Questions for the Record

Chris Miller, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Verizon Consumer Group

Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law

Arctic Frost Accountability: Oversight of Telecommunications Carriers' Responses to Jack Smith's Witch Hunt (February 10, 2026)

Questions from Subcommittee Chair Marsha Blackburn

1. In responding to my question about the total number of members of Congress whose records Verizon produced to Jack Smith, you stated that Verizon "believes that—either from the former Special Counsel's office or a predecessor law enforcement entity—we received subpoenas for a total of 15 members of Congress."

a. Is that still your understanding?

b. Did you conduct any subsequent searches after the February 10 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing to confirm how many members' records Verizon ultimately produced in the Arctic Frost matter?

Yes, Verizon received subpoenas from either Special Counsel Jack Smith's Office or a predecessor law enforcement entity regarding 15 Members of Congress. Verizon performed diligent and broad searches prior to the February 10 hearing date, including searches based on search terms provided by the Committee, and does not believe that additional responsive materials exist beyond those already identified. As described below, because Verizon does not have knowledge of every personal or campaign line used by every member of Congress unless it has been identified to Verizon, we are coordinating with both the Senate and the House to identify any such lines.

2. During your testimony, you indicated that Verizon and the United States Senate entered into a contract for services in or around May 2022 and that this contract was in effect on and through May 2023. With respect to that contract:

a. Please provide a full and complete copy of the contract executed between Verizon and the United States Senate in or around May 2022 which was in effect on and through May 2023.

b. What is the term of the contract?

c. Since May 2022, has the contract been modified? If so, please provide copies of the changes to the contract.

d. What is the total annual amount paid (both yearly and in total) by the U.S. Senate to Verizon under the contract?

e. If the contract between Verizon and the U.S. Senate in force as of your receipt of this question for the record is different than the contract in force during May 2023, please provide a copy of the contract in force today.

The U.S. Senate Sergeant at Arms has maintained a long-standing customer relationship with Verizon for over 20 years, routinely issuing annual purchase orders for wireless services and equipment under the terms and conditions of Verizon's GSA Schedule contracts. During the time you have mentioned above, the Senate Sergeant at Arms executed purchase orders in June 2022. This was done under Verizon's GSA agreement (GSA MAS 47QTCA20D00B5). We refer to the GSA agreement, relevant purchase orders, and change orders generally as "the contract" below.

A copy of the relevant purchase orders and change orders covering the period July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023, along with Verizon's current GSA MAS, is being provided with this response. A copy of the purchase orders and change orders covering the periods from July 1, 2023 - October 31, 2026 is also being provided.

In addition, Verizon reached an agreement in 2025 with the Senate Sergeant at Arms regarding new processes for legal demands relating to official Senate lines, including providing notification to the Senate Sergeant at Arms, notwithstanding Verizon's interpretation of Section 6628. That agreement was memorialized in a letter of understanding dated October 28, 2025, which is also being provided.

The total amounts invoiced by Verizon for services since 2016 are shown below by year and in total.

Year	Invoice amount by year
2016	$4,350,319.66
2017	$4,463,164.60
2018	$4,728,163.75
2019	$5,095,932.39
2020	$5,430,433.57
2021	$5,266,542.29
2022	$5,653,050.13
2023	$6,040,518.70
2024	$6,288,947.04
2025	$6,250,813.86
2026	$562,076.04
Grand Total	**$54,129,962.03**

The total amounts invoiced by Verizon for equipment since 2021 are shown below by year and in total.

Year	Invoice amount by year
2021	$872,072.56
2022	$830,236.65
2023	$907,746.81
2024	$1,514,535.47
2025	$1,391,563.43
2026	$135,551.48
Grand Total	**$5,651,706.40**

The two tables above show the data for the years Verizon has been able to identify amounts invoiced to the Senate Sergeant at Arms.

Verizon respectfully submits that it has fully complied both with its contract with the Senate Sergeant at Arms and federal law in responding to valid legal process accompanied by non-disclosure orders, which Verizon was required to follow. For the avoidance of any doubt, Verizon did not produce the content of any communications, including any content that was contained in telephone calls, texts, or SMS communications.

