminal about that?

Mr. Ohr. If the Russian Government was attempting to influence the Trump campaign in some way, I would think that would be a national security threat.

Mr. Gowdy. What would that some way be?

Mr. Ohr. Espousing certain positions, or if they had some kind of control or influence over members of the campaign that could affect U.S. policy in a way that would be favorable to Russia or Russian interests.

Mr. Gowdy. And what did Mr. Simpson relay to you about that? What control or dominion or --

Mr. Ohr. I think Mr. Simpson was -- what Glenn Simpson was giving me was more the means by which this communication was

being -- what he thought how the communication was happening. I don't think he was talking as much about what exactly they were -- you know, what policies or whatever they were talking about.

Mr. Gowdy. You've been a prosecutor for how long?

Mr. Ohr. I began as a prosecutor in 1991.

Mr. Gowdy. So from 2018 to 1991, you have essentially asked questions for a living?

Mr. Ohr. Uh-huh. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. What questions did you ask Glenn Simpson about the origin of his information? And I'm still -- maybe it's just me. I'm still struggling to figure out -- now, if it was a conspiracy to access the DNC server, I'm interested. If it's a conspiracy to access John Podesta's email, I'm interested. I'm actually interested if it's a conspiracy to disseminate what was taken even if they didn't take it.

But I doubt he met with a high-ranking DOJ official to say, someone in the Russian Government knows someone in the Trump campaign.

Mr. Ohr. I believe one of the things -- again, I don't remember if it was Glenn Simpson or Chris Steele that mentioned this -- talked about -- I'm going to get the names wrong, but somebody associated with the Trump campaign having advance knowledge of when information about the Clinton campaign that had been stolen and hacked, when it was going to be leaked.

Mr. Gowdy. What criminal code section would that violate?

Mr. Ohr. I mean, I think, again, it's --

Mr. Gowdy. Conspiracy to defraud the United States?

Mr. Ohr. Right, conspiracy. It could be --

Mr. Gowdy. You don't see that statute used very often I don't think, do you, not that part of it? Recently, we've seen it.

Mr. Ohr. Sorry?

Mr. Gowdy. Recently, we've seen it. Is that what you were thinking, that it was a conspiracy to defraud the United States?

Mr. Ohr. I think any attempt by a foreign power to gain influence over a Presidential campaign would be troubling.

Mr. Gowdy. But that does not include Steele relying on Russians to provide dirt on Trump.

Mr. Ohr. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

Mr. Gowdy. That does not include Steele relying on Russians to provide dirt on Trump, question mark?

Mr. Ohr. I think my understanding is that what Steele was finding out was investigating the links, the national security threat posed by Russian Government officials attempting to gain influence over the Trump campaign. So I don't think that's criminal. I think that's highlighting a national security threat.

Mr. Gowdy. He was relying on foreign nationals for that information?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know who he was getting it from.

Mr. Gowdy. Who were Steele's sources?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Gowdy. How did you vet those -- how did he vet those sources? How did Fusion GPS vet those sources?

Mr. Ohr. I think -- I don't know the specifics. The fact that my wife was looking at some of the same figures, like Sergei Millian, suggests that that was one way they were trying to vet the information.

So when I provided it to the FBI, I tried to be clear that this is source information. I don't know how reliable it is. You're going to have to check it out and be aware. These guys were hired by somebody relating to -- who's related to the Clinton campaign, and be aware --

Mr. Gowdy. Did you tell the Bureau that?

Mr. Ohr. Oh, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Why did you tell the Bureau that?

Mr. Ohr. I wanted them to be aware of any possible bias or, you know, as they evaluate the information, they need to know the circumstances.

Mr. Gowdy. So you specifically told the Bureau that the information you were passing on came from someone who was employed by the DNC, albeit in a somewhat triangulated way?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I used -- I didn't know they were employed by the DNC, but I certainly said, yes, that -- that they were working for -- you know, they were somehow working associated

with the Clinton campaign. And I also told the FBI that my wife worked for Fusion GPS or was a contractor for GPS, Fusion GPS.

Mr. Gowdy. And, again, you thought it was important to tell the Bureau that for bias --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. -- motive, interest in the outcome, all of the reasons that you have to produce --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. -- not complementary information?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And so you think it should have also been included in a FISA application?

Mr. Ohr. I have no -- I don't do FISA applications. I don't know. So I would think you should attempt to corroborate any source information you get before you --

Mr. Gowdy. Would a jury be told about that?

Mr. Ohr. I think certainly I would -- if I were calling a witness, I would provide that kind of information to the defense.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, and your very competent counsel would spend hours making sure the jury knew of the connection between the source and a political opponent, don't you think? Hours.

Mr. Ohr. I'm sure it would be a topic of cross-examination.

Mr. Gowdy. It wouldn't be a footnote.

Mr. Ohr. I --

Mr. Gowdy. It wouldn't be an oblique footnote buried

somewhere in an application. They'd spend hours on it.

Mr. Ohr. I'm sure if it were a trial setting, there would be cross-examination about it.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. So Simpson, you met with Simpson how many times?

Mr. Ohr. I recall two times.

Mr. Gowdy. Now, some of my colleagues don't believe in coincidences. I have not made up my mind yet on whether or not that's possible, but you met with Simpson -- I mean, with Steele, if I remember correctly, in late July --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. -- at a breakfast with Mrs. Ohr?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you know what else happened in late July?

Mr. Ohr. I have seen in the papers that the FBI opened some kind of investigation in late July. I was certainly not aware of that at the time.

Mr. Gowdy. Who opened it?

Mr. Ohr. I've just seen something in the papers. I don't know.

Mr. Gowdy. Oh, you can guess. What FBI agent opened it?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Gowdy. I'll give you a hint. You mentioned his name already. Peter Strzok. How many times did you talk to Peter Strzok before July of 2016?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. None, I don't think. I did not know Peter Strzok.

Mr. Gowdy. How did you meet him?

Mr. Ohr. At some point, I believe in the fall of 2016, I met with him and Lisa Page, as I told you before.

Mr. Gowdy. Why? Why did you meet with them?

Mr. Ohr. To pass the latest information that I had received.

Mr. Gowdy. How did you find out who to meet with? Who did you call to find out?

Mr. Ohr. So, prior to that meeting, I had -- okay. After the July 30th meeting with Chris Steele, I wanted to provide the information he had given me to the FBI. I reached out for Andrew McCabe, at that time, Deputy Director of the FBI and somebody who had previously led the organized crime, Russian organized crime squad in New York and who I had worked with in the past, and asked if he could meet with me.

I went to his office to provide the information, and Lisa Page was there. So I provided the information to them. And some point after that, I think, I was given Peter Strzok, or somehow put in contact with Peter Strzok.

Mr. Gowdy. And that would have been when?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the exact date. I'm guessing it would have been in August since I met with Chris Steele at the end of July, and I'm pretty sure I would have reached out to Andrew McCabe soon afterwards.

Mr. Gowdy. So you provided the information Glenn Simpson

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

gave to you to Peter Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. No, no. The information Chris Steele had given me -- oh, no. Yes. Yeah, I'm sorry.

So after Glenn Simpson gave me information, yes, I believe I provided that to Peter Strzok.

Mr. Gowdy. So the Steele and Simpson information, you were the conduit to Peter Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. I -- they may have had other conduits certainly with respect to Mr. Steele, but yes, I did.

Mr. Gowdy. In July of 2016, Chris Steele emailed you and made reference to, and I'll quote, "our favorite business tycoon."

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Who was he referring to?

Mr. Ohr. Oleg Deripaska.

Mr. Gowdy. How did you know that that's who he was referring to?

Mr. Ohr. We had had conversations prior to that time about Oleg Deripaska earlier that year.

Mr. Gowdy. It couldn't have been Donald Trump?

Mr. Ohr. No, I don't think so.

Mr. Gowdy. Why not?

Mr. Ohr. We never had conversations about Donald Trump before July 30th. He talked with me about Russian organized crime matters. We had talked in the past about Deripaska. That was pretty much the only person in my mind that he could have been

referring to.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you and Chris Steele ever discuss Donald Trump?

Mr. Ohr. In the July 30th conversation, one of the items of information that Chris Steele gave to me was that he had information that a former head of the Russian Foreign Intelligence Service, the SVR, had stated to someone -- I didn't know who -- that they had Donald Trump over a barrel.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you know Jon Winer?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, I'm acquainted with Jonathan Winer.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever discuss the Russian investigation or the 2016 Presidential race with Jon Winer?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever pass information -- he was an employee of the State Department?

Mr. Ohr. I think so.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever pass information from him on to the Bureau or the Department?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Other than Chris Steele and Glenn Simpson, did anyone else ever provide information to you that you then provided to the Department or the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. I mentioned my wife and the memory stick.

Mr. Gowdy. Your wife?

Mr. Ohr. So I don't think anyone else did, no.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you look at that stick or thumb drive?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. You didn't even open it?

Mr. Ohr. No. I didn't want to plug it into my machine at work. I just gave it to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. Why didn't you want to plug it into your machine at work?

Mr. Ohr. I don't plug any stick that anyone gives me, even my wife, into a work computer.

Mr. Gowdy. What did she describe was on it?

Mr. Ohr. My understanding was that it included her research on behalf of Fusion GPS.

Mr. Gowdy. Was her job to find as much information as she could, good and bad, on Donald Trump, or was it opposition research?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think -- my understanding was not that -- she was asked to look at specific individuals and companies, and I think they were all related to -- were Russia, because her expertise was researching Russian topics, reading Russian websites, that sort of thing.

So I think she was just gathering whatever information she could find on those persons, and then she would pass that to Fusion GPS. So it wouldn't -- it wasn't limited to favorable or unfavorable. It was just whatever she could find.

Mr. Gowdy. The July 30th breakfast that Chris Steele and

your wife and you attended, what was discussed there?

Mr. Ohr. So Chris Steele provided me with basically three items of information. One of them I've described to you already, the comment that information supposedly stated and made by the head, former head of the Russian Foreign Intelligence Service.

He also mentioned that Carter Page had met with certain high-level Russian officials when he was in Moscow. My recollection is at that time, the name Carter Page had already been in the press, and there had been some kind of statement about who he had met with when he went to Moscow. And so the first item that I recall Chris Steele telling me was he had information that Carter Page met with higher-level Russian officials, not just whoever was mentioned in the press article. So that was one item.

And then the third item he mentioned was that Paul Hauser, who was an attorney working for Oleg Deripaska, had information about Paul Manafort, that Paul Manafort had entered into some kind of business deal with Oleg Deripaska, had stolen a large amount of money from Oleg Deripaska, and that Paul Hauser was trying to gather information that would show that, you know, or give more detail about what Paul Manafort had done with respect to Deripaska.

Mr. Gowdy. Did Mr. Steele ever express his opinion on candidate Trump to you?

Mr. Ohr. At that time, I don't recall, but later on, prior to the election when I spoke with Chris Steele, I got the sense he

was very alarmed by this information, which I think he believed to be true. And so I definitely got the impression he did not want Donald Trump to win the election.

Mr. Gowdy. You got the impression or he told you that?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember specifically what he said, but it was a strong enough impression that I told the FBI that.

Mr. Gowdy. Have you had a chance to review your 302s?

Mr. Ohr. I looked at my 302s in preparation for my testimony with the Senate Intelligence Committee back in January of this year; and I did review them on one subsequent occasion, again, early this year. So I have seen them, but I have not looked at them for at least 6 months.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you recall whether it was you that Chris Steele said he was desperate that Donald Trump not win?

Mr. Ohr. I think I said that to the FBI, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Was that your impression of him or is that something he said to you?

Mr. Ohr. I -- I don't recall exactly what he said, but, as I said, whether he said it directly or not, I had the very strong impression. I just don't want to say words that I don't remember right at this moment.

Mr. Gowdy. What does the word "desperate" mean?

Mr. Ohr. I think he was very anxious or very -- very concerned that Donald Trump not win.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, "concerned" and "desperate" are two

separate words. What does the word "desperate" mean?

Mr. Ohr. I think very concerned. And, again, I wanted to provide that to the FBI, because it was important that the FBI know what his mindset was. You want to know when --

Mr. Gowdy. If you're relying on a source that says they're desperate to prevent someone from winning, you would want to know that.

Mr. Ohr. Yes, of course.

Mr. Gowdy. How about willing to do anything to keep him from winning, do you remember seeing that in your 302, or words to that effect?

Mr. Ohr. No, I don't recall that specifically, no.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, what do you -- instead of me guessing what you recall, what do you recall Chris Steele telling you about Donald Trump and whether or not he wanted to see him prevail in November?

Mr. Ohr. As I told you, I don't recall the exact words. I definitely had a very strong impression that he did not want Donald Trump to win, because he believed his information he was giving me was accurate, and that he was, as I said, very concerned, or he was desperate, which is what I then told the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. If I remember right, you've been a prosecutor since 1991?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, sir.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever have a chance to cross-examine

anyone?

Mr. Ohr. On occasion. Not as often as a defense counsel, but yes.

Mr. Gowdy. So tell me all of the questions, cross-examination-like questions that you asked Chris Steele about the source of his information.

Mr. Ohr. I knew -- he would not give me the source of his information, so I couldn't get it.

Mr. Gowdy. How much of what Chris Steele told you would have ever come out in a courtroom?

Mr. Ohr. I'm not sure it would have. I --

Mr. Gowdy. Oh, I'm --

Mr. Ohr. This was source information.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm pretty sure it would not.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Gowdy. Why not?

Mr. Ohr. It was source information. It was hearsay. I --

Mr. Gowdy. What's hearsay?

Mr. Ohr. It's something that he did not -- it was something that he heard from someone else.

Mr. Gowdy. What is hearsay for those not familiar with the definition?

Mr. Ohr. A statement that was made outside of court.

Mr. Gowdy. Offered to prove?

Mr. Ohr. The truth of the matter asserted, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Yes. There are exceptions, but we can't find one for what Chris Steele told you. Was Chris Steele talking directly to the source?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know exactly. I assumed he was talking to a source. I don't know what the source specifically knew.

Mr. Gowdy. Did he have subsources?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm guessing you never talked to the sources or subsources.

Mr. Ohr. That is correct.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, Mr. Ohr, that information would never see the inside of a courtroom, because you can't cross-examine it. You can't find out who, if anyone, really is the source of that. Do you agree?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. But this is not evidence in a courtroom. He is providing information from -- this is source information. And most FBI investigations involve source information, at least in the early stages.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. I don't really want to do this, but we're going to have to do it anyway. Why would that information not come in a courtroom? Why is hearsay not allowed?

Mr. Ohr. We don't -- the rules of evidence are try to ensure that we have, you know, first-person evidence for a courtroom.

Mr. Gowdy. Why? Why?

Mr. Ohr. Because we consider that more reliable.

Mr. Gowdy. Yes. It's more reliable, more likely to be true, right?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And the most powerful tool you have to eliminate the truth is what? I'll give you a hint. It's in the Sixth Amendment.

Mr. Ohr. Cross-examination.

Mr. Gowdy. You get to confront the people, right? You get to cross them?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Not only were you not able to do it, you don't even know if Steele was able to do it.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Gowdy. So best-case scenario, best-case scenario, it's double hearsay. Worst-case scenario, we don't have any -- it could be quintuple hearsay, right?

Mr. Ohr. I think -- I don't know. It definitely is hearsay, and it was source information, which is what I was telling the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. I like the phrase "source information." Source information is of no help if the source is not credible, agree?

Mr. Ohr. The FBI -- I agree, but the point -- what the FBI has to do when it gets information is see if there's other information from other places that corroborate the information. And this is the point of giving -- that's why the FBI collects

source information, not to present it in court, but to see if different sources corroborate each other, and whether a picture begins to emerge.

Mr. Gowdy. I guess what alarms me about this fact pattern is all the way in December of 2016, a guy named Comey was referring to the information as unverified. That's in December of 2016. What happened in October of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I'm not sure what you're referring to.

Mr. Gowdy. Was it used in a court filing?

Mr. Ohr. I'm not aware of how it was used.

Mr. Gowdy. Have you read the FISA application?

Mr. Ohr. I am aware that there was -- I've read in the paper that some kind of a FISA application was used -- or that some of the information was used in a FISA application, but I was not aware of that at the time.

Mr. Gowdy. Were you aware that Director Comey referred to the information as unverified all the way into December of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall that, you know, at the time, but I certainly considered it, as I said, source information.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you know what steps Peter Strzok took to either corroborate or contradict the information?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. So you don't know Steele's source.

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Gowdy. You don't know if he had subsources.

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Gowdy. You don't know if any of it was even attempted to be corroborated or contradicted?

Mr. Ohr. My assumption is that the FBI tries to corroborate the information if they think it's something they want to pursue.

Mr. Gowdy. How would you know better than Comey? He said it was unverified. They didn't even try to corroborate it until 2017.

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what they had, what they were doing.

Mr. Gowdy. Who at the Department knew that you were talking to Chris Steele and Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I spoke with some people in the Criminal Division, other career officials who dealt with some of these matters.

So --

Mr. Gowdy. Any of them have names?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. So I was about to tell you. One of them was Bruce Swartz, who is the Counselor For International Affairs in the Criminal Division; a person who was working with him at the time, working on similar matters in the Criminal Division was Zainab Ahmad; and a third person who was working on some -- some of these matters I believe was Andrew Weissmann.

Mr. Gowdy. Who is that last one?

Mr. Ohr. Andrew Weissmann. He was the head of the Fraud Section at the time.

Mr. Gowdy. I've heard his name somewhere before, I think.

Changing the subject, have you talked to anyone on the special counsel's team?

Mr. Ohr. I've had one social contact with a member of the special counsel team. An FBI agent who I've worked with in the past named Bill McCausland was, at least for a while, assigned to the special counsel team from New York. When he was working in Washington, we went out for lunch one time. We -- obviously, we did not discuss the investigation. Other than that, I am not aware of any contact with the special counsel team.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever put Chris Steele in touch with anyone on special counsel team?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I know that the FBI, at one point in 2017, asked me to ask Chris if he would meet with the FBI, and I conveyed that message. And I know at some point a meeting took place. I don't know who from the FBI was present, so I don't know if they were from the special counsel team or not.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm going to have to get you to go back through that again. You lost me, which I'm sure is my fault, not yours.

Mr. Ohr. No, no. Sorry. So -- I'm sorry, you're going to have to repeat the question so I get it right.

Mr. Gowdy. Well, I think what I was wondering is whether or not Chris Steele either asked you or communicated to you that he wanted to talk to special counsel team and whether you made any efforts to connect him?

Mr. Ohr. So the -- okay, that's a different question. But I

know that Chris Steele referred to the FBI and the special counsel team in some of our conversations it seemed like interchangeably.

I do not know who Chris Steele spoke with when the FBI spoke with him in 2017, so I don't know if the FBI people who spoke with him were a part of the special counsel's team or not. The person I was speaking with when I reported these conversations was not part of the special counsel team.

Mr. Gowdy. Are you aware that Chris Steele's relationship with the Bureau soured and/or dissolved at some point in the fall of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. At some point I became aware of that, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. How did you learn that?

Mr. Ohr. I am not sure where I first learned of it. I certainly would have heard that from Chris Steele at some point, but I'm not sure where I learned it first.

Mr. Gowdy. Why did it dissolve?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know specifically.

Mr. Gowdy. I'm sure Chris told you, didn't he, or did you not ask?

Mr. Ohr. I mean, I guess I was making an assumption at the time that -- but it's just an assumption, that -- that the FBI would have stopped talking with him because he talked to a reporter.

Mr. Gowdy. Why would that dissolve a relationship with the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. Normally, the FBI tells its sources not to talk to anybody else.

Mr. Gowdy. That would be a good assumption. So Chris Steele was working for Fusion GPS and the FBI at the same time?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Gowdy. Was he being paid by both?

Mr. Ohr. I believe so.

Mr. Gowdy. Why was the Bureau paying him for information if you were going to pass it on from Fusion GPS to the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. I know the FBI had other contacts with Chris Steele besides my contact, besides what I was getting, but I don't know the specific nature of what they paid him for.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever talk to the media?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Did DAG Yates know that you were talking to Steele or Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Did any of your supervisors at the Department know? I think the others you described were more peers.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Gowdy. Any of your supervisors?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you know if Mrs. Nellie Ohr ever talked to Peter Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know of any conversation, no.

Mr. Gowdy. If there were a text from Strzok to Page that said, quote, "remind me [redacted, name redacted] met with Bruce and got more stuff today," close quote, do you know who that Bruce would be?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Could it be Bruce Ohr?

Mr. Ohr. I guess it could be.

Mr. Gowdy. Do you remember meeting with someone on or about December 20th and getting information from that person?

Mr. Ohr. Not as I sit here.

Mr. Gowdy. Would anything refresh your recollection?

Mr. Ohr. Maybe an email or something. I don't know. I don't think in my notes it reflected anything like that.

Mr. Gowdy. If I remember correctly, the only sources of information for you were Simpson, Steele, and Mrs. Ohr.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Outside the government, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. What was the last part?

Mr. Ohr. Outside the government, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. All right. Other than Mrs. Ohr, were you talking to the other two in December of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I believe I met with Glenn Simpson in December 2016.

Mr. Gowdy. About what?

Mr. Ohr. He provided me with a memory stick, and he provided additional information regarding the contacts between the Russians

and the Trump campaign.

Mr. Gowdy. So now we're up to two memory sticks.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Both of whom could have gone to the Bureau but didn't.

Mr. Ohr. Oh, I provided them to the Bureau.

Mr. Gowdy. I get that. I get that, Mr. Ohr. I'm still wondering why they wanted to go through a DOJ attorney that was not assigned to the investigation.

Mr. Ohr. Well, I've known Glenn Simpson, not very well, but I've known him for several years. So maybe he felt more comfortable talking with me. That's my -- that's my assumption, but --

Mr. Gowdy. You've been with the Department since 1991?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, sir.

Mr. Gowdy. Are there other cases where you recall taking information from fact witnesses and passing it on to the Bureau?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. I don't recall specific instances, but whenever I -- over the years, as I've talked with people who are, you know, experts or have information one way or another on transnational organized crime, including Russian organized crime, I take their information, and if it looked like it -- if there's anything there, I would pass it to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. I've been out of it for about 8 years, so you help me if I'm wrong, but a stick, or thumb drive, would be

physical evidence --

Mr. Ohr. Yes, sir.

Mr. Gowdy. -- for which a chain would exist --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. -- if it were ever needed in court?

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Gowdy. And you made yourself part of the chain?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Can you think of other instances in your career since 1991 where you made yourself part of a chain of custody?

Mr. Ohr. Not -- I don't remember getting any other sticks or anything like that, so --

Mr. Gowdy. How many cases would you say you handled in your career at the Department?

Mr. Ohr. When I was an AUSA and actively prosecuting cases, I'm sure I did a few hundred.

Mr. Gowdy. Then if tradition holds, you did a few less when you went to Main Justice than when you were out in the field?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. So what, 250, is that conservative?

Mr. Ohr. I wouldn't want to guess.

Mr. Gowdy. I want to be conservative. 200?

Mr. Ohr. As I said, I'm sure it was, you know, several hundred altogether.

Mr. Gowdy. Several hundred would be more than 200, but we'll

be really conservative and say 200.

Mr. Ohr. All right.

Mr. Gowdy. And you can't think of a single case where you inserted yourself into a chain of custody other than this one?

Mr. Ohr. That's right.

Mr. Gowdy. I guess my colleagues are wondering why. Why this one?

Mr. Ohr. As I mentioned before, I met people over the years who would have information that they wanted to tell somebody in U.S. law enforcement. I had been working in this area for many years, so many people know me but might not know an FBI agent who's working in this area. They would tell me things; I would pass it to the FBI.

Mr. Gowdy. You never gave information to your wife to then give to Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. No. No.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever have any conversations with Peter Strzok about Donald Trump?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe so, no.

Mr. Gowdy. What causes you to not be certain?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I passed him the information I had received, so that's -- you know, so that information mentions Donald Trump's name, but outside of that, I don't think we had any other conversations.

[10:05 a.m.]

Mr. Gowdy. Did he ever express any animus or bias towards Trump to you in those conversations?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think so, no.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever meet with Lisa Page?

Mr. Ohr. She was at the same meeting -- she was at the meeting with Peter Strzok, and she was at the initial meeting with Andrew McCabe.

Mr. Gowdy. Where did the meeting take place, the one with you and Strzok and Page?

Mr. Ohr. I believe that was in the Criminal Division at main Justice.

Mr. Gowdy. Did either one of them express any concern that you were in a chain of physical evidence?

Mr. Ohr. Well, at that point, I don't believe that any memory sticks had been passed. So they understood that I had received information, and they said they would get me an agent to talk to who would write the stuff down and do whatever -- well, I don't know if write it down, but that they would give me an agent to speak with and provide the information.

Mr. Gowdy. Is that why there are 302s of you in the file?

Mr. Ohr. I believe so.

Mr. Gowdy. That is the agent interviewing you?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Who did you give the sticks to?

Mr. Ohr. The agent. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. Which agent?

Mr. Ohr. I believe at this point it was Joe Pientka.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you get a receipt?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Gowdy. No chain of custody receipt?

Mr. Ohr. I just -- this was, you know, unverified, as you say. It was source information. I just passed it to the FBI for whatever it was worth.

Mr. Gowdy. Why did you meet with Chris Steele after the FBI had dissolved its relationship with him?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I met with Chris Steele at any point after that. Chris Steele would continue to call at various times, and I would listen to what he had to say, and I would pass it to the FBI. The only time information went the other way -- it wasn't information -- was when the FBI asked me to convey to Chris would he be willing to meet with them again and I did that.

Mr. Gowdy. Who at the FBI asked whether Steele would be willing to meet with them again?

Mr. Ohr. It was the agent I was talking to. At that point, I don't remember if it was Joe Pientka or another agent. At various times, I was told to start talking to a new agent, and so I would provide the information to the new agent.

Mr. Gowdy. So this is after the Bureau dissolved its relationship with Steele --

Mr. Ohr. I believe so, yes.

Mr. Gowdy. -- did not pay him the last installment of the money he thought was owed --

Mr. Ohr. Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Gowdy. -- for breaking the agreement that he had with them not to tell others that he was a Bureau source and/or talking to the media.

Mr. Ohr. That is my assumption. But, yes, I was not part of any decision at the FBI, so I don't know specifically. But that is my understanding.

Mr. Gowdy. And your testimony is someone at the Bureau was willing to reengage with Christopher Steele.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Gowdy. And tell me again who that was.

Mr. Ohr. I don't know where the request came from. It was given to me by the agent that I was reporting to, and then I conveyed that to Chris Steele.

Mr. Gowdy. Did you ever wonder why the Bureau didn't convey that directly to Steele, why the Bureau was also using you as a conduit?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember if I wondered about that at the time. I guess it didn't seem out of place, since I was telling them: Hey, this is what he told me. And they said: Oh, well, the next time you talk with him, can you ask him this? And so I did.

Mr. Gowdy. I have only got a little bit of time left. I see Mr. Ratcliffe writing furiously, so he can have the 1 minute and 30 seconds I have left.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Mr. Ohr, I want to make sure I heard you right. You met with Lisa Page on two occasions that you --

Mr. Ohr. I remember two. There might have been a third, but I remember two.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And one of those was shortly after you met with Christopher Steele. On July 30, you had a meeting with Andy McCabe and Lisa Page.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You said that meeting was at main Justice?

Mr. Ohr. No, that meeting was in Andrew McCabe's office.

Mr. Ratcliffe. It was in Andrew McCabe's office.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And it was sometime, you believe, in August, because it was shortly after the meeting with Christopher Steele?

Mr. Ohr. Probably, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And that was because, at that point in time, you wanted the FBI to have that information and be aware of your contact with Christopher Steele?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did anyone prompt that call to Andy McCabe?

Mr. Ohr. No, I don't think so. I think that was me. Just me.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You, out of just an idea that that was the appropriate thing to do?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. But you also thought it was appropriate to be communicating with Christopher Steele.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Even though you don't have any authority, apparently.

Mr. Ohr. He is just calling me or meeting with me, as we had done on and off for many years. So if he tells me something that is of interest or concern, I pass that to the FBI.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And you said something about you thought that was your job.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Part of my job, as I saw it, as having been for a long time responsible for organized crime at the Department, was to try to gather as much information or introduce the FBI to possible sources of information, whatever ways to further the program's goals.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. But yet Sally Yates -- she was your boss, right?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You said she didn't know that you were talking to Steele or Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. How do you know she didn't know?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I didn't tell her.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. So she may have known from some other source.

Mr. Ohr. Possible.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Well, you would think she would, because over at the FBI Andy McCabe knew that you were talking to Steele and Simpson as early as August of 2016.

Mr. Ohr. Right. But I don't know what, if anything, was conveyed to Sally Yates.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Andy McCabe knew. Did Jim Comey know in August of 2016 that you were talking to Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I think our first hour has expired. So I will visit with you in a little bit.

Mr. Ohr. Okay.

[Recess]

Ms. Shen. We are back on the record. The time is 10:25.

Sir, my name is Valerie Shen. I am the chief national security counsel for Ranking Member Cummings on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Ms. Hariharan. Arya Hariharan for Ranking Member Nadler.

Ms. Shen. We will be leading the questioning on behalf of the minority side today.

Mr. Ohr. Good morning.

Ms. Shen. Good morning.

## EXAMINATION

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So I would like to ask you just some additional background questions about your career. So we will end up covering, I think, some of the ground that we mentioned last round. But what is your current title at the Department of Justice?

A I am a senior counsel in the Office of International Affairs in the Criminal Division of the Justice Department.

Q And how long have you held that position?

A Since January of this year.

Q And how would you describe your general roles and responsibilities in that position?

A I advise the director and deputy directors of the Office of International Affairs in the operation of the office and the work of the office.

Q Who is currently your direct supervisor?

A The Director of Office of International Affairs is Vaughn Ary, A-r-y.

Q And who does Vaughn Ary report to?

A He reports to the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Bruce Swartz, and to the Assistant Attorney General.

Q And who does that Assistant Attorney General report to?

A The Deputy Attorney General.

Q Who reports to the Attorney General.

A Correct.

Q What previous positions have you held at DOJ? What was your previous position before your current one?

A My previous position was the Director of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force, or OCDEF, OCDEF.

Q What was your role and your responsibilities as part of that position?

A I was the head of that component responsible for the operation of OCDEF and helping to coordinate drug and organized crime investigations within the Department.

Q And how long did you hold that position for?

A I had that position from late 2014 until January of 2018, the current year.

Q And when you were in that position, who did you directly report to?

A I reported to the Deputy Attorney General.

Q What was your position at the Department of Justice prior to the Director of OCDEF?

A From 2011 to 2014, I was counselor for transnational organized crime and international affairs in the Criminal Division.

Q And what were your roles and responsibilities as part of that position?

A I worked on organized crime policy matters and on

international policy and case matters as they came up.

Q And who did you report to when you were in that position?

A To Bruce Swartz and to the Assistant Attorney General.

Q And what position did you hold at the Department of Justice before you were the counselor for transnational organized crime and international affairs?

A From 1999 to 2011, I was the chief of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section in the Criminal Division.

Q And what were your roles and responsibilities in that position?

A I oversaw the Department of Justice's organized crime program, primarily transnational organized crime.

Q And who did you report to as part of that position?

A I reported to one of the deputy assistant attorney generals in the Criminal Division. For most of the time that I was the chief of that section, I reported to Deputy Assistant Attorney General John Keeney, K-e-e-n-e-y.

Q And what was your position at the Department of Justice prior to that position?

A From 1991 to 1999, I was an assistant U.S. attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York.

Q And what types of cases did you prosecute when you were in the Southern District of New York?

A Many different kinds of cases. I served in the general

crimes unit, the narcotics unit, senior narcotics unit, securities unit, the gang unit, and in my last year in the office I was the chief of the violent gang unit.

Q As part of the chief of the violent gang unit, are there any particular cases you found notable? Or can you just elaborate a little bit more about your work as the chief of the violent gangs unit?

A Our job was to prosecute the most violent gangs in New York City. We did provide numerous prosecutions for murder, racketeering, drugs of violent gangs in various parts of New York City.

Q Are you a counterintelligence expert?

A No.

Q Have you ever worked as a counterintelligence professional?

A No.

Q What would you say your professional areas of expertise are?

A I have worked most of my career in organized crime and drug investigations.

Q How many years of experience do you have in organized crime?

A Certainly the time I was chief of the Organized Crime Section, 12 years. I worked some organized crime cases when I was an AUSA. And then as counselor -- well, I would say everything

since then has involved organized crime.

Q So it would be fair to say you have decades of experience in organized crime.

A Yes.

Q Are there certain nations or regions of organized crime that you have had a special focus on in your career?

A Yes. We are concerned with organized crime from many different regions. Russia and the former Soviet Union is one. Eastern Europe and the Balkans is another. Asian organized crime and emerging organized crime groups from other parts of the world as well.

Q So would you call yourself an expert in Russian organized crime?

A Yes.

Q And as part of your work in Russian organized crime, have you worked on cases involving the Russian mafia or mob? I am not sure what the correct terminology is.

A Yes, I have overseen those kind of investigation is.

Q And in your investigations involving the Russian mafia or mob, what types of investigations or crimes do those tend to involve?

A They often involve fraud, public corruption, extortion, money laundering, other crimes.

Q Do those criminal investigations sometimes involve Russian oligarchs?

A Yes.

Q Have you ever prosecuted a Russian oligarch?

A One of the cases that I had some supervisory responsibility as the chief of the Organized Crime Section was the prosecution of a former prime minister of Ukraine named Pavlo Lazarenko. He was not only a former Prime Minister but he had a great deal of money, so I suppose you could call him an oligarch.

Q What was Pavlo Lazarenko -- what kind of criminal activity was he engaged in?

A I believe we charged him with money laundering and fraud.

Q Can you describe in a little bit more detail what your specific role was in that prosecution of Pavlo Lazarenko?

A The prosecution of Lazarenko was carried out by the San Francisco Strike Force, which was in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of California. As the chief of the Organized Crime Section in Washington, we had some supervisory responsibility for all Strike Force investigations.

Q And why is his case specifically notable to you?

A He was an extremely prominent figure both politically and having a lot of money in Ukraine. The case involved corruption on a very large scale: theft of Ukraine Government moneys. He came to the United States. So it was a very long and drawn-out prosecution.

Q How long was the prosecution, do you recall?

A I don't remember exactly, but it was several years.

Q As part of the prosecution of Pavlo Lazarenko, were there other individuals who were also prosecuted in related crimes?

A Yes, there was another defendant in California. I believe his name may have been Kerechenko, but I am not sure.

Q Was that individual a U.S. citizen or a Russian national?

A I don't recall.

Q Do you recall playing a role in the 2003 indictment of the Russian crime boss Semion Mogilevich?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And can you describe what your role was in that prosecution?

A Again, as the chief of the Organized Crime Section, we had some supervisory responsibility for the work of the Philadelphia Strike Force that indicted Semion Mogilevich. I don't recall now whether there was a RICCO charge -- I believe there was in that case -- and we had an independent responsibility to review and approve all RICCO indictments before they were filed.

Q Do you recall generally what types of crimes Semion Mogilevich was involved in?

A He was involved in stock manipulation, if I remember correctly.

Q Do you recall the revocation of Russian oligarch's Oleg Deripaska's visa around 2006?

A Yes, although there -- yes. There have been different incidents involving Mr. Deripaska over the years, so I may have trouble remembering specifically what happened in 2006. But yes.

Q I guess I will go to the beginning. What is sort of your earliest recollection of your official involvement in prosecution or activity involving Oleg Deripaska?

A I don't recall my first exposure to matters involving Mr. Deripaska, but I do recall that, at some point, it may have been in 2006, I worked with the FBI and with other U.S. Government agencies to try to limit Mr. Deripaska's access to the United States.

Q And why did yourself and the FBI believe Mr. Deripaska's access to the United States should be limited at that time?

Mr. Weinsheimer. He really can't get into other investigations and the basis for that investigation.

Ms. Shen. Okay.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q Can you describe as a more general matter why Mr. Oleg Deripaska was on the United States Government radar?

A I can say generally that Mr. Deripaska's activities have been of concern to the U.S. Government for some time.

Q So, overall, would it be fair to say that you have significant experience in investigating and prosecuting Russian

organized crime, including Russian oligarchs with connection to the Russian Government?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Ohr, why did you decide to join the Justice Department?

A I wanted to prosecute cases. I believe strongly in the mission of the Department of Justice, to protect our American citizens by investigating and prosecuting crime. That is what I wanted to do.

Q And in your nearly three decades at the Justice Department, what would you call your proudest accomplishment?

A It is hard to single out any particular accomplishment. I think I feel very privileged to have been able to work at the Department for this long. I think when a prosecutor looks back on their career, they remember things like their first trial, they remember things like their longest trial. Those tend to stick out more than stuff that you do in a managerial capacity. But it would be hard for me to single out any one episode.

Q Let me just step back for a moment, just because there is certainly a lot of mention of Russian oligarchs in the news these days. Certainly, some of the individuals are part of our investigation. And with your experience, I was wondering if you could elaborate at a higher level to, you know, if and why you think it is important for us to understand what the national security implications are of these individuals and the crimes they

commit.

I mean, a lot of these crimes we talk about are of a financial nature, money laundering. But I don't think it really puts maybe the full context of perhaps the import, you know, to the country.

So I was just wondering if you could speak a little bit more in detail about, you know, the body of work that you have been engaged in and how you think people should really think about these cases in a larger sense, right, and why they should matter to them.

A Okay. I will try to answer that question.

You began with Russian oligarchs. I think one thing that outsiders do not always understand is that Russia works differently from the United States and most Western countries, that Russia is a place where, unfortunately, crime and corruption are quite pervasive, and that the line between government, business, and organized crime is thin, gray, nonexistent, whatever you want to say. So what people might look at as a business deal or a government action often may be linked to criminal activity. And so we have to be very careful when we see Russian criminal, business, or government activity and be aware that they often flow into each other.

It is my experience that Russian criminals, businessmen, government officials often use the government for their own private ends, and, conversely, the Russian state often uses

oligarchs and criminals for government ends, to an extent which I think is not well understood by most people in the West.

Q Okay. So, if I am hearing right, it sounds like in Russia it is often indistinguishable, criminal networks from the official Russian Government network, and where those boundaries may lie. Is that accurate to say?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And so would it be fair to say that the activities of Russian oligarchs who may be involved in crimes is especially notable because they are also so heavily involved in the business of the official Russian state? Is that a fair statement?

A Yes.

Q You know, we have also -- I have certainly heard many reports about particular acts of violence both within official Russian state officials but also these so-called Russian oligarchs.

So I was wondering if you could speak more -- is that something you have witnessed in your experience as well, in the course of your prosecutions, just certain threats that may not be as familiar to the tactics that we would expect of U.S. businessmen, certainly?

A Yes. Because the lines are so blurry in Russia, there is always the potential for violence. At different times since the fall of the Soviet Union, the violence has been more or less

explicit, but the threat of violence is always there. And people who are doing things in Russia that involve a lot of money or government actions, I think, always are calculating whether some sort of violence could occur.

Q Has a specific threat of violence ever come up either for you personally or a colleague of yours as they have been involving themselves in investigating or prosecuting a case related with Russia?

A I don't believe I recall any times where I have personally felt threatened. I think investigators working in this area are always cautious. I can't remember any specific incidents, as I sit here.

Q I imagine that yourself and other prosecutors, investigators who work in Russian organized crime would have contacts with certain sources or at least sources who are sources who are either Russian nationals or have ties to that world. Do you feel like the threat of violence affects the type of sourcing that you tend to be involved in?

A Sure. I think people who are reporting or conveying information about Russian organized crime and corruption, I think they are very concerned about their safety.

Q And so, in your experience, the sources related to your work, is it, in your mind, especially important to keep their identities confidential because of the potential risk to personal safety?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

Mr. Ohr, I would like to turn back now to really just kind of lay out the chronology of your relationship with Mr. Steele and some of the contacts that you have had over the years just so we can get a complete understanding of how that developed and where we are today.

So, as I am sure you might have gathered, one of the major reasons you have been asked to appear before this joint investigation is related to your relationship with Christopher Steele and your contacts with him. So how did you first meet Mr. Steele?

A I believe I met Chris Steele for the first time around 2007. That was an official meeting. At that time, he was still employed by the British Government. I went to London to talk with British Government officials about Russian organized crime and what they were doing to look at the threat, and the FBI office at the U.S. Embassy in London set up a meeting. That was with Chris Steele. And there were other members of different British Government agencies there. And we met and had a discussion. And afterwards, I believe the agent and I spoke with Chris Steele further over lunch.

That was, I think, the first time I met him.

Q And you said that Mr. Steele worked for the British Government at the time. Was that at MI-6?

A Yes.

Q And you said in this meeting that he was one of several British Government employees at the meeting?

A Yes.

Q So, based on that introduction, is it fair to say that your contacts with Christopher Steele began as a, you know, shared professional specialization?

A Yes.

Q And that specialization would be Russian organized crime?

A Yes.

Q So, at the time that you were introduced to Mr. Steele, was he considered a specialist in Russian organized crime?

A That was my understanding, yes.

Q Subsequent to that first meeting, did you attend other related meetings or events with Mr. Steele?

A Around the beginning of 2008, I recollect meeting Chris Steele -- I believe this was the next time I met him -- at some sort of a conference in England. I forget the exact location, but it was talking about Russian organized crime. And there were many participants there -- I don't remember exactly -- and Chris Steele was one of the people there.

Q How did you run into him? Was he a panelist? Did you see him, recognize him? How did that --

A I think it was the latter, but I don't recall exactly.

Q Okay. So, at the time that you met Mr. Steele again, it was in the capacity as a previous or a professional contact or acquaintance. Is that correct?

A That is right.

Q Okay. Is it generally common to encounter either current or former law enforcement or intelligence officials at such conferences?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Rough estimate, how often would you say you encountered, you know, such individuals, like, a second time at an event like that?

A It is pretty common. I can't give a percentage.

Q But you wouldn't be surprised at all to see a familiar face from your professional network at a conference like that.

A Exactly.

Q Okay.

Can you sort of describe in general terms the community of law enforcement and intelligence officials who do specialize in Russian organized crime? You know, would you call it an extremely large number of people or limited? I am just trying to get a sense of the world and sort of how tight-knit it is versus who is likely to know each other where.

A I couldn't give you an exact number, obviously, but I know the number of agents and prosecutors working on, say, Russian organized crime matters has historically been pretty small. That

goes both for the United States and for other nations as well. So, over the years, you tend to meet most of the people who are working in this area.

Q Okay. So, of the specialists who work in Russian organized crime, there are very few specialists that you wouldn't know, given the number of years you have been working in this area. Is that fair to say?

A I probably know most of them, yes.

Q Okay. And most of these other individuals probably also know each other and likely have professional contacts with each other over the years?

A Yes.

Q So I guess it would be fair to say that your association with Mr. Steele developed naturally because, again, there are just only so many expert in Russian organized crime. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And so you did not develop a relationship with Mr. Steele for any improper or political purpose.

A That is correct.

Q Would you describe your relationship with Mr. Steele as a purely professional one?

A Over the years, we would talk and have lunch together. So I would say, you know, we would talk a little bit about our families. So, in that sense, it is professional, but it is a cordial relationship.

Q Sure. So you would talk about your families in a way that, say, work colleagues might talk about their families?

A Yes.

Q So, since meeting Mr. Steele and sort of the two specific meetings we just talked about, how often would you estimate you had contacts with him subsequently?

A It is hard to say. Maybe once a year. It might be a couple of years between hearing from him, or I might hear from him twice in 1 year. But not that frequently.

Q What form did these contacts tend to take place? Were they in person? Calls? Emails?

A Some of both. At some point, Chris Steele left the British Government and became involved with a firm called Orbis. And, at that point, I know he -- sometime after that we were in contact, and we stayed in contact. So sometimes it was by telephone, email.

Q And, generally speaking, what were the purposes of your contacts with Mr. Steele?

A Generally, Mr. Steele would be providing some information about Russian organized crime that he thought would be of interest to the U.S. Government.

Q And so these contacts with Mr. Steele tended to be related to your work in Russian organized crime.

A Yes.

Q And throughout your contacts with him, did you consider

Mr. Steele to be a trustworthy expert in his field?

A Yes. He was certainly very skilled, and, yes, I believe he was pretty trustworthy.

Q Did Mr. Steele ever have involvement in or make contributions to any of your prosecutions at the Department of Justice?

A Chris Steele provided information that did help specific cases, yes.

Q And did you sometimes also consult with him on your official matters, or was it more just receiving information?

A I think it was more receiving information.

Q And this information that you received from Mr. Steele proved credible and actionable in some of your cases?

A At least in some of the cases, I think it was actionable, yes.

Q Okay.

So now I would like to sort of switch to the 2016-2017 timeframe. And since we are in unclassified setting, I will try to keep all the information to that, but if at any point you think the answer does involve classified information, please just let us know, and we can address that.

Do you recall what your first contact was with Mr. Steele in 2016?

A I believe we had some sort of email contact early in 2016.

Q And what did that contact consist of?

A He was providing some information about Oleg Deripaska.

Q And, again, we heard his name in the last round, but can you just briefly describe to us, like, who is Oleg Deripaska, like, what is his significance?

A Oleg Deripaska is a Russian oligarch. He, until very recently, was the head of a company called RUSAL, one of the biggest, if not the biggest, aluminum producers in the world. He also has connections to organized crime and to the Russian Government.

Q And why did Mr. Steele reach out to you about Oleg Deripaska?

A I believe he was letting me know that Mr. Deripaska would be in the United States at some point.

Q And why did you believe he thought that would be information significant to you?

A I don't recall. I mean, I don't know exactly what he was thinking. He was just letting me know in case we wanted to do something, I suppose.

Q What was your reaction to receiving that information?

A I thanked him for the information.

Q Did you respond to him in any way at the time?

A I think my response was basically, "Thank you. I'll keep an eye on it," or something like that.

Q So it was just a piece of information that he thought

you might be interested in, but it wasn't part of an existing conversation or it wasn't part of some larger conversation at the time.

A We had spoken about Deripaska over the years, so it is just the latest bit of information.

Q Okay. Do you recall what your next contact was with Mr. Steele after that regarding Deripaska?

A Not specifically. I know there were a couple of contacts early in the year, but then I don't remember exactly what the next contact was.

Q Do you recall if Mr. Steele brought issues to you other than regarding Mr. Deripaska in the early 2016 timeframe or later in the year?

A As I sit here, I don't recall if there were any other topics.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 1

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So I am going to introduce as exhibit 1 a July 1, 2016, email from yourself to Chris Steele with the subject matter "Availability for a Skype com with CDS?"

Mr. Ohr, are you familiar with this email chain?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

I will also note that this email is Bates-stamped

HPSCI-32318-DOJ-6, indicating that it was produced to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and marked "law enforcement sensitive" in the header. This document was, however, recently leaked to the press and posted online.

So, in the first message at the bottom of the page, Mr. Steele writes to you, quote: "Dear Bruce, I hope all is well with you. I am seeing" -- redacted -- "in London next week to discuss ongoing business, but there is something separate I want to discuss informally and separately. It concerns our favorite business tycoon."

So, Mr. Ohr, I think you already answered this question, but can you describe what Mr. Steele wanted to discuss with you informally and separately about your favorite business tycoon?

A I don't recall if this is the specific time he raised it, but I think he was letting me know that there might be an opportunity to interview Oleg Deripaska.

Q So, again, "our favorite business tycoon" is a reference to Oleg Deripaska?

A Yes.

Q And the "favorite business tycoon" is not a reference to then-candidate Donald Trump?

A No.

Q Can you speak a little bit more to why during this timeframe Mr. Steele would reach out to you again involving Mr. Deripaska?

A Again, I am not 100 percent sure just from looking at this document, but I believe that at about this time Chris Steele was letting me know that there might be an opportunity for the U.S. Government to interview Oleg Deripaska.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 2  
Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So I am now going to introduce as exhibit 2 an email chain dated July 30, 2016, between yourself and Chris Steele with the subject "CDS in D.C."

It is also Bates-stamped with HPSCI-DOJ-8 and marked "law enforcement sensitive" in the header. This document was also leaked to the press and posted publicly recently.

Mr. Ohr, are you familiar with this email chain?

A Yes.

Q So, at the top of the chain, Mr. Steele writes, quote: "Great to see you and Nellie this morning, Bruce. Let's keep in touch on the substantive issues. Glenn is happy to speak to you on this if it would help."

Mr. Ohr, who were all the attendees of this morning meeting referred to in the chain?

A Chris Steele was there. He had an associate at the meeting whose name I do not recall. And my wife, Nellie, and I.

Q Okay. And what were the substantive issues that were raised during this meeting?

A Chris Steele provided some information to us. Specifically, he -- these are the things I mentioned before. He talked about the people that Carter Page had met with when he was in Moscow sometime before this. He told me that the former head of -- or he had information that the former head of the Russian foreign intelligence service had said that they had Trump over a barrel. And he told me that Paul Hauser, a lawyer who worked for Oleg Deripaska, was collecting information about a large amount of money that Oleg Deripaska had -- or that Paul Manafort had stolen from Oleg Deripaska.

Q So I believe in the last round you said that some of these Carter Page meetings were with high-level Russian officials. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q And did you recall any of the names of the high-level Russian officials?

A The trouble is that there are several high-level Russian officials with similar names. So I do not want to get the wrong name here.

Q Okay. Was it notable to you that Carter Page had in-person meetings with high-level Russian officials?

A Yes. In combination with the other item that Chris Steele mentioned, it was very concerning, yes.

Q Okay. So it is not typical to hear about a U.S. citizen who has meetings with high-level Russian officials. Is that fair

to say?

A Yes. But, in particular, in this case, I think there had been a press story where Carter Page or some associate claimed he had met with different people. So it was particularly concerning here because it sounded like he may be concealing that he had met with higher-level Russian officials.

Q I see. So Mr. Steele was bringing you information not just about what he believed were meetings that took place but meetings that were attempted to be concealed. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

So, in that same email, the "Glenn," is that a reference to Mr. Glenn Simpson?

A Yes.

Q And why do you think Mr. Steele suggested that you might want to talk to Glenn about these issues -- Mr. Simpson?

A Well, I don't know exactly what Chris Steele was thinking, of course, but I knew that Chris Steele was working for Glenn Simpson and that Glenn might have additional information that Chris either didn't have or was not authorized to prevent, give me, or whatever.

Q Did you, in fact, talk to Mr. Simpson about these issues?

A I believe I spoke with Mr. Simpson a few weeks later in August.

Q And did Mr. Simpson provide you additional details about --

A He did provide me some additional information.

Q What were some of those additional details?

A Again, I don't want to -- I met with him a couple times and I met with Chris Steele a couple times, so I don't want to get it wrong. I don't know exactly what Glenn Simpson provided in August.

Q Were there any other topics that were discussed during your July 30, 2016, meeting?

A Yes, there were. Based on my sketchy notes from the time, I think there was some information relating to the Russian doping scandal, but I don't recall the substance of that. And based on my notes, it indicated that Chris Steele had provided some reports to the FBI, I think two, but that Glenn Simpson had more.

Q Was this the Russian doping scandal related to the FIFA allegations?

A I don't recall.

Q Okay.

So your wife, Nellie, also attended this meeting. What, if any, role did she participate in the substantive discussions?

A I don't think she said anything. And I don't know if she was present for all of the discussion, because Chris Steele and I, at least for part of the discussion, were standing away

from the table. But she was there, and she certainly heard some of it.

Q Okay.

And did any topic of this meeting relate to your ongoing substantive work at Department of Justice?

A Yes. It was relating to Russian organized crime and Russian Government actions. To me, it seemed like, yes, it was part of the same topics I had been pursuing for many years.

Q During this meeting, did you also talk about the Trump campaign and the fall election?

A Yes. The Carter Page information I think was significant because there was some sort of connection, at least in the press I think, between Carter Page and the Trump campaign. And, of course, the second item had to do with supposedly the Russian foreign intelligence service having some kind of compromising information about Donald Trump.

Q Remind me, I think the term you had used was "had Trump over a barrel." Is that accurate?

A That is what my notes indicate. I think that is what Chris said.

Q Okay. And how did you interpret "having Trump over a barrel" to mean?

A My interpretation is that that meant that, if true, the Russian Government had some kind of compromising material on Donald Trump.

Q Okay. So, in reporting this to you, do you believe Mr. Steele believed it to be true that the Russian Government had some sort of compromising material on then-candidate Donald Trump?

A I think -- my impression is that Chris Steele believed his sources. What I should say in addition, though, is that whenever you are dealing with information from Russia, you have to be careful, because it is a very complicated place. And so even information from a good source has to be looked at carefully.

Q Okay.

In the last round, I think someone noted that shortly after this July 30 meeting the FBI's investigation into potential coordination between the Trump campaign and Russia was initiated by the FBI, although you weren't aware of that at the time. Is that correct?

A That is right.

Q Okay. So, just to be clear, your July 30, 2016, meeting didn't have anything to do with the decision to initiate the investigation into links between Russia and the Trump campaign?

A None that I know of.

Q Okay.

So, moving back to, I guess, August 2016, do you recall if Mr. Steele maintained contact with you into the summer and the fall of 2016?

[11:12 a.m.]

Mr. Ohr. Yes. But I don't know -- the next time I'm aware of meeting with Chris Steele is in September. So, yes.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q And what took place at that September meeting with Chris Steele?

A Chris Steele was in Washington, D.C., again, and he reached out to me, and, again, we met for breakfast, and he provided some additional information.

Q And can you describe what that additional information was he provided?

A Again, I would have to look at my notes because I don't want to mix up the different meetings.

Q Okay. Is it fair to say was it a follow-on conversation from the July 30, 2016? Was it similar topics?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you have any other meetings in 2016 after that September 2016 meeting with Christopher Steele?

A I don't believe so.

Q Okay. Did you continue to speak or exchange communications with Chris Steele after that --

A Yes.

Q -- September 2016 meeting?

A Sorry. Yes.

Q And were those communications on the same set of topics

that were brought up previously in the July 30, 2016, meeting?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Were there any communications you had with Chris Steele in the rest of 2016 that were separate topics entirely, unrelated to what was discussed previously?

A At some point Chris Steele provided me with some information about an unrelated matter. I don't recall if it was 2016 or 2017.

Q But would it be accurate to say that the rest of your contacts, communications with Mr. Steele in 2016 once again related to the substantive information he provided during that July 30, 2016, meeting?

A Yes. We were following along on -- he was providing more information along the same lines.

Q So some of these communications, did they relate to the Russian Government's intent to interfere with the 2016 Presidential election?

A That is how I read it, yes.

Q Okay. And did Mr. Steele provide you specific information related to the Russian Government's attempt to interfere with the Presidential election?

A I believe so, yes.

Q And I think I know the answer to this, but so a number of Mr. Steele's communications were related to members of the Trump campaign and allegations of colluding with Russia. Is that

correct?

A I believe so, yes.

Q The information that Mr. Steele relayed to you in 2016, did you share this information with Federal law enforcement officials?

A Yes, I did.

Q Okay. And who exactly did you share the information with?

A As I mentioned earlier, my first move was to reach out for Andrew McCarthy.

Q Or Andrew McCabe is what you meant?

A McCabe, yes. Not McCarthy. I'm sorry. Andrew McCarthy will be angry. I know him, too.

But Andy McCabe, yes, and met with him and Lisa Page and provided information to him. I subsequently met with Lisa Page, Peter Strzok, and eventually Joe Pientka at the FBI. And I also provided this information to people in the criminal division, specifically Bruce Swartz, Zainab Ahmad, and Andrew Weissman.

Q Okay. So I believe you described a meeting you attended with Lisa Page and Peter Strzok and officials in the criminal division. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q And I believe you said earlier that you did not know Peter Strzok prior to that meeting. Is that correct?

A I believe that is correct.

Q Did you know Lisa Page prior to that meeting?

A Yes.

Q Okay. How did you know Lisa Page?

A Lisa Page had previously been a trial attorney in the organized crime and racketeering section, so she was one of my employees.

Q Oh, okay. The other criminal division officials at that meeting, did you know them prior to that meeting?

A Yes. I worked with Mr. Swartz for many years, and I had worked with Ms. Ahmad for a lesser period of time when she was on detail to Washington. And I don't recall for sure whether Andrew Weissman was present at this particular meeting, but I know him for -- I've known him for some years as well.

Q And, again, what exactly was the purpose of that meeting? Was that for you to relay specific information to those individuals?

A That was part of the purpose of the meeting. I think the criminal division officials also wanted to make sure that the criminal and national security parts of the FBI were talking or communicating.

Q So in other words, there was a desire to have the people with the right portfolios in the room on the same page, to have the same information. Is that --

A I believe that's -- yes.

Q What was your understanding of why Lisa Page was a part

of that meeting? Was it as a -- how do I say -- as someone representing Mr. McCabe and reporting back to him, or was it a different capacity?

A Well, she had been introduced into this with my first meeting with Andrew McCabe. So, yes, in that sense. But I don't know what she was reporting or exactly what her responsibilities were as part of this subsequent meeting.

Q Sure. I'll just ask it more generally. What was your understanding of why Lisa Page was participating in that meeting?

A I think she was working on the investigation.

Q Okay. And what was your understanding of why Peter Strzok specifically was in that meeting?

A I believe he was working on the investigation as well.

Q Again, I mean, this was discussed last round. Obviously, these two names have been in the news for lots of different reasons. I guess I just want to be able to dispel any notion that there's anything more perhaps than two officials performing their jobs at the time.

So trying to form the question. Do you have any reason to believe that Lisa Page and Peter Strzok's attendance at this meeting should indicate any nefarious purpose or concern or implication of bias on the Russian investigation or law enforcement community at large?

A The answer is no. I saw their participation as appropriate since I had originally conveyed my information to

Mr. McCabe, and he in turn had put Lisa Page and then Peter Strzok in contact with me. So it seemed like the natural progression.

And in addition, Peter Strzok and Lisa Page were -- said they would put me in contact with a line-level FBI agent who would be my contact. And so that also seemed appropriate.

Q Okay. So subsequent to that meeting, Lisa Page and Peter Strzok were not your main points of contact at the FBI. Is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q So at the time you decided to share the information you received from Mr. Steele with Federal law enforcement, were you directed to share this information by someone or was this a proactive decision on your part?

A It was my decision.

Q And why did you think it was important to share this information with the FBI?

A I was very concerned when I got the information. It seemed to have very serious national security implications. I wanted to get it to the officials, the career officials, who would be able to take the information and evaluate it and decide whether further action was appropriate.

Q Okay. And I think you mentioned earlier that this is something you had done before, which is to pass on fact information to the FBI. Is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And in the past, did you do so for similar reasons because you had a national security concern or something of that nature?

A Whenever I received information that had an organized crime or a national security nexus, I would convey that information to the FBI.

Q Okay. So even if an issue wasn't part of your current official duties, you thought it was an appropriate practice or a desired practice perhaps to pass information to the FBI. Is that correct?

A Any time a citizen gets information about a crime or a national security threat it's appropriate to convey it to the FBI.

Q Okay. Thank you.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 3

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q Okay. I'd like to introduce as exhibit 3 a letter dated July 6, 2018, from Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Chuck Grassley to Deputy Director Rosenstein and FBI Director Wray that in its first paragraph is, quote: Formally requesting the declassification of the FD-302 interview summaries in which Bruce Ohr relayed his contacts with Christopher Steele and to request that you produce the declassified versions directly to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Ohr, are you familiar at all with this letter?

A No.

Q Okay. I'll give you some time to review if you would like.

A Okay.

Q Okay. So on page 2 of the letter it lists 12 separate dates and 302s where the FBI interviewed you indicating the first interview took place on November 22, 2016, and the last one on May 15, 2017. Is this list of interviews and dates generally consistent with your recollection?

A Yes.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. Right. Right. I can't recall specific dates.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q But nothing strikes you as being inaccurate looking at it? I mean, understanding that there's -- you're not going to be able to actually remember each date for the interview, but this is a rough timeframe that you recall being interviewed in?

A Yes. The caveat I would say is, I continued to have some conversations with Christopher Steele after May 15, 2017. I've reported all of those to the FBI, but I do not see any 302s relating to those conversations.

Q Okay. Generally, how soon after communications with Mr. Steele would you notify the FBI?

A As quickly as possible, same day or the next day, whenever possible.

Q Okay. And after you notified the FBI, how soon after that would the FBI be able to interview you about those communications?

A Usually within a day.

Q Did you provide any documents or evidence to the FBI as part of these interviews?

A We mentioned two memory sticks, so I provided those to the FBI.

Q Okay. Did you provide any other documents or evidence other than two memory sticks?

A On a couple of occasions I had written up my notes. And I don't recall whether I gave them copies or showed them, but I may have given them copies.

Q Okay. And these notes, were they contemporaneous with your meetings or calls with Mr. Steele?

A I didn't generally write note -- well, yes. But when I met with Chris Steele or Glenn Simpson I did not take notes during the meeting, so I would have written something after.

Ms. Shen. Okay. All right. Thank you. And I think we're out of time for this round, so we'll take a short break. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Mr. Parmiter. Let's go back on the record.

Mr. Meadows.

Mr. Meadows. Mr. Ohr, thank you for your testimony. I guess

I'm going to just try to ask some clarifying questions because my good friend, Mr. Gowdy, is a prosecutor and an attorney, and I guess some of this stuff I'm just scratching my head to figure out why it would have happened this way.

So for the record, you said Sally Yates did not know, to your knowledge, that you were involved in coordinating with the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. That's right, to my knowledge.

Mr. Meadows. Are there other types of investigations that you've been involved with where you didn't inform those that you reported to?

Mr. Ohr. When I'm working on -- when I was working on cases, of course, I would inform my superiors on the cases.

Mr. Meadows. Right. But she was your superior, so why would you have not informed her of you working, it seemed like, multiple times on this particular investigative matter with the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I wasn't serving as an investigator or prosecutor on that case. I was simply getting source lead information.

Mr. Meadows. So did you get any of that information -- were you paid on official DOJ time while you got the information?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. I think it's overall part of my job, but it wasn't a case, so --

Mr. Meadows. So you're saying it was part of your job to do it, but it was not part of your job to inform your supervisors?

Mr. Ohr. I thought the information --

Mr. Meadows. Because I have a hard time with that. I think most of the American people would have a hard time. Why would Bruce Ohr independently engage 60-plus times with Christopher Steele, through text messages or phone calls or personal meetings, and not inform anybody at DOJ?

Mr. Ohr. Well, first of all, I did inform some people at DOJ --

Mr. Meadows. So who did you inform?

Mr. Ohr. -- in the criminal division. But what I would --

Mr. Meadows. So who did you inform? Who did you inform at DOJ?

Mr. Ohr. The people I mentioned, some people in the criminal division, Bruce Swartz, Zainab Ahmad, Andrew Weissman.

Mr. Meadows. So why would you have informed Bruce Swartz and not Sally Yates?

Mr. Ohr. My -- at the time my lead was this is source information, lead information. It's nothing that they can do anything with. It should be passed to the FBI for them to use it or not as they feel appropriate.

And it was obviously, you know, scary, inflammatory, however you want to characterize it, and I did not want -- I wanted to keep it in the career channels where agents would do whatever was appropriate with it and not make it part of a larger policy discussion.

Mr. Meadows. Well, so how do you reconcile that, wanting to

keep it in the proper channels, that you use this improper or unconventional channel to actually get this information to the FBI? Why would you be so concerned about protocol in one area and yet do something that, according to your previous testimony, you've never done since you were employed at DOJ since 1991, you've never acted in this way before, why would you have been so concerned about protocol in one area and not protocol in the other area?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I think as I said before, I have received information from different people about organized crime over the years, and in each case I've provided it to the FBI. Frankly, I don't think most of that got to the level where my superiors, you know, would have had any use for that information or had any, you know, anything they could do with the information.

So this wasn't the first time I had spoken directly to the FBI. That was a regular practice of mine to let the FBI know whatever I heard.

Mr. Meadows. Was it a regular practice in those previous examples that you're thinking of to let the people that you reported to know that you had received information?

Mr. Ohr. It's hard to characterize generally, but, you know --

Mr. Meadows. Well, you were remembering other instances that you were just sharing. So is it your typical habit to let your supervisor or those you report to know your professional activity?

Mr. Ohr. In general, yes.

Mr. Meadows. And so in this particular case, you believed because the information was that salacious or inflammatory, I guess, is what you were saying, and not necessarily, I guess, could not be used, I guess is your word, is that correct, could not be used? That's what you just said?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall exactly what I just said, but yeah, what -- I think maybe I misspoke. What I said is that I didn't think my superiors in the Deputy Attorney General's Office would be able to act on that information because they're not --

Mr. Meadows. But you could?

Mr. Ohr. I could pass it to the FBI --

Mr. Meadows. You could act on it, but they couldn't?

Mr. Ohr. I could pass it to the FBI. All they could do is pass it to the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me go a little bit further. So obviously this relationship that you had with the FBI matured as it got closer to the 2016 election and beyond. There were more contacts, wouldn't you --

Mr. Ohr. There were more contacts.

Mr. Meadows. So earlier in your testimony you talked about the fact that you had a personal relationship with Glenn Simpson that dated back, I think, several years, is what you said.

Mr. Ohr. I wouldn't necessarily call it personal, but, yes, I had met him several times over the years.

Mr. Meadows. All right. And so when, at what point did you reach out to Mr. Simpson as it relates to your wife's contract work?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I ever reached out to Glenn Simpson about my wife's work.

Mr. Meadows. So how did she get a contract with Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I know there was some sort of contact, but it wasn't by me.

Mr. Meadows. So you know about all of her helping write the dossier and do -- and give you this information, but you don't know how she got a contract? You mean a husband and wife -- she's getting paid -- how much did she get paid?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember exactly.

Mr. Meadows. Approximately?

Mr. Ohr. I don't even know. Any guess I would make would be wrong.

Mr. Meadows. So you can recall with specificity some of this other stuff, but you can't recall how much your wife got paid and how she got the job?

Mr. Ohr. Well, my wife was a Russia --

Mr. Meadows. I find that curious as a prosecutor how you would not remember those things.

Mr. Ohr. My wife is a Russia analyst. She's worked in the field for several years as well.

Mr. Meadows. I didn't ask about her credentials.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Meadows. How did she get a contract job with Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember who made the contact, whether she spoke with Glenn Simpson directly or whether there was another party or someone else involved. I just know it wasn't me.

Mr. Meadows. So when she came home and said, "Honey, I got a job with Glenn Simpson," what did you say?

Mr. Ohr. Oh, I'm sure we had a conversation at the time. I just can't remember now.

Mr. Meadows. Did you say there may be a conflict of interest if she's being -- if Glenn Simpson is being paid by the DNC or Hillary Clinton and I'm working for the Department of Justice? Could there potentially be a conflict? Did you say anything like that?

Mr. Ohr. Well, my wife started working for Glenn Simpson, doing -- a contractor for Fusion GPS in late 2015, and I don't believe it had anything to do with the campaign at that point.

Mr. Meadows. So she never talked about the campaign with you?

Mr. Ohr. Well, at some point I became aware that the topics she was researching had to do with the possible --

Mr. Meadows. When did you become aware?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall exactly.

Mr. Meadows. So when you became aware what was your conversation? Did you tell her that it created a problem for you because you were with the Department of Justice?

Mr. Ohr. I think she can work for the firm that has dealings with the DNC. I don't think that's --

Mr. Meadows. And you can investigate it -- while she's working for the firm that is hired by the DNC and you can be the source that leads information from that same group to the FBI? Do you not see a problem with that, Mr. Ohr?

Mr. Ohr. I can't --

Mr. Meadows. I mean, would you do it the same way if you had it to do over again, Mr. Ohr?

Mr. Ohr. That's hard to say. I was not part of the investigation. I did not have any kind of investigative --

Mr. Meadows. But you were part of the investigation. You coordinated with the FBI. You're part of the investigation.

Mr. Ohr. I -- as I saw it --

Mr. Meadows. Multiple times, according to your own testimony.

Mr. Ohr. As I saw it, I was receiving information that I passed to people who were working on the investigation, and they decided what to do with it. I don't know what they did with it. I don't know whether -- I don't know what investigations specifically were existing at the time. I didn't have any input or work on those investigations. I'm just providing

information --

Mr. Meadows. Well, hold on. I want to give you a chance to correct. You had no input into the investigation. Is that your sworn testimony here today?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I did. I was providing information that I knew to --

Mr. Meadows. So you gave no commentary on the validity of what the source told you or what you thought? You gave no commentary?

Mr. Ohr. I --

Mr. Meadows. Your 302s don't suggest that.

Mr. Ohr. No. I warned them that my wife work for Fusion GPS.

Mr. Meadows. When did you do that?

Mr. Ohr. When I first spoke with Mr. McCabe.

Mr. Meadows. In August of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, uh-huh.

Mr. Meadows. So in August of 2016 you tell Andy McCabe that you're concerned because your wife works for Fusion GPS and that's where you're getting the information?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. I wanted Mr. McCabe to know that there was a possible, you know -- that the --

Mr. Meadows. Conflict of interest --

Mr. Ohr. -- of interest or appearance thereof, yeah.

Mr. Meadows. So there's a possible conflict of interest in

August of 2016 before a FISA warrant is actually initiated?

Mr. Ohr. Well, first of all, let me --

Mr. Meadows. Is that correct?

Mr. Ohr. No, because what -- I think I did not mean to say conflict of interest. What I would say is that in evaluating any information that I transmitted to the FBI, I wanted the FBI to be aware of any possible bias --

Mr. Meadows. So you believe there was the possibility of bias?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. Okay. So there's a possibility of bias, and that would affect the credibility of this confidential human source or the information you got from them?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So when your conversations -- and so I assume that you had a conversation with Glenn Simpson sometime between July 30, when you met with Christopher Steele, and this August meeting?

Mr. Ohr. We must have reached out somehow to arrange the August meeting, but I don't think there was any substantive conversation.

Mr. Meadows. So text messages, maybe a phone call here or there to try to arrange it?

Mr. Ohr. Something to arrange the meeting, yes.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So you're the coordinating person

to bring an opposition research group together with the FBI. Why did it take Bruce Ohr? Why did it not take -- you know, why was it not Peter Strzok? Why was it not someone else? Why would it take someone with the Department of Justice to do that?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I know -- I don't know why Peter Strzok or someone else --

Mr. Meadows. Could it be because your wife worked with Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. Oh, you're saying that had nothing to do with it?

Mr. Ohr. No. I know Glenn Simpson separately. And Chris Steele had mentioned in July, I believe, that Glenn Simpson might be willing to talk to me, so yes.

Mr. Meadows. So why was Christopher Steele so interested in the 2016 Presidential election? From what I read he's from England. Why would he be so concerned and so against Donald Trump, the candidate, that he would want you to talk to Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. Chris Steele has, for a long time, been very concerned about Russian crime and corruption and what he sees as Russian malign acts around the world, in the U.S., U.K., and elsewhere. And if he had information that he believed showed that the Russian Government was acting in a hostile way to the United States, he wanted to get that information to me.

Mr. Meadows. So if he's real concerned about Russian intervention, why would you and Mr. Steele be talking about trying to make sure that Mr. Deripaska could get into the United States when the State Department didn't want him here? But you and Mr. Steele wanted to make sure that Mr. Deripaska got here. If he was concerned about Russian interference, why would you be doing that?

Mr. Ohr. First of all, I did not want Mr. Deripaska to come to the United States.

Mr. Meadows. Well, the emails exchanged suggest something very different.

Mr. Ohr. I respectfully disagree. I know Chris Steele --

Mr. Meadows. So why would Chris Steele then?

Mr. Ohr. I think Chris Steele --

Mr. Meadows. I mean, what did he convey to you?

Mr. Ohr. He conveyed, I believe, if I remember correctly, that there might be an opportunity to interview Mr. Deripaska.

Mr. Meadows. About what?

Mr. Ohr. About --

Mr. Meadows. Russia?

Mr. Ohr. -- all kinds of things.

Mr. Meadows. Trump?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. I don't know about Trump, but certainly about Russia.

Mr. Meadows. Well, you had multiple conversations about your

favorite business tycoon, which you say was Deripaska. It could have been Mr. Trump. But let's assume that you're correct on your assumption since you didn't really know. Is that correct? He didn't say I'm talking about my favorite business tycoon Deripaska?

Mr. Ohr. No. But we had conversations over the years about Mr. Deripaska.

Mr. Meadows. Well, not a whole lot, because I went back to look at the number of conversations. Your interactions with Mr. Steele on Mr. Deripaska had been limited prior to 2015. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Ohr. But it's been --

Mr. Meadows. No, for the record, is that correct?

Mr. Ohr. It is correct, but it's been brought up every time pretty much when he talk with me.

Mr. Meadows. So on the three times that you talked to him prior to 2015 about Deripaska he brought up -- he brought it up each time?

Mr. Ohr. Pretty much, yeah.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So the three times he brings up -- so every time he brings up Deripaska, in what context did he bring up Deripaska as it relates to Mr. Trump with you?

Mr. Ohr. Usually he was telling me that -- whether Deripaska had received some kind of an official visa, which could not be blocked by the State Department, and he would be coming to the

United States.

Mr. Meadows. Is it your understanding -- I have credible evidence that would suggest that your understanding is the FBI actually helped Mr. Deripaska figure out how to get here officially? Are you aware of any of those conversations where he would come as a business delegation with the U.N.?

Mr. Ohr. The -- I know the -- well--

Mr. Weinsheimer. Can we have a second?

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. So I'm aware that the FBI spoke with Mr. Deripaska on other occasions, but I don't know the specific topics they discussed.

Mr. Meadows. All right. Are you aware that the FBI spoke to Mr. Deripaska in September of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall specifically for 2016.

Mr. Meadows. Are you aware that based on some of your conversations -- go ahead.

Mr. Ohr. My apologies. 2016 I was not aware of that.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So you're not aware that there were any FBI involvement with Mr. Deripaska in September 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I don't. That's news to me.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me go on a little bit further because I guess I want to go back to where Mr. Gowdy was talking about in this December 20 conversation -- or text message where it says: Bruce has more information for us. Actually, I

think the redacted name under there is Joe for Joe Pientka.

So was Joe Pientka your go-between in December when you got additional information from either Christopher Steele or Glenn Simpson in getting it to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Joe Pientka, I believe, was my contact at that time, yeah.

Mr. Meadows. So he was your contact at that time?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. You have a meeting. You get information. You immediately go to Joe Pientka, who immediately goes to Peter Strzok. Are you aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. All right. Where did you assume that Joe Pientka would go with the information that you gave him?

Mr. Ohr. I didn't know.

Mr. Meadows. Still to this day, you do not know?

Mr. Ohr. Well, now from what you're telling me, it sounds like --

Mr. Meadows. No. No. Not based on me. Based on other things. You are unaware that there was a coordination between Joe Pientka and Peter Strzok or Lisa Page?

Mr. Ohr. I was --

Mr. Meadows. You're unaware of that?

Mr. Ohr. I was not aware of the specific roles that they were playing.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Meadows. Okay. Specifically, did Joe Pientka ever say that he was giving it to the people that he reported to, that he would take your information and get it to someone else?

Mr. Ohr. No. I think they just say thank you for the information, and then it disappears into the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. So if it just disappears in the FBI and you're not sure where it's going, why did you continue to be so aggressive after November 1 or thereabouts when Christopher Steele had been terminated by the FBI, in and around that particular time?

Why would you have continued on your conversations and intelligence gathering with Christopher Steele knowing that he had been terminated by the FBI and you were just getting information from that same source back to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. When I got a call from Chris Steele and he provided information, if it seemed like it was significant, I would provide it to the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. But he had been terminated by the FBI. In your previous testimony said you were aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. At some point I became aware he had been terminated. But nevertheless, when I receive information from Chris Steele I'm not going to sit on it. I've got to give it to the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. So why didn't you say, "Listen, Chris, you've been terminated. I'm at the Department of Justice. Why don't you

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

take this back to the FBI?" Why was that not happening? Was there an unofficial coordination that the FBI terminated and now they're recognizing you're this backdoor conduit to get them the information?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what they were thinking.

Mr. Meadows. I didn't ask you what they were thinking. What I am asking you, was there an unofficial back channel that was acknowledged by the FBI that they knew that you were the unofficial handler for Chris Steele after that termination?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know if you can characterize it that way. All I can say is, I would get calls from Chris Steele and I would pass it to the FBI.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me ask you a different question then. Did the FBI ever encourage you to reach out to try to get additional information from Chris Steele?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, there was one occasion.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So there was a coordination?

Mr. Ohr. On that --

Mr. Meadows. I mean, for you to say that you didn't know -- I mean, if they're reaching out to you then there is obviously this channel that has been at least unofficially acknowledged. If they're reaching out and they're saying, can you get Christopher Steele to do what?

Mr. Ohr. On one of the occasions when I talked to the FBI to tell them I got a call from Chris Steele, they said, oh, next time

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

you talk with him, can you ask him if he's willing to meet with us? And I conveyed that back to Chris Steele.

Mr. Meadows. After he had been terminated --

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Meadows. -- you got a -- the same FBI that terminated, that have told the American people that, oh, when we found out there was a credibility problem we terminated him, after that time you basically got a call from the FBI that said can you engage Mr. Steele again?

Mr. Ohr. Well, it wasn't a call. It was when I told them what I had heard.

Mr. Meadows. So it was in-person contact.

Mr. Ohr. They said, by the way, can you ask him if he'd be willing to talk with us, yes.

Mr. Meadows. All right. Were you aware or did your wife characterize or Glenn Simpson characterize anything that was on the two thumb drives that you were given? Did they give you kind of a contextual: What was in there?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I knew that the thumb drive my wife gave me contained her research for Fusion GPS. The thumb drive that Glenn Simpson gave me I immediately turned over to the FBI, but I think at the time I suspected it was the dossier and I --

Mr. Meadows. Did he characterize it? That's my question.

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. So he didn't say there's juicy stuff in here,

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

there's dirt in here, or this is important, you need to get it there, he just said, this is a thumb drive, give it to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah. He said that and then --

Mr. Meadows. Mr. Ohr. Mr. Ohr. Mr. Ohr.

Mr. Berman. Mr. Meadows, can he finish his answer?

Mr. Meadows. He can finish the answer, but at the same time I want to make sure that we're shooting straight here.

You're saying that Glenn Simpson gave you a thumb drive and didn't suggest what was on it or anything else and said give it to the FBI, and your curiosity was not piqued?

Mr. Ohr. I think I assumed it was the dossier, but he did not say that.

Mr. Meadows. Why did you assume it was the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. This was in December. The rest of the conversation had to do with additional information that he had gathered about the possible connections between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign, and he gives me a thumb drive. I think the natural assumption at that point -- I had not seen the dossier. I had heard there was such a thing as a dossier, but I hadn't seen it. So he gives me a thumb drive. I assumed this was the dossier.

Mr. Meadows. So he gives you the dossier or what you believed to be the dossier. How did you first become aware of the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall. It might have been in the press or

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

I don't remember.

Mr. Meadows. Well, so what you're saying is, is he gave you something that was already -- how could it be in the press, because I don't think it was printed until later, was it?

Mr. Ohr. It wasn't printed, but I think people were aware there was such a thing as a dossier. It just hadn't been printed. I don't recall, you know, specifically, but yeah.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me go back because your conversations -- I think Glenn Simpson has given sworn testimony that he never talked to you. And what you're saying under sworn testimony today is that indeed you've talked to Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I have talked to Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Meadows. And actually, is it true that Glenn Simpson called you on Inauguration Day, according to your notes, January 20 of 2017, says, I needed to talk to you. Did you talk to him on Inauguration Day? You take good notes, by the way.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Yes.

Mr. Meadows. I can't read your handwriting.

Mr. Ohr. Many defense counsel complained about my handwriting as well.

Yes, Glenn Simpson contacted me on or about January 20, yes.

Mr. Meadows. And what was that about?

Mr. Ohr. He was concerned that one of the sources, Chris Steele's sources, was going to be supposed and that would put the source in personal danger.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Meadows. And why was he concerned about that source being exposed?

Mr. Ohr. I think he was aware of some kind of article that was likely to come out in the next, you know, few days or something.

Mr. Meadows. So how would Glenn Simpson know that and the intel community and the Department of Justice and FBI not know that? I mean, what made Glenn Simpson so uniquely qualified to call you on Inauguration Day about a concern about a source being outed?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what his sources are.

Mr. Meadows. So you mean he must have talked to media. Did he share with you that he had talked to the media, that he was concerned about that? I mean, help me understand that conversation from January 20.

Mr. Ohr. He says something along the lines of, I -- there's going to be some reporting in the next few days that's going to -- could expose the source, and the source could be in personal danger.

Mr. Meadows. And so when he's talking about there's going to be some reporting, there was a lot of reporting that was going on. Did you find it just normal protocol that the Department of Justice and the FBI would still engage when there was a number of facts or at least allegations that continue to be shared in the press? Did you find that concerning? Where were you having these

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

one-on-one conversations and then reading about it in the press, did you find that concerning?

Mr. Ohr. Well, what I don't -- what I recall at the time is being very concerned, if someone's life was in danger, that we had to be able to respond to that.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So did you talk to Lisa Page, Peter Strzok, the deputy attorney general -- I mean deputy attorney director -- or assistant director -- and Joe Pientka about the FISA application?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. So your notes from November 21, where you got all of their names and you talk about FISA, what's that in reference to?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think I said FISA. I think I asked him if they had a prosecutor, and they said no, and that they might look at Manafort again. And I don't recall the other thing, but, yes. But I don't think there was any discussion of FISA.

Mr. Meadows. And so there was no discussion of FISA because Carter Page was really not the subject of your investigation?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what -- I mean, I wasn't part of any FISA investigation, so I don't know.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So help me reconcile two things. Earlier you said that all you did was got information, you passed it on. Just now you talked about that you actually had conversations between you and some of the other people as it

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

relates to, you know, how you prosecute or what you were going to do or who was going to be involved. So how extensive were those conversations?

Mr. Ohr. I believe this was the only time, and I did ask is there a prosecutor, yeah.

Mr. Meadows. Yeah. So if this was the only time, then why would your notes suggest on March 15 of 2017, why would your notes suggest that you had discussions about a special prosecutor?

Mr. Ohr. I would like to see the notes to be sure, but my recollection --

Mr. Meadows. Well, I can refresh your memory.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. But my recollection is that Chris Steele was concerned about queries from Congress or from special counsel or whoever that might expose his source's identity, and so he asked about that.

Mr. Meadows. Well, there was different notes about that, so let me refresh your memory.

You were concerned about a special counsel being able to ask questions in the U.K. that was your notes. That was your own individual notes.

Mr. Ohr. Right, that Chris Steele had asked something along the lines of can a special prosecutor ask questions --

Mr. Meadows. So why were you having discussions with Christopher Steele about a special prosecutor before one was ever appointed?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. It's just something --

Mr. Meadows. Because one wasn't appointed for another 2 months.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Meadows. So why were you having questions about prosecution with a special prosecutor with a source that you said all you were doing was taking the information and get it to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. I wrote down what Chris Steele asked about. I often could not answer his questions, and this was one of those times. He'd said, can a special prosecutor ask questions in the U.K., and I'm sure I've said something like I don't know but --

Mr. Meadows. Did you ever get back to him with that answer?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Meadows. And so you just let him ask the question and you never responded?

Mr. Ohr. I couldn't answer many of his questions.

Mr. Meadows. All right. So let me finish with this and I'll yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Your testimony earlier indicated you handled this differently than anything you've done in your career at the Department of Justice. I mean, it was like nails on a chalkboard to me. I heard it. I mean, you said that this was a unique circumstance.

And yet, it appears that there was, according to your testimony, there was either an implied or a confirmed relationship

between the FBI and you to get information from Chris Steele to them after he was terminated. Is that correct?

Mr. Ohr. The FBI -- it's correct to the extent that the FBI knew I was continuing to get contacted by Chris Steele and they had given me an agent to contact to provide -- to, you know, to forward the information, so --

Mr. Meadows. Yeah. But you're changing that a little bit because you did admit that they reached out to you. So there was this coordination that was happening. Obviously, you had conversations with Lisa Page and McCabe and some of them about prosecuting and how you would go about it. So there's actually more of a relationship there than perhaps I'm getting information because I happen to have a personal relationship with Christopher Steele.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. As we discussed earlier, as I said earlier, there was the one occasion where I did ask Lisa Page and Peter Strzok, do you have a prosecutor? And that's what they told me. I did not pass that information to anybody.

And on the one occasion in 2017, the FBI, when I reported to them, one of my conversations with Chris Steele, they said, can you ask him if he'd be willing to meet with us? So on those two occasions there was more conversation.

Mr. Meadows. Did Andy McCabe or Peter Strzok or Lisa Page ever talk to you about getting a special prosecutor involved after the election of 2016?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I don't think so, no. I don't have any recollection of that.

Mr. Meadows. So did they suggest that to Christopher Steele?

Mr. Ohr. Not that I know of.

Mr. Meadows. I guess, why did it come up? I mean, why would Christopher Steele ask that question when it is a fairly infrequent use in terms of the way that we prosecute things? Why did it have come up if it wasn't being discussed?

Mr. Weinsheimer. Just a second.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. Right. That's what I was going to say. So basically, I don't know what -- what I can say is that at various times it's clear to me that Chris Steele is not an expert in the U.S. judicial system. So he would sometimes ask things that didn't quite, you know -- weren't obvious. But beyond -- or, you know, where it didn't quite make sense about the U.S. judicial system. But in this case, I don't know what -- I don't know why he asked that question.

Mr. Meadows. Did Chris Steele get paid by the Department of Justice?

Mr. Ohr. My understanding is that for a time he was a source for the FBI, a paid source.

Mr. Meadows. I'll yield to my good friend, Mr. Ratcliffe.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Mr. Ohr, I want to follow up on the issue of the authority or permission that you had to be engaging with

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Christopher Steele. I know you have been asked about this by Mr. Gowdy and Mr. Meadows, but I have to cover this again because I'm really trying to establish what the Department of Justice knew and what the FBI knew as it relates to the FISA process.

