

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION OF ITEM #3-A

MARCH 4, 1986 - PARKER CENTER AUDITORIUM

COMMISSIONERS: MS. BARBARA SCHLEI, VICE-PRESIDENT
MR. SAMUEL L. WILLIAMS, COMMISSIONER
MR. STEPHEN D. YSLAS, COMMISSIONER

APPEARANCES: MR. LAWRENCE TEETER
MR. JACK KIMBROUGH
MR. GREGORY STONE
MR. DAVID MENDELSON
MR. PAUL SCHRADER
MR. JACK CORBIN
MS. CATHERINE LESLIE

LILLIE E. WILSON
HEARING REPORTER

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MS. SCHLEI: GOOD AFTERNOON. THIS IS THE MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS.

THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA THAT WE WILL BE UNDERTAKING TODAY IS THE REPORT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY. OVER MANY YEARS WE HAVE RECEIVED A GREAT NUMBER OF REQUESTS TO THIS COMMISSION AND TO THE DEPARTMENT TO RELEASE THE LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT'S INVESTIGATION INTO THE ASSASSINATION OF SENATOR KENNEDY. LAST JULY WE HEARD FROM MANY OF YOU IN PERSON AND IN WRITING. YOU SHARED WITH US AND GAVE US THE BENEFIT OF YOUR EXPERIENCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF DOCUMENTS OF HISTORICAL AND FORENSIC SIGNIFICANCE. SUBSEQUENTLY, YOU WERE KIND ENOUGH TO PROVIDE US WITH ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN THE FORMS OF LETTERS AND FOLLOW UP DISCUSSIONS WITH THE STAFF. AGAIN ON FEBRUARY 11TH SOME OF YOU TRAVELED TO LOS ANGELES TO REQUEST THE RELEASE OF SOME PORTION OF THE INVESTIGATION. IN THE PROCESS LEADING UP TO TODAY WE HAVE GIVEN MUCH THOUGHT TO YOUR CONCERNS AND YOUR INPUT.

WE NOW WISH TO MAKE AVAILABLE ANOTHER BRIEF OPPORTUNITY FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE ASKED TO SPEAK TO ADDRESS THE QUESTION OF THE RELEASE OF THE SUMMARY AND THE RELEASE OF THE 50,000 DOCUMENTS IN THE BASE FILE. I WOULD ASK THAT THOSE OF YOU WHO SHARE A

1 SIMILAR CONCERN NOMINATE A MEMBER OF YOUR GROUP TO
2 SPEAK ON YOUR BEHALF SO THAT WE CAN MOVE MOST
3 EXPEDITIOUSLY THROUGH THIS PROCESS. I BELIEVE THAT
4 THOSE OF YOU WHO HAVE ASKED TO SPEAK HAVE SUBMITTED
5 CARDS. AND SGT. JACKSON WOULD YOU CALL THOSE PEOPLE
6 WHO HAVE REQUESTED AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK.

7 MR. LAWRENCE TEETER: THANK YOU. IT IS MY
8 UNDERSTANDING THAT THE COMMISSION PLANS TO RELEASE
9 THE 50,000-VOLUME SUMMARY TODAY IN REDACTED FORM, AND
10 ALSO INTENDS TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL WHEREBY THE
11 REMAINDER OF THE ROBERT F. KENNEDY FILES IN THIS
12 MATTER WILL BE RELEASED TO AN APPROPRIATE ARCHIVAL
13 FACILITY AFTER REDACTION PROCESS HAS BEEN COMPLETED.
14 I SIMPLY WANT TO ADDRESS MYSELF TO SOME OF THE
15 CONCERNS VERY BRIEFLY REGARDING THAT PROCESS. IN
16 YEARS PAST CBS, INC. SUED EDWARD DAVIS IN HIS
17 CAPACITY AS THE CHIEF OF POLICE FOR ACCESS TO THESE
18 FILES, AND AS PART OF THAT LAWSUIT THE AUTHOR OF A
19 BOOK ABOUT THIS CASE, CHIEF DETECTIVE ROBERT HALPIN
20 EXECUTED AN AFFIDAVIT IN WHICH HE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT
21 THAT BOOK WAS WRITTEN WITH THE EXPRESS PERMISSION OF
22 THE THEN HIERARCHY OF THE LOS ANGELES POLICE
23 DEPARTMENT. AND THAT FURTHERMORE DURING THE
24 AUTHORSHIP OF THAT BOOK HIS CO-AUTHOR WAS SHOWN
25 VARIOUS UNSPECIFIED ITEMS FROM THE FILES OF THE
26 SPECIAL UNIT SENATOR THAT INVESTIGATED THIS CASE.

27 I WOULD TAKE THE POSITION THAT THAT PERMANENT
28 OF PORTIONS OF THE FBI FILE OR THE WENT A FURTHER

1 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE THAT I HAVE DIRECTED YOUR
2 ATTENTION TO LAST TIME AS A WAIVER OF THIS DEPART-
3 MENT'S CAPACITY TO ASSERT ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT
4 PRIVILEGES AS A JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILING TO DISCLOSE
5 PORTIONS OF THE FILES THAT THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT
6 OTHERWISE WISH TO WITHHOLD.

7 I THINK THERE HAS TO BE A DISTINCTION
8 BETWEEN MATERIAL THAT IS PRIVILEGED WITH RESPECT TO A
9 PERSON WHO HAS PROVIDED THAT INFORMATION TO THE
10 DEPARTMENT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PRIVILEGES. CLEARLY A
11 LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY HAS A STANDING TO WAIVE THE
12 LAW ENFORCEMENT PRIVILEGE CHARACTER OF MATERIAL BY
13 RELEASING IT IN THE PAST TO A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC.
14 IT DOESN'T HAVE STANDING TO WAIVE PRIVILEGES THAT
15 BELONG TO THIRD PARTIES SUCH AS THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT
16 PRIVILEGE OR THE PATRON PRIVILEGE OR THE LIKE. BUT
17 IT DOES HAVE THE CAPACITY AND THE LEGAL STANDING AND
18 CAPABILITY TO WAIVE LAW ENFORCE- MENT PRIVILEGES BY
19 MAKING THOSE RELEASES. I BELIEVE THAT THE DEPARTMENT
20 HAS ALREADY DONE SO. AND, THEREFORE, THE REDACTION
21 PROCESS SHOULD PROCEED WITH THAT IN MIND AND SHOULD
22 ACCOMPLISH THE EXCISION ONLY OF MATERIAL THAT IS
23 PRIVILEGED WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE WHO PROVIDED
24 THAT INFORMATION TO THE DEPART- MENT, NOT LAW
25 ENFORCEMENT PRIVILEGES, BECAUSE I THINK THOSE
26 PRIVILEGES HAVE BEEN WAIVED. THANK YOU.

27 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU.

28 MR. JACK KIMBROUGH: EUTHENISMS WERE

1 CREATED TO REPLACE UNPLEASANT WORKERS. THE EUTHENISM
2 WE HAVE HERE TODAY IS REDACTION. REDACTION IS A
3 COVER WORD FOR CENSORSHIP. THAT'S UNPLEASANT, BUT
4 THAT'S WHAT WE ARE PROPOSING TO DO. THEY ARE GOING
5 TO CENSOR HISTORY. THEY ARE GOING TO GIVE US A BUNCH
6 OF BLANK PAPER. I CAN GET THAT BY GOING TO A
7 STATIONARY STORE. BUT ON TOP OF THAT WE ALREADY KNOW
8 THE REAL KILLER. AND A LOT OF OTHER PEOPLE TOO. BUT
9 WE KNOW THE SHOOTER AND MANY PEOPLE KNOW THE SHOOTER.
10 IT APPEARED IN PEOPLE'S ALMANAC. MILLIONS KNOW THAT
11 THERE WERE AT LEAST 13 SHOTS, AND THAT MEANS THERE
12 WAS MORE THAN ONE GUN. MILLIONS OF PEOPLE KNOW THIS.
13 AND A LOT MORE ARE GOING TO KNOW IT BECAUSE IT'S
14 GOING TO GET IN THE GENNIS BOOK OF RECORDS. I SENT A
15 PERSONAL LETTER TO EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENTIRE
16 CONGRESS, STATE LEGISLATURE, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
17 THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE LAST THREE DISTRICT
18 ATTORNEYS. THAT IS A RECORD. SO DO WHATEVER YOUR
19 CONSCIENCE DICTATES.

20 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU.

21 MR. GREGORY STONE: I HAVE COME HERE FROM
22 WASHINGTON, D.C. TO MAKE THIS APPEARANCE BECAUSE OF
23 MY CONCERN WHICH HAS LASTED OVER A PERIOD OF MORE
24 THAN A DECADE WITH THE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS
25 SURROUNDING THE ASSASSINATION OF ROBERT KENNEDY. I
26 DON'T AGREE THAT THOSE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS ARE
27 ANSWERED. I DO BELIEVE THAT IT IS PROFOUNDLY
28 IMPORTANT THAT ALL STEPS BE TAKEN TO GAIN RESPONSIBLE

1 AND SERIOUS AND SATISFACTORY ANSWERS TO THE
2 FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE.

3 ON FEBRUARY 12TH PAUL SCHRADER, PROFESSOR
4 PHILIP MELANSON AND I SUBMITTED A PROPOSAL WHICH WE
5 HOPE HAS BEEN AND WILL BE CONSIDERED VERY CAREFULLY
6 BY THE COMMISSION IN THE DECISIONS IT TAKES TODAY.
7 WHAT IS IMPORTANT ABOUT TODAY IS NOT A 3 PERCENT
8 SUMMARY OF THE FILE, WHICH IS GOING TO BE RELEASED OR
9 EXPECTED TO BE RELEASED. WHAT IS IMPORTANT ABOUT
10 THIS CASE IS THE 97 PERCENT OF MATERIAL WHICH REMAINS
11 WITHHELD, AND WITH RESPECT TO WHICH WE URGE AND
12 IMPLORE THE COMMISSION TO MOVE EFFICIENTLY AND WITH
13 ALL DELIBERATE SPEED TO MAKE AVAILABLE. THE 97
14 PERCENT FILE IS CRITICAL. THE 3 PERCENT FILE WILL
15 HELP US VERY LITTLE IN UNDERSTANDING THESE FUNDA-
16 MENTAL QUESTIONS.

17 VERY BRIEFLY, WE URGE THAT REDACTION
18 CONTINUE AND BE ACCELERATED BECAUSE THE CURRENT PACE
19 CALLS FOR RELEASE WITHIN 20 YEARS OF THE 50,000 PAGES.
20 THAT IS NOT SATISFACTORY. WE URGE THAT THERE BE AN
21 OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC INPUT AND REVIEW WITH RESPECT
22 TO THE CITY ATTORNEY'S PROPOSAL, WHICH I UNDERSTAND
23 WILL BE INCLUDED WITH THE DOCUMENTS RELEASED TODAY SO
24 THAT THE PUBLIC HAS AN OPPORTUNITY WHEN THE REDACTION
25 OF THE 50,000 PAGES TAKES PLACE TO HAVE SOME SPECIFIC,
26 SERIOUS INPUT IN THAT PROCESS.

27 WE URGE THAT THE PROCESS BE OPEN IN THE
28 FUTURE IN THE WAY THAT IT HAS NOT BEEN IN THE LAST

1 SEVEN MONTHS. AND WE URGE THAT TIME TABLES AND
2 TARGET DATES BE ENUNCIATED BY THE COMMISSION SO THAT
3 WE WILL KNOW THAT THIS PROCESS WILL NOT DRAG ON AND
4 ON FOR 20 YEARS, THAT WE CAN RESOLVE THE DISCLOSURE
5 IN 2 OR 3 YEARS. THANK YOU, VERY MUCH.

6 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU, MR. STONE.

7 DAVID MENDELSON: I'M DAVID MENDELSON. AND
8 I SPOKE TO YOU IN JULY. I CAME FROM NEW YORK TO
9 SPEAK TO YOU AGAIN. I AM REALLY DISTRESSED THAT WE
10 ARE ONLY GIVEN 2 MINUTES TO SPEAK TO YOU. IN JULY
11 YOU EXPRESSED SUCH RESPECT FOR SOME OF THE PEOPLE
12 THAT SPOKE, NOT MYSELF SO MUCH AS I THINK FROM DR.
13 MELANSON AND OTHERS WHO HAVE EXPERIENCE IN THESE
14 KINDS OF PROCESSES. AND OVER THE LAST 7 MONTHS IT
15 SEEMS LIKE, NOT SEEMS LIKE, I KNOW THEY HAVE WRITTEN
16 YOU DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS AS YOU ASKED, AND NOT
17 ONE OF THE LETTERS WERE ANSWERED, NOT ONE. AND SO I
18 GUESS I SHOULD NOT BE SURPRISED THAT WE ARE ONLY
19 GIVEN 2 MINUTES TO DISCUSS WHAT HAS HAPPENED OVER
20 THAT PERIOD OF TIME.

21 THE DEATH OF ROBERT KENNEDY WAS A MAJOR
22 EVENT IN THE HISTORY OF THIS COUNTRY. AND IT
23 RESULTED IN THE ELECTION OF RICHARD NIXON IN HIS
24 PLACE. AND AS ANYONE WHO IS FAMILIAR WITH THE RECORD
25 THAT HAS BEEN RELEASED KNOWS THERE ARE MAJOR
26 INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE EVIDENCE THAT'S BEEN
27 RELEASED BY THE F.B.I. AND EVEN BY LAPD AND THE
28 THEORY THAT ONLY SIRHAN WAS FIRING A GUN.

1 AND I AM VERY CONCERNED THAT IT HAS NOT
2 BEEN AN OPEN PROCESS, AND THAT WE DON'T KNOW EVEN NOW
3 WHAT THE REDACTION CRITERIA WERE. I THINK IT'S
4 UNFORTUNATELY OUTRAGEOUS THAT YOU COULDN'T EVEN LET
5 US KNOW A WEEK IN ADVANCE WHAT THE REDACTION CRITERIA
6 WERE. I UNDERSTAND THERE IS A FIVE-PAGE LETTER
7 THAT'S GOING TO BE RELEASED, BUT IT MAKES IT
8 IMPOSSIBLE FOR THESE EXPERTS WHO YOU YOURSELF SAID
9 SHOULD BE PART OF THE PROCESS TO EVEN SPEAK FOR 2
10 MINUTES NOW IN REACTION TO THAT. AND I HOPE THAT IN
11 THE FUTURE THE REDACTION PROCESS WILL BE OPEN TO THE
12 PUBLIC, AND THAT WE CAN GET THESE ISSUES RESOLVED
13 FINALLY. I DON'T LIKE TO COME OUT HERE AT MY OWN
14 EXPENSE AND TAKE TIME OFF FROM WORK TO DO THIS. BUT
15 IT'S IMPORTANT, AND I HOPE THAT WE CAN MOVE FORWARD
16 IN THE FUTURE. AGAIN THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE STEPS
17 YOU HAVE TAKEN. I DO APPRECIATE THAT SOMEBODY HAS
18 BEEN DONE THAT.

19 PAUL SCHRADE: THERE ARE THOSE OF US WHO
20 HAVE COME BEFORE THIS COMMISSION LAST YEAR, THIS YEAR
21 AND TEN YEARS AGO AS I DID IN AN ATTEMPT TO GET THE
22 KIND OF INFORMATION NECESSARY TO MAKE THE HISTORICAL
23 RECORD AND TO CONTINUE THE INVESTIGATION INTO THOSE
24 SERIOUS QUESTIONS THAT STILL DISTURB MANY AMERICANS
25 ABOUT WHAT HAPPENED THAT NIGHT OF JUNE 5TH. I HAVE
26 JUST GIVEN TO CHIEF GATES THE LOS ANGELES POLICE
27 DEPARTMENT'S SKETCH OF THOSE OF US IN THE ROOM THAT
28 NIGHT WHO WERE WOUNDED. THERE WERE FIVE OF US

1 BESIDES ROBERT KENNEDY. I GAVE HIM THE AUDIT OF THE
2 BULLETS, AND I GAVE HIM POLICE PHOTOGRAPHS WHERE THEY
3 SIMULATED THE BULLET FLIGHT THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO HAVE
4 GONE INTO MY HEAD. AND I CHALLENGE CHIEF GATES NOW,
5 FIRST OF ALL TO COME OUT WITH THE WHOLE RECORD. BUT
6 FROM HIS OWN EVIDENCE TO SHOW HOW THAT BULLET PASSING
7 THROUGH ROBERT KENNEDY'S COAT AND SIMULATED IN THESE
8 PHOTOGRAPHS COULD EVER HAVE GOTTEN INTO MY HEAD.
9 BECAUSE IF THAT IS NOT THE CASE AND THE RECORD MAY
10 SHOW IT'S THE CASE AND MAY AGREE WITH THE POLICE
11 DEPARTMENT'S VERSION, THEN I WILL SAY THAT QUESTION
12 HAS BEEN ANSWERED, BUT IT'S UNANSWERED AT THIS POINT.
13 BECAUSE IF IT'S NOT ANSWERED BY THE RECORD OR BY ANY
14 OTHER EVIDENCE, THAT DOES SUPPORT THE 2-GUN THEORY.
15 BECAUSE THE POLICE AUDIT OF THE BULLET, WHICH I ALSO
16 GAVE HIM FOR THE EIGHT BULLETS FROM THE SIRHAN GUN,
17 ANY VARIATIONS FROM THAT REPORT MEANS THERE WAS A
18 SECOND GUN FIRING IN THERE THAT NIGHT.

19 THESE ARE THE KINDS OF QUESTIONS THAT HAVE
20 GONE UNANSWERED, AND THEY HAVE GONE UNANSWERED
21 BECAUSE THIS POLICE COMMISSION FOR 17 YEARS HAS
22 REFUSED TO GIVE UP RECORDS THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN UP IN
23 EVERY CASE THAT WE KNOW. IN THE JOHN KENNEDY CASE,
24 THE MARTIN LUTHER KING CASE, THE RECORD HAS BEEN MADE.
25 THE PUBLIC HAS BEEN INFORMED. THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO
26 KNOW HAS BEEN MET. BUT THIS COMMISSION, THIS POLICE
27 DEPARTMENT, THIS CITY HAS SCANDALOUSLY REFUSED TO PUT
28 THOSE RECORDS INTO THE PUBLIC ARENA. THE RECORDS ACT,

1 THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT DEMANDS AND
2 REQUIRES YOU TO DO THIS. SO YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF
3 LAW EVEN THOUGH YOU ARE SUPPOSED TO BE IN CHARGE OF
4 DEALING WITH LAW VIOLATIONS IN THIS CITY. AND I
5 THINK THAT IS SCANDALOUS TOO.

6 NOW I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE
7 ALTERNATIVES THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE PROPOSING ON
8 THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE, BUT MY TIME IS UP. AND I HOPE
9 THERE IS TIME THAT WE CAN QUESTION YOU ABOUT YOUR
10 PROPOSALS, BECAUSE CERTAINLY YOU HAVE BEEN OPERATING
11 A CLOSED SHOP AS HAS BEEN POINTED OUT HERE ALREADY IN
12 YOUR DEALINGS WITH US WHO ARE INTERESTED FOR
13 HISTORICAL OR INVESTIGATORY REASONS IN THIS CASE.

14 MS. SCHLEI: MR. SCHRADER, IF YOU WOULD LIKE
15 TO TAKE ANOTHER MOMENT TO ADVISE US AS TO THOSE
16 QUESTIONS WE CERTAINLY WOULD LIKE TO HEAR THEM.

17 MR. SCHRADER: YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT -- THIS
18 IS AN AGENDA ITEM, SO WE HAVE ONLY THE INFORMATION
19 THAT IS IN THE AGENDA ITEM. I HAVE TALKED TO A LOT
20 OF PEOPLE IN THE PRESS THE LAST TWO DAYS. THEY ARE
21 CONCERNED TOO, BECAUSE YOU DID NOT EMBARGO THE 10-
22 VOLUME SUMMARY SO THEY COULD REVIEW IT AND REPORT
23 ADEQUATELY TO THE PUBLIC. IT'S ANOTHER VIOLATION OF
24 THE PUBLIC TRUST. WE DON'T HAVE A CHANCE TO EVEN SEE
25 THE FIVE PAGES OF SCREENING AND REDACTION STANDARDS
26 THAT ARE GOING TO BE SET IN CONCRETE BY THIS
27 COMMISSION AS PROPOSED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.
28 AND YOU ASKED US FOR IDEAS ABOUT THAT. WE SUBMITTED

1 IDEAS ABOUT IT, NEVER HEARD FROM YOU. THIS IS NOT
2 ONLY DISCOURTEOUS, IT'S NOT DOING THE PUBLIC BUSINESS
3 IN A RESPONSIBLE WAY. AND WE WANT THAT QUESTION
4 ANSWERED AS WELL.

5 AS FAR AS THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE IS
6 CONCERNED YOU DON'T ANSWER THE QUESTION OF WHO HAS
7 AUTHORITY. WHO OWNS THESE RECORDS AT THAT POINT?
8 ARE THEY STILL HELD BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, WHICH
9 HAS BEEN SUPPRESSING THEM FOR 17 YEARS OR DO THEY
10 PASS TO THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE OR DO THEY PASS TO THE
11 REPOSITORY THAT THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE IS SUPPOSED TO
12 SELECT? WHAT ABOUT THOSE STANDARDS? ARE THEY OPEN
13 FOR DISCUSSION? ARE YOU GOING TO HOLD PUBLIC
14 HEARINGS ON THEM OR IS THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE HOLDING
15 PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THEM OR ARE THEY GOING TO BE
16 SET IN CONCRETE? ARE THEY IN LINE WITH THE PUBLIC
17 RECORDS ACT?

18 THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF COURT DECISIONS WHICH
19 SAYS THAT THE CALIFORNIA ACT WHICH REQUIRES YOU TO
20 PUT THIS INFORMATION INTO THE PUBLIC SECTOR HAS THE
21 SAME STANDARDS AS THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT,
22 WHICH IS THE FEDERAL STATUTES. DO THE STANDARDS
23 REFLECT THAT? ARE YOU DOING SOMETHING ILLEGAL AGAIN
24 BY RESTRICTING THE FLOW OF INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC
25 AS YOU HAVE DONE OVER THE LAST 17 YEARS? WHAT IS THE
26 TIME SCHEDULE? ARE WE TALKING ABOUT 1500 PAGES IN
27 THAT 10-VOLUME SUMMARY, WHICH IS ALREADY PUBLISHED IN
28 A BOOK BY CHIEF OF DETECTIVES HOUTON? IN 1970 HE

1 BASED HIS BOOK ON THAT RECORD. AND YOU ARE NOT
2 GIVING US ANYTHING NEW TODAY IN THAT RECORD. THAT IS
3 ONLY THE POLICE SUMMARY OF ITS INVESTIGATION, WHICH
4 SUPPORTS PARTICULAR CONCLUSIONS OF THE POLICE
5 DEPARTMENT, WHICH ARE OPEN TO QUESTION. SO YOU ARE
6 DOING A PUBLIC RELATIONS GESTURE HERE TO SAY OH, WE
7 ARE GOING TO PROVIDE 1500 PAGES. IT'S ALREADY IN
8 THIS BOOK, WHICH IS 17 YEARS OLD, OR 16 YEARS OLD.
9 SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOUR GAME IS. SO, WE HAVE THESE
10 QUESTIONS.

11 WE ALSO WANT TO KNOW WHO IS GOING TO PAY
12 FOR THE SCREENING OF THE REDACTION? IS THE POLICE
13 COMMISSION AUTHORIZING THE MONEY AS IT MUST UNDER THE
14 PUBLIC RECORDS ACT OR IS THE MAYOR'S COMMITTEE OR IS
15 THE INSTITUTION THAT IS GOING TO BE SELECTED BY THE
16 MAYOR'S COMMITTEE SUPPOSED TO COME UP WITH THE MONEY?

17 THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUIRES YOU TO PUT
18 THESE PAPERS INTO THE PUBLIC ARENA AS IN THE KING
19 CASE AND IN THE JOHN KENNEDY CASE. YET, YOU ARE NOT
20 DOING THAT. YOU HAVE THIS AMBIGUOUS PROPOSAL HERE,
21 WHICH WE HAVE NO CHANCE TO DISCUSS WITH YOU BECAUSE
22 WE ARE LIMITED ON TIME. YOU ROLL THOSE PROPOSALS OUT
23 TO US AND EXPECT US TO COOPERATE WITH YOU TO ACCEPT
24 YOUR DECISIONS. THERE IS NO PUBLIC DIALOGUE HERE.
25 YOU ARE A PUBLIC COMMISSION. BUT YOU ACT LIKE YOU
26 OWN THESE RECORDS AND THAT THE PUBLIC DOES NOT, AND
27 THE PUBLIC DOES ACCORDING TO LAW.

28 I THINK IT IS A SITUATION WHERE YOUR

1 ARROGANCE OF POWER IS REALLY IMPRESSING THE PEOPLE IN
2 THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY AND THROUGHOUT THE NATION
3 NOW, THAT THEY ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE PUBLIC SERVANTS
4 AND SHOULD BE. AND THAT IS WHY 20 PERCENT OF THE
5 PEOPLE GO TO THE POLES IN THE CITY ELECTION, AND ONLY
6 50 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE GO TO THE POLES IN THE
7 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN THIS COUNTRY, BECAUSE OF THE
8 ACTIONS LIKE YOURS. SO WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THIS,
9 AND WE ARE ANGRY ABOUT IT. BUT WE HAVE TO BE ANGRY
10 ABOUT IT. AND JUSTICE ALWAYS IS. AND I THINK WE ARE
11 BEING TREATED UNJUSTLY.

12 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU, MR. SCHRADER.

13 JACK CORBIN: MY NAME IS JACK CORBIN. I
14 COME FROM SOUTHBEND, INDIANA. AND I'M REPRESENTING
15 TWO ORGANIZATIONS. ONE IS THE ASSASSINATION ARCHIVES
16 AND RESEARCH CENTER IN WASHINGTON. AND THE OTHER IS
17 WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE IN SPRINGFIELD,
18 MASSACHUSETTS. I'M WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE
19 PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THAT INSTITUTION
20 TO DEVELOP A NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER FOR THE STUDY
21 OF AMERICAN POLITICAL ASSASSINATIONS. I HAVE
22 CORRESPONDED WITH THE BOARD BEFORE AND HAVE OFFERED
23 MY ASSISTANCE IN RESOLVING THIS ISSUE.

24 I WANT TO POINT OUT A COMPARISON TO THE
25 WARREN COMMISSION. IN SEPTEMBER OF 1964 THE WARREN
26 COMMISSION ISSUED A 1-VOLUME REPORT WHICH WAS IN
27 ESSENCE A SUMMARY OF THEIR WORK. THAT WAS
28 APPROXIMATELY NINE MONTHS AFTER THEY BEGAN THEIR WORK.

1 BUT IT WAS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWED BY 26 VOLUMES OF
2 EXHIBITS AND TESTIMONY, AND THEN A LATER RELEASE OF
3 OTHER INFORMATION THROUGHOUT THE REST OF THE DECADE
4 AND INTO THE NINETEEN SEVENTIES.

5 ALMOST 18 YEARS AFTER ROBERT KENNEDY'S
6 ASSASSINATION WE ARE ONLY GETTING A SUMMARY REPORT,
7 WHICH AS INDICATED EARLIER IS A 3 PERCENT SUMMARY.
8 THE REST OF THE MATERIAL, 97 PERCENT, IS STILL BEING
9 WITHHELD. THIS IS REALLY THE MEAT AND POTATOES OF
10 THE CASE. I THINK IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT THE
11 DISCLOSURE BE MADE. I'M WILLING AS ARE OTHERS IN
12 THIS ROOM TO ASSIST YOU IN THAT PROCESS. I THINK YOU
13 SHOULD SPECIFICALLY HAVE A TIME TABLE AS TO WHEN THIS
14 WOULD BE DONE. I THINK AS FAR AS A REPOSITORY FOR
15 THIS I WOULD BE WILLING TO HELP YOU WITH SUGGESTIONS
16 THERE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE MATERIAL THAT YOU
17 ALREADY HAVE. I'M WONDERING HOW MUCH OF THAT
18 MATERIAL HAS BEEN DAMAGED. THE TAPE AND PHOTOGRAPHS,
19 HOW THEY MAY HAVE BEEN DESTROYED OR PERHAPS
20 DETERIORATED OVER THE THE LAST 18 YEARS. SO I'M
21 CONCERNED ABOUT THAT TOO. THANK YOU.

22 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU, MR. CORBIN.

23 CATHERINE LESLIE: GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M AN
24 ATTORNEY FOR THE ACLU, AND I AM HERE TO EXPRESS OUR
25 CONCERNS FOR THE FAILURE OF THE POLICE COMMISSION TO
26 RELEASE THESE DOCUMENTS. WE THINK THIS FAILURE IS
27 DEFINITELY EVIDENCE OF A VIOLATION OF THE SPIRIT OF
28 THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT, IF NOT THE LAW ITSELF. AT

1 THIS POINT RATHER THAN REITERATE WHAT EVERYONE HAS
2 SAID, I JUST WANT TO EXPRESS OUR SERIOUS CONCERN THAT
3 THESE DOCUMENTS ARE RELEASED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO
4 THE PUBLIC. THANK YOU, VERY MUCH.

5 MS. SCHLEI: THANK YOU, MS. LESLIE.

6 OVER THE PAST SEVERAL MONTHS MEMBERS OF A
7 SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE LOS ANGELES POLICE
8 COMMISSION COMPRISED OF THE COMMISSION'S PRESIDENT,
9 MR. TALCOTT, AND MYSELF ALONG WITH THE DEPARTMENT,
10 COMMISSION STAFF, MR. LEW UNGER OF THE CITY
11 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, HAVE DELIBERATED ON THE ISSUES
12 INVOLVED IN THE RELEASE OF THE SUMMARY OF THE
13 LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT'S INVESTIGATION OF THE
14 ASSASSINATION OF SENATOR KENNEDY. ALL OF THE
15 MATERIALS, ALL OF THE CORRESPONDENCE, AND ALL OF THE
16 RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH WE RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC
17 WERE CONSIDERED IN THE COURSE OF THIS PROCESS. WE
18 ARE GRATEFUL FOR THAT INPUT.

19 AS HAS BEEN TESTIFIED HERE TODAY ACCESS TO
20 INFORMATION CONCERNING HOW GOVERNMENT WORKS IS A
21 FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT OF EVERY PERSON IN THIS STATE. FOR
22 THAT REASON WE SOUGHT IN THIS PROCESS TO REDACT AS
23 LITTLE AS POSSIBLE FROM THE SUMMARY. THE PUBLIC HAS
24 A RIGHT TO THE FACTS REGARDING THIS GREAT TRAGEDY.

25 STANDARDS FOR REDACTION WERE DEVELOPED BY
26 THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. WE SPENT A GREAT DEAL OF
27 TIME ON THIS PROCESS, BECAUSE WE WANTED NOT ONLY TO
28 REDACT THIS SUMMARY, BUT ALSO TO SET UP STANDARDS FOR

1 THE MORE THAN 50,000 DOCUMENTS THAT ARE THE BASE FILE
2 OF THE INVESTIGATION. FINALLY, WE DETERMINED THAT
3 THERE WERE ONLY TWO EXEMPTIONS PROPERLY CLAIMED IN
4 THE KENNEDY REPORT. ONE INVOLVES THE RIGHT OF
5 PRIVACY. THE OTHER, CONCERNS OF GOVERNMENTAL
6 PRIVILEGE.

7 MOST OF THE REDACTIONS IN THIS SUMMARY OF
8 THE KENNEDY INVESTIGATION WERE BASED ON AN
9 INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO PRIVACY. WHAT DO WE MEAN BY
10 PRIVACY? SOMEONE'S HOME ADDRESS, THEIR TELEPHONE
11 NUMBER, THAT SOMEONE IN THE AGONY OF THIS TERRIBLE
12 MOMENT MAY HAVE USED VULGAR OR NASTY LANGUAGE? I
13 DON'T BELIEVE THAT ANY ANYTHING WAS CUT OUT, REDACTED
14 THAT WOULD SHED ANY LIGHT ON THE ASSASSINATION ITSELF.

15 LET ME TELL YOU WHAT THAT PROCESS WAS. THE
16 REDACTION WAS ACTUALLY DONE BY THE DEPARTMENT STAFF
17 WORKING WITH MR. UNGER OF THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.
18 WHEN THEY CAME TO A HARD QUESTION THAT QUESTION WAS
19 PRESENTED TO COMMISSIONER TALCOTT AND ME FOR A FINAL
20 DETERMINATION. IF THE REPORT HAS A NUMBER 1 NEXT TO
21 THE REDACTION OR HAS NO NUMBER NEXT TO THE REDACTION
22 THE BASIS FOR THE REDACTION WAS THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY.
23 ALL REDACTIONS BASED ON AN ASSERTION OF GOVERNMENTAL
24 PRIVILEGE WILL HAVE A NUMBER 2 NEXT TO THE REDACTION.
25 THESE ARE REDACTIONS TO PROTECT INFORMATION OBTAINED
26 WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IT WOULD BE KEPT
27 CONFIDENTIAL OR TO PROTECT GOVERNMENT INTERESTS BY
28 NOT RELEASING INFORMATION WHICH WOULD DIVULGE

1 CONFIDENTIAL INVESTIGATIVE TECHNIQUES OR CONFIDENTIAL
2 INFORMANTS.

3 THE LAST PAGE OF THE REDACTION PROCESS
4 DEALT WITH THE INDEXES. THE SUMMARY ORIGINALLY WAS
5 IN 10 VOLUMES. VOLUME 9, WHICH WAS 118 PAGES IN
6 LENGTH, CONSTITUTED AN INDEX FOR VOLUMES 1 THROUGH 8.
7 VOLUME 10, A SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT, CONTAINED ITS OWN
8 4-PAGE INDEX. BOTH OF THESE INDEXES WERE SIMPLY
9 ALPHABETICAL LISTINGS OF NAMES REFERENCING EVERY PAGE
10 ON WHICH THAT NAME APPEAR. IT WAS DETERMINED THAT
11 THE REDACTION OF THOSE INDEXES WOULD BE EXCESSIVELY
12 BURDENSOME AND WOULD OUTWEIGH ANY PUBLIC INTEREST
13 SERVED BY DISCLOSING THOSE RECORDS. THOSE INDEXES,
14 THEREFORE, WERE REMOVED IN THEIR ENTIRETY UNDER THE
15 AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6255.
16 THE TABLE OF CONTENTS, HOWEVER, TO THE SUMMARY
17 APPEARS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SUMMARY. THE
18 REDACTION PROCESS HAS NOW BEEN COMPLETED.

19 SEVENTY-FIVE COPIES OF THE SUMMARY HAVE
20 THUS FAR BEEN PRINTED AND MORE WILL BE AVAILABLE IN
21 THE NEAR FUTURE. WE HAVE ALSO PROVIDED PRINTING
22 INSTRUCTIONS EXPLAINING THAT MANNER IN WHICH
23 INTERESTED CITIZENS CAN OBTAIN A COPY OF THE SUMMARY
24 FOLLOWING ANY ACTION BY THIS BOARD. THE REDACTIVE
25 MATERIAL HAS BEEN BOUND INTO THREE BOOKS WHICH WILL
26 CONSTITUTE A SINGLE COPY OF THE SUMMARY. THE RECORDS
27 AND IDENTIFICATION DIVISION ON THE SECOND FLOOR OF
28 PARKER CENTER IS PREPARED TO SELL COPIES FOR \$150 A

1 PIECE TO CITIZENS WHO MAKE THEIR REQUESTS IN PERSON.
2 THAT FEE HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
3 PROVISIONS OF THE CITY ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. R & I
4 WILL ALSO HONOR MAIL REQUESTS WITH AN ADDITIONAL
5 CHARGE FOR MAILING. COPIES OF THE 6-PAGE REDACTION
6 STANDARDS PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY, MR. UNGER,
7 ARE ALSO AVAILABLE AT RECORDS AND IDENTIFICATION
8 DIVISION.

9 AS YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE COMMISSIONER TALCOTT
10 AND I WISH TO THANK MR. UNGER, CHIEF GATES AND THE
11 COMMISSION STAFF FOR THEIR EXTENSIVE EFFORTS ON THIS
12 PROJECT. THIS IS BOTH A PROUD AND A VERY SAD MOMENT.
13 SAD BECAUSE IT VIVIDLY BRINGS BACK THE LOSS OUR
14 ENTIRE COUNTRY SUFFERED THAT FATAL NIGHT. SAD
15 BECAUSE THE VERY HISTORY OF THIS NATION WAS
16 DRAMATICALLY CHANGED, AND I BELIEVE FOR THE WORSE.
17 SAD FOR ALL OF US WHO WERE CLOSE TO SENATOR KENNEDY
18 WHO HAD BEEN WITH HIM THAT NIGHT AT THE AMBASSADOR
19 HOTEL. SAD FOR A COUNTRY WHO LOST A BRILLIANT LEADER.

20 WE CAN BE PROUD, I BELIEVE, OF THE
21 EXCEPTIONAL JOB THIS DEPARTMENT HAS DONE, BOTH IN THE
22 INVESTIGATION AND NOW IN MAKING THE REPORT PUBLIC.
23 GOOD GOVERNMENT IS OPEN GOVERNMENT. HOW THE POLICE
24 AND MILITARY CONDUCT THEIR BUSINESS MUST ALWAYS BE
25 OPEN TO PUBLIC SCRUTINY. WE, THEREFORE, RECOMMEND
26 THE FOLLOWING: THAT THE REDACTION SUMMARY OF THE
27 LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION OF
28 SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION BE RELEASED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

BEFORE THE

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OF THE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTION OF ITEM #3-B

MARCH 4, 1986 - PARKER CENTER AUDITORIUM

COMMISSIONERS: MS. BARBARA SCHLEI, VICE-PRESIDENT
MR. SAMUEL L. WILLIAMS, COMMISSIONER
MR. STEPHEN D. YSLAS, COMMISSIONER

APPEARANCES: MR. LAWRENCE TEETER
MR. JACK KIMBROUGH
MR. GREGORY STONE
MR. DAVID MENDELSON
MR. PAUL SCHRADER
MR. JACK CORBIN
MS. CATHERINE LESLIE

LILLIE E. WILSON
HEARING REPORTER

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

.....

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MS. SCHLEI: WE WILL NOW ADDRESS ITEM 3-B,
THE RELEASE OF THE COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF SENATOR
KENNEDY'S ASSASSINATION. CONSISTENT WITH THE
COMMITMENT THAT THIS BOARD MADE LAST JULY THE
SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS, PRESIDENT TALCOTT, MYSELF, MR.
UNGER, AND THE DEPARTMENT AND COMMISSION STAFF HAVE
STUDIED THE ISSUE OF REDACTING AND RELEASING THE MORE
THAN 50,000 DOCUMENTS WHICH CONSTITUTE THE FULL
INVESTIGATION. THE STANDARDS FOR REDACTION
DEVELOPED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE AND USED FOR
THE 15,000-PAGE SUMMARY WILL FORM THE BASIS FOR
REDACTING THE EXTENSIVE BODY OF MATERIAL IN THE
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT. HOWEVER, THAT REDACTION CANNOT
BE VIEWED AS A ONE TIME PROCESS.

PROPER ADMINISTRATION OF THIS MATERIAL OVER
TIME WILL DICTATE THAT REVIEW AND REDACTION BE AN
ON-GOING PROCESS WHICH WILL REQUIRE DIFFERING
DECISIONS AT DIFFERENT POINTS IN TIME. FOR INSTANCE,
AS TIME PASSES INDIVIDUALS ENTITLED TO CERTAIN
PRIVACY EXCEPTIONS DIE. AND THE REDACTION OF
INFORMATION RELATING TO THEM MAY NO LONGER BE
JUSTIFIED. EVENTUALLY, PRACTICALLY ALL OF THE
INFORMATION WILL BE SUBJECT TO RELEASE. FURTHER, THE
REDACTION STANDARDS THEMSELVES WILL SURELY REQUIRE
ADDITIONS AND AMENDMENTS AS NEW MATERIAL AND ISSUES
WHICH DID NOT ARISE DURING THE REDACTION OF THE

1 SUMMARY DO ARISE WHEN WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF
2 REDACTING THE BASE FILES. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE SUCH
3 CONSIDERATION THAT WILL HAVE TO BE LOOKED AT IS
4 WHETHER THE LAW ENFORCEMENT PRIVILEGE HAS BEEN WAIVED.
5 WE HAVE ALREADY REVIEWED THE ISSUE OF THE AUTOPSY
6 PHOTOGRAPHS AND DETERMINED THAT THEY WILL NOT BE MADE
7 PUBLIC. THE MATTER OF SELECTING THE REPOSITORY FOR
8 THE REDACTED INVESTIGATION WAS ONE WHICH MANY OF YOU
9 HAVE EXPRESSED STRONG INTERESTS IN AND STRONG
10 CONCERNS ABOUT.

11 THE SUBCOMMITTEE HAS CONCLUDED THAT THE
12 POLICE DEPARTMENT POSSESSES NEITHER THE EXPERTISE NOR
13 THE MANPOWER TO REVIEW, REDACT AND ADMINISTER AN
14 ARCHIVE OF THIS MAGNITUDE, NOR COULD WE DO A THOROUGH
15 JOB IN STUDYING ALL OF THE ISSUES INHERENT IN
16 SELECTING AN APPROPRIATE REPOSITORY. WHEN SUCH
17 INVESTIGATIVE MATERIAL IS MADE PUBLIC IT IS NO LONGER
18 A POLICE MATTER. THE ISSUE OF MAINTAINING AND
19 PROVIDING ACCESS TO IT ARE LEGAL AND HISTORICAL IN
20 NATURE. THEREFORE, YOUR SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDS AS
21 FOLLOWS: THAT THIS BOARD APPROVE THE RELEASE OF THE
22 FULL INVESTIGATION INTO THE SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY
23 ASSASSINATION SUBJECT TO REDACTIONS CONSISTENT WITH
24 THE GUIDELINES DEVELOPED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY AND
25 AMENDED AS FOUND SUITABLE AND NECESSARY DURING THE
26 REDACTION PROCESS TO ADDRESS NEW MATERIAL OR NEW
27 ISSUES THAT DID NOT ARISE DURING THE REDACTION OF THE
28 SUMMARY. WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THIS BOARD ASK

1 MAYOR BRADLEY TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE WHO WILL BE
2 RESPONSIBLE FOR SELECTING AN APPROPRIATE REPOSITORY
3 FOR THE FULL INVESTIGATION, A PLACE WHERE SCHOLARS,
4 HISTORIANS OR JUST INTERESTED CITIZENS CAN GO AND
5 READ THROUGH THIS VAST HISTORICAL FILE, WHERE THEY
6 CAN BE SAFELY PRESERVED FOR SCHOLARS AND FOR FUTURE
7 GENERATIONS.

