

**NR\_key\_name:** 39D15C5380B3E54885256532004E56CE  
**SendTo:** CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Ron Haron/O=ARRB @ ARRB

**CopyTo:** CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Jim Goslee/O=ARRB @ ARRB;CN=Manuel Legaspi/O=ARRB @ ARRB  
**DisplayBlindCopyTo:**  
**BlindCopyTo:**

**From:** CN=Douglas Horne/O=ARRB  
**DisplayFromDomain:**  
**DisplayDate:** 10/16/1997  
**DisplayDate\_Time:** 10:16:06 AM  
**ComposedDate:** 10/16/1997  
**ComposedDate\_Time:** 10:15:40 AM

**Subject:** Doug Horne and Ron Haron returned DIA Call from Ms. Jerrie Buckholtz  
CALL REPORT DOCUMENT'S AUTHOR: DOUGLAS HORNE/ARRB Date Created: 10/16/97 The Payers Description of the  
Call Date: 10/15/97Subject: Doug Horne and Ron Haron returned DIA Call from Ms. Jerrie BuckholtzSummary  
of the Call:Last week Ms. Buckholtz called and said that DIA's "action officer" (presumably Anne Winner, the  
DIA's designated JFK compliance official) had told her that DIA had satisfied all of the requirements in ARRB's  
letter of December 10, 1996, and wanted the Executive Secretariat to "clear it off of the boards." She asked  
me last week whether DIA had indeed satisfied all of requirements in our letter of December 10, 1996. At that  
time I asked her to be patient and told her I would call her back on the 15th of October after I had researched  
the big picture of where we stand with DIA.Today I returned her call, with Ron Haron in attendance. I told her  
that DIA had not satisfied our letter of December 10, 1996 in that no final compliance statement had been  
received by ARRB--and that the deadline extension we had granted of October 1 had passed without receipt of  
the final compliance statement. I then explained that there were numerous action items in other  
correspondence (that the Executive Secretariat was not privy to) that had not been answered, either. I said  
that if all of the outstanding questions were answered in the final compliance statement, then separate reply  
letters would not be required--but that in some fashion, the formal concerns and requests in our  
correspondence to DIA of February 6, May 14, July 2, and July 11 of this year should be answered in writing.  
She agreed, and requested that I fax to her all correspondence with DIA which she was previously not privy to.  
I sent her a 29-page fax, which included a copy of Section 6 of the JFK Act.I further explained that DIA had  
indeed conducted some record searches we had requested, and that at a September 23 meeting between  
ARRB staff members and Anne Winner and the reservists who had conducted the searches, ARRB staff had  
reviewed numerous documents which DIA thought might be responsive to our search criteria, and ARRB staff  
had flagged 31 of these documents (less than one third of the total) as "assassination records" which needed  
to undergo declassification review in accordance with the JFK Act. (the list of documents reviewed and those  
flagged was also faxed to her.) I told her that I had not been in attendance at that meeting because I was on  
leave, but that those staff members who had attended said Anne Winner had expressed considerable  
confusion about the JFK Act, the duties of the Review Board, and had many questions about the document  
review process, and had asked for formal ARRB correspondence which would (1) formally identify and request  
DIA declassification review of the 31 documents flagged at the meeting, and (2) explain in detail ARRB's  
document review and declassification process. I told Ms. Buckholtz that I would be happy to send that letter to  
DIA and that I would be doing so sometime within the next 30 days.Ron Haron asked DIA to re-commit to

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