July 5, 2018

The Honorable Arthur A. Elkins, Jr.
Inspector General
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Mr. Elkins:

I am writing to request that your office investigate new allegations against EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt based on information the Committee has obtained during several transcribed interviews with some of Mr. Pruitt’s top aides. Although our investigation is still ongoing, I believe your office should conduct a much more detailed and thorough investigation of several specific matters.

First, we have obtained evidence that a dinner meeting Mr. Pruitt had in Rome with Cardinal George Pell was removed from his public schedule—under the direction of Mr. Pruitt’s Chief of Staff, Ryan Jackson—after Cardinal Pell was charged with sexual assault. Based on the interviews our staff members have conducted, it is possible that other meetings, including with lobbyists, also may have been omitted from Mr. Pruitt’s public schedule if they were deemed “personal.”

Second, we have obtained additional evidence that Mr. Pruitt routinely asked senior EPA staff to help his family members—including his wife and his daughter—while they were on EPA premises during official work hours. These requests included helping his wife find employment as a political fundraiser and helping his daughter obtain a White House internship and a legal fellowship. One senior staff member believed some of these requests were inappropriate and that one would violate the law for her to make.

Third, despite Mr. Pruitt’s categorical denial that he ever spoke with President Donald Trump about replacing Attorney General Jeff Sessions, Mr. Pruitt’s Senior Counsel, Samantha Dravis, explained during her transcribed interview with Committee staff that Mr. Pruitt was indeed interested in the Attorney General position this spring and that he “hinted” to her about a conversation he had with President Trump.
Concealing Meeting with Cardinal Pell After Sexual Assault Charges

Administrator Pruitt and several EPA senior staff had a dinner meeting on June 9, 2017, in Rome with Cardinal George Pell, who served at the time as Vatican Prefect for the Secretariat of the Economy. Before the trip, in May 2017, allegations emerged that Cardinal Pell had sexually abused two choirboys in the 1990s. These allegations followed previous reports that Cardinal Pell had mishandled sexual abuse cases against clergy members. Shortly after Mr. Pruitt’s trip to Italy, Australian police announced that they charged Cardinal Pell criminally with sexual assault.

Based on transcribed interviews conducted by Committee staff with several of Mr. Pruitt’s top aides, it appears that an EPA staff member raised concerns about Mr. Pruitt meeting with Cardinal Pell before the trip, and that after sexual abuse charges were filed against Cardinal Pell, Mr. Pruitt’s Chief of Staff, Ryan Jackson, directed EPA staff to remove all references to the meeting from Mr. Pruitt’s public schedule after it occurred.

During a transcribed interview with Millan Hupp, Mr. Pruitt’s former Director of Scheduling and Advance, she explained that concerns were raised about Cardinal Pell before the trip to Italy:

Q: Did any staff raise concerns about Administrator Pruitt meeting with Cardinal Pell?
A: There was a question brought up by Mark Kasman [Director of the Office of Regional and Bilateral Affairs] at some point in time.
Q: What was that concern or question?
A: I recall him bringing to our attention that there were some issues involving Cardinal Pell around the same time.
Q: And why did that meeting go forward despite the concerns?
A: Which meeting is this?
Q: It is not on this itinerary. So who made the decision to omit the dinner with Cardinal Pell from the itinerary?
A: Well, this is also not the complete itinerary. It does not have Bologna on it.
Q: Is it on the final itinerary?
A: I do not know. …
Q: What was the concern expressed by Mr. Kasman about Cardinal Pell?

---


The Honorable Arthur A. Elkins

A: I don’t remember specifically what the concerns were.
Q: Was that concern expressed to Mr. Jackson or just to you? In what way did he express it?
A: He brought it up to Kevin Chmielewski and myself during a meeting we had with him in his office.
Q: And did you share it with anyone?
A: I do not remember.
Q: Do you know if Kevin shared it with anyone?
A: I do not know.
Q: So, as far as you know, he shared a concern with you and you did nothing with it?
A: I do not remember what I did with it. I don’t remember the timeframe in which he brought up the concern.  

After Cardinal Pell was charged with sexual assault, Mr. Pruitt’s Chief of Staff, Mr. Jackson, directed EPA staff to remove all references to Cardinal Pell from the trip’s itinerary, according to three senior EPA staff.

During her transcribed interview with Committee staff, Ms. Hupp explained:

Q: Did someone ever discuss omitting Cardinal Pell’s name from the itinerary?
A: Yes.
Q: Who?
A: Our chief of staff.
Q: What did he say?
A: There was an instance when Cardinal Pell was to be a point of contact on one of the Vatican tours, and it was requested that I remove his name as the point of contact.
Q: You said it was requested in a passive voice. Who requested it and in what way?
A: Ryan Jackson requested it.
Q: Orally?
A: Yes.
Q: What did he say?
A: He simply asked me to remove that note.
Q: Did he say why?
A: Not that I can recall.
Q: Did you have an understanding of why?
A: Not that I can recall.

Committee staff also conducted a transcribed interview of Samantha Dravis, Mr. Pruitt’s former Associate Administrator for the Office of Policy and Senior Counsel, who explained:

---

4 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Millan Hupp (May 18, 2018).
5 Id.
Q: At some point we understand that Cardinal Pell’s name was one of the points of contacts for the tour of the Vatican.
A: Okay.
Q: Were you aware of Mark Kasman or anyone else raising any concerns about the administrator meeting with Cardinal Pell?
A: No, I have subsequently read media reports that those concerns were flagged. They were not flagged to me. I was not aware of that issue or of those concerns, nor was I aware of anybody raising that concern to the administrator at the time.
Q: And you didn’t know the issue about Cardinal Pell—
A: No.
Q: —at the time. After the trip were you aware when Cardinal Pell became arrested, did that become an issue in the office?
A: Well, I remember reading it in the New York Times, and I remember sending the New York Times article to Ryan Jackson just out of disbelief, and it was obviously a shocking thing to read, but I don’t recall any further discussions with Mr. Jackson about it or anybody else on the EPA staff. Now, I subsequently learned through a conversation with Mr. Ferguson that, in fact, Ryan Jackson did hold a meeting with Mr. Chmielewski, Ms. Hupp, and Mr. Ferguson.
Q: And what did Mr. Ferguson tell you about that meeting?
A: He told me that Ryan had made a decision to change the schedule. I was not involved in that discussion, so I don’t know if that’s true or not.
Q: Did he explain to you what he meant by change the schedule?
A: I took that to mean that, you know, essentially on one of these that his name would not appear on the schedule.
Q: And by one of these, you were holding up exhibit 2 which is this itinerary that got produced via FOIA?
A: Yes, ma’am.
Q: So you didn’t speak directly to Ryan Jackson about that?
A: No, I did not.
Q: But you were told by Lincoln Ferguson that Ryan Jackson had a meeting and in it he told Lincoln Ferguson and others to remove Cardinal Pell’s name from the itinerary?
A: That a decision was made at that meeting to remove his name from one or more schedules, official schedules.
Q: Did Lincoln Ferguson explain why they were going to remove the name?
A: He did not explain, but I think it was implied that it was because of this concern that you just raised.6

During his transcribed interview with the Committee, Mr. Pruitt’s Chief of Staff, Mr. Jackson, denied reports that concerns were raised before the trip about Mr. Pruitt meeting with Cardinal Pell, but admitted that he directed EPA staff to remove references to Cardinal Pell after it occurred because he deemed it “personal”:

6 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Samantha Dravis (June 28, 2018).
Q: During the planning process, do you remember a time period where someone raised concern about a potential for the meeting with Cardinal Pell?
A: I’m sorry?
Q: Do you recall someone raising a concern or a question about whether the Administrator should meet with Cardinal Pell?
A: No, I don’t recall.
Q: So you don’t recall that before the meeting—before the trip, during one of the planning meetings with Kevin Chmielewski and Millan Hupp and the Administrator, there was raised a concern that there had been some news stories about Cardinal Pell’s potential abuse and that perhaps he should not be on the agenda?
A: I wasn’t aware of those news stories, and I don’t—I wasn’t a part of a meeting. I don’t remember being part of a meeting at all talking about that.
Q: Were you part of the meetings that planned the trip?
A: Yes.
Q: With the Administrator?
A: Yes.
Q: And did you know that the Administrator was going to meet with Cardinal Pell before the trip?
A: I may have, but it wouldn’t have had much significance to me.
Q: And you went on the trip, right?
A: Yes.
Q: And you were at the dinner with Cardinal Pell?
A: Yes.
Q: Following the trip, do you recall the news stories about Cardinal Pell’s arrest coming out?
A: Yes.
Q: Was there then a meeting that you had with Millan Hupp and Lincoln Ferguson where you discussed removing Cardinal Pell’s name from the Administrator’s agenda?
A: We had a discussion when we came back about ensuring that the schedule reflected the official meetings that the Administrator attended and who attended those meetings, you know, what he did. The schedule, whether it be here in Washington, D.C., on the road here for domestic trips, and for this international trip and probably other international trips, changes by the moment sometimes. When we got back, I said, you know, we’re going to, you know, ultimately have to produce the schedule for this. We just need to ensure that if he had an official meeting, that the participants are there. If he has a personal dinner and we know the participants, then we may or may not release it, but it either has to be thorough or not be included, especially if it’s a personal dinner. In this case, in this event, there was, you know, a dinner one of the evenings when we were in Rome. There were, I think, 15 people there. I mean, it was not an official function at all. It was simply getting dinner. Cardinal Pell was there, but so were a dozen, 15 other people. I don’t even know who they are all were. So in that case, I don’t know what got produced on the schedule. I don’t know that anybody’s name got produced on the schedule, just because it was a personal
dinner. Now, earlier iterations of the schedule had Cardinal Pell at one point, I remember, leading a tour of the Apostolic Palace, I believe it’s what it’s called. That didn’t materialize. I think maybe he was involved or was thought to be involved in something—something else, was planning to be involved in something else. That didn’t materialize either.

Q: So did you instruct the EPA staff to remove Cardinal Pell’s name from the dinner?
A: I said that in any official event we need to try to go above and beyond to ensure that we have reflected who attended that and what that was about. If we had a personal dinner, I don’t think it’s important.

Q: And how did you deem that the Cardinal Pell dinner was then personal?
A: There was no EPA business there. It was just a gathering of people.

Q: And did you do that, in part, because it was embarrassing, after the fact, that Cardinal Pell had attended the dinner with Administrator Pruitt?
A: I did that because there were—and there have been since—just personal dinners or personal meetings which he has had that if it doesn’t relate to EPA business, I don’t think it’s necessary to put it on the schedule.

Q: So, in other instances, you’ve also—
A: I mean, I think there were other instances on that trip where there was a personal dinner, and I’m not sure, I can’t remember, but I don’t know that it was reflected, and even if it was reflected, did it list any of the attendees. Maybe it listed the attendees on the EPA staff, but the other, you know, private attendees, I don’t know that it did.

Q: So you instructed EPA staff to remove all of the names of people from both this and from other productions, right—
A: I believe so, yeah.

Q: —of things that you then deemed to be personal dinners, personal events, personal meetings. Is that right?
A: That’s what we try to do, yes.

Q: And that would include personal dinners and events and meetings with individuals who would be heads of companies or regulated entities?
A: On this trip, we only had one middle-of-the-day meeting with companies, with representatives from different companies. It was an official event, and I’m hoping that all of those participants appeared on the official calendar.

Q: But you have since instructed EPA staff to make sure to scrub out names of people who the Administrator has personal meetings and meals with, right?
A: Because I think that’s personal information, just like a phone number or a Social Security number or something like that. If it doesn’t have—if it’s not EPA business, I don’t know why it’s—why it’s relevant.

Q: Okay. But that would include people for whom—are the heads of companies or regulated industries that—Lobbyists. Lobbyists, right?
A: It could.

Q: If you deem it to be a personal meeting or a personal dinner or personal lunch, you’re removing it from all the agendas. Is that right?
A: I don’t know that it’s my determination, if that’s what you mean. If those that are looking through, in this particular case, the Administrator’s calendar noticed
that something is a personal event as opposed to a public event, I think, by March, we redacted it.

Q: Did you consider the tours of the Vatican, the private tours of the Vatican to be personal or public events? Personal or work-related events, I guess?

A: They were—since the tours happened during the day, one of the contemplations was, well, do you just, you know, have a hole in the day or you just go ahead and say that there was a tour here or there was a visit to the EPA library or—not EPA library—Vatican library, or there was a mass at St. Peter’s. One of the contemplations was, well, if we redact this, then, you know, a criticism could be that, you know, he just went on this personal stuff while he was on this trip or that he only went on personal stuff or he only went on a majority of personal stuff, or something like that, so might as well just release it.

Q: My question is, were the tours personal or were they work related?

A: I think they could have been, you know, a little bit of both. I mean, it’s a cultural experience. It’s a—the whole trip at the Vatican was the equivalent of a bilateral with any other country, and any kind of meetings or tours or introductions or briefings about it could be as much, you know, business as it is just something neat to do and see.

Q: Sure. Wouldn’t the dinner then with Cardinal Pell, who was the equivalent of the treasury secretary for the Vatican, be a little of both, personal and work related?

A: You know, I suppose, if it was one on one, but it really—but it wasn’t. It was just a big group of people at dinner.

Q: So in the contemplation of whether it’s work related or personal, there’s also an expectation that it would be work related if it’s one on one, but it’s personal if it’s in a large group?

