THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR SEAN P. MALONEY
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
STAFF SECRETARY

FROM: MARK F. LINDSAY, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: DRAFT HEARING QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

Attached for your review are Questions for the Record (QFR) which were submitted in conjunction with the testimony of Michael J. Lyle, Director of the Office of Administration, before the Treasury Postal Appropriations Subcommittee.

Because the Subcommittee has imposed a strict deadline, it is imperative that we receive your corrections or comments no later than 12:00 noon on Wednesday, April 12, 2000. We apologize for the short notice and we appreciate your assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact my office in the event that you have questions.

DRAFT

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Issue: **Automated Records Management System (ARMS)**

Questions:

1. **Is ARMS the current system used to collect and store all electronic mail messages in the EOP? Is this the system that is used to comply with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution? Is ARMS the system that had the "glitch" referred to in the press reports? What was the total cost of developing and deploying ARMS? What are the annual operation and maintenance costs? Under which appropriation account are these costs funded?**

   RESPONSE: The Automated Records Management System (ARMS) is the current system used to manage electronic mail (e-mail) for the following EOP components that are subject to the Federal Records Act: the Office of Administration (OA), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy. ARMS is the mechanism that these agencies utilize to comply with the portion of the *Armstrong* decision that requires e-mail, including transmission and receipt data, to be records managed. Although not required by the *Armstrong* decision or the Presidential Records Act (PRA), the White House utilizes ARMS to manage its e-mail for eventual transfer to the Presidential library, and some Office of the Vice President (OVP) e-mails have been managed by ARMS. The Information Systems and Technology Division (IS&T) is currently working to make sure that ARMS manages all OVP e-mail.

   The ARMS "glitch" referred to in the press reports involves two separate configuration errors that prevented certain incoming Internet e-mails from being recorded in ARMS for a period of time. See response to Question 4 below for a technical description of the configuration errors.

   The total cost of developing and deploying ARMS was $985,013. The annual operation and maintenance costs for ARMS for FY99 were $365,119. Exhibit 1 contains a breakout of these costs.

   The Armstrong Resolution Account was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that the ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS were funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

2. **The White House has suggested that, because the Appropriations Committee fenced $966,700 in FY 1997 IT funds pending the development of an architecture for the White House Capital Investment Plan, operation and maintenance of certain systems was jeopardized and, in fact, may have caused some of the problems that the White House experienced with the e-mails:**

   - **In FY 1994, the EOP received a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 million for costs associated with the Armstrong Resolution. Are there any restrictions on using these funds to maintain ARMS or any other IT systems within the EOP network that are necessary for maintaining electronic records management and/or compliance with the Armstrong Resolution?**

RESPONSE: The fencing of information technology funds in FY 1997 precluded the EOP from maintaining, repairing or from making improvements to an already antiquated computer system. In fact, the EOP reported to the Subcommittee on February 28, 1997, that the failure to unfence the funds would cause: (1) increased vulnerability to EOP computer systems and Internet connections from external threats; (2) increased network downtime due to depletion of spare parts; (3) eroded levels of preventative maintenance; (4) curtailed ability to replace broken equipment; and (4) significantly delayed response time. In response to the Questions for the Record submitted by the Committee for FY 1998 dated April 7, 1998, we advised the Committee that if the funds were not unfenced there would be increased security threats to the network from denial of service attacks, spoofing, and storming. We itemized numerous specific instances of system crashes (e.g., Lattis Network Switch, ONDCP subnet, and FDDI network work group hub) and advised that another failure may result in a shutdown of a segment of the network. Indeed, in response to one Committee question, we advised that:

> *The client/server network backup system used to preserve data integrity and facilitate the archival of Presidential and Federal records has exceeded its life cycle. Several users have already experienced the loss of data due to file server hardware failures. An analysis of the backup system has been completed with the recommendations to correct the problem. The cost to implement the solution is estimated at $20,000, but the funds are fenced.*

Thus, as a direct result of the fenced funds, an already antiquated EOP computer system further deteriorated and at a more rapid rate.

At this same point in time the EOP was confronted with its Year 2000 (Y2K) vulnerabilities. The fenced funds contributed to making the already difficult Y2K problem even more difficult. In addition to having to repair equipment that had been cannibalized and neglected as a direct result of the fenced funding, we had to renovate and test this equipment and all of our mission critical systems in little more than a year. Consequently, the resources and personnel necessary to achieve Y2K compliance increased significantly and it became necessary to defer non-Y2K projects such as the development of an Intranet, the interfacing of the payroll/personnel system with the financial management system, upgrades to the financial management system, and the Mail2 reconstruction.

DRAFT

There are restrictions on using the Armstrong Resolution Account in that it was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS have been funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

Virtually all of the e-mail associated with the MAIL2 problem were Presidential records. Since the Armstrong decision is applicable only to Federal records, we determined that Congressional approval would be necessary in order to utilize Armstrong funds for the reconstruction effort. On March 20, 2000, after completing the Y2K effort and after obtaining the necessary documentation to support the request, the EOP requested the approval from the Subcommittee.

- **On March 20, 2000, the Committee received a request to use $1.7 million in Armstrong Resolution funds to reconstruct this e-mail. Why didn't the White House submit a request to use the Armstrong Funds for the purpose of both fixing this "glitch" and reconstructing the e-mails at the time the "glitch" was discovered?**

RESPONSE: We did not request approval to utilize Armstrong funds at the time the "glitch" was discovered for two reasons: (1) as noted above, the reconstruction had to be deferred until the EOP's Year 2000 (Y2K) objectives were achieved and (2) we needed to obtain the necessary documentation to support the request.

Upon the completion of the EOP's Y2K effort, the Director of OA requested the Information Systems & Technology Division (IS&T) to prepare a plan and develop cost estimates for the reconstruction in the January/February time frame, which were completed in mid-March. Upon receipt of this supporting documentation, we promptly submitted our request. Moreover, by waiting, the EOP actually saved money in connection with the reconstruction effort. Indeed, in November of 1998, Northrop Grumman quoted us a price of $602,000 to perform a feasibility assessment. This assessment did not include the costs associated with purchasing equipment, or performing the reconstruction. Because government personnel, who were previously assigned to the Y2K effort, were able to perform the feasibility assessment, the EOP did not incur the $602,000 costs requested by Northrop Grumman.

The request did not seek approval to utilize the funds to repair the glitch because the reconfigurations already had been accomplished under the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman.

DRAFT

3. **During the period of time when in-coming electronic messages were not being records managed, were you out of compliance with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution?**

   RESPONSE: No. First, the *Armstrong* decision is inapplicable to Presidential records. Second, the *Armstrong* decision required a record-keeping system such as ARMS to capture electronic mail, including transmission and receipt data. At all times, the EOP has utilized ARMS in accordance with *Armstrong* – some anomalies simply occurred in connection with ARMS. The *Armstrong* decision does not mandate against the types of anomalies that occurred; therefore, the requirements of the *Armstrong* decision were not violated. Moreover, the EOP remained in compliance with *Armstrong* in that the information was captured on backup tapes, which can be accessed to reconstruct the records.

4. **What was the technical nature of the problem and how did it occur? When did the White House discover it? When did the White House begin to assess the problem and begin remediaton efforts? Which appropriation cost covered the cost of this remediation effort? How long did it take to fix the problem?**

   RESPONSE: In August of 1996, an EOP sub-contractor mistakenly utilized all upper case letters (MAIL2) instead of the required upper and lower case letters (Mail2) when creating a script to move users from one server to another. Because ARMS did not recognize MAIL2 as a proper entry, some incoming Internet e-mail for users on Mail2 were not records managed in ARMS from August of 1996 to November of 1998 when the accounts were properly reconfigured. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in June of 1998, affected 426 users from the White House, 58 from the Office of Policy Development, and 4 from the OA. All accounts were properly reconfigured (fixed) as required by the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman in November of 1998. It took approximately 5 months to determine the cause of the problem and then to reconfigure the affected accounts.

   Additionally, in November of 1998 when Northrop Grumman was fixing the MAIL2 anomaly, they made yet another configuration error. When user accounts are created, they are assigned a particular view that corresponds to the section of the alphabet (e.g., ABC) that corresponds to the first letter of their first name (e.g., Ann Smith would be in the view that contains the letter "A"). In the latter configuration error, the letter "D" was inadvertently omitted from a view and the letter "J" was included twice. As a result, incoming Internet e-mail to user accounts with first names beginning with the letter "D" were not records managed in ARMS from November of 1998 to May of 1999 when the error was fixed. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in April of 1999, affected approximately 200 users in the EOP (42 from WHO, 8 from OPD, 54 from OMB, 4 from CEQ, 32 from OA, 20 from ONDCP, 6 from OSTP, 3 from the White House Climate Change Task Force, 1 from the Council of Economic Advisors, and 21 from the National Security Council). It took approximately one month to troubleshoot and fix the problem.

DRAFT

5. **Did this "glitch" effect all e-mail within the EOP complex? Which specific EOP agencies were affected? How many electronic messages were affected?**

RESPONSE: No - - the e-mail anomalies affected only some incoming Internet e-mail. For the specific agencies affected, see Response to Question 4. At this point in time, we do not know the number of electronic messages that were affected.

6. **Are the affected electronic messages currently being reconstructed? What is the status of that effort? Who is performing it? What funds are currently being used for this effort? What is the total estimated cost of the reconstruction effort?**

RESPONSE: Yes. On March 29, 2000, OA issued a letter contract for the reconstruction to ECS Technologies, Inc., an 8(a) contractor that has performed similar reconstruction work for the EOP in the past. As we orally advised this Subcommittee, so as not to further delay the reconstruction, we realigned \$100,000 from OA's current year projects to "Other Services" to fund a letter contract so that work could commence on the reconstruction effort. Upon the Subcommittee's approval of the use of Armstrong funds, we will transfer the remaining balance from the Armstrong Resolution Account to the extent not required to complete our Armstrong obligations to "Other Services" to continue work on the reconstruction. Based on the results of the market survey that we conducted, we anticipate that \$1 – 3 million will be required for the reconstruction. We anticipate that we will likely be seeking additional funds from the Subcommittee to complete this task.

DRAFT

Automated Records Management System II (ARMS II)

Issue:
Questions:

In 1997, the White House described ARMS II as a system expected to achieve increased online storage, enhanced search capabilities and retrieval, and automated dispositioning. In August of last year, the EOPs Information Technology Architecture Annual Update submitted to the Subcommittee indicated that ARMS II was still under development and a part of the information technology modernization effort. The Committee understands that development of ARMS II has now stopped.

1. **What is the current status of ARMS II? If all work has stopped, why was it stopped and why wasn't the Subcommittee informed?**

RESPONSE: The EOP's August 1999 Update to its Information Technology Architecture (ITA) did not indicate that ARMS II was still under development. While the ITA contained Electronic Document Management Projects/Pilots, ARMS II was not specifically identified as a project. As explained in our March 1, 2000 response to questions from this Subcommittee, we have delayed the implementation of ARMS II until the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems such as ARMS. While we do not believe that NARA's Fast Track Initiative or endorsement of DOD Standard 5015.2-STD constitute such guidance or technical standards, we are optimistic about NARA's work with the National Science Foundation to create an electronic records archives independent of electronic format, which was announced on March 28, 2000. However, until NARA completes its projected two-year Business Process Engineering effort, which is likely to impact electronic record-keeping practices, and/or until the results of NARA's work with the National Science Foundation are known, we believe it is prudent to delay implementation of ARMS II at this point in time. We believe it would be unwise for OA to risk implementing ARMS II only to find that it may be necessary to perform another tape reformatting project in several years when NARA issues new technical guidance. This has happened before. In fact, we are currently reformatting tapes from a previously NARA approved format to another format because NARA determined the old format would no longer meet their needs. Thus, until NARA issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems, we intend to defer implementation of ARMS II.

2. **Is there an automated system in place to collect and sort other internal records?**

RESPONSE: There are many automated systems within the EOP that collect and sort other internal records, although ARMS is the only electronic record-keeping system. For example, the Federal Financial Accounting and Management Information System (FAMIS) collects and sorts internal financial management records. Similarly, the Payroll and Personnel System collects and sorts internal payroll and personnel records. Yet another example is the PRISM system, which collects and sorts internal procurement records.

DRAFT

3. **Information provided to the Subcommittee indicates that the White House stopped work on ARMSII because the National Archives has not yet provided agencies with guidance and technical standards on developing electronic record-keeping systems. According to the Archives, they have developed guidance through their FastTrack initiative. Archives hasn't issued technical standards but they have endorsed DOD standards. The Committee understands that Archives has been working with the White House in the development of their electronic records keeping system. Describe your current work with Archives to develop electronic records keeping system. If you are not currently working with Archives, when did that effort stop?**

RESPONSE: OA is unaware of any work with Archives to develop an electronic record-keeping system to replace ARMS. However, we have been working closely with NARA to ensure a successful transition and transfer of records between Administrations. See also our response to Question 1 above.

DRAFT

Issue: **Financial Accountability within the EOP**
Questions:

1. **Last year, CBO estimated that the cost of implementing the provisions Section 638 of PL 106-58 establishing a Chief Financial Officer to be $250,000 yet the White House is requesting a total of $660,000 for this effort. What accounts for the difference between CBO's estimate and the FY 2001 request?**

RESPONSE: Because the basis for the CBO's estimate was not provided, we are unable to account for the difference between CBO's estimate and the EOP's FY2001 request. The following, however, summarizes the FY 2001 request for funds relating to the establishment of a CFO in the EOP.

The Office of Administration's FY 2001 budget request of $660,000 is composed of two pieces: $290,000 for salary and benefits costs to support a 5 person staff; and $370,000 to contract with an independent firm to conduct an auditability assessment for the EOP agencies and accounts.

Salary and Benefits
The $290,000 represents estimated salary and benefits for the following staff, with an estimated start of duty date of March 1, 2001:

CFO at Executive Level IV
Deputy CFO – GS-15
Accounting Officer – GS-15
Systems Staff – GS-13
Administrative support – GS-7

The benefits rate used was 25%, based on the current EOP average. Estimates include the calendar year 2000 cost of living adjustment (COLA) and a projected COLA (3.7%) for calendar year 2001.

The estimated start date for the staff of March 1, 2001 was a conservative average, since it is not known how long the selection process will take for the CFO position, or how this will relate to the staffing of the rest of the positions.

The full year cost (FY 2002) of these five FTE would be approximately $492,000.

Auditability Assessment
Compliance with the CFO Act requires the submission of agency-wide audited financial statements to OMB by March 1 of each year. This submission involves a three-step process, including an agency auditability assessment, preparation of auditable financial statements, and the conduct of the audit itself. Estimates solicited from four local accounting firms who currently provide these services to the federal government ranged from $300,000 to $1,200,000 for all three services.

The EOP request of $370,000 is based on an average of the four accounting firm estimates for

DRAFT

the auditability assessment alone. The costs for template preparation and the audit will be requested in future years' budgets.

DRAFT

Issue: **Information Technology Architecture (ITA)**
Questions:

1. **On February 4, 2000, GAO completed its review of EOP's information technology architecture, as requested by the Subcommittee. In pertinent part, GAO found that the current architecture defines principles and goals governing how it wants to operate in both business and technical terms but that EOP still needs to define how it wants to operate in the future in business terms AND define a "roadmap" or implementation plan for getting there. In responding to GAO's review, the EOP disagreed with its findings and stated that it has defined all of its current and future core business requirements.**

   Given your disagreement with the GAO review, it is inconsistent that, in your annual update to the Committee (August 31, 1999), you clearly state that: . . ."the enterprise architecture planning considers both a short-term operational and long-term strategic focus on the use of information and technology to support EOP's business needs… to fulfill this mission we will take steps to enhance our enterprise architecture planning process by building a conceptual business model and defining the data needed to run the business." Additionally, the Committee understands that the WH has brought on a contractor to assist in developing an updated business/information model and to specify applications that support this model. It seems that this statement and the hiring of a contractor confirm GAO's findings.

   - **How do you explain these inconsistencies?**

   RESPONSE: We do not view these as inconsistencies. Although we have built a conceptual business model and have defined the data needed to run the business, we nonetheless recognize that we need to continue to enhance our enterprise architecture. As we have emphasized in the past, an ITA is a "living document" that must continue to evolve. The EOP will continue to assess and reassess its business processes and to integrate its work processes and information flows with current and future technologies to achieve the strategic goals of the Presidency. To meet the EOP's business needs, the EOP will continuously evaluate and identify additional systems applications to support these business requirements, and periodically update its "roadmap" or implementation plan for transitioning over a specified period of time from the "as-is to the "to-be" architectural environments. The EOP ITA provides us with the mechanism to do so. Moreover, the hiring of a contractor to assist the EOP in its ITA efforts is consistent with OA's Fiscal Year 2000 Capital Investment Plan, which contained specific funding for this purpose.

DRAFT

- **In section 3 of EOP's 1999 ITA Update, current core business processes are specified. On which pages in the ITA Update are the future core business processes defined?**

RESPONSE: As we stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, contrary to the GAO report, the EOP ITA identifies all of the EOP's current and future business processes. These core business processes, which are driven by the current, past and future President(s), have changed little over the years, remaining relatively constant. While the 2000 Update to the EOP's ITA will focus on identifying and analyzing those common business processes that can be further streamlined and/or manual business processes that can be automated, we anticipate that these core business processes will remain unchanged.

2. **The FY 2001 request includes $1,485,000 for projects that are to test, develop and implement EOP software and systems that are intended to streamline business processes and increase productivity. These projects include the White House Integrated System for Document Management (WHISDM) and an electronic document management/pilot projects.**

    - **How do WHISDM and the other electronic document management/pilot projects relate? What is the expected return on investment of WHISDM? Is this return on investment supported by a business case analysis? If so, please submit for the record.**

RESPONSE: As stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, currently, the implementation of WHISDM is limited to three offices within the White House: the Office of Presidential Personnel, the Office of Records Management, and the Office of Correspondence. WHISDM, however, is a large-scale electronic document management project that has the capability to provide records management and document management capabilities across the EOP enterprise. Thus, as part of the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects, we will assess whether WHISDM is a potential system for EOP-wide use. Funds from the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects of the CIP will then be used to fund any customizations associated with adding the additional EOP components.

In Fiscal Year 1998, a requirements and alternatives analysis was performed by an independent consultant to identify and evaluate the requirements and potential software solutions to meet the needs of the three White House Offices, and to ensure consistency with the overall technical direction of the EOP. The implementation of WHISDM to date, however, has been largely necessitated by Y2K because the existing systems used by the three offices were not Y2K compliant. Thus, a formal business case analysis was not required. As part of Phase II of the WHISDM effort, however, the successful contractor will be required to assist the EOP in performing a business process review and preparing a business case analysis.

Issue: **First Lady Travel**
Questions

The Committee understands that the current procedures being used by the White House to make distinctions between political and official travel are, for all practical purposes, no different than those procedures used by previous Administrations. Having said that, however, it is also true that no previous First Lady ran as a candidate for the US Senate. In reviewing the First Lady's travel records for travel to New York during 1999:

1. **The Committee specifically requested reimbursement data for both political and official travel for fiscal year 1999. Although there were a total of 29 trips taken by the 1st Lady to New York in 1999, the White House only provided data for 16 of these trips and data for 9 other trips taken in FY 2000.**

- **Why didn't the White House provide data for all of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999? Why did the White House begin with June 9, 1999?**

RESPONSE: The White House has already provided data for all Presidential and First Lady travel, both foreign and domestic from Fiscal Year 1998 through February 18, 2000. See Exhibit 2. Additionally, the Committee made an oral request for "all First Lady travel to New York since she formed her exploratory committee." In response to this request, we provided the data on First Lady travel to New York since June 9, 1999, the date on which her first exploratory travel began. See Exhibit 3.

- **During the hearing, it became apparent that the White House provided different documents to the majority and minority staff regarding Airlift Operations, Exploratory Payment History. Although these documents were provided to the Subcommittee through the Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, and the witness had a copy of the document provided to the minority staff, the witness did not seem to be familiar with the document provided to the majority staff. Please explain why the witness was unfamiliar with the documents provided to the majority staff. Why were different documents provided to the majority and minority staff? For the record, provide (1) the document submitted to the minority staff; and (2) the document submitted to the majority staff, excluding Secret Service personnel and costs.**

RESPONSE: The document provided to the majority staff contained additional information regarding official travelers that are not part of the EOP's appropriation. Neither the USSS detail nor the "White House" photographer is funded from EOP appropriations. Accordingly, requests for information on costs associated with the USSS detail and the photographer should be posed directly to the USSS and the Department of Defense, respectively. With regard to the document provided to the minority staff, that document also contained a footnote referring to the USSS detail and the photographer. See Exhibit 3 for a corrected version of the document that does not include the USSS detail or the photographer.

• **Provide the following information for ALL of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to date including:**

- **Trip Date**
- **Invoice Date**
- **Payment Date**
- **Destination**
- **Designation**
- **# of Official passengers (excluding USSS only)**
- **Designation of Official passengers**
- **# of Political passengers**
- **Flight Time (wheels up to wheels down)**
- **Type of Aircraft**
- **Official Reimbursements**
- **Political Reimbursements**

RESPONSE: See Exhibit 2 for all First Lady travel from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 4 contains an update of First Lady Travel to New York for Fiscal Year 2000 as of March 31, 2000. Exhibit 5 supplements Exhibit 2 with Airlift Operations information not previously requested.

2. **Current law requires that the cost of campaign travel using government aircraft be reimbursed at the 1st class rate and that political travel be reimbursed at the coach rate. On trips where there is a mixed purpose —for instance official and political, who within the White House Office determines which portions of the trip are political and which portions are official and the subsequent rate of reimbursement? Provide the job titles and offices of all persons responsible for making these determinations.**

RESPONSE: The White House follows all applicable legal rules in determining whether a trip is official, political or a mixed purpose trip as provided by Hatch Act and Federal Election Commission (FEC) law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.101, 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 6 O.L.C. 214 (1982). Likewise, the appropriate rate of reimbursement for trips which contain a political component is calculated according to formulas provided by Hatch Act and FEC law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

"Mixed" trips occur when there is non-campaign related political activity which occurs at a stop. The Hatch Act provides that reimbursement for such mixed trips is to be determined according to the "hard time" formula which allows for a pro rata reimbursement by the relevant political entity according to the time spent in political activity and the time spent in official activity. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503.

FEC law provides that "where a candidate conducts any campaign-related activity in a trip, [other than incidental contacts] the stop is a campaign-related stop." 11 C.F.R. § 106.3(b)(3). As such, when the First Lady, for example, conducts campaign activity at any stop, all of her travel to that stop is considered campaign related, not mixed, even in instances in which official activity may also occur during the trip.

The offices involved in billing for trips include the White House Counsel's Office or the Office of Counsel to the Vice President, the Office of Management and Administration, the White House Military Office, the Office of Political Affairs and the Offices of Scheduling and Advance.

3. **In documents provided to the Committee on March 1, 2000, almost all of the trips identified between 1 and 2 "official" staff traveling with the First Lady, identified by the White House as the Trip Coordinator and the White House Photographer. The White House also stated that travel costs for these staff were considered official costs and paid for with federal appropriations. What official responsibilities does the White House photographer have on trips that are classified as 100 percent political? Of the trips taken by the First Lady to New York for political purposes, how many times did the White House photographer accompany her and at what cost? If costs were not funded through the White House Office, what federal account covered these costs?**

RESPONSE: The First Lady continues in her official role as First Lady at all times and continues to carry her official responsibilities and duties as First Lady at all times, whether or not she is on official business. As such, there are certain individuals whose official duties require them to travel with the First Lady regardless of whether her travel is official, political or campaign-related. Since these individuals are conducting official government business, the law provides that their travel should be paid for with appropriated funds. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

The White House Photographers accompany the President, Vice President and the First Lady in an official capacity regardless of the nature of the trip in order to document their activities for official archival purposes. EOP appropriations do not support the White House Photographer. The White House Photographer is supported through Department of Defense appropriations.

4. **Although the White House has stated that the Secret Service requires the First Lady to use government aircraft, the Committee understands that, during the First Lady's Book Tour, Simon and Schuster provided the First Lady with private aircraft. The White House now says that the First Lady only used military aircraft. Provide, for each trip related to the First Lady's book tour: date of travel, destination, designation, type of aircraft, official reimbursements and, if applicable, "other" reimbursements.**

RESPONSE: As it has recommended consistently in the past for other First Ladies, the Secret Service recommends strongly that the First Lady travel by military aircraft for security reasons. The White House has followed that recommendation for the First Lady's travel, including during her book tour. For travel data related to the First Lady's book tour, See Exhibit 6.

5. **In some instances, although the number of non-official travelers is different, the costs of the trips were identical. For instance, on a trip to New York on November 8th, there was one non-official traveler —the First Lady—with a total cost of $494.00. Two weeks later, there was an identical trip with two non-official travelers —the First Lady and**

one other person —again with a total cost of $494.00. What accounts for this discrepancy in the cost of travel? For the "Exploratory Trip" taken on December 6-10, 1999, total official costs were $1,465.00. Provide, by major spending category (for example, food, lodging, etc.), an itemization of these costs.

RESPONSE: On both trips in question, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler. With regard to the November 23rd trip, the best available information at the time of the response to the oral request was that there were two non-official travelers. This information was updated at the time that the trip was reviewed. At that time, because of a last minute change in the manifest, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler.

The breakout for the trip on December 6-10, 1999 is as follows:

HOTEL: $1,360 at $340/night (no government rate was available)
PER DIEM: $105

6. **Although your documents indicate that it took an "average of 28 days for the political party to reimburse for the costs of the trip", in some instances it took up to 6 months to send the political party an invoice. Of the 22 political trips taken to New York in 1999, 8 were not billed for at least 3 months and 14 of the billings didn't happen until after the Committee had requested information on the billings. What are the current procedures for billing? Is there an established time frame for submitting the invoices to the political party and for receiving reimbursements? Who submits these invoices to the political party?**

RESPONSE: Although the White House makes every effort to produce trip data in a timely manner so that it can be promptly billed to political parties, we must review each and every trip to ensure compliance with the applicable rules and regulations. The length of this review process varies based on the complexity of the trip. Moreover, since travel is subject to last minute changes based on the schedules of the President and the First Lady, a careful review is necessary in order to make the proper designations to comply with the rules and regulations.

Current procedures implemented by the White House Office of Management and Administration require the production of trip data within one week of completion of a trip. The production of the trip data then triggers the billing process for reimbursement from political parties. Though the White House is making an earnest effort to expedite the trip billing process, there will still be delays in invoicing due to the complexity of particular trips.

Prior to March 2000, the White House worked to submit invoices as soon as possible, but there was not a specified time frame for submitting invoices to a political party. First and foremost, White House policy is to comply with the rules and regulations governing travel and to ensure that all bills are accurate.

The majority of political reimbursements are received by Airlift Operations within 30 days from the date of billing. The First Lady's campaign has been paying in less than 30 days.

DRAFT

Airlift Operations invoices the political party through the White House Office of Management and Administration.

7. **FEC rules require a candidate to pay in advance either the cost of a first class ticket if there is a scheduled flight, or comparable charter fares if there is no scheduled flight. An exception may be made if the comparable fare is under $1,000. The cost of deferring this payment would then effectively be a loan treated as a campaign contribution.**
   - **Do you apply these rules to the First Lady's use of non-commercial campaign travel?**

RESPONSE: FEC law pertaining to payment of expenses for campaign-related travel on a government conveyance, as interpreted by the FEC, provides for reimbursement to the government for such travel, not payment in advance. See 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Advisory Opinion No. 1984-48. See also 5 C.F.R. § 734.503 (which provides for reimbursement of costs, including travel costs, associated with political activity.) The White House has followed all applicable legal rules in ensuring appropriate reimbursement to the government for political travel.

DRAFT

Issue: **FY 2001 Capital Investment Plan**

Questions:

1. **The President requests $9,905,000 for the Capital Investment Plan in FY 2001. The Office of Administration's appropriation request also includes IT funding: $436,000 for the maintenance of systems purchased or upgraded during the infrastructure renovation and $100,000 for maintenance and replacement of internet storm serves and network equipment. Why are IT infrastructure improvements being funded out of Salaries and Expenses?**

   RESPONSE: IT infrastructure improvements are not being funded out of Salaries and Expenses. Consistent with Office of Management and Budget guidance, capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Capital Investment Plan (CIP). Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Thus, because the $536,000 ($436K + $100K) sited above is associated with the ongoing operation and maintenance of equipment and not for infrastructure improvements, the costs are appropriately funded using Salaries and Expenses. Of this request, $359,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the EOP's Internet connectivity; $77,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the help desk software; and the remaining $100,000 is for the normal system maintenance and replacement of the Internet storm servers and network equipment. Again, these funds will be utilized to maintain the current system performance level and do not represent a major system renovation or improvement.

2. **What is the Office of Administration's total funding request for IT needs? What is the difference between the server and network infrastructure investments being funded in the CIP and the server and infrastructure investments being funded by Salaries and Expense?**

   RESPONSE: For OA's total funding request for IT needs, see Exhibit 7. The difference between the server and network infrastructure costs being funded in the CIP versus Salaries and Expenses is that, consistent with OMB guidance, capital improvements are to be funded out of the Capital Investment Plan. Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are to be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Consistent with this principle, the CIP contains funding to replace servers on a two-year cycle due to the rapid technological advancement that occurs in this area. Once these servers are implemented, however, normal system maintenance, including repair and replacement if necessary, would be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

Issue: **Grant to Puerto Rico Elections Commission**
Questions:

1. **The President is requesting $2.5 million for a grant to the Puerto Rico Elections Commission within the appropriation, "Unanticipated Needs". Funds appropriated in this account are authorized to meet "unanticipated needs for the furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense..."**
   - **Please explain how a $2.5 million grant to Puerto Rico can be considered an "unanticipated need."**

   RESPONSE: The Unanticipated Needs Account historically has been utilized to fund projects or initiatives that arise on a one-time basis or, at most, on an irregular basis and for which it is difficult, if not impossible, to plan far in advance. In this case, it is in the national interest for public education in Puerto Rico on the islands' status options and the referendum provides a Federally-sanctioned vote there on preferences among the options.

2. **The justification materials indicate that these funds will "partially" meet the needs of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission to help offset the costs of public education and public choice for future status options. What is the total cost of this effort and who will assume responsibility for the balance of these costs? Has a commitment been made by this source to provide the balance of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Secretary of State and the Governorship of Puerto Rico have estimated the total cost of a referendum and related education campaign at $10 million. This was largely based on the appropriation of $9 million for the recent referendum.

   The Government of Puerto Rico will provide the funding beyond the $2.5 million the EOP has requested.

3. **The justification material indicates that a portion of the funds will be used for an education program and a portion for conducting a referendum on future status options. Has a specific proposal been submitted by the Puerto Rico Elections Commission regarding both the education program and the referendum? Please provide this proposal for the record.**

   RESPONSE: The President of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission is preparing a plan for a referendum and related education campaign. A copy will be provided to the Subcommittee upon receipt.

4. **Who will provide oversight regarding the obligation and use of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Office of Administration, in consultation with the President's Interagency Group on Puerto Rico, will oversee the obligation and use of the funds.

DRAFT

The Office of Administration administered a previous appropriation on the Puerto Rico status question (FY90).

5. **For the record, provide historical obligations for the Unanticipated Needs account, by fiscal year (to date).**

   RESPONSE: See Exhibit 8.

DRAFT

Transition Costs and Procedures

Issue:
Questions:

1. **Of all federal agencies, the EOP is clearly the most affected by a change in Administration. In fact, all staff within the White House Office, the Office of Policy Development and the Office of the Vice President are political staff —presumably all of these individuals will be leaving at the transition.**

   Although the new Administration certainly has the right to organize itself as it sees fit, the EOP is a fairly static organization in terms of business processes —it's basic functions and responsibilities do not change over time or between Administration's. In general, I think it's also fair to say that the EOP probably stores more information and paper than any other federal agency in terms of documents that will ultimately go to the Clinton Presidential Library. I am not trying to rush things when I ask these questions, nonetheless, I am concerned about the procedures that are in place to ensure a smooth transition between Administrations.

   - **Some of the records in the EOP will be classified as "Presidential Records" and will ultimately end up at the Clinton Library. Others will be classified as Federal records and will be stored by the National Archives. Have you been working with the National Archives to ensure a smooth transition in terms of Presidential and Federal Records? What specific guidance has Archives provided to you and what have you done to pass this on to employees within the EOP?**

   RESPONSE: The EOP has been working with the National Archives (NARA) to ensure a smooth transition. The Office of Administration is currently working with NARA to finalize several records disposition schedules that will govern how federal records will be covered. Additionally, in January of this year, the EOP met with NARA representatives to discuss numerous issues relating to the Presidential transition. NARA has provided the EOP with written guidance entitled "Planning for a Successful Presidential Transition" that we have distributed to the appropriate personnel. We will continue to work closely with NARA to ensure a smooth transition.

   - **Over the years, the White House has made a number of changes to some of its basic business functions —such as improvements to its resume processing system as well as security clearances and the issuing of passes. Given the significant personnel turn over that is anticipated, it is imperative that there are systems in place to process personnel efficiently and within the requirements of the law. What are you doing to ensure that all the requisite personnel processing systems are in place for the new Administration?**

   RESPONSE: OA is proud of the changes that we have implemented to continually improve our business processes and better serve our customers. These improvements, including personnel processing, recruitment, and security and background check processing, will remain in place for future Administrations. In addition, many of our investments in information technology have changed the way in which financial data is collected and

DRAFT

distributed; enhanced our procurement methods; and allow increased communication between the various OA divisions and our customers. These changes will also assist us as we prepare for a new Administration.

2. **One of the areas I am most concerned about is the information technology infrastructure initiative that we have been working on for the past several years. We have invested a significant amount of resources in upgrading EOPs technology. I am very concerned about the applicability of these investments to the needs of a new Administration. That is part of the reason why we insist you have both a clearly defined business model as well as an institutional process for moving you to your future business environment within your Capital Investment Plan. I am also concerned that, with the new Administration, there may be an immediate desire to replace certain systems before they know what the current capabilities of the individual systems are. EOP has an established process in place to review information technology requirements. This process seems to be working and the EOP is no longer allowing its individual agencies to development and use stovepipe systems. What are you doing to ensure that this process will remain in place during the transition?**

   RESPONSE: As the Subcommittee is aware, many of our achievements in the area of information technology were studied and developed by the Information Technology Management Team (ITMT), which we created under the guidance of the Subcommittee. The majority of the ITMT members are career government employees who will continue to serve in the new Administration. We anticipate that the structure and guidance of the ITMT will continue. In addition, we now have in place an information technology architecture plan and a strategic plan for moving us forward. Again, many of the key staff members who have been guiding the development of these initiatives, as well as the head of the Information Systems and Technology Division, are career civil servants who will continue this effort into the next Administration.

3. **For the record, by EOP agency and including the Executive Residence, provide the total cost of the transition and the total amount requested in the FY 2001 request. Break these costs out by personnel/non-personnel.**

RESPONSE: Three of the FY 2001 EOP budget requests include transition funding. The nature of the White House Office, the Office of the Vice President, and the Executive Residence guarantees that these three agencies will incur additional personnel unemployment, terminal leave, temporary personnel support and other operational expenses associated with a high level of turnover. These expenses are partially offset by personnel savings due to the high vacancy level anticipated during the transition period. A breakout of the transition costs by personnel and non-personnel for each agency is provided below. Additionally, on March 1, 2000, in response to questions from the Subcommittee, we provided estimated terminal leave payments for each EOP agency. See Exhibit 9.

Most EOP agencies did not request additional funding for transition costs. Some of these agencies will be able to accommodate transition costs within the annual appropriation provided, but others may require supplemental funding once the new Administration begins.

The nature and amount of any supplemental request will be determined by the needs of the

new Administration. The goals and priorities of the new President will determine the operational and infrastructure requirements for the upcoming administration and impact the need for additional funds.

Figure 1 - Transition Costs by Agency

(Dollars in 000s)

Agency	Personnel	Non-personnel	Total
White House Office	1,150	994	2,144
Office of the Vice President	20	74	94
Executive Residence	40	60	100
Total	1,210	1,128	2,338

DRAFT

Questions for the Record Submitted by the Committee

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE/EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE

Issue: **Reimbursable Political Activities**
Questions:

1. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence bill for reimbursable activities held within the White House within 60 days of the event and that interest and penalties be assessed for those activities that are not paid for within 90 days of the event date. In FY 1999, the Committee provided funds to support an Accounting Technician "to account and bill for reimbursable political events through the year".**

   The report on Reimbursable Activities submitted to the Committee on January 1, 2000 indicates that there were 5 political events that were NOT billed within this 60-day period. It further indicates that the billing information needed by the Executive Residence was being held up by the White House Social Office.

   - **Is it accurate to say that bills for these 5 events were prepared after the 60-day requirement because of delays in receiving billing information from the White House Social Office?**

     RESPONSE: Yes. Although the billing data was processed within the 90-day requirement, the delay was in obtaining the name and/or address of the entity to which the bill should be submitted. The exception was the Holiday Press Festival where two additional invoices were received after the initial bill had been submitted to the Democratic National Committee (DNC). A new bill was prepared for the DNC.

   - **Is the White House Social Office aware of the current law requirements as it relates to reimbursable political activities?**

     RESPONSE: Yes, the White House Social Office is aware of the legal requirements relating to reimbursements to political entities and conforms itself to those requirements.

   - **Why was there a delay in receiving the billing information? How many attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information?**

     RESPONSE: Despite the best efforts of the Social Office, there was a delay in obtaining the names and/or addresses of the appropriate entities and providing the Executive Residence with the billing information. Several attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information.

   - **Given the delay in billing, payments were made beyond the 90 days required in law. Why weren't penalties assessed for these events? What would have been the total amount of penalties, interest and other charges assessed to these events had the delay in payment been caused by the host and not the White House Social Office?**

DRAFT

RESPONSE: The delay in billing was not caused by any lack of diligence by the Social Office, but rather due to difficulties in determining the appropriate entity to bill. With regard to the events in question, as soon as it was discovered that the DNC was the appropriate entity to bill for the event, the DNC paid promptly.

For the bill dated May 10, 1999 for the Holiday Press Festival, penalties were included as the payment was two months past due.

Payment was received from the DNC on a timely basis. Had it been necessary to charge interest and penalties the total cost would have been $69.39.

2. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence charge interest and assess penalties for late payments (90 days after the event date). Two events in fiscal year 1999 included penalties. What was the total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999?**

   RESPONSE: The total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999 was $56.74.

DRAFT

Issue: **White House Repair and Restoration**

Questions:

1. **The White House has requested $5,000,000 for replacement of the existing raceway containing critical voice and data communications line.**

- **What is the current condition of this raceway? Why is it critical to begin this project in FY 2001? What are the consequences of a one-year delay for this project?**

  RESPONSE: The metal raceway is partially deteriorated and the supports are very rusty. The cable infrastructure within these raceways directly supports the communications network. In the event that the raceway fails or collapses, there would be a major communications outage. If the project is delayed for one year, no guarantee can be made that the raceway system will continue to support the cable infrastructure. This would require the installation of temporary supports and could impact airflow to the cooling tower since the raceway runs through the exhaust chamber of the cooling tower. The chemicals and damp air that flow through the exhaust chamber are the major contributing cause of the deterioration.

- **Is $5,000,000 the total estimated cost for this project?**

  RESPONSE: Yes.

- **Budget justification documents indicate that a professional engineering survey of existing conditions will be conducted. The design and the final construction documents will follow this survey. If this project has not been designed, on what basis is the $5 million estimate made? This phase —a survey and the preparation of the construction documents-- will take from 9 months to one year. What is the cost of this phase?**

  RESPONSE: The estimate of $5 million is based on similar work conducted within the EOP complex. The breakdown is as follows:

Excavation and Duct Bank Installation	$1,500,000
Cabling and terminations	1,200,000
Cable Frame	325,000
Overhead/Profit at 10%	635,250
Contingency Factor of 15%	549,037
SUBTOTAL FOR CONSTRUCTION	$4,209,287
Design Cost at 10%	420,928
Management Cost at 8%	370,417
TOTAL Project Estimate	$5,000,632

  It is anticipated that the design phase will cost approximately $458,000 (design fee plus management cost of 10%).

DRAFT

- **If the survey and design phase will take one year to complete, why is it necessary to request construction funds in FY 2001? It seems that you will not be ready to start the construction phase until 2002?**

  RESPONSE: In order to move as expeditiously as possible, we anticipate beginning design in October of 2000 with completion by June of 2001. Accordingly, we could begin construction in early August of 2001 so that the majority of the excavation work and concrete work could be performed when the President normally vacations and completed before winter.

2. **What specifically will be purchased with the $60,000 requested for "computer modernization"? Since the Executive Residence is within the purview of the Executive Office of the President, this project should be consistent with the current capital investment project. Is this project both compatible and consistent with the EOP's overall modernization strategy?**

   RESPONSE: The specific computer items are as follows: a network server, a replacement tape backup system, ten replacement personal computers, five replacement monitors, and five replacement printers.

   The Executive Residence is not connected to the EOP computer network. It is a self-contained, closed network.

Domestic Staff

DRAFT

Issue:

Questions:

1. **The President is requesting an additional 4 FTE for the Executive Residence: a night doorman, a butler, a laundry attendant, and a housekeeper. The total price tag for these staff is $330,030, an average of more than $75,000 per employee. Why are these 4 FTE so costly?**

   RESPONSE: The total represented by the $330,030 includes salary, premium pay, and benefits as follows:

	Salary	Benefits	Premium Pay
Butler	$55,016	$17,628	$22,006
Doorman	$45,000	$12,613	$ 7,650
Laundry Asst.	$24,837	$ 6,954	$ 9,040
Housekeeper	$55,307	$17,698	$26,281

2. **Part of the justification for these additional FTE is that "staff are required to work a tremendous number of overtime hours. The staffing requirements of events make it difficult to meet leave requests..." What is the current average overtime per month per employee within the Executive Residence?**

   RESPONSE: The average cost of domestic overtime for FY 2001 is $1,664.

3. **Two years ago, the average salary for the White House Domestic Staff was $58,260. For FY 2000, the average salary is $72,047, an increase of 24 percent. What accounts for this tremendous growth in domestic staff salaries?**

   RESPONSE: Many of the specialized, professional staff of the Executive Residence have been there for a long time, thereby placing them in the higher grades. Additionally, numerous staff, which were part of the Civil Service Retirement System, have retired over the past few years. Since the new employees are part of the Federal Employees Retirement System, the Executive Residence has seen the average benefits rates rise from 14% to 32%.

4. **What are the estimated overtime costs for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001?**

   RESPONSE: The estimated overtime cost for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 is $718,875 and for fiscal year 2001 is $768,683.

5. **The White House Repair and Restoration account includes a request of $100,000 for the "Transition Impact" —basically staff overtime associated with the upcoming Presidential transition. Isn't it unusual to request funds for domestic staff overtime in the White House Repair and Restoration account? Why weren't these funds requested with the Executive Residence Operating Expenses Appropriation?**

RESPONSE: The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request funds for these one-time costs.

DRAFT

Issue: **Presidential Transition Costs**
Questions:

1. **The White House is requesting $100,000 for costs associated with transitioning the first families; $100,000 for family quarters redecoration, and $150,000 for linen replacement.**

   - **The request includes $40,000 for staff overtime associated with moving the First Families and the inauguration. What specific inaugural activities will the domestic staff be involved in? Why are these funds being requested within the White House Repair and Restoration Account and not the Executive Residence Operating Expenses appropriation?**

   RESPONSE: These funds are for the transition from the current First Family and the newly elected First Family. The overtime will be associated with moving, packing, cleaning, unpacking, and room setup. Inaugural events will be reimbursable and are not included in this request.

   The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request the funds for these one-time charges.

   - **In the past, Congress has provided $50,000 for family quarters redecoration. What accounts for the doubling of the request for these purposes?**

   RESPONSE: Funds have historically been requested to allow the new First Family the opportunity to redecorate and renovate the living quarters as this will be their primary residence. The rooms in the living quarters usually require replacement carpeting, wall coverings, furnishings, and drapes. The amount previously requested has not been increased for inflation.

   - **In regards to the linen replacement project, a portion of these funds are being used to replace and replenish linens in the Executive Residence. Why does this project need to occur prior to the arrival of the new First Family?**

   RESPONSE: The linen replacement is needed due to normal wear and tear, not the arrival of the new First Family.

Exhibit 1

ARMS Development and Maintenance Costs

ARMS Development/Deployment (Armstrong):

VAX Upgrade	$748,101
ARMS Design/Development	236,912
	$985,013

ARMS Maintenance (Salaries & Expenses):

FY00 maintenance	$397,820
FY99 maintenance	365,119
FY98 maintenance	292,012
FY97 maintenance	158,577
FY96 maintenance	94,500
FY95 maintenance	73,901
FY94 maintenance	33,378

Exhibit 2

Presidential and First Lady Travel
Fiscal Years 1998 – February 18, 2000

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

---

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/08	Newark, NJ	Mixed	$ 2,105.13
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
10/12-19	**Venezuela**	**Official**	$0.00
	Brazil		
	Argentina		
10/27-28	Chicago, IL	Official	$ 19,066.80
10/31-11/02	West Palm Beach, FL	Mixed	$ 8,987.12
	Amelia Island, FL	Political	
	Staten Island, NY	Political	
	Middlesex County, NJ	Political	
	New York, New York	Mixed	
11/06	College Station, TX	Official	$ 4,622.99
11/14-11/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 21,359.00
	Sacramento, CA	Mixed	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Wichita, KS	Official	
	St. Louis, MO	Political	
11/22-11/26	Denver, CO	Mixed	$0.00
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Vancouver, BC	Official	
12/03	Akron, OH	Official	$ 7,073.64
	Chicago, IL	Political	
12/9-12/11	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,826.88
	Miami, FL	Mixed	
12/21-12/22	**Italy**	**Official**	$0.00
	Bosnia-Herzegovia		
12/30-01/04	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$ 50,577.43
	Virgin Islands	Official	
01/08-1/09	New York, NY	Political	$ 21,765.33
	McAllen, TX	Mixed	
	Brownsville, TX	Official	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	

01/15	New York, NY	Official	$ 7,188.26
01/28	Champaign-Urbana, IL Lacrosse, WI	Official Official	$ 13,673.31
02/03	Los Alamos, NM Albuquerque, NM	Official Official	$10,843.70
02/10	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$ 90.00
02/13	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$ 4,436.82
02/19	Baltimore, MD West Orange, NJ	Mixed Political	$ 2,122.03
02/25-03/01	Kissimmee, FL San Francisco, CA Oakland, CA Salt Lake City, Utah Los Angeles,CA	Official Mixed Official Official Political	$ 39,356.26
03/03	New York, NY	Official	$ 9,258.42
03/10	Westport, CT Cincinnati, OH	Mixed Political	$ 3,844.16
03/18	Las Vegas, NV	Official	$ 6,531.17
03/22-04/02	**Africa**	**Official**	$0.00
04/07-08	Kansas City, MO Chicago, IL	Official Mixed	$ 18,376.76
04/09	Carlton, KY	Official	$ 7,128.87
04/14-4/15	Houston, TX Pratt City, AL	Official Official	$ 12,478.68
04/15-4/19	**Chile**	**Official**	$0.00
04/22	Harper's Ferry, WV	Official	$ 710.08
04/28	New York, NY	Political	$ 30.00
05/01-5/4	Palo Alto, CA Los Angeles, CA Chicago, IL	Mixed Mixed Political	$ 19,753.58

05/08	Dover, DE	Official	$ 3,932.00
05/09	Williamsburg, VA Boston, MA	Political Political	$ 30.00
05/12-5/18	**Germany** **England** **Switzerland**	**Official**	$0.00
5/22	Annapolis, MD	Official	$ 2,725.98
06/02	Houston, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 11,979.06
06/03	Cleveland, OH	Mixed	$ 450.00
06/05	Boston, MA	Official	$ 9,634.71
06/08	New York, NY Cranbury Park, CT	Mixed Political	$ 1,920.03
06/12-6/14	Monterey, CA San Francisco, CA Portland, OR Eugene, OR Los Angeles, CA	Official Political Mixed Official Political	$ 37,155.76
06/22	Nashville, TN	Official	$ 7,364.35
06/24-07/03	**China**	**Official**	$0.00
07/09	Atlanta, GA Daytona, FL Miami, FL	Mixed Official Political	$ 10,118.65
07/17	Little Rock, AR New Orleans, LA	Political Mixed	$ 13,427.73
07/25-7/27	Norfolk, VA Aspen, CO Albuquerque, NM	Official Political Mixed	$ 18,788.31
07/30	West Jefferson, NC Raleigh, NC	Official Political	$ 9,996.00
07/31-08/02	East Hampton, NY	Mixed	$ 7,118.76

08/10-8/11	Louisville, KY	Mixed	$ 17,516.02
	Chicago, IL	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
08/18-8/30	Martha's Vineyard, MA	Official	$ 65,441.31
	Worcester, MA	Official	
08/31-09/05	**Russia**	**Official**	$0.00
	Ireland		
09/09	Orlando, FL	Political	$ 290.00
	Miami, FL	Political	
09/14	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 4,849.94
09/17	Cincinnati, OH	Political	$ 319.66
	Boston, MA	Political	
09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$ 3,649.74
9/25-9/27	Chicago, IL	Political	$ 5,671.00
	San Jose, CA	Political	
	Palo Alto, CA	Political	
	San Diego, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
	San Antonio, TX	Political	
	Houston, TX	Political	
	Presidential FY 98 Subtotal:		$ 549,585.43

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
09/30-10/01	Miami, FL	Mixed	$32.67
	Quantico, VA	Official	
10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,403.66
10/22	Philadelphia, PA	Official	$3,379.75
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$4,154.12
10/30-11/02	**Ireland**	**Official**	$0.00
	England	**Official**	
11/21-11/26	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	$8,516.87
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
12/09	Boston, MA	Mixed	$14,219.88
	New York, NY	Mixed	
1/21	Baltimore, MD	Official	$825.54
01/26-1/27	New York, NY	Official	$11,368.26
01/28	Hartford, CT	Official	$4,368.62
01/30-02/03	Boston, MA	Political	$0.00
	Switzerland	**Official**	
02/19	Dallas, TX	Mixed	$1,825.29
	Fort Worth, TX	Political	
	Austin, TX	Political	
03/16	Houston, TX	Mixed	$2,298.86
	Atlanta, GA	Political	
04/14-4/15	New York, NY	Mixed	$8,039.99
04/27-4/29	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$9,211.75
	Chicago, IL	Official	
	Ann Arbor, MI	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
04/30	New Haven, CT	Mixed	$2,108.75

05/01-5/3	Boston, MA Palo Alto, CA	Mixed Political	$1,860.57
05/07	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$30.00
05/11	New York, NY	Official	$3,216.69
05/11-5/18	**France** **Switzerland** **England**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
05/25	San Francisco, CA Danville, CA Los Angeles, CA	Mixed Official Political	$2,524.53
06/02-6/3	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,662.82
06/04-6/5	Boston, MA	Mixed	$7,658.43
06/21	Albuquerque, NM	Mixed	$614.61
06/22	Nashville, TN Indianapolis, IN	Official Mixed	$1,696.13
07/09	Montpelier, VA	Official	$1,022.07
7/13-7/16	Baltimore, MD Short Hills, NJ West Orange, NJ Newburgh, NY Pittsfield, MA Lenox, MA Albany, NY Auburn, NY Victor, NY Waterloo, NY Seneca Falls, NY Ithaca, NY	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Mixed	$30,712.75
07/20	Philadelphia, PA Drescher, PA Gladwyne, PA	Official Official Political	$1,564.37
07/27	Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH	Mixed Political	$2,092.83
08/12	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$3,638.22

09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$11,389.59
09/24-26	Denver, CO	Political	$2,961.78
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Portland, OR	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Palo Alto, CA	Official	
09/29-10/02	**Puerto Rico**	**Official**	$6,567.70
	Chile	**Official**	
	Uruguay	**Official**	

First Lady FY 98 Subtotal:	$152,967.10
FY 98 Total:	$702,552.53

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/02	Cleveland, OH	Political	$90.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
10/12	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,969.58
10/16	Chicago, IL	Political	$193.61
10/24	Los Angeles, CA	Political	$3,503.05
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
10/29	Cape Canaveral, FL	Official	$9,711.72
	West Palm Beach, FL	Political	
10/30	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/06	Fayetteville, AR	Official	$13,831.76
11/18-23	**Japan**	**Official**	$0.00
	Korea	**Official**	
	Guam	**Official**	
12/03	Providence, RI	Official	$3,931.88
12/05	Wynne, AR	Official	$3,032.50
12/08	Nashville, TN	Official	$7,461.26
12/12-15	**Israel**	**Official**	$0.00
	Jerusalem	**Official**	
	Gaza City	**Official**	
	Bethlehem	**Official**	
12/30-01/01	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$24,278.60
01/08	Detroit, MI	Official	$9,241.00
01/15	New York, NY	Official	$16,119.00
01/20	Buffalo, NY	Official	$21,804.00
	Montgomery County, PA	Official	
01/24	Little Rock, AR	Official	$4,372.80
	Beebe, AR	Official	

01/26	St. Louis, MO	Official	$0.00
2/2	New York, NY Boston, MA	Mixed Mixed	$4,243.00
2/5	Atlanta, GA	Official	$5,786.00
2/7	**Jordan**	**Official**	$0.00
2/9	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$0.00
2/14	**Mexico**	**Official**	$0.00
2/18	Dover, NH Manchester, NH	Official Mixed	$18,340.00
2/25-3/1	Tucson, AZ San Francisco, CA Los Angeles, CA Park City, UT	Official Mixed Political Official	$62,280.00
3/3	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
3/8	**Nicaragua** **El Salvador** **Honduras** **Guatemala**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/12-3/13	Hope, AR Texarkana, TX Little Rock, AR	Official Political Political	$9,067.43
3/16	Palm Beach, FL	Political	$0.00
4/1	Norfolk, VA	Official	$4,133.00
4/9	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$1,314.69
4/12	Barksdale AFB, LA	Official-	$7,046.80
4/15-4/16	San Francisco, CA Detroit, MI Boston, MA	Official Mixed Mixed	$8,406.49
5/4-5/6	**Belgium** **Germany**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/7-5/8	Houston, TX Austin, TX Oklahoma City, OK	Mixed Political Official	$6,298.76
5/11	Atlanta, GA	Official	$7,073.03
5/14-5/17	Seattle, WA Palo Alto, CA Los Angeles, CA San Diego, CA	Political Political Political Political	$8,353.79
5/19	New York, NY	Mixed	$11,043.00
5/20	Littleton, CO	Official	$6,476.28
5/22	Irvington, VA	Political	$0.00
5/23	Grambling, LA	Official	$9,974.50
5/25-5/30	Edinburgh, TX Yulee, FL	Official Political	$14,448.70
6/2	Colorado Springs, CO	Official	$6,792.02
6/11	Whiteman AFB, MO	Official	$2,554.50
6/12	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,340.50
6/15-6/19	**Switzerland** **Germany** **Slovenia** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
6/28	West Port, CT New York, NY	Political Mixed	$6,883.00
6/30	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,475.14
7/5	Hazard, KY Memphis, TN Clarksdale, MS East St. Louis, IL Rapid City, SD Phoenix, AZ Los Angeles, CA	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official	$86,063.00

7/13	Miami, FL	Mixed	$3,917.54
7/16	Des Moines, IA	Mixed	$1,941.42
7/22	Lansing, MI	Official	$8,364.00
7/23-7/24	New York, NY Cincinnati, OH Aspen, CO	Official Political Political	$10,314.50
7/25	**Morocco**	**Official**	$0.00
7/29-7/30	**Italy** **Sarajevo**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
8/3	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,058.00
8/6-8/8	Little Rock, AR Helena, AR St. Louis, MO	Political Official Official	$25,159.00
8/9	Atlanta, GA	Official	$10,501.50
8/15	West Chester, NY	Official	$0.00
8/16	Kansas City, MO	Official	$9,341.50
8/19-9/3	Martha's Vineyard, MA Nantucket, MA Hamptons, NY Syracuse, NY Skaneateles, NY	Official Official Political Official Official	$59,603.00
9/6	Norfolk, VA	Official	$8,863.00
9/9-9/15	**New Zealand**	**Official**	$0.00
9/20	Raleigh-Durham, NC	Official	$9,775.20
9/21	New York, NY (U.N)	Official	$22.50

9/27	New Orleans, LA	Political	$45.00
9/30	Palisades, NY	Official	$7,383.50
	Presidential FY 99 Subtotal:		$582,224.05

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/07	Westport, CT	Political	$22.50
10/08-10/09	Little Rock, AR	Mixed	$7,249.00
10/10-10/13	**Bulgaria**	**Official**	$0.00
	Czech Republic	**Official**	
10/16-10/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$260.00
	Sante Fe, NM	Political	
	Madison, WI	Political	
	Elmhurst, IL	Political	
10/18-10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$7,662.21
	Boston, MA	Political	
	Providence, RI	Political	
10/22-10/23	Detroit, MI	Political	$5,301.07
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
10/27	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
	Edison, NJ	Political	
10/29-10/31	Cape Canveral, FL	Official	$4,659.00
	Jacksonville, FL	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Chicago, IL	Political	
	Minneapolis, MN	Political	
	Des Moines, IA	Political	
11/1	Allentown, PA	Political	$22.50
	Athens, OH	Political	
	Tampa, FL	Political	
11/02	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/16-11/22	**Honduras**	**Official**	$0.00
	El Salvador	**Official**	
	Guatemala	**Official**	
	Dominican Republic	**Official**	
	Haiti	**Official**	
12/1-12/3	New York, NY	Official	$29,041.72

12/05	Boston, MA	Official	$7,958.81
12/10-12/11	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA	Official Official	$15,070.50
01/13	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,799.50
2/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,076.00
2/6-2/8	**Holland** **Jordan**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/3-3/4	New York, NY	Mixed	$1,908.07
3/19	Clinton, TN	Official	$2,975.66
3/20-4/1	**Egypt** **Tunisia** **Morocco**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
4/9	Dover, DE	Official	$1,000.51
4/13	Boca Raton, FL	Mixed	$3,249.50
4/14	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,847.60
4/19-4/20	New York, NY Long Island, NY	Mixed Mixed	$15,748.20
4/22	Niagra Falls, NY	Official	$2,242.10
4/29	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,692.87
5/5	Fort Dix, NJ	Official	$1,500.00
5/7	Buffalo, NY Teterboro, NJ	Mixed Political	$4,515.50
5/8	New York, NY	Official	$5,520.00
5/11-5/15	**Ireland** **England** **Italy** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/19-5/22	Grand Canyon, AZ	Official	$38,724.23
	Flagstaff, AZ	Official	
	Littleton, CO	Official	
	Santa FE, NM	Official	
	Acoma Pueblo, NM	Official	
	Albuquerque, NM	Official	
	Cortez, CO	Official	
	Mesa Verde, NM	Official	
5/24	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,040.00
5/25-5/30	Yulee, FL	Political	$0.00
6/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$4,560.00
6/4	Boston, MA	Official	$7,308.00
6/9-6/10	Binghamton, NY	Mixed	$5,538.16
	New York, NY	Mixed	
	Lawrenceville, NJ	Mixed	
6/11-6/12	St Louis, MO	Political	$143.00
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
	Berkeley, CA	Political	
6/16-6/20	**France**	**Official**	$0.00
	Morocco	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Germany	**Official**	
7/5	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,559.00
7/7-7/9	Binghamton, NY	Political	$417.00
	Oneonta, NY	Political	
	Cooperstown, NY	Political	
	Bassett, NY	Political	
	Clinton, NY	Political	
	Utica, NY	Political	
	Rome, NY	Political	
	Syracuse, NY	Political	
	Albany, NY	Political	

7/12-7/15	New Rochelle, NY	Political	$570.03
	Rye, NY	Political	
	Valhalla, NY	Political	
	Jones Beach, NY	Political	
	New York, NY	Political	
	Garden City, NY	Political	
	Rockville Center, NY	Political	
	Holbrook, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
7/19-7/22	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,280.00
7/23	New York, NY	Official	$3,330.50
	Canton, OH	Official	
7/29-7/31	Elmira, NY	Political	$179.00
	Bath, NY	Political	
	Hornell, NY	Political	
	Ithaca, NY	Political	
8/4-8/6	Jamestown, NY	Political	$75.00
	Dunkirk, NY	Political	
	Amherst, NY	Political	
	Kenmore, NY	Political	
	Buffalo, NY	Political	
	Niagra, NY	Political	
	Lockport, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Mixed	
8/7	Westchester, NY	Official	$75.00
8/9-8/10	New York, NY	Political	$365.00
8/17-8/18	Dallas, TX	Political	$45.00
	McAllen, TX	Political	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	
	Austin, TX	Political	
9/8-9/10	Bay Shore, NY	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
	South Ozone Park, NY	Political	
	Elmhurst, NY	Political	
9/13-9/15	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Flushing, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
9/18	New York, NY	Official	$1,783.00

9/21-9/23	West Port, Ct	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
9/24-9/25	Albany, NY	Mixed	$481.00
	Schenectady, NY	Mixed	
	Troy, NY	Mixed	
	Saratoga, NY	Mixed	
9/26-9/27	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
9/28	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
9/30-	**Ottawa, Canada**	**Official**	$75.00
	Massena, NY	Mixed	
	Watertown, NY	Mixed	

First Lady FY 99 Subtotal:	$205,185.74
FY 99 Total:	$787,409.79

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/1-10/4	Las Vegas, NV	Mixed	$ 21,493.00
	Palo Alto, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
10/7-10/9	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,428.03
	Ottawa, Canada	**Official**	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
10/13	Harrisonburg, VA	Official	$ 3,419.00
10/18	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
10/25	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
10/29	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$ 3,851.50
	Atlanta, GA	Mixed	
10/30	Providence, RI	Official	$ 8,850.00
10/31-11/2	**Norway**	**Official**	$470.00
11/4-11/5	Hartford, CT	Official	$ 43,659.28
	Newark, NJ	Official	
	Little Rock, AR	Official	
	Hermitage, AR	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
11/10	York, PA	Official	$ 6,019.00
11/14-11/23	**Turkey**	**Official**	$0.00
	Greece	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Bulgaria	**Official**	
	Macedonia	**Official**	
	Kosovo	**Official**	
11/30-12/2	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	$ 35,890.25
	Los Angeles, CA	Official	
	Seattle, WA	Official	
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
12/9	Worcester, MA	Official	$ 3,969.00

12/10-12/11	Little Rock, AR Memphis, TN Orlando, FL Ft. Lauderdale, FL Miami, FL	Official Official Mixed Political Political	$ 28,069.75
1/3	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/4	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/5-1/6	Chappaqua, NY	Official	$ 4,154.50
1/6	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/7	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/9	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/10-1/11	Annapolis, MD Grand Canyon, AZ Houston, TX	Official Official Mixed	$ 19,463.00
1/13-1/14	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Mixed	$ 10,888.00
1/18	Boston, MA	Mixed	$ 5,112.50
1/21-1/22	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
1/28-1/30	Quincy, IL **Switzerland**	Official **Official**	$ 7,900.00
2/5-2/7	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Political	$ 8,571.00
2/7	Hot Springs, VA	Political	$0.00
2/9-2/10	McAllen, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 3,949.50
	Presidential FY 00	Subtotal:	$ 241,157.31

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/4-10/11	**Poland**	**Official**	$0.00
	Slovakia	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Iceland	**Official**	
10/13-10/16	New York, NY	Political	$105.00
	Armonk, NY	Political	
	Glen Falls, NY	Political	
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Bolton Landing, NY	Political	
	Lake Placid, NY	Political	
	Saranac Lake, NY	Political	
	Hempstead, NY	Political	
	Huntington Station, NY	Political	
	Astoria, NY	Political	
10/17-10/20	Monticello, NY	Political	$105.00
	Bloomington, NY	Political	
	Claremont, NY	Political	
	Kingston, NY	Political	
	Middletown, NY	Political	
	New City, NY	Political	
	Spring Valley, NY	Political	
	Nyack, NY	Political	
	Pomona, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
	Scarsdale, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Political	
10/24-10/25	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Great Neck, NY	Mixed	
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$ 10,444.50
	Detroit, MI	Political	
11/1-11/3	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Rye Brook, NY	Political	
11/4-11/6	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 768.50
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	

11/8	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/9-11/21	**Israel** **Jordan** **Turkey** **Greece** **Italy**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
11/23	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/29-12/1	New York, NY Buffalo, NY Boston, MA	Mixed Political Mixed	$1,233.40
12/2	Cincinnati, OH	Political	$0.00
12/6-12/10	New York, NY Jamaica, NY	Political Political	$1,465.00
12/13	Providence, RI	Mixed	$ 1,170.00
12/14	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/16	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/17	Minneapolis, MN Kansas City, MO	Political Political	$22.50
12/21-12/22	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/9-1/10	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/24-1/25	New York, NY Albany, NY	Political Political	$ 154.00
1/26	Miami, FL	Official	$ 2,718.00
2/3-2/4	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
2/5-2/13	New York, NY Buffalo, NY Rochester, NY Syracuse, NY Albany, NY Suffolk County, NY	Political Political Political Political Political Political	$670.00

2/15-2/17	New York, NY	Political	$ 375.00
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Mt. Vernon, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
	First Lady FY 00 Subtotal:		$20,025.90
	FY 00 Total:		$261,183.21

Exhibit 3

Airlift Operations

First Lady Exploratory Travel & Campaign Payment History

AIRLIFT OPERATIONS
Exploratory Payment History
June 1, 1999 through February 2, 2000

Type	Invoice Date	Payment Date	Num		Open Balance	Amount	Number of Non-official staff	Number of Official Staff	Fligth Time
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31429	SAM 80955 / 9F0609		1,487.23	4	1	2 hrs. 40 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30276/77	SAM #1069/1081 / 9F0707-0709		3,662.00	4	1	12 hrs 25 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31222	SAM#1112/1113 / 9F0712-15		1,946.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30280	SAM #1123/1175 / 9F0729-0731		3,850.00	3	1	3 hr 20 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30278	SAM #1167/1200 / 9F0804-0806		2,795.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	01/20/2000		31670	SAM #1168/1205 / 9F0809-0811	1,462.00	1,462.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30279	SAM #1292/1293 / 9F0908-0910 (PP #1)	652.00	2,786.00	4	1	1 hr. 40 min
	10/15/1999	12/30/1999	30281	SAM #1294/1295 / 9F0913-0915		2,618.00	3	1	2 hrs.
	10/18/1999	12/30/1999	30282	SAM #1296/1297 / 9F0921-0923		2,568.00	3	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/29/1999	12/30/1999	31434	SAM #1299 / 9F0924-0925		2,210.00	3	1	2 hrs.
	01/20/2000		31669	SAM #1298 / 9F0926-0927	1,693.94	1,693.94	2	1	2 hrs.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31436	SAM #1363 / 9F0928		736.00	2	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31223	SAM#1424 / 9F1013-16		1,668.00	1	1	3 hrs. 5 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31224	SAM #1425/1429/1434 / 9F1017-20		2,787.00	1	1	2 hrs. 45 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31441	SAM #1468 / 9F1024		752.00	1	1	50 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31225	SAM #1504/1512 / 9F1102-1103		978.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min
	12/23/1999	12/30/1999	31229	SAM #1513 / 9F1108		494.00	1	1	1 hr. 45 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31228	SAM #1584 / 9F1123		494.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31443	SAM #1620 / 9F1206-1210		1,462.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31227	SAM #1646 / 9F1214		736.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min.
					$ 3,807.94	$ 36,685.17			

TOTAL BILLED	$36,685.17
TOTAL PAID	$32,877.23
TOTAL OUTSTANDING	$3,807.94
AVG # OF DAYS TO PAY	28

Exhibit 4

First Lady Travel to New York

Updated Airlift Operations data as of March 31, 2000

Travel of the First Lady to New York Airlift Operations Information

Dates:	#Official Staff Military Aircraft:	#Political Staff Military Aircraft:	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount:	Aircraft:
10/18-10/20/98	1	3		3/21/1999	9/15/1999	$1,811.50	C9
10/27/98	1	5	1:40	5/24/1999	1/14/2000	$2,790.00	C9
11/2/98	1	4	1:35	1/11/1999	2/25/1999	$2,234.00	C20
12/1-12/3/98	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
2/2/99	1	4	:45	4/9/1999	8/16/1999	$593.00	C9
3/3-3/4/99	1	6	1:50	6/2/1999	9/9/1999	$1,118.25	C9
4/19-20/99	1	6	1:45	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$176.80	C9
4/22/99	6	0	1:55	N/A	N/A	N/A	C32
4/29/99	1	3	1:30	6/14/1999	9/9/1999	$885.70	C20
5/7/99	1	5	2:40	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$2,573.75	C20
5/8/99	5	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
5/24/99	1	3	1:35	6/30/1999	3/23/2000	$1,115.50	C20
6/2/99	1	3	1:40	7/23/1999	3/23/2000	$827.32	C20
7/23/99	5	0	1:15	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
8/7/99	4	0	1:40	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/18/99	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/30/99	1	2	2:10	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$2,204.72	C20
11/29-12/1/99	1	2	4:35	3/15/2000	4/4/2000	$3,562.00	C37
12/16/99	1	3	1:30	*	*	*	C20
12/21/99	1	2	2:25	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,377.00	C20
1/9-1/10/00	1	2	1:10	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$1,165.00	C9
1/24-1/25/00	1	1	2:50	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$1,393.00	C20
2/3-2/4/00	1	1	1:45	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,071.00	C20
2/5-2/13/00	1	2	2:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,752.00	C20
2/15-2/17/00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20

Note:* Information not available at time of response.
Note: N/A= not applicable/ trip is 100% official

Exhibit 5

Airlift Operations Data
(not previously requested)

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY TO NEW YORK

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)	#Official Staff Military Aircraft	# Political Staff Military Aircraft	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount	Aircraft:
1/17-1/19	New York, NY	Political	$75.00	1	1	2:35	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,388.00	C20
	White Plains	Political								
	Buffalo, NY	Political								
1/21	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:30	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
2/20	Albany, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$910.00	C20
2/22	Tonowanda, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,013.00	C20
	Staten Island	Political								
2/24-2/27	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 255.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,764.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
2/29	Syosset, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
3/1	Valley Cottage, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$812.00	C20
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	New Hempstead, NY	Political								
	Purchase, NY	Political								
3/2-3/3	New York, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
3/4-3/7	Queens, NY	Political	$ 105.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
	Tuxedo Park, NY	Political								
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Asroria, NY	Political								
3/8-3/11	New York, NY	Political	$ 330.00	1	2	10:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$5,893.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Ithaca, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
3/13-3/15	New York, NY	Political	$ 75.00	1	1	3:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,156.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
	Suffolk County, NY	Political								
3/16	New York, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,329.30	C20
	Huntington Station, NY	Political								
3/17	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	4	1:30	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,220.00	C20
3/18	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.60	C20
3/20-3/22	Harlem, NY	Political	$ 471.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Rosslyn Heights, NY	Political								
	White Plains, NY	Political								
	New York, NY	Political								
	Armonk, NY	Political								
3/24	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	2	*	*	*	*	C20
3/26	Albany, NY	Political	$0.00							
3/29-3/30	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20

Note: * Information not available at time of response.

Exhibit 6

The First Lady's Book Tour

Simon & Schuster

The First Lady's Simon and Schuster Book Tour

1/15/96-5/3/96

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost (Gross Obligations):	Aircraft:	Simon and Schuster Reimbursement:
1/15-1/20	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$1,420.02	C20	$6,462.50
	Little Rock, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Blytheville, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Detroit, MI	Mixed			
	Chicago, IL	Simon & Schuster			
	Boston, MA	Simon & Schuster			
1/31	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$400.82
2/7-2/9	Denver, CO	Simon & Schuster	$881.86	C20	$6,094.60
	Los Angeles, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	San Francisco, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	Dallas, TX	Simon & Schuster			
2/22	Philadelphia, PA	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$1,208.13
5/2-5/3	Boca Raton, FL	Simon & Schuster	$187.73	C20	$4,130.00
	Atlanta, GA	Simon & Schuster			
	St. Louis, MO	Simon & Schuster			
	Minneapolis, MN	Simon & Schuster			

Exhibit 7

The total IT request, including systems maintenance, for the Office of Administration is as follows:

Capital Investment Plan $9,905,000

Salaries & Expenses
Information Systems & Technology
Customer Service 1,104,000
Telephones 482,000
Management & Planning 185,000
Data Center 1,832,000
Network 1,154,000
Facility Contract 7,273,000
System Integration 1,328,000
Personnel Compensation 4,531,000

General Services
Graphics & Publications 12,000

Human Resource Management
Payroll System 221,000

Financial Management
Accounting System 140,000

Library & Research Services
On-line Databases 235,000

Facilities Management
Facilities Software 3,000

TOTAL $28,405,000

Exhibit 8

Unanticipated Needs

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

g:\data\fy2001\unanticipated needs\un_hist.xls

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1972	1,000,000	446,000	Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention
1973	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1974	1,000,000	330,000	Energy Policy Office
		39,000	Federal Property Council
		92,000	U.S. Puerto Rico Ad Hoc Advisory Board
1975	500,000	231,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		212,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1976	1,000,000	235,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		10,000	Federal Paperwork Commission
		131,300	Privacy Protection Study Commission
		19,000	National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials
1977	1,000,000	57,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries
		100,000	Commission on Mental Health
		45,000	Office of Drug Abuse Policy
1978	1,000,000	52,000	Metric Board
		6,000	World Hunger Commission
		1,000	Commission on Pension Policy
		33,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		26,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1979	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1980	1,000,000	134,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		67,000	White House Office
		67,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		134,000	Department of State
		34,000	Commission on World Hunger
		168,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
1981	1,000,000	65,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		100,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
		58,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries
1982	844,800	26,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		15,000	Commission on Radio Broadcast to Cuba
		52,000	Property Review Board
		145,000	Native Hawaiians Study
		50,000	Federalism and Private Sector Initiatives
1983	1,000,000	39,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		80,000	White House Private Sector Initiatives Program
		60,000	White House Quality Education Initiative
		250,000	Agency for International Development

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

g:\data\fy2001\unanticipated needs\un_hist.xls

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1984	1,000,000	375,000	WHCA EOP Computer Center Conversion
1985	1,000,000	162,000	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1986	957,000	180,608	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1987	1,000,000	242,000	President's Special Review Board
		195,000	Iran Contra Hearings
		325,000	U.S. Secret Service
1988	1,000,000	150,000	Task Force on Market Mechanisms
		20,000	WHO Conference for a Drug-Free America
		110,000	President's Commission on Privatization
1989	1,000,000	181,000	National Space Council
1990	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1991	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1992	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1993	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1994	1,000,000	250,000	JFK Assassination Records Review Board
1995	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1996	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1997 [1]	0	- 0 -	
1998 [2]	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1999	1,000,000	- 0 -	
2000	1,000,000	325,000	White House Council on Youth Violence

[1] In FY 1997, the $1,000,000 requested for the Unanticipated Needs Account was diverted to fund conferences on model state drug laws through the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

[2] In FY 1998, the Unanticipated Needs Account was funded through the VA, HUD appropriations act, P.L. 105-65.

Exhibit 9

Estimated Terminal Leave Payments

Executive Office of the President: FY 2001 President's Request
Additional Questions

QUESTION 1: By EOP agency, provide the total number of FTE broken out by: # of political FTE and # of career FTE. For the political positions, include the job title for each position.

RESPONSE:

FTE BREAKOUT

AGENCY	AUTHORIZED FTE	CAREER FTE	POLITICAL FTE[1]
CEA	35	27	8[2]
NSC	60	60	0
OA	192	182	10
OPD	31	0	31
OVP	22	0	22
VP-RES	1	0	1
WHO	400	0	399

For a listing of job titles for the political FTE, see Exhibit 1.

QUESTION 2: By EOP agency, provide the total number of positions expected to be vacant due to the Presidential transition. Include total estimated terminal leave payments for each agency.

RESPONSE: The EOP is unable to speculate as to the number of positions expected to be vacant due to the presidential transition. However, the EOP has made certain assumptions for budget preparation purposes.

TOTAL ESTIMATED TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS[3]

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
WHO	$610K[4]
OVP	$28K

[1] Includes actual positions as well as vacant Senate Confirmed Positions.
[2] Administratively Determined (AD) technical staff not included in this number.
[3] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates as of February 11, 2000. These amounts reflect potential costs and do not reflect the amounts budgeted for FY 2001, which in some cases assumed that the majority of these costs would be offset from savings from attrition.
[4] Does not include terminal leave costs of GS equivalent personnel.

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR SEAN P. MALONEY
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
STAFF SECRETARY

FROM: MARK F. LINDSAY, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: DRAFT HEARING QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

Attached for your review are Questions for the Record (QFR) which were submitted in conjunction with the testimony of Michael J. Lyle, Director of the Office of Administration, before the Treasury Postal Appropriations Subcommittee.

Because the Subcommittee has imposed a strict deadline, it is imperative that we receive your corrections or comments no later than 12:00 noon on Wednesday, April 12, 2000. We apologize for the short notice and we appreciate your assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact my office in the event that you have questions.

DRAFT

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Issue: **Automated Records Management System (ARMS)**

Questions:

1. **Is ARMS the current system used to collect and store all electronic mail messages in the EOP? Is this the system that is used to comply with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution? Is ARMS the system that had the "glitch" referred to in the press reports? What was the total cost of developing and deploying ARMS? What are the annual operation and maintenance costs? Under which appropriation account are these costs funded?**

   RESPONSE: The Automated Records Management System (ARMS) is the current system used to manage electronic mail (e-mail) for the following EOP components that are subject to the Federal Records Act: the Office of Administration (OA), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy. ARMS is the mechanism that these agencies utilize to comply with the portion of the *Armstrong* decision that requires e-mail, including transmission and receipt data, to be records managed. Although not required by the *Armstrong* decision or the Presidential Records Act (PRA), the White House utilizes ARMS to manage its e-mail for eventual transfer to the Presidential library, and some Office of the Vice President (OVP) e-mails have been managed by ARMS. The Information Systems and Technology Division (IS&T) is currently working to make sure that ARMS manages all OVP e-mail.

   The ARMS "glitch" referred to in the press reports involves two separate configuration errors that prevented certain incoming Internet e-mails from being recorded in ARMS for a period of time. See response to Question 4 below for a technical description of the configuration errors.

   The total cost of developing and deploying ARMS was $985,013. The annual operation and maintenance costs for ARMS for FY99 were $365,119. Exhibit 1 contains a breakout of these costs.

   The Armstrong Resolution Account was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that the ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS were funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

2. **The White House has suggested that, because the Appropriations Committee fenced $966,700 in FY 1997 IT funds pending the development of an architecture for the White House Capital Investment Plan, operation and maintenance of certain systems was jeopardized and, in fact, may have caused some of the problems that the White House experienced with the e-mails:**

   - **In FY 1994, the EOP received a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 million for costs associated with the Armstrong Resolution. Are there any restrictions on using these funds to maintain ARMS or any other IT systems within the EOP network that are necessary for maintaining electronic records management and/or compliance with the Armstrong Resolution?**

RESPONSE: The fencing of information technology funds in FY 1997 precluded the EOP from maintaining, repairing or from making improvements to an already antiquated computer system. In fact, the EOP reported to the Subcommittee on February 28, 1997, that the failure to unfence the funds would cause: (1) increased vulnerability to EOP computer systems and Internet connections from external threats; (2) increased network downtime due to depletion of spare parts; (3) eroded levels of preventative maintenance; (4) curtailed ability to replace broken equipment; and (4) significantly delayed response time. In response to the Questions for the Record submitted by the Committee for FY 1998 dated April 7, 1998, we advised the Committee that if the funds were not unfenced there would be increased security threats to the network from denial of service attacks, spoofing, and storming. We itemized numerous specific instances of system crashes (e.g., Lattis Network Switch, ONDCP subnet, and FDDI network work group hub) and advised that another failure may result in a shutdown of a segment of the network. Indeed, in response to one Committee question, we advised that:

> *The client/server network backup system used to preserve data integrity and facilitate the archival of Presidential and Federal records has exceeded its life cycle. Several users have already experienced the loss of data due to file server hardware failures. An analysis of the backup system has been completed with the recommendations to correct the problem. The cost to implement the solution is estimated at $20,000, but the funds are fenced.*

Thus, as a direct result of the fenced funds, an already antiquated EOP computer system further deteriorated and at a more rapid rate.

At this same point in time the EOP was confronted with its Year 2000 (Y2K) vulnerabilities. The fenced funds contributed to making the already difficult Y2K problem even more difficult. In addition to having to repair equipment that had been cannibalized and neglected as a direct result of the fenced funding, we had to renovate and test this equipment and all of our mission critical systems in little more than a year. Consequently, the resources and personnel necessary to achieve Y2K compliance increased significantly and it became necessary to defer non-Y2K projects such as the development of an Intranet, the interfacing of the payroll/personnel system with the financial management system, upgrades to the financial management system, and the Mail2 reconstruction.

DRAFT

There are restrictions on using the Armstrong Resolution Account in that it was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS have been funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

Virtually all of the e-mail associated with the MAIL2 problem were Presidential records. Since the Armstrong decision is applicable only to Federal records, we determined that Congressional approval would be necessary in order to utilize Armstrong funds for the reconstruction effort. On March 20, 2000, after completing the Y2K effort and after obtaining the necessary documentation to support the request, the EOP requested the approval from the Subcommittee.

- **On March 20, 2000, the Committee received a request to use $1.7 million in Armstrong Resolution funds to reconstruct this e-mail. Why didn't the White House submit a request to use the Armstrong Funds for the purpose of both fixing this "glitch" and reconstructing the e-mails at the time the "glitch" was discovered?**

RESPONSE: We did not request approval to utilize Armstrong funds at the time the "glitch" was discovered for two reasons: (1) as noted above, the reconstruction had to be deferred until the EOP's Year 2000 (Y2K) objectives were achieved and (2) we needed to obtain the necessary documentation to support the request.

Upon the completion of the EOP's Y2K effort, the Director of OA requested the Information Systems & Technology Division (IS&T) to prepare a plan and develop cost estimates for the reconstruction in the January/February time frame, which were completed in mid-March. Upon receipt of this supporting documentation, we promptly submitted our request. Moreover, by waiting, the EOP actually saved money in connection with the reconstruction effort. Indeed, in November of 1998, Northrop Grumman quoted us a price of $602,000 to perform a feasibility assessment. This assessment did not include the costs associated with purchasing equipment, or performing the reconstruction. Because government personnel, who were previously assigned to the Y2K effort, were able to perform the feasibility assessment, the EOP did not incur the $602,000 costs requested by Northrop Grumman.

The request did not seek approval to utilize the funds to repair the glitch because the reconfigurations already had been accomplished under the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman.

DRAFT

3. **During the period of time when in-coming electronic messages were not being records managed, were you out of compliance with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution?**

   RESPONSE: No. First, the *Armstrong* decision is inapplicable to Presidential records. Second, the *Armstrong* decision required a record-keeping system such as ARMS to capture electronic mail, including transmission and receipt data. At all times, the EOP has utilized ARMS in accordance with *Armstrong* – some anomalies simply occurred in connection with ARMS. The *Armstrong* decision does not mandate against the types of anomalies that occurred; therefore, the requirements of the *Armstrong* decision were not violated. Moreover, the EOP remained in compliance with *Armstrong* in that the information was captured on backup tapes, which can be accessed to reconstruct the records.

4. **What was the technical nature of the problem and how did it occur? When did the White House discover it? When did the White House begin to assess the problem and begin remediaton efforts? Which appropriation cost covered the cost of this remediation effort? How long did it take to fix the problem?**

   RESPONSE: In August of 1996, an EOP sub-contractor mistakenly utilized all upper case letters (MAIL2) instead of the required upper and lower case letters (Mail2) when creating a script to move users from one server to another. Because ARMS did not recognize MAIL2 as a proper entry, some incoming Internet e-mail for users on Mail2 were not records managed in ARMS from August of 1996 to November of 1998 when the accounts were properly reconfigured. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in June of 1998, affected 426 users from the White House, 58 from the Office of Policy Development, and 4 from the OA. All accounts were properly reconfigured (fixed) as required by the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman in November of 1998. It took approximately 5 months to determine the cause of the problem and then to reconfigure the affected accounts.

   Additionally, in November of 1998 when Northrop Grumman was fixing the MAIL2 anomaly, they made yet another configuration error. When user accounts are created, they are assigned a particular view that corresponds to the section of the alphabet (e.g., ABC) that corresponds to the first letter of their first name (e.g., Ann Smith would be in the view that contains the letter "A"). In the latter configuration error, the letter "D" was inadvertently omitted from a view and the letter "J" was included twice. As a result, incoming Internet e-mail to user accounts with first names beginning with the letter "D" were not records managed in ARMS from November of 1998 to May of 1999 when the error was fixed. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in April of 1999, affected approximately 200 users in the EOP (42 from WHO, 8 from OPD, 54 from OMB, 4 from CEQ, 32 from OA, 20 from ONDCP, 6 from OSTP, 3 from the White House Climate Change Task Force, 1 from the Council of Economic Advisors, and 21 from the National Security Council). It took approximately one month to troubleshoot and fix the problem.

DRAFT

5. **Did this "glitch" effect all e-mail within the EOP complex? Which specific EOP agencies were affected? How many electronic messages were affected?**

RESPONSE: No - - the e-mail anomalies affected only some incoming Internet e-mail. For the specific agencies affected, see Response to Question 4. At this point in time, we do not know the number of electronic messages that were affected.

6. **Are the affected electronic messages currently being reconstructed? What is the status of that effort? Who is performing it? What funds are currently being used for this effort? What is the total estimated cost of the reconstruction effort?**

RESPONSE: Yes. On March 29, 2000, OA issued a letter contract for the reconstruction to ECS Technologies, Inc., an 8(a) contractor that has performed similar reconstruction work for the EOP in the past. As we orally advised this Subcommittee, so as not to further delay the reconstruction, we realigned $100,000 from OA's current year projects to "Other Services" to fund a letter contract so that work could commence on the reconstruction effort. Upon the Subcommittee's approval of the use of Armstrong funds, we will transfer the remaining balance from the Armstrong Resolution Account to the extent not required to complete our Armstrong obligations to "Other Services" to continue work on the reconstruction. Based on the results of the market survey that we conducted, we anticipate that $1 – 3 million will be required for the reconstruction. We anticipate that we will likely be seeking additional funds from the Subcommittee to complete this task.

DRAFT

Automated Records Management System II (ARMS II)

Issue:
Questions:

In 1997, the White House described ARMS II as a system expected to achieve increased online storage, enhanced search capabilities and retrieval, and automated dispositioning. In August of last year, the EOPs Information Technology Architecture Annual Update submitted to the Subcommittee indicated that ARMS II was still under development and a part of the information technology modernization effort. The Committee understands that development of ARMS II has now stopped.

1. **What is the current status of ARMS II? If all work has stopped, why was it stopped and why wasn't the Subcommittee informed?**

RESPONSE: The EOP's August 1999 Update to its Information Technology Architecture (ITA) did not indicate that ARMS II was still under development. While the ITA contained Electronic Document Management Projects/Pilots, ARMS II was not specifically identified as a project. As explained in our March 1, 2000 response to questions from this Subcommittee, we have delayed the implementation of ARMS II until the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems such as ARMS. While we do not believe that NARA's Fast Track Initiative or endorsement of DOD Standard 5015.2-STD constitute such guidance or technical standards, we are optimistic about NARA's work with the National Science Foundation to create an electronic records archives independent of electronic format, which was announced on March 28, 2000. However, until NARA completes its projected two-year Business Process Engineering effort, which is likely to impact electronic record-keeping practices, and/or until the results of NARA's work with the National Science Foundation are known, we believe it is prudent to delay implementation of ARMS II at this point in time. We believe it would be unwise for OA to risk implementing ARMS II only to find that it may be necessary to perform another tape reformatting project in several years when NARA issues new technical guidance. This has happened before. In fact, we are currently reformatting tapes from a previously NARA approved format to another format because NARA determined the old format would no longer meet their needs. Thus, until NARA issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems, we intend to defer implementation of ARMS II.

2. **Is there an automated system in place to collect and sort other internal records?**

RESPONSE: There are many automated systems within the EOP that collect and sort other internal records, although ARMS is the only electronic record-keeping system. For example, the Federal Financial Accounting and Management Information System (FAMIS) collects and sorts internal financial management records. Similarly, the Payroll and Personnel System collects and sorts internal payroll and personnel records. Yet another example is the PRISM system, which collects and sorts internal procurement records.

DRAFT

3. **Information provided to the Subcommittee indicates that the White House stopped work on ARMSII because the National Archives has not yet provided agencies with guidance and technical standards on developing electronic record-keeping systems. According to the Archives, they have developed guidance through their FastTrack initiative. Archives hasn't issued technical standards but they have endorsed DOD standards. The Committee understands that Archives has been working with the White House in the development of their electronic records keeping system. Describe your current work with Archives to develop electronic records keeping system. If you are not currently working with Archives, when did that effort stop?**

RESPONSE: OA is unaware of any work with Archives to develop an electronic record-keeping system to replace ARMS. However, we have been working closely with NARA to ensure a successful transition and transfer of records between Administrations. See also our response to Question 1 above.

DRAFT

Issue: **Financial Accountability within the EOP**
Questions:

1. **Last year, CBO estimated that the cost of implementing the provisions Section 638 of PL 106-58 establishing a Chief Financial Officer to be $250,000 yet the White House is requesting a total of $660,000 for this effort. What accounts for the difference between CBO's estimate and the FY 2001 request?**

RESPONSE: Because the basis for the CBO's estimate was not provided, we are unable to account for the difference between CBO's estimate and the EOP's FY2001 request. The following, however, summarizes the FY 2001 request for funds relating to the establishment of a CFO in the EOP.

The Office of Administration's FY 2001 budget request of $660,000 is composed of two pieces: $290,000 for salary and benefits costs to support a 5 person staff; and $370,000 to contract with an independent firm to conduct an auditability assessment for the EOP agencies and accounts.

Salary and Benefits
The $290,000 represents estimated salary and benefits for the following staff, with an estimated start of duty date of March 1, 2001:

CFO at Executive Level IV
Deputy CFO – GS-15
Accounting Officer – GS-15
Systems Staff – GS-13
Administrative support – GS-7

The benefits rate used was 25%, based on the current EOP average. Estimates include the calendar year 2000 cost of living adjustment (COLA) and a projected COLA (3.7%) for calendar year 2001.

The estimated start date for the staff of March 1, 2001 was a conservative average, since it is not known how long the selection process will take for the CFO position, or how this will relate to the staffing of the rest of the positions.

The full year cost (FY 2002) of these five FTE would be approximately $492,000.

Auditability Assessment
Compliance with the CFO Act requires the submission of agency-wide audited financial statements to OMB by March 1 of each year. This submission involves a three-step process, including an agency auditability assessment, preparation of auditable financial statements, and the conduct of the audit itself. Estimates solicited from four local accounting firms who currently provide these services to the federal government ranged from $300,000 to $1,200,000 for all three services.

The EOP request of $370,000 is based on an average of the four accounting firm estimates for

DRAFT

the auditability assessment alone. The costs for template preparation and the audit will be requested in future years' budgets.

DRAFT

Issue: **Information Technology Architecture (ITA)**
Questions:

1. **On February 4, 2000, GAO completed its review of EOP's information technology architecture, as requested by the Subcommittee. In pertinent part, GAO found that the current architecture defines principles and goals governing how it wants to operate in both business and technical terms but that EOP still needs to define how it wants to operate in the future in business terms AND define a "roadmap" or implementation plan for getting there. In responding to GAO's review, the EOP disagreed with its findings and stated that it has defined all of its current and future core business requirements.**

   Given your disagreement with the GAO review, it is inconsistent that, in your annual update to the Committee (August 31, 1999), you clearly state that: . . ."the enterprise architecture planning considers both a short-term operational and long-term strategic focus on the use of information and technology to support EOP's business needs… to fulfill this mission we will take steps to enhance our enterprise architecture planning process by building a conceptual business model and defining the data needed to run the business." Additionally, the Committee understands that the WH has brought on a contractor to assist in developing an updated business/information model and to specify applications that support this model. It seems that this statement and the hiring of a contractor confirm GAO's findings.

   - **How do you explain these inconsistencies?**

   RESPONSE: We do not view these as inconsistencies. Although we have built a conceptual business model and have defined the data needed to run the business, we nonetheless recognize that we need to continue to enhance our enterprise architecture. As we have emphasized in the past, an ITA is a "living document" that must continue to evolve. The EOP will continue to assess and reassess its business processes and to integrate its work processes and information flows with current and future technologies to achieve the strategic goals of the Presidency. To meet the EOP's business needs, the EOP will continuously evaluate and identify additional systems applications to support these business requirements, and periodically update its "roadmap" or implementation plan for transitioning over a specified period of time from the "as-is to the "to-be" architectural environments. The EOP ITA provides us with the mechanism to do so. Moreover, the hiring of a contractor to assist the EOP in its ITA efforts is consistent with OA's Fiscal Year 2000 Capital Investment Plan, which contained specific funding for this purpose.

DRAFT

- **In section 3 of EOP's 1999 ITA Update, current core business processes are specified. On which pages in the ITA Update are the future core business processes defined?**

RESPONSE: As we stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, contrary to the GAO report, the EOP ITA identifies all of the EOP's current and future business processes. These core business processes, which are driven by the current, past and future President(s), have changed little over the years, remaining relatively constant. While the 2000 Update to the EOP's ITA will focus on identifying and analyzing those common business processes that can be further streamlined and/or manual business processes that can be automated, we anticipate that these core business processes will remain unchanged.

2. **The FY 2001 request includes $1,485,000 for projects that are to test, develop and implement EOP software and systems that are intended to streamline business processes and increase productivity. These projects include the White House Integrated System for Document Management (WHISDM) and an electronic document management/pilot projects.**

   - **How do WHISDM and the other electronic document management/pilot projects relate? What is the expected return on investment of WHISDM? Is this return on investment supported by a business case analysis? If so, please submit for the record.**

RESPONSE: As stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, currently, the implementation of WHISDM is limited to three offices within the White House: the Office of Presidential Personnel, the Office of Records Management, and the Office of Correspondence. WHISDM, however, is a large-scale electronic document management project that has the capability to provide records management and document management capabilities across the EOP enterprise. Thus, as part of the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects, we will assess whether WHISDM is a potential system for EOP-wide use. Funds from the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects of the CIP will then be used to fund any customizations associated with adding the additional EOP components.

In Fiscal Year 1998, a requirements and alternatives analysis was performed by an independent consultant to identify and evaluate the requirements and potential software solutions to meet the needs of the three White House Offices, and to ensure consistency with the overall technical direction of the EOP. The implementation of WHISDM to date, however, has been largely necessitated by Y2K because the existing systems used by the three offices were not Y2K compliant. Thus, a formal business case analysis was not required. As part of Phase II of the WHISDM effort, however, the successful contractor will be required to assist the EOP in performing a business process review and preparing a business case analysis.

Issue: **First Lady Travel**
Questions

The Committee understands that the current procedures being used by the White House to make distinctions between political and official travel are, for all practical purposes, no different than those procedures used by previous Administrations. Having said that, however, it is also true that no previous First Lady ran as a candidate for the US Senate. In reviewing the First Lady's travel records for travel to New York during 1999:

1. **The Committee specifically requested reimbursement data for both political and official travel for fiscal year 1999. Although there were a total of 29 trips taken by the 1st Lady to New York in 1999, the White House only provided data for 16 of these trips and data for 9 other trips taken in FY 2000.**

   - **Why didn't the White House provide data for all of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999? Why did the White House begin with June 9, 1999?**

RESPONSE: The White House has already provided data for all Presidential and First Lady travel, both foreign and domestic from Fiscal Year 1998 through February 18, 2000. See Exhibit 2. Additionally, the Committee made an oral request for "all First Lady travel to New York since she formed her exploratory committee." In response to this request, we provided the data on First Lady travel to New York since June 9, 1999, the date on which her first exploratory travel began. See Exhibit 3.

- **During the hearing, it became apparent that the White House provided different documents to the majority and minority staff regarding Airlift Operations, Exploratory Payment History. Although these documents were provided to the Subcommittee through the Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, and the witness had a copy of the document provided to the minority staff, the witness did not seem to be familiar with the document provided to the majority staff. Please explain why the witness was unfamiliar with the documents provided to the majority staff. Why were different documents provided to the majority and minority staff? For the record, provide (1) the document submitted to the minority staff; and (2) the document submitted to the majority staff, excluding Secret Service personnel and costs.**

RESPONSE: The document provided to the majority staff contained additional information regarding official travelers that are not part of the EOP's appropriation. Neither the USSS detail nor the "White House" photographer is funded from EOP appropriations. Accordingly, requests for information on costs associated with the USSS detail and the photographer should be posed directly to the USSS and the Department of Defense, respectively. With regard to the document provided to the minority staff, that document also contained a footnote referring to the USSS detail and the photographer. See Exhibit 3 for a corrected version of the document that does not include the USSS detail or the photographer.

• Provide the following information for ALL of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to date including:

- **Trip Date**
- **Invoice Date**
- **Payment Date**
- **Destination**
- **Designation**
- **# of Official passengers (excluding USSS only)**
- **Designation of Official passengers**
- **# of Political passengers**
- **Flight Time (wheels up to wheels down)**
- **Type of Aircraft**
- **Official Reimbursements**
- **Political Reimbursements**

RESPONSE: See Exhibit 2 for all First Lady travel from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 4 contains an update of First Lady Travel to New York for Fiscal Year 2000 as of March 31, 2000. Exhibit 5 supplements Exhibit 2 with Airlift Operations information not previously requested.

2. **Current law requires that the cost of campaign travel using government aircraft be reimbursed at the 1st class rate and that political travel be reimbursed at the coach rate. On trips where there is a mixed purpose —for instance official and political, who within the White House Office determines which portions of the trip are political and which portions are official and the subsequent rate of reimbursement? Provide the job titles and offices of all persons responsible for making these determinations.**

RESPONSE: The White House follows all applicable legal rules in determining whether a trip is official, political or a mixed purpose trip as provided by Hatch Act and Federal Election Commission (FEC) law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.101, 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 6 O.L.C. 214 (1982). Likewise, the appropriate rate of reimbursement for trips which contain a political component is calculated according to formulas provided by Hatch Act and FEC law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

"Mixed" trips occur when there is non-campaign related political activity which occurs at a stop. The Hatch Act provides that reimbursement for such mixed trips is to be determined according to the "hard time" formula which allows for a pro rata reimbursement by the relevant political entity according to the time spent in political activity and the time spent in official activity. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503.

FEC law provides that "where a candidate conducts any campaign-related activity in a trip, [other than incidental contacts] the stop is a campaign-related stop." 11 C.F.R. § 106.3(b)(3). As such, when the First Lady, for example, conducts campaign activity at any stop, all of her travel to that stop is considered campaign related, not mixed, even in instances in which official activity may also occur during the trip.

The offices involved in billing for trips include the White House Counsel's Office or the Office of Counsel to the Vice President, the Office of Management and Administration, the White House Military Office, the Office of Political Affairs and the Offices of Scheduling and Advance.

3. **In documents provided to the Committee on March 1, 2000, almost all of the trips identified between 1 and 2 "official" staff traveling with the First Lady, identified by the White House as the Trip Coordinator and the White House Photographer. The White House also stated that travel costs for these staff were considered official costs and paid for with federal appropriations. What official responsibilities does the White House photographer have on trips that are classified as 100 percent political? Of the trips taken by the First Lady to New York for political purposes, how many times did the White House photographer accompany her and at what cost? If costs were not funded through the White House Office, what federal account covered these costs?**

RESPONSE: The First Lady continues in her official role as First Lady at all times and continues to carry her official responsibilities and duties as First Lady at all times, whether or not she is on official business. As such, there are certain individuals whose official duties require them to travel with the First Lady regardless of whether her travel is official, political or campaign-related. Since these individuals are conducting official government business, the law provides that their travel should be paid for with appropriated funds. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

The White House Photographers accompany the President, Vice President and the First Lady in an official capacity regardless of the nature of the trip in order to document their activities for official archival purposes. EOP appropriations do not support the White House Photographer. The White House Photographer is supported through Department of Defense appropriations.

4. **Although the White House has stated that the Secret Service requires the First Lady to use government aircraft, the Committee understands that, during the First Lady's Book Tour, Simon and Schuster provided the First Lady with private aircraft. The White House now says that the First Lady only used military aircraft. Provide, for each trip related to the First Lady's book tour: date of travel, destination, designation, type of aircraft, official reimbursements and, if applicable, "other" reimbursements.**

RESPONSE: As it has recommended consistently in the past for other First Ladies, the Secret Service recommends strongly that the First Lady travel by military aircraft for security reasons. The White House has followed that recommendation for the First Lady's travel, including during her book tour. For travel data related to the First Lady's book tour, See Exhibit 6.

5. **In some instances, although the number of non-official travelers is different, the costs of the trips were identical. For instance, on a trip to New York on November 8th, there was one non-official traveler —the First Lady—with a total cost of $494.00. Two weeks later, there was an identical trip with two non-official travelers —the First Lady and**

one other person —again with a total cost of $494.00. What accounts for this discrepancy in the cost of travel? For the "Exploratory Trip" taken on December 6-10, 1999, total official costs were $1,465.00. Provide, by major spending category (for example, food, lodging, etc.), an itemization of these costs.

RESPONSE: On both trips in question, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler. With regard to the November 23rd trip, the best available information at the time of the response to the oral request was that there were two non-official travelers. This information was updated at the time that the trip was reviewed. At that time, because of a last minute change in the manifest, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler.

The breakout for the trip on December 6-10, 1999 is as follows:

HOTEL: $1,360 at $340/night (no government rate was available)
PER DIEM: $105

6. **Although your documents indicate that it took an "average of 28 days for the political party to reimburse for the costs of the trip", in some instances it took up to 6 months to send the political party an invoice. Of the 22 political trips taken to New York in 1999, 8 were not billed for at least 3 months and 14 of the billings didn't happen until after the Committee had requested information on the billings. What are the current procedures for billing? Is there an established time frame for submitting the invoices to the political party and for receiving reimbursements? Who submits these invoices to the political party?**

   RESPONSE: Although the White House makes every effort to produce trip data in a timely manner so that it can be promptly billed to political parties, we must review each and every trip to ensure compliance with the applicable rules and regulations. The length of this review process varies based on the complexity of the trip. Moreover, since travel is subject to last minute changes based on the schedules of the President and the First Lady, a careful review is necessary in order to make the proper designations to comply with the rules and regulations.

   Current procedures implemented by the White House Office of Management and Administration require the production of trip data within one week of completion of a trip. The production of the trip data then triggers the billing process for reimbursement from political parties. Though the White House is making an earnest effort to expedite the trip billing process, there will still be delays in invoicing due to the complexity of particular trips.

   Prior to March 2000, the White House worked to submit invoices as soon as possible, but there was not a specified time frame for submitting invoices to a political party. First and foremost, White House policy is to comply with the rules and regulations governing travel and to ensure that all bills are accurate.

   The majority of political reimbursements are received by Airlift Operations within 30 days from the date of billing. The First Lady's campaign has been paying in less than 30 days.

DRAFT

Airlift Operations invoices the political party through the White House Office of Management and Administration.

7. **FEC rules require a candidate to pay in advance either the cost of a first class ticket if there is a scheduled flight, or comparable charter fares if there is no scheduled flight. An exception may be made if the comparable fare is under $1,000. The cost of deferring this payment would then effectively be a loan treated as a campaign contribution.**
   - **Do you apply these rules to the First Lady's use of non-commercial campaign travel?**

RESPONSE: FEC law pertaining to payment of expenses for campaign-related travel on a government conveyance, as interpreted by the FEC, provides for reimbursement to the government for such travel, not payment in advance. See 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Advisory Opinion No. 1984-48. See also 5 C.F.R. § 734.503 (which provides for reimbursement of costs, including travel costs, associated with political activity.) The White House has followed all applicable legal rules in ensuring appropriate reimbursement to the government for political travel.

DRAFT

Issue: **FY 2001 Capital Investment Plan**

Questions:

1. **The President requests $9,905,000 for the Capital Investment Plan in FY 2001. The Office of Administration's appropriation request also includes IT funding: $436,000 for the maintenance of systems purchased or upgraded during the infrastructure renovation and $100,000 for maintenance and replacement of internet storm serves and network equipment. Why are IT infrastructure improvements being funded out of Salaries and Expenses?**

   RESPONSE: IT infrastructure improvements are not being funded out of Salaries and Expenses. Consistent with Office of Management and Budget guidance, capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Capital Investment Plan (CIP). Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Thus, because the $536,000 ($436K + $100K) sited above is associated with the ongoing operation and maintenance of equipment and not for infrastructure improvements, the costs are appropriately funded using Salaries and Expenses. Of this request, $359,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the EOP's Internet connectivity; $77,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the help desk software; and the remaining $100,000 is for the normal system maintenance and replacement of the Internet storm servers and network equipment. Again, these funds will be utilized to maintain the current system performance level and do not represent a major system renovation or improvement.

2. **What is the Office of Administration's total funding request for IT needs? What is the difference between the server and network infrastructure investments being funded in the CIP and the server and infrastructure investments being funded by Salaries and Expense?**

   RESPONSE: For OA's total funding request for IT needs, see Exhibit 7. The difference between the server and network infrastructure costs being funded in the CIP versus Salaries and Expenses is that, consistent with OMB guidance, capital improvements are to be funded out of the Capital Investment Plan. Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are to be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Consistent with this principle, the CIP contains funding to replace servers on a two-year cycle due to the rapid technological advancement that occurs in this area. Once these servers are implemented, however, normal system maintenance, including repair and replacement if necessary, would be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

Issue: **Grant to Puerto Rico Elections Commission**
Questions:

1. **The President is requesting $2.5 million for a grant to the Puerto Rico Elections Commission within the appropriation, "Unanticipated Needs". Funds appropriated in this account are authorized to meet "unanticipated needs for the furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense..."**
   - **Please explain how a $2.5 million grant to Puerto Rico can be considered an "unanticipated need."**

   RESPONSE: The Unanticipated Needs Account historically has been utilized to fund projects or initiatives that arise on a one-time basis or, at most, on an irregular basis and for which it is difficult, if not impossible, to plan far in advance. In this case, it is in the national interest for public education in Puerto Rico on the islands' status options and the referendum provides a Federally-sanctioned vote there on preferences among the options.

2. **The justification materials indicate that these funds will "partially" meet the needs of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission to help offset the costs of public education and public choice for future status options. What is the total cost of this effort and who will assume responsibility for the balance of these costs? Has a commitment been made by this source to provide the balance of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Secretary of State and the Governorship of Puerto Rico have estimated the total cost of a referendum and related education campaign at $10 million. This was largely based on the appropriation of $9 million for the recent referendum.

   The Government of Puerto Rico will provide the funding beyond the $2.5 million the EOP has requested.

3. **The justification material indicates that a portion of the funds will be used for an education program and a portion for conducting a referendum on future status options. Has a specific proposal been submitted by the Puerto Rico Elections Commission regarding both the education program and the referendum? Please provide this proposal for the record.**

   RESPONSE: The President of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission is preparing a plan for a referendum and related education campaign. A copy will be provided to the Subcommittee upon receipt.

4. **Who will provide oversight regarding the obligation and use of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Office of Administration, in consultation with the President's Interagency Group on Puerto Rico, will oversee the obligation and use of the funds.

DRAFT

The Office of Administration administered a previous appropriation on the Puerto Rico status question (FY90).

5. **For the record, provide historical obligations for the Unanticipated Needs account, by fiscal year (to date).**

   RESPONSE: See Exhibit 8.

DRAFT

Transition Costs and Procedures

Issue:

Questions:

1. **Of all federal agencies, the EOP is clearly the most affected by a change in Administration. In fact, all staff within the White House Office, the Office of Policy Development and the Office of the Vice President are political staff —presumably all of these individuals will be leaving at the transition.**

   Although the new Administration certainly has the right to organize itself as it sees fit, the EOP is a fairly static organization in terms of business processes —it's basic functions and responsibilities do not change over time or between Administration's. In general, I think it's also fair to say that the EOP probably stores more information and paper than any other federal agency in terms of documents that will ultimately go to the Clinton Presidential Library. I am not trying to rush things when I ask these questions, nonetheless, I am concerned about the procedures that are in place to ensure a smooth transition between Administrations.

   - **Some of the records in the EOP will be classified as "Presidential Records" and will ultimately end up at the Clinton Library. Others will be classified as Federal records and will be stored by the National Archives. Have you been working with the National Archives to ensure a smooth transition in terms of Presidential and Federal Records? What specific guidance has Archives provided to you and what have you done to pass this on to employees within the EOP?**

   RESPONSE: The EOP has been working with the National Archives (NARA) to ensure a smooth transition. The Office of Administration is currently working with NARA to finalize several records disposition schedules that will govern how federal records will be covered. Additionally, in January of this year, the EOP met with NARA representatives to discuss numerous issues relating to the Presidential transition. NARA has provided the EOP with written guidance entitled "Planning for a Successful Presidential Transition" that we have distributed to the appropriate personnel. We will continue to work closely with NARA to ensure a smooth transition.

   - **Over the years, the White House has made a number of changes to some of its basic business functions —such as improvements to its resume processing system as well as security clearances and the issuing of passes. Given the significant personnel turn over that is anticipated, it is imperative that there are systems in place to process personnel efficiently and within the requirements of the law. What are you doing to ensure that all the requisite personnel processing systems are in place for the new Administration?**

   RESPONSE: OA is proud of the changes that we have implemented to continually improve our business processes and better serve our customers. These improvements, including personnel processing, recruitment, and security and background check processing, will remain in place for future Administrations. In addition, many of our investments in information technology have changed the way in which financial data is collected and

distributed; enhanced our procurement methods; and allow increased communication between the various OA divisions and our customers. These changes will also assist us as we prepare for a new Administration.

2. **One of the areas I am most concerned about is the information technology infrastructure initiative that we have been working on for the past several years. We have invested a significant amount of resources in upgrading EOPs technology. I am very concerned about the applicability of these investments to the needs of a new Administration. That is part of the reason why we insist you have both a clearly defined business model as well as an institutional process for moving you to your future business environment within your Capital Investment Plan. I am also concerned that, with the new Administration, there may be an immediate desire to replace certain systems before they know what the current capabilities of the individual systems are. EOP has an established process in place to review information technology requirements. This process seems to be working and the EOP is no longer allowing its individual agencies to development and use stovepipe systems. What are you doing to ensure that this process will remain in place during the transition?**

RESPONSE: As the Subcommittee is aware, many of our achievements in the area of information technology were studied and developed by the Information Technology Management Team (ITMT), which we created under the guidance of the Subcommittee. The majority of the ITMT members are career government employees who will continue to serve in the new Administration. We anticipate that the structure and guidance of the ITMT will continue. In addition, we now have in place an information technology architecture plan and a strategic plan for moving us forward. Again, many of the key staff members who have been guiding the development of these initiatives, as well as the head of the Information Systems and Technology Division, are career civil servants who will continue this effort into the next Administration.

3. **For the record, by EOP agency and including the Executive Residence, provide the total cost of the transition and the total amount requested in the FY 2001 request. Break these costs out by personnel/non-personnel.**

RESPONSE: Three of the FY 2001 EOP budget requests include transition funding. The nature of the White House Office, the Office of the Vice President, and the Executive Residence guarantees that these three agencies will incur additional personnel unemployment, terminal leave, temporary personnel support and other operational expenses associated with a high level of turnover. These expenses are partially offset by personnel savings due to the high vacancy level anticipated during the transition period. A breakout of the transition costs by personnel and non-personnel for each agency is provided below. Additionally, on March 1, 2000, in response to questions from the Subcommittee, we provided estimated terminal leave payments for each EOP agency. See Exhibit 9.

Most EOP agencies did not request additional funding for transition costs. Some of these agencies will be able to accommodate transition costs within the annual appropriation provided, but others may require supplemental funding once the new Administration begins.

The nature and amount of any supplemental request will be determined by the needs of the

new Administration. The goals and priorities of the new President will determine the operational and infrastructure requirements for the upcoming administration and impact the need for additional funds.

Figure 1 - Transition Costs by Agency

(Dollars in 000s)

Agency	Personnel	Non-personnel	Total
White House Office	1,150	994	2,144
Office of the Vice President	20	74	94
Executive Residence	40	60	100
Total	1,210	1,128	2,338

DRAFT

Questions for the Record Submitted by the Committee

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE/EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE

Issue: **Reimbursable Political Activities**
Questions:

1. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence bill for reimbursable activities held within the White House within 60 days of the event and that interest and penalties be assessed for those activities that are not paid for within 90 days of the event date. In FY 1999, the Committee provided funds to support an Accounting Technician "to account and bill for reimbursable political events through the year".**

   The report on Reimbursable Activities submitted to the Committee on January 1, 2000 indicates that there were 5 political events that were NOT billed within this 60-day period. It further indicates that the billing information needed by the Executive Residence was being held up by the White House Social Office.

   - **Is it accurate to say that bills for these 5 events were prepared after the 60-day requirement because of delays in receiving billing information from the White House Social Office?**

     RESPONSE: Yes. Although the billing data was processed within the 90-day requirement, the delay was in obtaining the name and/or address of the entity to which the bill should be submitted. The exception was the Holiday Press Festival where two additional invoices were received after the initial bill had been submitted to the Democratic National Committee (DNC). A new bill was prepared for the DNC.

   - **Is the White House Social Office aware of the current law requirements as it relates to reimbursable political activities?**

     RESPONSE: Yes, the White House Social Office is aware of the legal requirements relating to reimbursements to political entities and conforms itself to those requirements.

   - **Why was there a delay in receiving the billing information? How many attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information?**

     RESPONSE: Despite the best efforts of the Social Office, there was a delay in obtaining the names and/or addresses of the appropriate entities and providing the Executive Residence with the billing information. Several attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information.

   - **Given the delay in billing, payments were made beyond the 90 days required in law. Why weren't penalties assessed for these events? What would have been the total amount of penalties, interest and other charges assessed to these events had the delay in payment been caused by the host and not the White House Social Office?**

DRAFT

RESPONSE: The delay in billing was not caused by any lack of diligence by the Social Office, but rather due to difficulties in determining the appropriate entity to bill. With regard to the events in question, as soon as it was discovered that the DNC was the appropriate entity to bill for the event, the DNC paid promptly.

For the bill dated May 10, 1999 for the Holiday Press Festival, penalties were included as the payment was two months past due.

Payment was received from the DNC on a timely basis. Had it been necessary to charge interest and penalties the total cost would have been $69.39.

2. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence charge interest and assess penalties for late payments (90 days after the event date). Two events in fiscal year 1999 included penalties. What was the total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999?**

   RESPONSE: The total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999 was $56.74.

DRAFT

Issue: **White House Repair and Restoration**

Questions:

1. **The White House has requested $5,000,000 for replacement of the existing raceway containing critical voice and data communications line.**

- **What is the current condition of this raceway? Why is it critical to begin this project in FY 2001? What are the consequences of a one-year delay for this project?**

  RESPONSE: The metal raceway is partially deteriorated and the supports are very rusty. The cable infrastructure within these raceways directly supports the communications network. In the event that the raceway fails or collapses, there would be a major communications outage. If the project is delayed for one year, no guarantee can be made that the raceway system will continue to support the cable infrastructure. This would require the installation of temporary supports and could impact airflow to the cooling tower since the raceway runs through the exhaust chamber of the cooling tower. The chemicals and damp air that flow through the exhaust chamber are the major contributing cause of the deterioration.

- **Is $5,000,000 the total estimated cost for this project?**

  RESPONSE: Yes.

- **Budget justification documents indicate that a professional engineering survey of existing conditions will be conducted. The design and the final construction documents will follow this survey. If this project has not been designed, on what basis is the $5 million estimate made? This phase —a survey and the preparation of the construction documents-- will take from 9 months to one year. What is the cost of this phase?**

  RESPONSE: The estimate of $5 million is based on similar work conducted within the EOP complex. The breakdown is as follows:

Excavation and Duct Bank Installation	$1,500,000
Cabling and terminations	1,200,000
Cable Frame	325,000
Overhead/Profit at 10%	635,250
Contingency Factor of 15%	549,037
SUBTOTAL FOR CONSTRUCTION	$4,209,287
Design Cost at 10%	420,928
Management Cost at 8%	370,417
TOTAL Project Estimate	$5,000,632

  It is anticipated that the design phase will cost approximately $458,000 (design fee plus management cost of 10%).

DRAFT

- **If the survey and design phase will take one year to complete, why is it necessary to request construction funds in FY 2001? It seems that you will not be ready to start the construction phase until 2002?**

  RESPONSE: In order to move as expeditiously as possible, we anticipate beginning design in October of 2000 with completion by June of 2001. Accordingly, we could begin construction in early August of 2001 so that the majority of the excavation work and concrete work could be performed when the President normally vacations and completed before winter.

2. **What specifically will be purchased with the $60,000 requested for "computer modernization"? Since the Executive Residence is within the purview of the Executive Office of the President, this project should be consistent with the current capital investment project. Is this project both compatible and consistent with the EOP's overall modernization strategy?**

   RESPONSE: The specific computer items are as follows: a network server, a replacement tape backup system, ten replacement personal computers, five replacement monitors, and five replacement printers.

   The Executive Residence is not connected to the EOP computer network. It is a self-contained, closed network.

Domestic Staff

DRAFT

Issue:
Questions:

1. **The President is requesting an additional 4 FTE for the Executive Residence: a night doorman, a butler, a laundry attendant, and a housekeeper. The total price tag for these staff is $330,030, an average of more than $75,000 per employee. Why are these 4 FTE so costly?**

   RESPONSE: The total represented by the $330,030 includes salary, premium pay, and benefits as follows:

	Salary	Benefits	Premium Pay
Butler	$55,016	$17,628	$22,006
Doorman	$45,000	$12,613	$ 7,650
Laundry Asst.	$24,837	$ 6,954	$ 9,040
Housekeeper	$55,307	$17,698	$26,281

2. **Part of the justification for these additional FTE is that "staff are required to work a tremendous number of overtime hours. The staffing requirements of events make it difficult to meet leave requests..." What is the current average overtime per month per employee within the Executive Residence?**

   RESPONSE: The average cost of domestic overtime for FY 2001 is $1,664.