I know that you weren't involved in the actual FISA applications, but what the FBI and the Department of Justice knew through you is important.

And so you've been asked a couple of questions about this engagement and you've several times said that you thought it was part of your job to get and pass along source information. And I think you're relating that, is it fair to say, that you didn't really think you needed authority or permission, that it was just part of your job that allowed you to do that?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And you said you had done it a number of other times in other cases?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Had you ever done it in any other cases where your wife was involved?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall my wife being involved in any of these other cases.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. But isn't that what makes this case different, is that you're passing along information where you know that your wife is involved and you know that your wife is being compensated for her involvement, correct?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. So that is -- yes. And that is why I began, when I first spoke to the FBI about this, to emphasize my wife is working for Fusion GPS.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And I get that, and I'm going to get to that in terms of how you explained that. But there are a number of us who used to work at the Department of Justice. I'm trying to understand your mindset for the Sally Yates issue and what she knew and when she knew it.

You know that there are rules against being involved in cases where you get a financial benefit.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And there are requirements and obligations that prosecutors have if those circumstances arise.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And what are those obligations?

Mr. Ohr. If you're -- if I was working on the case, I would probably have to get off the case.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And as it relates to getting a financial benefit?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I mean, my wife can work for whoever she works for, but I can't work on a case where she's getting a financial benefit.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Right. And so in this case she was getting a financial benefit?

Mr. Ohr. Right. But I wasn't working on the case.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ratcliffe. Other than to be part of the chain of custody of evidence, is your testimony.

Mr. Ohr. I passed along the information I got.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. Well, we don't -- you know, the facts will speak for themselves with respect to this.

Mr. Ohr. Sure.

Mr. Ratcliffe. But you were asked a question about how much your wife was paid. You said you weren't sure. This \$44,000, does that sound approximately correct?

Mr. Ohr. That could be, but I don't know as I sit here.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. If money that your wife was paid for her work on this case, would ultimately you benefit from that financially? In other words, do you have shared accounts?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, we do.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Did you ever file financial disclosures reflecting that you received financial benefits as it pertained to your wife Nellie Ohr on a matter before the Department of Justice?

Mr. Ohr. Not that I received. I filed the public financial disclosure reports regularly. I did not report that I was receiving money in connection with a matter I was working on because, in my mind, I'm not.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do others think that that was an incorrect assumption on your part?

Mr. Weinsheimer. I don't think he's able to answer what

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

others --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Well, are there actions that have been taken by the Department of Justice or any of its investigating arms with respect to the disclosures, the financial disclosures, as it pertains to Nellie Ohr's work?

Mr. Weinsheimer. Hang on 1 second.

Mr. Ohr. As far as I know, no.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And I'm not -- I'm trying to understand this. I'm not trying to embarrass you. But it's been publicly reported that you've been demoted from different positions. Is that an accurate public reporting?

Mr. Ohr. I've been moved twice since December, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Just briefly give me the circumstances and the timing of the moves. Because at the relevant time period here, again, I think you've been clear, you were the ADAG or the associate deputy attorney general, correct?

Mr. Ohr. I was an ADAG, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Yeah. And so you have had two position changes since then.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. So in December of 2017 I was told that there were going to be articles relating to my conversations with Chris Steele in the press, and they were going to move me out of the Office of Deputy Attorney General but retain me as the director of the -- of OCDETF.

They gave two reasons. One was they said I had not given

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

them timely notice of my conversations with Chris Steele; and the other one they said was that they were planning to change the structure of the Department anyway because I was a component head and -- as far as the only component head who was sitting in the Office of Deputy Attorney General. So as part of the broader reorganization of the department, they had planned to move me out of the Deputy Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. That's the first one.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. And then in January or at end of December, I don't remember the exact date, but right around there, I was informed that the Attorney General and the deputy attorney general did not want me in a position where I would be having contact with the White House as part of my general -- as part of my work. And because OCDEF did have contact with the White House, and particularly the National Security Council, on organized crime policy, they were going to move me into the criminal division.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. So with respect to the first move in December of 2017, you said they said you weren't giving timely notice of your communications with Christopher Steele. Who was "they"?

Mr. Ohr. I was informed by Scott Schools and Jim Crowell in the Deputy Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. And then in January of 2018 when you were told that the AG and the deputy AG did not want you in that position, which at that point, depending on at what point

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the -- just for the record, who was the AG and who was the deputy AG at that point?

Mr. Ohr. Oh, that was Attorney General Sessions and Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So getting back to the issue that I mentioned regarding what the Department of Justice knew and what the FBI knew, you're not sure what Sally Yates knows -- knew about your involvement. You just said you hadn't told her anything about that.

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. But you've identified at the Department of Justice folks as early as August of 2016 or folks at the Department of Justice and the FBI being aware of your involvement. At the Department of Justice, Mr. Swartz, Mr. Weissman, and the third name I didn't get. Zainab?

Mr. Ohr. Ahmad, Ms. Ahmad.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Ahmad. Can you spell that for me?

Mr. Ohr. I think it's A-h-m-a-d, but I'm not sure.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And the first name was Zainab, did you say?

Mr. Ohr. Zainab. I believe that's Z-a-i-n-a-b.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. And over at the FBI, the folks that you have identified, obviously you met with Andy McCabe, Lisa Page, Peter Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ratcliffe. Who else?

Mr. Ohr. Joe Pientka.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Joe Pientka. So, again, so the record is clear with respect to what the Department of Justice and the FBI knew about your involvement, those are the folks that were aware as of August of 2016 that you had an involvement with Christopher Steele?

Mr. Weinsheimer. Hang on a second.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. Those are the people that I knew that I had told. I had told them, of course, at different times, as I mentioned before. I had met with Mr. McCabe and Lisa Page very early on, and then later I had met with the larger group of people that you named. And, in fact, Mr. Pientka I don't think I met with until November.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Well, so -- and I'm not holding you to a specific date, but you said shortly after your meeting with Christopher Steele you called Andy McCabe, is what you said?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And you believe within a few weeks or some short period of time, you estimated probably in August, that you met with Mr. McCabe, Ms. Page --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. -- and Peter Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe Peter was there. I don't recall.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

I don't think so.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And when you say there, that was at -- was it at --

Mr. Ohr. Mr. McCabe's office.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Mr. McCabe's office, okay. All right.

And so with respect to the Department of Justice, what is your best recollection of when Mr. Swartz, Mr. Weissman, and Ms. Ahmad --

Mr. Ohr. Ahmad, yeah. I don't recall exactly. I don't recall exactly. I --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you know if it was around the same timeframe as Mr. McCabe and Ms. Page?

Mr. Ohr. It may not all have been at the same time.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Is it fair to say it would have been at least in the summer or early fall of 2016?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Yes, I think so. Yes. Uh-huh.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And what were your contacts with Mr. Swartz, Mr. Weissman, and Ms. Ahmad?

Mr. Ohr. I remember mentioning this to Bruce Swartz. And because Ms. Ahmad worked closely with him she may have been present. And then at some point I had a conversation with the two of them and with Mr. Weissman. And I don't remember if that's the same meeting that Peter Strzok and Lisa Page were at. It could have been, but I don't recall specifically.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. And would those meetings have taken

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

place at Main Justice?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. There's reference into your notes about a meeting in September of 2016 at Perkins Coie?

Mr. Ohr. That doesn't ring a bell. I'm sorry.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Are you aware of a meeting with -- was there a meeting with Glenn Simpson, Fusion GPS, Mr. Steele, and others that you were involved with?

Mr. Ohr. I met once with Chris Steele in September when he came to town, but it was just him and me, just two of us, yeah. I don't believe I had any meetings with any of these other folks.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. Well, the reason I'm trying to -- again, and you're aware of this even though you weren't involved in the FISA -- the process, you know that ultimately that FBI and the Department of Justice, as has been publicly reported, filed verified applications to get a warrant to surveil an American citizen, Carter Page. You're aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. From the press, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. From the press. And you're aware that occurred the first time on October 21 of 2016? I'll let the -- you may not be aware of the date.

Mr. Ohr. Not aware of the date.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I'll represent to you that that was the date.

But you know as a prosecutor that when you make those verifications and the folks on behalf of the FBI and the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Department of Justice that do so, they have to verify that the information in a FISA application has been thoroughly vetted and confirmed. We've talked a little bit about that. You had no role with respect to that. I think there are real questions whether or not that was done.

But the other obligation that we know that we had or you continue to have as a Federal prosecutors is to make a full disclosure of material facts, correct?

[12:19 p.m.]

Mr. Ohr. As part of the FISA application?

Mr. Ratcliffe. As a part of any -- as a part of any application to a Federal court.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. You're supposed to tell the court material facts.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Material facts. Okay. And that's really what I'm trying to get at, is to establish the material facts that we can agree the FBI and the Department of Justice knew as of October the 21st of 2016. Again, I know you weren't involved in the process other than to give them some of this information.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So at that point, and through the folks that we've mentioned at the FBI and the Department of Justice, they were aware that -- they were aware of the relationship between you and Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson, correct?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. The people we've discussed.

Mr. Ratcliffe. The people we discussed. They were also aware of the relationship between Nellie Ohr and Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Weinsheimer. One second.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Uh-huh.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. I believe that I told the people that we've discussed about my wife's work, yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ratcliffe. And if you did, then they would have known that your wife was being compensated in part for contributions to what we've referred to as the Steele dossier?

Mr. Ohr. Well, just to be careful about that, my wife was researching various entities who are some of the same people mentioned in the dossier.

My understanding of the dossier, and I didn't look at it that carefully, but it seems to be reports from Chris Steele to Fusion GPS.

So I don't think my wife's information, as far as I knew, was reported in those specific reports. It was certainly provided to Fusion, which had both Chris Steele's reports and my wife's research.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you recall telling the FBI during any of your interviews as reflected in 302s that your wife was working on the Steele dossier and providing information?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall specifically what I said, but --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you think she was?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think so. I think she was working on the same topic, so you could say in a broader sense maybe. But the dossier itself, as far as I know, and I could be wrong, but those appear to be Chris Steele's reports, not Fusion GPS.

Mr. Ratcliffe. To be clear, your wife was compensated for information that she was providing to Fusion GPS and Christopher Steele.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what information from my wife was given to Christopher Steele. I know she was giving it to Fusion GPS, obviously.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Right. Was the FBI and the Department of Justice also aware of media contacts between Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Weinsheimer. One second.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. I mean, I don't have specific information on that, no.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay.

So, again, going back to the Sally Yates issue, is it your testimony that at some point in time as you were sitting down with the FBI for the purpose of talking to them about information that you were helping to coordinate from Christopher Steele that you shouldn't have advised or didn't advise Sally Yates about the fact that you were being interviewed for that purpose?

Mr. Ohr. I did not inform Sally Yates that I was talking to the FBI and that I was receiving information from Chris Steele. That's correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. My question is, did you have the thought that it might be a good idea to let my boss know that I'm being interviewed by the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. It was -- my thought at the time was I should get this to the career people who would work on it, but that was my

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

thought.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Do you know whether Sally Yates actually -- are you aware of the fact that Sally Yates actually signed off on two different verified applications in the FISA process as it relates to Carter Page?

Mr. Ohr. I've seen that in the press.

Mr. Ratcliffe. We've talked about the relevant facts that the FBI and the Department of Justice was aware of. Were they also -- one that I didn't ask you about -- they were also aware of Mr. Steele's bias against Donald Trump, were they not?

Mr. Ohr. I provided information to the FBI when I thought Christopher Steele was, as I said, desperate that Trump not be elected. So, yes, of course, I provided that to the FBI.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes. And so were the Department of Justice and THE FBI also aware of Glenn Simpson's bias against Donald Trump?

Mr. Ohr. I certainly told the FBI that Fusion GPS was working with -- doing opposition research on Donald Trump.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. So, again, so the record is clear, what the Department of Justice and the FBI was aware of prior to the first FISA application was your relationship with Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson, your wife's relationship with Christopher Steele and Glenn Simpson, Mr. Steele's bias against Donald Trump, Mr. Simpson's bias against Donald Trump, your wife's compensation for work for Glenn Simpson and Fusion GPS, correct?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Weinsheimer. Can I have a second?

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. Ohr. Right. So just, again, to reiterate, when I spoke with the FBI, I told them my wife was working for Fusion GPS. I told them Fusion GPS was doing research on Donald Trump. You know, I don't know if I used the term opposition research, but certainly that was my -- what I tried to convey to them.

I told them this is the information I had gotten from Chris Steele. At some point, and I don't remember exactly when, I don't think it was the first conversation, I told them that Chris Steele was desperate that Donald Trump not get elected.

So those are all facts that I provided to the FBI.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And you provided -- you said because you wanted to make sure -- first you said you thought there might be a conflict of interest and then you changed that and said, well, I didn't mean conflict of interest, I just wanted to make sure that they were aware of the possibility of bias as it related to those facts, correct?

Mr. Ohr. In case there is any concern that there might be any kind of bias or anything like that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So that the FBI and the Department of Justice had the opportunity, if they were going to file a FISA application, to say, the central piece of evidence that we're submitting, this dossier, just so you know, the associate deputy attorney general was involved in this respect and his wife was

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

involved in this respect, so they would have the opportunity to decide what material facts related to that information and provide it to a court.

Mr. Ohr. Right. Again, I can't answer what they were putting into the FISA. I was providing it to them for whatever purpose.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Right. But we've agreed that those are material facts that you provided and they could have provided. You don't know whether or not they provided that information to the FISA court or not.

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. But they should have.

Mr. Weinsheimer. I don't think he can answer that.

Mr. Ohr. I can't answer that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Well, I want to make -- part of the reason I'm also trying to make this record real clear is there's someone that's been appointed to look at potential FISA abuse, United States Attorney John Huber. Have you talked to Mr. Huber?

Mr. Ohr. I have not. I mean, I have spoken with Mr. Huber in the past when he was a U.S. attorney, but I have not spoken with him as part of this.

Mr. Meadows. One little cleanup. You had mentioned that your interaction with Joe Pientka did not start until November of 2016, earlier in the questioning from Mr. Ratcliffe. Is that correct?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I think that's right. I think I was introduced to him in November.

Mr. Meadows. So you would have been introduced to him after he was terminated -- Christopher Steele's relationship with the FBI was terminated?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember exactly when Christopher Steele's relationship with the FBI was terminated?

Mr. Meadows. Well, I'm representing that Christopher Steele's relationship was terminated on or about the 1st of November, so you would have been introduced to Mr. Pientka after that time.

Mr. Ohr. I believe I was introduced to Mr. Pientka around November 21.

Mr. Meadows. Okay. Thank you. Yield back.

Let me ask you one other question, because in some of your notes you referred to some inquiries as it related to Christopher Steele with a Cleta Mitchell as it related to the NRA. What did he represent that Ms. Mitchell was involved with?

Mr. Ohr. I may be wrong, but I think my recollection is that Glenn Simpson mentioned Cleta Mitchell, not Chris Steele, but I may be wrong about that.

Mr. Meadows. And it could be. In what context? Because she hadn't been on the board for the NRA for a number of years, so it would have been very old news at that point.

Mr. Ohr. I didn't know who Cleta Mitchell was. What I

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

was -- I believe what -- and I think it was Glenn Simpson mentioned to me was that Cleta Mitchell became aware of money moving through the NRA or something like that from Russia. And I don't remember the exact circumstances. And that she was upset about it, but the election was over. I seem to remember that from my notes.

Mr. Meadows. So in your conversations with Mr. Simpson did you verify the veracity of that allegation?

Mr. Ohr. I was just taking the information. I wasn't -- you know, so I don't remember asking followup questions on that.

Mr. Meadows. And he said he knew that how?

Mr. Ohr. I don't --

Mr. Meadows. How did he find out about Cleta Mitchell?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think he said.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Mr. Ohr, the reason I hesitated before is I don't want to start, my time is about to expire and I want to start a new topic. I'll leave it for the next hour. But it relates to your interviews with the FBI.

And just so that I'm clear and can be thinking about this, it's my understanding -- I have seen that you sat down with the FBI on 12 different occasions, or I have seen 302s that relate to 12 different interviews that you gave between November 22 of 2016 and May 15 of 2017.

My only question for you right now is, did you have interviews with the FBI regarding these matters after May 15 of

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

2017.

Mr. Ohr. I believe I did.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Were those with the FBI or were they part of the special counsel investigation?

Mr. Ohr. The agent I talked with was not part of the special counsel team.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Okay. Any reason -- well, you're not the one that produced those. I'll save that question for the folks that can answer why I haven't seen those 302s.

I think our time has expired.

[Recess.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q The time is 12:44 p.m.

So I'd like to just turn back to the roles you may or may not have played in the investigations we're talking about, just to be absolutely clear.

So, first of all, because our joint investigation is presumably about the FBI's investigation into Secretary Clinton's private emails and potential disparate treatment with the FBI's handling of the Trump-Russia collusion investigation, I will ask, did you have any involvement in the Clinton email investigation?

A No.

Q And to what extent were you ever involved in the Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A I was not involved. I simply provided the information

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

as I've discussed.

Q And were you ever involved in the broader investigation of Russian attempts to interfere with the U.S. election?

A No.

Q Did your portfolio at the Department of Justice have any purview over any of these investigations that I've mentioned?

A No.

Q And were there other individuals at DOJ who did in fact have portfolios of purview over these investigations?

A Yeah.

Q Were there other Department of Justice officials whose portfolios did in fact have purview over these investigations?

A Yes.

Q So last round I think I got a little confused because, I think, as you just said, you did not have any involvement with the Trump-Russia collusion investigation. However, I think there's some dispute about that. You did talk about how you gave information and then provided input that ultimately became part of the work of the investigation.

Can you just like help us understand, clarify exactly what the difference is? Because there's, I imagine, that in the FBI and the Department of Justice there's a core investigative team, that people are considered members on the team, people who are considered, quote, you know, involved, and then there are many other current officials in government who nonetheless have

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

conversations with members of that team. I'm sure some were substantive and I'm sure some have to do with, you know, the nature of the underlying investigation or even specific evidence and facts as part of that investigation.

But can you just sort of outline the boundaries of what constitutes being involved on the team versus not involved, but may have, you know, had a conversation or played a role or been meeting-related?

A So, I mean, I think I've tried to explain what I did in connection with this investigation. I was not investigating the case. I wasn't responsible for the investigation. I was not working as a prosecutor on the case. I didn't make any kind of decisions or prepare any pleadings or anything like that. I provided the information that I've discussed.

Q Okay. So did the FBI provide updates to you or keep you apprised of the progress of the Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A No.

Q So you had no substantive role or oversight responsibilities in the Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A That's correct. And to be clear, though, the one time I did I ask them, is there a prosecutor assigned to the case, and they told me no.

Q Were you involved in any way in the decision to initiate the counterintelligence operation relating to Russian contacts

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

with individuals in the Trump campaign?

A No.

Q Were you aware of the FBI's decision to initiate the Trump-Russia collusion investigation at the time?

A No, I don't think so.

Q And overall you were not involved in the Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A Correct.

Q And have you ever been a decisionmaker for matters pertaining to the FBI's Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A No.

Q Again, we discussed this a little bit, I guess, a few rounds ago now, but I believe there was a November 26 meeting in which you attended with Peter Strzok, Lisa Page, and some DOJ criminal -- does that sound right -- or a late 2016 meeting?

A There was a meeting on November 21, I believe my notes reflect, with Peter Strzok, Lisa Page, and Joe Pientka.

Q Okay. And was that meeting the first time that you had met Peter Strzok?

A I think I may have met Peter Strzok on one earlier occasion when we had the meeting with the criminal division officials.

Q Okay. And can you just remind me when was that?

A I don't recall exactly.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Was that the meeting in McCabe's office?

A No. I had the first meeting with McCabe in August, and the meeting with the criminal division officials and Peter Strzok and Lisa Page, I think that was in -- I think it was -- it may have been, I don't know, it was in the fall some time, I think, but prior to November 21.

Q But this other meeting, this prior meeting where you first met Peter Strzok, that was also in 2016?

A Yes.

Q So, again, I think you've already answered this question a couple times in broad strokes, but just to be clear, were you involved in the October 2016 FISA application for surveillance on Carter Page?

A No.

Q Did you have any role in drafting or reviewing the Carter Page FISA application?

A No.

Q Were you part of the decisionmaking chain of command for the Page FISA application?

A No.

Q Were you part of the approval process for the Page FISA application?

A No.

Q Were you aware of the Page FISA application at the time?

A No.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Were you involved in any of the subsequent renewals of the Page FISA application?

A No.

Q Were you involved in any of the FISA applications -- were you involved in any of the other FISA applications related to the Trump-Russia collusion investigation?

A No.

Q And were you ever involved with Special Counsel Mueller's investigation?

A No.

Q And to reiterate, you were never part of the FBI's Trump-Russia collusion counterintelligence investigation?

A Correct.

Ms. Shen. Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So I just want to help clarify some of the discussion about your contacts with the FBI, because as it's been presented in the previous hour and in certain media outlets, it's been presented as improper or nefarious.

So just to start generally, do you believe your communications with Mr. Steele were somehow improper?

A No.

Q Can you explain why?

A I received information from Chris Steele which I thought could be important and I passed that to the FBI. I think that

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

anybody could do that, and I don't think that's improper.

Q Do you believe you were acting appropriately in deciding to report Mr. Steele's -- communications with Mr. Steele to the FBI?

A Yes, I do.

Q And you had said it earlier, because of national security concerns, right?

A That's right.

Q Do you believe it was improper or inappropriate for the FBI to accept this information?

A No, I think it was proper for them to accept it.

Q Are you familiar with any Department of Justice protocol that requires DOJ employees -- any protocol related to DOJ employees sharing information with law enforcement officials outside of the scope of their official duties? Is there any protocol in place?

A I'm not aware of anything like that.

Q Are you aware of any protocols for when Department employees observe or receive criminal or counterintelligence tips?

A No.

Q So is there like a -- you know, with ordinary citizens, right, there's a hotline where you can call to report suspected criminal activity or terrorism or suspected terrorism activity to the FBI. Does such a process exist for DOJ employees or do you essentially act like an ordinary citizen in that case?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A I think we basically act like an ordinary citizen in that case.

Q So, in effect, you're expected to report that information in a manner similar to how non-DOJ employees who want to report tips to law enforcement, specifically FBI, as far as you can understand?

A As far as I can understand, yeah.

Q Would you characterize this information Mr. Steele was sharing with you as something similar to a tip or was it a fully formed report?

A These were leads.

Q Leads?

A Yeah.

Q Okay. And did the information, as far as you could understand it from what he described to you, was it more counterintelligence related or more criminal?

A That's part of the problem, is it's both.

Q Okay. And, again, to reiterate, you are not a counterintelligence official?

A Correct.

Q So counterintelligence information, even if it's mixed up in a criminal matter, would be outside the scope of your official duties?

A Correct.

Q So given that you're not a counterintelligence official

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

and you don't act in that capacity in an official sense, it made -- do you believe it made sense to report that information through your normal chain of command or the FBI?

A I believed it was proper to report it to the FBI.

Q Is it -- and I think you've said this now a couple of times -- but is it fair to say that any communication you had with Mr. Steele that involved substantive counterintelligence matters you immediately shared with the FBI?

A I shared -- when I received information from Chris Steele in the end of July, I reported it to the FBI, I don't know exactly how often, how quickly, but within a couple weeks, I think. When I received more information in September, again, I think I reported it to the FBI, I don't remember if it was immediately but within a couple weeks. Once I had a regular contact at the FBI, I think I reported those either the same or the next day after that.

Q So just to make sure, you're not aware of any policy or protocol at the Department that you were violating when having these -- at the time when you had these conversations with the FBI?

A That's correct.

Q All right. So it was brought up in the previous hour, and you testified to this, to some extent to this fact, how you provided information to the FBI but not necessarily to certain Department of Justice officials. And I want to clarify the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

difference between your supervisors who were in the political track versus the career track.

Are you aware of -- so to be clear, when you said you did not report it to your supervisors, did you mean the politicals, as in Deputy Attorney General Yates, or did you mean within the career track?

A Deputy Attorney General Yates.

Q So that would be on the political track?

A Yes. I believe, just to be clear, I think at that point as a component head my superiors were all on the political side, so yes.

Q Gotcha.

Are you aware of any Department of Justice rule that requires its employees to inform DOJ political leadership when you provide information to law enforcement that's outside the scope of your duties, official duties?

A I'm not aware of any such policy.

Q So arguably this would include any leads or tips that apply to counterintelligence or criminal matters?

A I'm not aware of any policy along those lines.

Q Are you aware of any Department of Justice policy that would have required you to inform anyone at the Department, political or career, about your interviews with the FBI?

A No, not that I'm aware of, no.

Q Are you aware -- actually, I may have asked this

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

already -- but are you aware of any Department of Justice rules that require you to inform anyone at the Department, political or career, of your communications with Mr. Steele?

A No.

Q So, again, so it's fair to say that you were not aware that were you violating any Department of Justice policy --

A Correct.

Q -- at the time?

You stated that Deputy Attorney General Yates was not aware of your communications with Mr. Steele or your interviews. Was any other Obama DOJ political appointee aware of your communications with Mr. Steele?

A I am not aware of any political official knowing of my communications.

Q Or your interviews with the FBI?

A Right.

Q Do you believe it would have been appropriate to share what is in effect a counterintelligence criminal tip related to an FBI investigation with a political appointee?

A No. I mean, I think all I can say is I made the decision at the time to inform career people and that's what I did.

Q And before I jump into the next subject, there has been some focus on, you know, why when Mr. Steele shared this information, like, why you didn't cross-examine him or why you

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

didn't follow through.

Is it safe to -- is it fair to characterize that it's the FBI's job to investigate and verify the credibility of a source or leads information and not necessarily you as a private citizen providing that? Like that is why they are there?

A That's part of their job certainly, yes.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So, again, at the time you did in fact inform some DOJ criminal division career employees about your communication with Mr. Steele and your communications with the FBI. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q However, at the same time you did not inform any of your superiors who all happened to be political appointees or any other political appointees. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Can you explain why you made the decision to inform certain career Department employees but not any political Department employees?

A I wanted the information to be given to the career employees who would be able to evaluate the information and do any necessary followup, because it was still source leads information.

Q But aren't there certain Department political employees who also have substantive portfolios in that area? In the same vein, wouldn't you think they would be interested to know that information, too?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A They might have been interested. I really can't speculate.

Q But you -- I mean, it appears to me, I don't know if it's a coincidence, but you drew a line at career employees versus political, or is that a mischaracterization?

A Right. But I think more -- what I was trying to do was get it to the officials who were working on this kind of information.

Q Uh-huh.

A So I didn't just call any career person, I called people who understood and dealt with these kinds of Russian matters, Russian organized crime matters.

Q But, again, like the most senior career employee that was informed, at some level above them was a political appointee. Did you have any specific thoughts as to why it was important to inform the career level but not that one political level above it?

A Beyond saying I wanted to keep it in career channels and not make it political or not have it treated in a political way, that's all I can say.

Q So was it important to you to keep it in career channels?

A I thought it was appropriate that career officials would be the ones dealing with the information.

Q What would be your concern if it did end up in political channels?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A You know, all I can say is that the information was, you know, leads, source information, it's not the kind of information that higher-ups used to determine policy or make decisions. It's a very raw end of the case.

And so just like the FBI probably would not report up to the top of the Department all the leads they were getting from people out in the outside. I felt this should go to the people who were going to be looking at it.

Ms. Shen. Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Before I turn it back over to Val, I want to kind of go through the timeline of events that has occurred since this news broke of your communications with Mr. Steele and the impact that it's had at your position at DOJ. I know it was touched upon a little bit, but I couldn't write my notes fast enough, so I wanted to make sure I have the exact date, times, names, correct.

When were you removed -- when were you reassigned from the position of associate deputy attorney general?

A I believe it was early December of 2017.

Q And at that time you were still the head of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force?

A That's correct.

Q When were you reassigned from that position?

A End of December, beginning of January of this year.  
January of this year.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q 2018?

A Yes.

Q And you mentioned that the Department provided a couple of explanations as to why those reassignments occurred. So for the -- from the early December 2017 reassignment, the reasons they gave were?

A December 2017, yeah, so end of 2017.

Q Right. I'm sorry.

A Yes.

Q The reasons they gave for that reassignment, the first?

A Two reasons. One was they said I had not given them sufficiently and timely notice of my conversations with Chris Steele. And, secondly, that they were planning a reorganization of the Department where none of the component heads would be sitting within the Deputy Attorney General's Office.

Q And who are the names of the two individuals who gave you that explanation.

A Scott Schools and Jim Crowell.

Q How do you spell that?

A C-r-o-w-e-l-l.

Q Was that a meeting? Was that in writing? Was that --

A That was a meeting.

Q Did they provide you anything in writing?

A I think there's a thing you sign acknowledging the transfer, something like that. But the reasons were not written

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

down.

Q Did they cite any DOJ policy with regards to the timely notice requirement or regulation?

A As I said, I think there's some sort of thing that you sign whether you accept the transfer immediately or whether you want 2 weeks or something like that. So there's some kind of form. But that's what I remember. I don't remember if it's called a timely --

Q No, no, I mean with regard to their explanation.

A No, they didn't cite anything specific.

Q So they didn't give -- so they weren't able to identify specific violations of policy or misconduct? They weren't able to refer back to a specific DOJ policy?

A Right. Right.

Q I'm sorry. Let me --

A They did not cite any reg to me or anything like that.

Q Okay. So that was for the December 2017?

A Right.

Q Now, for January 2018?

A Yes.

Q Who were the individuals involved?

A It was Scott Schools, and I don't remember if someone else was in the room. There may have been another member of ODAG, but I'm not sure. And I was told at this time that the Attorney General or the deputy attorney general did not want me in a

position where I would be having contact with the White House.

Q Was this a meeting or was this in writing?

A It was a meeting.

Q And was it again a form where you sign acknowledging the transfer or did they provide anything else?

A Just a form acknowledging the transfer.

Q Did they offer an explanation as why you couldn't have contact with the White House, why they didn't want you in that type of position? Did they offer details?

A They did not provide any additional details.

Q Did the DAGs at any point speak with you directly?

A No.

Q Prior to this are you -- sorry.

Ms. Shen. Oh, just in either of these two meetings with Scott Schools and the other individuals, were there subsequent communications on this topic after these two meetings?

Mr. Ohr. Nothing substantive. There may have been paperwork kind of -- I don't remember if there was any other forms to sign or anything like that, but, no, I don't think so.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Are you aware of any other -- prior to this instance -- any complaints about your substantive performance or the quality of your work prior to December 2017?

A No.

Q Are you aware of the decision either in December 2017 or

January 2018 based on a report by the Office of Professional Responsibility?

A No.

Q Are you aware of any OPR complaint filed against you?

A No.

Q Are you aware of any -- again, referencing both December 2017 and January 2018 -- are you aware if the decision was based upon an opinion provided by the Department's ethics office?

A No.

Q Are you aware of any appeals process for when someone is reassigned or demoted, however you would like to refer to it?

A I am not aware of any -- I don't know what the yes or no on that, but I did not seek to appeal any of those decisions.

Q Did they advise you at the time? Did they say, like, "Oh, you have this option, do you acknowledge it"?

A They might have. I don't recall.

Q Have you at any point been approached by the Department's Inspector General's Office regarding your contacts with Mr. Steele?

A Yes.

Q If you can, share approximately when that occurred? I won't pry into the details of it.

A I think it was in July --

Q Of this year?

A -- of this year.

Q And have you fully cooperated with his request?

A Yes.

Q To the best of your --

A Yes.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So just going back to your first meeting with Mr. Schools and Mr. Crowell, I believe, you said one of the bases or the two bases was not providing a timely -- sufficiently timely notice of your communications with Mr. Steele. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

Q And did they provide an explanation of what would have been a sufficiently timely notice?

A No.

Q Did you ask about the basis or what that meant for them directly at the time?

A I don't believe so.

Ms. Hariharan. Did they offer an example?

Mr. Ohr. No.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So sitting here today do you know what they meant, I mean what could you have done differently to avoid not having -- to avoid having provided the insufficiently timely notice, given that there's no rule or regulation that they cited?

A Right. I don't have a specific understanding, but I assume if I had told them months before that might have been different.

Q Are you familiar with any other cases where career civil servant Department employees have been reassigned on the basis of not providing timely notice for a communication that is not

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

contained in a Department policy or regulation?

A I don't, as I sit here, I don't -- I can't think of any particular examples.

Q So such a basis is not some kind of common administrative action that you're familiar with?

A I really couldn't say.

Mr. Hariharan. Are you aware of any prior case where a Department career civil servant has been reassigned without a written justification?

Mr. Ohr. Again, I don't know.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q During each of these meetings were -- how were those meetings set up? How did you know to go to these meetings? Did someone call you to reach out to set up the meeting?

A Yes.

Q Who was that person?

A In the first meeting it was one of the administrative people in the Office of Deputy Attorney General, I don't remember who. And the second time it may have been -- I don't recall exactly. I got some kind of a call asking me to come down. I don't remember who made the call.

Q And what was the timeframe between the reaching out to set up the meeting and the actual meeting taking place in both instances?

A In the first case it was only a few minutes. The second

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

case, I was no longer sitting in the Main Justice building. I don't recall exactly how long it was, but it wouldn't have been very long.

Q So within the day?

A Probably, yes.

Q And so prior to that reaching out and asking you to come down -- I'm talking about the first meeting now and asking you to come down in a few minutes to have the meeting with the ODAG officials, did you have any prior communication on the topic of your reassignment?

A No, not on the topic of my reassignment. No.

Q So when you received this communication, did you -- did the communication from the -- I'm sorry -- the administrative official indicate what the purpose of the meeting was?

A No.

Q What about in the second meeting when you had a call, did that call indicate what the purpose of that meeting was?

A I don't recall.

Q So is it fair to say that when you were told that you were going to be reassigned to this meeting, that it came as a bit of a surprise to you?

A Yes.

Q Do you recall anything that you said in response during that meeting -- those meetings?

A Not at the first meeting. At the second meeting I think

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

I said, okay, but I would need a little time to let the folks at OCDEF know. So I said, I don't want to do it today.

And one of the options was 2 weeks or something like that. So I think I said I wanted -- whatever the time period was, a few days or a couple weeks, I asked for that and they said fine.

Q And so in terms of asking for a few days or a couple weeks, does that mean asking for time before it becomes effective. Is that correct?

A Right.

Q So in the first instance then -- I'm sorry, I'm jumping back and forth -- in the December 2017 meeting about the associate deputy attorney general title, what was the timeframe between the meeting and when that reassignment became effective?

A I think that was immediate.

Q Immediate. Okay.

A I didn't ask for any time there.

Q Because there was not as much of a practical day-to-day difference?

A Correct.

Q Okay. But in your capacity as the director of OCDEF, what work were you engaged in at the time? Was there a specific project or --

A Well, mainly, I just wanted to make sure I had a chance to say goodbye to the folks at OCDEF and the network of prosecutors and agents around the country.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q When your reassignment from director of OCDEF took place, who took over your duties at that point?

A I don't know.

Q So you're not aware of someone that the Department had talked to to ensure a smooth transition of your duties?

A Well, okay, let me just -- the first time I don't know. For the second meeting when I left OCDEF, my deputy took over as the acting director. So at that time there was -- I knew who was doing it.

Q Were you the one that informed your OCDEF team of your reassignment or were --

A Yes.

Q Was there any kind of larger Department notice or email sent out announcing your reassignment?

A I sent an email out to the OCDEF community.

Q But there wasn't a separate email from, like, an HR Department or the ODAG's office sending out a notice regarding your reassignment?

A I don't recall anything like that.

Q So, Mr. Ohr, I don't want to put you in -- I'm not trying to put you in an awkward position. At the same time, I personally think it's very concerning -- what you've told me concerns me personally a lot. The way that this was handled, it doesn't sound typical to me. You know, I work on a committee that has jurisdiction over Federal civil service employees, Title 5

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

employees. We have an understanding of what due process protections, and we take those very seriously.

You know, I'm not actually a subject matter expert on all of these procedures or the Department's procedures. You know, that being said, I feel like I have to ask you, do you feel like that your process with your reassignments was handled in accordance with all the due process you think --

Mr. Weinsheimer. I'm not sure that this is relevant to your investigation. I let this go on for a long time. It's a long day and you've spent a lot of time having very specific questions, and we're now really getting into specific personnel matters, and I don't think it's appropriate for him to answer that question.

Ms. Shen. Well, in all fairness, the specific personnel matters that we're discussing, I think the facts establish, have a direct causal relationship to the very core of the larger investigation and many other questions that have been asked and will be continued to be asked. I don't think I'll be the only one to discuss this issue. In fact, I was not even the first one to raise it, it was folks in the other round who did.

So I think this is a pretty natural -- and I can promise you, since this is going to be the last question, I think it's a pretty natural ending to the overarching discussion that both I and people across the aisle have been having.

Mr. Weinsheimer. But you've asked him about his reaction to a personnel matter. You've gotten all the facts you need in terms

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

of whatever is the relevance of the personnel matter. What his opinion of that personnel matter I don't think is relevant.

And he may have certain rights or he may have certain options in terms of what he wants to do. I don't think his reaction to what's happened so far is relevant to your investigation.

Ms. Shen. Okay. Well, then can I be permitted to ask a few factual questions that's related to this topic?

Mr. Weinsheimer. I've allowed to you ask all sorts of factual questions.

Ms. Shen. Okay. Well, then I will ask -- then I'll ask a couple more.

So, Mr. Ohr, in light of what you've told us, do you have any plans to pursue a personnel action in relation to the Department's handling of your position?

Mr. Weinsheimer. Can I just interrupt for a second?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[1:19 p.m.]

Mr. Ohr. So I understand what you're asking, but I think all I can really say, to be honest, is I'm a Department of Justice employee. I did not seek to appeal any of these actions. I don't know, I can't say what I'm going to do in the future. But I didn't seek any kind of appeal.

Ms. Hariharan. Okay. So earlier this month, a columnist for The Hill reported that you were discussing with Christopher Steele the possibility of reengaging him with both the FBI and the Special Counsel's Office, and I know it was brought up in the previous hour. So we will introduce the article as exhibit 4. I'll give you a second to quickly review it.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 4

Was marked for identification.]

Mr. Berman. Pages 4 through 7 are not the article, just so you know.

Ms. Hariharan. Yes. They're attachments within the article.

Mr. Ohr. Okay.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Can you describe how soon after, again, to the best of your knowledge, with regards to when Mr. Steele was officially terminated as a paid confidential human source for the FBI, how soon after that he was attempting to reengage with the FBI or the Special Counsel's Office in an official capacity?

A Well, the conversations or the texts that are reported

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

on in this article all follow the FBI asking me to ask Chris if he would be willing to meet with them again.

I conveyed that to Chris Steele. He conveyed back to me that he was interested.

Then there is a period of time, which I think is reflected in these texts, where the reengagement had not happened and Chris is asking: What's happening, what's going on? And so I said, I'll convey this, but that's all I could say.

Q Does it speak to Mr. Steele's credibility as a source or as a point of access to various source networks for accurate and potentially credible information that the FBI would consider reengaging with him as a --

A It's kind of speculation, I think, on my part. I mean, clearly the FBI was the one that asked to reengage.

Q And, again, we're just trying to clarify sort of why that may have been the case.

Is it consistent with your understanding that Mr. Steele's sources were still providing him information relevant to the question of Russian interference or Russian collusion or just broader Russian activities in the United States?

A I think --

Q That's part of the reason he was reaching out to you, part of the reason perhaps the FBI would want to reach out to him?

A At some point, as reflected in some of these texts, Chris Steele is indicating he has additional information. It's

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

not clear to me whether that had to do with the, quote, special counsel's investigation or what, you know, but -- and so I didn't know specifically, you know, where it would fit in, if anywhere.

He does reference the special counsel, but, again, I don't know if that has, you know -- if that's right or what, whether he just conflated the FBI and the special counsel. I don't know.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 5

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So since you've mentioned it a few times and it's also linked in within the article itself, we'd like to introduce as exhibit No. 5 the text messages that are labeled HPSCI 3-23-18-DOJ-27 through DOJ-30, which are law enforcement sensitive documents that were leaked to the press at a previous date.

These text messages, they're from March 30, 2017, through November 27, 2017, between you and Mr. Steele. And if you could turn to page 2, Mr. Steele, writes, quote, "we are frustrated with how long this reengagement with the Bureau and Mueller is taking. There are some new perishable operational opportunities we do not want to miss out on," end quote.

Then again on the third page, for November 18, 2017, he wrote, quote, "I am presuming you've heard nothing back from your SC colleagues on the issue you kindly put to them for me. We have heard nothing from them either. To say this is disappointing would be an understatement," end quote.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Would it be fair to say that Mr. Steele was having a difficult time communicating with both the FBI and the Special Counsel's Office outside of his communications with you, in your understanding, in your recollection from these messages?

A He is expressing frustration that he is not in contact with the FBI and the Special Counsel's Office.

Q Now, I'm not sure how familiar you are with some of the what I would characterize as conspiracy theories that have floated around, based on these text messages, and not only your communications with Mr. Steele but his attempted communications with the Special Counsel Office or the FBI.

In your opinion, is Mr. Steele's attempt to reengage with the special counsel or the FBI evidence of a secret conspiracy between those parties?

A I think the communications speak for themselves. He's trying to reestablish contact and it's not happening.

Q Do you know if he ended up being successful in reengaging with the FBI or the Special Counsel's Office?

A At some point during 2017 Chris Steele did speak with somebody from the FBI, but I don't know who.

Q You wouldn't happen to remember when?

A Not as I sit here, no.

Q And would you even be in a position to know that information, since you're not involved in the investigation?

A The only reason why I say this is that at some point

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Chris Steele told me that he had met with somebody from the FBI.

Q Do you know why he was -- Mr. Steele was so eager to reengage with the FBI or the special counsel?

A I only know from the information he gave here that he thought there were some additional opportunities. We did have a conversation at some point during this time period where he provided some information about what kind of opportunity, and I passed that along to the FBI.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So just to go back to -- I think from these text messages, you know, it appears that he's trying to engage or through you maybe try to contact the FBI again. Is that accurate? As in this was not his first attempted outreach, but that there had been some level of back-and-forth with the FBI and him already.

A Well, it's tough to say, because these text messages cover a period of several months. And at some point during this time, the FBI did speak with Chris Steele, according to what Chris Steele reported. And he had obviously had contact with the FBI back in 2016. So, in that sense, yes, he's trying to get back in touch with the FBI.

Q So in late 2016, I believe someone represented it to be around the November timeframe, Mr. Steele's formal status as an FBI confidential human source was terminated. Subsequently, 6 months later, he's attempting to reengage with the FBI.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Why do you think the FBI would be -- I'm sorry, let me rephrase. Do you have any insight as to why Mr. Steele believed that the FBI would nonetheless be receptive?

A Well, as these notes reflect -- well, maybe they're not explicit, but as I had mentioned before, at some point, and it looks like from these notes around May of 2017, the FBI had asked me to ask Chris if he would meet with them again.

Q When the FBI asked you to ask Mr. Steele to reengage, did they provide any commentary as to why they were asking you to do so?

A No.

Q So when the FBI had asked you to engage with Chris Steele, were they specific as to whether they wanted to establish, again, a formal relationship as a confidential human source versus just have some level of contact again?

A I think they said they wanted to talk with him. That's, I think, all they said.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q There has been a lot of conversation not only in this interview today but in our previous interviews as part of this joint investigation with relation to confidential human sources.

Are you familiar with the Department of Justice policy against revealing information from confidential human sources during an ongoing criminal investigation?

A I know that the Department attempts to keep confidential

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

human source information confidential.

Q And why does that policy exist?

A If we reveal this information, it will make people not want to tell us in the future, and because in an investigation we may be acting on confidential human source information and revealing that information prematurely could, you know, damage our investigative efforts.

Q So could disclosing the identity of a confidential human source then create a risk to that person or their source networks?

A Yes, of course.

Q And would that in any way -- in your experience, how would -- how could disclosing the identity of a confidential human source compromise our national security, the national security investigations or criminal investigations?

A When a source's name is outed, that could put the source at risk. It could prevent future attempts by the source to gather information on behalf of U.S. law enforcement.

There are a lot of ways that could damage ongoing cases, as well as the broader policy of trying to recruit sources to give information to law enforcement.

Q If you could turn back to exhibit 5, which was the text messages. And I'd like to turn your attention to page 3, where on October 26, 2017, Mr. Steele wrote to you, quote, "Can we have a word tomorrow, please? Just seen a story in the media about the Bureau handing over docs to Congress about my work and

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

relationship with them. Very concerned about this. People's lives may be endangered," end quote.

So in my understanding of this, Mr. Steele appears to be concerned that the production of documents to Congress could potentially endanger the lives of active sources or source networks. Is that consistent with your understanding?

A Yes.

Q How did you react to Mr. Steele's concerns at that time?

A I think we had a conversation.

Q Did you agree in his assessment that lives could potentially be at risk, source lives?

A I wanted to hear what he had to say, but, as I've said before, if sources are identified in public, then there could -- people's lives could be in danger.

Q In your experience as an organized crime, transnational crime prosecutor, would you be concerned if Congress began requesting personal identifying information related to confidential human sources, their methods, their networks? Would that be of a concern to you?

A Speaking in general, yes.

Q Do you believe that the Department has legitimate concerns that providing that information to Congress would, in turn, place those sources at risk?

Mr. Weinsheimer. Just to be clear, Mr. Ohr can speak on behalf of himself.

Ms. Hariharan. Yes, I'm sorry.

In your opinion.

Mr. Ohr. In my opinion, yes.

Ms. Hariharan. Okay.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So given the nature of protecting confidential human sources or protecting any kind of classified or sensitive information, you know, I think there's sort of -- in my mind, there's obviously just straight-up saying details, names, descriptions, and like that, but there's also, you know, contextual information that could potentially help someone else identify a source. And it's often much more difficult to know what to protect in that example. Would you agree?

A If I understand your question correctly, the identity of the source could be put at risk in ways other than the straight revealing of their name or other identifying information, yes.

Q Right. So I think often, you know, there are people who don't necessarily understand that the information that they're seeking or might be talking about could be placing or could be an identifying piece of information, because it may not be obvious on its face.

But certain things, like dates of meetings or, you know, number of sources at given points of time, or locations of meetings, you know, in your experience, is that the kind of thing that is also protected because, you know, contextually it could

lead to someone piecing together a puzzle and identifying a source?

A Yes. Almost -- a lot of information relating to contacts with a source is sensitive, because it could be used to help identify a source.

Q And so when in an open setting someone is asking for information about, say, the number of contacts a law enforcement official has with a source or how many meetings they had with a source or when they first met the source, would those be examples of types of information that, in your opinion, should be protected?

A I think, from the law enforcement point of view, we would want to be careful about any information about sources being made public.

Ms. Shen. Okay. Thank you.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Going back to your time as a line prosecutor, did you utilize information or confidential human sources in your cases, understanding that you are not on the investigative side, you're on the prosecution side?

A Yes.

Q Now, was that information from these sources consistently accurate or did it vary from source to source?

A Not only from source to source, but different information from the same source might be more or less credible,

depending on the circumstance.

Q As part of the process, the investigative side would have gone through and corroborated, if they could, any of the information provided by the sources before you even dreamed of using it?

A Part of the job of an agent is to try to flesh out source information and corroborate it and use that information as lead information to generate other information and evidence that could be useful in an investigation and prosecution.

Q And that happens in almost -- in every case that may or may not use a confidential source or material provided by them, correct?

A It's pretty common.

Q So, understanding that, the information provided by Mr. Steele, at one time an official confidential human source and then as a lead or conduit for that kind of information, the investigative side of the shop, i.e., the FBI, would have taken the time to go through and verify or corroborate what they could of the information that he -- that you provided via him?

A This is our standard procedure. What they did with it I don't know.

Q But, generally speaking, that is the standard procedure for dealing with those types of leads and that type of information?

A Yes.

Q How -- you may have described this a little bit -- but how valuable -- again, going back to your time as a line prosecutor -- how valuable were these sources to your ability to successfully prosecute all manner of organized crime individuals?

A Source information is very important to Federal law enforcement, particularly in the organized crime and drug areas.

Ms. Hariharan. In that case, I think we're done for our hour.

Mr. Ohr. Thank you.

Ms. Hariharan. We should take a lunch break. We are off the record at 1:39. We'll break for lunch.

[Recess.]

[2:21 p.m.]

Mr. Parmiter. Let's go back on the record. The time is 2:21.

Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Jordan. Thank you.

Mr. Ohr, why did they pick you? That's what I'm trying to figure out. Why did Fusion and Mr. Steele -- let's just focus on Mr. Steele. Why did he come to you? If he's, as you said, if he's already being paid by the FBI, going directly to the FBI, meeting with the FBI, why did he need to talk to you?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know specifically why he reached out to me.

Mr. Jordan. Tell me when you first met Christopher Steele.

Mr. Ohr. I met him in 2007.

Mr. Jordan. Where at?

Mr. Ohr. At a meeting. At that time he was still working for the British Government, their intelligence service. And I was in London for meetings on Russian organized crime.

The FBI office in our Embassy in London set up a meeting with our British Government counterparts on Russian organized crime. It took place at Christopher Steele's building, and he was there and there were other members of different British Government agencies there.

Mr. Jordan. So our government and their government set up a meeting, and you both were at that meeting and you met there.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Between '07 and '16 -- so when was your first meeting with Christopher Steele relative to our subject today? When was that, '16?

Mr. Ohr. That was July 30 of 2016.

Mr. Jordan. The meeting that's been talked about already?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So July 30, 2016. Between 2007, when you first met Mr. Steele in Great Britain, and July 30, 2016, did you meet with Mr. Steele any time between those dates?

Mr. Ohr. I did on occasion. I don't remember exactly how many times, but a few times.

Mr. Jordan. A few times. Under 10, more than 10?

Mr. Ohr. Probably under 10.

Mr. Jordan. Under 10? Was it also in like a conference-type setting, or was it some individual meetings?

Mr. Ohr. Some of both. There was at least one time I saw him in a conference-like setting, and then there were some meetings where either I or I and an FBI agent met with him.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. The July 30 meeting with Mr. Steele, prior to that what was your most recent meeting with Mr. Steele on a different subject prior to the July 30, 2016, meeting?

Mr. Ohr. We had some -- we did not meet earlier that year that I recall. We had met either the year or 2 before that.

Mr. Jordan. So then 1 or 2 years prior --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. -- was your most recent meeting before the subject matter which we're discussing today?

Mr. Ohr. I believe that is correct.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Were you curious why all of a sudden you hadn't talked to him in, say, 2 years, why he wanted to get together with you now on this subject matter?

Mr. Ohr. Well, he didn't explain the subject matter ahead of time. It was -- over our -- over the years he had occasionally called when he was coming into town. So we agreed to meet for breakfast.

And when he -- when we met then he provided the information that I've described earlier. So I think I was in a little bit of shock at that point.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. When you meet on July 30, was your -- refresh my memory, we may have went over this -- was your wife at that meeting as well?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, she was.

Mr. Jordan. She was at that meeting. And did Mr. Steele know that your wife was working for Fusion?

Mr. Ohr. I'm not sure. Probably, but I don't recall right now.

Mr. Jordan. And he gives you this information.

What did he give you, actually? Did you just talk?

Mr. Ohr. We just talked.

Mr. Jordan. So no documents were exchanged there, no memory

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

stick, nothing, no substantive other than just a conversation?

Mr. Ohr. That is correct.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And was it just the three of you, Mr. Steele, your wife, and you?

Mr. Ohr. There was an associate of Mr. Steele's there as well, another gentleman, younger fellow. I didn't catch his name.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So that's the first time I knew that. Okay. So there was a fourth individual there, but he also -- he worked for Mr. Steele?

Mr. Ohr. I believe so, yes.

Mr. Jordan. All right.

Who contacted you first? Well, let me back up.

Tell me when you first met Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Ohr. I met Glenn Simpson several years ago. I don't recall the exact date.

Mr. Jordan. Several years ago meaning? Can you give me -- 2007, like Mr. Steele, or more recent than that?

Mr. Ohr. It might -- it's several -- I mean, probably -- I don't know. Definitely more than 5 years before, but I don't recall.

Mr. Jordan. Five years earlier.

Mr. Ohr. Yes, at least that, maybe 10 years earlier.

Mr. Jordan. I think you said earlier today, sometime this morning, that you met with Glenn Simpson twice in person. You had some conversations with him on the phone, it looks like some email

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

exchanges. But you met twice in person in 2016. Is that right?

Mr. Ohr. That is my recollection.

Mr. Jordan. Once was August and once was December?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. So August 2016. What was your most recent meeting prior to that August 2016 meeting with Glenn Simpson -- before this subject matter on August 2016, what was your most recent meeting prior to that?

Mr. Ohr. You know, I don't recall. It probably was at least a few years before.

Mr. Jordan. Just like Mr. Steele, at least a couple years earlier?

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And tell me about this first meeting with Mr. Simpson again.

Mr. Ohr. This happened around August 22. I believe, if I remember from looking at my notes -- I don't have a specific recollection of the date -- when I had spoken with Chris Steele, I think he indicated that Glenn might be available to meet. Or maybe that was in an email. And I don't recall how the August 22 meeting was set up, whether I reached out for Glenn Simpson or whether he reached out for me.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And what did you discuss exactly, again, at this meeting?

Mr. Ohr. He provided some additional information. And the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

only reason I'm hesitating is I don't know exactly what he said as opposed to what Steele said.

Mr. Jordan. Just give me 1 second. I apologize. Additional information. So was the meeting on August 22 -- so you have the meeting on July 30 with Christopher Steele --

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. -- and your wife. That's the first time you had met with him in a couple years.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Twenty-two days later, you're meeting with Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Was your wife at that meeting?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Was anyone else at that meeting?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe so.

Mr. Jordan. So the two of you. And you said additional information. So was the 22nd, August 22 meeting with Glenn Simpson building on information you learned from the July 30 meeting with Christopher Steele?

Mr. Ohr. That was my understanding.

Mr. Jordan. That was your understanding. Were there any meetings with either Steele or Simpson -- obviously not Simpson, because you said this was your first one -- any meetings with Steele or anyone else between the 30th and the 22nd about this

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

subject?

Mr. Ohr. Not that I recall.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So those are the first two meetings on what we've been talking about --

Mr. Ohr. I believe so.

Mr. Jordan. -- with the two principal -- well, with Mr. Steele and Mr. Simpson. All right.

Go back to the 30th meeting now. I know we're jumping back and forth. Go back to Steele. What exactly did he convey at the July 30 meeting?

Mr. Ohr. As I mentioned before, there were three primary items of information.

Mr. Jordan. Let me just go find those in my notes, because I remember you saying that. I want to make sure I have it.

You talked about Mr. Page. You talked about the statement he had made, Donald Trump over a barrel, and a gentleman named Hauser. Is that right?

Mr. Ohr. That's right.

Mr. Jordan. Those three pieces of information.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. And you -- we'll get to the next meeting in August when you go, because there was a meeting in between those when you went to meet Mr. McCabe and Mr. Strzok and Ms. Page, right?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I believe what happened after that first

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

July -- well, first of all, can I step back for a moment, because I think you may not have been in the room.

In the July 30 meeting, Chris Steele also mentioned something about the doping -- you know, one of the doping scandals. And he also mentioned, I believe -- and, again, this is based on my review of my notes -- that he had provided Mr. Gaeta with two reports, but that Glenn had all reports. So, okay, so there's that. Then --

Mr. Jordan. I'm just trying to get the chronology. There's a July 30 meeting. There's an August 22 meeting. July 30 is with Mr. Steele and your wife and some associate of Mr. Steele. The August 22 meeting is just you and Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. In between those two meetings --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- I thought you said you met with Mr. McCabe --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- Ms. Page, and Mr. Strzok.

Mr. Ohr. No. What I met with -- what I did after the July 30 meeting is I reached out for Andy McCabe and asked to meet with him.

Mr. Jordan. Right.

Mr. Ohr. He said -- you know, there was a certain time we set up. I went over there to talk with him and Lisa Page was there. I did not know she was going to be there. I do not

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

believe that Peter Strzok was there at that meeting.

Mr. Jordan. But Page and McCabe were. And that meeting took place sometime between the 30th of July of 2016 and the 22nd of August 2016.

Mr. Ohr. To the best of my recollection. I don't have a date for that meeting.

Mr. Jordan. And when did you learn, in these three meetings in those 22 days, when did you learn that Mr. Steele was being paid, as you said earlier, paid by the FBI and actually providing information to them directly?

Mr. Ohr. I had known years prior to that that Chris Steele had an informant relationship, was a paid informant with the FBI.

Mr. Jordan. So you knew it at the time. When you first met him on the 30th, you knew he was already --

Mr. Ohr. He already had a relationship.

Mr. Jordan. You knew that?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Did he talk about that at all? Did he talk about what he was giving to the FBI? Did he talk about his meetings with the FBI in your July 30 meeting?

Mr. Ohr. The only thing I recall him mentioning is that he had provided two of his reports to Special Agent Gaeta.

Mr. Jordan. So the same information he gave you, did he tell you he had given that directly to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know what he told the FBI.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. After he gave you this information, did you -- I'm just curious how you're thinking -- did you step back and say, well, why does he want to talk to me if he's a paid informant and he can give it directly? Why the go-between? Why not just like go say, if he told you three sentences and then two other pieces of information about the doping scandal, whatever, three other sentences, why didn't he just tell it directly to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. He may well have. I don't know what -- you know, he had a relationship with the FBI at that time. He may well have provided that information to the FBI. I didn't know.

Mr. Jordan. Why did he need to say it twice, is what I'm asking.

Mr. Ohr. He and I had spoken from time to time over the years and --

Mr. Jordan. What I'm trying to figure out is why did they need you.

Mr. Ohr. I don't -- I don't know what --

Mr. Jordan. I don't see how they -- I mean, if Christopher Steele is a paid informant of the FBI and he's this source who's credible, he's been working with the FBI, as you said, for a long time, you knew he was a paid informant, why did he need to talk to you --

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. -- to give the same darn information?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. All right. So the timeline is, again, the 30th you meet with Steele. Sometime between the 30th and the 22nd of August you meet with McCabe and Page. And then we're to the meeting on the 22nd with Glenn Simpson.

Tell me -- again, go back. How did you first meet Glenn Simpson? How did you guys first meet? You said you met Steele at an organized crime event or some forum in Great Britain. How did you first meet Simpson, again?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall specifically. It may have been at some kind of conference or something, but I don't recall specifically. I knew he was interested in Russian organized crime, that was the nature of our prior contacts, but I don't recall the specifics.

Mr. Jordan. When did your wife first meet Glenn Simpson? And when did your wife first -- when was her employment -- when did her employment start with Fusion?

Mr. Ohr. I believe she knew Glenn Simpson for several years as well, because he was interested in Russian organized crime. My wife was a Russia analyst. And so I think they met.

I recall at least one conference or meeting, I believe it was at the Department of Justice, not Main Justice but one of our offices, where different speakers were there to talk about some aspect of Russian organized crime. And I believe Glenn Simpson was there and my wife was there. And I don't know if they knew

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

each other before then or not. So that's what I remember about them meeting, was certainly some time ago.

She started, had signed on as an independent contractor with Fusion GPS I believe in late 2015.

Mr. Jordan. And, again, and I think you've talked about this earlier, why was she hired?

Mr. Ohr. To do research on Russian -- Russian or Russia-connected individuals and companies.

Mr. Jordan. And build on that. Research. I mean, that's pretty broad. Do research on Russia, I mean, that's, you know -- was she hired specifically for the dossier as well, or was that one and the same when you say research on Russia?

Mr. Ohr. I believe her initial assignments had nothing to do with Chris Steele or with the Trump campaign or anything. I think she was just given other assignments.

Mr. Jordan. When you met with Mr. Steele on July 30, did he know your wife was working for Fusion?

Mr. Ohr. Again, I'm not sure. I'm guessing -- well, I shouldn't guess. I'm not sure. He may have.

Mr. Jordan. Did Mr. Steele know that you knew Mr. Simpson, and did Mr. Simpson know that you knew Mr. Steele?

Mr. Ohr. I believe so, yes.

Mr. Jordan. How about this memory stick on December 12 that you got from Glenn Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. Sorry, what's the question about that?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. The memory stick you got on December 10 of 2016, what can you tell me about that? Do you know anything that was -- you got a memory stick on the 10th of December.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Yes. So, as I think I may have mentioned earlier, Glenn Simpson wanted to meet in early December, whatever date that was in December.

At that meeting, he provided me with a memory stick and provided some additional details on information about possible connections between the Russian Government and the Trump campaign. And he did not at that time explain specifically what was on the memory stick, but my guess at the time was that this was the dossier.

Mr. Jordan. You did handwritten notes. There was a long --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. There's a long one that has a similar date.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. It's the same date.

Mr. Ohr. I believe so, yes.

Mr. Jordan. Is that -- and the very first thing is, Glenn gave me a memory stick.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. All right. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, I am.

Mr. Jordan. It looks like three or four pages, maybe five.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Was that a recap of what you thought was on the memory stick?

Mr. Ohr. No. It was a recap of our conversation.

Mr. Jordan. Is your conversation, though, what you assumed was on the memory stick or what you were told was on the memory stick?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I don't think he explicitly told me it was the dossier, but I think I assumed that. And the additional information he gave, he didn't indicate whether it was in the dossier or not.

Mr. Jordan. All right. When you -- did you ever give information -- or did you ever give anything to -- information or any document or any memory stick or any type of -- anything tangible to Mr. Steele or Mr. Simpson in your meetings with them?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. How about when you met with Mr. McCabe and Ms. Page between these two meetings, did you give them notes that you had taken? Was there anything in writing you gave to Andy McCabe and Lisa Page?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe so, no.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Let's move to --

Mr. Issa. Before you go on, he said he thought at the time it was the dossier. How did he know there was a dossier? When did he learn of the existence of a dossier?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall exactly when I learned of the existence of the dossier. I think prior to this meeting I was

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

aware there was such a thing. I had not seen it. And I don't know if I even knew the word "dossier" at the time or just Chris Steele reports or something. I don't recall whether I, you know, knew that term.

And I don't recall exactly why, whether -- I don't recall exactly why I assumed that that was the dossier, but either prior -- one of the conversations with Chris Steele prior to that time, I might have, you know, been -- made me expect that Glenn might give me the dossier. I don't recall exactly.

But at that time, being aware that there was something like that in existence and then being given a memory stick by Glenn Simpson, I think that's what I assumed was on there.

Mr. Jordan. You met with Glenn Simpson in person twice. How many times did you meet with Christopher Steele in person?

Mr. Ohr. I believe just the two times, the July 30 and then sometime in September.

Mr. Jordan. And each of them gave you -- I think you said earlier each of them gave you a memory stick?

Mr. Ohr. No. Glenn Simpson gave me a memory stick in December. The other memory stick we have discussed before this was at some point, and it may have been in the fall of 2016, my wife gave me a second memory stick or a first memory stick.

Mr. Jordan. And what did you do with that?

Mr. Ohr. I gave that --

Mr. Jordan. Both you gave to the FBI?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. The memory stick your wife gave you, when was that and what was on it?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall exactly when I got that from her, but my understanding at the time was that that represented her research into particular Russian figures on behalf of Fusion GPS.

Mr. Jordan. Was it before the election or after the election?

Mr. Ohr. You know, I'm afraid I can't recall.

Mr. Jordan. Who did you give it to, Mr. Pientka?

Mr. Ohr. I'm sorry?

Mr. Jordan. Did you give it to the guy, your handler, your agent, Mr. Pientka?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah. I believe I would have given it to Mr. Pientka, yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And you think -- but it was before the one -- do you think it was different than the memory stick Mr. Simpson gave you, the contents of it?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. You know that?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. But you think so?

Mr. Ohr. I think so, because I believe the memory stick that Mr. Simpson gave me was the reports from Chris Steele that are referred to as the dossier. And the memory stick that my wife

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

gave me was her research, through open sources, into the work that she had done for Fusion GPS.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. But you definitely got the memory stick from your wife prior to the one that you received in December from Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Ohr. I'm not sure. I think I said first a moment ago, but I'm not sure.

Mr. Jordan. Did you have discussions with your wife about this whole subject area?

Mr. Ohr. We had some conversations, sure.

Mr. Jordan. And can you tell me about some of the things that she may have related to you about this?

Mr. Ohr. Well --

Mr. Berman. Congressman, with the staff earlier we discussed the fact that Mr. Ohr wants to fully cooperate and answer fully every question that he can. We're trying to get him to answer all your questions, at the same time not testify directly to conversations he had with his wife, which are generally protected by privilege, although I recognize Congress takes a different view of privilege. He does want to answer your question.

Mr. Ohr. Okay. What I can tell you, I think, is that my understanding was when we met with Chris Steele on July 30 that that was -- the specific information he gave me was not known to my wife at the time.

After that, I can say that I think I certainly tried to keep

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

separate what I was getting from Chris Steele and from Glenn Simpson from any conversations with my wife.

She was specifically researching particular people. At some point, I became aware that she was looking at, among other people, Sergei Millian, which was one of the names that either Chris Steele or Glenn Simpson had given to me. I know she was researching these things.

In September of 2016, she ended her -- she stopped being a contractor with Fusion GPS and she went to work at VeriSign as a Russia cyber analyst. And at some point, I don't remember when specifically, she wanted to know or she was, you know, afraid that the -- was curious whether the FBI would want her -- results of her research. And she did -- and she provided that to me in the form -- and I said yes, and then she provided it in a memory stick.

Mr. Jordan. Shortly after she left the employment of Fusion, you said?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall when it was.

Mr. Jordan. But you said she left employment at Fusion in September of 2016.

Mr. Ohr. That I remember. I don't recall when she gave me the memory stick.

Mr. Jordan. Did you ever give her any information that you had learned from Mr. Steele or Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I certainly tried not to. I can't remember every

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

conversation we had, but I don't remember giving her any information.

Mr. Jordan. Was your wife aware of the conversations, the Skype meetings and the text messages and conversations you were having with Mr. Steele and Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I think she knew that I was having some contact with them, but aside from that one meeting that she was at on July 30, she wasn't --

Mr. Jordan. There is one note in here that says, I think Glenn sent this to the wrong person, he sent it to me, and she forwards it to you.

Mr. Ohr. Yes, uh-huh. So that's the -- I mean, yes. So that time -- so she was aware that Glenn Simpson was reaching out for me. We have the same email address. So when there's a message from Glenn Simpson saying, you know, can you bring or whatever it was, she says, I think this is meant for you, not for me, or she sends a text to that effect.

Mr. Jordan. Were you aware of the money trail, the fact that the DNC and the Clinton campaign had paid Perkins Coie, the law firm who then had paid Fusion, who were then paying Christopher Steele, were you aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I was aware of that at the time. I knew they were --

Mr. Jordan. When did you learn about that?

Mr. Ohr. I think in the press.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Do you know when your wife knew that, that trail?

Mr. Ohr. She may also have learned it from the press. I'm not entirely sure. I don't think she -- she was not -- you know, she didn't go to their office, I think, most days. I think she was basically researching topics on the internet and providing the information. So I don't think she had a lot of conversations, from what I can tell, on the specifics.

Mr. Jordan. Let me go back a second.

Your wife first met Glenn Simpson when?

Mr. Ohr. Several years ago. I don't remember --

Mr. Jordan. The same meeting you were at or different?

Mr. Ohr. Probably -- I don't know. I mean, I've seen Glenn Simpson at various -- on various occasions over the years, and I believe my wife has as well.

The one time I remember the three of us being in a room was this one conference that DOJ had. I think it was NIJ that had -- you know, or National Institute of Justice maybe.

Mr. Jordan. Several years ago?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah, several years ago. And I don't --

Mr. Jordan. Do you recall -- your wife began working in late 2015-early 2016 timeframe for Fusion. When was the most recent meeting prior to when she began employment at Fusion that your wife had with Glenn Simpson? Do you know?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Years, months, days before that? What would it be?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I assume there was some kind of --

Mr. Jordan. Prior to just the initial contact for employment.

Mr. Ohr. Okay. So my guess is years, but -- well, I shouldn't guess, so I don't know. But I don't think it was one close -- close in time.

Mr. Jordan. Similar to what we discussed earlier with you.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. It had been 2 years prior before you -- since you had most recently talked to Chris Steele before he wants to meet you on July 30, a couple years prior before Glenn Simpson wants to meet you on August 22. Same pattern with your wife?

Mr. Ohr. I can't -- because I don't know the years. I'm guessing it's -- again, I shouldn't guess, but I know it was not close in time, in terms of weeks or months.

Mr. Jordan. Why do you think they picked your wife? There's probably lots of Russian experts in the Washington, D.C., area.

Mr. Ohr. You know, I think -- first of all, I don't think that there are that many people that do Russia research that are available to do these kinds of contracts. So I think, you know, they have talked over the years from time to time.

So I don't know why he picked her, but they were certainly acquainted and knew of each other, you know, knew of each other's

work at least in general.

Mr. Jordan. Let me go to Peter Strzok. Let me do this, then I'll go to you, Darrell, then I know John wants to get back in here too.

Tell me about your relationship with Peter Strzok, how many interactions you had with him.

Mr. Ohr. I believe I only saw him maybe twice. I don't know specifically. I did not know him before I was introduced to him.

Mr. Jordan. When was that date?

Mr. Ohr. Well, I don't recall exactly, but I think this was the -- reconstructing it, I think the first time I may have met him is with the meeting I had with Lisa Page, Peter Strzok, and some of the criminal division people. So that would have been in the fall at some point.

Mr. Jordan. And, again, he was not at the August meeting. So you're saying the fall of 2016.

Mr. Ohr. I'm pretty sure he was not at the August meeting, yeah, or the meeting around that time.

Mr. Jordan. Mr. Ohr testified a few weeks back, about 5 weeks ago, that -- Mr. Strzok testified, excuse me, I'm sorry, that Mr. Ohr gave FBI documents which included material that I believe originated from Mr. Steele. That's Peter Strzok's testimony when I was questioning him 5 weeks ago.

What were those documents?

Mr. Ohr. I had -- well -- so what I recall is before I

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

met -- certainly in November, when I met with Peter Strzok, Lisa Page, and Joe Pientka, prior to that meeting, and then prior to my meeting, I believe, with Joe Pientka on November 22, I had tried to write up some of my notes of the prior conversations, the ones in July, August, September.

Mr. Jordan. Okay, so back up. November 22 you meet with Pientka. Prior to that, you met with Strzok, Page, and McCabe and Pientka.

Mr. Ohr. No, I'm sorry. I met with Mr. McCabe and Lisa Page in July. I don't believe I gave them any notes at that time.

Mr. Jordan. I know, you said that earlier. Go to this November timeframe.

Mr. Ohr. Oh, you mean August. Yeah, I'm saying August. I'm getting mixed up here.

Then in the fall sometime, it could have been September, but I don't recall precisely, I met with Lisa Page, Peter Strzok, and the three people I previously mentioned from the criminal division. I don't believe I gave them any documents at that time either.

I remember, though -- and my notes reflect this -- that in November, before I sat down with Joe Pientka, I had prepared -- and I had prepared some summaries of the conversations I had had with Mr. Steele and with Mr. Simpson up to that time, you know, prior to November. And I had also prepared a -- what I think I had labeled a partial chronology of my meetings with those

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

guys.

So those, I don't recall specifically whether I gave them, the documents, to Mr. Strzok and Ms. Page and Mr. Pientka on the 21st or to Mr. Pientka on the 22nd, but I may well have. I certainly prepared the documents with the intention of sharing that information and offering them the documents if they wanted it.

Mr. Jordan. I'm sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes, just to clear up one thing. With respect to those contacts with folks at the Department of Justice, like Andrew Weissmann and Bruce Swartz and Ms. Ahmad, and contacts with Mr. McCabe and Ms. Page in that timeframe, are there, other than what we've seen in these documents, are there emails or text messages that would document those contacts? And, if so, how would I request those?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I don't think -- I don't think I had -- beyond the notes that you have from me, those I think are my only -- the only records I'm aware of, of those meetings.

And part of the reason for introducing me to Joe Pientka, what I was told was so that they would -- you know, I would have a regular contact and they would kind of take -- keep track of things.

Mr. Jordan. John makes a good point.

So the documents you handed to Page, Strzok, or Pientka or whoever around the November 21-22 time period --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- are they different than what we were given?

Mr. Ohr. Those are the notes. That's what you have.

Mr. Jordan. This is what you gave?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Yeah. I believe -- I don't physically remember, you know, I don't remember physically handing it to them, but I believe I did give it to them.

Mr. Jordan. These handwritten notes?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And so this is different. The documents that Mr. Strzok testified to, he was testifying to that versus the -- well, you wouldn't --

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. I get you. I get you. But you handed him documents, and then you also handed him the memory stick.

Mr. Ohr. At some point -- whenever I got the memory stick from my wife and whenever I got the memory stick from Glenn Simpson, I turned that over to the FBI, probably to Joe Pientka directly.

Mr. Jordan. How many times did you give documents to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. So the two memory sticks and then these documents. I think those are the only things I remember giving to them physically.

Mr. Jordan. The handwritten notes that we have --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- and the two memory sticks.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. All right. And it was Mr. Pientka who took receipt of them and/or Page and Strzok?

Mr. Ohr. It probably would have been Mr. Pientka, but I don't recall for sure. And, again, I don't specifically recall giving him the documents.

Mr. Jordan. These notes of yours and the memory sticks, did you give them to anyone else?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. No one at the Justice Department?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Any of the people, your peers that you talked about, I think Ms. Ahmad, Mr. Weissmann, no one else?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I gave them any documents, no.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Did you talk to any of those folks about this material, your notes you put together?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Your peers, did you talk to them? Did you go to Mr. Weissmann and say, "You know what, I just want to run some things by you, I got to go meet with the FBI, here's my notes"? Did you do that kind of stuff?

Mr. Ohr. No. No, nothing like what you're saying. I think I conveyed some of the substance of the same conversations to

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Swartz, Ms. Zainab, and at least on one occasion Mr. Weissmann would have been present, but I don't recall specifically.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. When did you know that the FBI had an active counterintelligence investigation into the Trump campaign and Russia?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall when I -- exactly when I learned that. It was sometime later.

Mr. Jordan. "Sometime later" is pretty vague, Mr. Ohr. Give me an idea.

Mr. Ohr. I can't -- I don't know. At some point obviously --

Mr. Jordan. 2016?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall. It may have been 2017, but I'm not sure. And I think I saw it in the press. I'm not sure if that's the first time. It may have been the first time I heard of it. I'm not sure.

Mr. Jordan. When did you know -- I think this may have been asked earlier, but just for my -- when did you know that the research Mr. Steele was doing that you were passing on to the FBI was used as part of a FISA application?

Mr. Ohr. I think I read that in the press. So whenever it was reported in the press.

Mr. Jordan. Did you know the FBI had different versions of the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. That rings a bell, but I don't recall specifically

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

what I heard about that.

Mr. Jordan. It rings a bell. Can you elaborate?

Mr. Ohr. I can't specifically. I mean, I don't recall the specifics.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. I want to go through some of the documents and work through those, but I know that the gentleman from California has some questions. So if that's all right, we'll go there and then we'll come back and work through these documents.

Mr. Issa. Thank you. And mine will be brief.

Your wife earned purportedly \$44,000 working for Fusion GPS for about a year. Is that right?

Mr. Ohr. Again, I don't recall the number, but --

Mr. Issa. During that period of time, who else did she work for?

Mr. Ohr. She had an ongoing contract with something called Plusis (ph) that does training for law enforcement on, among other things, cybersecurity. I don't recall if she earned money from them during the -- late 2015 to September 2016.

Mr. Issa. Do you file a joint return?

Mr. Ohr. Yes. Whatever it would be would be reflected on our tax return.

Mr. Issa. Do you recall? You make about 212,000, 220,000, somewhere in that range. Do you recall how much your tax return was so you'd know how much she made?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember the specifics, no.

Mr. Issa. But there was other income besides the 44,000, to your recollection? Most people do think about how much they earn per year.

Mr. Ohr. I certainly was paying attention to what I was earning, but I don't recall --

Mr. Issa. Okay.

Mr. Ohr. I'm sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Issa. I mean, we don't have to dwell on this, but you filed a joint return. You have no idea how much she made in '15 or '16 from any or all income?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall as I sit here. I know her income fluctuated when she was an independent contractor.

Mr. Issa. Okay. You said she had a contract. How do you know it was a contract? Is that routine? Does she have her own contracts she presents to people?

Mr. Ohr. No. I think it was Fusion's contract.

Mr. Issa. Okay. Now, normally in a contract like Fusion GPS, one of the first things they have is that the work product they pay for is their work product and cannot be shared.

Would you be familiar in any way of whether or not she signed a contract that would have limited her ability to hand you information, the fruit of their paid-for research?

Mr. Ohr. I don't specifically know what was in her contract.

Mr. Issa. So would it be fair to say that -- let's assume

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

that it was in the contract, as it almost always would be with any company -- that, in fact, she had to gain their permission or even their request to turn that information over to you?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah, I don't know. I mean, you're making an assumption that I just don't know.

Mr. Issa. Well, since you know that Glenn Simpson, Christopher Steele, and others really disliked the President and were motivated to stop him, I'm just asking if this was proprietary information that belonged to Fusion GPS and it was being given to you by your wife, but effectively it was being given to you through your wife by Fusion GPS. That's what it appeared to be. I just want to see if you knew that or reasonably would believe that.

Mr. Ohr. I don't think that was the case.

Mr. Issa. So you think she did that on a rogue basis, that she didn't go to Fusion GPS for permission?

Mr. Ohr. I think it was her giving it to me, not -- without -- you know, without any sanction or whatever from -- as far as I know, yes.

[3:02 p.m.]

Mr. Issa. Okay. And I will conclude, like I said, and it will be very brief. We have already had a vast amount of publicly reported information about Peter Strzok and Lisa Page's dislike of the President -- well-stated dislike. You worked with them. You presented information to them.

Tell me, did you have any indication that they or anybody else at the FBI had any dislike for the President -- jokes, comments, anything that would have you believe anything but the greatest respect for the President of the United States-elect.

Mr. Ohr. There were no jokes or comments or anything like that in my presence, that I can recall. They obviously took the information I gave them seriously, which was certainly not flattering to the President. But I never heard anything that was indicating --

Mr. Issa. So, no evidence of glee or Wow, this is great?

Mr. Ohr. No, no.

Mr. Issa. The last question, which closes the loop on everybody. In your interactions at all times during 2016, 2017, were you in contact with people at the Department of Justice or FBI who showed any notable like or dislike for the President and said so to you in a way in which you recognized that they had a preference? I know that is broad.

Mr. Ohr. That is pretty broad.

Mr. Issa. How about if we just limit it to people who were,

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

in any way, tangentially involved with this investigation and this activity?

Mr. Ohr. Even that covers a long period of time. I am not recalling anything like that from the people who I was dealing with on this matter.

Mr. Issa. So, at this point you never ran into anybody you saw that had stated preference, one way or the other, or articulated in any way?

Mr. Ohr. Right. I can't recall anything like that at the moment as I sit here.

Mr. Issa. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jordan. Earlier you said that you told the FBI that Mr. Steele, when you were conveying to them where you were getting this information, Mr. Steele was desperate to stop Trump from winning. When did you convey that to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think it was after the July 30 meeting, although I am not entirely sure. It may have been after the September meeting.

Mr. Jordan. So it was either the August meeting or September meeting, one of those?

Mr. Ohr. I think that is probably right. I don't recall exactly.

Mr. Jordan. My colleague wanted me to ask -- Mr. Biggs -- was your wife fluent in Russian? Can she speak the language?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A She can certainly read it well. I think she would say her speaking is a little rusty.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Another colleague.

When did you first learn your wife was working for Fusion?

When did you know she was working for fusion?

Mr. Ohr. When she began.

Mr. Jordan. When she began?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah.

Mr. Jordan. 2015. When did you first become aware that Rod Rosenstein knew of your wife's work for Fusion?

Mr. Ohr. I am sorry?

Mr. Jordan. Do you know when Mr. Rosenstein knew of your wife's work for Fusion, and her work on the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. I believe that was in October of 2017.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And how about the special counsel, when do you think he knew about you and your wife's work for -- your wife's work for Fusion and her work on the dossier? Any idea?

Mr. Ohr. First of all, let me just say I don't know what the special counsel knew at any time. I have not had any conversation with the special counsel or his staff. What I had said, I think, to Mr. Rosenstein in October of 2017, was that my wife was working for Fusion GPS. I am not sure if you were in the room earlier when I said that the dossier, as I understand it, is the collection of reports that Chris Steele had prepared for Fusion GPS. My wife had separately done research on certain Russian

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

people and companies or whatever that she had provided to Fusion GPS. But I don't believe her information is reflected in the Chris Steele reports. They were two different chunks of information heading into Fusion GPS.

Mr. Jordan. So your wife didn't work on the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. Not specifically, from what I can tell. She worked on some of the same people. So, for example, I think I mentioned earlier, she had worked on Sergie -- done some research on Sergie Millian. And I think Sergie Millian is mentioned in the dossier, but I don't think it is her work that made it into the dossier.

Mr. Ratcliffe. If that testimony that you just gave regarding whether or not your wife worked on the dossier conflicts with testimony that you previously gave and recorded in the 302 with the FBI, which testimony was given in more recent time? Which would you think would be more accurate and more closely aligned to the facts?

Mr. Ohr. I provided information to the FBI. How they documented it, I didn't know. But I am telling you now is my understanding of what happened, which is that dossier consisted of reports prepared by Chris Steele, which is separate from --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Have you reviewed the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. I have taken a look at the dossier, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You testified before that you didn't look at the information that your wife gave you to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Correct; I did not look.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ratcliffe. So how do you know, as you are testifying under oath here, that the information that your wife gave to the FBI was not part of the dossier?

Mr. Ohr. What I saw of the dossier was in the form of the kinds of reports that Chris Steele and Orbis prepared. So I believe from what I can tell -- and I haven't studied it closely -- that these reports reflected information that Orbis has collected and then provided to Fusion GPS.

Mr. Ratcliffe. That is your belief.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. But, again, to be clear, you never reviewed the information that your wife gave to the FBI.

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Did you review the information that your wife gave to Christopher Steele or Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. Well, your first question was: I didn't review the information that my wife gave to me and the stick that I gave to Fusion GPS. I am not aware that my wife ever gave any information to Chris Steele.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Directly?

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Because she gave information to Fusion GPS?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You don't have any knowledge about whether or not Glenn Simpson was giving information to Christopher Steele or

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

how they were --

Mr. Ohr. I don't have any specific information, but it is all going to Glenn Simpson.

Mr. Ratcliffe. One more thing I want to clarify. You said that you had not provided any information to the special counsel or the special counsel staff.

Mr. Ohr. I, you mean?

Mr. Ratcliffe. Yes.

Mr. Ohr. That is correct.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Was the Andrew Weissman that you mentioned dealing with earlier in the criminal division the same Andrew Weissman that is part of the special counsel's investigative team?

Mr. Ohr. I believe he is.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Earlier today, you told us that you had a meeting with him and gave him information. He was one of the folks that you were communicating with at the Department of Justice in the fall of 2016. Is that accurate?

Mr. Ohr. That is accurate. I provided some of the information I learned from Chris Steele and Glenn Simpson to, among other people, Andrew Weissman.

Mr. Ratcliffe. To that same Andrew Weissman?

Mr. Ohr. Right. At the time -- I am sorry.

Mr. Ratcliffe. The information you gave him regarding Christopher Steele, regarding Glenn Simpson, regarding the Steele dossier, regarding Nellie Ohr, all of that information that you

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

related in August you believe 2016, that is knowledge that the special counsel would have through part of the special counsel's investigative team, Andrew Weissman, correct?

Mr. Ohr. Right. I mean -- no, just to be clear, the information -- I don't recall exactly what information Andrew Weissman got from me.

Mr. Ratcliffe. But you gave him information.

Mr. Ohr. But I gave him some information.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And whatever that information is --

Mr. Ohr. He received it at that time in his capacity as head of the chief of the fraud section.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Any reason to believe he wouldn't continue to contain that information when he became part of the special counsel's team?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I assume the special counsel has access to what information the FBI collected, which would probably include everything. But I shouldn't be assuming that. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. Has the special counsel talked to you?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Have they talked to your wife?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Let's go to -- I think this document was introduced last round that we got from you, whatever application this is, these text messages like. Let's go on the first page. I

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

am just curious. About halfway down, "1-31-17. Doubtless sad and crazy day for you and" -- I assume SY is Sally Yates. "Just wanted to check on the situation, along with Bureau colleagues with our guy."

Can you tell me who "our guy" is?

Mr. Ohr. I am sorry, where?

Mr. Jordan. The first page.

Mr. Ohr. Are you looking at this document?

Mr. Jordan. Yes.

Mr. Ohr. Okay.

Mr. Jordan. This is what we were given. I want the one January 31, 2017.

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe that is in this document.

Mr. Jordan. This is different than what you were presented. We are going to have to make some copies of this.

Can I read this to you or should we go do copies?

Mr. Ohr. Whatever you like, sir.

Mr. Jordan. Can we hold the time while we make copies? Is that how this work?

Mine starts with 1-25-17 at the top.

Mr. Weinsheimer. I have got that.

Mr. Jordan. So go halfway down, the first. Approximately halfway down. It looks like, "Bruce, doubtless sad and crazy day for you regarding" -- and this is the same day that Sally Yates was fired. Before that it talks about "our guy." Who is our guy?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. I believe our guy in this case refers to the source that Chris Steele was worried was going to be outed and might need -- and whose life may be in danger.

Mr. Jordan. The next one below: "You have sympathy and support. If you end up out, though, I really need another contact point's number." What does he mean "if you end up out"? What is he talking about here?

Mr. Ohr. My interpretation of this is that if I were to be forced out, or leave the Department, he would need another possible -- he says Bureau, so FBI "contact point who could help make arrangements for the safety of the source." So that is why I responded: "Understood. I can certainly give you an FBI contact if that becomes necessary."