A: I think that there’s not some objective standard on it. I think that you have to make a reasonable assessment of what the event is. In this case, in the dinner with Cardinal Pell—or the dinner where Cardinal Pell attended with a group of, you know, a dozen other people—I don’t think anybody sitting there thought that it was an official thing. Everyone sitting there thought that it was just a personal dinner.⁷

Contrary to Mr. Jackson’s claim that the meeting with Cardinal Pell did not address work-related topics, Mr. Dravis sent an email during the dinner explaining that Cardinal Pell and Mr. Pruitt discussed a red team-blue team approach to debate the causes of climate change.⁸ Her email stated: “I am at dinner with Cardinal Pell and Mr. Pruitt. They discussed this article. Can you print a copy for His Excellency?”⁹ The article she referenced was an April 20, 2017, Wall

---

⁷ House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Ryan Jackson (June 29, 2018).


⁹ Email from Samantha Dravis, Associate Administrator for the Office of Policy and Senior Counsel to the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, to Secretary to Cardinal George Pell (June 9, 2017) (online at www.documentcloud.org/documents/4456498-Rome-Pruitt-Cardinal-Pell.html#document/p30/a422728).
Street Journal op-ed by New York University Professor Steven Koonin asserting that a “concrete step toward those worthy goals would be to convene a ‘Red Team/Blue Team’ process for climate science, one of the most important and contentious issues of our age.”

During her transcribed interview with Committee staff, Ms. Hupp described how other meetings, including with lobbyists, may have been excluded from Mr. Pruitt’s publicly released calendar if they were deemed “personal”:

Q: Did you ever not put meetings with lobbyists on the Administrator’s calendar?
A: None that I recall.
Q: So if the Administrator scheduled—if you scheduled a meeting for the Administrator with anybody, every meeting you would schedule would end up on his official calendar?
A: If it was a meeting related to official EPA business, absolutely.
Q: Would you schedule meetings that were not related to official EPA business?
A: There were times where he would have personal lunches that we may not add to his calendar.
Q: Were any of those personal lunches with lobbyists?
A: I don’t know.
Q: Would you schedule them?
A: I don’t recall scheduling personal lunches with lobbyists.
Q: Do you recall scheduling personal lunches for Mr. Pruitt?
A: Actually, I’m sorry, that’s not true. I did schedule one lunch with—it was actually with Rick Smotkin.
Q: When did you schedule it for?
A: When did I schedule it?
Q: Yes. When was the lunch?
A: Sometime this year. I’m not certain the timeframe.
Q: And what made it a personal lunch versus an official lunch?
A: Rick had indicated that he just wanted to catch up. And he was bringing his 10-year-old daughter, she was going to attend as well.
Q: And did you put that on the Administrator’s formal calendar or not?
A: I do not remember.
Q: So when you scheduled official meetings for the Administrator, do those always appear on his calendar?
A: To my knowledge, yes.
Q: Sometimes when we have seen FOIA versions of the calendar for the Administrator, there seem to be a lot of gaps sometimes. Maybe you could explain for us what we’re missing. Is there maybe two separate calendars that you keep?
A: Not to my knowledge, no.
Q: So if we are seeing gaps on his calendars, that means he’s not scheduled for meetings during those times?

---

A: I do not know.
Q: Does someone else schedule things onto his calendar?
A: His scheduler does, yes.
Q: Have you ever had a discussion with the Administrator or with the scheduler or anyone else at the EPA about what to put onto the Administrator’s calendar and what not to put onto the Administrator’s calendar?
A: Could you possibly be more specific?
Q: Sure. Did you ever discuss what were appropriate things to put onto the calendar that could be FOIA’d versus what’s not appropriate to put onto the calendar that can be FOIA’d?
A: We would at times discuss whether or not we should add a personal event to the calendar.
Q: And who would you discuss that with?
A: I don’t remember specifically.
Q: Did you discuss it with the Administrator ever?
A: Not that I recall.
Q: Did you discuss it with the scheduler?
A: I don’t remember specifically. I’ve had many scheduling discussions with his scheduler.
Q: Do you recall any discussions with his scheduler about what to put onto the calendar or not?
A: We would have discussions about whether or not to add a personal dinner to the calendar.
Q: And were there ever times when you decided not to add something to the calendar?
A: Yes.
Q: And who would make that decision?
A: I don’t suppose there was an ultimate decisionmaker. I mean, if he had a dinner with his wife, it was—we agreed that it was not necessary to add to the calendar.
Q: You’re saying “we agreed.” I’m just trying to understand who’s agreeing to this.
A: I’m sorry. I’m referencing discussions with his scheduler.
Q: Okay. So you and the scheduler would discuss not adding a dinner with his wife to the schedule. Is that right?
A: Yes.\(^{11}\)

**Administrator’s Requests to Help Wife Obtain $250,000 Political Fundraising Job**

During her transcribed interview with Committee staff, Ms. Dravis explained that Mr. Pruitt asked her to help his wife find a job as a political fundraiser:

Q: You mentioned he requested that you help his wife find employment?
A: Yes.
Q: And what type of employment was she looking for?

\(^{11}\) House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Millan Hupp (May 18, 2018).
A: Mr. Pruitt initially expressed an interest in his wife, Marlyn, to be hired as a political fundraiser. And, you know, I asked him if she had any experience in that. He said that she did not. And then asked if I would give her a call and kind of discuss with Marlyn what she might be interested in doing, as well as, you know, what potential jobs might be out there for her.

Q: Did any of them involve a Chick-fil-A?
A: In that conversation, he did not discuss the Chick-fil-A with me. But I—in previous conversations in a group setting, I had heard him mention that he thought it might be a good idea for her to own a Chick-fil-A.

Q: To own a Chick-fil-A or to work at Chick-fil-A?
A: I don't know. I guess I'm using them interchangeably.
Q: And he mentioned that at work?
A: At—yes.
Q: In a work setting?
A: Yes.
Q: To other EPA staffers?
A: Yes.
Q: Could you tell us more about that, to the extent you remember?
A: You know, I really don't remember the conversation verbatim. I just remember that it was in a group setting. He was sort of expressing thoughts out loud and said, you know, it would—it—I remember that he said, wouldn't it be great if D.C. had a Chick-fil-A. And I said, well, FYI, there are several Chick-fil-As already in the D.C. area. And, you know, I think he expressed a sentiment that it would—that he would like Marlyn to be a franchisee.

Q: Okay. And do you know if anyone at EPA acted on that?
A: Well, I did not at the time, but I've since learned through media reports—
Q: Okay.
A: —that Sydney did.
Q: Okay. And did you discuss with Mrs. Pruitt the political fundraising job that he asked you to?
A: I don't—
Q: Or did you have that conversation with her?
A: I did have a conversation with Marlyn. I asked her, you know, what she was thinking and what her interests were. And it ended up that she expressed more of a comfort in doing something that would focus on administrative tasks and event planning and something like that.

Q: Did she mention Chick-fil-A to you?
A: She did not, no.
Q: And was that the one conversation you had with her about that job opportunities?
A: I had more than one conversation, but I can't remember the precise number of conversations I had with Marlyn.
Q: More than five?
A: Less than five, probably.
Q: And did you feel like you were required to pick up the phone and talk to her because your boss asked you to?
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A: Well, I don’t know if “required” is the right word, but I—I certainly, you know, tried to be agreeable to requests that my boss was asking me to do.

Q: Okay.

A: And I did tell Mr. Pruitt, I think these calls would be better coming from you. And he did not share that assessment for the particular calls that he asked me to make.\textsuperscript{12}

Ms. Dravis informed Committee staff that she advised Mr. Pruitt that he should consult EPA Senior Counsel for Ethics Justina Fugh, but Mr. Pruitt declined and instead indicated that he would consult with Cleta Mitchell, who is now representing Mr. Pruitt in his legal defense:

Q: So one of the things I wanted to go back to is you said that Administrator Pruitt had asked you to help his wife find a job.

A: Yes.

Q: So if you could go through that just in a little bit more detail. If you can start with exactly what he said, how was it that he asked you to begin this task?

A: Sure. I can tell you to the best of my recollection he had called me down to his office for an in-person conversation and indicated that Marlyn was going to be moving—Marlyn, his wife, was going to be moving up to Washington. She had stayed back for the first half of the year to take care of their kids and—take care of their kids and that she was going to be moving up to Washington, and he wanted her to get a job and indicated that he thought she would be good at political fundraising. I don’t think I mentioned this during the last hour, but I remember telling him right out of the gate that: Just so you’re aware, any income that your spouse would earn will have to be disclosed on your financial disclosure. And he responded that he was planning to set up an LLC. And I remember saying: Okay, well, you know, this is something you’re going to want to definitely check with Justina on. And that was when he indicated he did not plan to speak to Justina, that he was planning to speak to—he was planning to work on this with Ms. [Cleta] Mitchell.\textsuperscript{13}

