

**From:** Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**To:** Weich, Ron (SMO); Reich, Steven (ODAG)  
**Sent:** 7/12/2011 12:01:32 PM  
**Subject:** Two other issues for our meeting today -

Apropos of the Grassley letter about access to the shared drive, please see the Grassley staff question to Molly below -

DP

DP

Molly also has reported that the contractor CACI advised her this am that **ATF** has asked them to provide the produce and access collections for Melson and Hoover so that each of them can see what docs from him have been produced and made available to the committees and he wants these materials in advance of our production to the committees. Since this raises the shared drive and other issues, I asked her to hold off on responding until after we meet today. It may be that this request is not limited to Melson and Hoover, but she'll check on that. FB

----- Original Message -----

From: Leavitt, Tristan (Judiciary-Rep) [mailto:Tristan\_Leavitt@judiciary-rep.senate.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 11:08 AM  
To: Gaston, Molly (SMO)  
Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep) <Jason\_Foster@judiciary-rep.senate.gov>; Stephen.Castor@mail.house.gov <Stephen.Castor@mail.house.gov>  
Subject: RE: Question

Molly,

I never heard back from you. Did you receive this email?

Best,  
Tristan

Tristan Leavitt  
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary

-----Original Message-----

From: Leavitt, Tristan (Judiciary-Rep)  
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 9:19 PM  
To: 'Molly.Gaston@usdoj.gov'  
Cc: Foster, Jason (Judiciary-Rep); Downey, Brian (Judiciary-Rep)  
Subject: Question

Molly,

As I alluded to earlier today, you were correct that the documents leaked to the press were indeed in the in camera documents, beginning at HOCR ATF A 000060 (the blank cover email) and running through 000063 (3 pages of the proposal). However, they also appeared two other times, and it raised a question. Immediately after the first appearance, the blank cover email is reproduced at 000073. It is followed at 000074-75 by the identical first and third pages of the proposal, but missing the second page of the proposal, which appeared at 000062. This second page was the portion including the language leaked to the press. Note that although a page is missing, the bates numbers do not skip one to reflect the missing page--they go straight from 000074 for the first page of the proposal to 000075 for the third page.

The third appearance is at HOCR ATF A 001694-001697, and it was identical to the first appearance in again including the cover email and all 3 pages of the proposal.

Our question is, who at ATF made each of those three individual productions to DOJ? Did they come from three different individuals? Also, when was each produced? We believe this information may assist in determining how that language may have been leaked to the press.

Thank you for your assistance.

Best,  
Tristan