

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :
 :
 v. : **Case No. 21-cr-592 (ABJ)**
 :
 DAVID WIERSMA, and :
 DAWN FRANKOWSKI, :
 :
 Defendants. :

NOTICE OF FILING

For the purpose of illustrating the government’s consistent and diligent efforts to produce voluminous discovery materials arising out of the breach of the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021 (the “Capitol Breach”), the government has filed status memoranda describing the efforts of the Capitol Breach Discovery Team on a regular basis since July 2021. We request that those memoranda, attached hereto and listed below, be made part of the record in this case:

1. Memorandum Regarding Status of Discovery as of July 12, 2021 (and Exhibit A);
2. Memorandum Regarding Status of Discovery as of August 23, 2021; and
3. Memorandum Regarding Status of Discovery as of September 14, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,
CHANNING D. PHILLIPS
Acting United States Attorney
DC Bar No. 415793

By: /s/ Emily A. Miller
EMILY A. MILLER
Capitol Breach Discovery Coordinator
DC Bar No. 462077
555 Fourth Street, N.W., Room 5826
Washington, DC 20530
Emily.Miller2@usdoj.gov
(202) 252-6988

By: /s/ Monica A. Stump
MONICA A. STUMP
Assistant United States Attorney
PA Bar Number 90168
District of Columbia
Capitol Riot Detailee
Nine Executive Drive
Fairview Heights, Illinois 62208
Telephone No. (618) 622-3860
monica.stump@usdoj.gov

**UNITED STATES' MEMORANDUM
REGARDING STATUS OF DISCOVERY AS OF JULY 12, 2021**

The United States files this memorandum for the purpose of describing the status of discovery. As an initial matter, substantial discovery has already been provided in this case. However, as set forth below, because the defendant's criminal acts took place at the same general time and location as many other charged crimes, the government's investigation into the breach of the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021 (the "Capitol Breach") has resulted in the accumulation and creation of a massive volume of data that may be relevant to many defendants. The government is diligently working to meet its unprecedented overlapping and interlocking discovery obligations by providing voluminous electronic information in the most comprehensive and useable format.

The Capitol Breach

On January 6, 2021, as a Joint Session of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate convened to certify the vote of the Electoral College for the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, a mob stormed the U.S. Capitol by breaking doors and windows and assaulting members of law enforcement, as others in the crowd encouraged and assisted those acts. Thousands of individuals entered the U.S. Capitol and U.S. Capitol grounds without authority, halting the Joint Session and the entire official proceeding of Congress for hours until the United States Capitol Police ("USCP"), the Metropolitan Police Department ("MPD"), and other law enforcement agencies from the city and surrounding region were able to clear the Capitol of rioters and to ensure the safety of elected officials. This event in its entirety is hereinafter referred to as the "Capitol Breach."

Scope of Investigation

The investigation and prosecution of the Capitol Breach will be the largest in American history, both in terms of the number of defendants prosecuted and the nature and volume of the evidence. In the six months since the Capitol was breached, over 500 individuals located throughout the nation have been charged with a multitude of criminal offenses, including but not limited to conspiracy, tampering with documents or proceedings, destruction and theft of government property, obstruction of law enforcement during civil disorder, assaults on law enforcement, obstruction of an official proceeding, engaging in disruptive or violent conduct in the Capitol or on Capitol grounds, and trespass. There are investigations open in 55 of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's 56 field offices.

Voluminous Materials Accumulated

The government has accumulated voluminous materials that may contain discoverable information for many, if not all, defendants. An illustrative list of materials accumulated by the government includes:

- Thousands of hours of closed circuit video (“CCV”) from sources including the USCP, MPD, and United States Secret Service, and several hundred MPD Automated Traffic Enforcement camera videos;
- Footage from Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network (C-SPAN) and other members of the press;
- Thousands of hours of body worn camera (“BWC”) footage from MPD, Arlington County Police Department, Montgomery County Police Department, Fairfax County Police Department, and Virginia State Police;
- Radio transmissions, event chronologies, and, to a limited extent, Global Positioning Satellite (“GPS”) records for MPD radios;
- Hundreds of thousands of tips, including at least 237,000 digital media tips;

- Location history data for thousands of devices present inside the Capitol (obtained from a variety of sources including two geofence search warrants and searches of ten data aggregation companies);
- Subscriber and toll records for hundreds of phone numbers;
- Cell tower data for thousands of devices that connected to the Capitol's interior Distributed Antenna System (DAS) during the Capitol Breach (obtained from the three major telephone companies);
- A collection of over one million Parler posts, replies, and related data;
- A collection over one million Parler videos and images (approximately 20 terabytes of data);
- Damage estimates from multiple offices of the U.S. Capitol;
- A multitude of digital devices and Stored Communication Act ("SCA") accounts; and
- Responses to grand jury subpoenas, of which over 6,000 have been issued, seeking documents such as financial records, telephone records, electronic communications service provider records, and travel records.

We are still collecting and assembling materials from the numerous entities who were involved in the response to the Breach, and we are still investigating – which means the amount of data (phones, devices, legal process, investigative memoranda) is growing.

Voluminous Legal Process and Investigative Memoranda

In addition to the materials collected, tens of thousands of documents have been generated in furtherance of the investigation, to include interviews of subjects, witnesses, tipsters and officers; investigations into allegations concerning officer conduct on January 6; source reports; evidence collection reports; evidence analysis reports; chain-of-custody documents; legal documents including preservation letters, subpoenas, 2703(d) orders, consent forms, and search warrants; and memoranda of investigative steps taken to evaluate leads or further investigations.

Interrelated Crimes and Discovery

The Capitol Breach involves thousands of individuals inside and outside the Capitol, many of whom overwhelmed and assaulted police. (According to a Washington Post analysis of the events, “the mob on the west side eventually grew to at least 9,400 people, outnumbering officers by more than 58 to one.”) *See*

https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/interactive/2021/dc-police-records-capitol-riot/?itid=sf_visual-forensics. The cases clearly share common facts, happening in generally the same place and at the same time. Every single person charged, at the very least, contributed to the inability of Congress to carry out the certification of our Presidential election.

These circumstances have spawned a situation with overlapping and interlocking discovery obligations. Many defendants may be captured in material that is not immediately obvious and that requires both software tools and manual work to identify, such as video and photos captured in the devices and SCA accounts of other subjects. Accordingly, the defense is generally entitled to review all video or photos of the breach whether from CCV, BWC or searches of devices and SCA accounts. Notably, we have received a number of defense requests for access to such voluminous information, and requests for the government to review the entirety of the law enforcement files related to this investigation. For example, in support of a motion to compel access to all of the footage, one such counsel stated:

The events of January 6, 2021 were memorialized to an extent rarely, if ever, experienced within the context of federal criminal cases. The Government itself has a wealth of surveillance video footage. Virtually every attendee in and around the Capitol on January 6, 2021 personally chronicled the events using their iPhone or other similar video device. Many of the attendees posted their video on one or more social media platforms. Many held their videos close to their vests resulting in little if any publication of same. News media outlets from around the world captured video footage. Independent media representative from around the world captured video footage. Intelligence and law enforcement personnel present at the Capitol on January 6, 2021 also captured video footage of events of the day. By

the Government's own admission, the Government has an overwhelming amount of video footage of the events of January 6, 2021. During the handlings of January 6 cases, the Government has garnered and continues to garner access to added video footage from, among other sources, the general public and the defendants themselves. ***Upon information and belief, the Government is not capable of vetting, cataloging and determining materiality of the video footage such as to ensure that disclosure of same is timely made in all cases to which the footage is material for disclosure purposes.*** The "information and belief" in this regard is a function of the undersigned counsel's personal knowledge relative to footage given to the Government, familiarity with other January 6 cases both as counsel for other January 6 defendants and as counsel familiar with other counsel representing January 6 defendants and the understanding that the footage provided to the Government does not appear to have been produced to other defendants whose cases warrant similar disclosure by the Government of material evidence. ***Defendant has requested the Government confirm whether there is a single repository for all video footage amassed relative to the events at the Capitol on January 6, 2021 and, further, has requested access to same for inspection and examination for determination of materiality and disclosure of the Government's protocol to determine materiality.***

United States v. Jacob Chansley, 21-cr-00003 (RCL) (Document No. 58)(emphasis added).

Examples of additional similar discovery requests we have received in Capitol Breach cases are quoted in Exhibit A, attached hereto.

Early Establishment of Discovery Team

Shortly after the Capitol Breach, the U.S. Attorney's Office established a Capitol Breach Discovery Team to create and implement a process for the production of discovery in January 6 cases. The Discovery Team is staffed by federal prosecutors who have experience in managing complex investigations involving voluminous materials, Department of Justice experts in project management and electronic discovery management, and a lead discovery agent from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Members of the Discovery Team consult regularly with Department of Justice subject matter experts, including Associate Deputy Attorney General and National Criminal Discovery Coordinator Andrew Goldsmith. As discussed further below, members of

the Discovery Team also meet and confer on a regular basis with Federal Public Defender (“FPD”) leadership and electronic discovery experts.

Recognition of Need for Vendor Promptly Addressed

Following the Capitol Breach, the United States recognized that due to the nature and volume of materials being collected, the government would require the use of an outside contractor who could provide litigation technology support services to include highly technical and specialized data and document processing and review capabilities. The government drafted a statement of work, solicited bids, evaluated them, and selected a vendor. This was an unprecedented undertaking which required review at the highest levels of the Department of Justice and was accomplished as quickly as possible.

On or about May 28, 2021, the government contracted Deloitte Financial Advisory Services, LLP (“Deloitte”), a litigation support vendor with extensive experience providing complex litigation technology services, to assist in document processing, review and production of materials related to the Capitol Breach. As is required here, Deloitte furnishes secure, complex, and highly technical expertise in scanning, coding, digitizing, and performing optical character recognition – as well as processing, organizing, and ingesting a large volume of Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”) and associated metadata in document review platforms – which is vital to the United States’ ability to review large data/document productions and is essential to our ability to prosecute these cases effectively.

Implementation of Contract with Deloitte

We have already begun transferring a large volume of materials to Deloitte (as of July 7, 2021, over 200 disks of data and 34,000 USCP records), who is populating the database. Specific processing workflows and oversight are being established between the United States Attorney's Office and the vendor. We have already coordinated with Deloitte to use various tools to identify standard categories of Personal Identifying Information ("PII") and to redact them. Once the database is accessible, we will begin systematically reviewing materials for potentially discoverable information, tagging when possible (e.g., video by a location or type of conduct, interviews describing a particular event), and redacting when necessary. Among other things, the vendor is also building a master evidence tracker to assist us in keeping records of what is provided to us and what is ultimately produced, which is part of our approach to a defensible discovery protocol.

Systematic Reviews of Voluminous Materials

We are implementing and continuing to develop processes and procedures for ensuring that voluminous materials have been and will continue to be systematically reviewed for information that, *inter alia*, may be material to the defense, e.g.:

- Comparing all known identifiers of any charged defendant against tips, Parler data, ad tech data, cell tower data, and geofence data; and
- Searching all visual media (such as CCV, BWC, social media or device search results) – the collection of which grows on a regular basis – against known images of charged defendants.

Certain Specific Defense Requests

Multiple defense counsel have inquired about investigations into officers who were *alleged* to have been complicit in the January 6 Capitol Breach. We have received copies of investigations into officer conduct, have finished reviewing them, and plan to disclose the relevant materials shortly.

Complexities Require Careful Consideration

Producing discovery in a meaningful manner and balancing complex legal-investigative and technical difficulties takes time. We want to ensure that all defendants obtain meaningful access to voluminous information that may contain exculpatory material, and that we do not overproduce or produce in a disorganized manner. That means we will review thousands of investigative memoranda, even if there is a likelihood they are purely administrative and not discoverable, to ensure that disclosures are appropriate.

Legal-Investigative Considerations

We must also carefully ensure we are adequately protecting the privacy and security interests of witnesses and subjects from whom those materials were derived. For example, we cannot allow a defendant's PII to be disseminated – without protection – to hundreds of others. Similarly, we cannot allow personal contact information for Congressional members, staffers, and responding police officers – targets and victims of these crimes – whose phones may have connected to the Capitol's DAS network to inadvertently be produced. We also must protect Law Enforcement Sensitive materials by ensuring they are carefully reviewed for discoverability and, if they are discoverable, that they are disclosed in an appropriate manner. We continue to develop workable paradigm for disclosing a vast amount of Capitol CCV while ensuring that the Capitol's security is maintained. We are also scrupulously honoring defendants' attorney-client

privilege by employing a filter team that is continually reviewing devices and accounts for potentially privileged communications.

Technological Considerations

A large volume of the information that has been collected consists of ESI. ESI frequently contains significant metadata that may be difficult to extract and produce if documents are not processed using specialized techniques. Metadata is information about an electronic document and can describe how, when and by whom ESI was created, accessed, modified, formatted, or collected. In the case of a document created with a word processing program, for example, metadata may include the author, date created, and date last accessed. In the case of video footage, metadata may identify the camera that was used to capture the image, or the date and time that it was captured. Metadata may also explain a document's structural relationship to another document, e.g., by identifying a document as an attachment to an investigative memoranda.

Processing, hosting, and production of the voluminous and varied materials described above, to include the preservation of significant metadata, involves highly technical considerations of the document's source, nature, and format. For example, the optimal type of database for hosting and reviewing video footage may differ from the optimal type of database for hosting investigative memoranda. Similarly, a paper document, a word processing document, a spreadsheet with a formula, video footage from a camera, or video footage associated with a proprietary player may each require different types of processing to ensure they are captured by database keyword searches and produced with significant metadata having been preserved.

Involving Defense Counsel in Voluminous Discovery Plan

The Discovery Team regularly meets with FPD leadership and technical experts with respect to discovery issues. Given the volume of information that may be discoverable, FPD is providing input regarding formats that work best with the review tools that Criminal Justice Act panel attorneys and Federal Defender Offices have available to them. Due to the size and complexity of the data, we understand they are considering contracting with third party vendors to assist them (just as the United States Attorney's Office has done for this matter). So as to save defense resources and to attempt to get discovery more quickly to defense counsel, there were efforts made to see if FPD could use the same vendor as the United States Attorney's Office to set up a similar database as the government is using for reviewing the ESI, but for contractual and technical reasons we have recently learned that was not feasible. We are in the on-going process of identifying the scope and size of materials that may be turned over to FPD with as much detail as possible, so that FPD can obtain accurate quotes from potential database vendors. It is hoped that any databases or repositories will be used by FPD offices nationwide that are working on Capitol Breach cases, counsel that are appointed under the Criminal Justice Act, and retained counsel for people who are financially unable to obtain these services. A database will be the most organized and economical way of ensuring that all counsel can obtain access to, and conduct meaningful searches upon, relevant voluminous materials, e.g., thousands of hours of body worn camera and Capitol CCV footage, and tens of thousands of documents, including the results of thousands of searches of SCA accounts and devices.

Compliance with Recommendations Developed by the Department of Justice and Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts Joint Working Group on Electronic Technology

As is evidenced by all of the efforts described above, the United States is diligently working to comply with the *Recommendations for Electronically Stored Information (ESI)*

Discovery Production developed by the Department of Justice and Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts Joint Working Group on Electronic Technology in the Criminal Justice System in February 2012.¹ See <https://www.justice.gov/archives/dag/page/file/913236/download>. For example, we are: (1) including individuals with sufficient knowledge and experience regarding ESI; (2) regularly conferring with FPD about the nature, volume and mechanics of producing ESI discovery; (3) regularly discussing with FPD what formats of production are possible and appropriate, and what formats can be generated and also maintain the ESI's integrity, allow for reasonable usability, reasonably limit costs, and if possible, conform to industry standards for the format; (4) regularly discussing with FPD ESI discovery transmission methods and media that promote efficiency, security, and reduced costs; and (5) taking reasonable and appropriate measures to secure ESI discovery against unauthorized access or disclosure.

¹ These *Recommendations* are explicitly referenced in the Advisory Committee Note to Rule 16.1. Importantly, the two individuals primarily responsible for developing the Recommendations are Associate Deputy Attorney General Andrew Goldsmith, who (as noted earlier) is working closely with the prosecution's Discovery Team, and Sean Broderick, the FPD's National Litigation Support Administrator, who is playing a similar role for the D.C. Federal Defender's Office on electronic discovery-related issues. Messrs. Goldsmith and Broderick have a long history of collaborating on cost-effective ways to address electronic discovery-related issues, which undoubtedly will benefit all parties in this unprecedented undertaking.

EXHIBIT A
Additional Examples of Defense Discovery Requests

1	“Videos in the government's possession that filmed the interior of the capital building from approximately 2:50 PM to 3:35 PM on January 6, 2021.”
2	“[A]ll photographs or video footage obtained or confiscated by the government from outside sources during the investigation of this case are material to the defense’s preparation.”
3	“Our position is that the government must identify any evidence it believes to capture [defendant], regardless of whether it intends to rely on the same in its case in chief.”
4	“Copies of any and all documents, photographs, and video received by the U.S. Attorney’s office and/or Metropolitan Police Department or any other law enforcement agency from any law enforcement officer or prosecutor from any other jurisdiction regarding this case.”
5	“I write to request that the United States review the contents of the FBI’s “I” drive and disclose any and all exculpatory evidence identified therein.”
6	“Network news outlets aired footage of one or more Officers directing protestors towards doors and seemingly invited them to enter the building -- this is Brady material for our clients.”
7	“The discovery I'm requesting is all video and/or audio footage in which Capitol Police and any other Gov't officials or agents remove barriers and/or interact with protestors who entered the Capitol or gained access to the patios or other structures connected to the Capitol building complex.”
8	<p>“This request also includes any video footage, including from cameras owned by MPD (crime and red light) and DDOT (which are operated and maintained by MPD, and to which MPD has access), as well as any footage that government actors reviewed. This request also includes any video footage from MPD District where the defendant was taken, and all body worn camera footage that may have captured any portion of the alleged incident, investigation or arrest of my client.”</p> <p>“The request includes all Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage from all offices involves in any and all searchers, arrests, and investigations associated with this case and/ or labels with the CCN Number associated with this case; information that will permit undersigned counsel to identify the officer wearing the BWC; metadata related to any and all BWC footage; information from the AUSA’s office and/or MPD specifying any edits or redactions made to the footage and the corresponding justifications. Please also provide the access logs for the BWC footage for any and all officers involved in this case.”</p>
9	“All photographs , including those of the defendant, sketches, diagrams, maps, representations or exhibits of any kind, that relate to this case, regardless of whether the government intends to introduce them in its case-in-chief . . . Including all video recordings related to the January 6, 2021 events.”
10	“I further request that you review all documentation related to or generated in connection with this case that may be outside of the government’s official case file (e.g., materials in the FBI’s “I-Drive” or other similar repositories of investigation documents in the possession of federal or local agencies or law enforcement authorities.”

EXHIBIT A
Additional Examples of Defense Discovery Requests

11	“Any evidence (whether or not reduced to writing) that law enforcement or Capitol employees allowed any protestors into the building. Such evidence might include (without limitation) moving barricades, opening doors, instructing protestors they could enter, failing to intervene when protestors entered, etc...”
12	“Any evidence that concerns any Capitol police officers who were suspended and/or disciplined for removing barriers, opening doors, etc. on January 6 th .”
13	“I am also concerned about the thousands or tens of thousands videos the government has received from public sources, particularly how the government is searching, indexing, and storing these videos, and whether the government is withholding any video footage in its possession; Based on my review of the discovery thus far, there is official video surveillance and publicly sourced video footage that is exculpatory to the defendants. Many of those videos show [defendant] and other[s] peacefully walking around the Capitol. In these videos, they, like thousands of others, are doing nothing illegal with the possible exception of being present in the building, all of which is potentially exculpatory.”
14	“All information regarding any Capitol Police, MPD, National Guard, other law enforcement officer or other person in position of authority ("LEOs") who moved guard rails, opened or held doors open, stepped aside, allowed persons to enter or stay within the Capitol or otherwise did not direct, instruct or signify to the public -- implicitly or explicitly -- to vacate the Capitol or that the Capitol was closed to the public or restricted for public entry.”
15	“Any audio or video footage of [defendant] relevant to any of the charges in the indictment that has not previously been provided, whether captured by body-cameras worn or phones carried by Metropolitan Police Department officers, by body-cameras worn or phones carried Capitol Police officers, or by phones or other recording devices carried by any other witness.”
16	“For purposes of this letter, all photographs or video footage obtained or confiscated by the government from outside sources during the investigation of this case are material to the defense’s preparation. Please provide notice of any decision not to produce requested photographs, video footage, or recorded communications so that a judicial decision as to production may, if warranted, be sought. Please also provide all photographs, video footage, and recorded communications relating to the <i>Brady</i> and <i>Giglio</i> requests articulated below.”

**UNITED STATES' MEMORANDUM
REGARDING STATUS OF DISCOVERY AS OF AUGUST 23, 2021**

The United States files this memorandum for the purpose of describing our overall approach to discovery, and our discovery plan in relation to voluminous sets of data that the government collected in its investigation of the Capitol Breach cases, among which may be interspersed information the defense may consider material or exculpatory. The materials upon which this memorandum is focused include, for example, thousands of hours of video footage from multiple sources (e.g., Capitol surveillance footage, body-worn-camera footage, results of searches of devices and Stored Communications Act (“SCA”) accounts, digital media tips, Parler video, and unpublished news footage), and hundreds of thousands of investigative documents including but not limited to interviews of tipsters, witnesses, investigation subjects, defendants, and members of law enforcement. Further, we write to provide the Court with the status of our implementation of that plan as of August 23, 2021.

I. The Government’s Approach to Discovery is Intended to Ensure that All Arguably Exculpatory Materials are Produced in a Comprehensive, Accessible, and Useable Format.

The government has always understood the magnitude and complexity of the discovery project presented by the January 6 attack on the Capitol. We have taken a very expansive view of what may be material or potentially exculpatory and thus discoverable in Capitol Breach cases. Defense counsel in Capitol Breach cases have made requests including any and all information that captures an individual defendant’s conduct or statements; shows people “peacefully walking around the Capitol”; or suggests that a member (or members) of law enforcement allowed people to enter or remain in the Capitol or on restricted grounds, acted friendly or sympathetic to the rioters, or otherwise failed to do their jobs. Of course, there may be additional types of information a defendant may consider material or exculpatory, but since

the government does not know the defense theory in any particular case, it is impossible to for the government to determine what other types of information a defendant may believe to be material.

To the extent the type of information described above may exist, it may be interspersed among the voluminous sets of data referenced above. Given the volume of material, and because “[d]efendants are in a better position to determine what evidence they believe is exculpatory and will help in their defense,”¹ it is our intent to provide the defense with all data that may contain such information, but in a manner that will facilitate search, retrieval, sorting, and management of that information.

II. Our General Plan for Production of Voluminous Materials Involves Two Separate Platforms.

We have developed and begun implementing a plan to use two primary platforms to process and produce discoverable voluminous materials: one for documents (e.g., items such as law enforcement investigation files and business records) and one for digital materials (e.g., video footage). (These two platforms have frequently been referred to as our “database” although, in fact, they are two separate information repositories hosted by unrelated vendors.) We are working collaboratively with Federal Public Defender (“FPD”) leadership and electronic discovery experts, including Sean Broderick, the National Litigation Support Administrator for

¹ *United States v. Meek*, No. 19-cr-00378-JMS-MJD, 2021 WL 1049773 *5 (S.D. Ind. 2021). *See also United States v. Ohle*, No. S3 08 CR 1109 (JSR), 2011 WL 651849 *4 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)(not reported in F.Supp.2d)(“placing a higher burden on the Government to uncover such evidence would place prosecutors in the untenable position of having to prepare both sides of the case at once. Indeed, the adversarial system presumes that the defense will be more highly motivated to uncover exculpatory evidence, so if anything the onus is on defense counsel to conduct a more diligent search for material potentially favorable to his client. This is especially true considering that, if exculpatory evidence exists, the defense is in the best position to know what such evidence might be and where it might be located.”)

the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Defender Services Office, to ensure that Federal Public Defender offices nationwide that are working on Capitol Breach cases, counsel that are appointed under the Criminal Justice Act, and retained counsel for people who are financially unable to obtain these services will have access to the same platforms, including technological functionality commensurate to that available to the government, for the purpose of receiving and reviewing discoverable materials.

A. We will Share Documents from Our Own Relativity Workspace to a Defense Relativity Workspace, and are Making Rolling Productions Via Alternative Means Until the Defense Workspace is Available.

1. Overview

Deloitte is hosting a Relativity database, or “workspace,” for the government to manage and produce documents. Relativity is a cloud-based eDiscovery platform that offers functionalities including document organization, review, production, and analytics within a single environment, and is an industry leader in eDiscovery hosting. As further elaborated below, we are in the process of ingesting hundreds of thousands of documents into our Relativity workspace, so that we may review them, apply necessary redactions, and produce the documents as appropriate to the defense.

Ultimately, our plan is for all discoverable documents to be shared to a wholly separate defense Relativity workspace, also hosted by Deloitte, but wholly inaccessible to the government. Deloitte is currently creating such a defense workspace within Relativity for receipt of discoverable documents, and we are working toward a modification of our contract to fund the additional hosting and support of that database.²

² Hosting refers to storing and organizing documents in a case within a database for document review, organizing, searching, categorizing, and redacting, and providing users with accounts to access the database. Typically, providing discovery in a format that allows it to be loaded into a

A Relativity workspace will allow Capitol Breach defense teams to leverage Relativity's search and analytics capabilities to search the voluminous documents we expect to produce for information they believe may be material to their individual cases. Defense teams will be able to perform key term searches and metadata searches across hundreds of thousands of documents in the defense workspace. Further, in conjunction with any staff they designate to support their workspace, they will be able to design coding panes that allow them to "tag" items received in discovery as they deem relevant to their cases, e.g., by location ("Lower West Terrace") or defense theories of the case ("Police Let Defendants In"); and then generate search reports based on the results associated with a particular tag or multiple tags.³

As elaborated below, although Relativity significantly increases the pace at which we may review and process materials to make appropriate productions, performing these tasks correctly and comprehensively takes time. Nevertheless, we expect to begin making

database satisfies the government's discovery obligations. We understand that neither the Federal Public Defender nor the Criminal Justice Act panel has a vehicle in place through which they may engage in expedited contracting for the hosting and licensing services that are necessary to meet the demands of this unprecedented volume of materials. Thus, the government has agreed to provide the necessary hosting and licensing services through Deloitte. The government has been closely coordinating with FPD to ensure that when we modify our contract with Deloitte, we obtain sufficient licenses to cover the needs of current cases as well as those of cases that may be brought in the future.

³ We believe that to ensure defendants have meaningful access to the defense Relativity workspace, FPD will require additional support for the workspace. As the Court is aware, "Even if the discovery is produced in an optimal way, defense counsel may still need expert assistance, such as litigation support personnel, paralegals, or database vendors, to convert e-discovery into a format they can use and to decide what processing, software, and expertise is needed to assess the [Electronically Stored Information]." See *Criminal e-Discovery: A Pocket Guide for Judges*, Chapter II (Common Issues in Criminal e-Discovery), at 12. The *Pocket Guide* serves as a supplement to the federal judiciary's bench book. We are engaging in frequent and productive discussions with FPD in the effort to resolve contractual and technical details related to the implementation of an adequate support plan.

documentary productions from Relativity within the next two weeks, as discussed in more detail below, and will do so on a rolling basis going forward. Until the defense Relativity workspace is operational and defense accounts are established documents will continue to be produced in individualized cases via other available methods – most frequently cloud-based file sharing through USAfx.

2. The Government is Steadily Populating its Own Relativity Database with Materials.

We have already populated our Relativity database with over 30,000 records from the U.S. Capitol Police (“USCP”) and USCP reports related to allegations of misconduct by law enforcement in connection with the events of January 6, 2021. We are currently using our Relativity platform to process materials related to allegations of police misconduct, and plan to make those reports available within approximately the next two weeks. Capitol Breach prosecution teams will disseminate these materials once they become available. We are prioritizing these materials and Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) use-of-force investigation files because many defendants have requested them.

We are steadily working to ingest into Relativity potentially discoverable documents that we requested and received from multiple law enforcement agencies, while ensuring that materials that are or may be protected by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) are adequately protected. Of course, Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) files account for the majority of documentary evidence that we will need to ingest and review. The FBI estimates that there are approximately 750,000 investigative memoranda and attachments in its files associated with the Capitol Breach investigation. We intend to organize, deduplicate, and produce these materials as appropriate, using all of Relativity’s tools to do so as quickly as possible. As discussed below,

however, these processes are not wholly automated, and will require both technical expertise and manual assistance.

3. The Workflow in Processing Materials for Discovery Takes Time.

The process of populating Relativity with potentially discoverable material, all in varied formats and from different sources, is complicated. It is *not* like copying and pasting a file, or even like duplicating a hard drive. Before the hundreds of thousands of investigative files at issue here are ever loaded to Relativity, they must be meaningfully organized into folder structures that will make sense to reviewers and recipients. The materials must also be quality-checked, e.g., we must ensure that we have the password for protected documents, that the documents were provided in a format that will open, and that we remove irrelevant software and system files that would only cloud the workspace and confuse reviewers. After materials are loaded to Relativity, we must customize the manner in which they are displayed so as to be meaningful to reviewers who will make discoverability determinations and apply appropriate redactions and sensitivity designations. Not all documents are created equal, e.g., financial records and forensic cell phone search reports cannot meaningfully be displayed in the same way.

All of these processes will be assisted by leveraging Relativity's tools as much as possible, such as by using keyword searches to identify items that must be excluded or redacted; and deduplication tools to recognize documents that have already been processed so that they are not analyzed or reproduced multiple times. Although these processes are time-consuming, they are necessary to avoid production of unorganized data dumps, unreadable files, and unusable databases; or a failure of the government to take adequate steps to prevent both victims and defendants' private information from being shared with hundreds of defendants.

B. We will Share Digital Evidence from Our Own Evidence.com Instance to a Defense Evidence.com Instance, and Make Rolling Productions as Digital Media is Processed.

Relativity was primarily designed as document review platform and not to manage terabytes of digital evidence. Although it is technologically possible to view and share video evidence within Relativity, in this case, the volume of video would significantly reduce Relativity's performance speed.

Accordingly, we will use evidence.com as a platform to manage, review, and share digital media evidence. Evidence.com is a cloud-based digital evidence management system designed by Axon Enterprise, Inc. ("Axon"), an industry leader in body-worn-camera systems. Axon refers to a singular environment of evidence.com as an "instance." The government has agreed to fund a defense instance of evidence.com and to provide the necessary licensing services through Axon. This instance will be managed and administered by FPD, and the government will have no ability to log into or retrieve information from this instance. As recently as Saturday, August 21, 2021, we consulted with representatives from Axon about our plan and we expect our contract with Axon will be modified expeditiously. As with Relativity, the government has been closely coordinating with FPD to ensure that we cover the needs of current cases as well as those of cases that may be brought in the future. We understand that legal defense teams will likely wish to share voluminous evidence with defendants. Axon has additional infrastructure referred to as my.evidence.com that will allow defense attorneys to share voluminous evidence with individual defendants.

