
From: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
To: Reich, Steven (ODAG); Burton, Faith (SMO); Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: 7/15/2011 11:31:46 AM
Subject: Re: Redaction questions

Oh, ok--that works for me re: Jason. Thanks.

From: Reich, Steven (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 11:29 AM
To: Gaston, Molly (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO); Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Redaction questions

The categories you list are fine by me but I defer to Faith and Ron.

DP

From: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 11:27 AM
To: Reich, Steven (ODAG); Burton, Faith (SMO); Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: Re: Redaction questions

DP

On that subject, I have looked back through what we have produced and what from those documents we have redacted and suggest the following codes, followed by examples of what redactions those codes would represent.

DP

FYI—I took stock of the particular documents/Bates Nos. that Grassley staff followed up with us on for explanation of redactions. The purpose of many of the redactions we made in these documents is abundantly clear from context, or I know that the Committee has unredacted copies from other sources, so their request seems designed

DP

DP

From: Reich, Steven (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 10:39 AM
To: Gaston, Molly (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO); Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Redaction questions

Do you actually owe him a call?

From: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 9:53 AM
To: Burton, Faith (SMO); Weich, Ron (SMO); Reich, Steven (ODAG)
Subject: Re: Redaction questions

Ok. I will call Jason back and see if he just didn't understand the wording of my email, and then say that it is my understanding that this is the level of detail agreed upon with Steve.

Also, I will send you a proposed coding scheme shortly so that we can start using today.

From: Burton, Faith (SMO)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 09:47 AM
To: Weich, Ron (SMO); Reich, Steven (ODAG); Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Subject: RE: Redaction questions

DP

From: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 9:40 AM
To: Reich, Steven (ODAG); Gaston, Molly (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)
Subject: RE: Redaction questions

DP

Steve and Faith, I'll be a little late to the 9:45 but will join when I can.

From: Reich, Steven (ODAG)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 8:17 AM
To: Gaston, Molly (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)
Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: RE: Redaction questions

DP

From: Gaston, Molly (SMO)
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 8:15 AM
To: Reich, Steven (ODAG); Burton, Faith (SMO)
Cc: Weich, Ron (SMO)
Subject: Re: Redaction questions

DP

DP

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 HOCR-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
1315
1316
1317
1319
1320
1326

Batch 5

1334
1338
1341
1342
1343
1345
1348
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354

Batch 6

1389
1390
1391
1392

Batch 7

1393
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1404
1405
1407
1408
1409
1410
1412
1413
1417

Batch 8

1418
1419
1424
11427
1429
1433
1436
1457
1460
1463
1465
1466
1471
1474
1475

Batch 9

1480
1482
1483
1485
1493
1494
1503
1504
1514

Batch 10

1576
1571
1581
1586

1588
1590
1591

Batch 11

1628
1632
1635
1638
1644
1645

Batch 13

001715
001723
001742

Batch 14

001791
001803
001804
001809
001810
001816
001839
001840
001863
001864
001865
001866
001867
001887

Batch 15

001890
001892
001903
001905
001906
001907
001908
001909
001910
001911

Batch 16

001912
001918
001945

Batch 17

001956
001958
001962
001963
001966

001972
001981
001982
001993

Batch 18

001999

Batch 19

002030

Batch 20

002044
002045
002055

Batch 21

002069
002076
002081
002082
002083

-
Batch 22

002107

-
Batch 23

002126
002136
002142
002143
002157
002158
002167

Batch 24

002200
002205
002206
002217

Batch 25

002241
002247
002248
002265

-
Batch 26

002282
002283
002298
002303
002310
002311
002317