

**NR\_key\_name:** B55431FDC1AB4C538525665E006835D7  
**SendTo:** CN=Laura Denk/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**CopyTo:**  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:** CN=R ecord/O=ARRB  
**From:** CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 08/12/1998  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 2:58:24 PM  
**ComposedDate:** 08/12/1998  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 2:58:15 PM  
**Subject:** Commencement of Kodak Work for ARRB  
MEETING REPORT DOCUMENT'S AUTHOR: Douglas Horne/ARRB Date Created: 09/15/97 Meeting Logistics Date: 09/15/97 Agency Name: Witnesses/Consultants Attendees: Rollie Zavada, Jim Toner, Doug Horne, Alan Lewis, Charlie Mayn, Steve Tilley Topic: Commencement of Kodak Work for ARRB Summary of the Meeting Rollie Zavada (retired Kodak employee serving as Kodak consultant) and Jim Toner (Laboratory Head, Imaging Science Resources Lab) spent two days with me and with NARA support staff at Archives II and commenced their work projects for the ARRB. The travel and per diem expenses were funded by ARRB; Kodak's services were donated. Day 1 (Monday, September 8, 1997): This day was spent photographing the edge print and date code on the original Zapruder film, and Secret Service copies 1 and 2 (believed to be first generation copies made on 11/22/63). Kodak used a jig which mounted a 35 mm SLR camera pointing down at the various films which had been placed on a light table. The film images they exposed of the edge print (using Kodak ASA 200 color negatives) allowed them to record the edge print with 100% accuracy for later study, which will lead to the writing of a report on the pedigree of the film designated by NARA as the Zapruder original, and Secret Service copies 1 and 2. Noteworthy event: Following the shooting of applicable edge print information (manufacturer's code, slitter code, date code, and developing laboratory code), I consulted with Alan Lewis (about researcher David Mantik's reported observation that Secret Service copies 1 and 2 were of very different contrast, and appeared to Mantik to be of different generations), and we agreed that it would be useful to lay out the original, and Secret Service Copies 1 and 2 adjacent to each other on the light table and photograph all 3 films at once so as to compare contrast, density, edge print, etc. I so directed Kodak. To everyone's surprise, Secret Service copies 1 and 2 (the Elm Street portions) were of very different density and contrast. Secret Service copy 1 (quoting Kodak) was of greater density and higher quality than copy 2, and copy 2 was lighter in color, exhibited more grain, and therefore exhibits less detail than corresponding images in copy 1. By all appearances, Secret Service copy 2, according to Mr. Zavada, appears to be of a subsequent generation from copy 1. The differences were so uniform that Mr. Zavada stated he doubted they were due to improper storage, or excessive projection; his initial conclusion is that copy 2 is a subsequent generation to copy 1, and Mr. Toner concurred. Mr. Zavada will study the problem in more detail and comment on the observations made, and their meaning, in his report on the pedigree of the 3 films. [Incidentally, the film designated as the camera original clearly exhibited the best quality, Secret Service copy 1 was second best, and copy 2 was third best.] Author's comment: the quality of Secret Service copy 2 is still superior to any of the FBI copies I have examined in the past. Four frames selected by me were photographed adjacent to each other.  
**Body:**  
**recstat:** Record  
**DeliveryPriority:** N  
**DeliveryReport:** B  
**ReturnReceipt:**  
**Categories:**