8 FINALLY WE RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMITTEE BE
9 COMPOSED OF THE CITY ARCHIVIST, HADAN RUDD (SIC),
10 THE CITY LIBRARIAN, WYMAN JONES, AND THE PRESIDENT OF
11 THE CULTURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION AMA JET MAWA (SIC).
12 WE HAVE ASKED THOSE PEOPLE TO BE PRESENT TODAY SO
13 THEY CAN HEAR THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE BY THE
14 PUBLIC AND CONSIDER THEM IN THEIR DELIBERATIONS.

15 WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE MAYOR
16 CONSIDER ADDING TO THIS COMMITTEE ANY OTHER CITY
17 EXPERTS, ANY OTHER EXPERTS OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OR
18 APPROPRIATE INTERESTED PERSONS AS THE MAYOR MAY DEEM
19 APPROPRIATE. WE RECOMMEND THAT THIS MATERIAL BE
20 FORWARDED TO THE MAYOR TOGETHER WITH ALL OF THE
21 RECOMMENDATIONS AND MATERIALS THAT WE HAVE RECEIVED
22 FROM INTERESTED CITIZENS. THAT THE COMMITTEE SHOULD
23 DEVELOP AN APPROPRIATE TIME TABLE AND TARGET DATES
24 FOR THE RELEASE OF THE MATERIAL AS WELLS AS A
25 CONSIDERATION OF THE PROPER REPOSITORY FOR THE
26 MATERIAL.

27 FINALLY, ON THE QUESTION OF OWNERSHIP LET
28 ME NOTE TO THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS ONE

1 TECHNICAL LEGAL MATTER. THE THRESHHOLD QUESTION THAT
2 MUST BE POSED TO THE CITY ARCHIVIST IS WHETHER THE
3 DOCUMENTS REPRESENTS HISTORICAL RECORDS. IF THEY ARE
4 DEEMED HISTORICAL RECORDS THEY MUST BE PERMANENTLY
5 PRESERVED UNDER THE OWNERSHIP OF THE CITY OF LOS
6 ANGELES. HOWEVER, THE CITY, WHILE RETAINING
7 OWNERSHIP MAY CONTRACT WITH AN OUTSIDE INSTITUTION
8 TO ADMINISTER THESE HISTORICAL RECORDS. IF THEY ARE
9 DEEMED NOT TO BE HISTORICAL THE CITY COULD RETAIN
10 THEM OR DONATE THEM TO AN APPROPRIATE NON-CITY
11 INSTITUTION. THANK YOU, VERY MUCH.

12 MR. YSLAS: SO MOVE.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: SECOND.

14 MS. SCHLEI: IS THERE ANY COMMENT FROM THE
15 BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS? IF NOT, THEN I WOULD
16 LIKE TO CALL FOR A VOTE ON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE
17 SUBCOMMITTEE THAT THE ENTIRE 50,000 BASE DOCUMENTS OF
18 THE KENNEDY INVESTIGATION BE RELEASED, THAT AN
19 APPROPRIATE COMMITTEE BE FORMED BY THE MAYOR TO
20 UNDERTAKE THE STANDARDS FOR REDACTION, THE SELECTION
21 OF A REPOSITORY AND A METHOD FOR REDACTION OF THESE
22 DOCUMENTS.

23 ALL THOSE IN FAVOR?

24 MR. YSLAS: AYE.

25 MR. WILLIAMS: AYE.

26 ALL THOSE OPPOSED?

27 NONE. THE MOTION IS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

28 MR. SCHRADE: CAN WE FIND OUT WHAT THAT

1 TIME SCHEDULE IS FOR GETTING INTO THE RAW FILE AND
2 WHO IS GOING TO PROVIDE THE MONEY FOR REDACTING AND
3 SCREENING OF THE THIS MATERIAL, BECAUSE YOU HAVE
4 STOPPED THE PROCESS RIGHT NOW. YOU HAVE STOPPED
5 SCREENING AND REDACTING WITH THIS REPORT WHICH HAS NO
6 NEW INFORMATION. THE NEW INFORMATION IS IN THE
7 50,000 PAGES. AND I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW YOUR TIME
8 SCHEDULE ON THIS, THE FINANCING OF IT, AND I WOULD
9 ALSO LIKE TO KNOW IF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT IS GOING
10 TO PROVIDE A LIST OF MATERIAL, EVIDENCE THAT WAS
11 DESTROYED OR IS MISSING WHICH THIS COMMISSION IS
12 AWARE OF. AND I HAVE ANSWERS TO THOSE QUESTIONS, AND
13 CHIEF GATES I STILL WANT AN ANSWER TO THAT SHOT THAT
14 YOU SAID WOUND UP IN MY HEAD.

15 MS. SCHLEI: MR. SCHRADE, I WILL HAVE TO
16 RULE YOU OUT OF ORDER AT THIS TIME. AS TO THE
17 QUESTION OF THE TIME TABLE AND THE METHODOLOGY FOR
18 THE RELEASE OF THE 50,000 PAGES THAT MATTER WILL NOW
19 BE DETERMINED BY THE COMMITTEE TO BE SET UP BY MAYOR
20 BRADLEY, AND THAT QUESTION, SIR WILL PROPERLY BE
21 ADDRESSED TO THEM. CONCERNING YOUR LAST QUESTION AS
22 TO ANY MISSING OR DESTROYED DOCUMENTS, THAT IS A
23 QUESTION THAT I HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY HEARD PRESENTED,
24 AND I WILL UNDERTAKE TO LOOK INTO THE ANSWER TO THAT
25 QUESTION.

26 WE HAVE RECEIVED A REQUEST TO SPEAK BY MR.
27 GREG ROBERTS. I WILL HAVE TO RULE THAT REQUEST OUT
28 OF ORDER AS NO LONGER TIMELY. THAT CONCLUDES OUR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS 3-A AND 3-B.

.....