

MEMORANDUM

April 3, 1996

To: Eileen Sullivan

cc: Tom Samoluk, David Marwell, Jeremy Gunn, Phil Golrick

From: Joan Zimmerman

Subject: Documents Opened at the March 18-19, 1996 Board Meeting

1. **Report by USSS SA R. David Freriks on Thomas Vallee.** This 1968 interview was one of several followup investigations conducted on Thomas Vallee by the Secret Service. The report indicates that Vallee's case would be closed in Indianapolis and that quarterly investigations of Vallee would be discontinued. Subsequent Secret Service reports on Vallee (open at College Park) suggest that interest in him continued into the early 1970s. Vallee had been arrested at the behest of the Secret Service in anticipation of President Kennedy's scheduled visit to Chicago on November 2, 1963. President Kennedy's cancellation of his trip at the last minute has led to speculation that an assassination threat, possibly involving Vallee, caused Kennedy's change in plans. Vallee's photograph was reproduced in HSCA volume 4; at one time Vallee was rumored to be one of the three "tramps" arrested near Dealey Plaza on November 22, 1963.

2. **Memorandum from Eileen Dinneen to Dick Billings with Attachments.** (October 19, 1978) Eileen Dinneen, a researcher for the HSCA, studied protective cases established by the Secret Service from March 1963 to November 1963. Dinneen's purpose was to analyze potential threat criteria used by the Secret Service before the Kennedy assassination. Dinneen's report, which was based on her review of 413 cases, evaluated both sources of threat information relayed to the Secret Service from other agencies and the categories of persons considered threatening to the President.

3. **Threat Sheets (Individuals Listed by Protective Research).** In her research, Eileen Dinneen prepared single sheets summarizing information from Secret Service threat files. The 273 individuals whose summaries appear on the threat sheets came to the attention of the Secret Service either through references from other agencies, through their own direct contact with the White House, or through anonymous tips from the public.

4. **Eileen Dinneen Review of JFK Trip Files for 1963 with Secret Service Report Forms.** (March 24, 1978) Eileen Dinneen's review of Secret Service trip files prepared for President Kennedy's travels from March to November 1963, should merit interest because it is based on material destroyed by the Secret Service in January 1995. Dinneen studied changes in the President's itinerary, patterns of Secret Service reporting on trip events and threatening individuals, and the details of planning for President Kennedy's trips. Dinneen supplemented her four page memorandum with twenty one

“Secret Service Report Forms” summarizing the circumstances surrounding particular threats or peculiar situations.

N.B. Jane Vezeris sent a letter dated March 28, 1996, to David. The letter appears to have been written by John Machado since it rehashes his flimsy, self-serving, and self-contradictory explanation for the destruction of President Kennedy’s trip files in his July 31, 1995 letter to us. Machado wrote to complain about our characterization of Secret Service compliance with the JFK Act in the FY 1995 Report. My feeling is that, if anything, we understated Machado’s lack of cooperation. Since he has chosen to make a fuss about our pointing out the destruction of documents, this release, which the Secret Service will probably appeal, is an opportunity to register our sense that Machado’s performance has been unsatisfactory. Since Machado’s letter indicates that he still does not understand the significance of the documents he destroyed, perhaps some attention from the research community might sharpen his awareness. All of which is to say that if we point out that Dinneen’s report is based on materials now destroyed by the Secret Service, it may become a bit sensationalized. Since we have already tried the civilized method with Machado only to discover that nothing we say seems to sink in, we can give him a wider audience for his explanation of his behavior. We are prepared to respond to Machado’s March 28 letter. Such a course would bring implications for us, not all of them easily foreseen. I do not know what David thinks of the prospect of mentioning that Dinneen’s report is based on destroyed documents.