



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Legal Counsel

Washington, D.C. 20530

January 2, 2018

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

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

Dear Mr. Bassin:

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

Since the last partial response, we have processed 376 pages of responsive records. We have enclosed 51 pages of responsive records, with material redacted as exempt from disclosure pursuant to FOIA Exemption Five, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5), and pursuant to FOIA Exemption Six, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). For your information, Exemption Five exempts material protected by the attorney-client, deliberative process, and presidential communications privileges, as well as the attorney work product doctrine and other privileges. Exemption Six exempts material the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. We have withheld the remaining 325 pages in full pursuant to Exemption Five, and in part pursuant to Exemption Six. We are continuing to process responsive records.

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

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

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

Sincerely,



Paul P. Colborn
Special Counsel

Enclosures

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

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Saturday, January 21, 2017 9:45 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Current list

Here is the list we are working from now. We have not received (b) (5) (will get it soon and will send to (b) (6) as it is modeled after (b) (5) or (b) (5) getting that today and will send to (b) (6))

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 6:03 PM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Subject: FW: Executive Orders
Attachments: (b) (5) -- FINAL.docx; (b) (5) --
FINAL.docx; (b) (5) -- ONE LAST ADDITION.docx;
(b) (5) -- ONE FINAL EDIT.docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) -- FINAL.docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) -- REVISED.docx

The six latest versions of the immigration EOs.

(b) (5)

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 6:18 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: FW: Executive Orders
Attachments: (b) (5) -- FINAL.docx; (b) (5) --
FINAL.docx; (b) (5) -- ONE LAST ADDITION.docx;
(b) (5) -- ONE FINAL EDIT.docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) -- FINAL.docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) --REVISED.docx

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 5:19 PM
To: (b) (6) Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: F&Ls

There are so many! I'm checking now to make sure I've completed all mine.

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 5:18 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
<(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: F&Ls

Thank you! Sorry to have missed it earlier.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 5:15 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: F&Ls

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

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

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:53 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

Great. Thanks!

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:49 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

One small nit on this one as well. We made this change before. I don't know if they missed it or objected to it.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:42 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

Hey, that's great. If all of them are that clean, we'll be in good shape!

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:35 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

Here is (b) (5) with one nit, and its corresponding F&L.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:16 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Executive Orders on Immigration

Here are the immigration documents that are (b) (5) If you could review them by tomorrow (or earlier if possible) that would be great! Please see if any additional edits or

comments need to be made; especially note any new provisions.

And check to see if your F&Ls need to be revised.

Thanks,
Rosemary

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 11:27 PM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: Executive Orders on Immigration
Attachments: (b) (5)
REVISED+(b) (6).docx

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 10:25 PM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: Executive Orders on Immigration

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 7:31 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

(b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:16 PM

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:01 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: wrapping things up here

Thanks!

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 11:37 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: wrapping things up here

Very glad to hear that things are winding down for the evening. I'll check in with you in the morning re plans for the immigration orders.

Hope you get home safely and sleep well!

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 11:26 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: wrapping things up here

We just got off the phone with WHCO and are wrapping things up. Should be out of here soon.

In the morning, we can assess where we are on immigration. I think (b) (6)'s EO is the only one with remaining issues. I will send you the redline if you didn't get it already.

Thanks for all your help today and tonight. We should have a better day tomorrow.

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:02 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

We haven't sent any of them back yet

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:49 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6); (b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Executive Orders on Immigration

This makes one other change that (b) (6) noticed; I don't know whether you've already sent these back.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 6:35 PM

duplicate

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:08 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

I am thinking that I should alert Policy that we are redlining the immigration EOs. Does that make sense, or should I just ask them the status on their side?

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: Thursday and Friday

Thanks very much, Rosemary. I'm working to get some clarity on the rest of the week. Will let you know.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:23 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Thursday and Friday

Stewart: (b) (6) and I are focusing on immigration today, of course. I think we have issues with only two –
(b) (5)

But, looking ahead to Thursday for a minute, we were thinking we might have to do (b) (5)
(b) (5) Do we have a decision on which (b) (5) version is going forward? Do we have a (b) (5)
EO, yet? For (b) (5), we did get that version over the weekend, but we all thought that review might
be premature because it hadn't gone through much in the way of clearances at the WH yet. Can we get some
insight on where that one stands? We don't want to be caught flat-footed on this tomorrow.

For Friday, we are reviewing or re-reviewing the latest versions of the following:

(b) (5)

And I am reviewing draft redlines of some others – but do you know yet if there has been any winnowing of
the list below? It will be difficult to process all of the potentials on the list below, so if you had any guidance
on current thinking on the Friday roll-out, that would be great.

Thanks,
Rosemary

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 10:57 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: Friday list

Rosemary – below are the items potentially for Friday. I've noted the ones I have or think I should have. I'd
be grateful if you could send the others to me (sorry for the volume). I've added notes about what I think is
the latest, in the hopes that that is helpful.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:56 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC); (b) (6)
Subject: (b) (5)
Attachments: (b) (5) --
REVISED+(b) (6).docx; EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5).docx

I've added a couple of edits to the EO, hoping Rosemary still hasn't sent these over. I've also attached the corresponding F&L, with open issues highlighted.

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 1:16 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6)
Subject: RE: (b) (5)

I am not sending anything over until later this afternoon, when we are supposed to get some guidance from WH policy team on the whole immigration batch.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:56 PM

duplicate

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:02 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Subject: FW: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Attachments: (b) (5).docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) -- FINAL.DOCX; (b) (5).docx; FINAL--
(b) (5) (1.24.17
noon).docx; (b) (5).docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) (1.24.17) (v.3) (b) (5).docx

Rosemary (CC to Curtis to get him the latest docs) -- attached are the current versions of the immigration EOs. As mentioned earlier, (b) (5)
(b) (5). Changes may come from those, so I think the move for now is for the AAs to see how these look without yet diving into redline preparation. But please let me know if you think that there is a better way to proceed.

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:19 PM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:17 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>; Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Sounds good to me.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:16 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Curtis: I would like to share the new drafts and the cover memos with the pertinent AAs as soon as I can, cautioning them that things might change later today.
Rosemary

-----Original Message-----

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:02 PM

duplicate

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:23 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: FW: 2pm versions of immigration EOs
Attachments: (b) (5) (1.24.17 noon).docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5).docx; FINAL-- (b) (5)
(b) (5) (1.24.17 noon).docx

(b) (6) Here are yours. They may change (b) (5) For (b) (5)
please just check to see if you see any changes from the one we saw earlier this week.
I am still working on your redline.
Note cover memos for drafters' intent.
Rosemary

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:43 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Correct. Though if you see something, say something. :-)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:42 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

I'm assuming (b) (5) but if that's wrong, let me know!

-----Original Message-----

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:23 PM

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:43 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

OK!

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:36 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Whoops--it's actually in (b) (5), so I'll make it on the most recent version you just sent.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:33 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Rosemary--

(b) (6) has suggested another edit on the (b) (5). Assuming that's the redline you're working on, do you want me to send it now or later? I didn't want to create version control problems.

--(b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:23 PM

duplicate

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 3:54 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: form and legality memos for tonight
Attachments: 2017-01-19 FL Memo - (b) (5) v3 + (b) (6).docx; EO Form and
Legality -- (b) (5) + (b) (6) --with ceg + (b) (6) again.docx; EO Form and
Legality -- (b) (5) + (b) (6) --with ceg.docx; (b) (5)
(b) (5) - OLC form legality memo - 01 (b) (6) + (b) (6).docx

Rosemary: Here's what we have for tonight (minus (b) (6)s (b) (5)
(b) (5) and my (b) (5) memo).

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 5:04 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

I should add that (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 3:52 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Cc: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

On (b) (5), this adds in the one change I suggested last night (which we have suggested on previous occasions).

On (b) (5), I've added the nits we made last night and the edit (b) (6) suggested. It's intended to (b) (5)

(b) (5) (I think (b) (6) and (b) (6) had some concerns about that.) The edits made by the NSC looked fine to me.