3. **Two years ago, the average salary for the White House Domestic Staff was $58,260. For FY 2000, the average salary is $72,047, an increase of 24 percent. What accounts for this tremendous growth in domestic staff salaries?**

   RESPONSE: Many of the specialized, professional staff of the Executive Residence have been there for a long time, thereby placing them in the higher grades. Additionally, numerous staff, which were part of the Civil Service Retirement System, have retired over the past few years. Since the new employees are part of the Federal Employees Retirement System, the Executive Residence has seen the average benefits rates rise from 14% to 32%.

4. **What are the estimated overtime costs for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001?**

   RESPONSE: The estimated overtime cost for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 is $718,875 and for fiscal year 2001 is $768,683.

5. **The White House Repair and Restoration account includes a request of $100,000 for the "Transition Impact" —basically staff overtime associated with the upcoming Presidential transition. Isn't it unusual to request funds for domestic staff overtime in the White House Repair and Restoration account? Why weren't these funds requested with the Executive Residence Operating Expenses Appropriation?**

DRAFT

RESPONSE: The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request funds for these one-time costs.

DRAFT

Issue: **Presidential Transition Costs**
Questions:

1. **The White House is requesting $100,000 for costs associated with transitioning the first families; $100,000 for family quarters redecoration, and $150,000 for linen replacement.**

   - **The request includes $40,000 for staff overtime associated with moving the First Families and the inauguration. What specific inaugural activities will the domestic staff be involved in? Why are these funds being requested within the White House Repair and Restoration Account and not the Executive Residence Operating Expenses appropriation?**

   RESPONSE: These funds are for the transition from the current First Family and the newly elected First Family. The overtime will be associated with moving, packing, cleaning, unpacking, and room setup. Inaugural events will be reimbursable and are not included in this request.

   The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request the funds for these one-time charges.

   - **In the past, Congress has provided $50,000 for family quarters redecoration. What accounts for the doubling of the request for these purposes?**

   RESPONSE: Funds have historically been requested to allow the new First Family the opportunity to redecorate and renovate the living quarters as this will be their primary residence. The rooms in the living quarters usually require replacement carpeting, wall coverings, furnishings, and drapes. The amount previously requested has not been increased for inflation.

   - **In regards to the linen replacement project, a portion of these funds are being used to replace and replenish linens in the Executive Residence. Why does this project need to occur prior to the arrival of the new First Family?**

   RESPONSE: The linen replacement is needed due to normal wear and tear, not the arrival of the new First Family.

Exhibit 1

ARMS Development and Maintenance Costs

ARMS Development/Deployment (Armstrong):

VAX Upgrade	$748,101
ARMS Design/Development	236,912
	$985,013

ARMS Maintenance (Salaries & Expenses):

FY00 maintenance	$397,820
FY99 maintenance	365,119
FY98 maintenance	292,012
FY97 maintenance	158,577
FY96 maintenance	94,500
FY95 maintenance	73,901
FY94 maintenance	33,378

Exhibit 2

Presidential and First Lady Travel
Fiscal Years 1998 – February 18, 2000

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

---

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/08	Newark, NJ	Mixed	$ 2,105.13
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
10/12-19	**Venezuela**	**Official**	$0.00
	Brazil		
	Argentina		
10/27-28	Chicago, IL	Official	$ 19,066.80
10/31-11/02	West Palm Beach, FL	Mixed	$ 8,987.12
	Amelia Island, FL	Political	
	Staten Island, NY	Political	
	Middlesex County, NJ	Political	
	New York, New York	Mixed	
11/06	College Station, TX	Official	$ 4,622.99
11/14-11/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 21,359.00
	Sacramento, CA	Mixed	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Wichita, KS	Official	
	St. Louis, MO	Political	
11/22-11/26	Denver, CO	Mixed	$0.00
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Vancouver, BC	Official	
12/03	Akron, OH	Official	$ 7,073.64
	Chicago, IL	Political	
12/9-12/11	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,826.88
	Miami, FL	Mixed	
12/21-12/22	**Italy**	**Official**	$0.00
	Bosnia-Herzegovia		
12/30-01/04	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$ 50,577.43
	Virgin Islands	Official	
01/08-1/09	New York, NY	Political	$ 21,765.33
	McAllen, TX	Mixed	
	Brownsville, TX	Official	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	

01/15	New York, NY	Official	$ 7,188.26
01/28	Champaign-Urbana, IL Lacrosse, WI	Official Official	$ 13,673.31
02/03	Los Alamos, NM Albuquerque, NM	Official Official	$10,843.70
02/10	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$ 90.00
02/13	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$ 4,436.82
02/19	Baltimore, MD West Orange, NJ	Mixed Political	$ 2,122.03
02/25-03/01	Kissimmee, FL San Francisco, CA Oakland, CA Salt Lake City, Utah Los Angeles,CA	Official Mixed Official Official Political	$ 39,356.26
03/03	New York, NY	Official	$ 9,258.42
03/10	Westport, CT Cincinnati, OH	Mixed Political	$ 3,844.16
03/18	Las Vegas, NV	Official	$ 6,531.17
03/22-04/02	**Africa**	**Official**	$0.00
04/07-08	Kansas City, MO Chicago, IL	Official Mixed	$ 18,376.76
04/09	Carlton, KY	Official	$ 7,128.87
04/14-4/15	Houston, TX Pratt City, AL	Official Official	$ 12,478.68
04/15-4/19	**Chile**	**Official**	$0.00
04/22	Harper's Ferry, WV	Official	$ 710.08
04/28	New York, NY	Political	$ 30.00
05/01-5/4	Palo Alto, CA Los Angeles, CA Chicago, IL	Mixed Mixed Political	$ 19,753.58

05/08	Dover, DE	Official	$ 3,932.00
05/09	Williamsburg, VA Boston, MA	Political Political	$ 30.00
05/12-5/18	**Germany** **England** **Switzerland**	**Official**	$0.00
5/22	Annapolis, MD	Official	$ 2,725.98
06/02	Houston, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 11,979.06
06/03	Cleveland, OH	Mixed	$ 450.00
06/05	Boston, MA	Official	$ 9,634.71
06/08	New York, NY Cranbury Park, CT	Mixed Political	$ 1,920.03
06/12-6/14	Monterey, CA San Francisco, CA Portland, OR Eugene, OR Los Angeles, CA	Official Political Mixed Official Political	$ 37,155.76
06/22	Nashville, TN	Official	$ 7,364.35
06/24-07/03	**China**	**Official**	$0.00
07/09	Atlanta, GA Daytona, FL Miami, FL	Mixed Official Political	$ 10,118.65
07/17	Little Rock, AR New Orleans, LA	Political Mixed	$ 13,427.73
07/25-7/27	Norfolk, VA Aspen, CO Albuquerque, NM	Official Political Mixed	$ 18,788.31
07/30	West Jefferson, NC Raleigh, NC	Official Political	$ 9,996.00
07/31-08/02	East Hampton, NY	Mixed	$ 7,118.76

08/10-8/11	Louisville, KY	Mixed	$ 17,516.02
	Chicago, IL	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
08/18-8/30	Martha's Vineyard, MA	Official	$ 65,441.31
	Worcester, MA	Official	
08/31-09/05	**Russia**	**Official**	$0.00
	Ireland		
09/09	Orlando, FL	Political	$ 290.00
	Miami, FL	Political	
09/14	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 4,849.94
09/17	Cincinnati, OH	Political	$ 319.66
	Boston, MA	Political	
09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$ 3,649.74
9/25-9/27	Chicago, IL	Political	$ 5,671.00
	San Jose, CA	Political	
	Palo Alto, CA	Political	
	San Diego, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
	San Antonio, TX	Political	
	Houston, TX	Political	
	Presidential FY 98 Subtotal:		$ 549,585.43

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
09/30-10/01	Miami, FL	Mixed	$32.67
	Quantico, VA	Official	
10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,403.66
10/22	Philadelphia, PA	Official	$3,379.75
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$4,154.12
10/30-11/02	**Ireland**	**Official**	$0.00
	England	**Official**	
11/21-11/26	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	$8,516.87
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
12/09	Boston, MA	Mixed	$14,219.88
	New York, NY	Mixed	
1/21	Baltimore, MD	Official	$825.54
01/26-1/27	New York, NY	Official	$11,368.26
01/28	Hartford, CT	Official	$4,368.62
01/30-02/03	Boston, MA	Political	$0.00
	Switzerland	**Official**	
02/19	Dallas, TX	Mixed	$1,825.29
	Fort Worth, TX	Political	
	Austin, TX	Political	
03/16	Houston, TX	Mixed	$2,298.86
	Atlanta, GA	Political	
04/14-4/15	New York, NY	Mixed	$8,039.99
04/27-4/29	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$9,211.75
	Chicago, IL	Official	
	Ann Arbor, MI	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
04/30	New Haven, CT	Mixed	$2,108.75

05/01-5/3	Boston, MA Palo Alto, CA	Mixed Political	$1,860.57
05/07	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$30.00
05/11	New York, NY	Official	$3,216.69
05/11-5/18	**France** **Switzerland** **England**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
05/25	San Francisco, CA Danville, CA Los Angeles, CA	Mixed Official Political	$2,524.53
06/02-6/3	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,662.82
06/04-6/5	Boston, MA	Mixed	$7,658.43
06/21	Albuquerque, NM	Mixed	$614.61
06/22	Nashville, TN Indianapolis, IN	Official Mixed	$1,696.13
07/09	Montpelier, VA	Official	$1,022.07
7/13-7/16	Baltimore, MD Short Hills, NJ West Orange, NJ Newburgh, NY Pittsfield, MA Lenox, MA Albany, NY Auburn, NY Victor, NY Waterloo, NY Seneca Falls, NY Ithaca, NY	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Mixed	$30,712.75
07/20	Philadelphia, PA Drescher, PA Gladwyne, PA	Official Official Political	$1,564.37
07/27	Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH	Mixed Political	$2,092.83
08/12	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$3,638.22

09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$11,389.59
09/24-26	Denver, CO	Political	$2,961.78
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Portland, OR	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Palo Alto, CA	Official	
09/29-10/02	**Puerto Rico**	**Official**	$6,567.70
	Chile	**Official**	
	Uruguay	**Official**	

First Lady FY 98 Subtotal:	$152,967.10
FY 98 Total:	$702,552.53

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/02	Cleveland, OH	Political	$90.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
10/12	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,969.58
10/16	Chicago, IL	Political	$193.61
10/24	Los Angeles, CA	Political	$3,503.05
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
10/29	Cape Canaveral, FL	Official	$9,711.72
	West Palm Beach, FL	Political	
10/30	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/06	Fayetteville, AR	Official	$13,831.76
11/18-23	**Japan**	**Official**	$0.00
	Korea	**Official**	
	Guam	**Official**	
12/03	Providence, RI	Official	$3,931.88
12/05	Wynne, AR	Official	$3,032.50
12/08	Nashville, TN	Official	$7,461.26
12/12-15	**Israel**	**Official**	$0.00
	Jerusalem	**Official**	
	Gaza City	**Official**	
	Bethlehem	**Official**	
12/30-01/01	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$24,278.60
01/08	Detroit, MI	Official	$9,241.00
01/15	New York, NY	Official	$16,119.00
01/20	Buffalo, NY	Official	$21,804.00
	Montgomery County, PA	Official	
01/24	Little Rock, AR	Official	$4,372.80
	Beebe, AR	Official	

01/26	St. Louis, MO	Official	$0.00
2/2	New York, NY Boston, MA	Mixed Mixed	$4,243.00
2/5	Atlanta, GA	Official	$5,786.00
2/7	**Jordan**	**Official**	$0.00
2/9	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$0.00
2/14	**Mexico**	**Official**	$0.00
2/18	Dover, NH Manchester, NH	Official Mixed	$18,340.00
2/25-3/1	Tucson, AZ San Francisco, CA Los Angeles, CA Park City, UT	Official Mixed Political Official	$62,280.00
3/3	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
3/8	**Nicaragua** **El Salvador** **Honduras** **Guatemala**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/12-3/13	Hope, AR Texarkana, TX Little Rock, AR	Official Political Political	$9,067.43
3/16	Palm Beach, FL	Political	$0.00
4/1	Norfolk, VA	Official	$4,133.00
4/9	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$1,314.69
4/12	Barksdale AFB, LA	Official-	$7,046.80
4/15-4/16	San Francisco, CA Detroit, MI Boston, MA	Official Mixed Mixed	$8,406.49
5/4-5/6	**Belgium** **Germany**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/7-5/8	Houston, TX Austin, TX Oklahoma City, OK	Mixed Political Official	$6,298.76
5/11	Atlanta, GA	Official	$7,073.03
5/14-5/17	Seattle, WA Palo Alto, CA Los Angeles, CA San Diego, CA	Political Political Political Political	$8,353.79
5/19	New York, NY	Mixed	$11,043.00
5/20	Littleton, CO	Official	$6,476.28
5/22	Irvington, VA	Political	$0.00
5/23	Grambling, LA	Official	$9,974.50
5/25-5/30	Edinburgh, TX Yulee, FL	Official Political	$14,448.70
6/2	Colorado Springs, CO	Official	$6,792.02
6/11	Whiteman AFB, MO	Official	$2,554.50
6/12	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,340.50
6/15-6/19	**Switzerland** **Germany** **Slovenia** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
6/28	West Port, CT New York, NY	Political Mixed	$6,883.00
6/30	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,475.14
7/5	Hazard, KY Memphis, TN Clarksdale, MS East St. Louis, IL Rapid City, SD Phoenix, AZ Los Angeles, CA	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official	$86,063.00

7/13	Miami, FL	Mixed	$3,917.54
7/16	Des Moines, IA	Mixed	$1,941.42
7/22	Lansing, MI	Official	$8,364.00
7/23-7/24	New York, NY Cincinnati, OH Aspen, CO	Official Political Political	$10,314.50
7/25	**Morocco**	**Official**	$0.00
7/29-7/30	**Italy** **Sarajevo**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
8/3	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,058.00
8/6-8/8	Little Rock, AR Helena, AR St. Louis, MO	Political Official Official	$25,159.00
8/9	Atlanta, GA	Official	$10,501.50
8/15	West Chester, NY	Official	$0.00
8/16	Kansas City, MO	Official	$9,341.50
8/19-9/3	Martha's Vineyard, MA Nantucket, MA Hamptons, NY Syracuse, NY Skaneateles, NY	Official Official Political Official Official	$59,603.00
9/6	Norfolk, VA	Official	$8,863.00
9/9-9/15	**New Zealand**	**Official**	$0.00
9/20	Raleigh-Durham, NC	Official	$9,775.20
9/21	New York, NY (U.N)	Official	$22.50

9/27	New Orleans, LA	Political	$45.00
9/30	Palisades, NY	Official	$7,383.50
	Presidential FY 99 Subtotal:		$582,224.05

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/07	Westport, CT	Political	$22.50
10/08-10/09	Little Rock, AR	Mixed	$7,249.00
10/10-10/13	**Bulgaria**	**Official**	$0.00
	Czech Republic	**Official**	
10/16-10/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$260.00
	Sante Fe, NM	Political	
	Madison, WI	Political	
	Elmhurst, IL	Political	
10/18-10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$7,662.21
	Boston, MA	Political	
	Providence, RI	Political	
10/22-10/23	Detroit, MI	Political	$5,301.07
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
10/27	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
	Edison, NJ	Political	
10/29-10/31	Cape Canveral, FL	Official	$4,659.00
	Jacksonville, FL	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Chicago, IL	Political	
	Minneapolis, MN	Political	
	Des Moines, IA	Political	
11/1	Allentown, PA	Political	$22.50
	Athens, OH	Political	
	Tampa, FL	Political	
11/02	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/16-11/22	**Honduras**	**Official**	$0.00
	El Salvador	**Official**	
	Guatemala	**Official**	
	Dominican Republic	**Official**	
	Haiti	**Official**	
12/1-12/3	New York, NY	Official	$29,041.72

12/05	Boston, MA	Official	$7,958.81
12/10-12/11	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA	Official Official	$15,070.50
01/13	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,799.50
2/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,076.00
2/6-2/8	**Holland** **Jordan**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/3-3/4	New York, NY	Mixed	$1,908.07
3/19	Clinton, TN	Official	$2,975.66
3/20-4/1	**Egypt** **Tunisia** **Morocco**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
4/9	Dover, DE	Official	$1,000.51
4/13	Boca Raton, FL	Mixed	$3,249.50
4/14	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,847.60
4/19-4/20	New York, NY Long Island, NY	Mixed Mixed	$15,748.20
4/22	Niagra Falls, NY	Official	$2,242.10
4/29	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,692.87
5/5	Fort Dix, NJ	Official	$1,500.00
5/7	Buffalo, NY Teterboro, NJ	Mixed Political	$4,515.50
5/8	New York, NY	Official	$5,520.00
5/11-5/15	**Ireland** **England** **Italy** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/19-5/22	Grand Canyon, AZ	Official	$38,724.23
	Flagstaff, AZ	Official	
	Littleton, CO	Official	
	Santa FE, NM	Official	
	Acoma Pueblo, NM	Official	
	Albuquerque, NM	Official	
	Cortez, CO	Official	
	Mesa Verde, NM	Official	
5/24	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,040.00
5/25-5/30	Yulee, FL	Political	$0.00
6/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$4,560.00
6/4	Boston, MA	Official	$7,308.00
6/9-6/10	Binghamton, NY	Mixed	$5,538.16
	New York, NY	Mixed	
	Lawrenceville, NJ	Mixed	
6/11-6/12	St Louis, MO	Political	$143.00
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
	Berkeley, CA	Political	
6/16-6/20	**France**	**Official**	$0.00
	Morocco	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Germany	**Official**	
7/5	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,559.00
7/7-7/9	Binghamton, NY	Political	$417.00
	Oneonta, NY	Political	
	Cooperstown, NY	Political	
	Bassett, NY	Political	
	Clinton, NY	Political	
	Utica, NY	Political	
	Rome, NY	Political	
	Syracuse, NY	Political	
	Albany, NY	Political	

7/12-7/15	New Rochelle, NY	Political	$570.03
	Rye, NY	Political	
	Valhalla, NY	Political	
	Jones Beach, NY	Political	
	New York, NY	Political	
	Garden City, NY	Political	
	Rockville Center, NY	Political	
	Holbrook, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
7/19-7/22	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,280.00
7/23	New York, NY	Official	$3,330.50
	Canton, OH	Official	
7/29-7/31	Elmira, NY	Political	$179.00
	Bath, NY	Political	
	Hornell, NY	Political	
	Ithaca, NY	Political	
8/4-8/6	Jamestown, NY	Political	$75.00
	Dunkirk, NY	Political	
	Amherst, NY	Political	
	Kenmore, NY	Political	
	Buffalo, NY	Political	
	Niagra, NY	Political	
	Lockport, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Mixed	
8/7	Westchester, NY	Official	$75.00
8/9-8/10	New York, NY	Political	$365.00
8/17-8/18	Dallas, TX	Political	$45.00
	McAllen, TX	Political	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	
	Austin, TX	Political	
9/8-9/10	Bay Shore, NY	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
	South Ozone Park, NY	Political	
	Elmhurst, NY	Political	
9/13-9/15	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Flushing, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
9/18	New York, NY	Official	$1,783.00

9/21-9/23	West Port, Ct	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
9/24-9/25	Albany, NY	Mixed	$481.00
	Schenectady, NY	Mixed	
	Troy, NY	Mixed	
	Saratoga, NY	Mixed	
9/26-9/27	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
9/28	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
9/30-	**Ottawa, Canada**	**Official**	$75.00
	Massena, NY	Mixed	
	Watertown, NY	Mixed	

First Lady FY 99 Subtotal:	$205,185.74
FY 99 Total:	$787,409.79

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/1-10/4	Las Vegas, NV	Mixed	$ 21,493.00
	Palo Alto, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
10/7-10/9	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,428.03
	Ottawa, Canada	**Official**	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
10/13	Harrisonburg, VA	Official	$ 3,419.00
10/18	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
10/25	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
10/29	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$ 3,851.50
	Atlanta, GA	Mixed	
10/30	Providence, RI	Official	$ 8,850.00
10/31-11/2	**Norway**	**Official**	$470.00
11/4-11/5	Hartford, CT	Official	$ 43,659.28
	Newark, NJ	Official	
	Little Rock, AR	Official	
	Hermitage, AR	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
11/10	York, PA	Official	$ 6,019.00
11/14-11/23	**Turkey**	**Official**	$0.00
	Greece	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Bulgaria	**Official**	
	Macedonia	**Official**	
	Kosovo	**Official**	
11/30-12/2	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	$ 35,890.25
	Los Angeles, CA	Official	
	Seattle, WA	Official	
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
12/9	Worcester, MA	Official	$ 3,969.00

12/10-12/11	Little Rock, AR Memphis, TN Orlando, FL Ft. Lauderdale, FL Miami, FL	Official Official Mixed Political Political	$ 28,069.75
1/3	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/4	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/5-1/6	Chappaqua, NY	Official	$ 4,154.50
1/6	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/7	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/9	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/10-1/11	Annapolis, MD Grand Canyon, AZ Houston, TX	Official Official Mixed	$ 19,463.00
1/13-1/14	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Mixed	$ 10,888.00
1/18	Boston, MA	Mixed	$ 5,112.50
1/21-1/22	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
1/28-1/30	Quincy, IL **Switzerland**	Official **Official**	$ 7,900.00
2/5-2/7	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Political	$ 8,571.00
2/7	Hot Springs, VA	Political	$0.00
2/9-2/10	McAllen, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 3,949.50
	Presidential FY 00	Subtotal:	$ 241,157.31

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/4-10/11	**Poland**	**Official**	$0.00
	Slovakia	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Iceland	**Official**	
10/13-10/16	New York, NY	Political	$105.00
	Armonk, NY	Political	
	Glen Falls, NY	Political	
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Bolton Landing, NY	Political	
	Lake Placid, NY	Political	
	Saranac Lake, NY	Political	
	Hempstead, NY	Political	
	Huntington Station, NY	Political	
	Astoria, NY	Political	
10/17-10/20	Monticello, NY	Political	$105.00
	Bloomington, NY	Political	
	Claremont, NY	Political	
	Kingston, NY	Political	
	Middletown, NY	Political	
	New City, NY	Political	
	Spring Valley, NY	Political	
	Nyack, NY	Political	
	Pomona, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
	Scarsdale, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Political	
10/24-10/25	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Great Neck, NY	Mixed	
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$ 10,444.50
	Detroit, MI	Political	
11/1-11/3	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Rye Brook, NY	Political	
11/4-11/6	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 768.50
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	

11/8	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/9-11/21	**Israel**	**Official**	$0.00
	Jordan	**Official**	
	Turkey	**Official**	
	Greece	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
11/23	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/29-12/1	New York, NY	Mixed	$1,233.40
	Buffalo, NY	Political	
	Boston, MA	Mixed	
12/2	Cincinnati, OH	Political	$0.00
12/6-12/10	New York, NY	Political	$1,465.00
	Jamaica, NY	Political	
12/13	Providence, RI	Mixed	$ 1,170.00
12/14	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/16	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/17	Minneapolis, MN	Political	$22.50
	Kansas City, MO	Political	
12/21-12/22	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/9-1/10	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/24-1/25	New York, NY	Political	$ 154.00
	Albany, NY	Political	
1/26	Miami, FL	Official	$ 2,718.00
2/3-2/4	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
2/5-2/13	New York, NY	Political	$670.00
	Buffalo, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Political	
	Syracuse, NY	Political	
	Albany, NY	Political	
	Suffolk County, NY	Political	

2/15-2/17	New York, NY	Political	$ 375.00
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Mt. Vernon, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
		First Lady FY 00 Subtotal:	$20,025.90
		FY 00 Total:	$261,183.21

Exhibit 3

Airlift Operations

First Lady Exploratory Travel & Campaign Payment History

AIRLIFT OPERATIONS
Exploratory Payment History
June 1, 1999 through February 2, 2000

Type	Invoice Date	Payment Date	Num		Open Balance	Amount	Number of Non-official staff	Number of Official Staff	Fligth Time
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31429	SAM #0955 / 9F0609		1,487.23	4	1	2 hrs. 40 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30276/77	SAM #1069/1081 / 9F0707-0709		3,662.00	4	1	12 hrs 25 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31222	SAM#1112/1113 / 9F0712-15		1,946.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30280	SAM #1123/1175 / 9F0729-0731		3,850.00	3	1	3 hr 20 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30278	SAM #1167/1200 / 9F0804-0806		2,795.00	3	1	1 hr. 55 min.
	01/20/2000		31670	SAM #1168/1205 / 9F0809-0811	1,462.00	1,462.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30279	SAM #1292/1293 / 9F0908-0910 (PP #1)	652.00	2,786.00	4	1	1 hr. 40 min
	10/15/1999	12/30/1999	30281	SAM #1294/1295 / 9F0913-0915		2,618.00	3	1	2 hrs.
	10/18/1999	12/30/1999	30282	SAM #1296/1297 / 9F0921-0923		2,568.00	3	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/29/1999	12/30/1999	31434	SAM #1299 / 9F0924-0925		2,210.00	3	1	2 hrs.
	01/20/2000		31669	SAM #1298 / 9F0926-0927	1,693.94	1,693.94	2	1	2 hrs.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31436	SAM #1363 / 9F0928		736.00	2	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31223	SAM#1424 / 9F1013-16		1,668.00	1	1	3 hrs. 5 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31224	SAM #1425/1429/1434 / 9F1017-20		2,787.00	3	1	2 hrs. 45 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31441	SAM #1468 / 9F1024		252.00	1	1	50 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31225	SAM #1504/1512 / 9F1102-1103		978.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min
	12/23/1999	12/30/1999	31229	SAM #1513 / 9F1108		494.00	1	1	1 hr. 45 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31228	SAM #1584 / 9F1123		494.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31443	SAM #1620 / 9F1206-1210		1,462.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31227	SAM #1646 / 9F1214		736.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min.
					$ 3,807.94	$ 36,685.17			

TOTAL BILLED	$36,685.17
TOTAL PAID	$32,877.23
TOTAL OUTSTANDING	$3,807.94
AVG # OF DAYS TO PAY	28

Exhibit 4

First Lady Travel to New York

Updated Airlift Operations data as of March 31, 2000

Travel of the First Lady to New York Airlift Operations Information

Dates:	#Official Staff Military Aircraft:	#Political Staff Military Aircraft:	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount:	Aircraft:
10/18-10/20/98	1	3		3/21/1999	9/15/1999	$1,811.50	C9
10/27/98	1	5	1:40	5/24/1999	1/14/2000	$2,790.00	C9
11/2/98	1	4	1:35	1/11/1999	2/25/1999	$2,234.00	C20
12/1-12/3/98	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
2/2/99	1	4	:45	4/9/1999	8/16/1999	$593.00	C9
3/3-3/4/99	1	6	1:50	6/2/1999	9/9/1999	$1,118.25	C9
4/19-20/99	1	6	1:45	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$176.80	C9
4/22/99	6	0	1:55	N/A	N/A	N/A	C32
4/29/99	1	3	1:30	6/14/1999	9/9/1999	$885.70	C20
5/7/99	1	5	2:40	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$2,573.75	C20
5/8/99	5	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
5/24/99	1	3	1:35	6/30/1999	3/23/2000	$1,115.50	C20
6/2/99	1	3	1:40	7/23/1999	3/23/2000	$827.32	C20
7/23/99	5	0	1:15	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
8/7/99	4	0	1:40	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/18/99	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/30/99	1	2	2:10	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$2,204.72	C20
11/29-12/1/99	1	2	4:35	3/15/2000	4/4/2000	$3,562.00	C37
12/16/99	1	3	1:30	*	*	*	C20
12/21/99	1	2	2:25	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,377.00	C20
1/9-1/10/00	1	2	1:10	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$1,165.00	C9
1/24-1/25/00	1	1	2:50	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$1,393.00	C20
2/3-2/4/00	1	1	1:45	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,071.00	C20
2/5-2/13/00	1	2	2:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,752.00	C20
2/15-2/17/00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20

Note:* Information not available at time of response.
Note: N/A= not applicable/ trip is 100% official

Exhibit 5

Airlift Operations Data
(not previously requested)

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY TO NEW YORK

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)	#Official Staff Military Aircraft	# Political Staff Military Aircraft	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount	Aircraft:
1/17-1/19	New York, NY	Political	$75.00	1	1	2:35	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,388.00	C20
	White Plains	Political								
	Buffalo, NY	Political								
1/21	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:30	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
2/20	Albany, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$910.00	C20
2/22	Tonowanda, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,013.00	C20
	Staten Island	Political								
2/24-2/27	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 255.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,764.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
2/29	Syosset, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
3/1	Valley Cottage, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$812.00	C20
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	New Hempstead, NY	Political								
	Purchase, NY	Political								
3/2-3/3	New York, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
3/4-3/7	Queens, NY	Political	$ 105.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
	Tuxedo Park, NY	Political								
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Asroria, NY	Political								
3/8-3/11	New York, NY	Political	$ 330.00	1	2	10:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$5,893.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Ithaca, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
3/13-3/15	New York, NY	Political	$ 75.00	1	1	3:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,156.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
	Suffolk County, NY	Political								
3/16	New York, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,329.30	C20
	Huntington Station, NY	Political								
3/17	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	4	1:30	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,220.00	C20
3/18	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.60	C20
3/20-3/22	Harlem, NY	Political	$ 471.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Rosslyn Heights, NY	Political								
	White Plains, NY	Political								
	New York, NY	Political								
	Armonk, NY	Political								
3/24	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	2	*	*	*	*	C20
3/26	Albany, NY	Political	$0.00							
3/29-3/30	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20

Note: * Information not available at time of response.

Exhibit 6

The First Lady's Book Tour

Simon & Schuster

The First Lady's Simon and Schuster Book Tour
1/15/96-5/3/96

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost (Gross Obligations):	Aircraft:	Simon and Schuster Reimbursement:
1/15-1/20	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$1,420.02	C20	$6,462.50
	Little Rock, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Blytheville, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Detroit, MI	Mixed			
	Chicago, IL	Simon & Schuster			
	Boston, MA	Simon & Schuster			
1/31	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$400.82
2/7-2/9	Denver, CO	Simon & Schuster	$881.86	C20	$6,094.60
	Los Angeles, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	San Francisco, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	Dallas, TX	Simon & Schuster			
2/22	Philadelphia, PA	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$1,208.13
5/2-5/3	Boca Raton, FL	Simon & Schuster	$187.73	C20	$4,130.00
	Atlanta, GA	Simon & Schuster			
	St. Louis, MO	Simon & Schuster			
	Minneapolis, MN	Simon & Schuster			

Exhibit 7

The total IT request, including systems maintenance, for the Office of Administration is as follows:

Capital Investment Plan $9,905,000

Salaries & Expenses
Information Systems & Technology
Customer Service 1,104,000
Telephones 482,000
Management & Planning 185,000
Data Center 1,832,000
Network 1,154,000
Facility Contract 7,273,000
System Integration 1,328,000
Personnel Compensation 4,531,000

General Services
Graphics & Publications 12,000

Human Resource Management
Payroll System 221,000

Financial Management
Accounting System 140,000

Library & Research Services
On-line Databases 235,000

Facilities Management
Facilities Software 3,000

TOTAL $28,405,000

Exhibit 8

Unanticipated Needs

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

g:\data\fy2001\unanticipated needs\un_hist.xls

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1972	1,000,000	446,000	Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention
1973	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1974	1,000,000	330,000	Energy Policy Office
		39,000	Federal Property Council
		92,000	U.S. Puerto Rico Ad Hoc Advisory Board
1975	500,000	231,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		212,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1976	1,000,000	235,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		10,000	Federal Paperwork Commission
		131,300	Privacy Protection Study Commission
		19,000	National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials
1977	1,000,000	57,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries
		100,000	Commission on Mental Health
		45,000	Office of Drug Abuse Policy
1978	1,000,000	52,000	Metric Board
		6,000	World Hunger Commission
		1,000	Commission on Pension Policy
		33,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		26,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1979	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1980	1,000,000	134,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		67,000	White House Office
		67,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		134,000	Department of State
		34,000	Commission on World Hunger
		168,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
1981	1,000,000	65,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		100,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
		58,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries
1982	844,800	26,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		15,000	Commission on Radio Broadcast to Cuba
		52,000	Property Review Board
		145,000	Native Hawaiians Study
		50,000	Federalism and Private Sector Initiatives
1983	1,000,000	39,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		80,000	White House Private Sector Initiatives Program
		60,000	White House Quality Education Initiative
		250,000	Agency for International Development

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

g:\data\fy2001\unanticipated needs\un_hist.xls

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1984	1,000,000	375,000	WHCA EOP Computer Center Conversion
1985	1,000,000	162,000	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1986	957,000	180,608	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1987	1,000,000	242,000	President's Special Review Board
		195,000	Iran Contra Hearings
		325,000	U.S. Secret Service
1988	1,000,000	150,000	Task Force on Market Mechanisms
		20,000	WHO Conference for a Drug-Free America
		110,000	President's Commission on Privatization
1989	1,000,000	181,000	National Space Council
1990	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1991	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1992	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1993	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1994	1,000,000	250,000	JFK Assassination Records Review Board
1995	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1996	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1997 [1]	0	- 0 -	
1998 [2]	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1999	1,000,000	- 0 -	
2000	1,000,000	325,000	White House Council on Youth Violence

[1] In FY 1997, the $1,000,000 requested for the Unanticipated Needs Account was diverted to fund conferences on model state drug laws through the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

[2] In FY 1998, the Unanticipated Needs Account was funded through the VA, HUD appropriations act, P.L. 105-65.

Exhibit 9

Estimated Terminal Leave Payments

Executive Office of the President: FY 2001 President's Request
Additional Questions

QUESTION 1: By EOP agency, provide the total number of FTE broken out by: # of political FTE and # of career FTE. For the political positions, include the job title for each position.

RESPONSE:

FTE BREAKOUT

AGENCY	AUTHORIZED FTE	CAREER FTE	POLITICAL FTE[1]
CEA	35	27	8[2]
NSC	60	60	0
OA	192	182	10
OPD	31	0	31
OVP	22	0	22
VP-RES	1	0	1
WHO	400	0	399

For a listing of job titles for the political FTE, see Exhibit 1.

QUESTION 2: By EOP agency, provide the total number of positions expected to be vacant due to the Presidential transition. Include total estimated terminal leave payments for each agency.

RESPONSE: The EOP is unable to speculate as to the number of positions expected to be vacant due to the presidential transition. However, the EOP has made certain assumptions for budget preparation purposes.

TOTAL ESTIMATED TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS[3]

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
WHO	$610K[4]
OVP	$28K

[1] Includes actual positions as well as vacant Senate Confirmed Positions.
[2] Administratively Determined (AD) technical staff not included in this number.
[3] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates as of February 11, 2000. These amounts reflect potential costs and do not reflect the amounts budgeted for FY 2001, which in some cases assumed that the majority of these costs would be offset from savings from attrition.
[4] Does not include terminal leave costs of GS equivalent personnel.

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR SEAN P. MALONEY
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
STAFF SECRETARY

FROM: MARK F. LINDSAY, ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBJECT: DRAFT HEARING QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

Attached for your review are Questions for the Record (QFR) which were submitted in conjunction with the testimony of Michael J. Lyle, Director of the Office of Administration, before the Treasury Postal Appropriations Subcommittee.

Because the Subcommittee has imposed a strict deadline, it is imperative that we receive your corrections or comments no later than 12:00 noon on Wednesday, April 12, 2000. We apologize for the short notice and we appreciate your assistance. Please do not hesitate to contact my office in the event that you have questions.

DRAFT

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY THE COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Issue: **Automated Records Management System (ARMS)**

Questions:

1. **Is ARMS the current system used to collect and store all electronic mail messages in the EOP? Is this the system that is used to comply with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution? Is ARMS the system that had the "glitch" referred to in the press reports? What was the total cost of developing and deploying ARMS? What are the annual operation and maintenance costs? Under which appropriation account are these costs funded?**

   RESPONSE: The Automated Records Management System (ARMS) is the current system used to manage electronic mail (e-mail) for the following EOP components that are subject to the Federal Records Act: the Office of Administration (OA), the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Council on Environmental Quality, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the Office of National Drug Control Policy. ARMS is the mechanism that these agencies utilize to comply with the portion of the *Armstrong* decision that requires e-mail, including transmission and receipt data, to be records managed. Although not required by the *Armstrong* decision or the Presidential Records Act (PRA), the White House utilizes ARMS to manage its e-mail for eventual transfer to the Presidential library, and some Office of the Vice President (OVP) e-mails have been managed by ARMS. The Information Systems and Technology Division (IS&T) is currently working to make sure that ARMS manages all OVP e-mail.

   The ARMS "glitch" referred to in the press reports involves two separate configuration errors that prevented certain incoming Internet e-mails from being recorded in ARMS for a period of time. See response to Question 4 below for a technical description of the configuration errors.

   The total cost of developing and deploying ARMS was $985,013. The annual operation and maintenance costs for ARMS for FY99 were $365,119. Exhibit 1 contains a breakout of these costs.

   The Armstrong Resolution Account was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that the ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS were funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

2. **The White House has suggested that, because the Appropriations Committee fenced $966,700 in FY 1997 IT funds pending the development of an architecture for the White House Capital Investment Plan, operation and maintenance of certain systems was jeopardized and, in fact, may have caused some of the problems that the White House experienced with the e-mails:**

   - **In FY 1994, the EOP received a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 million for costs associated with the Armstrong Resolution. Are there any restrictions on using these funds to maintain ARMS or any other IT systems within the EOP network that are necessary for maintaining electronic records management and/or compliance with the Armstrong Resolution?**

RESPONSE: The fencing of information technology funds in FY 1997 precluded the EOP from maintaining, repairing or from making improvements to an already antiquated computer system. In fact, the EOP reported to the Subcommittee on February 28, 1997, that the failure to unfence the funds would cause: (1) increased vulnerability to EOP computer systems and Internet connections from external threats; (2) increased network downtime due to depletion of spare parts; (3) eroded levels of preventative maintenance; (4) curtailed ability to replace broken equipment; and (4) significantly delayed response time. In response to the Questions for the Record submitted by the Committee for FY 1998 dated April 7, 1998, we advised the Committee that if the funds were not unfenced there would be increased security threats to the network from denial of service attacks, spoofing, and storming. We itemized numerous specific instances of system crashes (e.g., Lattis Network Switch, ONDCP subnet, and FDDI network work group hub) and advised that another failure may result in a shutdown of a segment of the network. Indeed, in response to one Committee question, we advised that:

> *The client/server network backup system used to preserve data integrity and facilitate the archival of Presidential and Federal records has exceeded its life cycle. Several users have already experienced the loss of data due to file server hardware failures. An analysis of the backup system has been completed with the recommendations to correct the problem. The cost to implement the solution is estimated at $20,000, but the funds are fenced.*

Thus, as a direct result of the fenced funds, an already antiquated EOP computer system further deteriorated and at a more rapid rate.

At this same point in time the EOP was confronted with its Year 2000 (Y2K) vulnerabilities. The fenced funds contributed to making the already difficult Y2K problem even more difficult. In addition to having to repair equipment that had been cannibalized and neglected as a direct result of the fenced funding, we had to renovate and test this equipment and all of our mission critical systems in little more than a year. Consequently, the resources and personnel necessary to achieve Y2K compliance increased significantly and it became necessary to defer non-Y2K projects such as the development of an Intranet, the interfacing of the payroll/personnel system with the financial management system, upgrades to the financial management system, and the Mail2 reconstruction.

DRAFT

There are restrictions on using the Armstrong Resolution Account in that it was created specifically "for electronic communications records management activities for compliance with and resolution of *Armstrong v. the Executive Office of the President.*" Consistent with this language, and based on the fact that the Armstrong funds were insufficient for maintaining compliance, OA determined in 1995 that ongoing operation and maintenance of ARMS should not be funded using the Armstrong account. Accordingly, while the costs of developing and deploying ARMS and reconstructing those records that preceded the development of ARMS have been funded utilizing Armstrong funds, ongoing maintenance costs unassociated with the reconstruction effort have been funded utilizing the Salaries and Expenses account.

Virtually all of the e-mail associated with the MAIL2 problem were Presidential records. Since the Armstrong decision is applicable only to Federal records, we determined that Congressional approval would be necessary in order to utilize Armstrong funds for the reconstruction effort. On March 20, 2000, after completing the Y2K effort and after obtaining the necessary documentation to support the request, the EOP requested the approval from the Subcommittee.

- **On March 20, 2000, the Committee received a request to use $1.7 million in Armstrong Resolution funds to reconstruct this e-mail. Why didn't the White House submit a request to use the Armstrong Funds for the purpose of both fixing this "glitch" and reconstructing the e-mails at the time the "glitch" was discovered?**

RESPONSE: We did not request approval to utilize Armstrong funds at the time the "glitch" was discovered for two reasons: (1) as noted above, the reconstruction had to be deferred until the EOP's Year 2000 (Y2K) objectives were achieved and (2) we needed to obtain the necessary documentation to support the request.

Upon the completion of the EOP's Y2K effort, the Director of OA requested the Information Systems & Technology Division (IS&T) to prepare a plan and develop cost estimates for the reconstruction in the January/February time frame, which were completed in mid-March. Upon receipt of this supporting documentation, we promptly submitted our request. Moreover, by waiting, the EOP actually saved money in connection with the reconstruction effort. Indeed, in November of 1998, Northrop Grumman quoted us a price of $602,000 to perform a feasibility assessment. This assessment did not include the costs associated with purchasing equipment, or performing the reconstruction. Because government personnel, who were previously assigned to the Y2K effort, were able to perform the feasibility assessment, the EOP did not incur the $602,000 costs requested by Northrop Grumman.

The request did not seek approval to utilize the funds to repair the glitch because the reconfigurations already had been accomplished under the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman.

DRAFT

3. **During the period of time when in-coming electronic messages were not being records managed, were you out of compliance with the requirements of the Armstrong Resolution?**

   RESPONSE: No. First, the *Armstrong* decision is inapplicable to Presidential records. Second, the *Armstrong* decision required a record-keeping system such as ARMS to capture electronic mail, including transmission and receipt data. At all times, the EOP has utilized ARMS in accordance with *Armstrong* – some anomalies simply occurred in connection with ARMS. The *Armstrong* decision does not mandate against the types of anomalies that occurred; therefore, the requirements of the *Armstrong* decision were not violated. Moreover, the EOP remained in compliance with *Armstrong* in that the information was captured on backup tapes, which can be accessed to reconstruct the records.

4. **What was the technical nature of the problem and how did it occur? When did the White House discover it? When did the White House begin to assess the problem and begin remediaton efforts? Which appropriation cost covered the cost of this remediation effort? How long did it take to fix the problem?**

   RESPONSE: In August of 1996, an EOP sub-contractor mistakenly utilized all upper case letters (MAIL2) instead of the required upper and lower case letters (Mail2) when creating a script to move users from one server to another. Because ARMS did not recognize MAIL2 as a proper entry, some incoming Internet e-mail for users on Mail2 were not records managed in ARMS from August of 1996 to November of 1998 when the accounts were properly reconfigured. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in June of 1998, affected 426 users from the White House, 58 from the Office of Policy Development, and 4 from the OA. All accounts were properly reconfigured (fixed) as required by the terms of OA's existing contract with Northrop Grumman in November of 1998. It took approximately 5 months to determine the cause of the problem and then to reconfigure the affected accounts.

   Additionally, in November of 1998 when Northrop Grumman was fixing the MAIL2 anomaly, they made yet another configuration error. When user accounts are created, they are assigned a particular view that corresponds to the section of the alphabet (e.g., ABC) that corresponds to the first letter of their first name (e.g., Ann Smith would be in the view that contains the letter "A"). In the latter configuration error, the letter "D" was inadvertently omitted from a view and the letter "J" was included twice. As a result, incoming Internet e-mail to user accounts with first names beginning with the letter "D" were not records managed in ARMS from November of 1998 to May of 1999 when the error was fixed. The problem, which was discovered by Northrop Grumman in April of 1999, affected approximately 200 users in the EOP (42 from WHO, 8 from OPD, 54 from OMB, 4 from CEQ, 32 from OA, 20 from ONDCP, 6 from OSTP, 3 from the White House Climate Change Task Force, 1 from the Council of Economic Advisors, and 21 from the National Security Council). It took approximately one month to troubleshoot and fix the problem.

DRAFT

5. **Did this "glitch" effect all e-mail within the EOP complex? Which specific EOP agencies were affected? How many electronic messages were affected?**

   RESPONSE: No - - the e-mail anomalies affected only some incoming Internet e-mail. For the specific agencies affected, see Response to Question 4. At this point in time, we do not know the number of electronic messages that were affected.

6. **Are the affected electronic messages currently being reconstructed? What is the status of that effort? Who is performing it? What funds are currently being used for this effort? What is the total estimated cost of the reconstruction effort?**

   RESPONSE: Yes. On March 29, 2000, OA issued a letter contract for the reconstruction to ECS Technologies, Inc., an 8(a) contractor that has performed similar reconstruction work for the EOP in the past. As we orally advised this Subcommittee, so as not to further delay the reconstruction, we realigned $100,000 from OA's current year projects to "Other Services" to fund a letter contract so that work could commence on the reconstruction effort. Upon the Subcommittee's approval of the use of Armstrong funds, we will transfer the remaining balance from the Armstrong Resolution Account to the extent not required to complete our Armstrong obligations to "Other Services" to continue work on the reconstruction. Based on the results of the market survey that we conducted, we anticipate that $1 – 3 million will be required for the reconstruction. We anticipate that we will likely be seeking additional funds from the Subcommittee to complete this task.

DRAFT

Automated Records Management System II (ARMS II)

Issue:
Questions:

In 1997, the White House described ARMS II as a system expected to achieve increased online storage, enhanced search capabilities and retrieval, and automated dispositioning. In August of last year, the EOPs Information Technology Architecture Annual Update submitted to the Subcommittee indicated that ARMS II was still under development and a part of the information technology modernization effort. The Committee understands that development of ARMS II has now stopped.

1. **What is the current status of ARMS II? If all work has stopped, why was it stopped and why wasn't the Subcommittee informed?**

RESPONSE: The EOP's August 1999 Update to its Information Technology Architecture (ITA) did not indicate that ARMS II was still under development. While the ITA contained Electronic Document Management Projects/Pilots, ARMS II was not specifically identified as a project. As explained in our March 1, 2000 response to questions from this Subcommittee, we have delayed the implementation of ARMS II until the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems such as ARMS. While we do not believe that NARA's Fast Track Initiative or endorsement of DOD Standard 5015.2-STD constitute such guidance or technical standards, we are optimistic about NARA's work with the National Science Foundation to create an electronic records archives independent of electronic format, which was announced on March 28, 2000. However, until NARA completes its projected two-year Business Process Engineering effort, which is likely to impact electronic record-keeping practices, and/or until the results of NARA's work with the National Science Foundation are known, we believe it is prudent to delay implementation of ARMS II at this point in time. We believe it would be unwise for OA to risk implementing ARMS II only to find that it may be necessary to perform another tape reformatting project in several years when NARA issues new technical guidance. This has happened before. In fact, we are currently reformatting tapes from a previously NARA approved format to another format because NARA determined the old format would no longer meet their needs. Thus, until NARA issues adequate technical standards and guidance to federal agencies to utilize in developing electronic records management systems, we intend to defer implementation of ARMS II.

2. **Is there an automated system in place to collect and sort other internal records?**

RESPONSE: There are many automated systems within the EOP that collect and sort other internal records, although ARMS is the only electronic record-keeping system. For example, the Federal Financial Accounting and Management Information System (FAMIS) collects and sorts internal financial management records. Similarly, the Payroll and Personnel System collects and sorts internal payroll and personnel records. Yet another example is the PRISM system, which collects and sorts internal procurement records.

DRAFT

3. **Information provided to the Subcommittee indicates that the White House stopped work on ARMSII because the National Archives has not yet provided agencies with guidance and technical standards on developing electronic record-keeping systems. According to the Archives, they have developed guidance through their <u>FastTrack</u> initiative. Archives hasn't issued technical standards but they have endorsed DOD standards. The Committee understands that Archives has been working with the White House in the development of their electronic records keeping system. Describe your current work with Archives to develop electronic records keeping system. If you are not currently working with Archives, when did that effort stop?**

RESPONSE: OA is unaware of any work with Archives to develop an electronic record-keeping system to replace ARMS. However, we have been working closely with NARA to ensure a successful transition and transfer of records between Administrations. <u>See also</u> our response to Question 1 above.

DRAFT

Issue: **Financial Accountability within the EOP**
Questions:

1. **Last year, CBO estimated that the cost of implementing the provisions Section 638 of PL 106-58 establishing a Chief Financial Officer to be $250,000 yet the White House is requesting a total of $660,000 for this effort. What accounts for the difference between CBO's estimate and the FY 2001 request?**

RESPONSE: Because the basis for the CBO's estimate was not provided, we are unable to account for the difference between CBO's estimate and the EOP's FY2001 request. The following, however, summarizes the FY 2001 request for funds relating to the establishment of a CFO in the EOP.

The Office of Administration's FY 2001 budget request of $660,000 is composed of two pieces: $290,000 for salary and benefits costs to support a 5 person staff; and $370,000 to contract with an independent firm to conduct an auditability assessment for the EOP agencies and accounts.

Salary and Benefits
The $290,000 represents estimated salary and benefits for the following staff, with an estimated start of duty date of March 1, 2001:

CFO at Executive Level IV
Deputy CFO – GS-15
Accounting Officer – GS-15
Systems Staff – GS-13
Administrative support – GS-7

The benefits rate used was 25%, based on the current EOP average. Estimates include the calendar year 2000 cost of living adjustment (COLA) and a projected COLA (3.7%) for calendar year 2001.

The estimated start date for the staff of March 1, 2001 was a conservative average, since it is not known how long the selection process will take for the CFO position, or how this will relate to the staffing of the rest of the positions.

The full year cost (FY 2002) of these five FTE would be approximately $492,000.

Auditability Assessment
Compliance with the CFO Act requires the submission of agency-wide audited financial statements to OMB by March 1 of each year. This submission involves a three-step process, including an agency auditability assessment, preparation of auditable financial statements, and the conduct of the audit itself. Estimates solicited from four local accounting firms who currently provide these services to the federal government ranged from $300,000 to $1,200,000 for all three services.

The EOP request of $370,000 is based on an average of the four accounting firm estimates for

DRAFT

the auditability assessment alone. The costs for template preparation and the audit will be requested in future years' budgets.

DRAFT

Issue: **Information Technology Architecture (ITA)**
Questions:

1. **On February 4, 2000, GAO completed its review of EOP's information technology architecture, as requested by the Subcommittee. In pertinent part, GAO found that the current architecture defines principles and goals governing how it wants to operate in both business and technical terms but that EOP still needs to define how it wants to operate in the future in business terms AND define a "roadmap" or implementation plan for getting there. In responding to GAO's review, the EOP disagreed with its findings and stated that it has defined all of its current and future core business requirements.**

   Given your disagreement with the GAO review, it is inconsistent that, in your annual update to the Committee (August 31, 1999), you clearly state that: . . ."the enterprise architecture planning considers both a short-term operational and long-term strategic focus on the use of information and technology to support EOP's business needs… to fulfill this mission we will take steps to enhance our enterprise architecture planning process by building a conceptual business model and defining the data needed to run the business." Additionally, the Committee understands that the WH has brought on a contractor to assist in developing an updated business/information model and to specify applications that support this model. It seems that this statement and the hiring of a contractor confirm GAO's findings.

   - **How do you explain these inconsistencies?**

   RESPONSE: We do not view these as inconsistencies. Although we have built a conceptual business model and have defined the data needed to run the business, we nonetheless recognize that we need to continue to enhance our enterprise architecture. As we have emphasized in the past, an ITA is a "living document" that must continue to evolve. The EOP will continue to assess and reassess its business processes and to integrate its work processes and information flows with current and future technologies to achieve the strategic goals of the Presidency. To meet the EOP's business needs, the EOP will continuously evaluate and identify additional systems applications to support these business requirements, and periodically update its "roadmap" or implementation plan for transitioning over a specified period of time from the "as-is to the "to-be" architectural environments. The EOP ITA provides us with the mechanism to do so. Moreover, the hiring of a contractor to assist the EOP in its ITA efforts is consistent with OA's Fiscal Year 2000 Capital Investment Plan, which contained specific funding for this purpose.

DRAFT

- **In section 3 of EOP's 1999 ITA Update, current core business processes are specified. On which pages in the ITA Update are the future core business processes defined?**

RESPONSE: As we stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, contrary to the GAO report, the EOP ITA identifies all of the EOP's current and future business processes. These core business processes, which are driven by the current, past and future President(s), have changed little over the years, remaining relatively constant. While the 2000 Update to the EOP's ITA will focus on identifying and analyzing those common business processes that can be further streamlined and/or manual business processes that can be automated, we anticipate that these core business processes will remain unchanged.

2. **The FY 2001 request includes $1,485,000 for projects that are to test, develop and implement EOP software and systems that are intended to streamline business processes and increase productivity. These projects include the White House Integrated System for Document Management (WHISDM) and an electronic document management/pilot projects.**

    - **How do WHISDM and the other electronic document management/pilot projects relate? What is the expected return on investment of WHISDM? Is this return on investment supported by a business case analysis? If so, please submit for the record.**

RESPONSE: As stated in our previous response to the Subcommittee on March 1, 2000, currently, the implementation of WHISDM is limited to three offices within the White House: the Office of Presidential Personnel, the Office of Records Management, and the Office of Correspondence. WHISDM, however, is a large-scale electronic document management project that has the capability to provide records management and document management capabilities across the EOP enterprise. Thus, as part of the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects, we will assess whether WHISDM is a potential system for EOP-wide use. Funds from the Electronic Document Management/Pilot Projects of the CIP will then be used to fund any customizations associated with adding the additional EOP components.

In Fiscal Year 1998, a requirements and alternatives analysis was performed by an independent consultant to identify and evaluate the requirements and potential software solutions to meet the needs of the three White House Offices, and to ensure consistency with the overall technical direction of the EOP. The implementation of WHISDM to date, however, has been largely necessitated by Y2K because the existing systems used by the three offices were not Y2K compliant. Thus, a formal business case analysis was not required. As part of Phase II of the WHISDM effort, however, the successful contractor will be required to assist the EOP in performing a business process review and preparing a business case analysis.

Issue: **First Lady Travel**
Questions

The Committee understands that the current procedures being used by the White House to make distinctions between political and official travel are, for all practical purposes, no different than those procedures used by previous Administrations. Having said that, however, it is also true that no previous First Lady ran as a candidate for the US Senate. In reviewing the First Lady's travel records for travel to New York during 1999:

1. **The Committee specifically requested reimbursement data for both political and official travel for fiscal year 1999. Although there were a total of 29 trips taken by the 1st Lady to New York in 1999, the White House only provided data for 16 of these trips and data for 9 other trips taken in FY 2000.**

- **Why didn't the White House provide data for all of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999? Why did the White House begin with June 9, 1999?**

RESPONSE: The White House has already provided data for all Presidential and First Lady travel, both foreign and domestic from Fiscal Year 1998 through February 18, 2000. See Exhibit 2. Additionally, the Committee made an oral request for "all First Lady travel to New York since she formed her exploratory committee." In response to this request, we provided the data on First Lady travel to New York since June 9, 1999, the date on which her first exploratory travel began. See Exhibit 3.

- **During the hearing, it became apparent that the White House provided different documents to the majority and minority staff regarding Airlift Operations, Exploratory Payment History. Although these documents were provided to the Subcommittee through the Assistant to the President for Management and Administration, and the witness had a copy of the document provided to the minority staff, the witness did not seem to be familiar with the document provided to the majority staff. Please explain why the witness was unfamiliar with the documents provided to the majority staff. Why were different documents provided to the majority and minority staff? For the record, provide (1) the document submitted to the minority staff; and (2) the document submitted to the majority staff, excluding Secret Service personnel and costs.**

RESPONSE: The document provided to the majority staff contained additional information regarding official travelers that are not part of the EOP's appropriation. Neither the USSS detail nor the "White House" photographer is funded from EOP appropriations. Accordingly, requests for information on costs associated with the USSS detail and the photographer should be posed directly to the USSS and the Department of Defense, respectively. With regard to the document provided to the minority staff, that document also contained a footnote referring to the USSS detail and the photographer. See Exhibit 3 for a corrected version of the document that does not include the USSS detail or the photographer.

• **Provide the following information for ALL of the First Lady's travel to New York in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to date including:**

- **Trip Date**
- **Invoice Date**
- **Payment Date**
- **Destination**
- **Designation**
- **# of Official passengers (excluding USSS only)**
- **Designation of Official passengers**
- **# of Political passengers**
- **Flight Time (wheels up to wheels down)**
- **Type of Aircraft**
- **Official Reimbursements**
- **Political Reimbursements**

RESPONSE: See Exhibit 2 for all First Lady travel from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 4 contains an update of First Lady Travel to New York for Fiscal Year 2000 as of March 31, 2000. Exhibit 5 supplements Exhibit 2 with Airlift Operations information not previously requested.

2. **Current law requires that the cost of campaign travel using government aircraft be reimbursed at the 1st class rate and that political travel be reimbursed at the coach rate. On trips where there is a mixed purpose —for instance official and political, who within the White House Office determines which portions of the trip are political and which portions are official and the subsequent rate of reimbursement? Provide the job titles and offices of all persons responsible for making these determinations.**

RESPONSE: The White House follows all applicable legal rules in determining whether a trip is official, political or a mixed purpose trip as provided by Hatch Act and Federal Election Commission (FEC) law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.101, 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 6 O.L.C. 214 (1982). Likewise, the appropriate rate of reimbursement for trips which contain a political component is calculated according to formulas provided by Hatch Act and FEC law. See 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; 11 C.F.R. § 9034.7; 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

"Mixed" trips occur when there is non-campaign related political activity which occurs at a stop. The Hatch Act provides that reimbursement for such mixed trips is to be determined according to the "hard time" formula which allows for a pro rata reimbursement by the relevant political entity according to the time spent in political activity and the time spent in official activity. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503.

FEC law provides that "where a candidate conducts any campaign-related activity in a trip, [other than incidental contacts] the stop is a campaign-related stop." 11 C.F.R. § 106.3(b)(3). As such, when the First Lady, for example, conducts campaign activity at any stop, all of her travel to that stop is considered campaign related, not mixed, even in instances in which official activity may also occur during the trip.

The offices involved in billing for trips include the White House Counsel's Office or the Office of Counsel to the Vice President, the Office of Management and Administration, the White House Military Office, the Office of Political Affairs and the Offices of Scheduling and Advance.

3. **In documents provided to the Committee on March 1, 2000, almost all of the trips identified between 1 and 2 "official" staff traveling with the First Lady, identified by the White House as the Trip Coordinator and the White House Photographer. The White House also stated that travel costs for these staff were considered official costs and paid for with federal appropriations. What official responsibilities does the White House photographer have on trips that are classified as 100 percent political? Of the trips taken by the First Lady to New York for political purposes, how many times did the White House photographer accompany her and at what cost? If costs were not funded through the White House Office, what federal account covered these costs?**

RESPONSE: The First Lady continues in her official role as First Lady at all times and continues to carry her official responsibilities and duties as First Lady at all times, whether or not she is on official business. As such, there are certain individuals whose official duties require them to travel with the First Lady regardless of whether her travel is official, political or campaign-related. Since these individuals are conducting official government business, the law provides that their travel should be paid for with appropriated funds. 5 C.F.R. § 734.503; FEC Ad. Op. No. 1984-48.

The White House Photographers accompany the President, Vice President and the First Lady in an official capacity regardless of the nature of the trip in order to document their activities for official archival purposes. EOP appropriations do not support the White House Photographer. The White House Photographer is supported through Department of Defense appropriations.

4. **Although the White House has stated that the Secret Service requires the First Lady to use government aircraft, the Committee understands that, during the First Lady's Book Tour, Simon and Schuster provided the First Lady with private aircraft. The White House now says that the First Lady only used military aircraft. Provide, for each trip related to the First Lady's book tour: date of travel, destination, designation, type of aircraft, official reimbursements and, if applicable, "other" reimbursements.**

RESPONSE: As it has recommended consistently in the past for other First Ladies, the Secret Service recommends strongly that the First Lady travel by military aircraft for security reasons. The White House has followed that recommendation for the First Lady's travel, including during her book tour. For travel data related to the First Lady's book tour, See Exhibit 6.

5. **In some instances, although the number of non-official travelers is different, the costs of the trips were identical. For instance, on a trip to New York on November 8th, there was one non-official traveler —the First Lady—with a total cost of \$494.00. Two weeks later, there was an identical trip with two non-official travelers —the First Lady and**

one other person —again with a total cost of $494.00. What accounts for this discrepancy in the cost of travel? For the "Exploratory Trip" taken on December 6-10, 1999, total official costs were $1,465.00. Provide, by major spending category (for example, food, lodging, etc.), an itemization of these costs.

RESPONSE: On both trips in question, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler. With regard to the November 23rd trip, the best available information at the time of the response to the oral request was that there were two non-official travelers. This information was updated at the time that the trip was reviewed. At that time, because of a last minute change in the manifest, the First Lady was the only non-official traveler.

The breakout for the trip on December 6-10, 1999 is as follows:

HOTEL: $1,360 at $340/night (no government rate was available)
PER DIEM: $105

6. **Although your documents indicate that it took an "average of 28 days for the political party to reimburse for the costs of the trip", in some instances it took up to 6 months to send the political party an invoice. Of the 22 political trips taken to New York in 1999, 8 were not billed for at least 3 months and 14 of the billings didn't happen until after the Committee had requested information on the billings. What are the current procedures for billing? Is there an established time frame for submitting the invoices to the political party and for receiving reimbursements? Who submits these invoices to the political party?**

RESPONSE: Although the White House makes every effort to produce trip data in a timely manner so that it can be promptly billed to political parties, we must review each and every trip to ensure compliance with the applicable rules and regulations. The length of this review process varies based on the complexity of the trip. Moreover, since travel is subject to last minute changes based on the schedules of the President and the First Lady, a careful review is necessary in order to make the proper designations to comply with the rules and regulations.

Current procedures implemented by the White House Office of Management and Administration require the production of trip data within one week of completion of a trip. The production of the trip data then triggers the billing process for reimbursement from political parties. Though the White House is making an earnest effort to expedite the trip billing process, there will still be delays in invoicing due to the complexity of particular trips.

Prior to March 2000, the White House worked to submit invoices as soon as possible, but there was not a specified time frame for submitting invoices to a political party. First and foremost, White House policy is to comply with the rules and regulations governing travel and to ensure that all bills are accurate.

The majority of political reimbursements are received by Airlift Operations within 30 days from the date of billing. The First Lady's campaign has been paying in less than 30 days.

DRAFT

Airlift Operations invoices the political party through the White House Office of Management and Administration.

7. **FEC rules require a candidate to pay <u>in advance</u> either the cost of a first class ticket if there is a scheduled flight, or comparable charter fares if there is no scheduled flight. An exception may be made if the comparable fare is under $1,000. The cost of deferring this payment would then effectively be a loan treated as a campaign contribution.**
   - **Do you apply these rules to the First Lady's use of non-commercial campaign travel?**

RESPONSE: FEC law pertaining to payment of expenses for campaign-related travel on a government conveyance, as interpreted by the FEC, provides for <u>reimbursement</u> to the government for such travel, not payment in advance. <u>See</u> 11 C.F.R. § 106.3; FEC Advisory Opinion No. 1984-48. <u>See</u> <u>also</u> 5 C.F.R. § 734.503 (which provides for <u>reimbursement</u> of costs, including travel costs, associated with political activity.) The White House has followed all applicable legal rules in ensuring appropriate reimbursement to the government for political travel.

DRAFT

Issue: **FY 2001 Capital Investment Plan**

Questions:

1. **The President requests $9,905,000 for the Capital Investment Plan in FY 2001. The Office of Administration's appropriation request also includes IT funding: $436,000 for the maintenance of systems purchased or upgraded during the infrastructure renovation and $100,000 for maintenance and replacement of internet storm serves and network equipment. Why are IT infrastructure improvements being funded out of Salaries and Expenses?**

   RESPONSE: IT infrastructure improvements are not being funded out of Salaries and Expenses. Consistent with Office of Management and Budget guidance, capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Capital Investment Plan (CIP). Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are appropriately funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Thus, because the $536,000 ($436K + $100K) sited above is associated with the ongoing operation and maintenance of equipment and not for infrastructure improvements, the costs are appropriately funded using Salaries and Expenses. Of this request, $359,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the EOP's Internet connectivity; $77,000 is for the ongoing maintenance of the help desk software; and the remaining $100,000 is for the normal system maintenance and replacement of the Internet storm servers and network equipment. Again, these funds will be utilized to maintain the current system performance level and do not represent a major system renovation or improvement.

2. **What is the Office of Administration's total funding request for IT needs? What is the difference between the server and network infrastructure investments being funded in the CIP and the server and infrastructure investments being funded by Salaries and Expense?**

   RESPONSE: For OA's total funding request for IT needs, see Exhibit 7. The difference between the server and network infrastructure costs being funded in the CIP versus Salaries and Expenses is that, consistent with OMB guidance, capital improvements are to be funded out of the Capital Investment Plan. Once implemented, however, ongoing operation and maintenance of those capital improvements are to be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account. Consistent with this principle, the CIP contains funding to replace servers on a two-year cycle due to the rapid technological advancement that occurs in this area. Once these servers are implemented, however, normal system maintenance, including repair and replacement if necessary, would be funded out of the Salaries and Expenses account.

DRAFT

Issue: **Grant to Puerto Rico Elections Commission**

Questions:

1. **The President is requesting $2.5 million for a grant to the Puerto Rico Elections Commission within the appropriation, "Unanticipated Needs". Funds appropriated in this account are authorized to meet "unanticipated needs for the furtherance of the national interest, security, or defense..."**
   - **Please explain how a $2.5 million grant to Puerto Rico can be considered an "unanticipated need."**

   RESPONSE: The Unanticipated Needs Account historically has been utilized to fund projects or initiatives that arise on a one-time basis or, at most, on an irregular basis and for which it is difficult, if not impossible, to plan far in advance. In this case, it is in the national interest for public education in Puerto Rico on the islands' status options and the referendum provides a Federally-sanctioned vote there on preferences among the options.

2. **The justification materials indicate that these funds will "partially" meet the needs of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission to help offset the costs of public education and public choice for future status options. What is the total cost of this effort and who will assume responsibility for the balance of these costs? Has a commitment been made by this source to provide the balance of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Secretary of State and the Governorship of Puerto Rico have estimated the total cost of a referendum and related education campaign at $10 million. This was largely based on the appropriation of $9 million for the recent referendum.

   The Government of Puerto Rico will provide the funding beyond the $2.5 million the EOP has requested.

3. **The justification material indicates that a portion of the funds will be used for an education program and a portion for conducting a referendum on future status options. Has a specific proposal been submitted by the Puerto Rico Elections Commission regarding both the education program and the referendum? Please provide this proposal for the record.**

   RESPONSE: The President of the Puerto Rico Elections Commission is preparing a plan for a referendum and related education campaign. A copy will be provided to the Subcommittee upon receipt.

4. **Who will provide oversight regarding the obligation and use of these funds?**

   RESPONSE: The Office of Administration, in consultation with the President's Interagency Group on Puerto Rico, will oversee the obligation and use of the funds.

DRAFT

The Office of Administration administered a previous appropriation on the Puerto Rico status question (FY90).

5. **For the record, provide historical obligations for the Unanticipated Needs account, by fiscal year (to date).**

   RESPONSE: See Exhibit 8.

DRAFT

Transition Costs and Procedures

Issue:
Questions:

1. **Of all federal agencies, the EOP is clearly the most affected by a change in Administration. In fact, all staff within the White House Office, the Office of Policy Development and the Office of the Vice President are political staff —presumably all of these individuals will be leaving at the transition.**

   Although the new Administration certainly has the right to organize itself as it sees fit, the EOP is a fairly static organization in terms of business processes —it's basic functions and responsibilities do not change over time or between Administration's. In general, I think it's also fair to say that the EOP probably stores more information and paper than any other federal agency in terms of documents that will ultimately go to the Clinton Presidential Library. I am not trying to rush things when I ask these questions, nonetheless, I am concerned about the procedures that are in place to ensure a smooth transition between Administrations.

   - **Some of the records in the EOP will be classified as "Presidential Records" and will ultimately end up at the Clinton Library. Others will be classified as Federal records and will be stored by the National Archives. Have you been working with the National Archives to ensure a smooth transition in terms of Presidential and Federal Records? What specific guidance has Archives provided to you and what have you done to pass this on to employees within the EOP?**

   RESPONSE: The EOP has been working with the National Archives (NARA) to ensure a smooth transition. The Office of Administration is currently working with NARA to finalize several records disposition schedules that will govern how federal records will be covered. Additionally, in January of this year, the EOP met with NARA representatives to discuss numerous issues relating to the Presidential transition. NARA has provided the EOP with written guidance entitled "Planning for a Successful Presidential Transition" that we have distributed to the appropriate personnel. We will continue to work closely with NARA to ensure a smooth transition.

   - **Over the years, the White House has made a number of changes to some of its basic business functions —such as improvements to its resume processing system as well as security clearances and the issuing of passes. Given the significant personnel turn over that is anticipated, it is imperative that there are systems in place to process personnel efficiently and within the requirements of the law. What are you doing to ensure that all the requisite personnel processing systems are in place for the new Administration?**

   RESPONSE: OA is proud of the changes that we have implemented to continually improve our business processes and better serve our customers. These improvements, including personnel processing, recruitment, and security and background check processing, will remain in place for future Administrations. In addition, many of our investments in information technology have changed the way in which financial data is collected and

distributed; enhanced our procurement methods; and allow increased communication between the various OA divisions and our customers. These changes will also assist us as we prepare for a new Administration.

2. **One of the areas I am most concerned about is the information technology infrastructure initiative that we have been working on for the past several years. We have invested a significant amount of resources in upgrading EOPs technology. I am very concerned about the applicability of these investments to the needs of a new Administration. That is part of the reason why we insist you have both a clearly defined business model as well as an institutional process for moving you to your future business environment within your Capital Investment Plan. I am also concerned that, with the new Administration, there may be an immediate desire to replace certain systems before they know what the current capabilities of the individual systems are. EOP has an established process in place to review information technology requirements. This process seems to be working and the EOP is no longer allowing its individual agencies to development and use stovepipe systems. What are you doing to ensure that this process will remain in place during the transition?**

   RESPONSE: As the Subcommittee is aware, many of our achievements in the area of information technology were studied and developed by the Information Technology Management Team (ITMT), which we created under the guidance of the Subcommittee. The majority of the ITMT members are career government employees who will continue to serve in the new Administration. We anticipate that the structure and guidance of the ITMT will continue. In addition, we now have in place an information technology architecture plan and a strategic plan for moving us forward. Again, many of the key staff members who have been guiding the development of these initiatives, as well as the head of the Information Systems and Technology Division, are career civil servants who will continue this effort into the next Administration.

3. **For the record, by EOP agency and including the Executive Residence, provide the total cost of the transition and the total amount requested in the FY 2001 request. Break these costs out by personnel/non-personnel.**

RESPONSE: Three of the FY 2001 EOP budget requests include transition funding. The nature of the White House Office, the Office of the Vice President, and the Executive Residence guarantees that these three agencies will incur additional personnel unemployment, terminal leave, temporary personnel support and other operational expenses associated with a high level of turnover. These expenses are partially offset by personnel savings due to the high vacancy level anticipated during the transition period. A breakout of the transition costs by personnel and non-personnel for each agency is provided below. Additionally, on March 1, 2000, in response to questions from the Subcommittee, we provided estimated terminal leave payments for each EOP agency. <u>See</u> Exhibit 9.

Most EOP agencies did not request additional funding for transition costs. Some of these agencies will be able to accommodate transition costs within the annual appropriation provided, but others may require supplemental funding once the new Administration begins.

The nature and amount of any supplemental request will be determined by the needs of the

new Administration. The goals and priorities of the new President will determine the operational and infrastructure requirements for the upcoming administration and impact the need for additional funds.

Figure 1 - Transition Costs by Agency

(Dollars in 000s)

Agency	Personnel	Non-personnel	Total
White House Office	1,150	994	2,144
Office of the Vice President	20	74	94
Executive Residence	40	60	100
Total	1,210	1,128	2,338

DRAFT

Questions for the Record Submitted by the Committee

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE/EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE

Issue: **Reimbursable Political Activities**
Questions:

1. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence bill for reimbursable activities held within the White House within 60 days of the event and that interest and penalties be assessed for those activities that are not paid for within 90 days of the event date. In FY 1999, the Committee provided funds to support an Accounting Technician "to account and bill for reimbursable political events through the year".**

   The report on Reimbursable Activities submitted to the Committee on January 1, 2000 indicates that there were 5 political events that were NOT billed within this 60-day period. It further indicates that the billing information needed by the Executive Residence was being held up by the White House Social Office.

   - **Is it accurate to say that bills for these 5 events were prepared after the 60-day requirement because of delays in receiving billing information from the White House Social Office?**

     RESPONSE: Yes. Although the billing data was processed within the 90-day requirement, the delay was in obtaining the name and/or address of the entity to which the bill should be submitted. The exception was the Holiday Press Festival where two additional invoices were received after the initial bill had been submitted to the Democratic National Committee (DNC). A new bill was prepared for the DNC.

   - **Is the White House Social Office aware of the current law requirements as it relates to reimbursable political activities?**

     RESPONSE: Yes, the White House Social Office is aware of the legal requirements relating to reimbursements to political entities and conforms itself to those requirements.

   - **Why was there a delay in receiving the billing information? How many attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information?**

     RESPONSE: Despite the best efforts of the Social Office, there was a delay in obtaining the names and/or addresses of the appropriate entities and providing the Executive Residence with the billing information. Several attempts were made to obtain the necessary billing information.

   - **Given the delay in billing, payments were made beyond the 90 days required in law. Why weren't penalties assessed for these events? What would have been the total amount of penalties, interest and other charges assessed to these events had the delay in payment been caused by the host and not the White House Social Office?**

DRAFT

RESPONSE: The delay in billing was not caused by any lack of diligence by the Social Office, but rather due to difficulties in determining the appropriate entity to bill. With regard to the events in question, as soon as it was discovered that the DNC was the appropriate entity to bill for the event, the DNC paid promptly.

For the bill dated May 10, 1999 for the Holiday Press Festival, penalties were included as the payment was two months past due.

Payment was received from the DNC on a timely basis. Had it been necessary to charge interest and penalties the total cost would have been $69.39.

2. **Current law requires that the Executive Residence charge interest and assess penalties for late payments (90 days after the event date). Two events in fiscal year 1999 included penalties. What was the total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999?**

RESPONSE: The total amount of interest and penalties assessed in fiscal year 1999 was $56.74.

DRAFT

Issue: **White House Repair and Restoration**

Questions:

1. **The White House has requested $5,000,000 for replacement of the existing raceway containing critical voice and data communications line.**

   - **What is the current condition of this raceway? Why is it critical to begin this project in FY 2001? What are the consequences of a one-year delay for this project?**

     RESPONSE: The metal raceway is partially deteriorated and the supports are very rusty. The cable infrastructure within these raceways directly supports the communications network. In the event that the raceway fails or collapses, there would be a major communications outage. If the project is delayed for one year, no guarantee can be made that the raceway system will continue to support the cable infrastructure. This would require the installation of temporary supports and could impact airflow to the cooling tower since the raceway runs through the exhaust chamber of the cooling tower. The chemicals and damp air that flow through the exhaust chamber are the major contributing cause of the deterioration.

   - **Is $5,000,000 the total estimated cost for this project?**

     RESPONSE: Yes.

   - **Budget justification documents indicate that a professional engineering survey of existing conditions will be conducted. The design and the final construction documents will follow this survey. If this project has not been designed, on what basis is the $5 million estimate made? This phase —a survey and the preparation of the construction documents-- will take from 9 months to one year. What is the cost of this phase?**

     RESPONSE: The estimate of $5 million is based on similar work conducted within the EOP complex. The breakdown is as follows:

Excavation and Duct Bank Installation	$1,500,000
Cabling and terminations	1,200,000
Cable Frame	325,000
Overhead/Profit at 10%	635,250
Contingency Factor of 15%	549,037
SUBTOTAL FOR CONSTRUCTION	$4,209,287
Design Cost at 10%	420,928
Management Cost at 8%	370,417
TOTAL Project Estimate	$5,000,632

     It is anticipated that the design phase will cost approximately $458,000 (design fee plus management cost of 10%).

- **If the survey and design phase will take one year to complete, why is it necessary to request construction funds in FY 2001? It seems that you will not be ready to start the construction phase until 2002?**

  RESPONSE: In order to move as expeditiously as possible, we anticipate beginning design in October of 2000 with completion by June of 2001. Accordingly, we could begin construction in early August of 2001 so that the majority of the excavation work and concrete work could be performed when the President normally vacations and completed before winter.

2. **What specifically will be purchased with the $60,000 requested for "computer modernization"? Since the Executive Residence is within the purview of the Executive Office of the President, this project should be consistent with the current capital investment project. Is this project both compatible and consistent with the EOP's overall modernization strategy?**

   RESPONSE: The specific computer items are as follows: a network server, a replacement tape backup system, ten replacement personal computers, five replacement monitors, and five replacement printers.

   The Executive Residence is not connected to the EOP computer network. It is a self-contained, closed network.

Domestic Staff

DRAFT

Issue:

Questions:

1. **The President is requesting an additional 4 FTE for the Executive Residence: a night doorman, a butler, a laundry attendant, and a housekeeper. The total price tag for these staff is $330,030, an average of more than $75,000 per employee. Why are these 4 FTE so costly?**

   RESPONSE: The total represented by the $330,030 includes salary, premium pay, and benefits as follows:

	Salary	Benefits	Premium Pay
Butler	$55,016	$17,628	$22,006
Doorman	$45,000	$12,613	$ 7,650
Laundry Asst.	$24,837	$ 6,954	$ 9,040
Housekeeper	$55,307	$17,698	$26,281

2. **Part of the justification for these additional FTE is that "staff are required to work a tremendous number of overtime hours. The staffing requirements of events make it difficult to meet leave requests..." What is the current average overtime per month per employee within the Executive Residence?**

   RESPONSE: The average cost of domestic overtime for FY 2001 is $1,664.

3. **Two years ago, the average salary for the White House Domestic Staff was $58,260. For FY 2000, the average salary is $72,047, an increase of 24 percent. What accounts for this tremendous growth in domestic staff salaries?**

   RESPONSE: Many of the specialized, professional staff of the Executive Residence have been there for a long time, thereby placing them in the higher grades. Additionally, numerous staff, which were part of the Civil Service Retirement System, have retired over the past few years. Since the new employees are part of the Federal Employees Retirement System, the Executive Residence has seen the average benefits rates rise from 14% to 32%.

4. **What are the estimated overtime costs for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001?**

   RESPONSE: The estimated overtime cost for domestic staff for fiscal year 2000 is $718,875 and for fiscal year 2001 is $768,683.

5. **The White House Repair and Restoration account includes a request of $100,000 for the "Transition Impact" —basically staff overtime associated with the upcoming Presidential transition. Isn't it unusual to request funds for domestic staff overtime in the White House Repair and Restoration account? Why weren't these funds requested with the Executive Residence Operating Expenses Appropriation?**

DRAFT

RESPONSE: The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request funds for these one-time costs.

DRAFT

Issue: **Presidential Transition Costs**
Questions:

1. **The White House is requesting $100,000 for costs associated with transitioning the first families; $100,000 for family quarters redecoration, and $150,000 for linen replacement.**

   - **The request includes $40,000 for staff overtime associated with moving the First Families and the inauguration. What specific inaugural activities will the domestic staff be involved in? Why are these funds being requested within the White House Repair and Restoration Account and not the Executive Residence Operating Expenses appropriation?**

   RESPONSE: These funds are for the transition from the current First Family and the newly elected First Family. The overtime will be associated with moving, packing, cleaning, unpacking, and room setup. Inaugural events will be reimbursable and are not included in this request.

   The Executive Residence, in consultation with OMB, utilized the Repair and Restoration account to request the funds for these one-time charges.

   - **In the past, Congress has provided $50,000 for family quarters redecoration. What accounts for the doubling of the request for these purposes?**

   RESPONSE: Funds have historically been requested to allow the new First Family the opportunity to redecorate and renovate the living quarters as this will be their primary residence. The rooms in the living quarters usually require replacement carpeting, wall coverings, furnishings, and drapes. The amount previously requested has not been increased for inflation.

   - **In regards to the linen replacement project, a portion of these funds are being used to replace and replenish linens in the Executive Residence. Why does this project need to occur prior to the arrival of the new First Family?**

   RESPONSE: The linen replacement is needed due to normal wear and tear, not the arrival of the new First Family.

Exhibit 1

ARMS Development and Maintenance Costs

ARMS Development/Deployment (Armstrong):

VAX Upgrade	$748,101
ARMS Design/Development	236,912
	$985,013

ARMS Maintenance (Salaries & Expenses):

FY00 maintenance	$397,820
FY99 maintenance	365,119
FY98 maintenance	292,012
FY97 maintenance	158,577
FY96 maintenance	94,500
FY95 maintenance	73,901
FY94 maintenance	33,378

Exhibit 2

Presidential and First Lady Travel
Fiscal Years 1998 – February 18, 2000

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

---

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/08	Newark, NJ	Mixed	$ 2,105.13
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
10/12-19	**Venezuela**	**Official**	$0.00
	Brazil		
	Argentina		
10/27-28	Chicago, IL	Official	$ 19,066.80
10/31-11/02	West Palm Beach, FL	Mixed	$ 8,987.12
	Amelia Island, FL	Political	
	Staten Island, NY	Political	
	Middlesex County, NJ	Political	
	New York, New York	Mixed	
11/06	College Station, TX	Official	$ 4,622.99
11/14-11/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 21,359.00
	Sacramento, CA	Mixed	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Wichita, KS	Official	
	St. Louis, MO	Political	
11/22-11/26	Denver, CO	Mixed	$0.00
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Vancouver, BC	Official	
12/03	Akron, OH	Official	$ 7,073.64
	Chicago, IL	Political	
12/9-12/11	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,826.88
	Miami, FL	Mixed	
12/21-12/22	**Italy**	**Official**	$0.00
	Bosnia-Herzegovia		
12/30-01/04	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$ 50,577.43
	Virgin Islands	Official	
01/08-1/09	New York, NY	Political	$ 21,765.33
	McAllen, TX	Mixed	
	Brownsville, TX	Official	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	

01/15	New York, NY	Official	$ 7,188.26
01/28	Champaign-Urbana, IL	Official	$ 13,673.31
	Lacrosse, WI	Official	
02/03	Los Alamos, NM	Official	$10,843.70
	Albuquerque, NM	Official	
02/10	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$ 90.00
02/13	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$ 4,436.82
02/19	Baltimore, MD	Mixed	$ 2,122.03
	West Orange, NJ	Political	
02/25-03/01	Kissimmee, FL	Official	$ 39,356.26
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Oakland, CA	Official	
	Salt Lake City, Utah	Official	
	Los Angeles,CA	Political	
03/03	New York, NY	Official	$ 9,258.42
03/10	Westport, CT	Mixed	$ 3,844.16
	Cincinnati, OH	Political	
03/18	Las Vegas, NV	Official	$ 6,531.17
03/22-04/02	**Africa**	**Official**	$0.00
04/07-08	Kansas City, MO	Official	$ 18,376.76
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
04/09	Carlton, KY	Official	$ 7,128.87
04/14-4/15	Houston, TX	Official	$ 12,478.68
	Pratt City, AL	Official	
04/15-4/19	**Chile**	**Official**	$0.00
04/22	Harper's Ferry, WV	Official	$ 710.08
04/28	New York, NY	Political	$ 30.00
05/01-5/4	Palo Alto, CA	Mixed	$ 19,753.58
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Chicago, IL	Political	

05/08	Dover, DE	Official	$ 3,932.00
05/09	Williamsburg, VA Boston, MA	Political Political	$ 30.00
05/12-5/18	**Germany** **England** **Switzerland**	**Official**	$0.00
5/22	Annapolis, MD	Official	$ 2,725.98
06/02	Houston, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 11,979.06
06/03	Cleveland, OH	Mixed	$ 450.00
06/05	Boston, MA	Official	$ 9,634.71
06/08	New York, NY Cranbury Park, CT	Mixed Political	$ 1,920.03
06/12-6/14	Monterey, CA San Francisco, CA Portland, OR Eugene, OR Los Angeles, CA	Official Political Mixed Official Political	$ 37,155.76
06/22	Nashville, TN	Official	$ 7,364.35
06/24-07/03	**China**	**Official**	$0.00
07/09	Atlanta, GA Daytona, FL Miami, FL	Mixed Official Political	$ 10,118.65
07/17	Little Rock, AR New Orleans, LA	Political Mixed	$ 13,427.73
07/25-7/27	Norfolk, VA Aspen, CO Albuquerque, NM	Official Political Mixed	$ 18,788.31
07/30	West Jefferson, NC Raleigh, NC	Official Political	$ 9,996.00
07/31-08/02	East Hampton, NY	Mixed	$ 7,118.76

08/10-8/11	Louisville, KY Chicago, IL San Francisco, CA Los Angeles, CA	Mixed Political Mixed Political	$ 17,516.02
08/18-8/30	Martha's Vineyard, MA Worcester, MA	Official Official	$ 65,441.31
08/31-09/05	**Russia** **Ireland**	**Official**	$0.00
09/09	Orlando, FL Miami, FL	Political Political	$ 290.00
09/14	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 4,849.94
09/17	Cincinnati, OH Boston, MA	Political Political	$ 319.66
09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$ 3,649.74
9/25-9/27	Chicago, IL San Jose, CA Palo Alto, CA San Diego, CA Los Angeles, CA San Antonio, TX Houston, TX	Political Political Political Political Political Political Political	$ 5,671.00
	Presidential FY 98 Subtotal:		$ 549,585.43

FY 1998 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
09/30-10/01	Miami, FL	Mixed	$32.67
	Quantico, VA	Official	
10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,403.66
10/22	Philadelphia, PA	Official	$3,379.75
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$4,154.12
10/30-11/02	**Ireland**	**Official**	$0.00
	England	**Official**	
11/21-11/26	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	$8,516.87
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
12/09	Boston, MA	Mixed	$14,219.88
	New York, NY	Mixed	
1/21	Baltimore, MD	Official	$825.54
01/26-1/27	New York, NY	Official	$11,368.26
01/28	Hartford, CT	Official	$4,368.62
01/30-02/03	Boston, MA	Political	$0.00
	Switzerland	**Official**	
02/19	Dallas, TX	Mixed	$1,825.29
	Fort Worth, TX	Political	
	Austin, TX	Political	
03/16	Houston, TX	Mixed	$2,298.86
	Atlanta, GA	Political	
04/14-4/15	New York, NY	Mixed	$8,039.99
04/27-4/29	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$9,211.75
	Chicago, IL	Official	
	Ann Arbor, MI	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
04/30	New Haven, CT	Mixed	$2,108.75

05/01-5/3	Boston, MA Palo Alto, CA	Mixed Political	$1,860.57
05/07	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$30.00
05/11	New York, NY	Official	$3,216.69
05/11-5/18	**France** **Switzerland** **England**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
05/25	San Francisco, CA Danville, CA Los Angeles, CA	Mixed Official Political	$2,524.53
06/02-6/3	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,662.82
06/04-6/5	Boston, MA	Mixed	$7,658.43
06/21	Albuquerque, NM	Mixed	$614.61
06/22	Nashville, TN Indianapolis, IN	Official Mixed	$1,696.13
07/09	Montpelier, VA	Official	$1,022.07
7/13-7/16	Baltimore, MD Short Hills, NJ West Orange, NJ Newburgh, NY Pittsfield, MA Lenox, MA Albany, NY Auburn, NY Victor, NY Waterloo, NY Seneca Falls, NY Ithaca, NY	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Official Mixed	$30,712.75
07/20	Philadelphia, PA Drescher, PA Gladwyne, PA	Official Official Political	$1,564.37
07/27	Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH	Mixed Political	$2,092.83
08/12	Milwaukee, WI	Mixed	$3,638.22

09/20-9/23	New York, NY	Official	$11,389.59
09/24-26	Denver, CO	Political	$2,961.78
	Seattle, WA	Political	
	Portland, OR	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	
	Palo Alto, CA	Official	
09/29-10/02	**Puerto Rico**	**Official**	$6,567.70
	Chile	**Official**	
	Uruguay	**Official**	

