

SECRET

7 APR 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: NFAC Administrative Staff

SUBJECT : Draft OMB Circular on Employee Parking

1. I view the subsidization of federal employees to be a true concern in an energy-conscious environment. At the same time, one cannot view federal parking in the aggregate. As mentioned in the OMB drafts, there are clear distinctions that have to be made between agencies concerning location, facilities, public transportation, and the like. One major consideration that may be limited to CIA is the employee cover issue.

2. While some of the data I use is old and the figures could be revised, the differences between agency statistics and other federal agencies in the area clearly reflect that an exemption for CIA may be in order.

3. I suspect that, given the Langley location, we probably have a employee population whose demographic ratios may be dramatically different from others within the metropolitan area. While we do not have the demographic breakdown for the agency, we have obtained the figures on OWI personnel and they may or may not be representative of the total building population. Of the total people on our rolls as of 27 April 1978, 77 percent reside in Virginia, 19 percent in Maryland, 2 percent in the District and 1 percent in West Virginia.

4. Our lack of public transportation and close proximity to the Beltway encouraged our employees to locate at substantial distances from the building. This dispersion, I suspect, was driven by the fact most employees were not able to afford the limited housing in the immediate area and there was little or no apartment housing in the relatively expensive neighborhoods nearby. These factors certainly contribute to a greater population dispersion than normally found in suburban locations.

5. Because of this dispersion, the opportunity for carpooling is reduced considerably. Further, as you well know, there is practically no public transportation and what there is available, is limited to the District and Virginia. I understand that there is only limited bus service from Maryland and there were attempts to reduce, rather than increase, service.

6. Agency figures from the 1976 parking formula show there are approximately 400 employees who work shifts and who, for the most part, would be precluded from carpooling. There are probably another 100 employees who are handicapped and forced to use other public transportation. Given the nature and complexity of CIA's mission, the majority of the 300 or so supergrade employees may not be able to take advantage of carpooling.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1 7. Of the remaining employees assigned to the Headquarters building, it is rather impressive that almost employees already carpool. It seems that any additional increase would be insignificant and, further, the loss in "free" overtime put in by our employees would be severe. With one exception - the DCI area - (15%) - most directorates are evenly balanced in terms of employees carpooling (34 - 38%) and these figures exceed the metropolitan figures. 25X1

25X1 8. One additional factor, unique to CIA, is the fact that carpooling between overt employees and personnel under cover can be a serious consideration/limitation if good cover practices are to be maintained.

9. It is my opinion that the additional management costs to be incurred to handle a very marginal increase in carpooling certainly does not appear to be cost effective. Rather, an aggressive affirmative action program, to include the possible elimination of the preferential parking system, and whatever other innovative ideas that could be developed are a better approach, at least at Lanagley. 25X1

25X1 10. One of the main OMB arguments to subsidized parking in some facilities is that many employees have been forced to public transportation because of limited parking spaces. That is certainly not the case at the CIA Headquarters building.

25X1 11. It appears that federal employees would be burdened with a regressive tax. At the same time, however, the government would be subsidizing the parking of the private sector at those companies under contract to the government who provide free parking to their employees. This, of course, is charged to the government through general and administrative expenses on the contract. The numbers of employees provided this benefit must be immense given the high level of contracting out. It is clearly arbitrary to single out the federal employee at the same time the government is subsidizing the private sector.

R.E. HINEMAN
Director
Weapons Intelligence

SECRET

PROPOSED EQUITABLE PARKING CHARGE

The following proposal is intended to encourage increase car-pooling and use of public transportation, but also avoid any unnecessary financial hardship and decline in working morale by Federal employees.

Charge the parking fee as outlined in 16 April 1979.

Charge the full fee effective 1 October 1979 rather than 50 percent in 1979 and full charge in 81 because people are more likely to change to carpooling and public transportation in response to one large fee than to two small increases.

Increase the salary of all Federal employees by one half of the average parking fee. This would be consistent with the stated purpose that the fees are not intended as a revenue device.

The employee would now have several options available: If he chose to drive alone the net cost would be one half the parking fee; if he participated in a two person carpool there would be no net cost; and for a three person or larger carpool each participant would realize a net savings.

NFAC/OWI/AVAD

20 APR 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, NFAC Administrative Staff

FROM : H. C. Eisenbeiss
Director of Central Reference

SUBJECT : Comments on the OMB Circular Regarding
Employee Parking

1. The subject of paid parking caused, as you might guess, considerable reactions on the part of OCR employees. Principal arguments made against the proposal include:

a. Mass transit facilities to commute to Headquarters building from surrounding areas is virtually non-existent. The Office has employees who travel a considerable distance to come to Headquarters, including those who commute from West Virginia, and who have no option to utilize public transportation. The position in paragraph 3.e. that cites free or low cost parking as a disincentive to transit use is, therefore, basically not valid for the Agency.

b. The cost involved in administering paid parking would not be insignificant both in terms of time and personnel. Further, how would fees be assessed? Surely those parking inside the building would be charged considerably more than those who park in the west parking lot. Since there is no commercial parking available locally and the rental value for the space paid to GSA is less than \$10.00 monthly, it would appear that the Agency has every right to receive an exemption in accord with the circular.

c. If paid parking is imposed here at Headquarters, there is a good possibility that employees will park outside the Agency compound in residential areas, along route 123, etc. This situation will obviously be the cause for an environmental impact study by Fairfax County officials.

SUBJECT: Comments on the OMB Circular Regarding
Employee Parking

d. There are a number of employees who work late hours, attend educational courses after-hours in the building, etc. A very real problem would arise if they declined to undertake these efforts because transportation is not available for them during late evening hours.

e. The current carpool program already occupies a large share of the parking space at Headquarters; the Agency is, in fact, already in compliance with the spirit of the OMB circular. Further, we have been repeatedly informed that there are not sufficient resources available to monitor closely the misuse of carpool permits. How will the Agency be able to handle the additional carpools which might result from a paid parking scheme?

f. The circular incorrectly implies that there are no "out-of-pocket" costs for those who drive to work as compared with those who utilize public transportation.

2. Since the location of the National Security Agency is similar to that of our own Agency, located a substantial distance from urban areas with the lack of public transportation facilities, it is suggested that the Agency find out how they intend to respond to the OMB circular.

3. Attached herewith is a useful historical perspective on the subject submitted by the Curator, Historical Intelligence Collection.



H. C. Eisenbeiss

STAT

Attachment:
As stated