On (b) (5), I've added and beefed up the comments as we discussed (and elsewhere). I've highlighted the new/revised comments.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:23 PM

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 1:03 PM
To: (b) (6); (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (OLC); (b) (6) (b) (6) (OLC)
Subject: Friday signings...

Hi all. We've got the list of documents tentatively scheduled for signature on Friday:

1. (b) (5) - (b) (6)
2. (b) (5) - (b) (6)
3. (b) (5) - (b) (6)
4. (b) (5) - (b) (6)
5. (b) (5) - (b) (6)
6. (b) (5) - (b) (6)

(b) (5)
(b) (5). As a result, we are awaiting revised versions and so this is a heads up for now that we will need to review any changes and settle on final language.

We will need to issue F&Ls for the EOs, so those may need to be updated depending on changes made. We will try to have paperwork signed as early on Thursday as we can.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Rosemary

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5)

Sounds good! I'll hold on it.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: (b) (5)

This is the latest redline, but I met with (b) (6) to go over her comments yesterday and she was going to redraft. Please don't send this out until I check with her on an updated version. She got sidetracked yesterday focusing on (b) (5).

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 12:56 PM

duplicate

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:56 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5)

Thank you, Rosemary. Looks good. I'll pass it back to try to push things along.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:52 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: (b) (5)

Scott: Here is the updated version of (b) (5) (b) (6) had sent it yesterday, but it was sent with the others and I focused on the ones signed today.
RH

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:50 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: 2pm versions of immigration EOs

Here it is. It was just tied up with the other ones.

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 3:52 PM

duplicate

duplicate

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:58 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: FINAL-- (b) (5)
(1.24.17 noon)+OLC (1 25 2017)

Perfect—thanks!

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 2:57 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FINAL-- (b) (5) (1.24.17 noon)+OLC (1 25 2017)

Send this one. Took care of a nit and attributed comments to OLC.

Stewart, Scott (OLC)

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 5:39 PM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC)
Cc: Hart, Rosemary (OLC); Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Subject: Lastest EO/PM forecast

Curtis – John Bash let me know that this is the forecast for tomorrow and Friday (and at least part of early next week):

Tomorrow: (b) (5)
(b) (5)

Friday: (b) (5)
(b) (5)

"Early next week": (b) (5)
(b) (5)

John said (b) (5)
(b) (5) Perhaps you will have more detail when you speak with Greg.

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 6:22 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: Re: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!

(b) (6) See you tomorrow :)

On Jan 25, 2017, at 6:19 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

(b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 6:19 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!

Ok, great! Hope you have a good evening!

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 6:18 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!

Yes, I spoke with him already.

Thanks for checking!

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 6:16 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: FW: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!

Thanks, Rosemary. Could we update (b) (6) that (b) (5) probably isn't going? (I noticed that he wasn't on your follow up email, but maybe you already talked to him.)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 5:53 PM
To: (b) (6) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)> (OLC)
<(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)> (OLC) <(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)> (OLC)
<(b) (6)>; (b) (6) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!

Update on this schedule. (b) (5)
(b) (5)

(b) (5), (b) (6)

1-4 are with WHCO, which is reviewing our redlines (Nate's partial deadline). We are still reviewing (b) (5). I've asked that we get the passbacks as early in the day as possible so we can review them and work to finalize during the day. I don't anticipate anyone has to work on anything tonight.

Note that (b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5) Scott is double-checking on that because if that's not the case, that would be a huge load for us and a significant shift in the plans we just heard about.

I am sorry about the constantly changing plans. This is not unusual early on in an Administration, but I know it can be frustrating. We'll power through!

Thanks for everything,
Rosemary

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 1:03 PM

duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 6:53 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: Re: Friday signings... CHANGE IN PLANS!


If there are no EOs tomorrow, I hope you can leave before midnight!

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

On Jan 25, 2017, at 5:53 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

duplicate

duplicate



Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:14 PM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Subject: Re: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

Great. (b) (6) and I will review asap tomorrow.

> On Jan 25, 2017, at 11:04 PM, Stewart, Scott (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:
>
> Their passback on the Friday immigration EO.
>

(b) (5)

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:25 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: Re: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

Sounds good.

