

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

J. William Koegel, Jr.
202.429.6408
wkoegel@steptoe.com

1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel 202.429.3000
Fax 202.429.3902
steptoe.com

February 6, 2007

Bill Keller
Executive Editor
The New York Times
Executive-Editor@nytimes.com

Dear Mr. Keller:

We represent CACI International Inc and CACI P.T., Inc. ("CACI"). We write to demand a correction to the hatchet job performed on CACI in the February 4, 2007 *Times* article In Washington, Contractors Take on Biggest Role Ever. Appearing on page 1, the *Times* article stated:

It did not matter that the company they [GSA] chose, CACI International, had itself recently avoided a suspension from federal contracting; or that the work, delving into investigative files on other contractors, appeared to post a conflict of interest; or that each person supplied by the company would cost taxpayers \$104.00 an hour. Six CACI workers soon joined hundreds of other private-sector workers at the G.S.A., the government's management agency.

These shreds and shards of information and innuendo combine to present a beguiling picture. Contractors are featured as corrupt, incompetent, or both, while government officials are portrayed as feckless and incapable. The biased and unbalanced article is rife with misleading statements, omissions and half truths regarding CACI. That Messrs. Shane and Nixon chose not to feature any part of the written statement that CACI provided to them contributed to the distorted impression of CACI.¹

¹ CACI's statement read:

One of the primary resources that contractors can provide to the government is a short term surge capability with experienced personnel, enabling government organizations to respond rapidly and effectively to new or high priority projects. Once a project is complete, the government no longer has to pay for those resources. CACI's assistance in helping GSA address its backlog of suspension and debarment cases, which lasted only three months, is an excellent example of this surge benefit that contractors provide. During this project, CACI personnel did not perform any inherently governmental functions and did not act in any decision-making roles, in accordance with the statement of work established by GSA.

Bill Keller
February 6, 2007
Page 2

While your readers were informed on page 1 that CACI “had itself recently avoided suspension from federal contracting” only those completely enthralled with this article would learn, on page 26, that CACI was “cleared.” This didn’t prevent the *Times* from characterizing this, wholly without foundation, as matter of indifference to GSA. In the *Times*’ view, GSA should simply have avoided doing business with CACI because the company was once the subject of a GSA investigation. Does the *Times* believe that a company that GSA has cleared should nevertheless be disqualified from government contracting?

CACI was also featured in the context of a page 1 point that “competition, intended to produce savings, appears to have sharply eroded.” What the article fails to mention is that the work performed for GSA was pursuant to a contract that CACI won on an open and competitive basis under the GSA Schedule.

The article then trots out the conflict of interest canard, claiming that CACI employees had to judge the misdeeds of potential competitors. This is simply wrong. CACI employees did not judge anything in performing this contract. CACI’s contract specialists reviewed the files, analyzed and summarized the recommendations of the GSA Office of the Inspector General on open suspension and debarment cases, researched information to update the various cases, and prepared draft responses that were used by GSA officials to determine and decide suspension/debarment matters. Not surprisingly, the article identifies no actual conflicts, no impaired objectivity, and no actions by CACI personnel that were in any way inappropriate. Clearly, the *Times* chose to retreat to the “appearance” indictment in the absence of any actual conflict.


No article of the *Times* ilk would be complete without a suggestion that the contractor was bilking the government. Toward that end, the article would lead the reader to believe that CACI’s rate for contract specialists, \$104.00 an hour, was exorbitant and excessive. Unsurprisingly, the article doesn’t offer a basis for that position. That rate, which was set in a competitive environment, reflects the cost of supplying highly qualified and experienced personnel for an important, quick-turn around project. The CACI contract specialists who worked on this project had a combined 100 years of contracting experience. The project lasted three months. Did Messrs. Shane and Nixon make any attempt to determine what it would have cost the government to hire new employees and then lay them off at the end of three months?

For more than four decades – since 1962, and through nine presidential administrations – CACI has been proud to be one of the leading information technology support contractors that has helped the United States meet national priorities. A public company since 1968, CACI is listed on the NYSE. The Company is proud of the vital work it provides to its important customers and to the defense and intelligence communities, and the valuable service CACI provides to defend our homeland and safeguard America’s future.

Bill Keller
February 6, 2007
Page 3

We expect articles regarding CACI to be complete and accurate. The *Times* article fell far short of those standards, so we call upon the *Times* to publish a complete retraction and correction of the misleading information in the passage regarding CACI. For future reference, you may consult the Company's website, www.caci.com, which contains considerable information regarding CACI's work. Toward that end, CACI will post this letter on its website.

Sincerely,



J. William Koegel, Jr.

JWK/lpc