

NR_key_name: E160FC47864AED618525650100551A8C
SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 08/28/1997
DisplayDate_Time: 11:43:44 AM
ComposedDate: 08/28/1997
ComposedDate_Time: 11:29:34 AM
Subject: Kurtz Letter

David:A few more thoughts on the Kurtz letter:1. Given Section 8, (4)(A) of the JFK Act, who is Kurtz, from another agency and not the head of that other agency to determine/define that your letter does not constitute an "official Board action?" Is his letter an "official NARA action" by the Archivist?2. Why is the "official Board action" considered so important in terms of NARA and the Board "working together" to "clarify the historical record?" What is the nexus?3. In the context of advising the Congress and the public of the "intention to perform any testing," what does he mean when he says that "the position of the Review Board in this matter will necessarily be an important consideration?" (emphasis added.) Does that mean that NARA will ask the Congress and/or seek public comment from the public on whether or not to actually perform the testing?4. As I have said as far back as the meeting with all relevant agency personnel last year, notification of Congress is tantamount to making a public announcement. 5. I think that to keep things moving, a strongly worded cover letter from you taking issue with Kurtz's letter and conceding nothing on the authority of the Executive Director, accompanying a letter signed by the Review Board requesting the CE 567 testing and also requesting a meeting of relevant parties before any notification of the Congress and the public.I will be interested in hearing what Steve and Kurtz had to say.

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