

RELEASE IN PART
B5,B6

From: Mills, Cheryl D <MillsCD@state.gov>
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2011 4:21 PM
To: H
Subject: Re: S/WCI

Yes

From: H [mailto:HDR22@clintonemail.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2011 04:09 PM
To: Mills, Cheryl D
Subject: Re: S/WCI

[Redacted]

B5

From: Mills, Cheryl D [mailto:MillsCD@state.gov]
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2011 07:05 AM
To: H
Subject: Fw: S/WCI

Confidential fyi - from bottom up

From: Mills, Cheryl D
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2011 07:04 AM
To: Harrell, Peter E
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J; Toiv, Nora F
Subject: Re: S/WCI

Helpful

[Redacted]

B5

Cdm

From: Harrell, Peter E
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2011 01:43 AM
To: Mills, Cheryl D
Cc: Sullivan, Jacob J; Toiv, Nora F
Subject: S/WCI

From: Peter Harrell [mailto:[Redacted]]
Sent: Saturday, October 29, 2011 01:41 AM
To: Harrell, Peter E
Subject: S/WCI

B6


DELIBERATIVE AND PREDECISIONAL

PERSONAL VIEWS ONLY

Cheryl—

In addition to the options memo on S/WCI, I wanted to send you some purely personal thoughts about this issue. (I've seen the memo process as both developing options and also as a process to build stakeholder buy-in to the idea that S/WCI might move and stakeholder open-mindedness about where S/WCI might move to, and for many reasons have not wanted to directly inject my personal views into that).


In broad brush, I think about 5 issues when I think about where S/WCI should go:



B5



B5



Respectfully,

Peter

--

Peter E. Harrell



B6