

Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks
Sent: Wed, 19 Oct 2005 19:09:24 -0400
From: "Gottesman, Blake" <Blake_Gottesman@who.eop.gov>
To: "Kavanaugh, Brett M." <Brett_M._Kavanaugh@who.eop.gov>
Cc: "Keller, Karen E." <Karen_E._Keller@who.eop.gov>, "Campbell, Sarah" <Sarah_Campbell@who.eop.gov>

given the quantity of e-mails i have sent to you and their average level of importance, i can see how/why this happened.

(wanna know more about the spelling of G-d ?)

From: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:22 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

I should add that I usually read emails more closely [REDACTED] b(6)
[REDACTED] b(6) but my "I need to check the latest blog entry" time was particularly high last week and caused some distraction. Anyway, sorry about that.

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:17 PM
To: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

copy.

(and, consistent with your point below, this is the first and only instance when i can remember us holding a letter of this nature.)

From: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:15 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks
Roger; MAH has the first one and I will check status. On that first letter, my fault for letting the work on a good response wait for several days (until Monday) with no action. I think this was part of my "PCU needs to get its act together" emails but anyway, not a good excuse to hold it for MP's arrival.

On the second letter re Harriet, I recommend that you give him that one

asap. Going forward, I am not real comfortable holding letters on timely policy subjects like Harriet from Members of Congress (recognizing that it's 100% my fault that I obviously blew off your email below -- unintentionally -- as I guess I must have stopped reading after "do you know the status" of the first letter).

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:02 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake; Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

bk,
i misspoke. we kept the letter up here, and i just told you about it in the e-mail below (vice sending it down).

bottom line: we have not given either note to the president b/c we're waiting for drafts. if at all possible, it'd be great if we could get these to the president and out before we leave tomorrow.

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2005 11:25 AM
To: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: note to rep trent franks

i brought down to you last week an incoming letter from rep franks, to which i recommended that we draft a more personal response (than the one pcu originally brought up for signature). do you know the status of the revised version? i'm asking b/c franks has sent another letter* which came up through pcu for potus' reading file. i think we should send both notes in together. my sense is that it's not necessary to respond directly to the more recent letter; as such, we may want to adjust the response to make clear that potus is repsonding to the earlier one (e.g., "thank you for your letter of september xx.").

* the letter is about miers, franks' confidence in the president's heart on the issue of abortion, and his hope/prayer that a justice miers would hasten the day when the unborn are protected by law

given the quantity of e-mails i have sent to you and their average level of importance, i can see how/why this happened.

(wanna know more about the spelling of G-d ?)

From: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:22 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

I should add that I usually read emails more closely (unless they from Farley are about her dropping her cell phone in a river), but my "I need to check the latest blog entry" time was particularly high last week and caused some distraction. Anyway, sorry about that.

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:17 PM
To: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

copy.

(and, consistent with your point below, this is the first and only instance when i can remember us holding a letter of this nature.)

From: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:15 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

Roger; MAH has the first one and I will check status. On that first letter, my fault for letting the work on a good response wait for several days (until Monday) with no action. I think this was part of my "PCU needs to get its act together" emails but anyway, not a good excuse to hold it for MP's arrival.

On the second letter re Harriet, I recommend that you give him that one asap. Going forward, I am not real comfortable holding letters on timely policy subjects like Harriet from Members of Congress (recognizing that it's 100% my fault that I obviously blew off your email below -- unintentionally -- as I guess I must have stopped reading after "do you know the status" of the first letter).

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 19, 2005 6:02 PM
To: Gottesman, Blake; Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: RE: note to rep trent franks

bk,
i misspoke. we kept the letter up here, and i just told you about it in the e-mail below (vice sending it down).

bottom line: we have not given either note to the president b/c we're waiting for drafts. if at all possible, it'd be great if we could get these to the president and out before we leave tomorrow.

From: Gottesman, Blake
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2005 11:25 AM
To: Kavanaugh, Brett M.
Cc: Keller, Karen E.; Campbell, Sarah
Subject: note to rep trent franks

i brought down to you last week an incoming letter from rep franks, to which i recommended that we draft a more personal response (than the one pcu originally brought up for signature). do you know the status of the revised version? i'm asking b/c franks has sent another letter* which came up through pcu for potus' reading file. i think we should send both notes in together. my sense is that it's not necessary to respond directly to the more recent letter; as such, we may want to adjust the response to make clear that potus is repsonding to the earlier one (e.g., "thank you for your letter of september xx.").

* the letter is about miers, franks' confidence in the president's heart on the issue of abortion, and his hope/prayer that a justice miers would hasten the day when the unborn are protected by law