

**NR\_key\_name:** 3E349DAD91E3E8718525662300406480

**SendTo:** INTERNET-BOARD

**CopyTo:**

**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**

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

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

**DisplayFromDomain:**

**DisplayDate:** 06/14/1998

**DisplayDate\_Time:** 8:33:53 AM

**ComposedDate:** 06/14/1998

**ComposedDate\_Time:** 7:43:20 AM

**Subject:** Bill's e-mail, upcoming meeting, and where we are going  
it appears that a majority of the board would like to meet and so we will have a meeting on wednesday as originally scheduled. Because of Bill's comments, it seems appropriate for me to clarify the circumstances of the changes and to add a few comments. First, as I have previously expressed to the Board, it is my opinion that it does not need to meet more than once a month for records-related issues. The Board met two weeks ago and it will be meeting in another two weeks. The total amount of time that was spent on records last meeting was less than five minutes. With one modest exception, I doubt that more time will be needed during the next meeting. I have done my best to try to get the difficult records issues presented to the Board and it is my expectation that the pattern of short meetings on records will be the norm through the end. Second, the principal reason for future Board meetings would be, in my opinion, to advance work on the final report. The substantive discussions on the final report need to be at open meetings. In my personal opinion, the discussion at the last open meeting -- although edifying -- did not advance the ball. During the meeting, when I was asked to express my opinion, I stated that I thought that it was important that the Board set up a plan for determining what its specific recommendations would be and how it planned to get the recommendations drafted and approved (under the current outline this is Chapter 7). (The staff is continuing apace with its work on chapters 1-6.) No Board member followed up on my suggestion and the meeting adjourned with no plan that I was aware of regarding future strategy. To my mind, that should have been the principal reason for meeting: getting a specific plan going. I continue to urge the Board to move forward on this issue. Third, I apologize for Bill's needing to change plans. Either Tracy or I spoke to him at the developing stages in order to give him our best knowledge. It is difficult to coordinate in a fast way activities among five people in five different cities. There were three principal reasons for the proposed change: first, I had hoped that it would be more convenient for the majority (which clearly did not work out); second, I have perceived mounting tensions and I thought it might be a good idea to change the venue and get out of a rut; third, it seemed that it could be accomplished as a "wash" financially. As soon as we learned that all Board members could make the change to NYC, Tracy immediately began to search for hotels. We inaccurately believed that it would be possible to obtain convenient hotels in Washington. The idea for meeting in NYC was, however, mine and I am responsible for the inconveniences that resulted and I truly regret that I tried to do it. Fourth, to my mind, the principal reason for meeting again in June, rather than July, would be because of the uncertainty of my position. At the last Board meeting, I did my best to give the Board a complete picture of my situation -- including the uncertainties attached. The Board had the option of considering contingency plans or awaiting

**Body:** Record

**recstat:**

**DeliveryPriority:** H

**DeliveryReport:** B

**ReturnReceipt:**

**Categories:**