Q1. Why do we need to move?

A1. As ASA (CW) Telle noted in his memorandum, our rent is among the highest in the Corps. During his roll out of the CW Transformation initiative, he specially called out New York District for its high rent, which is 9 percent of the Corps total rental costs. In keeping with an Executive Order directing agencies to reduce their rental costs by a third, he has directed that we move from 26 Federal Plaza. He believes that having our office in one of the highest cost areas in the world gives the impression the Corps is not concerned with cost discipline. As stated in his 23 February 2026 memorandum, New York District must move to a more cost-effective location within a 50-mile radius of 26 Federal Plaza or within a reasonable commuting distance via mass transit for the majority of the District. While I understand this direction may have significant impacts on many of our employees, it will also present benefits to others. A move out of 26 Federal Plaza will also alleviate the security concerns some have about being located here as well as concerns about the lack of amenities in the building or about its aging systems.

A1 Union Response: High Rent, Security Concerns, Lack of Amenities, and Aging Systems are all great reasons to move. We all want to have a safe and comfortable workplace that benefits the mission and gives the best value to the American taxpayer. The Union's response to the following questions are with this in mind.

Q2. When did planning for the move start?

A2. The District's rent has been on the ASA's radar for several months. He mentioned it at a meeting in November so it became clear that he would be taking action. As a result, NAD formed a team to get a jump start on planning for a potential order to move. A small planning team was assembled, and each member was required to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement which subjected them to disciplinary action should they release any information to others. The planning team was in contact with the ASA to obtain guidance and direction. The District did have representation on this planning team. Now that we have received the official directive, the District will form its own PDT with representatives from all divisions and offices. We will follow our CBA concerning Union involvement.

A2 Union Response: This is USACE admitting to having pre-decisional involvement without notifying the Union or providing an opportunity for the Union to be involved. This is in direct violation of the IFPTE Local 98 Collective Bargaining Agreement with the New York District of USACE Article 25. The purpose of this article is to allow Union members to flag potential labor violations, avoidable issues for workers, and statutory violations during the preliminary phases of planning. Such involvement would create a more efficient process by helping the Agency avoid legal issues and shorten impact and implementation negotiations. We have filed a grievance stating that the USACE failed in their contractual obligations to the bargaining unit, which is now going into arbitration.

Q3. Where are we moving to?

A3. The District will be issuing a Request for Lease Proposal (RLP) seeking proposals from interested lessors. The planning team did look at relocating to military installations, however none met the relocation criteria. We'll provide additional information regarding specifics as soon as it's available.

A3 Union Response: This answer was given on March 9th, 2026 and there hasn't been a response since. The Union filed several FOIAs to see what due diligence the Agency has performed. With the market research and communications provided, it doesn't seem like much.

Q4. If the goal is really to reduce our rental costs, why are we only looking at New Jersey rather than looking at reducing our costs in 26 Federal Plaza or other locations within New York City?

A4. We are seeking approval from ASA to consider locations within New York City when he receives the required during the week of 16 March but if not granted, we are obligated to follow his direction.

A4 Union Response: Through the FOIAs we have not seen any specific locations presented to the ASA as an alternative for his consideration. As the FOIAs come in, we will provide updates.

Q5. What are the factors that will be used to evaluate proposals?

A5. The RLP will specify that the evaluation factors are price, quality and conditions of space, area safety and security, project schedule, and connection to public transportation at a minimum. RLP is still in draft form.

A5 Union Response: The RLP was posted on March 18th, 2026 with significant errors and incomplete information. Furthermore, the Agency has a duty by law to negotiate with the Union prior to any decisions being finalized on items that were placed on the RLP prior to the first (and only at this point) negotiation meeting on March 19th, 2026 such as number of parking spaces and size of work areas.

Q6. Are we requiring the new buildings to have amenities such as childcare, cafeteria access, gyms, etc.?

A6. These are factors that will be reviewed in determining the successful offeror.

A6 Union Response: See Union Response to A5. If the Agency followed the law, the Union would have been able to negotiate these items, not just review them as factors.

Q7. What security controls are we requiring?

A7. The RLP will set forth our security needs. The Security Office will be part of our PDT to ensure that the new facilities meet our security requirements.

A7 Union Response: No Response as Management has the right to set internal security policies without input from the Union.

Q8. Why should we believe, this process will be conducted fairly?

A8. The process will be fair and based upon the criteria set forth in the RLP. Approval will be required by the DoW.

<u>A8 Union Response</u>: While the criteria is set forth in the RLP, there is no transparency on the weight of those factors. If the process is fair, then the Agency should have been transparent about it from the beginning.

Q9. Who will sign the lease?

A9. The lease will be signed by the NAD Real Estate Contracting Officer.

<u>A9 Union Response</u>: No Response other than to mention that the Union has filed FOIA requests for communications with the NAD Real Estate Contracting Officer regarding the move.

Q10. If the lease is signed in July how can all of the construction work be done by August?

A10. The schedule will be included in the RLP. All of the construction work will not be required to be completed until December 2026.

<u>A10 Union Response</u>: This doesn't address the underlying question. Management is required to move to the new office by August as per the ASA's memo. Are we to believe that Management is going to be working out of an insecure office?

Q11. People will probably leave or retire rather than continue to stay with the District depending on where we move. Will we get exemptions from the hiring freeze, or will we be expected to work even harder than we have been doing in past year or so?

A11. I don't foresee the District receiving immediate exemptions from the hiring freeze should people leave because of our relocation; however, we will do whatever we can to ensure we have adequate staff to execute our mission. This may include seeking exemptions to the freeze should we need to fill key positions, temporary details, or hiring using methods that do not require exemptions.

<u>A11 Union Response</u>: Even if the hiring freeze were not in effect, it would be hard to hire new people from Long Island or the Hudson Valley to report out of an office in New Jersey.

Q12. Now that the office will be more than 50 miles away can I consider an alternate work site like others have done?

A12. This is something that we will look at, we will not be able to rent any alternative sites or pay other agencies to obtain workspace.

<u>A12 Union Response</u>: Why not? It's clear that costs are not an issue in this change so why not use the money for making the work more accessible for both the worker and the American taxpayer?

Q13. Instead of incurring the disruption and costs of relocating, why can't ASA just approve remote work?

A13. Remote work is not on the table given the direction that employees return to in person work.

<u>A13 Union Response</u>: This is not an answer. There is also still an unresolved ULP regarding the impacts and implementation of the RTO order. So this line of FAQs is mentioning multiple ULPs in one go.

Q14. Given the time it took to build out our space with our most recent move, how can this move be completed by December 31, 2026? Will the space be built out to meet our requirements or will we just move into existing space to meet the deadline?

A14. The RLP will specify floor layouts and our needs.

<u>A14 Union Response</u>: See Union Response to A10. This is not a complete answer by any means.

Q15. Will we be getting new furniture?

A15. We will not be taking our furniture.

<u>A15 Union Response</u>: They still haven't specified whether they will be buying new furniture or using existing furniture from a turnkey office.

Q16. How will the savings be calculated since initial costs will be higher and our rent will drop here at 26 Federal Plaza once we pay off our last move?

A16. This relocation is tied to cost efficiency initiatives that started in April 2025 with SECDEF issuing a memo and a USACE directive ordering a lease reduction of 33% or more within 18 months. The district office would not see a cost saving at 26 Fed until the lease would expire which is in 3 yrs. This would not meet the goals set forth by OSW.

<u>A16 Union Response</u>: As stated many times, there is confusion on how moving from federally-owned property to a commercial property will result in a cost-savings.

Q17. Will NAD's rent skew our savings since they don't pay rent now?

A17. NAD's rent will be separate from the District's in doing the analysis.

<u>A17 Union Response</u>: No Response.

Q18. It appears that NAD is moving with us. The wording of the ASA letter actually makes it look like we are to co-locate with NAD. Given this, who has the lead, NAN or NAD?

A18. The District and NAD will have to work together on the relocation. However, the District has the greater number of impacted people, so it is my intent that we have the lead for our space.

<u>A18 Union Response</u>: There is conflicting information regarding this. While this is their claim, management also claims that they were not aware of any decision to move prior to the Town Hall with COL Jesse Curry of NAD. On the other hand, NAN management states in Q2 that they have been involved with planning since 2025. Which one is it?

Q19. The ASA memo mentions working out of an interim location by December 31, 2026? What does interim mean, does it mean that we can work remotely?

A19. We will seek guidance as the relocation progresses, but if it's not contemplated then people will be allowed to work remotely until the new space is complete.

A19 Union Response: No Response.

Q20. Does GSA need to approve of us moving to a private building?

A20. No, we will be procuring this lease with Title 10 Authority. We intend to follow all regulations and seek all necessary approvals.

A20 Union Response: Title 10 also states that there needs to be proof of the government considering federally-owned property and a clear reason why the Agency decided to move exclusively to a privately-owned building.

Q21. For those living in NY we will have smaller paychecks due to double taxes. Even though we will get it back when we file our taxes, what is the Corps doing to help since this is not our choice?

A21. Unfortunately, there is nothing we can do to alleviate the tax concerns from NYC residents but note that this is a situation that our NJ teammates have had to deal with.

A21 Union Response: This is something that the non-NY teammates should have had help with from the beginning. It is not a sufficient answer to say that "everyone suffered, so you must too".

Q22. I will have out of pocket losses now due to increased transportation costs? Will we get an increase in transit benefits?

A22. No. However, you will be able to revise your current allocation should your costs go up subject to the current limit.

A22 Union Response: Transit costs can increase by at least a hundred dollars per month for most commuters. This probably will go past the monthly maximum benefit afforded to all employees. Furthermore, anyone who will need to switch to driving as a result of this move cannot get mileage and parking fees covered under transit benefits.

Q23. Given the inequities that exist today in the use of situational teleworking will you be empowering supervisors to allow for extensive teleworking to avoid longer commutes?

A23. Supervisors have the authority to authorize situational telework where specific situations warrant it such as adverse weather, medical appointments, etc. Situational telework will not be permitted just to avoid longer commutes.

A23 Union Response: Why not? It's clear that in-person collaboration is not a priority given the fact that our leadership functions are ordered to be physically removed from the rest of the workforce in August.

Q24. I will now have to commute an extra 15-30 minutes each way, which means the majority of my 24-hour day is now spent on work. Why is the District avoiding trying to help employees achieve work life balance. Can we not take lunch and leave earlier?

A24. I understand that any additional time added to already long commutes stinks, but current regulations prohibit employees from taking lunch at the end of their workday. Employees will continue to be allowed to use alternative work schedules such as flextime to improve their work life balance.

<u>A24 Union Response</u>: See response to A23.

Q25. Is this just another way of forcing employees to leave so you can downsize the District?

A25. No. As the ASA has publicly stated, our rent is among the highest in the Corps. The EO directs all agencies to reduce their rental costs by 33 percent, so a move is necessary. We understand this will impact many employees, but it will also benefit others. Being located outside a high-cost area such as New York City may actually improve our ability to recruit new employees. I understand change is often hard to accept, especially when it may impact the time and costs of your daily day, but I hope employees give our new location a chance, we do not want you to leave. I know it may look like just more of the same, but I truly appreciate what each of you do every day. I hope that you each look at the "why" of what we do and realize the Corps' value to the public. You are a key part of that value.

<u>A25 Union Response</u>: Try recruiting new people from Long Island, Connecticut, and the Hudson Valley after this move happens. See how "improved" this process will be.

Q26. What is the plan for communicating with us? Will documents be posted?

A26. I intend to conduct regular Town Halls as the situation develops and will keep employees informed via email and other means of communications. Relevant documents that can be made public will be provided. We will post FAQs as they arise. The Request for Lease Proposals will also be posted once it is published.

<u>A26 Union Response</u>: There have been no additional town halls other than the regular Spring Town Hall where, despite COL Young stating that he will give us the chance to speak if we didn't speak during the Winter Town Hall, we weren't allowed any input. FAQs have now been reduced and relevant documents have not been provided at all.

Q27. Do you have a sense of how much more this will cost in terms of commute?

A27. Once a location is chosen, we will look to evaluate where people live in relation to potential new spaces. We know commuting costs are a concern so we will try to help map out the commuting routes as this develops.

<u>A27 Union Response</u>: The way that they show appreciation as per A25 is by putting our needs last.

Q28. Will we be entitled to relocation benefits?

A28. No, but we will look to evaluate where people live in relation to potential new spaces. We know commuting costs are a concern so we will try to help map out the commuting routes as this develops.

A28 Union Response: See Union Responses to A5 and A6. If the Agency followed the law, the Union would have been able to negotiate these items, not just review them as factors.

Q 29. Many people in the NYC area do not own cars. The only way for them to get to a work location outside Manhattan (such as New Jersey) is to first commute into Manhattan, then transfer to another train to get to New Jersey. This will significantly increase commuting time for a large percentage of the workforce if they don't leave USACE entirely?

A29: A requirement for the new location is it will be within one-quarter mile of an interstate rail terminal. While it may increase commuting for many, it may also reduce commute times for others.

A28 Union Response: If it's in Jersey City, it will be bad for a lot of people since the PATH is not directly connected to any major transportation hub besides Newark Penn Station.

Q30. Not to push a sore subject, would the Corporate Board consider reinstatement of pre- pandemic telework policies of one telework day a week? In the distant past, even 2 telework days a week was the norm. This subject will not disappear as motivation is waning, and people prioritize quality of life to counter long commutes and complicated, intensive workloads?

A30: Situational teleworking is at the discretion of the supervisors. However, telework will not be granted to alleviate commute times. The enterprise is working under the EO requiring return to in-person work.

A30 Union Response: See Union Responses to A5, A6, and A28. If the Agency followed the law, the Union would have been able to negotiate these items, not just review them as factors. The Agency still refuses to negotiate over the Return to Office mandate.

Q31. I am concerned that moving us to a commercial space will leave us vulnerable and exposed. Commercial entities are not as beholden to all federal laws that govern federal entities. There are transparency concerns too. It's easy to say go commercial but how does that really benefit the American people? Only a select few real estate developers benefit from NAN moving to a commercial space.

A31: Security will be an evaluation factor for the new location. The guidance from the ASA (CW) is that we relocate to a commercial building.

A31 Union Response: This doesn't address the core questions of why this is the guidance when it doesn't make sense from a fiscal or security standpoint.

Q32. Will the prospective landlords' histories be considered in addition to the other criteria mentioned during "all hands" meeting? We don't want to move to a slumlord building just because the rent is cheaper. 26 fed has to follow federal laws and regulations that the commercial sector can cut corners or redefine which can open us up to lower standards. Will there be adherence to fed laws? We will need water and air quality checks and fixes. what about pest control?

A32: Yes. Past performance of the landlords is an evaluation factor. Quality is also an evaluation factor.

<u>A32 Union Response</u>: Past performance also wouldn't be able to tell us whether they will dramatically increase our rents after the first year lease.

Q33. Sir, thank you for your transparency during the town hall (March 9, 2026). I appreciate your openness and willingness to give us as much information as possible on the relocation efforts.

A33: Thank you and we will commit to continued transparency as information becomes available. Some information will be procurement sensitive. Where we can share, we will.

<u>A33 Union Response</u>: ?

