Approved For Release 2006/06/26: CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170071-4

ET

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUB COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS CO. LETTEE IN SUPPORT OF THE CIA REQUEST FOR APPLICATION OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT THE CIA HAZZUARTERS INSTALLATION.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee --

We deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today in support of our request for appropriations in the amount of \$54, 500, 000 to provide for the construction of a headquarters installation for the Central Intelligence Agency.

The authorization for this construction is contained in Title IV of H. R. 6829, the Military Construction Act of 1955, which is presently before the President for signature.

SECRET

July 15, 1955
MORI/CDF

STATE OF

Title IV of the Military Construction Act authorizes the Director of Central Intelligence to spend not to exceed \$46, 000, 000 for construction of the installation and \$8, 500, 000 for transfer to the National Capital Planning Commission and the Department of Interior for acquisition of land for and construction to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus to the site of the Research Station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley in Fairfax County, Virginia. If CIA does not utilize the Langley site, this \$8, 500, 000 will not be available for obligation. Title IV further authorizes not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the acquisition of the site itself.

Chapter III of H. R. 7278, the supplemental appropriations bill now before you, appropriates \$3,000,000 for CIA to prepare detail plans and specifications, rather than the full amount of the authorization.

SERVET

There is no reason to conceal the fact that we need a headquarters installation, or that we have considered several sites for its location. It would seem to be unrealistic and a false concept of security to attempt to conceal either our need or the request for appropriations. A good deal of the testimony which we are furnishing in support of this authorization can certainly be made a matter of your public record.

However, I would appreciate the opportunity of discussing certain facets of our request on an off-the-record basis with this Committee. In particular, I would wish to have testimony concerning the exact number of people employed at the headquarters and certain security aspects of the installation off-the-record. For this reason I have requested that this meeting be in Executive Session following which, Mr. Chairman, If it is agreeable with you, the text can be edited for security deletions prior to publication.

SEMET

4,

See Chart I The Central Intelligence Agency is presently located in 34 separate buildings in the District of Columbia area. These range from the Administration building, where my own office is located, at 24th and E Streets, Northwest, behind the Heurich Company brewery on Rock Creek Parkway, to our Documents

25X1

Division, which is housed in a temporary building

Several of our buildings are clustered around the Administration

25×1

building, others are over by the Reflecting Pool in front of the

Lincoln Memorial, others are in the Potomac Park area.

Twenty of these buildings are of the so-called "Temporary" variety, and the demand for their destruction increases daily from many quarters, including the Congress. For this reason, our authorization language contains a proviso that when CIA occupies its new installation, GSA is directed to demolish temporary building space equivalent to that which we relinquish.

5.

SEGRE

Cmart 2 (Overlay) Furthermore, the approaches to the proposed new Potomac River bridge or tunnel will cut through some of our temporary as well as our permanent buildings, thus eliminating considerable of our present space.

The need for CIA to do something about a headquarters installation has been with us for several years now, but the problem has become increasingly urgent since we first discussed it with the Congress in 1951. During this four-year period we have made a series of attempts to find an adequate building in Washington which could house at least the bulk of our personnel. We have been unsuccessful. The General Services Administration tells us that there is nothing adequate available, and that we must build. Aside from the lack of available facilities, we feel a complete centralized installation tailored to our particular needs would pay for itself over a reasonable period of time not only in Improved security, but in increased efficiency and economy of operations.

SECRET

I would like to dwell for a minute on the question of security. The security aspects of our being scattered in widely separated buildings is appailing when one considers the number of highly classified papers which must be circulated between these buildings in the course of a single day.

This point might be best illustrated by the fact that approximately 100, 000 classified intelligence documents are received in our Collection Division each month. When you add to this total the various classified memoranda, staff studies and similar material originating within CIA, we have a daily average of approximately 5, 000 classified documents moving from one CIA building to at least one other CIA building in the course of an ordinary working day. Many of these documents are necessarily at the top levels of security classification.

SECRET

The loss of any one of these to a hostile party could be damaging to the national security or to the success of some of our covert operations, and possibly could lead to the death of some of our covert personnel and agents.

7.

When I recall what we have been able to accomplish in certain major cities abroad, with the connivance of a courier making his periodic rounds between dispersed buildings, and then stop to think what some foreign agent might be able to do to us between our buildings, my concern and a larm about this situation increases daily.

25X1

8.

SECRETT

A large, centralized, and disciplined organization allows for the full effectiveness of normal security controls on the one hand, and faces the opposition with an almost insuperable task of identifying key personnel on the other.

The risks that our national security is asked to endure in this make-shift assortment of buildings are plainly intolerable risks, which must be eliminated at the earliest opportunity, for even if the cost of a new building were a net loss, rather than a long term saving, it would be cheap compared to the jeopardy in

which we might be placed were our national intelligence system

SEGRET

to be compromised by an enemy nation.

SEGRE

We also feel that, through a smaller number of entrances, careful control of parking spaces, and certain technical surveillance devices that can be installed, we will be able to detect more quickly individuals who might attempt to identify our personnel.

An additional security problem is the fire hazard in keeping personnel and documents, including some of our most valued files, in temporary buildings. These "tempos" are inflammable, and even with the best of sprinkler systems, it is impossible to insure adequate protection against fire.

I can give an example, Mr. Chairman, of what we are faced with if you will recall the very heavy rains which we had here over last week-end. This resulted in the flooding of several areas in a building which we occupy at 26th Street and Rock Creek Parkway, which you will remember as the old roller skating rink.

SEGRET

Approved For Release 2006/06/26: CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170071-4

9.

The storm sewers were inadequate to carry off the rain water.

On that Friday afternoon, a drain backed up covering the floor with two inches of water in one of our vaults which contains several million IBM type cards on which we record and index intelligence documents and information.

All the bottom file drawers had to be removed from some 40 card file cabinets. Friday evening, after some repairs, the drain backed up again, pouring water all over the floor. The water backed up high enough in the drain to cause it to overflow at the level of the vault ceiling, thereby pouring water over all the card files at one end of the vault and so weakening the ceiling that it fell down on top of the cabinets.

Officials of this section were notified at II:30 that night as to what had happened, and the staff of the division was mobilized and worked until 2:00 o'clock Saturday morning mopping up water and removing cards.

SECTION

At 2:00 a.m. we were assured by the Public Building Service that the situation was remedied and the drain cleared. Nevertheless it backed up again on Saturday morning. Approximately 50 percent of the vault area and parts of the Heavy Machine Room and Card Punch Room were under water. Portions of 100 IBM card trays holding 300, 000 punched cards were soaked. It is impossible even yet to estimate how many of these cards are completely unuseable because if they become warped they cannot be run through 1BM machines. Every effort is being made to dry them properly, but if they have to be reproduced, it will be both costly and time consuming. I can offer you no better illustration for the need for a permanent type building.

The security of our telephone system leaves much to be desired when we must connect buildings through a central switchboard.

SEGRET

This cannot be made 100% secure and tap proof under present conditions, but if we were to have modern equipment properly installed in a single building we could provide a reasonably secure telephone system. We estimate also that we could save \$32,800 per year, which is our per annum mileage charge for trunk lines between our buildings and our central switchboard.

I think that we can all agree that from the standpoint of efficiency our operations will be greatly improved by being all together in one building. As you know, a great deal of our business cannot be conducted over the telephone, but must be handled face to face. If I wish to talk to my Director of Security on a matter, he must come to my office from a temporary building at the far end of the Reflecting Pool.

If I want the translation of a document, it must go to

or the translator must come to 24th Street Northwest.

25X1

An economic intelligence analyst who wishes to consult a reference work in our library must go to a building almost a quarter of a mile away. These examples of course we can multiply daily and by the hundreds.

Chart 3

Chart 4

other tangible dollar savings which will accrue if we are in a single building. As you can see from this chart, we estimate that an annual savings of almost \$3,000,000 may be expected from the consolidation of our headquarters activities, which in a little less than 19 years will equal the capital cost of the building.

25X9

In constructing this new building, we are making plans to house While this is in excess of our present on-board strength in Washington, it will allow for desk space for those who return to Washington on temporary duty or who are awaiting reassignment, as well as a slight expansion to handle emergencies.

SECRET

Chart 6

Chart 7

25X1

and gross space.

Administration in the development of our building requirements.

As can be seen on this chart, we are planning on a building to contain a total of gross space. We are aiming for the highest possible ratio of net to gross space, and we propose to utilize a space-per-person ratio which is appreciably below the average in similar Government buildings in the metropolitan area. In any building there is a certain amount of circulation and service space such as corridors, stairways, toilets, and so forth, which makes up the difference between net space

For instance, the net to gross ratio in the Pentagon is slightly less than 6 to 10, whereas we are seeking a figure of 7 to 10. We are asking for nothing but space in which we can operate securely and efficiently under one roof, and we shall neither recommend nor accept devices or fittings that exceed our minimum requirements in this regard.

SEGRET

SFORT

We plan to have a simple and dignified exterior. We are working closely with GSA on space requirements and cost estimates.

I wish at this time, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the location of this proposed installation. We first faced the problem as to how far from the District of Columbia we should locate. We reached the conclusion that in order to do our work properly we must remain close to the President, the members of the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Pentagon, as well as the Congress and other agencies of Government. This we felt meant that we should not be more than twenty minutes from the White House under normal traffic conditions. Following Cabinet discussions of this problem, the Office of Defense Mobilization has granted us a waiver from current dispersal standards. We then undertook the investigation of numerous sites, both federally and privately owned.

Chart 8 (Large Map)

We have decided that the most suitable is a portion of the government-owned land at Langley, Virginia. This is a tract of approximately 300 acres, a hundred of which can be made available to us. At the time that the authorization language for the Military Construction Act was submitted to the Congress there were still certain unresolved factors in connection with the site, particularly with regard to roads, water, sewers, etc.

However, when we appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee, these matters with the exception of the road had been resolved, and the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, their Chamber of Commerce, the McLean Business Association, and the Fairfax County Planning Commission all urged that we come to the Langley site.

The road is, however, a major problem in connection with utilizing Langley.

SECRET.

The present road -- Highway 123, which passes the entrance to the site -- is only a two-lane highway, and a very dangerous one at that. It would not be adequate to handle the morning and evening traffic if we were to locate at Langley. However, Congress has authorized, as you know, construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway which, when completed, will run from Mount Vernon to the Great Falls on the Virginia side of the Potomac.

Despite some recent newspaper publicity quoting opponents of our move to Langley, and some letters which have been received by members of the Congress stating that no highway was authorized on the Virginia side above Memorial Bridge, and that this land was for park purposes only, the fact remains that Public Law 284 of the 71st Congress approved on the 29th of May, 1930, provides that funds shall be appropriated as required—and I quote—

SEGNET

"for the expeditious, economical, and efficient development and completion of the following projects:

(a) For the George Washington Memorial Parkway, to Include the shores of the Potomac, and adjacent lands, from Mount Vernon to a point above the Great Falls on the Virginia side, except within the city of Alexandria, . . . "

The government has planned for a long period of time to complete this parkway from its present terminus approximately 3-1/2 miles below Chain Bridge to its eventual terminus at the Great Falls.

In order for CIA to occupy the Langley site it will be necessary to have a seven mile stretch of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus to the Langley site completed at the same time that our own installation would be ready for occupancy at Langley.

SERVE

The Senate Armed Services Committee at our request wrote a provision into Title IV of the authorization legislation which would allow us to transfer to the National Capital Planning Commission the necessary sums for them to complete the acquisition of the right of way for the Parkway to the Langley site, and to transfer the necessary sums to the Department of the Interior to construct the extension of the parkway from its present terminus to the Langley site, a distance of about seven miles. The total authorization for this purpose is \$8,500,000.

The House Armed Services Committee was also persuaded as to the merits of this possible location, and they accepted the Senate amendment in conference. However, I could not make a final site selection involving Langley until I was assured of the authorization for the George Washington Memorial Parkway extension.

Before Congressional action was completed on the Military
Construction bill, it was necessary for me to appear before the
House Appropriations Committee. I showed them, as I have
shown you gentlemen this morning, the sites which we were
considering. But the House Appropriations Committee felt that
since CIA had not definitely selected a site, they would appropriate
for us only the sum of \$3,000,000 with which we were to prepare
detail plans and specifications for the headquarters installation.
They did not include the \$4,000,000 which we need at the same
time for transfer to start the acquisition of rights of way and
extension of the parkway, if we are to locate at Langley.

Darkway would not be completed at the time we were ready to occupy Langley, and thus might make that site unavailable.

We would then be at a loss in drawing plans and specifications, because we would not know for certain what site we were going to occupy and what engineering adjustments would have to be made.