Ms. Dravis informed Committee staff that Mr. Pruitt asked her to call personal friends of hers to help Mrs. Pruitt, including investor and Republican donor Doug Deason, as well as an individual at the Federalist Society. Ms. Dravis said her call to the Federalist Society led to Mrs. Pruitt’s employment with the Judicial Crisis Network:

A: So Ms. Pruitt started by asking me if I knew of anyone that she could do political fundraising for, and I said, no, I didn’t know of anything. I don’t recall how we arrived at this specific point, but we arrived and settled on that I would call Doug Deason, who was a personal friend of the Administrator and a personal friend of mine, and that I would also call an individual at the Federalist Society, and I would start there to see if either of those two had any ideas or opportunities that

\textsuperscript{12} House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Samantha Dravis (June 28, 2018).

\textsuperscript{13} Id.
would be good for Marilyn.

Q: And who is Doug Deason?
A: Mr. Deason is a friend of Mr. Pruitt. He is a friend of mine. He works, I believe, with like a private equity type of business that he owns.

Q: And just to be clear, when Administrator Pruitt talked to you about making these calls, helping his wife find a job, were you at work when this happened?
A: Yes, ma’am.

Q: And so you made those two calls and then did anything come of those initial phone calls?
A: Yes. Well, I spoke with Mr. Deason, and he indicated that he, you know, would really like to be helpful, that he would look into it and see if there were any entities, whether philanthropic or otherwise, that could be a good fit. But he did flag for me that he had personal investments in the oil and gas business, and that this might present a conflict of interest. I thanked him for raising that, said that I would relay that back. And ultimately I connected him—I text messaged Cleta Mitchell and Doug Deason, connected them, and essentially sort of said: Take it from here. If something works out, great. And then I subsequently to that called over to the Federalist Society and made the same request, said: You know, Mr. Pruitt has asked me to ask you if, you know, you guys know of anything or have anything that would be a good fit for Marlyn for a place for her to work, she is looking for somewhere to work.

Q: And do you know whether anything came to fruition from either of those tracks?
A: Yes. I believe that Marlyn was ultimately hired to work at an entity called the Judicial Crisis Network and that that was a result of the interactions that I had with the Federalist Society.\(^{14}\)

According to Ms. Dravis, Mr. Pruitt requested that she ask for Mrs. Pruitt to receive a salary of $250,000:

Q: Did Administrator Pruitt ever talk to you about a projected salary for Mrs. Pruitt, like what type of salary range he was looking for her to have?
A: He did.

Q: Can you tell us what he said?
A: I recall at one point he mentioned a figure around $250,000.

Q: And was your understanding that he was expecting you to relay this to the individuals you were calling seeking employment for her?
A: Yes.

Q: And did you do that?
A: I did relay that to an individual at the Federalist Society, and I phrased it—I was very clear to say this is not a request from me, this is something that Administrator Pruitt has mentioned to me, the figure that he has mentioned to me, and that was not received very well.

Q: You mean by the Federalist Society?

\(^{14}\) Id.
A: Correct.\textsuperscript{15}

The Federalist Society reportedly balked at this salary level, giving Ms. Davis the impression that they believed $250,000 was significantly higher than would be commensurate with Mrs. Pruitt's skills and experience:

Q: You indicated that the Federalist Society said they did not receive it well when you gave a projected salary range. Can you explain a little bit more about that, what was the response?
A: Well, she ultimately was interviewed by an organization that was not the Federalist Society. So I understood their role to just be that they were passing on the resume or helping to facilitate. But they were explicitly clear that, you know, if she were to be hired that it would only be for something that's commensurate with her skills and experience, that fit with those skills and experience, and that the compensation would be at a rate, again, commensurate with those skills and experience. And that, you know, from their perspective, if she were to be offered a role that it would be very important that it was done in a legally compliant and ethical way. And so the figure that I mentioned was—you know, they just pretty categorically said that there is no way that will happen, she will be compensated at a rate that we believe is commensurate with the skills and experience that she has.

Q: And was the $250,000 salary significantly higher than her skills and experience would have garnered on the market rate?
A: I can't assess that.

Q: Is that what they expressed to you, though?
A: That was more or less the impression that I was getting from them, yes.\textsuperscript{16}

Ms. Dravis told Committee staff that even after she helped Mrs. Pruitt find full-time employment, Mr. Pruitt asked her to contact the Republican Attorneys General Association to find Mrs. Pruitt an additional position as a political fundraiser. Ms. Dravis said she refused because she was recused from communicating with the Republican Attorney Generals Association and believed Mr. Pruitt's request could violate the Hatch Act:

Q: Did you make any other calls?
A: I did not make any other calls. Mr. Pruitt asked me to make some additional calls, but I did not end up making those additional calls.

