



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security

One Ashburton Place, Room 2133

Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Tel: (617) 727-7775

TTY Tel: (617) 727-6618

Fax: (617) 727-4764

www.mass.gov/eopss

MAURA T. HEALEY
Governor

GINA K. KWON
Secretary

KIMBERLEY DRISCOLL
Lieutenant Governor

September 23, 2026

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Nathan Story
Nathanielstory@gmail.com

Re: 8/16/2026 Public Records Request

Dear Mr. Story:

The Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS) submits this response to your request on August 16, 2026 for the following:

“Emails sent or received by Susan Terrey <Susan.W.Terrey@mass.gov>[.] Limit the search to emails containing the keyword "israel" or "israeli"[.] Limit the search to emails dated May 30, 2026 to present[.] Please include any attachments to matched emails.”

The search identified 4,223 potentially responsive records. Additional conversations with you narrowed the scope of the request to the following:

“Emails sent by Susan Terrey <Susan.W.Terrey@mass.gov>
Limit the search to emails containing the keyword "israel" or "israeli"
Limit the search to emails dated Jan 1, 2026 to present”

EOPSS has identified records responsive to your request. Please note that redactions have been made pursuant to M.G.L. c. 4, § 7, cl. 26 (n). Exemption (n) applies to the following records:

records, including, but not limited to, blueprints, plans, policies, procedures and schematic drawings, which relate to internal layout and structural elements, security measures, emergency preparedness, threat or vulnerability assessments, or any other records relating to the security or safety of persons or buildings, structures, facilities, utilities, transportation, cyber security or other infrastructure located within the commonwealth[.]

The Supreme Judicial Court has held that this exemption “allows a records custodian to withhold an otherwise public record if the record is sufficiently related to the safety or security of persons or infrastructure, and if disclosure of the record, in the ‘reasonable judgment of the record custodian,’ is ‘likely to jeopardize public safety.’” People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. (PETA) v. Dep’t of Agric. Res., 477 Mass. 280, 282 (2017), quoting M.G.L. c. 4, § 7, Twenty-sixth (n).

The SJC has instructed that the custodian’s first consideration must be “whether, and to what degree, the records sought resemble the records listed as examples in the statute... and to what degree, the record is one a terrorist ‘would find useful to maximize damage’” Id. at 289. The responsive records include threat and vulnerability assessments prepared in connection with security planning for the Commonwealth. It is EOPSS’ position that the responsive records are highly likely to be records that a bad actor would find useful to maximize damage and are nearly entirely records of the type enumerated or contemplated by exemption (n), including threat or vulnerability assessments relating to the safety of persons, buildings, facilities, and infrastructure located within the Commonwealth. These threat and vulnerability assessments contain not only detailed information on credible threats to the Commonwealth, these assessments also display valuable information on the reporting structure and analysis techniques, all of which, in the reasonable judgement of this office, is likely to jeopardize public safety if publicly disclosed.

Please also note that redactions have been made pursuant to the attorney/client privilege doctrine. See Suffolk Constr. Co. v. Div. of Capital Asset Mgt., 449 Mass. 444, 450 (2007). Suffolk Constr. Co. allows for the withholding of “confidential communications between public officers and employees and governmental entities and their legal counsel undertaken for the purpose of obtaining legal advice or assistance.” 449 Mass. at 450. Under the common interest doctrine, “[t]he attorney-client privilege not only protect statements made by the client to the attorney in confidence for the purposes of obtaining legal advice in a particular matter, but also protect such statements made to or shared with necessary agents of the attorney or the client, including experts consulted for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of such advice.” Hanover Ins. Co. v. Rapo & Jensen Ins. Serv’s, Inc., 449 Mass. 609, 616 (2007).

Please also note that redactions have been made pursuant to M.G.L. c. 4, § 7, cl. 26 (b). Exemption (b) applies to records that are “related solely to internal personnel rules and practices of the government unit, provided however, that such records shall be withheld only to the extent that proper performance of necessary governmental functions requires such withholding.”

If you wish to challenge any aspect of this response, you may appeal to the Supervisor of Public Records following the procedure set forth in 950 C.M.R. 32.08, a copy of which is available at <https://www.mass.gov/code-of-massachusetts-regulations-cmr>. You may also file a civil action in accordance with M.G.L. c. 66, § 10A.

Sincerely,

/s/ Saanvi Thakur

Paralegal Specialist
Office of the General Counsel