

From: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 1:45 PM

To: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: CHI and NJ Opt-out strategies

I sent the talking points a few minutes ago and the meeting between (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and Rachel is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon. With Susan's assistance, we're trying to get some direction this week before Marc leaves for Hawaii.

That being said, the best laid plans ...

So I'm good with your plan. We can talk together if it would be helpful (you, Mark, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) myself) to get consensus on anything we'd like (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to convey to Marc on the trip. Let me know and I'll set it up.

From: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 12:08 PM

To: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: CHI and NJ Opt-out strategies

I know I'm asking you to prognosticate the un-prognosticable, but do you figure they'll have these dialogues relatively quickly? If so, I would as soon not do highlighting etc. I'd rather either just leave it or change it. But if it looks like it's going to drag, then certainly (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) approach is a good one. How about this – I wait until Thursday at the latest, and if you get no feedback, then I take (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) approach.

Meantime, I will (a) start blocking out something for CHI, and (b) start some NYC-specific scripting for an interop briefing there, assuming there will ever be a briefing which of course is a flip of the coin.

From: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 11:27 AM

To: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Subject: RE: CHI and NJ Opt-out strategies

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

I talked to Susan and (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) yesterday about the mandatory approach. It's clear (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) isn't comfortable making process and strategy changes without clear direction from Marc. I will provide (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) some talking points that he will use in discussion with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and Rachel. If they're sold, he/they will go to Marc for direction.

In the meantime, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) suggests we highlight the decision parts that would change if Interop were Mandatory. This way we can still use the paper to drive a decision by the client. If Marc still wants to give LEAs an opt-out option or the decision drags on, we can submit the paper with the highlights.

Thoughts? Thanks,

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

From: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2010 9:13 AM

To: (b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)

Subject: CHI and NJ Opt-out strategies

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

I tentatively have CHI / Cook County as the next locale for which I should gin up a strategy, and have done some research in prep for the actual drafting, but am not comfortable doing that until there's some resolution on where we are headed viz the SFR strategy, because of course if we adopt the "it's not optional" point of view, that certainly simplifies life, no?

But I'm also wondering about New Jersey. Has the new state administration taken office yet? When is ICE going to renew dialogue with their SIB to find out if the new governor is receptive? Should I put that on the back burner, or move it up front?

Thanks in advance,

(b)(6...