Q34. In terms of relocation, it sounded like the intent is to move to NJ. since reasonable public transport to NJ may not work for everyone, will free parking be provided? workers will already be incurring additional tolls, so to pay high parking fees on top of that seems unfair for employees that chose to make a career out of USACE that was supposed to be located here in Manhattan?

A34: Free parking is not an evaluation factor. However, access to commute rail is a factor. In addition, for those who want to drive and pay for parking, the proximity public parking will also be considered in the evaluation.

<u>A34 Union Response</u>: See Union Responses to A5, A6, and A28. If the Agency followed the law, the Union would have been able to negotiate these items, not just review them as factors.

Q35. I suggest further refinement of what a transit hub is and placing a higher score for hubs such as Grand Central Terminal and Penn Station compared to a subway/PATH station such as Union Square, Fulton Street, Newark etc. Regional rail hubs such as Grand Central and Penn Station have the benefit of interstate/intrastate connectivity and frequency while subway or PATH stations do not have that same benefit. If the new location is in midtown Manhattan, then the District may benefit from greater access to transit overall and continue to attract talented staff from throughout the tri-state area and beyond.

A35: Acknowledged your recommendation of midtown. It's too early to say what properties and landlords fit our requirements at this time but noted. Also acknowledge your comment on attracting talent.

A35 Union Response: Based on the decision to move to New Jersey and the FOIA documents that have been provided, it doesn't seem like this recommendation was taken seriously.

Q36. Does Telle have the legal authority to dictate district operations? Isn't operational command a chief of engineer's responsibility? If the rent is too high, is there a way to renegotiate the GSA federal government rental contract rather than make such a huge and unnecessary disruption as moving?

A36: ASA (CW)Telle is in the chain of command for the Chief. No, GSA will not re-negotiate the current lease.

A36 Union Response: FOIA documents revealed that USACE never communicated with the GSA Building Manager or the GSA Asset Portfolio Manager at 26 Federal Plaza.

Q37. New York City is a nexus of workforce talent. I myself only joined USACE in order to live and work in NYC. I moved here from another state to do so. I would not have moved here to work in New Jersey. Many people gladly move or commute to NYC for all the opportunities it affords. New Jersey does not hold the same allure. Military people will go where they are ordered to, but top civilian talent does not care about New Jersey. We can find work anywhere; we will find other jobs in Manhattan. You will not poach high performers from private industry in NYC to work across the river.

A37: Your concern is noted.

A37 Union Response: it was not noted.

Q38. Changes in commute times should be considered and measured in percentages. Someone who commutes 3 hours each way may see improvement if the office moves 30 minutes closer to them (17% decrease in commuting time). But someone who commutes 30 minutes each way could see 100% increase. This does not account for complexity of transfers: if that 30-minute commuter has to transfer to a new transit system, this might TRIPLE their commute due to transit between stations and intermittent train schedules.

A38: Your concern is noted.

A38 Union Response: it was not noted. See Agency Answer to Q27.

Q39. While decreasing rent costs by 33% will serve in the best interest of the American taxpayer, please consider calculating and sharing a cost-to-benefit ratio (like many other projects here at USACE.) Please consider that asking any of the 385 employees that work at NAN to cross both the Hudson and East Rivers via commute twice a day will significantly lower the benefits of working for this organization. The day-to-day inconvenience of increased hours of commuting will be compounded by an increased reliance of multiple mass transportation systems to be operating on-time and efficiently in order to make required transfers. Additionally, it will increase the out-of-pocket costs (that already exist for many prior to a relocation) for many of the American taxpayers that have dedicated their careers to serving their country and communities.

A39: Your concern is noted.

<u>A39 Union Response</u>: it was not noted.

Q40. Hello, just writing to provide some positive feedback - you are doing a great job navigating this office relocation challenge. I want you to know that an increasing number of people I've spoken to these last few days are very happy with the possibility of working in New Jersey. Most of my teammates are from Jersey or commute through Jersey. New Jersey is safer, cheaper, and more affordable. With the increase of crime in NYC and the rise in protesting around our office building, coming into the office has felt like a huge risk. We don't want to put ourselves in danger. We have spouses and kids at home to think about. Don't let the union bully you or push you around to consider NYC options. Believe me, they are a slim minority just with loud voices. It isn't fair to us, the silent majority. We are the real heart of this district, and we know what is right for the future of our workforce. Lots of businesses and residents are going to be leaving NYC in high numbers due to the current mayoral climate. NJ is the way to go.

A40: Thank you for your feedback. There are benefits to be realized by moving to New Jersey should that be the final decision.

<u>A40 Union Response</u>: Did Adam Telle write this? As stated previously, the Union has no issues with considering a safer environment, which is weird why they are considering Newark, NJ. Again, no shade to New Jersey. But what are the standards here?

Q41. How much remaining $ exactly do we owe GSA for our last District move when we leave our current lease 3 years early? Why can't you provide the market research/analysis info that was already done by the planning team for the move? Who exactly is on the board that makes the ultimate decision of where we move to? Why is it more cost effective for the Federal Government to pay a private firm for building space in Jersey than to pay GSA? Has GSA been given the opportunity to work with us on our payment in order to remain at 26 Fed?

A41: GSA does not re-negotiate leases while in the current lease. We are unable to release the market research done by the NAD planning team since much of it is procurement sensitive information. The directive requires us to move from 26 Fed so remaining is not an option.

<u>A41 Union Response</u>: The FOIA documents show that there were no communications with key GSA personnel and that the market research is not all procurement sensitive. People need more of an answer other than "because we were told to do so". Also this doesn't answer the underlying question of the 4-5 millions of dollars in unamortized costs owed to GSA.

Q42. Will the DRP or similar programs re-open for employees unable to accommodate the move?

A42: There are no plans currently to re-open the DRP.

<u>A42 Union Response</u>: Seems like they want us to quit for free.

Q43. If we are not taking our furniture - Please share FF&E cost. Other fit out costs? Are these being taken into account?

A43: That information is not available at this time. However, when it becomes available, we can share it as long as it is not procurement sensitive.

A43 Union Response: it was not shared.

Q44. How will you ensure Union involvement is meaningful and timely, rather than after major decisions are effectively already made?

A44: We committed to meeting our obligations in the CBA re Union participation.

A44 Union Response: There are three active ULPs and a grievance that is going to arbitration due to their lack of commitment to the CBA.

Q45. What specific information will you commit to sharing proactively (not just in response to questions) at each major milestone: RLP issuance, shortlist, selection, lease signing, build-out, and move?

A45: Leadership will remain transparent through this. Some information is going to be procurement-sensitive and cannot be shared. I will commit to a PDT team and a proposal evaluation team.

A45 Union Response: All information about the move that has been revealed by the Union through FOIA requests. Personnel, Congress-members, and community members are angry at the fact that they were not briefed on any of this.

Q46. Will meeting minutes, briefing slides, and major decision documents from the relocation PDT be regularly shared with the workforce, and on what schedule?

A46. Yes, the PDT can provide general information that is not considered procurement sensitive.

A46 Union Response: While the PDT for the move logistics has been more transparent, the other PDT has not.

Q47. How will you track and report whether the projected savings actually materialize over time, and will those metrics be shared regularly with the workforce?

A47: It will start by choosing a location that meets the evaluation factors and satisfies the reduction in rent cost.

A47 Union Response: Note: Unless the landlord pays us to move in at a rate equal or more than our rent at 26 Federal Plaza, this is not going to be cheaper.

Q48. How will supervisors be held accountable for applying telework and schedule flexibilities consistently and fairly across teams, rather than on a purely discretionary basis?

A48: Situational telework is at the discretion of the supervisor based on specific case by case details pertaining to the situation and the employee. Unfortunately, easing commuting times is not one of them.

A48 Union Response: See A27. The way that they show appreciation as per A25 is by putting our needs last.

Q49. I don't want to our office to move. Being co-located with other federal agencies is a good thing. If we were to move to One World Trade, at least we would be co-located with FEMA. Every day I find inspiration in being close to, walking by, and looking out the window to see the courthouses, Foley Square, City Hall, the municipal building, and the African Burial Ground. Being around those historic buildings and monuments and other federal and municipal employees keeps me going in tough times. In this location, I feel connected to our American and the New York area's history. I feel ashamed that our leadership does not feel we deserve to be here anymore. Apparently, we aren't worth it. The FBI is, ICE is, HUD is, HHS is, EPA is, the immigration courts are, DoD is, Space Force is, the CIA is, but we aren't. Our work is no longer worth being somewhere so special. Why wouldn't I and other employees leave the Corps of Engineers for the private sector, now? Our work is worth billions, and our leaders would rather save a few million dollars in rent than keep us somewhere we can feel proud of. Scarcity thinking is killing this agency.

A49: Your concerns are noted. Please know that your Corporate Board cares and is voicing your concerns up the chain.

A49 Union Response: it was not noted.

Q50. There should be representation on the relocation PDT of people who live in NYC, Long Island, Connecticut, upstate NY, etc., since commuting seems to be the biggest concern for most of the employees. This way, commuters from every geographic area will be able to have their specific concerns represented.

A50: Acknowledged and the Corporate Board is taking this info consideration while nominating.

A50 Union Response: it was not taken into consideration.

Q51. 26 Fed Plaza (The complex is considered the second-largest civilian federal office building in the United States) each floor is approx. 44000 sq ft x3 = 132000 sq ft Looking for something 88000 sq ft? We can reduce one floor. 80 Maiden Lane – buildings located in Financial Districts not far from us now:

https://marketplace.vts.com/building/80-maiden-lane-&-90-maiden-lane-new-york-ny

https://www.80maidenlane.com/

They have 4 floors available right now 16,17,18,19 in total of 85,693 sq ft for $49sqft/year Which gives total of $ 4,198,957 and we have left let say 2min up to this 6min cap with 30% reduction from 8.7min a year There are many options in the city.

A51. Acknowledged and thank you for sending. The process will have to play out. There will be integrity in the procurement process.

A51 Union Response: it was not taken into consideration.

Q52. Are multiple agencies in 26 Federal Plaza also being relocated? If not, why just USACE?

A52: USACE was ordered through the Assistant Secretary of the Army (ASA) Civil Works (CW). We do not know what other agencies are doing to meet the EO to reduce rental costs.

A52 Union Response: There is a nationwide effort to move all agencies out of federal buildings. There are two theories as to why:

1. *To give more space to law enforcement agencies.*
2. *To sell all federally-owned property to the private sector.*

Q53. Our rent is paid to a government agency if we are in a GSA building. It's essentially moving pots of money around in the government right now. How does spending rent now to a private company now save the government money? Seems counterintuitive.

A53: The current plan is to reduce the rent by approximately at least 33%.

A53 Union Response: There doesn't answer the question.

Q54. What if the analysis determines our current lease is the best option?

A54. We will consider that possibility if necessary after the evaluation of proposals.

A54 Union Response: Narrator Voice: it was not taken into consideration.

Q55. Why is accessibility of public transportation not "a criteria for selection" that you have outlined?

A55. The RLP will require that the location must be within a specified distance from a interstate commuter rail station.

A55 Union Response: PATH is considered an interstate commuter rail. Just not a very accessible one.

Q56. Will commuting times for the majority of the staff be considered as part of a new location?

A56. This will be something that will be considered when making the final decision.

A56 Union Response: Not according to A27.

Q57. Why is accessibility of public transportation not being taken into consideration/ "a criteria for selection" that you have outlined? A significant portion of the workforce does not own or have daily access to personal vehicles.

A57. The RLP will require that the location must be within a specified distance from a interstate commuter rail station. The accessibility of transportation will be considered in the final decision.

<u>A57 Union Response</u>: Not according to A27.

Q58. Is USACE the only federal agency being forced to relocate from the building?

A58. We don't know the status of other agencies.

<u>A58 Union Response</u>: See answer to A53.

Q59. As engineers we want things to make sense - please show us how the move will reduce costs for the government overall. How can this be possible if we pay to move, cancel our lease, lose the remaining value of the furniture we bought and floor renovations we completed just a few years ago, another federal agency moves into our space, retrofits it for their needs, and pays the same rent (to the government - GSA), etc.

A59. As directed, we must reduce our rental costs. This can only be accomplished by relocating out of 26 Fed.

<u>A59 Union Response</u>: It doesn't answer how the relocation to a privately-owned space accomplishes this.

Q60. Is the requirement for a 33% reduction based on # of desks or footprint/space?

A60. The 33 percent is a reduction in costs.

<u>A60 Union Response</u>: No Response.

Q61. Is there a termination fee when we terminate the lease?

A61. We may terminate the lease with 4 months notice. There is no termination fee.

<u>A61 Union Response</u>: No Response. However, it is odd that the Agency has not notified GSA personnel of this move.

Q62. What will happen if an acceptable new location is not found / does not exist?

A62. We will evaluate that possibility after the evaluation of proposals.

<u>A62 Union Response</u>: No Response.

Q63. What is the area established for new locations in the RLP (for example: 50-mile radius was mentioned in the memo)?

A63. The RLP will establish the area of consideration. This will be determined after we seek clarification of whether locations in New York City will be permitted. We do know that the area of consideration will not include any military installations or locations in CT or PA.

A63 Union Response: No Response.

Q64. In the search for a new site, are the metrics based on our current personnel numbers or is the modelling looking to account for the physical space for potential hiring/growth in the future?

A64. The space to be leased will include room for growth.

A64 Union Response: Is that after or before a significant part of our workforce leaves because of this move?

Q65. Is USACE going to reach out to the state to see what is possibly available?

A65. Our guidance is that we are to move to commercial space.

A65 Union Response: Again. Why?

Q66. Please elaborate on the real estate analysis for the proposed move. To ensure we are being the best stewards of taxpayer dollars, can you clarify if the analysis compares the total cost to the federal government, not just the cost to our agency? My concern is that a lower commercial lease rate might not translate to a net saving for the government as a whole.

A66. The analysis will look at the savings to the Corps.

A66 Union Response: This contradicts A65.

Q67. How is the move and potential furniture procurement being funded?

A67. Military funds will be used. Any furniture costs will be included as part of the rent.

A67 Union Response: How much will the furniture cost?

Q68. With the questions that are being asked, would you consider a SharePoint site with the raw data used to analyze the locations, such as the heatmap, for those interested in reviewing it?

A68. We will post FAQs and other information. Other data, such as the RLP, will be posted as appropriate.

A68 Union Response: It was not posted.

Q69. To ensure the most fiscally sound decision, will the cost analysis for the 'best value trade-off' compare a single-lease scenario against a multi-office, hub-and-spoke model? Given the variance in commercial real estate prices across the region, and our

workforces commuting routines, a distributed footprint could potentially offer the lowest total annual lease cost to the federal government.

A69. All employees who currently work in 26 Fed will move to the new location. We will not have multiple headquarters locations.

A69 Union Response: Is cost-savings a priority or not?

Q70. Will the new space have a parking area or somewhere for our district fleet (10 vehicles)? Currently, we have a parking contract that expires February 29, 2028.

A70. The new space will have parking for our vehicles. Any existing parking contract will be terminated.

A70 Union Response: No Response.

Q71. Are we looking for locations with established security or will we contract out, increasing costs?

A71. Security requirements will be included in the lease requirements. This may include security improvements to be included as part of the rent.

A71 Union Response: No Response.

Q72. Did the district try to renegotiate w/ GSA?

A72. The District sought to open negotiations with GSA, and they declined as they do not renegotiate when they have an active lease in place.

A72 Union Response: FOIA documents showed that the District never reached out to the Building Manager or the Asset Manager at GSA 26 Federal Plaza.

Q73. The extensive security requirements will likely be treated as a major construction project by landlords, who will then pass those costs on to us. Have we budgeted for/considered a significant tenant improvement cost on top of the annual rent when performing the cost benefit analysis of a relocation?

A73. We are working with the District Security Chief and NAD Security Chief to guide the requirements needed to meet Army regulations. The directive to reduce lease costs by at least 33% is the driving factor for relocating the District. While we understand that tenant improvement costs will be part of the calculation, we expect that the opportunity to focus on moving to 2nd-generation space, which does not require as many improvements, will result in overall cost-saving measures.

A73 Union Response: No Response.

Q74. A significant change in commuting will impact morale and retention, leading to costs from recruitment and loss of institutional knowledge. How are we weighing these critical "human costs" against the projected financial savings? Will you be requesting a

survey of staff with their potential plans following a move to NJ (in each of the pre-defined locations)? This would help pre-identify the potential 'hidden cost' of having to find, hire, and train completely new staffers, which would ultimately cause delays in executing the BINP initiative.

A74. We know this is a difficult change, especially not knowing where we are going to be specifically moving geographically. The committee evaluating the Request for Lease Proposals will use data collected from district employee home zip codes, as well as surveys we expect to conduct to help inform the selection process. Once we have geographically identified the location for our new office and we can share, we will, so you can assess impacts to your specific commute. For now. There are websites like this one you can use to help inform your commute times and routes:

https://moovitapp.com/index/en/public_transit-NYCNJ-121

A74 Union Response: The survey process was notably frustrating to USACE personnel as the workers who are best suited for making surveys were put aside to release a hastily and crudely made commuting survey.

Q75. The preference for "move-in ready" space is noted, but the timeline and security needs suggest such a property may not exist. If we must consider a "first-generation" or raw space, have we calculated the additional build-out time and cost this would require?

A75. We are focused on looking at 2nd generation space because that will allow us to meet the timeframes in the directive. Once the submittals are received in response to the RLP, the evaluation panel will determine if there are any locations that meet our criteria, including the timelines in the Directive. We cannot speculate further on what the course of action would be if no responses are received from our RLP.

A75 Union Response: No Response.

Q76. The RLP lists a preference for a large meeting space for up to 250 people (similar to 6th floor), which is an uncommon feature that can limit options and increase costs. How will we weigh the value of such amenities against core factors like price and location during the selection process?

A76. Preference is not a requirement, but we would like to be able to hold town halls and award ceremonies in person. The evaluation panel will weigh the rest of the proposal against the required factors (safety, distance to transit, etc.), with amenities that are not requirements.

A76 Union Response: See Union Response to A5 and A6. If the Agency followed the law, the Union would have been able to negotiate these items, not just review them as factors.

Q77. A physical move necessitates a complex IT migration for secure and unclassified networks, which carries its own timeline and costs. Is the budget for the physical relocation and IT infrastructure transition being tracked separately from the real estate lease costs?

A77. We have already engaged ACE-it and the headquarters team to get the IT equipment we need to support District operations. The focus of the Directive is lease cost reduction, there is an understanding from Army leadership that there will be other costs, but long term, our rent costs will be significantly reduced.

A77 Union Response: So long term rent cost savings are considered? Why was it discarded when it was pointed out that our rent at 26 Federal Plaza would decrease once our renovation costs were paid off?

Q78. Will staff be made aware of the locations of buildings that have submitted lease proposals? Recognizing that actual information about specific addresses and proposals might not be able to be shared but will we be kept aware of what city (Hoboken/Jersey City/Newark) and more specifically the transit location? Having this information sooner rather than later would be helpful for planning to understand what future commutes may look like and whether the reality of staff continuing to work for NAN is realistic or not. Many people in the region rent or lease their apartments or homes so knowing what specific commuting options are to the new space ahead of time will help both staff and will help the district potentially know ahead of time how many staff we will be losing. Commuting options to Newark versus Hoboken versus even Exchange Place (JC) versus Newport (JC) are very different even from within NJ.

A78. Information that is not procurement-sensitive will be provided to employees.

A78 Union Response: FOIA documentation shows that non-procurement sensitive information was not shared with employees.

Q79. To ensure the most fiscally sound decision, will the cost analysis for the 'best value trade-off' compare a single-lease scenario against a multi-office, hub-and-spoke model? Given the variance in commercial real estate prices across the region, and our workforces commuting routines, a distributed footprint could potentially offer the lowest total annual lease cost to the federal government.

A69. All employees who currently work in 26 Fed will move to the new location. We will not have multiple headquarters' locations.

New Question: Why are hub and spoke not being considered? Is this a directive or a District preference? This could be a significant opportunity to benefit the agency and people that work here.

A79. A hub and spoke will not be considered. It is important that there only be one District Headquarters to ensure continuity and engagement between colleagues.

A79 Union Response: This doesn't explain much and doesn't answer most of the questions.

Q80. When are we going to know if New York office space is being considered?

A80. Based on the market research done by the planning team, space in New York is not feasible.

