Thank you for your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated April 20, 2013, and received April 22, 2013, at the NASA Headquarters FOIA Office. Your request was for:

I request a copy of each written response or letter from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to a Congressional Committee (not a congressional office) (or Committee Chair) in calendar years 2012 and 2013 to date. By this, I mean one-time type responses to Committee inquiries. You may exclude from the scope of this request regular periodic reports. You may exclude from the scope of this request constituent responses to a congressional office.

This is a narrow request involving a small number of responsive records. You may limit the search for records to include only that office or offices that would be likely to communicate with Congressional Committees.

The NASA Headquarters program office(s) conducted a search for Agency records. We are releasing 126 pages of responsive documents to your request. However, eight pages and portions of the documents are exempt from release under either or both 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6), "... personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy," and 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(C), "records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes...could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."
Under 14 CFR §1206.605, you may appeal this partial denial by writing to:

Administrator
NASA Headquarters
Mail Stop: FOIA, Room 9J74
300 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20546
ATTN: FOIA Appeals

Your appeal must be received within thirty calendar days from the date of this letter. A copy of your initial request and this partial denial letter must accompany the appeal. The appeal should be marked “FREEDOM OF INFORMATION APPEAL” both on the envelope and the face of the letter. In order to expedite the appellate process and ensure full consideration of your appeal, your appeal should contain a brief statement of the reasons you believe this initial decision to be in error.

Fees for processing this request are less than $15.00 and are not being charged in accordance with 14 CFR § 1206.700(i)(2).

Please contact Lubna Shirazi at Lubna.M.Shirazi@nasa.gov or 202-358-2034 for further assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Josephine Sibley
Headquarters, FOIA Officer
January 17, 2012

The Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski  
Chairwoman  
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science,  
and Related Agencies  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairwoman:

The FY 2012 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-55) provides a total of $406.0 million for the Commercial Crew Program. P.L. 112-55 also includes a limitation with respect to the Commercial Crew Program, stipulating “That $100.0 million of the funds provided for commercial spaceflight activities shall only be available after the NASA Administrator certifies to the Committee on Appropriations, in writing, that NASA has published the required notifications of NASA contract actions implementing the acquisition strategy for the heavy lift launch vehicle system identified in section 302 of P.L. 111-267 and has begun to execute relevant contract actions in support of the development of the heavy lift launch vehicle system.” The purpose of this letter is to provide the certification called for in P.L. 112-55.

NASA is appreciative of the support by the Committees on Appropriations for the Commercial Crew Program that will establish a U.S. commercial capability to transport American astronauts to the International Space Station at the earliest possible time. However, NASA currently anticipates that this decreased level of funding below the President’s FY 2012 request will push out the likely availability of a U.S. capability to carry crews to the ISS to 2017, and has necessitated a shift in our preferred acquisition strategy of utilizing firm fixed-price contracts for multiple suppliers. NASA has adopted a modified strategy for this next phase that will involve a new competition using Space Act Agreements intended to maintain competition for a longer period and enable multiple potential industry partners, with the flexibility to adjust technical direction, milestones, and funding. This strategy carries increased technical uncertainty, but it is the most viable alternative given the constrained budget environment.

The President is committed to ensuring America’s continued preeminence in space and launching a new era of human spaceflight that takes us beyond where we have ever explored before. Space exploration inspires the next generation of scientists and engineers and contributes to important discoveries about Earth and the solar system, as well as innovation that grows our economy and creates jobs. NASA shares Congress’ goal of sustaining American leadership in space exploration and is committed to implementing the
Commercial Crew Program, extended operation of the International Space Station through at least 2020, and development and launch of the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and Space Launch System (SLS) as authorized by Congress in the bipartisan NASA Authorization Act of 2010 and appropriated in P.L. 112-55. NASA is also committed to responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars and a sustainable program in the long run.

In the weeks following NASA’s September 14, 2011, announcement of the design selected for the SLS, the Agency moved expeditiously to initiate the contract actions and other steps necessary to bring this architecture for space exploration to fruition, and all contracts are currently active. As listed below, NASA has posted, or plans to post, a series of documents designed to support the development of various components of SLS, including:

- SLS Acquisition Overview Synopsis, posted September 22, 2011;
- SLS Stages Acquisition Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Development Request for Information (RFI), posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction RFI, posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Stages Justification for Other Than Full-and-Open Competition (JOFOC), posted on November 1, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines JOFOC, posted on November 8, 2011;
- SLS Engine Undefined Contract Action (UCA), issued December 1, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction Draft NASA Research Announcement (NRA), posted on December 12, 2011;
- SLS Booster UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- SLS Stages UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- Orion MPCV EFT-1 UCA, issued December 21, 2011;
- MPCV Exploration Flight Test-1 (EFT-1) JOFOC, posted on January 5, 2012;
- SLS Advanced Development Draft NRA, to be posted February 2012;

With the contract actions listed above, I hereby certify that NASA has executed all relevant contract actions in support of SLS development. In the coming months, NASA will continue to perform program formulation activities and execute design reviews to assure that the requirements developed for Orion MPCV, SLS, and Ground Systems Development & Operations (GSDO) are properly formulated, integrated, and correlated with the Agency’s strategic objectives. By late summer 2012, SLS, MPCV, and GSDO are planned to have completed their System Requirements Reviews and System Definition Reviews and to enter into the preliminary design phase of the life cycle. In addition to the design reviews, hardware test and manufacturing is ongoing. For example, over the next six months, the SLS J-2X engine is planned to begin its next round of development testing with its PowerPack Assembly 2 (PPA-2) test series to validate and characterize the J-2X engine design, and the MPCV ground test article manufacturing process continues to support the EFT-1 flight in early 2014. By the end of calendar year 2012, NASA expects to have made significant
progress toward the EFT-1 flight in 2014 and the first uncrewed SLS developmental flight currently scheduled for December 2017.

I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science,  
and Related Agencies  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510  

Dear Senator Hutchison:

The FY 2012 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-55) provides a total of $406.0 million for the Commercial Crew Program. P.L. 112-55 also includes a limitation with respect to the Commercial Crew Program, stipulating “That $100.0 million of the funds provided for commercial space flight activities shall only be available after the NASA Administrator certifies to the Committee on Appropriations, in writing, that NASA has published the required notifications of NASA contract actions implementing the acquisition strategy for the heavy lift launch vehicle system identified in section 302 of P.L. 111-267 and has begun to execute relevant contract actions in support of the development of the heavy lift launch vehicle system.” The purpose of this letter is to provide the certification called for in P.L. 112-55.

NASA is appreciative of the support by the Committees on Appropriations for the Commercial Crew Program that will establish a U.S. commercial capability to transport American astronauts to the International Space Station at the earliest possible time. However, NASA currently anticipates that this decreased level of funding below the President’s FY 2012 request will push out the likely availability of a U.S. capability to carry crews to the ISS to 2017, and has necessitated a shift in our preferred acquisition strategy of utilizing firm fixed-price contracts for multiple suppliers. NASA has adopted a modified strategy for this next phase that will involve a new competition using Space Act Agreements intended to maintain competition for a longer period and enable multiple potential industry partners, with the flexibility to adjust technical direction, milestones, and funding. This strategy carries increased technical uncertainty, but it is the most viable alternative given the constrained budget environment.

The President is committed to ensuring America’s continued preeminence in space and launching a new era of human spaceflight that takes us beyond where we have ever explored before. Space exploration inspires the next generation of scientists and engineers and contributes to important discoveries about Earth and the solar system, as well as innovation that grows our economy and creates jobs. NASA shares Congress’ goal of sustaining American leadership in space exploration and is committed to implementing the
Commercial Crew Program, extended operation of the International Space Station through at least 2020, and development and launch of the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and Space Launch System (SLS) as authorized by Congress in the bipartisan NASA Authorization Act of 2010 and appropriated in P.L. 112-55. NASA is also committed to responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars and a sustainable program in the long run.

In the weeks following NASA's September 14, 2011, announcement of the design selected for the SLS, the Agency moved expeditiously to initiate the contract actions and other steps necessary to bring this architecture for space exploration to fruition, and all contracts are currently active. As listed below, NASA has posted, or plans to post, a series of documents designed to support the development of various components of SLS, including:

- SLS Acquisition Overview Synopsis, posted September 22, 2011;
- SLS Stages Acquisition Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Development Request for Information (RFI), posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction RFI, posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Stages Justification for Other Than Full-and-Open Competition (JOFOC), posted on November 1, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines JOFOC, posted on November 8, 2011;
- SLS Engine Undefined Contract Action (UCA), issued December 1, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction Draft NASA Research Announcement (NRA), posted on December 12, 2011;
- SLS Booster UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- SLS Stages UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- Orion MPCV EFT-1 UCA, issued December 21, 2011;
- MPCV Exploration Flight Test-1 (EFT-1) JOFOC, posted on January 5, 2012;
- SLS Advanced Development Draft NRA, to be posted February 2012;

With the contract actions listed above, I hereby certify that NASA has executed all relevant contract actions in support of SLS development. In the coming months, NASA will continue to perform program formulation activities and execute design reviews to assure that the requirements developed for Orion MPCV, SLS, and Ground Systems Development & Operations (GSDO) are properly formulated, integrated, and correlated with the Agency's strategic objectives. By late summer 2012, SLS, MPCV, and GSDO are planned to have completed their System Requirements Reviews and System Definition Reviews and to enter into the preliminary design phase of the life cycle. In addition to the design reviews, hardware test and manufacturing is ongoing. For example, over the next six months, the SLS J-2X engine is planned to begin its next round of development testing with its PowerPack Assembly 2 (PPA-2) test series to validate and characterize the J-2X engine design, and the MPCV ground test article manufacturing process continues to support the EFT-1 flight in early 2014. By the end of calendar year 2012, NASA expects to have made significant
progress toward the EFT-1 flight in 2014 and the first uncrewed SLS developmental flight currently scheduled for December 2017.

I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
January 17, 2012

The Honorable Frank Wolf
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The FY 2012 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-55) provides a total of $406.0 million for the Commercial Crew Program. P.L. 112-55 also includes a limitation with respect to the Commercial Crew Program, stipulating "That $100.0 million of the funds provided for commercial spaceflight activities shall only be available after the NASA Administrator certifies to the Committee on Appropriations, in writing, that NASA has published the required notifications of NASA contract actions implementing the acquisition strategy for the heavy lift launch vehicle system identified in section 302 of P.L. 111-267 and has begun to execute relevant contract actions in support of the development of the heavy lift launch vehicle system." The purpose of this letter is to provide the certification called for in P.L. 112-55.

NASA is appreciative of the support of the Committees on Appropriations for the Commercial Crew Program that will establish a U.S. commercial capability to transport American astronauts to the International Space Station at the earliest possible time. However, NASA currently anticipates that this decreased level of funding below the President’s FY 2012 request will push out the likely availability of a U.S. capability to carry crews to the ISS to 2017, and has necessitated a shift in our preferred acquisition strategy of utilizing firm fixed-price contracts for multiple suppliers. NASA has adopted a modified strategy for this next phase that will involve a new competition using Space Act Agreements intended to maintain competition for a longer period and enable multiple potential industry partners, with the flexibility to adjust technical direction, milestones, and funding. This strategy carries increased technical uncertainty, but it is the most viable alternative given the constrained budget environment.

The President is committed to ensuring America’s continued preeminence in space and launching a new era of human spaceflight that takes us beyond where we have ever explored before. Space exploration inspires the next generation of scientists and engineers and contributes to important discoveries about Earth and the solar system, as well as innovation that grows our economy and creates jobs. NASA shares Congress’ goal of sustaining American leadership in space exploration and is committed to implementing the
Commercial Crew Program, extended operation of the International Space Station through at least 2020, and development and launch of the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and Space Launch System (SLS) as authorized by Congress in the bipartisan NASA Authorization Act of 2010 and appropriated in P.L. 112-55. NASA is also committed to responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars and a sustainable program in the long run.

In the weeks following NASA’s September 14, 2011, announcement of the design selected for the SLS, the Agency moved expeditiously to initiate the contract actions and other steps necessary to bring this architecture for space exploration to fruition, and all contracts are currently active. As listed below, NASA has posted, or plans to post, a series of documents designed to support the development of various components of SLS, including:

- SLS Acquisition Overview Synopsis, posted September 22, 2011;
- SLS Stages Acquisition Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Development Request for Information (RFI), posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction RFI, posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Stages Justification for Other Than Full-and-Open Competition (JOFOC), posted on November 1, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines JOFOC, posted on November 8, 2011;
- SLS Engine Undeфинited Contract Action (UCA), issued December 1, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction Draft NASA Research Announcement (NRA), posted on December 12, 2011;
- SLS Booster UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- SLS Stages UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- Orion MPCV EFT-1 UCA, issued December 21, 2011;
- MPCV Exploration Flight Test-1 (EFT-1) JOFOC, posted on January 5, 2012;
- SLS Advanced Development Draft NRA, to be posted February 2012;

With the contract actions listed above, I hereby certify that NASA has executed all relevant contract actions in support of SLS development. In the coming months, NASA will continue to perform program formulation activities and execute design reviews to assure that the requirements developed for Orion MPCV, SLS, and Ground Systems Development & Operations (GSDO) are properly formulated, integrated, and correlated with the Agency’s strategic objectives. By late summer 2012, SLS, MPCV, and GSDO are planned to have completed their System Requirements Reviews and System Definition Reviews and to enter into the preliminary design phase of the life cycle. In addition to the design reviews, hardware test and manufacturing is ongoing. For example, over the next six months, the SLS J-2X engine is planned to begin its next round of development testing with its PowerPack Assembly 2 (PPA-2) test series to validate and characterize the J-2X engine design, and the MPCV ground test article manufacturing process continues to support the EFT-1 flight in early 2014. By the end of calendar year 2012, NASA expects to have made significant
progress toward the EFT-1 flight in 2014 and the first uncrewed SLS developmental flight currently scheduled for December 2017.

I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
The FY 2012 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-55) provides a total of $406.0 million for the Commercial Crew Program. P.L. 112-55 also includes a limitation with respect to the Commercial Crew Program, stipulating "That $100.0 million of the funds provided for commercial spaceflight activities shall only be available after the NASA Administrator certifies to the Committee on Appropriations, in writing, that NASA has published the required notifications of NASA contract actions implementing the acquisition strategy for the heavy lift launch vehicle system identified in section 302 of P.L. 111-267 and has begun to execute relevant contract actions in support of the development of the heavy lift launch vehicle system." The purpose of this letter is to provide the certification called for in P.L. 112-55.

NASA is appreciative of the support by the Committees on Appropriations for the Commercial Crew Program that will establish a U.S. commercial capability to transport American astronauts to the International Space Station at the earliest possible time. However, NASA currently anticipates that this decreased level of funding below the President's FY 2012 request will push out the likely availability of a U.S. capability to carry crews to the ISS to 2017, and has necessitated a shift in our preferred acquisition strategy of utilizing firm fixed-price contracts for multiple suppliers. NASA has adopted a modified strategy for this next phase that will involve a new competition using Space Act Agreements intended to maintain competition for a longer period and enable multiple potential industry partners, with the flexibility to adjust technical direction, milestones, and funding. This strategy carries increased technical uncertainty, but it is the most viable alternative given the constrained budget environment.

The President is committed to ensuring America's continued preeminence in space and launching a new era of human spaceflight that takes us beyond where we have ever explored before. Space exploration inspires the next generation of scientists and engineers and contributes to important discoveries about Earth and the solar system, as well as innovation that grows our economy and creates jobs. NASA shares Congress' goal of sustaining American leadership in space exploration and is committed to implementing the
Commercial Crew Program, extended operation of the International Space Station through at least 2020, and development and launch of the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and Space Launch System (SLS) as authorized by Congress in the bipartisan NASA Authorization Act of 2010 and appropriated in P.L. 112-55. NASA is also committed to responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars and a sustainable program in the long run.

In the weeks following NASA’s September 14, 2011, announcement of the design selected for the SLS, the Agency moved expeditiously to initiate the contract actions and other steps necessary to bring this architecture for space exploration to fruition, and all contracts are currently active. As listed below, NASA has posted, or plans to post, a series of documents designed to support the development of various components of SLS, including:

- SLS Acquisition Overview Synopsis, posted September 22, 2011;
- SLS Stages Acquisition Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines Synopsis, posted September 28, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Development Request for Information (RFI), posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction RFI, posted October 7, 2011;
- SLS Core Stage Engines JOFOC, posted on November 1, 2011;
- SLS Engine Undefinitized Contract Action (UCA), issued December 1, 2011;
- SLS Advanced Booster Engineering Demonstration and Risk Reduction Draft NASA Research Announcement (NRA), posted on December 12, 2011;
- SLS Stages JOFOC, posted December 16, 2011;
- SLS Booster UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- SLS Stages UCA, issued December 16, 2011;
- Orion MPCV EFT-1 UCA, issued December 21, 2011;
- MPCV Exploration Flight Test-1 (EFT-1) JOFOC, posted on January 5, 2012;
- SLS Advanced Development Draft NRA, to be posted February 2012;

With the contract actions listed above, I hereby certify that NASA has executed all relevant contract actions in support of SLS development. In the coming months, NASA will continue to perform program formulation activities and execute design reviews to assure that the requirements developed for Orion MPCV, SLS, and Ground Systems Development & Operations (GSDO) are properly formulated, integrated, and correlated with the Agency’s strategic objectives. By late summer 2012, SLS, MPCV, and GSDO are planned to have completed their System Requirements Reviews and System Definition Reviews and to enter into the preliminary design phase of the life cycle. In addition to the design reviews, hardware test and manufacturing is ongoing. For example, over the next six months, the SLS J-2X engine is planned to begin its next round of development testing with its PowerPack Assembly 2 (PPA-2) test series to validate and characterize the J-2X engine design, and the MPCV ground test article manufacturing process continues to support the EFT-1 flight in early 2014. By the end of calendar year 2012, NASA expects to have made significant
progress toward the EFT-1 flight in 2014 and the first uncrewed SLS developmental flight currently scheduled for December 2017.

I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
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February 2, 2012

The Honorable Ralph M. Hall
Chairman
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 2, 2012

OLIA:CF:dac

The Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson
Ranking Member
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Johnson:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
The Honorable Steven Palazzo  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics  
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler  
Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 2, 2012

The Honorable Jerry Costello
Ranking Member (Acting)
Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Costello:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Seth Stalder
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
The Honorable John D. Rockefeller, IV  
Chairman  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler  
Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 2, 2012

OLIA:CF:dac

The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
Ranking Member
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hutchison:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
The Honorable Bill Nelson  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Science and Space  
Committee on Commerce, Science,  
and Transportation  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Seth Statler  
Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 2, 2012

OLIA:CF:dac

The Honorable John Boozman  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Science and Space  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Boozman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Stasler  
Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
SMD/Strategic Integration and Management Division

TO: Administrator

FROM: Acting Associate Administrator for Science Mission Directorate

SUBJECT: Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Notification of Baseline Launch Readiness (LRD) Change

In accordance with Public Law 109-155, Section 103, I am providing notification that the development schedule for the GPM project will exceed the Major Program Annual Report (MPAR) baseline launch readiness date by greater than six months. The MPAR cost baseline will not be exceeded.

Enclosed is a letter from the Earth Science Division responsible for the GPM project on this subject.

The Science Mission Directorate is prepared to support any further analysis of this issue required by Agency protocols.

[Signature]

Charles J. Ogden

Enclosure

cc: Office of the Chief Financial Officer/E. Robinson
Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs/L. Statler
Office of the Chief Engineer/M. Rynchikawitch
TO: Acting Associate Administrator for Science Mission Directorate

FROM: Director for Earth Science Division

SUBJECT: Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Notification of Baseline Launch Readiness Date (LRD) Change

In accordance with Public Law 109-155, section 103, we are providing notification that the GPM project will exceed the Major Program Annual Report (MPAR) baseline LRD by greater than six months. The MPAR cost baseline will not be exceeded.

The GPM project has made excellent progress over the last two years since their Confirmation Review but schedule reserve erosion has been a continuing challenge. Spacecraft hardware technical issues and rework due to Agency-wide parts issues, GPM Microwave Imager instrument radio frequency subsystem development issues, and delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March earthquake and required hardware rework have contributed to this schedule reserve erosion.

As a result, the GPM project's LRD milestone of July 2013, which was approved at confirmation, is likely to be delayed by more than six months. The Earth Science Division is prepared to support any further analysis of this issue required by Agency protocols.

Michael H. Freilich

cc: Science Mission Directorate/M. Luther
Science Mission Directorate/R. Maizel
Science Mission Directorate/C. Hartman
February 13, 2012

The Honorable Frank Wolf
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice,
Science, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Reesh Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 13, 2012

Dear Congressman Fattah:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 13, 2012

OLIA:CF:dac

The Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski
Chairwoman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairwoman:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

L. Scott Stadler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
February 13, 2012

The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hutchison:

Section 103(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-155) requires that NASA transmit to the Committee copies of any internal notifications that a major program milestone is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the date provided in the Baseline Report.

Enclosed is a copy of an internal notification to the Administrator reporting that the Global Precipitation Measurement project (GPM) Launch Readiness Date is likely to be delayed by more than six months from the July 2013 date reported in the Baseline Report for GPM. The mission has confronted challenges associated with: spacecraft hardware technical issues; issues in the development of the GPM Microwave Imager instrument; and a delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March 2011 earthquake in Japan and required hardware rework. NASA does not expect this delay to cause the project to exceed its development cost baseline. NASA has begun work on the more detailed reports pursuant to this notification required by Section 103(d) of the Act.

We would be pleased to discuss the enclosed notifications with you in greater detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

L. Scott Shatler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure
FROM: Mia & Associate Administrator for Science Mission Directorate

TO: Administrator

SUBJECT: Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Notification of Baseline Launch Readiness (LRO) Change

In accordance with Public Law 109-155, Section 103, I am providing notification that the development schedule for the GPM project will exceed the Major Program Annual Report (MPAR) baseline launch readiness date by greater than six months. The MPAR cost baseline will not be exceeded.

Enclosed is a letter from the Earth Science Division responsible for the GPM project on this subject.

The Science Mission Directorate is prepared to support any further analysis of this issue required by Agency protocols.

Charles J. Cooper

Encloures

cc:
Office of the Chief Financial Officer/ E. Robinson
Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs/ L. Statler
Office of the Chief Engineer/ M. Ryckiewitch
TO: Acting Associate Administrator for Science Mission Directorate
FROM: Director for Earth Science Division
SUBJECT: Global Precipitation Measurement (GPM) Notification of Baseline Launch Readiness Date (LRD) Change

In accordance with Public Law 109-155, section 103, we are providing notification that the GPM project will exceed the Major Program Annual Report (MPAR) baseline LRD by greater than six months. The MPAR cost baseline will not be exceeded.

The GPM project has made excellent progress over the last two years since their Confirmation Review but schedule reserve erosion has been a continuing challenge. Spacecraft hardware technical issues and rework due to Agency-wide parts issues, GPM Microwave Imager instrument radio frequency subsystem development issues, and delay in delivery of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Dual-frequency Precipitation Radar due to the impact of the March earthquake and required hardware rework have contributed to this schedule reserve erosion.

As a result, the GPM project's LRD milestone of July 2013, which was approved at confirmation, is likely to be delayed by more than six months. The Earth Science Division is prepared to support any further analysis of this issue required by Agency protocols.

Michael H. Freilich

cc: Science Mission Directorate/M. Luther
Science Mission Directorate/R. Maizel
Science Mission Directorate/C. Harman
March 15, 2012

Mr. David M. Gibbons
Director
Surveys and Investigations Staff
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Gibbons:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your recent letter, received on March 13, 2012, notifying NASA that the Surveys and Investigations staff will undertake an inquiry into the distribution of full-time equivalents at NASA.

NASA's point of contact for this inquiry will be Mary D. Kerwin, Deputy Associate Administrator for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs. Ms. Kerwin may be reached at 202-358-1948 or at mary.d.kerwin@nasa.gov

Sincerely,

Mary D. Kerwin
Deputy Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
300 E Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 202(b), Public Law 401, 79th Congress (codified at 2 U.S.C. §72 a (b)), this Staff has been directed by the Committee on Appropriations to make an inquiry into the distribution of full time equivalents at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Please designate an appropriate point of contact to arrange for obtaining the data pertinent to this inquiry and notify my office by telephone within five business days of the receipt of this letter. If there are any questions regarding this matter, I can be contacted on (202) 225-3881.

Sincerely yours,

David M. Gibbons
Director
Surveys and Investigations Staff
House Committee on Appropriations
DATE: 3/13/12

TO: Mr. Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
    Administrator
    National Aeronautics and Space Administration

FROM: Joyce Stover
        House Appropriations Committee
        Surveys and Investigations Staff
        Washington, D.C. 20515
        PHONE: (202) 225-3881
        FAX: (202) 225-2112

FAX NUMBER: 202-358-2810
TELEPHONE: 202-358-1801

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER SHEET: 2

Thank you for your assistance.

Joyce Stover
March 8, 2012

OLIA:DG:dac

The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
Ranking Member
Committee on Commerce, Science,
and Transportation
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hutchison:

This letter will confirm the non-reimbursable detail of Robert Floyd to the United States Senate, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, for the time period February 27, 2012, through January 2, 2013. We understand that Mr. Floyd will assist the Committee with NASA issues and legislative matters.

Mr. Floyd currently serves as an Assistant Technical Manager at NASA's Johnson Space Center. We are certain that this detail will be beneficial to both the Commerce Committee and NASA.

NASA will continue to pay Mr. Floyd’s salary, benefits and travel costs associated with this non-reimbursable detail to the Commerce Committee.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
February 8, 2013

The Honorable Darrell Issa
Chairman
Committee on Oversight and
Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Issa:

This is in further response to your letters of April 10, 2012 and April 30, 2012, to the Administrator requesting information regarding NASA conference and travel expenditures from January 1, 2005 to the present. The enclosed report provides the detailed information requested in your letter of April 10, 2012.

While NASA has been steadily enhancing its conference review processes since 2008, it made a number of significant improvements in FY 2012. Starting in October 2011, in accordance with Administration direction, NASA required that all NASA-sponsored conferences be centrally reviewed and approved by the Deputy Administrator; this process also required improved documentation of the planning and justification for the investments made in conferences hosted by NASA. Starting in May 2012, again in accordance with Administration guidance, NASA implemented reviews of spending and senior approvals for all conferences with costs over $100,000. In June 2012, NASA updated its conference policies to enhance review and approval requirements for NASA-sponsored conferences with costs less than $100,000, and to ban industry and others' widely attended gatherings and NASA-directly funded meals at NASA-sponsored conferences. This focus, along with the overall emphasis placed on travel savings at all levels, led to millions of dollars in reduced spending on conferences in FY 2012.

NASA also spearheaded several key internal initiatives, including savings in connection with NASA's three largest internal conferences, by directing that all three be changed in the coming years to a virtual format (and piloting the first of these as a virtual event in October 2012). For one of these conferences that was already essentially underway, NASA reduced its size significantly. These changes are conservatively estimated to have saved over $2 million in FY 2012. In addition, NASA centralized a conference database tool to permit better coordinated planning across the Agency, and expanded
the scope of events tracked as "conferences," consistent with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum 12-12, issued in May 2012. This broader definition was also applied retroactively, so the information in the enclosed report encompasses more types of events than prior reports by NASA.

NASA spent the vast majority of the funds (80 percent in FY 2012) associated with conference attendance for presentations and participation at scientific and technical conferences. This practice helps to fulfill one of the fundamental mandates of the National Aeronautics and Space Act that NASA "shall provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the results thereof." At such events, NASA scientists, engineers, and leaders present scientific and technical papers and participate in interchanges on leading-edge research and technology with peers in the Federal government, the science community, the aeronautics and aerospace industries, and our international partners at conferences. Conferences attended and sponsored by NASA address a broad and diverse range of scientific and engineering challenges faced by NASA in carrying out its missions, including climate and other Earth science research, advanced aeronautics, and the cutting-edge technologies needed for both current and planned robotic and human space flight programs. As the enclosed report shows, in keeping with past reports to NASA's Office of Inspector General and Congress, a clear majority of conferences sponsored by NASA were undertaken in furtherance of this key statutory goal.

In addition to facilitating the dissemination and advancement of scientific research, conferences also serve as a cost-effective way for NASA to carry out other mission-related purposes, such as educational outreach, program development, institutional planning, and information gathering. For example, conferences on program management provide opportunities for examination of current trends in aerospace project and engineering management by offering forums for the exchange and dissemination of best practices, new ideas, and training to help the Agency cost-effectively meet the toughest challenges in space exploration today.

Items specifically requested in your April 10 letter and included in this response are:

1. "A list of overnight conferences funded by the department and attended by more than 50 employees since January 1, 2005. For each conference provide date(s), location, cost, funding source, and the number of attendees."

   The enclosed listing identifies the conferences NASA has hosted or sponsored that were attended by 50 or more employees, along with the requested fields.

2. "The names, titles, and salaries of any individuals employed by the department to plan events."

   We have coordinated with NASA Centers and Headquarters Offices and, to the best of our knowledge, NASA does not employ any individuals with a job title of event planner. However, a variety of people may be involved on an ad hoc,
part-time basis to ensure the successful planning and execution of these conferences.

3. "Address any websites created to promote, track, or commemorate department conferences. If the website is currently archived on the agency's intranet, provide an electronic copy."

For each conference identified for item 1 of your request, URLs for all identified websites have also been included in the enclosed report.

Your follow-on letter of April 30, 2012 requested a list of any entities used by NASA to select sites for overnight conferences since 2005, and any documents or communications referring or relating to Location Solvers since January 1, 2009. Since 2005, site selection for NASA conferences is a role that has been reserved for civil servants. Starting in January 2009, NASA elevated the approval level to require an SES, SL or ST approver, and, since October 2012, NASA has required the selection be approved by a senior manager, an Official-in-Charge of a Headquarters Office or Center Director. With regard to your question regarding Location Solvers, "NASA's procurement records indicate that NASA has never had a contract or contractual relations with Location Solvers. We additionally asked all Centers and Headquarters Offices to check local records for any use of Location Solvers, and none was found.

NASA has been steadily strengthening our conference sponsorship and attendance processes and we are currently implementing further improvements in our systems, processes, and reports. These measures are part of our continued efforts to be careful stewards of taxpayer dollars in carrying out our missions.

Thank you for your attention to these matters. We would be pleased to respond to questions regarding this report.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Stalter
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure

cc:
The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member
Report

Regarding

NASA Conferences with over 50 NASA Attendees

January 2005 – September 2012

February 2013
# NASA-Funded Conferences

## January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Workforce Planning Conference</td>
<td>Austin, TX, USA</td>
<td>6/20/2005</td>
<td>6/23/2005</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OHCM</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$42,973.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Vehicle Systems Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Columbus, OH, USA</td>
<td>7/18/2005</td>
<td>7/19/2005</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ARMED</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$155,810.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>3/13/2006</td>
<td>3/16/2006</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>LPI; NASA JSC Co-sponsor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$74,329.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NASA Conference Report**

January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPP Synergy Retreat Meeting</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>4/18/2006</td>
<td>4/21/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA IPP</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$49,300.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Procurement Training Conference 2006</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA, USA</td>
<td>12/12/2006</td>
<td>12/14/2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OP</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>$536,108.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA Project Management (PM) Challenge 2007</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>2/6/2007</td>
<td>2/7/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>$368,829.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA Administrator's Fellowship Project (NAFP), Harriett G. Jenkins Pre-Doctoral Fellowship Project (IPPP), and Curriculum Improvement Partnership Award (CIPA) Project Symposium</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH, USA</td>
<td>7/16/2007</td>
<td>7/19/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA ED</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$71,680.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Audits All Hands Conference</td>
<td>Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td>7/16/2007</td>
<td>7/20/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OIG</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$96,980.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Geophysical Union (AGU) 2007 Fall Meeting</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, USA</td>
<td>12/10/2007</td>
<td>12/14/2007</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AGU; NASA SMD Co-sponsor</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$138,453.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NASA Conference Report**

January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Solutions Conference</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>1/7/2008</td>
<td>1/8/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA USI</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$110,813.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Workforce Planning Workshop</td>
<td>Nashville, TN, USA</td>
<td>1/7/2008</td>
<td>1/10/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OHCM</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$65,283.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit</td>
<td>Reno, NV, USA</td>
<td>1/7/2008</td>
<td>1/10/2008</td>
<td>AIAA; NASA ARMD Co-Sponsor</td>
<td>NASA ARMD</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$440,188.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Retreat</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>1/23/2008</td>
<td>1/25/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$18,594.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cx Managers Meeting</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT, USA</td>
<td>2/19/2008</td>
<td>2/22/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA ISC</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$93,498.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Project Management (PM) Challenge 2008</td>
<td>Daytona Beach, FL, USA</td>
<td>2/26/2008</td>
<td>2/27/2008</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>$848,172.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39th Lunar and Planetary Science Conference (LPSC)</td>
<td>League City, TX, USA</td>
<td>3/10/2008</td>
<td>3/14/2008</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>LP; NASA JSC Co-sponsor</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$81,347.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA General Counsel Conference 2008</td>
<td>Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td>4/28/2008</td>
<td>5/2/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA QGC</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$72,239.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA's Future Forum</td>
<td>San Jose, CA, USA</td>
<td>5/14/2008</td>
<td>5/14/2008</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ED</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$71,395.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Security Managers Workshop</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA, USA</td>
<td>9/9/2008</td>
<td>9/11/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OCIO</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$15,467.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Aeronautics Program (FAP) Annual Meeting 2008</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA, USA</td>
<td>10/7/2008</td>
<td>10/9/2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA ARMD</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$537,449.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NASA Conference Report
January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012

Page 4 of 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Geophysical Union (AGU) 2008 Fall Meeting</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, USA</td>
<td>12/15/2008</td>
<td>12/19/2008</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AGU; NASA SMD Co-sponsor</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>$529,486.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA DA Retreat</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>1/28/2009</td>
<td>1/30/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$19,657.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPI Summit</td>
<td>Huntsville, AI, USA</td>
<td>6/8/2009</td>
<td>6/11/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA NEACC</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$93,211.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Senior Executive Summit 2009</td>
<td>Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td>10/6/2009</td>
<td>10/7/2009</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA MSD</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>$960,515.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting of the Lunar Exploration Analysis Group (LEAG)</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>11/16/2009</td>
<td>11/19/2009</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$52,163.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_NASA Conference Report_  
January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA Retreat</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>12/8/2009</td>
<td>12/10/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$23,289.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Geophysical Union (AGU) 2009 Fall Meeting</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA, USA</td>
<td>12/14/2009</td>
<td>12/18/2009</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AGU; NASA SMD Co-sponsor</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>$827,992.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Project Management (PM) Challenge 2010</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>2/9/2010</td>
<td>2/10/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>$977,722.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th National Space Symposium</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO, USA</td>
<td>4/12/2010</td>
<td>4/15/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Space Foundation; NASA HEOMD Co-sponsor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$335,521.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SpaceOps 2010 Conference</td>
<td>Huntsville, AL, USA</td>
<td>4/25/2010</td>
<td>4/30/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AIAA; NASA MSFC Co-sponsor</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$263,204.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEACC Annual Center Business Process Leads Summit</td>
<td>Annapolis, MD, USA</td>
<td>6/8/2010</td>
<td>6/10/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA NEACC</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$140,261.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Assurance of Complex Electronics Forum</td>
<td>Sandusky, OH, USA</td>
<td>6/16/2010</td>
<td>6/18/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA GRC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th AIAA Fluid Dynamics Conference and Co-Located Events</td>
<td>Chicago, IL, USA</td>
<td>6/28/2010</td>
<td>7/1/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AIAA; NASA GRC Co-sponsor</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$294,549.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NASA Conference Report
January 1, 2008 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NASA Office of Audit All-Hands Meeting</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX, USA</td>
<td>8/10/2010</td>
<td>8/12/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OIG</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$123,084.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Procurement Training Workshop</td>
<td>Ames Research Center, CA, USA</td>
<td>8/15/2010</td>
<td>8/19/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OP</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$230,992.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA IT Summit 2010</td>
<td>National Harbor, MD, USA</td>
<td>8/16/2010</td>
<td>8/18/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCIO</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>$1,027,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal and Fluids Analysis Workshop (TFAWS 2010)</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>8/16/2010</td>
<td>8/20/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$97,856.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cx Managers Meeting and DM-2 Static Firing</td>
<td>Ogden, UT, USA</td>
<td>8/30/2010</td>
<td>9/2/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$202,915.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Education Stakeholders Summit</td>
<td>Chantilly, VA, USA</td>
<td>10/18/2010</td>
<td>10/20/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ED</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$139,968.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Unleashed</td>
<td>Hampton, VA, USA</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
<td>10/28/2010</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ARMID</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$134,303.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA Retreat</td>
<td>Galveston, TX, USA</td>
<td>2/2/2011</td>
<td>2/4/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$19,797.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Project Management (PM) Challenge 2011</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA, USA</td>
<td>2/9/2011</td>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA DCE</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>$1,648,880.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NASA Conference Report
January 1, 2012 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18th IAA Humans in Space Symposium</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>4/11/2011</td>
<td>4/15/2011</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$510,483.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Annual Engineering Leadership Workshop</td>
<td>Hampton, VA, USA</td>
<td>9/19/2011</td>
<td>9/22/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$179,080.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NASA Conference Report
January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219th Meeting of the American Astronomical Society (AAS) Conference</td>
<td>Austin, TX, USA</td>
<td>1/8/2012</td>
<td>1/12/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AAS; NASA SMD Co-sponsor</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$178,979.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting</td>
<td>Nashville, TN, USA</td>
<td>1/8/2012</td>
<td>1/14/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>AIAA; NASA ARMD Co-Sponsor</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>$482,135.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Research Program Annual Investigators Workshop</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>2/14/2012</td>
<td>2/16/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA HEOMD</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$221,219.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Project Management (PM) Challenge 2012</td>
<td>Orlando, FL, USA</td>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>2/23/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>$537,622.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating John Glenn's Legacy: 50 years of Americans in Orbit</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH, USA</td>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>3/1/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA GRC</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>$48,427.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Aeronautics Program (FAP) Annual Technical Conference 2012</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH, USA</td>
<td>3/13/2012</td>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ARMD</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$332,946.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43rd Lunar and Planetary Science Conference (LPSC)</td>
<td>Woodlands, TX, USA</td>
<td>3/19/2012</td>
<td>3/23/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>LPI; NASA JSC Co-Sponsor</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$326,893.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th National Space Symposium</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, CO, USA</td>
<td>4/16/2012</td>
<td>4/19/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Space Foundation; NASA HEOMD Co-Sponsor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$212,820.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA General Counsel Annual Meeting 2012</td>
<td>Cambridge, MD, USA</td>
<td>5/22/2012</td>
<td>5/25/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OGC</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$74,669.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd International Workshop on On-Orbit Satellite Servicing</td>
<td>Greenbelt, MD, USA</td>
<td>5/30/2012</td>
<td>5/31/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA GSFC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$40,286.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts &amp; Approaches for Mars Exploration Workshop</td>
<td>Houston, TX, USA</td>
<td>6/12/2012</td>
<td>6/14/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA HEOMD</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$94,746.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS Integration In the NAS Project Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Mountain View, CA, USA</td>
<td>7/31/2012</td>
<td>8/1/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA ARMD</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$34,382.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NASA Conference Report**

January 1, 2005 - September 30, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>NASA-Paid Attendees</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermal and Fluids Analysis Workshop (TFAWS 2012)</td>
<td>Pasadena, CA, USA</td>
<td>8/13/2012</td>
<td>8/17/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$247,279.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th PhysPAG Meeting 2012</td>
<td>Washington, DC, USA</td>
<td>8/14/2012</td>
<td>8/16/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA GSFC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$37,236.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA Cost Analysis Symposium 2012</td>
<td>Laurel, MD, USA</td>
<td>8/21/2012</td>
<td>8/23/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA OCE</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$86,132.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALEX Fest: Exploring the UV Universe - A Conference to Celebrate Nine Years of Exploration</td>
<td>Pasadena, CA, USA</td>
<td>9/4/2012</td>
<td>9/7/2012</td>
<td>Link</td>
<td>NASA SMD</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$50,438.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departure of Shuttle Endeavour from KSC</td>
<td>Cape Canaveral, FL, USA</td>
<td>9/16/2012</td>
<td>9/17/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>NASA KSC</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>$64,401.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Honorable Darrell Issa  
Chairman  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:


We have begun implementing the latest policy of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) regarding attendance and sponsorship of conferences that requires us to institute a number of changes in conference sponsorship and attendance practices, but allows us to both support a vibrant science and technology enterprise at NASA and spend the taxpayers' dollars wisely. The OMB memorandum requires a significant increase in conference reporting and approval requirements — oversight that we will provide to ensure our staff are able to participate in dialogue, exchange, and professional development opportunities that have value to the Agency and further our leadership in space exploration but are within the parameters of the policy.

NASA is committed to providing the Committee with the conference data requested, and we have launched a major exercise across the Agency to gather the specific information in response to your request. We expect to provide you with our completed response this Fall.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler  
Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
May 7, 2012

OLIA/2012-01011:SS:us

The Honorable Darrell Issa  
Chairman  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter of April 10, 2012, to Administrator Bolden regarding conference and related activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and to confirm receipt of your April 30, 2012, letter requesting additional conference-related information.

The Space Act of 1958 mandated that NASA "shall provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning its activities and the results thereof." Conferences are a key vehicle for accomplishing this mandate, providing NASA scientists, engineers, and leaders the opportunity to present scientific and technical papers and to participate in interchanges on leading-edge technology with peers from elsewhere in the Federal government, the science community, the aeronautics and aerospace industries, and our international partners. Conferences attended and sponsored by NASA also address a broad and diverse range of scientific and engineering challenges faced by NASA in carrying out its missions, from the latest Earth science research, to advanced aeronautics, to cutting-edge technologies needed for both current and planned robotic and human space exploration programs.

In addition to facilitating dissemination and advancement of scientific research, conferences also serve as an effective way for NASA to carry out other mission-related purposes, such as program development, planning and information gathering, and education and program outreach. For example, conferences on program management provide opportunities for examining current trends in aerospace project and engineering management, offering forums for the exchange and dissemination of best practices, new ideas, as well as training for managers across NASA to help the Agency cost-effectively meet the toughest challenges today.

NASA is committed to providing the Committee with the conference data that you have requested, and is in the process of gathering the specific information that you requested in your April 10 and April 30, 2012, letters.
Your April 10, 2012, letter also requested information on individuals employed by NASA to plan events. We have checked with our Centers and, to the best of our knowledge, NASA does not have anyone specifically employed to plan events. However, every sponsored conference does have a required point of contact for approval and reporting purposes under the conference reporting policy, and a variety of people may be involved on a part-time basis in ensuring the successful planning and execution of these conferences, but none as a full time event planner.

Sincerely,

Seth Statler

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
300 E Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

As part of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform’s ongoing investigation into agency spending on conferences, I am writing to request information about the Department’s use of companies to identify conference venues. Documents obtained by the Committee and public statements by the General Services Administration (GSA) Inspector General Brian Miller raised questions about the conduct of government employees who engage service providers to arrange venues for oversight conferences. Government employees who accept gifts and discounts from those service providers may expose themselves to criminal liability.

In the case of the GSA’s excessive and wasteful 2010 conference in Las Vegas, GSA employees engaged a company called Location Solvers. To better understand the extent to which event planners across the federal government rely on service providers such as Location Solvers, I request that the Department answer specific questions about any engagement with this or similar companies.

According to documents received by the Committee in conjunction with its investigation, GSA used a private company, Location Solvers, to secure the M Resort, a luxury hotel in Las Vegas, as the site of GSA’s excessive 2010 Western Regions Conference. The M Resort paid Location Solvers a fee of $12,601.50. The fact that the M Resort agreed to pay such a fee indicates that further discounts might have been available to GSA if GSA had contacted the hotel directly, rather than working through Location Solvers. It is possible that the fee was passed on indirectly to the taxpayers.
All other conference costs were borne by the taxpayers. For example, taxpayers footed the conference catering bill. Taxpayers also covered the salaries of the GSA event planners who engaged Location Solvers to do their jobs.

Location Solvers enjoyed a cozy relationship with GSA employees. Documents received by the Committee confirm that GSA employees received illegal gifts from Location Solvers. Part 2635 of Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations prohibits government employees from accepting gifts valued at more than $20. Transcripts of investigative interviews produced to the Committee show that on several occasions, Location Solvers provided federal employees with gifts with values well in excess of the $20 limit.

Lisa Daniels, a GSA event planner, admitted allowing Location Solvers to pay for her one-night stay at the Rio All Suites Hotel and Casino in Las Vegas. She also accepted tickets to a Cher concert. During her interview with the staff of the GSA Inspector General, she stated:

Q: Okay. You and I both know that Michael Jahn is a prohibited source. He’s a contractor, okay, right?
A: Right.
Q: We agree with that. So what are the rules? You’re not supposed to receive anything in —
A: Right. No, I know that, but I didn’t even remember that I had done that.
Q: Okay. Well, I’m going to help you —
A: So I didn’t — no, I didn’t do it. I’m saying I remember now. When you put it in your report, I was like oh, my gosh. No, I stayed at the Rio. And he said oh, gosh, that’s right. And then I went back, and I was like wait a minute. I was trying to figure out the first site visit meeting, and I was like that means I had to go to DC — or to — to have stayed two nights at the Rio, and then I realized I only stayed one night, and he picked up the tab for the other one.
Q: Yeah, he did.

131 Transcribed Interview of Lisa Daniels at 87-88 (Apr. 5, 2012); Transcribed Interview of Aronel Taylor at 45 (Mar. 15, 2011); Lisa Rein, GSA Probe Focuses on Conference Contractor, WASH. POST (Apr. 23, 2012).
A: For the hotel. Yeah, he -- so he did -- so that would be the hotel that he gave me for free.

Q: That's right, and that -- and that in Vegas and that was the M Resort.

A: Right.

Q: Okay. What about the Cher tickets? I've done my homework.

A: Yeah. He's -- and that's what I said to him. We went to the Cher concert, and that had to have been on Sunday night.\textsuperscript{134}

Daniels also stated that in a two-year period, she received flowers from Location Solvers monthly.\textsuperscript{135} Location Solvers had a similar relationship with Aronel Taylor, another GSA event planner. Taylor told investigators that she preferred to use Location Solvers to identify conference sites because the company had treated her well. She stated:

Q: I looked up your training records. You had the procurement training. You had the credit card training. And you've violated those. I am not going to lie to you. You remember the training when it talks about competitiveness and fairness? Remember that part of it?

A: Yeah. I just, you know, I can use other vendors. I can. I just hadn't. He's [Jahn] just been good to me. But, yeah, I see your point.

Q: You know what? If I can make $12,600.00 from you, I would be good to you, too. That was one event.

A: Yeah.

Q: And I'm sure that these competitors would be more than happy to be good with you and even send you flowers on your birthday --

A: Uh-huh.\textsuperscript{136}

The evidence obtained by the Committee reveals an acquisition process, devoid of competition, brought on by corruption and greed. The website for Location Solvers lists the Department of Homeland Security among the company's clients; GSA does not

\textsuperscript{134} Transcribed Interview of Lisa Daniels at 87-88 (Apr. 3, 2012) (emphasis added).

\textsuperscript{135} Id. at 146.

\textsuperscript{136} Transcribed Interview of Aronel Taylor at 48-50 (Aug. 29, 2011) (emphasis added).
appear on the client list. Since the list on the web site is not exhaustive, the Committee is seeking information regarding each department or agency's use of Location Solvers and/or similar companies.

The Committee seeks to gauge the frequency with which the federal government utilizes service providers such as Location Solvers. Additionally, the Committee is interested in ensuring other federal employees are not engaging in improper or illegal conduct with respect to event planning. In order to assist the Committee with its investigation, please provide the following documents and information:

1. A list of any entities used by the Department to select sites for overnight conferences since 2005; and,

2. All documents or communications referring or relating to Location Solvers since January 1, 2009.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is the principal oversight committee of the House of Representatives and may at "any time" investigate "any matter" as set forth in House Rule X. The Committee also has jurisdiction over the civilian acquisition system, generally. An attachment to this letter provides additional information about responding to the Committee's request.

We request that you provide the requested documents and information as soon as possible, but no later than noon on May 11, 2012. When producing documents to the Committee, please deliver production sets to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee prefers, if possible, to receive all documents in electronic format.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Ashley Callen or Ashok Pinto of the Committee Staff at (202) 225-5074. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Darrell Issa
Chairman

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member
Responding to Committee Document Requests

1. In complying with this request, you should produce all responsive documents that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, and representatives acting on your behalf. You should also produce documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy or to which you have access, as well as documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party. Requested records, documents, data or information should not be destroyed, modified, removed, transferred or otherwise made inaccessible to the Committee.

2. In the event that any entity, organization or individual denoted in this request has been, or is also known by any other name than that herein denoted, the request shall be read also to include that alternative identification.

3. The Committee’s preference is to receive documents in electronic form (i.e., CD, memory stick, or thumb drive) in lieu of paper productions.

4. Documents produced in electronic format should also be organized, identified, and indexed electronically.

5. Electronic document productions should be prepared according to the following standards:

   (a) The production should consist of single page Tagged Image File (“TIF”), files accompanied by a Concordance-format load file, an Opticon reference file, and a file defining the fields and character lengths of the load file.

   (b) Document numbers in the load file should match document Bates numbers and TIF file names.

   (c) If the production is completed through a series of multiple partial productions, field names and file order in all load files should match.
6. Documents produced to the Committee should include an index describing the contents of the production. To the extent more than one CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder is produced, each CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder should contain an index describing its contents.

7. Documents produced in response to this request shall be produced together with copies of file labels, dividers or identifying markers with which they were associated when they were requested.

8. When you produce documents, you should identify the paragraph in the Committee’s request to which the documents respond.

9. It shall not be a basis for refusal to produce documents that any other person or entity also possesses non-identical or identical copies of the same documents.

10. If any of the requested information is only reasonably available in machine-readable form (such as on a computer server, hard drive, or computer backup tape), you should consult with the Committee staff to determine the appropriate format in which to produce the information.

11. If compliance with the request cannot be made in full, compliance shall be made to the extent possible and shall include an explanation of why full compliance is not possible.

12. In the event that a document is withheld on the basis of privilege, provide a privilege log containing the following information concerning any such document: (a) the privilege asserted; (b) the type of document; (c) the general subject matter; (d) the date, author and addressee; and (e) the relationship of the author and addressee to each other.

13. If any document responsive to this request was, but no longer is, in your possession, custody, or control, identify the document (stating its date, author, subject and recipients) and explain the circumstances under which the document ceased to be in your possession, custody, or control.

14. If a date or other descriptive detail set forth in this request referring to a document is inaccurate, but the actual date or other descriptive detail is known to you or otherwise apparent from the context of the request, you should produce all documents which would be responsive as if the date or other descriptive detail were correct.

15. The time period covered by this request is included in the attached request. To the extent a time period is not specified, produce relevant documents from January 1, 2009 to the present.

16. This request is continuing in nature and applies to any newly-discovered information. Any record, document, compilation of data or information, not produced because it has not been located or discovered by the return date, shall be produced immediately upon subsequent location or discovery.
17. All documents shall be Bates-stamped sequentially and produced sequentially.

18. Two sets of documents shall be delivered, one set to the Majority Staff and one set to the Minority Staff. When documents are produced to the Committee, production sets shall be delivered to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

19. Upon completion of the document production, you should submit a written certification, signed by you or your counsel, stating that: (1) a diligent search has been completed of all documents in your possession, custody, or control which reasonably could contain responsive documents; and (2) all documents located during the search that are responsive have been produced to the Committee.

Definitions

1. The term "document" means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of how recorded, and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, working papers, records, notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, inter-office and intra-office communications, electronic mail (e-mail), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation, telephone call, meeting or other communication, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, revisions, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto), and graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), and electronic, mechanical, and electric records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.

2. The term "communication" means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether in a meeting, by telephone, facsimile, email, regular mail, telexes, releases, or otherwise.

3. The terms "and" and "or" shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this request any information which might
otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neuter genders.

4. The terms "person" or "persons" mean natural persons, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities, and all subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, or other units thereof.

5. The term "identify," when used in a question about individuals, means to provide the following information: (a) the individual's complete name and title; and (b) the individual's business address and phone number.

6. The term "referring or relating," with respect to any given subject, means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with or is pertinent to that subject in any manner whatsoever.
April 10, 2012

The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr
Administrator
NASA
300 E Street SW
Washington, DC 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is gathering government-wide data about the cost and frequency of agency-funded overnight conferences held outside of the Washington, D.C.-area. As part of this investigation, I am writing to request documents and information related to such conferences and the employees who planned and attended them.

On February 9, 2009, the President publicly condemned frivolous spending of taxpayer dollars at a town hall meeting in Indiana. He stated: "you can’t go take a trip to Las Vegas or go down to the Super Bowl on the taxpayers’ dime."  

With that in mind, on July 24, 2009, I wrote to the Social Security Administration (SSA) to request documents and information related to a "three-day conference for managers at the Arizona Biltmore Resort and Spa." The agency subsequently produced documents to the Committee that showed it had been careless with taxpayer dollars. The SSA Administrator determined that the conference organizers made some decisions that were not fully compliant with [SSA] policies or adequately sensitive to the expectations of the agency.  

1 Dave Topkis, Las Vegas Still ‘Reeling’ from Obama Comments, Says Mayor, LAS VEGAS SUN (Oct. 21, 2010).
3 Letter from Hon. Michael J. Astrue, Adm’r, U.S. Social Security Admin., to Hon. Darrell Issa, Ranking Member, Committee (Sept. 10, 2009).
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The Administrator made significant organizational changes at SSA to prevent a recurrence. At the time, I hoped that the abundance of negative publicity about the event from a variety of news outlets would serve as notice that federal departments and agencies cannot use taxpayer dollars to pay for vacations disguised as conferences.

The General Services Administration (GSA) failed to heed the President’s message and to learn from the mistakes of the SSA. According to an April 2, 2012, report by the GSA Office of the Inspector General (OIG), the agency’s biennial Western Regions Conference held in October 2010 was “excessive” and “wasteful.” The conference, held at the M Resort in Las Vegas, cost $822,751. According to the OIG report, witnesses characterized the conference as “over the top.” In fact, the planners made it a priority to outdo previous years’ conferences.

Other agencies will hold major conferences in the upcoming months. The Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority lists a two-day coal mine methane conference in September for 150 attendees organized by the Environmental Protection Agency; a six-day Department of Health and Human Services conference scheduled for June, with 325 expected attendees; and a Department of Defense worldwide education symposium for 2,500 in July.

On November 9, 2011, the President signed an executive order that directed agencies to spend funds more efficiently. Specifically related to travel, the President stated:

“To ensure efficient travel spending, agencies are encouraged to devise strategic alternatives to Government travel, including local or technological alternatives, such as teleconferencing and video conferencing. Agencies should make all appropriate efforts to conduct business and host or sponsor events in space controlled by the Federal Government, wherever practicable and cost effective.”

---

7 Id. at 1-2.
8 Id.
9 Steve Tetreault & Peter Urban, Nevada's industry scramble to limit fallout from GSA junket, LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, Apr. 4, 2012.
11 Id.
With regard to commemorative items, the President directed agencies to "limit the purchase of promotional items (e.g. plaques, clothing, and commemorative items), in particular where they are not cost-effective." This order, in addition to the President’s public comments, should deter event organizers from even considering expensive off-site conferences.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) appears to be ignoring the President's clear guidance. Despite the President's comments and the executive order, CFPB is seeking to hire an "Invitations Coordinator." This individual’s duties include tracking invitations for CFPB agency officials, researching the events to which they are invited, and maintaining a master schedule of events. The individual who fills this role could earn as much as $102,900 annually.

As families around the country are having to spend less to make ends meet, the federal government must follow suit. The American people have an expectation that the federal government is not using their tax dollars to pay for lavish conferences or to fund the salaries of event planners. In order to assist the Committee with its investigation, please provide responses to the following requests for information:

1. Provide a list of overnight conferences funded by the department and attended by more than 50 employees since January 1, 2005. For each conference provide date(s), location, cost, funding source, and number of attendees.

2. Provide the names, titles, and salaries of any individuals employed by the department to plan events.

The Committee also requests that the Department produce the following documents, in electronic format, for the time period January 1, 2005 to the present:

3. The address of any website created to promote, track, or commemorate department conferences. If the website is currently archived on the agency’s intranet, provide an electronic copy.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is the principal oversight committee of the House of Representatives and may at "any time" investigate "any matter" as set forth in House Rule X. An attachment to this letter provides additional information about responding to the Committee’s request.

---
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We request that you provide the requested documents and information as soon as possible, but no later than noon on April 23, 2012. When producing documents to the Committee, please deliver production sets to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee prefers, if possible, to receive all documents in electronic format.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Ashley Callen or Ashok Pinto of the Committee Staff at (202) 225-5074. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Darrell Issa
Chairman

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Member
June 15, 2012

The Honorable Frank R. Wolf
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter of May 22, 2012, requesting assurances regarding NASA’s conference policies and procedures. You also asked for confirmation that all current year actual and planned conference expenditures are necessary activities, directly related to the mission and core responsibilities of the Agency.

NASA endeavors to fulfill our Space Act mandate while fulfilling the great responsibility we have to expend taxpayer dollars in a prudent fashion. We currently review any NASA-sponsored conference with total costs exceeding $20,000, before proceeding with approval. Recently, in response to OMB Memorandum 12-12, we are also reviewing non-NASA conferences where attendance by NASA personnel may exceed $100,000 for any one conference. In addition to limiting Agency participation in certain conferences, we have also challenged offices sponsoring Agency conferences to find innovative alternatives. I am being kept fully and currently informed of these efforts.

NASA is currently reviewing and refining several proposals that will further enhance our policies and procedures relating to conferences and plans to implement these by early summer. Moreover, to enhance reporting and approval processes, we are investing in a system enhancement to the Agency’s Conference Tracking System, which will permit detailed planning and monitoring on a conference-by-conference basis.

As the NASA Administrator, I take my responsibility and accountability for use of taxpayer dollars in this area very seriously, and I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
Dear Administrator Bolden:

I am deeply concerned about wasteful conference spending, such as the abuses revealed in the recent GSA Las Vegas conference scandal.

The attached Fox News report describes an extravagant Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference in Hawaii. Such actions not only raise questions about the possible waste of public funds; they also undermine public confidence in government.

I ask you to immediately reassess the Agency’s conference policies and procedures and report back to the Committee by June 5, 2012, confirming that your policies and procedures are adequate to prevent waste and abuse. In your response please also confirm that any and all current year actual and planned conference expenditures represent necessary activities that are directly related to the mission and core responsibilities of the Agency, and adhere to legal and regulatory standards and the strictest standards of responsibility and accountability.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Wolf,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
Judges' plans for lavish $1 million Hawaii conference bring scrutiny

Published May 21, 2012
FoxNews.com

On the heels of the scandal surrounding one government agency’s lavish Las Vegas conference, federal judges in the western U.S. circuit are catching flak from Congress for a planned Maui getaway that could cost taxpayers more than $1 million.

The Maui meet-up is scheduled for August under the banner of the 2012 Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference, and will include judges, attorneys, staff and “special guests” from various federal courts spread across nine western states—including judges on the California-based Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

While in Hawaii, the guests are scheduled to stay in the upscale Hyatt Regency Maui Resort & Spa. And they’ll have the chance to kick back with an array of recreational activities—sport fishing, golf, paddle-board lessons, yoga, Zumba, even a floral design workshop.

The official website for the conference stresses that “government funds are not used for any recreational or sporting activities.”

But Sens. Jeff Sessions, R-Ala., and Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, in a letter to Ninth Circuit Chief Judge Alex Kozinski, called the activities “unrelated to the business of the court” and questioned whether the Ninth Circuit really needed to ship everyone out to the islands—a trip that incurs substantial costs in travel and lodging alone.

“The programs read more like a vacation than a business trip to discuss the means of improving the administration of justice,” they wrote. “We are concerned about the overall cost of this conference and do not believe that discussions about the administration of justice would be less successful were they held somewhere other than a spa and resort in Hawaii.”

A statement from the senators estimated the trip could cost more than $1 million—pegging the cost of accommodations alone at more than $500,000. That factors in room rates of between $230 and $250 per night for four nights.

Continued...
The government also provides a per diem—according to the conference website, this per diem starts at a base level of $289.

Circuit Court Executive Cathy Catterson issued a written response to the complaints Monday afternoon saying the senators' letter is being reviewed and defending the upcoming conference.

"As part of the Third Branch of government, the Ninth Circuit is fully aware of its responsibilities as a steward of public funds," Catterson said, noting the conference is "authorized by law" for the purposes of considering court business and ways to improve the administration of justice.

"The conference fully adheres to these goals, providing an exceptional educational program and the opportunity to conduct numerous business meetings that further circuit governance. Judges and other attendees take seriously their obligation to participate fully in the conference," she said. "Costs for lodging and air travel to attend the conference are comparative to those found at mainland venues. Any sporting and recreational activities are paid for by individuals and are not reimbursable."

The hotel itself is situated on Kaanapali Beach, in the northwestern corner of the island on the outskirts of the island's lush rainforests. The resort features a full-service spa, a salon, 1,800 feet of beachfront property, two pools with waterfalls, a rope bridge and an outdoor whirlpool.

The GOP senators, in their letter, fired off a slew of questions for the Ninth Circuit about the cost of past conventions and the rationale for the upcoming one. They referenced the scandal over the General Services Administration conference in Las Vegas, which cost taxpayers more than $800,000.

"Technology is so advanced that people are earning college degrees online and soldiers serving halfway across the world use Skype with their families at home," Grassley said in a statement.

"Likewise, a judicial circuit court should be capable of using technology to share information without requiring a trip to an island paradise. It's especially tone-deaf to plan a pricey conference after the GSA debacle. The taxpayers can't sustain this kind of spending, and they shouldn't have to. The court should re-examine whether this is the best use of tax dollars."

http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/05/21/senators-scrutinize-judges-over-tone-deaf-conference-on-island-paradise/
Dear Chairman Wolf:

Thank you for your letter of May 31, 2012. I confirm that your letter reflects NASA’s intentions for the Commercial Crew Program (CCP). NASA is working to ensure that we end our reliance on foreign crew transportation to the International Space Station (ISS) and utilize safe, cost-effective U.S. crew transportation capabilities as soon as we are able to certify those systems to carry NASA astronauts.

As you know, our strategy is two-fold. NASA is using Space Act Agreements to support the development of commercial crew transportation capabilities that NASA could eventually buy, and will use FAR-based contracts for the certification of those capabilities and for the procurement of crew transportation services to and from the ISS. NASA is developing a strategy to award FAR-based contracts and anticipates having this strategy substantively complete before Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCAP) award. We will continue to keep the Committee informed on the progress of this effort.

I would emphasize that it is very important that final FY 2013 funding for the CCP be as robust as possible—a conference funding outcome for the CCP above the Senate-proposed level and closer to the President’s FY 2013 request is highly desirable, in that it will increase NASA’s ability to deliver the safe and effective program we both wish to see accomplished. Furthermore, it is important to note that the CCP will require increased annual funding in future years to accomplish the current program plan.

Thank you again for your support for continued implementation of the CCP this summer, and I look forward to working with you to deliver a Commercial Crew Program that will utilize safe, cost-effective U.S. crew transportation capabilities.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
May 31, 2012

Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Washington, DC 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

As you know, I have been deeply troubled by NASA's goals for and management of the Commercial Crew Program (CCP) over the last two years. The report accompanying H.R. 5326 expressed a number of my concerns and imposed a new management paradigm on the program that was intended to address those concerns. The publication of the Committee's CCP report language touched off a series of discussions between my office, other members, outside experts and NASA itself in which it became clear that many of the concerns expressed in the report are broadly shared and that there is significant interest in identifying potential solutions to those concerns.

Although I believe the approach outlined in the Committee's report remains the most appropriate way forward for this program, the Committee has engaged NASA to find other potential solutions that will address some of the identified concerns while preventing any disruption in development work pending conference on the fiscal year 2013 appropriations bill. As a result of recent discussions, we have reached some common understandings with NASA regarding how the CCP should be managed and how NASA will respond to the oversight needs of the Congress with respect to the CCP's implementation. I believe these understandings represent a path forward that partially addresses the significant concerns raised in the Committee's report and, while differing from the management and budget plan NASA proposed earlier in the year, still allows the CCP to meet its programmatic goals.
For our discussions, it is my understanding that NASA now has the following intentions for the CCP:

- The primary objective of the CCP is the achievement of the fastest, safest and most cost-effective means of domestic access to the International Space Station (ISS).

- In the upcoming Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCAP) phase, NASA plans to award Space Act Agreements (SAAs) to no more than 2.5 program partners (i.e., two full awards and one partial award), with the final number of awards made representing the minimum necessary to ensure the successful achievement of the CCP’s primary objective.

- NASA intends to make the upcoming CCiCAP awards the final phase of general development funding for commercial crew contractors. Following these awards, NASA plans to provide commercial crew funding only for FAR-based certification and service contracts.

- NASA plans to define and implement a strategy to award FAR-based contracts in a manner that will minimize substantive delays and programmatic risks as the CCP moves from CCiCAP to the certification phase. NASA also plans to substantively complete this strategy prior to the awarding of SAAs for the CCiCAP phase and to communicate progress in the development of the strategy to the Committee.

- NASA intends to implement protocols to protect taxpayer interests by ensuring that, in the event of a commercial partner’s termination from the program due to default or failure to perform, the government will:
  - have access to and use of data and licenses produced by that partner through the CCP;
  - have the “right of first refusal” to purchase real property produced by that partner through the CCP at a price that fully reflects the Federal investment already made in the acquisition or development of that property; and
  - require compliance with statutory and regulatory controls on the export of CCP-funded technology and property produced by that partner or the acquisition of that partner by a foreign-controlled entity.

- NASA intends to collect and evaluate information on potential CCiCAP partners’ business viability, management, finances, resources and compliance regimes to provide confidence that these partners are capable of meeting their obligations under the program.

- This management plan can be successfully implemented with a potential fiscal year 2013 CCP funding level of or near the Senate level.

If the CCP were to be managed in a manner that is consistent with these intentions, I would not object to the continued implementation of the program this summer. To that end, I request written confirmation from your office that these understandings accurately reflect NASA’s CCP intentions and assumptions, as well as advanced notification at any point in the future if NASA intends to propose a substantive change to these understandings.
I expect NASA to provide to the Committee an updated multiyear roadmap for the program that reflects the updates and changes to the management plan embodied in the above understandings. This roadmap should include for each phase of the program the number of expected commercial participants and their estimated financial contribution to the program; the procurement mechanism to be used; and the major performance milestones to be achieved. Recognizing that such a plan would likely be procurement-sensitive in its complete form, a modified, publicly releasable roadmap should also be provided. A clearly defined roadmap for the remainder of this program will be important to addressing some of the concerns identified in the Committee report and for Congressional oversight.

I also expect that NASA will remain open to and cooperative with outside oversight (including any additional oversight requested by the Committee) as we move forward. Above all, I believe it is imperative that the funding provided for this program be focused to ensure that U.S. crew access to the ISS is restored as quickly and safely as possible, while minimizing government exposure in the event of contractor termination or failure.

Thank you, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Wolf
Chairman
House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies
July 25, 2012

OLIA/2012-000504

The Honorable Darrell E. Issa
Chairman
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This letter is in response to your July 12, 2012, letter regarding participation by senior officials at political fundraising events.

As you know, the Hatch Act permits senior government officials to participate in certain political activities that are consistent with the law as long as it does not interfere with their official duties. However, Administrator Bolden and Deputy Administrator Garver have not attended any Super PAC event or participated in the "Speakers Series" or similar political fundraising event. Additionally, no NASA employee is assigned to coordinate with the Democratic National Committee on events such as the "Speakers Series."

Thank you for your interest in NASA.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
July 12, 2012

The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
300 E Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

In June 2010, I wrote to the heads of federal departments and agencies requesting information regarding the involvement of White House political personnel in official travel.¹ Now, I am writing to request similar information in the context of fundraising for the Democratic Party. Recent media reports indicate that Cabinet Secretaries are actively involved in fundraising for super PACs.² On June 7, 2012, Politico reported that with regard to Cabinet Secretaries participating in political events, the President has now "turned [the Cabinet] loose for fundraisers and taxpayer-funded trips that meld policy and politics, and sometimes fall into the gray area between the two."³ Additionally, according to White House correspondent Daniel Stone:

Rather than fundraise for super PACs himself, the president decided he would send campaign and administration emissaries to the events (legally, Obama officials couldn’t ask for the money outright, but could hobnob with donors before checks exchanged hands). Yet to keep Democratic campaign coffers full, the president agreed to an ambitious fundraising schedule, as many as six each week . . . .⁴

The Committee is investigating the frequency with which Cabinet Secretaries appear at super PAC events and whether government funds have been used for travel to and from these events.

¹ See, e.g., Letter from Rep. Darrell Issa, Ranking Member, H. Comm. on Oversight & Government Reform (OGR) to Hon. Hillary Clinton, Sec’y, U.S. Dep’t of State (June 3, 2010).
⁴ Daniel Stone, Obama’s Fundraising on Steroids: Choosing an Ambitious Schedule to Avoid Super PACs, DAILY BEAST, May 6, 2012.
Shortly after the President filed for re-election, the *Wall Street Journal* reported on another type of fundraising event—the “Speakers Series.”5 According to the *Journal*, high-ranking government officials, well-known entertainers, accomplished corporate leaders, and senior White House advisors have participated in Speakers Series events, which give supporters the chance to meet these individuals in exchange for a contribution to the Obama campaign.6

The Speakers Series, the super PAC fundraising participation, and travel to battleground states, appear to reflect an orchestrated attempt to use government officials for partisan fundraising purposes. The *Wall Street Journal* further reported that government officials such as Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa P. Jackson, Secretary of Energy Steven Chu, and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan have all participated in the Speakers Series.7 Close advisors to the President have also participated. The story in the *Journal* stated:

> White House chief of staff Bill Daley has rubbed elbows with small groups of top Obama campaign donors, as has [sic] senior White House advisors David Plouffe and Valerie Jarrett.8

The Committee’s mandate is to oversee the proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars. The Committee must also investigate any intersection between official duties and political activities. Historically, the intersection between political and official events has led to misuse of official government funds.

The Hatch Act, which governs political activity by government officials, falls squarely within the Committee’s jurisdiction. As such, the Committee has held two hearings on this subject during the 112th Congress. Most recently, on May 16, 2012, the Committee held a hearing entitled, "The Hatch Act: Options for Reform." The hearing sought, among other things, to evaluate potential changes to the Office of Special Counsel’s jurisdiction over state and local Hatch Act violations, provide better guidance for presidential political appointees who have both official and political responsibilities, and consider how new communications technology affects the Hatch Act community. As in the past, panel witnesses reflected a noteworthy consensus that a Hatch update was essential for improving enforcement and guidance.

To assist the Committee in its investigation of Cabinet travel for fundraising purposes and other Hatch Act matters, please provide the following documents and information, as well as answers to the following questions:

1. Have you or any senior department or agency official attended any super PAC or other political events?

---

6 Id.
7 Id.
8 Id.
2. If so, provide a list of the event(s), the department or agency participant(s), the date(s), the venue(s), the department or agency official(s)' mode of transportation to and from the event, and designate whether official or campaign funds were used to pay for the transportation. In addition, provide an agenda or program for the event(s).

3. Have you or any senior department or agency official participated in the Speakers Series or other similar political events?

4. Are there any department or agency employees who coordinate with the Democratic National Committee on events such as the Speakers Series or other political events? If so, provide their names.

5. Please provide all documents and communications related to the Speakers Series or other political events in which you or other senior officials have participated.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is the principal oversight committee of the House of Representatives and may at “any time” investigate “any matter” as set forth in House Rule X. An attachment to this letter provides additional information about responding to the Committee’s request.

We request that you provide the requested documents and information as soon as possible, but by no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 26, 2012. When producing documents to the Committee, please deliver production sets to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee prefers, if possible, to receive all documents in electronic format.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Ashley Callen of the Committee staff at (202) 225-5074. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Darrell Issa
Chairman

Enclosure

c: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member
Responding to Committee Document Requests

1. In complying with this request, you are required to produce all responsive documents that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, and representatives acting on your behalf. You should also produce documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy or to which you have access, as well as documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party. Requested records, documents, data or information should not be destroyed, modified, removed, transferred or otherwise made inaccessible to the Committee.

2. In the event that any entity, organization or individual denoted in this request has been, or is also known by any other name than that herein denoted, the request shall be read also to include that alternative identification.

3. The Committee’s preference is to receive documents in electronic form (i.e., CD, memory stick, or thumb drive) in lieu of paper productions.

4. Documents produced in electronic format should also be organized, identified, and indexed electronically.

5. Electronic document productions should be prepared according to the following standards:

   (a) The production should consist of single page Tagged Image File ("TIF”), files accompanied by a Concordance-format load file, an Opticon reference file, and a file defining the fields and character lengths of the load file.

   (b) Document numbers in the load file should match document Bates numbers and TIF file names.

   (c) If the production is completed through a series of multiple partial productions, field names and file order in all load files should match.

   (d) All electronic documents produced to the Committee should include the following fields of metadata specific to each document:

   BEGDOC, ENDDOC, TEXT, BEGATTACH, ENDDATTACH, PAGECOUNT, CUSTODIAN, RECORDTYPE, DATE, TIME, SENTDATE, SENTTIME, BEGINDATE, BEGINTIME, ENDDATE, ENDTIME, AUTHOR, FROM,
6. Documents produced to the Committee should include an index describing the contents of the production. To the extent more than one CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder is produced, each CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder should contain an index describing its contents.

7. Documents produced in response to this request shall be produced together with copies of file labels, dividers or identifying markers with which they were associated when the request was served.

8. When you produce documents, you should identify the paragraph in the Committee's schedule to which the documents respond.

9. It shall not be a basis for refusal to produce documents that any other person or entity also possesses non-identical or identical copies of the same documents.

10. If any of the requested information is only reasonably available in machine-readable form (such as on a computer server, hard drive, or computer backup tape), you should consult with the Committee staff to determine the appropriate format in which to produce the information.

11. If compliance with the request cannot be made in full by the specified return date, compliance shall be made to the extent possible by that date. An explanation of why full compliance is not possible shall be provided along with any partial production.

12. In the event that a document is withheld on the basis of privilege, provide a privilege log containing the following information concerning any such document: (a) the privilege asserted; (b) the type of document; (c) the general subject matter; (d) the date, author and addressee; and (e) the relationship of the author and addressee to each other.

13. If any document responsive to this request was, but no longer is, in your possession, custody, or control, identify the document (stating its date, author, subject and recipients) and explain the circumstances under which the document ceased to be in your possession, custody, or control.

14. If a date or other descriptive detail set forth in this request referring to a document is inaccurate, but the actual date or other descriptive detail is known to you or is otherwise apparent from the context of the request, you are required to produce all documents which would be responsive as if the date or other descriptive detail were correct.

15. Unless otherwise specified, the time period covered by this request is from January 1, 2009 to the present.

16. This request is continuing in nature and applies to any newly-discovered information. Any record, document, compilation of data or information, not produced because it has not been
located or discovered by the return date, shall be produced immediately upon subsequent location or discovery.

17. All documents shall be Bates-stamped sequentially and produced sequentially.

18. Two sets of documents shall be delivered, one set to the Majority Staff and one set to the Minority Staff. When documents are produced to the Committee, production sets shall be delivered to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

19. Upon completion of the document production, you should submit a written certification, signed by you or your counsel, stating that: (1) a diligent search has been completed of all documents in your possession, custody, or control which reasonably could contain responsive documents; and (2) all documents located during the search that are responsive have been produced to the Committee.

Schedule Definitions

1. The term “document” means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of how recorded, and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, working papers, records, notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, inter-office and intra-office communications, electronic mail (e-mail), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation, telephone call, meeting or communication, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto), and graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), and electronic, mechanical, and electric records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.

2. The term “communication” means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether in a meeting, by telephone, facsimile, email (desktop or mobile device), text message, instant message, MMS or SMS message, regular mail, telexes, releases, or otherwise.
3. The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this request any information which might otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neuter genders.

4. The terms “person” or “persons” mean natural persons, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities, and all subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, or other units thereof.

5. The term “identify,” when used in a question about individuals, means to provide the following information: (a) the individual’s complete name and title; and (b) the individual’s business address and phone number.

6. The term “referring or relating,” with respect to any given subject, means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with or is pertinent to that subject in any manner whatsoever.

7. The term “employee” means agent, borrowed employee, casual employee, consultant, contractor, de facto employee, independent contractor, joint adventurer, loaned employee, part-time employee, permanent employee, provisional employee, subcontractor, or any other type of service provider.
February 13, 2013

The Honorable Darrell E. Issa
Chairman
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Issa:

The Administrator has asked that I respond to your request for information regarding his official travel schedule for the time period from July 15, 2009, to the present.

Pursuant to your request, enclosed is a list that provides the following information for each NASA-funded trip conducted by the Administrator from July 15, 2009 through August 31, 2012.

a) The travel start and end dates;
b) The official purpose of the travel;
c) The travel destination;
d) Officials and other individuals with whom the Administrator met during the travel, including the names of principals involved in any meetings;
e) NASA employees and/or other Federal employees who accompanied the Administrator on each trip; and,
f) Non-Federal employees who accompanied the Administrator on each trip whose travel was funded by NASA.

We would be happy to discuss this information in further detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/3/12</td>
<td>JONATHAN D.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Senior Advisor for Operations Management</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/12</td>
<td>J. WILLIAM VANCE</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Assistant Administrator for Operations Management</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/12</td>
<td>CHRISTOPHER M.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Acting Chief, Office of Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/12</td>
<td>RICHARD R.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Deputy Administrator for Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/12</td>
<td>EMILY J.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/7/12</td>
<td>JOHN S.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Leader, Strategic Relations</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/12</td>
<td>JOHN K.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Leader, Strategic Relations</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9/12</td>
<td>ROBERT T.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/12</td>
<td>J. WILLIAM VANCE</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Assistant Administrator for Operations Management</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/12</td>
<td>RICHARD R.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Deputy Administrator for Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>EMILY J.</td>
<td>WASHINGTON D.C.</td>
<td>Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table represents the schedule of events and speakers for a series of lectures and seminars related to the Aerospace and Aviation industry. The dates and locations are specified for each event, along with the titles and statuses of the speakers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/22/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the Social Security Administration to discuss the agency's budget and the importance of its programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Secretary of the Treasury to discuss tax policy and economic stimulus measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Attorney General to discuss the administration's justice initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Secretary of Homeland Security to discuss border security and immigration policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Security Agency to discuss cybersecurity and intelligence operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/04/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to discuss the agency's role in advancing technology and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/07/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Institutes of Health to discuss the agency's role in medical research and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Science Foundation to discuss scientific research and education initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to discuss the administration's science and technology priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to discuss the agency's efforts to advance space exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Institutes of Health to discuss the agency's role in medical research and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Science Foundation to discuss scientific research and education initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Institutes of Health to discuss the agency's role in medical research and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/13</td>
<td>AAFF/CA</td>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>Meeting with the Director of the National Science Foundation to discuss scientific research and education initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above activities are examples of events that could be planned for the Administrator's schedule.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
<td>Data 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 6</td>
<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
<td>Data 9</td>
<td>Data 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 11</td>
<td>Data 12</td>
<td>Data 13</td>
<td>Data 14</td>
<td>Data 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 16</td>
<td>Data 17</td>
<td>Data 18</td>
<td>Data 19</td>
<td>Data 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 21</td>
<td>Data 22</td>
<td>Data 23</td>
<td>Data 24</td>
<td>Data 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data 26</td>
<td>Data 27</td>
<td>Data 28</td>
<td>Data 29</td>
<td>Data 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Note:** The table continues with more rows and columns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Panel discussion on space exploration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Spacewalk founder visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Policy event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/18</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Conference with industry leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Industry Tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Education Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/21</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Technology Expo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Innovation Symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Security Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Policy Roundtable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Industry Council Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Innovation Lab Open House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/27</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Tech Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Advocacy Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/29</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Economy Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/30</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Leadership Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Space Policy Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event Notes:**
- All events are scheduled for the morning of the respective date.
- Spacewalk founder and industry leaders will attend the space policy roundtable on May 23.
- The space innovation lab open house is scheduled for May 26.
- The space economy summit is planned for May 29.
- The space policy luncheon is set for May 30.
The Honorable Steven Palazzo  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics  
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter of September 19, 2012, signed jointly with Chairman Hall, Ranking Member Johnson, and Subcommittee Ranking Member Costello, in which you formalize a request from Committee staff that NASA undertake an analysis of the potential cost and schedule for the Commercial Crew Program under certain stipulated assumptions.

Many of the matters raised in your letter were discussed during the hearing before the Committee on September 14, 2012. As the Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, William Gerstenmaier, testified, NASA has a two-fold strategy to end the United States' sole reliance on foreign crew transportation to the International Space Station (ISS) and utilize a safe, cost-effective U.S. Crew Transportation System (CTS) as soon as we are able to certify those systems to carry NASA astronauts:

- NASA is using Space Act Agreements under the Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCap) phase to support the design and development of commercial crew transportation capabilities; these agreements will be 21 months in duration for the base period, running from August 2012 through May 2014, leading to approximately a critical design review level of maturity for at least two of the agreements.
- NASA will use FAR-based contracts for the certification of commercially developed capabilities and for the procurement of crew transportation services to and from the ISS to meet NASA requirements.

NASA is committed to ensuring that the requirements, standards, and processes for CTS certification for all commercial missions are held to the same or equivalent safety standards as Government human spaceflight missions, and NASA certification will cover all aspects of any CTS. To enable the earliest possible crew transportation, NASA will begin the initial certification efforts immediately and has issued a Request
for Proposals for 2-4 FAR-based fixed-price Certification Products Contracts (CPCs) for the CTS Certification Phase 1 that will begin early NASA-managed certification activities; the period of performance will be approximately 15 months, with awards in February 2013. This will be followed in FY 2014 by award of 1-2 CTS Certification Phase 2 FAR-based contracts to include development, test, evaluation, and certification.

During the period of the six-month FY 2013 Continuing Resolution, NASA expects to fund Commercial Crew activities at an annualized rate of $406 million, equivalent to the FY 2012 enacted level, which will support planned CCiCap and CPC activities during that period. To support program requirements beyond the six-month period, a full-year funding level of at least the FY 2013 Senate-proposed level of $525 million is required.

It is important to note that the CCP will require increased annual funding in future years—above the level projected for FY 2013—to maintain competition during development and accomplish the current program plan to deliver an effective and timely ISS crew transportation capability. NASA has endeavored to be clear on this point in our discussions with Congress. It is important that appropriate funding be provided to secure timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for the ISS rather than asking NASA to attempt to match a crew transportation capability to a specified funding profile that is not based on a defined project plan. NASA has presented analysis and assumptions behind our project estimates to date, which have been reviewed for reasonableness by an independent contractor. As Mr. Gerstenmaier previously briefed Committee staff and testified at the recent hearing, as part of the CCiCap process, NASA has collected detailed technical information from proposers for projected cost/schedule required to complete development and achieve a crewed flight demonstration. NASA will use this information as input to cost and schedule models to support an independent cost assessment, develop a more rigorous project plan, and inform updates of NASA's budget estimates for the certification phase 2 as part of the FY 2014 budget request.

NASA would need to rely on these models to evaluate the cost/schedule scenario stipulated by Committee staff. Therefore, we do not expect to be able to provide a response to this request prior to the submission of the FY 2014 budget request. The Administrator and Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, as part of the release of the FY 2014 budget request, will brief the details of this activity for Committee staff and be prepared to discuss it as part of the FY 2014 budget hearings. It should be noted that some of the assumptions stipulated in the Committee letter are inconsistent with the premises of NASA’s updated acquisition strategy, which forms the basis of our cost and schedule modeling efforts:

- NASA does not assume flat funding in future years for the CCP and does not assume that future funding is constrained by authorization levels enacted for previous years; as stated above, NASA is convinced that annual funding levels above that projected for FY 2013 will be necessary to complete the CCiCap effort and conduct the FAR-based certification efforts.
- NASA does assume that all baseline CCiCap effort under recently signed SAAs will be completed.
• NASA does not assume that cost-share amounts proposed by the CCiCap partners for the optional milestones will be available if the optional milestones under the SAA are not exercised.

• NASA does assume that activities subsequent to the baseline period will be carried out under FAR-based contracts, unless NASA elects, on a case-by-case basis, to exercise specific optional milestones.

• NASA does not assume a specific estimate for certification phase 2 at this time; this will be developed as the result of further detailed assessment that will rely on a variety of data; while NASA believes that having up to two contractors through Phase 2 would provide significant advantages for ensuring a safe and affordable CTS through competition, the ultimate number of awards will be driven by technical maturity, funding availability, and mission needs.

• NASA does assume a crew transportation flight rate to ISS through at least 2020 of approximately 2 missions per year carrying 4 NASA/International Partner astronauts. As NASA has testified before the Committee, NASA is currently looking at the technical feasibility of extending the life of the ISS beyond 2020, possibly to 2028. In addition to certifying ISS systems to operate beyond 2020, a decision to extend the life of the ISS would require multilateral agreement among the ISS partners.

ISS is a critical resource for this Nation. The ISS is allowing U.S. researchers to experiment with the unique properties of space, which enables the United States to continue to be a leader in technology and innovation. ISS also allows the United States to lead and interact with many nations. The ISS is currently hosting research from 66 countries, which see the United States as the leader in space. Obtaining timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for this unique facility is critical.

The Committee’s support for this high-priority effort is greatly appreciated. As always, we stand ready to provide additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
October 15, 2012

The Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson
Ranking Member
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Johnson:

Thank you for your letter of September 19, 2012, signed jointly with Chairman Hall, Subcommittee Chairman Palazzo, and Subcommittee Ranking Member Costello, in which you formalize a request from Committee staff that NASA undertake an analysis of the potential cost and schedule for the Commercial Crew Program under certain stipulated assumptions.

Many of the matters raised in your letter were discussed during the hearing before the Committee on September 14, 2012. As the Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, William Gerstenmaier, testified, NASA has a twofold strategy to end the United States’ sole reliance on foreign crew transportation to the International Space Station (ISS) and utilize a safe, cost-effective U.S. Crew Transportation System (CTS) as soon as we are able to certify those systems to carry NASA astronauts:

- NASA is using Space Act Agreements under the Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCap) phase to support the design and development of commercial crew transportation capabilities; these agreements will be 21 months in duration for the base period, running from August 2012 through May 2014, leading to approximately a critical design review level of maturity for at least two of the agreements.
- NASA will use FAR-based contracts for the certification of commercially developed capabilities and for the procurement of crew transportation services to and from the ISS to meet NASA requirements.

NASA is committed to ensuring that the requirements, standards, and processes for CTS certification for all commercial missions are held to the same or equivalent safety standards as Government human spaceflight missions, and NASA certification will cover all aspects of any CTS. To enable the earliest possible crew transportation, NASA will begin the initial certification efforts immediately and has issued a Request for Proposals for 2-4 FAR-based fixed-price Certification Products Contracts (CPCs)
for the CTS Certification Phase 1 that will begin early NASA-managed certification activities; the period of performance will be approximately 15 months, with awards in February 2013. This will be followed in FY 2014 by award of 1-2 CTS Certification Phase 2 FAR-based contracts to include development, test, evaluation, and certification.

During the period of the six-month FY 2013 Continuing Resolution, NASA expects to fund Commercial Crew activities at an annualized rate of $406 million, equivalent to the FY 2012 enacted level, which will support planned CCiCap and CPC activities during that period. To support program requirements beyond the six-month period, a full-year funding level of at least the FY 2013 Senate-proposed level of $525 million is required.

It is important to note that the CCP will require increased annual funding in future years—above the level projected for FY 2013—to maintain competition during development and accomplish the current program plan to deliver an effective and timely ISS crew transportation capability. NASA has endeavored to be clear on this point in our discussions with Congress. It is important that appropriate funding be provided to secure timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for the ISS rather than asking NASA to attempt to match a crew transportation capability to a specified funding profile that is not based on a defined project plan. NASA has presented analysis and assumptions behind our project estimates to date, which have been reviewed for reasonableness by an independent contractor. As Mr. Gerstenmaier previously briefed Committee staff and testified at the recent hearing, as part of the CCiCap process, NASA has collected detailed technical information from proposers for projected cost/schedule required to complete development and achieve a crewed flight demonstration. NASA will use this information as input to cost and schedule models to support an independent cost assessment, develop a more rigorous project plan, and inform updates of NASA’s budget estimates for the certification phase 2 as part of the FY 2014 budget request.

NASA would need to rely on these models to evaluate the cost/schedule scenario stipulated by Committee staff. Therefore, we do not expect to be able to provide a response to this request prior to the submission of the FY 2014 budget request. The Administrator and Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, as part of the release of the FY 2014 budget request, will brief the details of this activity for Committee staff and be prepared to discuss it as part of the FY 2014 budget hearings. It should be noted that some of the assumptions stipulated in the Committee letter are inconsistent with the premises of NASA’s updated acquisition strategy, which forms the basis of our cost and schedule modeling efforts:

- NASA does not assume flat funding in future years for the CCP and does not assume that future funding is constrained by authorization levels enacted for previous years; as stated above, NASA is convinced that annual funding levels above that projected for FY 2013 will be necessary to complete the CCiCap effort and conduct the FAR-based certification efforts.
- NASA does assume that all baseline CCiCap effort under recently signed SAAs will be completed.
• NASA does not assume that cost-share amounts proposed by the CCiCap partners for the optional milestones will be available if the optional milestones under the SAA are not exercised.
• NASA does assume that activities subsequent to the baseline period will be carried out under FAR-based contracts, unless NASA elects, on a case-by-case basis, to exercise specific optional milestones.
• NASA does not assume a specific estimate for certification phase 2 at this time; this will be developed as the result of further detailed assessment that will rely on a variety of data; while NASA believes that having up to two contractors through Phase 2 would provide significant advantages for insuring a safe and affordable CTS through competition, the ultimate number of awards will be driven by technical maturity, funding availability, and mission needs.
• NASA does assume a crew transportation flight rate to ISS through at least 2020 of approximately 2 missions per year carrying 4 NASA/International Partner astronauts. As NASA has testified before the Committee, NASA is currently looking at the technical feasibility of extending the life of the ISS beyond 2020, possibly to 2028. In addition to certifying ISS systems to operate beyond 2020, a decision to extend the life of the ISS would require multilateral agreement among the ISS partners.

ISS is a critical resource for this Nation. The ISS is allowing U.S. researchers to experiment with the unique properties of space, which enables the United States to continue to be a leader in technology and innovation. ISS also allows the United States to lead and interact with many nations. The ISS is currently hosting research from 66 countries, which see the United States as the leader in space. Obtaining timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for this unique facility is critical.

The Committee's support for this high-priority effort is greatly appreciated. As always, we stand ready to provide additional information.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
October 15, 2012

The Honorable Ralph M. Hall
Chairman
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter of September 19, 2012, signed jointly with Ranking Member Johnson, Subcommittee Chairman Palazzo, and Subcommittee Ranking Member Costello, in which you formalize a request from Committee staff that NASA undertake an analysis of the potential cost and schedule for the Commercial Crew Program under certain stipulated assumptions.

Many of the matters raised in your letter were discussed during the hearing before the Committee on September 14, 2012. As the Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, William Gerstenmaier, testified, NASA has a two-fold strategy to end the United States' sole reliance on foreign crew transportation to the International Space Station (ISS) and utilize a safe, cost-effective U.S. Crew Transportation System (CTS) as soon as we are able to certify those systems to carry NASA astronauts:

- NASA is using Space Act Agreements under the Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCap) phase to support the design and development of commercial crew transportation capabilities; these agreements will be 21 months in duration for the base period, running from August 2012 through May 2014, leading to approximately a critical design review level of maturity for at least two of the agreements.
- NASA will use FAR-based contracts for the certification of commercially developed capabilities and for the procurement of crew transportation services to and from the ISS to meet NASA requirements.

NASA is committed to ensuring that the requirements, standards, and processes for CTS certification for all commercial missions are held to the same or equivalent safety standards as Government human spaceflight missions, and NASA certification will cover all aspects of any CTS. To enable the earliest possible crew transportation, NASA will begin the initial certification efforts immediately and has issued a Request for Proposals for 2-4 FAR-based fixed-price Certification Products Contracts (CPCs)
for the CTS Certification Phase 1 that will begin early NASA-managed certification activities; the period of performance will be approximately 15 months, with awards in February 2013. This will be followed in FY 2014 by award of 1-2 CTS Certification Phase 2 FAR-based contracts to include development, test, evaluation, and certification.

During the period of the six-month FY 2013 Continuing Resolution, NASA expects to fund Commercial Crew activities at an annualized rate of $406 million, equivalent to the FY 2012 enacted level, which will support planned CCI Cap and CPC activities during that period. To support program requirements beyond the six-month period, a full-year funding level of at least the FY 2013 Senate-proposed level of $525 million is required.

It is important to note that the CCP will require increased annual funding in future years—above the level projected for FY 2013—to maintain competition during development and accomplish the current program plan to deliver an effective and timely ISS crew transportation capability. NASA has endeavored to be clear on this point in our discussions with Congress. It is important that appropriate funding be provided to secure timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for the ISS rather than asking NASA to attempt to match a crew transportation capability to a specified funding profile that is not based on a defined project plan. NASA has presented analysis and assumptions behind our project estimates to date, which have been reviewed for reasonableness by an independent contractor. As Mr. Gerstenmaier previously briefed Committee staff and testified at the recent hearing, as part of the CCI Cap process, NASA has collected detailed technical information from proposers for projected cost/schedule required to complete development and achieve a crewed flight demonstration. NASA will use this information as input to cost and schedule models to support an independent cost assessment, develop a more rigorous project plan, and inform updates of NASA’s budget estimates for the certification phase 2 as part of the FY 2014 budget request.

NASA would need to rely on these models to evaluate the cost/schedule scenario stipulated by Committee staff. Therefore, we do not expect to be able to provide a response to this request prior to the submission of the FY 2014 budget request. The Administrator and Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, as part of the release of the FY 2014 budget request, will brief the details of this activity for Committee staff and be prepared to discuss it as part of the FY 2014 budget hearings. It should be noted that some of the assumptions stipulated in the Committee letter are inconsistent with the premises of NASA’s updated acquisition strategy, which forms the basis of our cost and schedule modeling efforts:

- NASA does not assume flat funding in future years for the CCP and does not assume that future funding is constrained by authorization levels enacted for previous years; as stated above, NASA is convinced that annual funding levels above that projected for FY 2013 will be necessary to complete the CCI Cap effort and conduct the FAR-based certification efforts.
- NASA does assume that all baseline CCI Cap effort under recently signed SAAs will be completed.
NASA does not assume that cost-share amounts proposed by the CCiCap partners for the optional milestones will be available if the optional milestones under the SAA are not exercised.

NASA does assume that activities subsequent to the baseline period will be carried out under FAR-based contracts, unless NASA elects, on a case-by-case basis, to exercise specific optional milestones.

NASA does not assume a specific estimate for certification phase 2 at this time; this will be developed as the result of further detailed assessment that will rely on a variety of data; while NASA believes that having up to two contractors through Phase 2 would provide significant advantages for insuring a safe and affordable CTS through competition, the ultimate number of awards will be driven by technical maturity, funding availability, and mission needs.

NASA does assume a crew transportation flight rate to ISS through at least 2020 of approximately 2 missions per year carrying 4 NASA/International Partner astronauts. As NASA has testified before the Committee, NASA is currently looking at the technical feasibility of extending the life of the ISS beyond 2020, possibly to 2028. In addition to certifying ISS systems to operate beyond 2020, a decision to extend the life of the ISS would require multilateral agreement among the ISS partners.

ISS is a critical resource for this Nation. The ISS is allowing U.S. researchers to experiment with the unique properties of space, which enables the United States to continue to be a leader in technology and innovation. ISS also allows the United States to lead and interact with many nations. The ISS is currently hosting research from 66 countries, which see the United States as the leader in space. Obtaining timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for this unique facility is critical.

The Committee's support for this high-priority effort is greatly appreciated. As always, we stand ready to provide additional information.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
Dear Congressman Costello:

Thank you for your letter of September 19, 2012, signed jointly with Chairman Hall, Ranking Member Johnson, and Subcommittee Chairman Palazzo, in which you formalize a request from Committee staff that NASA undertake an analysis of the potential cost and schedule for the Commercial Crew Program under certain stipulated assumptions.

Many of the matters raised in your letter were discussed during the hearing before the Committee on September 14, 2012. As the Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, William Gerstenmaier, testified, NASA has a two-fold strategy to end the United States' sole reliance on foreign crew transportation to the International Space Station (ISS) and utilize a safe, cost-effective U.S. Crew Transportation System (CTS) as soon as we are able to certify those systems to carry NASA astronauts:

- NASA is using Space Act Agreements under the Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCtCap) phase to support the design and development of commercial crew transportation capabilities; these agreements will be 21 months in duration for the base period, running from August 2012 through May 2014, leading to approximately a critical design review level of maturity for at least two of the agreements.

- NASA will use FAR-based contracts for the certification of commercially developed capabilities and for the procurement of crew transportation services to and from the ISS to meet NASA requirements.

NASA is committed to ensuring that the requirements, standards, and processes for CTS certification for all commercial missions are held to the same or equivalent safety standards as Government human spaceflight missions, and NASA certification will cover all aspects of any CTS. To enable the earliest possible crew transportation, NASA will begin the initial certification efforts immediately and has issued a Request
for Proposals for 2-4 FAR-based fixed-price Certification Products Contracts (CPCs) for the CTS Certification Phase 1 that will begin early NASA-managed certification activities; the period of performance will be approximately 15 months, with awards in February 2013. This will be followed in FY 2014 by award of 1-2 CTS Certification Phase 2 FAR-based contracts to include development, test, evaluation, and certification.

During the period of the six-month FY 2013 Continuing Resolution, NASA expects to fund Commercial Crew activities at an annualized rate of $406 million, equivalent to the FY 2012 enacted level, which will support planned CCI Cap and CPC activities during that period. To support program requirements beyond the six-month period, a full-year funding level of at least the FY 2013 Senate-proposed level of $525 million is required.

It is important to note that the CCP will require increased annual funding in future years--above the level projected for FY 2013--to maintain competition during development and accomplish the current program plan to deliver an effective and timely ISS crew transportation capability. NASA has endeavored to be clear on this point in our discussions with Congress. It is important that appropriate funding be provided to secure timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for the ISS rather than asking NASA to attempt to match a crew transportation capability to a specified funding profile that is not based on a defined project plan. NASA has presented analysis and assumptions behind our project estimates to date, which have been reviewed for reasonableness by an independent contractor. As Mr. Gerstenmaier previously briefed Committee staff and testified at the recent hearing, as part of the CCI Cap process, NASA has collected detailed technical information from proposers for projected cost/schedule required to complete development and achieve a crewed flight demonstration. NASA will use this information as input to cost and schedule models to support an independent cost assessment, develop a more rigorous project plan, and inform updates of NASA's budget estimates for the certification phase 2 as part of the FY 2014 budget request.

NASA would need to rely on these models to evaluate the cost/schedule scenario stipulated by Committee staff. Therefore, we do not expect to be able to provide a response to this request prior to the submission of the FY 2014 budget request. The Administrator and Associate Administrator for Human Exploration and Operations, as part of the release of the FY 2014 budget request, will brief the details of this activity for Committee staff and be prepared to discuss it as part of the FY 2014 budget hearings. It should be noted that some of the assumptions stipulated in the Committee letter are inconsistent with the premises of NASA's updated acquisition strategy, which forms the basis of our cost and schedule modeling efforts:

- NASA does not assume flat funding in future years for the CCP and does not assume that future funding is constrained by authorization levels enacted for previous years; as stated above, NASA is convinced that annual funding levels above that projected for FY 2013 will be necessary to complete the CCI Cap effort and conduct the FAR-based certification efforts.

- NASA does assume that all baseline CCI Cap effort under recently signed SAAs will be completed.
- NASA does not assume that cost-share amounts proposed by the CCiCap partners for the optional milestones will be available if the optional milestones under the SAA are not exercised.

- NASA does assume that activities subsequent to the baseline period will be carried out under FAR-based contracts, unless NASA elects, on a case-by-case basis, to exercise specific optional milestones.

- NASA does not assume a specific estimate for certification phase 2 at this time; this will be developed as the result of further detailed assessment that will rely on a variety of data; while NASA believes that having up to two contractors through Phase 2 would provide significant advantages for insuring a safe and affordable CTS through competition, the ultimate number of awards will be driven by technical maturity, funding availability, and mission needs.

- NASA does assume a crew transportation flight rate to ISS through at least 2020 of approximately 2 missions per year carrying 4 NASA/International Partner astronauts. As NASA has testified before the Committee, NASA is currently looking at the technical feasibility of extending the life of the ISS beyond 2020, possibly to 2028. In addition to certifying ISS systems to operate beyond 2023, a decision to extend the life of the ISS would require multilateral agreement among the ISS partners.

ISS is a critical resource for this Nation. The ISS is allowing U.S. researchers to experiment with the unique properties of space, which enables the United States to continue to be a leader in technology and innovation. ISS also allows the United States to lead and interact with many nations. The ISS is currently hosting research from 66 countries, which see the United States as the leader in space. Obtaining timely, safe, redundant crew transportation for this unique facility is critical.

The Committee’s support for this high-priority effort is greatly appreciated. As always, we stand ready to provide additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.,
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Two Independence Square, SW
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

On August 14, 2012, staff from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology were briefed by program officials on follow-up questions the Committee had as a result of the agency’s recent announcement regarding the design, development, test, verification, and certification of commercial crew transportation systems prior to contracting for such transportation services. During the teleconference, Committee staff requested that NASA provide its analysis of the impacts of a flat funding profile for the Commercial Crew Program, including the schedule for awarding a transportation services contract to one or more providers, as well as the most probable date for initiation of operational commercial crew transportation services to the International Space Station (ISS). In addition, the Committee is interested in receiving NASA’s estimates for the most likely annual cost to NASA for commercial crew transportation services to the ISS (including the cost of any government-provided services or infrastructure) following the initiation of operational services to the ISS as well as the anticipated price per seat for those commercial services. Committee staff were told that such an analysis had not been conducted to date and that completion of such an analysis would need to be requested under our signature. This letter formalizes the Committee’s request and provides additional details on Committee expectations.

In conducting its analysis, NASA should make the following assumptions:

- For FY 2013, NASA’s Commercial Crew Program is funded under the likely scenario of six months of funding under a Continuing Resolution totaling $203 million, with total funding for FY 2013 being no more than $325 million. All subsequent years would be funded at no more than $525 million per fiscal year.
• All baseline Integrated Capability (CCI Cap) work established under recently signed Space Act Agreements (SAA) would be completed.
• The cost-shares proposed by each of the selected companies for the baseline and optional milestones needed to achieve a certified, operational capability to provide commercial crew transportation services to the ISS will be used to determine the total amount of industry funding available prior to certification.
• Activities subsequent to the baseline period shall be carried out under FAR-based contract(s).
• Following completion of baseline work, the total cost to NASA of the additional development, testing, verification, validation, and certification work to be completed before operational commercial crew transportation services can be initiated is the summation of the required NASA funding identified by the two selected companies with the lowest and second lowest NASA funding requirements for the optional milestones contained in the Space Act Agreements. If NASA believes the costs for achieving the milestones through certification will be higher, NASA may adjust the estimates accordingly, but the total amount of NASA funding available on an annual basis for all Commercial Crew-related activities shall be limited by the first assumption stated above regarding FY 2013 and outyear funding.
• The commercial crew transportation flight rate to the ISS through 2020 shall be two missions per year carrying four NASA/International Partner astronauts.

We had assumed NASA would have already conducted such an analysis as part of its planning process to assess the executability of its proposed Commercial Crew Program under most likely—rather than best case—funding scenarios. Given that it has not yet been done, we would request that the analysis, as well as a listing of the assumptions used in the analysis, be completed and provided to the Committee within 90 days of the receipt of this letter.

We are concerned that the budgetary assumptions used to date by NASA in planning the conduct of the Commercial Crew Program have been inconsistent both with the NASA Authorization Act of 2010's $300 million per year annual funding profile and with subsequent Appropriations Acts that have to date not proposed or appropriated annual funding levels in excess of $525 million per year. Given that, and given the fiscal constraints that the federal budget is likely to face in the coming years, NASA should not assume that funding in excess of $525 million per year will be available for the Commercial Crew Program for the foreseeable future. Thus, NASA should not protect for a higher funding rate or level of funding under the Continuing Resolution for the Commercial Crew Program than the amount provided in FY 2012. Protecting for higher levels of funding would hamper other important NASA programs by withholding needed funding. The results of the analysis we are requesting will provide critically needed information for both Congress and NASA as we assess the executability and future direction of the Commercial Crew Program, and we thus look forward to receiving the results of your analysis within the next 90 days.
Administrator Charles Bolden
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Sincerely,

Ralph M. Hall
Chairman

Eddie Bernice Johnson
Ranking Democrat

Steven M. Palazzo
Chairman, Subcommittee on Space
and Aeronautics

Jerry Casper
Ranking Democrat, Subcommittee
on Space and Aeronautics
October 26, 2012

The Honorable Darrell Issa
Chairman
Committee on Oversight
and Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your October 12, 2012, letter regarding a request for the Administrator's travel records. I want to assure you that NASA has been in contact with your office regarding this request and we are working diligently to respond.

We will continue to work with your staff on this matter as we complete the response.

Sincerely,

L. Seth Statler
Associate Administrator
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

cc:
The Honorable Elijah Cummings
October 12, 2012

The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
300 E Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear General Bolden:

On August 21, 2012, I wrote to you requesting information about your travel as head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The letter is enclosed for your ready reference. Since that time, Committee staff has contacted NASA’s Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, attempting to determine when the agency plans to produce the requested documents. To date, NASA has been unresponsive.

Please produce the requested documents to the Committee without further delay. Absent a complete production, I will have no other alternative but to use compulsory process to obtain this information. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact Ashok Pinto or John Zadrozny of the Committee staff at (202) 225-5074. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Darrell Issa
Chairman

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Elijah Cummings, Ranking Minority Member
February 5, 2013

The Honorable Barbara A. Mikulski
Chairwoman
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairwoman:

This is in response to your letter of January 18, 2013, requesting information about the potential impacts of the March 1, 2013, sequestration on NASA. Our response articulates impacts of sequestration relative to the President’s FY 2013 budget request for NASA of $17,711.4 million in direct discretionary funding. NASA estimates that a March 1 sequester applied to the annualized levels in the current FY 2013 Continuing Appropriations Resolution (Section 101, P. L. 112-175) would reduce the total NASA funding level to $16,984.7 million in direct discretionary funding, or $726.7 million less than the President’s FY 2013 budget request, and $894.1 million less than the annualized levels in the current FY 2013 Continuing Appropriations Resolution.

