

**From:** "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833  
**Date:** Fri, 08 Jan 2021 00:21:40 +0000

---

Great. Thank you for the quick turnaround!

On Jan 7, 2021, at 7:19 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

No issues from the Tartaglione team. Thanks, [REDACTED].

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 7, 2021 7:14 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833  
For Tartaglione there are not, but there are records showing Epstein attorney visits in there.

On Jan 7, 2021, at 7:05 PM, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hey [REDACTED] – I will look now, but first, can you confirm there are no visit logs or count slops reflecting attorney visits in here?

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 7, 2021 7:04 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

[REDACTED]  
Before greenlighting the Epstein FOIA production tomorrow, I wanted to make sure that you were okay with the 26 pages BOP sent yesterday (attached) from the *Tartaglione* perspective. I think the only mentions of Tartaglione are on the last two pages, where his name is on a SHU roster and redacted. I assume no issues from the *Tartaglione* team, but please let me know. Thanks and sorry for the tight turnaround here.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 7, 2021 1:15 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

All,  
Following up on the below: for some reason, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. I've saved these in the shared drive at the links below. ([REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], please note that I segregated in separate folders the attorney and social visit log pages in the production version and the attorney and social visit log pages and the count slips in the translucent version--no count slips in the production version because they are withheld in full.)

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Please let me know if you have any issues with these new pages, or with the production version (which, to be clear, should just be the pages in the translucent version that are not withheld in full, with the green no longer translucent). This has to be produced by Friday so, if possible, please let me know of any questions or concerns by eod tomorrow (Thursday).  
Thanks, all,  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 7:55 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] >  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833  
All,  
FYI, it now looks like there may be approximately [REDACTED] as translucent pages for review (they sent a final count of pages that does not line up with what we have). I am following up with them [REDACTED] on short notice before the production on Friday. I will follow up once I have more information from BOP about the discrepancies here.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. [REDACTED], but now are redacted to show Epstein's name (similar to the census roster discussion below). Please let me know if you have any concerns.  
Thanks,  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] >  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833  
[I agree with \[REDACTED\], and feel free to call me if you want to talk through these, \[REDACTED\].](#)

---

**From:** [REDACTED] >  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 2:14 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] >  
**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] >; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

<[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

Thanks, [REDACTED]. My understanding on that point was that the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Also, I want to flag a point I meant to raise before. In the earlier round, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]—it starts at the end  
of the Part 2 file and continues into the Part 3 file). This does not make a big practical difference because [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Please let me know if you have any concerns on this point, or if we need to  
discuss more.

Thanks,  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 6, 2021 11:43 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]>

**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>;  
[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>;  
<[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

I've taken a look. All looks fine, subject to one question for whoever is best positioned to answer [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] In  
other places we appear to have confined our redactions to [REDACTED]. Why are we treating these two  
files differently?

---

**From:** [REDACTED] (USANYS)

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 4:51 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]>

**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>;  
[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>;  
<[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

Sounds good, thanks. I should be able to review all by tomorrow.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]>

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 4:27 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]>

**Cc:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>;  
[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>;  
<[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Epstein FOIA case, Times v. BOP, 20-cv-833

That's right. Your declaration [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] The exception to this is [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]



