

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 09, 2017 8:09:46 AM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T; Albence, Matthew  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** OHA Meeting of 08 Feb 17

Phil/Matt –

As the request of OHA, (b)(6) and I met with Mr. Dave Fluty (Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs), CAPT Dandridge (DHS PHS Liaison), Leslie Holland (OHA Workforce Development, and Jeff Marquez (OHA Chief of Staff) to provide an update on medical planning activities re: the Eos. Topics discussed:

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Finally, OHA would like to meet with IHSC on a more regular basis (every 2-3 weeks) to offer assistance in ensuring our needs are moved forward for resolution. Very productive meeting and went a long way in cementing a more productive relationship.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Chief of Staff | ICE Health Service Corps

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** 9 Feb 2017 14:14:52 +0000  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) D; Albence, Matthew  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: OHA Meeting of 08 Feb 17

Thanks (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 09, 2017 8:09:46 AM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T; Albence, Matthew  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** OHA Meeting of 08 Feb 17

Phil/Matt –

As the request of OHA, (b)(6) and I met with Mr. Dave Fluty (Acting Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs), CAPT Dandridge (DHS PHS Liaison), Leslie Holland (OHA Workforce Development, and Jeff Marquez (OHA Chief of Staff) to provide an update on medical planning activities re: the Eos. Topics discussed:

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Finally, OHA would like to meet with IHSC on a more regular basis (every 2-3 weeks) to offer assistance in ensuring our needs are moved forward for resolution. Very productive meeting and went a long way in cementing a more productive relationship.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Chief of Staff | ICE Health Service Corps

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** 5 Feb 2017 11:15:34 +0000  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

I'm going to go through (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) last email, make a few edits and send that up.

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

**From:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:25:50 PM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T  
**Subject:** FW: Data for S1

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 9:41:05 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

Lisa,

Yes, we pulled four SIRs on Friday evening from Philadelphia and provided synopses, which are in regards to declined detainers from August 2016 (attached). The below examples that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) pulled together from yesterday's survey of all ICE field offices have four examples from the past three months. That request from the field offices (attached) has at 11 examples of detainer declined in 2016 or early 2017. Please let me know if additional examples are needed.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

**Field Operations**  
**Enforcement and Removal Operations**  
**U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement**  
**Department of Homeland Security**

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Warning: This document is UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (U//FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official. No portion of this report should be furnished to the media, either in written or verbal form.

**From:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 7:42 PM  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** FW: Data for S1

H (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Phil said something about u reaching out to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for info??

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 6:05:52 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

I would prefer 2016. We get SIRs almost every day (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) should be able to get us 2016 examples.

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 5:01:44 PM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T  
**Subject:** FW: Data for S1

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 1:32:27 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

There are more examples of declined detainees from 2014-5 for which the subjects have since reoffended but Phil wanted recent examples.

Also, just made minor edits to below.

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 1:26 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** FW: Data for S1

Lisa, here is what I put together for recent examples...

### Recent Examples of Declined Detainers

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 10:11 AM  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Cc:** Hoechst, Lisa B (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

Thank you, Erin.

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Field Operations  
Enforcement and Removal Operations  
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement  
Department of Homeland Security

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Warning: This document is UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (U//FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). It is to be controlled, stored, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to FOUO information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" without prior approval of an authorized DHS official. No portion of this report should be furnished to the media, either in written or verbal form.

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 9:59 AM  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Cc:** Hoechst, Lisa B (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** Data for S1  
**Importance:** High

Good morning-

The field has been canvassed for examples of egregious cases in which detainers were declined. Attached please find examples listed by AOR. The following AORs provided a negative response: ERO ATL, ERO BUF, ERO DAL, ERO SND, ERO SLC, ERO PHO, ERO HOU, ERO WAS, ERO DEN.

If you need anything further, please let me know. Thank you.



**Respectfully,**

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

**Detention and Deportation Officer  
Domestic Operations Division-East  
ICE Presidential Transition Team  
ICE ERO Headquarters  
500 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW Washington, DC 20**

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

WARNING: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval from the originator.