Q: And did you talk to him about not making those calls?
A: Yes.

Q: And what happened?
A: After Marlyn had been hired to work at the Judicial Crisis Network—and it was my understanding that she was working, I believe, full time—he had a separate conversation with me in which he indicated that he wanted her to have additional

\textsuperscript{15} Id.

\textsuperscript{16} Id.
employment or an additional contract and asked if I would be willing to call RAGA, my former—the Republican Attorneys General Association. He, again, was raising the concept of her performing political fundraising. And I, you know, pretty roundly just said: I can’t do that because that would be a violation of—I think it’s—it would be a violation of the Hatch Act, and I’m recused from talking to them. So he asked then if there was anybody in the AG network, sort of attorney general network, individuals that might be willing to hire her. And I think I just said I don’t know and never followed up.

Q: And, again, in this instance were you in the EPA headquarters building when this conversation took place?
A: Yes, ma’am.\textsuperscript{17}

Ms. Dravis explained her specific concerns about violating the Hatch Act as follows:

Q: What was your Hatch Act concern?
A: The Republican Attorney General Association is a 527 organization.
Q: Can you just lay out what the concern would be with you calling?
A: It’s generally my understanding that Federal employees are not supposed to engage in business or activity with political organizations, or at a minimum, it would be something that I would want to get cleared by ethics.\textsuperscript{18}

On June 28, 2018, Cleta Mitchell, Mr. Pruitt’s personal attorney, wrote an op-ed entitled, “A Defense of Scott Pruitt.” Contrary to Mr. Dravis’ account of being in direct contact with Ms. Mitchell about obtaining a position for Mr. Pruitt’s wife, Ms. Mitchell claimed, “at no time did I speak with or hear from any EPA employee regarding their ‘helping’ with her job hunt.” She went on to claim, “To say that the administrator ‘used’ EPA staffers to get his wife a job simply isn’t true.” Instead, she claimed that “some EPA staff members may have taken it upon themselves to get involved in her job search.”\textsuperscript{19}

Because Ms. Dravis’ transcribed interview was being conducted on the same day as Ms. Mitchell’s op-ed, Committee staff asked her to respond to Ms. Mitchell’s claims:

Q: There was a press report this morning that, since you’ve been here you may not have seen, so I understand you may not be able to react to this specific press report.
A: Okay.
Q: But it was about the topic of Administrator Pruitt asking staff to help find a job for his wife.
A: Okay.
Q: And Cleta Mitchell is quoted as saying that staff inserted themselves. Can you

\textsuperscript{17} Id.
\textsuperscript{18} Id.
\textsuperscript{19} Cleta Michell, A Defense of Scott Pruitt, National Review (June 28, 2018) (online at www.nationalreview.com/2018/06/scott-pruitt-defense-against-left-wing-critics/).
just react to that and whether you think that would be an accurate characterization of what happened?

A: That is not an accurate characterization of what happened. I was explicitly asked by Administrator Pruitt to assist Marlyn with obtaining this employment. There’s no reason that I can think of why I would want to insert myself into such a situation. And, in fact, there are text messages that I have exchanged with Ms. Mitchell and Mr. Deason. So she ought to know that, in fact, an EPA employee did have communication with her about this. So beyond that, I can’t speak to what is going on with Ms. Mitchell.20

Administrator’s Requests to Staff to Help Daughter

Ms. Dravis informed Committee staff that Mr. Pruitt also asked her to help his daughter obtain an internship at the White House:

Q: Did he ask you to handle any other non-EPA-related tasks?
A: I can recall that he asked me to assist his daughter, [Mc]Kenna—well, he—she had expressed a desire to work at the White House as a summer intern. And I don’t believe I took any concrete action with regard to that. I believe by the time I turned to actually do something about it, she was already granted the internship through somebody else on the staff. So I didn’t end up having to do anything to make that happen, but he did request that.21

Mr. Jackson said during his interview that he was the one who called the White House internship program to get information for Mr. Pruitt’s daughter:

Q: Did you help Administrator Pruitt’s daughter McKenna obtain an internship at the White House?
A: I suggested to the Administrator that Washington, D.C., you know, is the great land of internships, one of the best would be certainly the White House, but Congress is great, firms are great. He—he and I had just, you know, a personal conversation about, gee, it would be great with her starting law school this fall to get some kind of experience. I said, well, you know, I am more than happy to ask if there’s still an opportunity to apply, because a White House internship would be an incredible experience, but that was the extent of it.

