

NR_key_name: BD7675A9D8AC6D7B852564FE007C5FAD

SendTo: CN=David Marwell/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 08/25/1997

DisplayDate_Time: 6:38:59 PM

ComposedDate: 08/25/1997

ComposedDate_Time: 6:38:30 PM

Subject: Doug Horne Called Jamie Silverberg
CALL REPORT: PUBLIC DOCUMENTS Author: Douglas Horne/ARRB Date Created: 08/25/97 The players who initiated the call? Review Board's representative in the call: Douglas HorneGeneral Public's representative in the call: James Lorin Silverberg ("Jamie")Description of the Call Date: 08/25/97Subject: Doug Horne Called Jamie SilverbergSummary of the Call:I left a voice mail for Jamie Silverberg today and asked him to call me. I told him the ARRB was interested in doing a forensic examination in September of his "item no. 2" on his inventory, which is the Time-Life first generation copy of the Zapruder film. He called me back at 5:50 P.M. from an out-of-town location, and we discussed the issue. He desires two assurances from us in this matter, and if he gets them in writing, he says it looks in principle like this is eminently "do-able:"-An assurance from the Board (not from any member of the staff) that his first generation copy of the Zapruder film (item no. 2) would definitely be returned to him (i.e., not kept or declared an assassination record); and-An assurance from the Board that ARRB would be responsible for any additional damage to the film beyond that which exists presently to "item no. 2" on his inventory. [Item no. 2 is already badly damaged--such damage was documented in my memo of April 11th.][My recommendation is that this issue be raised with the Board members at this week's weekly meeting via telephone, and that they be asked to vote and sign a notation and voting form on this subject which would satisfy LMH Company's concerns. We could then forward Mr. Silverberg the Board members' assurances as enclosures to a cover letter from the Executive Director, or General Counsel.]He said that upon receipt of adequate written assurances from the Board, he would need about 2 hour's notice in order to get this film out of a vault and obtain it for our designated courier (i.e., me). I proposed an alternative to him, namely, having his courier take it up to Archives instead of me, and he did not seem interested in that at all. I explained to him that our examination by our Kodak consultants will be taking place on September 8th, and that for this reason we would desire to pick up his "item no. 2" on Friday, September 5th, and place it in our SCIF over the weekend; we would return it, I said, on Tuesday, September 9th, the day after the examination.I closed by asking him whether the original home movie had ever been located, since he volunteered to look for it during our meeting on April 10th. I explained that it would be most useful to examine the edge print on this portion of the original film, if it had been located. He declined to reveal whether it had ever been located (or even searched for), but said that "all further dealings with any matters involving these materials will be handled through our dealings with the Justice Department. My client has been extremely magnanimous and generous with the government, and yet has run up \$ 100,000.00 in legal expenses in dealing with the government on Zapruder film issues; therefore all additional matters will

Body: Record

recstat: Record

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: