

From: William Michael FitzGibbon, Sr.
To: GWIA:TPoindex@[winston.com]
Date: 12/15/00 7:21AM
Subject: Re: MURR Questions

7c

Tom, I think the questions encapsulate my concerns regarding [redacted] and the access issue. Sorry it has taken a few days to get back with you. The office was closed due to ice on Wednesday and I came down with a [redacted] and was out Thursday [redacted] I'm in the office until around noon your time today but will be back on Monday.

7c

Wm Michael FitzGibbon

>>> "Thomas Poindexter " <TPoindex@winston.com> 12/14 11:30 AM >>>

Michael, based on our recent conversation, please find attached the questions that I believe you have asked to be addressed by MURR. Please modify the questions or add to them as you see fit so that we can ensure that your issues are being addressed. You can e-mail your response or call me at

[redacted] Also, please let me know if a critical timeframe is involved in obtaining answers from MURR.

T. C. Poindexter
Winston & Strawn
1400 L. St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
202-371-5748

Contents privileged. If this message has been received in error, please destroy without reading. Message should not be forwarded without permission of the author. tpoindex@winston.com

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 7c
FOIA- 2001-0248

E/S

You inquired regarding recent MURR decisions involving access authorization of other MU and the similarity of those decisions to circumstances. Specifically, you had the following questions:

1. It initially appears that [redacted] will be performing activities similar to [redacted] yet they have or will have unescorted access. As such, please explain why [redacted] is not being treated differently and more importantly, unfairly.
2. Please note the letter dated [redacted] which notes, among other things, that "we can arrange for escorted access to be provided to either or both individuals," referring to [redacted] in part. Please explain why a decision has been made at this time which appears to preclude [redacted] from unescorted access. If such a decision has been made, it would appear to be premature and potentially inconsistent treatment.
3. Similar to the question above, please note why a [redacted] letter from [redacted] to [redacted] appears to pre-conclude that a decision has been made not to grant [redacted] unescorted access. Refer specifically to the statement, "Finally, I note what is probably a typographical error in your [redacted] letter. In the last sentence you mentioned "unescorted access." What will be actually under discussion is "escorted access."

7c