We have already migrated over 2,900 body-worn-camera videos totaling over 2,300 hours (nearly 100 days) into our instance of evidence.com. For the reasons relayed above, from a technological perspective, we expect to be able to share this footage with FPD's evidence.com

instance within approximately the next two weeks. Before we can share voluminous video footage with FPD, we must also ensure that the footage is adequately protected. Based on a review of the body-worn-camera footage conducted by our Office, the footage displays approximately 1,000 events that may be characterized as assaults on federal officers. As these officers now, or in the future may, qualify as victims under the Crime Victims Rights Act, they have the “right to be reasonably protected from the accused” and the “right to be treated with fairness and with respect of the victim’s dignity and privacy.” 18 U.S.C. §§ 3771(a)(1) and (8).

When we share the footage, we also intend to share information we have developed that will help facilitate efficient defense review of body-worn-camera footage. For example:

- Individuals in our Office who reviewed all the body-worn-camera footage in our instance created a spreadsheet that identifies footage by agency, officer, video start time, a summary of events, and location of the camera in 15-minute increments. The locations are defined in zone map they created. We will share our zone map and the spreadsheet with the legal defense teams, subject to adequate protection.
- We obtained from MPD Global Positioning Satellite (“GPS”) information for radios that may be of assistance in identifying the location of officers whose body-worn-camera footage is relevant to the defense. We will share this information with the legal defense teams, subject to adequate protection.

We will continue to ingest video evidence into evidence.com on a rolling basis, and to produce it regularly. As evidence.com was designed to function in coordination with body-worn-cameras designed by Axon, ingesting body-worn-camera footage into our instance was fairly simple. Other footage will need to be converted from proprietary formats before it can be ingested into evidence.com, and so processing will take longer.

At this time, the FBI is in the process of transmitting Capitol surveillance footage for ingestion into evidence.com. Because of the size of the footage, it will take several weeks to receive and ingest the footage. Based on our current understanding of the technical complexities involved, we expect to start rolling productions from 7,000 hours of footage that the USCP

provided the FBI within approximately the next four weeks. An additional 7,000 hours of footage is not relevant to this case and, therefore will not be produced.

III. Conclusion.

In sum, while we have not resolved every contractual or technical detail, and while our discovery plan continually evolves to address issues as they arise, we are making substantial progress in our diligent efforts to provide the defense comparable discovery review platforms for both documents and digital media, to populate those platforms, and to use alternative means to provide the most relevant discovery without delay. We are confident that our plan will come to fruition, and although we have not reached agreement on every aspect of this plan, we continue to have good faith, productive discussions with FPD regarding production of voluminous data. In the interim, we will diligently continue to transfer data to our vendors, process it for production, and make interim productions by other means until the defense platforms are in place. As we continue to implement our plan, we will continue to file status memoranda with the Court on a regular basis.

**UNITED STATES' MEMORANDUM
REGARDING STATUS OF DISCOVERY AS OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2021**

The United States files this memorandum for the purpose of describing the status of implementation of our discovery plan in relation to voluminous sets of data that the government collected in its investigation of the Capitol Breach cases, among which may be interspersed information the defense may consider material or exculpatory. The materials upon which this memorandum is focused include, for example, thousands of hours of video footage from multiple sources (e.g., Capitol surveillance footage, body-worn-camera footage, results of searches of devices and Stored Communications Act accounts, digital media tips, Parler video, and unpublished news footage), and hundreds of thousands of investigative documents including but not limited to interviews of tipsters, witnesses, investigation subjects, defendants, and members of law enforcement.

Capitol Breach Defense Discovery Liaison Established

The Federal Public Defender for the District of Columbia (“FPD”) has agreed to serve as the Discovery Liaison for defense counsel in Capitol Breach cases. FPD will be the common point of contact between the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, Defender Services Office, and defense counsel.

Status of Defense Access to Discovery Databases

As noted in our Memorandum Regarding Status of Discovery as of August 23, 2021 (the “August 23 Memo”), incorporated herein by reference, under our discovery plan, we will use two primary platforms to process and produce discoverable voluminous materials, evidence.com for voluminous digital media materials (e.g., body-worn-camera footage and U.S. Capitol Police (“USCP”) surveillance footage) and Relativity for documents (e.g., items such as law

enforcement investigation files and business records). Further, we will ensure that all Capitol Breach legal defense teams will have access to the same platforms, including technological functionality commensurate to that available to the government, for the purpose of receiving and reviewing discoverable materials.

Evidence.com

On September 3, 2021, the United States modified its contract with Axon Enterprise, Inc. (“Axon”), our evidence.com vendor. Pursuant to the modification, the government has funded a Capitol Breach defense instance of evidence.com and purchased licenses that will enable legal defense teams to gain access to a defense discovery database. The defense instance is managed and administered by FPD, and the government has no ability to log into or retrieve information from the defense instance. FPD is currently working with Defender Service’s National Litigation Support Team to create a structure for distributing and tracking Axon licenses for defense counsel. As we stated in our previous memo, defense counsel can share evidence from the defense instance with individual defendants using a cloud-based file-sharing service offered by Axon called my.evidence.com (as well as provide downloaded video, except when prohibited by a sensitivity designation).

