

MIKE BOST
12TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
TRANSPORTATION &
INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-1312

1440 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5661

23 PUBLIC SQUARE, SUITE 404
BELLEVILLE, IL 62220
(618) 233-8026

300 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 4
CARBONDALE, IL 62901
(618) 457-5787

May 2, 2016

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District
Attn: Amy Snively
Room 529
601 E. 12th St.
Kansas City, MO 64106

Dear Ms. Snively:

The National Geospatial Agency (NGA) is a key part of the Intelligence Community and has a very sensitive mission. I remain concerned with the deeply flawed Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that the US Army Corps of Engineers issued on site selection for a new NGA West facility location. The report's factual errors, blatant omissions, and underestimated risks are nothing short of egregious. The site for NGA-West must be decided on its merits; and in order for an informed decision to be made, it is critical that the FEIS be factual and comprehensive. It is clear that the FEIS did not provide an informed basis for this important national security decision and significant investment of taxpayer dollars.

The FEIS for NGA has significant errors and a blatant disregard for geographical accuracy. St. Clair County, Illinois is confused with St. Clair County, Missouri and St. Clair County, Michigan. Additionally, the final report references the Osage River as part of the proposed site, but there is no Osage River in St. Clair County, Illinois.

As you may know, on April 22nd I joined my colleagues in the Illinois delegation in sending a letter to NGA Director Robert Cardillo urging a public meeting to obtain answers about this flawed analysis. We highlighted security issues with the proposed North St. Louis site and questioned the accuracy of data included in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers FEIS report.

Security is mission critical for the new National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency West campus, yet the FEIS did not fully address this critical parameter. While the FEIS claims to have incorporated security risk analysis into its conclusions, there is no mention of standoff distances or antiterrorism/force protection standards. As you are aware, these standoff distances and force protection standards for Military Construction are outlined in the Department of Defense Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for New and Existing Buildings are outlined in UFC 4-010-01, Appendix B, issued October 8, 2003 and updated January 22, 2007.

Table B-1 Standoff Distances for New and Existing Buildings in UFC 4-010-01, Appendix B chart outlines minimum stand-off distance requirements. The minimum requirements are considered to only provide Low or Very Low applicable levels of protection, however.

The FEIS claims that each site met the basic security requirements, yet it doesn't fully take those requirements into consideration. Force protection standards for Military Construction have traditionally compelled agencies with similarly sensitive national security missions to co-locate with existing military installations or in areas without encroachment issues. Even if the proposed North St. Louis NGA site does meet the minimum required DoD stand-off /security distance perimeters required for all DoD Military Construction, it would still provide only "Poor" or "Low" security based on DoD's own definition. The FEIS recognizes that the Scott AFB site is strongly preferred to the St. Louis site from a security perspective. This criterion should supersede all others so that NGA employees, the warfighters who count on them and the general public are not put at unnecessary risk.

It is mind-boggling that we could spend nearly \$200 billion in taxpayer dollars on a key national security project based on a fundamentally flawed environmental analysis. While the St Louis site was noted as being more environmentally preferred, it has significant unknown impacts. It is clear that the two sites were not compared equally. In the FEIS, the St. Clair County site is penalized for being fully transparent by submitting both a Phase I and Phase II analysis, yet with over 182 acres of property and another 200 acres available for expansion, a facility could be built in St. Clair County without impacting the stream, wetland, and archaeological sites noted in the report.

The North St. Louis site offers no similar environmental analysis and, therefore, has significant unknown impacts which could result in millions of dollars in cleanup and delays in construction. Environmental issues at the North St. Louis site include hazardous waste and presumed radioactive contamination. During the Cold War, reports indicate that the U.S. Army conducted classified chemical weapons testing over the vicinity of the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex. The Army Corps made no mention of likely Pruitt-Igoe contamination in their report; yet for some still unexplained reason, this major portion of the originally-proposed North St. Louis site was dropped from the FEIS.

Historic structures and undetermined archeological sites are also possible environmental concerns with the North St. Louis site. The Osage Nation asserts that the site would impact their ancient burial grounds; and multiple community groups, including Save Northside STL and Tillie's Corner, have asked that NGA not build on the North St. Louis site.

The FEIS also erred in its cost assessment of the two sites. It claims the cost to acquire and develop the Scott AFB/St. Clair County site is almost 20 percent more than the North St. Louis site. The final report concedes that the government currently does not know the time or cost necessary to remediate the North St. Louis site and includes only a single sentence of explanation: "The estimate to acquire and develop the St. Clair County Site is almost 20 percent more, which provides a slight advantage to the St. Louis City Site." The assertion is counterintuitive, as construction costs at St. Clair County are 3% lower than St. Louis City and union labor rates paint the same picture.

Additionally, possible delays will increase military construction costs and the Scott AFB site will be available much sooner than the North St. Louis site. A single year of delay at the North St. Louis site could result in an increase of \$40 million to the project's construction budget. The North St. Louis site also requires the use of eminent domain, while the St. Clair County site has a single landowner.

The FEIS states that "the St. Louis City Site offers an advantage to meet the intent of many federal priorities." This creates the appearance of the FEIS choosing regulations to justify the North St. Louis site, while ignoring others which justify the St. Clair County site.

Per DoDI 4165.71, first priority in the location of new offices and other facilities must be given to rural areas per the *Rural Development Act of 1972*.

Executive Order 12072 was also misinterpreted as this Executive Order merely requires that **IF** an agency has a mission requirement to locate in an urban area, then first consideration should be given to the Central Business District; not that urban areas must be given priority.

Further definition is provided by the US Army Corps of Engineers own guidance on how to interpret these items. Per USACE ER 405-3-10, Chapter 2, Section 3, Paragraph 2-8, d.:

*Urban and Rural Site Issues. **First priority in the location of new offices and other facilities will be given to rural areas, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. GSA's Customer Guide for Real Property discusses the Rural Development Act and states that agencies must provide a statement for actions going to GSA. If the customer's mission does not require a specific location or specific geographic area, then USACE must give first priority to locating new offices or other facilities in a rural area. If mission or program requires being in an urban area, then USACE must consider the Central Business District (CBD) under E.O. 12072 and then historic properties in the CBD under E.O. 13006. In order to justify why the CBD does not fit the customer's requirements, USACE must at a minimum consider safe and efficient mission performance, nature and function of facility, public convenience, and safe and healthful working conditions for employees.***

Another glaring error in the FEIS is in the area of workforce benefits to NGA and millennial recruitment. The final report ignores the thousands of millennials who work at Scott Air Force Base, and that the majority of them already have security clearances. It also emphasizes a survey that is statistically insignificant. Of the 48 students who responded to the survey, less than half preferred North St. Louis. This small study is hardly representative of millennials and the future workforce as a whole, and neglects to survey those who already work at NGA. Yet this statistically insignificant survey was cited as a major reason for choosing North St. Louis.

In summary, the Army Corps of Engineers must correct the errors and omissions in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and do a new study so that a report which is factually and geographically accurate can be issued.

When all the facts are considered – when mission, force protection, security, environmental impact, cost, and room for expansion are fully and objectively assessed – it is clear that St. Clair County, Illinois is the far superior location for the next National-Geospatial Intelligence Agency West campus.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mike Bost". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Mike Bost
Member of Congress