

Lt. Col. Alexander Vindman

- 1. Lt. Col. Vindman testified that he had “no concerns” about his two edits being excluded from the final call transcript. In fact, he noted that he does not, “think anybody intentionally necessarily did something by not putting them in there.” Moreover, Lt. Col. Vindman affirmed that the September 25th release of the call transcript was very accurate.**

Q: And you mentioned your two edits weren't reflected in the ultimate product?

A: Yeah.

Q: Who would have decided not to incorporate your edits?

A: I'm not sure if it was, you know, if there was any forethought necessarily in including them or not including them. I think it could have simply been, in this case, there was a paper version of it that was --- maybe even multiple paper versions of it, not in the digital system. In the digital system I would go in, I would make the edits, I would do it in a kind of a track change format and then somebody else would choose to accept them or not accept them. And this one I just wrote it on paper referencing my notes in the transcript, made those edits, and then handed it back to --- you know --- I recall handing it to my leadership, Tim Morrison, to take a look at, and I think after that I took it over to the executive secretary for them to do. But there could have been other copies that were also being reviewed, I don't know. Again, I apologize, I don't think anybody intentionally necessarily did something by not putting them in there, but they just didn't make the final version.

Q: Okay. So you have no concerns that these two edits weren't incorporated?

A: No, not really. No. [pgs.88-89]

Q: So if we're trying to understand what happened on the call, this certainly is a very accurate record?

A: Correct. [pg. 254]

- 2. Although Lt. Col. Vindman testified about how something that Ambassador Sondland said in the July 10 meeting with Ambassador Bolton and Ukrainian officials caused concerns, he couldn't recall what words Sondland actually used. (pgs. 59-60)**

Q: I want to go back to the July 10 meeting in Ambassador Bolton's office. Can you just tell us precisely, what did Sondland say that caught your concern?

A: So for that meeting, frankly, I was very focused on the substance, the national security content for the meeting. And I do recall him talking about investigations, but my reaction, you know, was probably relatively subdued. What very quickly unfolded thereafter was that Ambassador Bolton ended the meeting and, you know, something to the extent of, well, it was nice meeting you, looking forward to working with you, went out for the phone call and that was it. So ---

Q: You mean the photo?

A: Photo, correct. Thank you.

Q: Okay. Do you recall the specific words Ambassador Sondland used?

A: For that one, I do not recall the specific words ---

Q: Okay.

A: --- because, frankly, in my view, it seemed --- it was --- he was talking to the room. You know, it was not something that I was very, very focused on. But in the following conversation, it was a conversation between the two of us, and that one I do recall.

Q: I'll get to that in a second. So in Ambassador Bolton's office, you remember him using the terminology "investigations"?

A: Yes.

Q: Okay. Did he use the terms "2016"?

A: I don't recall.

Q: Okay. How about the Bidens?

A: I don't recall.

Q: Burisma?

A: I don't think so, no.

3. Many of the reactions that Lt. Col. Vindman testified about were due to Vindman reading certain words or meanings into situations where they were not explicitly said. For example, Vindman was concerned about Sondland mentioning "investigations" because he must have meant Burisma (due to the 'narrative' in the press) and Vindman was certain that there was no active investigation into Burisma at the time. (p. 61-62)

A: I guess what I found concerning is when this matter of investigations came up, the part that I recall is that there were no active investigations into Burisma. So he was calling to continue an investigation that didn't, in fact, exist.

Q: But I thought you said you couldn't remember if he mentioned the word Burisma?

A: **Well, he didn't mention the word Burisma.** But when he said investigations, this was part of the narrative at the time. There was --- and you couldn't differentiate between the two. There was the 2016 interference element and then there was the Burisma element. They were all, they were part of the same investigation, discussion, or the narrative.

4. Lt. Col. Vindman's testimony was littered with inconsistencies about his recollections. For example, Vindman mixes up his recollection of what Sondland said in the Ward room meeting. (p. 63-66)

Q: Okay. And then the second time Sondland referenced investigations was in the Ward room?

A: Correct.

Q: And what do you recall specifically of what Sondland said to the Ukrainians in the Ward room?

A: So that is right, the conversation unfolded with Sondland proceeding to kind of, you know, review what the deliverable would be in order to get the meeting, and he talked about the investigation into the Bidens, and, frankly, I can't 100 percent recall because I didn't take notes of it, but Burisma, that it seemed --- I mean, there was no ambiguity, I guess, in my mind. He was calling for something, calling for an investigation that didn't exist into the Bidens and Burisma.

Q: Okay. Ambiguity in your mind is different from what you ---

A: Sure.

Q: --- actually heard?

A: Right. Correct.

Q: What did you hear Sondland say?

A: That the Ukrainians would have to deliver an investigation into the Bidens.

Q: Into the Bidens. So in the Ward Room he mentioned the word "Bidens"?

A: To the best of my recollection, yes.

Q: Okay. Did he mention 2016?

A: I don't recall.

Q: Did he mention Burisma?

A: My visceral reaction to what was being called for suggested that it was explicit. There was no ambiguity.

Q: I'm just saying, did he mention like investigations generically?

A: No. It wasn't just investigation generically.

Q: Did he mention 2016?

A: This was all part of the same consistent narrative, 2016 elections ---

Q: Just what you heard though, in the Ward Room.

A: Again, based on my visceral reaction, it was explicit what he was calling for. And to the best of my recollection, he did specifically say "investigation of the Bidens."

Q: Okay. But not Bidens and Burisma?

A: That's right. So...the meeting that occurred in the Ward Room referenced investigations into the Bidens, to the best of my recollection, Burisma and 2016.

Q: So 2016 was mentioned in the Ward Room?

A: To the best of my recollection.

5. Lt. Col. Vindman agreed that it would be appropriate for Ukrainian officials to investigate allegations of wrongdoing by American board directors of Burisma. In his words, "Americans are not immune from criminal activity." (pgs. 208-09)

Q: If there was an allegation of wrongdoing by Burisma board directors, that would be something that the Ukrainians could look into, right?

A: I think so. They're a sovereign state, they can choose to do that, yes.

Q: So if there's an American that is operating in Ukraine as a businessman and they are accused of wrongdoing, the Ukrainians can investigate that?

A: Americans are not immune from criminal activity just because they're Americans overseas. So yes, if there's a criminal activity, they should, yeah.

6. Lt. Col. Vindman testified that although it is not regular practice to place Presidential call summaries onto a restricted system, it is not “entirely unusual.” (pg. 124)

Q: Are you aware of any other call transcripts or summaries that were placed into the more restricted system?

A: I mentioned that, you know, this is not entirely unusual. It doesn't happen regularly, I think most of these types of things handle --- occur in normal channels, but I am aware of other communications that have been --- yeah --- so, without going into the specific incidents, I guess, these are other classified materials.

7. During Lt. Col. Vindman's tenure, he was in contact with two Ukrainian officials—former Ukrainian Ambassador to the United States, Valeriy Chaly and then Deputy Chief of Mission, Oksana Shulyar—Ambassador Chaly had authored an op-ed in *The Hill* during the height of the Presidential campaign in 2016 criticizing President Trump's candidacy. (pg. 133)

Q: Which Ukrainian officials were you having discussions with?

A: My primary contact would be the Deputy Chief of Mission at the time, Oksana Shulyar...

Q: What other Ukrainians?

A: So I --- with regard to the specific --- so I also met with the Ambassador, Ambassador Chaly...