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

On Jan 25, 2017, at 11:14 PM, Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)> wrote:

Let's talk in the morning.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Stewart, Scott (OLC)" <(b) (6)>
Date: January 25, 2017 at 11:04:46 PM EST

duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 8:54 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

That works. By then I should be able to send you a few minor changes to the draft.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 8:53 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

I am going down to the SCIF to read a document and should be back in a bit.

9:30 for a call?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 8:33 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

Let me know when a good time to call you would be.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:15 PM

duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:25 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

That makes sense.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:24 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

I just finished reviewing the draft. It might make sense for me to review your redline and add my edits on top. I think I can do that in 10 minutes, and then we can talk?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:14 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)

Here are my comments on everything but (b) (5)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 8:53 AM

duplicate

duplicate

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:32 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC)
Subject: RE: EO

I'm a doofus—losing track of too many similar provisions. Never mind, and thank you!

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:31 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: EO

(b) (5)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:28 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: EO

I have long since lost track of your original comments—sorry! (b) (5)
(b) (5)?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:25 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: EO

It is (b) (5). Did I cite it wrong in my comment? Sorry if I did.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:21 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: EO

Or is it (b) (5)?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:19 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: EO

(b) (6)—

You looked at this section, I think. Is this the right reference? (b) (5)

(b) (5)

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:35 AM
To: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Subject: RE: Today

Hi Scott.

(b) (6) and I have been emailing back and forth this morning on the (b) (5) EO. We should have a final redline (mostly technical) within the hour.

I am reviewing (b) (6)'s (b) (5) passback, and also (b) (6)'s initial redline. Should be done by noon with both of those.

On the others, we are a bit in a holding pattern, as we need drafts from WHCO.

From: Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:30 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (5)>
Subject: Today

Good morning, Rosemary! Just wanted to see how the EOs for tomorrow are looking. (I've heard nothing further from WHCO this morning.)

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 11:20 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh
Attachments: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh.+(b) (6).docx.docx

Here it is. I've removed the internal comments and removed highlighting except where I've edited stuff since/while we talked.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:46 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Let's talk now. (b) (6)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:39 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Also, do you think we need to (b) (5) ?

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Let me know whenever you want to talk.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:33 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Here you go.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:00 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Sure. That makes sense.

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:59 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

I'm working through your comments and questions. Should I shoot it back to you before I call?

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:58 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Jeff is covering the 10 a.m. meeting, so I am available to talk whenever you are. I am here at (b) (6)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:44 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

Sounds good. Will look at it right now.

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 9:44 AM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh

I generally agreed with your edits, except where noted, and have added some edits and questions of my own. Please review.

Jeff and I have a 10 a.m. meeting with an intradepartmental group. I will see if he can cover – I am already pressed for time this morning. I'll circle back with you when I know my schedule over the next hour.

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 12:08 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)-(b) (6)+ rh
Attachments: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+(b) (6)+ rh.+(b) (6).docx

Here you go!

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 12:06 PM
To: (b) (6) (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)-(b) (6)+ rh

Thanks. Would you mind (b) (5) and sending to me? It would save me a few minutes!

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 11:50 AM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC) <(b) (6)>
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)-(b) (6)+ rh

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

(b) (5)

I'm sorry for the fuss!

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 10:46 AM

duplicate

duplicate

Hart, Rosemary (OLC)

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 12:33 PM
To: Gannon, Curtis E. (OLC); Stewart, Scott (OLC)
Cc: (b) (6) (OLC)
Subject: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+ OLC (1 26 2017)
Attachments: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+ OLC (1 26 2017).docx

Curtis and Scott: Here is our redline of the latest passback on this EO, which is slated for issuance tomorrow. Please let us know if you have additions, changes, or questions for us.

Thanks,
Rosemary

(b) (6) (OLC)

From: (b) (6) (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 1:14 PM
To: Hart, Rosemary (OLC); (b) (6)
Subject: RE: (b) (5) EO (25 Jan 929pm)+ OLC (1 26 2017)
Attachments: EO Form and Legality -- (b) (5) docx

Here's the F&L

From: Hart, Rosemary (OLC)
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 12:33 PM

duplicate