

SECRET

September 11, 1995  
WORKING PAPER

Notes from meeting w/ ARRB staff Sept. 11, 1995

ARRB Attendees: Marwell, Gunn, Mary + one  
CIA Attendees : Barry, Ellie**Issue: Inconsistency between Mexico City Chrono item #132 and ARRB document #31**

Gunn proposed that the Agency release the information in document 31 that was released by mistake in the Mexico City Chrono. Otherwise, the staff would have to take the document back to the ARRB for reconsideration which they felt would undercut the credibility of the CIA and the staff. The Board will not uphold a postponement in a specific document if that information is released by mistake in another copy of the same document.

Ellie's response - because the information deals with Mex. liaison, she will have to take their proposal to a higher level. [response needed by 16 September]

They also requested a "new" highlighted version of the Mexico City Chrono which reflects all information released to NARA in the multiple copies of the Chrono and in the documents referenced in the Chrono.

**Issue: The three documents of concern.**

GIBSON - Ellie reviewed the Gibson issues--the fact that he had denied in court his affiliation with the CIA, etc. I noted that since the document would not be included in the determination list would the Board be willing to reconsider.

Marwell said that we could make an addition pitch to the Board to reconsider, but he did not think it would have any effect on their decision.

PROENZA - Ellie explained that our goal here was to protect the "asset" not the method and that the deletions could be reduced to those words that could result in the identification of the agent.

Marwell said that the Board may reconsider based on the need to protect a source.

Mary ask who was the asset? Was it LIRING?  
Ellie said she did not know (it could have been some "AM" source.

SECRET

## SECRET

Mary ask for more information on LIRING.

**"PRIVATE LINE TAP"** - According the Marwell, the Board considered the issue of the "private lines" but since the paragraph dealt with Oswald, voted to release. Mary said is was hard to defend the individual released since she did not have any information on the person.

We pointed out that the this release impacted on other documents which dealt with private line taps plus the Board had not limited its release to the paragraph that mentioned Oswald but released the name in other calls which had nothing to do with Oswald.

Marwell said the Board may re-look at the document as part of looking at similar documents.

The issue of the taps on other Bloc embassies came up. Mary said the Board was inclined to release given the end of the Cold War.

[Note: we will locate as many of the "private line tap" documents we can for special review]

**Issue:        Removing the Proenza and Private line tap documents form the formal notification list**

Marwell clearly prefers not to do it at this time (said they would discuss). Has no problem with asking the Board to reconsider or giving us the opportunity to presence additional evidence since their next meeting was within the 30 days set by the law, but felt that the Board was not inclined to keep tabling documents that they had reached a decision on.

Marwell asked if the Agency plans to "appeal"; he would like a heads-up.

Later, in private, Marwell said that he wanted to build into the process a loop that would handle these types of situations.

**Issue:        Presentation to Board at Sept. 20/21 meeting**

It was agreed that "STATIONS" would be the focus of the presentation -- 10:00 am, 20 Sept., one hour.

Marwell recommended providing evidence of bilateral agreements as well as identifying current harm. Said that the Board was leaning strongly toward releasing stations.

Mary pointed out that there were still issues on the Mexico City station window. There are documents from the 50s,

SECRET

SECRET

references in summaries to the founding of the station and, most important, the visit by the HSCA to Mexico City.

Ellie said there was the possibility of opening windows of stations when Oswald was present, however, this was a key issue for the Agency and a senior Directorate/Agency decision. She indicated that the DO would oppose expanding the Mexico City window into the 70s.

As for the older documents, we pointed out that we had already agreed to the release of those documents.

Marwell suggest that the 20 Sept. presentation would be a good opportunity to address the Private Line and other Tel Taps issue rather than requesting a separate meeting.

After the meeting Marwell elaborated on the presentation. He said to try a avoid going over old ground (US-Mexico relationship; when possible provide specific/hard evidence (bilateral agreements carry weight); war-stories did not go over well and neither did Bill McNair. He emphasized the importance of using the language of the law.

SECRET