Q: Did you ever make any calls on her behalf?
A: I think that I called to ensure that the deadline had not passed, and maybe to get somebody to email me the application maybe just to get a link. I’m not even—I can’t even remember who provided that to his daughter, but she took it from there.

Q: Who did you call at the White House to get that information?

20 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Samantha Dravis (June 28, 2018).
21 Id.
A: Well, the White House internship program, I don’t know who I know over there.
Q: Did you give any kind of recommendation?
A: No. 22

According to Ms. Dravis, Administrator Pruitt also asked her to write his daughter a recommendation letter, during the work day, with a one hour turn around:

A: And then he, on another occasion, requested that I assist [Mc]Kenna with a letter of recommendation for the Blackstone Legal Fellowship, and—
Q: Did you have to write that letter for her?
A: I did.
Q: And did you?
A: I did.
Q: Okay.
A: I want to be clear, if I may. McKenna herself also personally reached out and asked me if I would—
Q: Okay.
A: —complete the letter of recommendation.
Q: And was that on work hours?
A: I believe it was, yes.
Q: Okay.
A: It was—when I received the call, they said it has to be done within the hour. So I only had about an hour to do it.
Q: Good heavens. That’s a short turnaround. Can you remember anything else?
A: There may be others, but I—those are the ones that I remember.
Q: And you’ve been around Washington long enough to understand that when you work for a Federal agency, when you’re on the clock, you’re supposed to be doing work for the taxpayers, right?
A: I do. I also understand that de minimus or limited personal use of the computer and internet at work is also permissible.
Q: Sure.
A: So I don’t believe that I violated any EPA policy by using the computer to type up a quick letter of recommendation.
Q: Fair enough. I guess where I was going with that was do you think the Administrator appreciated that there was supposed to be a bright line between EPA business and non-EPA business with his staff?
A: I think it’s clear he did not. 23

22 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Ryan Jackson (June 29, 2018).
23 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Samantha Dravis (June 28, 2018).
Administrator Pruitt’s Desire to Become Attorney General

On July 3, 2018, CNN reported that Mr. Pruitt “directly appealed to President Donald Trump this spring to fire Attorney General Jeff Sessions and let him run the Department of Justice instead, according to three people familiar with the proposal.” Mr. Pruitt denied this report entirely, claiming, “This report is simply false. General Sessions and I are friends and I have always said I want nothing more than to see him succeed in his role.”

In contrast to Mr. Pruitt’s emphatic and categorical denial, Ms. Dravis explained during her transcribed interview with Committee staff that Mr. Pruitt was indeed interested in the position this spring and “hinted” about a conversation he had with President Trump:

Q: Has Administrator Pruitt ever talked to you about what he might want his next job to be?
A: Yes.
Q: And what did he say?
A: He had had conversations with me about media speculation around the possibility that he could become the next Attorney General.
Q: And what was his reaction to that speculation?
A: It’s my sense that that’s a position that he would be very interested in.
Q: Do you know if he took any steps to try to pursue that happening?
A: I don’t know for sure.
Q: When was it that you had those conversations?
A: Around the beginning of this year. So maybe February, March of 2018.
Q: And you said you didn’t know for sure whether he had taken any steps. Did he indicate that he might talk to anybody about it, had talked to anybody about it?
A: He hinted that some sort of conversation had taken place between he and the President. But he did not provide me with specifics. I was not present for the conversation. I don’t know what, if anything, was discussed.

Ms. Dravis told Committee staff that she discussed with Mr. Pruitt his ambitions to be Attorney General several times:

Q: And how many conversations do you remember having with the Administrator about that topic?
A: After he was EPA Administrator?
Q: Yes.
A: One or two.
Q: Okay. Were there any before?
A: Yes, there were several before he was—that was the position he was initially

---
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26 House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Interview of Samantha Dravis (June 28, 2018).
interested in.

Q: Okay. So he was hoping to become—he was hoping to be the attorney general—

A: Yes.

Q: —instead of Mr. Sessions?

A: At one point, yes.\textsuperscript{27}

**Conclusion**

This information compounds the serious concerns already raised about Mr. Pruitt’s stewardship of the EPA. Although Mr. Pruitt is charged with protecting human health and the environment, it appears that he is forsaking the true task of the EPA while abusing his authority and promoting his own political ambitions. It is imperative that your office independently investigate these allegations in order to protect the agency’s critical mission.

Sincerely,

\underline{Elijah E. Cummings}

Elijah E. Cummings
Ranking Member

cc: The Honorable Trey Gowdy, Chairman
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