

Exemptions 3+6 - Names redacted
Exemption 5 - deliberative process

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED] - PAO
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 5:38 PM
To: McNeill, Dan K. GEN - FORSCOM CG
Cc: [REDACTED] COL - SJA; [REDACTED] COL - PAO; [REDACTED] COL - CG
[REDACTED] XO; [REDACTED] - PAO; [REDACTED] MAJ - PAO; [REDACTED] COL OCPA;
[REDACTED] BG OCPA; [REDACTED] TC OCPA
Subject: Media Query: PUC HVTs
Importance: High

[REDACTED]

V/R,

[REDACTED]
Deputy Chief of Public Affairs
HQ USA Forces Command
404 [REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED] MAJ
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 4:54 PM
To: [REDACTED] - PAO
Subject: FW: PUC HVTs
Importance: High

FYI.....

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@krwashington.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 3:53 PM
To: [REDACTED] COL; [REDACTED]@bragg.army.mil
Subject: FW: PUC HVTs
Importance: High

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

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@krwashington.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2004 3:51 PM
To: **Subject:** PUC HVTs
Importance: High

Col. [REDACTED]

I'd like to talk to Lt. Gen. John R. Vines about the PUC HVTs (aka "ghost detainees") that he approved

000877

ForSCOM #6

830

while
he was commander in Afghanistan and what the rationale was for hiding those prisoners from the ICRC.
I know the General approved of at least a handful of PUC HVTs, and I am going to report that fact. I also
believe
that the Army had a good rationale for creating the category of "persons under control, high value targets"
and I
would like to give the General the opportunity to fully explain that rationale.

My editors want this story right away, but are willing to give me until Friday 16:00 to get comments.

Best regards,



000878