

NR_key_name: D45F82F636CBF7148525638700571825
SendTo: CN=Tim Wray/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Dave Montague/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Christopher Barger/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/15/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 11:51:31 AM
ComposedDate: 08/15/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 11:51:18 AM
Subject: Introductory meeting
MEETING REPORT DOCUMENTS AUTHOR: Christopher Barger/ARRB Date Created: 08/15/96 Meeting Logistics
Date: 08/15/96 Agency Name: Department of the Navy Attendees: Lt. Col. Mike Finney Topic: Introductory
meeting Summary of the Meeting Christopher Barger met with Lt. Col. Mike Finney very briefly on Thursday,
August 15. Finney has replaced Sparks in the Navy General Counsel's office. The original purpose of this
meeting was to both determine the extent of the Navy's (and ONI's) compliance with our requests from last
fall, and to arrange points of contact with ONI. However, the contacts Tim Wray made on August 14 precluded
that necessity. Today's meeting, then, was for background information purposes, and was held basically to
give Finney a face to place with the Board, and to establish a personal relationship of some kind. Finney was
very pleasant and cordial. He began the meeting by explaining his understanding of things to this point; telling
Barger what he knows and what actions have been taken. He stated that he had read the statute and
information we had faxed him and was aware of what is required of the Navy by the statute. He gave Barger a
copy of a response to a request of ours that ONI had internally filed, but apparently never forwarded to us. He
apologized for the miscue, saying that he expected that someone just "filed it in the wrong drawer." Barger
explained that ARRB now has points of contact established by Tim Wray, and that we felt it would be best to
proceed using those contacts primarily, and contacting Finney only when a) formal requests need to be made;
b) we run into road blocks from agencies or personnel subordinate to him; and c) on a semi-regular basis for
purposes of keeping both he and we up to date on the process. Finney agreed that this would be appropriate
and most conducive to achieving the goals of the statute. Finney asked what he could presently do to help us.
Barger responded that at the moment, there was nothing that couldn't be first handled by our contacts.
Barger explained that, to this point, ARRB hadn't done much work with the Navy, but we were expecting to
often in the near future, and so Finney should be prepared to hear from subordinates regarding us. He was
also told to contact Stuart Aly if any questions arise. Finney said that, since we were taking the time to advise him
that we would be around, he assumed we had something specific to research, and asked what it was. Barger
responded that it had to do with information we have recently come across regarding a possible program that
might have been run by ONI; nothing further was discussed. Finney concluded the meeting warmly, saying that
we should not hesitate to call him if we need anything, that he will make sure we get full compliance from the
Navy, and that he looked forward to working with us. [Note: Barger's feeling is that Finney, both professionally
and personally, is more receptive to the work of the ARRB. The potential exists for a good informal
relationship and communication.] Don't forget to compose individual Action Item documents for any action
Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: