

Q The January 28th, 1993 printout, 18 of the people that were on the Exhibit 1 list were deactivated as of that date?

A That's correct. And our records properly show that they were -- from that time forward, they carried an inactive status.

The next historic WAVES document I used in my analysis was a printout. The printout is dated 4-14 of 1993, but what it shows is all of those individuals who became inactive in the month of February of 1993. There are 48 individuals from the list of 476, Exhibit 1, who are listed on this WAVES printout showing that they have become inactive. So concurrent with the first chart I have shown, the number of inactive passholders grows as we move forward in time.

The next printout I have, it shows active passholders that are employed by the White House operations personnel. And I looked at this list viewing it for exclusions from the list of 476, meaning that if you are on this, you are active. If you are not on this and you were employed by White House operations personnel, which all but three individuals on this list were, you would be excluded, because you would have an inactive status.

Now, the breakdown on this list are -- and the list is dated 5-2 of 1993. So that is our cutoff in time is May 2nd of 1993.

Now, there are 100 people -- I'm sorry, let me back up, because the numbers get confusing here. There are 94 people from Exhibit 1 included on this list.

Q Included on the May 2nd, 1993 list?

A Correct. On here are eight errors. The eight errors, I did not write their names down. I will give them -- I will try to enumerate them from memory. An individual by the last name of Blumenthal, an individual by the last name of Carpendale, an individual by the last name of Cutshall. The other five names escape me.

Mr. Goldberg. Is the Hagin or Eagin --

The Witness. I will deal with that when I am done with this.

BY MS. COMSTOCK:

Q And James Baker, is he included in that?

A No, he is not. He is separate to that.

Q I think we can get those for the record. That will be fine.

A Okay. There are eight names that E-PASS, the E-PASS system showed them as inactive, and the information was not passed over to the

WAVES system to also show them deactivated or having inactive status. And on this May 2nd list, there are eight errors that we made, and they show up as active when, in fact, they should have been inactive.

Q All right. There is also six other individuals in the total number of this list that are not listed on here,. Three of them are employees of the residence. Their last names are Blake, Bowens and Brooks. And an additional three are people that have yet to be employed by the White House, an individual by the last name of Carr, who became employed -- or who became active in our pass system as of 6-3-93; an individual by the last name of Carpenter, who became active in our pass system on 5-27-93; and an individual by the name of Balfour, who became active in our pass system on 7-24-93.

Q Is this May 2nd, 1993 list, this is a WAVES list?

A This is a WAVES list showing all active passholders employed by White House operations personnel.

Q Okay. If somebody had put somebody on an access list, would they also appear on this WAVES list?

A No, they would not, because an access means that you are permitted access into the complex. It doesn't mean you have been issued a pass.

Q So these would be all the people who had at least a temporary hard pass at this time?

A At least a temporary hard pass.

Q On the chart does it indicate whether it was a temporary or a permanent?

A It does. The first one is White House staff, the second one is temporary EOB, permanent EOB, temporary White House staff.

Q Okay. So the "WHS" stands for "White House staff"?

A Correct.

"TEO" stands for "temporary Executive Office Building."

Q "OEB"?

A Stands for "Executive Office Building."

TWHS stands for "temporary White House staff."

Q Okay. So that covers all of our codes there on that?

A There is also "TVOL", which is "temporary volunteer."

Mr. Goldberg. Can I ask a clarifying question, just so we don't have to come back and redo all of this again on my time? I know it is not typical practice, but it would just be more efficient.

EXAMINATION BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q I want to clear up the three names that you said were not to be employed. Is that three names that were taken from the list of names of the White House files that were somehow requested from the FBI inappropriately?

A No, I am not saying they were requested inappropriately. I am saying that they weren't employed.

Q I am just trying to clarify which list you found those three people on. I didn't mean to ask you to characterize them.

A I found those three people on this list, Exhibit Number 1, the list of 476 names.

Q Which the White House has represented as the list of names that Marceca requested?

A If they have, yes.

Mr. Goldberg. Do you know the answer to that question?

BY MS. COMSTOCK:

Q You are saying the three people are on Exhibit 1, but they don't appear on any of the WAVES lists?

A On any of the WAVES lists. And the reason they do not appear is because this WAVES list is dated 5-2 of 1993, and they were not hired until after 5-2 of 1993, so they couldn't appear on a list that we produced.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q I am confused, but not by your answer, but just by why is Marceca asking for these files.

Ms. Comstock. The White House represented that 89 of these were correctly -- there is a number of these in this 476 list which were correctly sought.

Mr. Goldberg. I am sorry. Let me just ask Barbara a question before I get back to you.

Ms. Comstock. Why don't we go off the record for a minute.

[Discussion off the record.]

