

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 3:18 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: 'Greenberg, Randi L'; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: DRAFT Response to Rep. Honda (D-CA)

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

This response mentions, but does not address limited participation. Is there language on this point?

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

*Office of Congressional Relations
 U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement*

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 3:08 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Cc: Greenberg, Randi L; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: RE: DRAFT Response to Rep. Honda (D-CA)

(b)(6),
 (b)(7)(C)

Here is some approved language below we recently used to answer a similar question from Rep. Lofgren. Figure it's best to keep with the same language to maintain consistency. Hope this helps!

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

A jurisdiction has three options for participation in the Secure Communities program – full participation, limited participation, or delayed participation until 2013. By 2013, to fulfill the Congressional mandate for increased information sharing, the federal government plans to activate IDENT/IAFIS interoperability for all criminal fingerprint submissions nationwide. In order to delay participation until 2013, a local law enforcement agency must formally notify a Secure Communities “partner”. A “partner” is considered the State Identification Bureau (SIB), the FBI’s Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) division, DHS’s United States Visitor and Immigration Status Indicator Technology (US-VISIT) program or Immigration & Customs Enforcement (ICE) Secure Communities program. Formal notification can include a phone call, a letter, an email, a facsimile, etc. Once the request is received from the law enforcement agency, a facilitated conversation will be conducted with all partners and the requesting agency to try to determine the hesitation for participation and to proceed with an agreeable activation schedule. If it is not possible to reach an agreement, then the activation of the Secure Communities information-sharing capability will be delayed until 2013, when nationwide deployment is scheduled.

From: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 1:59 PM
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Subject: DRAFT Response to Rep. Honda (D-CA)

(b)(6),
 (b)(7)(C)

Per our conversation, below is a consolidated response to the inquiry from Rep. Honda following the late May briefing. Please share this with appropriate members of the SC team and let me know your thoughts. I will upload this into SharePoint at 4:00pm for clearance through OAS.

Cara

The below information is provided in response to your request for information on the impact of the Secure Communities initiative on the state of California and Sonoma County year to date for fiscal year 2010. Also provided is information resulting from the Criminal Alien Program for the San Francisco Area of Responsibility.

In response to your question on a jurisdictions ability to "opt out" of Secure Communities, in the case of California the states Attorney General, in a May 24, 2010 letter to the San Francisco Sheriff, determined that jurisdictions will not have this option. However, if a jurisdiction does not want to receive the immigration history of someone in custody, they can contact ICE and we will work with the state identification bureau to address the request.

Secure Communities (As of June 1, 2010)

AREA	ACTIVATION DATE	SUBMISSIONS	IDENT MATCHES	
			L1	L2/L3
California	5/26/2009	588,408	10,763	52,278
Sonoma County	3/2/2010	5,358	44	461

	ICE CUSTODY				REMOVALS AND RETURNS			
	L1	L2	L3	NC	L1	L2	L3	NC
California	6,409	7,610	1,979	5,677	3,438	4,599	1,256	3,176
Sonoma County	17	65	11	131	9	36	6	64

Criminal Alien Program (fy10 ytd)

SF AREA OF
RESPONSIBILITY 38,201

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

*Office of Congressional Relations
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement*

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)