From: Reich, Steven (ODAG)
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: 7/11/2011 2:16:45 PM
Subject: RE: joint Castor/Foster meeting?

It's fine.

From: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 2:12 PM
To: Reich, Steven (ODAG)
Subject: joint Castor/Foster meeting?

DP

From: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Jason_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 1:04 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Cc: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep); Castor, Stephen (Stephen.Castor@mail.house.gov)
Subject: RE: voicemail

Ron, I understand you were scheduled to meet with Steve Castor on the House side at 4pm. He's planning to be over here this afternoon, so he can save you some time by just joining us at 3pm.

From: Weich, Ron (SMO) [mailto:Ron.Weich@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 7:07 PM
To: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep); Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Subject: RE: voicemail

Thanks. Steve and I will meet you guys in Kolan's office Monday at 3.

From: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Kolan_Davis@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 2:33 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO); Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: Re: voicemail

3 is ok with me

From: Weich, Ron (SMO) [mailto:Ron.Weich@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2011 02:27 PM
To: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep); Gaston, Molly (SMO) <Molly.Gaston@usdoj.gov>
Subject: RE: voicemail

Jason, sorry I hadn't replied to your earlier email.

I had mentioned to Kolan that I would like to meet with you and Kolan, in part to introduce Steve Reich who is going to be working on this matter as well. I had suggested a meeting earlier this week but it turned out to be a day on which you were going to be in a witness interview. Can Steve and I meet with you and Kolan on Monday at 3PM or after? We're happy to come to Kolan's office. I am unaware of any interview that day (although of course I am not aware of all of your interviews). I will be prepared to discuss the issues you raise below in that meeting.

From: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Jason_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 8:24 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Cc: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep); Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: RE: voicemail

Ron,

I haven't heard back yet on the question below from last Friday about who I should follow up with regarding who in the press shop may have had access to the *in camera* batch of documents. I believe Steve Castor has been seeking similar information from Matt Axelrod as well, but hasn't received a complete answer yet.

Nor have we received the briefing or any documents requested by Senator Grassley on March 15 regarding the DEA's involvement (previous correspondence attached) When will that be forthcoming?

I was puzzled to read your assertion that "the provision of certain sensitive law enforcement information to the Committee is problematic because, once in the Committee's possession, it is likely to become public." As you acknowledged to Kolan and me on the phone, the Committees have already been in possession of lots of arguably sensitive material from other sources for months that has not become public.

Yet it appears to be someone in the Department who leaked a document to the press about Agent Dodson's participation in an undercover operation without redacting his name and pitched a story attempting to undermine his credibility. Tristan and Brian went to DOJ to review the documents today and confirmed that the blank email and attachment in question is among the *in camera* documents and not among those produced to the Committees. Curiously, someone redacted the name of the criminal suspect, but did not redact Dodson's name from the document. We'd like to understand the rationale behind that decision. As we discussed, a redaction key identifying specific reasons for deleting material would be the normal way to communicate clearly to the Commitees if there is a legitimate reason to withhold particular information. Thanks.

Cordially,
Jason A. Foster
Chief Investigative Counsel

Charles E. Grassley, Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary
152 Dirksen Senate Office Building
United States Senate

Direct: (202) 224-7142

From: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2011 6:05 PM
To: 'Weich, Ron (SMO)'; Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: RE: voicemail

Ron, who will be responsible for addressing whether the DOJ press shop had access documents from the *in camera* batch?

From: Weich, Ron (SMO) [mailto:Ron.Weich@usdoj.gov]

Sent: Friday, July 01, 2011 6:01 PM
To: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep); Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: RE: voicemail

Kolan – Jason, Molly and I just spoke. Now that we understand the context of Sen. Grassley's handwritten letter, we will be able to respond to it. Thanks.

From: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Jason_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2011 5:29 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO); Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: RE: voicemail

I too was not at my desk, sorry. Happy to talk if we can connect, but here is some additional information that might be helpful. I cc'd Molly above, who had the opportunity to review Exhibit 10 throughout this morning's interview.

FYI, I consulted with the House staff about what they reviewed *in camera* on the occasion when Brian and Tristan were turned away at DOJ headquarters. We believe the document in question may be located somewhere between bates numbers 58-63 from that batch, which has not yet been provided to us or the House Committee. Of course, I can't be sure if those pages are the document in question as we haven't yet had an opportunity to review them. I'm assuming this is a separate bates series since we also have an HOGR ATF 00058-63, which is a different document and which was actually delivered to us after the votes on the nominations. Any additional explanation on that would be appreciated.

The document referenced in Exhibit 10 in today's interview is described by the reporter who obtained it this way: "Essentially, I got a copy of a proposal he [S/A I ATF made in May 2010 to go undercover and investigate gun traffickers." The reporter also represented separately that s/he had possession of a blank email from ATF dated May 27, 2010 and that the document was attached to that email. In Exhibit 10, the reporter is described as a "DOJ producer" and excerpts from various documents are selectively contrasted with excerpts from ATF public testimony in various font sizes, as if cut and pasted together. According to S/A ATF e reporter indicated to him yesterday that DOJ was, in fact, the source of the 5/27/10 blank email and attached document.

I understand this prompted S/A I ATF to complain to his new SAC, Mr. Brandon, about the leak resulting in contacts from the press. S/A ATF ndicated to SAC Brandon that following his public testimony he just wants to go back to doing his job the best he can and do what the taxpayers pay him to do. That is made extremely difficult if senior ATF and DOJ officials are attempting to attack his credibility in the press to distract from the larger issues. I also understand that former SAC Bill Newell, told a gathering of other SACs something to the effect of "the only weapons I know that were walked in Phoenix were walked by ATF " You can understand why unfounded statements like by an SAC to other SACs would make it difficult for S/A ATF and SAC Brandon to find a way that he can effectively contribute to the agency's mission going forward (such as, perhaps in another field office) by denying him the opportunity for a fresh start w/o prejudicing the head of any prospective new field division against him. To be clear SAC Brandon is, by all reports, attempting to address the situation appropriately up through his chain of command.

Cordially,
Jason A. Foster
Chief Investigative Counsel

Charles E. Grassley, Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary
152 Dirksen Senate Office Building

United States Senate

Direct: (202) 224-7142

From: Weich, Ron (SMO) [mailto:Ron.Weich@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep)
Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep)
Subject: Re: voicemail

Not at my desk. Jason, I will call you.

From: Davis, Kolan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Kolan_Davis@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2011 01:28 PM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) <Jason_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov>
Subject: voicemail

Got your vm. I'm planning on being out this afternoon, but Jason will be able to talk to you. Should he give you a call after 3 at 514-2125?