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q Did you have these charts before the Senate hearing?

A No, I didn't. I had them made yesterday.

Now, where was I?

BY MS. COMSTOCK:

Q We had gone through the May 2nd, 1993 list and identified what some of the codes were on there.

A Okay. So using this May 2nd, 1993 list, and knowing that there were three employees of the residence, three employees that had yet to be hired, eight individuals that were our error, that were listed as active when they were not active, and when you work the math, it tells me that there were 368 individuals from Exhibit 1 that were listed as inactive at that point in time. So any list we produced after May 2nd of 1993 showed 368 of those 476 names as inactive passholders to the White House complex.

Q So after May 2nd, 1993, anyone requesting an active list of passholders would not have gotten 368 of the names that are on Exhibit 1?

A That is correct.

Q All right. The next historic WAVES document I have is dated 11-3 of '93, and what it shows are those passholders who became inactive during the month of May 1993. There are five individuals from the list of 476 that became inactive during the month of May 1993.

Q Okay. And on this – Billy Dale is included on this list?

A Yes. Billy Dale is included on this list.

Q John Dreylinger?

A Billy Dale, and it shows him becoming inactive on May 24th of 1993. That is when he was made inactive.

Q And John Dreylinger becomes inactive on May 24th also?

A May 24th of 1993 also.

Q This list is just one page?

A This list is only one page. I only copied AA to GO from our records, just to reduce on the amount of paperwork that we would have had to have brought in.

Q And Barnaby Brasseur is also on this list as being *deactivated on May 24th, 1993*?

A He is one of the five. Dreylinger, Dale, Brasseur, are three --

Q Those are are probably the only --

A Flagler is four, and there is a fifth one. There are five individuals.

Q I'm sorry, who is Flagler?

A He is from the list.

Q Oh, from the list, I see.

A There are five individuals from the list that we are calling Exhibit 1 that are on this printout, meaning that any list we would have produced after May of 1993, these five individuals would also be listed as inactive.

Q All right.

A The next historic WAVES document I have is dated 11-3-93, and what it shows are those individuals that went from an active to an inactive status in June of 1993. There are six individuals from Exhibit 1 who became inactive in June of 1993, and those six names are listed on this printout.

The final document I have is dated 7-8-93, and again, this is a listing of all active passholders employed by White House operations personnel. On that list there are -- here's the way the numbers work: There are four people that are legitimately passholders that are on the list, and they are the three employees of the residence, Blake, Bowen and Brooks. One employee who was yet to be hired, Elizabeth Balfour, she was not hired, according to our records, until after July 8th of 1993. There are 85 people from this list that are common to Exhibit 1, they should be there, and there are eight errors. I have given you three names. The fourth name that I can recall is Danica Bizic. As the day goes on, I will recall them all.

But what this shows me is that there are -- as of May 2nd -- I'm sorry, July 8th, 1993, there are 379 individuals from this list that we are calling Exhibit 1 that would have been inactive on any report we would have generated from WAVES.

To confirm that the records in WAVES stay current, I don't have any copies of the document at this point in time because I just double-checked last night, but I have a printout dated 8-19-94 of all inactive passholders. All 379 of these individuals are listed on that printout as inactive, and there are some additional ones also that from the --

Q I'm sorry, did you say August 19th, 1993?

A August 19th, 1994.

Q 1994, okay.

A Right. But it is a logical -- it is a safe assumption or a logical conclusion that if somebody was not included on a printout dated July 8th, 1993 of active passholders, they were included on a printout dated 8-19-94 showing inactive passholders.

Q I see.

A In the intermediate and the time in between, they have stayed -- their status stayed as inactive.

Q Okay.

A Am I clear? Are you clear? I know I'm clear, but I have been living with these numbers for quite some time. Have I expressed myself adequately?

Q I think the bottom line is that of the names that are on the list of Exhibit 1, any glitches or whatever that the Secret Service had can only account for eight of those names; is that correct?

A Okay. The scope of my analysis ran from 1984 up to July 8th of 1993. I can tell you definitively that 94 of those individuals -- if we were to have produced a list in 1989, 94 of those individuals from Exhibit 1 would have been inactive.

Q So someone who came up with those 94 names had to get them either from an inactive list or from somewhere else?

A Or from somewhere else. I don't know where they would have come from.

BY MR. GOLDBERG:

Q Could it come from the same list and just be listed as inactive?

A We do generate --

Q So it could be the same list that would have them active or inactive; is that accurate?

A We do generate -- I tell you what, can I finish, and then I will address your question.

At the same time after August of 1991, August 8th, I believe, 182 of those people would have been listed as inactive on any report or printout we produced through WAVES. Again, on May 2nd of 1993, 368 would have been inactive. And if you want to look at just the 1992 date,