Overall, for purposes of this assessment, the Agency assumed that the FY 2013 Continuing Resolution, with all of its terms and conditions, would be extended from March 27 to September 30, 2013, and that the sequester would cancel 5.0 percent of the full-year amount, which would be the equivalent of roughly a 9 percent reduction over the remaining seven months of the fiscal year. NASA’s assessment of the impacts of a March 1 sequester is presented in the enclosure.

I would be pleased to discuss this information with you in greater detail if you wish.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator

Enclosure
Impacts of March 1, 2013, Sequester on FY 2013 President’s Budget Request for NASA

Science (President budget request: $4,911.2 million; -$51.1 million sequester impact to FY 2013 budget request)

Sequestration would reduce Science by $51.1 million below the FY 2013 budget request, which would cause NASA to have to take such steps as:

- Reducing funding for new Explorer and Earth Venture Class mission selections by 10 to 15 percent, resulting in lower funding levels for new activities and causing minor launch delays, and
- Reducing funding available for competed research (e.g., “research and analysis”) projects by about 2 percent, resulting in about a 5 percent reduction in new awards to support labor/jobs at universities, businesses, and other research entities distributed around the nation this year. Ongoing projects started with awards made prior to this fiscal year would not be affected.

Aeronautics (President budget request: $511.5 million; -$7.3 million sequester impact to FY 2013 budget request)

Sequestration would reduce Aeronautics by $7.3 million below the FY 2013 budget request. The Aeronautics Mission Directorate would need to take cuts to areas such as funding for facilities maintenance and support; air traffic management concept development; systems analysis conducted with the Joint Planning and Development Office; research into safety for vehicle and systems technologies; and research into civil tilt-rotor technologies. These reductions would decrease or delay NASA’s ability to develop technologies necessary to enable next generation air traffic management and to ensure needed safety levels. The reductions would also negatively impact NASA’s ability to maintain and operate national asset level test facilities to support the related R&D efforts, and would lead to cancellations of ongoing partnerships.

Space Technology (President’s budget request: $699.0 million; -$149.4 million sequester impact to FY 2013 budget request)

Sequestration would reduce Space Technology by $149.4 million below the FY 2013 budget request. At that funding level, the Space Technology Mission Directorate cannot maintain its technology portfolio as several projects underway require increased funding in FY 2013 to proceed. Thus NASA would likely have to cancel one of these projects or be able to offer no new awards for programs that vary in scope from research grants, to public-private
partnerships, to in-space demonstrations during FY 2013. NASA would also consider the following:

- Canceling 6 technology development projects, including work in deep space optical communications, advanced radiation protection, nuclear systems, deployable aeroshell concepts, hypersonic inflatable Earth reentry test, and autonomous systems. In addition, the program would consider delaying an additional 9 projects.

- Canceling several flight demonstration projects in development, including the Deep Space Atomic Clock, Cryogenic Propellant Storage and Transfer and the Materials on International Space Station Experiment-X projects.

- Elimination or de-scoping of annual solicitations for Space Technology Research Grants (STRG), NASA Innovative Advanced Concept (NIAC), and the Small Spacecraft Technology (SST) Program.

- Reduction in the number of Flight Opportunity program flights and payloads that could be flown in FY 2013 and beyond.

- Elimination of Centennial Challenges funding to perform new prizes.

**Exploration (President’s budget request: $3,032.8 million; -$332.2 million sequester impact to the FY 2013 budget request)**

Sequestration would reduce Commercial Space Flight funding by $441.6 million below the FY 2013 budget request. After sequestration, NASA would not be able to fund milestones planned to be allocated in the fourth quarter of FY 2013 for Commercial Crew Integrated Capability (CCiCap) such as the SpaceX Inflight Abort Test Review, the Boeing Orbital Maneuvering and Attitude Control Engine Development Test, and the Sierra Nevada Corporation Integrated System Safety Analysis Review #2. Overall availability of commercial crew transportation services would be significantly delayed, thereby extending our reliance on foreign providers for crew transportation to the International Space Station.

The sequester would also reduce Exploration Research and Development funding by $45.5 million below the FY 2013 budget request. For Advanced Exploration Systems, the sequester would delay procurement of critical capabilities required for the next phase of Human Space Exploration. In the Human Research Program (HRP), national research solicitations/selections would be canceled, with the largest impact likely being at the Johnson Space Center. Additionally, reduced resources for the HRP would likely result in reduced funding to the National Space Biomedical Research Institute and delay NASA Space Radiation Laboratory upgrades.
Construction and Environmental Compliance and Restoration (CECR) (President's budget request: $619.2 million; -$251.7 million sequester impact from FY 2013 budget request)

For the Construction of Facilities (CoF) program, the $227.8 million sequester impact would adversely impact the infrastructure needed for NASA’s Space Launch System (SLS), Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle, Launch Services, Rocket Propulsion Test, 21st Century Launch Complex, Commercial Crew and Cargo, and Space Communications and Navigation (SCaN) programs.

- Sequestration would leave NASA with almost no funds for Programmatic CoF.
- Sequestration would cancel many institutional construction projects that would repair, refurbish, or replace critical infrastructure that supports NASA’s mission. These projects are required to repair NASA’s rapidly deteriorating infrastructure in order to protect NASA employees and meet Mission requirements. For Institutional CoF, projects are likely to be cancelled at the following locations:
  - Glenn Research Center
  - Goddard Space Flight Center/Wallops Flight Facility
  - Jet Propulsion Laboratory
  - Johnson Space Center
  - Kennedy Space Center
  - Langley Research Center
  - Marshall Space Flight Center

For the Environmental Compliance and Restoration program, the $23.9 million sequester impact would result in numerous delays to projects requiring re-negotiation of agreed upon compliance dates, with the potential for the imposition of fines for non-compliance. The most pronounced impacts would likely occur at the Santa Susana Field Lab, Kennedy Space Center, and White Sands Test Facility.

Office of the Inspector General (President’s budget request: $37.0 million; -$0.4 million sequester impact from FY 2013 budget request)

Sequestration would reduce the Office of Inspector General by $0.4 million, which would reduce future hiring and mean that some critical positions are not back-filled. These impacts would likely result in fewer audits and investigations.

1 The Agency is currently operating under a Continuing Resolution operating plan under which $53 million was transferred from the Exploration account to the Space Operations account ($3 million) and the Construction and Environmental Compliance and Restoration account ($50 million). The effect of $53 million in transfers from Exploration to other accounts under the Agency’s CR operating plan is not included in this description.
2 The effect of a $30 million transfer from Exploration to CECR Exploration CoF is not included in this description.
The recent fiscal cliff agreement only delayed until March 1, 2013, across-the-board spending cuts totaling $85 billion, to be shared equally by defense and domestic activities.

I am deeply troubled that the true impacts of this sequester on the operations of the Federal government, and thus the impact on the American people, have not been disclosed. Both the Congress and the American people have a right to know what this means. The public has the right to understand how the services of the government they rely upon will be impacted.

Taxpayers deserve to know, for example: Will Social Security offices have reduced hours? How will timeliness and accuracy of severe weather warnings be affected? How will cuts to State and local education benefits impact local schools and our children? How will cuts impact national security? The Congress and the American public deserve to know what will happen to essential Federal services if sequester is not stopped.

To provide clear answers to questions like these, I am requesting that the leadership of all Federal agencies provide to the Appropriations Committee specific information about the impact that sequester will have on the agency’s operations, employees, contractors, and to the extent known, the State and local economies where the agencies operate or distribute funding.

The Budget Control Act of 2011 included more than $1 trillion in discretionary spending cuts to be enacted over the next 10 years and threatened sequester only if compromise could not be reached on reforms to revenues and mandatory spending. It is imperative that we have a full explanation of the impacts of further cuts on the American economy, its national security, and the essential functions of government.
The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
January 18, 2013
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Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please respond to this request in writing no later than February 1, 2013.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Mikulski
Chairwoman
February 27, 2013

Mr. David M. Gibbons  
Director  
Surveys and Investigations Staff  
Committee on Appropriations  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Gibbons:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter, received on February 25, 2013, requesting a point of contact for obtaining NASA information on data regarding the reprogramming of appropriated funds.

I will serve as the NASA point of contact for this study. I can be reached at (202) 358-1948 or via e-mail at mary.d.kerwin@nasa.gov.

Sincerely,

Mary D. Kerwin  
Deputy Associate Administrator  
for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs
DATE: 2/12/13

TO: Honorable Bolden
   Administrator
   NASA

FROM: Joyce Stover
   House Appropriations Committee
   Surveys and Investigations Staff
   Washington, D.C. 20515
   PHONE: (202) 225-2881
   FAX: (202) 225-2112

FAX NUMBER: 202-358-2810
TELEPHONE: 202-358-1010

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER SHEET: 2

Thank you for your assistance.

Joyce Stover
The Honorable Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
300 E Street
Washington, D.C. 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

In accordance with the provisions of Section 202(b), Public Law 601, 79th Congress (codified at 2 U.S.C. §722 a (b)), this Staff has been directed by the Committee on Appropriations to make an inquiry into the reprogramming of appropriated funds, other actions subject to notification requirements contained in the reprogramming guidance provided in appropriations acts or accompanying explanatory statements, and internal controls employed by Federal Departments and agencies to insure that all actions subject to notification requirements are properly reported to the Appropriations Committees. This inquiry will cover the period FY 2007 through FY 2012. Under separate cover, this Staff will be sending a detailed request for information to your agency. 

Please designate an appropriate point of contact to arrange for obtaining the data pertinent to this inquiry and notify my office by telephone within five business days of the receipt of this letter. If there are any questions regarding this matter, I can be contacted on (202) 225-3881.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
David M. Gibbons
Director
Surveys and Investigations Staff
House Committee on Appropriations

122
March 7, 2013

The Honorable Frank Wolf
Chairman
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice,
Science and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter of March 4, 2013, regarding the upcoming multilateral meeting of the Strategic Implementation Team of the Committee of Earth Observing Satellites at NASA's Langley Research Center and possible representation at the meeting by Chinese representatives. I would like to assure you in the strongest possible terms that NASA is committed to complying with the restrictions of Section 539 of Division B of the FY 2012 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-55).

Accordingly, NASA has declined all bilateral engagement with China and Chinese-owned companies. The Agency has not permitted, since the enactment of either Section 1340 of the FY 2011 Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act (P.L. 112-10) or Section 539 of Division B of P.L. 112-55, any visit to a NASA-owned or -utilized facility by any official Chinese visitors where such a visit effectuated the bilateral participation, collaboration, or coordination with China or a Chinese-owned company.

NASA has also suspended all agreements with China and published both a Procurement Information Circular (PIC) (PIC 12-01A) and a Grant Information Circular (GIC) (GIC 12-01) to publicly advise all of its contractors and grantees— including hundreds of U.S. universities that might otherwise receive NASA sponsorship for fundamental scientific research—of the restrictions on the use of NASA funds.

As I have testified previously before the Congress, NASA, in very limited cases, interacts with officials of the Government of China in the context of certain multilateral bodies which include both U.S. and Chinese participation, such as the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNCOPUOS), the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS), and the International Space Exploration Coordination Group (ISECG). By its terms, the
statute makes clear that its limitation on NASA's use of appropriated funds in furtherance of "a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China" also applies to hosting official Chinese visitors at NASA facilities for such bilateral activities. The limitation does not apply to meetings at NASA facilities of multilateral bodies, such as set out above, that include Chinese officials.

In consultation with Agency counsel, NASA believes that hosting meetings of these multilateral institutions at NASA facilities, including participation by official Chinese visitors as members of these multilateral institutions, is not inconsistent with Section 539(b) of Division B of P.L. 112-55.

As such, in two specific instances, in the case of the International Space University (ISU) at Kennedy Space Center, June 2012, and the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems (CCSDS) and Interagency Operations Advisory Group (IOAG) at KSC, December 10-13, 2012, NASA hosted official Chinese visitors participating exclusively in multilateral meetings under the auspices of these multilateral organizations. While NASA will host the upcoming CEOS Strategic Implementation Team (SIT) meeting at the Langley Research Center, the one representative who registered in accordance with required NASA procedures no longer plans to attend.

In such cases, all NASA Centers are required to follow specific protocols to ensure that visits by foreign nationals from countries such as China do not pose a threat to the Agency's safety or security, including the security of technology. These include limited access only to information that is in the public domain and no access to classified, sensitive but unclassified, or export-controlled information or hardware. All such visitors must be escorted at all times and are not permitted access to any non-public U.S. Government or NASA technical data.

I would be pleased to discuss with you further our committed efforts to comply with statutory restrictions regarding bilateral participation, collaboration, or coordination with China or Chinese-owned companies.

Sincerely,

Charles F. Bolden, Jr.
Administrator
March 4, 2013

Administrator
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Washington, DC 20546

Dear Administrator Bolden:

It has come to my attention that NASA will be hosting the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CBOS) Strategic Implementation Team meeting at the Langley Research Center from March 12-14, 2013, and that officials from the government of the People’s Republic of China are currently planning to attend.

I am writing to remind you that the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by NASA is prohibited by subsection (b) of section 539 of Division B of Public Law (P.L.) 112-55, except in cases where NASA has provided appropriate certifications to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate no later than 14 days prior to the visit.

Because it is now less than 14 days before the commencement of the CBOS meeting and no such certification has been provided, the hosting of any Chinese visitors would be in clear violation of the law. Accordingly, I expect any participation by official Chinese visitors will be promptly cancelled. Please confirm immediately that the necessary actions have been taken to ensure that the conduct of the CBOS meeting does not violate section 539.

Given this lapse of compliance, I am concerned that there may have been other instances where the law has not been followed. I request an immediate review of all center and headquarters visits since the enactment of P.L. 112-55 to ensure that official Chinese visitors have not inappropriately gained access to any NASA facilities. If any such occurrences are found, they should be reported immediately to the Committee.

NASA’s violation of section 539 would be particularly surprising given the recent press attention to the threat of Chinese espionage and last month’s release of President Obama’s “Administration Strategy on Mitigating the Theft of U.S. Trade Secrets”. That strategy identifies China as the leading espionage threat and notes the particular interest in “unmanned aerial
vehicles, and other aerospace/aeronautics technologies”—the very work in which the Langley Research Center specializes. Given these stated concerns about the threat of Chinese espionage, I would expect NASA to be more sensitive to compliance with the law restricting the hosting of Chinese government officials at NASA centers.

Additionally, a 2011 report on foreign spies by the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive noted that “Chinese actors are the world’s most active and persistent perpetrators of economic espionage,” and singles out the Chinese government as the most “aggressive and capable collectors” of sensitive U.S. technologies. The report also noted that the Chinese “economic espionage programs combine collection of open source information, HUMINT (human intelligence), signals intelligence (SIGINT), and cyber intrusions...”

It is for these very serious reasons that I authored the statute limiting NASA’s collaboration with the Chinese government and remain committed to ensuring strict compliance with the law. I look forward to your prompt reply.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Wolf
Chairman
House Committee on Commerce, 
Justice, Science and Related Agencies