

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. SCOPE OF REPORT.	4
III. FINDINGS	7
A. The Independent Counsel Concluded That There Was No Substantial Evidence of a Conspiracy Involving Senior White House Officials or Mrs. Clinton to Obtain Confidential Background Reports on Former Republican White House Staff	8
B. Mr. Marceca Did Not Knowingly Make False Statements to the FBI When He Requested the Background Reports of Former White House Staff Who No Longer Required Access	11
C. Although Portions of Mr. Marceca's Testimony Before Congress Were False and Misleading, the Independent Counsel Concluded That Prosecution Was Unwarranted.	16
IV. BACKGROUND	18
A. Congress Investigated Mr. Marceca's Request for the Confidential FBI Background Report of Fired White House Travel Office Director Billy Ray Dale	18
B. The Federal Bureau of Investigation Conducted an Internal Investigation of its Role in Providing Background Reports to Mr. Marceca	23
1. The FBI Has Historically Provided the White House and Others with Confidential Background Reports for Certain Specific Purposes.	23

	PAGE
2. The FBI Issued a Report Concluding That Inadequate Management Controls Contributed to the Release of Background Reports of Former White House Staff to the White House Office of Personnel Security.	25
C. The Independent Counsel Concluded That the FBI Files Matter Was Not Within His Jurisdiction Over the Travel Office Matter . . .	26
V. SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATIVE STEPS	27
A. The Reconstructed June 10, 1993 WHOP List Reflected a Methodology That Was 99 Percent Accurate in Recreating the Portion of the Actual List That Was Recovered.	31
B. The Independent Counsel and The Senate Judiciary Committee Asked the FBI to Conduct Forensic Analyses of the Background Reports and Related Documents	35
1. The Fingerprint Analysis Disclosed No Fingerprints of Senior White House Officials.	35
2. The OIC's Physical Examination of Requested Background Reports Revealed Few Documents with Evidence of Multiple Stapling or Folded Corners. .	37
a. Staples	37
b. Folded Corners.	38
3. The OPS File Check-Out Log Contained a Six Month Gap.	39

	PAGE
VI. FACTUAL SUMMARY.	40
A. Anthony Marceca, a Former Campaign Advance Worker, Without Experience, Training, or Supervision, Was Assigned the Task of Reviewing Confidential FBI Background Reports	40
1. Mr. Marceca Routinely Proceeded Through the Offices and Names on the June 10, 1993 List	44
2. Mr. Livingstone and Mr. Marceca Did Nothing to Change the Process after They Realized That There Was a Problem.	48
3. Mr. Marceca Read the Contents of Some Background Reports	51
B. After the Discovery of the Request for Billy Dale's Background Report, Mr. Marceca Gave Sworn Testimony in a Declaration, Before a Grand Jury, in a Congressional Deposition, And in a Public Congressional Hearing	53
1. Mr. Marceca Testified That He Believed That All of the Names on the List Were Current White House Passholders.	54
a. Mr. Marceca's June 9, 1996 Declaration	54
b. Mr. Marceca's June 11, 1996 Grand Jury Testimony.	55
c. Mr. Marceca's June 18, 1996 House Deposition.	55
d. Mr. Marceca's Testimony at the June 26, 1996 Public Hearing in the House of Representatives.	57
e. Mr. Marceca's September 11, 1999 Immunized Admissions Regarding the Requests for Background Reports	59

	PAGE
2. Mr. Marceca Testified That He Did Not Read the Contents of Confidential FBI Background Reports, Except in Limited Circumstances.	61
a. Mr. Marceca's June 9, 1996 Declaration	62
b. Mr. Marceca's June 10, 1996 Interview with OIC Agents	63
c. Mr. Marceca's June 11, 1996 Grand Jury Testimony	64
d. Mr. Marceca's June 18, 1996 House Deposition.	65
e. Mr. Marceca's Testimony at the June 26, 1996 House Committee Hearing	68
f. Mr. Marceca's September 11, 1999 Immunized Testimony Regarding Whether he Read the Contents of the Background Reports.	71
VII. ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL STATUTORY VIOLATIONS	73
A. The Evidence Does Not Support the Conclusion that Mr. Marceca's Conduct Reflected a Conspiracy Involving Senior White House Officials or Mrs. Clinton to Obtain Confidential Background Reports.	75
B. The Evidence Establishes That Mr. Marceca Did Not Violate 18 U.S.C. § 1001 Because He Was Unaware That Any Particular Request for a Background Report Contained a Statement That Was False.	79
1. The Statement on the Request Form That the Background Report Was Needed to Allow a Person Access to the White House Was False.	80

	PAGE
2. Mr. Marceca Did Not Know that the Statement on Any Particular Request was False.	81
a. The List Mr. Marceca Used Did Not Distinguish Between Active and Inactive Passholders.	81
b. Analysis of Evidence Regarding Mr. Marceca's Use of the June 10, 1993 List	82
c. Evidence Relating to Lack of Intent to Conceal Contemporaneously His Requests For Background Reports.	84
d. Lack of Supervision, Training, and Experience.	85
e. Review of Background Reports for Suitability	85
C. Although Portions of Mr. Marceca's Testimony Before Congress Were False, the Independent Counsel Declined to Prosecute Him Because Such a Prosecution Would Not Vindicate the Independent Counsel's Mandate	88
1. Marceca's Testimony in Congress Was Knowingly False When He Said That He Never Suspected That There Were Individuals on the List Who Were Not Current Passholders.	89
2. Mr. Marceca's Statements That He Read the Contents of the Background Reports Only in Certain Circumstances Were False.	90
3. Mr. Marceca's Testimony That No Senior White House Official Was Involved in Requesting Background Requests was True	92
VIII.SUMMARY CONCLUSION	92

APPENDIX 1 -- DESCRIPTION OF OIC LIST RECONSTRUCTION
METHODOLOGY

1.	Methodology Used to Identify Names for Reconstructed List.	i
2.	Methodology Used to Determine the Type of Pass Held by Individuals on Reconstructed WHOP List	iv
3.	Methodology Used to Determine Temporary or Permanent Status of WHOP Passholders on June 10, 1993.	v
4.	Comparison of Reconstructed Po-Zy List to Actual Po-Zy List.	vi

APPENDIX 2 -- DESCRIPTION OF SUBSTANTIVE POST-IT NOTES AND
HIGHLIGHTING