

NR_key_name: 9B7A8689D151315B8525622100426B8A
SendTo: CN=Kevin Tiernan/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Joan Zimmerman/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo: CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Tammi Long/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Dennis Quinn/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Phil Golrick/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/23/1995
DisplayDate_Time: 8:24:10 AM
ComposedDate: 08/23/1995
ComposedDate_Time: 8:05:29 AM
Subject: review track database
I'm changing my mind about what I told Kevin in response to his question yesterday: for the familiar "2-4" combination for informant postponements, please delete any existing analysis for the requirements of section 6(2). The FBI has abandoned its argument that 6(2) justifies its postponements. Similarly, when entering new postponements on the review track, do not go through the 6(2) analysis, even if the FBI has marked 6(2) and 6(4) as grounds for its postponement. In my mind, Carol Keeley and John Hartingh have made sufficiently clear that the FBI no longer contends that 6(2) justifies its informant postponements in the absence of evidence (which so far has never been provided) that the informant is still alive. A friendly reminder -- by noon tomorrow (Thursday), I need you (that is, Kevin and Joan) to complete your analysis of all non-foreign counterintelligence postponements in the documents that were originally in your piles for the mid-July meeting. This includes the documents from Richard Gibson's file. We are dealing with a fairly small number of documents for next week's Review Board meeting, so if we meet this interim deadline, we should be in position to present FBI documents to the Review Board by Monday afternoon without working late or over the weekend.
Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: