

From: "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Subject: FW: [REDACTED] Notes from call with [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, 27 Jul 2020 17:18:45 +0000

Embedded: Numbers_you_requested.msg

From: [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 2:40 PM

To: [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>

Subject: [REDACTED] Notes from call with [REDACTED]

- They have obtained all electronic files/emails relating to this and going broader (based on how they got swept up) relating to SDFL and the Epstein case. Also reviewed the hard copy files in SDFL and made copies of a substantial portion of it. A lot of those documents had been already collated electronically by [REDACTED] / [REDACTED] in CVRA litigation.
- Collected in electronic form all of the FBI's holdings from West Palm RA. Also had been collected by FBI HQ for a FOIA request. Also held by the FBI in a separate collection of Epstein case materials at HQ. Physically looked through the FBI's hard copy documents in West Palm. Identical to the electronic holdings.
- Also collected through JMD all emails from individuals at HQ who played a role in reviewing and considering the Epstein matter. Includes [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] other ODAG people. They are Outlook files, which contain emails and calendar entries.
- In Acosta's materials, gap from 5/2007-11/2007, a critical period, in which all his sent emails failed to be retained. There are gaps out there that are insurmountable. The USAO/EOUSA switched over the email system so that emails were retained in a different way, that was happening on a rolling basis nationwide, and at SDFL during that period.
- There was a change in responsibility for retaining retainable emails. Changed from EOUSA to USAO. A number of emails dropped out. Don't have a perfect collection. But where USA emails not available from his files, if he sent it to his staff, we have it from their inbox.
- Notorious "one sided email" that was made public in the CVRA litigation following disclosure by defense counsel to [REDACTED] in unrelated emails. Involve [REDACTED]; but when made public redacted defense counsel's emails. Don't have other side on some emails with Acosta.
- Pulled 5 people's emails: Acosta, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] Nominally her first line supervisor but was not a player. Guy that [REDACTED] consulted with named [REDACTED], but he was not very active. Have a lot of emails from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], but don't think they collected their emails individually but have them to the extent they are on emails with 5 main subjects. Time period= begins when (case came in 5/2006, opened 6/2006, Acosta and [REDACTED] briefed 7/2006), extends up to 7/2010 when Epstein completed his sentence.
- Method: identified custodians, pulled documents for period of time, ran search terms or reviewed every email.
- Volume of emails pulled from SDFL: hundreds of thousands. Identified in the thousands of relevant documents.
- In terms of copies from hard copy files: 24 boxes reviewed; subset of that was scanned in. Duplication into what is in the CVRA holdings.
- Emails in Outlook, documents in PDF.
- [REDACTED] asked for number of documents prior to search terms or narrowing; number of files identified as relevant to what they were looking at; some estimate of the number of pages of PDF material. Confirmed we don't want the numbers for the FBI holdings (which we already have). Regarding internal DOJ, may circle back but for now less focused on that.

- █████ flagged that there was a little bit about victims, in which █████ was talking in the aggregate or the generic in assessing state of mind, but there is not that much of it.
- Maxwell was a captioned subject of the FBI case in SDFL as of 12/2/2006. But really there is nothing- █████ did not recall any mention of her name in any document or any email at all. She was not on the radar. Even the pro memo which was in support of the proposed indictment, didn't in any way reference Maxwell. Focused entirely on Epstein. After our indictment appeared, they went back to see if she even appeared, but Maxwell was not addressed at all.
- OPR is in the final stages of their report. Think that we will want to review a copy before its released, think it will be publicly released. Would like us to do a sensitivity review of it to see if there is anything there that would raise issues. Timeline is that draft will be ready in a week, and would provide to us at the same time as they provide to subjects for their review. Using new technology where we (and subjects) could review but not comment or retain. Final will be public late summer. Hoping August.