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** 4 Feb 2017 20:44:19 -0500  
**To:** Albence, Matthew; Miller, Philip T; #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Subject:** RE: (No Subject)  
**Attachments:** RE: Data for S1

Pls see attached. I realized that after sending the original examples to Lisa, so I removed the Miami-Dade and Broward Co examples.

**From:** Albence, Matthew  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 8:42 PM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T; (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Subject:** RE: (No Subject)

Miami-Dade just came back online and is fully cooperative. We should remove them from this response so as not to threaten that.

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 8:37:48 PM  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C); #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Cc:** Albence, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: (No Subject)

A separate attachment. Thanks!

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 7:37:17 PM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T; #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Cc:** Albence, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: (No Subject)

10-4. Would you prefer that the examples come first or after? Or just as a separate attachment?

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 8:23 PM  
**To:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Cc:** Albence, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE: (No Subject)

Thanks (b). Can you recent in a clean email with a second doc containing the crim examples.

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 04, 2017 7:20:13 PM  
**To:** Miller, Philip T; #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Cc:** Albence, Matthew  
**Subject:** RE:

#### ICE Arrests After Declined Detainers

- In FY 2016, there were 1,970 declined detainers
- Between January 1, 2014 and September 30, 2016, ERO documented 21,205 declined detainers in 567 counties in 48 states including the District of Columbia
- Eighty-eight percent of the 19,288 declined legacy I-247 detainers were issued to individuals with prior criminal histories. Some individuals account for multiple declined detainers, resulting in 17,193 total individuals with an associated declined I-247 detainer. Over half of these individuals (9,112) went on to commit additional crimes, and forty-six percent of these individuals were still at-large at the end of FY 2016, having faced no subsequent ICE action.
- 1,798 I-247N and I-247D form detainers (associated with 1,691 individuals) have been declined by LEAs. Of these 1,691 individuals, 56 percent (940 individuals) have gone on to commit additional crimes for which they were subsequently arrested. At of the end of FY 2016, 67 percent of these individuals have been subject to later ICE intervention, while the remaining 33 percent remain categorized as still at-large.
- As of September 30, 2016, upon release from the LEA, 53 percent of all individuals with declined detainers have been arrested for committing additional crimes, crimes that may not have occurred had the respective LEAs not declined the detainers. Forty-five percent of these individuals were still at-large at the end of FY 2016. Two hundred fifty-three known jurisdictions have declined detainers belonging to individuals who were subsequently arrested on criminal charges and are currently at-large.
- Of the top ten jurisdictions with the most declined detainers for priority criminal individuals, seven, including the top three jurisdictions, are in California, with Los Angeles County accounting for the most at 1,427 such declined detainers. Queens County, New York has the fourth largest, at 926 individuals with prior criminality and declined detainers. Miami-Dade County, Florida and Cook County, Illinois are fifth and ninth on the list, respectively.
- Recently, some of the country's largest jurisdictions, including Chicago, New York City, and Los Angeles, are publicly stating that they will continue noncompliant policies regardless of potential federal funding cuts to jurisdictions deemed uncooperative.

**Breakdown of Prior Criminality by Individual and Detainer Type  
for Detainers Declined from January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2016**

<b>Criminality</b>	<b>Individuals Declined per Detainer Form Type</b>		
	<b>I-247</b>	<b>I-247N</b>	<b>I-247D</b>
Significant Risk	-	6	8
Criminal Street Gang	-	7	10
Prior Felony	6,599	231	298
Prior Aggravated Felony	-	33	74
Multiple Prior Misdemeanors	668	38	107
Prior Violent Misdemeanor	4,364	266	282
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,631</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>779</b>

**Subsequent Criminality and ICE Action**

- Of the 21,205 declined detainers between January 1, 2014 and September 30, 2016:
  - 9,533 (45 percent) declined detainers were associated with 8,815 individuals with no subsequent local law enforcement criminal arrest. Of this population,
    - 963 declined detainers were associated with 888 individuals with subsequent ICE action (i.e., ICE arrest, book-in or removal)
    - 8,570 declined detainers were associated with 7,927 individuals with no subsequent ICE action (considered at-large)
  - 11,672 (55 percent) declined detainers were associated with 9,945 individuals with a subsequent local law enforcement criminal arrest. Of this population,
    - 6,290 declined detainers were associated with 5,461 individuals with subsequent ICE action (i.e., ICE arrest, book-in, or removal)
    - 5,382 declined detainers were associated with 4,484 individuals with no subsequent ICE action (considered at-large)
- Notably, because the declined detainer population is increasingly composed of individuals with prior criminal convictions, there has been greater visibility into the at-large criminal alien population and the risks associated with declining detainers issued to such persons. As of September 30, 2016, upon release from the Local Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA), 53 percent of individuals with declined detainers went on to commit additional crimes for which they were subsequently arrested, crimes that may not have occurred had the respective LEAs not declined the detainers. Forty-five percent of these are currently at-large.
- In an effort to combat the risk of the at-large criminal alien population, ERO has established 10 Mobile Criminal Alien Teams (MCATs) at localities in which personnel resources do not align with criminal alien workload. These teams are responsible for identifying the location and apprehending criminal aliens who were released to the streets after LEAs declined their

detainers. They focus on apprehending at-large criminal aliens and mitigating public safety threats.

**From:** Miller, Philip T  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 7:18 PM  
**To:** #ERO CHIEFS OF STAFF  
**Cc:** Albence, Matthew  
**Subject:**

(b)(6);(b)(7)  
(C)

Can you clean up the data presentation on a laptop? Looks fragmented on an iPhone.

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Sent with Good ([www.good.com](http://www.good.com))

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** 4 Feb 2017 18:38:15 +0000  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

(b)(5)

**From:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 1:32 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)  
**Subject:** RE: Data for S1

There are more examples of declined detainers from 2014-5 for which the subjects have since reoffended but Phil wanted recent examples.

Also, just made minor edits to below.

**From:** Simon, Joseph D  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 4, 2017 1:26 PM  
**To:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Cc:** Sullivan, George D  
**Subject:** FW: Data for S1

Lisa, here is what I put together for recent examples...

### Recent Examples of Declined Detainers

(b)(5)



(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

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

Cc: Hoechst, Lisa B (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Subject: Data for S1

Importance: High

Good morning-

The field has been canvassed for examples of egregious cases in which detainees were declined. Attached please find examples listed by AOR. The following AORs provided a negative response: ERO ATL, ERO BUF, ERO DAL, ERO SND, ERO SLC, ERO PHO, ERO HOU, ERO WAS, ERO DEN.

If you need anything further, please let me know. Thank you.

Respectfully,

(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

**Detention and Deportation Officer**

**Domestic Operations Division-East**

**ICE Presidential Transition Team**

**ICE ERO Headquarters**

**500 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW Washington, DC 20536** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

WARNING: This document is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (FOUO). It contains information that may be exempt from public release under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). This document is to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public or other personnel who do not have a valid need to know without prior approval from the originator.

**From:** Hoechst, Lisa B  
**Sent:** 28 Dec 2016 15:24:16 -0500  
**To:** Albence, Matthew; ERO Field Ops Taskings; ERO LES Tasking; ERO SC & ENFORCEMENT TASKINGS  
**Cc:** (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Miller, Philip T  
**Subject:** FW: Transition RFIs 212-216 - Response due tomorrow at 11AM short turnaround  
**Attachments:** RFI 216 - Sharing Priority Data with DOJ and other prosecutors.docx, RFI 215 - Criminal Offender Database Q.docx, RFI 214 - Resources for Criminal Immigration Enforcement.docx, RFIs 212 213 - DOJ Prosecution Questions.docx

Short turnaround for this transition tasking. The majority to enforcement with input from LESA.

Since I'm out if you need another division to weigh in please contact them directly with a copy to me

Due back to me by 7am tomorrow morning please.


