

RELEASE IN PART B5,B6

**From:** H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, October 30, 2011 4:09 PM  
**To:** 'millscd@state.gov'  
**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