

NR_key_name: EADA06136EE5BD358525659B005DAE74
SendTo: CN=Ron Haron/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo: CN=Kevin Tiernan/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 01/29/1998
DisplayDate_Time: 1:04:12 PM
ComposedDate: 01/29/1998
ComposedDate_Time: 12:03:15 PM
Subject: FBI Master List
non. thank you for your list -- I can see that you put a huge amount of time into it and Kevin and I agree that a master list is a good thing. I did spend a couple of hours this morning reviewing it. Rather than filling in the "status/comments" field in the WordPerfect table, I decided that it would be more efficient to just give you the following comments. (1) I'll address the easiest one first::As we discussed on Tuesday, approximately 220 of the HSCA subjects have been reviewed and negotiated by Review Board staff members and are in some stage of "post-production" at the Bureau. Any "master list" created for compliance purposes should probably reflect that Review Board negotiations are complete and that the FBI must complete its "post-production." As I mentioned to you on Tuesday, the information on which subjects are through the negotiation phase is available in my card box, which I update each afternoon. (LuAnn Wilkins at the FBI also keeps a notebook in which she logs the status of each HSCA subject file.)(2) Now -- the harder ones. . .The chart states, in a number of places, that certain of the HSCA subjects are complete and have been "transmitted to the Archives" on a particular date. While it is true that the FBI completed its initial processing on many of the HSCA subjects and transmitted redacted copies of those records to the Archives long ago, the Review Board never reviewed those records. Since our statute requires us to review postponements requested by the agencies, we review them. So, even though the Bureau transmitted its initially processed records to the Archives, there may be a significant amount of work left to do both on our end and on the Bureau's part that is not reflected on the chart. (3) The problem I outline in (2) reappears with regard to the core files in the chart. For instance -- the chart states that the HQ Lee Harvey Oswald file (105-82555) was transmitted to the Collection on 3/24/94. As you know, the Review Board was not appointed by the President until 4/94 and it then had the job of reviewing every postponement that the FBI claimed in the LHO HQ file. We spent a large part of our first two years reviewing the Bureau's postponements in the "core and related" files and MOST of those records were voted on by the Board and transmitted to the Archives after each Review Board meeting (as reflected in the Fed. Reg. notices that we issue each month after Board meetings.) HOWEVER, we do still have some records from the core files (listed in our databases) that have NOT been voted on by the Board because they contain pending issues, such as foreign government information, grand jury information, and outstanding IRS referrals. Any "master list" of files to be used for compliance purposes should probably reflect what has been done and what is left to do.(4) I have been working on a status list for the requests for addl. information because my working documents that you used in creating the list had not been updated in a while. I will give you my updated chart on the requests for addl. information before our meeting on Tuesday.I'm glad that we have an
Body: Record
recstat:
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: