AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING: THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION'S PLANS FOR FUTURE USE

(110–113)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION AND
INFRASTRUCTURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 10, 2008

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

41–941 PDF WASHINGTON : 2008

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota, *Chairman*

NICK J. RAHALL, II, West Virginia, *Vice Chair*
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
JERRY F. COSTELLO, Illinois
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JERROLD NADLER, New York
CORRINE BROWN, Florida
BOB FILNER, California
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Texas
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
LEONARD L. BOSWELL, Iowa
TIM HOLDEN, Pennsylvania
BRIAN BAIRD, Washington
RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL E. CAPUANO, Massachusetts
TIMOTHY H. BISHOP, New York
MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, Maine
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
RUSS CARNAHAN, Missouri
JOHN T. SALAZAR, Colorado
GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, California
DANIEL LIPINSKI, Illinois
DORIS O. MATSUI, California
NICK LAMPSON, Texas
ZACHARY T. SPACE, Ohio
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
BRUCE L. BRALEY, Iowa
JASON ALTMIRE, Pennsylvania
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
HEATH SHULER, North Carolina
MICHAEL A. ACURI, New York
HARRY E. MITCHELL, Arizona
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania
JOHN J. HALL, New York
STEVE KAGEN, Wisconsin
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
JERRY MCNERNEY, California
LAURA A. RICHARDSON, California
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey

JOHN L. MICA, Florida
DON YOUNG, Alaska
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
HOWARD COBLE, North Carolina
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
WAYNE T. GILCHREST, Maryland
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
JERRY MORAN, Kansas
GARY G. MILLER, California
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
HENRY E. BROWN, JR., South Carolina
TIMOTHY V. JOHNSON, Illinois
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JOHN BOOZMAN, Arkansas
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
JIM GERLACH, Pennsylvania
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
TED POE, Texas
DAVID G. REICHERT, Washington
CONNIE MACK, Florida
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
LYNN A WESTMORELAND, Georgia
CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR., Louisiana
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
THELMA D. DRAKE, Virginia
MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
VERN BUCHANAN, Florida
ROBERT E. LATTA, Ohio

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia, *Chairwoman*

MICHAEL H. MICHAUD, Maine
JASON ALTMIRE, Pennsylvania
MICHAEL A. ARCURI, New York
CHRISTOPHER P. CARNEY, Pennsylvania, *Vice Chair*
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota *(Ex Officio)*

SAM GRAVES, Missouri
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, West Virginia
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
JOHN R. 'RANDY' KUHL, JR., New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida *(Ex Officio)*

CONTENTS

Page

Summary of Subject Matter vi

TESTIMONY

Winstead, Hon. David, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration 5

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Altmire, Hon. Jason, of Pennsylvania 24
Norton, Hon. Eleanor Holmes, of the District of Columbia 25
Oberstar, Hon. James L., of Minnesota 28

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED BY WITNESSES

Winstead, Hon. David 30

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

Winstead, Hon. David, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, responses to questions from the Subcommittee 34

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure

James L. Oberstar
Chairman

David Heymsfeld, Chief of Staff
Ward W. McCarragher, Chief Counsel

Washington, DC 20515

John L. Mica
Ranking Republican Member

James W. Coon II, Republican Chief of Staff

April 8, 2008

SUMMARY OF SUBJECT MATTER

TO: Members of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management

FROM: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management Staff

SUBJECT: Hearing on the Old Post Office Building: General Services Administration's Plans for Future Use

PURPOSE OF THE HEARING

The Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management will hold a hearing on Thursday, April 10, 2008, at 2:00 p.m., in 2167 Rayburn House Office Building to receive testimony regarding plans for the future development of the Old Post Office building.

BACKGROUND

The Old Post Office building in Washington, DC, constructed from 1892 to 1899, was intended to be the U.S. Post Office Department Headquarters building as well as the city's main post office. The Old Post Office building, which is the second-tallest structure in the nation's capital, is designed in Romanesque style. Over its lifetime there have been frequent urban renewal efforts calling for its demolition, most notably during the Depression era. However, dedicated preservationists were successful in blocking its destruction and preserving the building. The Old Post Office building is now one of Washington's most enduring landmarks.

According to the General Services Administration's ("GSA") history of the building, in 1928 the Old Post Office building was slated for demolition as part of the development now known as the Federal Triangle. Lack of funds during the Great Depression saved the building at that time, and over the next 30 years it provided space for various government agencies. In 1964, the

President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue recommended the demolition of all but the clock tower. Led by Nancy Hanks, Chairperson of the National Endowment of the Arts, local citizens protested and Congress reversed the decision of the President's Council. In recognition of her heroic efforts and dedication to historic preservation in general, in 1983 Congress passed P.L. 98-1 to designate the plaza adjacent to the Old Post Office as the Nancy Hanks Plaza and the building was officially renamed the Nancy Hanks Center. The Old Post Office building was finally awarded a place on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973.

To encourage more commercial use of federal space at ground level, Congress enacted the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act in 1976. The Act authorized both government and commercial enterprises to share federally owned space at ground level. In 1977, renovation of the Old Post Office building began as part of the Pennsylvania Avenue redevelopment.

In 1982, the GSA entered into a 55-year out-lease with a private sector developer to lease and operate the Old Post Office building. The renovation of the building made it a multifunctional building that included office space, retail, and a food court. The redevelopment included construction of a 100,000-square-foot underground "Pavilion Annex" adjacent to the building for the purpose of a shopping mall. Development options at the Old Post Office building were also buttressed by the fact that several Metro lines are in close proximity to the building.

The development expected at the Old Post Office building was not successful because of constant turnover of retail businesses and low satisfaction by tenants. The original developer went into bankruptcy and the lender foreclosed on the leasehold.

In 1998, Congress passed the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999 (P.L. 105-277), which required that GSA submit a viable development plan for the Old Post Office before any federal funds be used to convert the space. In December 2000, GSA submitted a development plan to Congress, and by Committee resolution dated May 16, 2001, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure approved the plan. In 2005, the GSA issued a Request for Expressions of Interest ("RFI") for the project. The responses would allow the GSA to gauge and understand the entities who might propose to redevelop the asset, the concepts they may propose, and the anticipated benefit to the government. Although GSA received several responses to the RFI, the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") prevented the development project from moving forward.

Architectural and Historical Significance

The Old Post Office building occupies an entire city block, centered on the north side of the Federal Triangle along Pennsylvania Avenue. The Old Post Office building was designed by renowned architect Willoughby J. Edbrooke who also served as Supervising Architect of the U.S. Treasury Department. At one point, the Old Post Office building was the tallest and largest building in Washington. The building is often considered an excellent example of the Romanesque Revival style, which was greatly admired in the late 19th Century. The building's relative substantial magnitude, arched window designs, and ornamentation represent a Romanesque Revival style. The Old Post Office building also has several other distinguishing features including French Gothic dormers and sculpture, Byzantinian sculptural capitals, and French Renaissance detailing. The dramatic effect of the combination of these international design concepts creates a spectacular effect along Pennsylvania Avenue's predominantly Classical Revival corridor.

The Old Post Office building, one of the first steel-frame buildings in Washington, is sheathed in granite from Maine, and is set upon an iron and steel superstructure that is nine stories tall. The five-feet-thick granite masonry walls are self-supporting, while the steel girders are used to support the interior floor beams. A terra-cotta shell encases each steel and iron structural beam. Along Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., three large semicircular arches frame the main access to the Old Post Office building. The arches are ornamented with Romanesque Revival columns, capitals, and moldings. The northern portion of the building is defined by the recessed portion of the building. At the center of the Old Post Office building is perhaps the building's most defining feature: a clock tower that rises 315 feet in the air and provides some of the best views of Washington, DC. The roof is steeply pitched with a slate covering. In a nod to current greening and energy efficient initiatives, the nine-story building has an enormous skylight that floods the interior court with natural light. When it was built, the Office of the Postmaster General, which was located in the building, was the largest interior space in Washington.

Current Issues with the Old Post Office Building

The Old Post Office building is an aging historical building that is inefficient, underutilized, and a financial drain on the Federal Building Fund. Because of the building's large atrium and relatively little office space for a building of its size, the costs of operating and maintaining the building per square foot of usable space are high.

In 2007, the GSA received $5.4 million in rent payments from federal tenants occupying the building. These tenants include the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of Education. Total expenses for the property were $11.9 million, which resulted in a net loss to the Federal Building Fund of $6.5 million in 2007. To redevelop the property, the current tenants must be relocated, which requires prospectuses to be approved by the Office of Management and Budget, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

PRIOR OVERSIGHT AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

In 1998, Congress enacted the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999 (P.L. 105-277), which required that GSA submit a viable development plan for the Old Post Office before any federal funds be used to convert the space. In December 2000, GSA submitted a development plan to Congress, and by Committee resolution dated May 16, 2001, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved the plan.

On March 17, 2005, Representative Deborah Pryce introduced H.R.1429. The bill directed GSA to transfer, without compensation, to a non-profit, nonpartisan educational institution for the purpose of establishing a women's history museum all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of Federal real property known as the "Pavilion Annex" that is adjacent to the Old Post Office building in Washington, DC. The bill prohibited the use of such property for commercial purposes. The bill was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. No further action was taken on the bill.

On January 16, 2008, Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton introduced H.R. 5001, the "Old Post Office Building Redevelopment Act of 2008". The purpose of the bill is to expedite plans for the development for the Old Post Office building by providing the GSA with the necessary authority and flexibility to enter into agreements to redevelop the Old Post Office building. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration to enter into development agreements with private sector entities to redevelop the Old Post Office building. Prior to executing any development agreement, the GSA must send to Congress a report which includes financial data, such as a cost-benefit analysis, and a description of the material provisions of the agreement. The development agreement will not become effective until the end of a 30-day period of continuous session of Congress.

WITNESS

Mr. David L. Winstead
Commissioner
Public Building Service
General Services Administration

THE OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING: THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION PLANS FOR FUTURE USE

Thursday, April 10, 2008

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, DC.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:05 p.m., in Room 2167, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Eleanor Holmes Norton [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Ms. NORTON. Good afternoon, and welcome to all to today's hearing this afternoon. I am pleased to welcome Public Building Commissioner David Winstead of the General Services Administration. I very much look forward to his testimony.

On January 16th, 2008, I had no option but to introduce a bill, H.R. 5001, the Old Post Office Development Act, to develop the nearly empty, so-called ″Old Post Office″—a unique, historic treasure located at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, owned by the Federal Government's GSA.

For more than 10 years, our Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management has expressed mounting concern about the neglect and underutilization of this valuable Government site and has pressed GSA to develop and use this building to its full potential.

The Old Post Office Building, completed in 1899, is one of the oldest buildings here that has yet to be rehabilitated and preserved. This grand example of Romanesque Revival occupies an entire city block because it was the main post office of the Nation's capital. The building was placed on the historic register in 1973, and it remains one of the city's most unusual, interesting and appealing landmarks. Part of the appeal of the Old Post Office Building also is its central location in the Federal Triangle, its proximity to many Federal historic sites and buildings and its several Metro lines, as well as a host of restaurants and other amenities that surround the location. Its present design as a post office is straight out of the 19th Century and makes the building virtually unusable for any purpose absent appropriate remodeling to maximize return on the building to the Government.

During decades of underutilization, the GSA has attempted to make the space suitable for office space, but the building's huge, cavernous, central area and the narrow shelf that surrounds the

atrium can accommodate only very few small agencies. Efforts to introduce amenities have either failed or have proven entirely unsatisfactory. In what appeared to be desperation to create some benefit from the site, GSA built an annex to the rear of the building that it hoped would become a shopping mall, but this plan also failed.

The waste and risk posed by the Old Post Office Building became even more apparent following a violent altercation and killing of a George Washington University student outside the Old Post Office Building in May 2005. This killing followed an event in which the GSA rented the facility to gain revenue from the building. Only after this embarrassment did the OMB, which has been a principal impediment to the redevelopment of the building, allow GSA to proceed. We were pleased when the GSA issued a 2005 Request for Expression of Interest to which it received a number of indications of interest from the private sector. Yet, for no good or sufficient reason that it has been able or allowed to articulate, GSA has never proceeded to the next step. It is holding all of these indications of interest from the private sector.

Consequently, I have introduced a bill to assure the full use of the Old Post Office for the benefit of our Federal taxpayers and for this city. A delay in making use of this centrally located, historic treasure has made it one of the Government's most wasted assets and a public embarrassment. It is bad enough that the Government gets no revenue from beneficial use of the space. It is worse that the building has drained huge sums from the Federal Building Fund. The building's 2007 rent payments of $5.4 million paled in comparison to the total expenses for the property of $11.9 million, resulting in a loss of $6.1 million in 2007.

To understand the financial burden, the drain on the Federal Government, one has only to multiply this figure—this $11 million-plus figure—over the many decades during which the Government has taken millions upon millions of dollars in losses on the Old Post Office; add this amount to millions of dollars in renovations and additions that eventually proved useless in making the building a viable source of revenue, and we begin to get a clear picture of the need to move this project forward quickly.

The highly regarded GSA renovation of the nearby Tariff Building demonstrates the GSA record of making excellent use of otherwise antiquated and virtually useless Federal structures. The process that preserved the Tariff Building, while returning it to productive use as the Hotel Monaco with revenue for the Government, is the most recent model for the Old Post Office. Only the Federal Government has the resources and capability to properly renovate such an historic property, but the return on the investment is virtually assured. The redevelopment of the Tariff Building shows what can be achieved when the Federal Government works with the private sector to produce a site that brings a return to the Government, provides a safe and necessary facility for the Government or for the city and preserves an historic treasure all at the same time. The historic Old Post Office Building, centrally located in the heart of the Nation's capital on Pennsylvania Avenue, provides an opportunity to replicate the return to the Government we have seen from Hotel Monaco and from other historic structures.

The policy of the Federal Government has long been and always will be to preserve and to make usable historic properties rather than sell them for revenue. Preservation and use are particularly important for this property, where not only the historic status of the Old Post Office but security concerns inherent in its location mean that the property must be maintained by the Federal Government. In today's climate of budget deficits, it is imperative that the Federal Government maximize the use of the assets it has available. The Old Post Office is an underperforming asset and is a drain on revenue while its full use, its central location and its unique, historic value could provide a handsome financial return to the Government.

Barring unforeseen matters in today's testimony, I intend to move this bill to the Full Committee and to the floor at the earliest time available.

The Subcommittee received today's testimony an hour before the hearing. Although informed of the applicable procedures by Subcommittee staff, GSA staff persisted in its adherence to incorrect procedures. GSA is all too familiar with the underlying issues and had ample notice and time to prepare for this hearing. The Subcommittee is always ready to allow for exigencies, but this delay was unnecessary and unacceptable and should not be repeated. The Subcommittee appreciates receiving today's testimony from Commissioner Winstead about the development potential of the Old Post Office.

I am pleased to have remarks from the Ranking Member, Mr. Graves.

Mr. GRAVES. Thank you, Madam Chair, for holding this hearing. I want to very much thank Public Building Commissioner David Winstead for testifying today and for being here. I look forward to hearing your testimony today on the future plans of the Old Post Office.

Despite its central location here in the Nation's capital, the Old Post Office Building is an underutilized Federal asset and is a financial drain on the Federal Building Fund. The costs of operating and maintaining this aging and inefficient historic building are quite high. For example, GSA received $5.4 million in 2007 for rent payments from Federal tenants occupying the building. However, the total expenses for the property were $11.9 million, resulting in a net loss to the Federal Building Fund of $6.5 million.

Our Subcommittee Chairman, Ms. Norton, has introduced a bill to authorize GSA to enter into a public-private partnership to leverage private funding to redevelop this historic landmark. Moving this building from a liability to an asset on the Federal Building Fund's balance sheet should benefit the American taxpayer. As part of the redevelopment of this property, the current tenants must be relocated. These include the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Department of Education. This move will be necessary in order to accomplish the economic turnaround of this property.

Again, I want to thank Public Building Commissioner Winstead for being here today, and I look forward to hearing your testimony and to learning more about this project.

Thanks, Madam Chair.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Graves.

We are pleased to have been joined by the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, Mr. Mica.

Mr. Mica, do you have any remarks you would like to make at this time?

Mr. MICA. Well, first of all, I thank you for recognizing me. Secondly, I came down to compliment Ms. Norton and our Ranking Member for conducting this hearing. I think we have discussed the issue of having public assets' values not realized. In fact, to put it humorously, I am tired of our sitting on our assets and not realizing their full potential.

