



One Hundred Fourteenth Congress  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Committee on Foreign Affairs  
2170 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515  
[www.foreignaffairs.house.gov](http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov)

May 1, 2015

The Honorable Shaun Donovan  
Director  
The Office of Management and Budget  
725 17th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Director Donovan:

Since 2013, the Committee has been conducting oversight of the Department of State's plan to construct a Foreign Affairs Security Training Center (FASTC) at Fort Pickett, Virginia. This has included briefings, letters, site visits to current and prospective locations, and personal engagement with you. The purpose of this effort has been to gain a full understanding of the Administration's decision to build a new training center at far more than the cost of expanding the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Glynco, GA, an interagency facility operated by the Department of Homeland Security. While OMB has provided helpful information, it has yet to provide its critical analysis justifying the Administration's initial FY2016 request for \$99.1 million in new funding, despite numerous requests.

I agree with the Department's assessment that the current Diplomatic Security training facility at Bill Scott Raceway in Summit Point, West Virginia is inadequate to meet the Department's goal of training 9,200 personnel per year.<sup>1</sup> However, in order to best improve Department security, we must be as efficient as possible with limited resources. The Department's proposal to construct a new, purpose-built facility at Fort Pickett raises serious questions about whether it is the most efficient and cost-effective option.

The Department of State initially proposed to spend \$950 million to construct FASTC at Fort Pickett, an underused military base located in Blackstone, Virginia. A narrowing of the project lowered that estimate to approximately \$907 million, *then* to \$461 million, and most recently, to \$413 million. Meanwhile, FLETC has proposed to expand its existing facilities to accommodate State's initial training proposal at a cost of \$272 million. It was these significantly evolving cost estimates that prompted my original January 2014 correspondence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Report to Congress on the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center as required by Senate Report 113-195, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Relations Programs Appropriations Bill 2015, February 2015.

To ensure that the State Department's proposal made the most fiscal sense, I asked OMB on January 9, 2014, to evaluate which of the two training proposals best met the State Department's training needs in a "fiscally responsible way": (1) State's proposal to construct FASTC, or (2) an expansion of the existing Department of Homeland Security FLETC site. In so doing, I requested that OMB conduct a "rigorous analysis of the data provided by these agencies that considers the strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each agency's existing capabilities, proposed new infrastructure, and any other relevant tangible factors."<sup>2</sup>

On February 21, 2014, OMB replied that it would "continue to work with the Department of State and the Department of Homeland Security throughout the FY2015 Budget process to ensure that the Budget supports training programs that best address the Department of State's needs in a cost effective manner."<sup>3</sup> On April 17, 2014, State and FLETC personnel confirmed to Committee staff that the Administration had decided to adopt State's proposal to build FASTC. Despite this Committee's documented interest in the matter, OMB provided no explanation of its decision to pursue the FASTC option.

On May 19, 2014, I wrote to then-Director Sylvia Matthews Burwell again, noting my desire to ensure that "Diplomatic Security agents and other State personnel have the right training to operate overseas in dangerous environments" while emphasizing the Committee's "responsibility to ensure that funds are invested wisely." I also requested the "opportunity to review the results of your analysis for the FLETC and State and FASTC proposals," as well as a briefing by OMB personnel about this decision.<sup>4</sup> For the next ten months, my staff followed up and repeatedly requested by email and telephone that OMB produce the analysis. To date, the Office of Management and Budget has not complied with this oversight request.

On March 18, 2015, you replied with a letter asserting that OMB's "role in reviewing the State Department's proposal for a new diplomatic security training facility was to ensure that due diligence was done in reviewing alternatives to the Fort Pickett location, the site selected for FASTC in 2011." After considering variables at FASTC and FLETC, OMB "ultimately relied on the State Department's unique understanding of diplomatic missions abroad to give appropriate weight to "cost, capabilities, and synergies."<sup>5</sup> Again, OMB failed to produce the analysis.

Instead, on April 17, 2015, OMB officials met with Committee staff to discuss Committee requests for information regarding FASTC/FLETC and its analysis of the two facilities. *This discussion revealed that OMB analysts had, in fact, after an extensive and lengthy review, completed a written analysis recommending that the State Department pursue its Diplomatic Security training at FLETC, not at Fort Pickett.* This was inconsistent with the State Department's assertion that OMB "has reaffirmed, that Fort Pickett is the most effective and efficient proposal for a consolidated hard-skills training facility" and "reaffirmed that FLETC is

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Chairman Royce, Chairman Michael McCaul, and Chairman Jeff Duncan to OMB Director Sylvia Burwell, January 9, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> Letter from OMB Associate Director for Legislative Affairs Kristen J. Sarri to Edward R. Royce.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Chairman Royce to OMB Director Burwell.

<sup>5</sup> Letter from OMB Director Donovan to Chairman Royce.

The Honorable Shaun Donovan

Page 3

May 1, 2015

not a viable solution for FASTC.”<sup>6</sup> More importantly, it underscored the need for greater transparency before the State Department obligates more resources to constructing FASTC at Fort Pickett.

This is why the Committee has repeatedly requested that OMB provide the analyses it conducted of FASTC and any alternatives it considered. Without them, Committee Members cannot adequately weigh the President’s FY2016 Budget Request and ensure the efficient and effective use of taxpayer resources. To assist with the Committee’s oversight of this matter, I again ask that you please produce the following **not later than 5:00 P.M. on May 8, 2015**:

1. All analyses conducted by the Office of Management and Budget concerning the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center and any alternative facilities, including, but not limited to, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers for use by the U.S. Department of State.

I also ask that you produce the following **not later than 5:00 P.M. on May 22, 2015**:

2. All documents and communications referring or relating to the Foreign Affairs Security Training Center and/or the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers from January 1, 2012 to the present.

When producing documents to the Committee, please deliver production sets for the Majority and Minority Staff to Room 2170 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee prefers, if possible, to receive all documents in electronic and hard copy. Please see the attached Definitions of Terms for further information about this request.

If you do not provide a copy of the material requested by the dates listed above, then the Committee will be forced to resort to compulsory methods to obtain them. Please do not hesitate to contact me at any time if you have any questions. Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,



EDWARD R. ROYCE  
Chairman

Enclosure

Cc: The Honorable Eliot Engel, Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on Foreign Affairs

---

<sup>6</sup> Letter from Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs Julia Frifield to Chairman Royce, October 3, 2014.

## DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

1. The term "document" means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of how recorded, whether classified or unclassified, and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, working papers, records notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, interoffice and intra office communications, electronic mail (e-mail), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation, telephone calls, meeting or other communications, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, revisions, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto). The term also means any graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, voice mails, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), electronic and mechanical records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, computer server files, computer hard drive files, CDs, DVDs, memory sticks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.
2. The term "documents in your possession, custody, or control" means (a) documents that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, or representatives acting on your behalf; (b) documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy, or to which you have access; and (c) documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party.
3. The term "communication" means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether face-to-face, in a meeting, by telephone, mail, telexes, discussions, releases, personal delivery, or otherwise.

4. The terms "and" and "or" shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this request any information which might otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neuter genders.
5. The terms "person" or "persons" means natural persons, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities, and all subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, and other units thereof.
6. The terms "referring or relating," with respect to any given subject, means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with or is in any manner whatsoever pertinent to that subject.