SECRET

SEMFT

if we were not to go to Langley we would need up to a million dollars to acquire another site -- presumably the Winkler property at Alexandria -- but the h. R. 7278 as reported in the House did not appropriate to us the funds for land acquisition, and, therefore, we do not know whether the Winkler tract would still be available to us next year when additional funds could be granted. We would therefore be in a dilemma in drawing plans for the Winkler tract without assurance that it would be available.

It is my feeling that the House Appropriations Committee withheld these funds because we had not selected a site. At that time we were unable to do so, until we were assured of the authorization.

I now wish to state to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, that the Central Intelligence Agency has reached the decision that it wishes to locate its headquarters installation at the present site of the Research Station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Virginia.

Approved For Release 2006/06/26: CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170071-4

SECTION

We will draw our plans and specifications to meet that site, but, In order for us to do so, we must have assurances as to the funds for the parkway extension, so that the remaining rights of way can be acquired and construction started. This will take, I am informed, the same three-year period of time which will be necessary to construct our headquarters installation. Having made this decision regarding a site, I wish to urge most strongly on this Committee that in addition to the \$3,000,000 which has been included by the House Appropriations Committee In H. R. 7278, that we be given an additional \$4,000,000 for the purposes which I have just described, making a total of \$7,000,000 in appropriations at this time.

At the time that we made our presentation to the House Appropriations Committee we felt that it might be advisable to finance the cost of this construction from unobligated balances for fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

SECRET

Following general government practice, these funds are available for expenditure for a period of two years after the year of obligation, after which the appropriations lapse and the remaining funds are covered into the Treasury.

We had such funds available, and you will note that Chapter III of H. R. 7278 -- the Supplemental Appropriations Bill now before you -- appropriates \$3,000,000 to be derived from unobligated balances of appropriations made available to the Central Intelligence Agency for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954. However, I have since been informed that the senior members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handled this matter are unalterably opposed to the use of our unexpended balances for this purpose, as they feel that it will impair the security of our appropriations. Therefore, I do not think that the House Committee is prepared to appropriate further funds for this construction from unobligated balances.

SERRET

I, therefore, would like to request, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee rewrite Chapter III of H. R. 7278 so as to make a direct appropriation for these purposes rather than to use unexpended balances. If this is done, I believe the House Committee may agree to such additional appropriations as your Committee may make in line with my request.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there are a few property owners in the Langley area who object to our installation being constructed there. I wish to call your attention to this brochure which was presented to us by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce.

On June 1st, 1955, the President of the Fairfax

County Chamber of Commerce wrote us -- and I quote --

"Without, to the best of my knowledge, a single dissent among our more than 450 members, representing the business leadership of Fairfax County, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce welcomes the CIA to Fairfax County!"

On 27 May, Wallace Carper, Chairman of the Board of County Supervisors of Fairfax County, wrote me extending "a cordial welcome to use the Bureau of Public Roads property near Langley." He called to my attention the action of his board assuring provisions for services which come within the jurisdiction of the County of Fairfax.

The McLean Business Association passed a resolution in favor of our occupying the Langley site as did the Great Falls

Grange No. 738 with a membership of 242 members.

The Editor and Publisher of the Providence Journal in McLean wrote me on June 7th that they were pleased to learn that "the many misconceptions regarding the attitude of the residents of the McLean area toward the location of the CIA office building at Langley, have finally been cleared up, and that your organization is again seriously considering the Langley site. " Mr. Smith stated that as editor of the local weekly newspaper they were confident that the majority of the residents of thearea welcomed CIA as a desirable addition to the community.

The Chairman of the Fairfax County Planning Commission, Mr. Keith Price, wrote us on the 1st of June that the members of the Commission had formally voted an invitation of welcome to us.

Thus, gentlemen, the elected representatives of the people of this area in the form of the Board of County Supervisors, as well as the Chamber of Commerce, and the Planning Commission, and many individual residents of the area, have extended their cordial welcome to us if we are to utilize the Langley site. In addition they have on their own initiative found ways and means to overcome many of the obstacles which confronted us in the beginning.

With this support I have reached my determination, and I hope that you gentlemen will appropriate the \$7,000,000 necessary to get this project underway at Langley.

I feel strongly that detail plans and specifications should be prepared for a definite site. If for any reason you cannot grant my request for the Parkway, then I would select the Winkler site. However, I would still need an additional \$1,000,000 to acquire the site, or a total of \$4,000,000.