

**FEDERAL FORECLOSURE:
REDUCING THE FEDERAL REAL ESTATE
PORTFOLIO**

FIELD HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON
GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT
AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

APRIL 8, 2025

Serial No. 119–18

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: *govinfo.gov*
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

60–028 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia, <i>Ranking</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	<i>Minority Member</i>
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	Columbia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	ROBERT GARCIA, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	GREG CASAR, Texas
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	DAVE MIN, California
ELI CRANE, Arizona	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel
PETER WARREN, Senior Advisor
ALEX RANKIN, Counsel
MADELINE BREWER, Counsel
JENN KAMARA, Senior Professional Staff Member
LAUREN HASSETT, Professional Staff Member
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JAMIE SMITH, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia, Chairwoman

MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico <i>Ranking</i>
PAT FALLON, Texas	<i>Minority Member</i>
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	Columbia
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	STEPHEN LYNCH, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	ROBERT GARCIA, California
BRANDON GILL, Texas	GREG CASAR, Texas
	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on April 8, 2025	1

WITNESSES

Mr. David Marroni, Director, Physical Infrastructure, U.S. Government Accountability Office	
Oral Statement	5
Mr. John Hart, CEO, Open the Books	
Oral Statement	6
Mr. Ron Kendall (Minority Witness), Executive Chairman Emeritus, National Federal Development Association	
Oral Statement	8

Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Press Release, White House, “Biden Announces New Actions to Ease Burden of Housing Costs”; submitted by Rep. Lynch.
- * Press Release, GSA, “GSA Accelerates Efforts to Rightsize Federal Real Estate”; submitted by Rep. Lynch.

Documents are available at: docs.house.gov.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Marroni; submitted by Rep. Brown.
- These documents were submitted after the hearing, and may be available upon request.*

FEDERAL FORECLOSURE: REDUCING THE FEDERAL REAL ESTATE PORTFOLIO

Tuesday, April 8, 2025

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., in the Wilbur J. Cohen Federal Building Auditorium, 330 Independence Avenue S.W., Washington, D.C., Hon. Marjorie Taylor Greene [Chairwoman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Greene, Cloud, Fallon, Timmons, Burchett, Burlison, Jack, Stansbury, Norton, Lynch, Garcia, and Crockett.

Also present: Representative Brown.

Ms. GREENE. This hearing of the Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency will come to order.

Welcome, everyone. Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time. I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Welcome, everyone, to today's DOGE Subcommittee hearing on Federal real estate. This is an area where the Trump Administration is taking long overdue action.

The Federal Government owns a massive real estate portfolio of more than a quarter million buildings. No one knows how much of this real estate is actually being put to use or what it is worth on the open market.

Here is what we do know. Taxpayers spend about \$10 billion annually just to operate and maintain all of it. American taxpayers have been drowning in debt, inflation, unaffordable grocery prices, high interest rates, and have been suffering to get by, all while the Federal Government is pouring billions of dollars into wasteful empty office buildings and luxurious high-end furniture, which they, the American taxpayers, cannot even afford themselves. It is quite a hypocrisy.

These buildings sat largely empty during the entire Biden Administration, which kept Federal office workers at home long after the COVID-19 pandemic ended. By the way, truck drivers, first responders, so many people worked during the pandemic, but Federal workers could stay home and these Federal buildings sat empty.

Here in D.C., GAO found, in 2023, that the vast majority of Federal agency headquarter buildings were less than 25 percent occupied, some much less. Meanwhile, from 2022 to 2024, the backlog of deferred maintenance on the aging buildings the government owns grew from \$216 billion to \$370 billion. That is more than one-third of a trillion dollars it will cost to restore them if we do not sell them.

What is worse, aside from paying for useless leases and allowing Federal buildings to decay, the Biden Administration spent billions on high-end furniture for empty buildings during the pandemic. No one was sitting in those chairs or at those desks. Our witness from Open the Books will testify to that.

It is only now, under the Trump Administration, that we see a light at the end of the tunnel. This Administration is taking historic action on reducing the size of the government and with it a significant reduction in the useless office space that is claimed to be essential for the government to operate.

GSA has established a goal to reduce the size of the federally owned real estate footprint by 50 percent. This is a massive real estate auction.

The President issued an executive order instructing agencies to update their property inventory and to determine which of their government-leased or government-owned spaces they do not need.

In just a few months since inauguration day, DOGE and the General Services Administration have sold off several Federal properties and worked with agencies to eliminate hundreds of unneeded taxpayer-funded office leases. More specifically, they have canceled nearly 700 Federal leases of 7.9 million square feet of space, saving taxpayers around \$400 million.

One of the canceled leases was a nearly quarter of a billion dollar 15-year lease at a luxury office building on Pennsylvania Avenue to house Voice of America and the United States Agency for Global Media. The Biden Administration signed the lease late last year, sticking taxpayers with the tab. It is one of the fanciest office buildings in the city. You can see of the building on this poster board. Incredible.

Furthermore, this beautiful building had zero broadcasting capabilities, a capability one would think would be essential for a broadcasting media agency. The cost to taxpayers to build out the building with broadcasting capabilities, \$130 million. The Biden team wanted to move USAGM and Voice of America from this building that we are sitting in today into that luxury space. Instead, the President is shutting down the whole state-run media operation and taxpayers will be spared a quarter billion dollar lease and millions more for renovations and security measures.

This is just one example of countless egregious abuses of leases and contracts being paid out across the Federal Government.

Another egregious abuse of taxpayer dollars regarding Federal property was the \$200 million the FBI received last year for a new headquarters in Maryland. While the FBI was going after the American people, parents at school board meetings, and many others, our Federal Government gave them hundreds of millions of dollars of American tax dollars for a brand-new, beautiful headquarters.

Federal agencies should not be maintaining empires at taxpayer expense. That is why GSA, the Federal landlord agency driving this reform process, plans to lead by example. Imagine that. It intends to vacate its current headquarters building in downtown D.C. and co-locate with another agency. Then it will sell the GSA headquarters.

Before I close, I will note that Congress also acted on this front in January. We passed a law requiring Federal building occupancy to be tracked and for low-occupancy buildings to be sold, but it will take a willing partner in the White House to implement that law and to take other steps to shrink the Federal real estate empire. We now have that partner, and I look forward to working with the Trump Administration and DOGE to finally rightsize the Federal real estate footprint.

And with that, I yield to Ranking Member Stansbury for her opening statement.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good morning. I always enjoy a field hearing, and it is nice to be out in the field here in Washington, D.C. I would like to thank the Chairwoman for holding this hearing focused on properties that the Federal Government manages.

The General Services Administration, or GSA, manages roughly 9,000 federally owned properties and private sector leases in all 50 states and territories. Federal real estate is what makes it possible for the civil service to serve the American people. This is programs like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, education, care for our veterans, and all of the programs and services that are so vital to our communities, but unfortunately, as we know, are currently under attack.

For more than two decades across both Republican and Democratic administrations, the Government Accountability Office identified Federal property management as a significant challenge, including problems of excess and underutilized space and poor building conditions. All of that is to say, that this is a longstanding issue that many administrations have worked on and it certainly is not something new.

My colleagues and I have consistently worked to improve stewardship of Federal real estate so it can better serve the American people, and that is why I would love to make this a bipartisan hearing about how we address the needs of this country and best serve the people of this Nation.

The last Administration disposed of property, saving nearly \$2 billion for American taxpayers. And recently, Congress worked together to pass bills for additional tools to reform and consolidate the Federal property inventory. These efforts also directed the sale of four Federal buildings, including the one we are here in today. The Inflation Reduction Act also helped to facilitate property consolidation, including reducing the Department of Homeland Security footprint by over a million square feet and saving taxpayers over a billion dollars over 30 years.

But instead of building on these successes and continuing to do what could be characterized as the tedious analytical work on behalf of Americans, the Trump Administration is currently taking a fire sale approach of looting the Federal Government and stripping

it for parts to pay for tax cuts that we know will come up in their reconciliation deal.

Let us be clear. Republicans are trying to pass legislation right now that would give billionaires permanent tax breaks, on the order of \$37 trillion over the next three decades. And in order to pay for that, they are looting the Federal Government and taking a page out of the playbook of private equity. Take public assets, privatize them, sell them for profit, lease them back, help your buddies make money. And that is exactly what we are seeing here today.

And unfortunately, we have seen this across the Federal Government since the Trump Administration took office. In fact, we have been deeply concerned that the entire DOGE effort has been a front to help support billionaires who are trying to privatize public services.

And just this week we have seen, as Elon Musk is on his exit out of the Federal Government, he has secured billions of dollars in new contracts across the Federal Government. Conflict of interest? Yes, absolutely. It appears that he has recently secured contracts and promises for contracts at the Department of Defense, NASA. He has installed Starlink at the White House and is asking to install it at other Federal agencies. And we understand that there is the potential to potentially deploy his AI technology across the Federal agencies to replace the tens of thousands of Federal employees that have recently been illegally fired.

That is why we are deeply concerned about the non-data driven fire sale that the Trump Administration is proposing for Federal properties, such as the one we are in today.

So, I am deeply distraught and dismayed that we do not have an Administration witness with us here today. The GSA is not here to answer questions. That, yet again, Elon Musk is not in front of this Committee. And unfortunately, we have yet to see a single Trump political appointee in front of this Committee or the Oversight Committee. So, we will continue to do our jobs to elucidate what is happening inside the Federal Government.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses today and I look forward to talking about how we can actually manage Federal properties and the Federal work force to continue to provide the vital services that are needed for the American people.

Finally, I just want to say that it is quite rich to talk about the abuse of Federal properties after Donald Trump used the historic Postal Service building just down the street during his Administration to make millions and millions of dollars from foreign governments while they came and visited him in the Oval Office. So, let us make sure that we are doing right by the American people and doing things in a way that is transparent and also in the interest of the public.