First Lady FY 98 Subtotal:	$152,967.10
FY 98 Total:	$702,552.53

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/02	Cleveland, OH	Political	$90.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
10/12	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,969.58
10/16	Chicago, IL	Political	$193.61
10/24	Los Angeles, CA	Political	$3,503.05
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
10/29	Cape Canaveral, FL	Official	$9,711.72
	West Palm Beach, FL	Political	
10/30	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/06	Fayetteville, AR	Official	$13,831.76
11/18-23	**Japan**	**Official**	$0.00
	Korea	**Official**	
	Guam	**Official**	
12/03	Providence, RI	Official	$3,931.88
12/05	Wynne, AR	Official	$3,032.50
12/08	Nashville, TN	Official	$7,461.26
12/12-15	**Israel**	**Official**	$0.00
	Jerusalem	**Official**	
	Gaza City	**Official**	
	Bethlehem	**Official**	
12/30-01/01	Hilton Head, SC	Official	$24,278.60
01/08	Detroit, MI	Official	$9,241.00
01/15	New York, NY	Official	$16,119.00
01/20	Buffalo, NY	Official	$21,804.00
	Montgomery County, PA	Official	
01/24	Little Rock, AR	Official	$4,372.80
	Beebe, AR	Official	

01/26	St. Louis, MO	Official	$0.00
2/2	New York, NY Boston, MA	Mixed Mixed	$4,243.00
2/5	Atlanta, GA	Official	$5,786.00
2/7	**Jordan**	**Official**	$0.00
2/9	Wintergreen, VA	Political	$0.00
2/14	**Mexico**	**Official**	$0.00
2/18	Dover, NH Manchester, NH	Official Mixed	$18,340.00
2/25-3/1	Tucson, AZ San Francisco, CA Los Angeles, CA Park City, UT	Official Mixed Political Official	$62,280.00
3/3	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
3/8	**Nicaragua** **El Salvador** **Honduras** **Guatemala**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/12-3/13	Hope, AR Texarkana, TX Little Rock, AR	Official Political Political	$9,067.43
3/16	Palm Beach, FL	Political	$0.00
4/1	Norfolk, VA	Official	$4,133.00
4/9	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	$1,314.69
4/12	Barksdale AFB, LA	Official-	$7,046.80
4/15-4/16	San Francisco, CA Detroit, MI Boston, MA	Official Mixed Mixed	$8,406.49
5/4-5/6	**Belgium** **Germany**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/7-5/8	Houston, TX Austin, TX Oklahoma City, OK	Mixed Political Official	$6,298.76
5/11	Atlanta, GA	Official	$7,073.03
5/14-5/17	Seattle, WA Palo Alto, CA Los Angeles, CA San Diego, CA	Political Political Political Political	$8,353.79
5/19	New York, NY	Mixed	$11,043.00
5/20	Littleton, CO	Official	$6,476.28
5/22	Irvington, VA	Political	$0.00
5/23	Grambling, LA	Official	$9,974.50
5/25-5/30	Edinburgh, TX Yulee, FL	Official Political	$14,448.70
6/2	Colorado Springs, CO	Official	$6,792.02
6/11	Whiteman AFB, MO	Official	$2,554.50
6/12	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,340.50
6/15-6/19	**Switzerland** **Germany** **Slovenia** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
6/28	West Port, CT New York, NY	Political Mixed	$6,883.00
6/30	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$2,475.14
7/5	Hazard, KY Memphis, TN Clarksdale, MS East St. Louis, IL Rapid City, SD Phoenix, AZ Los Angeles, CA	Official Official Official Official Official Official Official	$86,063.00

7/13	Miami, FL	Mixed	$3,917.54
7/16	Des Moines, IA	Mixed	$1,941.42
7/22	Lansing, MI	Official	$8,364.00
7/23-7/24	New York, NY Cincinnati, OH Aspen, CO	Official Political Political	$10,314.50
7/25	**Morocco**	**Official**	$0.00
7/29-7/30	**Italy** **Sarajevo**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
8/3	Chicago, IL	Official	$8,058.00
8/6-8/8	Little Rock, AR Helena, AR St. Louis, MO	Political Official Official	$25,159.00
8/9	Atlanta, GA	Official	$10,501.50
8/15	West Chester, NY	Official	$0.00
8/16	Kansas City, MO	Official	$9,341.50
8/19-9/3	Martha's Vineyard, MA Nantucket, MA Hamptons, NY Syracuse, NY Skaneateles, NY	Official Official Political Official Official	$59,603.00
9/6	Norfolk, VA	Official	$8,863.00
9/9-9/15	**New Zealand**	**Official**	$0.00
9/20	Raleigh-Durham, NC	Official	$9,775.20
9/21	New York, NY (U.N)	Official	$22.50

9/27	New Orleans, LA	Political	$45.00
9/30	Palisades, NY	Official	$7,383.50
		Presidential FY 99 Subtotal:	$582,224.05

FY 1999 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/07	Westport, CT	Political	$22.50
10/08-10/09	Little Rock, AR	Mixed	$7,249.00
10/10-10/13	**Bulgaria**	**Official**	$0.00
	Czech Republic	**Official**	
10/16-10/17	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$260.00
	Sante Fe, NM	Political	
	Madison, WI	Political	
	Elmhurst, IL	Political	
10/18-10/20	New York, NY	Mixed	$7,662.21
	Boston, MA	Political	
	Providence, RI	Political	
10/22-10/23	Detroit, MI	Political	$5,301.07
	Chicago, IL	Mixed	
10/27	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
	Edison, NJ	Political	
10/29-10/31	Cape Canveral, FL	Official	$4,659.00
	Jacksonville, FL	Political	
	San Francisco, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	Chicago, IL	Political	
	Minneapolis, MN	Political	
	Des Moines, IA	Political	
11/1	Allentown, PA	Political	$22.50
	Athens, OH	Political	
	Tampa, FL	Political	
11/02	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
11/16-11/22	**Honduras**	**Official**	$0.00
	El Salvador	**Official**	
	Guatemala	**Official**	
	Dominican Republic	**Official**	
	Haiti	**Official**	
12/1-12/3	New York, NY	Official	$29,041.72

12/05	Boston, MA	Official	$7,958.81
12/10-12/11	Los Angeles, CA San Francisco, CA	Official Official	$15,070.50
01/13	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,799.50
2/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,076.00
2/6-2/8	**Holland** **Jordan**	**Official** **Official**	$0.00
3/3-3/4	New York, NY	Mixed	$1,908.07
3/19	Clinton, TN	Official	$2,975.66
3/20-4/1	**Egypt** **Tunisia** **Morocco**	**Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
4/9	Dover, DE	Official	$1,000.51
4/13	Boca Raton, FL	Mixed	$3,249.50
4/14	Chicago, IL	Official	$4,847.60
4/19-4/20	New York, NY Long Island, NY	Mixed Mixed	$15,748.20
4/22	Niagra Falls, NY	Official	$2,242.10
4/29	New York, NY	Mixed	$2,692.87
5/5	Fort Dix, NJ	Official	$1,500.00
5/7	Buffalo, NY Teterboro, NJ	Mixed Political	$4,515.50
5/8	New York, NY	Official	$5,520.00
5/11-5/15	**Ireland** **England** **Italy** **Macedonia**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00

5/19-5/22	Grand Canyon, AZ	Official	$38,724.23
	Flagstaff, AZ	Official	
	Littleton, CO	Official	
	Santa FE, NM	Official	
	Acoma Pueblo, NM	Official	
	Albuquerque, NM	Official	
	Cortez, CO	Official	
	Mesa Verde, NM	Official	
5/24	New York, NY	Mixed	$3,040.00
5/25-5/30	Yulee, FL	Political	$0.00
6/2	New York, NY	Mixed	$4,560.00
6/4	Boston, MA	Official	$7,308.00
6/9-6/10	Binghamton, NY	Mixed	$5,538.16
	New York, NY	Mixed	
	Lawrenceville, NJ	Mixed	
6/11-6/12	St Louis, MO	Political	$143.00
	Los Angeles, CA	Political	
	Berkeley, CA	Political	
6/16-6/20	**France**	**Official**	$0.00
	Morocco	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Germany	**Official**	
7/5	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,559.00
7/7-7/9	Binghamton, NY	Political	$417.00
	Oneonta, NY	Political	
	Cooperstown, NY	Political	
	Bassett, NY	Political	
	Clinton, NY	Political	
	Utica, NY	Political	
	Rome, NY	Political	
	Syracuse, NY	Political	
	Albany, NY	Political	

7/12-7/15	New Rochelle, NY	Political	$570.03
	Rye, NY	Political	
	Valhalla, NY	Political	
	Jones Beach, NY	Political	
	New York, NY	Political	
	Garden City, NY	Political	
	Rockville Center, NY	Political	
	Holbrook, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
7/19-7/22	Orlando, FL	Official	$3,280.00
7/23	New York, NY	Official	$3,330.50
	Canton, OH	Official	
7/29-7/31	Elmira, NY	Political	$179.00
	Bath, NY	Political	
	Hornell, NY	Political	
	Ithaca, NY	Political	
8/4-8/6	Jamestown, NY	Political	$75.00
	Dunkirk, NY	Political	
	Amherst, NY	Political	
	Kenmore, NY	Political	
	Buffalo, NY	Political	
	Niagra, NY	Political	
	Lockport, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Mixed	
8/7	Westchester, NY	Official	$75.00
8/9-8/10	New York, NY	Political	$365.00
8/17-8/18	Dallas, TX	Political	$45.00
	McAllen, TX	Political	
	Houston, TX	Mixed	
	Austin, TX	Political	
9/8-9/10	Bay Shore, NY	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
	South Ozone Park, NY	Political	
	Elmhurst, NY	Political	
9/13-9/15	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Flushing, NY	Political	
	Great Neck, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
9/18	New York, NY	Official	$1,783.00

9/21-9/23	West Port, Ct	Political	$75.00
	New York, NY	Political	
9/24-9/25	Albany, NY	Mixed	$481.00
	Schenectady, NY	Mixed	
	Troy, NY	Mixed	
	Saratoga, NY	Mixed	
9/26-9/27	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Philadelphia, PA	Mixed	
9/28	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
9/30-	**Ottawa, Canada**	**Official**	$75.00
	Massena, NY	Mixed	
	Watertown, NY	Mixed	
		First Lady FY 99 Subtotal:	$205,185.74
		FY 99 Total:	$787,409.79

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE PRESIDENT

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/1-10/4	Las Vegas, NV	Mixed	$ 21,493.00
	Palo Alto, CA	Political	
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
10/7-10/9	New York, NY	Mixed	$ 25,428.03
	Ottawa, Canada	**Official**	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
10/13	Harrisonburg, VA	Official	$ 3,419.00
10/18	Newark, NJ	Political	$0.00
10/25	New York, NY	Political	$0.00
10/29	Philadelphia, PA	Political	$ 3,851.50
	Atlanta, GA	Mixed	
10/30	Providence, RI	Official	$ 8,850.00
10/31-11/2	**Norway**	**Official**	$470.00
11/4-11/5	Hartford, CT	Official	$ 43,659.28
	Newark, NJ	Official	
	Little Rock, AR	Official	
	Hermitage, AR	Official	
	Chicago, IL	Official	
11/10	York, PA	Official	$ 6,019.00
11/14-11/23	**Turkey**	**Official**	$0.00
	Greece	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Bulgaria	**Official**	
	Macedonia	**Official**	
	Kosovo	**Official**	
11/30-12/2	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	$ 35,890.25
	Los Angeles, CA	Official	
	Seattle, WA	Official	
	Philadelphia, PA	Political	
12/9	Worcester, MA	Official	$ 3,969.00

12/10-12/11	Little Rock, AR Memphis, TN Orlando, FL Ft. Lauderdale, FL Miami, FL	Official Official Mixed Political Political	$ 28,069.75
1/3	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/4	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/5-1/6	Chappaqua, NY	Official	$ 4,154.50
1/6	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/7	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/9	Shepherdstown, WV	Official	$0.00
1/10-1/11	Annapolis, MD Grand Canyon, AZ Houston, TX	Official Official Mixed	$ 19,463.00
1/13-1/14	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Mixed	$ 10,888.00
1/18	Boston, MA	Mixed	$ 5,112.50
1/21-1/22	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
1/28-1/30	Quincy, IL **Switzerland**	Official **Official**	$ 7,900.00
2/5-2/7	Chappaqua, NY New York, NY	Official Political	$ 8,571.00
2/7	Hot Springs, VA	Political	$0.00
2/9-2/10	McAllen, TX Dallas, TX	Mixed Political	$ 3,949.50
	Presidential FY 00	Subtotal:	$ 241,157.31

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)
10/4-10/11	**Poland**	**Official**	$0.00
	Slovakia	**Official**	
	Italy	**Official**	
	Iceland	**Official**	
10/13-10/16	New York, NY	Political	$105.00
	Armonk, NY	Political	
	Glen Falls, NY	Political	
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Bolton Landing, NY	Political	
	Lake Placid, NY	Political	
	Saranac Lake, NY	Political	
	Hempstead, NY	Political	
	Huntington Station, NY	Political	
	Astoria, NY	Political	
10/17-10/20	Monticello, NY	Political	$105.00
	Bloomington, NY	Political	
	Claremont, NY	Political	
	Kingston, NY	Political	
	Middletown, NY	Political	
	New City, NY	Political	
	Spring Valley, NY	Political	
	Nyack, NY	Political	
	Pomona, NY	Political	
	White Plains, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
	Scarsdale, NY	Political	
	Rochester, NY	Political	
10/24-10/25	New York, NY	Mixed	$45.00
	Great Neck, NY	Mixed	
10/27-10/28	Chicago, IL	Mixed	$ 10,444.50
	Detroit, MI	Political	
11/1-11/3	New York, NY	Political	$75.00
	Rye Brook, NY	Political	
11/4-11/6	Las Vegas, NV	Political	$ 768.50
	Los Angeles, CA	Mixed	
	San Francisco, CA	Mixed	

11/8	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/9-11/21	**Israel** **Jordan** **Turkey** **Greece** **Italy**	**Official** **Official** **Official** **Official** **Official**	$0.00
11/23	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
11/29-12/1	New York, NY Buffalo, NY Boston, MA	Mixed Political Mixed	$1,233.40
12/2	Cincinnati, OH	Political	$0.00
12/6-12/10	New York, NY Jamaica, NY	Political Political	$1,465.00
12/13	Providence, RI	Mixed	$ 1,170.00
12/14	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/16	New York, NY	Political	$22.50
12/17	Minneapolis, MN Kansas City, MO	Political Political	$22.50
12/21-12/22	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/9-1/10	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
1/24-1/25	New York, NY Albany, NY	Political Political	$ 154.00
1/26	Miami, FL	Official	$ 2,718.00
2/3-2/4	New York, NY	Political	$ 195.00
2/5-2/13	New York, NY Buffalo, NY Rochester, NY Syracuse, NY Albany, NY Suffolk County, NY	Political Political Political Political Political Political	$670.00

2/15-2/17	New York, NY	Political	$ 375.00
	Chappaqua, NY	Political	
	Mt. Vernon, NY	Political	
	New Rochelle, NY	Political	
	First Lady FY 00 Subtotal:		$20,025.90
	FY 00 Total:		$261,183.21

Exhibit 3

Airlift Operations

First Lady Exploratory Travel & Campaign Payment History

AIRLIFT OPERATIONS
Exploratory Payment History
June 1, 1999 through February 2, 2000

Type	Invoice Date	Payment Date	Num		Open Balance	Amount	Number of Non-official staff	Number of Official Staff	Fligth Time
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31429	SAM #0955 / 9F0609		1,487.23	4	1	2 hrs. 40 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30276/77	SAM #1069/1081 / 9F0707-0709		3,662.00	4	1	12 hrs 25 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31222	SAM#1112/1113 / 9F0712-15		1,946.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30280	SAM #1123/1175 / 9F0729-0731		3,858.00	3	1	3 hr 20 min.
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30278	SAM #1167/1200 / 9F0804-0806		2,795.00	3	1	1 hr. 55 min.
	01/20/2000		31670	SAM #1168/1205 / 9F0809-0811	1,462.00	1,462.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min
	10/15/1999	12/07/1999	30279	SAM #1292/1293 / 9F0908-0910 (PP #1)	652.00	2,786.00	4	1	1 hr. 40 min
	10/15/1999	12/30/1999	30281	SAM #1294/1295 / 9F0913-0915		2,618.00	3	1	2 hrs
	10/18/1999	12/30/1999	30282	SAM #1296/1297 / 9F0921-0923		2,568.00	3	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/29/1999	12/30/1999	31434	SAM #1299 / 9F0924-0925		2,210.00	3	1	2 hrs.
	01/20/2000		31669	SAM #1298 / 9F0926-0927	1,693.94	1,693.94	2	1	2 hrs.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31436	SAM #1363 / 9F0928		736.00	2	1	1 hr. 40 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31223	SAM#1424 / 9F1013-16		1,668.00	1	1	3 hrs. 5 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31224	SAM #1425/1429/1434 / 9F1017-20		2,787.00	3	1	2 hrs. 45 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31441	SAM #1468 / 9F1024		752.00	1	1	50 min
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31225	SAM #1504/1512 / 9F1102-1103		978.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min
	12/23/1999	12/30/1999	31229	SAM #1513 / 9F1108		494.00	1	1	1 hr. 45 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31228	SAM #1584 / 9F1123		494.00	2	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/29/1999	01/06/2000	31443	SAM #1620 / 9F1206-1210		1,462.00	3	1	1 hr. 35 min.
	12/22/1999	12/30/1999	31227	SAM #1646 / 9F1214		736.00	1	1	1 hr. 35 min.
					$ 3,807.94	$ 36,685.17			

TOTAL BILLED	$36,685.17
TOTAL PAID	$32,877.23
TOTAL OUTSTANDING	$3,807.94
AVG # OF DAYS TO PAY	28

Exhibit 4

First Lady Travel to New York

Updated Airlift Operations data as of March 31, 2000

Travel of the First Lady to New York Airlift Operations Information

Dates:	#Official Staff Military Aircraft:	#Political Staff Military Aircraft:	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount:	Aircraft:
10/18-10/20/98	1	3		3/21/1999	9/15/1999	$1,811.50	C9
10/27/98	1	5	1:40	5/24/1999	1/14/2000	$2,790.00	C9
11/2/98	1	4	1:35	1/11/1999	2/25/1999	$2,234.00	C20
12/1-12/3/98	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
2/2/99	1	4	:45	4/9/1999	8/16/1999	$593.00	C9
3/3-3/4/99	1	6	1:50	6/2/1999	9/9/1999	$1,118.25	C9
4/19-20/99	1	6	1:45	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$176.80	C9
4/22/99	6	0	1:55	N/A	N/A	N/A	C32
4/29/99	1	3	1:30	6/14/1999	9/9/1999	$885.70	C20
5/7/99	1	5	2:40	6/30/1999	3/13/2000	$2,573.75	C20
5/8/99	5	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
5/24/99	1	3	1:35	6/30/1999	3/23/2000	$1,115.50	C20
6/2/99	1	3	1:40	7/23/1999	3/23/2000	$827.32	C20
7/23/99	5	0	1:15	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
8/7/99	4	0	1:40	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/18/99	6	0	1:35	N/A	N/A	N/A	C20
9/30/99	1	2	2:10	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$2,204.72	C20
11/29-12/1/99	1	2	4:35	3/15/2000	4/4/2000	$3,562.00	C37
12/16/99	1	3	1:30	*	*	*	C20
12/21/99	1	2	2:25	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,377.00	C20
1/9-1/10/00	1	2	1:10	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$1,165.00	C9
1/24-1/25/00	1	1	2:50	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$1,393.00	C20
2/3-2/4/00	1	1	1:45	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,071.00	C20
2/5-2/13/00	1	2	2:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,752.00	C20
2/15-2/17/00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20

Note:* Information not available at time of response.
Note: N/A= not applicable/ trip is 100% official

Exhibit 5

Airlift Operations Data
(not previously requested)

FY 2000 TRAVEL OF THE FIRST LADY TO NEW YORK

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost: (Gross Obligations)	#Official Staff Military Aircraft	# Political Staff Military Aircraft	Flight Time:	Airlift Ops Invoice Date:	Airlift Ops Payment Date:	Amount	Aircraft:
1/17-1/19	New York, NY	Political	$75.00	1	1	2:35	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$3,388.00	C20
	White Plains	Political								
	Buffalo, NY	Political								
1/21	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:30	3/23/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
2/20	Albany, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/30/2000	4/4/2000	$910.00	C20
2/22	Tonowanda, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	2:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,013.00	C20
	Staten Island	Political								
2/24-2/27	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 255.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,764.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
2/29	Syosset, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.00	C20
3/1	Valley Cottage, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:50	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$812.00	C20
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	New Hempstead, NY	Political								
	Purchase, NY	Political								
3/2-3/3	New York, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
3/4-3/7	Queens, NY	Political	$ 105.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$978.00	C20
	New York, NY	Political								
	Tuxedo Park, NY	Political								
	Pearl River, NY	Political								
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Asroria, NY	Political								
3/8-3/11	New York, NY	Political	$ 330.00	1	2	10:00	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$5,893.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Ithaca, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
3/13-3/15	New York, NY	Political	$ 75.00	1	1	3:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$2,156.00	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Albany, NY	Political								
	Suffolk County, NY	Political								
3/16	New York, NY	Political	$ 22.50	1	1	1:40	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,329.30	C20
	Huntington Station, NY	Political								
3/17	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	4	1:30	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$1,220.00	C20
3/18	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	1	1:35	3/28/2000	4/4/2000	$494.60	C20
3/20-3/22	Harlem, NY	Political	$ 471.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20
	Chappaqua, NY	Political								
	Rosslyn Heights, NY	Political								
	White Plains, NY	Political								
	New York, NY	Political								
	Armonk, NY	Political								
3/24	New York, NY	Political	$0.00	1	2	*	*	*	*	C20
3/26	Albany, NY	Political	$0.00							
3/29-3/30	Chappaqua, NY	Political	$ 45.00	1	1	*	*	*	*	C20

Note: * Information not available at time of response.

Exhibit 6

The First Lady's Book Tour

Simon & Schuster

The First Lady's Simon and Schuster Book Tour

1/15/96-5/3/96

Date:	Destination:	Designation:	Official Cost (Gross Obligations):	Aircraft:	Simon and Schuster Reimbursement:
1/15-1/20	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$1,420.02	C20	$6,462.50
	Little Rock, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Blytheville, AR	Simon & Schuster			
	Detroit, MI	Mixed			
	Chicago, IL	Simon & Schuster			
	Boston, MA	Simon & Schuster			
1/31	New York, NY	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$400.82
2/7-2/9	Denver, CO	Simon & Schuster	$881.86	C20	$6,094.60
	Los Angeles, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	San Francisco, CA	Simon & Schuster			
	Dallas, TX	Simon & Schuster			
2/22	Philadelphia, PA	Simon & Schuster	$30.00	C20	$1,208.13
5/2-5/3	Boca Raton, FL	Simon & Schuster	$187.73	C20	$4,130.00
	Atlanta, GA	Simon & Schuster			
	St. Louis, MO	Simon & Schuster			
	Minneapolis, MN	Simon & Schuster			

Exhibit 7

The total IT request, including systems maintenance, for the Office of Administration is as follows:

Capital Investment Plan $9,905,000

Salaries & Expenses
Information Systems & Technology
Customer Service 1,104,000
Telephones 482,000
Management & Planning 185,000
Data Center 1,832,000
Network 1,154,000
Facility Contract 7,273,000
System Integration 1,328,000
Personnel Compensation 4,531,000

General Services
Graphics & Publications 12,000

Human Resource Management
Payroll System 221,000

Financial Management
Accounting System 140,000

Library & Research Services
On-line Databases 235,000

Facilities Management
Facilities Software 3,000

TOTAL $28,405,000

Exhibit 8

Unanticipated Needs

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

g:\data\fy2001\unanticipated needs\un_hist.xls

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1972	1,000,000	446,000	Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention
1973	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1974	1,000,000	330,000	Energy Policy Office
		39,000	Federal Property Council
		92,000	U.S. Puerto Rico Ad Hoc Advisory Board
1975	500,000	231,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		212,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1976	1,000,000	235,000	Presidential Clemancy Board
		10,000	Federal Paperwork Commission
		131,300	Privacy Protection Study Commission
		19,000	National Study Commission on Records and Documents of Federal Officials
1977	1,000,000	57,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries
		100,000	Commission on Mental Health
		45,000	Office of Drug Abuse Policy
1978	1,000,000	52,000	Metric Board
		6,000	World Hunger Commission
		1,000	Commission on Pension Policy
		33,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		26,000	Commission on CIA Activities within the United States
1979	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1980	1,000,000	134,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		67,000	White House Office
		67,000	Council on Wage and Price Stability
		134,000	Department of State
		34,000	Commission on World Hunger
		168,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
1981	1,000,000	65,000	U.S.-Japan Economic Relations Group
		100,000	National Agenda for the Eighties
		58,000	Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries
1982	844,800	26,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		15,000	Commission on Radio Broadcast to Cuba
		52,000	Property Review Board
		145,000	Native Hawaiians Study
		50,000	Federalism and Private Sector Initiatives
1983	1,000,000	39,000	Special Task Force on Crime in South Florida
		80,000	White House Private Sector Initiatives Program
		60,000	White House Quality Education Initiative
		250,000	Agency for International Development

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

Appropriations and Expenditures 1972-2000

(This account was titled "Emergency Fund for the President" until 1975)

FY	APPROPRIATION	ACTUAL	DESCRIPTION
1984	1,000,000	375,000	WHCA EOP Computer Center Conversion
1985	1,000,000	162,000	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1986	957,000	180,608	VP's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism
1987	1,000,000	242,000	President's Special Review Board
		195,000	Iran Contra Hearings
		325,000	U.S. Secret Service
1988	1,000,000	150,000	Task Force on Market Mechanisms
		20,000	WHO Conference for a Drug-Free America
		110,000	President's Commission on Privatization
1989	1,000,000	181,000	National Space Council
1990	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1991	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1992	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1993	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1994	1,000,000	250,000	JFK Assassination Records Review Board
1995	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1996	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1997 [1]	0	- 0 -	
1998 [2]	1,000,000	- 0 -	
1999	1,000,000	- 0 -	
2000	1,000,000	325,000	White House Council on Youth Violence

[1] In FY 1997, the $1,000,000 requested for the Unanticipated Needs Account was diverted to fund conferences on model state drug laws through the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

[2] In FY 1998, the Unanticipated Needs Account was funded through the VA, HUD appropriations act, P.L. 105-65.

Exhibit 9

Estimated Terminal Leave Payments

Executive Office of the President: FY 2001 President's Request
Additional Questions

QUESTION 1: By EOP agency, provide the total number of FTE broken out by: # of political FTE and # of career FTE. For the political positions, include the job title for each position.

RESPONSE:

FTE BREAKOUT

AGENCY	AUTHORIZED FTE	CAREER FTE	POLITICAL FTE[1]
CEA	35	27	8[2]
NSC	60	60	0
OA	192	182	10
OPD	31	0	31
OVP	22	0	22
VP-RES	1	0	1
WHO	400	0	399

For a listing of job titles for the political FTE, see Exhibit 1.

QUESTION 2: By EOP agency, provide the total number of positions expected to be vacant due to the Presidential transition. Include total estimated terminal leave payments for each agency.

RESPONSE: The EOP is unable to speculate as to the number of positions expected to be vacant due to the presidential transition. However, the EOP has made certain assumptions for budget preparation purposes.

TOTAL ESTIMATED TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS[3]

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
WHO	$610K[4]
OVP	$28K

[1] Includes actual positions as well as vacant Senate Confirmed Positions.
[2] Administratively Determined (AD) technical staff not included in this number.
[3] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates as of February 11, 2000. These amounts reflect potential costs and do not reflect the amounts budgeted for FY 2001, which in some cases assumed that the majority of these costs would be offset from savings from attrition.
[4] Does not include terminal leave costs of GS equivalent personnel.

AGENCY	ESTIMATED TERM. LEAVE
VP-RES	$9K
OA	$11K
OPD	$86K
NSC	$60K[5]
CEA	$33K
TOTAL	$837K

White House Office

QUESTION 1: Provide the following information for "Travel and Transportation of Persons" for fiscal years 1998-2000 to date:

- **Number of trips**
- **Number of EOP staff traveling on each trip**
- **Destination of each trip**
- **General itinerary for each trip**
- **Cost for each trip**

For the fiscal year 2001 request, provide the estimated number of trips.

RESPONSE: There have been 267 trips from fiscal year 1998 through February 18, 2000. Exhibit 2 lists all travel the President and First Lady have taken for fiscal years 1998 to February 18, 2000, including the following information for each trip: date, destination, designation (official, political, mixed, or other), and the total official cost.[6] Official costs indicate the expenses paid from travel funds appropriated to the White House Office.

On official trips, cost represents the amount paid from the White House account. On mixed trips, the figure represents the total costs paid from the White House account. For political and other trips, cost represents expenses for individuals who accompanied the President or First Lady in an official capacity, e.g., communications facility support, clerical, logistical, administrative support and White House Travel Office staff.

On trips with more than one stop, the figure in the total cost column is a summation of all official costs for all stops on a trip.

---

[5] Based on actual leave balances and hourly rates of Senior Level (SL) staff, who have historically departed during the transition to a new Administration.

[6] Information provided for fiscal years 1998 – 2/25/99 is as of March 24, 1999 and includes additional trips not supported by Air Force One and the related Air Force Fleet. Information provided from 2/25/99 – fiscal year 2000 is as of February 18, 2000.