

NR_key_name: FE705F57CE80BFE8862565FA007E3DFD
SendTo: Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arrrb.gov
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB
From: MAILER-DAEMON@safety.interliant.com
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 05/04/1998
DisplayDate_Time: 5:53:18 PM
ComposedDate:
ComposedDate_Time:
Subject: Returned mail: User unknown
The original message was received at MON, 4 May 1998 17:47:05 -0500 (CDT) from smtp@localhost ----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----<Judge.John.Tunheim@usd.cmn.cchub.com> ----- Transcript of session follows -----... while talking to ccmail1.allegro.net.:>>> RCPT To:<Judge.John.Tunheim@usd.cmn.cchub.com><<< 553 non local recipient rejected550 <Judge.John.Tunheim@usd.cmn.cchub.com>... User unknown - att1.unkReturn-Path: Eileen_Sullivan%ARRB@notes.interliant.comReceived: (from smtp@localhost) by safety.interliant.com (8.8.5/Interliant) id RAA24040 for <Judge.John.Tunheim@usd.cmn.cchub.com>; Mon, 4 May 1998 17:47:05 -0500 (CDT)Received: from internet-502.interliant.com(198.64.193.192) by safety.interliant.com via smap (V1.3) id smab23937; Mon May 4 17:47:02 1998Received: by internet-502.interliant.com(Lotus SMTP MTA v1.1 (385.6 5-6-1997)) id 862565FA.007D9F9F ; Mon, 4 May 1998 17:52:08 -0500X-Lotus-FromDomain: ILGW @ ARRB @ INTERLIANT @ OUTBOUNDFrom: "Eileen Sullivan"<Eileen_Sullivan%ARRB@notes.interliant.com>To: Judge.John.Tunheim@usd.cmn.cchub.comMessage-ID: <862565FA.007D9E70.00@internet-502.interliant.com>Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 18:43:20 -0400Subject: Re: Indigo Films, documentary about ARRB
Mime-Version: 1.0Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-asciiTo: Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arrrb.gov, waltz.interliant.comcc: "Jeremy_Gunn/ARRB%ARRB" @ jfk-arrrb.gov (bcc: Eileen Sullivan/ARRB)From: hall.409 @ osu.edu @ INTERNET @ INTERLIANTDate: 05/01/98 05:25:41 PM MSTSubject: Re: Indigo Films, documentary about ARRB
Eileen and Jeremy, I continue to have serious reservations about the proposal, which I have now read. The language strikes me as hyperbolic and even bombastic in places, and it largely misses what it is that we have done and what it is that we have contributed. So, I vote no, although I would, as always, be willing to discuss the issue further with colleagues. Best, Kermit
At 02:01 PM 5/1/98 -0400, Eileen Sullivan wrote:>>This same message below, along with the attachments, is also being>transmitted by fax.>>Dear Board Members:>>As you are aware, David Frank and Nan Waffen of Indigo films would like to>do a documentary about the Review Board. I have attached a revised>proposal and a copy of an e-mail that I received from Ms. Waffen.>>After reviewing this material, please let Jeremy and me know how and if you>would like to proceed. With regard to interviews, Indigo films has>requested interviews with you and Jeremy. Jeremy is reluctant to do so,>but will participate if you think it is advisable.>>Ms. Waffen would like to meet with you for a few minutes while you are here>in May. She would explain a little more about the documentary and answer>any questions you may have. Please let me know if you would like me to>arrange

Body:
recstat:
DeliveryPriority:
DeliveryReport:
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: