From:

Reich, Steven (ODAG)

To:

Burton, Faith (SMO); Gaston, Molly (SMO); Pustay, Melanie A (SMO); Mallon, Carmen L (SMO)

CC: Sent: Weich, Ron (SMO)

Subject:

7/15/2011 8:14:05 AM RE: Redaction questions

Going forward. I told him explicitly that we would not do this as a general proposition going backward. That said, I told him that if there were specific documents previously produced about which they had redaction questions, they should ask and we would answer the questions about specific documents.

From: Burton, Faith (SMO)

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 8:12 AM

To: Reich, Steven (ODAG); Gaston, Molly (SMO); Pustay, Melanie A (SMO); Mallon, Carmen L (SMO)

Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)

Subject: Re: Redaction questions

Adding Melanie and Carmen. Is this the plan going forward or also going backward?

From: Reich, Steven (ODAG)

Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 08:03 AM

To: Gaston, Molly (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)

Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)

Subject: RE: Redaction questions

I spoke to Steve Castor and told him that, starting absolutely as quickly as we can, we would create a key of reasons for redactions (eg: 1 = Personal privacy) and that we would handwrite on the redacted documents the code for why redactions were made and also give them a copy of the key so he understood the codes.

DP

From: Gaston, Molly (SMO)

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 2:18 PM

To: Burton, Faith (SMO); Reich, Steven (ODAG)

Subject: Fw: Redaction questions

See the results of my test case below: they are going to want more detail.

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

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 02:14 PM

To: Gaston, Molly (SMO); Leavitt, Tristan (Judiciary-Rep) <Tristan_Leavitt@judiciary-rep.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: Redaction questions

Perhaps we can have a conversation where that explanation can be fleshed out a bit? I'm not sure what that means as described below.

From: Gaston, Molly (SMO) [mailto:Molly.Gaston@usdoj.gov]

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 2:12 PM **To:** Leavitt, Tristan (Judiciary-Rep) **Cc:** Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) **Subject:** Re: Redaction questions

Thanks, Tristan.

With respect to your questions about HOGR-ATF 1179-1181, the Exit Strategy:

With the exception of the redaction of text in the penultimate line on the first page, every single redaction in this document is a reference to a sensitive surveillance technique.

The redaction of text in the penultimate line on the first page is of sensitive information about an investigative target.

Thanks, Molly

From: Leavitt, Tristan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Tristan_Leavitt@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2011 01:45 PM

To: Gaston, Molly (SMO)

Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) < Jason_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov>

Subject: Redaction questions

Molly,

As you suggested, we have identified the instances where we would like to know the substance behind redactions. They follow individually, as per your request. As mentioned on the phone the other day, this doesn't need to include redacted phone numbers.

Thanks,

Tristan

Batch 1

1144

1145

1146

1179

1180

1181

1183

1184

1185

1190

Batch 2

1209

1218

Batch 3

1245

1246

1247

1263

1264

Batch 4

12725

1286

1296

1306

1307

Batch 5

Batch 6

Batch 7

Batch 8

Batch 9

Batch 10

Batch 11

Batch 13

Batch 14

Batch 15

Batch 16

Batch 17

Batch 18

Batch 19

Batch 20

Batch 21

Batch 22

Batch 23

Batch 24

Batch 25

Batch 26