

MEMORANDUM

April 26, 1996

To: Jeremy Gunn
From: Mary McAuliffe
Subject: Status reports

CIA

1. Regarding ARRB requests for information:

- CIA has provided a significant amount of material in response to **CIA-1**, although it has not answered many of the individual requests, either in part or in full (see Michelle's updated memo, attached). A small amount of material that CIA provided in response to this request has recently turned up in the SKIF and has been filed in the Response to Requests file (4.20.4).
- CIA has responded in full to **CIA-2, 4 and 5** (there does not appear to have been a **CIA-3**). These were requests from CIA team for information on crypts, pseudos, station prefixes, and file numbers/indicators.
- Barry is going to check on the status of **CIA-6**, which dealt with cable traffic between Mexico City, headquarters, and JMWAVE.
- In response to **CIA-7**, CIA has made the Mexico City Station history available to us (restricted access), and is one step away from being able to make its index to CIA histories available. The Agency has no record of a JMWAVE station history ever having been written, but is looking into it. The rest of our CIA-7 request, especially for histories/studies/reports on CIA activities with respect to Cuba from October 1, 1962 to January 1, 1964, are "subject to further discussion."
- CIA has only recently received **CIA-8** (for Intelligence Community staff records) and **CIA-9** (for serial publications) and has not yet had a chance to respond.

I would suggest a continued follow-up on the materials that CIA has not yet provided. I would also recommend waiting to look at the Mexico City Station history until the entire index to CIA histories is available. It is my understanding that almost everyone necessary for sign-off on the index has

already signed off, and that we should be given access soon.

As for the "Monster Plot" document, which Charlie Battaglia recommended that we request from CIA, Barry has not even heard of it. Chuck Briggs has not heard of it by that name, either, but speculates that it might be the lengthy document dealing with Nosenko. We can put in a request for this document as soon as we figure out what it is. If it is the Nosenko document, it is readily available.

As noted above, Michelle has revisited CIA and the CIA-1 collection and prepared an update (see attached). Christopher and Manuel also have several suggestions for further requests from CIA following research in DRE files on April 19 and other Cuba-related research (see attached). In particular, they would like to request files for David Morales and Ted Shackley, in addition to files of Ron Cross, Doug Gupton, and Bart Henry.

2. Regarding overview of remaining records in CIA's JFK Collection, Bob and Dennis spent April 19 reviewing portions of the 63 boxes, and Dennis followed up with another trip to CIA on April 23 (see attached). Michelle also helped out on this project, which was a follow-up of work that she and Manuel did in March. In all, the team has seen approximately one-third of the CIA's remaining JFK records, exclusive of the microfilm collection. They report that they continue to see many of the same issues, especially on Mexico City, and even the same--or similar--documents as in the Oswald file. They have also found a wide variety of documents whose sensitivity appears high while their relevance to the assassination appears distant or dubious. Many documents from CIA employee personnel files, security files, 201 files, files on the CIA/U-2 Detachment at Atsugi, OGC files (heavy on names) related to a variety of litigation cases from the 1970s, as well as lists of defectors, expense reports for Cuban exile groups, and certain pre-assassination cables related to specific CIA operations appear to fall in this category.

In partial correction of Michelle's and Manuel's memo of March 8, team members have now concluded that the 63 boxes of the JFK collection consists primarily of records that CIA considered part of the investigation of the assassination, including, but not limited to, all records requested by or related to the various Committees and other bodies that served in an investigative capacity. The records from these boxes fall within the time frame spanning the years from the Warren Commission through the HSCA and are made up of files which the HSCA staff actually examined. Some, but not all, of these records have been reproduced in the microfilm collection, which in general contains the complete files from which relevant documents were pulled and examined, but does not always include the relevant documents themselves.

Given the disorder of the entire collection and the confusion which still exists concerning its nature and provenance, team members are wondering whether it might be helpful to talk with Russ Holmes, who took charge of the collection for many years before it passed to HRG. Having talked with Russ a number of times myself, I wonder whether he will add any light and suspect that he may simply confuse matters, but I am willing to give it a try if you think we should do so. I would like Barry's

assessment of Russ before we actually commit to discussions, though. History Staff at CIA had its own difficulties in coming to grips with the collection (and Russ's explanations of it), but came up with a final report (from 1992), which Barry has given us.

As for the extensive duplication of documents within the 63 boxes, which team members have noted, I plan to ask Barry whether there is any way we can handle all or most duplicates of any given document at the same time. I'm not sure HRG has any reliable way to retrieve these, but I'd like to explore the possibility as soon as Barry returns on Monday.

3. As for next steps with the Agency, Monday morning Barry and I will be comparing detailed notes to figure out exactly what we need to do to clean up the Oswald file prior to the next Board meeting. In preparation for this, CIA team has been housecleaning the SKIF and checking the status of all remaining Review Track documents from the Oswald file, comparing our collection of documents that have not been reviewed with Review Track. Even after accounting for orphans and strays (which have not been reviewed for a variety of reasons), as well as documents caught somewhere in transit along the review process, we have found that we cannot account for a large number of documents from the Oswald file that Review Track tells us remain to be reviewed. We hope that these are currently residing at CIA.

As part of this effort to clean up the Oswald file, Christopher and Michelle have been doing a thorough check of the Mexico Chron, hunting down all documents relating to it that the Board has reviewed, so that we can make review recommendations for the Chron consistent with the Board's previous decisions.

In preparation for the huge number of new names that we anticipate encountering in the remaining files of CIA's JFK Collection, Manuel has developed (and David has approved) a new system of name tracking (see draft, attached). Manuel, by the way, is our new Name Czar. He has appointed Christopher as his Deputy.

You should also be aware that at the last Board meeting, the Board voted to require substituting the words "no suitable substitute language" for the Gunn substitute in all documents being considered at that meeting or to be considered at future meetings. The Board also asked the staff to report back on the feasibility of changing the Gunn substitute where it appears in past documents. Manuel researched this out and discovered nine documents in which the Gunn substitute has previously appeared. If we were to make this change in these documents, what notification to the public should we give? Would a reference in an upcoming Federal Register notice be sufficient?

JFK Library

I have talked with Will Johnson and received his approval of the proposed dates for our trip (week of

June 17). CIA is definitely on board, but John Pereira is waiting to hear from David before committing CIA to a broad rather than a narrow search of the records. I'm not at all clear from talking with Barry how likely such a commitment will be. I gather that it is currently "under discussion."

State Department

Because of the uncertainties of how CIA will eventually approach records review at the JFK Library, I have not yet called Nina Noring at State and plan not to do so until I have a clearer idea of what we want of her. If we end up reviewing only designated records, then I expect that she will be able to handle State Department equities by herself (I'm quite certain that she has declassification authority). If all the records are done, though, then she will need to go up ahead of time and assess whether she will need some help. I want to give her sufficient warning, but I also do not want to unsettle her unnecessarily.

As for State Department records here in Washington, we are currently up to date--with the exception of a few records that State still has out for coordination with other Agencies, primarily FBI and Defense. Nina seems to be keeping her eye on things (she brought in the Passport Office documents requiring coordination to do herself when Passport Office took too long about it), and all seems well under control there.

In general, the State Department has been very willing to release records under the JFK Act. One exception would seem to be in the area of privacy, where we have today received a letter from Nina (see attached) in prompt response to our request for evidence regarding a a Pasport Office document found in HSCA files.

Attachments (6)

McAuliffe e:\wp-docs\status.wpd
File 4.20.2.1