

**Carl Woock**

From: Matthew P. Schaefer [MSchaefer@brannlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 11:03 AM
To: Nelson Whipple
Cc: Tyson Seely; Thomas Adler
Subject: RE: Update

Nelson:

Thanks. 1 pm eastern is fine. The changes may potentially be only a couple of words in a single question, if that makes a difference (in other words, it is almost like extending the current survey), but I have not yet sat down to wordsmith it. Essentially, the permanent regulation makes it optional whether the tell consumers in the Transactional Notice that their name will be disclosed to the Department, although the retailer must tell consumer's in the annual notice that their names are being reported.

Thanks,

Matt

From: Nelson Whipple [mailto:nwhipple@rsqinc.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 10:58 AM
To: Matthew P. Schaefer
Cc: Tyson Seely; Thomas Adler
Subject: RE: Update

Matt,

We are looking into costs for fielding and analyzing 250, 500 and 1,000 more surveys (of basically the same survey with wording changes). We assume that we would want to do a pilot of 250 again.

I am travelling today (actually to Maine), so I will be available somewhat sporadically. I think the most likely time for me to be able to talk is 1 PM eastern. Does that work for you?

Best,

Nelson

From: Matthew P. Schaefer [mailto:MSchaefer@brannlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 3:54 AM
To: Nelson Whipple
Cc: Tyson Seely; Thomas Adler
Subject: RE: Update

Tim and Nelson:

The Department issued permanent regulations on Friday that made a couple of changes with regard to implementation of the law – not drastic, but potentially impacting our results. My thought is that we may want to consider whether to make a modest wording change to the question that details the notice requirements and gather some additional

completes that might accomplish both testing the changed conditions and, potentially, validating the results so far as meaningful despite the change.

If you have time to discuss later today (Monday) that would be useful – I am free except between 2 and 4. What kind of cost is associated with securing additional completes (250? 500? 1000?)

Thanks,

Matt

From: Nelson Whipple [<mailto:nwhipple@rsginc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 17, 2010 5:04 PM
To: Matthew P. Schaefer
Cc: Tyson Seely; Thomas Adler
Subject: Update

Matt,

We currently have 934 complete, so it might be possible that we will hit 1000 before the weekend. The numbers on the tracking page are not yet weighted, but they show the following:

6a) Reporting my name, billing address, shipping address, and the amount of my purchases to the State is an invasion of my privacy. 69% agree (includes 44% strongly agree)

6b) I do not mind the State of Colorado knowing the kinds of products I buy, from whom I buy them, where I have them shipped, and how much I spend. 73% disagree (includes 45% strongly disagree)

7) If you were to make a similar purchase in the future, but with this new disclosure requirement in place, what would you most likely do? Only 35% would purchase from same seller again

8) As a result of this law, how would your Internet and catalog purchases from those out-of-state retailers who must report your name, address and purchase amount to the Department of Revenue likely be affected over the coming year? 67% said "decrease"

Best,

Nelson

Nelson Whipple | Director
Resource Systems Group, Inc.
205 West Wacker Drive, Suite 615 | Chicago, IL 60606
Office 312.673.3320 ext. 201 | Mobile 847.644.0390 | www.rsginc.com