Mr. Jordan. I guess I am confused, because it is not that he is saying if you end up out -- I am not sure what that all means -- but if you end up out, I don't need someone at DOJ, I need someone at the Bureau.

Mr. Ohr. He is worried about the safety of his source. So when I had learned earlier --

Mr. Jordan. But if you are the key to the safety of the source and you are at the Department of Justice, why doesn't he want someone else at the Department of Justice? Why doesn't he want someone at the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Obviously, if we are worrying if we are somehow securing the safety of the source, I think that is something that

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

the FBI would do.

Mr. Jordan. Sort of underscores the point, why were you in in the first place? If it is the FBI's responsibility, why has it been, up to this point, Bruce Ohr's responsibility and the Department of Justice? But now if you end up out, we want to get someone in the Bureau to guard the safety of this source.

Mr. Ohr. When Chris Steele had previously told me -- and I don't remember the exact date, but a few days before this, I think -- that his source might be outed and in danger, I reported that to the FBI and basically asked: If something develops quickly, should I call you? And he said, Yes.

I don't remember exactly what I said to Chris Steele about that, but our concern at that time was there could be a threat to the safety of the source.

Mr. Jordan. I get that. I don't understand why it has to jump from the Department of Justice to FBI. Seems to me if you are the key and you are in the Department of Justice, you would continue to work with someone in the Department of Justice, or shouldn't he have been working with someone in the Department of Justice in the first place?

Mr. Ohr. I think -- I don't know exactly what was in his mind, but I do know that if we were going to try to protect a source, it was going to have to eventually be an FBI agent that takes those steps.

Mr. Jordan. "I can give you an FBI contact if and when it

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

becomes necessary." Was it necessary, and if so, who did you give him?

Mr. Ohr. It did not.

Mr. Jordan. Let's go to the next page. I am looking at the entries on 3-18-2017. "Just wondering if you had any news. Obviously, we are a bit apprehensive, given Comey's scheduled appearance at Congress on Monday. Hoping that important firewalls will hold. Many thanks."

And then you respond: "I believe my earlier information is still accurate."

So tell me what the firewalls mean, and then what your earlier information was.

Mr. Ohr. My understanding of firewalls, again, had to do with information that the FBI might have that might identify, or somehow help to identify Chris Steele's source. And I had --

Mr. Jordan. So we are talking about the same guy that you were talking about 2 months earlier.

Mr. Ohr. That is my recollection, as I look at this now. And I had told him earlier that the FBI is very careful about producing information that could identify a source and lead to the source being harmed, and that that is still accurate. Because I had no --

Mr. Jordan. And was it accurate? Was that source revealed?

Mr. Ohr. I am not aware that the source was revealed.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So let's go 2 months then. The next

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

page, 2 months forward, 5-15, three-quarters of the way down.  
"Having now consulted my wife and business partner about the question we discussed on Saturday, I am pleased to say yes, we should go ahead with it. Best, Chris."

Go ahead with what?

Mr. Ohr. The FBI had asked me a few days before, when I reported to them my latest conversation with Chris Steele, they had had would he -- next time you talk with him, could you ask him if he would be willing to meet again.

Mr. Jordan. So this is the re-engagement?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So then the messages just a few days later get into that subject. They are actually not a few days later; a month later.

Mr. Ohr. A month later? I am sorry, I don't understand?

Mr. Jordan. Well, hang with it. We are going to read what you guys wrote back and forth. "Having now consulted with me wife and business partner about the question we discussed on Saturday, I am pleased to say yes, we should go ahead with it."

So you have asked him will he re-engage with the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. And he says: "Talked with my wife; I'm in."  
You say: "Thanks. We'll let them know and we will follow up."

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. "Thanks again. I chatted with my colleagues and

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

can give you an update when you have a minute." What was the update about? Was it about that subject?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. So that all happens on May 15?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. June 22, "Hi, Bruce. Is there any news on the re-engagement yet? Anything we can do to help from this end? Grateful for an update."

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. How did those re-engagement talks go?

Mr. Ohr. Based on these additional text messages back and forth, it took some time. I remember that Chris Steele was anxious why it was taking so long. But at some point, Chris Steele informed me that they had -- he had, in fact, met with somebody from the FBI.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So move forward.

"Still frustrated" -- "Bruce, still frustrated. We are frustrated with how long this re-engagement with Mueller and the investigation is taking." Talk to me about that last clause, "Mueller is taking."

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I know the FBI had asked if Chris Steele was interested in re-engaging. I don't know what role if any the special counsel team played in that. I think -- so, Chris Steele was referring to that, but I have no knowledge of whether there was a re-engagement with Mueller as opposed to --

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Did you pass that along to the FBI, that Mr. Steele has also mentioned re-engaging or engaging with the special counsel?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall. I am pretty sure I met with the FBI to tell them that this is my latest communication with Chris Steele, because that was my practice. But I don't recall whether I said Bureau and Mueller or just re-engagement.

Mr. Jordan. Okay.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I want to follow up, Mr. Ohr. On the end of the last hour that I was here, I asked you about these 302s -- I have seen 12 of them -- interview dates from November 22, 2016 to May 15, 2017. I asked you whether there were any sit-down interviews and corresponding 302s after that date. And I thought I heard you say yes.

Mr. Ohr. I believe I did, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you know how many?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know specifically, but each of these communications that are reflected in the text messages back and forth, whenever we had a call or anything substantive, I would have reached out to the FBI and given them the information. I didn't know what they were writing down or not writing down.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Do you know anything different about those interviews or about those 302s as to why they wouldn't have been produced in response to a request by Members of Congress?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know if they did 302s later on. A lot of

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

these conversations seemed less substantive, but I don't know. I didn't know about the original 302s either.

Mr. Jordan. Did you continue to meet with the FBI to discuss your conversations with Mr. Steele all the way up through late November of 2017?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. Was Chris Steele working? Was he being paid by Oleg Deripaska? Was he like a lobbyist or a consultant being paid by Oleg Deripaska?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. The September 22 meeting.

Mr. Ohr. You are now jumping back to --

Mr. Jordan. Jump back to 2016.

Mr. Ohr. Very good.

Mr. Jordan. In your communications from -- Mr. Steele wrote you an email. He talks about "I am going to be in town in Washington again on business of mutual interest." Is that anything different than you told me earlier, or what does that mean?

Mr. Ohr. No. I think it is more of the same.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. October 18, you get a text, or excuse me, an email from Mr. Steele: "I have something quite urgent I would like to discuss with you." October 18, 2016. What was the urgent matter?

Mr. Ohr. I don't have an independent recollection of this,

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

but based on the notes, I think it was conveying some more information about Oleg Derapaska.

Mr. Jordan. Can you tell me what that was?

Mr. Ohr. I think there is an email maybe dated the 19th or 18th that has an attachment, or a little paragraph or something attached that talks about a dispute between Oleg Derapaska and the Ukrainian Government. I think that is what he was contacting me about. But I don't recall beyond that what we discussed.

Mr. Jordan. If a phone call -- with email talking about a phone call first sent to your wife, but she thinks it is for you from Mr. Simpson on December 12. Was this a follow-up call from your December 10 meeting and what did you discuss on this call?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall. I think he was providing some additional information on the same topics as our -- when we met. I am not sure exactly what the dates were, so I don't know if it was preparatory to the same meeting or a follow-up or what.

Mr. Jordan. I want to ask you one other thing. In one of these handwritten notes you talk about so much -- it is difficult to read -- but it says "HRC," looks like "second dossier."

Mr. Berman. Is there a date on that?

Mr. Jordan. It looks like 11-8-2017.

It looks like number three.

Mr. Ohr. Yes. My recollection is that Chris Steele was telling me that he had read a report or heard somewhere that

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

people were talking about a second dossier -- I don't know if it was about Hillary Rodham Clinton -- or by Hillary, or whatever, that a second dossier existed, and he was saying there is no second dossier.

Mr. Jordan. So this is your notes. Can you just read it for me? "Story in --

Mr. Ohr. Happy to read it.

Mr. Jordan. The one that is highlighted in yellow there.

Mr. Ohr. So I am looking at this piece of paper, 11-8-17, "Story in news today about Hillary" -- HRC, I assume that is Hillary Rodham Clinton -- "and second dossier totally" -- I can't even read my own writing -- "totally" -- think -- "may be unfounded." I remember him saying that is just not accurate.

Mr. Jordan. A second dossier about Clinton or a second dossier about Trump-Russia?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know? But since it is second dossier -- I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. Cathleen Cavilick.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Why is she included in this stuff?

Mr. Ohr. She is an official at the State Department and she had also, I believe, spoken with Chris Steele at some point. And whatever I had from her, I gave to the Department as well, because I thought it related to the same subject matter.

Mr. Jordan. Were there notes about this? Did you take notes

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

about Cathleen Caviglick that we don't have that you gave to the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. I don't think so. I would have reported that conversation to the FBI as well, but I don't believe I have any separate notes on that.

Mr. Jordan. Anyone else at the State Department that you talked to about these matters?

Mr. Ohr. No, not that I can recall.

Mr. Jordan. All right. I think we are out of time.

Thank you, Mr. Ohr.

Mr. Ohr. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Ms. Shen. We are back on the record. It is 3:35 p.m. for the minority round.

## EXAMINATION

BY MS. SHEN:

Q Mr. Ohr, last week, The New York Times reported that you met Mr. Steele in 2007 when he was still with MI6, with the approval of both the U.S. and U.K. Governments. Is that accurate?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q I am actually going to change tack a little bit here and just address an issue that has come up in the last round, and maybe even earlier, which is that we have been reading from -- we have been referencing and reading certain documents, some of which have been made public to the press, they are marked Bates stamped

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

HPSCI, we mentioned -- but as part of the same production there have also documents that have not been made public. I believe some of them were the handwritten notes you were looking at earlier and talked to.

Our understanding is this a document production produced to a congressional committee that is not the Oversight or Judiciary Committee from which is doing this investigation has not been cleared for release to the public. So there is a question of: How did it come into possession of our Members? It is our understanding that there is in fact a committee rule that may prohibit the sharing of a committee document production like that.

In addition to that, we have concerns to state for the record that such information could, in fact, contain sensitive information, I think on its face, discussion of confidential human sources. We are not really in a position to know kind of per earlier conversation the full implications of just putting this kind of information out in an unclassified setting in an open record.

So I want to state for the record that this is something that we oppose. We do not think it is responsible to be continuing to reference such information for the variety of reasons that I have outlined, and we hope that the practice does not continue in this interview or any subsequent interviews as part of this joint investigation.

Ms. Hariharan. Also to be clear, HPSCI rules require a full

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

committee vote before they release documents. They have certain arrangements with specific committees to produce documents. House Judiciary is not one of them.

So the documents that we introduced were pulled from public sourcing that were already leaked to reporters or whomever, not by us. We do not have access to these materials, except for what we found online.

Ms. Shen. Thank you.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So I will just reiterate the question real quick from previously.

So last week, the New York Times reported that you met with Mr. Steele in 2007, where he was still with MI6, with the approval of the U.S. and U.K. Governments, is that corrects.

A I believe so.

Q In 2007, Mr. Steele was the head of the Russia desk at MI6, is that accurate?

A I don't know his specifically title.

Q In your experience, is the United Kingdom considered a close intelligence partner to the United States?

A I can only speak to what I have seen in the press, and the answer is yes.

Q So it is your understanding that MI6 would closely partner with U.S. intelligence agencies?

A Again, I only speak to what I have seen publicly. Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q In your opinion, do U.S. intelligence community agencies tend to value the intelligence from MI6?

A I can't really say that. I don't know.

Q Okay. Generally speaking, does -- do your counterparts in the United Kingdom, are they considered reliable and accurate sources of information regarding Russia?

A Again, I can't speak generally. I can only say that information was provided to me and to the FBI by Chris Steele when he was with the British Government was considered good information.

Q So, The New Yorker has reported that information from Mr. Steele had once helped expose the Kremlin that had rigged the vote to host the World Cup in 2018 with bribes and swapped votes.

Is that something you have been aware of?

Mr. Weinsheimer. He can't really talk about other investigations.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q To your knowledge, or just based on public reporting, are you aware that Mr. Steele played a role or had contacts that played a role in the Justice Department's investigation of bribes and kickbacks in the FISA investigation?

Mr. Weinsheimer. He can't talk about other investigations and the role of sources. I know that you prefaced that question with public reporting. But to the extent it is public reporting, it speaks for itself. Given the work that he does, I think it is

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

too difficult to ask him to parse what he might know relating to other investigations and sources and methods that relate to other investigations what might be in the public sphere. So I would object to that question.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q Okay. Given your personal experiences and interactions with Mr. Steele, does it surprise you that the FBI would decide to use him as a confidential human source?

A No.

Q And do you believe that Mr. Steele is capable and would continue to provide credible, actionable information to the U.S. law enforcement?

A Yes.

Q So, it has also been widely publicly reported that Christopher Steele was not a fan of Donald Trump. You, at one point, noted that Mr. Steele was "desperate that Donald Trump not get elected and was passionate about him not being President." Is that accurate?

A Yes. Words to that effect. I don't recall the exact words.

Q Just based on public reporting as well.

Did Mr. Steele ever explain to you why he held this view?

A I think he was very alarmed by the information that he had provided to me about contacts between the Russian Government and the Donald Trump campaign.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q And why do you think he was so alarmed by this particular piece of information?

A Well, he described the information to me as -- well, I think it speaks for itself. I don't know how to characterize it. It was information I found alarming.

Q So, given Mr. Steele's, what seems very apparent opposition to Donald Trump, did you ever suspect that Mr. Steele was simply making up or fabricating his report related to Trump, his campaign or any Trump associate?

A I did not suspect that.

Q And why is that?

A I had a good track record with Mr. Steele, and his information has generally been pretty good.

Q And so do you believe that despite -- I think it is fair to call it a bias of Mr. Steele -- potential bias of Mr. Steele against Trump -- that Mr. Steele's reports nonetheless could be taken seriously by U.S. Federal law enforcement officials?

A I mean, I think my read is that his bias, as I reported to the FBI, was as a result of his reporting, the facts that he had reported to me.

Q Are you aware of any instances where Mr. Steele fabricated evidence in his reports or intentionally provided misleading information?

A No.

Q And we have already spoken somewhat about this, but

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

overall how would you describe the credibility of Mr. Steele's information and its potential value to U.S. national security?

A I think I have stated before, his information was generally pretty good, but we have to be careful about all information relating to Russia. And so with that caveat.

[Ohr Exhibit No. 6

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So I would like to introduce as exhibit 6 an August 7, 2018, article from The Hill entitled "Opinion: How a senior DOJ official helped then-researchers on Trump-Russia case." This article makes reference to your notes, emails, and text messages that were, again, turned over to Congress but also apparently given to this reporter.

Are you familiar with this article?

A I have not read this article. I was aware that it came out.

Q Would you like some time to read it now?

A I will take a quick look.

Okay.

Q So, if you could go down to the article, to the sentence I think it is the third paragraph from the bottom of the first page, and it reads, "Steele's FBI relationship had been terminated about 3 months earlier. The Bureau concluded on November 1, 2016, that he leaked information to the news media and was 'not suitable

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

for use' as a confidential source, memos show.

"The FBI specifically instructed Steele that he could no longer 'operate to obtain any intelligence whatsoever on behalf of the FBI,' those memos show."

So, in this article it also includes attachments, including -- well, four documents. One of them is referenced, this termination memo in that the quotes that I just read to you. So I am going to introduce the termination memo now as exhibit 7.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[Ohr Exhibit No. 7

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So if you can go to the part of the termination memo, which actually appears to be undated, or at least I can't find it, but it is entitled, "Federal Bureau of Investigation, Source Closing Communication" and under the note it reads, "The following are possible reasons which may justify closing for cause: unauthorized criminal activity, serious control problems, unreliable and violated instructions." Right underneath that, it states that the general reason for closing in this case was "confidentiality revealed."

So this memo appears to list unreliable as a possible reason for closing. And yet, the reason for closing did not identify as one of the bases. Is that also your reading of this document?

A I just say I haven't seen this document before. I see the general reason for closing "confidentiality revealed."

Q Is it a fair interpretation, just based on the face of this documentation that, at least in the confines of this document, the FBI's reason for closing was confidentiality revealed, but not unreliable?

A It would be speculating.

Q Has the FBI ever expressed to you that they believed Mr. Steele was an unreliable source of information?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Not that I recall.

Q If you could turn back to the article now and right where I left off at the very bottom of the page, it reads: "Yet Steele asked Ohr in the January 31st text exchange if he could continue to help feed information to the FBI. 'Just wanted to check you are okay. Still in the situ and able to help locally as discussed, along with your Bureau colleagues.

"I am still here and able to help as discussed or texted back. I will let you know if that changes. Steele replied, 'If you end up out though, I really need another Bureau contact point number who is briefed. We can't allow our guy to be forced to go back home. It would be disastrous.' Investigators are trying to determine who Steele was referring to."

[Ohr Exhibit No. 8

Was marked for identification.]

BY MS. SHEN:

Q Now I am going to introduce as exhibit 8 -- again, this was accompanied in the article posted online -- but the January 31 text exchange referenced there. I would like to point out that although in the article the quote ends at "it would be disastrous," in the text message at 11:12-09 a.m., the text actually continues. So I will read the entire text, which is: "Thanks. You have my sympathy and support. If you end up out, though, I really need another Bureau contact/point number who is briefed. We can't allow our guy to be forced to go back home. It

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

would be disastrous all around. The position right now looks stable. A million thanks."

Mr. Ohr, I do believe we already addressed this, but just to be absolutely clear, your text exchanges with Mr. Steele on January 31, what were they about?

A My interpretation is these related to the safety of the source.

Q So these text exchanges did not have anything to do with the Trump-Russia collusion investigation at the time?

A No, not directly. Just the safety of the source.

Q So if I could ask you to go back to the article again. A few paragraphs down on the second page it reads: "There is something separate I want to discuss with you informally and separately. It concerns our favorite business tycoon" -- an apparent reference to Trump. Again, we have covered this, but is the article accurate in saying that the reference was to Trump?

A No.

Q The next sentence, the article reads: "The overture came just four days before Steele walked into the FBI office in Rome with still unproven allegations that Trump had an am improper relationship with Russia, including possible efforts to hijack the Presidential election."

Mr. Ohr, did your conversation with Mr. Steele have anything to do with any meetings or communications he may have had in an FBI office in Rome a few days later?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A I don't believe so, no.

Q Okay. Jumping down a little bit. On the same page the article reads -- again, quoting from these text messages -- I am sorry, it quotes from the July 30, 2016, email, which we had previously introduced as exhibit 2, and it reads: "Great to see you and Nellie this morning, Bruce, Steele wrote shortly after the breakfast meeting. 'Let's keep in touch on the substantive issues. Glenn is happy to speak to you on this if it would help.'

"That meeting occurred exactly 1 day before FBI counterintelligence official Peter Strzok formally opened the investigation, dubbed Crossfire Hurricane, into whether the Trump campaign was colluding with Moscow to steal the election."

Once again, to be absolutely clear, was your meeting with Christopher Steele and your wife Nellie on July 30, 2016, related in any way to FBI counterintelligence official Peter Strzok formally opening an investigation named Crossfire Hurricane?

A I don't believe so.

Q The next paragraph reads: "At the time, the case was based mostly on an Australian diplomat's tip that Trump campaign advisor, George Papadopoulos, appeared to know in advance that the Russians possessed information involving Hillary Clinton before hacked documents were released on WikiLeaks."

Mr. Ohr, were you involved in any way in an Australian diplomat's tip that the Trump campaign advisor George Papadopoulos

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

appeared to have advance knowledge of Hillary Clinton's hacked emails?

A No.

Q If you turn to the last page of the article, at the very top it reads: "By early November 2016, Steele was terminated for unauthorized media contacts and the FBI was turning to Ohr as a back channel to Steele."

Mr. Ohr, would you agree with the characterization that the FBI was turning to you as a "back channel" to Mr. Steele?

A I don't know what the FBI's thinking was specifically. They just told me that if I received information, that there would be an agent that I could talk with.

Q Okay. But at no point did the FBI indicate to you that they were turning to you as an illicit way of obtaining information from Mr. Steele?

A They never said anything like that.

Q It is 3:56, and I think we will actually just end our round now.

[Recess.]

Mr. Parmiter. Let's go back on the record. The time is 4:02 p.m.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Mr. Ohr, I just have a couple of things I want to follow up with you. Earlier today, we established that Christopher Steele had been terminated as a confidential human source for violating the FBI's rules about communicating with the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

press. Do you remember that?

Mr. Ohr. We talked about Chris Steele's termination, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I will represent to you that there is an FBI document that is not classified, or has been declassified that relates to that occurring on or about November 1, 2016.

Before that, there is some indication in the record that Glenn Simpson was a person who was urging Christopher Steele to share the dossier contents with members of the media. Are you aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know specifically who he was sharing the document with, but, yes, I understand that Glenn Simpson was providing information to whoever would employ him.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So my question is, there is also some indication that perhaps Glenn Simpson made you aware of the fact that he was urging Christopher Steele to contact the media about the dossier contents?

Mr. Ohr. My notes from our December conversation, the conversation I had from Glenn Simpson, I believe I mentioned that, yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So you made the FBI aware of that.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. When did you make them aware of that?

Mr. Ohr. I think it was when I heard it. As soon as I heard it.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And do you know when that was?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

I am sorry, go ahead.

Mr. Ohr. Sorry; within a day or two of my receiving the information.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Well, if the news -- Christopher Steele's efforts to communicate that information to the media resulted in news stories in October of 2016, would it have been in that timeframe?

Mr. Ohr. I don't believe I spoke with Glenn Simpson in that time frame.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay.

Mr. Ohr. I recall meeting Mr. Simpson in December, and I think --

Mr. Ratcliffe. And in August?

Mr. Ohr. And in August, right. So I remember this coming up in December and I reflected it in my notes, which I informed the FBI.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Well, that is all I am really trying to determine. We know that the FBI knew no later than November 1, because that is when they essentially fired Christopher Steele. I am wondering before that they knew, and if you can narrow that down for me.

Mr. Ohr. Don't have information on that.

Mr. Ratcliffe. I want to make sure that I have -- that I understand completely your touch points or involvement in this Trump-Russia investigation as you have related them to us today.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

So as it pertains to folks outside of the Department of Justice and the FBI, your involvement included passing evidence from Nellie Ohr and Glenn Simpson to the FBI, correct?

Mr. Ohr. I mean, as I have said before, I received a memory stick from Glenn Simpson that I provided to the FBI, and at some point I also received a memory stick from my wife that I provided to the FBI.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Right. How is that different from what I said?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know if that is evidence.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Provided information to the FBI from Glenn Simpson --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. -- and Nellie Ohr?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You also provided information to the FBI regarding Christopher Steele as documented in at least 12 sit-downs from November 2016 to May 2017.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. You also communicated with members of the FBI beginning with a phone call to Andy McCabe, but included Andy McCabe, Lisa Page, FBI Agents Strzok and Pientka as early as August of 2016.

Mr. Ohr. We have discussed a series of meetings or conversations I had with the FBI that included various

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

combinations of those people, yes, over a period of time.

Mr. Ratcliffe. And with respect to the Department of Justice, your sharing information there included folks at the criminal division, to include Swartz, Weissman, and Ahmed.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Anyone else?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[4:09 p.m.]

Mr. Ohr. I don't think I gave any of the information to other people.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. So all of those things document your involvement in the -- what I've called the Trump-Russia investigation.

Earlier today you told me that you didn't think that you actually had a role in the investigation. You meant other than those things that I just related?

Mr. Ohr. I don't see those as playing a role in the investigation. I provided information and the other things we've discussed today. I neither investigated nor --

Mr. Ratcliffe. Okay. Well, I think we'll have to agree to disagree on that, about whether or not that plays a role on the investigation. But thanks for confirming what your involvement was. And I appreciate your courtesies to me in terms of answering questions for the record.

Before I leave, I've asked you a lot of questions today, have I been fair and courteous to you?

Mr. Ohr. You've certainly been courteous. I don't know, it's hard for me to make a judgment about fairness. You have been courteous. Thank you.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Well, thank you. The reason I say that is, believe it or not, sometimes things get misrepresented to the media about how our approach was. I have been civil and courteous

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

and --

Mr. Ohr. Yes, you are.

Mr. Ratcliffe. -- given you time. Have I given you every opportunity to answer the questions that I've asked you?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, you have.

Mr. Ratcliffe. Is there anything that I haven't given you an opportunity to say in response to my questions?

Mr. Ohr. I don't have anything to add at this time.

Mr. Ratcliffe. So you have had a chance to fully and completely and truthfully answer the questions that I've related to the best of your ability?

Mr. Ohr. To the best of my ability.

Mr. Ratcliffe. All right. Thank you. I appreciate your time.

Mr. Jordan. Thank you, John.

Mr. Ohr, so Mr. Ratcliffe had earlier talked about the number of times you've sat down with the FBI to sort of brief them on your meetings with Mr. Steele, Mr. Simpson. And then there has been -- I've not seen these, but there has been some 302 made of those meetings.

And Mr. Ratcliffe indicated that there were four times in 2016, I believe eight times in 2017, and then you said there have been additional of those type of meetings after -- the last date I have is May 15 of 2017.

Mr. Ohr. That is my recollection, yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. How many of those additional meetings, could you hazard a guess at how many of those, and when was the last one?

Mr. Ohr. I don't remember how many there were. The last one, I think, was in November of 2017.

Mr. Jordan. So all the way through November of 2017. And do you know how many between the time the special counsel was named in November 2017? Three? Four? Five? Six?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. More than one?

Mr. Ohr. More than one, yes. Beyond that, I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And the first meeting was 11 -- so roughly a year, 11/22/2016. So November 22, 2016, through November of 2017?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. More than 12, more than 13, you said, because there's the 12 we know about, the ones you're telling us about?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. So more than 13 times you sat down with the FBI. What prompted each meeting?

Mr. Ohr. I would call the FBI to let them know I had spoken with Chris Steele and did they want to hear about it, and then they would say come over, and I would go over and talk to some agents.

Mr. Jordan. What was the catalyst? Was it you telling the FBI? Was this part of this reengagement? What was the catalyst?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. As near as I can recall, in each case it was me calling the FBI agent to say, I've had a conversation with Chris Steele.

Mr. Jordan. Why did it start in November? Why not sooner?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know. That's when they provided or hooked me up with Joe Pientka.

Mr. Jordan. November of 2016 --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- they said to you, hey, we're going to put you together with Mr. Pientka, an FBI agent, and we want you to come give us a briefing after every encounter, whether a phone call or meeting or any type of exchange, text message, you have with Mr. Steele? Is that how it was done?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall the exact words, and I don't think it was said quite that way, but --

Mr. Jordan. I'm still struggling with who did what.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Did the FBI tell you, "We want you to let us know every single time you communicate with Mr. Steele so that we can sit down with you, and we're going to make Mr. Pientka the guy who sits down with you to get a briefing on that"?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall them saying we want you to call us every time you have contact with Mr. Steele. I think they provided Mr. Pientka to me as a point of contact, and it was up to me to call him. From my point of view, I called him, I think,

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

every time I had a conversation with Chris Steele.

Mr. Jordan. Did the FBI ask you to call him?

Mr. Ohr. No. I think that one time, that one time.

Mr. Jordan. How did this happen? How did this arrangement happen? You just decided out of the goodness of your heart, "Every time I talk to Steele I'm going to call the FBI"?

Mr. Ohr. I thought it was important to just be as complete as possible in providing the information I had.

Mr. Jordan. So you initiated this?

Mr. Ohr. Well, they had provided Joe Pientka to me initially as a point of contact.

Mr. Jordan. Based on the meeting clear back in August?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Why didn't these regular meetings then start until November?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. What may have been the catalyst for that?

Mr. Ohr. I don't -- that would be speculating. Once they provided Joe Pientka's name to me I made it a practice to contact him every time I had contact.

Mr. Jordan. They first provided Joe Pientka's name to you in November?

Mr. Ohr. I think that's right.

Mr. Jordan. So up until then, who was your contact at the FBI? Andy McCabe?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. As I think I mentioned, I met with Peter Strzok and Lisa Page on, you know, at least one occasion probably in the fall and then on November 21.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. When is the last time you visited with -- last contact you've had with Mr. Steele?

Mr. Ohr. I believe it's the one in November of 2017.

Mr. Jordan. November of 2017?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. All right. How about Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. The last contact was probably the contact we had on January 20 when he was calling to express concern about the safety of the source.

