

GILMORE D. CLARKE-MICHAEL RAPUANO  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
145 EAST 32nd STREET  
NEW YORK 16

DD/S  
55-2619

October 20, 1955

Honorable Allen W. Dulles  
Director, Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Dulles,

You directed us to make a study of certain suggested sites for a new headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency. This we have done and we present herewith our findings. In addition to the report appended herewith, we shall submit, separately, appendices to it to cover, in some detail, the factual data respecting automobile traffic arteries, water supply, sewage disposal, and telephone, electric light and power services.

We wish to express our appreciation to Deputy Director White and to Messrs. Garrison and Chandler of the Agency Staff; their assistance was invaluable.

We take this opportunity to thank all those, outside of the Central Intelligence Agency, who assisted us in this study.

Very truly yours,

Clarke and Rapuano

Gilmore D. Clarke

**REPORT ON THE PROPOSED LOCATION  
FOR A NEW HEADQUARTERS FOR THE  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY**

In accordance with a request from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, we have prepared this report, with recommendations, as a guide to aid the Agency in determining upon a suitable site for a new headquarters building.

We are impressed with the importance of this assignment, inasmuch as we realize that the Central Intelligence Agency is one of the most potent factors in the struggle for peace among the free nations of the world. It is our understanding that it functions in all parts of the world and, as such, is this Nation's most important fact-gathering organization. In these circumstances, we believe that a new site should provide a dignified setting for the building or buildings and that it should be set apart from the buildings of other public agencies in order that the imperative security measures may obtain with the least effort and expense.

**HISTORY OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY**

In order to help us better to understand the problem, we obtained a brief history of the C. I. A. which was prepared by a member of its staff; we incorporate it herewith in this report.

"The Central Intelligence Agency was the outgrowth of the intelligence experience of World War II and particularly the congressional investigation into the surprise attack at Pearl

**"Harbor. The aim was to concentrate national intelligence responsibility in one place. No such function existed in Government before World War II. Its formal beginning was an executive order of January 22, 1946, creating the Central Intelligence Group. After a period of consideration by the Congress, the Central Intelligence Agency was established by Section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947.**

**The statements of functions in the Executive Order and the statute are substantially the same, but under the statute the former Group became an independent Executive Agency of the Administrative Branch of the Government. Congress stated that, for the purpose of coordinating the intelligence activities of the several Government departments and agencies in the interest of national security, it shall be the duty of the Agency, under the direction of the National Security Council, to advise and make recommendations to the National Security Council on intelligence activities relating to national security; to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to national security, and to provide for its appropriate dissemination; to perform additional services of common concern to the intelligence agencies; and such other functions and duties related to intelligence as the National Security Council may direct. The Agency is prohibited from any law-enforcement, police, or internal-security functions, and the departmental**

"Intelligence agencies are continued by statute in their functions. However, the Director of Central Intelligence is responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

The Agency has now evolved from a small coordinating group into its full stature in the complex field of foreign intelligence. In so doing, it has become a most unusual and complicated organization. Its end products are national intelligence estimates to assist the President and his top-policy planners in making their decisions for the future of the country. Such estimates must be based on the most complete and most up-to-date information available. Any subject, location, or person may be the subject of an estimate and many are involved in most estimates. The mechanical collection, handling, indexing, dissemination, and analysis of the vast amount of available information before an evaluation can start is a formidable task and requires many specialists and special equipment. The evaluation process brings to bear the best informed and most expert knowledge in the Government on the problems under consideration. This is again formidable—a process of coordination requiring the interrelation of all governmental intelligence facilities. All of this work is performed behind a tight screen of security, which additionally complicates the problems of coordination and communications. Elaborate compartmentation is necessary both for functions and for individuals to a degree far greater than in any other activity,

"public or private, and yet this compartmentation must not interfere with the free and rapid flow of information to those who have a need for it. Many subjects cannot be discussed on the telephone so that coordinating units must be within convenient distance. Documents may not be left unattended and must be escorted in transit. This requires unusual amounts of vault and safe space and secure means of documentary transmission both mechanical and by courier. Physical security of the entire site and of each component within the site must provide assurance against unauthorized entry.

The Central Intelligence Agency has a heavy responsibility to the national defense and security, and the Director of Central Intelligence bears the final responsibility for the national intelligence mission. To meet this involves a complex organization in which the primary need is, of course, able, imaginative personnel. But, the people can work only as efficiently as their surroundings will permit and unnecessary delay in physical processing may have serious results; inability to coordinate in a timely manner may result in an error; a security compromise may have grave consequences. Consequently, the planning for and design of housing for this Agency present problems that would not be encountered in any other building, public or private."

## **CRITERIA**

Prior to the preparation of any study related to the selection of a site, the C. I. A. established the following criteria based upon its experience since the establishment by Congress in 1947.

1. It was determined that the new headquarters of the Agency should be within a radius of ten miles and within 20 minutes by automobile from the Zero Milestone in the City of Washington.
2. It was determined that the size of the building and the number of automobiles to be parked in its immediate vicinity would require an area of not less than 100 acres.
3. It was determined that 2,300,000 sq. ft. of building floor space will be required and that it will be necessary to provide space to park approximately 4,000 automobiles and adequate means for ingress and egress for automotive traffic.
4. It was stressed that the site should lend itself to ease in carrying out the security measures that are imperative.
5. It was emphasized that the new Headquarters should have ease of communication by road to the White House, to the Pentagon, and to the offices of the Department of State.

## **SEVERAL SITES UNDER CONSIDERATION**

Prior to the time that this office was requested to prepare a report the Agency, through members of its staff and with the aid of the members of the staffs of certain other governmental agencies, reviewed many sites in the District of Columbia and its environs, both within and without the area having a 10 mile radius from the Zero Milestone. The number of sites under

consideration was narrowed to six and subsequently to two. Nevertheless, we inspected the six sites and certain others that, in our judgment, were worthy of consideration. Either one or both members of this firm visited the sites which even remotely met the established criteria and subsequently we discussed with members of the staff of the Agency the advantages and the disadvantages of each site. (See Map #1)

On Wednesday, September 21, we conducted a hearing at the Headquarters of the Agency at which time we listened to the proponents of four of the sites which received the most serious consideration. The proponents of each one of these sites were cooperative in giving us data in the form of maps and reports in order that we might be informed concerning the problems of each one of these areas.

As a result of our studies, we also narrowed our considerations down to two sites; the one near Langley, Virginia and the other, known as the Winkler site, situated in the City of Alexandria along the Shirley Highway approximately one mile southwest of Seminary Road. Both of these sites were inspected in the field on several occasions and problems related to traffic, to water supply, to sanitary sewers and, more particularly, to the physical character of the sites themselves, were given the most careful study. We discussed the problems related to the development of these two sites with a member, or members, of the staffs of the C. I. A. and the National Capital Planning Commission and with the Chairman of the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

#### LOCATION OF RESIDENCES OF STAFF MEMBERS

One of the most important factors that merits especially careful consideration is the relationship between the places of residence of the employees of the C. I. A. and the proposed headquarters site. We were reliably informed

that the annual turn-over of employees of the C. I. A. is somewhat less than for other governmental agencies, taken for the body of employees as a whole. In considering the staff members, exclusive of secretarial employees, the turn-over is substantially less than for any other Government agency. A large percentage of these staff members own their own homes and they have more or less dedicated themselves to service with the C. I. A. until retirement even though they are not under the Civil Service regulations. Since this is a highly specialized area of endeavor, the staff members are especially well qualified and, in most cases, highly trained for service with this Agency. In the circumstances, the ease with which the majority may reach the headquarters site is an important factor governing its selection.

We find that the places of residence (See Map #2) of both staff and clerical employees are distributed at the present time as follows: In the District of Columbia- Northwest, 37%; NorthEast, 5%; SouthEast, 7%; SouthWest, 1%; for a total of 50% of the employees. In the State of Virginia - Arlington County, 15%; Fairfax County, 8%; City of Alexandria, 8%; Prince William County, .04%; Loudown County, .02%; for a total of 31.6% of the employees. In the State of Maryland - Montgomery County, 11%; Prince George County, 7%; City of Baltimore, .3%; Arundel County, .1%; for a total of 18.4% of the employees.

We learned that 50% of all the employees are married and that 25% of these married employees own their own homes.

Based upon these data, we determined that it is considerably more convenient for the employees of the C. I. A. to reach the Langley site, following the construction of the highway, parkway, and related improvements, including water supply and sewage disposal, that are essential before this site can be utilized, than it would be for them to reach the Winkler or, in fact, any other



site under consideration. In the case of the Winkler site, for example, a majority of the employees living in the District of Columbia would be forced to pass through the Pentagon network at the busiest hours of the day, both morning and evening, together with the traffic going to and departing from the Pentagon. The Shirley Memorial Highway has now more than reached its capacity, and, even after it is widened to six lanes as far south as King Street, it will still be inadequate to accommodate the concentrated peak load that would result from the more than 3,000 automobiles of the C. I. A. Headquarters staff during the morning and evening hours.

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE LANGLEY SITE

The Langley site is situated in Fairfax County and consists of 140 acres of a <sup>749.5</sup> ~~582~~ acre tract owned by the Federal Government. The center of this large tract of land is approximately 7-1/2 miles, as the crow flies, from the Zero Milestone. The westerly boundary is along Turkey Run; the northerly and easterly boundary is the Potomac River and borders private lands from the River to the Leesburg Road, which forms the southerly boundary. <sup>167.5</sup> acres of this tract are under the jurisdiction of the National Parks Service and extend along the wooded banks of the Potomac River extending back from the River a distance of more than 1,000', an area that will accommodate comfortably the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The remainder of the site, comprising <sup>582</sup> acres, is under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads. This agency has developed a small part of the center of the site as a research laboratory. The Chief of the Bureau has expressed a willingness to relinquish the use of 140 acres of the tract, now under the Bureau's jurisdiction, for the development of the C. I. A. Headquarters.

If the C. I. A. Headquarters should be situated on this site, it will occupy part of a Government Reservation of 582 acres. Any development for the C. I. A. within this site will be such that a wide belt of forest land will be left around the periphery in a manner aiding to provide the desired security. It is safe to assume that the proposed C. I. A. 140 acre tract, within this larger governmental property, will be enclosed with a security fence.

The site varies in elevation from 185' to 219' above mean sea level, and is 150 or more feet above the floor of the Potomac River. The soil conditions are such as to provide for building foundations without the necessity of using piles. The terrain is rolling and the differences in elevation within the area may be utilized by the architects in the development of the site so as to take full advantage of the slopes.

#### MEANS OF ACCESS TO THE LANGLEY SITE

The principal access to the site from the District of Columbia is now via Chain Bridge and the Leesburg Road (Route 123); this artery is now inadequate. It will be necessary, as contemplated in Public Law 161, 84th Congress, (Chapter 368 - 1st Session - HR 6829) to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway from its present terminus at Spout Run, approximately 3/4 of a mile west of the Key Bridge, to the Langley site. It is understood that preliminary plans for this dual parkway, providing for a total of four lanes (two in each direction), have been completed. Monies have been made available to start the improvement of Leesburg Road from the Chain Bridge and the junction of Glebe Road to the site. This road should be developed ultimately as a separated six-lane artery and Chain Bridge should be widened to provide for six lanes with a suitable connection to the proposed new dual highway along the abandoned Baltimore and Ohio Canal on the east side of the Potomac River.

The Langley site is situated just east of the crossing of the Potomac of the proposed Cabin John Bridge that will become an element in the Outer Loop Freeway around the Washington Metropolitan District in Montgomery and Prince George Counties in the State of Maryland, connecting with a second crossing of the Potomac via the proposed Jones Point Bridge immediately south of the City of Alexandria at Hunting Creek.

When this Outer Loop Freeway, a part of the Interstate System of Highways, is completed the Langley site will be situated close to the Virginia bridge-head of the Cabin John Bridge crossing and hence make the site even more readily accessible from all points in the States of Maryland and Virginia as well as from the District of Columbia. Until such time as the Outer Loop is constructed, the four-lane George Washington Parkway, reaching up to the site along the west bank of the Potomac, will prove to be adequate as a means of access to and egress from the Langley site, inasmuch as it will serve the C. I. A. Headquarters, almost exclusively, north of Spout Run. When the Outer Loop is constructed, it will be necessary, due to the additional traffic that will be generated, to build an additional traffic lane on the northbound drive between the Langley site and the proposed Cabin John Bridge, and an additional traffic lane on the southbound drive between the site and Chain Bridge, in order adequately to move the automobiles off of the site in two directions, via an appropriate grade crossing elimination structure over or under the parkway. With the initial construction of the parkway, the two sections of the project that we have designated for an ultimate width of three lanes, should be graded to accommodate three lanes; only two need be constructed until such time as the Cabin John Bridge is built.

The proposed dual highway along the old Baltimore and Ohio Canal (now under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service), that will connect with the District of Columbia highway and freeway network extending southerly from the proposed outer loop freeway at the Cabin John Bridge crossing of the Potomac, will afford an additional artery of communication between the Langley site and the center of the National Capital and thus provide the site with an additional arterial way to the White House, the Pentagon and the State Department.

In Virginia it will become necessary, ultimately, to improve Route 123 that leads directly from the Langley site, at its junction with the Leesburg Road (Route 193), to and through McLean, Lewinsville and Tysons Corner, where it crosses the Leesburg Pike (Route 7).

A related improvement that will serve as an added measure of assistance in automotive travel, for those going between the Langley site and the District of Columbia, will be the proposed widening of the Francis Scott Key Bridge from four to six lanes (3 in each direction) and the proposed connections between this bridge and the George Washington Memorial Parkway. These improvements will measurably help those who may travel between the center of the Capital City and Langley.

Appendix "A", with a map, attached to this report, sets forth in more detail the pertinent factors and requirements related to arterial matters.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF THE LANGLEY SITE

Now that the Bureau of Public Roads has indicated its willingness to release to the C. I. A. 140 acres of land out of the tract under its jurisdiction at Langley, the coverage of structures on this 140 acre tract will be exceedingly light and negligible in relation to the total government reservation of 582 acres.

If the structure is situated in or near the center of this 140 acre parcel of land, it is fair to state that it may not be visible in the summer months from outside areas bordering the property. Any logical layout of the site would aim to maintain a wide belt of woodland on the periphery. Automobile parking areas will, of course, take up approximately 25 acres of land, but the arrangement may be devised so as to keep areas of woodland between areas graded and paved for car parking. The fact that there is more land available here at Langley than was at first anticipated makes this site even more favorable than it was heretofore when but 100 acres were to be released to the C. I. A. by the Bureau of Public Roads.

#### IMPACT OF C. I. A. DEVELOPMENT ON FAIRFAX COUNTY

The impact of this proposed C. I. A. development of the Langley site upon the immediately surrounding areas in Fairfax County will no doubt be felt, but this should result in a minimum of detrimental effect by reason of the fact that the site for the C. I. A. Headquarters (a) borders upon a strip of public park land which extends to the Potomac River on the north and partly on the east sides; (b) is insulated on the west side by wooded areas of public lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads; (c) will be insulated by a wide strip of forest land on the south side along the Leesburg Road. An additional factor that will lessen the impact of this proposed development upon the immediate surrounding areas of Fairfax County is the fact that the largest number of employees (over 68 percent) will enter the property via the George Washington Memorial Parkway to be situated on park lands north of the proposed C. I. A. Headquarters generally along the Potomac River. Approximately 31 percent of the employees at present live in Virginia and some of these will also use the parkway in going to and returning from work. In the circumstances, we doubt whether more than a very few of the

C. L. A. employees will find it necessary to change their places of residence by reason of the location of the Headquarters at Langley; this site, we believe, is the most convenient to the largest number.

It is natural that certain employees, who may find this new site inconvenient for them, may wish to move closer to the site, but that is no reason for concern on the part of those who predict that any governmental development is bound to result in large areas being given over to small lots with the accompanying commercial developments.

It has been brought out by those who oppose the Langley site for the C. L. A. Headquarters that the impact of this proposed development will be detrimental to the surrounding areas in Fairfax County. By that they infer that this insulated development will result in (a) a substantially denser population for an unknown distance from the site, and (b) additional commercially zoned areas causing a generally undesirable environment that does not now obtain and that is not possible under the proposed scheme for zoning that the officials of Fairfax County have caused to be made to serve as a guide in the future development of the County. The County officials have completed a comprehensive plan for development to include, in addition to zoning, the layout for new or improved arteries of travel, parks, schools, public utilities and etc.

Mr. Dodd McHugh, planning consultant for Fairfax County, has anticipated a rate of growth which is in excess of any possible increase that may be attributed to the C. L. A. Headquarters development. In any event, the ultimate improvement of existing roads, the construction of new roads and parkways, the construction of sanitary and storm water sewers and the installation of water mains,

will tend to increase the population in Fairfax County whether or not the C. I. A. Headquarters is situated in the County. If the Zoning Board of Appeals, representing the people of Fairfax County, take their task seriously and uphold the zoning scheme as at present planned, then there need be no cause for concern. In these circumstances the C. I. A. Headquarters cannot help but become a distinct asset to the County.

It is evident that the Board of Supervisors of the County are of the opinion that the C. I. A. is a desirable neighbor for, on May 4, 1955, they adopted a resolution inviting the C. I. A. to Fairfax County and, at the same time, offered to cooperate "in all matters under its own responsibilities".

#### **PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS, FAIRFAX COUNTY**

There will be few improvements made in Fairfax County, by reason of the C. I. A. Headquarters, which ultimately would not be made in the course of time. The George Washington Memorial Parkway, for example, was planned to extend northerly along the west side of the Potomac River to the proposed Cabin John Bridge Crossing before the C. I. A. expressed its intention to build a new headquarters. If the Langley site is selected the parkway, of necessity, will be constructed sooner than it otherwise might have been. The same will be true of other highway and public utility improvements.

#### **WATER SUPPLY**

The problem related to water supply for the Langley site has been the subject of special study on our part. We have assembled more detailed data to supplement the information contained in Mr. James W. Head Jr.'s letter to Colonel Lawrence K. White, dated April 1, 1955. In that letter, Mr. Head assured Colonel White of the potential adequacy of the water supply that the

City of Falls Church will be able to deliver to the Langley site. See Appendix "B" for a more detailed report on this subject.

#### SANITARY SEWERS AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL

The problem related to sanitary sewers and to sewage disposal for the Langley site has also been the subject of special study on our part. We have assembled additional data to supplement the resolution of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors of May 18, 1955, in which it was stated that "the County can assure within two years from this date the availability of sewers for the facility contemplated on a basis of charges or rentals for such service at figures which will not exceed the regular charges elsewhere in the County". The meaning of this Resolution was further clarified by Mr. Carlton C. Massey, County Executive of Fairfax County, in a letter to Director Dulles dated June 30, 1955. See Appendix "C" for a more detailed report on this subject.

#### TELEPHONE, ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER

We have investigated questions related to the telephone and electric service and learned that the public utility corporations will extend their services to either the Langley or Winkler sites and meet the requirements of the Agency at no expense to the Government. (Appendix "D")

#### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

We have obtained the pertinent facts with respect to other sites. There were certain factors, in the case of each one of the other sites, that caused us to eliminate them from a detailed consideration; in all cases but one, they did not fulfill adequately the criteria that the C. I. A. established for the site for the new headquarters. In the case of the Winkler site we found that it meets most of the established criteria. But there are other considerations that cause us to recommend

Approved For Release 2004/09/23 : CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170020-0  
against the Winkler tract. The chief consideration has to do with the physical



character of the site itself. In our considered judgment the lands of the Winkler tract are too low in relation to the Shirley Highway and to the surrounding areas. We could not possibly recommend this site for one of the Nation's most important enterprises in these critical times in the history of the world. It would be most unfortunate, we believe, to spend a sum of fifty million dollars, more or less, upon buildings and their appurtenances on the Winkler site. This site, however, may be suitable for a smaller installation.

We recommend the Langley site, a site that will provide a dignified setting high above the Potomac River bordered by park lands on two sides and with additional government land in the immediate vicinity to serve as a protective buffer against the surrounding privately owned lands to the west and south. The Langley site is already owned by the Federal Government so that it becomes unnecessary to take additional properties from the taxrolls, an added desirable factor.

It is important to take a long range view of this large undertaking. The Central Intelligence Agency is a permanent division of government. As such, it is desirable, we believe, to select for it the best possible available site even though all of the contemplated improvements, such as the Outer Belt Freeway, the Cabin John Bridge, the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and the proposed dual highway along the B & O Canal are as yet only in the plan stage. It may be that some inconvenience will be encountered at the beginning of the occupancy of the new buildings for the C. I. A. at Langley; however, this will not be of long duration, since the contemplated arterial improvements will make this site easily accessible from all sections of the Washington Metropolitan area. The fact remains that the site at Langley is, in our opinion, the best possible site we know to be available which meets the established criteria. We unhesitatingly recommend it.

13

APPENDIX J

Congressional References

1. Military and Naval Construction Act (P.L. 82-155, September 28, 1951). For CIA building authorization in the amount of \$38,000,000 see Title IV, Sec. 401, under the cover of the Secretary of the Air Force. There was no testimony by CIA witnesses on this bill. (This authorization was repealed by Sec. 511, P.L. 84-161).

- See also:
- a. Report, No. 767, from the House Armed Services Committee, July 26, 1951. Report notes (p. 19) that all projects in Sec. 401 are classified; therefore there is no specific reference to CIA construction which was approved under Air Force cover. *(To accompany H.R. 4914)*.
  - b. Report, No. 727, from the Senate Armed Services Committee, September 4, 1951. Report notes (p. 16) that all projects in Sec. 401 are classified; therefore there is no specific reference to CIA construction which was approved under Air Force cover. *(To accompany H.R. 4914)*.
  - c. Report, No. 1036, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, October 18, 1951 (to accompany H.R. 5650, Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1952).

d. Conference Report, <sup>House</sup> No. 1226, October 20, 1951, (Senate and House Appropriations Committees conferees). (To accompany H.R. 5650).

2. Military Construction Act of 1955 (P.L. 84-161, July 15, 1955).

For authorization to construct a CIA headquarters installation, see Title IV, Sec. 401 and Title V, Secs. 501, 502<sup>(4)</sup>, 504.

See also: a. Hearings, Military Public Works Construction,

May-June 1955, before the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. For CIA testimony, June 7, 1955, see pp. 536-549.

(Testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on this subject was in executive session and not printed). (To accompany S. 1765 (H.R. 6829)).

b. Report, No. 865, from the House Armed Services Committee, June 20, 1955. Committee approval at pp. 14, 17 in the amount of \$56,000,000. (To accompany H.R. 6829).

c. Report, No. 694, from the Senate Armed Services Committee, June 30, 1955. Committee approval at pp. 2, 14-15, 16 in the amount of \$53,500,000. (To accompany H.R. 6829).

d. Conference Report, House No. 1083, July 7, 1955, (Senate and House Armed Services Committees conferees). Approval at pp. 28-29 in the amount of \$55,000,000. (To accompany H.R. 6829).

3. Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956 (P.L. 84-219, August 4, 1955). For CIA building partial appropriation, see Chapter III.

See also: a. Hearings, Military Construction Appropriations for 1956, June 1955, before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations of the House Committee on Appropriations. For CIA testimony, June 23, 1955, see pp. 165-181.

b. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the Central Intelligence Agency.... House Document No. 210, July 1, 1955.

c. Hearings, The Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1956, June-July 1955, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. For CIA testimony, July 15, 1955, see pp. 24, 48-49, 239-275, 278-~~290~~, ~~291~~-316, 363. (To accompany H.R. 7278).

d. Report, No. 1116, from the House Committee on Appropriations, July 12, 1955. Approval at pp. 14, 34 in the amount of \$3,000,000 for the preparation of detail plans and specifications for the building. (To accompany H.R. 7278).

e. Report, No. 1094, from the Senate Committee on Appropriations, July 23, 1955. Approval at pp. 11, 53, 69 in the amount of \$7,000,000.

(To accompany H.R. 7278).

f. Conference Report, House No. 1586, July 29, 1955,  
(Senate and House Appropriations Committees  
conferrees). Approval at pp. 2, 8 in the amount of  
\$5,500,000. (To accompany H. R. 7278).

4. Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (P. L. 84-814, July 27, 1956).

For CIA building appropriation in the amount of \$49,000,000, see  
Chapter III, p. 3.

x See also: a. Hearings, The Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1957,  
Vol. 1, May-June 1956, before the House Committee on  
Appropriations. For CIA testimony before the Sub-  
committee on Department of Defense Appropriations,  
see pp. 238-306.

x b. Hearings, The Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1957,  
May-July 1956, before the Senate Committee on  
Appropriations. For CIA testimony, July 11, 1956,  
see pp. 719-776. (To accompany H. R. 12138).

c. Report, No. 2638, from the House Committee on  
Appropriations, July 7, 1956. Approval of appro-  
priation for the CIA building in the amount of  
\$49,000,000 at pp. 8, 36. (To accompany H. R. 12138).


- d. Report, No. 2580, from the Senate Committee on Appropriations, July 14, 1956. Approval of appropriation for the CIA building in the amount of \$49,000,000 at pp. 5, 31.( To accompany H. R. 12138).
- e. Report, House No. 2864, (Senate and House Appropriations Committees conferees). (To accompany H. R. 12138).

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/09/23 : CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170020-0

Next 9 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2004/09/23 : CIA-RDP63T00245R000100170020-0

<b>TRANSMITTAL SLIP</b>		DATE
<b>TO:</b> Legis. Counsel.		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS:  		
<b>FROM:</b>		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241  
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 36-8  
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)