

**NR\_key\_name:** 9A40A42F843625B685256345004D3EF1  
**SendTo:** CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB  
**From:** CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 06/10/1996  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 10:03:55 AM  
**ComposedDate:** 06/10/1996  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 10:03:44 AM  
**Subject:** ARRB Photographic Consultant

CALL REPORT: PUBLICDocument's Author: Douglas Horne/ARRB Date Created: 06/10/96 The Players  
Description of the Call Date: 06/07/96Subject: ARRB Photographic ConsultantSummary of the Call:Fred  
Williamson, Director of Imaging Technical Policy for Kodak in Washington, D.C., called me for the first time  
today to informally relay Kodak's corporate decision regarding ARRB's request for photographic consultant  
assistance.Bottom Line: Kodak wants to play. This decision was relayed to Fred Williamson by Dr. Jim Myer,  
Senior Vice President for Kodak in Rochester, whose functional title is Chief Technical Officer and Director of  
Research. Dr. Myer was represented to me to be 2 levels above Mr. Jim Milch at Rochester, whom I spoke  
with in May about the possible scope of the assistance ARRB was looking for. Fred Williamson told me that  
Kodak had checked on the Review Board's mandate and standing with the House Government Oversight  
Committee and had received a favorable report on ARRB. Furthermore, Kodak is interested in maintaining its  
position as the world's pre-eminent authority on imaging, and for this reason primarily is interested in helping  
the Review Board.Mr. Williamson told me that Kodak is not interested in making any profit whatsoever, but  
that they are interested in recovering from the Review Board whatever actual costs are incurred, in the case of  
both materials used, but more importantly to cover the expenses of any retirees which they would have to call  
out of retirement to assess authenticity issues involving films from 1963.Mr. Williamson said that he thought it  
was time for one side or the other to make a proposal in writing by letter, and for the other to respond, as  
confirmation of the conversations held to date, and as a vehicle to get the process moving. I told him that I felt  
the ARRB should initiate written contact, since it was ARRB that was asking for the assistance; this was  
agreeable to him. We both concurred that issues of scope of assistance and cost should be addressed, in a  
general way, in the ARRB letter, so that Kodak could respond appropriately.ARRB's letter, when sent, should  
be addressed to:Dr. Jim Myer, Eastman Kodak CompanyChief Technical Officer and Director of ResearchATTN:  
7-83-RL/MC 02212Rochester, New York 14650(copy to: Fred Williamson, Eastman Kodak Company 1250 H  
Street N.W., Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20005)

**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**