And with that, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, Rep. Brown from Ohio is waived on to the Subcommittee for the purpose of questioning the witnesses at today's hearing.

I am pleased now to introduce today's witnesses.

Mr. David Marroni is a Director in GOA's [sic] Physical Infrastructure team. He oversees work on Federal real property man-

agement and the U.S. Postal Service. Mr. Marroni joined GAO in 2004.

Mr. John Hart is CEO of Open the Books. Mr. Hart is a veteran of Capitol Hill, having served in the late U.S. Representative and Senator Tom Coburn's long-time Communications Director and co-author. Mr. Hart helped enact landmark transparency legislation to put Federal spending online.

Mr. Ron Kendall is the Executive Chairman emeritus at the National Federal Development Association. He previously served in senior roles in the Federal Government, including within GSA's Public Buildings Service.

Again, I want to thank you all for being here to testify today.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Ms. GREENE. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Thank you. You may take a seat.

We appreciate you being here today, and I look forward to your testimony. Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statements and they will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statement to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on, and the Members can hear you. When you begin speaking—well, this one may be different. Is it the same? The light will blink? It will? OK.

When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes have expired, and we would ask that you please try to wrap it up.

I now recognize Mr. Marroni for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF DAVID MARRONI
DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE
U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**

Mr. MARRONI. Thank you, Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Subcommittee. I am happy to be here today to discuss GAO's perspectives on how to make Federal property work better for the American taxpayer.

For more than 20 years, we have identified the management of Federal property as a high-risk area in need of substantial transformation. The Federal Government has held on to too much space and has been too slow in shedding underused properties.

Federal buildings are often in poor condition and not well configured for the modern workplace, and the data needed to make good real property decisions has often been unreliable, in some cases nonexistent.

The pandemic shined a spotlight on these longstanding problems and created a unique opportunity to rightsize the Federal Government's property holdings. While there have been important actions

in recent years to take advantage of this opportunity, progress has been slow. Agencies were in a wait-and-see mode for too long.

Since January, there has been a notable shift in momentum. GSA is now rapidly moving forward with plans to terminate leases and dispose of large amounts of Federal property. This has disrupted the longstanding inertia that has slowed previous efforts to reshape the Federal Government's real property holdings.

There is a risk of moving too fast. Most buildings have active tenants and relocating them could be costly. As a result, as GSA and other agencies move forward, it is important that they balance the goal of speedy reductions with the need for deliberate planning. This will best ensure the most efficient and effective result for the American taxpayer.

There are a lot of moving parts right now that will shape Federal property for years to come. First, the Trump Administration's return-to-office policy and its reductions in force are still relatively early in their implementation. Second, agencies will be measuring building utilization across all their owned and leased space for the very first time starting this summer. Third, it is going to take time and money to move out of properties and consolidate into others, so agencies will need to prioritize. The Administration will have better information on each of these data points by this summer to help inform its efforts.

GSA and other agencies should use that new information to sequence real property reductions in a way that makes the most sense. GSA's recent decision to take an incremental approach to property disposals by starting with owned buildings that are clearly not needed is a positive step in this direction. Taking a deliberate and strategic approach to real property reductions could generate substantial savings for the taxpayer and mitigate the risk of costly mistakes and unexpected mission impacts.

In conclusion, rightsizing the Federal Government's real property holdings is long overdue. As the Administration moves forward with reductions, they should do so deliberately in a way that balances speed with planning. Doing so will best position the Federal Government to achieve the most efficient and effective result for the American taxpayer while ensuring agencies have the right space to successfully carry out their missions.

Madam Chairwoman, that concludes my opening statement. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you.

I now recognize Mr. Hart for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN HART
CEO
OPEN THE BOOKS**

Mr. HART. Madam Chair Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, and distinguished Members, thank you for having me today at this hearing.

As we gather in this cavernous auditorium, we have an opportunity to reflect on, not just the costly problem that Chairman Greene described in her opening statement, but its root causes. Today's expansive, excessive, and sometimes opulent Federal real estate portfolio is both a monument to the administrative state and

a mausoleum of lost dreams, opportunity, and freedom for American taxpayers.

In the early 20th century, progressives like Herbert Croly dreamed of managing a complex new world with a managerial class. Croly believed in, quote/unquote, “increasing control over property in the public interest.” He would no doubt be pleased to see this auditorium and the administrative state’s impressive portfolio of office space. So, this hearing is an opportunity for Congress to turn away from this failed policy of the past and reestablish our Founders timeless vision of limited constitutional government and transparency.

At Open the Books, we view transparency as a first principle in a free society. Our work was, in part, enabled by landmark bipartisan transparency legislation: the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, or the Coburn-Obama bill, that I helped craft when I was working for then-Senator Tom Coburn. And that bill created *USAspending.gov* and put all Federal spending online for the first time.

Our Founders wisely prioritized transparency and wrote it into the Constitution. Article I, section 9, clause 7 says that a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time. Note that these words precede the Bill of Rights, the First Amendment, and our right to free speech itself.

In the public square, transparency is like oxygen. We cannot speak if we cannot breathe. So, when we at Open the Books looked at the Federal real estate portfolio, we discovered the high cost of decorating and redecorating the administrative state. And to taxpayers, today’s hearing is quite literally a kitchen table issue.

Every family can relate to the cost of furniture. That is why taxpayers are so incensed when they learned that Federal agencies are freely spending billions of dollars every year on high-end pieces. Since Fiscal Year 2021, executive agencies have spent more than \$4.6 billion on furniture alone. That amount could buy 9.2 million American families a modest \$500 kitchen table. And of course, workplaces need desks, chairs, and meeting tables. And it is true that beautiful spaces can make us more productive, but beauty at what cost and on whose dime?

Do Federal employees need seven figures worth of abstract modern art to make government run? The State Department spent \$1.4 million on artwork for various embassies, including \$200,000 to procure a pair of custom paintings from a contemporary abstract artist. Do they need high-end leather recliners worth thousands of dollars each? Our Embassy in Islamabad is a place where you can put your feet up, thanks to 40 Ethan Allen chairs which cost taxpayers \$120,000.

During the peak years of the COVID emergency, from 2020 to 2022, agencies spent \$3.3 billion on furniture even as work migrated to Zoom. The SEC managed to spend \$700,000 furnishing a single conference room in New York. And social distancing guidelines failed to keep even the Centers for Disease Control from buying solar-powered picnic tables with charging ports that, by their own rules, should have sat unoccupied.

And an added burden for taxpayers is that many spaces are in long-term disrepair, as we mentioned before. Federal buildings need \$370,000 billion in fixes. All in all, we have an incomprehensible amount of physical space and furnishings, too much of it inefficiently procured, leased, and maintained.

At Open the Books, we believe taxpayers are demanding transparency and accountability. Instead of expanding Federal agencies, they want Congress to expand their agency and their right to pursue happiness on their terms with their own resources. Thomas Jefferson wisely said, "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." Every dollar saved in Washington is a dream realized somewhere in America. The administrative state's well-decorated real estate portfolio is a worthy place to start.

I look forward to your questions.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Hart.

I now recognize Mr. Kendall for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF RON KENDALL
EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN EMERITUS
NATIONAL FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION**

Mr. KENDALL. Thank you, Chairwoman Greene, Ranking Member Stansbury, other Members of Congress, staff, guests. A brisk good morning to all.

My name is Ron Kendall. I am the Executive Chairman emeritus of the National Federal Development Association. That is a trade association comprised of owners and developers of real estate that is leased to the Federal Government, along with various service providers, financiers, attorneys, brokers, and so forth.

My relevance to this Committee's inquiry today is twofold. First, 24 years ago when I served as the Chief Asset Officer of the Public Buildings Service, I wrote a paper called the Portfolio Restructuring Strategy. It bears very closely to what the Administration is doing today in terms of disposal of Federal buildings.

I want to explain that a bit. It is based upon three key findings. No. 1, that the PBS-owned portfolio had significant accrued depreciation in terms of physical needs for the properties. Billions of dollars, just as it is today.

Two, is the recognition that GSA was never going to receive appropriations sufficient to be able to cure that depreciation, that all the repairs and replacements that the buildings needed.

The third is a critical point. What we did—when my analysts went to look at the portfolio's performance, we noticed something very interesting. Fifteen percent of the buildings, in terms of building number, 250 roughly out of 1,750 buildings, produced 95 percent of the financial—what is called FFO, funds from operations, a term borrowed from the REIT industry. The profitability of the Federal Buildings Fund depended upon 250 buildings. That is a small number, less than 15 percent, but it constituted 55 percent of the square footage.

So, the portfolio strategy was very simple: Take and direct the scarce capital resources that GSA would receive by appropriation to those buildings, because those are the ones that are keeping you going, and sell off the balance, but only when you need to, not

when the buildings are—when the buildings fall into decrepit states or when fire, like safety issues, are pressing and you need to vacate. There is no need to get out before then.

Now, some may construe the strategy as being very GSA-centric in terms of the profitability of the Federal Buildings Fund, but that is a mistake in apprehension, because it is really good government. GSA's core portfolio, that is how we defined it back then, 24 years ago, is a portfolio of well-occupied, high-rent buildings in major metropolitan areas. And so, by having those buildings in the inventory, you avoid paying high-lease costs to the private sector, so it is really benefiting the American taxpayer.

Now, my concern today is that the DOGE-led disposal group, the non-core buildings that were posted briefly and taken down after a day, 440 some buildings, consisted of buildings that should not be on that list, buildings that are brand new, like the Volpe Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Brand new. It will not need major repair for 15 or 20 years.

The Main Justice building was on that. That is a core property. So, my concern is that this is not being done judiciously. The list of core properties is pretty easy to figure out and needs to be protected.

So, disposal is not the enemy. It is how it is done, and it must be done carefully with deliberate study.

I am about out of time. I simply want to talk quickly about leases. It looks to me that there is a list of leases that are being terminated purely because they are soft term. Agencies still have needs for that space. So, my concern is that we are not looking at agency mission when terminating soft term leases. It is very important to maintain the viability of agencies to execute their mission.

I am out of time. I look forward to questions.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questions. And I thank the witnesses for their testimony.

Mr. Marroni, the title of your testimony is "Reducing the Government's Holdings Could Generate Substantial Savings," and I agree with that. And thanks to the Trump Administration, we are finally seeing some savings, \$400 million on leases, according to the Administration.

Do you think the government's excess properties exist in part because Federal agencies and the bureaucrats who run them have no incentive to move or to give up their space? Just, why won't these agencies co-locate and downsize?

Mr. MARRONI. So, there are a number of reasons, but certainly cultural reticence to sharing space is something we have identified in the past. Also, inertia, for lack of a better word. It is a space you have already had and there is not as much incentive to move. It costs money to move out of space at times and agencies have not always put that up front. There is a number of other reasons possibly too, but certainly those are both valid reasons that they have brought up before. Those are reasons that have been brought up before.

Ms. GREENE. Right. Except their actions are different. They certainly were ready to jump out of this building and lease a very expensive building on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Recent Presidents could not overcome that bureaucratic inertia, yet President Trump and DOGE ended almost 700 leases in just a few months. That is unbelievable.

Has any other administration acted so quickly to reduce the Federal footprint, that you know of?

Mr. MARRONI. Not that I am aware of.

Ms. GREENE. Yes. Much needed, though.

Mr. Marroni, your testimony states that a GAO covert operation last year was successful about half the time in sneaking prohibited items past the guards and into Federal buildings. I am really interested in that.

What sort of items did you sneak in? What dangers does this vulnerability pose?

Mr. MARRONI. Right. So, we snuck in three different items: a multipurpose tool with a knife, a baton like a baton you could use to attack someone with, and pepper spray. All those are prohibited items. All those are things you could cause real harm if you wanted to, and like you said, about half the time we were able to get that through, so that raises concerns. We only did 27 tests and got through half the time. That suggests other items could be getting through at a greater level.

Ms. GREENE. But you got through half the time in 27 tests.

Mr. MARRONI. Correct. And that also comports with FPS', the Federal Protective Service's, own covert testing program.

Ms. GREENE. Wow. That is definitely terrifying. Thank you for that. I have a lot of death threats and several people have been convicted and served time in prison for planning to murder me, so I always appreciate the efforts on every single aspect of security to make sure that people that work within the Federal Government and the Capitol and visitors, as well, are safe. So, thank you.

Mr. Hart, I appreciate the work your organization has done in making the American people aware how the government spends American's hard-earned money, including this chart behind me here. It shows a disgusting amount of Federal spending on furniture, which is what you talked about.

So, how did you go about finding the Biden Administration spent about \$1 billion per year on furniture while Federal buildings sat empty during COVID and Federal workers worked from home?

Mr. HART. Yes. What we do, Chairman, is we have access to all Federal spending through *USAspending.gov*, and that's a bill that I helped pass back in 2006. So, we are able to do key word searches and look at furniture, look for vendors even, and identify—and key word search things like “recliners” to identify and understand how much the Federal Government is spending on furniture. And it is really a scope-of-government-problem issue, I mentioned in my opening statement. When we decide—

Ms. GREENE. Yes, it is a big scope—

Mr. HART. When we decide to have a large scope, there is going to be a big cost of furniture, so it is—but it is a very useful way to think about and assess whether we ought to have this number of Federal buildings at this time.

Ms. GREENE. Yes. Mr. Hart, we appreciate those efforts.

In 2021, the CDC spent almost a quarter million dollars on solar-powered picnic tables. The CDC at the time was telling people to

socially distance with masks and basically forcing a vaccine that many Americans did not want.

So, what use would its employees have for this new picnic table that has quite the price tag?

Mr. HART. Yes, it is quite expensive and, you know, the social distancing guidelines suggested they should not be seated at that table while they were spending \$237,000 on it.

Ms. GREENE. Look at those seats. Look at those seats. That is not social distancing.

Mr. HART. No, they are quite close. There is a close proximity of those seats to the other person in order to utilize those.

Ms. GREENE. Yes. Real quick, I have just got a short amount of time yet. I would like to ask just basically, just for the general audience, is \$238,000 spent on solar-powered picnic tables at the CDC appropriate? I think the American people thinks that is disgusting. Is \$700,000 spent by the SEC for their New York regional office conference room appropriate of taxpayer dollars? I do not think so. What about \$6.5 million spent on high-end furniture to redecorate the EPE office? No. And then \$284,000 in Herman Miller furniture for FEMA's headquarters conference center an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars? I would argue not.

I am definitely over time, so thank you, gentlemen.

I now yield to the Ranking Member, Stansbury, for 5 minutes.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Mr. Marroni, I am grateful that you are here. I know in the report that GAO has published that real estate of the Federal Government has been on the high-risk list since 2003, and part of that is that we are not disposing of it and taking care of it in as quickly a process as needed, so I think this is an issue that we have bipartisan agreement on. Certainly, if you are overinvested in assets, it is something that you need to deal with as a business.

But, you know, I am a former OMB employee. I was a non-partisan Federal official, and I worked on the Department of Interior's portfolio. And one of the things that the American public may not realize is that when the Federal Government is trying to figure out how to reconfigure its Federal property footprint, there is a whole planning process that begins.

So, you first work with the Federal agencies. You identify, are they going to change the configuration of how they are using space based on sharing of desk space, if there is laboratories needed, do they need to be physically located in certain spaces? This is what any company does, right. They try to figure out where their employees are going to be located.

Then there is a planning process with the actual real estate itself, because in many cases you cannot dispose of your leases without investing in construction and improvements because of the terms of a lease, if it is a lease, or if you are trying to dispose of the property and get fair market value.

So, what I really want to highlight here is that we need an expedited process, but any private company or public entity would have to go through an extensive planning process to do it in a way that would get a fair shake for the taxpayers. Would you agree with that?

Mr. MARRONI. There is certainly planning steps you want to take.

Ms. STANSBURY. Absolutely. So, the idea of just putting out a list of hundreds of Federal properties, including some of the most valuable real estate in Washington, DC. on the Federal Mall, including the headquarters of every major Federal agency, is not a planning process. That is a fire sale of some of the most valuable real estate properties in Washington, DC.

Now, we all know that Donald Trump is a real estate developer—let us not lose sight of that—and certainly he understands the significance of the disposal of properties in the most valuable real estate in our Nation's Capital. So, I think it is important that we keep that in mind as we are thinking about, is the intentions of what DOGE is doing, are they actually in the public interest?

And, Mr. Marroni, I want to also go back to kind of the bigger economic context, because I think it actually relates to the issues that we are dealing with this week in the House. In fact, you know, Donald Trump has put into place tariffs last week that are causing the markets to tank, right now the economy is in complete free fall, and House Republicans are whipping votes to try to get this new package across the finish line that would give permanent tax breaks to billionaires, and the markets are completely shook by it.

And I know you—this is outside your purview, but the issue here is that anyone who works in real estate right now knows that this is not a good time to sell real estate. Would you agree with that?

Mr. MARRONI. It is a challenging time, particularly commercial offices.

Ms. STANSBURY. Absolutely. So, that is the point I want to make. If we are talking about actually getting value for the taxpayers, then doing a fire sale of Federal properties and then putting into place expensive leases where the Federal Government would spend Federal taxpayer dollars to lease back from private entities at this moment, as the market is in free fall and the real estate market is in complete tanking at the moment, it is not a good use of taxpayer dollars. Like, this is a terrible idea at this moment, and it needs to be done through a sane process.

Now, Mr. Hart, I was interested in your testimony, and I actually just want to follow up. You used in your testimony a bunch of times this concept of dismantling the administrative state. And so, I am just curious, do you view the disposal of Federal real estate as part of dismantling the administrative state?

Mr. HART. No. I view it as empowering taxpayers and transferring wealth from Washington to individual Americans. So, I think it is probably one of the best economic stimulus programs you could have is to shift tax dollars from—

Ms. STANSBURY. May I ask, Mr. Hart, is your agenda to dismantle the administrative state?

Mr. HART. No. My agenda is transparency and to give—

Ms. STANSBURY. I am sorry, Mr. Hart, I understand. I just listened to your 5 minutes of testimony.

I think it is very clear that part of the agenda here is really about dismantling the administrative state and using real assets of the Federal Government to do that. I mean no disrespect, but I wanted to reclaim my time.

So, the point here is that things are not always as they appear in Washington, DC, and I think it is very clear that this is not about the Federal taxpayers and the American people. This is about disposing of Federal property and a fire sale to make the wealthy more wealthy.

Thanks. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. I would like to point out that the market is up about 1,400 points.

With that, I now recognize Mr. Fallon for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Madam Chair. You have got to love the hyperbolic accusations and class warfare all in one sentence.

We have 1,500 Federal buildings. We have 7,500 leases of other locations, 511 million square feet of office space, and it really comes down to need and want. There might be some people that want all of that space, but do we really need it? And clearly, when you read government reports, even pre-COVID, we did not need the space that we had. We had too much. Then COVID exacerbated and the surplus exploded.

Now, in 2022, Joe Biden in his State of the Union Address, and I quote, said, "The vast majority of Federal workers will once again work in person."

Mr. Kendall, do you believe Mr. Biden achieved his goal?

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Fallon, I believe that he made a directive which was tempered by agency input. There was a lot of—

Mr. FALLON. So, Mr. Kendall, sorry, I have 5 minutes. So, do you believe he achieved that goal, yes or no? We can talk about—

Mr. KENDALL. To some degree he did.

Mr. FALLON. To some degree. OK.

2023 GAO report found that 17 of the 24 largest Federal agencies used only 25 percent of their headquarters capacity. Of all 24, not one of them reached over 50 percent, and we are talking big ones: Defense, State, Commerce, Justice, Treasury, et al. This much space, when you are talking about operation and maintenance bills, are going to be in the billions. Leases, \$7 billion just on leases, and then there is a backlog deferred maintenance, which is now estimated—and these are not our numbers. These are not Republican numbers. These are numbers from government agencies—is \$370 billion. So, 17 out of 24; 71 percent are under 25 percent and all of them are under 49. We clearly have to take some of this off the books.

So, we can be accused of nefarious intent. The fact of the matter is we are looking out for the American taxpayer.

Now, you are talking about very expensive real estate in Washington, DC, New York City, San Francisco. And to alleviate some of our friends' concerns on the other side of the aisle, there is something called strategic sequencing to prevent the flooding of the market, and I would trust somebody that has real estate experience.

The Biden Administration, when we are talking about 1,500 buildings, 7,500 leases, 5,011 million square feet of office space, what did they do? Did they take action? Fact of the matter is, they did not. And it is time and it is high time, 20 years in the making, to take some action.

The U.S. Center of Disease Control, as Madam Chair pointed out, spent \$230 grand on solar picnic tables. That a good use of government funds, Mr. Kendall, you think?

Mr. KENDALL. I just wanted to respond to something you just said. When I did this portfolio restructuring strategy——

Mr. FALLON. I am not asking you that.

Mr. KENDALL [continuing]. There was \$197 million——

Mr. FALLON. Madam Chair?

Mr. KENDALL. It is \$183, so——

Ms. GREENE. The witness is not recognized.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you. Reclaim my time.

Mr. Kendall, you are a witness. You are here of your own volition. Could you answer my question? Do you think that \$230 grand for solar picnic tables at the Center of Disease Control is a good use of taxpayer money?

Mr. KENDALL. I have no opinion. I do not know——

Mr. FALLON. OK. How about State Department, high-end furniture, \$120 grand of leather furniture in Islamabad, Pakistan? You think that is a good use of taxpayer money?

Mr. KENDALL. I would like to examine——

Mr. FALLON. So, no opinion, again. How about the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation—spent \$14.4 million, about \$14,400 per employee, on brand-new furniture? Is that a good use of taxpayer money?

Mr. KENDALL. Did it include IT? Does it include computers and so forth?

Mr. FALLON. It is furniture. So, again, yes or no? No?

Mr. KENDALL. I do not have sufficient information to make an informed decision.

Mr. FALLON. OK. Thank you.

The Biden Administration essentially did nothing, and what we have had with new leadership, with DOGE is terminating 700 Federal leases already, 10 percent. That is a chunk. That is a good start. Any building that has national security implications is going to be unaffected. And now they are moving on to sell, and we are going to do it, again, with strategic sequencing as well.

I think it should be noted; the Democratic witness works for a trade association that represents real estate owners who lease space to the Federal Government. Is that a fair assessment, Mr. Kendall?

Mr. KENDALL. That is true.

Mr. FALLON. OK. Thank you.

Then we have got something in the research that we were doing. The McKinney-Vento Act of 1987, I was shocked to find, Madam Chair, that homeless assistance providers have right of first refusal on any sale of any Federal building. I think the American people should know that, and legislation should be drafted, and our office will be doing so, to repeal that, to give the Federal Government more flexibility to properly sell and unload these buildings to save the taxpayers—not the super-rich, evil people—the taxpayers of this country, some money.

Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Fallon.

I now recognize Ms. Norton from the District of Columbia for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I strongly oppose OMB and OPM's recent directive to Federal agencies to, quote, "propose relocations of agency, bureaus, and offices from Washington, DC, and the National Capital region to less costly parts of the country," end quote. I also strongly oppose the new bills that have been introduced this Congress to relocate the headquarters for Federal agencies in the National Capital region to outside the National Capital region.

These relocations, as we saw during the first Trump Administration, would harm the operations of these agencies and waste taxpayer dollars. They would also harm the economy of the National Capital region and upend the lives of Federal workers, many with kids who love their homes and schools.

Last month, I introduced a bill to prohibit such relocations. However, there are specific Federal buildings in D.C. that GSA should dispose of in an orderly manner and move the employees from those buildings into other buildings in D.C. These disposals would save the Federal Government money and could generate tax revenue for D.C., increase housing supply, and create new mixed-use neighborhoods in the District of Columbia.

There is a precedent for orderly disposals of Federal property in D.C. Congress has passed many of my bipartisan bills to transfer unused or underutilized Federal buildings and land in D.C. to the D.C. government or the private sector, including the Webster School, the development of the Wharf, and The Yards, and most recently the RFK Stadium campus.

Mr. Kendall, I believe that there needs to be an orderly process for disposing of Federal buildings in D.C. as opposed to putting many Federal buildings up for sale at the same time. How would putting many Federal buildings in D.C. up for sale at the same time affect the price the Federal Government could get for the buildings and the value of commercial real estate in D.C., generally?

Mr. KENDALL. Congresswoman Norton, selling into a down market is not a sagacious plan. As Ranking Member Stansbury said, that is a kind of fire sale approach. Vacancy in the office market in Washington, DC.—and I have been here for 47 years—it is the highest rate of vacancy in four and a half decades. You do not sell into a down market. You are going to—it is folly. You are going to get the lowest price possible, if you can move the assets at all.

I mean, there is, of course, McKinney-Vento, as the Congressman just made—it could go, some could go the homeless way and others might be public benefit discount conveyances and you get nothing. But the point is, it is not—you are loading up a market with—that is already under distress, so it is cataclysmic.

Ms. NORTON. Well, a few months ago, Congress passed the bipartisan Water Resources Development Act, which established a clear Federal standard requiring GSA to identify buildings for potential consolidation or disposal, specifically any with an occupancy rate below 60 percent. However, I am concerned that GSA is trying to dispose of Federal buildings without looking at data to judge whether the buildings are needed or not.

Mr. Marroni, based on the timeline established in the recent law, when do you expect the GSA would have the information needed to make more informed decisions about private property disposal?

Mr. MARRONI. Agencies are supposed to start collecting that data in July and then they are supposed to report in January.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you very much. I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady yields.

And I now recognize Mr. Cloud from Texas for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you all for being here. Appreciate you, Chairwoman, for holding this hearing on this topic. It is certainly one that we have talked about before, but one that we have seen very little action on.

You know, one of the reasons and discussion points surrounding those who were proponents of teleworking were that we would save all this money on not needing these Federal buildings, and yet what we have seen was—you know, in the business world, what you would do is you would lose a little productivity with people maybe working remotely, but you would gain that from, you know, less cost and overhead of maintaining buildings and facilities. But, of course, in the nature of the Federal Government, we sent people home and got less productivity and we continued to grow our assets and property portfolios and now are maintaining empty buildings to the tunes of millions and millions and millions, and billions of dollars even.

Biden had, as Mr. Fallon mentioned, committed to getting the work force back to work in person in offices, and of course, we know that did not happen. This has really been a bipartisan issue. Even Obama in 2011, in the campaign to cut waste, laid out what you could almost describe as the goals of DOGE, but we saw very little progress over that. And so, our friends in the left right now are kind of complaining about how this is being done, but one would have to ask them—they had all three branches, the House, the Senate, and the White House just 3 months ago—why didn't they do anything about it then?

And so now, we continue to—I am sorry, you are right, a couple years ago. But nonetheless, you had it a couple years ago and did not do anything with it. And so now, we find ourselves to the point where President Trump and the Trump Administration is finally doing something about this, and this is good for the American people. We must find savings for it. As Mr. Fallon mentioned, the vast majority, I think 17 of 24 agencies, were almost vacant, it seems, using 25 percent less, and then we have a backlog of \$370 billion in maintenance costs backlogs, and so we have to do something about this.

And I think it is worthy to note you keep mentioning selling properties in a down market. Who would benefit from that? Well, that would be the American people who are buying it. These businesses who could buy it up and turn it into a profitable asset, create a property that would bring tax flow to Washington, DC, for example, income as opposed to a vacant building sitting there being a burden on the American people. So, there is a lot of reasons to continue to move forward on this. Of course, we want to make sure this is done the right way.

Mr. Marroni, could you speak to kind of the decisionmaking process that you look to bring? First of all, thank you for being willing to take up this fight that so many administrations have been willing to talk about and bring little action to. But could you talk about, kind of, your decisionmaking process and apparatus as we continue to look forward and how you evaluate what properties are valid and which ones are not for sale or off-leasing.

Mr. MARRONI. Right. So, for owned properties, GSA and the Administration in general should take a look at—first, sequencing makes sense. Take a look at the properties. There are already a number of properties that have been previously identified as properties that should be gotten rid of. Oftentimes, these are buildings that are underused, have been for a long time, and have large deferred maintenance and liabilities. So, it makes sense, start with those. Get those out the door as quickly as you can and get those savings.

And then, as the new data that we are going to have on utilization, which is going to start rolling in in July comes in, you can use that to further assess where are there additional properties that are underused. We will have that data for the first time for many buildings and assess what makes next sense in the next tranche to sell off and consolidate.

This all is going to take money. It does take money to move out of spaces, to build out consolidations, to reconfigure spaces, but at the end of the day, you save—not only do you potentially get proceeds from the sales, but you also save the operation of maintenance costs, which have a very long tail, and save a lot of money over time by getting rid of buildings that are just too costly to maintain now.

