

From: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>
To: Justin Dillon <[REDACTED]>
Cc: nancy dahl <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Krauss settlement agreement - revised draft
Date: Mon, 15 Oct 2018 13:15:40 +0000

Thanks. Will look at this again.

Lawrence M. Krauss
Professor

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department
Arizona State University, [REDACTED] [Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404](mailto:[REDACTED]@asu.edu)
Research Office: 480.965.6378,
Assistant (Jessica): [480.965.9825](tel:480.965.9825)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | krauss.faculty.asu.edu

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 15, 2018, at 5:40 AM, Justin Dillon <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I think maybe we just disagree about what you should do here. I think you go too into the weeds; all of the lettered rehashing reads to me as the desperate, dying last gasp, rather than a serious indictment of their process. I think it dramatically undermines the effectiveness of the letter. But that's your call, of course; this is your resignation letter. The highlighting and bolding was my indication of the parts I found most dangerous and that I thought ran the most risk of having you violate the agreement. The highlighting was "dangerous," and the bolding was "very dangerous." Again, it's entirely your call how you want to go out—if you want to rehash what I think are minor points (we left them out of the appeal for a reason) or reargue points we did argue in the appeal, then you can do that. Same goes for risking disparagement by keeping in the harshest language. But I think the letter will be more effective if it's a tighter discussion of the overall process, and not a relitigation of all the bad things they did, and I would hate to see all of this hard work on settlement go out the window if Crow says you disparaged ASU.

Justin Dillon

KaiserDillon PLLC
1401 K Street NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 640-4427
[REDACTED]

On Oct 14, 2018, at 11:49 PM, Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Here is my basic reworking of yours.. The OEI paragraph is now short, and Erin herself is not mentioned explicitly. I did include the other list as I say, because none of these were in my appeal letter.. but I shortened them.

What was the highlighting and bolding for?

Thanks.

LMK

Lawrence M. Krauss

Professor

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department

Arizona State University, [REDACTED] Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404

Research Office: 480.965.6378 | Assistant (Jessica): 480.965.9825 krauss@asu.edu

| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

On Oct 14, 2018, at 8:20 PM, Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks.. there is a lot about this I like.. I am concerned about removing all the dashed items.. most of them never made it into my appeal letter and are actually complaints about actions of his administration that I have never mentioned in anything before.. I do feel the need to inform him of these..

I will think about Erin section.. I want to say more than you have, but perhaps less than I had.

Lawrence M. Krauss

Professor

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department

Arizona State University, [REDACTED] Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404

Research Office: 480.965.6378 | Assistant (Jessica): 480.965.9825 krauss@asu.edu

| [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

On Oct 14, 2018, at 6:48 PM, Justin Dillon <[REDACTED]> wrote:

<retirementletter2--jd redline.docx>

<retirementletter2--jd redlinelmk.docx>