Your remarks, Madam Chairman and Mr. Graves, are right on target. This is a valuable public asset. Let me say, I am ashamed that with a Republican administration and with a Republican Congress that we allowed this to continue, and I am glad to see that you are taking this forward. I support your legislative efforts. We have talked about other public buildings and other GSA properties that have not fully realized their potential. I will do anything I can to assist you.

I am pleased to see our GSA Public Buildings administrator, Mr. Winstead, here. I hope he understands that we will back GSA. If it takes going to OMB, the administration or whatever it takes, I am committed, and I will use any resources we have to work with the administration to make this successful. You cited great examples—the Monaco building and others—where there has been success. Our public trust deserves no less than fully utilizing the potential of these assets.

I will work with you. We will do anything we can, Ms. Norton. Again, I am not going to be able to stay, but I came down just to say thank you for moving this forward. I want to hear the results of this hearing and what comes forward and what the delays are or anything that is identified by the Public Building Commissioner that we need to work on, and we will do that together.

So thank you again.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the Ranking Member of the Full Committee for taking the time to come here. He has been Chair of this Subcommittee. He knows whereof he speaks. While he speaks about how, when we were in the minority that the majority did not move it, I must say that the majority at that time was every bit as adamant as I am today.

Mr. MICA. We did not get the job done.

Ms. NORTON. The two or three Chairs that have pressed this issue have given GSA every opportunity, but the bipartisan note that you and Mr. Graves have struck should leave no doubt with Mr. Winstead and with the GSA that there is no way to stop our moving. We are not going to continue to pay for a building that can be paying us, fellas. That is the bottom line here. The full support you see here is important.

If I may say so to the Ranking Member of the Full Committee and of the Subcommittee, they know how unusual it is for us to have to put in a bill to move a project forward. We just do not do that. We have never had to do that with GSA. Now, we do not know where the trouble is. If the trouble is at OMB, really, shame

on them because they are the keeper of the dollars. If anyone were under the illusion that this Subcommittee would ever sell a historic property, it was surely an illusion because, when I came here and sitting for 12 years in the minority, the Subcommittee over and over again has made it clear that all over the country historic properties are precious and that these properties will never be sold. Knowing that, hearing that from the minority, hearing that from the majority, the only thing we could think to do was to put in a bill with bipartisan support. We have done that, and you have heard from both sides of the aisle. I am pleased to receive your testimony and to thank the Ranking Member.

Mr. MICA. Will the gentlelady yield for just a second.

Also, this is not just any building or asset that we own. This is in our Nation's capital. It is in a very strategic location, and it is an important asset for us to retain. This is also an economic development project that will create jobs, that will give people opportunity, that will get a return for the taxpayer. It is located, again, in the heart of our Nation's capital, so there is even more urgency to this, not only because of its strategic site but also because of the need to stimulate the economy. This is a project that can do that.

So, again, I compliment you. Whatever it takes, we will work together to get this done. I know Mr. Oberstar will join me in that effort.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you again, Mr. Mica.

Indeed, Mr. Mica indicates the location. Here we have an historic slum—let's call it what it is—within a stone's throw from the White House. People look at the building. It is a curiosity. It is gorgeous. There is no landmark like it in Washington. They pass by it. If they go into it, they are truly bewildered that such an asset could remain in this condition, and it is not going to remain in this condition past this session of Congress.

I had hoped that by simply introducing a bill, unheard of in my term in the Congress, which is 17 years—unheard of—that that would be all it took to move the bill forward, and here we are having a hearing. I hope this proves an embarrassment to the GSA that we are having to tell the world that the GSA has been sitting on an historic property that can bring in money but is spending taxpayers' money, and we do not mean to keep it to ourselves any longer.

Mr. Winstead, we are glad to hear from you at this time.

TESTIMONY OF HON. DAVID WINSTEAD, COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WINSTEAD. Chairwoman Norton, Ranking Member Graves, Ranking Member Mica, I am pleased to be here. I am David Winstead, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service, appearing before the Subcommittee to talk about the future of the historic Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, DC.

I would like to start out by sort of reviewing this asset. I know you all have expressed a great deal of concern about the current state of it and how we are managing it through the National Capital Region and what we intend to do with it. I would mention, though, that, despite your concerns and despite the issues raised

by you all, I think we have made an awful lot of progress overall on the inventory on a lot of historic buildings and in the management of the Federal assets.

As you know, over the last 5 years, we have mounted a very progressive management of our real estate assets through the President's management agenda and through the Federal Real Property Council. In fact, we have focused on restructuring assets to get rid of those that are underutilized, to do private-sector, public-private partnerships under the constraints of the scoring rules and under the authorities we have. We have actually achieved quite a lot. We have improved utilization and have increased vacancies—or occupancies, rather—by 1.5 percent over the last 6 years. We have basically been operating at 1.6 percent per market. We have reduced energy consumption by 8 percent. I did want to mention that we just came out with the new portfolio (State of the Portfolio FY07 report), which is a document that really sets forth what we have been doing with all of the assets in the inventory. I will just call it to your attention because I think, overall, we have made a great deal of progress in that regard.

In terms of the Old Post Office, itself, obviously, the Chairwoman and Ranking Members have commented on it. It is a very old building. It was, obviously, built between 1892 and 1899. It is a nine-story building with a 315-foot clock tower and a glass-enclosed atrium for the public that comes to view Washington, D.C., the Mall and the Federal buildings in the Triangle. OPO has a total of about 315,000 square feet, plus an unoccupied Annex of 64,000 square feet that was, in fact, flooded 2 years ago in the floods that took out the IRS building behind it.

The first three floors are occupied by retail activity. Federal tenants on the upper floors include the Department of Education, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the President's Committee on Arts and Humanities.

I will mention that, despite the conditions that you have highlighted on this building, I have had the pleasure in recent years of attending an historic preservation conference in the facilities of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation where the Nation's historic preservation officers came to the Old Post Office to conduct and to look at the building and to talk about historic preservation, GSA's efforts as well as other Federal agency efforts.

When the Post Office was completed, it was, in fact, the second tallest building in Washington, exceeded only by the Washington Monument. It is 28 feet, essentially, taller than the Statue of Freedom on the Capitol. It was built entirely by steel and iron. Except for a load-bearing tower, the brick backing and granite wall are supported only by their weight. This is really the first major steel structure that is a self-supporting building erected in the Washington, D.C. area. The most remarkable internal feature, as you all well know, is the nine-story light court, topped by an enormous skylight, which has a lot of natural light.

Madam Chairman, I remember being here about a year ago for the sustainability hearing. I remember you pulled back the curtains in this hearing room to let in natural light, and I think the building interior, actually, is very well lit. Also, that atrium does,

in fact, impede on its efficiency, and I will mention about that and about some of the challenges that it has presented to both us and to our tenants.

The Old Post Office Building is the first Federal building erected on the avenue between the Capitol and the White House. In 1914, the city's post office moved to new quarters. In 1928, as a part of the McMillan Commission, the plans for the Federal Triangle were delineated, and OPO was slated for demolition, and there was a lack of funding in the Federal budget due to the Depression. Essentially, there was an effort that went on for 36 years to save the OPO.

In 1964, there were plans to complete the original Federal Triangle design for 12th Street, and a proposal was in place to demolish the OPO, preserving only the clock tower. There was a lot of local support I know you are well aware of through Do Not Tear It Down and through other coalitions—the Endowment of the Arts—that saved the building.

In 1971, there were congressional hearings that did explore the future as well as looking at executive orders to protect Federal structures. In 1973, as you noted, Madam Chairman, it was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. When the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation got formed in 1974, there was a promise it would be saved. Given its history and importance in security conditions—and I underline that—there are enormous security installations and concerns in the tower, itself. It was continued. It has always been viewed that this property is a necessary, important part, an historical part of the Federal inventory and that it is important for the American people. In 1976, Congress passed the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act, permitting space used in Federal buildings to be leased out for cultural, recreational and educational purposes. This Act was passed, in part, to provide additional uses for the OPO.

In 1982, we were awarded a master lease for a portion of the OPO known as the ″Pavilion.″ The building houses Federal offices as you know. Above the Pavilion floor, currently, we have about 200,000 square feet of tenants. I mentioned them earlier. In the Federal office space portion, there is about a 3 percent vacancy. Overall in the building, it is less than a 25 percent vacancy. The initial retail concept for the Pavilion, unfortunately, was not successful. The master lease was amended in 1989 to enable the construction of a new retail facility, the Annex, to be built in the courtyard of approximately 64,000 square feet.

In March of 1992, the annex was constructed, and there were Federal funds totaling $1.7 million and private funds of $5.5 million invested. The development of the OPO and the annex was not, fortunately, financially successful. I am sure part of the reason was the real estate market in 1992 was quite a bit distinguishable from the Washington market today, and it probably played into that. There are several reasons, in addition, for the failure back in the early 1990s. There was poor tenant satisfaction, and there was a constant retail turnover in the space that is mixed use and that has retail and food service. There was poor financial performance in the retail element due to market conditions, as I mentioned earlier. There was no clear destination/identity associated. I know that

has changed quite a bit in terms of what has happened in PADC's efforts in the Federal Triangle.

Now MCP sees vision for the Federal Triangle and for attractions off of the Mall. An investment company acquired the leasehold interest shortly thereafter, $8.5 million in foreclosure. The company hired a property management/leasing consultant to operate the facility in the interim. In 1998, following unsuccessful attempts to restructure the lease, GSA began to look at the entire building as a unified approach, utilizing a competitive process and a prudent approach to reposition the building.

In 2001, GSA acquired the leasehold interest for $7.1 million. As a result, the annex as well as tenant improvements in the lease portion of OPO are now unencumbered by any long-term lease, which financially and from a standpoint of ownership in how we proceed is a very positive event. In June of 2002, GSA began a process of tapping the expertise of the private sector in terms of providing guidance on the possibility of the redevelopment of the OPO. GSA issued an outline, a request for qualifications—an RFQ—to elicit public comment and to established a Web site for this purpose.

In 2005, GSA realized that, due to the rapidly changing real estate market, it needed new market information. We once again went out in the market with an RFI for the redevelopment of the OPO, and we expressed in that RFI that the Government reserved the right at any time to terminate the process if we concluded that the redevelopment of the property was not in the Government's best interest.

I will state and this Committee should be aware of the fact that there were some 20 responses to that RFI issued in 2005. A majority of them came from groups with, quite frankly, significant development expertise, particularly in adaptive-reuse and in mixed-use development. Most respondents visualized a mixed-use type of project involving a luxury hotel, residential units, related units such as restaurants, meeting places, function spaces, and spas, but other concepts included the possibility of incorporating museums. We have had a number of expressions of interest from museums in the use of some space in the OPO. There was also a proposal for a live television studio because of the aesthetics and the architectural setting of the Old Post Office.

After reviewing the responses to the RFI, GSA has been working to evaluate and to determine how best to proceed on this building. It is a very historic building. Obviously, you have mentioned that, Madam Chairman and Ranking Minority Member. It is very close to the White House. It could be in our view as well as in your view and in this Committee's view better utilized, and we need to do that. We need to move forward on that.

The Federal cultural agencies currently housed in the OPO, I would mention that this Committee should be aware, do have a great appreciation for the building value as a symbol of the architectural destiny and historic preservation. As I mentioned, I have attended historic preservation conferences held by the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, and there are great expressions of interest in continued tenancy of NEA. Ultimately, the building's location is too important not to have optimum use, and we have

been evaluating, and we will continue to evaluate. This Committee's interest is taken under full consideration, and we will be very responsive to what I have heard here today.

I will tell you that, nationwide, we continue to have a large draw on our R&A accounts that you all will be hearing in a month or so. We do have a substantial backlog of renovation needs in our old, historic properties. We have some 268 national historic landmarks. The Chairwoman is well aware of our efforts with St. Elizabeth's in modernizing and in revitalizing those buildings for use by DHS, but there are many, many other properties at 268. Our need in that regard is upwards of $7 billion. We anticipate that NCR needs a renovation of $2.6 billion.

We are constantly evaluating options for upgrading existing older buildings—historic site, adaptive reuse. Obviously, the Old Post Office is one of those assets that requires considerable evaluation and considerable reinvestment. At last estimated in 2007, it would cost well over $100 million to modernize the Old Post Office. It is estimated that if we were to invest that in the Old Post Office for the existing Federal office need for our 200,000 square foot of users in that building, for that same amount of money due to the cost of renovation of the Old Post Office and with the space and configuration of the open atrium, we could create with that same level of investment another building with potentially 40 percent more space with the same investment dollars.

So there is indication through our current and recent analysis that, with investments in office space use in this building, there are options that do have greater return, as I said, more space for the same dollar.

Section 111 of the National Historic Preservation Act authorizes Federal agencies to lease space not currently needed for Federal use to non-Federal entities. We have used this authority to lease space in more than 40 buildings nationwide. These leases have ranged from storage rooms at 50 U.N. Plaza in San Francisco to an amazing project that, obviously, has had much more progress than the Old Post Office, and that is in Boston, Massachusetts where we recently outleased the entire McCormack Post Office and courthouse building to the State courts of the State of Massachusetts. Now they have moved back out. We are now renovating that building for office space needs of agencies like the EPA.

So this section 111 is a very viable tool, and we have seen evidence in Boston. Obviously, Hotel Monaco is another example of that that enables us to work in partnership with the private sector to preserve both the historic significance and security concerns that we have, particularly of the OPO.

As I mentioned earlier, the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act provides and permits a portion of the space to be used for these mixed uses of purpose. Section 111 requires that, if we outlease under that, revenues coming back have to go back into historic buildings, of which we have plenty—268 nationwide—that we can reinvest those proceeds in.

So, in conclusion, Madam Chair, I would like to reiterate my concern I have heard here today from you and from both the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee and from the Ranking Member of the Full Committee over the length of time it has taken us to evaluate

this, to look at these options, to test the market, and to come to the conclusion that adaptive reuse is a major opportunity that we should look at.

I will tell you that I have had discussions with Administrator Doan of our agency. As you, Madam Chairman, stated in your comments, it is not her interest that this be sold out of the Federal inventory. So we are looking at a way to both retain it because of its significance in the Federal Triangle and also to get greater return. I am well aware of Bart Bush, who is our NCR Assistant Regional Administrator, is here today with me for any particular questions that might come up as well as Tony Costa, my Deputy Commissioner, who was the head of NCR for 7 or 8 years and who was actually there when a lot of these issues that I have mentioned had come up. So he is also available. I would be happy to welcome him to come up here with me if that is okay with the Committee.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that I am very concerned about what I have heard here today. I also apologize for the tardiness in the submittal of my statement. We will make sure that that will not happen in the future. I look forward to not only your initiative here and to the legislation but also in continuing to work with this Committee in trying to move this project forward.

I will tell you that—and Bart Bush can give you evidence—I have heard directly from the current tenants not on full utilization and not on the highest and best use but that they do love this facility and that they do currently have a lot of activity and competent use of this space.

So I would like to conclude my comments, and I will provide today or at any time following up to this hearing all possible data about this analysis that I have mentioned that we have done. What we are doing currently is reevaluating those and are trying to reach a decision about how to proceed on the highest and best use of the Old Post Office.

Madam Chair, I will stop at this point. I might ask, with your concurrence and with that of counsel's, if Tony Costa could come up here just in case there are some historic questions and if that would be all right.

Ms. NORTON. What was your last comment?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I apologize, Madam Chair. I would like, if I could, to have Tony Costa, who is former ARA.

Ms. NORTON. He is welcome to the table.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. NORTON. He has got a lot to answer for.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Tony, do you want to come on up?

Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. Let me just read from your testimony to begin with.

First, let me ask whether you are aware or whether Mr. Costa is aware of what the Ranking Member and I have said about this being under advisement, this building, in the sense that Congress has been pressing for its renovation and for its beneficial use for upwards of 8 to 10 years.

Is that understood?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am, I fully understand that.

Ms. NORTON. Can we agree that in 2005—3 years ago—that you, indeed, did come forward after the murder in front of the building and put out an RFI? Is that not the case?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Then I would like you to explain these sentences in your testimony.

After reviewing responses to the RFI—this is on page 4—GSA has been working to evaluate and determine what the best course of action would be for this building. This very historic building in close proximity to the White House could be better utilized, but we need to do it right. The Federal cultural agencies currently housed in the OPO appreciate the building's value as a symbol of artistic destination. Ultimately, the building and its location are too important to rush to a decision on what is the best use of the OPO in the future. We are looking at all of the options.

Now, the rush would be between now and 2005, not to mention 10 years ago when Congress, on a bipartisan basis, had been pressing. Could you explain to me, with almost 3 years of an RFI, leaving the private sector that has to invest money in order to respond to the RFI, whether that is fair to them or to us and why? Three years is not enough to have evaluated the option that you, yourself, indicated was the best option, which was to put this matter out for RFI.

Why is 3 years, not to mention the time before, not enough time to evaluate the proposals you have received?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, Madam Chair——

Ms. NORTON. What more needs to be done?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, as you know, we have highlighted that comment. We, obviously, did have through RFI a great deal of response. I have a copy of it if the Committee—I am sure the Committee has it.

Ms. NORTON. Has anybody been looking at those responses?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am, we have been.

Ms. NORTON. Would you explain to the Committee what the complication is. This Committee is aware of the kind of time and of the amount of time it usually takes for you to proceed. It takes too long even in the ordinary course. It normally does not take this long. Why has this taken longer?

Are you looking at options beyond those in the RFI which you, yourself, asked for?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, this actually came a little before I got on board, but I will tell you——

Ms. NORTON. Well, that is why you have Mr. Costa at the table. I want an answer.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I know. Let me state what we have been doing. We have been engaging both Bart Bush and his staff, as well as us. In looking at the input from the market, I will tell you that it is not cheap for developers and partners to put together proposals of this nature, but they have been preserved, and we do have the currency of their ideas. The market has changed in the last 2-1/2 years. I will admit to that. I do think that there is still a high level of interest, and the evaluation that has been going on is looking at the proposals that came back from the market as well as the economic viability of those over the long course of a lease under either

their own authority or under section 111. There has been dialogue both internally at PBS and with the Federal Building Fund portfolio people who are involved in this. There have been discussions at the NCR. There have been discussions with Mr. Costa. There have been discussions with the Administration. There have been discussions with OMB.

Ms. NORTON. How much longer would it take to complete the evaluation and to come forward with your decision?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, I do believe that we need, obviously, to make sure that we get——

Ms. NORTON. How much longer? Please answer the question.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think there are two things, Madam Chair.

Ms. NORTON. I am not asking for the process. I am asking a question that goes to time, and I am asking that question on behalf of the entire Committee and Subcommittee.

Given the fact that we have had 3 years with an RFI hanging out there——

Mr. WINSTEAD. Right.

Ms. NORTON. —its having been placed, apparently, by developers from around the country who have invested real dollars in order to meet your RFI and in as much as the Subcommittee has expressed its impatience with the need to pour money into this building, my question to you is not what will the process entail. That is inside baseball.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Right.

Ms. NORTON. My question to you is: When will you be prepared to, in fact, indicate your decision from the RFIs that have been submitted to you?

Mr. WINSTEAD. We are currently evaluating them within a very short period of time. That does involve also, as you know, a submittal to OMB and Congress of any relocation of existing tenant leases.

Ms. NORTON. All right.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is—that is——

Ms. NORTON. No. If you bring these things up, I am going to question you on these things.

There is now an excess of office space in the District of Columbia. There is also a credit crunch, and people are dying to get this space rented. Just to name two that come to mind out of your portfolio, out of this very Committee, NoMA on M Street. So let me ask you in light of the fact that you have raised it:

Do you think that there would be any difficulty in relocating the small agencies that are now in the Old Post Office Building?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, I do not. I spoke yesterday at the——

Ms. NORTON. Thank you. Let me go to the Ranking Member.

Mr. GRAVES. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have got several questions, Mr. Winstead. If we could, let's just move through them really quickly and get some answers.

I do want to point out that you mentioned in your statement the OMB scoring rules that are a real problem. The fact is we do waste billions of dollars in overtime because OMB and CBO scoring forces GSA to rely on short-term operating leases. I would just like to offer to you that I would like to help with that. It is a huge prob-

lem, and I would like to do anything I can to help you all move through that process.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. GRAVES. Real quickly, a couple of things.

What Federal agencies right now are tenants in the Old Post Office Building?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Congressman, the dominant ones are the National Endowment for the Arts—the NEA—which occupies 85,000 square feet, the National Endowment of Humanities that occupies 84,000 square feet, the Department of Education that occupies 16,000 square feet, the Department of Interior that occupies 20,000 square feet. Part of that interior space is utilized, as I mentioned, by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, which is the advisory group to all Federal agencies on how to manage and to preserve Federal resources. So it is sort of ironic that they are in this wonderful building and that they love it as a result.

Mr. GRAVES. How much do they currently pay to rent?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Congressman, they pay about $24 a square foot in rent, which is obviously way below the market. The market in that area or NoMA, you know, particularly in that area, would be around $31 to $49 a square foot, so it is substantially below market. Obviously, those tenant agencies like that space because of that rent.

Mr. GRAVES. They are obviously going to need to be relocated if the building is redeveloped, I am going to assume. Where would they most likely be relocated—in leased space or in Government-owned space—do you know?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Congressman, as you know, by policy, we always like to look at the Government space in the first order before we go to private market. As the Chairwoman mentioned, there are lots of options in Washington, D.C. The high probability would be that that amount of space would probably be delivered by the private sector.

Mr. GRAVES. Will their rent payments increase after they have relocated? You kind of already answered that.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, I just mentioned that comparable space in some of the newer buildings in downtown as well as at NoMA and at Foggy Bottom are in the $31 to $49 range, and some are above that.

Mr. GRAVES. Would the tenants—and you kind of already answered this, too. Would the tenants want to move?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I know several tenants—Tony, you wanted to comment on this. I know some of the tenants have contacted me. The Advisory Council has. I know NEA has expressed reluctance to move out of the Old Post Office.

Tony, do you have something to add on that?

Mr. COSTA. Good afternoon.

I think the tenants love the location, but everyone is aware that the building does require renovation. The location is great, though.

Mr. GRAVES. Let me ask you this: Does GSA need to seek approval from anyone before moving forward with relocating those current Federal tenants?

Mr. WINSTEAD. The only thing, as I mentioned earlier, Congressman, is obviously the prospectus approval for relocating those

agencies. Obviously, we deal with OMB and with you all in that regard and with the administration's concurrence, but that is what would be needed.

Mr. GRAVES. Has that been done or started?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Actually, some prospectuses were provided, but they are now 3 or 4 years old. They would have to be updated based on those agencies' needs, and we are looking at that. Bart Bush is in charge of that process, and he is looking at that.

Mr. GRAVES. Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Thank you, Congressman.

Ms. NORTON. Just let me say for the record, if there were a scoring problem, that is the first thing OMB would have told you to put in your testimony. The reason there is not a scoring problem, of course, is that we are not talking about the use of Federal money. We are talking about a public-private partnership. We are talking about the same kind of public-private partnership where most of the money gets dumped into a building, yes, with some amount of money from the Government but certainly not $100 million. It gets dumped into the building from a private developer who does so because he has got the right to develop on a prime spot on Pennsylvania Avenue, and he has got the gold standard—a Federal contract. Is that not the case?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. We are not talking about the Federal Government's spending $100 million of Federal money, are we?

Mr. WINSTEAD. If we renovated it as a Federal office building——

Ms. NORTON. But we have never talked about renovating. You did not put out an RFI for the Federal Government to renovate this building, did you? You put out a public-private partnership RFI, did you not?

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is correct. It also offered flexibility in the RFI. We were looking for all sorts of ideas. We actually—although the dominant response looked at both the OPO and the annex as a development project overall, there were several people who came in just looking at one and not the other. So there were a number of different variations of expressions of interest and viability. You know, the rent ranges that were proposed were enormous, but we do have those facts, Madam Chair, as you mentioned, and I am concerned that they are several years out of date and that we need to obviously go back out and follow up on this.

Ms. NORTON. Oh. You are suggesting that you need a new RFI, are you now? Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr. WINSTEAD. No. No. No, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. All right. You testified, did you not, that the current tenants were paying $24 per square foot?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I believe that is correct.

Ms. NORTON. Now, on Pennsylvania Avenue, this is a prime location. Aren't rents about $45?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am. I think they are between $31 and——

Ms. NORTON.You know, I have got my ″cha-ching″ running. Just add this to what the Government is losing because it has got rent here, you know, that is something close to half of what somebody could be getting for prime time. I can think of no location—if you

talked to anybody in the real estate or development business and said to them ″pick a place to have a building in the District of Columbia as the prime spot,″ I doubt that anyone would come up with a better location than this location. Location. Location. Location.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Absolutely. Also, it has a lot of, you know, public transit, which is obviously——

Ms. NORTON. Public transit. 12th Street comes right off of there. It just has everything.

Now, just let me, for the record, make clear because we have just gone through an exercise where we changed how prospectuses will be evaluated. The desire of the tenants are not determinative on how the taxpayers' money—are no longer determinative, I should say, on where the taxpayers' money will be spent for locations in the District of Columbia; is that not the case?

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is correct.

Ms. NORTON. In fact, tenants would all desire to be exactly where they are. They have to be crazy to want to move from where they are. Yes, it is a broken-down building, but they are historic types anyway. They are in the best location in the District of Columbia. So why should they want to move? The question is: Why should the taxpayers have a tenant who pays $24 when they could get $45? I will tell you they could get more for this location on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. WINSTEAD. As you know, we have had some great successes recently in the leasing market and along NoMA and in other areas. So there is an awful lot of interest.

Ms. NORTON. So we do have office space that we, ourselves, on this Committee would like to see used rather than in this location, which is where most Federal agencies want to be. Most of them want to be exactly here. We are trying to say, because of the lower costs on M Street, NoMA and such locations as that, we are not going to hear where you want to be. We are going to hear where, given all of the amenities, the best place for the agency is.

Now, you put some boilerplate language in here, and I certainly hope that it will continue to be. You say at the bottom of page 3 and going on to page 4 that the GSA expressly stated in the RFI that the Government reserves the right at any time to terminate the process if it concluded that redeveloping the building was not in the Government's best financial interest.

That is boilerplate language, is it not?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. Have you determined that, quoting you, redeveloping the building is not in the Government's best interest?

Mr. WINSTEAD. We have not at this point determined that it is not in the Government's best interest.

Ms. NORTON. Is it conceivable that redeveloping the building would not be in the Government's best interest?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think, with the interest from the market, the options that we have looked at are, obviously, current tenancy redevelopment or renovation as an office building. I think the options are—we have to move forward because of the condition of the building.

Ms. NORTON. Do you regard the Monaco Hotel as a precedent for developing an historic project of this kind?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, as you know, I think the Tariff Building was a very unique project and a very positive project in terms of when to move forward, I guess, in 2002, when it reopened its doors. We did use our authority under section 111 to outlease the building over a period of time. We put about $5 million into it. My understanding is, as a result of——

Ms. NORTON. Did you say $5 million?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. Is that all the Government put into that building?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Yes, ma'am. Is that right, Tony?

Mr. COSTA. Yes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I do understand. Although rental payments in the earlier years were about $150,000——

Ms. NORTON. What does that contract get you——

Mr. WINSTEAD. I apologize.

Ms. NORTON. —on the Monaco building?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Last year's revenues were $430,000.

Ms. NORTON. $430,000 annually is what you are getting?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, it is $180,000 base plus $250,000 that we got last year.

Mr. COSTA. It is a complicated revenue agreement, but the amount of revenue has gone up over the last 4 years, and it is up to $440,000, and we expect it to increase depending on the sales in the hotel because the Government does get revenue after sales go up beyond a certain point.

Ms. NORTON. You are close to getting your return back already, aren't you?

Mr. COSTA. Yes.

Ms. NORTON. And this building was started in 2003?

Mr. COSTA. It opened in 2002.

Ms. NORTON. It opened in 2002. In 6 years, you are already close to—you may already have exceeded, but you certainly are close to getting what you put in it that allowed you $5 million. This is a very expensive building. Anyone who has gone into this building has seen that every historic part of the building has been preserved. I hesitate to ask you—perhaps you know—how much it costs to renovate this building. How much does it cost? Because it certainly did not cost you.

Mr. WINSTEAD. No.

Ms. NORTON. So how much did it cost somebody to make this old Tariff Building into a state-of-the-art hotel?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, we did have an estimate for upgrading the building to—at least the figure I had was between $20 million and $25 million. That was basically, I think, the cost back then in 2002.

Ms. NORTON. In 2002 dollars, $25 million it cost somebody to renovate a hotel. You put in $5 million. You have already gotten or are close to getting your return back in 6 years, and then all the rest of it is going to be gravy from there on out. Is there any reason to believe that that model could not be used on the Old Post Office?

Mr. WINSTEAD. As to why this would not be used?

Ms. NORTON. Is there any reason to believe that this model is not applicable?

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is one of the options that was identified by the RFI, and that is one of the options that is on the table.

Ms. NORTON. We do understand we are not talking—so, for the record, we are not talking about a substantial investment of taxpayer dollars in this building in order to renovate this building for some kind of beneficial use. We are talking about the investment of private dollars in this building; is that not the case?

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is one of the options.

Ms. NORTON. What is the other option, sir?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, the other options are clearly a renovation of the entire building for office use, but as you suggested, that would——

Ms. NORTON. By the United States of America?

Mr. WINSTEAD. That would cost $100 million——

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. —of Federal money.

Ms. NORTON. Well, we had a hard enough time, Mr. Winstead, in getting the money for St. Elizabeth's. The Committee has never asked you to find the money. We have never asked the administration to put money in its budget. We have always cited the Tariff Building, which cost the taxpayers very little. I just want the record to be clear. You know, you put in your testimony—the reason I am having to do this, Mr. Winstead, is that you put $100 million in your testimony. Did you think I was going to let that go by? You also put in your testimony that there were other buildings around the United States that needed renovation.

Why aren't you doing the same thing in other buildings around the United States?

We are here because we happen to be able to look at this building every day because it is right in mainstream D.C., but your suggestion that there are other buildings like this only makes us suggest why aren't you doing this nationwide.

Could you provide for this Committee within 30 days a list of historic buildings in every State of the Union, owned by the GSA, and of their current use and of their ages within 30 days, please?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would be happy to. I did highlight some of those other properties, the Boston property being one, that is utilizing section 111, but we will be happy to get that together as well as to indicate what the outlease's terms were as well as the tenants.

Ms. NORTON. Yes. First of all, we have cited the fact that GSA has done this before. Some of these are State leases. We are not trying to offload the cost onto anybody who cannot pay for it. We are in the middle of a downturn that has everybody very fearful. Frankly, if we had done this—and we do not know how many of those people who responded to your RFI are still in a position to do this. I know this much. There were many, many people in 2002 who leaped at the opportunity to submit an RFI, so we are already on the tail end of an economy that is going down. It is making it harder and harder for the Government to do what, in fact, you could have done years ago.

Let me ask you: What can you tell us about the expressions of interest you have received?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, the RFI did come in and we have had substantial——

Ms. NORTON. How many expressions of interest did you have?

Mr. WINSTEAD. We have had over 20 expressions of interest.

Ms. NORTON. Astounding. When you consider what kind of commitment that would mean somebody was willing to make to this building because they understand it is a historic building, that is an astounding number of responses to the RFI.

Mr. WINSTEAD. You are correct. And I think anybody looking at a historic building with the challenges it has in terms of infrastructure and systems, it is much harder to calculate what your costs are going to be and what you might encounter. So you are correct, it is——

Ms. NORTON. Well, you asked for expressions of interest. So I don't accept what you just said at all, because these people have looked at the building. An expression of interest means this is what we think we would like to do, what can be done to the building. This wasn't a government RFP—you know, compete to do this. This means I, ABC, am telling you that I think you should do this with the building and I, ABC, am willing to put up the cash to get almost all of it done. So don't cite for me the usual RFP where we are competing a building. This is an expression of interest where somebody, without of course now saying he is prepared to compete because we have not gotten to that point yet, does say, look, this is what I believe should be done to the building, which means that if you choose me I would be prepared to go forward with doing that. That is a very substantial—nobody just throws in an RFI given what it takes to prepare a credible RFI for the government without calculating exactly what he is saying, what she is saying she would be willing herself to put up, since it is her money she is talking about, not yours, not the taxpayers' money.

Go ahead.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, Madam Chair, I think you are correct. I didn't mean to say—I think the sophistication of the respondents was quite high. Ten of them had done projects and close to a billion dollars. They were very sophisticated developers. So you are correct, they knew what they were looking at, they knew what the potential was, and they knew what they were getting into. So you are correct.

Ms. NORTON. Given the fact that—given what you have just said, do you believe that—well, first of all, let me quote to you from the part of my testimony that was most painful for me to write. Here it is. The part of my testimony that was most painful for me was this part.

The building's 2007 rent payments of $5.4 million paled in comparison with the total expenses for the property of 11.9, resulting in a loss of 6.1 million in 2007. Then I asked that this figure be multiplied by the decades during which the government has taken money from the building fund in order to make up for the losses from rents and to add to that the millions of dollars in renovations and additions that have proved useless.

In light of this loss to the government on a building that could, given the tariff building perhaps within 5 or 6 years bring us some revenue, is there any reason to believe that the next step after the RFI could not be completed within the next 2 months?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, we obviously will focus on getting this—getting——

Ms. NORTON. Technically would that be possible?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think technically the decision is made that technically——

Ms. NORTON. No. If we have to—we are going to carry this forward. So if you need help, you are going to get it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Within that period.

Ms. NORTON. You can either do it before or you can do it after. But this is going to be done. It would be a real mark on the GSA if you had to do it that way. But I intend to carry this, as I said in my opening statement, straight to the first markup at Full Committee. Would you——

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, just one comment. I know you have the figures in front of you. But the fund for operation differential, it has unfortunately in the last 2 years been significantly more. In fiscal year 2003 it was about a $700,000 loss; In 2004, 200,000. It has increased because of the security costs we have seen in the last 2 years. The uniqueness of this structure for office use is being open on weekends and the added burden and cost ofthat——

Ms. NORTON. Why was it open on weekends?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Because of obviously the retail and the other uses that are in the building.

Ms. NORTON. And you were renting this building for other uses? You have been renting this building for other uses?

Mr. WINSTEAD. No, no, no. The retail and food service functions in the building, and I do believe that occasionally we have functions in the building on the weekend as well. So there are——

Ms. NORTON. Do you mean for that little food court down there you have been keeping the building open?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Well, the food court and the other services. There are shops there and there are also space that has been rented for events on the weekend.

Ms. NORTON. $5.4 million worth of rent? I guess you are pretty desperate. I guess you have got to go for every penny because it reduces at least somewhat what you have to invest to make up for the losses. So you really are on a merry-go-round, aren't you? You have got to open the building, pay for security, all of which will bring you a loss but it will perhaps reduce the loss that you bring.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Your point is made, Madam Chairman.

Ms. NORTON. Now, talk about this—I don't know whether to call it a building or this addition or at the end that kind of sits aside from the building. It certainly doesn't go with the historic structure. Why was such a structure put there as a shopping mall? Whatever happened to it? Was it ever open?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I think I covered in my testimony—and let me kind of refer back to it. It was, but the original concept was for essentially a festival food court in that annex building and unfortunately I think back then the traffic that we were getting along Pennsylvania Avenue was not quite at the level obviously of the residential redevelopment of downtown. And the traffic and tourism—we have much more traffic than we did back then. The concept—the lessor at that point tried to switch from the concept of

destination retail, which unfortunately just did not attract enough suitable retail lessees and he went bankrupt and that was an unfortunate event as a result of that.

Ms. NORTON. So it has been closed since when?

Mr. COSTA. It actually never was fully occupied. For less—about a year, 18 months, it was partially occupied and then it just closed down.

Ms. NORTON. Would you submit within 30 days the cost of that—that I can't criticize there. I can see what you were doing, you were trying to get some greater use out of the building. But, again, there is always plenty of traffic on Pennsylvania Avenue. You have got to have somebody that knows how to market those things. And that is, of course, what we are seeking in the public/private partnership. So that has been just there with no tenant. How about renting—has the space been rented other than to the food court and the shops that are there on the first floor?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chair, I do know during my tenure there has not been. That is the last 2-1/2 years. There has not been any rental of that space. I don't know whether before that there had been.

Ms. NORTON. Well, before that it was rented because that is where the killing took place outside after it was rented to someone.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Okay. You are speaking of the atrium, not the annex?

Ms. NORTON. No, not the annex.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Oh, I am sorry.

Ms. NORTON. The annex you say was open for a year and a half?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Right.

Ms. NORTON. But the building itself was rented and we can understand why because again with the losses you were getting I am sure you were trying to get some revenue from the building. Then we had the killing. Has the building been leased to any except those who occupy the building in the weekdays for shops, for selling things I suppose I should say?

Mr. COSTA. There are kiosks and also events still take place. So we are renting out the atrium space even on weekends at times.

Ms. NORTON. So give us examples of who you rent to.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I do know, Madam Chair, they have—as I mention, they have conferences. I have attended one in some of the conference areas on the first floor, which is right above the retail. So there has been an effort to try to get rooms into at least——

Ms. NORTON. The Subcommittee does not take the position you should not be renting the space. If you were renting the space to some kind of rowdy student group, that was different. Would you submit to the Subcommittee within 30 days all of those to whom the space has been rented since the killing in 2005?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would be happy to.

Ms. NORTON. I ask the Ranking Member if he has any further questions. I think that I have only a few more questions.

The largest project that the GSA has handled is about to come out of the Congress. And that, of course, is the Department of Homeland Security. It really is going to test your own mettle to see if you can manage such a project, move it, move it quickly, 5 or 6 agencies on one compound. You don't usually supervise the build-

ing of more than one building and it is going to be a number of buildings over a number of years.

Would you tell me where you are now in the process of preparing for St. Elizabeth's? What work has been done and what remains to be done for preparation for the Department of Homeland Security construction?

Mr. WINSTEAD. Madam Chairman, we continue at both the NCR level and the headquarters to be engaged with DHS and their tenant needs. And St. Elizabeth meetings are being held weekly. In that regard, as you know, we are planning still at about 4-1/2 million square feet of office and related space for about 14,000 employees on the 176-acre campus. The project overall will be about a $3 billion project, $2 billion from GSA and 1.4 billion from DHS. We are still looking at construction completion in 2016.

I will tell you that I personally—Bart Bush has been very involved in this, as well as Tony and other members of my staff. We are making great progress. We are meeting and we will continue to meet at the highest levels of the DHS, as well as the project management level.

We have reached out to the community, thanks to your efforts quite frankly. I attended I think a year and a half ago a community meeting of the NC up there with you. We continue to follow up through our project management team. I have reached out to Harriet Tregoning, who is the Director of Planning for the District of Columbia at my level. I knew her from years ago in Maryland. We have coordinated closely with the city. We continue to make substantial progress. I was not party to a meeting that was held yesterday, but both Bart and Tony were with the top level at DHS. We do have a meeting with Lurita Doan, myself, somebody from the Park Service, as well as higher levels, I think the Deputy Secretary of DHS, in a couple of weeks just to go over everything in terms of the plan moving forward, of which we are very optimistic.

I will tell you a lot of effort has gone into making sure that that national landmark like OPO is well managed. There is a lot of concern in that regard about density and placement of buildings. I personally got involved in that as well as Bart's staff and Tony, as well as the historic preservation people at the head office, and I do think we are making substantial progress. We are understanding DHS's needs. They are committed. We have housing plans and we are proceeding. I will tell you that I am pleased.

My information might not be as current as Bart and Tony in terms of recent meetings, but I am pleased in the efforts I have made with the Dick Moe, who is the head of the National Historic Trust and John Nau, who chairs the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, who have both gotten very involved in this process to ensure that we can achieve the densities on that site that satisfy DHS's housing needs but also are very sensitive to the aesthetics, the campus at DHS and new building that we will be doing, which will be substantial. We are going to reuse a majority of the existing buildings, but there is going to be new buildings for obviously Coast Guard quarters and DHS headquarters.

But I am pleased—I don't know whether Tony has a comment or two about this, but we will keep this Committee informed on any issues that come up going forward.

Ms. NORTON. Well, we have complimented your management of historic properties, but you have never seen anything like this. That is probably dotted with historic properties everywhere. So you are going to be faced with not only building new structures but with conforming the structures there to what DHS needs, is going to test every bit of expertise that you supposedly have.

Now, by law, the Coast Guard will not, cannot move unless the access road is provided and there were to be negotiations to make sure that happened with the National Park Service. I would like to know the exact status of that, please.

Mr. WINSTEAD. All right.

Mr. COSTA. We are making good progress.

Ms. NORTON. Exactly what is the status now please? We are always making good progress. That is what bureaucrats always—you know, we are making progress. What is the exact status? You should have had this out last year. In fact, we should have had it out 3 years ago. So you have had extra time to negotiate the access road. And if that part is done, then we won't be looking back to say whatever happened to the access road when what you should be doing is spending your time on the construction itself. So I have got to ask you the exact status, if there are difficulties, and you need to tell us what the difficulties are, so that we can be helpful if there are difficulties.

Mr. COSTA. We appreciate the support. We have been doing engineering studies to actually design exchanges, access around the campus. The work with the National Park Service is really about going through statutory requirements to assess the impact of development along historic roadways. And so I know it is a bureaucratic answer, but it is the bureaucracy of the process of going through it.

Ms. NORTON. I am not going to burden the hearing with this technical discussion. I will ask you to call my office. And you and a representative from the Park Service should come so that we can understand what that concern would be. The Congress is extremely frustrated that the Department of Homeland Security is taking so long to go up. I don't want to be faced with the notion that it is really an access road problem. And if there are things that we need to do, if you would call my scheduler, we will get all the relevant actors together.

What is the state of the environmental cleanup? The environmental process has been explained by the community to the community. The mayor himself and I, along with Lorita Doan were at a press conference informing the community, the parts of the community that live closest to St. Elizabeth's. So all of that was done more than a year ago. So I want to know, have we begun the environmental cleanup? What is the status of the environmental cleanup?

Mr. COSTA. The issue that was raised about a year ago near the border of the campus, we actually did testing already and there really was no extensive cleanup needed. There is cleanup in the middle of the campus associated with the old heating plant. So there are two separate environmental cleanup issues. Again, the cleanup issue related to the neighborhood, we have completed all testing and there is no cleanup required.

Ms. NORTON. I know that is very good news for me. I am sure others in the city already know it. So what we are really saying is that out of an abundance of caution you did in fact look at the area that was close to homes, found that no environmental cleanup in their yards or in that area was needed at all; is that correct?

Mr. COSTA. Yes, we did.

Ms. NORTON. Now, everyone understands what you said about the heating plant. This was a city within a city. What is the status of the environmental cleanup for inside the property?

Mr. COSTA. Most of that cleanup will occur during construction and excavation. So we wouldn't do it twice. So the plan will be as we excavate for construction—the basic plan is the same that we used for the Southeast Federal Center.

Ms. NORTON. To hear you say that is interesting to me because that certainly isn't the way we did it at the Southeast Federal Center. At the Southeast Federal Center, we had about three tranches, three separate appropriation years. I asked for money to clean it up so that by the time you got to the point that we did the public/private, the Southeast Center for Public/Private Act, cleanup was not an issue.

Mr. COSTA. I should have been clearer, because the Southeast Federal Center really had two components. One was associated with the request for funding where we managed contamination that was frankly running into the Anacostia if we didn't do that cleanup. We also have additional cleanup through the development of the Southeast Federal Center, which actually we are trying to save money by doing it during excavation of the process.

Ms. NORTON. I see. Now, who is to pay for the infrastructure?

Mr. COSTA. For the Southeast Federal Center——

Ms. NORTON. No, no.

Mr. COSTA. Those are part of our requests.

Ms. NORTON. Those are what?

Mr. COSTA. Those are part of our funding requests we have been requesting.

Ms. NORTON. They are part of the funding request for this year?

Mr. COSTA. Yes. There is a component for infrastructure.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much. This Subcommittee works very closely with the GSA. We understand your concerns, but we are disappointed in the way this particular project has been handled. We stand ready to be helpful to the GSA. We believe that you have many experts who know how to do every bit of what needs to be done, and all we ask is candor on your part when there is a problem.

We do understand the role of the OMB in all of this. But there is the Congress of the United States and we do have bipartisan support. So no Federal agency I think can keep us losing money off of this—from this project. We intend to move forward. We understand the position you have been put in.

We very much appreciate your testimony. This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:25 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management

Hearing on "The Old Post Office Building: General Services Administration's Plans for Future Use"
Thursday, April 10, 2008

Statement – Congressman Jason Altmire (PA-04)

Thank you, Chairwoman Norton, for calling today's hearing to discuss the future development of the Old Post Office building.

Constructed in the late 19th Century, the Old Post Office building remains one of the capitol's most historic landmarks. Since its founding, it has overcome a number of plans calling for its destruction, and in 1973 it was forever preserved when it received its place on the National Register of Historic Places.

Current issues associated with the Old Post Office building, however, have resulted in today's hearing. The building has become underutilized and a financial drain on the federal government. In 2007, total expenses for the Old Post Office building totaled $11.9 million. However, the General Services Administration (GSA), who remains responsible for the property, received only $5.4 million in rent payments from tenants occupying the building – resulting in a net loss of $6.5 million.

In 1998, GSA was required by Congress to develop a plan for future development of the Old Post Office building, so that fiscal losses could be avoided. The GSA clearly has not been successful in this task. I look forward to hearing from Commissioner Winstead of the GSA today on his agency's plans for further developing the Old Post Office building and about what actions can be taken to make it an asset.

Madam Chair, thank you again for holding this hearing.

###

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT HEARING ON
"OLD POST OFFICE BUILDING:
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION'S PLANS FOR FUTURE USE"

APRIL 10, 2008

Good afternoon and welcome to today's hearing. I am pleased to welcome Public Building Commissioner David Winstead of the General Services Administration (GSA) and very much look forward to his testimony. On January 16, 2008 I introduced HR 5001, the Old Post Office Development Act, to redevelop the nearly empty "Old Post Office" a unique, historic treasure located at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., owned by the federal government's GSA. For more than ten years, our Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management has expressed mounting concern about the neglect and underutilization of this valuable government site and has pressed the GSA to develop and use this building to its full potential.

The Old Post Office building, completed in 1899, is one of the oldest buildings here that has yet to be rehabilitated and preserved. This grand example of Romanesque revival occupies an entire city block because it was the main post office of the nation's capital. The building was placed on the Historic Register in 1973 and remains one of the city's most unusual, interesting and appealing landmarks. Part of the appeal of the Old Post Office building also is its central location in the Federal Triangle, its proximity to many major federal historic sites and buildings, its several Metro lines and a host of restaurants and other amenities that surround the location.

Its present design as a post office is straight out of the 19th century and makes the building virtually unusable for any purpose absent appropriate remodeling to maximize return on the building to the government. During decades of underutilization, the GSA has attempted to make the space suitable for office space, but its huge, cavernous central area and the narrow shelf that surround the atrium can accommodate only a few very small agencies. Efforts to introduce amenities have either failed or have proven entirely unsatisfactory. In what appeared to be desperation to create some benefit from the site, GSA built an annex to the rear of the building that it hoped would become a shopping mall, but this plan also failed.

The waste and risk posed by the Old Post Office Building became even more apparent following a violent altercation and killing of a George Washington University student outside the Old Post Office Building in May 2005. This killing followed an event in which the GSA rented the facility to gain revenue from the building. Only after this embarrassment did the OMB, which has been a principle impediment to the redevelopment of the building, allow GSA to proceed. We were pleased when the GSA issued a 2005 Request for Expression of Interest, to which it received a number of indications of interest from the private sector. Yet, for no good or sufficient reason that it has been able or allowed to articulate, GSA has never proceeded to the next step. Consequently, I introduced HR 5001 to assure the full use of the Old Post Office for the benefit of the federal taxpayers and this city.

Delay in making use of this centrally located historic treasure has made it one of the government's most wasted assets and a public embarrassment. It is bad enough that the government gets no revenue from beneficial use of the space. It is far worse that the building has drained huge sums from the Federal Building Fund. The building's 2007 rent payments of $5.4 million paled in comparison to the total expenses for the property of $11.9 million, resulting in a loss of $6.1 million in 2007. To understand the financial burden on the federal government, one has to only multiply this figure over the many decades during which the government has taken millions of dollars in losses on the Old Post Office. Add this amount to millions of dollars in renovations and additions that eventually proved useless in making the building a viable source of revenue and we begin to get a clear picture of the need to move this project forward quickly.

The highly regarded GSA renovation of the nearby Tariff Building demonstrates the GSA record of making excellent use of otherwise antiquated and virtually useless federal structures. The process that preserved the Tariff Building while returning it to productive use as the Hotel Monaco with revenue for the federal government is the most recent model for the Old Post Office. Only the federal government has the resources and capability to properly renovate such a historic property, but the return on the investment is virtually assured. The redevelopment of the Tariff Building shows what can be achieved when the federal government works with the private sector to produce a site that brings a return to the government, provides a safe and necessary facility for the city, and preserves a historic treasure. The historic Old Post Office Building, centrally located in the heart of the Nation's Capital on Pennsylvania Avenue, provides an opportunity to replicate the return to the government we have seen from Hotel Monaco and other historic structures.

The policy of the federal government has long been to preserve and make usable historic properties rather than sell them for revenue. Preservation and use are particularly important for this property, where not only its historic status but, security concerns inherent in its location mean that the property must be maintained by the federal government. In today's climate of budget deficits, it is imperative that the federal government maximize the use of the assets it has available. The Old Post Office Building is an underperforming asset and a drain on revenue while its full use, its central location,

and its unique historic value could provide a handsome financial return to the Government. Barring unforeseen matters in today's testimony, I intend to move this bill to the full committee and to the floor at the earliest time available.

The subcommittee received today's testimony an hour before the hearing. Although informed of the applicable procedures by subcommittee staff, GSA staff persisted in its adherence to incorrect procedures. GSA is all too familiar with the underlying issues and had ample notice and time to prepare for the hearing. The subcommittee is always ready to allow for exigencies, but this delay was unnecessary and unacceptable and should not be repeated.

The subcommittee appreciates receiving today's testimony from Commissioner Winstead about the development potential of the Old Post Office Building.

STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE JAMES L. OBERSTAR
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
"The Old Post Office Building:
The General Services Administration's Plans for Future Use"
April 10, 2008

Thank you Chairwoman Norton for holding this hearing on the plans for the future development of the Old Post Office Building, this historic structure, which is not only a landmark, but a jewel of "America's Main street" Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Old Post Office Building, here in our Nation's Capital was built from 1892 to 1899 to be the headquarters of the U.S. Post Office Department. This Romanesque building is the second tallest structure and one of the first steel-frame buildings in the District of Columbia.

Despite the magnificence of this building and its extraordinary location, it has been difficult to develop this building to its fullest potential. This Committee has provided oversight and direction to GSA previously to accomplish this, specifically in 1998 Congress passed a provision the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Appropriations Act, P.L. 105-277 which required GSA to submit a viable development plan to Congress. That plan was submitted in December 2000 and on May 16, 2001 this Committee by resolution approved the plan.

Notwithstanding these, efforts the desired development has not occurred. To remedy this situation Chairwoman Norton introduced H.R. 5001 "Old Post Office Building Redevelopment Act of 2008". This bill would not only help spur the redevelopment of this building but also help ensure that the taxpayers get the fullest return from this "national jewel"

I am eager to hear from our witness this morning and hear in more detail about the plans for this historic structure.

STATEMENT

OF

DAVID WINSTEAD

COMMISSIONER

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

U.S. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 10, 2008

Madam Chair, Members of the Subcommittee, it is an honor for me to be here before you today to discuss the future of the historic Old Post Office, at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW in the Federal Triangle, in Washington, DC. In my testimony today, I will review the history of the Old Post Office, and describe the efforts GSA has been undertaking over the past eight years to modernize and restore the property.

History

The Old Post Office (OPO) was built between 1892 and 1899. It is a nine-story building with a 315' clock tower and a glass-enclosed atrium. OPO has a total of 315,000 square feet of space, plus an unoccupied Annex of 64,000 square feet. The first three floors are occupied by retail activities. Federal tenants on the upper floors include the Department of Education, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, and the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities.

When completed, the OPO was the second tallest building in Washington, exceeded only by the Washington Monument. It is twenty-eight feet taller than the Statue of Freedom on the Capitol. Built entirely with a steel and iron frame, except for the load-bearing tower, the brick backing and granite veneer walls support only their own weight. This building was the first major steel frame building erected in Washington. The most remarkable interior feature is the nine-story light court topped by an enormous skylight. When built, it was the largest uninterrupted enclosed interior space in Washington.

OPO was the first Federal building erected on Pennsylvania Avenue between the Capitol and the White House. It was built to house the Post Office Department headquarters and the city post office. In 1914, the city post office moved to new quarters adjacent to Union Station and then, in 1934, the Post Office Department moved to the New Post Office Building (Ariel Rios Building) across 12th Street.

In 1928, as part of the McMillan Commission Plan for the development of the Federal Triangle area, the OPO was slated for demolition because it did not conform stylistically to the classical Beaux Arts design concept the Commission favored. Lack of funding in the Federal budget, due to the Depression, saved the Old Post Office. Several agencies occupied the building for the next 36 years.

Again, in 1964, there were plans to complete the original Federal Triangle design for 12th Street, and the OPO was to be demolished, preserving only the clock tower. The local preservationists' group "Don't Tear It Down" and the National Endowment for the Arts , fought to save the building. In 1971, Congressional hearings were held to discuss its future and an Executive Order was issued calling for the protection of Federally-owned historic properties. The OPO was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1973. When the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation issued a new plan in

1974, there was promise that it would be saved. Given this history, as well as the important security considerations that must be considered given its placement within the Federal Triangle, GSA has always viewed this property as being a necessary, important and historic part of the federal inventory and the American people.

In 1976, Congress passed the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act, permitting space in Federal buildings to be leased for commercial, cultural, recreational and educational uses. This act was passed in part as an effort to provide additional uses of OPO. In 1982, GSA awarded a master lease for the portion of OPO now known as the Pavilion. The lessor developed the first three floors of the building for restaurant and retail operations. The building housed Federal offices above the Pavilion level.

The initial retail concept for the Pavilion was not successful. The master lease was amended in 1989 to enable construction of a new retail facility (Annex) to be built in the OPO/IRS courtyard, of approximately 64,000 square feet. In March 1992, the Annex was constructed, with Federal funds totaling $1.75 million and private funds for $5.5 million invested. The building opened, but it was never fully leased. The development of the OPO and its Annex was not financially successful, resulting in a default on the mortgaged leasehold in 1993. Some reasons for the failure of the retail include:

- Poor tenant satisfaction and constant retail turnover;
- Poor financial performance on retail element due to market conditions;
- No clear destination identity associated with the downtown retail market;

An investment company acquired the leasehold interest for $8.5 million at foreclosure, with the intent to restructure the leasehold terms and conditions, and ultimately sell the leasehold interest. The company hired a property manager/leasing agent/consultant to operate the facility in the interim.

Redeveloping OPO

In 1998, following unsuccessful attempts to restructure the lease, GSA began to look at an entire building approach, utilizing a competitive process, as the prudent approach to repositioning the building. GSA commenced discussions to buy out the master lease. In 2001, GSA acquired the leasehold interest for $7.1 million. As a result, the Annex as well as the tenant improvements in the leased portion of the OPO are now unencumbered by any long-term lease.

In June 2002, GSA began the process of tapping the expertise of the private sector to provide guidance on the possibility of redevelopment of OPO. GSA issued an outline of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to elicit public comment and established a Web site for this purpose.

In 2005, GSA realized that due to the rapidly changing real estate market in Washington, DC, it needed new market information. To obtain this information, GSA issued a Request for Information (RFI) for the redevelopment of the OPO. However, GSA expressly stated in the RFI that the Government reserved the right at any time to

terminate the process, if it concluded that redeveloping the building was not in the Government's best financial interest.

A total of 20 responses were submitted, a majority of which came from groups with significant development experience, particularly in adaptive use projects. Most respondents visualized a mixed-use type of project, involving a luxury hotel, residential units and related uses such as restaurants, meeting rooms, function space, and spas. Other concepts included the possibility of a museum or a live television studio.

After reviewing responses to the RFI, GSA has been working to evaluate and determine what the best course of action would be for this building. This very historic building in close proximity to the White House could be better utilized, but we need to do it right. The Federal cultural agencies currently housed in the OPO appreciate the building's value as a symbol of artistic destination. Ultimately, the building and its location are too important to rush to a decision on what is the best use of the OPO in the future. We are continuing to look at all options.

Leveraging private sector dollars to restore public sector buildings
Nationwide, GSA estimates that it has a substantial backlog of older buildings in need of modernization. This means that GSA must search for other options to upgrade our more valuable sites that must be retained but require substantial investment for continued use.

The Old Post Office is one of those assets that require considerable investment. As last estimated in 2007, it would cost well over $100 million to modernize the Old Post Office. Section 111 of the National Historic Preservation Act authorizes Federal agencies to lease space not currently needed for Federal use to non-Federal entities. We have used this authority to lease space in more than 40 of our buildings nationwide. These leases range from a storage room at the 50 United Nations Plaza in San Francisco to a lease of the entire John W. McCormack Post Office and Courthouse in Boston to the state courts. This enables GSA to work in partnership with developers to preserve our historically significant buildings and to keep them open to the public. As I mentioned earlier, the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act permits a portion of the space in Federal buildings to be leased for commercial, cultural, recreational and educational uses.

Conclusion
In closing, Madam Chair and Members of this Subcommittee, I would like to reiterate how much GSA appreciates the interest and support you continue to show in the future of OPO. We look forward to continuing to work with you in our effort to ensure this historic building within the Federal Triangle is maintained and properly utilized for the American people. And we will continue our analysis to ensure that we do so in a way that protects the financial interests of the Federal Government.

Follow-up items from House T&I Subcommittee Hearing on the Old Post Office Building – 4/10/08

1. **Provide a list of historic buildings owned by GSA including the building's use and its age. (OCA)**

(Please see email attachment: *Historic Buildings List Update 04.08.xls*)

2. Provide information on what it costs GSA to maintain the Old Post Office Building Annex with no tenants. What are the operational costs for the entire OPO complex for the past 10 years. (NCR/RPAM)

The OPO and the Annex are not tracked separately and they operate as a single facility. For the Annex, GSA only provides minimum heat in the winter for freeze protection and air circulation in the summer to maintain the building. The Annex portion of expenses is estimated at $75,000 per year.

Below are the total funded expenses for the facility going back to fiscal year 1999. As of March 2008, the expenses for the current year are $4.2 million.

	YTD September 1999	YTD September 2000	YTD September 2001	YTD September 2002	YTD September 2003	YTD September 2004	YTD September 2005	YTD September 2006	YTD September 2007
TOTAL FUNDED EXPENSE	$12,234,154.60	$6,301,449.75	$5,086,472.18	$7,725,611.13	$6,973,142.73	$5,804,096.98	$8,161,384.38	$16,396,262.21	$11,899,060.11

FY99 - total funded expenses are high because GSA accrued $7M for the lease-hold interest buy-out and paid it to Wells Fargo in 2001.

FY05 - the directed expenses increased from FY04 primarily due to security costs. Until FY05, the security costs were paid by the federal tenants and the costs also included the security for the outlease portion of the OPO. GSA is now paying for the security for the outlease portion of the building.

FY06 - the $16.3M includes expenses due to the 2006 flood

3. Provide the a list of those entities that have rented out space in the Old Post Office building atrium for events/conferences since the 2005 killing.(NCR)

Special Events in the OPO since the stabbing that occurred outside the building:

Month/Year	Group Name
4/05	GN Resound North America
10/05	Gorman-Rupp Company
12/05	Project Performance
2/06	Louisiana State Society, Inc.
4/06	Society of American Asian Scientist in cancer research
11/06	International Club of DC
12/06	Association of American Medical Colleges
12/06	CACI (originally known as Consolidated Analysis Center, Inc)
12/07	Association of American Medical Colleges
4/08	Franklin & Eleanor Roosevelt Institute

4. Together with the National Park Service, brief the Chair on the roadway at St. Es. (GSA/NPS/OCIA)

Not yet scheduled.

5. Congressman Mica would like a copy of the latest State of the Portfolio Completed. OCIA delivered a copy of the latest State of the Portfolio to Mr. Mica's staff this week.

Buildings Over 50 (As of 2008)

Region	Location Code	Location Name	City	Property Type	ANSI Rentable	Construction Date
1	CT0013	WILLIAM R. COTTER FB	HARTFORD	OFFICE BUILDING	157,931	1933
1	CT0024	NEW HAVEN COURTHOUSE	NEW HAVEN	OFFICE BUILDING	116,756	1919
1	MA0011	CPT JF WILLIAMS CG BLDG.	BOSTON	OFFICE BUILDING	134,400	1918
1	MA0013	J W MCCORMACK PO&CT	BOSTON	OFFICE BUILDING	556,865	1933
1	MA0076	US CUSTOM HOUSE	NEW BEDFORD	OFFICE BUILDING	7,416	1836
1	MA0113	FEDERAL BLDG USCT	WORCESTER	CT/OFFICE	96,724	1932
1	ME0009	US BORDER STATION	CALAIS	OFFICE BUILDING	1,109	1938
1	ME0034	EDWARD T. GIGNOUX COURTHOUSE	PORTLAND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	116,250	1911
1	ME0035	US CUSTOM HOUSE	PORTLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	19,009	1871
1	ME0501	US BORDER STATION	CALAIS	OFFICE BUILDING	9,409	1936
1	ME0503	USBS GARAGE	CALAIS	OFFICE BUILDING	900	1936
1	ME0551	US BORDER STATION	COBURN GORE	OFFICE BUILDING	3,870	1932
1	ME0552	USBS CUSTOMS RES	COBURN GORE	RESIDENCE	1,480	1932
1	ME0553	USBS IMMIGRATION RES	COBURN GORE	RESIDENCE	1,480	1932
1	ME0601	US BORDER STATION	FORT FAIRFIELD	OFFICE BUILDING	4,198	1934
1	ME0701	US BORDER STATION	LIMESTONE	OFFICE BUILDING	3,275	1934
1	ME0751	US BORDER STATION	ORIENT	OFFICE BUILDING	3,702	1937
1	ME0752	USBS GARAGE	ORIENT	WAREHOUSE	414	1937
1	NH0010	FEDERAL BUILDING	LACONIA	OFFICE BUILDING	31,271	1940
1	RI0009	FEDERAL BLDG USCT	PROVIDENCE	CT/OFFICE	123,094	1908
1	RI0010	J O PASTORE FB USPO	PROVIDENCE	CT/OFFICE	110,060	1940
1	VT0002	US BORDER STATION	BEECHER FALLS	OFFICE BUILDING	6,696	1932
1	VT0007	US BORDER STATION	CANAAN	OFFICE BUILDING	3,569	1935
1	VT0008	USBS EAST RICHFORD	RICHFORD	OFFICE BUILDING	6,838	1931
1	VT0014	USBS, RICHFORD	RICHFORD	OFFICE BUILDING	6,343	1934
1	VT0018	FEDERAL BLDG USPO&CU	ST ALBANS	OFFICE BUILDING	61,331	1938
1	VT0551	U S BORDER STATION	ALBURG SPRINGS	OFFICE BUILDING	2,873	1937
1	VT0552	USBS GARAGE	ALBURG SPRINGS	WAREHOUSE	440	1937
1	VT0601	US BORDER STATION	BEEBE PLAIN	OFFICE BUILDING	3,079	1937
1	VT0651	US BORDER STA USPO	DERBY LINE	OFFICE BUILDING	15,836	1932
1	VT0652	USBS USPO GAR & INSP	DERBY LINE	ALL OTHER	2,472	1931
1	VT0653	USBS USPO CATTLE SHD	DERBY LINE	WAREHOUSE	845	1932
1	VT0751	USBS, NORTH TROY	NORTH TROY	OFFICE BUILDING	3,933	1937
1	VT0801	US BORDER STATION	NORTON	OFFICE BUILDING	4,681	1934
1	VT0851	US BORDER STATION	WEST BERKSHIRE	OFFICE BUILDING	5,379	1935
2	NJ0056	FED. BLDG. 20 WASHINGTON PLACE	NEWARK	OFFICE BUILDING	136,950	1920
2	NY0002	JAMES T. FOLEY USPO & CT HOUSE	ALBANY	CT/OFFICE	198,339	1934
2	NY0016	FED BLDG & CTHSE-BINGHAMTON	BINGHAMTON	CT/OFFICE	75,074	1935
2	NY0026	MICHAEL J. DILLON COURTHOUSE	BUFFALO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	160,877	1936
2	NY0059	BORDER STATION--FORT COVINGTOI	FORT COVINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	4,315	1933
2	NY0128	FEDERAL BLDG--201 VARICK ST	NEW YORK-MANHATTA	OFFICE BUILDING	921,306	1929
2	NY0130	THURGOOD MARSHALL USCH	NEW YORK-MANHATTA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	570,416	1936
2	NY0131	ALEX HAMILTON US CUST HOUSE	NEW YORK-MANHATTA	OFFICE BUILDING	382,085	1907
2	NY0196	BORDER STN OVERTON--ROUSES PT	ROUSES POINT	OFFICE BUILDING	6,517	1933
2	NY0197	BORDER STN ST JOHNS HWY-ROUSE	ROUSES POINT	OFFICE BUILDING	14,747	1933
2	NY0216	BORDER STATION--TROUT RIVER	TROUT RIVER	OFFICE BUILDING	6,785	1932
2	NY0218	ALEXANDER PIRNIE FB	UTICA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	87,767	1928
2	NY0234	US GPO & CTHSE-BROOKLYN	NEW YORK-KINGS	COURTHOUSE (CT)	490,941	1892
2	NY0311	HOWARD STREET GARAGE	NEW YORK-MANHATTA	PARKING	4,132	1933
2	NY0576	AGRIC PROCESSING STN-CHAMPLAIN	CHAMPLAIN	ALL OTHER	2,869	1933
2	NY0579	AGRI INSPECTION STN-CHAMPLAIN	CHAMPLAIN	ALL OTHER	2,350	1951
2	NY0586	INSPECTION BUILDING-CHATEAUGAY	CHATEAUGAY	OFFICE BUILDING	4,802	1933

2	NY0626	INSPECTION BUILDING--MOOERS	MOOERS	OFFICE BUILDING	3,638	1932
2	NY0651	ROBERT MCEWEN US CUSTOM HOUS	OGDENSBURG	OFFICE BUILDING	18,833	1809
2	PR0003	JOSE V. TOLEDO FB & U.S. CTHSE	SAN JUAN, SAN JUAN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	93,095	1914
2	PR0521	GSA CENTER--GUAYNABO	GUAYNABO, SAN JUAN	OFFICE BUILDING	85,639	1941
3	MD0003	APPRAISERS STORES	BALTIMORE	OFFICE BUILDING	147,664	1934
3	MD0006	US CUSTOMHOUSE	BALTIMORE	OFFICE BUILDING	135,148	1907
3	MD0033	MAUDE R TOULSON FED BLDG	SALISBURY	CT/OFFICE	28,676	1925
3	MD0665	STD MAGAZINE 921-A	BALTIMORE	WAREHOUSE	11,102	1911
3	NJ0015	U.S. POST OFFICE & COURTHOUSE	CAMDEN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	87,861	1932
3	NJ0088	CLARKSON S FISHER FB-US CH	TRENTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	163,375	1933
3	NJ0501	BLDG 0501 WAREHOUSE	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	198,715	1952
3	NJ0502	BLDG 0502 WAREHOUSE	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	198,715	1952
3	NJ0503	BLDG 503 WAREHOUSE 3	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	198,715	1952
3	NJ0504	BLDG 504 WAREHOUSE 4	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	198,715	1952
3	NJ0506	BLDG 0506 ADMIN BLDG	SOMERVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	1,844	1952
3	NJ0507	BLDG 0507 VAULT BLDG	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	5,422	1952
3	NJ0508	BLDG 0508 GARAGE	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	5,998	1952
3	NJ0509	BLDG 0509 FIRE P HSE	SOMERVILLE	SERVICE	1,674	1952
3	NJ0511	BLDG 0511 SCALE HOUS	SOMERVILLE	WAREHOUSE	351	1952
3	PA0064	FB & COURTHOUSE	ERIE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	50,036	1938
3	PA0143	ROBT N C NIX FB USPO	PHILADELPHIA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	354,607	1937
3	PA0144	US CUSTOMHOUSE	PHILADELPHIA	OFFICE BUILDING	503,771	1934
3	PA0158	UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE	PITTSBURGH	COURTHOUSE (CT)	703,986	1934
3	PA0182	WILLIAM J NEALON FB-US CH	SCRANTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	155,298	1931
3	PA0603	AT POWER HOUSE	PHILADELPHIA	ALL OTHER	-	1928
3	PA0605	FEDERAL BUILDING 05	PHILADELPHIA	SERVICE	-	1942
3	PA0644	ERIE LIBRARY	ERIE	OFFICE BUILDING	28,892	1898
3	PA0776	THE BAKER BUILDING	ERIE	OFFICE BUILDING	4,662	1947
3	VA0020	C BASCOM SLEMP FED BLDG	BIG STONE GAP	COURTHOUSE (CT)	18,961	1913
3	VA0053	OWEN B PICKETT US CUSTOMHOUSE	NORFOLK	OFFICE BUILDING	18,622	1859
3	VA0054	WALTER E HOFFMAN US CH	NORFOLK	COURTHOUSE (CT)	199,980	1934
3	VA0062	LEWIS F POWELL JR US CH ANNEX	RICHMOND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	92,570	1936
3	VA0063	LEWIS F POWELL JR US CH	RICHMOND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	175,961	1858
3	VA0450	PENDLETON HALL	CHARLOTTESVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	13,123	1956
3	VA0686	U. S. COURTHOUSE	HARRISONBURG	OFFICE BUILDING	51,959	1939
3	VA1405	FED EXEC INSTITUTE	CHARLOTTESVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	50,310	1953
3	WV0003	ELIZABETH KEE FEDERAL BUILDING	BLUEFIELD	COURTHOUSE (CT)	37,619	1908
3	WV0010	FOREST SERVICE BUILDING	ELKINS	OFFICE BUILDING	30,604	1937
3	WV0016	SIDNEY L CHRISTIE FB	HUNTINGTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	84,000	1907
3	WV0047	FB & US COURTHOUSE	WHEELING	COURTHOUSE (CT)	64,824	1907
3	WV0054	FEDERAL BUILDING	HUNTINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	125,246	1958
3	WV0507	DEPOT BLDG 14 - PUMP HOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	SERVICE	495	1942
3	WV0511	DEPOT BLDG 20 - WAREHOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	WAREHOUSE	1,797	1945
3	WV0514	DEPOT BLDG 33 - SCALE HOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	ALL OTHER	73	1952
3	WV0515	DEPOT BLDG 34 - GATE HOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	ALL OTHER	140	1952
3	WV0518	DEPOT BLDG 100 - WAREHOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	WAREHOUSE	39,014	1946
3	WV0521	DEPOT BLDG - 103 WAREHOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	WAREHOUSE	28,078	1946
3	WV0522	DEPOT BLDG - 104 WAREHOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	WAREHOUSE	16,035	1942
3	WV0523	DEPOT BLDG 105 - WAREHOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	WAREHOUSE	10,238	1943
3	WV0524	DEPOT BLDG 106 -EQUIPMENT SHED	POINT PLEASANT	STORAGE OTHER TH	2,662	1958
3	WV0525	DEPOT BLDG - OIL HOUSE	POINT PLEASANT	SERVICE	265	1942
4	AL0004	FB-CT	ANNISTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	19,397	1906
4	AL0005	MONTGOMERY BUS STATION	MONTGOMERY	OFFICE BUILDING	8,000	1950
4	AL0011	ROBERT S. VANCE FB-CT	BIRMINGHAM	COURTHOUSE (CT)	157,252	1921
4	AL0019	FB-CT	DOTHAN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	17,874	1911
4	AL0028	FB-CT	GADSDEN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	30,884	1910
4	AL0034	PO-CT	HUNTSVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	37,248	1936
4	AL0039	JOHN A CAMPBELL USCT	MOBILE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	103,526	1932

4	AL0043	F.M.JOHNSON,JR. FBCT	MONTGOMERY	COURTHOUSE (CT)	117,907	1933
4	AL0046	G. W. ANDREWS FB-CT	OPELIKA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	19,258	1918
4	AL0055	FB CT	SELMA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	21,712	1909
4	FL0019	PO-CT-CU	KEY WEST	CT/OFFICE	49,263	1931
4	FL0029	DAVID W. DYER FB & CTHSE	MIAMI	COURTHOUSE (CT)	166,208	1933
4	FL0039	WINSTON E. ARNOW FB-CH	PENSACOLA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	47,868	1939
4	FL0049	U. S. COURTHOUSE	TALLAHASSEE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	40,630	1937
4	GA0005	PO-CT	ATHENS	CT/OFFICE	39,049	1942
4	GA0007	M. L. KING JR. FB	ATLANTA	OFFICE BUILDING	336,592	1934
4	GA0008	ELBERT P. TUTTLE US CRT OF APP	ATLANTA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	173,676	1910
4	GA0009	U.S. COURTHOUSE	AUGUSTA	OFFICE BUILDING	51,108	1916
4	GA0025	PO-CT	COLUMBUS	OFFICE BUILDING	53,473	1934
4	GA0036	J. ROY ROWLAND FED. COURTHOUSE	DUBLIN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	23,054	1937
4	GA0044	FB-CT	GAINESVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	48,113	1910
4	GA0057	WILLIAM AUGUSTUS BOOTLE FB CH	MACON	OFFICE BUILDING	77,312	1896
4	GA0076	U.S. CUSTOMHOUSE	SAVANNAH	OFFICE BUILDING	23,613	1852
4	GA0078	TOMOCHICHI FB-CH	SAVANNAH	OFFICE BUILDING	110,742	1899
4	GA0665	PBS WAREHOUSE	THOMASVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	8,695	1900
4	GA0666	FEMA WAREHOUSE	THOMASVILLE	WAREHOUSE	8,695	1943
4	GA2637	GNANN HOUSE	PLAINS	OFFICE BUILDING	4,418	1925
4	KY0006	WILLIAM H. NATCHER FB-USCT	BOWLING GREEN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	28,036	1913
4	KY0042	PO-CT	LEXINGTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	84,161	1934
4	KY0043	FB-CT	LONDON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	16,380	1910
4	KY0045	GENE SNYDER USCT-CU	LOUISVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	361,991	1932
4	KY0058	FEDERAL BUILDING	OWENSBORO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	31,755	1911
4	KY0059	FB-CT	PADUCAH	COURTHOUSE (CT)	48,028	1938
4	KY0062	PO-CT	PIKEVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	23,689	1932
4	MS0009	DAN M. RUSSELL JR CHTS - ANNEX	GULFPORT	COURTHOUSE (CT)	33,569	1923
4	MS0031	JAMES EASTLAND POCT	JACKSON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	102,305	1934
4	MS0071	MISS RIVER COMM	VICKSBURG	CT/OFFICE	48,650	1894
4	NC0003	FEDERAL BUILDING	ASHEBORO	OFFICE BUILDING	6,291	1900
4	NC0005	FB-CT	ASHEVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	93,883	1930
4	NC0011	U.S. POST OFFICE COURTHOUSE	NEW BERN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	36,720	1935
4	NC0020	FB-CT-PO	ELIZABETH CITY	COURTHOUSE (CT)	23,209	1906
4	NC0028	L.R.PREYER FB-PO-CT	GREENSBORO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	113,859	1933
4	NC0029	US COURTHOUSE	GREENVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	12,766	1915
4	NC0058	FB-PO CENT.STATION	RALEIGH	CT/OFFICE	78,374	1878
4	NC0072	UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE	STATESVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	34,007	1939
4	NC0085	ALTON LENNON FB-CT	WILMINGTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	56,971	1919
4	NC0090	FEDERAL BUILDING	GREENSBORO	CT/OFFICE	89,043	1955
4	SC0002	CHARLES E. SIMON USCT	AIKEN	CT/OFFICE	12,539	1936
4	SC0004	G. ROSS ANDERSON JR. FB-CT	ANDERSON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	28,566	1938
4	SC0011	U.S. CUSTOMHOUSE	CHARLESTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	36,229	1879
4	SC0012	PO-CT	CHARLESTON	OFFICE BUILDING	42,025	1896
4	SC0018	J. BRATTON DAVIS US BKRPCY CH	COLUMBIA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	47,427	1936
4	SC0020	VARO BLDG	COLUMBIA	OFFICE BUILDING	80,249	1952
4	SC0028	C.F.HAYNSWORTH FBCT	GREENVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	64,699	1937
4	SC0041	DONALD STUART RUSSELL FED CH	SPARTANBURG	COURTHOUSE (CT)	49,570	1931
4	TN0006	JOEL W.SOLOMON FBCT	CHATTANOOGA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	119,383	1933
4	TN0010	FB-CT	COLUMBIA	OFFICE BUILDING	32,872	1941
4	TN0011	L. CLURE MORTON US PO/CH	COOKEVILLE	CT/OFFICE	22,391	1916
4	TN0029	ED JONES FB-CT	JACKSON	PARKING	59,500	1932
4	TN0052	E KEFAUVER FED BLDG	NASHVILLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	291,971	1952
5	IL0032	CUSTOMHOUSE	CHICAGO	OFFICE BUILDING	244,914	1932
5	IL0033	FED BLDG US RRB	CHICAGO	OFFICE BUILDING	340,354	1923
5	IL0054	FEDERAL BUILDING	CHICAGO	OFFICE BUILDING	559,222	1912
5	IL0059	FED'L BLDG/US CTHSE	DANVILLE	CT/OFFICE	52,640	1911
5	IL0069	U.S. COURTHOUSE	EAST ST LOUIS	COURTHOUSE (CT)	56,132	1910

5	IL0154	FED BLDG & US CTHSE	PEORIA	CT/OFFICE	108,125	1938
5	IL0173	FINDLEY FED BLDG	SPRINGFIELD	COURTHOUSE (CT)	127,244	1930
5	IN0031	E. ROSS ADAIR FEDERAL BLDG	FORT WAYNE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	100,542	1932
5	IN0048	BIRCH BAYH FED BLDG & US CTHSE	INDIANAPOLIS	COURTHOUSE (CT)	359,292	1905
5	IN0057	CHARLES A HALLECK FB	LAFAYETTE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	45,197	1932
5	IN0096	ROBERT GRANT FED BLDG&US CTHS	SOUTH BEND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	99,745	1933
5	IN0521	BLDG 60 GSH FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	164,046	1941
5	IN0522	BLDG 61 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	163,554	1941
5	IN0523	BLDG 71 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	169,305	1941
5	IN0524	BLDG 75 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	2,936	1941
5	IN0529	FED CTR BLDG 66	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	115,433	1942
5	IN0530	BLDG 63 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	164,151	1941
5	IN0531	BLDG 64 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	163,260	1941
5	IN0532	BLDG 91 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	22,711	1952
5	IN0533	BLDG 48	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	38,281	1953
5	IN0534	BLDG 40 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	15,765	1941
5	IN0535	BLDG 87 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	OFFICE BUILDING	7,462	1943
5	IN0536	BLDG 62 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	14,221	1941
5	IN0537	BLDG 65 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	17,449	1941
5	IN0538	BLDG 55 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	966	1918
5	IN0539	BLDG 56 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	17,908	1918
5	IN0540	WATER TOWER	JEFFERSONVILLE	UTILITY SYSTEMS	19	1918
5	IN0541	BLDG 102 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	150	1918
5	IN0542	BLDG 103 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	129	1918
5	IN0543	BLDG 104 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	95	1918
5	IN0544	BLDG 105 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	148	1918
5	IN0545	BLDG 107 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	ALL OTHER	114	1918
5	IN0548	BLDG 89 GSA FED CTR	JEFFERSONVILLE	WAREHOUSE	21,106	1944
5	IN1703	MAJOR GENERAL EMMETT J. BEAN	INDIANAPOLIS	OFFICE BUILDING	1,579,337	1953
5	MI0005	FEDERAL BLDG	ALPENA	OFFICE BUILDING	12,432	1913
5	MI0029	THEODORE LEVIN US COURTHOUSE	DETROIT	COURTHOUSE (CT)	628,998	1934
5	MI0048	FEDERAL BLDG	FLINT	CT/OFFICE	62,778	1931
5	MI0072	FOB US POST OFF CTHS	KALAMAZOO	CT/OFFICE	64,722	1939
5	MI0073	CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN	LANSING	COURTHOUSE (CT)	108,012	1932
5	MI0097	FEDERAL BLDG & US COURTHOUSE	PORT HURON	CT/OFFICE	43,501	1877
5	MI0501	HART-DOLE-INOUYE BLDG NO 1	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	221,635	1928
5	MI0502	FED CTR BLDG NO 1A	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	104,189	1928
5	MI0503	FED CTR BLDG NO 2	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	214,800	1902
5	MI0504	FED CTR BLDG NO 2A	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	35,358	1902
5	MI0505	BLDG 2B FEDERAL CTS.	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	19,834	1902
5	MI0506	BLDG NO 2-C FED CNTR	BATTLE CREEK	OFFICE BUILDING	36,303	1902
5	MI0507	BLDG 4 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	29,481	1928
5	MI0508	BLDG 4A FEDERAL CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	9,526	1928
5	MI0509	BLDG 5 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	UTILITY SYSTEMS	32,282	1921
5	MI0510	BLDG 6 FEDERAL CTR	BATTLE CREEK	UTILITY SYSTEMS	9,044	1886
5	MI0524	BLDG 28 FEDERAL CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	4,906	1945
5	MI0525	BLDG 30 FED CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	1,955	1945
5	MI0526	BLDG 7 FED CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	4,352	1912
5	MI0527	BLDG 8 FEDERAL CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	24,335	1900
5	MI0528	BLDG 20 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	1,471	1902
5	MI0529	BLDG 22 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	195	1880
5	MI0530	BLDG 23 FEDERAL CTR	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	143	1902
5	MI0531	BLDG 24 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	413	1942
5	MI0532	BLDG 31 FED CENTER	BATTLE CREEK	WAREHOUSE	99	1945
5	MI0601	ROSA PARKS FEDERAL BUILDING	DETROIT	OFFICE BUILDING	42,516	1933
5	MI0604	FEDERAL GARAGE	DETROIT	SERVICE	782	1934
5	MI0605	FEDERAL BOILERHOUSE	DETROIT	UTILITY SYSTEMS	1,576	1932
5	MN0015	GERALD W. HEANEY FED BLDG &	DULUTH	CT/OFFICE	125,885	1930

5	MN0021	USPS BLDG & CTHSE	FERGUS FALLS	CT/OFFICE	46,573	1933
5	MN0036	FEDERAL BUILDING	MINNEAPOLIS	OFFICE BUILDING	143,197	1915
5	MN0521	CUSTOM & IMMIG STAT	NOYES	OFFICE BUILDING	12,515	1932
5	OH0023	FRANK T BOW FEDERAL	CANTON	CT/OFFICE	73,154	1933
5	OH0028	POTTER-STEWART USPO & CRTS HS	CINCINNATI	COURTHOUSE (CT)	443,807	1938
5	OH0033	METZENBAUM U.S. COURTHOUSE	CLEVELAND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	185,105	1910
5	OH0046	KINNEARY US CTHSE	COLUMBUS	COURTHOUSE (CT)	214,440	1935
5	OH0100	DONALD J. PEASE FEDERAL BLDG	MEDINA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	5,934	1938
5	OH0143	US COURTHOUSE CMHSE	TOLEDO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	80,844	1932
5	OH0514	WAREHOUSE 4	DAYTON	WAREHOUSE	203,571	1952
5	WI0016	FED BLDG & US CTHSE	EAU CLAIRE	CT/OFFICE	26,810	1909
5	WI0044	FED BLDG & US CTHSE	MILWAUKEE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	427,773	1898
5	WI0064	FEDERAL BLDG	RHINELANDER	OFFICE BUILDING	12,024	1920
6	IA0027	UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE	DAVENPORT	COURTHOUSE (CT)	68,391	1933
6	IA0030	U S COURTHOUSE	DES MOINES	COURTHOUSE (CT)	73,142	1929
6	IA0087	FED BLDG & US CTHSE	SIOUX CITY	COURTHOUSE (CT)	98,611	1932
6	KS0070	U S COURT HOUSE	WICHITA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	147,110	1932
6	MO0033	FEDERAL BUILDING 41	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	101,613	1942
6	MO0035	FEDERAL BUILDING	KANSAS CITY	WAREHOUSE	151,314	1953
6	MO0039	FEDERAL BG	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	406,567	1953
6	MO0106	ROBT A YOUNG FED BLD	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	1,004,783	1933
6	MO0531	FED BLDG NO 2	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	260,523	1942
6	MO0532	FED BLDG NO 4	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	11,025	1942
6	MO0533	FED BLDG NO 50	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	13,914	1957
6	MO0534	FED BLDG NO 3	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	22,076	1942
6	MO0544	FED BLDG NO 1	KANSAS CITY	OFFICE BUILDING	1,060,963	1942
6	MO0545	FEDERAL BUILDING 42	KANSAS CITY	SERVICE	1,744	1942
6	MO0548	FED BLDG, NO 28	KANSAS CITY	WAREHOUSE	3,304	1942
6	MO0551	FRC BLDG 100	OVERLAND	WAREHOUSE	1,015,363	1956
6	MO0552	FED RCDS CTR BG 101	OVERLAND	SERVICE	52,263	1956
6	MO0553	FRC - BG 102	OVERLAND	UTILITY SYSTEMS	19,025	1956
6	MO0559	US ARMY PUBLIC CTR	OVERLAND	WAREHOUSE	303,959	1953
6	MO0601	FEDERAL CTR BG 101	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	100,484	1942
6	MO0602	FEDERAL CTR BG 107	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	28,194	1942
6	MO0605	FED CTR BG 102E	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	13,749	1942
6	MO0606	FEDERAL CTR BG 103	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	241,351	1942
6	MO0607	FED CTR BG 103D	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	13,814	1942
6	MO0608	FED CTR BG 103E	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	13,495	1942
6	MO0609	FEDERAL CTR BG 104	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	333,324	1942
6	MO0610	FED CTR BG 104E	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	17,650	1942
6	MO0611	FED CTR BG 104F	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	16,185	1942
6	MO0612	FEDERAL CTR BG 105	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	351,546	1942
6	MO0613	FED CTR BG 105E	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	18,411	1942
6	MO0614	FED CTR BG 105F	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	17,230	1942
6	MO0615	FEDERAL CTR BG 105L	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	17,514	1942
6	MO0616	FED CTR BG 103F	ST LOUIS	SERVICE	23,753	1942
6	MO0617	FEDERAL CTR BG 115	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	10,195	1942
6	MO0618	FEDERAL CTR BG 110	ST LOUIS	OFFICE BUILDING	139,938	1942
6	MO0620	FEDERAL CTR BG 122B	ST LOUIS	SERVICE	12,950	1942
6	MO0622	ELEC SUB STA. 108A	ST LOUIS	UTILITY SYSTEMS	3,012	1942
6	MO0623	ELEC SUB STA. 108B	ST LOUIS	UTILITY SYSTEMS	2,379	1942
6	MO0628	BLDG 208B	ST LOUIS	WAREHOUSE	2,916	1942
6	NE0018	FEDERAL BG	GRAND ISLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	27,485	1910
7	AR0021	IC PARKER COURTHOUSE/USPO	FORT SMITH	COURTHOUSE (CT)	85,858	1937
7	AR0030	LITTLE ROCK USPO/COURTHOUSE	LITTLE ROCK	COURTHOUSE (CT)	249,558	1932
7	AR0031	LITTLE ROCK OLD USPO/CTHS	LITTLE ROCK	COURTHOUSE (CT)	74,074	1881
7	AR0057	TEXARKANA USPO/COURTHOUSE	TEXARKANA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	87,713	1933
7	LA0002	ALEXANDRIA USPO/COURTHOUSE	ALEXANDRIA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	42,118	1933

7	LA0006	BATON ROUGE FED BLDG/COURTHOI	BATON ROUGE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	56,542	1933
7	LA0029	MONROE FEDERAL BLDG/COURTHOL	MONROE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	42,650	1934
7	LA0033	NEW ORLEANS CUSTOM HOUSE	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	309,576	1881
7	LA0034	FE HEBERT FEDERAL BLDG	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	209,123	1939
7	LA0035	JM WISDOM COURTHOUSE	NEW ORLEANS	COURTHOUSE (CT)	180,694	1915
7	LA0066	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 13	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	5,443	1934
7	LA0692	FSS DEPOT WAREHOUSE 2	HARAHAN	WAREHOUSE	200,530	1943
7	LA0693	FSS DEPOT OFFICE & GARAGE	HARAHAN	ALL OTHER	4,433	1943
7	LA0694	FSS DEPOT PUMP HOUSE	HARAHAN	WAREHOUSE	1,335	1943
7	LA0731	GSA PMD DEPOT WHSE 6 BLDG 74	BATON ROUGE	WAREHOUSE	19,328	1949
7	LA0737	GSA PMD DEPOT BLDG 70 SHIPPING	BATON ROUGE	WAREHOUSE	2,304	1952
7	LA0811	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 1	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	4,206	1934
7	LA0812	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 2	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	2,744	1934
7	LA0813	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 3	NEW ORLEANS	OFFICE BUILDING	2,773	1934
7	LA0814	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 4	NEW ORLEANS	WAREHOUSE	887	1934
7	LA0815	BPSH NEW ORLEANS BLDG 14	NEW ORLEANS	SERVICE	444	1934
7	NM0015	SANTA FE US FEDERAL COURTHOUSI	SANTA FE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	41,528	1899
7	NM0501	ALBUQUERQUE POST OFFICE	ALBUQUERQUE	ALL OTHER	53,639	1908
7	NM0502	ALBUQUERQUE COURTHOUSE	ALBUQUERQUE	CT/OFFICE	66,436	1931
7	OK0039	C ALBERT FED BLDG/COURTHOUSE	MCALESTER	COURTHOUSE (CT)	21,976	1914
7	OK0041	MUSKOGEE FED BLDG/COURTHOUSE	MUSKOGEE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	118,778	1915
7	OK0046	OKC POST OFFICE/COURTHOUSE	OKLAHOMA CITY	COURTHOUSE (CT)	220,942	1912
7	OK0063	TULSA FEDERAL BLDG	TULSA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	122,184	1917
7	OK0074	LAWTON FEDERAL BLDG/COURTHOU	LAWTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	24,484	1917
7	OK0503	GSA PMD CENTER WAREHOUSE	OKLAHOMA CITY	WAREHOUSE	10,980	1942
7	OK0504	GSA PMD CENTER MAINTENANCE	OKLAHOMA CITY	WAREHOUSE	2,360	1942
7	TX0006	JM JONES FEDERAL BLDG	AMARILLO	CT/OFFICE	62,615	1939
7	TX0012	AUSTIN COURTHOUSE	AUSTIN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	55,819	1935
7	TX0019	J BROOKS FEDERAL BLDG	BEAUMONT	COURTHOUSE (CT)	132,622	1934
7	TX0057	TERMINAL ANNEX FEDERAL BLDG	DALLAS	OFFICE BUILDING	227,655	1930
7	TX0058	SANTA FE FEDERAL BLDG	DALLAS	OFFICE BUILDING	284,957	1928
7	TX0069	EL PASO COURTHOUSE	EL PASO	CT/OFFICE	109,200	1936
7	TX0075	FORT WORTH COURTHOUSE	FORT WORTH	COURTHOUSE (CT)	119,274	1933
7	TX0080	GALVESTON CUSTOMS HOUSE	GALVESTON	OFFICE BUILDING	12,113	1856
7	TX0081	GALVESTON USPO/COURTHOUSE	GALVESTON	CT/OFFICE	95,838	1937
7	TX0101	HOUSTON CUSTOMS HOUSE	HOUSTON	OFFICE BUILDING	135,645	1911
7	TX0116	USBS CONVENT	LAREDO	OFFICE BUILDING	55,567	1943
7	TX0117	LAREDO POST OFFICE/COURTHOUSE	LAREDO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	50,013	1906
7	TX0126	WR BURKE COURTHOUSE	LUFKIN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	16,551	1935
7	TX0130	SB HALL JR FEDERAL BLDG	MARSHALL	COURTHOUSE (CT)	16,338	1914
7	TX0163	OC FISHER FED BLDG/COURTHOUSE	SAN ANGELO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	33,462	1911
7	TX0164	HIPOLITO F. GARCIA FOB/US CTHS	SAN ANTONIO	CT/OFFICE	236,287	1937
7	TX0182	TYLER POST OFFICE/COURTHOUSE	TYLER	COURTHOUSE (CT)	46,412	1934
7	TX0210	SHERMAN FEDERAL BLDG/COURTHO	SHERMAN	COURTHOUSE (CT)	30,022	1907
7	TX0655	SAN ANTONIO FED CTR BLDG 6	SAN ANTONIO	ALL OTHER	1,211	1914
7	TX0657	SAN ANTONIO FED CTR BLDG 12	SAN ANTONIO	WAREHOUSE	6,643	1873
7	TX0701	LABRANCH FEDERAL BLDG	HOUSTON	OFFICE BUILDING	76,779	1946
7	TX0807	FED CTR WHSE 8	FORT WORTH	WAREHOUSE	175,806	1942
7	TX0811	FED CTR WHSE 10	FORT WORTH	WAREHOUSE	134,312	1953
7	TX0813	FED CTR WHSE 11	FORT WORTH	WAREHOUSE	90,688	1953
7	TX0815	FED CTR WHSE 9	FORT WORTH	WAREHOUSE	269,784	1953
7	TX0816	FED CTR WHSE 12	FORT WORTH	WAREHOUSE	259,952	1953
7	TX0821	FED CTR BLDG 24 OFFICE	FORT WORTH	OFFICE BUILDING	21,658	1952
7	TX0824	FED CTR BLDG 41 N GUARD HOUSE	FORT WORTH	OFFICE BUILDING	496	1942
7	TX0829	FED CTR BLDG 50 OFFICE/SHOPS	FORT WORTH	SERVICE	4,852	1942
7	TX0891	FED CTR BLDG 52 OFFICE/SHOPS	FORT WORTH	OFFICE BUILDING	11,099	1942
7	TX0892	FED CTR SHED 53 VEHICLE STOR	FORT WORTH	SERVICE (OTB)	5,528	1943
7	TX0894	FED CTR SHED 55 PAINT SHOP	FORT WORTH	SERVICE	1,672	1943

7	TX0911	FED CTR BLDG 47 GAS METER HOUS	FORT WORTH	UTILITY SYSTEMS	86	1941
7	TX0912	FED CTR BLDG 49 MOTOR SHOP	FORT WORTH	SERVICE	12,094	1942
8	CO0006	FB-CU	DENVER	CT/OFFICE	246,879	1931
8	CO0009	BYRON WHITE US CRTHS	DENVER	COURTHOUSE (CT)	235,353	1916
8	CO0018	WAYNE ASPINALL FBCT	GRAND JUNCTION	CT/OFFICE	36,907	1918
8	CO0050	FEDERAL GARAGE BLDG	DENVER	PARKING	1,095	1937
8	CO0051	FEDERAL GARAGE BLDG	DENVER	WAREHOUSE	12,246	1947
8	CO0500	DFC LAND	LAKEWOOD	ALL OTHER	-	1950
8	CO0501	DFC BLDG 1	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	5,156	1941
8	CO0506	DFC BLDG 6	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	178	1941
8	CO0507	DFC BLDG 7	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	928	1941
8	CO0511	DFC BLDG 20	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	389,299	1941
8	CO0512	DFC BLDG 21	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	22,303	1941
8	CO0514	DFC BLDG 25	LAKEWOOD	LABORATORY	360,806	1941
8	CO0515	DFC BLDG 40	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	45,592	1940
8	CO0516	DFC BLDG 41	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	494,904	1941
8	CO0518	DFC BLDG 44	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	8,793	1941
8	CO0519	DFC BLDG 45	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	81,331	1941
8	CO0520	DFC BLDG 46	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	21,053	1941
8	CO0521	DFC BLDG 47	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	30,645	1941
8	CO0522	DFC BLDG 48	LAKEWOOD	WAREHOUSE	149,947	1941
8	CO0524	DFC BLDG 49B	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	1,542	1941
8	CO0525	DFC BLDG 49C	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	676	1942
8	CO0526	DFC BLDG 49D	LAKEWOOD	UTILITY SYSTEMS	221	1942
8	CO0529	DFC BLDG 52	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	10,981	1941
8	CO0530	DFC BLDG 53	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	373,369	1941
8	CO0531	DFC BLDG 54	LAKEWOOD	WAREHOUSE	2,062	1941
8	CO0532	DFC BLDG 55	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	12,837	1941
8	CO0533	DFC BLDG 56	LAKEWOOD	OFFICE BUILDING	304,165	1941
8	CO0543	DFC BLDG 75	LAKEWOOD	SERVICE	6,358	1944
8	CO0545	DFC BLDG 77	LAKEWOOD	WAREHOUSE	1,515	1944
8	CO0618	DFC BLDG 3A	LAKEWOOD	LABORATORY	861	1942
8	CO0619	DFC BLDG 2A	LAKEWOOD	LABORATORY	1,966	1941
8	CO0643	DFC BLDG 21A	LAKEWOOD	WAREHOUSE	458	1941
8	CO0653	GREENHOUSE, BLDG 85B	LAKEWOOD	LABORATORY	3,395	1949
8	MT0004	MIKE MANSFIELD FB / CH	BUTTE	CT/OFFICE	58,369	1904
8	MT0017	FB-PO-CT	MISSOULA	CT/OFFICE	129,921	1913
8	MT0501	CHIEF MOUNTAIN POE	BABB	OFFICE BUILDING	6,638	1939
8	MT0502	CHIEF MTN PORT OF ENTRY	BABB	PARKING	229	1939
8	MT0503	CHIEF MOUNTAIN PORT OF ENTRY	BABB	SERVICE (OTB)	193	1939
8	MT0551	PIEGAN PORT OF ENTRY	BABB	RESIDENCE	9,452	1933
8	ND0002	FB	BISMARCK	OFFICE BUILDING	37,637	1913
8	ND0006	FB-CT	FARGO	CT/OFFICE	92,707	1931
8	ND0008	RONALD N. DAVIES FEDERAL BLDG	GRAND FORKS	CT/OFFICE	36,002	1937
8	ND0014	JUDGE BRUCE M. VAN SICKLE FB&C	MINOT	CT/OFFICE	35,085	1915
8	ND0018	PO-CU	PEMBINA	OFFICE BUILDING	13,384	1932
8	ND0501	AMBROSE PORT OF ENTRY	AMBROSE	OFFICE BUILDING	4,944	1932
8	ND0521	PORTAL PORT OF ENTRY	PORTAL	OFFICE BUILDING	11,885	1932
8	ND0531	ST JOHN PORT OF ENTRY	ST JOHN	OFFICE BUILDING	4,087	1931
8	SD0021	U.S. COURTHOUSE	SIOUX FALLS	CT/OFFICE	69,839	1895
8	UT0010	FOREST SERVICE BLDG	OGDEN	OFFICE BUILDING	50,087	1933
8	UT0014	J WILL ROBINSON FB	PROVO	OFFICE BUILDING	26,420	1938
8	UT0017	FRANK E MOSS COURTHOUSE	SALT LAKE CITY	COURTHOUSE (CT)	207,759	1932
8	UT0046	MOSS SHED	SALT LAKE CITY	WAREHOUSE	1,605	1950
8	UT0501	CLEARFIELD FEDERAL DEPOT	CLEARFIELD	WAREHOUSE	10,190	1943
8	UT0511	CLEARFIELD FEDERAL DEPOT	CLEARFIELD	WAREHOUSE	131,516	1943
8	UT0512	CLEARFIELD FEDERAL DEPOT	CLEARFIELD	WAREHOUSE	128,156	1943
8	UT0531	CLEARFIELD FEDERAL DEPOT	CLEARFIELD	WAREHOUSE	128,340	1943

8	WY0003	EWING T. KERR FB-CT	CASPER	CT/OFFICE	43,876	1932
8	WY0004	FOB	CHEYENNE	OFFICE BUILDING	29,919	1933
9	AZ0015	JAMES A. WALSH COURTHOUSE	TUCSON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	69,299	1930
9	AZ0551	BS OLD CUS BLDG	NOGALES	OFFICE BUILDING	17,791	1936
9	AZ0553	BS MORLEY GATE	NOGALES	ALL OTHER	678	1936
9	AZ0601	BS MAIN BLDG	SASABE	OFFICE BUILDING	4,260	1937
9	AZ0602	BS GARAGE	SASABE	SERVICE	309	1937
9	AZ0611	BS MAIN BLDG	DOUGLAS	OFFICE BUILDING	15,168	1933
9	AZ0612	BS GARAGE	DOUGLAS	SERVICE	920	1933
9	AZ0681	BS MAIN BLDG	NACO	OFFICE BUILDING	12,883	1937
9	AZ0682	US BORDER STATION	NACO	OFFICE BUILDING	1,640	1937
9	CA0041	US COURT HOUSE	LOS ANGELES	CT/OFFICE	758,388	1937
9	CA0083	FEDERAL BUILDING	SACRAMENTO	OFFICE BUILDING	160,548	1933
9	CA0088	J. WEINBERGER COURTHOUSE	SAN DIEGO	CT/OFFICE	63,756	1913
9	CA0091	APPRAISERS BLDG	SAN FRANCISCO	OFFICE BUILDING	435,519	1944
9	CA0092	US CUSTOM HOUSE	SAN FRANCISCO	OFFICE BUILDING	120,308	1911
9	CA0093	FEDERAL OFFICE BLDG	SAN FRANCISCO	OFFICE BUILDING	291,037	1933
9	CA0096	JAMES R. BROWNING U.S. CRTHSE	SAN FRANCISCO	COURTHOUSE (CT)	314,495	1893
9	CA0149	FEDERAL BUILDING	LOS ANGELES	OFFICE BUILDING	45,771	1955
9	CA0272	PARKING GARAGE	LOS ANGELES	PARKING	39,025	1932
9	CA0305	SAN FRANCISCO FEDERAL BLDG	SAN FRANCISCO	OFFICE BUILDING	523,208	1900
9	CA0313	1068 MISSION STREET	SAN FRANCISCO	OFFICE BUILDING	-	1913
9	CA0501	BS OLD CUSTOMS BLDG	CALEXICO	OFFICE BUILDING	14,329	1933
9	CA0581	BS EXIST MAIN BLDG	SAN DIEGO	OFFICE BUILDING	19,629	1932
9	CA0621	BS MAIN BLDG	ANDRADE	OFFICE BUILDING	4,410	1958
9	CA0622	BS RESIDENCE NO. 1	ANDRADE	RESIDENCE	3,431	1958
9	CA0623	BS RESIDENCE NO. 2	ANDRADE	RESIDENCE	1,088	1958
9	CA0801	BS MAIN BLDG	TECATE	OFFICE BUILDING	18,725	1932
9	CA0802	BS RESIDENCE	TECATE	RESIDENCE	2,155	1932
9	CA0803	B S RESIDENCE	TECATE	RESIDENCE	2,155	1932
9	CA0901	GSA BLDG 1	MENLO PARK	LABORATORY	40,829	1953
9	CA0902	GSA BLDG 2	MENLO PARK	OFFICE BUILDING	44,117	1956
9	CA0903	USGS BLDG 3	MENLO PARK	OFFICE BUILDING	89,556	1953
9	CA9551	RICHARD H CHAMBERS CH	PASADENA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	151,742	1931
9	HI0001	FEDERAL BUILDING & USPO	HILO	OFFICE BUILDING	35,134	1917
9	HI0002	U.S. CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE	HILO	OFFICE BUILDING	5,688	1941
10	AK0001	ANCHORAGE FED BUILD	ANCHORAGE	CT/OFFICE	91,360	1940
10	AK0005	FEDERAL	KETCHIKAN	OFFICE BUILDING	36,611	1938
10	AK0020	POST OFFICE CT JAIL	NOME	COURTHOUSE (CT)	27,093	1958
10	ID0552	GARAGE	PORTHILL	WAREHOUSE	470	1940
10	OR0018	J A REDDEN US CTHS	MEDFORD	COURTHOUSE (CT)	29,806	1916
10	OR0023	GUS J. SOLOMON CTHSE	PORTLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	162,015	1933
10	OR0024	THE PIONEER CTHSE	PORTLAND	COURTHOUSE (CT)	43,333	1875
10	OR0025	CUSTOM HOUSE	PORTLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	84,316	1901
10	OR0033	911 FEDERAL BLDG	PORTLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	247,036	1953
10	OR0501	TROUTDALE WEST FED WHSE	TROUTDALE	WAREHOUSE	49,916	1945
10	OR0502	TROUTDALE NORTH FED WHSE	TROUTDALE	WAREHOUSE	905	1945
10	WA0028	PORT ANGELES FB	PORT ANGELES	OFFICE BUILDING	19,194	1933
10	WA0035	WILLIAM KENZO NAKAMURA CTHS	SEATTLE	COURTHOUSE (CT)	150,913	1940
10	WA0036	FED OFFICE BLDG	SEATTLE	OFFICE BUILDING	236,628	1933
10	WA0045	FED BLDG U S POST OF	SPOKANE	OFFICE BUILDING	125,715	1904
10	WA0053	WM O DOUGLAS FBUSCT	YAKIMA	CT/OFFICE	52,984	1912
10	WA0059	FED ARCH & REC CTR	SEATTLE	OFFICE BUILDING	183,908	1946
10	WA0551	STATION & QUARTERS	CURLEW	ALL OTHER	2,420	1937
10	WA0552	GARAGE	CURLEW	WAREHOUSE	371	1937
10	WA0553	STORAGE	CURLEW	WAREHOUSE	274	1937
10	WA0601	STATION	LAURIER	ALL OTHER	4,225	1936
10	WA0602	RESIDENCE IMMIGRATIO	LAURIER	RESIDENCE	2,198	1936

10	WA0603	RESIDENCE CUSTOMS	LAURIER	RESIDENCE	2,198	1936
10	WA0611	STATION	METALINE FALLS	ALL OTHER	3,737	1932
10	WA0612	RESIDENCE IMM	METALINE FALLS	RESIDENCE	-	1932
10	WA0613	RESIDENCE CUSTOMS	METALINE FALLS	RESIDENCE	-	1932
10	WA0821	WAREHOUSE 5	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	171,116	1944
10	WA0822	WAREHOUSE NO 3	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	196,629	1944
10	WA0823	WAREHOUSE NO 4	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	230,484	1944
10	WA0824	WAREHOUSE NO 1	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	194,903	1953
10	WA0825	WAREHOUSE NO 2	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	187,310	1953
10	WA0831	WAREHOUSE NO 7	AUBURN	OFFICE BUILDING	201,849	1944
10	WA0832	WAREHOUSE NO 8	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	204,655	1944
10	WA0833	WAREHOUSE 6	AUBURN	WAREHOUSE	191,255	1944
10	WA0953	FED CTR SO OFFICE	SEATTLE	OFFICE BUILDING	410,478	1932
10	WA0954	FED CTR S WAREHOUSE	SEATTLE	WAREHOUSE	347,647	1940
10	WA0956	FED CTR S BIA OFFICE	SEATTLE	OFFICE BUILDING	8,976	1933
10	WA0984	FED CTR S EAST PARKG	SEATTLE	PARKING	-	1942
11	DC0003	JAMES L. WHITTEN FB	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	324,903	1907
11	DC0004	AGRI ANNEX	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	72,522	1937
11	DC0005	AGRI SOUTH	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	1,806,711	1934
11	DC0007	VETERANS ADMIN	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	625,223	1919
11	DC0013	HERBERT C. HOOVER BLDG	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	1,638,657	1932
11	DC0014	ELIJAH BARRETT PRETTYMAN BLDG	WASHINGTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	556,035	1952
11	DC0016	COURT OF MIL APP	WASHINGTON	COURTHOUSE (CT)	39,331	1910
11	DC0017	WHITE HOUSE-WEST WING	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	67,461	1902
11	DC0019	FEDERAL TRADE	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	258,831	1938
11	DC0020	INTERIOR	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	1,099,677	1937
11	DC0021	GSA	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	704,337	1917
11	DC0022	IRS BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	1,244,706	1930
11	DC0023	ROBERT F. KENNEDY BLDG	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	904,858	1935
11	DC0024	LIBERTY LOAN	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	142,451	1918
11	DC0026	LAFAYETTE	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	466,818	1940
11	DC0028	ARIEL RIOS FED BLDG	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	735,433	1934
11	DC0029	POST OFFICE OLD	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	375,228	1899
11	DC0030	NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	116,155	1886
11	DC0031	GSA-ROB	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	838,290	1932
11	DC0032	1951 CONST AVE NW	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	113,716	1933
11	DC0033	MARY E. SWITZER BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	542,815	1940
11	DC0034	WILBUR J COHEN BLDG	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	1,049,147	1940
11	DC0035	DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER EXECUTIVE	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	541,938	1875
11	DC0036	US INTERNATIONAL TR	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	196,847	1835
11	DC0042	PRESIDENTS GUEST HOU	WASHINGTON	RESIDENCE	55,191	1827
11	DC0046	HARRY S. TRUMAN	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	2,022,466	1941
11	DC0048	WINDER	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	70,391	1854
11	DC0053	49 L STREET SE	WASHINGTON	WAREHOUSE	32,013	1924
11	DC0075	320 FIRST STREET NW	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	245,225	1928
11	DC0078	1724 F STREET NW	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	46,898	1920
11	DC0111	DOLLEY MADISON	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	12,942	1820
11	DC0112	TAYLOE HOUSE	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	9,667	1828
11	DC0113	COSMOS CLUB	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	10,989	1928
11	DC0119	JACKSON PL COMPLEX	WASHINGTON	RESIDENCE	4,422	1868
11	DC0501	SIDNEY YATES (AUDITORS)	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	152,329	1879
11	DC0521	EPA EAST	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	436,678	1934
11	DC0522	EPA WEST	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	413,496	1934
11	DC0523	CONNECTING WING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	198,536	1934
11	DC0531	2430 E ST NW CENTRAL	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	35,651	1904
11	DC0532	2430 E ST NW EAST	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	12,626	1935
11	DC0533	2430 E ST NW SOUTH	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	67,951	1935
11	DC0650	NYA 213	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	574,576	1942

11	DC0720	THE WEBSTER SCHOOL BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	8,500	1882
11	DC1400	MAIN SCHOOL BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	87,592	1916
11	DC1401	CLASS & RECREATION BLDG	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	4,583	1940
11	DC1402	OFFICE BLDG - EAST ANNEX	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	31,041	1943
11	DC1403	LAB	WASHINGTON	LABORATORY	27,784	1943
11	DC1404	LAB EXTENSION	WASHINGTON	LABORATORY	30,467	1944
11	DC1405	MEMORIAL CHAPEL	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	6,317	1924
11	DC1406	DISPENSARY	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	15,183	1943
11	DC1408	GATE HOUSE - VISITORS CENTER	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	853	1943
11	DC1409	GYMNASIUM	WASHINGTON	ALL OTHER	7,212	1929
11	DC1410	FIELD HOUSE	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	6,363	1943
11	DC1411	CEFETERIA	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	5,381	1929
11	DC1412	BOILER HOUSE	WASHINGTON	UTILITY SYSTEMS	2,396	1916
11	DC1413	OFFICE BUILDING - SOUTH ANNEX	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	45,278	1944
11	DC1414	CODE & SIGNAL LAB	WASHINGTON	LABORATORY	23,446	1944
11	DC1415	OFFICE BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	77,077	1946
11	DC1416	OPERATIONS BUILDING	WASHINGTON	OFFICE BUILDING	24,483	1947
11	DC1417	PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	1,975	1952
11	DC1420	CLASSIFIED WASTE DESTRUCTOR	WASHINGTON	SERVICE	3,518	1958
11	MD0044	SUITLAND FED CTR. 2	SUITLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	-	1958
11	MD0070	SUITLAND HOUSE	SUITLAND	OFFICE BUILDING	7,180	1937
11	MD0531	DOE MAIN BLDG GTN	GERMANTOWN	OFFICE BUILDING	463,143	1957
11	MD0533	DOE AUDITORIUM	GERMANTOWN	ALL OTHER	11,002	1957
11	MD0534	DOE RADIO BLDG	GERMANTOWN	ALL OTHER	1,604	1957
11	MD0538	DOE OLD EQUIP SHED	GERMANTOWN	WAREHOUSE	4,387	1957
11	MD0540	DOE GAR B'HS BLDG	GERMANTOWN	PARKING	8,780	1957
11	MD0736	FRC WHITE OAK BUILDING 201	SILVER SPRING	ALL OTHER	-	1945
11	VA0003	MARTIN V.B. BOSTETTER CTHSE	ALEXANDRIA	COURTHOUSE (CT)	58,604	1931
11	VA0085	HYBLA VALLEY OFC BLD	ALEXANDRIA	OFFICE BUILDING	93,150	1958
11	VA0247	BUILDING D	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	34,020	1953
11	VA0501	BUTLER BLDG 01	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	4,200	1953
11	VA0502	BUTLER BLDG 02	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	4,200	1953
11	VA0503	BUTLER BLDG 03	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	4,000	1953
11	VA0504	BUTLER BLDG 04	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	4,200	1953
11	VA0505	BUTLER BLDG 05	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	8,280	1953
11	VA0506	BUILDING A, 6810	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	985,666	1953
11	VA0507	BUILDING B	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	231,734	1953
11	VA0508	BUILDING C	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	18,000	1953
11	VA0509	BUTLER BLDG 13	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	3,030	1953
11	VA0510	BUTLER BLDG 07	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	4,835	1953
11	VA0560	BUTLER BLDG 08	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	1,720	1953
11	VA0561	BUTLER BLDG 14	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	1,035	1953
11	VA0563	BUTLER BLDG 12	FRANCONIA	WAREHOUSE	800	1953

○