

June 2006

FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

Most Public Benefit Conveyances Used as Intended, but Opportunities Exist to Enhance Federal Oversight



GAO

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability

GAO
Accountability · Integrity · Reliability

Highlights

Highlights of [GAO-06-511](#), a report to the Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives

Why GAO Did This Study

Under the public benefit conveyance (PBC) program, state or local governments and certain nonprofits can obtain surplus real property for public uses. The General Services Administration (GSA) has responsibility for the program but has delegated authority to the Department of Defense (DOD) for properties disposed of as part of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. Several “sponsoring agencies” ensure that properties are used as agreed to by grantees. GAO (1) determined the number, types, and locations of PBC properties disposed of in fiscal years 2000 through 2004, (2) assessed efforts to ensure that the properties are used as agreed to, and (3) identified any challenges facing agencies and grantees.

What GAO Recommends

GAO recommends that GSA coordinate with DOD and sponsoring agencies to (1) ensure that data on PBC properties are reliable and consistent, (2) consider developing uniform standards and guidance, and (3) address various challenges facing agencies and grantees. GAO also recommends that sponsoring agencies ensure that their compliance monitoring policies are followed. GSA, HHS, HUD, and Education generally concurred with the recommendations directed to them. HHS and HUD questioned the practicality of uniform standards and guidance for diverse properties.

www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-06-511.

To view the full product, including the scope and methodology, click on the link above. For more information, contact Mark L. Goldstein at (202) 512-2834 or GoldsteinM@gao.gov.

FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY

Most Public Benefit Conveyances Used as Intended, but Opportunities Exist to Enhance Federal Oversight

What GAO Found

GAO could not determine from GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data the exact number, types, and locations of properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 as part of the PBC program. Although GSA and DOD data on properties conveyed should have matched sponsoring agency data on properties being monitored, there were numerous inconsistencies. GSA data showed that 285 properties were conveyed, but 128 (45 percent) of these properties were not identified in data provided by sponsoring agencies. Similarly, DOD data showed that 179 properties were conveyed, yet 41 (23 percent) of these properties were not identified in sponsoring agency data. As a result, GSA, as well as the Office of Management and Budget and Congress, are not well equipped to effectively oversee the program. Better data would facilitate oversight and assessment of results and possible problems. GAO tried to resolve the inconsistencies and identified 298 properties that were conveyed for a variety of public uses, such as airports and parks. They were located throughout many states and U.S. territories. GAO noted that data on reverted property were not regularly collected.

GAO found that agencies generally did not follow policies and procedures they established, or those outlined in the property deeds, for ensuring that conveyed properties are used as intended. GAO could evaluate compliance monitoring for 41 of 58 properties selected for review. Of these, 36 did not receive the compliance monitoring specified in agency policies and procedures or the deed. Despite this, 51 of the 58 properties we analyzed were being used as agreed to by the grantee under the conveyance terms; while 4 had reverted back to the federal government, 2 had not been fully developed, and 1 was not used as agreed to by the grantee. GAO also found wide variation in agency policies and practices, depending on type of use, which seems to make the program unnecessarily complex. GAO identified several challenges faced by agencies and grantees. Agency officials cited the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program and to adhere to complex federal real property-related laws as challenges. Some agencies were concerned that GSA avoids reversions; however GSA said that in avoiding reversions, its intentions are to reduce the government’s overall financial burden. Grantees were generally pleased with the program, although a common challenge they cited was not having adequate information on both the program in general and individual properties.

Former Surplus Real Property Used by Communities



Source: GAO.

Contents

Letter

Results in Brief	1
Background	2
Lack of Reliable, Consistent Data Hampers PBC Program Management and Oversight	5
Inconsistent Compliance Monitoring Was Common, although Most Case Study Properties Were Used as Agreed to by the Grantee	13
Challenges Managing and Participating in the PBC Program Were Evident	23
Conclusions	39
Recommendations for Executive Action	50
Agency Comments and Our Evaluation	51
	52

Appendixes

Appendix I: Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	57
Appendix II: Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004	60
Appendix III: Summary Data on Properties Selected for Case Study	74
Appendix IV: Properties Selected for Case Studies	78
Appendix V: Comments from the General Services Administration	141
Appendix VI: Comments from the Department of Health and Human Services	144
Appendix VII: Comments from the Department of Education	148
Appendix VIII: GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments	149

Tables

Table 1: List of Public Benefit Use Authorities and Their Statutory Citations	7
Table 2: Sponsoring Agencies and Their Responsibilities, by Public Benefit Use	8
Table 3: Consistency of Compliance Oversight Performed for Case Study Properties in Accordance with Requirements in Agencies' Policies and Property Deeds	24
Table 4: Compliance Oversight Methods Stated in Agencies' Policies and Procedures for Properties Conveyed, Fiscal Years 1990-2004	34

Figures

Figure 1: PBC Process for Former Civilian Agency or Non-BRAC DOD Surplus Real Property	10
Figure 2: PBC Process for BRAC Surplus Real Property	12
Figure 3: Number of Properties Identified by Type of Use, Fiscal Years 2000-2004	21
Figure 4: Location of the Properties Identified, Fiscal Years 2000-2004	22
Figure 5: Little Cottonwood Park – one property	79
Figure 6: Port of Long Beach - one property	80
Figure 7: Savannah and Cabrillo Navy Housing – one property	81
Figure 8: Rolling Hills Preparatory School – one property	82
Figure 9: Westwood Transitional Village – one property	83
Figure 10: Southern California Logistics Airport - one property	84
Figure 11: Homestead Air Force Base Communications Annex – one property	85
Figure 12: Homestead Air Force Base Homeless Trust – one property	86
Figure 13: U.S. Custom House – one property	87
Figure 14: MacDill Air Force Base Railroad Spur – one property	88
Figure 15: U.S. Classic Courthouse – one property	89
Figure 16: Federal Building and USDA Lab – one property	90
Figure 17: Wyandotte County Correctional Facility and Court Services Building – one property	91
Figure 18: North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging, Inc. – one property	93
Figure 19: Milford Lake – one property	94
Figure 20: Tuttle Lake Wildlife Area – five properties	95
Figure 21: NIKE Village Site Topsfield, MA – one property	96
Figure 22: Bentley College – one property	98
Figure 23: New Jewish High School – one property	99
Figure 24: Veteran’s Memorial Park – one property	100
Figure 25: The Commander’s Mansion - one property	101
Figure 26: Squantum Gardens and Naval Terrace – one property	103
Figure 27: NIKE Site PH-02 – one property	105
Figure 28: Liberty House – one property	107
Figure 29: Valley Forge Christian College – two properties	108
Figure 30: Warminster Community Park – one property	110
Figure 31: Northampton Township Municipal Park – one property	112
Figure 32: Kings Branch Housing – one property	113

Figure 33: Carswell Air Force Base Communications Annex - one property	115
Figure 34: Lake Lewisville Independent School District Outdoor Learning Area – two properties	116
Figure 35: Naval Air Station Dallas Clear Zone - one property	117
Figure 36: Naval Air Station Dallas, Duncanville Housing Site - one property	118
Figure 37: Utah College of Applied Technology - one property	119
Figure 38: Weber County Schools Warehouse - one property	121
Figure 39: Davis School District Warehouse - one property	122
Figure 40: Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 - one property	123
Figure 41: Ogden Nature Center - one property	124
Figure 42: Weber County Fairgrounds - one property	125
Figure 43: Former Petersburg Correctional Institute – one property	126
Figure 44: Falling Creek Linear Park – one property	128
Figure 45: Riverside Regional Jail – one property	129
Figure 46: Cameron Station – one property	130
Figure 47: Naval Station Puget Sound – three properties	132
Figure 48: Midway NIKE Housing Site – one property	134
Figure 49: Howard A. Hanson Dam – one property	135
Figure 50: Olympia Federal Building – one property	137
Figure 51: Sand Point Magnuson Park – four properties	139

Abbreviations

BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
DOD	Department of Defense
DOT	Department of Transportation
DOJ	Department of Justice
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
Education	Department of Education
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GSA	General Services Administration
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
Interior	Department of the Interior
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
MARAD	Maritime Administration
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.



United States Government Accountability Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

June 21, 2006

The Honorable Tom Davis
Chairman
The Honorable Henry A. Waxman
Ranking Minority Member
Committee on Government Reform
House of Representatives

The federal real property portfolio is vast and diverse—over 30 agencies control hundreds of thousands of real property assets worldwide, including facilities and land worth hundreds of billions of dollars. However, many of these assets, which include vacant and underutilized properties, are no longer needed because of significant changes in the size and mission needs of federal agencies. This is one of the reasons that federal real property remains on our list of high-risk federal programs.¹ Unneeded assets present significant potential risks to federal agencies not only for lost dollars because such properties are costly to maintain; but also for lost opportunities because the properties could be put to more cost-beneficial uses, exchanged for other needed property, or sold to generate revenue for the government. In addition, continuing to hold real property that may no longer be needed does not present a positive image of the federal government in local communities.

The public benefits conveyance (PBC) program is one means of disposing of surplus federal property. Under the PBC program, which was primarily codified in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (Property Act), state or local governments and certain tax-exempt nonprofit organizations can obtain surplus real property for public uses such as homeless centers, educational facilities, and public parks. The General Services Administration (GSA) has primary responsibility for the administration of the program, but as required by law, has delegated conveyance authority to the Department of Defense (DOD) for DOD properties that are closed or realigned as part of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process.² Under laws and federal regulations promulgated by GSA implementing the PBC program, several “sponsoring agencies”

¹GAO, *Federal Real Property: Further Actions Needed to Address Long-standing and Complex Problems*, [GAO-05-848T](#) (Washington, D.C.: June 22, 2005).

²P.L. No. 101-510, Section 2905 (b), 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1990).

perform a number of functions integral to the PBC process. These agencies include the Departments of Education (Education), the Interior (Interior), Health and Human Services (HHS), Homeland Security (DHS), Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Justice (DOJ), and Transportation (DOT). In general, one sponsoring agency is designated per type of public benefit use based on its policy area of expertise. For example, Interior is the sponsoring agency for parks and recreation use and HHS is the sponsoring agency for public health use. Depending on the sponsoring agency, these responsibilities can include reviewing and approving PBC applications, deeding and conveying property, and monitoring the grantee's use of the property and compliance with deed restrictions. GSA or DOD assigns the property to the sponsoring agency so that a deed can be developed and the property can be conveyed to the grantee. Property not in compliance with the use agreed to by the grantee under the deed can revert to the federal government.

Our objectives were to (1) determine the number, types, and locations of surplus real properties disposed of using the PBC program in fiscal years 2000 through 2004; (2) assess GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency efforts to ensure that properties are used as agreed to by the grantee; and (3) identify any challenges facing agencies and grantees with regard to the program. To meet these objectives, we analyzed PBC property data and interviewed GSA and DOD officials. We also interviewed officials in each of the seven sponsoring agencies and reviewed these agencies' policies and procedures for the PBC program. In order to determine whether the agencies were performing compliance monitoring and properties were being used as agreed to by the grantees, we selected 58 properties for case study review that were conveyed during the 15-fiscal-year period from 1990 through 2004. We chose properties from a 15-year time period because this time frame would ensure that most of the properties would have an established compliance history. The 58 properties were chosen because they represented a mix of public uses, locations, stages of development (e.g., in planning versus completed), and compliance methods and histories. A list of the 58 properties we selected as case studies can be found in appendix III. Our scope and methodology are described in more detail in appendix I. We conducted our review from September 2004 through May 2006 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Results in Brief

We could not determine from GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data the exact number, types, and locations of properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 as part of the PBC program. Although GSA and DOD

data on properties conveyed should have matched sponsoring agency data on properties they were monitoring, there were numerous inconsistencies. For example, although GSA data showed that 285 properties were conveyed, 128 (45 percent) of these properties were not identified in data provided by sponsoring agencies. Similarly, DOD data showed that 179 properties were conveyed, yet 41 (23 percent) of these properties also were not identified in sponsoring agency data. As a result, the status of properties for which data were inconsistent remains unclear. Furthermore, GSA, which has primary responsibility for the program under the Property Act, as well as the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congress, are not well equipped to effectively oversee the program. Better data would facilitate oversight and assessment of results and possible problems. Lack of quality data was a major reason we designated federal real property as a high-risk area in 2003, and the inconsistencies we encountered with the PBC data illustrate this problem. We also found other data reliability problems, including incomplete data and lack of specificity. Despite the inconsistencies with the data and reliability issues, we attempted to resolve the data consistencies and were able to identify 298 PBC properties on which DOD, GSA, and sponsoring agency data were generally in agreement. These properties were conveyed for a variety of public uses, such as airports, schools, and parks, and were located throughout many of the 50 states, Guam, and Puerto Rico. Almost half of the properties were disposed of as part of the BRAC process. Although available data showed that 12 properties conveyed as PBCs reverted to the federal government, data on reverted property were not regularly collected, so other properties may have reverted. To ensure better oversight and accountability, we are recommending that GSA coordinate and work with DOD and each of the sponsoring agencies to ensure that PBC property data are reliable and consistent between agencies.

Our review showed that agencies generally did not follow policies and procedures they established, or those outlined in the deed, for ensuring that conveyed properties were used as intended by grantees. In our case study of 58 properties, we were able to evaluate compliance practices for 41 properties. Eighty-eight percent, 36 of the 41, did not receive the monitoring specified in agency policies or the property deed. It is important to note that despite the problems we found with compliance monitoring, 51 of the 58 properties we selected as case studies were being used as agreed to by the grantee under the terms of the conveyance and 7 were not. Of the 7 properties, 4 had reverted to the federal government, 2 had not been fully developed, and 1 was not used as intended. The other 51 properties we

visited were being used by the grantees for a variety of public purposes, as illustrated by the following examples:

- A nature center area in Ogden, Utah, provided a sanctuary for wildlife.
- Land formerly occupied by an army hospital in Waltham, Massachusetts, was redeveloped for use by a private high school, a nearby college, and public park.
- Two former NIKE missile sites in Washington and Massachusetts were redeveloped to provide transitional housing for homeless individuals.

In our case study review, we also found that GSA and the sponsoring agencies generally used a mix of self-reporting by grantees and site inspections by agencies to ensure that PBC properties were being used as agreed to by grantees, although the frequency of these actions varied between agencies. For example, DOT's Maritime Administration (MARAD) does not require site inspections for port facility use, while HHS requires site inspections for homeless and public health properties within the first 12 months of use and at least every 5 years thereafter. We also noted that agencies' policies on properties reverting to the federal government varied. The range of compliance monitoring approaches we encountered was largely due to the decentralized nature of the program and differences in agency preferences for carrying out monitoring. We found no compelling rationale or criteria for the differences in compliance approaches and reversion policies and practices, and as a result, the PBC program seems unnecessarily complex, with a wide range of different policies and practices being administered separately by several agencies, depending on the type of public benefit use. The complex nature of the federal real property environment was an underlying cause of problems that led to our designation of this area as high risk in 2003 and the wide variation in agencies' implementation of the PBC program illustrates this condition. We are recommending that sponsoring agencies with compliance monitoring responsibilities take action to better ensure that their compliance monitoring policies are followed and that GSA coordinate with DOD and the sponsoring agencies and give consideration to developing uniform standards and guidance for the program, where appropriate.

We identified several other challenges facing agencies and grantees with regard to the program. Agency officials we spoke with cited the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program as the primary challenge they faced in fulfilling their compliance monitoring and other

PBC responsibilities. Another challenge agency officials cited was the need to adhere to complex, federal real property-related laws, such as those related to military base closures and homeless assistance. We noted that GSA and sponsoring agencies often sought alternatives to the reversion of noncompliant property to the government. However, some sponsoring agency officials were concerned that the tendency by GSA to avoid reversions takes away a main compliance enforcement mechanism. GSA officials said that their agency attempts to resolve compliance issues with PBC properties and avoid reversions because of the overall risk and financial burden these properties could pose to the federal government. Most of the grantees were pleased with the program, although a common challenge they cited was not being fully informed about the workings of the program and the condition of individual properties prior to conveyance. In some cases, grantees said that this lack of information resulted in unanticipated costs. We also found that information on the PBC program was fragmented across several government Web sites, compounding the concerns grantees expressed about communication. We are recommending that GSA work with DOD and each of the sponsoring agencies to address these challenges. In commenting on a draft of this report, GSA, HHS, HUD, and Education provided comments and generally concurred with the recommendations directed to them. HHS and HUD questioned the practicality of uniform standards and guidance for diverse properties. DOD, DOJ, and DOT had no official comments on this report but provided separate technical comments, which we incorporated into the report where appropriate. DHS had no comments on this report. Interior was unable to provide official comments in time to be included in the report.

Background

The Property Act governs the disposal of most federal real property.³ When a federal agency no longer needs a property to carry out its mission responsibilities, the property is reported as excess and is offered to other federal agencies for use. If another federal agency does not have a need for the property, it is considered surplus to the federal government, and state or local governments and certain tax-exempt nonprofit organizations can obtain the property through the PBC program for an approved public benefit use. The PBC program is not the only method used to dispose of

³40 U.S.C. §§ 541-559 governs the disposal of real and personal property.

surplus real property; property can also be disposed of by negotiated⁴ and public sale⁵ or by other conveyances available under BRAC, such as economic development conveyances.⁶

Properties are conveyed⁷ to grantees with deed restrictions ranging from 30 years to in perpetuity and can be provided at a discount of up to 100 percent of fair market value. Six public benefit use authorities have been in existence since before the Property Act became law; they are education, public health, parks and recreation, historic monument, wildlife conservation, and public airport. The remaining six public benefit use authorities—correctional, homeless, port facility, self-help housing, law enforcement, and emergency management response—were enacted into law between 1984 and 1997. Table 1 lists the public benefit use authorities, the years they were enacted, and their statutory citations.

⁴GSA can negotiate a sale at appraised fair market value with a state or local government if the property will be used for another public purpose.

⁵If state and local governments or other eligible nonprofits do not wish to acquire the property, GSA can dispose of property via a competitive sale to the public, generally through a sealed bid or auction.

⁶DOD has authority to transfer BRAC property to local redevelopment authorities (LRA) that are created under the BRAC process to help spur local economic development and job creation. An economic development conveyance may be with or without an initial payment at the time of transfer and may be at or below the estimated fair market value of the property. Terms and conditions of payment to DOD are fully negotiable. According to DOD, these negotiations should be fair and reasonable to both parties and strike a balance between compensation to the federal taxpayer and the need for the conveyance to spur redevelopment and job creation.

⁷To convey property is to transfer title or ownership of property to another entity.

Table 1: List of Public Benefit Use Authorities and Their Statutory Citations

Public benefit use authorities	When enacted	Statutory citation
Education	Prior to 1949	40 U.S.C. § 550(c).
Public health	Prior to 1949	40 U.S.C. § 550(d).
Parks and recreation	Prior to 1949	40 U.S.C. § 550(e).
Historic monument	Prior to 1949 1972 Amendments	40 U.S.C. § 550(h).
Wildlife conservation ^a	Prior to 1949	16 U.S.C. § 667b.
Public airport ^a	Prior to 1949	49 U.S.C. § 47151.
Correctional	1984	40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(1).
Homeless ^a	1988	42 U.S.C. § 11411.
Port facility	1994	40 U.S.C. § 554.
Self-help housing	1997	40 U.S.C. § 550(f).
Law enforcement	1997	40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(2).
Emergency management response	1997	40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(3).

Source: GAO.

^aWildlife conservation, public airport, and homeless public uses were not codified in the Property Act.

GSA and DOD are responsible for managing the disposal of surplus real property through the PBC process. GSA handles the disposal of former civilian agency and non-BRAC DOD surplus property. DOD handles the disposal of surplus BRAC property. Seven federal agencies—DHS, DOJ, DOT, Education, HHS, HUD, and Interior—assist GSA and DOD with the PBC process. These agencies are known as sponsoring agencies, and at least one sponsoring agency is designated per type of public benefit use based on its policy area expertise. For example, Interior is the sponsoring agency for parks and recreation use, and HHS is the sponsoring agency for public health use. Table 2 displays the sponsoring agencies and their responsibilities by public benefit use. As shown in table 2, for some public benefit uses, one sponsoring agency is responsible for reviewing and approving applications, while another sponsoring agency is responsible for conveying the property and performing compliance monitoring. For example, DHS's Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is tasked with reviewing and approving emergency management response applications, while GSA performs compliance oversight of properties conveyed for this use.

Table 2: Sponsoring Agencies and Their Responsibilities, by Public Benefit Use

Public benefit use	Sponsoring agency	Sponsoring agency responsibilities	Length of deed restriction
Education	Department of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	30 years
Public health	Department of Health and Human Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	30 years
Parks and recreation	Department of the Interior – Federal Lands to Parks Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	In perpetuity
Historic monument	Department of the Interior – Historic Surplus Property Program General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval (Historic Surplus Property Program) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (Historic Surplus Property Program) 	In perpetuity
Wildlife conservation	Department of the Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review^a (GSA or FWS) and approval (GSA) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (GSA) 	In perpetuity
Public airport	Department of Transportation – Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval (FAA) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (FAA) 	In perpetuity
Correctional	Department of Justice General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval (DOJ) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (GSA) 	In perpetuity
Port facility	Department of Transportation – Maritime Administration (MARAD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	In perpetuity
Self-help housing	Department of Housing and Urban Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	40 years
Law enforcement	Department of Justice General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval (DOJ) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (GSA) 	In perpetuity
Emergency management Response	Department of Homeland Security – Federal Emergency Management Agency General Services Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval (FEMA) • Deeding and conveyance (GSA) • Compliance monitoring (GSA) 	In perpetuity
Homeless	Department of Health and Human Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application review and approval • Deeding and conveyance • Compliance monitoring 	30 years


Source: GAO.

^aUnlike other sponsoring agencies that are tasked with reviewing PBC applications, the law does not specifically state who is responsible for reviewing and approving wildlife conservation PBCs. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has been providing this service when either the applicant or GSA requests that the agency provide a letter of endorsement for the proposed use. In cases where the input of FWS is not sought, GSA reviews and approves wildlife conservation PBCs.

The PBC process differs depending on whether surplus real property is former BRAC property versus former civilian agency or non-BRAC DOD property. As noted previously, GSA is responsible for managing the disposal of former civilian agency and non-BRAC DOD property as PBCs. GSA determines the current condition of surplus real property, including any environmental contamination and cleanup required. Pursuant to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act), HUD then reviews the property to determine if it is suitable for homeless use. If the property is considered suitable for homeless use, it is first made available for homeless use consideration 60 days prior to any other public benefit use. If the property is not considered suitable or if there is no interest in the property, it becomes available for all other public benefit uses. State or local governments and qualified nonprofits interested in obtaining the property by public benefit conveyance submit applications to the sponsoring agencies describing how they plan to use the property. The sponsoring agencies then consider all applications and determine which one proposes the best public use for the property. The sponsoring agency notifies GSA of the chosen applicant. GSA assigns the property to the sponsoring agency so that a deed can be developed and the property can be conveyed to the grantee.

Once a property has been conveyed, grantees are responsible for adhering to all restrictions in the deed. Examples of deed restrictions include limitations on the property's use and revenue generation, the length of time to develop or implement the approved use, and requirements to allow site inspections or to submit periodic utilization reports. If the sponsoring agency determines that a grantee is out of compliance, the grantee is notified and the sponsoring agency works with the grantee to help bring the property back into compliance. After continued noncompliance, the sponsoring agency decides whether the property should revert and, if so, suggests that GSA take action to revert the property. The property then reverts to the federal portfolio and is reconsidered for disposal. Figure 1 shows the PBC process in general for former civilian agency and non-BRAC DOD surplus property.

Figure 1: PBC Process for Former Civilian Agency or Non-BRAC DOD Surplus Real Property



Source: GAO.

The disposal of surplus BRAC property by the PBC process is handled differently from the disposal of former civilian agency or non-BRAC DOD property. As noted previously, GSA, as required by law, has delegated conveyance authority to DOD for those DOD surplus properties that are generated through the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. DOD has subsequently delegated its BRAC disposal authority to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including the authority to manage surplus real property disposals involving PBCs. A key difference in the PBC process for the disposal of BRAC property is the participation of a local redevelopment authority (LRA). Though such participation is not required by law, most BRAC closures have historically involved an LRA, which is generally composed of members from the surrounding community or communities affected by the base closure.⁸ LRAs have historically been responsible for planning for the future reuse of BRAC property and for


⁸According to DOD officials, an LRA is not always established, particularly when the portion of land being disposed of is small or in an area that is not well populated.

acting as the single point of contact between the government and the interests within the communities during the disposal process. The primary function of the LRA is to create a redevelopment plan that proposes the future use of each parcel of surplus real property in the installation.⁹ The LRAs and the military departments determine what portion of surplus installation property will be disposed of as PBCs. When considering future reuse, LRAs take into consideration community needs, interests of possible reuse recipients, the environmental condition of the property, and any necessary remediation. The LRA is also tasked with giving consideration to local homeless needs. The Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994¹⁰ amended the McKinney-Vento Act and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to provide for different procedures relating to the use and transferability of properties to assist the homeless at a military installation that is to be closed or aligned under BRAC. Pursuant to the 1994 amendment, the LRA develops a redevelopment plan for the installation and solicits interest from homeless providers. HUD provides LRAs with technical advice and guidance on the homeless requirements and reviews the redevelopment plan to determine if it appropriately balances the interests of the homeless in the vicinity of the installation with the economic and other redevelopment needs of the community. Figure 2 shows the PBC process in general for BRAC surplus property.

⁹The LRA's role in planning for the redevelopment of surplus DOD properties in the 2005 BRAC round may be reduced as a result of Congress's general mandate to DOD to seek to obtain fair market value in its BRAC disposal actions. See Pub. L. No. 101-510 § 2900(b)(4), 10 U.S.C. 2687 note (1990). Accordingly, this mandate could also impact the extent to which PBCs are used as a means of conveying 2005 BRAC surplus properties.

¹⁰Pub. L. No. 103-421 (1994).

Figure 2: PBC Process for BRAC Surplus Real Property



Source: GAO.

The proposed redevelopment plans are then submitted to the military department. Although deeding authority varies among the different public benefit uses, for parcels that have been approved for disposal as PBCs, the Army, Navy, or Air Force generally assigns the property to the appropriate sponsoring agency, which deeds the property to the grantee.¹¹ Compliance for surplus BRAC property conveyed as public benefit conveyances is handled by the sponsoring agencies in the same manner as surplus former

¹¹For public airport and historic monument conveyances, the military department does not assign the property to the sponsoring agency. Instead, the military department obtains approval from the sponsoring agency prior to deeding the property to the grantee itself. In the case of homeless use conveyances, according to DOD's *Base Reuse Implementation Manual*, if there is no specific request from HUD, the military department may directly transfer the property for homeless use to the grantee.

civilian agency or non-BRAC DOD property. Reverted property returns either to GSA's or the military department's inventory of real property assets.¹²

Lack of Reliable, Consistent Data Hampers PBC Program Management and Oversight

We could not determine, from GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data, the exact number, types, and locations of properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 as part of the PBC program. There were numerous properties identified by GSA and DOD that did not match with properties identified by the sponsoring agencies. As a result, we could not determine the status of 128 GSA properties and 41 DOD properties purportedly conveyed using the PBC program. Despite inconsistencies with GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data, we undertook our own effort to resolve the inconsistencies and were able to identify 298 PBC properties for which GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies data were generally in agreement. These properties were conveyed for a variety of public uses, such as airports, schools, and parks, and were located in many of the 50 states, Guam, and Puerto Rico. For a number of reasons, reliable, consistent data on PBC properties would be beneficial to the effective oversight and management of the program.

GSA, DOD, and Sponsoring Agency Data Were Not Consistent or Reliable

GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data had inconsistencies that prevented us from determining, with reasonable assurance, the exact number, types, and locations of properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 as part of the PBC program. GSA and DOD each maintain separate lists of properties they have disposed of using the PBC program. In addition, each of the sponsoring agencies maintains a separate list of the properties for which it has compliance responsibilities. GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies keep PBC property data in various formats, including electronic data and paper case files, and in different locations, such as in central headquarters or field offices. In addition, we found that each agency keeps different pieces of information on each property.

To address the challenge of having multiple and varying data sources, we requested that GSA and DOD provide us with a complete and reliable list of properties conveyed and that each of the sponsoring agencies provide us with a complete and reliable list of properties for which it had compliance

¹²For homeless use conveyances, property can revert to the LRA.

responsibilities. Specifically, we asked that the agencies provide us with the following pieces of information: property name, description, address, sponsoring agency,¹³ grantee including contact information, date of conveyance, intended use, and compliance history, including dates of utilization reports or site inspections. Because each agency, as noted above, keeps property data in varying formats, we received electronic data and case file documents, such as property deeds.

Although GSA and DOD data on properties conveyed should have matched sponsoring agency data on properties they were monitoring, there were several inconsistencies. For properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004, a significant number on GSA's and DOD's lists did not match with the sponsoring agencies' lists. More specifically, although GSA data showed that 285 properties were conveyed, 128 (45 percent) of these properties were not identified in data provided by the sponsoring agencies. It was also sometimes difficult to compare properties on GSA's list with those on sponsoring agencies' lists because at times the property name, acreage, and date conveyed differed. Nineteen properties in GSA data appeared to be similar to properties on the sponsoring agencies' lists, but because of differences in the properties' name, acreage, or date conveyed, we could not determine with certainty whether these properties were in fact the same. For example, a GSA property named the "Grand Forks Safeguard Waterline" was listed as conveyed for public health use to the North Valley Water District.¹⁴ HHS lists a similar property in North Dakota as being conveyed to the same grantee for public health use, but the name of the property and date conveyed differ. GSA property data also frequently lacked the name of the grantee and the sponsoring agency assigned compliance responsibilities. In particular, data on 77 (27 percent) of the 285 properties reported by GSA lacked the name of the grantee, and data on 150 (53 percent) lacked the name of the sponsoring agency. In addition, data on 91 (32 percent) of the 285 properties reported by GSA did not include precise information on the public use for which they were conveyed. Specifically, the public use for these properties was categorized as "Other." Similarly, DOD data showed that 179 properties were conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004, yet 41 (23 percent) of these properties were not identified in sponsoring agency data. It was also hard to compare

¹³We asked that only GSA and DOD provide information on the sponsoring agency.

¹⁴GSA did not provide a description of this property, so we were unable to determine if the property description was consistent with the description provided by HHS.

DOD data to sponsoring agency data because the property name, acreage, and date conveyed varied, making it difficult to determine whether properties matched. Specifically, 24 properties on DOD's list appeared to be similar to properties on the sponsoring agencies' lists, but because of differences in the property name, acreage, or date conveyed, we could not determine with certainty whether these properties were the same.

Because of discrepancies between GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency property data, the status of several properties that appear to have been conveyed using the PBC program could not readily be determined. As mentioned, there were 128 and 41 properties that were identified in GSA and DOD data, respectively, that did not appear in the sponsoring agency data. Determining the status of these properties was beyond the scope of this review. Nonetheless, it was unclear whether these properties were actually conveyed and if so, whether the sponsoring agencies were monitoring their use and whether they were being used as agreed by the grantees. Our inability to verify that the sponsoring agencies were aware of these properties and were monitoring their use raised concerns that a basic tool for oversight—in this case, consistent data on the universe of PBC properties—was lacking, thereby making the program vulnerable to misuse.

We also found that the data submitted by GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies were incomplete and unreliable, as the following examples illustrate.

- *Data were incomplete*—The data we received from the agencies had missing fields. For example, in a significant number of instances, GSA data were missing the property address; the sponsoring agency; or the grantee's name, address, and contact information. In some instances, DOD property data also lacked the grantee's name, address, and contact information. In addition, some of the sponsoring agencies did not provide compliance information for each of their properties. For example, MARAD and FAA did not provide us compliance information for any of their properties. Other agencies, such as Interior, provided compliance information for some but not all of their properties. Specifically, Interior did not provide compliance data for 6 of 23 properties submitted by its Historic Surplus Property Program and for 22 of 125 properties submitted by its Federal Lands to Parks Program.
- *Data lacked specificity*—The data provided by the agencies lacked specificity. Because each agency maintains its own database of

properties, there is wide variation—such as how detailed the information is—that each agency keeps on its PBC properties. For example, the physical description of each property conveyed ranged from basic information on the size (e.g., 9 acres) to very detailed explanations of the location and landscape of the property. In some instances, agencies also used abbreviations for the names of the property and grantee that were not easily discernible. GSA data show, for example, that 12 acres known as the Klein Water Treatment Plant were conveyed for public health use in April 2004 to a grantee listed as “SACWSD.”

- *Data lacked unique identifiers*—Only GSA and the Air Force provided unique identifying codes for each property.¹⁵ Properties were identified most often by name, and it was common for one or more properties to have the same name. DOD’s list of properties, for example, included nine properties all named “Fort Ord.” In addition, we found that property names were changed after the properties were transferred from GSA and DOD to the sponsoring agency. For example, a former BRAC parcel of property conveyed for parks and recreation use was referred to as “San Diego, CA – NTC” on DOD’s list but as “Liberty Station Park” on the sponsoring agency’s list. GSA and Air Force codes were not regularly used by the sponsoring agencies monitoring the property grantees’ compliance, so it was difficult to determine whether a property listed as conveyed by GSA or DOD was the same property on the sponsoring agencies’ lists. No PBC-programwide system of coding properties exists so that a property can be tracked for compliance after it transferred from GSA or DOD to the sponsoring agency.

Data Not Regularly Maintained on Property That Reverted to the Government

GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies do not regularly collect data on property that has reverted to the federal government. In fiscal years 2000 through 2004, GSA and the sponsoring agencies reported, using the data available, that 12 properties conveyed for public uses reverted to the federal government. Yet we cannot reliably determine the number of properties that reverted during this period because GSA and DOD do not systematically collect data on property that comes back to the federal inventory, so there may be other properties that reverted. For example,

¹⁵In commenting on this report, HHS noted that it also has a unique identification number for each property conveyed by HHS, which it uses in conjunction with GSA and DOD identifying codes. HHS did not provide these numbers to us during our audit.

GSA's manual for its NetReal database¹⁶ does not require that realty staff update property information in the system once a property has reverted. Therefore, GSA cannot identify all of the properties in the database that have reverted to the federal government. Because of this uncertainty, we requested data from each of the sponsoring agencies on the number of properties that reverted during this period. When we compared the sponsoring agencies' lists of reverted properties with that of GSA's list, we identified one property—USCG Naushon Housing—that was reported as reverted by the sponsoring agency but not by GSA. According to GSA officials, they were able to verify that the property had reverted by checking paper files in their regional offices. In addition, GSA's list of reverted properties included five properties that did not appear on the sponsoring agencies' lists of reverted properties. GSA data noted that two of these properties—a boundary line adjustment and property easement—were not reversions. Therefore, we cannot be sure whether GSA's NetReal database includes all the properties that reverted during this period and whether properties included in the database are reversions as opposed to other types of real estate transactions. In commenting on a draft of this report, GSA said that NetReal was designed to collect disposal data for case management during the disposal process—not to track predisposal or postconveyance activities. According to GSA, it is in the process of developing a new system called the Real Estate Disposal Inventory Network (REDI Net), which will replace NetReal. The REDI Net system, when completed, will identify and maintain an accurate accounting for all major procedural tasks for the disposal of excess and surplus real property. It will also include contact and document management elements, thereby creating an electronic clearinghouse for all real property disposal projects handled by GSA. An initial application of the system is planned to be released this fiscal year.

DOD reported that it did not revert any property in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 because, according to DOD officials, DOD is not involved in the PBC reversion process. Instead, DOD officials noted that it is the responsibility of the sponsoring agencies to monitor compliance of former BRAC property. DOD stated that because it is not involved in the reversion process, it does not keep track of reverted properties. However, we found that one property on the sponsoring agencies' list—the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 property—reverted back to the

¹⁶GSA's NetReal database is used by regional realty staff to keep track of property disposed of by the PBC process as well as by other disposal methods.

Army instead of to GSA. Because DOD does not have a systematic method in place to track the number of properties that revert, we also can not reliably determine the number of properties that reverted back to DOD during this time period.

Reliable and Consistent Data Are Important Given the Decentralized Nature of the Program and the Number of Agencies Involved

Having reliable, consistent data on PBC properties is critically important for multiple reasons. First, as we have described, the lack of reliable, consistent data makes it difficult to determine basic facts about the program, such as the number of properties that have been conveyed through it. The PBC program is decentralized and a number of agencies are involved in maintaining PBC property data. GSA, DOD, and each of the sponsoring agencies maintain separate lists of properties conveyed as part of the PBC program. These data are kept in different types of formats and locations. In addition, each agency keeps different pieces of data on each property. Because of these factors, as well as the quality of the PBC data—which were incomplete and unreliable—we were unable to determine, with reasonable assurance, the number of properties conveyed. Furthermore, the status of properties for which GSA and DOD data did not match sponsoring agency data was unclear.

Second, complete, accurate property data could help mitigate the risk associated with holding property no longer needed by the federal government and ensure that PBC properties are being used as agreed by grantees, an important element of managing the program. We have previously reported that unneeded property presents significant potential risks to federal agencies not only of lost dollars, because such properties are costly to maintain, but also of lost opportunities, because the properties could be put to more cost-beneficial uses, exchanged for other needed property, or sold to generate revenue for the government. Agencies that continue to hold excess or underutilized property are also likely incurring significant costs, both for staff time spent managing the properties and for maintenance, utilities, security, and other building needs. Third, there are additional costs associated with unneeded properties that are not being used appropriately as can occur with PBCs. These include the deterioration of property and the negative image unused or misused property can present to the local community. Such property presents an image of waste and inefficiency that can erode taxpayers' confidence in government. Moreover, a property that is occupying a valuable location and is not used for other purposes, sold, or redeveloped can have a negative impact on the local economy.

For these reasons, the lack of reliable, consistent data on PBC properties makes it difficult for GSA, the primary agency with responsibility for the program under the Property Act, as well as OMB and Congress, to effectively oversee the program. Better data would facilitate oversight and assessment of results and possible problems. We have previously reported that there is a lack of reliable and useful real property data for strategic decision making. In April 2002, we reported that the government's only central source of descriptive data on the makeup of the real property inventory, known then as GSA's worldwide inventory database and related real property reports, contained data that were unreliable and of limited usefulness.¹⁷

Unreliable real property data—both at GSA and at individual real property holding agencies—was a reason we designated federal real property as a high-risk area,¹⁸ and the inconsistencies we encountered with the PBC data illustrate this problem. Partly in response to our high-risk reports, the President issued an executive order in 2004 aimed at improving federal real property asset management.¹⁹ This executive order, among other things, required GSA to establish and maintain a single, comprehensive and descriptive database of real property under the custody and control of all executive branch agencies, except when otherwise required for reasons of national security. To meet this requirement, GSA has undertaken an effort to revamp its worldwide inventory database, now referred to as the federal real property profile. We have not evaluated GSA's database efforts and related report. In addition to improving data on the federal inventory as a whole, quality data will be critical for addressing the wide range of problems facing the government in the real property area.

Developing complete, reliable data on properties disposed of through the PBC program would be beneficial for assessing the program and could be even more important for managing the program if the PBC program were to be used more extensively in the future to address the government's surplus property problem. The government, at the time of our review, could not be sure whether properties disposed of through the PBC program are being

¹⁷GAO, *Federal Real Property: Better Governmentwide Data Needed for Strategic Decisionmaking*, [GAO-02-342](#) (Washington, D.C.: Apr. 16, 2002).

¹⁸GAO, *High-Risk Series: Federal Real Property*, [GAO-03-122](#) (Washington, D.C.: January 2003).

¹⁹Presidential Executive Order 13327.


used as agreed to by grantees, and GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies would likely struggle to provide effective management and oversight of the program without better data. However, most of the grantees we spoke to were generally pleased with the results of the PBC program. And, as will be discussed later, most of the properties we visited appeared to be used as agreed to by the grantees and in ways that benefited their communities. Thus, more accurate information on the number of properties that have been conveyed and their compliance status could go a long way to showing how effective the PBC program is for disposing of surplus property. GSA and DOD officials told us that better data on PBC properties could possibly be developed as part of GSA's efforts to revamp its governmentwide database—the federal real property profile. In fact, GSA has told us that the federal real property profile will include the ability to maintain historical data on federal real property assets after disposal is completed. In commenting on a draft of this report, GSA said that the REDI Net system it is developing to replace NetReal, its current property management database, will also improve the data accuracy issues we identified, provide performance measures to gauge the effectiveness of GSA program operations, and improve program management and oversight.

Conveyed Properties Identified Were Located Nationwide and Reflected a Range of Uses

Despite inconsistencies with GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agency data, we undertook our own effort to resolve the data inconsistencies and were able to identify 298 PBC properties for which the agency data were generally in agreement. This effort provided us with reasonable assurance that these properties were conveyed and that the sponsoring agencies were aware of their monitoring responsibilities. The 298 properties we could identify are listed in appendix II. Of these properties, 158 (53 percent) were former civilian agency or non-BRAC DOD surplus properties disposed of by GSA, and 140 (47 percent) were former BRAC surplus properties disposed of by DOD. GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data showed that each type of public benefit use was represented, but some uses were more common than others. The largest numbers of properties, 109, were conveyed for parks and recreation use while 1 property, was conveyed for self-help housing and 1 property was conveyed for emergency management response use. As shown in figure 3, properties conveyed for airport and port facility uses are more often former BRAC surplus real properties. In comparison, properties conveyed for correctional, homeless, law enforcement, wildlife conservation, and historic monuments uses are more often former civilian agency and non-BRAC DOD surplus real properties. About the same number of BRAC and civilian agency or non-BRAC DOD surplus real properties are conveyed for education, public health, and

parks and recreation uses. These trends are related to the types of federal surplus real properties that become available through GSA and DOD. For example, aircraft runways that are well suited for public airport use appear to be available as surplus BRAC properties more often than as surplus civilian agency and non-BRAC DOD surplus real properties.

Figure 3: Number of Properties Identified by Type of Use, Fiscal Years 2000-2004




Source: GAO.

GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency data showed that the properties we identified were conveyed for PBC use throughout many of the 50 states, as well as Guam and Puerto Rico. As figure 4 shows, California had the largest number of conveyed properties, 45, and Delaware, Iowa, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Rhode Island, Wisconsin and Puerto Rico each had one conveyed property. In fiscal years 2000 through 2004, no

property was conveyed in Maine, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming or in the District of Columbia.

Figure 4: Location of the Properties Identified, Fiscal Years 2000-2004



Source: GAO.

Inconsistent Compliance Monitoring Was Common, although Most Case Study Properties Were Used as Agreed to by the Grantee

Our review showed that the sponsoring agencies generally did not follow policies and procedures they established, or those outlined in the deed, for ensuring that conveyed properties were used as intended by grantees. In our case study of 58 properties, we were able to evaluate compliance practices for 41 properties. Eighty-eight percent, or 36 of 41, did not receive the compliance monitoring specified in agency policies or the property deed. Inconsistent compliance monitoring is a concern because it results in a lack of assurance that properties are being used as agreed to by grantees and that the program's overall objectives are being met. Despite these issues, most of the properties that we visited were being used as agreed to by the grantee and appeared to be producing benefits. In our case study review, we found that GSA and the sponsoring agencies used a mix of self-reporting by grantees and site inspections to ensure that properties were being used as agreed to by grantees, although the frequency of these actions varied. We also noted that the agencies' policies on property reversions to the federal government varied. As a result, the PBC program seems unnecessarily complex, with a wide range of compliance approaches and reversion policies and procedures being administered separately by several agencies, depending on the type of public benefit use. The complex nature of the federal real property environment was an underlying cause of problems that led to our designation of this area as high-risk in 2003, and the wide variation among agencies with regard to the PBC program seems to illustrate this condition.

Inconsistent Compliance Monitoring Was Common

We could evaluate compliance monitoring for 41 of 58 properties we selected for detailed review. Eighty-eight percent (36 of 41) of the properties where we could evaluate compliance practices did not receive the compliance monitoring that was specified in agency policies or property deeds. In order to determine whether the agencies were performing compliance monitoring and properties were being used as agreed to by the grantees, we selected 58 properties for case study review that were conveyed during the 15-fiscal-year period from 1990 through 2004. We chose properties from a 15-year period (i.e., versus 5-year period) because the longer time frame would increase the likelihood that most properties would have an established compliance history. The 58 properties were chosen because they represented a mix of public uses, locations, stages of development (e.g., in planning versus completed), and compliance methods and histories. A list of the 58 properties we selected as case studies can be found in appendix III, and more information on our methodology for selecting properties can be found in appendix I.

For 41 of the 58 properties we selected for case study review, we were able to evaluate whether the agencies performed compliance monitoring consistent with the property deeds and the agencies' compliance policies. We were unable to evaluate compliance oversight for 17 properties we selected because 8 recently conveyed properties, as expected, did not yet have a compliance history;²⁰ 4 properties had already reverted to the federal government;²¹ and we were unable to obtain compliance information from the agencies for 5 properties.²² As shown in table 4, 36 of the 41 properties (88 percent) where we could evaluate compliance practices received inconsistent compliance oversight—that is, they did not receive the compliance monitoring spelled out in the agencies' policies and property deeds.

Table 3: Consistency of Compliance Oversight Performed for Case Study Properties in Accordance with Requirements in Agencies' Policies and Property Deeds

Compliance oversight	Federal Lands to Parks Program ^a	Historic Surplus Property Program ^a	Education	GSA	HHS	HUD	Total
Inconsistent	8	2	10	7	8	1	36
Consistent	2	0	3	0	0	0	5
Number of properties evaluated	10	2	13	7	8	1	41

Source: GAO.

^aThis program is part of the Department of the Interior.

²⁰These properties include the Federal Building/USDA Lab property, the U.S. Classic Courthouse property, the U.S. Custom House property, and the Communication Site - Homestead AFB property; a Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD property, the George property, and two Defense Depot - Ogden, UT properties.

²¹The four reverted properties were the NIKE PH-02 property; the Milford Lake property; the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 property; and the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion) property.

²²We did not receive compliance information from MARAD for one Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD property; and from the Federal Lands to Parks Program for four properties that were part of the former Naval Station Puget Sound at Sand Point. These were the Sand Point Playground Parcel, Sand Point Magnuson Park, Portion Sand Point Magnuson Park, and Sand Point Puget Sound, WA NAVSTA properties.

Note: This table includes only the 41 properties for which we could evaluate the consistency of compliance oversight and the sponsoring agencies responsible for performing this oversight. We were unable to evaluate the consistency of compliance oversight for 17 properties we selected for case study review because 8 recently conveyed properties did not yet have a compliance history, 4 properties had already reverted back to the federal government, and we were unable to obtain compliance information from the agencies for 5 properties.

Specifically, compliance records provided to us by GSA and the sponsoring agencies indicated that a number of grantees did not consistently submit utilization reports as specified in their property deeds and, in some cases, the agencies did not respond to the grantees' failure to report in a timely manner. In other cases, the agencies did not conduct site inspections as frequently as required by their compliance policies. For example, we found that

- for 4 properties, grantees did not consistently provide utilization reports as required by their deeds,
- for 16 properties, agencies did not consistently conduct site inspections as required by their policies, and
- for 16 properties, grantees did not consistently provide utilization reports as required by their deeds and agencies did not consistently conduct site inspections as required by their policies.
- Agencies' compliance policies generally require that agencies' PBC program staff send a letter of request to the grantee if the grantee fails to provide periodic utilization reports. The letter reminds the grantee of the requirement to submit reports as specified in its deed and states the consequences of not reporting. But grantees for 20 of the 41 properties we evaluated did not consistently provide utilization reports. In at least one case, the compliance record provided by the sponsoring agency did not indicate that the agency had sent a letter of request, as the following illustrates.
- The Olympia Federal Building was conveyed to the State of Washington as a historic monument PBC in 1998. Yet since that time, according to the building managers we interviewed, the state filed only one utilization report in 2000 and has never received any notice or requests from Historic Surplus Property Program staff for the other reports even though biennial reports are required in the deed. Historic Surplus

-
- Property Program compliance records did not include the one utilization report purportedly filed by the state.²³

In other instances, sponsoring agencies took a number of years to respond to missing utilization reports, as the following examples illustrate.

- The City of Tacoma filed consecutive annual utilization reports from 1991 to 1997 for the Portion Howard A. Hanson Dam King County, Washington property as required in the deed. However, according to HHS documents, the agency did not receive annual utilization reports from the grantee for 1998, 1999, and 2000 and sent a letter in May 2000 demanding reports for all 3 years within 30 days, which the grantee provided. Although the property did not appear to be used for unintended purposes during the period of nonreporting, according to agency guidance, the agency should have responded in a more timely manner when the grantee first failed to file the 1998 report.
- The City of Duncanville, Texas, was conveyed more than 3 acres of the former Naval Air Station, Dallas Duncanville Housing Site, for parks and recreation use in November 1998, but compliance records provided to us by staff from the Federal Lands to Parks Program indicated that the city did not file a utilization report until December 2004. According to the deed, the grantee was to submit biennial utilization reports beginning from the date of conveyance.

Some agencies' compliance policies have given discretion to agencies' PBC program managers to waive grantee reporting requirements. For example, HHS's and Education's compliance policies specifically state that the agencies have discretion to waive a grantee's compliance requirement to submit utilization reports. In commenting on a draft of this report, HHS noted that waivers are rare and given only after a prior history of full compliance by the grantee. The other agencies' compliance policies do not specifically state that agencies or their staff have this discretion. However, the discretion is implied because the GSA regulations implementing the PBC program have given the agencies the flexibility to determine what compliance method will be used and how often compliance monitoring

²³The compliance records provided to us showed that the Portion Howard A. Hanson Dam King County, Washington and Olympia Federal Building properties monitored by HHS and the Historic Surplus Property Program, respectively, also received site inspections not consistent with the agencies' policies and procedures.

must be performed. Compliance records provided by the agencies indicated that the grantee for only 1 of the 41 properties we evaluated had been released from utilization reporting requirements.²⁴

Site inspections were also performed inconsistently for 16 of the 41 properties we evaluated. As noted in table 3, site inspections are required by seven of the sponsoring agencies responsible for compliance monitoring. Agency policies for HHS, GSA, and Interior's Federal Lands to Parks Program and Historic Surplus Property Program state that PBC program officials are required to perform site inspections for each of their properties once every 5 years, yet compliance records provided by these agencies showed that inspections did not always occur as often as required. For example, GSA policies require that GSA conduct site inspections once every 5 years. However, according to the documents GSA provided us, the agency has conducted only one site inspection of the former U.S. Post Office and Courthouse property in Kansas City, Kansas, since this property was conveyed in 1995 for correctional use. Similarly, HHS's policies and procedures require site inspections at least once every 5 years. However, according to the documents HHS provided us, the agency has conducted only one site inspection at the Midway NIKE Housing Site Kent, Washington property that was conveyed in 1994 for transitional housing. The sole documented site inspection occurred before the conveyance, when this property was still being leased by the grantee.

Although some agencies' compliance policies allow program staff flexibility with respect to the frequency of site inspections, there was no indication in the compliance records for any of the 41 properties we evaluated that site inspection requirements had been waived. For example, compliance records for the Little Cottonwood Park property did not include documentation that the agency no longer found it necessary to conduct site inspections according to the 5 year schedule in the Federal Lands to Parks Program's compliance policy, even though the last documented site inspection was more than 5 years ago.

²⁴Education's compliance records for two Valley Forge General Hospital properties conveyed to the Valley Forge Christian College showed that the PBC program administrator waived the College's utilization reporting requirement because Education was so frequently in contact with the grantee that Education "knew more about the status of these properties and the College's future plans than about most other properties in the department's inventory."

GSA is the only sponsoring agency that relies solely on site inspections for compliance monitoring. According to GSA's compliance policy, site inspections are to be performed for a property once every 5 years. Since the agency is a central management agency of the federal government and not a "program" agency like the other sponsoring agencies, GSA officials said that site inspections instead of self-reporting are a more effective way for GSA to monitor compliance and ensure that properties are used as agreed to by grantees. Nonetheless, compliance records provided by GSA indicated that none of the seven properties that GSA was responsible for monitoring received site inspections according to the time frame outlined in the agency's compliance policies. For example, the Riverside Regional Jail Authority said it was not aware of any site inspections nor had it had any contact with GSA since a portion of the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute property was conveyed to it in 1992.

In total, 36 of the 41 properties, or 88 percent, where we could evaluate compliance practices did not receive the monitoring specified in agency policies or the property deed. As a result, we have concerns that compliance monitoring of PBC properties is not being performed consistently under each agency's specified policies or property deeds, and as such PBC properties could be vulnerable to uses other than those that were agreed to by the grantee.

Despite Inconsistent Compliance Monitoring, Most Case Study Properties Were Used as Agreed to by the Grantee

Despite concerns and challenges with respect to compliance monitoring and program management, 51 of the 58 properties we visited appeared to be used as agreed to by the grantee under the terms of the conveyance and 7 were not. Of the 7 properties, 4 had reverted to the federal government, 2 had not been fully developed, and 1 was not being used as agreed to by the grantee in the deed. Most of the properties we visited were being used for a variety of purposes, including parks and recreational facilities, educational institutions, and homeless services. Others, though fewer, were being used to support historic monuments, public health, correctional institutions, lands for wildlife conservation, public airports, and port facilities. Examples of the kinds of public uses we observed among the 58 properties follow. A full description of each of the 58 properties can be found in appendix IV.

Parks and Recreation Use

- Several large tracts of land from the former Naval Air Warfare Center in Warminster, Pennsylvania, have been developed to serve local parks and recreation needs. Both Warminster and Northampton Townships have

developed portions of the former air base into community parks with athletic fields, walking trails, and pavilions.

- In Seattle, hangars and other buildings from the former Naval Station Puget Sound at Sand Point have been adapted for various purposes such as community theater, indoor soccer, and in-line hockey, while the surrounding lands have been developed as a community garden, dog park, playground, and athletic field.
- A portion of land once part of the former Defense Depot - Ogden, Utah, was conveyed to the City of Ogden and leased to the Ogden Nature Center for a nature conservation area that provides a sanctuary for local wildlife and birds of prey. Annually, approximately 35,000 visitors take advantage of the Nature Center's hiking trails, nature education programs, and summer camps.

Education Use

- Properties conveyed for education purposes have been developed by public and private educational institutions for a range of instructional and supporting functions. For example, the former Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center in Waltham, Massachusetts, was divided into three conveyances: two for education and one for a public park. The two education grantees were Bentley College, a private higher education institution, and the New Jewish High School,²⁵ a private secondary school. Bentley College is currently developing the property for additional student housing, while the New Jewish High School has built and occupied two new buildings that contain classrooms, a cafeteria, a gym, and a library.
- Buildings from the former Defense Depot - Ogden, Utah, were conveyed to a local public school system and a technical college. The local school system is using the building as warehouse space for school supplies, while the technical college is using the space to house several instructional programs, including truck and forklift operations, materials handling, and plumbing.
- The University of Washington is using buildings conveyed from the former Naval Station Puget Sound at Sand Point for a variety of purposes, including administrative and departmental offices, art studios,

²⁵The New Jewish High School has recently been renamed the Gann Academy.

supply warehouses, and storage for the university's record and library system.

Homeless and Public Health Use

- Existing housing units on two former NIKE missile sites in Topsfield, Massachusetts, and Kent, Washington, were adapted for use as transitional housing for homeless individuals and for a residential treatment program for homeless substance abusers. In addition, part of Homestead Air Force Base was used to construct new transitional housing for homeless individuals.
- Two buildings that were part of the former Valley Forge General Hospital in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, were renovated and adapted to provide mental health services and transitional housing for the homeless.
- A 4-mile long former railroad right-of-way leading to the Howard A. Hanson Dam in King County, Washington, was conveyed to the City of Tacoma to provide access to its drinking water intake that uses water from the dam. Recently, a new pipeline has been constructed on the property to supply additional water to the City's water system.

Correctional Use

- The Virginia Department of Corrections has used conveyed lands that were part of the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute near Petersburg, Virginia, to grow grain crops in support of its prison farm system. The Department of Corrections subsequently transferred a portion of the land it had received to the Riverside Regional Jail Authority, a partnership of seven local governments, for a regional jail. A new correctional facility has been built on that property that can accommodate up to 1,300 male, female, and juvenile offenders.

Historic Monument Use

- The Commanding Officer's Quarters, a 19th century home on the grounds of the former Watertown Arsenal in Massachusetts, was conveyed to the Town of Watertown for historic monument use. The town has renovated the structure, restored its grounds, and rents out the facility for public and private receptions and meetings.
- The former Olympia Federal Building in Washington was conveyed to the state of Washington, which renovated the building to state historic preservation standards and adapted it for the Secretary of State's Corporations Division. The division registers business-related entities in the state, including domestic and foreign corporations, limited

partnerships, limited liability partnerships, and limited liability companies.

Wildlife Conservation Use

- Surplus lands conveyed to the state of Kansas have been incorporated into the state's extensive Tuttle Lake conservation area, which offers fishing, boating, camping, picnicking, and outdoor sports such as hunting. The area also provides food and shelter for migratory shore birds and waterfowl.

As indicated earlier, we found that seven of the properties we selected as case studies were not being used as agreed to by grantees or had reverted to the federal government. Of the seven properties, four had reverted to the federal government, two had not been fully developed, and one was not being used as agreed to by the grantee in the deed. The one property not being used as agreed to by the grantee—the 20 Units King's Branch Housing property—was conveyed for use as short-term housing for individuals with physical disabilities. Instead of being used for short-term housing, the property was being used to house individuals and their families permanently. HHS program management officials conducted two site visits to the property in 1999 and 2003. The 2003 site inspection found the property to be in violation of deed and program requirements. In addition to using the property for purposes other than what was agreed to in the deed, the grantee did not provide all of the utilization reports that the deed required. After numerous attempts to correct the grantee's noncompliance, HHS suggested that the grantee purchase the property at fair market value, through a process known as abrogation, in order to release the grantee from the deed requirements. Until the abrogation is complete, HHS is assessing monthly payments for noncompliance from the grantee.

Grantees for the two properties that were not fully developed—the Valley Forge General Hospital property known as Liberty House and the Defense General Supply Center Falling Creek Reservoir property—had experienced problems complying with the development time lines and approved programs of use for the properties. Although both grantees had compliance problems, neither HHS nor Federal Lands to Parks Program officials believed that the grantees' noncompliance had risen to a level that required purchase at fair market-value price (abrogation), transfer, or reversion.

- In the case of the Valley Forge General Hospital property known as Liberty House, the grantee has renovated two of three buildings on the property and has operated a facility that serves the needs of mentally ill homeless individuals for more than 9 years. The grantee is considered

noncompliant because, thus far, it has not restored a farmhouse that was originally intended for use as a small group home. The grantee has not been able to secure funding for the renovation, so the building remains boarded up and unused at the front of the property. HHS, for this reason, has determined that the grantee is in violation of the property's deed requirements.

- The Defense General Supply Center Falling Creek Reservoir property was conveyed for parks and recreation use, but for lack of funding, the grantee has failed to fully develop the property according to the original program of use. The property—a narrow parcel of land that consists of a small ravine and water reservoir—is part of a much larger plan for a linear park system. Although the grantee has constructed a footpath through the property since conveyance, the grantee has not made any other improvements to the land because it has focused its efforts on acquiring park lands adjacent to the parcel conveyed by the federal government. Program officials from the Federal Lands to Parks Program said that they have not taken action for the property to revert since the grantee intends to develop the property as part of its comprehensive development plan for the linear park.

Four of the properties we selected as case studies had fully or partially reverted to the federal government. These included the NIKE Site PH-02 property; the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 property; the Milford Lake property; and the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion) property. All four properties were voluntarily reverted by the grantees; three were reverted because of the grantees' inability to implement or continue the program of use stated in the deed, while part of the fourth property—the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion) property—was voluntarily reverted by the grantee at the request of the federal government. Specifically:

- The Milford Lake forestry research property in Kansas was voluntarily reverted by the grantee when it did not fully utilize the property. Specifically, three of the parcels of land were not being used or were leased to a neighboring farmer to cut hay. Another parcel had been used for forestry research, but the trees planted there had not survived.
- The NIKE PH-02 property a former missile site in Bristol, Pennsylvania, was conveyed to Bristol Township in 1981 for parks and recreation use. The township planned to build athletic fields but was never able to obtain funding for development, so the property was voluntarily

reverted back to the federal government and was sold at auction to a private individual.

- The grantee of the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 property in Ogden, Utah, decided to voluntarily revert the property when, faced with unanticipated building infrastructure costs, it realized that it could not afford to pay for with an environmental assessment required by HHS and property maintenance costs at the same time. In addition, the grantee had difficulty developing community support for the project.
- The Virginia Department of Corrections was conveyed 479 acres, referred to as the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion) property, for use as a grain crops farm. The land is managed by the Department of Corrections and worked by inmates from Southampton Prison. The grain crops are harvested and fed to farm animals that produce milk and meat to feed the prison population in the state. A portion of the land was voluntarily reverted at the request of the federal government because of homeland security needs.

As noted above, the reversion of properties is not always due to noncompliance with deed requirements or misuse by grantees, but can be the result of the grantee's inability to implement the approved program of use in a timely fashion. This condition can be caused by insufficient financial resources resulting from unanticipated and insurmountable costs or the grantees's inability to obtain funding. For example, University of Washington officials told us that they are considering returning Building 9 of the former Naval Station Puget Sound property because of the estimated costs and scope of work required to meet environmental and historic preservation requirements. Furthermore, reversion can occur if the federal government wants a property back for its own use, as was the case for the reversion of a segment of the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion) property because of homeland security needs.

Agencies Used a Mix of Self-Reporting by Grantees and Site Inspections to Ensure Compliance, although Frequency Varied

GSA and the sponsoring agencies used a mix of self-reporting by grantees and site inspections to ensure that properties were being used as agreed to by grantees, although the frequency of these actions varied. Compliance oversight of public benefit conveyances is carried out through two mechanisms: utilization reports and site inspections. Utilization reports are submitted by grantees according to terms specified in the deeds, while agency staff conduct site inspections according to the agency's compliance

policies and procedures. Compliance monitoring by GSA and the sponsoring agencies varies, both in terms of what a particular agency's policies and procedures require and the agency's actual practice. For example, as table 3 shows, HHS, Education, HUD, and Interior (Federal Lands to Parks Program and Historic Surplus Property Program) have compliance policies that require grantees to submit annual or biennial utilization reports, while GSA, FAA, and MARAD do not require these reports from grantees. Similarly, most agencies' compliance policies required that agency officials conduct site inspections on a periodic basis ranging from quarterly to once every 5 years. MARAD's compliance policies do not specify how frequently site inspections should be performed and instead leave discretion to agency officials to determine when site inspections are necessary.

Table 4: Compliance Oversight Methods Stated in Agencies' Policies and Procedures for Properties Conveyed, Fiscal Years 1990-2004

Agency	Federal Lands to Parks Program ^a	Historic Surplus Property Program ^a	Education	GSA	HHS	HUD	FAA	MARAD
Utilization report	Biennial	Biennial	Annual or biennial	Not required	Annual	Quarterly to annually	At the discretion of FAA	Annual, as required by deeds
Site inspection	Biennial until use is implemented; intervals not to exceed 5 years thereafter ^b	Biennial until use is implemented; intervals not to exceed 5 years thereafter	Within first 12 months; as needed thereafter	Every 5 years	Within first 12 months, at 1-5 year intervals thereafter	Quarterly for first 48 months; annually thereafter	Once every 4 years	None specified

Source: GAO.

^aThis program is part of the Department of the Interior.

^bAccording to a Federal Lands to Parks Program official, the policy requiring biennial site inspections until implementation and at intervals not to exceed 5 years thereafter was changed in 2004 to at least a 5-year interval.

The substance of the agencies' compliance policies also varied, ranging from very detailed criteria and guidance for performing compliance oversight to basic descriptions of the agencies' compliance responsibilities. Examples of the variation in agencies' compliance policies follow.

- Compliance policies provided by GSA, Education, HHS, and the Federal Lands to Parks Program contained detailed criteria and guidance on

how agency staff should conduct compliance monitoring for the PBC properties in their inventories. The handbooks used by Education and HHS include separate chapters on compliance and remedial actions, abrogation, reversions, utilization reporting, and site inspections. The chapters on compliance and remedial actions offer program staff detailed guidance for investigating and reporting various compliance issues, such as failure to utilize the property, unauthorized sale of the property, or failure to provide utilization reports to the agency. The chapters devoted to site inspections provide program staff with guidance on how to review and file reports and perform site inspections. Similarly, GSA's compliance manual, known as the *Executive Order Surveys and Compliance Inspections Handbook*, includes information on how site inspections should be performed by GSA staff for wildlife conservation and correctional use PBCs. The manual provides a compliance report format for both uses as well as instructions on how frequently site inspections should be performed and how inspection paperwork should be processed. According to GSA officials, GSA is in the process of updating the manual²⁶ to include information and guidance on performing compliance oversight for emergency management response and law enforcement public uses, which did not exist when the manual was originally created in 1996.

- The Historic Surplus Property Program relies on a memorandum developed by Interior to guide its compliance monitoring. The 1983 memorandum includes broad compliance criteria for both historic monument and parks and recreation PBCs and provides suggests time frames for responding to grantee compliance issues. According to Historic Surplus Property Program officials, although the 1983 memorandum requires biennial site inspections until a property's use is implemented and inspections are not to exceed every 5 years thereafter, in practice site inspections are performed at the discretion of the Historic Surplus Property Program.
- HUD has not established separate policies and procedures for compliance oversight of self-help housing conveyances; instead, compliance responsibilities are described in the property application and deed. In order for a property to be conveyed for self-help housing use, the property application and deed state that the local government where the property is located must agree to certain oversight

²⁶GSA's new compliance manual is titled the *Utilization/Compliance Desk Guide*.

responsibilities and execute an oversight agreement. According to HUD officials, this arrangement was made under authorities granted by the Property Act and the Housing and Urban Development Act. Only one property has been conveyed for self-help housing thus far.

- MARAD relies on its regulations and property deeds as guidance for monitoring port facility properties.²⁷ These documents lacked criteria for identifying noncompliant properties and guidance for agency staff on how to address noncompliance. For example, MARAD provided us with rules that govern the conveyance of surplus port properties and property deeds for some of the properties it oversees. Although the rules broadly outlined the PBC process for surplus port properties, and the deeds contained specific covenants and requirements for the grantee, none of the documents MARAD provided offered guidance for agency program managers on how they should conduct compliance monitoring activities or how they should respond to compliance breaches.

Agencies' Reversion Policies Varied

We also found that the agencies' policies on reversions of property to the federal government varied. According to PBC program regulations issued by GSA, it is the responsibility of the sponsoring agency to ensure that grantees correct noncompliance and to take whatever action is necessary for a property to revert to the federal government if such action is warranted. According to sponsoring agency officials, reversion is a remedy of last resort, and agencies try to help grantees find remedies for noncompliance before taking steps to revert a property. Often the remedies involve alternatives to reversion, such as providing grantees with additional technical assistance, amending the program of use, reconveying the property to other eligible parties, abrogation (in which the grantee purchases the property and is released from the terms of the deed), or land swaps.

GSA and the sponsoring agencies have developed criteria for determining when a reversion should be required and processes for bringing property back to the federal government. This information is located in both property deeds and agencies' policies and procedures. According to GSA and the sponsoring agencies, all deeds for properties conveyed using the

²⁷Conveyances of surplus port properties as PBCs were authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (P. L. No. 103-160). MARAD promulgated rules under 46 CFR Part 387.

program include a reversion clause, which protects the government's interests in the property. These clauses state, in general, that the federal government has the right to reversion if the grantee fails to comply with deed restrictions or to correct noncompliance. In addition to the standard reversion clause, some agencies include information about how much time the grantee has to correct noncompliance and what procedure the sponsoring agency will follow to implement the reversion.

Education, HHS, GSA, FAA, and Interior (Federal Lands to Park Program and Historic Surplus Property Program) have also developed separate policies and procedures, some of which include criteria for determining when a reversion should occur and processes for bringing the property back to the federal government. Two agencies—HUD and MARAD—have not developed such policies and procedures. We found that the substance of the agencies' reversion policies, like that of their compliance policies, varied. Examples of agency reversion policies follow.

- The Federal Lands to Park Program's *Surplus Property Handbook* provides some information on how to determine when a property is noncompliant and when remedial action is necessary. It includes the steps in the reversion process, identifies acceptable alternatives for reversion, and assigns the grantee responsibility for all costs associated with the reversion.
- GSA's two handbooks, the *Excess and Surplus Real Property Handbook* and *Executive Order Surveys and Compliance Inspections Handbook*, provide little guidance on how the reversion process works for properties for which GSA has compliance monitoring responsibilities. The *Excess and Surplus Real Property Handbook* provides realty staff with limited guidance on the documentation required before the reversion begins, such as title and environmental information. The *Executive Order Surveys and Compliance Inspections Handbook* states that if a property is no longer used for its intended purpose or if it is needed for national defense purposes, title shall revert to the United States. The handbook also notes that if noncompliance is found after a site inspection, a reversionary deed will be requested. No other information on when a reversion should occur or what processes should be used is included in these two handbooks.
- FAA's *Airports Compliance Handbook* states that for a reversion to occur, FAA must find a grantee "in default under the covenants of the instrument of conveyance." The handbook provides FAA officials with

general procedures for reversions, such as how to determine when a grantee is in default and what steps to take to notify grantees of the government's intent. Voluntary reversions of property are preferred, and transferring property to another grantee is considered a suitable alternative to reversion. The handbook also provides FAA officials with sample text for a notice of reversion, an instrument to reconvey the property or to release the deed, and guidance on what is required for a reversion, including a physical inspection of the property and a sign indicating the property is owned by the federal government.

The aforementioned differences in the compliance monitoring approaches used by GSA and the sponsoring agencies, and in their reversion policies and procedures, are due mostly to the decentralized nature of the PBC program and to flexibility in GSA's regulations implementing the PBC laws. These regulations make the sponsoring agencies responsible for monitoring and enforcing compliance, but do not specify how the agencies are to carry out these responsibilities. Consistent with the law, GSA regulations implementing the PBC program allow each agency to determine the method of compliance monitoring to use and the frequency of these activities. Also consistent with the law, GSA's implementing regulations allow each agency to determine when a noncompliant property should be reverted to the federal government. This approach has afforded a great deal of flexibility to agencies carrying out compliance monitoring and exercising their rights of reversion. However, this approach has had the negative effect of making the PBC program seem unnecessarily complex, with a wide range of inconsistent agency policies and practices being administered separately by several agencies, depending on the type of public benefit use.

During our review, we found no compelling rationale for the differences in compliance monitoring approaches and reversion policies and practices used by GSA and sponsoring agencies. Essentially, the rigor with which each agency carries out these duties appears to be based mostly on preference. For example, GSA does not require utilization reports for the different types of properties it monitors because, as GSA officials indicated, the agency believes that site inspections are more reliable. Most sponsoring agencies, on the other hand, rely heavily on utilization reports. The complex nature of the federal real property environment was an underlying cause of problems that led to our designation of this area as high risk in 2003, and the wide variation among agencies with regard to the PBC program seems to illustrate this condition. Greater uniformity in compliance monitoring and exercising the right of reversion would simplify

the program for agencies and potential grantees and enable better oversight of the program by GSA and other stakeholders, such as OMB and Congress.

Challenges Managing and Participating in the PBC Program Were Evident

Sponsoring agencies cited the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program and perform compliance monitoring as a primary challenge. In addition, according to agency officials, PBC program management has been made more difficult because of the need to adhere to complex federal real property laws, such as those related to military base closures and homeless assistance. We also found that for a number of reasons GSA and the sponsoring agencies often seek alternatives to reversion when noncompliance is found, and some sponsoring agency officials were concerned that the tendency of GSA to avoid reversion takes away a main compliance enforcement mechanism. GSA officials said that the agency seeks resolutions of compliance issues instead of reversions because of the overall risk and financial burden these properties could pose to the federal government. Most grantees reported being pleased with the program, although they noted that information about the program's operations and the condition of properties could be improved.

Agencies Cited Insufficient Resources to Manage the Program as a Challenge

Some agency officials identified the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program as the primary challenge they face in fulfilling their compliance monitoring and other PBC responsibilities. According to sponsoring agency officials, the PBC program is not central to most agencies' missions, and therefore agency officials often allot limited resources to manage their portfolio of PBC properties. For example, PBC staff at GSA and the sponsoring agencies often perform other work or manage other mission programs in addition to the PBC program. Specifically, PBC regional staff at the Historic Surplus Property Program are also responsible for managing the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act program, the Historic America Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, and the National Historic Landmarks program. Similarly, MARAD staff in the Office of Ports and Domestic Shipping are responsible for managing the PBC program as well as more than seven other programs, including Port Finance and Port and Cargo Security. Although it may be reasonable for staff in agencies with fewer properties to have split responsibilities, limited staffing resources was a common concern among agencies.

Neither GSA nor any of the sponsoring agencies have appropriations exclusively dedicated to the management of the PBC program; instead, the program is included in funding for other mission programs or activities. For example, the Federal Lands to Parks PBC program is funded through the National Park Service's "Recreations" budget line item, which supports multiple recreational programs and activities. Similarly, the Historic Surplus Property's PBC program is included in the national and regional office budgets for several of the National Register of Historic Places programs previously mentioned. According to the Education PBC staff, their program's budget is funded with discretionary moneys from the General Administration and Management function. In general, decisions about the level of resources devoted to the PBC program are made by agency officials as they determine the priorities of their agency within its appropriation.

Staff responsible for administering the PBC program at several sponsoring agencies with large PBC portfolios cited limited staffing and budgetary resources as the reasons behind their reported difficulties in performing compliance monitoring and other PBC responsibilities. Although we did not assess agencies' use of resources with regard to the PBC program, multiple officials at several agencies expressed concerns in this area, as the following examples illustrate.

- Federal Lands to Parks Program officials said that restricted program resources affect their ability to do effective outreach and provide accurate information about the PBC program and opportunities to prospective applicants. They said having limited staff and operating resources often made it difficult to participate in the BRAC process to ensure that interested parties are informed about the PBC program, that appropriate natural and cultural resources have been identified and considered for protection through the program, and that PBC requests are considered by the military and local redevelopment authorities. Furthermore, according to these officials, limited program resources caused site inspection guidelines to be revised from a requirement of inspecting not-yet-implemented programs every 2 years and at 5-year intervals thereafter in favor of "at least a 5-year interval" between inspections.
- Historic Surplus Property Program officials said that a lack of allotted funds for the PBC program and escalating monitoring responsibilities as more properties are conveyed have caused a drain on the administration

of the PBC program as well as on the funding for the historic preservation program the office is required to manage.

- Education officials said that significant increases in administrative costs of carrying out PBC responsibilities, including real estate appraisals, environmental studies, purchase of private title searches, recording of deeds and reversions, and reimbursement of travel expenses incurred during site inspections and enforcement, have been a challenge for the agency.

We found that several agencies have sought other ways of meeting their PBC program administration and compliance monitoring responsibilities. Program managers, for example, from the Federal Lands to Parks Program noted that budget and staffing reductions to the PBC program made during a 1993 Interior reorganization led to a shift of policy from performing routine compliance site inspections to resolving already identified compliance problems. Faced with similarly limited staff and budgetary resources and the additional responsibility of managing the self-help housing PBCs, HUD decided to contract out its oversight responsibilities for self-help housing properties to the local government in which the property was located. For example, in the deed for the South Weymouth, MA – NAS property known as Squantum Gardens and Naval Terrace, HUD included an oversight agreement that requires the City of Quincy, as the local government, to collect and review quarterly utilization reports, conduct site visits, and report the property’s compliance status to HUD. Once the property has been fully developed, the agreement reduces the frequency with which the City of Quincy must collect utilization reports and conduct site inspections from quarterly to once every year. According to property compliance records for one property we visited—the Former Petersburg Correctional Institute property conveyed to the Riverside Regional Jail Authority—GSA contracted with a private company to perform site inspections. GSA officials said that internal staffing needs prevented agency staff from inspecting the site themselves.

Complex Landscape of Federal Real Property Laws Is Another Challenge Agencies Cited

PBC program management has also been made more difficult because of myriad laws that affect the program and the addition of new public uses, according to agency officials at Education, HHS, and the Federal Lands to Parks Program within Interior, which have responsibility for some of the largest PBC portfolios. Since the 1949 Property Act, a number of federal laws have amended the program to create new authorities and have increased the complexity of the conveyance process. For example, new

types of public uses have been created for correctional,²⁸ homeless,²⁹ port facilities,³⁰ law enforcement,³¹ emergency management response,³² and self-help housing.³³ The McKinney-Vento Act, as amended, and BRAC also altered the PBC process by adding new procedural requirements for homeless use consideration and for the disposal of surplus military property. In addition, other federal laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969³⁴ (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966³⁵ (NHPA) have affected the PBC process.

In the past, we reported that the complex legal and budgetary environment in which real property managers operate has a significant impact on real property decisionmaking.³⁶ In the disposal area, a range of laws intended to address other objectives challenge agencies' efforts to dispose of unneeded property, including properties disposed of through the PBC program. For example, agencies are required under NEPA to consider the environmental impact of their decisions to dispose of property. Generally speaking, agencies are responsible for environmental cleanup prior to disposal. These costs can be considerable and can involve years of study. In another example, for properties with historic designations—which are common in the federal portfolio—agencies are required by NHPA to ensure that historic preservation is factored into how the property is eventually used. The Property Act further specifies that unneeded property first be offered to other federal agencies; and the McKinney-Vento Act sets forth requirements that consideration be given to making unneeded property available to assist the homeless.

²⁸40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(1).

²⁹42 U.S.C. § 11411.

³⁰40 U.S.C. § 554.

³¹40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(2).

³²40 U.S.C. § 553(b)(3).

³³40 U.S.C. § 550(f).

³⁴42 U.S.C. § 4321 et. seq.

³⁵16 U.S.C. § 470 et. seq.

³⁶[GAO-03-122](#).

The McKinney-Vento Act

Signed into law in 1987, the McKinney-Vento Act created additional requirements for the disposal of surplus property through the PBC program. Some sponsoring agencies reported that McKinney-Vento Act requirements have delayed the PBC process for the disposal of civilian property. The McKinney-Vento Act requires that all excess, surplus, unutilized, and underutilized federal property be considered for homeless use purposes before the property is made available for any of the other disposal methods.³⁷ To do so, HUD collects information from 26 federal landholding agencies on all unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus properties; evaluates each property's suitability for homeless use; and publishes a list of these properties in the *Federal Register*. Many of the properties reported as excess are not suitable for homeless use for diverse reasons such as environmental contamination, distance from existing communities or public transportation, or location within a military installation.

All former civilian agency and non-BRAC surplus properties deemed suitable for homeless use by HUD must go through a 60-day holding period during which the property is ineligible for disposal for any purpose other than for homeless use. HHS is responsible for accepting and reviewing applications for homeless use from state and local governments and certain nonprofit entities. Interested homeless representatives must submit to HHS a written notice of intent to apply for a property for homeless use during the 60-day holding period. After applicants have given notice of intent to apply, federal law provides them up to 90 days to submit their application to HHS, and grants HHS the discretion to extend the time frame if necessary. Once HHS has received an application, it has 25 days to review, accept, or decline the application. During the entire application process, each property under consideration is ineligible for disposal for any other purpose, including other public benefit uses. Thus, in total, a surplus real property determined suitable for homeless use might be ineligible for consideration for other disposal opportunities for more than 175 days.

Because of amendments to BRAC, the process for considering the use of property at any military installation for homeless use differs from that for former civilian agency or non-BRAC surplus real property. Homeless use considerations for surplus BRAC property will be described in more detail below.

³⁷42 U.S.C. § 11411.

The Defense Base Closure and
Realignment Act of 1990

Nearly half of the 298 identifiable properties conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and 27 of the 58 properties we selected as case studies were former BRAC properties. This is significant because sponsoring agency officials at Education, HHS, MARAD, and the Federal Lands to Parks Program said that the BRAC process further complicates the PBC process because of the additional steps and paperwork involved in conveying former BRAC military property. Specifically, the unique role of the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) and a lack of consistency in how the military departments carry out property disposal also complicate the PBC process. As previously noted, the disposal of BRAC property typically involves an LRA made up of community members that are responsible for planning the future use of the former military property. The LRA is afforded up to 270 days to complete a redevelopment plan that details how all surplus real property associated with the closed or realigned installation will be reused or redeveloped, including property disposed of as PBCs. In particular, the redevelopment plan must balance the needs of the homeless with the need for economic and other redevelopment. HUD provides technical assistance and determines if the reuse plans meets statutory requirements relating to the homeless. The LRA's responsibilities to generate a redevelopment plan while considering the needs of the homeless can add considerable time and complexity to the PBC process. For example, according to HUD's *Guidebook on Military Base Reuse and Homeless Assistance*, if time limits were stretched to the greatest possible extent, the process of reviewing BRAC property for homeless use and generating a redevelopment plan could take as long as 540 days after the property is listed as surplus in the *Federal Register*. These time frames were reconfirmed by an Army BRAC official.

The PBC process was further complicated by GSA's delegation of disposal authority to the Secretary of Defense, as required by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.³⁸ This authority was further delegated within DOD to each of the three military departments: the Army, Navy, and Air Force. According to DOD officials, DOD headquarters is not directly involved in the disposal of surplus BRAC real property, nor does it play a coordinating role in the disposal process other than to gather information from the three military departments for its annual report to GSA. Consequently, each of the three military departments establishes its own policies and procedures for property disposal as long as they adhere to DOD's *Base Reuse Implementation Manual* (BRIM) and BRAC

³⁸Pub. L. No. 101-510 § 2905 (b), 10 U.S. C. 2687 note (1990).

implementing regulations,³⁹ which served as the principal guidance for BRAC property disposal.⁴⁰ As a result of this flexibility, each military service has established its own approach to BRAC property disposal, such as the roles assigned to the principal stakeholders. For example, although BRIM states that the military services will make the final determination on how all former BRAC property will be disposed of, an Army BRAC official said that in practice the LRA often has significant influence on how each parcel of land at former Army facilities will be disposed of. In contrast, Navy officials told us that the Navy makes the final determination on the allocation of the property among the various disposal methods, including PBCs. The lack of uniform procedures across the military departments adds confusion to the already complex PBC process because the sponsoring agencies have to follow different procedures with each of the military departments.

Agencies Seek Alternatives to Reversion for Noncompliance

For a number of reasons, GSA and sponsoring agencies seek alternatives to the federal government's taking back properties for noncompliance. The main impediment to reversion involves the assumption of risk and uncertainty that reversion entails for GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies. According to GSA regulations implementing the PBC program, for most public uses, it is the responsibility of the sponsoring agency to monitor compliance and to notify GSA when a property should revert, and GSA makes the final decision on whether to take back the property. However, agency officials from Education, HHS, and the Federal Lands to Parks Program said that reversion had increasingly become untenable as a tool when deed requirements are not met. Agency officials attribute the increasing difficulty of reversions to issues ranging from adhering to numerous legal requirements to the availability of budgetary resources. Program staff from Education and HHS said that agencies that monitor compliance are now responsible for paying for an array of legal requirements—including environmental studies, real estate appraisals, title searches, and title insurance—before GSA will consider allowing properties to revert. In addition, some agencies expressed concern about the possibility of being held responsible for paying for the maintenance,

³⁹32 CFR 174-176.

⁴⁰BRIM was the primary DOD guidance for the disposal of surplus real property during BRAC rounds in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995, the time period during which the properties we selected as case studies were conveyed. DOD updated BRIM for the 2005 round of BRAC and renamed it the *Base Realignment and Redevelopment Manual* (BRRM).

protection, and environmental cleanup of a property once it reverts. A number of agencies said that the issue of who is responsible for paying for these costs—the sponsoring agency, GSA, DOD, or the grantee—has not yet been clearly defined. These factors have made it difficult for agencies to take reversionary actions without budgeted resources of their own.

In addition, according to some sponsoring agencies, in recent years GSA has opposed reversions suggested by the sponsoring agencies. For example, according to an Education official, GSA does not encourage enforcement actions that result in reversions for noncompliance and has exercised its statutory authority to object to suggested reversions, preventing the sponsoring agencies from taking back title to properties that are in long-term noncompliance and leaving the agencies with no alternative solutions. The official noted that GSA's policies on reversion have a chilling effect on all reversions and compliance efforts since it is virtually impossible to enforce compliance without the ability to take back title, given that other alternatives require voluntary cooperation by grantees or cooperation from the United States Attorney in litigation in federal court. An HHS official expressed similar concerns, stating

“GSA will not accept property it determines is not marketable. Therefore, it is very difficult to revert those properties and enforce compliance. The failure of GSA to accept the return of properties makes it very difficult for HHS to adequately carry out its mission in assuring that the properties are used in accordance with established regulations.”

According to HHS, in one instance, GSA's refusal to take back a noncompliant homeless use property in Warren, Michigan, resulted in the property sitting vacant for about 4 years and the structures deteriorating to the point where they had to be demolished by the new grantee.

GSA program officials said that before GSA will approve an agency's request for a property to revert to the federal government, it must consider a number of factors, which will determine whether reacquiring the property is in the best interest of the government. The factors include the overall risk and financial burden to the government, the marketability of the property, and the ease of redispensing of the property. According to GSA, the greatest risk that reversion poses is that properties can remain in the inventory for prolonged periods of time, require additional funds for maintenance and protection, and be difficult to redispense of by transfer, reconveyance, or sale. GSA's concerns about the risk and uncertainty of reverted property were confirmed by officials at the Federal Lands to Parks Program.

As discussed earlier, DOD's involvement in the reversion process is unclear. DOD's BRIM, the primary guidance for implementing BRAC and disposing of surplus real property as PBCs, does not specifically address how reversions of BRAC property should be handled and whether DOD takes back noncompliant property.⁴¹ According to DOD headquarters officials, DOD is not involved in the PBC reversion process. Instead, DOD officials noted that it is the responsibility of the sponsoring agencies to monitor compliance for former BRAC property and of GSA to take back property when grantees are found to be noncompliant. However, we received differing statements from military department officials about how the reversion process works for BRAC property, as the following examples illustrate.

- Army officials noted that DOD has not regularly been involved in the reversion process because DOD is not responsible for compliance. Army officials said that they are currently holding discussions with GSA on whether former BRAC property would return to GSA or to the Army if it were to revert.
- According to one Navy official, former Navy BRAC property would revert to the sponsoring agency. The official said that this was because the Navy assigns the property to the sponsoring agency and the sponsoring agency deeds the property to the grantee and is responsible for compliance. However, another Navy official disagreed, saying that the official Navy position is that Navy BRAC property conveyed as PBCs would revert to the Navy and not to the sponsoring agency.
- An Air Force official said that when GSA revised the federal regulations governing the PBC program a couple of years ago, the language regarding reversions was clarified. The Air Force official further stated that former Air Force BRAC property would revert to the sponsoring agency while GSA rescreened it for other public uses and disposal methods.

Furthermore, even though DOD officials stated that DOD is not involved in the reversion process, as noted earlier in the report, we found that one of

⁴¹DOD updated BRIM for the 2005 round of BRAC and renamed it the *Base Realignment and Redevelopment Manual (BRRM)*. BRRM also does not specifically address how reversions of BRAC property should be handled and whether DOD takes back noncompliant property.

the properties we selected for case study review—the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42—reverted to the Army instead of to GSA.

Some Grantees Reported Poor Communication about the Program and Lack of Information on the Condition of Individual Properties

Most grantees reported being pleased with the PBC program; however, nearly a quarter of the grantees we interviewed reported a lack of information about how the PBC program worked, and some of these grantees also reported that more information about the condition of individual properties would have been helpful. According to a number of grantees, better, more accurate information would help them plan for the most appropriate use of and anticipate costs associated with the development of the property. For example, several grantees said that more information about the PBC process would have benefited their planning process:

- According to the grantee of the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 property, prior knowledge of the PBC process and of the costs the grantee would incur would have been helpful. For example, after the property was conveyed the grantee discovered it was required to conduct an environmental groundwater assessment and to pay to maintain the unoccupied building while the environmental assessment was pending. The grantee voluntarily reverted the property after 2 years because it was unable to fund the environmental assessment and maintain the property at the same time.
- According to the grantees of a Defense Depot – Ogden, UT property and the Warminster, PA - NAWC property, information on the condition of properties was difficult to obtain. For example, an official with Warminster Township said that because the military was unable to provide maps or blueprints that indicated the location of buried plumbing and electrical infrastructure, construction crews removing a portion of a former runway mistakenly cut electrical lines that serviced a neighboring property.
- Valley Forge Christian College property officials said that they were unable to procure drawings identifying the location of buried infrastructure at the former Valley Forge General Hospital. College officials said that because of the lack of information on the infrastructure, they did not sufficiently anticipate the full scope of the physical and financial challenges the conveyance posed to the institution, and the college faced financial difficulties as a result.

Grantees made a number of suggestions about how to improve the PBC program, as the following examples illustrate.

- According to the Rolling Hills Preparatory School, grantee of a Long Beach, CA – NAVSHPYD property, it was not informed of the rules of the PBC process. The grantee said that it did not know upfront that it would be required to pay for the studies, consultants, and attorneys’ fees that were part of the process. The grantee suggested that the PBC program could be better managed by providing grantees with additional upfront training and better insight into the rules, time lines, potential hurdles, and possible costs of the PBC process for former BRAC property.
- According to officials at the New Jewish High School, grantee of a Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center property, a “cheat sheet” of the requirements of the PBC process should be created. This sheet would include information on how the program works, grantee’s responsibilities regarding compliance, and a list of the various PBC uses matched to the sponsoring agencies and contacts within those agencies for interested parties.
- Elder Housing Corporation, grantee of the South Weymouth, MA - NAS property now known as Squantum Gardens and Naval Terrace, said that more information on other public benefit uses would be helpful. For example, officials from the corporation said that they had submitted their application for self-help housing use, but they were not informed of other possible PBC uses (i.e., besides self-help housing) that might have been a better match for the property. The corporation chose to purchase the property at fair market value when it was unable to implement its self-help housing program, in part because of a reluctance of lenders to finance a property that could revert.
- An official from Valley Forge Christian College, grantee of the Valley Forge General Hospital property, suggested that the government continue to maintain surplus facilities until they were conveyed instead of letting them deteriorate, which would make it easier for grantees to plan for the properties’ use and would assist with the future renovation of properties. The deferred maintenance of surplus properties was a challenge identified by several grantees.

Compounding the concerns grantees expressed about communication, information on the PBC program was fragmented across several government Web sites. For example, although GSA’s Web site offers an

overview of the property disposal process that includes PBCs among the other disposal methods, it does not provide specific information on how the program works, nor does it provide links to the sponsoring agencies or a description of their role in the program. It was also unclear how a potential applicant should begin the process of considering a property for public benefit conveyance or whom to contact about the program.

With respect to finding information on the program by using sponsoring agencies' Web sites, only HHS's Web site offered overviews of the PBC process and grantee responsibilities, answers to frequently asked questions, and relevant links to additional information. It was difficult to find any information about the PBC program on other sponsoring agencies' Web sites, without prior knowledge of the program and its uses. For example, it was necessary to know that Interior's Federal Lands to Parks Program was the sponsoring agency for parks and recreation PBCs in order to find any pertinent information on Interior's Web site. Once located, the Federal Lands to Parks Program Web page provided program overviews, answers to frequently asked questions, links, and contact information. Web sites maintained by the other sponsoring agencies offered either minimal program information or none at all. DOT's Web site offered limited program information for public airport and port facility PBCs but no contact information, while Education's, HUD's and FEMA's Web sites did not provide any PBC program information. Furthermore, because DOD does not provide a search engine function on any of its Web sites, it was difficult to easily search its sites for PBC program information related to the disposal of BRAC property.

Conclusions

Most PBC properties we visited are being used as agreed to by the grantee for a range of purposes including education, parks and recreation, and public health; but problems related to data consistency between agencies and compliance monitoring hinder program management. Specifically, the lack of reliable, consistent data on PBC properties prevents effective management and oversight by GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies. Lack of quality data on the federal real property inventory in general has been a persistent problem we have identified. GSA and DOD officials told us that developing better data on PBC properties could possibly be accomplished as part of GSA's efforts to revamp its governmentwide database—the federal real property profile.

We found that most case study properties where we could assess compliance activity did not receive the monitoring specified in agencies'

policies or the property deed. This is a concern because PBC properties could be vulnerable to being used for purposes other than those agreed to by the grantee. In addition, GSA regulations implementing the PBC program allow each agency a great deal of flexibility in carrying out its compliance responsibilities, including how to address noncompliant properties and determine when properties should revert to the federal government. As a result, the PBC program seems unnecessarily complex, with agencies using a wide range of policies and practices depending on the type of public benefit use. We found no compelling rationale or criteria for the differences in compliance approaches and reversion policies and practices. The complex nature of the federal real property environment was an underlying cause of problems that led to our designation of this area as high risk in 2003, and the wide variation among agencies with regard to the PBC program seems to illustrate this condition.

Other problems hindering the effectiveness of the program include challenges cited by agencies and communication shortcomings cited by grantees. Agency officials we spoke with cited the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program and the complex legal landscape in which they operate as factors that affect the program. In addition, agencies reported difficulties with property reversions and have sought alternatives to addressing noncompliance. Some grantees cited as a challenge the lack of communication about the program and individual properties. We found that information on the PBC program was fragmented across several government Web sites. Improvements in these areas would help provide greater assurance that the federal government fulfills its role as a steward of former federal real property assets. It could also ensure that the PBC program remains a viable option for addressing the federal government's long-standing problems with excess and underutilized real property, which was a factor that led to our designation of real property as a high-risk area.

Recommendations for Executive Action

We are making four recommendations to the GSA Administrator, one which is also directed to the Secretaries of Education, the Interior, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation.

Because GSA is the federal agency with primary responsibilities for the PBC program under the Property Act, we recommend that the Administrator of GSA coordinate with DOD and each of the sponsoring agencies to ensure that PBC property data are reliable and consistent between agencies for the purposes of effective management, oversight, and

accountability. These data should include, at a minimum, a unique identifying code or name and pertinent data related to each property such as location, type, sponsoring agency, grantee, reversion status, if applicable, the property's compliance history, and other relevant information, as appropriate. This effort to improve the data could be accomplished as part of, or in conjunction with, the federal real property profile initiative already underway.

We also recommend that the Administrator of GSA, and the Secretaries of Education, the Interior, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation take actions they deem appropriate to better ensure that their agencies' current compliance monitoring policies are followed.

We also recommend that the Administrator of GSA coordinate with DOD and sponsoring agencies to give consideration to developing uniform standards and guidance for the PBC program to address inconsistencies, as appropriate. Such an effort could include, for example, standard policies and procedures for compliance site inspections and utilization reports, a determination of the appropriate frequency of compliance site inspections and utilization reports, and standard criteria and processes for reversions of property to the government.

We also recommend that the Administrator of GSA coordinate and work with DOD and sponsoring agencies to develop strategies for addressing various challenges facing agencies and grantees. These include the need to allocate sufficient resources to manage the program and to improve communication about the program's legal complexities, the reversion process, and the characteristics of individual properties. This effort could be done in conjunction with, or as part of, the recommendation to develop uniform standards and guidance for the program.

Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

We provided a draft of this report to GSA, DOD, DOJ, DOT, DHS, Education, Interior, HHS, and HUD for review and comment. Education concurred with the report's overall findings and recommendation to the Secretary of Education to better ensure that their agencies' current compliance monitoring policies are followed. Education's comments are contained in appendix VII. DOD, DOJ, and DOT had no official comments on this report but provided separate technical comments, which we incorporated into the report where appropriate. DHS notified us that it had

no official comments on this report. Interior was unable to provide official comments in time to be included in the report.

GSA concurred with the report's overall findings and the three recommendations we made to the GSA Administrator. GSA said that the agency will take the necessary steps to improve the program areas highlighted in our recommendations through assuming a greater oversight role and issuing policy guidance. However, GSA had a number of comments on our findings. GSA said that the majority of the data accuracy issues identified in the report are due to differences in how GSA tracks information and how the sponsoring agencies track the same information. We agree that data discrepancies identified in the report are due in part to the separate lists of properties kept by the agencies on the PBC program as well as the different formats, locations, and pieces of data kept on each property. For that reason, we recommended that GSA coordinate with DOD and the sponsoring agencies to ensure that PBC property data are reliable and consistent between agencies. GSA stated that it does not believe that the data discrepancies identified in the report indicate that the government as a whole is not aware of or responsible for compliance requirements of the PBC program. We continue to believe that the lack of reliable, consistent data on PBC properties makes it difficult for GSA to effectively oversee the program and for the sponsoring agencies to ensure that they are performing compliance monitoring for all the properties that have been conveyed. Better data would facilitate oversight of the program and ensure that the government is performing compliance monitoring for all the properties conveyed using the PBC program. GSA also provided technical comments, which we incorporated into the final report where appropriate. Comments from GSA can be found in appendix V.

HHS generally concurred with the report's overall findings and with the recommendation to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to better ensure that their agencies' current compliance monitoring policies are followed. HHS stated that in keeping with our recommendation, it has been aggressive in ensuring the grantees' timely submission of annual utilization reports. However, HHS had the following comments on our findings and other recommendations. HHS said that although the report examined the interagency dispute on the reversion of conveyed surplus property, it believed that the report failed to draw any meaningful conclusions about the competing viewpoints on the subject and did not offer specific recommendations to address the problem. Furthermore, HHS noted that clear guidance on reversions would provide a framework for the sponsoring agencies to address administrative deficiencies identified in the

draft report. HHS suggested that we determine whether reversion is a suitable method for compliance enforcement and whether GSA's and DOD's objections to reversions have merit. Determining whether reversion is a suitable method for addressing noncompliance was beyond the scope of this review. We agree that the unclear reversion process and competing viewpoints on reversions are a concern, but leave the consideration of uniform standards and guidance for the PBC program including standard criteria and processes for reversions of property, to GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies.

HHS had a number of comments on our findings on PBC property data. HHS noted that GSA and DOD maintain responsibility for a number of properties that are never assigned to a sponsoring agency and therefore would not be in the sponsoring agencies' property records. Furthermore, HHS said that it provides GSA and DOD with a significant amount of information about each property it conveys and HHS believes that the lack of reliable, consistent PBC property data is largely due to GSA's and DOD's failure to use the property information furnished to them by the sponsoring agencies and to update their property records. As a result, HHS expressed concern about whether GSA and DOD would be able to efficiently develop a governmentwide database of PBC properties without in-depth discussions with the sponsoring agencies. We believe that GSA, DOD and the sponsoring agencies should be involved in the development of consistent, reliable PBC data and made such a recommendation. HHS suggested that if a governmentwide database of real property information were to be developed, it should be Web-based and accessible to the federal agencies so that property information could be updated on a recurring basis. HHS said that in accordance with our recommendation, it will dedicate a field for reversions in its database of PBC properties.

HHS disagreed with our statement that only GSA and the Air Force provide unique identifying codes for each property. HHS commented that it also has a unique identification number for each property conveyed by HHS, which it uses in conjunction with GSA and DOD identifying codes. HHS did not provide these numbers to us during our audit. Furthermore, HHS said that in its experience, the names of properties frequently change as properties are transferred between GSA and DOD and the sponsoring agencies, requiring HHS to verify the identity of the parcel of property assigned to it. We believe HHS's statements corroborate our finding that a PBC-programwide system of coding properties does not exist and support our recommendation that reliable, consistent PBC property data be developed

and that these data include, at a minimum, a unique identifying code or name for each property.

HHS had additional comments on our recommendation that GSA coordinate with DOD and sponsoring agencies to give consideration to developing uniform standards and guidance for the PBC program to address inconsistencies, as appropriate. Specifically, HHS said that it believes that standard policies and procedures for compliance site inspections and utilization reports would not be feasible because of inherent differences in the types of public uses and the possible administrative burden that would be imposed on the sponsoring agency and the grantee if they were required to report information not pertaining to their specific public use. We do not agree that the differences in the public uses preclude GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies from working collectively to consider whether opportunities exist for uniformity in standards and guidance for the PBC program and instead believe that HHS's comments lend support to our recommendation that discussion between the agencies would be useful and could address issues of program inconsistencies. HHS also provided technical comments, including some related to individual properties. We incorporated these into the final report where appropriate. Comments from HHS can be found in appendix VI.

HUD generally concurred with the report's recommendation to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to better ensure that their agencies' current compliance monitoring policies are followed. HUD stated that in keeping with our recommendation, it will review its compliance policies. However, HUD had additional comments on our recommendation that GSA coordinate with DOD and sponsoring agencies to give consideration to developing uniform standards and guidance for the PBC program to address inconsistencies, as appropriate. Specifically, HUD said that conveyances for residential housing are different from those for commercial property and therefore it would be inappropriate to develop uniform standards for all PBCs. HUD believes that it has already adopted the appropriate standards for housing conveyances, which are similar to those for other housing programs. As we noted in our response to HHS's comments, we do not agree that the differences in public uses preclude GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies from working together to consider whether opportunities exist for uniformity in standards and guidance and instead believe that HUD's comments also support our recommendation that discussion between the agencies would be useful and could address issues of program inconsistencies. HUD provided comments by e-mail

through its agency liaison. These comments have been incorporated into the report where appropriate.

As agreed with our office, unless you publicly announce the contents of this report earlier, we plan no further distribution until 30 days from the report date. At that time, we will send copies of this report to other interested congressional committees and the Administrator of GSA, the Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Secretary of Transportation. We will also make copies available to others upon request. In addition, the report will be available at not charge on the GAO Web site <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact me at (202) 512-2834 or goldsteinm@gao.gov. Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last page of this report. Key contributors to this report are listed in appendix VIII.



Mark L. Goldstein
Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Our objectives were to (1) determine the number, types, and locations of surplus real properties disposed of using the public benefit conveyance (PBC) program in fiscal years 2000 through 2004; (2) assess General Services Administration (GSA), Department of Defense (DOD), and sponsoring agency efforts to ensure that properties are used as agreed to by the grantee; and (3) identify any challenges facing agencies and grantees with regard to the program. To determine the number, types, and locations of surplus real properties disposed of using the PBC program in fiscal years 2000 through 2004, it was necessary to develop a database of properties conveyed by the PBC program because a comprehensive database does not exist. To compile a database of properties, we obtained data from GSA and DOD on all the properties conveyed as PBCs in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 (i.e., October 1, 1999, to September 30, 2004). We also asked each of the sponsoring agencies to provide us with a complete list of properties for which they gained compliance monitoring responsibilities during this time period. We asked GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies to provide us with the following pieces of information for each property on their list: property name, description, address, sponsoring agency,¹ grantee including contact information, date of conveyance, intended public use, and compliance history including dates of compliance reports or inspections. Agencies provided us with both electronic data and case files.

We compiled the data into a database of properties and made note of missing fields of data. In order to verify that each sponsoring agency was aware of its responsibilities to monitor each property, we compared each property on GSA's and DOD's lists with those on the sponsoring agencies' lists. We used six pieces of information for each property to determine whether properties on both lists were the same. These were the property name, public use, grantee, acreage, location, and date conveyed. Properties were considered the same if data for a property on GSA's or DOD's lists was the same in four or more fields as a property on the sponsoring agency's list, and they were considered similar if between two and three fields were the same. We determined the total number of identifiable properties by summing the properties considered to be the same or similar. Because these properties were on either GSA's or DOD's lists and the sponsoring agencies' lists, we have reasonable assurance that these properties were conveyed and that the sponsoring agencies were aware of their responsibilities to monitor them. A number of properties on GSA's and DOD's lists could not be matched with a property on the sponsoring

¹We asked only that GSA and DOD provide information on the sponsoring agency.

agencies' lists because data in none of the six fields on any list was in agreement. Determining the status of these properties would have been time-consuming and was outside of the scope of our review. To determine the number of properties that reverted to the federal government in fiscal years 2000 through 2004, we asked GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies to provide us with data on the number of properties that reverted from October 1, 1999 through September 30, 2004. We compiled this data into a database and used the same process described above to compare the lists of reverted properties provided by GSA and DOD to the lists provided by the sponsoring agencies. To determine the reliability of the PBC property data, we collected information from agency officials at GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies about their data collection systems and asked these officials to describe the controls their agency had in place to ensure that the data are accurate and complete.

To assess GSA's, DOD's, and sponsoring agencies' efforts to ensure that properties were being used as agreed to by the grantee, we reviewed the federal statutes and regulations that established the PBC program, collected documents on the organizational structure of the program and the responsibilities of each agency involved in the program, and examined the steps in the PBC process for both civilian and BRAC property. To determine how each agency manages its PBC program, we obtained GSA's, DOD's, and sponsoring agencies' policies and procedures for management of the PBC program, including information on the application review and approval, deeding and conveyance, and compliance monitoring processes. In order to better understand the reversion process and to identify criteria the agencies' used to revert properties, and the steps involved in the reversion process, we interviewed agency officials on the reversion process and obtained the agencies' policies and procedures on reversions.

In order to determine whether the agencies were performing compliance monitoring and properties were being used as agreed to by the grantees, we selected 58 properties for case study review that were conveyed between October 1, 1989 and September 30, 2004. Specifically, we requested that GSA and the sponsoring agencies provide us with data on all of the properties for which they gained compliance monitoring responsibilities. We chose properties from a 15-year time period because that time frame would help ensure that most of the properties had an established compliance history. The 58 properties were chosen because they represented a mix of public uses, locations, stages of development (e.g., in planning versus completed), and compliance methods and histories. We asked GSA and the sponsoring agencies to provide us with the following

documents for each property selected for case study: the application, deed, survey, compliance records such as utilization reports, site inspections, and other significant correspondence related to each property's compliance (e.g., letters of request).

We evaluated the consistency of the compliance oversight performed for each property by comparing compliance records provided for each property to the compliance requirements stated in the agency's policies and procedures and the property deed. We were able to evaluate compliance oversight for 41 of the 58 properties we selected for case study review. Compliance oversight was considered consistent if the agency provided documentation for all the utilization reports and site inspections required in the agency's policies and procedures and the deed since the date of conveyance. If there were any gaps without documented explanation in the compliance record, compliance for the property was considered inconsistent. We were unable to evaluate compliance oversight for 17 properties selected for case study review because these properties had either been conveyed so recently that compliance monitoring was not yet required, had already reverted back to the federal government, or we were unable to obtain compliance information from the agencies. In addition, we visited each of the 58 case study properties to gain further insights about the program and determine whether the properties appeared to be used as described in property documents.

To identify any challenges related to the PBC program, we interviewed GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency officials and grantees about the program and asked them to provide us with information on any challenges to PBC program management and suggestions for improving the program. We collected documents to better understand each challenge, including information on the resources dedicated to the program, information available to prospective applicants and grantees, and information on why properties revert and what can be done to prevent it. We also researched the myriad federal laws that affect the PBC program, including the McKinney-Vento Act, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Base Closure and Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and visited the Web sites of GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies to determine how easy it was to obtain information on the PBC program and available surplus property. We conducted our review from September 2004 to May 2006 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
Alaska					
1 Bethel Army Advisor Housing - Lot 11	Apr-02	0.3	Homeless	Tundra Women's Coalition	Non-BRAC
2 Dillingham Wharf	Nov-03	2.4	Other (Port facility) ^a	Not provided	Non-BRAC
3 Gibson Cove	Jan-04	37.1	Parks and recreation	City of Kodiak	Non-BRAC
Alabama					
4 Mobile Point Light Station	Mar-01	10.1	Parks and recreation	Alabama Historical Commission	Non-BRAC
5 Federal Building	Aug-01	1.2	Education	Cullman City School System	Non-BRAC
6 Jasper FB&CT	Aug-02	1.4	Education	Walker County Board of Ed	Non-BRAC
7 Coosa River Storage Annex (CRSA)	Apr-03	2832.4	Parks and recreation	Talladega County Commission	Non-BRAC
8 Sand Island Lighthouse	Sept-03	0.2	Parks and recreation	Town of Dauphin Island	Non-BRAC
9 Fort McClellan	Apr-00	7.0	Public health	WWTP	BRAC
10 Fort McClellan	Oct-02	130.0	Parks and recreation	Anniston	BRAC
Arkansas					
11 Fort Chaffee	Jul-01	583.0	Parks and recreation	Sabastian County	BRAC
12 Low Level Windshear Alert System #4	Mar-00	0.4	Public health	Not provided	Non-BRAC
13 US Army Reserve Center #05571	Dec-01	7.0	Public health	Not provided	Non-BRAC
14 AR0006ZZ Blytheville Federal Bldg	Jan-03	1.0	Historic monument	City of Blytheville	Non-BRAC
15 Sandy Beach Recreation Area	Feb-03	48.3	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
16 AR0081ZZ Hot Springs SSA Fed Bldg	Aug-03	0.6	Homeless	Quapaw House, Inc.	Non-BRAC
17 Fort Chaffee	Aug-01	412.0	Public health	City of Ft. Smith (Landfill extension)	BRAC
18 Eaker	Mar-00	48.7	Parks and recreation	YMCA	BRAC
19 Eaker	Sept-02	10.4	Public health	HHS for Water/sewer	BRAC
20 Eaker	Sept-02	105.5	Public airport	Blytheville-Gosnell Regional Airport Authority	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name		Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
21	Eaker	Sept-02	78.8	Public airport	Blytheville-Gosnell Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
22	Eaker	Sept-02	1076.0	Public airport	Blytheville-Gosnell Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
23	Eaker	Sept-02	494.7	Public airport	Blytheville-Gosnell Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
24	Eaker	Sept-02	191.6	Public airport	Blytheville-Gosnell Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
Arizona						
25	Federal Building	Aug-02	0.7	Parks and recreation	City Of Mesa	Non-BRAC
26	Federal Building	Aug-02	0.3	Other (Law enforcement) ^a	City of Prescott	Non-BRAC
27	Por. Colorado River Basin Salinity	May-03	640.0	Correctional	AZ Dept. of Corrections	Non-BRAC
28	INS Border Patrol	Oct-03	0.9	Public health	HHS	Non-BRAC
29	Williams	Dec-99	286.4	Education	Arizona State University	BRAC
30	Williams	Dec-99	12.6	Public health	City of Mesa	BRAC
31	Williams	Feb-00	1.7	Homeless	House of Refugee Inc.	BRAC
32	Williams	Feb-01	18.1	Education	Arizona State University	BRAC
33	Williams	Sept-02	0.8	Public health	Flood Control District of Maricopa County	BRAC
34	Williams	Apr-04	39.2	Public airport	Williams Airport Gateway Authority	BRAC
California						
35	Parcel 2	Nov-99	11.4	Parks and recreation	City of Pomona	Non-BRAC
36	Redding Reserve Site	Dec-99	5.2	Homeless	Vietnam Veterans of California	Non-BRAC
37	Reclamation Unit LC-2 Trinity	Mar-00	28.3	Parks and recreation	Lewiston Community Services	Non-BRAC
38	Santa Rosa High Frequency Radio Station	Apr-02	69.2	Wildlife conservation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
39	Former Calexico Border Patrol	Jan-04	2.1	Education	Imperial Co. Office of Education	Non-BRAC
40	SSA Building - CA0184ZZ	Mar-04	0.6	Homeless	City of Modesto	Non-BRAC
41	Fort Ord	Sept-01	31.0	Education	York Schools	BRAC
42	Recreation Center #2, Fort Bragg	Aug-03	4.0	Parks and recreation	City of Fayetteville	BRAC
43	Sierra Army Depot	Sept-03	67.0	Education	Ft. Sage	BRAC
44	Fort Ord	Sept-03	3.0	Education	Monterey College of Law	BRAC
45	Fort Ord	Sept-04	2.0	Homeless	Housing Authority of Monterey County	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
46 Long Beach, CA - NAVSTA	Feb-00	1.5	Port facility	City of Los Angeles	BRAC
47 Long Beach, CA - NAVSTA	Feb-00	14.3	Port facility	Port of Los Angeles	BRAC
48 Stockton, CA - NAVRESCEN	Mar-00	4.3	Port facility	Port of Stockton	BRAC
49 San Francisco, CA - PWC	Apr-00	3.0	Parks and recreation	City of Novato	BRAC
50 San Francisco, CA - PWC	Apr-00	3.6	Parks and recreation	City of Novato	BRAC
51 San Francisco, CA - PWC	Apr-00	7.3	Parks and recreation	City of Novato	BRAC
52 San Francisco, CA - PWC	Apr-00	1.7	Education	Community Action Marin Inc.	BRAC
53 San Francisco, CA - PWC	Apr-00	3.0	Education	Novato Unified School District	BRAC
54 San Diego, CA - NTC	Aug-00	9.0	Public health	City of San Diego	BRAC
55 San Diego, CA - NTC	Feb-01	49.0	Parks and recreation	City of San Diego	BRAC
56 Oakland, CA - Naval Hospital	Sept-01	8.5	Education	Seneca Center	BRAC
57 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Oct-01	20.0	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
58 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Oct-01	25.0	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
59 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Oct-01	8.0	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
60 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Oct-01	70.0	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
61 Long Beach, CA - NAVSTA	Oct-01	63.4	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
62 Long Beach, CA - NAVSTA	Oct-01	134.1	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
63 Long Beach, CA - NAVSTA	Oct-01	2.7	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC
64 Tustin, CA - MCAS	Nov-01	7.9	Parks and recreation	City of Irvine	BRAC
65 Tustin, CA - MCAS	Dec-02	20.0	Education	Irvine Unified School District	BRAC
66 Tustin, CA - MCAS	Dec-02	10.0	Education	Tustin Unified School District	BRAC
67 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Nov-03	13.0	Education	Marymount College	BRAC
68 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Nov-03	24.0	Education	Rolling Hills Preparatory School	BRAC
69 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	July-04	0.4	Port facility	City of Los Angeles/Port of Los Angeles	BRAC
70 Ontario	Mar-01	8.4	Public airport	Los Angeles Department of Airports	BRAC
71 March	Aug-01	185.2	Public airport	March Joint Powers Authority	BRAC
72 March	Nov-01	33.2	Public airport	March Joint Powers Authority	BRAC
73 March	June-02	151.5	Public airport	March Joint Powers Authority	BRAC
74 McClellan	Dec-02	6.4	Parks and recreation	North Highlands Recreational and Park District	BRAC
75 March	July-03	11.3	Public airport	March Joint Powers Authority	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
76 March	Sept-04	15.0	Education	Moreno Valley Unified School District	BRAC
77 George	May-04	960.0	Public airport	Victor Valley Airport Authority	BRAC
78 George	Oct-99	0.0	Public health	City of Victorville	BRAC
79 Castle	Sept-04	1321.9	Public airport	Castle Joint Powers Authority	BRAC
Colorado					
80 Lowry AFB Education	Apr-02	11.0	Education	Logan School	Non-BRAC
81 Lowry AFB Remaining HHS	Apr-02	10.0	Public health	Colorado Department of Health	Non-BRAC
82 Fitzsimons AMC	Jan-01	105.0	Education	City of Aurora	BRAC
83 Fitzsimons AMC	July-02	8.0	Parks and recreation	City of Aurora	BRAC
84 Fitzsimons AMC	Nov-02	3.0	Education	UCHSC	BRAC
85 Lowry	Dec-99	98.5	Parks and recreation	City and County of Denver Parks	BRAC
86 Lowry	May-00	129.1	Education	Colorado Community College	BRAC
87 Lowry	Nov-01	6.2	Public health	Colorado Department of Health	BRAC
88 Lowry	Jan-02	1.6	Parks and recreation	City and County of Denver Parks	BRAC
89 Lowry	Apr-03	4.8	Public health	City and County of Denver	BRAC
90 Lowry	June-03	1.9	Public health	Third Way Center	BRAC
Connecticut					
91 FAA Direction Finder	Apr-02	19.6	Parks and recreation	Town of Killingly	Non-BRAC
92 New London, CT - NUSC/NUWC Det	Mar-00	0.7	Parks and recreation	State Dept. of Environmental Protection	BRAC
Delaware					
93 UPH building	June-00	0.0	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
Florida					
94 Amelia Island Light	Sept-00	2.4	Historic monument	The City of Fernandina Beach	Non-BRAC
95 Crooked River Lighthouse Reservation	Nov-00	1.3	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
96 MacDill AFB RR Spur	Mar-02	6.7	Parks and recreation	City of Tampa	Non-BRAC
97 Lakeland Federal Property	Aug-02	2.0	Parks and recreation	City of Lakeland, FL	Non-BRAC
98 Lexington Terrace	Sept-02	30.0	Parks and recreation	Escambia County	Non-BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
99 Army Reserve Outdoor Training Facility	Nov-02	134.2	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
100 U.S. Classic Courthouse	Aug-03	1.0	Historic monument	City of Tampa	Non-BRAC
101 Federal Building/USDA Lab	Nov-03	0.5	Historic monument	City of Winter Haven	Non-BRAC
102 Communication Site - Homestead AFB	Feb-04	20.0	Law enforcement	City of Homestead	Non-BRAC
103 U.S. Custom House	May-04	0.5	Historic monument	Broward County Board of Commissioners	Non-BRAC
104 Fort Meade	July-01	348.0	Public airport	Anne Arundel County	BRAC
105 Key West, FL - NAS	Feb-00	0.8	Parks and recreation	City of Key West	BRAC
106 Cecil Field - NAS (Jacksonville, FL)	Apr-00	2016.6	Parks and recreation	City of Jacksonville	BRAC
107 Key West, FL - NAS	July-00	43.8	Parks and recreation	City of Key West	BRAC
108 Key West, FL - NAS	Aug-00	16.5	Parks and recreation	City of Key West	BRAC
109 Key West, FL - NAS	Aug-00	3.3	Parks and recreation	City of Key West	BRAC
110 Key West, FL - NAS	Aug-00	26.5	Historic monument	Monroe County	BRAC
111 Cecil Field - NAS (Jacksonville, FL)	Sept-00	27.9	Public airport	Jacksonville Ports Authority	BRAC
112 Orlando, FL - NTC	Sept-00	2.9	Public airport	GOAA	BRAC
113 Orlando, FL - NTC	Sept-00	38.0	Public airport	Greater Orlando Aviation Authority via City	BRAC
114 Orlando, FL - NTC	Sept-00	42.4	Public airport	Greater Orlando Aviation Authority via City	BRAC
115 Cecil Field - NAS (Jacksonville, FL)	Mar-03	12.8	Public airport	Jacksonville Ports Authority	BRAC
Georgia					
116 Blythe Island Range Rear Light	Apr-01	10.0	Parks and recreation	Glynn County	Non-BRAC
117 (P) Ft. Benning Military Reservation	Dec-03	14.4	Parks and recreation	City of Columbus	Non-BRAC
Guam					
118 Agat Parcel 3	Oct-02	5.0	Other (Public health) ^a	GOVGUAM	Non-BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
119 Agana, Guam - NAS	Sept-00	43.4	Parks and recreation	Department of Parks and Recreation	BRAC
120 Agana, Guam - NAS	Sept-00	1410.2	Public airport	Guam International Airport Authority	BRAC
Hawaii					
121 Barbers Point, HI - NAS	Oct-00	20.0	Public health	City & County of Honolulu	BRAC
122 Barbers Point, HI - NAS	Sept-00	21.0	Education	State of Hawaii	BRAC
Iowa					
123 Fort Des Moines Motorpool	June-04	0.9	Parks and recreation	NPS/City of Des Moines	Non-BRAC
Idaho					
124 Rexburg USARC	Mar-01	2.5	Education	Madison School District	Non-BRAC
125 US Army Reserve Center	July-01	2.8	Parks and recreation	City of Idaho Falls	Non-BRAC
126 Boise Federal Building/Post Office	July-04	1.4	Historic monument	Not provided	Non-BRAC
Illinois					
127 Radar Station	Nov-99	10.0	Homeless	Not provided	Non-BRAC
128 Former National Guard Facility	May-00	11.2	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
129 Glenview, IL - NAS	Mar-00	94.7	Education	Village of Vernon Hills	BRAC
130 Glenview, IL - NAS	Mar-00	12.2	Education	Village of Vernon Hills	BRAC
131 Glenview, IL - NAS	Apr-00	2.8	Parks and recreation	Village of Vernon Hills	BRAC
Indiana					
132 Vincennes Federal Building	Oct-99	0.6	Historic monument	Not provided	Non-BRAC
133 Lock and Dam No. 47 (Old Dam Park)	Dec-00	2.6	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
134 SSA District Office	Jan-04	0.6	Homeless	Family Services of Elkhart County, Inc.	Non-BRAC
135 Jefferson Proving Ground	Oct-99	221.0	Parks and recreation	Park	BRAC
136 Jefferson Proving Ground	Sept-04	403.0	Parks and recreation	Park	BRAC
137 Grissom	Mar-00	10.8	Public health	City of Peru	BRAC
Kansas					
138 U.S. Reserve Center Annex	July-00	0.4	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
139 Milford Lake	Apr-03	119.5	Education	Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	Non-BRAC
Kentucky					
140 Black Gem Recreational Area	Mar-01	6.6	Parks and recreation	Pike County Government	Non-BRAC
141 Cannelton L&D, Cloverport Access St.	June-03	15.7	Parks and recreation	City of Cloverport	Non-BRAC
142 Corbin SSA Bldg	Sept-03	1.0	Education	Corbin Independent School District	Non-BRAC
143 Licking River Access Site 12A	Jan-04	20.6	Parks and recreation	City of Wilder	Non-BRAC
144 Uniontown Ferry Access Site	Jan-04	2.5	Parks and recreation	City of Uniontown	Non-BRAC
145 Port Smithland Lock and Dam	Oct-04	92.0	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
Louisiana					
146 Portion of TR C-49	Apr-02	3.5	Wildlife conservation	LA Dept. of Wildlife	Non-BRAC
147 Eugene M. Nettles U.S. ARC	June-02	3.8	Homeless	Not provided	Non-BRAC
148 Opelousas Fed Bldg	Aug-03	1.5	Other (Law enforcement) ^a	27th Judicial Dist. Attny.	Non-BRAC
149 SSA Baton Rouge District	Jan-04	1.1	Education	Dept. of Education	Non-BRAC
150 England	June-04	151.5	Public airport	England Economic & Industrial Development District	BRAC
Massachusetts					
151 YTRN Granby Former Comm. Trans. Fac.	June-01	99.5	Parks and recreation	Commonwealth of Mass.	Non-BRAC
152 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Aug-01	22.3	Education	Bentley College	Non-BRAC
153 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Oct-01	17.4	Education	New Jewish High School, Inc. (Gann Academy)	Non-BRAC
154 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Oct-01	25.0	Parks and recreation	City of Waltham	Non-BRAC
155 Hingham Cohasset	Sept-03	125.0	Parks and recreation	State Park	BRAC
156 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	Jan-01	28.0	Self-help housing	Elder Housing Corporation (City of Quincy)	BRAC
157 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	May-03	220.2	Parks and recreation	South Shore Tri-Town Development Corp.	BRAC
158 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	May-03	5.1	Parks and recreation	South Shore Tri-Town Development Corp.	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
159 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	May-03	1.2	Parks and recreation	South Shore Tri-Town Development Corp.	BRAC
160 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	Feb-04	1.9	Parks and recreation	Town of Rockland	BRAC
Maryland					
161 Casson Neck Property	July-01	12.5	Parks and recreation	Dorchester County	Non-BRAC
162 Laplata Housing	Apr-02	13.3	Homeless	Southern Maryland Tri-County Community Action Committee	Non-BRAC
163 De LaSalle Building	June-02	17.8	Education	Archdiocese of Washington	Non-BRAC
164 Stillpond Housing Units	June-02	0.3	Homeless	Crossroads Community, Inc	Non-BRAC
165 Stillpond Housing Units	June-02	0.3	Homeless	Community Crossroads Inc	Non-BRAC
166 Stillpond Housing Units	June-02	0.4	Homeless	Community Crossroads Inc	Non-BRAC
167 Stillpond Housing Units	June-02	0.4	Homeless	Community Crossroads Inc	Non-BRAC
168 Station Stillpond	Mar-03	12.4	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
169 Annapolis, MD - NSWC Carderock DIV Det	Aug-02	24.0	Parks and recreation	Anne Arundel County, MD	BRAC
Michigan					
170 Seul Choix Point Light	Feb-00	0.1	Historic monument	Michigan Department of Natural Resources	Non-BRAC
171 Benton Harbor Federal Building	July-00	0.4	Historic monument	City of Benton Harbor	Non-BRAC
172 South Haven Keeper's Dwelling	July-00	0.7	Historic monument	City of South Haven	Non-BRAC
173 Parcel 2	Aug-00	10.1	Historic monument	State of Michigan	Non-BRAC
174 Muskegon Land	Mar-04	1.0	Public health	Not provided	Non-BRAC
175 K.I. Sawyer	Dec-99	1389.1	Public airport	County of Marquette	BRAC
176 K.I. Sawyer	Apr-00	2.3	Public airport	County of Marquette	BRAC
177 Wurtsmith	Feb-01	1.7	Education	Charter Township of Oscoda	BRAC
178 K.I. Sawyer	Apr-02	1.3	Public airport	County of Marquette	BRAC
179 Wurtsmith	Sept-02	848.6	Public airport	Oscoda-Wurtsmith Airport Authority	BRAC
180 K.I. Sawyer	Sept-04	108.9	Public airport	County of Marquette	BRAC
Missouri					
181 Monett, Barry Co.	May-00	9.3	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
182 Seldalia Federal Bldg.	July-01	0.8	Correctional	Pettis County	Non-BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
183 D.G. Hall Fed Bldg/Court	Oct-01	0.4	Homeless	Economic Security Corp. of Southwest Area	Non-BRAC
184 Columbia Federal Bldg	Oct-03	0.8	Education	Health Adventure Center	Non-BRAC
185 NIKE Kansas City 30	Aug-03	20.0	Education	Lone Jack School District	BRAC
Mississippi					
186 Greenwood Boat Ramp	Apr-03	1.2	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
Montana					
187 Canyon Ferry Reservoir	Apr-03	8.5	Other (emergency management reponse) ^a	Canyon Ferry Fire Service	Non-BRAC
North Carolina					
188 Federal building	May-00	0.4	Historic monument	Town of Rutherfordton	Non-BRAC
189 McKinney Lake Fish Hatchery	Jan-01	6.5	Parks and recreation	State of North Carolina	Non-BRAC
190 USARC Building Site, 4.9 Acres	Apr-02	4.9	Parks and recreation	Greenville Park & Rec.	Non-BRAC
191 Oak Island Lighttower	July-03	5.7	Parks and recreation	Town of Caswell Beach	Non-BRAC
North Dakota					
192 Grand Forks Safeguard Waterline	May-01	Not provided	Public health	HHS-North Valley Water District	Non-BRAC
193 Grand Forks Safeguard Waterline	Apr-02	97.0	Public health	City of Park River	Non-BRAC
194 117 Main St. Storage Bldg	May-02	0.4	Historic monument	State Historical Society of North Dakota	Non-BRAC
195 Fort Totten	Nov-02	44.0	Parks and recreation	NYC Parks and Recreation	BRAC
Nebraska					
196 Nebraska City Repair	June-00	1.8	Parks and recreation	National Park Service	Non-BRAC
New Hampshire					
197 Pease	Nov-99	151.9	Public airport	Pease Development Authority	BRAC
198 Pease	Oct-03	2535.0	Public airport	Pease Development Authority	BRAC
New Jersey					
199 Firehouse, BLDG 228 (Raritan)	July-00	1.2	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
200 Electronic Station ESMT	July-00	0.9	Other (Parks and recreation) ^a	Not provided	Non-BRAC

Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
201 Barnegat Recreation Facility	Mar-01	0.7	Historic monument	Not provided	Non-BRAC
202 Kearny Naval Reserve Center	Mar-02	2.6	Homeless	Not provided	Non-BRAC
203 Navy Housing	June-02	6.5	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
204 Chapel Hill Front Range Light	Oct-03	0.4	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
205 Fort Monmouth	Apr-03	8.0	Education	Brookdale College	BRAC
206 Fort Monmouth	May-03	142.0	Parks and recreation	Wall Township	BRAC
207 Fort Monmouth	June-03	1.0	Public health	Wall Township (Pumphouse)	BRAC
208 Camp Kilmer	Sept-03	30.0	Parks and recreation	City of Edison	BRAC
209 Trenton, NJ - NAWC-AD	May-01	28.1	Public airport	Mercer County	BRAC
Nevada					
210 Stewart Avenue Federal Building	May-02	2.0	Historic monument	City of Las Vegas	Non-BRAC
New York					
211 Galeville Airport	Feb-00	55.0	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
212 Braddock Point Light Land (Tract 2)	July-00	0.0	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
213 Turkey Point Light	Aug-02	8.2	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
214 Fort Totten	Dec-01	37.0	Education	NYC	BRAC
215 Fort Totten	Jan-02	2.0	Homeless	Eastern Paralyzed Vets of America	BRAC
216 Plattsburgh	Apr-00	31.6	Parks and recreation	City of Plattsburgh	BRAC
217 Griffis	June-04	1344.0	Public airport	Airport Authority	BRAC
Ohio					
218 VOA Relay Site	Mar-00	20.0	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
219 Old ANT Huron	Sept-03	0.4	Parks and recreation	City of Huron	Non-BRAC
220 Rickenbacker	Nov-99	18.7	Public airport	Columbus Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
221 Rickenbacker	June-01	18.3	Public airport	Columbus Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
222 Rickenbacker	Aug-02	6.9	Public airport	Columbus Regional Airport Authority	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
223 Rickenbacker	Sept-03	310.3	Public airport	Columbus Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
224 Newark	Sept-03	13.3	Public airport	Licking County Regional Airport Authority	BRAC
Oregon					
225 Pt. Orford Radio Site	Dec-00	5.2	Parks and recreation	Oregon State Parks	Non-BRAC
226 Oregon City Federal Building	Feb-04	1.5	Other (Law enforcement) ^a	Clackamas County	Non-BRAC
Pennsylvania					
227 Maxwell Locks and Dam	May-00	2.7	Parks and recreation	Not provided	Non-BRAC
228 Uniontown Federal Building	Oct-01	0.4	Correctional	Fayette County	Non-BRAC
229 Naval Air Warfare Center	May-02	39.0	Parks and recreation	Township of Northampton	Non-BRAC
230 Ambridge SSA Bldg	Oct-02	0.6	Education	Ambridge Area School District	Non-BRAC
231 Cowanesque Lake Project	Dec-02	2.6	Homeless	United Christian Inc	Non-BRAC
232 Bristol SSA Bldg	May-03	0.7	Education	Bristol Borough School District	Non-BRAC
233 Tacony Warehouse	Sept-02	1.0	Parks and recreation	PA Fish and Boat Commission	BRAC
234 Warminster, PA – NAWC	Nov-00	243.0	Parks and recreation	Warminster Township	BRAC
235 NIKE Site PH-02	Sept-00	8.8	Parks and recreation	Bristol Township	Non-BRAC
Puerto Rico					
236 Primate Research Center	July-00	270.0	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
Rhode Island					
237 Davisville, RI - NCBC	June-00	189.0	Parks and recreation	North Kingstown	BRAC
South Carolina					
238 Greenwood Federal Building	Oct-01	0.6	Parks and recreation	Greenwood County	Non-BRAC
239 Airport	Dec-01	1240.0	Public airport	Horry City Airport	Non-BRAC
240 Golf Course	Dec-01	150.0	Parks and recreation	City of Myrtle Beach	Non-BRAC
241 Social Security Admin./Federal Bldg	Jan-02	0.6	Homeless	Interfaith Hospitality Network of York County	Non-BRAC
242 Sumter Federal Building	Nov-02	0.5	Education	Sumter Technology Ceter, Inc.	Non-BRAC
243 Charleston, SC - NAVSHIPYD	July-00	25.0	Parks and recreation	Charleston County Parks and Recreation	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
244 Myrtle Beach	Mar-00	2.5	Education	Cathedral Bible College	BRAC
245 Myrtle Beach	Aug-01	292.5	Parks and recreation	City of Myrtle Beach	BRAC
246 Myrtle Beach	Dec-02	1205.6	Public airport	Horry County	BRAC
Tennessee					
247 Former Marine Corps Reserve Center	Oct-01	0.01	Education	Washington County Dept. of Education	Non-BRAC
248 Former Marine Corps Reserve Center	Oct-01	30.1	Education	East Tennessee State University	Non-BRAC
249 Naval Hospital	July-02	38.7	Education	University of Memphis	Non-BRAC
250 Lafayette Federal Building	June-03	0.5	Correctional	City of Lafayette	Non-BRAC
251 Memphis, TN - NAS	Dec-99	550.9	Public airport	City of Millington	BRAC
Texas					
252 Former Navy Reserve Center	Mar-00	1.0	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
253 Library	July-01	0.2	Education	City of Westworth Village Library	Non-BRAC
254 Easement Deed 2	Aug-01	0.0	Public airport	City of Austin	Non-BRAC
255 Easement Deed No.3	Aug-01	0.0	Public airport	City of Austin	Non-BRAC
256 Easement and Fee Deed No. 1	Aug-01	174.8	Public airport	City of Austin	Non-BRAC
257 20 Units Kings Branch Housing	Aug-01	6.7	Homeless	Ability Resources, Inc.	BRAC
258 Port Mansfield	Jan-02	2.0	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
259 Brownsville SSA Fed Bldg	Oct-02	1.0	Education	Education Service Center Region 1 of Texas	Non-BRAC
260 Naval Auxiliary Landing Field	Mar-03	11.8	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
261 VORTAC Site	Dec-03	73.8	Parks and recreation	DHHS for Hood County TX	Non-BRAC
262 Camp Bullis	Mar-04	0.4	Parks and recreation	City of San Antonio	Non-BRAC
263 Dallas, TX - NAS	Mar-00	26.4	Parks and recreation	City of Grand Prairie	BRAC
264 Communications Annex, Carswell Air Force Base	Dec-00	17.01	Parks and recreation	City of Lake Worth	BRAC
Utah					
265 Administration Building	Mar-00	7.3	Education	Salt Lake City School District	Non-BRAC
266 Former Uranium Mill Tailing Site	June-00	383.2	Parks and recreation	NPS for City of Monticello	Non-BRAC
267 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Sept-01	6.0	Education	Weber County Schools	BRAC
268 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Sept-01	3.0	Education	Weber Applications Technology (Utah College of Applied Technology)	BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non-BRAC
269 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Aug-03	4.0	Parks and recreation	Weber Basin Disabled Assoc	BRAC
270 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Aug-03	25.0	Parks and recreation	City of Ogden (Weber County Fairgrounds)	BRAC
271 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Aug-03	25.0	Parks and recreation	City of Ogden (Ogden Nature Center)	BRAC
272 Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42	July-03	0.7	Public health	Planned Parenthood Association	BRAC
Virginia					
273 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute	Apr-92	154.0	Correctional	Riverside Regional Jail Authority	Non-BRAC
274 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute	June-02	25.0	Parks and recreation	Prince George County	Non-BRAC
275 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute	June-02	24.0	Parks and recreation	City of Hopewell	Non-BRAC
276 Staunton SSA Bldg	Aug-02	0.5	Public health	City of Staunton	Non-BRAC
277 Watkins K. Abbitt FB	Oct-03	0.3	Homeless	Central Piedmont Action Council, Inc.	Non-BRAC
278 Lynchburg SSA Building	Apr-04	0.9	Homeless	Salvation Army, Inc.	Non-BRAC
279 Vint Hill Farms Station	Mar-00	18.0	Parks and recreation	Fauquier County	BRAC
280 Fort Pickett	May-01	1183.0	Education	VA Tech	BRAC
281 Driver, VA - NRTF	July-01	247.7	Parks and recreation	City of Suffolk, Virginia	BRAC
282 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion)	May-04	275.4	Correctional	VDOC Central Office	Non-BRAC
Washington					
283 USARC Moses Lake	Aug-00	2.9	Parks and recreation	Grant County Housing Authority	Non-BRAC
284 Fed. Bldg./Post Office	Mar-02	0.4	Historic monument	City of Pasco	Non-BRAC
285 Army NIKE-Ajax Site 32-33	July-02	34.5	Education	Not provided	Non-BRAC
286 Bellingham Federal Building	July-04	0.5	Historic monument	City of Bellingham	Non-BRAC
287 Sand Point Puget Sound, WA NAVSTA	Apr-00	11.0	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle	BRAC
288 Portion, Sand Point Magnuson Park	Dec-02	8.2	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle	BRAC
Wisconsin					
289 North Point Light Station	Sept-03	2.0	Historic monument	Not provided	Non-BRAC

**Appendix II
Summary Data on All Identifiable Properties
Conveyed, Fiscal Years 2000-2004**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Acres	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/non- BRAC
West Virginia					
290 Matewan - 16 Tracts	Mar-00	2.6	Other (Parks and recreation) ^a	Town of Matewan	Non-BRAC
291 Matewan - 3 tracts	Mar-00	0.5	Other (Parks and recreation) ^a	Town of Matewan	Non-BRAC
292 Matewan - 3 tracts	Mar-00	0.3	Other (Parks and recreation) ^a	Town of Matewan	Non-BRAC
293 Old Post Office and Courthouse	Feb-01	0.4	Education	Boarman Arts Center	Non-BRAC
294 Welch SSA Bldg	Apr-03	0.4	Education	McDowell Board of Ed	Non-BRAC
295 Kennedy Park and Marina	May-03	13.3	Parks and recreation	Hancock County	Non-BRAC
296 Tract 757	Jan-04	0.2	Parks and recreation	City of Williamson	Non-BRAC
297 Tract 759	Jan-04	0.4	Parks and recreation	City of Williamson	Non-BRAC
298 Tract 758	Jan-04	0.5	Parks and recreation	City of Williamson	Non-BRAC

Source: Compiled by GAO from property information provided by GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies.

Note: For the purposes of this review, we relied on GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency property information provided for the PBC database. The information in this table has been reproduced exactly as it appears in the database. We found that in some instances, for the 58 properties we selected as case studies, information in the database was inconsistent with information found in property documents such as deeds. For example, the number of acres conveyed may have varied. Because for our purposes it was not necessary to reconcile information in the database with the property documents, we relied on the information in the database to construct this table.

^a Information provided by GSA for this property listed the type of conveyance as *Other*. During our effort to match properties on agencies' lists, we were able to determine the type of conveyance for this property by using information provided by the sponsoring agency.

Summary Data on Properties Selected for Case Study

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/ non-BRAC	Compliance oversight	Reversion
California						
1 VA Triangular Parcel Los Angeles, California	Feb-96	Homeless	Salvation Army	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
2 George	May-04	Public airport	Victor Valley Airport Authority	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
3 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Nov-03	Education	Rolling Hills Preparatory School	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
4 Savannah & Cabrillo Navy Housing	Sept-94	Education	Long Beach USD	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
5 Long Beach, CA - NAVSHIPYD	Oct-01	Port facility	City of Long Beach	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
6 Little Cottonwood Park	Sept-89	Parks and recreation	City of Los Alamitos	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Florida						
7 U.S. Classic Courthouse	Aug-03	Historic monument	City of Tampa	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	No
8 Federal Building/USDA Lab	Nov-03	Historic monument	City of Winter Haven	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	No
9 MacDill AFB RR Spur	Mar-02	Parks and recreation	City of Tampa	Non-BRAC	Consistent	No
10 U.S. Custom House	May-04	Historic monument	Broward County Board of Commissioners	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	No
11 Communication Site - Homestead AFB	Feb-04	Law enforcement	City of Homestead	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	No
12 Homestead Air Force Base Homestead, Florida	June-96	Homeless	Metropolitan Dade County Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Kansas						
13 U.S. Post Office & Courthouse	Nov-95	Correctional	Wyandotte County, KS	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
14 Federal Building, Manhattan, Kansas	Apr-98	Homeless	North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
15 Milford Lake	Apr-03	Education	Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	Yes
16 Tuttle Creek (portion)	Sept-89	Wildlife conservation	State of Kansas	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
17 Tuttle Creek (portion)	Jan-90	Wildlife conservation	State of Kansas	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No

**Appendix III
Summary Data on Properties Selected for
Case Study**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/ non-BRAC	Compliance oversight	Reversion
18 Tuttle Creek (portion)	Jan-90	Wildlife conservation	State of Kansas	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
19 Tuttle Creek (portion)	Jan-90	Wildlife conservation	State of Kansas	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
20 Tuttle Creek (portion)	Jan-90	Wildlife conservation	State of Kansas	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Massachusetts						
21 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Aug-01	Education	Bentley College	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
22 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Oct-01	Education	New Jewish High School, Inc. (Gann Academy)	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
23 Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center	Oct-01	Parks and recreation	City of Waltham	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
24 South Weymouth, MA - NAS	Jan-01	Self-help housing	Elder Housing Corporation (City of Quincy)	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
25 NIKE Village Site, Topsfield, Massachusetts	Apr-98	Homeless	Health and Education Services, Inc.	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
26 Commanding Officer's Quarters	Aug-98	Historic monument	Town of Watertown	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Pennsylvania						
27 Valley Forge General Hospital Phoenixville, Pennsylvania	Nov-95	Homeless	Community Mental Health Services, Inc.	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
28 Valley Forge General Hospital	July-96	Education	Valley Forge Christian College	Non-BRAC	Consistent	No
29 Valley Forge General Hospital	Sept-89	Education	Valley Forge Christian College	Non-BRAC	Consistent	No
30 NIKE Site PH-02	Sept-00	Parks and recreation	Bristol Township	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	Yes
31 Warminster, PA - NAWC	Nov-00	Parks and recreation	Warminster Township	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
32 Naval Air Warfare Center Warminster, Northampton Township	Nov-97	Parks and recreation	Northampton Township	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Texas						
33 20 Units Kings Branch Housing	Aug-01	Homeless	Ability Resources, Inc.	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
34 Lake Lewisville, parcel 2	Feb-94	Education	Lewisville ISD	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
35 Lake Lewisville, parcel 3	Feb-94	Education	Lewisville ISD	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
36 Dallas, TX - NAS	Mar-00	Parks and recreation	City of Grand Prairie	BRAC	Consistent	No
37 Naval Air Station, Dallas Duncanville Housing Site	Nov-98	Parks and recreation	City of Duncanville	BRAC	Inconsistent	No

**Appendix III
Summary Data on Properties Selected for
Case Study**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/ non-BRAC	Compliance oversight	Reversion
38 Communications Annex, Carswell Air Force Base	Dec-00	Parks and recreation	City of Lake Worth	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Utah						
39 Clearfield Federal Depot	Feb-93	Education	Davis County School District	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
40 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Sept-01	Education	Weber Applications Technology (Utah College of Applied Technology)	BRAC	Consistent	No
41 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Sept-01	Education	Weber County Schools	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
42 Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42	July-03	Public health	Planned Parenthood Association	BRAC	Not evaluated	Yes
43 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Aug-03	Parks and recreation	City of Ogden (Ogden Nature Center)	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
44 Defense Depot – Ogden, UT	Aug-03	Parks and recreation	City of Ogden (Weber County Fairgrounds)	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
Virginia						
45 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion)	May-04	Correctional	VDOC Central Office	Non-BRAC	Not evaluated	Yes
46 Defense General Supply Center, Falling Creek Reservoir	Nov-93	Parks and recreation	Chesterfield County	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
47 Former Petersburg Correctional Institute	Apr-92	Correctional	Riverside Regional Jail Authority	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
48 Cameron Station (portion)	Apr-97	Parks and recreation	City of Alexandria	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
Washington						
49 Midway NIKE Housing Site Kent, Washington	Sept-94	Homeless	King County Housing Authority	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
50 Portion, Howard A. Hanson Dam, King County, Washington	May-91	Public health	City of Tacoma	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
51 Sandpoint Naval Housing, Buildings 333-334	Jan-99	Education	University of Washington	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
52 Naval Station Puget Sound	Aug-99	Education	University of Washington	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
53 Naval Station Puget Sound	Aug-99	Education	University of Washington	BRAC	Inconsistent	No
54 Olympia Federal Building	Nov-98	Historic monument	State of Washington	Non-BRAC	Inconsistent	No
55 Sand Point Playground Parcel	Aug-98	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle Department of Parks and recreation	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
56 Sand Point Magnuson Park	Mar-99	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle	BRAC	Not evaluated	No

**Appendix III
Summary Data on Properties Selected for
Case Study**

(Continued From Previous Page)

Property name	Date conveyed/ reverted	Conveyance type	Grantee name	BRAC/ non-BRAC	Compliance oversight	Reversion
57 Sand Point Puget Sound, WA NAVSTA	Apr-00	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle	BRAC	Not evaluated	No
58 Portion, Sand Point Magnuson Park	Dec-02	Parks and recreation	City of Seattle	BRAC	Not evaluated	No

Source: Compiled by GAO from property information provided by GSA, DOD, and the sponsoring agencies.

Note: For the purposes of this review, we relied on GSA, DOD, and sponsoring agency property information provided for the PBC database. The information in this table has been reproduced exactly as it appears in the database. We found that in some instances, for the 58 properties we selected as case studies, information in the database was inconsistent with information found in property documents such as deeds. For example, the number of acres conveyed may have varied. Because for our purposes it was not necessary to reconcile information in the database with the property documents, we relied on the information in the database to construct this table.

Properties Selected for Case Studies

This appendix consists of summaries of information about 58 properties we selected as case studies for this review. We relied primarily on General Services Administration, Department of Defense, and sponsoring agency property information provided for the public benefit conveyance database and property documents obtained from the sponsoring agencies and grantees to develop the summaries. We found that in some instances, for the 58 properties we selected as case studies, information in the database was inconsistent with information found in property documents such as deeds. For example, the number of acres conveyed may have varied. Because for our purposes it was not necessary to reconcile information in the database with the property documents, we relied on the information in the database to construct these summaries.

California

Figure 5: Little Cottonwood Park – one property

Property name:	Little Cottonwood Park
Location:	Los Alamitos, CA
Size:	6.07 acres
Grantee:	City of Los Alamitos
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	September 7, 1989
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

Prior to the conveyance of this property, the City of Los Alamitos had developed the property as a park site while under a lease agreement with DOD's Department of the Army. The city agreed to maintain the property as a public park and recreation area through the PBC program.

Figure 6: Port of Long Beach - one property

Property name:	Long Beach, CA NAVSHIPYD
Location:	Long Beach, CA
Size:	282 acres
Grantee:	City of Long Beach
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Transportation/Maritime Administration
Date of conveyance:	October 3, 2001
Public use:	Port facility
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

Environmental issues delayed the transfer of the property to the City of Long Beach. Since the former Navy shipyard was heavily contaminated, restrictions were placed on the use of some of the conveyed property. The Long Beach Port Authority has assumed responsibility for cleaning the property and currently is using the property as a commercial shipping port. The former Navy dry dock piers are being filled in with sand and gravel. Although the property deed states that the grantee will furnish MARAD with annual utilization reports upon request, reports were not included in the documentation provided by the agency.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 7: Savannah and Cabrillo Navy Housing – one property

Property name:	Savannah and Cabrillo Navy Housing
Location:	Long Beach, CA
Size:	64 acres
Grantee:	Long Beach Unified School District
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	September 14, 1994
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was conveyed to the Long Beach Unified School District for educational use. Currently, the school district is using the property to house a grades 9-12 high school with approximately 3,700 students, as well as administrative offices. The grantee is required to submit annual utilization reports to the Department of Education.

Figure 8: Rolling Hills Preparatory School – one property

Property name:	Long Beach, CA NAVSHIPYD
Location:	Palos Verdes Estates, CA
Size:	24 acres
Grantee:	Rolling Hills Preparatory School
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	November 21, 2003
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was conveyed to Rolling Hills Preparatory School for use as an independent community school. When an endangered species of butterfly was discovered on the property, a study was conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) that resulted in certain environmental restrictions being placed on the property. The environmental issues and resulting restrictions have caused financial difficulties for the school, specifically because the school had to invest in a new utility distribution system when FWS required it to abandon the existing utility infrastructure. The school plans to use the property to expand its grades 6-12 school.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 9: Westwood Transitional Village – one property

Property name:	VA Triangular Parcel Los Angeles, CA
Location:	Los Angeles, CA
Size:	2.13 acres
Grantee:	Salvation Army
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	February 15, 1996
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Salvation Army has operated its Westwood Transitional Village on the property since 1989, and was conveyed the property for homeless use in 1996. The village currently provides 41 apartments, supportive services for residents, and a child care center. Funds and revenues generated by fees collected from the day care program are used to support the other programs on the property.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 10: Southern California Logistics Airport - one property

Property name:	George
Location:	Victorville, CA
Size:	960 acres
Grantee:	Victor Valley Airport Authority
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration
Date of conveyance:	May 17, 2004
Public use:	Public airport
Length of deed restrictions:	No provision in deed
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Victor Valley Airport Authority received 960 acres to be used for public airport purposes. The authority is generating revenue from the property in a number of ways. The authority collects revenues from building rents, airport facility use fees, state and federal grants, and revenue bonds. Although, the authority does not provide passenger service, it is collecting approximately \$1 million annually from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for planned passenger service in the future. In addition, the authority received approval from FAA to lease a portion of the property to a power company to construct a power generating facility. The authority receives approximately \$2 million per year from the power company for use of the land. Based on information from the grantee, the airport property fence was moved prior to approval of the lease by FAA.

Florida

Figure 11: Homestead Air Force Base Communications Annex – one property

Property name:	Communications Site - Homestead AFB
Location:	Homestead, FL
Size:	20 acres
Grantee:	City of Homestead
Sponsoring agency:	General Services Administration
Date of conveyance:	February 9, 2004
Public use:	Law enforcement
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The grantee has a 2-year construction plan for a Law Enforcement Training Facility. According to the grantee, the facility will enhance the law enforcement capabilities of the Homestead Police Department by providing it with a firearms range, training center, and K9 training facility that will be open to other local law enforcement agencies in addition to the Homestead Police Department. Of approximately \$400,000 needed to fund the project, \$200,000 in state and federal grants have been received and applied by the grantee.

Figure 12: Homestead Air Force Base Homeless Trust – one property

Property name:	Homestead Air Force Base – Homestead, FL
Location:	Homestead, FL
Size:	84.6 acres
Grantee:	Metropolitan Dade County Miami-Dade County Homeless Trust
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	June 28, 1996
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The former Homestead Air Base property is used as a 300-bed emergency housing facility that provides clothing, food, and shelter for homeless men, women, and children. Services offered on-site include case management, adult and vocational classes, job training, and health care. However, approximately 52 acres of the property have not yet been used by the grantee, which does not comply with the deed requirements. In response to the breach of compliance, HHS first demanded monthly payments for the portion of property that was not utilized, but later agreed to waive the payments while the grantee developed an eligible program for the rest of the property. Pending HHS approval, the grantee has proposed to develop the unused land for a homeless garden project.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 13: U.S. Custom House – one property

Property name:	U.S. Custom House
Location:	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
Size:	0.5 acres
Grantee:	Broward County Board of Commissioners
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Historic Surplus Property Program
Date of conveyance:	May 14, 2004
Public use:	Historic monument
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

According to PBC program regulations, the use of historic monument public benefit conveyances is not restricted, but such properties must be preserved. Although Broward County plans to use the former U.S. Custom House property as office space, a definite use has not yet been determined. Historic preservation and restoration of the original architecture of the building is estimated to cost \$450,000. The building, to date, remains unoccupied.

Figure 14: MacDill Air Force Base Railroad Spur – one property

Property name:	MacDill AFB RR Spur
Location:	Tampa, FL
Size:	6.68 acres
Grantee:	City of Tampa
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	March 15, 2002
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

Although the City of Tampa plans to use the property to construct a 10-mile trail that will connect Tampa and St. Petersburg, less than 10 percent of the property has been developed. During an on-site inspection conducted in July 2003, the National Park Service noted that the City of Tampa had failed to place signs identifying the property as part of the Federal Lands to Parks Program as required in the deed. The city corrected this problem and included a picture of the sign in the biennial report. The National Park Service has given the Tampa city government an extension from 3 years to 6 years to complete program development and implementation. Although the city has not acquired any surrounding properties, it is currently developing a comprehensive land management plan, which includes the trail development plans for the site.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 15: U.S. Classic Courthouse – one property

Property name:	U.S. Classic Courthouse
Location:	Tampa, FL
Size:	1.01 acres
Grantee:	City of Tampa
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Historic Surplus Property Program
Date of conveyance:	August 28, 2003
Public use:	Historic monument
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was conveyed to the City of Tampa without a commitment from the grantee on how it intended to use the property. The City has not yet determined the exact public use of the property. According to a city official, the property would most likely be used as the future home of the Tampa Museum of Art, though it is only one of three properties the museum is considering. Since conveyance, the property has remained mostly unoccupied and the community has been invited to suggest possible uses for the facility.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 16: Federal Building and USDA Lab – one property

Property name:	Federal Building/USDA Lab
Location:	Winter Haven, FL
Size:	0.47 acres
Grantee:	City of Winter Haven
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Historic Surplus Property Program
Date of conveyance:	November 10, 2003
Public use:	Historic monument
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

When the City of Winter Haven was conveyed this former federal building, its sole occupant was the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), which used the building as a laboratory primarily for orange juice testing. After the property was conveyed, the City of Winter Haven leased the property back to USDA for a period of 5 years. Currently, the city has no specific use plan developed, but it plans to lease the building to a nonprofit organization in 2008 for a public art facility, museum, or other cultural program or to use the building for municipal administration.

Kansas

Figure 17: Wyandotte County Correctional Facility and Court Services Building – one property

Property name:	U.S. Post Office and Courthouse
Location:	Kansas City, KS
Size:	2.05 acres
Grantee:	Wyandotte County, KS
Sponsoring agency:	General Services Administration
Date of conveyance:	November 8, 1995
Public use:	Correctional
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Kansas City Federal Courthouse and Post Office was conveyed to Wyandotte County for correctional use as a juvenile correctional facility. A site inspection of the property was conducted in July 2002 by GSA, which determined that the property was being used for the purpose for which it was conveyed. The county has renovated parts of the building to house

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

probation offices, family courts, and other juvenile services as well as detention cells used to hold juveniles.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 18: North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging, Inc. – one property

Property name:	Federal Building, Manhattan, KS
Location:	Manhattan, KS
Size:	2 story building
Grantee:	North Central Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	April 23, 1998
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was originally conveyed to the North Central-Flint Hills Area Agency on Aging for homeless use. The grantee currently uses the space to collocate services aimed at alleviating homelessness and has leased space to two other organizations that provide homeless services. HHS is aware of the use of space by other nonprofits to provide services for the homeless, and has found the practice consistent with its policy permitting grantees to associate with other eligible nonprofit agencies for the delivery of approved services.

Figure 19: Milford Lake – one property

Property name:	Milford Lake
Location:	Milford, KS
Size:	119.49 acres
Grantee:	Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Reversion date:	April 2, 2003
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Reverted
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

Kansas State University applied for and received the property to use for forestry research and to expand its tree improvement project operated by the Kansas State University Department of Forestry. Although the annual utilization reports filed by the university appeared to indicate that the university was in compliance, Education conducted an on-site inspection almost 18 years after conveyance and found the university to be noncompliant due to the university's failure to use the property as intended in the time allotted. The on-site inspection report stated that three parcels of property were unused or leased to a neighboring farmer to cut hay. Another parcel had been used as a research parcel, but the trees planted there had not survived. Education offered the university three alternatives, one of which was to return title to the federal government.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 20: Tuttle Lake Wildlife Area – five properties

Property name:	Tuttle Creek (portion)
Location:	Tuttle Creek, KS
Size:	130.1 acres total
Grantee:	State of Kansas
Sponsoring agency:	General Services Administration
Date of conveyance:	September 22, 1989; January 8, 1990
Public use:	Wildlife conservation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

Five tracts of land were conveyed to the State of Kansas for use as a conservation area for wildlife. The lands have been added to the state's extensive Tuttle Lake conservation area, which offers fishing, boating, camping, picnicking, and outdoor sports such as hunting. The area also provides food and shelter for migratory shore birds and waterfowl. A 2004 inspection by GSA and the Kansas City Department of Wildlife and Parks determined that the property was being used in accordance with the deed.

Massachusetts

Figure 21: NIKE Village Site Topsfield, MA – one property

Property name:	NIKE Village Site, Topsfield, MA
Location:	Topsfield, MA
Size:	8.93 acres
Grantee:	Health and Education Services, Inc.
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	April 2, 1998
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property comprises 16 ranch-style homes that were built in 1958 to provide housing for personnel of the Topsfield NIKE missile battery. NIKE Village operates state-funded residential programs that provide food and shelter to homeless individuals who are dually diagnosed with chronic, persistent mental illness and substance abuse, and to HIV-positive adults trying to maintain a life of sobriety. Residents may stay for up to 24 months.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

The facility is always fully occupied and currently has a waiting list. Since the property was conveyed, the grantee has faced financial challenges in upgrading its sewer infrastructure to meet state standards. As federal property, the site was exempt from these standards when it was owned by the Army.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 22: Bentley College – one property

Property name:	Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center
Location:	Waltham, MA
Size:	22.29 acres
Grantee:	Bentley College
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	August 29, 2001
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center was the site of a U. S. Army hospital. Divided into three parcels, the site was conveyed to the City of Waltham, the New Jewish High School, and Bentley College. The college and the high school agreed to bear the costs of developing a centralized infrastructure involving improvements such as access ways, parking lots, and detention pond. They also agreed to share their recreation facilities with the community. The college originally planned to build athletic fields on the site; however, when it received less property than originally planned it decided instead to use the property to house undergraduate students. Two of four planned residential buildings are under construction.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 23: New Jewish High School – one property

Property name:	Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center
Location:	Waltham, MA
Size:	17.42 acres
Grantee:	New Jewish High School, Inc. (Gann Academy)
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	October 1, 2001
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The original site, the Frederick C. Murphy Center, was divided into three parcels that were separately conveyed to Bentley College, the City of Waltham, and the New Jewish High School. The high school invested more than \$15 million into site development and the construction of two buildings. The first houses classrooms, a library, a cafeteria, and a sanctuary, while the second houses physical education facilities. Bentley College, the City of Waltham, and the New Jewish High School coordinated with respect to the property allocation of the original site and the plan for overall site development. The New Jewish High School signed a memorandum of understanding with GSA regarding the remediation of asbestos found in the soil after the property was conveyed.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 24: Veteran's Memorial Park – one property

Property name:	Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center
Location:	Waltham, MA
Size:	25.01 acres
Grantee:	City of Waltham, MA
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	October 1, 2001
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Frederick C. Murphy Federal Center was the site of a U. S. Army hospital. The entire site was donated to the City of Waltham by a local philanthropist in the 1930s and was taken through eminent domain for use as a hospital during World War II. The city had hoped that the entire parcel would be returned to the city for active and passive recreational use when it became surplus. However, because of federal legislation specific to the site, the city had to compete for use of the property with two other applicants (the New Jewish High School and Bentley College). The city eventually received approximately 25 acres and is in the process of building four multiuse athletic fields, two softball diamonds, and two parking lots. The city currently has an active claim against GSA seeking reimbursement for costs related to the remediation of environmental contamination found on the site.

Figure 25: The Commander's Mansion - one property

Property name:	Commanding Officer's Quarters
Location:	Watertown, MA
Size:	7.2 acres
Grantee:	Town of Watertown
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Historic Surplus Property Program
Date of conveyance:	August 20, 1998
Public use:	Historical monument
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The 27 room mansion was built in 1865 as a residence for the commanding officer of the Watertown Arsenal and his family. The surrounding driveways, walkways, and lawns were modified in 1919 by the Olmstead Brothers firm. The Town of Watertown restored the house in consultation with the U. S. Army and the Massachusetts Historical Commission. The deed grants the Massachusetts Historical Commission the authority to inspect and oversee the state of preservation. Renting the house and grounds for public and private functions such as weddings, receptions, luncheons, and dinners, the town uses the proceeds to preserve and

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

maintain the house and grounds. The building has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since January 1976.

Figure 26: Squantum Gardens and Naval Terrace – one property

Property name:	South Weymouth, MA – NAS
Location:	Quincy, MA
Size:	28 acres total
Grantee:	Elder Housing Corporation (formerly City of Quincy)
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Housing and Urban Development
Date of conveyance:	January 12, 2001
Public use:	Self-help housing
Length of deed restrictions:	40 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property became available when South Weymouth Naval Air Station was closed through the BRAC process. Originally two parcels, Naval Terrace and Squantum Gardens were used for officers' and enlisted personnel housing, respectively. The City of Quincy created Elder Housing Corporation as a nonprofit corporation in order to secure the property for self-help housing use. The buildings on the Naval Terrace parcel did not need major improvements; however, most of the buildings on the Squantum Gardens parcel were in poor condition and were demolished. Although Elder Housing Corporation planned to develop Squantum Gardens into 223 units of affordable senior housing, partly because of the reverter clause in the deed, it was unable to obtain financing for development. Elder Housing

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Corporation is now in the process of purchasing this parcel to free itself from deed restrictions and plans to develop it as affordable senior housing.

Pennsylvania

Figure 27: NIKE Site PH-02 – one property

Property name:	NIKE Site PH-02
Location:	Bristol, PA
Size:	8.8 acres
Grantee:	Bristol Township
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of reversion:	September 13, 2000
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Reverted
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was originally wooded land. It was conveyed to Bristol Township in 1981 for parks and recreation use, and the township planned to build athletic fields and other recreational facilities. The township was never able to obtain funding for development, so the property reverted to the federal government and was sold at auction to a private individual. The final sale is pending due to petroleum contamination found in the soil, which the Army Corps of Engineers is in the process of cleaning up. GSA anticipates that the cleanup will be complete sometime this year. The

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

property is no longer accessible to the public due to the closure of the main road by an adjacent storage company.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 28: Liberty House – one property

Property name:	Valley Forge General Hospital
Location:	Phoenixville, PA
Size:	7.1 acres
Grantee:	Community Mental Health Services, Inc.
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	November 20, 1995
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The parcel was formerly occupied by the Liberty Forge School, a state institution for mentally retarded children. In 1989, Community Mental Health Services (CMHS) applied for the property to provide temporary housing for mentally ill homeless persons under the McKinney Act. The original application for 13.5 acres resulted in a lease rather than a conveyance, but CMHS was unable to develop the property and implement the transitional housing program. CMHS reapplied for and was granted 7.1 acres in 1995. According to CMHS staff, buildings on the property were in “absolute decay,” and CMHS retained a property management company to renovate and maintain the grounds and buildings. The facility currently serves 48 residential patients. CMHS intends to restore an additional building to be used as a group home.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 29: Valley Forge Christian College – two properties

Property name:	Valley Forge General Hospital
Location:	Phoenixville, PA
Size:	7.65 acres (parcel 1) 7.46 acres (parcel 2)
Grantee:	Valley Forge Christian College
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	September 12, 1989 (parcel 1) July 9, 1996 (parcel 2)
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years (both parcels)
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The original site of approximately 181 acres was acquired by the federal government between 1942 and 1948 for Valley Forge General Hospital. The hospital was administered under the Army Health Services Command and was considered a substation of Ft. Detrick, Maryland. In 1976, the property was divided into a number of four parcels and separately conveyed to Chester County, Charlestown Township, and Phoenixville Area School District. The largest parcel—76.8 acres—was conveyed to Northeast Bible College, later renamed Valley Forge Christian College (VFCC). VFCC applied for and was conveyed two additional parcels: 7.6 acres in 1989 and

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

7.4 acres in 1996. VFCC says it has spent over \$20 million since 1996 on repairs and improvements to the buildings on the properties. Because of the physical and financial challenges the property's condition posed to the college, the board of trustees at one point considered the possibility of finding another campus at another location.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 30: Warminster Community Park – one property

Property name:	Warminster, PA - NAWC
Location:	Warminster, PA
Size:	243 acres
Grantee:	Warminster Township
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	November 30, 2000
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The original site of more than 800 acres was the Naval Air Warfare Center/Naval Air Development Center (NADC), which was closed by BRAC in 1996. The portion received by Warminster Township has approximately 20 acres of runway, a few scattered buildings, and 20 acres of woods; the rest is open meadow. NADC was considered a superfund site, and the Navy performed cleanup on most of the parcel prior to turning the property over for disposal. There is a 4-acre parcel that is still deemed contaminated, which the Navy has covered with 2 feet of soil and grass seed. The township did not anticipate the cost of cleaning out the buildings it received and removing the debris left behind by the Navy. Although Phase I of park development is complete, including walking, biking, and hiking trails and a playground, the township has run out of funds to complete

additional improvements, such as removing an asphalt runway that bisects the park.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 31: Northampton Township Municipal Park – one property

Property name:	Naval Air Warfare Center Warminster, Northampton Township
Location:	Northampton, PA
Size:	93.7 acres
Grantee:	Northampton Township
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	November 20, 1997
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The original parcel was 125 acres and was used by the Naval Warfare Center as an emergency landing site in case pilots overflowed the runway. When the base closed, the property was conveyed to multiple grantees, including Northampton Township. The township originally received 125 acres for parks and recreational purposes, but agreed to release 32 acres for a new elementary school and two other parcels that were used for fire department training purposes and a water well for public health purposes. This left the township with 93 acres. Opened in May 2005, the park includes sports fields, basketball courts, a roller hockey rink, a walking trail, playgrounds, picnic pavilions, and restrooms.

Texas

Figure 32: Kings Branch Housing – one property

Property name:	20 Units Kings Branch Housing
Location:	Tarrant County, TX
Size:	6.68 acres
Grantee:	Ability Resources, Inc.
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	August 31, 2001
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was conveyed in 1995 for use as transitional housing for homeless individuals with disabilities. Instead, the grantee has used the property to house these individuals and their families permanently. HHS program management officials conducted two site visits in 1999 and 2003 and found the property to be in breach of deed and program requirements. After numerous attempts to make the grantee comply with the requirements, HHS has compelled the grantee to purchase the property for at least fair market value in order to release the grantee from deed

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

requirements. Until the abrogation is complete, HHS is assessing monthly payments for noncompliance from the grantee. Ability Resources, Inc. plans to continue operation of its housing units as residences for households with at least one member having a disability.

Figure 33: Carswell Air Force Base Communications Annex - one property

Property name:	Communications Annex, Carswell Air Force Base
Location:	Tarrant County, TX
Size:	17.01 acres
Grantee:	City of Lake Worth
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	December 4, 2000
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

Originally the City of Lake Worth acquired 39 acres of property in 1973 for parks and recreation use; however, an interstate highway was constructed that bisected the park. This resulted in one of the tracts being no longer suitable for parks and recreation. The city requested permission to sell a portion of the parcel for commercial purposes and replace it with other parcels of land for parks and recreation use under the same restrictions and terms of the original deed. Interior approved the request and the city purchased six separate parcels of land totaling 17 acres and it plans to develop one park a year on these lands. According to the city's 2005 biennial report, it has completed two parks with another four parks being planned or partially developed.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 34: Lake Lewisville Independent School District Outdoor Learning Area – two properties

Property name:	Lake Lewisville, Parcel 2 and 3
Location:	Lewisville, TX
Size:	15.19 acres (parcel 2) 70.35 acres (parcel 3)
Grantee:	Lewisville Independent School District
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	February 25, 1994
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

Currently, the Lake Lewisville Independent School District Outdoor Learning Area is used by school groups during the day for educational purposes and study. The grounds include a science store, two classroom buildings, and a picnic area for outdoor learning. Five miles of trails have been constructed on the site and on adjacent property leased by the Army Corps of Engineers. The school district hopes to expand its school services to middle and high school students. District officials noted that one of the main problems of the property is its limited access.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 35: Naval Air Station Dallas Clear Zone - one property

Property name:	Dallas, TX - NAS
Location:	Dallas, TX
Size:	26.4 acres
Grantee:	City of Grand Prairie
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	March 3, 2000
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

According to city officials, the property was acquired by the City of Grand Prairie for public park purposes, and contains 13 separate tracts ranging in size from 0.33 acre to about 18 acres. Two tracts contain an existing aviation easement with lights for the nearby Naval Air Station runway. The city has not yet begun developing the property, nor have any improvements been made since its conveyance in May 2000. The city is currently in the midst of preparing a comprehensive master plan for the park site. Public access is currently not allowed.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 36: Naval Air Station Dallas, Duncanville Housing Site - one property

Property name:	Naval Air Station, Dallas, Duncanville Housing Site
Location:	Duncanville, TX
Size:	3.07 acres
Grantee:	City of Duncanville
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/ Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	November 5, 1998
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

When the city made its application for the property, the Duncanville Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) was made aware that a transitional housing provider group, Brighter Tomorrows, had also applied for the property under the McKinney Act. As a result of the homeless application, the city's application was placed on hold, for approximately 2 years, while the property was being considered for homeless use pursuant to the homeless requirements under the Base Closure Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance Act of 1994. HUD approved the city's application plan after the Duncanville LRA and Brighter Tomorrows agreed that the city could use the property for parks and recreation purposes. The property is currently being used as a park and includes parking, benches, a walking trail, and open space.

Utah

Figure 37: Utah College of Applied Technology - one property

Property name:	Defense Depot - Ogden, UT
Location:	Ogden, UT
Size:	3 acres; warehouse bays 1 and 2
Grantee:	Weber Applications Technology (Utah College of Applied Technology)
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	September 11, 2001
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The site was originally a defense depot that closed as a result of BRAC. The Utah College of Applied Technology applied for and was conveyed two warehouse bays for education and training purposes. Not long after the property was conveyed bay 1 was completely destroyed by fire; the college expected the rebuilding to be complete by September 2005. The warehouses are used for classroom instruction in materials handling, truck and forklift operations, nursing, plumbing, and HVAC. The college has

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

served over 3,400 students and nearly 300 companies, providing opportunities for initial employment and skill upgrades for employed individuals.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 38: Weber County Schools Warehouse - one property

Property name:	Defense Depot - Ogden, UT
Location:	Ogden, UT
Size:	6 acres; warehouse bays 3, 4, 5, and 6
Grantee:	Weber County Schools
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	September 11, 2001
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The site was originally a defense depot that closed as a result of BRAC. The property consists of four warehouse bays. The storage bays are used by the school district for shipping, receiving, and distribution of school supplies; office space for informational technology equipment, technical training, and equipment repair; and storage of building maintenance supplies. The school district has made over \$800,000 in improvements to the facilities including a new cooler, shelving, insulation, loading docks, and office space. The property was conveyed to the school district at an 80 percent discount because a portion of the warehouse space is used for administrative and storage purposes as opposed to education and training purposes.

Figure 39: Davis School District Warehouse - one property

Property name:	Clearfield Federal Depot
Location:	Farmington, UT
Size:	5.2 acres; G5 warehouse
Grantee:	Davis County School District
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	February 9, 1993
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was originally conveyed to the Weber County School District in 1977 and was used as a warehouse. When Weber County no longer needed the property, it was offered to the Davis County School District, which planned to use the building to house school supplies including furniture, custodial supplies, and computers. The property was conveyed to Davis County School District in 1993. Since taking possession, the school district has made numerous improvements to the warehouse, such as a new freezer to store perishables, heating system, café for employees, and additional parking spaces.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 40: Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42 - one property

Property name:	Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Building 42
Location:	Ogden, UT
Size:	0.74 acres, building 42
Grantee:	Planned Parenthood Association
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date reverted:	July 28, 2003
Public use:	Public health
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Reverted
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC

Source: GAO.

[Picture not available because the building was demolished]

The site was originally a Department of Defense distribution depot that closed as a result of BRAC. Planned Parenthood Association of Utah (PPAU) planned to use the facility as a subsidized health care facility. Although PPAU was committed to the program, the property was never developed because soon after the property was conveyed, PPAU learned that it was required to conduct an environmental groundwater assessment and to pay to maintain the unoccupied building while the environmental assessment was pending. The property was conveyed in 2001, but the grantee voluntarily reverted the property 2 years later because it was unable to fund the environmental assessment and maintain the property at the same time. According to PPAU officials, the building has since been demolished.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 41: Ogden Nature Center - one property

Property name:	Defense Depot - Ogden, UT
Location:	Ogden, UT
Size:	25 acres
Grantee:	City of Ogden (leased to Ogden Nature Center)
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/ Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	August 27, 2003
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC




Source: GAO.

The Ogden Nature Center is located on the former Defense Depot Ogden, which closed as a result of BRAC. The property was conveyed to the City of Ogden and the nature center has a 25-year concessionaire lease. The land was overrun with weeds when it was conveyed to the nature center and had been used as a dumping ground by the Army. The Army has since cleaned up most of the environmental contamination. The nature center acts as a sanctuary for local wildlife and birds of prey. Annually, approximately 35,000 visitors and program participants take advantage of the nature center's hiking trails, nature education programs, and summer camps.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 42: Weber County Fairgrounds - one property

Property name:	Defense Depot - Ogden, UT
Location:	Ogden, UT
Size:	25 acres
Grantee:	City of Ogden (leased to Weber County Fairgrounds)
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/ Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	August 27, 2003
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property is located on the former Defense Depot Ogden, which was closed as a result of BRAC. The 25 acres of land were conveyed to the City of Ogden for parks and recreational use. The fairgrounds originally attempted to have the property conveyed to it, but the local redevelopment authority (i.e., the city) would not approve the application. The fairground is in the process of finalizing a 50-year lease arrangement with the city. The property is used weekly as an overflow parking lot for trailers during events at the fairgrounds.

Virginia

Figure 43: Former Petersburg Correctional Institute – one property

Property name:	Former Petersburg Correctional Institute (portion)
Location:	Petersburg, VA
Size:	275.4 acres
Grantee:	VDOC Central Office
Sponsoring agency:	General Services Administration
Date reverted:	May 21, 2004
Public use:	Correctional
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Reverted
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Virginia Department of Corrections (VDOC) was conveyed 590.88 acres in 1986 surrounding the Bureau of Prisons' Petersburg Correctional Institute for use as a grain crops farm. VDOC uses the grain and crops to feed animals raised as food for the state prison population. In 2004, at the request of the federal government, VDOC returned 275 acres of the remaining land to the federal inventory so that the adjacent Army installation, Fort Lee Military Reservation, could expand its firing range, which was considered vital to homeland security. According to a VDOC

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

official, the Army said it would inform VDOC when it became necessary to vacate the property. However, VDOC has not thus far received notice from the Army and continues to plant and harvest crops on the land.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 44: Falling Creek Linear Park – one property

Property name:	Defense General Supply Center, Falling Creek Reservoir
Location:	Chesterfield County, VA
Size:	36.2 acres
Grantee:	Chesterfield County
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	November 10, 1993
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The site is intended to be part of a linear park system connected to historic areas along Falling Creek. The property is one of multiple pieces of land the county is trying to obtain along Falling Creek in order to develop a greenway along the river. The county has a master plan for development of the linear park, but the plan is contingent upon the county acquiring the remainder of the land along the river. Presently, there is no indication of any improvements to the property. The county has filed only three compliance reports, although the deed requires biennial utilization reporting. Officials were unfamiliar with the reversion process and did not know that the property could be reclaimed by the government due to noncompliance.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 45: Riverside Regional Jail – one property

Property name:	Former Petersburg Correctional Institute
Location:	Petersburg, VA
Size:	154.03 acres
Grantee:	Riverside Regional Jail Authority
Sponsoring agency:	General Services Administration
Date of conveyance:	April 21, 1992
Public use:	Correctional
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property abuts the Bureau of Prisons' Petersburg Federal Correctional Complex and I-295. In 1986, 590.88 acres were conveyed to the Virginia Department of Corrections (VDOC) for corrections use. With the approval of GSA and DOJ, VDOC transferred 154 acres to the Riverside Regional Jail Authority (RRJA)—a partnership between seven local jurisdictions formed to meet common correctional needs. Although the original agreement required RRJA to supply prison labor for VDOC farm operations, if requested, VDOC has not requested nor does it use RRJA prisoners as labor for the farm. The RRJA facility currently houses male, female, and juvenile offenders and can accommodate up to 1,300 prisoners.

Figure 46: Cameron Station – one property

Property name:	Cameron Station (portion)
Location:	Alexandria, VA
Size:	54.05 acres
Grantee:	City of Alexandria
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Lands to Parks Program
Date of conveyance:	April 3, 1997
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The site was originally occupied by a former Army base that had served as a quartermaster depot and was closed as a result of BRAC. The local redevelopment authority allocated the central portion of the property for residential development in its reuse plan. That portion, containing the existing military buildings and associated environmental contamination, was sold to a developer. The two end portions were conveyed to the city to provide parks and recreation services for city residents. Brenman Park provides a large multiuse playing field, two baseball fields, tennis courts, pavilions, a large pond, parking areas, and restrooms. Boothe Park provides tennis courts, a large pavilion, playground, baseball field, parking

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

lot, and restrooms. It abuts a large elementary school, which uses the facilities on a daily basis.

Washington

Figure 47: Naval Station Puget Sound – three properties

Property name:	Naval Station Puget Sound and Sand Point Naval Housing
Location:	Seattle, WA
Size:	15.5 acres total; buildings 5, 9, 25, 29, 192, 333, and 334
Grantee:	University of Washington
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Education
Date of conveyance:	January 8, 1999; August 10, 1999
Public use:	Education
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The properties conveyed to the University of Washington were part of a former naval air station. The university is using two buildings for a variety of purposes including administrative and departmental offices, record and supply storage, art studios, and a materials testing lab. The use of two additional buildings is currently undecided. Building 25 is being considering for use as a pediatric dental clinic. The university is considering reverting Building 9 back to the government or entering into a

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

public-private partnership because of an estimated \$55 million in needed renovations. Some of the remaining buildings have been designated as historic, which has presented the university with major renovation challenges.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 48: Midway NIKE Housing Site – one property

Property name:	Midway NIKE Housing Site Kent, WA
Location:	Kent, WA
Size:	10.18 acres, 32 buildings
Grantee:	King County Housing Authority
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	September 1, 1994
Public use:	Homeless
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The King County Housing Authority (KCHA) received 32 buildings (1 was demolished because of fire damage), which it uses to provide emergency and transitional housing services. KCHA provides these services through a partnership with three nonprofit agencies—the South King County Multi-services Center, the West Highline Mental Health Center, and the St. Stephen’s Housing Association. According to a KCHA official, the agency faced unanticipated renovation costs when the heating ducts had to be replaced because of a mold problem. In addition, because the housing program operates on a break-even basis, KCHA partnered with a number of nonprofits for grants that were used to fund the costs of replacing siding and roofs. KCHA uses volunteers to help with maintenance.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 49: Howard A. Hanson Dam – one property

Property name:	Howard A. Hanson Dam, King County, WA (portion)
Location:	King County, WA
Size:	204.4 acres
Grantee:	City of Tacoma
Sponsoring agency:	Department of Health and Human Services
Date of conveyance:	May 9, 1991
Public use:	Public health
Length of deed restrictions:	30 years
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The property was formerly used as a right of way by the Northern Pacific Railroad and came into the possession of the federal government when the federal government constructed the Howard A. Hanson Dam in the late 1950s. The property is comprised of a limited access roadway and 200 feet of land on each side that stretches for 4 miles. It was conveyed to the City of Tacoma Public Utilities Water Division (Tacoma Water) to provide access to its drinking water intake and treatment facility that uses water from the dam. Tacoma Water has recently constructed a buried pipeline on one side of the road to supply drinking water to the City of Tacoma. The dam itself was built and is managed by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers. Tacoma Water has spent \$310,000 to repair the road, which is dirt, and in the future plans to pave the roadway to minimize the amount of dust from

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

vehicles. Though closed to the public, the roadway is used by dam personnel, Tacoma Water personnel, construction employees, and logging companies.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 50: Olympia Federal Building – one property

Property name:	Olympia Federal Building
Location:	Olympia, WA
Size:	Less than 1 acre
Grantee:	State of Washington
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Historic Surplus Property Program
Date of conveyance:	November 1, 1998
Public use:	Historic monument
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	Non-BRAC



Source: GAO.

The Olympia Federal Building dates from 1915 and originally served as a federal building and post office. It is considered a historic monument. The building had been through three major earthquakes since being built and needed retrofitting for earthquake protection. It was in poor condition when the state acquired it. Originally conveyed for low-income housing, the nonprofit that received the property was unable to raise funds for its renovation and use as a homeless shelter. The nonprofit reverted the property and it was reconveyed to the state for historic monument use. The state has made extensive renovations to the building, spending about \$2.8 million for restoration. The Secretary of State's Corporations Division uses the building to register business entities in the state of Washington,


Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

including domestic and foreign corporations, limited partnerships, limited liability partnerships, and limited liability companies.

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

Figure 51: Sand Point Magnuson Park – four properties

Property name:	Sand Point Magnuson Park and Sand Point Puget Sound, WA NAVSTA
Location:	Seattle, WA
Size:	116.3 acres total
Grantee:	City of Seattle
Sponsoring agency:	Department of the Interior/Federal Parks to Lands Program
Date of conveyance:	August 28, 1998; March 17, 1999; April 6, 2000; December 12, 2002
Public use:	Parks and recreation
Length of deed restrictions:	In perpetuity
Property status (active/reverted):	Active
BRAC/non-BRAC:	BRAC



Source: GAO.

The buildings and lands conveyed to Seattle's Parks and Recreation Department comprised a portion of the former Naval Air Station Puget Sound at Sandpoint. These conveyances involved four parcels transferred between 1998 and 2002 that added to the preexisting Magnuson Park, which had been previously conveyed in the 1970s. The city razed many of the structures but preserved a number of buildings (including three large hangars) in addition to developing the surrounding land for a range of assorted recreational activities. These include a community garden, a theater, a pool, a day camp, facilities for indoor athletics such as soccer and in-line hockey, playgrounds, and a dog park. The Seattle Parks and Recreation Department also leases out space to more than 15 nonprofit and

Appendix IV
Properties Selected for Case Studies

community groups that are involved with sports, recreation, leisure, environmental, arts, culture, and education activities.

Comments from the General Services Administration



GSA Administrator

May 24, 2006

Mr. Mark L. Goldstein
Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues
U.S. Government Accountability Office
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Goldstein:

This letter responds to your request dated May 10, 2006, for the U.S. General Services Administration's (GSA's) review and comments concerning the draft report entitled "Federal Real Property: Most Public Benefit Conveyances Used as Intended But Opportunities Exist to Enhance Federal Oversight" (GAO-06-511).

I have reviewed the draft report and accept the findings reached by GAO. With regard to the recommendations made for executive action, GSA program officials will be taking the necessary steps to improve these program areas through assuming a greater oversight role and issuing policy guidance. As to the data accuracy issue identified by GAO, I am enclosing comments that may not have been noted by your staff during its review.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this draft report. If you have any questions regarding this information, please contact me or Mr. David L. Winstead, Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, at (202) 501-1100.

Sincerely,

David L. Bibb
David L. Bibb
Acting Administrator

Enclosure

U.S. General Services Administration
400 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20548
Tel: (202) 501-2000
www.gsa.gov

**GSA COMMENTS ON GAO DRAFT REPORT
"FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY: MOST PUBLIC BENEFIT CONVEYANCES USED AS INTENDED,
BUT OPPORTUNITIES EXIST TO ENHANCE FEDERAL OVERSIGHT"
(GAO-06-511)**

One of the objectives listed on page 2 of the report was to determine the number, types, and locations of surplus real property disposed of using the PBC program in fiscal years 2000 through 2004. On page 3, the report states, "We could not determine from GSA the exact numbers, types, and locations of property conveyed in fiscal years 2000 through 2004 as part of the PBC [public benefit conveyance] program."

Data accuracy and incomplete dates are viewed in the report as contributing factors that affect the financial risk of landholding agencies, sponsoring agencies, local economies, and grantees of PBC property. The concern over unreliable real property data Government wide has led the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to designate Federal real properties as high risk in 2003 and caused the President to issue Executive Order 13327 as a way for improving Federal real property asset management.

Given the importance of this identified area, additional information should be considered in GAO's report so that a complete assessment of GSA's role in the PBC program is accurately described.

Initially, it should be noted that the majority of data accuracy issues stem from the differences between how GSA tracks information, and how the sponsoring agencies that deed these properties track the same information. GSA does not believe that the discrepancies between GSA's data and the sponsoring agencies' data indicate that the Government as a whole is not aware of or responsible for the compliance requirements of the PBC programs.

GSA presently enters data elements into NetREAL, a system that profiles real property disposal cases and tracks key regulatory milestones. It also collects unusual facets about an asset, summaries of significant disposal issues, and the name and address of the party receiving the property from the Government.

NetREAL is a legacy system designed to collect disposal data for the case management during the actual regulatory disposal process. Data accuracy for PBC assignments could not be addressed by GSA for compliance because NetREAL was not designed, nor can it be configured, to track predisposal or post-conveyance activities.

GSA has recognized the need to upgrade or replace its NetREAL system to address the fast changing methods of data storage and reporting. In fact, in fiscal year (FY) 2003, GSA commenced an overhaul of the way that it collects, tracks, and reports real

Appendix V
Comments from the General Services
Administration

- 2 -

property disposal data elements for all three phases of the disposal process. Budgeting for necessary funds was the second step in the plan.

In FY 2005, GSA contracted with the Perct Systems Corporation (PSC) to develop a replacement system for NetREAL; one that performs data collection through project management. This new information technology (IT) system is identified as the Real Estate Disposal Inventory Network (REDI Net). GSA's REDI Net team includes realty specialists and 11 professionals who segregated REDI Net into three specific concentrations: (1) utilization, (2) disposal, and (3) post-disposal transactions for PSC's compliance.

The REDI Net team has recently completed the requirement analysis phase and is advancing to the development phase. Although the application will be released in iterations, an initial deployment of REDI Net is targeted for this fiscal year. REDI Net, when completed, will deploy industry standard project management principles to identify and maintain an accurate accounting for all major procedural tasks completed for the disposal of excess and surplus real property.

It will also include contact and document management elements thereby creating an electronic clearinghouse for all real property disposal projects handled by GSA. The deployment of REDI Net will improve the data accuracy concerns identified by GAO and also provide the mechanism to extract meaningful performance measures to gauge GSA's effectiveness of its program operation. GSA expects that REDI Net will enable us to improve PBC program management and oversight.

Comments from the Department of Health and Human Services



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Inspector General

Washington, D.C. 20201

JUN - 5 2006


Mr. Mark Goldstein
Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues
U. S. Government Accountability Office
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Goldstein:

Enclosed are the Department's comments on the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) draft report entitled "FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY: Most Public Benefit Conveyances Used As Intended, But Opportunities Exist to Enhance Federal Oversight" (GAO-06-511). These comments represent the tentative position of the Department and are subject to reevaluation when the final version of this report is received.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on this draft report before its publication.

Sincerely,


for Daniel R. Levinson
Inspector General

Enclosure

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) is transmitting the Department's response to this draft report in our capacity as the Department's designated focal point and coordinator for U.S. Government Accountability Office reports. OIG has not conducted an independent assessment of these comments and therefore expresses no opinion on them.

**COMMENTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ON THE U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE'S DRAFT REPORT
ENTITLED "FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY: MOST PUBLIC BENEFIT
CONVEYANCES USED AS INTENDED, BUT OPPORTUNITIES EXIST TO
ENHANCE FEDERAL OVERSIGHT" (GAO-06-511)**

General Comments

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft report. After reviewing this report, we have a number of concerns with specific findings in the report.

An objective of the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) review is to assess agency efforts to ensure that properties are used as agreed to by the grantee. When properties are not used as agreed to by the grantee, the sponsoring agency may seek to enforce the reversionary clause in the deed of conveyance. Although the agencies agree that this is an option of last resort, it is the only mechanism by which a grantee's misuse of the property can be terminated. Public benefit conveyance (PBC) disposal agencies, General Services Administration (GSA) and the Department of Defense (DOD) often block the sponsoring agencies' reversion efforts based on the assumption that the reacquisition of surplus property will result in expense and liability to the Federal Government. The draft report examines the interagency dispute on the reversion of conveyed surplus property in detail, and at length. The draft report fails, however, to draw any meaningful conclusions from the agencies' competing viewpoints on the subject. Neither does the draft report offer any specific recommendations to address the problem. The absence of thorough record keeping on reversions is a less significant issue than the fundamental disagreements between disposal and sponsoring agencies on how to implement reversions. Sponsoring agencies agree that clear authority to exercise the reversion remedy is needed to ensure that properties are used as agreed to by grantees. GAO is in a unique position to examine whether reversion is suitable for compliance enforcement and, if so, to determine whether the disposal agencies' objections have merit. Clear guidance on the reversing controversy would provide a framework within which the sponsoring agencies can approach many of the administrative deficiencies noted in the draft report.

GSA, DOD, and Sponsoring Agency Data Were Not Consistent or Reliable

GSA and DOD maintain conveyance responsibility for a number of properties which are not sponsoring agency programs and, as such, are never assigned to the sponsoring agency. Examples include properties conveyed for correctional facilities, historic monuments, etc., which are conveyed by GSA. Additionally, although McKinney-Vento Act applications for underutilized and unutilized properties are reviewed by HHS, DOD leases the properties to successful applicants. These properties would therefore not be in the sponsoring agencies' property records.

Assignment is requested from the respective disposal agency (GSA or DOD) after HHS approves an application. There are numerous ways in which property information is provided to the disposal agency:

**Appendix VI
Comments from the Department of Health
and Human Services**

- A copy of the incoming letter of interest is provided to the disposal agency following its receipt by the sponsoring agency. This interest letter contains the name and address of the potential grantee and a brief description of the proposed use of the property being requested.
- A copy of the approved application is submitted to the disposal agency along with the assignment request.
- The disposal agency is also provided a copy of the executed and recorded quitclaim deed or lease with its recordation information and contract number.
- Copies of any subsequent correspondence which may affect title to the property are forwarded to the disposal agency. Also, prior to a sponsoring agency's approval of any action which may affect title to the property (mortgage, easements, demolishing buildings, etc.), concurrence from the disposal agency is solicited pursuant to 40 U.S.C. § 550.

Given the amount of information provided by the sponsoring agency, GSA and DOD should, at a minimum, have data which include the sponsoring agency's contract number; contact information on the grantee; program use; dates of conveyance and expiration of restrictions, as well as history of actions which may affect title to the properties after leaving the disposal agencies' inventories.

The difficulty in comparing properties is that the initial notices issued by GSA and DOD often may list a specific name but they frequently change that name to another upon assignment. The disposal agency's name for the property in the letter of assignment is considered the "official" name and is the one that the sponsoring agency uses in subsequent documents. Specifically, parcel numbers used in its initial notices are frequently changed by DOD when the properties are assigned to the sponsoring agencies. This leads the sponsoring agency to request verification as to whether the initial parcel of property requested is the same parcel that has been assigned.

Data Lacked Unique Identifiers

We disagree with GAO's statement that only GSA and the Air Force provide unique identifying codes for each property. HHS also has a unique identification number for each property. Properties that have been conveyed by HHS are identified by Region, State, and Contract/Project Number (e.g. 04-FI-2282). Along with the Contract/Project Number, the GSA property number and DOD identifying codes (if available) are listed in HHS's real property database of public benefit conveyances.

Data Not Regularly Maintained on Property Reverted Back to the Government

A data field for reverted property can easily be added to HHS's property tracking system of public benefit conveyances.

Waiver of grantee's reporting requirements

HHS, on a case by case basis, may waive reporting requirements only after a prior history of full compliance in the grantee's use of the property. These waivers are rare and involve, for the most part, conveyances of easements, water and/or sewer lines, drainage ditches, etc.

**Appendix VI
Comments from the Department of Health
and Human Services**

King's Branch Housing property

GAO failed to mention that the grantee is assessed monthly payments for noncompliance and will continue with these payments until the abrogation action is completed. See 45 C.F.R. § 12.12(a)(6).

Grantee cited the lack of communication about the program and individual properties as challenges

Program information on the Federal Property Assistance Program and Title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Program is found on the HHS Web site. The potential grantee is given this Web site in the HHS standard information letter along with copies of regulations, brochures, and funding resources. Subsequently, HHS's letter which transmits the application instructions also includes the contact information for the disposal agency representative who will be able to provide specific information on the property (e.g. property location, acreage, environmental, and site visit).

Recommendations for Executive Action

We believe that the lack of reliable, consistent data on PBC properties is largely due to GSA's and DOD's failure to use information in the documentation furnished by most sponsoring agencies (e.g. copies of applications, quitclaim deeds, release and abrogation documents, return deeds, etc.). These documents contain updated information on the history of the properties after they have been disposed of by GSA and DOD. Given that GSA and DOD consistently fail to update their own property records with information furnished by the sponsoring agencies, we doubt whether they will be able to be more efficient at developing a governmentwide database without in-depth discussions with the sponsoring agencies.

It is noted that the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA), which is maintained by GSA, has a governmentwide database through which Federal funding agencies may log onto the CFDA Web site to update information on their specific programs on a recurring basis. We suggest a similar concept for the development of a governmentwide real property data collection system.

HHS, in keeping with GAO's recommendation, will dedicate a field in its database of public benefit conveyances system that will keep track of future reverted properties. HHS has been aggressive in ensuring the grantees' timely submission of annual utilization reports on the operation and maintenance of the properties.

We believe that standard policies and procedures for compliance site inspections and utilization reports would not be feasible. Since there are broad differences in programs of use, the sponsoring agencies information needs differ greatly. There may be report information that is needed for public health or homeless programs that would not be needed or appropriate in a Parks or Federal Aviation Administration program. It would create an administrative burden on the sponsoring agency, as well as the grantee, to have to report on a requirement that does not pertain to its program or to its operation of the program.

Comments from the Department of Education



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT

June 2, 2006

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Mr. Mark Goldstein
Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues
U. S. Government Accountability Office
441 G Street, NW
Room 2T23B
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Goldstein:

The U.S. Department of Education appreciates the research and work that went into the Government Accountability Office's (GAO's) comprehensive study of Public Benefit Conveyances (GAO 06-511). We agree that the federal real property disposal and Public Benefit Conveyance environment is very complex and characterized by often inconsistent laws, regulations, and procedures that complicate federal surplus real property disposal and compliance enforcement considerably.

The Department concurs with GAO that all agencies involved in this program must work together and cooperatively implement standardized processes. We are ready to work with GSA to address the challenges identified in your study. We will update our website to include information about the PBC program, and we will develop a plan of action to better ensure our compliance with our current monitoring policies.

We thank GAO for its unique insights into the complex, government-wide Public Benefit Conveyance environment and for identifying areas that need to be strengthened.

Sincerely,

Michelle Clark

400 MARSHALL AVENUE, S.W., WASHINGTON, DC 20501-4600
www.ed.gov

Use of this e-mail and any files transmitted with it is intended to provide a secure and confidential means of communication. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail. This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail.

GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

GAO Contact

Mark L. Goldstein (202) 512-2834 or goldsteinm@gao.gov

Staff Acknowledgments

In addition to the contact named above, David Sausville, Assistant Director; Carol Anderson-Guthrie; Lindsay Bach; Tonnye Conner-White; Kim Michaels; Susan Michal-Smith; Claudine Pauselli; and Kelly Slade made key contributions to this report.

GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov). Each weekday, GAO posts newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence on its Web site. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to Updates."

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. Government Accountability Office
441 G Street NW, Room LM
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
TDD: (202) 512-2537
Fax: (202) 512-6061

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Congressional Relations

Gloria Jarmon, Managing Director, JarmonG@gao.gov (202) 512-4400
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125
Washington, D.C. 20548

Public Affairs

Paul Anderson, Managing Director, AndersonP1@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149
Washington, D.C. 20548