
From: Grindler, Gary (OAG)
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2011 9:23 AM
To: O'Neil, David (ODAG); 'stuart.goldberg2@usdoj.gov'; Delery, Stuart F. (OAG); Weich, Ron (SMO); Schmalder, Tracy (SMO); Richardson, Margaret (SMO)
Subject: Re: Document Production Status

So any word?

From: O'Neil, David (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 07:52 PM
To: 'stuart.goldberg2@usdoj.gov' <stuart.goldberg2@usdoj.gov>; Grindler, Gary (OAG); Delery, Stuart F. (OAG)
Subject: Fw: Document Production Status

From: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 07:06 PM
To: O'Neil, David (ODAG)
Subject: FW: Document Production Status

FYI

From: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Kolan_Davis@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:02 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Document Production Status

Thanks. Assumed so. We're reviewing.

From: Weich, Ron (SMO) [<mailto:Ron.Weich@usdoj.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 7:01 PM
To: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Subject: RE: Document Production Status

Hey, just to be clear, I took this email into account in formulating the one that I just sent to the larger group.

From: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Kolan_Davis@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 10:13 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: Fw: Document Production Status

Below is Jason's take on where we are

From: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2011 09:49 PM
To: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Subject: Document Production Status

The only document the Justice Department has provided to us is 4(a). That was the Newell memo which was initially promised, then withheld, then produced. As for the other items on the list:

1. Written commitment about equal footing w/ Issa: It was my understanding that would come after the time agreement and a Leahy letter. We asked for a draft of the proposed text of the Leahy letter at the meeting with the AG, but I have not received it.
2. Written commitment about interview conditions: They objected to the one involving OLA being present, but we have nothing confirming that they accept the others.
3. Delivery of answers to QFRs: We had worked out a compromise for a promise of a date-certain. However, we haven't been told what that date is. They were to check to see what their estimate was likely to be.
4. Documents: DOJ has only provided us with (a). There have been some document productions to the House side. The most recent was 7:15 this evening. I'm not sure what is in those and of course they are preparing for the hearing over there.
 - a. Newell Memo: Was delivered after a general claim of sensitivity and much heavy lifting.
 - b. ATF Presentation (3/5/2010): We could confirm whether this one was produced to the House side if they provide us with the bates number where it is located.
 - c. Records related to 12/17/09 DOJ/FFL meeting: They said this category was sensitive, implying an *in camera* review. There's been no specific description of why this category is sensitive and no written commitment that we or the House side will receive an *in camera* review.
 - d. Briefing papers on F&F to HQ: If they provide bates numbers, we could confirm whether these have been produced to the House. If production will be rolling on this broader category, then a commitment to prioritize and identify them when produced would work.
 - e. Records relating to orders to stand down: Again, bates numbers would help if they say they have produced. If not, then a commitment to prioritize and identify them when produced would work.
 - f. Records relating to Terry ballistics: They said this one is off the table. However, we started getting questions today suggesting that DOJ had provided detailed information on this to the press.
 - g. ATF / USAtty communications on genesis of F&F: Same status as (d) and (e).
5. We've received nothing indicating that there are no responsive documents in any of the categories.