

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Roberts, John G.: Files

Folder Title: JGR/Portal-to-Portal
(8 of 14)

Box: 37

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Cong's Staff Ques
9/16/85

OMB QUESTIONS

1. What action has the administration taken to inform its appointees of the laws governing the use of government vehicles and their personal liability for illegal use of such vehicles?
2. What criteria did the OMB use to determine which government employees should be included in this proposed amendment and which ones should be omitted?
3. What is the significance in listing some employees in section (a) and other employees in section (b)?
4. What is the rationale for allowing the President or an agency head to authorize government transportation to an employee for 90 days, renewable quarterly?
5. What definition of agency applies in this provision?
6. What are examples of situations that would be covered by including "other operational considerations" in this provision?
7. Why is the exception provided in current law for "medical officers on out-patient medical service" needed?

8. What guidance has OMB given to the agencies concerning implementation of the current law governing the use of government vehicles for an official purpose?

9. For the record, which employees of the government currently are deemed to have cabinet level status? What restrictions govern the authority to make such designations?

10. What problems might arise if motor pool dispatchers and drivers are required to refuse to carry out illegal transportation requests of other government employees?

11. Does the Secret Service have separate legal authority to provide home-to-work transportation to any individual to whom it provides protection? If so, please provide the cite to the law. ✓

12. Under what authority is William McFarlane now receiving government-furnished commuting services? ✓

13. How many government employees located outside the continental United States currently receive government-furnished home-to-work transportation? For the record, please provide a listing of the categories of employees provided such service, together with the number of employees in each category.

14. What benefits does the government derive from providing commuting services to officers and employees of the government?

15. What other functions do chauffeurs assigned to vehicles that are dedicated to a single officer or employee of the government normally perform in addition to driving?

16. How many additional automobiles would need to be purchased or leased in order to provide government-furnished transportation between home and work to all the officers and employees covered in this proposal? How many of these vehicles would be armored?

17. How many additional chauffeurs would need to be hired if this proposal becomes law without change?

18. FOLLOW UP: Are you counting one chauffeur per vehicle so that overtime would be required for each chauffeur? Or, do you envision hiring 2 or 3 chauffeurs for each vehicle, each covering an 8-hour shift in the day?

19. How much will this proposal cost the government annually if enacted without change? For the record, please provide a breakdown of these costs?

20. How will this proposal enhance ^(aHw) the current motor pool operations in the agencies?

NOTE: Currently, government-furnished vehicles are available to government officers and employees when needed for official business. Of course, the officer or employee must first transport himself or herself to the government workplace.

21. How can OMB justify this proposal in light of this Administration's reducing and/or eliminating funds for what it feels are unnecessary programs?


22. Should the officials who would be provided home-to-work transportation be required to reimburse the government for its cost? ✓

23. When is the transportation of spouses of government officials at government expense justified? ✓

24. What criteria should be used to determine if an official's activities may be properly considered field work?


25. When the President or an agency head determines that home-to-work transportation should be provided on a temporary basis (Subsection (a)(3), why shouldn't this transportation

terminate if the need has subsided prior to the end of 90 days?

26. For the record, please provide more succinct language for subsections (a)(3) and (b)(2)(A) and (B) so as to deter discretionary interpretation? 

27. What are the justifications for providing home-to-work transportation for the deputy heads of executive departments?

28. How will an official's safety and security be ensured by the use of a government car?

29. Should the provision of home-to-work transportation for government employees be considered income for taxation purposes? 

30. Under this proposal, how many of the officials authorized to use a government vehicle for home-to-work transportation would also be provided a chauffeur?

31. For what other functions will an official's car and chauffeur be used besides home-to-work transportation?

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR FRED F. FIELDING

FROM:

JOHN G. ROBERTS *JGR*

SUBJECT:

Portal-to-Portal Letter

Attached is a draft along the lines we discussed. I am a bit concerned about the Carter OLC opinion, since it relies on an old Comptroller General opinion explicitly renounced in the 1983 Comptroller General opinion. We can, of course, contend that the reasoning is still correct, even if the Comptroller General has rejected his old opinion, but I wanted you to know that the Comptroller General opinion cited in the OLC opinion has been overruled.

I recognize that this draft may be a bit much, particularly in the last two paragraphs, but I think the best approach is to try to shame those carping about the very limited portal-to-portal being provided.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1985

Dear Mr. Bowsher:

I have received a copy of your letter dated August 19, 1985, to Senator William Proxmire, concerning the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees. As you know, we do not agree with the reading of the law on this subject contained in the Comptroller General decision of June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983). That decision itself recognized that it was inconsistent with prior Comptroller General decisions, as well as common practice over many Administrations known to and acquiesced in by Congress. The decision was also contrary to prior Department of Justice legal opinions and legal opinions issued by various agency general counsel.

In light of the confused state of the law on the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees, the Comptroller General decision pointed out the need for Congress to consider adopting clarifying legislation on the subject. As you know, Administration officials have been working closely with you and other General Accounting Office officials for some time to develop appropriate legislation to resolve the confusion in this area. After a lengthy and detailed drafting process, with the full participation of your office, former Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman was able to submit to Congress, on July 31, a comprehensive legislative proposal. Your office was, of course, fully aware of that submission.

Despite the foregoing, your letter to Senator Proxmire, which you propose to make public on September 18, concludes that "the officers and employees on the White House staff who might be involved should immediately cease such use of Government vehicles unless adequate justification is provided."

The only members of the White House staff receiving regular home-to-work transportation are the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser. Both officials would be covered by the proposed legislation. The National Security Adviser is provided such transportation under an opinion from the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel furnished during the Carter Administration, with respect to former National Security Adviser Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. That opinion noted the need for the National Security Adviser to be able to communicate with the President at all times. The opinion also stressed that the position of the National

Security Adviser makes him an important potential target for terrorists or disturbed persons. The provision of home-to-work transportation in a Government vehicle with secure communication facilities and a trained driver ensures constant communications capability and increased protection, both not in the interest of personal convenience but rather of national security.

The same reasoning applies with equal force to the Chief of Staff. In addition, the Secret Service has determined that a security threat exists with respect to the Chief of Staff, and has directed that the Chief of Staff be provided home-to-work transportation in response to that threat.

I view the foregoing as "adequate justification" for the provision of home-to-work transportation to these two officials. I could not, in good conscience, advise them to cease accepting such transportation when doing so could result in the President being unable to communicate with his Chief of Staff or his National Security Adviser in the event of a critical national emergency in which the necessary response time, in this nuclear age, is measured in minutes. Nor could I so advise them when doing so could subject them to unreasonable threats to their personal safety and thereby to our national security.

If you have other views, I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your earliest convenience. The foregoing reasons for providing home-to-work transportation to these individuals will not suddenly abate when you make your letter to Senator Proxmire public, yet the individuals need to know if they are at risk after that date. A decision that the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser may not continue to be provided home-to-work transportation must be accompanied by a willingness to accept responsibility for the consequences in terms of our Nation's ability to respond to a crisis and in terms of the security not only of the individuals involved but the Nation as well.

Sincerely,

Fred F. Fielding
Counsel to the President

The Honorable Charles A. Bowsher
Comptroller General of
the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

FFF:JGR:aea 9/17/85
cc: FFFielding
JGRoberts
Subj
Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR FRED F. FIELDING

FROM: JOHN G. ROBERTS 

SUBJECT: Portal-to-Portal Letter

Attached is a draft along the lines we discussed. I am a bit concerned about the Carter OLC opinion, since it relies on an old Comptroller General opinion explicitly renounced in the 1983 Comptroller General opinion. We can, of course, contend that the reasoning is still correct, even if the Comptroller General has rejected his old opinion, but I wanted you to know that the Comptroller General opinion cited in the OLC opinion has been overruled.

I recognize that this draft may be a bit much, particularly in the last two paragraphs, but I think the best approach is to try to shame those carping about the very limited portal-to-portal being provided.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1985

Dear Mr. Bowsher:

I have received a copy of your letter dated August 19, 1985, to Senator William Proxmire, concerning the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees. As you know, we do not agree with the reading of the law on this subject contained in the Comptroller General decision of June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983). That decision itself recognized that it was inconsistent with prior Comptroller General decisions, as well as common practice over many Administrations known to and acquiesced in by Congress. The decision was also contrary to prior Department of Justice legal opinions and legal opinions issued by various agency general counsel.

In light of the confused state of the law on the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees, the Comptroller General decision pointed out the need for Congress to consider adopting clarifying legislation on the subject. As you know, Administration officials have been working closely with you and other General Accounting Office officials for some time to develop appropriate legislation to resolve the confusion in this area. After a lengthy and detailed drafting process, with the full participation of your office, former Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman was able to submit to Congress, on July 31, a comprehensive legislative proposal. Your office was, of course, fully aware of that submission.

Despite the foregoing, your letter to Senator Proxmire, which you propose to make public on September 18, concludes that "the officers and employees on the White House staff who might be involved should immediately cease such use of Government vehicles unless adequate justification is provided."

The only members of the White House staff receiving regular home-to-work transportation are the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser. Both officials would be covered by the proposed legislation. The National Security Adviser is provided such transportation under an opinion from the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel furnished during the Carter Administration, with respect to former National Security Adviser Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. That opinion noted the need for the National Security Adviser to be able to communicate with the President at all times. The opinion also stressed that the position of the National

Security Adviser makes him an important potential target for terrorists or disturbed persons. The provision of home-to-work transportation in a Government vehicle with secure communication facilities and a trained driver ensures constant communications capability and increased protection, both not in the interest of personal convenience but rather of national security.

The same reasoning applies with equal force to the Chief of Staff. In addition, the Secret Service has determined that a security threat exists with respect to the Chief of Staff, and has directed that the Chief of Staff be provided home-to-work transportation in response to that threat.

I view the foregoing as "adequate justification" for the provision of home-to-work transportation to these two officials. I could not, in good conscience, advise them to cease accepting such transportation when doing so could result in the President being unable to communicate with his Chief of Staff or his National Security Adviser in the event of a critical national emergency in which the necessary response time, in this nuclear age, is measured in minutes. Nor could I so advise them when doing so could subject them to unreasonable threats to their personal safety and thereby to our national security.

If you have other views, I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your earliest convenience. The foregoing reasons for providing home-to-work transportation to these individuals will not suddenly abate when you make your letter to Senator Proxmire public, yet the individuals need to know if they are at risk after that date. A decision that the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser may not continue to be provided home-to-work transportation must be accompanied by a willingness to accept responsibility for the consequences in terms of our Nation's ability to respond to a crisis and in terms of the security not only of the individuals involved but the Nation as well.

Sincerely,

Fred F. Fielding
Counsel to the President

The Honorable Charles A. Bowsler
Comptroller General of
the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

FFF:JGR:aea 9/17/85
cc: FFFielding
JGRoberts
SUBj
Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 18, 1985

Dear Mr. Bowsler:

I have received a copy of your letter dated August 19, 1985, to Senator William Proxmire, concerning the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees. As you know, we do not necessarily agree with the new reading of the law on this subject contained in the Comptroller General decision of June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983). This is so because, as that decision itself recognized, it was inconsistent with prior Comptroller General decisions, as well as common practice over many Administrations known to and acquiesced in by Congress. The decision was also contrary to prior Department of Justice legal opinions and legal opinions issued by various agency general counsel.

In light of the confused state of the law on the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees, the Comptroller General decision again pointed out the need for Congress to consider adopting clarifying legislation on the subject. As you know, Administration officials have been working closely with you and other General Accounting Office officials for some time to develop appropriate legislation to resolve the confusion in this area. After a lengthy and detailed drafting process, with the full participation of your office, former Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman was able to submit to Congress, on July 31, a comprehensive legislative proposal. Your office was, of course, fully aware of these efforts.

Despite the foregoing, your letter to Senator Proxmire of August 19, which you propose to make public on September 18, concludes that "the officers and employees on the White House staff who might be involved should immediately cease such use of Government vehicles unless adequate justification is provided."

The only members of the White House staff receiving regular home-to-work transportation are the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser. Both officials would be covered

by the proposed legislation. The National Security Adviser was provided such transportation under an opinion from the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel furnished during the Carter Administration, with respect to former National Security Adviser Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. That opinion noted the need for the National Security Adviser to be able to communicate with the President at all times. The opinion also stressed that the position of the National Security Adviser makes him an important potential target for terrorists or disturbed persons. The provision of home-to-work transportation in a Government vehicle with secure communication facilities and a trained driver ensures constant communications capability and increased protection, not in the interest of personal convenience but rather of national security.

The same reasoning would apply with equal force to the Chief of Staff. In addition, however, such transportation is provided to the Chief of Staff as a result of a determination by the Director of the United States Secret Service that a threat exists sufficient to justify security coverage, including that the Chief of Staff be provided home-to-work transportation in response to that threat.

I trust that the foregoing is "adequate justification" for the provision of home-to-work transportation to these two officials. However, I do not wish to put them in jeopardy of violating the law. I could not, in good conscience, advise them to cease accepting such transportation when doing so could result in the President being unable to communicate with his Chief of Staff or his National Security Adviser in the event of a critical national emergency in which the necessary response time, in this nuclear age, is measured in minutes. Nor could I so advise them when doing so could subject them to unreasonable threats to their personal safety and thereby to our national security.

I would appreciate your comment on these determinations in view of your admonition in your letter of August 19. The foregoing reasons for providing home-to-work transportation to these individuals will not suddenly abate when you make your letter to Senator Proxmire public, yet the individuals need to know if they are to be deemed by you to be in violation of the law after that date. I should note in defense of these determinations and in support of this request, that a decision that the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser may not continue to be provided home-to-work transportation must be accompanied by a

willingness to accept responsibility for the consequences in terms of our Nation's ability to respond rapidly to a crisis and in terms of the security not only of the individuals involved but the Nation as well.

Sincerely,

Fred F. Fielding
Counsel to the President

The Honorable Charles A. Bowsher
Comptroller General of
the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

FFF:JGR:aea 9/18/85
cc: FFFielding
JGRoberts
Subj
Chron

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 17, 1985

*This is so because as
I'm not sure at Dept
of Justice and the aggravi
of business planter an
this year.*

Dear Mr. Bowsher:

I *DP* have received a copy of your letter dated August 19, 1985, to Senator William Proxmire, concerning the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees. As you know, we do not agree with the reading of the law on this subject contained in the Comptroller General decision of June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983). That decision itself recognized, ~~that~~ it was inconsistent with prior Comptroller General decisions, as well as common practice over many Administrations known to and acquiesced in by Congress. The decision was also contrary to prior Department of Justice legal opinions and legal opinions issued by various agency general counsel.

In light of the confused state of the law on the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees, the Comptroller General decision ^{on} pointed out the need for Congress to consider adopting clarifying legislation on the subject. As you know, Administration officials have been working closely with you and other General Accounting Office officials for some time to develop appropriate legislation to resolve the confusion in this area. After a lengthy and detailed drafting process, with the full participation of your office, former Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman was able to submit to Congress, on July 31, a comprehensive legislative proposal. Your office was, of course, fully aware of ~~that submission.~~ *these efforts.*

Despite the foregoing, your letter to Senator Proxmire ^{16 August 1985} which you propose to make public on September 18, concludes that "the officers and employees on the White House staff who might be involved should immediately cease such use of Government vehicles unless adequate justification is provided."

The only members of the White House staff receiving regular home-to-work transportation are the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser. Both officials would be covered by the proposed legislation. The National Security Adviser ~~was~~ provided such transportation under an opinion from the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel furnished during the Carter Administration, with respect to former National Security Adviser Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. That opinion noted the need for the National Security Adviser to be able to communicate with the President at all times. The opinion also stressed that the position of the National


Security Adviser makes him an important potential target for terrorists or disturbed persons. The provision of home-to-work transportation in a Government vehicle with secure communication facilities and a trained driver ensures constant communications capability and increased protection, both not in the interest of personal convenience but rather of national security.

The same reasoning applies with equal force to the Chief of Staff. In addition, ~~the Secret Service has determined that a security threat exists with respect to the Chief of Staff and has directed that the Chief of Staff be provided home-to-work transportation in response to that threat.~~

I view the foregoing as "adequate justification" for the provision of home-to-work transportation to these two officials. ~~I could not, in good conscience, advise them to cease accepting such transportation when doing so could result in the President being unable to communicate with his Chief of Staff or his National Security Adviser in the event of a critical national emergency in which the necessary response time, in this nuclear age, is measured in minutes. Nor could I so advise them when doing so could subject them to unreasonable threats to their personal safety and thereby to our national security.~~

~~I would appreciate your comment on these details in the view of your advice in your letter of August 17. If you have other views, I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your earliest convenience. The foregoing reasons for providing home-to-work transportation to these individuals will not suddenly abate when you make your letter to Senator Proxmire public, yet the individuals need to know if they are at risk after that date. A decision that the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser may not continue to be provided home-to-work transportation must be accompanied by a willingness to accept responsibility for the consequences in terms of our Nation's ability to respond to a crisis and in terms of the security not only of the individuals involved but the Nation as well.~~

Sincerely,

FFF

Fred F. Fielding
Counsel to the President

The Honorable Charles A. Bowsher
Comptroller General of
the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

... women, I do not wish to put them in jeopardy of the law.

a possible of a document by the Director to US... that a threat exists... support... the Chief of Staff

I should like to see in reference of this document and in support of this report; the



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON D.C. 20548

September 18, 1985

B-210555.11

The Honorable Jack Brooks
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter dated August 2, 1985, requesting the views and comments of this Office on a recent Office of Management and Budget (OMB) legislative proposal for amendment of 31 U.S.C. § 1344, concerning home-to-work transportation of Government employees. We support the enactment of legislation along the lines of the OMB proposal. We worked closely with OMB on earlier drafts of this proposal but we did not have an opportunity to review this final version before it was sent to you. We have several suggestions which we think will improve the draft both in form and substance.

As you know, this Office concluded in a decision dated June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983), issued at your request, that the use of Government vehicles for home-to-work transportation of Government employees was limited by 31 U.S.C. § 1344 to the President, cabinet level department heads, principal diplomatic and consular officials, medical officers providing out-patient medical services, and certain employees engaged in "field work."

In the letter transmitting our decision to you, we noted that the present law makes no provision for unusual circumstances in which there is no effective way to accomplish official business without the use of Government vehicles for home-to-work transportation. The OMB proposal provides a reasonable solution to this problem. It would authorize the President or an agency head to permit home-to-work transportation of employees for up to 90 days in the case of genuine emergencies or when "highly unusual circumstances" make such transportation essential to the effective conduct of official business.

In two GAO decisions, we declined to take exception to expenditures for such transportation when there were well-documented threats to the personal safety of certain employees or when extraordinary working conditions involving a

general transportation strike made Government transportation of essential employees necessary. See 54 Comp. Gen. 855 (1975); 54 Comp. Gen. 1066 (1975). The proposed exception would not authorize home-to-work transportation once emergency conditions abate nor could such transportation ever be provided solely for employee comfort or convenience.

Home-to-work transportation for such "operational conditions" would also be provided on a permanent basis for the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff, and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

A proposed change from current law is the expansion of the small group of officials who, by virtue of their status as heads of cabinet level departments, are eligible for routine transportation in a Government vehicle between their residences and offices. For example, deputies to the heads of cabinet-level departments are added to the group of eligible individuals, at the discretion of their respective Department heads.

We would recommend that the word "principal" be inserted in proposed section (b)(2)(A) before the word "deputy". In GAO's previous recommendations to your committee, we said that it seemed appropriate to provide home-to-work transportation to the number 2 official in a cabinet department. We have since learned that many departments have several deputies at lower levels of responsibility (or have several titles arguably equivalent to "Deputy".) We don't think it desirable to expand the list beyond the principal deputy who acts for the department head in his absence.

There is no specific provision in the OMB draft covering heads of all non-cabinet agencies. While proposed subsection (b)(2)(B) which includes "other persons in the Executive Branch designated at level II of the the Executive Schedule" would cover most non-cabinet agency heads, there are some significant omissions. For example, the administrators of the General Services Administration and the Small Business Administration would not be eligible, although the administrators of the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Highway Administration would be. Similarly, the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would be covered but not the chairmen of all the other major independent regulatory agencies, since they are listed at level III of the Executive Schedule.

The needs and responsibilities of the heads of non-cabinet agencies who are not eligible for home-to-work transportation under the current law do not differ in any practical sense from the needs and responsibilities of cabinet level Department heads and other eligible individuals. While setting the

general eligibility level at level II of the Executive Schedule is reasonable, we would prefer to see all agency heads, regardless of pay level, specifically declared eligible.

The proposed bill would authorize eligibility for those whom the President designates as having cabinet level status, whether or not they fit into any other category of eligibles. (Proposed section (b)(2)(A).) While we do not question some flexibility in this regard, we suggest that this provision be amended to set a maximum number of officials who can be authorized routine home-to-work transportation under such designation by the President.

Proposed subsection (a)(3) would permit routine home-to-work transportation for "the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff, and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs." These specific positions are not created by statute. Designating them by name in this manner could result in future difficulty were a President to change the structure or titles of his immediate staff. For example, when Attorney General Meese was Chief of the White House staff, he was called "Counselor to the President." We suggest instead that the President be authorized to designate up to, say, three of his top staff members to be eligible for routine Government-provided transportation.

We note that nothing in the OMB proposal would affect the eligibility for home-to-work transportation of certain individuals who receive such transportation pursuant to statutes other than 31 U.S.C. § 1344. Such individuals include the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, 22 U.S.C. § 2588, certain officials of the Central Intelligence Agency, 50 U.S.C. § 403, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, 22 U.S.C. § 2396(a)(5), the Deputy Secretary of State, 22 U.S.C. § 2678, and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Under Secretaries of Defense, and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 10 U.S.C. § 2637.

To avoid any misunderstanding about coverage and to minimize the need for further amendments to section 1344 in the future, we suggest that proposed subsection (b)(2)(C) be amended to read as follows, if it is desired to include the Commandant of the Coast Guard:

"(C)(i) any individual or position specifically made eligible for Government transportation between home and work by any Federal statute, and (ii) the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the United States Trade Representative."

The Trade Representative is added to our suggested amendment because, contrary to the statement in the OMB transmittal letter to you, we can find nothing in title 31 of the United

States Code that makes him "explicitly eligible" for home-to-work transportation.

In your letter to us transmitting the OMB draft legislation, you asked for comments on the OMB's analysis of the need for "providing authority for a significantly greater number of officials to receive portal-to-portal transportation than is currently authorized." We agree with OMB's statement in its transmittal letter to you that there is a need for additional office-holders to have such transportation in order to "discharge their official duties in an efficient and effective manner." The proposal seems carefully designed to keep these additional officials to a reasonable number.

We note that although the OMB proposal expands the group of Government officials statutorily eligible for home-to-work transportation, it nonetheless permits the transportation of far fewer persons than the large number we have found currently to be receiving home-to-work transportation under various agency interpretations of the current law and perhaps an even larger number prior to our June 3, 1983, letter to you. See General Accounting Office, Use of Government Motor Vehicles for the Transportation of Government Officials and the Relations of Government Officials, B-210555, GGD-85-76, September 1985. The OMB proposal would substantially reduce the number of Government officials now receiving routine home-to-work transportation.

You also asked whether we consider it necessary to include all three branches of Government in one bill. We think it highly desirable that home-to-work transportation be covered in a single statute. We see no advantage in dealing with the matter in a piecemeal fashion. Moreover, the prohibition against home-to-work transportation in section 16 of the original legislation as enacted in 1946 (Pub. L. No. 600, August 2, 1946; 60 Stat. 806, 810) applied to officers and employees of "any department." The term "department" was construed in section 18 of the same law as including "independent establishments, other agencies, wholly owned Government corporations * * *" but not the "Senate, House of Representatives, or Office of the Architect of the Capitol, or the officers or employees thereof." Note that the remainder of the legislative branch was not exempted nor were the members of the Supreme Court.

The informal codification of this Act in section 638a(c) of the "old" title 31 picked up the prohibition language of section 16 almost exactly but did not repeat the definition of "department" in section 18. Turning to the general definition of that term in the old 31 U.S.C. § 2, it appears that only the executive branch of government is covered. The entire legislative branch and the Supreme Court are specifically excluded from the definition.

The official codification--that is, section 1344--further confused the question of applicability by referring to "an appropriation" instead of an "appropriation available for any department." Moreover, the new title 31 definition of the term "agency," provided in section 101 and made applicable to all parts of title 31, distinguishes between "agencies" and "executive agencies." (In both cases, a "department" is a kind of agency.) Where the term "agency" is used alone, it applies to all three branches.

We think the original act must prevail over all subsequent codifications since the latter are not supposed to change substantive law. Nevertheless, the two codifications have created considerable confusion about the applicability of the home-to-work prohibition. We suggest that the Committee use the opportunity to restore the original congressional intent by amending the OMB proposed bill as follows:

Renumber paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection 1344(b) of title 31 to make them (2) and (3), respectively. Add a new paragraph (1), as follows:

"Members of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, or the officers or employees thereof; and the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court."

We would then propose deletion of (D) and (F) of section (b)(2) of the OMB bill as being unnecessary.

Your final request was for comments on the cost of the additional transportation provided by the proposed bill. We assume that you meant us to compare the added cost of the OMB proposal with the cost of transporting only those officials specifically authorized such transportation by the present law. As mentioned earlier, the OMB bill, if strictly enforced, would significantly reduce the numbers of employees now receiving these benefits inappropriately, according to our recent report to your Committee, with the result that present expenditures for this purpose would be reduced.

The costs of providing the home-to-work transportation for the additional officials authorized by the OMB bill cannot be precisely predicted because of the many variables involved. Some pertinent variables include the vehicle size, how far the official must commute, whether the vehicle will be leased or Government-owned, and whether or not the official will be chauffeured.

We have prepared some preliminary estimates, using two different assumptions, in an effort to determine the range of

costs which might be incurred under the bill. It appears to us that the least costly method of providing the home-to-work transportation would be for the official to use a Government-owned, mid-sized, non-chauffeured vehicle. Under this method, and assuming the official lives 10 miles from his/her place of employment, the estimated annual cost of the home-to-work transportation would be about \$1,100.


The most costly method would involve the official using a leased, large-sized, chauffeured vehicle. Under this method, and again assuming the official lives 10 miles from his/her place of employment, the estimated annual cost of the home-to-work transportation would be about \$9,465.

Under both methods we have assumed that the vehicle will be used in agency operations when not being used to provide home-to-work transportation and the chauffeur, if one is used, will have other agency duties when not driving the official either to work or home from work. Chauffeur salary costs would be counted only for the overtime he must work to drive the official to or from his home.

Unless the OMB proposal is modified to remove some of the open-ended authorities--e.g., the President's authority to designate an unlimited number of individuals as having cabinet level status--it will be difficult to arrive at a precise cost estimate for the bill. However, if the new discretionary authorities are used judiciously, the overall annual costs should be well within the range of costs described above. It is also essential that the expansion of the home-to-work authority not be viewed as an expansion of current authority in annual appropriation acts to lease or purchase automobiles.

We hope we have been of assistance to you. Unless released earlier by your office, this letter will be available for release to the public 30 days from today.

Sincerely yours,



Acting Comptroller General
of the United States

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 18, 1985

Dear Mr. Bowsheer:

I have received a copy of your letter dated August 19, 1985, to Senator William Proxmire, concerning the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees. As you know, we do not necessarily agree with the new reading of the law on this subject contained in the Comptroller General decision of June 3, 1983, 62 Comp. Gen. 438 (1983). This is so because, as that decision itself recognized, it was inconsistent with prior Comptroller General decisions, as well as common practice over many Administrations known to and acquiesced in by Congress. The decision was also contrary to prior Department of Justice legal opinions and legal opinions issued by various agency general counsel.

In light of the confused state of the law on the provision of home-to-work transportation to Government employees, the Comptroller General decision again pointed out the need for Congress to consider adopting clarifying legislation on the subject. As you know, Administration officials have been working closely with you and other General Accounting Office officials for some time to develop appropriate legislation to resolve the confusion in this area. After a lengthy and detailed drafting process, with the full participation of your office, former Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman was able to submit to Congress, on July 31, a comprehensive legislative proposal. Your office was, of course, fully aware of these efforts.

Despite the foregoing, your letter to Senator Proxmire of August 19, which you propose to make public on September 18, concludes that "the officers and employees on the White House staff who might be involved should immediately cease such use of Government vehicles unless adequate justification is provided."

The only members of the White House staff receiving regular home-to-work transportation are the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser. Both officials would be covered

by the proposed legislation. The National Security Adviser was provided such transportation under an opinion from the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel furnished during the Carter Administration, with respect to former National Security Adviser Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski. That opinion noted the need for the National Security Adviser to be able to communicate with the President at all times. The opinion also stressed that the position of the National Security Adviser makes him an important potential target for terrorists or disturbed persons. The provision of home-to-work transportation in a Government vehicle with secure communication facilities and a trained driver ensures constant communications capability and increased protection, not in the interest of personal convenience but rather of national security.


The same reasoning would apply with equal force to the Chief of Staff. In addition, however, such transportation is provided to the Chief of Staff as a result of a determination by the Director of the United States Secret Service that a threat exists sufficient to justify security coverage, including that the Chief of Staff be provided home-to-work transportation in response to that threat.

I trust that the foregoing is "adequate justification" for the provision of home-to-work transportation to these two officials. I could not, in good conscience, advise them to cease accepting such transportation when doing so could result in the President being unable to communicate with his Chief of Staff or his National Security Adviser in the event of a critical national emergency in which the necessary response time, in this nuclear age, is measured in minutes. Nor could I so advise them when doing so could subject them to unreasonable threats to their personal safety and thereby to our national security. However, I do not wish them to be put in any jeopardy of violating the law.

Accordingly, I would appreciate your earliest comment on these determinations in view of your admonition in your letter of August 19. The foregoing reasons for providing home-to-work transportation to these individuals will not suddenly abate when you make your letter to Senator Proxmire public, yet the individuals need to know if they are to be deemed by you to be in violation of the law after that date. I should note in defense of these determinations and in support of this request, that a decision that the Chief of Staff and the National Security Adviser may not continue to be provided home-to-work transportation must be accompanied

by a willingness to accept responsibility for the consequences in terms of our Nation's ability to respond rapidly to a crisis and in terms of the security not only of the individuals involved but the Nation as well.

Sincerely,



Fred F. Fielding
Counsel to the President

The Honorable Charles A. Bowsler
Comptroller General of
the United States
Washington, D.C. 20548

FFF:JGR:aea

cc: FFFfielding
✓JGRoberts
Subject
Chron

Copies sent to:

Don Regan
Bud McFarlane
B. Oglesby
Joe Wright
Mike Horowitz
Chris Hicks