Questions from Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Charles E. Grassley

3. What changes have you implemented to detect when a state or federal government agency seeks information from a device connected to a Member of Congress? Describe in detail. If none, please explain.

We have put processes in place to increase transparency to Members of Congress whose information is sought by law enforcement while working closely with Congress and the Administration to address the important issues raised by this Committee's inquiry.

Verizon has implemented a process whereby all legal demands Verizon receives are compared against a list of official congressional lines covered under the purchase orders or contracts Verizon has with the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives. This includes all official congressional lines, whether used by Members of Congress or their staff. Verizon has also added known personal or campaign lines of a Member of Congress to this process. Once a legal demand is identified as listing an official congressional line or known personal or campaign line associated with a Member of Congress, the legal demand is then escalated to senior leadership at Verizon. Verizon is coordinating with both the House and Senate to identify personal and campaign numbers belonging to Members of Congress, and we are awaiting further information on those lines to ensure we have complete information. This includes working with Senate leadership and individual members to identify accounts not associated with the Senate Sergeant at Arms, including campaign and personal accounts. Having a database of operative Senate and House Member numbers is key to notifying Members when phone records are subpoenaed.

Specifically, for law enforcement requests for congressional lines or for personal or campaign lines related to Members, we will ensure that Verizon senior leadership is notified and consulted before any information is disclosed. This will allow for informed and thoughtful decisionmaking at the highest levels of the company.

In addition, before producing records, Verizon will contact law enforcement officials to verify that they, in fact, intend to seek records for an official congressional line or a personal or campaign line used by a Member.

Finally, we will notify the Member of the law enforcement request to the fullest extent provided by the law. And if we receive a non-disclosure order preventing notice, we will challenge the order in court.

4. When a state or federal government agency seeks information connected to a Member of Congress, what is your company's response? Will your company challenge the government's efforts to seek that information or produce the information as requested? Please explain in detail including changes made to previous company policy.

When a state or federal government agency seeks information connected to a Member of Congress, Verizon's response team will notify and consult with Verizon senior leadership on appropriate next steps before any information is disclosed. This will enable informed, thoughtful decision-making at the highest levels of the company. In addition, before producing records, Verizon will contact state or federal law enforcement to verify that they, in fact, intend to seek the phone records of a Member of Congress. Finally, Verizon will notify the Member of the law enforcement request to the fullest extent provided by law. This new process took effect last year.

If Verizon determines that there is a basis to challenge a government subpoena and is unable to notify the Member due to a court-imposed non-disclosure order, Verizon will first challenge the non-disclosure order in court and, if that fails, will challenge the subpoena in court.

5. How many subpoenas or legal process has your company identified related to Arctic Frost and Special Counsel Jack Smith? In your response, please explain any limitations of the search and how your company plans to mitigate them.

Based on diligent searches of Verizon's records, Verizon identified and produced to the Committee 43 subpoenas issued by the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith. These subpoenas were identified by Verizon using search terms associated with Jack Smith and his office.

In addition, using search terms provided by Chairmen Grassley and Johnson in their November 12, 2025 letter, Verizon identified and produced to the Committee 27 additional subpoenas and two pen register orders that were issued prior to Jack Smith's appointment, and that may have related to the Arctic Frost investigation. Verizon also produced two subpoenas that were identified by Grand Jury number in the November 12, 2025 letter and requested by the Committee.

Verizon's ability to search for subpoenas within its records is limited by the fact that subpoenas and other legal demands typically list only telephone numbers and do not typically include names or details about the nature of the underlying investigation. Verizon performed diligent and broad searches, including searches based on search terms provided by the Committee, and does not believe that additional responsive

materials exist beyond those already identified relating to Arctic Frost and Special Counsel Jack Smith's office that targeted numbers used by Members.

6. Provide all communications between your company and DOJ and the FBI, both formal and informal, relating to Arctic Frost and Special Counsel Jack Smith.

Records of these communications are included in the case remarks that Verizon previously produced to the Committee for each subpoena Verizon identified from the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith.

Questions from Senator Mike Lee

7. Please describe with specificity the categories of information contained within the subpoenaed toll records. In particular, state whether the records include any of the following:

a. Records of telephone calls;

b. Records of text or SMS communications;

c. The duration of telephone calls;

d. The dates and/or times of communications;

e. Subscriber or account holder identifying information; and

f. Any geolocation or location-related data associated with the communications.

Verizon did not produce the content of any communications, including any content that was contained in telephone calls, texts, or SMS communications.

Federal law (18 U.S.C. § 2703(c)) sets forth the narrow categories of information that providers are required to provide the government in response to a valid subpoena. Verizon provided subscriber information and account information, such as the name of the account holder, the type of device used, billing statements, and the telephone numbers the subscriber called and was called by. The billing statements include the city and state of the tower that initially picked up the calls made or received (such as Washington, DC). Verizon did not produce precise location data in response to any of the subpoenas, which would have required a warrant.

8. Will you commit that—unless clearly prohibited by law—you will notify members of Congress when their toll records are subpoenaed? As part of this commitment, will you also explore all legal avenues to challenge improper nondisclosure orders that potentially violate federal law?

Yes. If a Member's toll records are subpoenaed, we will notify the Member of the law enforcement request to the fullest extent provided by the law. And if we receive a non-disclosure order preventing notice, we will challenge the order in court.

Questions from Senator Sheldon Whitehouse

9. Of the grand jury subpoenas received by Verizon for the toll records of U.S. Senators, and that Verizon has identified as being from the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith, how many requested records related to:

a. An account associated with or operated by the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms?

b. A personal account associated with a senator or a family member of a senator?

c. An account associated with a campaign for elected office?

d. Any other accounts?

Verizon received a May 25, 2023 grand jury subpoena from the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith for two lines associated with the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms, four campaign accounts, three personal accounts subscribed to by Senate Members, and one account associated with a family member of a Senate Member. Verizon also received subpoenas from Special Counsel Jack Smith's office that listed telephone numbers not pertaining to members of Congress.

10. Provide the name of each senator whose records were sought by the subpoenas referenced above.

Some of the names were orally provided to the Committee at the request of staff on calls beginning late October 2025. In addition, the Senate Judiciary Committee publicly released a redacted version of the May 25, 2023, subpoena issued by Special Counsel Jack Smith's office. Although that subpoena only listed numbers, the Senate Judiciary

Committee overlayed the numbers with the names of several U.S. Senators in the publicly released document,[1] including Senators R. Johnson, Tuberville, Blackburn, Hawley, Hagerty, Lummis, Sullivan, Cruz, Graham, and R. Scott.

11. As of 2023, did Verizon understand its obligations under 2 U.S.C. § 6628 to require Verizon to notify the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office—notwithstanding any non-disclosure order—if compulsory process was received for toll records related to an account that was not associated with or operated by the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office?

No. As described above, Verizon reached an agreement in 2025 with the Senate Sergeant at Arms regarding new processes for legal demands relating to official Senate lines, including providing notification to the Senate Sergeant at Arms. That agreement was memorialized in a letter of understanding dated October 28, 2025.

Verizon does not believe that 2 U.S.C. § 6628 by its terms applies to Verizon-generated records such as toll records. Verizon also does not believe the statute applies to accounts that are not associated with or operated by the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office. Verizon respectfully submits that it fully complied both with its contract with the Senate Sergeant at Arms and federal law in responding to valid legal process accompanied by non-disclosure orders, which Verizon was required to follow.

12. As of 2023, did Verizon understand its obligations under contracts with the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms to require Verizon to notify the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office—notwithstanding any non-disclosure order—if compulsory process was received for toll records related to an account that was not associated with or operated by the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office?

No. As described above, Verizon reached an agreement in 2025 with the Senate Sergeant at Arms regarding new processes for legal demands relating to official Senate lines, including providing notification to the Senate Sergeant at Arms. That agreement was memorialized in a letter of understanding dated October 28, 2025.

Verizon does not believe that 2 U.S.C. § 6628 by its terms applies to Verizon-generated records such as toll records. Verizon also does not believe the statute applies to

[1] https://www.grassley.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/verizon_subpoena_and_ndo_provided_to_chairman_grassley2.pdf

accounts that are not associated with or operated by the Office of the Senate Sergeant at Arms or a Senate office. Verizon respectfully submits that it fully complied both with its contract with the Senate Sergeant at Arms and federal law in responding to valid legal process accompanied by non-disclosure orders, which Verizon was required to follow.

13. Of the grand jury subpoenas received by Verizon for the toll records of members of the U.S. House of Representatives, and that Verizon has identified as being from the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith, how many requested records related to:

a. An account associated with or operated by the Office of the House Sergeant at Arms?

b. A personal account associated with a House member or a family member of a House member?

c. An account associated with a campaign for elected office?

d. Any other accounts?

Verizon received grand jury subpoenas from Special Counsel Jack Smith's office for two personal accounts of House Members and one personal account associated with a family member of a House Member. No grand jury subpoenas from Special Counsel Jack Smith's office requested records related to accounts associated with or operated by the Office of the House Sergeant at Arms or with known campaign accounts. Verizon did, however, also receive subpoenas from Special Counsel Jack Smith's Office that listed telephone numbers not pertaining to Members of Congress.

14. Provide the name of each member of the U.S. House of Representatives whose records were sought by the subpoenas referenced above.

The May 25, 2023 subpoena from Special Counsel Jack Smith's office included a number associated with a current member of the U.S. House of Representatives. This subpoena has been publicly disclosed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, which overlayed the names of Members on the telephone numbers listed in the subpoena (*see* footnote 1), and referenced Representative Kelly.

Verizon received another subpoena from Special Counsel Jack Smith's office targeting a number associated with a former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. One

of the subpoenas Verizon received that pre-dated Jack Smith but may relate to Arctic Frost targeted a number associated with a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. This Member, Representative Jordan, publicly disclosed that his number had been the subject of a subpoena.[2] Verizon also received a subpoena that targeted an official line of the U.S. House of Representatives. Verizon does not have subscriber records indicating who used that number during the period requested in the subpoena. Verizon also received subpoenas targeting numbers associated with three former Members of the U.S. House of Representatives; these subpoenas pre-dated Jack Smith but may relate to Arctic Frost.

Verizon has received a subpoena from the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (PSI) requesting the subscriber identities for the numbers listed in the subpoenas disclosed by Verizon, including those discussed above. Verizon is in the process of notifying subscribers. Once that process is complete, and assuming the relevant subscribers do not move to quash the subpoena, Verizon will provide those Members' names to PSI.

15. Has Verizon received compulsory process—including, but not limited to, federal grand jury subpoenas, administrative subpoenas, and court orders—for content or non-content records relating to U.S. Senators since January 20, 2025? If so, when, how many, and who were the senators?

Since January 20, 2025, Verizon has not produced records in response to compulsory process received from federal or state officials for any official Senate lines, nor any known personal or campaign lines of Senators. On occasion since January 20, 2025, Verizon has received legal demands for official Senate lines that were later withdrawn after they were escalated to the legal department and senior leadership based on our new process.

16. Has Verizon received compulsory process—including, but not limited to, federal grand jury subpoenas, administrative subpoenas, and court orders—for content or non-content records relating to members of the U.S. House of Representatives since January 20, 2025? If so, when, how many, and who were the members?

Since January 20, 2025, Verizon has received compulsory process, in response to which it produced records, for one personal number associated with a Member of the

[2] https://judiciary.house.gov/media/press-releases/biden-harris-justice-department-gathered-chairman-jordans-phone-records-over

U.S. House of Representatives and one official House line. Verizon notified the Members or their office of the legal process and confirmed their consent prior to producing records. As part of its commitment to its customers' privacy, Verizon does not release subscriber names without legal process.

In addition, Verizon has on occasion received legal demands for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives that were later withdrawn after they were escalated to the legal department and senior leadership based on our new process.