As a result of September 3, 2021 contract modifications, we are now technologically able to share approximately 2,300 hours of body-worn-camera videos to the defense instance of evidence.com. To ensure this enormous production is organized and meaningful for the defense, we are currently categorizing and tagging the videos. Further, to ensure that the videos (which display approximately 1,000 assaults upon officers and include occasional references to personal identifying information) are adequately protected, we are also exploring whether it is

technologically possible for downloading to be automatically suppressed when highly sensitive video is shared by defense counsel to defendants.

We are hopeful we will be able to transfer the body-worn-camera footage to the defense instance of evidence.com by the end of this week (Friday, September 17, 2021), and expect to produce it no later than the end of next week (Friday, September 24, 2021).¹

We have uploaded approximately twenty percent of the relevant USCP surveillance footage to our instance of evidence.com (i.e., in excess of one terabyte of video, consisting of about 140 cameras, 4,900 files, and 1,600 hours of footage). We are nearly finished applying sensitivity designations to these files. We expect to be able to share them to the defense instance next week.

FPD anticipates updating defense counsel with the status of their work to distribute and track Axon licenses approximately one week after the first significant production of discovery is loaded into the defense instance evidence.com platform.

Relativity

Deloitte Financial Advisory Services, LLP (“Deloitte”), our Relativity vendor, has established a Capitol Breach defense Relativity workspace. We continue to work toward a modification of our contract to fund the additional hosting and support of that database. Modifying the Deloitte contract presents multiple contractual, technical, and legal challenges that were not posed by the Axon contract, but we are moving with as much haste as possible given the various complexities. We believe that by October, the contract modifications will be

¹ As elaborated in our August 23 Memo, we will also provide information we have developed that will help facilitate defense review of the footage.

completed, thus allowing for defense access to the Relativity database.² To give the Court a sense of just some of the challenges that we are addressing, they include formulating concrete plans describing the staffing and technological safeguards that will be put into place to eliminate the possibility of work product being shared from one workspace to another. We must also ensure the modification, which must be fairly detailed under applicable government contracting rules and regulations, will be sufficient to support hundreds of defense cases, and are working closely with FPD in support of that effort. As this undertaking by FPD is also unprecedented, handling the contract modification correctly takes time. FPD will work with Defender Service's National Litigation Support Team to create a structure for distributing and tracking Relativity licenses and anticipates updating defense counsel with the status of their work approximately one week after the contract is modified to provide access to FPD. Finally, we must ensure that in making available hundreds of thousands of documents to hundreds of legal defense teams, we are careful to ensure that materials are properly scoped pursuant to the terms of any applicable warrants, and that access to the database is restricted in a manner that will ensure our compliance with applicable privacy laws. We are currently consulting with Department of Justice experts in privacy and discovery to ensure that these issues are properly handled.

Until the defense Relativity workspace is accessible, as we stated in our August 23 Memo, we will continue to provide voluminous documents from our Relativity database through individualized productions. (Any productions we make will also be added to the defense Relativity workspace.) On Friday, September 10, 2021, the Discovery Team made available for production in all Capitol Breach cases approximately 850 pages consisting of redacted reports

² To be clear, while we expect the defense Relativity database will be partially populated in October, we do not expect it to be complete at that time.

from USCP investigations of alleged wrongdoing by USCP officers on January 6, 2021. We anticipate providing Metropolitan Police Department internal investigation reports (approximately 600 pages) by next week. We are still reviewing the approximately 30,000 files in Relativity that were provided to us by USCP.

As the Discovery Team continues to receive additional documents, we cull them of any materials potentially protected by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) and provide the remainder (a majority) to Deloitte for ingestion into our Relativity database for discovery review. At this time, we have provided Deloitte the following additional documents for ingestion into our Relativity database:

- Discovery productions (approximately 11,500 records) that have been made in complex Capitol Breach cases (e.g., multi-defendant conspiracies involving Oathkeepers and Proud Boys);³ and
- Approximately 24,000 Federal Bureau of Investigation records.

This week, we also expect to provide Deloitte discovery productions that have been made in 75 individual cases (approximately 32,000 documents).⁴ As we have described in our prior discovery status memos, the process of populating Relativity with potentially discoverable material is complicated and takes time.

Incarcerated Defendants

In collaboration with FPD, we are developing proposals to increase access by incarcerated defendants to voluminous materials, which we expect to share with the D.C. Department of Corrections and to discuss within the next two weeks.

³ Although these productions were already made in the relevant cases, they will ultimately be made accessible to all Capitol Breach defendants through the defense Relativity workspace.

⁴ Although these productions were already made in the relevant cases, they will ultimately be made accessible to all Capitol Breach defendants through the defense Relativity workspace.

Conclusion

In sum, while we have not resolved every contractual or technical detail, and while our discovery plan continually evolves to address issues as they arise, we are making substantial progress in our diligent efforts to provide the defense comparable discovery review platforms for both documents and digital media, to populate those platforms, and to use alternative means to provide the most relevant discovery without delay. We are confident that our plan will come to fruition, and although we have not reached agreement on every aspect of this plan, we continue to have good faith, productive discussions with FPD regarding production of voluminous data. In the interim, we will diligently continue to transfer data to our vendors, process it for production, and make interim productions by other means until the defense platforms are in place. As we continue to implement our plan, we will continue to file status memoranda with the Court on a regular basis.