Thanks

Sent with Good (www.good.com)

**From:** Rahilly, Lyn M  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 28, 2016 3:01:49 PM  
**To:** Ulrich, Dennis; Hoechst, Lisa B; Akinbolaji, Lade R; Amos, Ashley N; Harto, Melissa  
**Cc:** McKean, Wendy C; Dvir, Karri P  
**Subject:** Transition RFIs 212-216 - Response due tomorrow at 11AM

OPLA, HSI and ERO - you are being tasked to collectively respond to 5 new Requests for Information from the transition team. The specifics of the 5 RFIs are pasted below. They focus on the criminal prosecution aspect of immigration enforcement, and seek information in that context.

(b)(5)



(b)(5)

Instructions on How to Respond:

- Due Date for responses: Return responses to me and cc Dennis Ulrich no later than 11AM tomorrow to allow time for ICE clearance by COB.
- For each RFI, either ERO or HSI is the “LEAD” for the response (see above). The Lead Office is responsible for ensuring a complete response that has been coordinated with the other two offices for content.
- Due to time constraints, I cannot consolidate and de-conflict separate RFI responses from each office – it is the Lead Office’s responsibility to provide a single response that represents the agency’s collective view.
- Input the response into the attached files – there is one for each RFI except for RFIs 212 and 213, which have been combined.
- If your office does not have any input for an RFI, please inform the Lead Office for that RFI.
- POCs for each office are in the “To” line of this email. They may designate other SME POCs as well who will be doing the work of drafting and coordinating the response. Please work with the SMEs if designated.

**Lyn Rahilly**  
**Assistant Director for Information Governance & Privacy**  
**U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement**  
**Direct: (202) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)**  
**Main: (202) 732-3300**

Questions? Please visit the Information Governance & Privacy Office website at <https://insight.ice.dhs.gov/mgt/oop/Pages/index.aspx>.

---

## Immigration and Customs Enforcement Presidential Transition Office

### **Response to the President-Elect's Transition Team (PETT) Request for Information**

RFI 216: How does ICE prioritize the most dangerous aliens/LPRs and communicate that information to the USAO? Can prosecutors share data? (In other words, are there any impediments to USAO or ICE sharing ICE's prioritization information with prosecutors engaged in criminal proceedings with these aliens at the state/local level?)

---

**ICE Subject Matter Experts Cleared by:**

**OPLA POC and Cleared By:**

**ICE Approving Official:**

**OGC Cleared By:**

[insert ICE response here]

## Immigration and Customs Enforcement Presidential Transition Office

### **Response to the President-Elect's Transition Team (PETT) Request for Information**

RFI 215: What is the state of DHS databases to identify violent criminal offenders? (In other words, what is the catalogue of databases ICE uses to identify violent criminal offenders?) Do [these databases] include information on immigration status?

---

**ICE Subject Matter Experts Cleared by:**

**OPLA POC and Cleared By:**

**ICE Approving Official:**

**OGC Cleared By:**

[insert ICE response here]



## Immigration and Customs Enforcement Presidential Transition Office

### **Response to the President-Elect's Transition Team (PETT) Request for Information**

RFI 214: If DOJ creates more positions and resources for criminal immigration cases, and makes prosecuting those cases a priority, where would ICE need more resources?

---

**ICE Subject Matter Experts Cleared by:**

**OPLA POC and Cleared By:**

**ICE Approving Official:**

**OGC Cleared By:**

[insert ICE response here]

## Immigration and Customs Enforcement Presidential Transition Office

### **Response to the President-Elect's Transition Team (PETT) Request for Information**

RFI 212: Are U.S. Attorney's Offices receptive to prosecuting criminal immigration cases, including re-entry cases?

RFI 213: To the extent cases are declined by the USAO, what reasons are given? Are they from guidelines from prosecution?

---

**ICE Subject Matter Experts Cleared by:**

**OPLA POC and Cleared By:**

**ICE Approving Official:**

**OGC Cleared By:**

[insert ICE response here]