

*ms file.*

# GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION



Region 3  
Washington 25, D.C.

September 1, 1961

IN REPLY REFER TO: 3CA

Central Intelligence Agency  
2430 E Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C.

Document No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Review of this document by CIA has  
determined that

- CIA has no objection to declass
- It contains information of CIA interest that must remain classified at TS S C Authority: HR 70-2

It contains nothing of CIA interest  
Date 10 03 81 Reviewer 029725

Attention: [REDACTED]  
Chief, Fiscal Division

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to discussions held between representatives of our respective agencies, we have made a detailed review of all billings rendered during fiscal year 1961 for security guarding.

Based on the review, we have found that on an overall basis with the exception of the billings for contract guarding at Langley, the figures developed by your office and those reflected on our billings for force account guarding, are substantially in agreement.

With respect to contract guarding, however, a difference of approximately \$25,800.00 exists between the figures shown on the recapitulation furnished by your office and our billings. Specifically, your recap for the months of May and June cites the amounts of \$24,045.28 and \$12,921.91 respectively, as billed by GSA for contract guarding performed at Langley; whereas, no amounts were shown as developed by CIA to compare with the GSA billings. In addition, figures developed by your offices include \$11,890.81 for the same services performed during the month of April whereas April and May services were included in May billing. Thus, \$25,076.38, the amount which we billed for services rendered for May and June which was not included on your recap sheets, accounts for all but an insignificant part of the overall difference in question.

Based on the foregoing, it appears that the differences in the figures relating to force account jobs may result from slight discrepancies between productive time reports furnished this office and summaries of these reports furnished your facility by the guard force. Minor discrepancies between our figures for contract guarding, in addition to the specific exceptions cited above, appear to stem from overtime work performed by the contractor, the billing period for which is not always concurrent with the end of a given calendar month.

We trust that the foregoing will serve to settle any question you have regarding variances on billing during the past year.

Sincerely yours

*J. D. Burgess*  
J. D. Burgess  
Acting Chief, Accounting Division

STATINTL