Mr. CLOUD. More than half of GSA's leases, I think it is 4,108 out of 7,685, are set to expire between, well, 2023 and 2027. How much of the Federal Government can save by allowing these leases to expire that are not needed, using properties that we already own?

Mr. MARRONI. Right. Well, from a pure financial basis, we spend about \$6 billion on leases each year. So, if you are reducing—whatever the math is, I cannot do the public math, but it is a substantial amount you can get from lease savings. You just want to make sure you know what your end state is going to be, how much space are you aiming for at the end to make sure you are sequencing things in a way that makes sense.

Mr. CLOUD. I only have 8 seconds left, so I will yield back to the Chairwoman. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

And I now recognize Mr. Lynch from Massachusetts for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Madam Chair.

At the outset, I would just suggest that if this Committee were truly concerned with delivering on government efficiency, we might examine the devastating impact of President Trump's recent trade tariffs on the financial security of the American people.

In just the 2 days of the President's tariff implementation, U.S. stocks have lost more than \$6.6 trillion in value. The market turmoil has already placed the retirement savings of millions of Amer-

icans at risk with more than \$44 trillion of U.S. retirement assets tied to the stock market, the 401(k) plans, and other retirement accounts.

I know that President Trump has recently stated, “I have not checked my 401(k),” close quote. Well, Americans, retirees, and workers that are approaching retirement have certainly been checking theirs, and I can tell you they are alarmed. They are alarmed by the extent to which the President’s trade war is pummeling their retirement investments. So, for the average American who is approaching retirement, who has about \$500,000 in a 401(k), that American worker lost \$35,000 in their 401(k) in the last 2 days of Trump’s tariffs.

So, you know, I have heard from one of our witnesses, if ever dollar saved is a dream realized, then this is really a nightmare for the American worker, especially for those who are approaching retirement. And while the President made great promises in reducing the cost of groceries, food, housing, during his campaign, I really would like him to get around to that if he could at some point.

So, Mr. Kendall, the suggestion here is that we are supposed to move away from a situation where the government owns the buildings. Instead, we are going to move to the private equity model where we sell the building that is home to a Federal agency, and then we are going to pay rent to a private equity firm to rent that same space out.

In Massachusetts, we just had a situation like this with one of our hospitals. Actually, eight of our hospitals. So, those hospitals were receiving a lot of money from Medicare and Medicaid, OK? They sold the building to a private equity firm. The private equity firm drove up the prices. The CEO of the private equity firm bought two yachts. He has got one of them off the coast of Ecuador. But at the end of the day, the Federal taxpayer money, the money that was going to that hospital through Medicare and Medicaid was now going in the pocket of a private individual who could spend it on whatever they want. They introduced the profit motive into the ownership of those buildings.

So, how does that work for these government buildings that are now are going to go to Elon Musk’s pals who are in private equity and they are going to have to get profit in addition to just covering their bills?

Mr. KENDALL. Well, Congressman, while my trade association always feels that there will be adequate leasing, the truth is leasing does cost more than federally owned space. And I make it very clear, the cost to the Federal Government to borrow long term is about two percent—two to three percent. There is a 500 basis point premium to have space that is leased. That is what the market charges. So, to bring it home to everybody, would you rather have a two percent mortgage on your house or a seven percent mortgage? Obviously, two percent is a lot cheaper.

So, it behooves the government, when it can afford to own space, to own it, and you only lease in the alternative. It is a stark world. You have to lease because you do not have the sufficient capital to own enough buildings, but it is a mistake if you have a choice to lease and to sell off buildings and now pay for them—to pay private sector lessors, it is going to be more expensive.

Mr. LYNCH. And if you have a unique facility that is designed to provide veterans benefits or some other public service, it makes it tougher for the government to move, right?

Mr. KENDALL. That is correct.

Mr. LYNCH. OK.

I yield back, Madam Chair.

If I could, I would ask unanimous consent, a press release from GSA, dated December 4—

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH [continuing]. Two-thousand-twenty-four. Thank you.

Mr. LYNCH. And a press release from the Biden-Harris White House titled “President Biden Announces New Actions to Ease the Burden of Housing Costs.”

Ms. GREENE. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Mr. Timmons from South Carolina for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We are here because this country faces an existential threat—\$36 trillion in debt, a \$1.8 trillion annual deficit—and we are trying to find commonsense solutions to address unused space and how we can be more efficient with taxpayer dollars in that regard.

And this is really a whole-of-government approach. We have to right-size our fiscal ship in order to have a country, long term. So, I guess this is just one small part of that endeavor. And it really is just common sense.

And I am going to tell you a story about my time in office. I got elected 7 years ago, and my predecessor had two offices. They were spread out in my district. I have a fairly small district. And they were in some of the highest-costing office space in my district. And we only had three employees, and we had two offices. And they were, you know, one was in Greenville, one was in Spartanburg. And I just said, “Well, that really does not make sense.”

So, I went to a wonderful, you know, municipality that is up and coming, and I got this fantastic office space. It is actually more square feet than I had between the two, but it is drastically nicer, and it costs less than half as much. So, just in my one little congressional office, we are probably saving \$60,000 to \$70,000 a year.

So, that is just pretty straightforward. And we are going to basically do the same thing across the country. We are going to figure out what we need and what we do not need, and then we are going to dispose of what we do not need by either selling it or by not renewing the lease.

So, Mr. Marroni, the Department of Government Efficiency has already terminated close to 700 Federal leases. What financial impact has that created for taxpayers?

Mr. MARRONI. That, once the leases are drawn out—there is about a 90–120 days, but there will be this lease savings. You will not be paying that lease rent anymore.

Mr. TIMMONS. And, I mean, 700 leases, that is likely hundreds of millions of dollars. I mean—

Mr. MARRONI. It depends on the—

Mr. TIMMONS. Depends on the property.

Mr. MARRONI [continuing]. Timing of the leases. Right.

Mr. TIMMONS. And I know we are complaining about property in D.C. that we own. So, this building is likely to be sold in the next couple of years. Do you want to guess at what, I mean, this is probably, what, 3 acres? How much is 3 acres worth, 4 blocks from the Capitol?

Mr. MARRONI. I would imagine quite a lot.

Mr. TIMMONS. Yes, it is at least tens of millions of dollars.

And you know what we really need in this area? We need housing. And so, I guarantee you that a developer—a big, bad developer is going to come in, and you know what is funny? The D.C. city code is going to require them to do 30 or 40 percent of it as affordable housing. So, that will make some of my colleagues across the aisle happy. But there will probably be, I do not know, 1,000, 2,000 units to address the housing crisis in this area.

Because what—this is crazy. The highest and best use of this property is not what is currently being used. And we are going to transition it to that. And the best part is, when they build this massive building and put housing in it, they are going to pay taxes.

So, we are going to take a building that is currently using taxpayer dollars to be maintained, but not very well, and we are going to then sell it, get tens of millions of dollars, and we are going to turn around and create a highest and best use for this property, which is then going to result in it paying taxes.

So, I mean, that is the whole theory. And, while we can look all across the country for areas that we can save money, I mean, this is just common sense.

I do have a question.

So, Mr. Marroni, why is this so hard? Like, what is wrong, historically, that has created this problem where we use such a small percentage of property that we lease and that we own? And what are the structural impediments to really turning this problem upside-down and solving it?

Mr. MARRONI. Yes. I will point to a couple. There is multiple reasons.

But the biggest challenge is, we are typically talking about underuse. So, it is not a lot of properties that are just purely vacant and empty and—there are some. But the bigger issue is agencies having space where only a portion is being used.

And so, a couple of problems. One, agencies typically have not had the incentive to move off of properties that are underused but not completely vacant. It costs money for them to get the buildings ready for disposal.

Another reason is reticence, inertia. You have been in this space for a long time; you are familiar with it. In recent years, there has been some uncertainty, right? How many people are going to be in the office versus not? Do we get rid of the space and have to get back new space?

Mr. TIMMONS. I am running out of time.

Mr. MARRONI. OK.

Mr. TIMMONS. I want to close with this.

President Biden, in his State of the Union address, talked about how he was bringing people back to work. He did not do that because he actually wanted to. He did that because the city of D.C.

was crumbling without the Federal workers coming and supporting the businesses that they previously supported.

So, I know that my colleagues across the aisle do not like this effort, but when this building becomes 2,000 apartments, those people are going to then spend money in Washington, so it will actually help the economy.

With that, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Ms. Crockett from Texas for 5 minutes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

And I can tell you, one thing that is crumbling for the city of D.C. was that continuing resolution that defunded approximately a billion dollars from them.

But I will focus on today's hearing.

The Republicans' recklessness and chaotic approach to reducing the size of government has shown us what we have already known: Concepts of a plan do not work.

This is the Committee's fourth hearing, and, still, no one from the so-called Department of Government Efficiency has testified before this Committee about their plans to break the Federal Government. Because, as it turns out, breaking the Federal Government does not just hurt people you do not like. It is not just going to be Democrats who miss out on Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security or only Democratic veterans who will miss out on their VA benefits. Their approach will negatively impact all Americans.

So, it is unfortunate that Republicans have taken a seemingly bipartisan issue and included it as part of their scam to subsidize tax giveaways for billionaires. They have not proposed anything that will improve the efficiency of the government. Instead, they have put the country on a path to a recession and implemented the largest tax increase on Americans in decades, through Trump's tariffs.

This hearing is their latest attempt to try to convince the American people that dismantling public-facing agencies will somehow improve government efficiency. Let me tell you, it will not. There is nothing efficient about terminating leases for IRS taxpayer assistance centers during tax season, nor dismantling farmer support offices in rural communities while farmers are trying to survive Trump's tariffs.

And, just like their trade policy, there is not any logic or strategy behind the Trump Administration's reductions in force or accelerated disposal of federally owned property. It has been discussed that managing Federal property has been on GAO's high-risk list for more than two decades. Currently, GAO has almost 60 recommendations that the Administration could fully implement but decided to ignore.

And I am going to veer off for 2 seconds, because all I kept hearing was "fire." "Fire, fire, fire" is what I heard. And as I heard "fire," it seems like we are talking about an Administration that has been hell-bent on firing government workers; they are hell-bent on engaging in fire sales of our government buildings; and, while we are at it, they are lighting the Social Security on fire, Medicaid on fire, Medicare on fire, 401(k)'s on fire, Department of Education on fire.

And, instead, what we need to light on fire are Trump's tariffs. In fact, we could probably go a little bit further and fire this incompetent Administration.

But, if we are going to talk about efficiency and worry about some solar-paneled whatevers, let us talk about the fact that, as of March 30, Trump's golfing has cost us approximately \$26 million. And the last time I checked, we are not getting anything in return for that.

So, I will get back on my remarks, but I just wanted to point out that maybe we need to talk about the President and his golfing habits. In fact, he decided that he was going to golf as the markets were tanking. He decided he was going to golf instead of receiving four heroes who died serving this country. He has decided that he wanted to play games while the rest of us are really trying to make sure that we can serve the American people.

So, Mr. Marroni, you were quoted in the *New York Times* article dated March 17, stating that it is important for officials to have a plan to generate the most savings and that, quote, "all of these moving parts point to the need for some deliberate planning."

Did the Administration consult with GAO regarding their plans to dispose of hundreds of federally owned buildings?

Mr. MARRONI. No.

Ms. CROCKETT. In your testimony, you highlight that one of the core issues associated with managing Federal property is the lack of reliable data to support decisionmaking. Is that correct?

Mr. MARRONI. Yes.

Ms. CROCKETT. Would reducing GSA's work force by 50 percent improve data gathering and analysis?

Mr. MARRONI. I cannot say. They are not—

Ms. CROCKETT. That is perfectly fine. We know that we need experts and not idiots.

But, Mr. Kendall, we will move on. In your written testimony, you State: Some of the actions of this Administration suggest that the Administration "is not following a strategy designed to save taxpayer money" and that the Administration seems to ignore agencies' mission integrity.

Why do you think that?

Mr. KENDALL. In the list of—

Ms. CROCKETT. You have got 20 seconds.

Mr. KENDALL. In the list of projects, there were a couple score Social Security offices, IRS taxpayer service offices, which those agencies, those end-user agencies, wanted, and yet the Administration is canceling those leases. So, it does imperil mission accomplishment.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much.

I will yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady yields.

And I now recognize Mr. Burlison from Missouri for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I first want to acknowledge these amazing chairs that we are sitting in. I looked them up. These chairs retail for \$2,900. This is the nicest chair that I have sat in. And, you know, I have worked at a lot of Fortune—I have worked at Fortune 500 companies, worked

in the private sector. Never had a chair this nice—in a building that is empty.

I am speaking to you from a microphone that I looked up right now. It is over \$1,600 for this very nice microphone that apparently needs video.

This is why we are here. We are in an empty building from an agency that decided this was not good enough, so they decided to spend \$250 million more over a 15-year period for a more luxurious location than this.

So—and, with that, I want to say thank you—

Mr. LYNCH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLISON [continuing]. For this hearing.

Mr. LYNCH. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURLISON. When it comes to—I have very limited time. I do not—

Mr. LYNCH. OK.

Mr. BURLISON [continuing]. Want to yield.

Mr. LYNCH. OK. I understand. I am just asking. Thank you.

Mr. BURLISON. So, the solution is quite simple: Reduce the budgetary burden of the national real estate portfolio by disposing of Federal properties like the one that we are in today. It could be repositioned, it could find a better purpose, as was mentioned before.

So, I want to ask Mr. Marroni, how many properties in the Federal portfolio—how many are there?

Mr. MARRONI. So, there is about 277,000 buildings, but that is everything.

Mr. BURLISON. And how many of those have approximate utilization of their full capacity or at 75 percent or above?

Mr. MARRONI. There is just not good data.

Mr. BURLISON. OK.

Mr. MARRONI. We do not have data.

Mr. BURLISON. How many are below 15 percent?

Mr. MARRONI. Same thing there. We only know for headquarters.

Mr. BURLISON. So, I want to show you, the American people, a chart that we found where there is a list of a number of buildings. And on this list, you have got, for example, the James Forrestal Building, which is—its estimated capacity is almost 5,000 people. There are eight people occupying that building today. We have the Wilbur Cohen Building, which, you know, could house almost 3,500 people, but there is 750.

This entire list—it goes from the top to the bottom. At the very bottom, the GSA headquarters is 14-percent occupied.

So, this is where we stand.

You know, Milton Friedman had a great quote that I wanted to mention. There are four ways that you can spend money. You can spend your own money, which you do. You are really careful or watch what you are doing and try to get the most of your money. Then you can spend your money on somebody else, like if you buy a birthday gift for someone else. Then you are not careful about the gift, but you are careful about the money. Then you can also spend somebody else's money on yourself, and in that case you have a really nice lunch. And then there is the example where you spend

somebody else's money on somebody else. And this is what happens when you are spending somebody else's money on somebody else.

So, I have a question for Mr. Hart.

You and your organization, Open the Books, say that you are committed to making every dime of government spending accessible to the public, which I commend you for what you are doing. Transparency is exactly what we need from our Federal Government.

More than half of the current leases that GSA maintains are set to expire between now and 2027. How much money could the American people save by not renewing these leases?

Mr. HART. Well, I can speak to the cost of furniture, which is going to be about \$1.1 billion on just furniture. And I would have to get you the figure on leases.

But what it illustrates, again, is that, when you decide to have a massive expanse of Federal agencies, it is very, very expensive to decorate and redecorate these agencies and buy chairs like the one you are sitting in right now.

Mr. BURLISON. Apparently my \$1,600 microphone——

Mr. HART. Right. Failed.

Mr. BURLISON [continuing]. Was not working.

Mr. BURCHETT. You got the \$800 one.

Mr. BURLISON. So, I want to put into perspective a report that we uncovered from the Public Buildings Reform Board's report to Congress. Instead of using, you know, the accounting that was given to them, they used available cell phone data. And, in 2023, the cell phone data indicated that approximately 441 people occupied the Frances Perkins Building on an average day, costing the American taxpayer approximately \$182,000 per employee each year in operating and maintenance expenses and rent paid.

Mr. Marroni, is that a reasonable expense from the American taxpayers, \$182,000 per employee?

Mr. MARRONI. You certainly do not want to spend more on real property than you need.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

And I now recognize Ms. Brown from Ohio for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Chairwoman.

I wanted to waive on to today's hearing because the General Services Administration is rushing to sell a piece of Federal infrastructure in my district, the Anthony J. Celebrezze Federal Building in downtown Cleveland.

Let me be clear: This is not just the sale of a building. It is a reckless decision that could destabilize essential services for my constituents, displace some 4,000 Federal employees, and deal a blow to the local economy.

The Celebrezze houses the IRS, the Veterans Benefits Administration, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, DHS, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. These are the people ensuring tax seasons run smoothly, our veterans get their benefits, and military payroll is processed accordingly.

Selling this building, especially on an expedited 3-year timeline compared to the usual 10 years this takes, is shortsighted and misguided.

And what it really represents is another example of Donald Trump and Elon Musk's chaotic and careless approach to cost-cutting. In fact, "cost-cutting" is too generous. What they are really doing is looting the Federal Government and stripping it for parts.

This sale could result in reduced public access to services, lower job security for thousands of workers, and a ripple effect throughout Cleveland's downtown economy. Local businesses, public transit, and city revenues all depend on the Federal footprint of this building.

The Administration promises to relocate workers to other spaces in Cleveland. That is great. But how? How can their word be trusted?

They are selling a building while forcing workers to return to the office. They claim they will look for new lease space as they simultaneously cancel leases nationwide. And they are firing Federal workers that provide my constituents and the American people with critical programs and services.

So, what assurances do we have that they will actually maintain staffing levels and secure new space for the agencies affected? Or is this just another slash-and-burn strategy, a thinly veiled attack on the Federal work force under the guise of reform?

This building is an anchor for downtown Cleveland. Removing this presence will not only leave a void in the heart of Cleveland, it will undermine the progress that we have made in revitalizing the city.

There is a responsible way to reduce and consolidate the Federal Government's real estate portfolio, but this hasty decision is not it.

So, Mr. Kendall, can you tell us, how does GSA balance the social and community impacts, like job loss, transit disruption, and economic disinvestment, with the needs of the agency?

Mr. KENDALL. That is a difficult question.

GSA defers to end-user agencies in terms of what their space needs are. They really are a reactive organization in terms of finding space. Typically, the rule is to use owned space and, if that is not available, to lease space.

The Celebrezze Building, I do not know the particulars of it. If there is not an exigency about selling it because it constitutes a life-safety threat to the occupants, it does not have to be moved.

I mean, part of the argument here today is that Federal workers are being put in opulent space, leased space, and incurring great costs, but they could be retained in maybe Class B or B-minus federally owned buildings and avoid lease costs. GSA is all about avoiding lease costs.

So, I do not know specifically about the mission needs of the agencies that are housed in that building, but my sense would be GSA is deferential to those concerns.

Ms. BROWN. So, given your experience at the GSA, how would you characterize the Administration's rushed approach? Would their rushed approach to decisionmaking and shortening disposal timeline lead to more efficiencies or less?

Mr. KENDALL. I think that there is a lot of haste going on today, and I think it is ill-thought-through. I think that a much more deliberate approach should be taken to deciding what buildings to retain and what to get rid of.

I also think that the staffing levels are endangering GSA's—the reduction in staffing—I understand 63 percent of the PBS employees are to be terminated. That is three out of every five. I do not know how it was determined, how they reached that number, and in consideration of what mission needs are and what types and numbers of employees you need to execute. So, I am concerned.

Ms. BROWN. So, the last thing I want to get, before I run out of time, this question in—is, the list reported that building utilization is a contributing factor to the need for management of Federal property. How is the President's return to work impacting GAO's analysis of Federal real estate?

Ms. GREENE. The gentlelady is out of time.

Ms. BROWN. Sorry. Thank you.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize Mr. Jack from Georgia.

Mr. JACK. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. And thank you for convening this hearing in an underutilized Federal office building.

To establish context for those watching at home, our Federal Government owns roughly 511 million square feet of office space, and that does not include large swaths of military bases.

So, again, to establish context, if you, like me, watched the National Championship last night and saw how massive the Alamodome looked, the 511 million square feet of Federal office space represents 3,200 Alamodomes.

If you watched at home—if you are watching this hearing at home, the average square footage of an American home is about 2,000 square feet, which represents 255,000 average American homes.

So, that is the scale with which we are dealing when we discuss Federal office space.

And if I could start with Mr. Marroni, I would like us to look into the 2020 GAO report that just describes how inaccurate the data base is that monitors all this Federal Government.

Are you familiar with that report? And could you share a little bit about its findings?

Mr. MARRONI. Right. We found that the Federal Real Property Profile, which is the data base for Federal real inventory, had significant—they have liability problems, including something as simple as address information.

Mr. JACK. And if I am not mistaken, that report demonstrated that, of the 511 million square feet of Federal office property, 67 percent of the addresses and accounting for it is inaccurate. Is that true?

Mr. MARRONI. That was the case in 2020. There has been some improvement.

Mr. JACK. One of the things that we have, you know, highlighted throughout this hearing thus far is just how underutilized this office space is. And could you walk us through GAO's survey—I think there were 24 agencies surveyed—just how much underutilization is there today?

Mr. MARRONI. Right. Well, in 2023, when we did that, there was significant underutilization in headquarters buildings. None of the agencies were using more than half of their office space in the D.C. area for headquarters, and about 17 of the 24 were using less than a quarter. So, it was a significant issue.

That was 2 years ago. We do not know what the picture looks like today, because there is not good data. That should be coming this summer.

Mr. JACK. And I am just curious; within those 17 to 24 agencies that use 25 percent or less of Federal office space, you know, which agency was the most egregious, if you will, at underutilizing office space?

Mr. MARRONI. So, the worst agencies were HUD and SSA for their headquarters buildings. But I will say, no one had a great track record in terms of the utilization.

Mr. JACK. Thank you.

And, in your assessment, how much taxpayer money could have been saved if the Federal Government had begun right-sizing its property portfolio shortly after the pandemic shift to telework became apparent?

Mr. MARRONI. So, certainly, it could get substantial savings. It is about \$8 billion a year on owned and leased office space, so any reduction is going to generate a lot of money.

Mr. JACK. Thank you.

If I could ask some questions of Mr. Hart.

First off, I appreciate your opening testimony. And just for the American public, I would love for you to walk through *USAspending.gov*, walk through the parameters of it, how can we use that.

Mr. HART. Yes. Thanks for the question.

So, *USAspending.gov* was created through the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006. That was a bipartisan bill that Coburn and Obama wrote. And what that bill did is, it for the first time took all of the disparate data bases among Federal agencies and put them together so that the American people could see how Congress is spending their money.

And, again, this is a foundational, first principle of American society, is that taxpayers have the right to inspect the government's checkbook; the government does not have the right to inspect their checkbook. So, transparency in the Founders' vision is not a two-way street. It is that we have tools to help hold government accountable, because it is their money, it is taxpayers' money.

Mr. JACK. Well, in that vein, in the last minute of questioning, I was alarmed, as I think some of our colleagues were, in your opening testimony, about some of the expenditures you walked through that were egregious examples of wasted taxpayer money.

In your findings, over the course of your work, what was the most egregious expenditure that you saw? And at the same time, too, would love recommendations from you as to how best we can correct that.

Mr. HART. Yes. Well, it is a very target-rich environment. I think the totality is quite egregious, where you are looking at a billion dollars spent on furniture.

We talked about the picnic table as one, where the CDC told the American people they cannot sit together, but yet they are spending \$230,000 on a picnic table that violates their own standards. That rubs the American taxpayer the wrong way in every way imaginable.

So, I think what you could do is really reorganize Federal agencies. You know, the perfect political moment to cut spending is always a mirage over the next election horizon, but this body has the opportunity to do an agency reorganization bill that will solve all of the problems we are talking about. Because it is a scope-of-government question.

And to the question before, is that we spend about \$80 million a year on leases. And that is not as much as the owned property; that is a larger number.

But there are incredible opportunities for savings that could be produced by having a smart, strategic agency reorganization.

Mr. JACK. Thank you very much.

I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Mr. Garcia from California for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Chairwoman.

And thank you to our witnesses.

I think we are, again, here at another hearing where House Republicans are trying to help Elon Musk get cover for looting our Federal Government. DOGE and, so far, this Committee has not been about efficiency or better services; it has been an attack on programs that we rely on, from public health to Medicaid to the Department of Education and, of course, now to office space.

And we all know that Elon Musk and Donald Trump are attacking all the safeguards designed to make sure they just cannot sell our government assets to their own companies, but they can also sell them to their friends.

Our Committee is ignoring the biggest threat from the Trump Administration so far, and that is their horrific economic plan, MAGA-nomics.

Now, Mr. Kendall, we have been hearing testimony complaining that the Federal Government spent \$4.6 billion on furniture since 2021. Do you know how much U.S. businesses will pay every year in tariffs under Donald Trump's plan? Any idea?

Mr. KENDALL. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. GARCIA. OK. Well, U.S. businesses will be paying \$654 billion a year, and that number will rise. And that is just in 1 year. That number, of course, is enormously much larger than anything that we ever spent in furniture. We are looking at the biggest tax increase in over 50 years.

Now, Mr. Kendall, the total value of all property held by the Federal Government is about \$330 billion, as stated. Is that correct?

Mr. KENDALL. I have no basis to challenge that number.

Mr. GARCIA. OK. Great. So, do you know how much wealth has been wiped out from the stock market in just 2 days after Donald Trump's tariff announcement? Any idea, Mr. Kendall?

Mr. KENDALL. It is in the trillions, but I do not know the—

Mr. GARCIA. Around \$6.6 trillion.

So, I want to make sure what people should be understanding here. Last week, we had the largest 2-day stock market fall in history. We are talking about furniture and office space while people are losing their retirement accounts, while the stock market is crashing, while Medicaid is under attack, while healthcare costs are going up.

We know that retirement accounts are being wiped out right now as we are holding this hearing. Companies, many of them, are no longer able to invest. People are losing their jobs. And we are here talking about furniture while Donald Trump is destroying the economy.

We also know that predicting a recession, which many are now doing, is looking more and more likely, which we hope, of course, does not actually happen.

And while all this was happening and Donald Trump was imposing his tariffs plan and the prices of almost everything—groceries, housing, clothing, computers—can be expected to go up, Donald Trump, of course, the next day, left to go play golf.

Now, Mr. Kendall, were you aware that, as markets were crashing, Donald Trump the next day went out to play a few rounds of golf?

Mr. KENDALL. I do read the papers, so I did know that.

Mr. GARCIA. And, perhaps, maybe instead he should have been working with world leaders, our allies, to actually work on the tariff crisis. But, instead, of course, he was of course on the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*, which is a very conservative paper, as we know.

I think it is clear that Donald Trump could not care less about the harm he's doing, doesn't care about American workers or the community. And, unfortunately, Republicans in Congress want to debate office space and furniture while the President torches our own American economy and the global economy.

We have businesses right now, back in my district and across the country, that are getting hammered and suffering and firing employees. But, instead, we are continuing to have these really unfortunate, I think, hearings. It is crazy. It is cowardly. We should stop the tariffs now.

And, with that, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. The gentleman yields.

I now recognize Mr. Burchett from Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Chairlady. Thank you for your indulgence in allowing me to be on this Committee. I come in here usually ticked off, and I leave in worse condition, so thank you for that.

Ms. GREENE. You are welcome.

Mr. BURCHETT. If I ever have a counselor, I am going to send you the bill.

Mr. Hart, do any Members of Congress, their spouses, or their immediate family have any property ownership rights to this property or any Federal land?

Mr. HART. Congressman, I do not know the answer to that question off the top of my head.

Mr. BURCHETT. OK.

Do spouses of Members of Congress own real property and lease it to the Federal Government? And how would we find that out? Because I think I know what you are going to say.

Mr. HART. I believe the answer to that question is yes.

Mr. BURCHETT. You do?

Mr. HART. I do believe that.

Mr. BURCHETT. Is there any way we could verify that information?

Mr. HART. Well, you go to *USAspending* and search—"Open the Books," our website, and you can look up Members' names, you can look up any person's name, and find that information.

Mr. BURCHETT. All right. I suspect that is being done as I speak.

Mr. Marroni, how much underutilized space does the Federal Government have?

Mr. MARRONI. Cannot say. There is not good data. We just do not have data. That is going to come this summer. Congress has now required it. But prior to this, once you get outside of headquarters, there was not measurement of how much—

Mr. BURCHETT. OK. I hate these studies. Every day we vote on a new study and I suspect there is some warehouse, like in "Raiders of the Lost Ark," at the end, where they were putting—and our top people are looking at it, and there is these studies that are just on these shelves in these vast, vast warehouses.

Would you agree with that assumption?

Mr. MARRONI. There are a lot of studies.