Mr. Jordan. January 20, 2017?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. Why did you switch from communicating with Mr. Steele -- well, let me back up. The arrangement you had with the FBI starting on November 22, 2016, where you would contact Mr. Pientka after you've touched base with Mr. Steele, after you've had a conversation with Mr. Steele, did that same arrangement exist for Mr. Simpson? Did they want the same thing from Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah. It wasn't -- again, it wasn't really an arrangement. Anytime I got information from Mr. Steele or from Mr. Simpson, I think I called the FBI, at least that's my recollection.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. Okay. What about Mr. Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. I said Mr. Steele or Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Jordan. Either one you would then let the FBI know about a conversation or discussion you've had?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Any type of contact?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Why did you switch your communication from emails to the text messages with --

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall. I just think I was responding in whatever medium Mr. Steele had contacted me on.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Do you know when you switched?

Mr. Ohr. Well, it looks like the first WhatsApp text, looks like it's in January of 2017.

Mr. Jordan. Do you remember the last email you sent in 2016, what the timeframe was?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Is there any type of disciplinary action that you're under at the Department of Justice?

Mr. Ohr. I have been contacted by the Office of Inspector General and I will be talking with them. But aside from that, no. And that's not -- yeah, I guess that's not really disciplinary action. So that's the closest thing I have.

Mr. Jordan. That was my next question, though, was has the IG in any way reached out to you?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. And is that an investigation specifically about you, or is it part of a broader investigation into some other matter?

Mr. Ohr. I'm not sure.

Mr. Jordan. How about the Office of Professional Responsibility, have you had any interaction with them?

Mr. Ohr. No.

Mr. Jordan. No. Walk me back through -- because you have had different titles and I want to make sure I understand this.

So you initially were associate deputy attorney general, and you also were head of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force. Is that right?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. Both titles?

Mr. Ohr. As of 2014, yes.

Mr. Jordan. And you had both titles through what date? When did that change?

Mr. Ohr. December of -- early December of 2017.

Mr. Jordan. So early December of 2017 it went from associate -- or ADAG and organized crime drug enforcement, it went to what?

Mr. Ohr. Director of Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force.

Mr. Jordan. So you just dropped the first title but kept the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

second?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So that one gets dropped early December. And then so you go from Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force director to a different title, and when does that happen?

Mr. Ohr. Early January.

Mr. Jordan. So January of '18?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. It goes to that. So a month later you change again. And what's your title now?

Mr. Ohr. Senior counsel, Office of International Affairs.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. So three titles all happen within a month?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Tell me why those things took place. Why did you go first from associate deputy attorney general to just the organized crime?

Mr. Ohr. As I mentioned earlier, in early December I was told by other members of ODAG -- I was called to a meeting and told that they were going to make me just the director and take away the ADAG title.

They gave me two reasons. One was they said I hadn't told them sufficiently early enough about my contacts with Chris Steele. And then they said they were, in any event, planning a reorganization where none of the heads of Department of Justice

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

components would sit within the Deputy Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Jordan. Hadn't told them sufficiently early enough?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Who?

Mr. Ohr. Told, I guess, the deputy attorney general or higher -- other officials in the Office of Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. Jordan. You hadn't told Sally Yates?

Mr. Ohr. I had not.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And if you had told Sally Yates, sounds like you would have kept that title.

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. But, I mean, that's what they said. They said the reason you're not going to be ADAG any longer is because you didn't tell Sally Yates on August 1, after your July 30 meeting with Christopher Steele, about your relationship with Christopher Steele.

Mr. Ohr. Yeah. I mean, they gave me the two reasons. And so I don't know specifically what would have been early enough. I mean, they said I didn't tell them sufficiently early. They didn't further explain that.

And then, as they said, they were in any event planning to reorganize so that nobody who was a component head sat within the Deputy Attorney General's Office.

Mr. Jordan. Is there anyone else you could have told that

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

would have satisfied them?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. Matt Axelrod? Did you talk to him about this at all?

Mr. Ohr. I did not.

Mr. Jordan. Never talked to him at all?

Mr. Ohr. No, not about this, nothing relating to this.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. All right.

So you lose the ADAG title because you had not told your superiors about your relationship with Mr. Steele and the information you were getting from him in early December 2017. Then why in early January -- or in January 2018, why did you lose the -- why did you go to the other title?

Mr. Ohr. I was told at the time that the Attorney General and the deputy attorney general didn't want me in a position where I would be interacting directly with the White House. And the director of OCDETF does deal with various members of the National Security Council on organized crime matters, organized crime policy.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. And no one from OPR has talked to you throughout any of this process?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. But the inspector general has?

Mr. Ohr. They have asked to interview me, and I will talk with them.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Mr. Jordan. But you have not done that interview yet?

Mr. Ohr. Correct.

Mr. Jordan. And you don't know if that specifically, just to be clear in my mind, if that's specifically about your situation and your interactions with Mr. Steele and the fact that you did tell your superiors about that interaction or if it's part of a broader investigation?

Mr. Ohr. I don't know.

Mr. Jordan. You don't know?

Mr. Ohr. Right.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. I want to go back one last time, make sure I fully get this.

You made it a point starting in November of '16 to -- any interaction you had with Mr. Steele or Mr. Simpson to then follow up with a meeting with folks at the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. Yeah. As much as I can remember, I would do that, yes.

Mr. Jordan. And that continued until you no longer met with anyone, until you had stopped meeting with Steele or Simpson --

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. -- in November of 2017?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. So for 1 full year you're meeting with them.

When was the -- do you recall, Mr. Ohr, when you were talking about reengaging with -- where's my notes -- we just talked about

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

that the last hour. Here we go. Reengaging with -- helping Mr. Steele reengage with the FBI.

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. Tell me the timeframe again.

Mr. Ohr. I --

Mr. Jordan. May of '17?

Mr. Ohr. Yes, I believe that that sounds right.

Mr. Jordan. So why do you have to reengage -- why does the FBI have to reengage if they're getting -- if they've already had, looks like, 12 meetings with you and you're having conversations with Mr. Steele? Seems like they've already engaged. There's no reengagement. It's continued engagement.

Mr. Ohr. What they asked me in May was to ask Chris Steele if he would be willing to meet with them. So that was the message I passed on.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ohr. I appreciate your time.

Mr. Ohr. Thank you.

BY MR. PARMITER:

Q Sir, can I follow up briefly on that?

A Absolutely.

Q In the text that Mr. Jordan is referring to, I believe it's exhibit 5, in several places Mr. Steele refers to -- in this discussion about reengagement he refers to -- I'm looking specifically at the, for example, at August 6, 2017.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A Yes.

Q Should be the second page of that.

A I've got it.

Q And he expresses his frustration.

First of all, he says, "we are frustrated." Do you know who he's referring to what he says "we"?

A I'm not sure.

Q Okay. "With how long this reengagement with the Bureau and Mueller is taking."

And then in a couple of places he says -- he uses the word, and I think you talked about this in the last hour, "SC"?

A Yes.

Q Do you know what he's referring to by SC?

A My interpretation is special counsel.

Q Okay. So he's -- his -- was your interpretation also then that he wanted to engage with the special counsel?

A Yes, but I'm not sure whether -- I don't know. I mean, clearly that's what he's asking, but when I passed the question from the FBI to Chris Steele it was simply whether he would meet with the FBI. He did not say special counsel.

Q Okay. And when you said things like -- this is the text immediately preceding the one, "the Bureau and Mueller," July 16, you said, "I will pass this along to my colleagues."

A Yes.

Q "I will pass this along to my colleagues," in a couple

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

other places, things like that. Who are you referring to there?

A The FBI agent that I was in contact with.

Q Okay.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q It's been a long day and I want to thank you for your patience. Our process sometimes out of necessity results in duplicity, so I appreciate you asking -- or answering some of the questions more than one time.

I have a couple of random questions, and some of these may fall into the category of having already been asked, but I just want to make sure they're on the record.

When you -- rewinding back to 9 o'clock this morning -- when you refer to OCDEF, you're talking about the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force?

A That is correct.

Q Okay. And in your association with OCDEF and you traveling on behalf of OCDEF and doing things that I believe I understand OCDEF does, it would not be unusual for you to interact with other law enforcement officials either around the country or around the world?

A Correct.

Q And in that capacity, would it be fair to say you -- for those people in attendance at conferences like that, you would be the face of the Department of Justice?

A Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q And in that capacity it would not be unusual for you to be identified as a conduit for people to reach out to for resource information or to pass information to?

A Yes.

Q And that is, as I understand what you've said today, that's initially how you became associated with Mr. Steele?

A Yes.

Q And did you have occasion to become associated with other acquaintances like Mr. Steele through your capacity as a liaison with OCDETF?

A Yes.

Q Did --

A Well, not just OCDETF but throughout my different --

Q Throughout your different capacities --

A Capacities, yes.

Q -- with the Department of Justice.

A Yes.

Q So did other people reach out to you, separate and apart from Mr. Steele, separate and apart from Russian organized crime, did others reach out to you with information?

A Yes. Yes. And mostly on Russian organized crime, but, yes.

Q And you, would it be fair to say, when they reached out to you, some of the things they would reach out to you for wouldn't necessarily be things that you in and of yourself could

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

instantly resolve or dispose of. You farm that information out to appropriate people?

A Yes.

Q And would that also have included the FBI?

A Yes.

Q Okay. You indicated that you -- I think you indicated you reached out to Mr. McCabe initially, but you had an association with him prior to him being the deputy director?

A Correct.

Q So he was at Washington field office and you knew him? Or how did you know him?

A I knew him at Washington field office, and I also dealt with him when he was in the New York division of the FBI.

Q Okay. So you reached out to him and then he provided Lisa Page and Peter Strzok?

A Yes.

Q Okay. How did he come to know that the types of violations, for lack of a better word, that Mr. Strzok would work, how did he know that they would be the appropriate people for your needs? You gave him an indication of the information that you were getting and then he produced them as opposed to maybe somebody from the criminal division? How did he come up with Strzok and Page?

A I don't know how he came up with them. I met with him, I believe, in August of 2016, and I provided the information to

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

him that I had received from Chris Steele.

Q So he took the information and decided that it would be Page and Strzok that would be the appropriate --

A Well, Lisa Page -- he had Lisa Page present at that initial meeting.

Q Okay.

A And then later on, it's my understanding that he had -- it got to Peter Strzok.

Q Okay.

A I met subsequently with Peter Strzok.

Q Okay. You had mentioned earlier you had two different, I believe, special agents or supervisory special agents that were handlers of Mr. Steele, I think a Special Agent Gaeta and I think a Pientka?

A No. I know that Chris Steele had conversations with Mike Gaeta, and then separately I was given Joe Pientka as a point of contact for me to provide information to starting in November 2016.

Q Okay. When you would just receive information from Mr. Steele and notify the FBI, it sounds like from testimony you've given your transmitting that information to the Bureau was pretty contemporaneous with you receiving the information. Is that correct?

A As close as I could make it. Certainly, once I started talking with Joe Pientka it was usually the same day or next day.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Who did you deal with before Joe Pientka?

A I dealt with, as I think I've mentioned, Andrew McCabe, and then Peter Strzok and Lisa Page.

Q So one of those people would be who you -- what was the mode of communication? Did you pick up the phone? You'd email? Would there be personal meetings?

A I recall at least one meeting that Peter Strzok and Lisa Page were present at, along with criminal division officials. I don't recall other, you know, the other ways.

Q When you started dealing with Mr. Pientka --

A Yes.

Q -- where is he assigned? Where was he assigned during this time?

A I would meet with him at the FBI headquarters.

Q So you met with him at FBI headquarters?

A Correct.

Q Was he ever assigned to New York, are you aware of?

A I don't know.

Q Okay. Somewhere along the line I was under the impression that one of the handlers for Mr. Steele was a New York assigned agent. Are you aware of that at all?

A Mike Gaeta was -- and, again, I don't know his official status, his handler or not, but Mike Gaeta was from the New York office.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

[4:31 p.m.]

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Okay. Was he also ever assigned overseas?

A Yes.

Q And where was he assigned?

A He was assigned to the FBI's legal attache in Rome.

Q And the legal attache is the sort of liaison in the embassy where agents are assigned?

A Yes.

Q And they coordinate law enforcement efforts on behalf of the Bureau and others from that post?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Are you familiar with a Daniel Jones, a former Senate Select Committee on Intelligence staffer?

A I believe that -- but I -- no independent recollection as I sit here, but I have seen that name in my notes, and it looks like Chris Steele had mentioned that name to me.

Q Okay. Are you aware that he works for, or is the founder of a group called Penn Quarter Group?

A No.

Q Okay.

A I did not know the name.

Q So not -- were you aware that he's raised approximately \$50 million from Democratic donors to continue the Fusion GPS investigation?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A No.

Q Separate and apart from Mr. Steele, are you aware or have you ever dealt with the FBI on any other informant issues, confidential human source issues?

A I've dealt with the FBI on numerous informant issues.

Q Would it be unusual for a source, a CHS, whatever they call them, would it be unusual for a source to be discontinued for some reason and then be opened again?

A It can happen.

Q Are you aware of it happening in any instance?

A I think so, but I don't recall specifics, yes.

Q Okay. So it wouldn't be usual if someone's discontinued for any reason if they resurfaced with information that was of interest to the FBI. They could be reopened under certain circumstances -- I don't know what those circumstances are -- but it's possible?

A Yes, I believe so.

Q Do you know, when you first met Mr. Steele, I think earlier your testimony was this went way back to maybe 2007?

A That's correct.

Q Do you have any reason to believe he was an FBI source then?

A I don't believe so.

Q Okay. Do you have any idea when he was opened approximately as an FBI source?

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

A I don't recall the specific year, but I think it followed a meeting or -- I don't recall a specific year. I know that I was at a -- present at a meeting with Chris Steele and with Mike Gaeta at some point some years ago.

Q Okay. So he might have been opened as a source prior to you relaying any information to the FBI that you're getting from Mr. Steele?

A It's possible. I don't know.

Q Okay. It was widely reported in the media that you were the number four official at the Department of Justice. I think by your reaction, I know where this will go, but I want to put it on the record. You occupied the title, associate deputy assistant -- or associate deputy attorney general?

A That's right. I was one of the associate deputy attorneys general.

Q And how many of them are there?

A There are more than five, somewhere between five and 10, I believe.

Q Is there any slots succession plan or continuity of operation plans, that if the attorney general and certain numbers of people below him are unable to do their jobs, that you would be the fourth person to take over the Department of Justice?

A No.

Q Okay. So there were multiple ADAGs and you were one of the multiple ADAGs, but you were never the fourth in charge at the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Department of Justice?

A That is correct.

Q Okay. You're a member of the Senior Executive Service?

A Yes, I am.

Q Is it true as a member of the Senior Executive Service, you can be moved within your organization for any reason or for no reason at all, based on where you're needed?

A I don't know the specifics, but certainly my attitude has always been that if the Department wants me in a -- to do a particular job, I will do that job.

Q Your, what's become known as the Ohr 302s, were they all done at FBI headquarters, or were any done --

A I did not participate in the creation of the 302s so I don't know how they wrote them up or how they did it.

Q But when you were present for the information that they documented in the 302s, was that FBI headquarters as far as you know or --

A Some of them were at FBI headquarters, and later on, it was at the Washington field office of the FBI.

Q And who at the Washington field office conducted an interview?

A I cannot remember the names.

Q But it wasn't Pientka?

A Right.

Q So it was somebody, another agent, or agents, at the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

FBI's Washington field office?

A My recollection is at least on two occasions I was handed onto a new agent.

Q Okay.

BY MR. PARMITER:

Q Sir, again, just to reiterate, we really appreciate, you know, the time that you've spent here today, and hopefully we just have a few more questions before our colleagues take the chair.

So just very briefly, to follow up on my colleague's questions about the ADAGs in ODAG.

A Yes.

Q So which at the time during your communications with Mr. Steele in 2016 and 2017 -- well, first, let me ask you this: I believe you said earlier that, you know, when you were ADAG you supervised -- you kind of wore two hats being the head of OCDETF. What other components of the Department did you directly supervise?

A That was the only one I directly supervised.

Q Okay. Who was directly supervising NSD or the FBI at that time?

A Well, the ADAGs don't directly supervise the components. There were other ADAGs whose responsibilities included talking to NSD, criminal division, and so forth.

Q So how does it break -- is it broken down by component, or is it broken down by the particular subject matter like

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

counterintelligence?

A It varies, I guess, would be the best way to say. And it can change also. So --

Q Okay. So when you were talking to Mr. Steele in 2016 and 2017, that sort of -- that period, who was the person, the ADAG who was in charge of the counterintelligence portion of the Department?

A Well, Tash Gauhar, in the Office of Deputy Attorney General, worked on national security matters, but I don't know if she was specifically in charge of counterintelligence or anything like that.

Q Did you ever speak to her about any of this --

A I did not.

Q -- material?

Okay. Why didn't you do that?

A I wanted to keep it at the lowest level and, you know, give the information to FBI and whoever I was going to be able to evaluate it, decide what to do with it.

Q Okay. So it would be fair to say you just wanted to keep yourself as sort of a conduit rather than, you know --

A Correct.

Q -- create something within ODAG about this?

A That's right.

Q Regarding Fusion GPS --

A Yes.

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q -- I think you said earlier that you became aware, or Mrs. Ohr became aware that her research was intended to be about Russia and, you know, about the potential ties between the campaign and Russia. Is that correct?

A Yes. At some point, yes.

Q Okay. Are you aware of any efforts by Fusion GPS to conduct sort of research about other politicians?

A No.

Q I'm --

A I mean, I know Fusion GPS did research on different topics, so I don't specifically know of research on other politicians.

Q Okay. For example, anyone who may have been in this room today --

A No.

Q -- or -- okay.

A Not aware of anything like that.

Q Senator Grassley?

A No, not --

Q Devin Nunes?

A No, not that I'm aware of, no.

Q Okay. Bob Goodlatte?

A No. Again, not aware of any Fusion GPS research on other Senators, Congressmen, other officials.

Q Okay. Just briefly because we touched on this, you've

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

mentioned Lisa Page a few times today. You met with her and Peter Strzok --

A Yes.

Q -- and Andy McCabe?

A Yes.

Q And I believe you said you'd known Lisa Page from when she was a trial attorney in OCRS. Is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Okay. Did she work directly for you?

A Yes. I was the chief of OCRS, so she was one of my employees. We had deputy chiefs in OCRS, and she would have reported directly to one of the deputy chiefs.

Q Okay. And through that deputy chief to you?

A Yes.

Q Okay. How long did she work for you? Do you recall?

A I don't recall.

Q Okay. After she left did you -- did you maintain communications with her after she left?

A No.

Q Did Mrs. Ohr know Ms. Page?

A She will -- -- my recollection is she would have met Ms. Page at some point, because once a year, when I was chief of OCRS I would have a -- invite the whole section over to our house. So I recall, on one occasion, Lisa Page being there, and so they would have -- I don't know if they spoke or whatever, but they

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

would have been in the same room.

Q Okay. Apart from the meeting that you had at the FBI, I believe it was at the FBI, with Deputy Director McCabe and Ms. Page and Mr. Strzok, did you have any other conversations with Lisa Page about anything the FBI was looking into related to Russia?

A No. But just, again, as I had mentioned earlier in my initial meeting was with Mr. McCabe and with Lisa Page. I don't believe Peter Strzok was there. And later when I met with Mr. Strzok and Lisa Page, I don't believe Andy McCabe was there. So, no, I can't -- I don't remember conversations on any other topics.

Q Did you ever discuss Mr. Steele with Ms. Page?

A I assume so, since I was telling them about what I was hearing from Chris Steele.

Q Apart from that meeting, I mean?

A We might have. I don't recall.

Q Okay. Do you recall her reaction specifically to the -- to what was conveyed in the meeting?

A I don't recall specifically. I think everybody was alarmed and took it seriously, but I don't recall any specific things she said or reaction.

Mr. Jordan. Bobby, can I ask something?

Mr. Parmiter. Yes, sir.

Mr. Jordan. Mr. Ohr, I'm sorry I'm back in here. When did you learn that Mr. Steele had been -- his relationship with the

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

FBI had been stopped, he'd been fired by the FBI?

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall specifically.

Mr. Jordan. Give me an approximate?

Mr. Ohr. I mean, you've told me that they terminated him in the beginning of November. But beyond that, I don't recall.

Mr. Jordan. Did -- how did you learn that? Did you learn -- did someone from the FBI tell you -- I mean, you're meeting with the FBI at least 13 times over a year's timeframe, and because they've asked you to meet with Mr. Pientka after every time you touch base with Steele and/or Simpson.

In one of those meetings -- did you learn in one of those meetings that he had been terminated? And it seems to me that's something you're going to -- by the way, the guy you're talking to and giving us information on at least once a month -- looks like a lot more often than that frankly, because you met 12 times in about 6 months -- oh, by the way, we fired him.

Mr. Ohr. I don't recall how I learned that he was terminated as a source, so that's the thing. But, again, and the FBI provided Joe Pientka to me as a point of contact. If I recall correctly, they did not instruct me to call him every time I had a contact from Chris Steele.

Mr. Jordan. But you did that?

Mr. Ohr. That was my -- that was me, yes.

Mr. Jordan. So it's fair to say what -- every time you met with -- that corresponds to some meeting just prior to that with

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Christopher Steele?

Mr. Ohr. Yes.

Mr. Jordan. The dates we have from the FBI when you've sat down with them correspond to at or about that time you had had a meeting with Christopher Steele and/or Simpson?

Mr. Ohr. And from November onward, all the contacts with Chris Steele were by telephone, so I didn't have meetings.

Mr. Jordan. Right.

Mr. Ohr. And I had one meeting with Glenn Simpson in December that we've discussed. And I recall one call with Glenn Simpson in January.

Mr. Jordan. Okay. All right. Thanks.

BY MR. BAKER:

Q Just briefly. This issue of being told untimely notice of conversations with Chris Steele, is that -- as you understand it, was that relating back to the very first time you started talking to Steele, or was this in relation -- the untimely part, is this in relation to public reporting now starting to happen?

A So what I was also told was that reports, press reports were about to run talking about my relationship with Chris Steele. So that's my -- but when they say untimely reporting, I think it's basically these press reports are about to run. We didn't have all the information.

Mr. Baker. Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. PARMITER:

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q One last question, sir.

A Just for you.

Q Can you tell me what sort of -- email servers is the wrong word -- email -- like, apps and email services you used to communicate with Mr. Steele and Mr. Simpson?

A I used WhatsApp, which is I think what that reflects. We had some Skype calls. I don't remember if there were any Skype texts or anything like that. I couldn't -- I don't think I could find anything. And then we had some telephone calls.

Q Okay. And regarding email, I mean did you email Mr. Simpson or Mr. Steele using --

A Yeah. There were some emails that I produced relating to my work email, and there was at least that one communication from Glenn Simpson on our home email.

Q Okay. And what was the -- why use Skype?

A I think there was -- I remember Chris Steele saying sometime earlier, maybe years earlier, that he liked using Skype.

Q Okay. But that list right there you think you could confidently say you used to communicate with both of them?

A No. With Chris Steele, Skype, WhatsApp, some emails. With Glenn Simpson, I don't think there was ever any Skype or WhatsApp, just some emails, and then, of course, meeting in person.

Q Okay. And forgive me if you've already answered this, did you first meet Mr. Simpson before or after the election, if

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

you recall?

A I've known -- met Mr. Simpson on various occasions over the years, you know, so --

Mr. Parmiter. Okay. I think that's all we have.

Mr. Ohr. All right.

Mr. Parmiter. Thank you.

Ms. Hariharan. All right. We are back on the record for the minority. It is 4:50 p.m., and hopefully we can do this really quickly.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q So there has been a significant amount of attention placed on not just you and your professional contacts, and your wife and her professional contacts, but your family in general. There has been a significant number of attacks in the public, and I cannot imagine what that is like, and I'm very sorry you have to deal with that. So if you will bear with us, we're going to go through some of the allegations that have been made in these public attacks just to get them out of the way.

So President Trump has been quoted as saying, quote: They should be looking at Bruce Ohr and his wife Nellie for dealing with -- by the way, indirectly -- Russians," end quote. For the record, have you or Mrs. Ohr engaged in a conspiracy to interfere in the U.S. election process with Russian individuals or entities?

A No.

Q Do you know what the President is getting at when he

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

accuses you and your wife of, quote, "dealing with -- by the way, indirectly -- Russians," end quote?

A No.

Q I know you have previously discussed your wife's background and the type of work she was doing for Fusion GPS, and I'm not going to force you to repeat that. The understanding is she was doing open source research translating Russian language materials because of her background.

To the best of your knowledge, was she reviewing any type of classified or highly sensitive materials or was --

A No.

Q Okay. So in general, if Mrs. Ohr was working on a sensitive project, would she -- for one of her clients. As I understand, she had multiple clients, correct --

A She was --

Q -- over a period of --

A She was working for Fusion GPS during part of the period we have been discussing.

Q Right. When she works on sensitive projects, does she discuss those details with you?

A Generally, no.

Q And on the flip side, have you discussed details of your cases with her?

A No.

Q At any time prior to the 2016 election, did she ask you

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

to provide your professional opinion about any research concerning Donald Trump?

A I don't recall anything like that, no.

Q Or the Russian entities -- or, excuse me, Russian individuals or companies she was researching?

A She didn't ask me for my professional opinion.

Q Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that prior to the 2016 election, your wife had any knowledge of the FBI's broader Russian investigation, or the FBI's Russian collusion investigation?

A No.

Q Do you have any reason to believe that Mrs. Ohr sought or reviewed any FISA applications related to the Russian investigation?

A No, she did not.

Q And to your knowledge, beyond the open source research that she was conducting, was Mrs. Ohr involved in meeting with sources to gather information?

A She was not.

BY MS. SHEN:

Q So, Mr. Ohr, within the past few weeks, President Trump has put you in name -- has named you in his Tweets about nine times to my count, and I will have the fortunate pleasure of reading you a couple of those now and asking you some questions.

So on August 17, 2018, Donald Trump tweeted, quote: "FOX

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

News has learned that Bruce Ohr wrote Christopher Steele following the firing of James Comey stating that he was afraid the anti-Trump Russia probe will be exposed, Charles Payne on FOX Business. How much more does Mueller have to see? They have blinders on. Rigged."

So, Mr. Ohr, did you write Christopher Steele following the firing of James Comey because you were, quote, "afraid the anti-Trump Russia probe will be exposed"?

A No.

Q Okay. So your writing to Christopher Steele following the firing of James Comey had nothing to do with the Trump/Russia probe. Is that accurate? To the Steele -- I'm sorry.

So your communications with Christopher Steele after the firing of James Comey was not due to any concern that either you or Mr. Steele would be exposed as some -- as part of some kind of conspiracy. Is that correct?

A I don't think so, if I understand your question.

Q Okay.

BY MS. HARIHARAN:

Q Do you recall if that conversation was a discussion about sources and concerns for their safety?

A I think -- I don't know if that's -- that's what I was trying to remember, but our conversations were about the concern for the source's safety.

BY MS. SHEN:

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

Q Okay. Also in August 17, 2018, President Trump tweeted, quote: Bruce Ohr of DOJ is in legal jeopardy. It's astonishing that he's still employed. Bruce and Nellie Ohr's bank account is getting fatter and fatter because of dossier that they are both peddling. He doesn't disclose it under Fed regs. Using your Federal office for personal, dot, dot, dot, dot, dot.

It continues to a second tweet on the same day: Using your Federal office for personal financial gain is a Federal gratuity statute violation, bribery statute violation, honest services violation, all major crimes, dot, dot, dot, because the DOJ is run by blank Jeff Sessions. So when does Mueller do what must be done? Probably never, @FOXNews.

Okay. Mr. Ohr, are you in some kind of legal jeopardy that you're aware of?

A Not that I'm aware of.

Q Okay. And is it true that your, or your wife's bank account is getting fatter and fatter because of the Trump dossier?

A I don't believe so.

Q Okay. So did you or your wife make any money as a result of the Trump dossier?

A I don't believe so.

Q Okay. So -- well, in reference to Trump dossier, when it says he didn't disclose under Federal regs, you and your wife didn't actually make any money off the Trump dossier, therefore, there would be no reason to disclose such a thing under Federal

COMMITTEE SENSITIVE

regs, if that's --

A Yes, correct.

Q So you were also being accused of, quote, using your office for personal financial gain. Mr. Ohr, have you used your Federal office for any personal financial gain?

A No.

Q Okay. And have you committed any major crimes?

A No.

Q Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Hariharan. So I think we'll just end with, we are very grateful that you've taken the time to be here with us. We cannot possibly imagine what this experience must have -- what the past year must have been like. And for that, we are very sorry.

And if there is anything you would like to share with us, because most folks don't get the opportunity to address, especially these kind of -- the public attacks that have occurred via social media and other outlets, if there's anything you would like to say, the floor is yours.

Mr. Ohr. I don't think I have anything to add. As I said before, I'm happy, privileged to work for the Department of Justice, and I continue to pursue that mission.

Mr. Berman. All right. Then I believe we are done and under 10 minutes. We're off the record at 4:57. Thank you so much.

[Whereupon, at 4:57 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

I have read the foregoing \_\_\_\_ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

---

Witness Name

---

Date