

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

**From:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 17, 2014 6:57 AM  
**To:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: St. Paul Explosives Incident Notification Query

If I did not reply – SORRY! Looks good to me and explains things well.

**From:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2014 12:44 PM  
**To:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: St. Paul Explosives Incident Notification Query

What do you think of this proposed response?

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

The incident that took place on January 1, 2014, does not meet the criteria for explosives notification. While the ROI that was written for this investigation (778065-14-0020) describes an explosion and resulting fire, this was a fuel air explosion and not the result of an explosives incident. Additionally, at the request of the Minneapolis Fire Department, ATF did not respond to this incident. As there is no CFI currently in the state of Minnesota, an ATF CFI from out of state was planning to assist with the origin and cause of the fire and so an opening report of investigation was written. However, the structure was never deemed safe enough for the investigation to ensue and the CFI never responded to the scene. The fire department ultimately had the building demolished, thus preventing any ATF investigation.

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
Group Supervisor  
St. Paul IV Field Office  
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) - Office  
(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) - Cell

**From:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Monday, April 14, 2014 1:59 PM  
**To:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** Fwd: St. Paul Explosives Incident Notification Query