

**NR\_key\_name:** 101AED8CE675DD08852565CD007D95EA

**SendTo:** INTERNET-BOARD

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

**From:** CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 03/20/1998

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 7:00:27 PM

**ComposedDate:** 03/20/1998

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 5:51:44 PM

**Subject:** Today's Conference Call

All Board members were present for the call. Because I had been out of town since the time of the last call, I did not have much to report (with one major exception).1. Testimony to the Government Affairs Committee. Curt Silvers from the Government Affairs Committee called me last week based upon the recommendation of Eric Scheinkopf, a former staff member of the ARRB who now works on Capitol Hill. I had not previously spoken to Silver or known of him. We spoke for a few minutes and he said that he might want me to testify -- but was non-committal. I told him that I could not testify on behalf of the Board, but only as a staff member. He said that he was not seeking the Board's position on issues, but on information about the nitty-gritty of working with declassification process. He ended the conversation by saying he didn't know what he was going to do and I frankly did not expect to hear from him again. He called back on Friday -- when I was in New York -- and left the message that he did want me to testify on the 25th. I did not receive this message until late Friday night when I returned from New York. I left for Poland on Saturday afternoon. During the conference call it was my understanding that the Board thought it would be appropriate to have a Board member testify -- possibly in lieu of, or partly in addition to me. This was a bit awkward for me, because it had been my understanding from Silver -- although I was not at all certain -- that he was seeking input from people who work on the issues on a day-to-day basis rather than from those people who are the policy makers. (The line-up of the panel, which I received this morning, would seem to suggest this. The other two witnesses were Steven Garfinkle, the Executive Director of ISOO, and Steven Aftergood, the Director of the Project on Government Secrecy of the American Federation of Scientists.) I was concerned that if my initial understanding had been correct, and that if I were to call Silver and then report to the Board that Silver did in fact want a staffer rather than a policy maker, there might be some question as to whether I had reported the conversation correctly. For this reason I thought that it would be highly advisable for the relevant Board member -- in this case Anna -- to call him directly, express the relevant concerns, and get his response. POST CONFERENCE CALL DEVELOPMENTS: I spoke with Anna after the conference call. She said that she would call Silver on Monday. I strongly urged her to call him promptly so that as much advance notice as possible could be given. She agreed to call him. After speaking with Silver, Anna called me and reported that he was not inclined to change the program. (I will leave it to Anna to report more fully on what was said.) He called me a few minutes later. I said that the Board had made it clear to me that it preferred to have a Board member involved and that it would be helpful if a Board member could appear. He said that he would call back on Monday after talking to others and give a final decision. (I assumed from the way he said it that he would be

**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record

**DeliveryPriority:** H

**DeliveryReport:** B

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**