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes. All right. Remember, you are—whatever. All right.

How much would the Federal Government save by allowing unneeded leases to expire?

Mr. MARRONI. The Federal Government spends about \$6 billion on leased office space, so depending on how many you let expire, you would get substantial savings.

Mr. BURCHETT. As I sit up here, people chastise the thought of making a profit. To me, that is not an evil thing. That allows for more people to be employed. It seems that we have forgotten exactly who we work for, and it is the people back home who are struggling.

When I was Mayor of Knox County, one of the first things I did was, I said, get me a list of all the property we own in Knox County. And it was amazing to me. I mean, we had property in neighborhoods, we had property—some of it was, obviously, undevelopable. One was on the corner of a small airport. But it was all over. We had something listed as a park, and it was nothing further from a park. And we ended up selling a lot of this property, and we paid cash for schools, crazy things like that. We did not stay in debt.

And, to me, that just seems like the model that the Federal Government should adopt. We should have a listing of the property, and the people ought to be able to review that and make better assumptions. Because I assume—I think they are a lot more smarter than we give them credit for. And I suspect that is part of the problem; they do not want to let them look under—look behind the curtain, so to speak.

Would you agree with that?

Mr. MARRONI. It is important to have that kind of data. There is an inventory that's available online, but there are significant issues with its reliability.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Hart, would you care to address that?

Mr. HART. We would like to enhance the transparency of all of that data. I think it is one of the most important assets that taxpayers should be able to review the cost so that they can make good decisions.

And, again, the purpose of transparency is to empower taxpayers. Transparency is not a two-way street. The government does not have the right to inspect our checkbook. Taxpayers do have the right to inspect the government's checkbook, because it is their money.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Kendall, would you care to offer your—

Mr. KENDALL. I am all in favor of transparency. No objection.

Mr. BURCHETT. It seems that our friends in the media always strive for that, and then—and we get pretty gutless up here. So, I would hope in the future we would address that.

Well, I will yield my 49 seconds back to you, Chairlady. Thank you for your indulgence, ma'am.

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Burchett.

In closing, I want to thank our witnesses once again for their testimony today.

I now yield to Ranking Member Stansbury for closing remarks.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman.

I hope that in some ways this hearing has been elucidating, but I am going to be honest, just listening here today, I have had trouble understanding the theory of the case.

Now, anyone who is in business knows that if you are going to go in front of a boardroom and present your case, you have got to have compelling data, you have got to have an analysis of what you're trying to accomplish, you have got to have an analysis of the money that you are going to save, and a proposal and a plan for how you are going to execute that.

And I think the thing that is troubling about the entire DOGE exercise is that it does not seem to have a coherent theory, it does not appear to have a plan, it does not appear to be utilizing data, and it does not appear to be executing on any kind of coherent theory of how we are saving money for the Federal Government because, as we learned here today, it will actually cost the Federal Government more money if they sell these vital assets to private companies, who will then lease them back to Federal agencies for more money.

So, it is troubling to try to understand. And I think it kind of goes along with the troubling theory of the case that Donald Trump seems to have about the economy overall. Because, as my colleague pointed out, we are sitting here talking about microphones and furniture in an office building while the economy is tanking and trillions of dollars in losses are happening, and we know that the potential for both a recession and costs are going to go up, which will cost the Federal Government more money. So, what is the theory of the case here?

I have also heard conflicting theories just about this very building that we are sitting in. Is this building too fancy, or does this building need to be demolished to make way for housing? It is not even clear what the argument is for this building that we are sitting in having this field hearing in.

Now, what I think is interesting about what we heard here today is that some of the quiet part was said out loud. In fact, what was stated by some of the other Members on this panel was that they would like to sell valuable real estate to private developers, potentially demolish Federal buildings like this, sell them potentially to private equity and developers, and then they can lease back and make money off of it.

And that is exactly what this scheme is all about, because this is what we are seeing across the entire DOGE effort and across the Administration.

And this is not really about public interest. This is, as we keep saying, the private equity model: privatize, buy low, sell high, make lots of money. This is what the DOGE bros are all about.

But we know that there is real data coming in July, as was stated by the GAO, that will help us take a data-driven approach. This is data that was demanded by Congress. It is bipartisan. Let us come up with a plan if we are actually going to deal with this bipartisan issue.

Now, I also want to point out some other ironies and inconsistencies that we heard here today.

One of my colleagues quoted Milton Friedman, which I found actually quite funny, because Elon Musk himself has also been quoting Milton Friedman over the weekend, because he thought that international trade was good and tariffs were bad.

Anybody? Anybody?

Donald Trump is crashing the economy over tariffs.

We also heard my colleagues across the aisle talk about right-sizing and righting the fiscal ship. Well, they are literally about to try to vote tomorrow on a budget proposal that will increase the deficit by \$37 trillion over the next 30 years. This would raise the debt ceiling by \$4 trillion just this year and would cost the United States the largest amount of debt ever in the history of its 250 years.

So, again, I do not understand the theory of the case. If what we are about here is trying to root out waste, fraud, and abuse, make the government more efficient, save the government money, then why on earth is Donald Trump trying to tank the economy? What are they trying to do with the sell-off and privatization of the Federal Government? What are they trying to do with downsizing and firing thousands of Federal employees?

So, I will close out by saying this: To my friends across the aisle and to the Administration, hands off our Social Security, hands off our Medicaid, hands off our Medicare, hands off the VA, hands off our education, and hands off our vital programs and the services and the Federal assets that make them possible.

With that, I yield back.

Ms. GREENE. I now recognize myself for closing remarks.

Thank you for our witnesses coming today. We greatly appreciate it.

And thank you to the American people for tuning in, into what is an extremely important issue.

Your Social Security is not under attack. Medicare is not under attack. Veterans' benefits are not under attack. But our very existence is under attack. And this has happened by dirty, greedy, lazy politicians and bureaucrats who have plunged you and chained you in \$36 trillion in debt. You are under attack. And you have been under attack by your own Federal Government.

We are here today, proudly, to talk about how we can reduce this debt. And this is a bipartisan issue. Selling Federal property and returning the money back to the American people is the right way to protect you.

And, as Republicans, we believe in this, and we proudly stand with President Trump, Elon Musk, and their DOGE efforts to reduce the size of the Federal Government, reduce the Federal debt.

And we are so grateful. And, definitely, America voted for President Trump to stand up for Americans, the American worker, and American companies with tariffs that return the order back to America and defeat the globalists who have attacked American interests, stolen intellectual property from American companies, and have turned rural America into a graveyard of factories that have been shut down and American jobs that have been shipped overseas.

So, I want to say directly: Thank you, President Trump, for standing up for us. And we will be so happy when you stick up for us and make it fair again through these tariffs.

The Federal Government's management of its massive real estate portfolio has been problematic for decades. Everyone knows it. The United States is \$36 trillion in debt. In Fiscal Year 1924, the government spent over \$1.8 trillion more than it took in. And in Fiscal Year 1925, the interest on our debt is expected to exceed \$1 trillion.

Many Americans are suffering every day while the Federal Government continues to recklessly spend hard-earned taxpayer dollars to foot the bill of luxurious, high-end furniture for offices or, on the flip side, carelessly waste billions on unused buildings and leases.

Young people cannot afford to buy a house. For today's 27-year-olds, only 33 percent own their homes, versus 40 percent of baby boomers when they were 27. From 2019 to 2024, housing prices in my home state of Georgia increased by up to 67 percent, as did areas all across the country. Everything went up. Life became unaffordable.

Over the past 4 years under Democrats, overall inflation hit 20 percent. The cost of food increased nearly 34 percent, and the cost of energy increased nearly 33 percent, and credit card debt was up nearly 50 percent. As Americans racked up grocery bills, credit card debt, and could not afford to buy a home, the Federal bureaucrats recklessly spend their money without a care in the world.

In the last year, 7 in 10 Americans completed at least one DIY project—do-it-yourself—and nearly 50 percent said it was because they could not afford professionals to do it. Americans were either renovating their own houses by themselves because they cannot afford to hire a company to do it or, in many cases, they will have to go without.

What do Federal bureaucrats do when they need to renovate a conference room or redecorate an office? They spend \$700,000 and \$6.5 million of your money to do it. American businesses cannot afford these types of upgrades, and the reality is that the Federal Government is \$36 trillion in debt and cannot afford it either.

As we continue investigating waste, fraud, and abuse, we can look no further, the unconscionable amount of spending that the Federal Government spends on empty buildings and brand-new high-end furniture and something as ridiculous as solar-powered picnic tables.

Every year, taxpayers have to spend about \$10 billion just to operate and maintain it all. In addition, the backlog of deferred maintenance that is now up to \$370 billion.

In 2023, GAO reported that 17 of the 24 largest Federal agencies used 25 percent or less of their headquarters buildings' capacity, and none of these agencies ever utilized more than 49 percent of the buildings' capacity in an average week.

I just want to inform you that that all happened at the same time when homeless rates skyrocketed, and veterans were kicked out to make room for illegal aliens.

When you own property in the real world, if you breach a term of your mortgage agreement, you mismanage your finances, or you miss payments, the lender will repossess your property and auction it off, while the Federal Government cannot miss payments because they will just print more money. They have grossly mismanaged their finances, and it is time for the American people to evict Federal bureaucrats, repossess the properties, and auction them off to the highest bidder.

Thankfully, the American people now have the President on their side. While the previous Administration did little to address the problems laid out here today, we are finally seeing meaningful progress under President Trump. The early successes of selling off unused properties and canceling wasteful leases by the Department of Government Efficiency shows what can be accomplished with strong leadership.

With Congress and the Trump Administration working together, I am confident we can finally resolve this decades-old problem and deliver the results and the money back to the American taxpayers.

With that, and without objection, all Members have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:47 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]