A80 Union Response: What market research?

Q81. During the Town Hall you mentioned that one of the factors to be considered is commuter rail within one-quarter mile of the new location. Will the number of commuter rail lines within one- quarter mile be considered? At 26 Federal, you have several subway stations within walking distance so there are multiple ways to get here if one of the subway lines is down. This is one of the reasons commuting into NYC is convenient for everyone.

A81. Yes, the location of the building to commuter rail stations and the availability of service will be considered in the evaluation of proposals. One correction to this is that the distance to commuter rail stations in the RLP is shown as 1/3 mile or 1760 feet.

A81 Union Response: This doesn't answer the question. PATH stations are not considered to be very accessible to a number of rail lines.

Q82. If and when possible, can the District present employees with a projected timeline for the move?

A82. Once we award the lease, we will know more about the schedule for the move. Information will be provided as soon as we know the schedule.

A82 Union Response: Sources state that the schedule of the move will be revealed at least 2 months after the lease is awarded.

Q83. We've heard about the nomination process for PDT representatives by division, but not much information about the Selection Board has been shared. Could you clarify who will be part of the Selection Board and how its members are chosen?

A83. At this time the evaluation team has not been selected. Members will be selected based on their experience and expertise in evaluating proposals.

A83 Union Response: No updates on this. Although we do not selections are being made.

Q84. Could you please clarify the difference between the roles of the PDT and the Selection Board in the office relocation process? It would be helpful to understand how each group is involved in evaluating options and making final recommendations.

A84. The PDT will implement the move, working on things such as identifying the required contracts that will be needed to accomplish the move, the current contracts that need to be terminated or modified, the schedule to make the move arrangements, etc. The evaluation team will evaluate the proposals received and evaluate them against the criteria contained in the RLP. The Real Estate Contracting Officer will make the final decision based on the evaluation results and a judgment as to which offeror represents the best value to the government.

A83 Union Response: No Response.

Q85. Recommend adding or prioritizing "retain the District workforce and institutional knowledge" in selection criteria for the new office.

A85. The evaluation criteria will consider commuting and the amenities offered by the offeror, which will help retain employees. Retention of employees would not be a factor these proposals are able to address.

A86 Union Response: Now we're back to saying that employee retention is not considered.

Q86. I acknowledge the District move is inevitable. I also acknowledge the driving factor is the rent in 26 Federal Plaza. What I (and others in my office) do not understand is why the directive is to move to New Jersey. Are there honestly no affordable locations in Brooklyn, Long Island City, or even Queens that would meet the criteria for distance to a local commuter rail station and still meet the 33% savings?

A86. Based on the market research done by the planning team, space in New York is not feasible.

A86 Union Response: A35 and A51 contradict this.

Q87. When will the relocation PDT be announced? Will you commit to including the union in the PDT? During the Town Hall, you committed to considering them as key players in the PDT but did not commit to including them in the PDT.

A87. The District PDT has been formed, and we will announce the names shortly. Jack Steketee from Planning is the PM. The Union has a representative.

A87 Union Response: The Union has a representative in one PDT but not the other. The

Q88. Will there be financial transparency regarding the proposed move? What is the financial impact of sunk costs toward furniture to be abandoned prior to full life cycle use as well as new furniture purchased?

A88. The decision as to where we will move will be based on rental costs per the EO and guidance. The sunk costs of abandoned furniture and similar costs will not be part of the analysis of rent savings.

A88 Union Response: So you're saying that the whole "cost savings" thing might not be a thing.

Q89. Is there going to be a directive to move again in 10 years? The directive that is being used to justify post to sam.gov may not be applicable in 10 years and there may be a directive to move back to a GSA-owned facility following standard procedure will be another sunk cost and more analysis.

A89. We do not know what will happen at the end of the new lease.

A89 Union Response: The new lease ends in 1 year so you better figure that out soon.

Q90. What is the cost we have to pay GSA for breaking the lease 3 years early? What specifically is the cost we owe GSA for tenant improvements that was being factored into our current lease costs. I heard it was $3-4M. That should be factored into cost savings if we can possibly stay.

A90. There is no cost to terminate the GSA lease as long as we give the required 4-month notice. In accordance with the EO and guidance to reduce rent, the analysis to determine the cost savings will look only at the rental costs and will not consider other costs.

A90 Union Response: There are $4-5 million in unamortized costs due to renovations made in our floors. We owe that to the GSA.

Q91. Has USACE notified GSA of our intention to leave 26 Fed this year? Will you ask GSA if they could lower the rent to keep USACE at 26 Fed?

A91. GSA has been asked if they will re-negotiate our lease at this time and has indicated that it will not do so.

A91 Union Response: Our FOIA documents show that they didn't reach out to the GSA Building Manager or GSA Asset Manager at 26 Federal Plaza.

Q92. If USACE moves to NJ, Public transit for me now will now be 2.5 hours minimum (if trains line up correctly). Will there be parking on site for a driving option?

A92. The RLP currently states that "Parking facilities with an adequate availability of parking spaces open to the general public to accommodate employees and visitors must be located within the immediate vicinity of the Building but generally not exceeding a walkable two thousand, six hundred forty (2,640) feet of the employee entrance of the offered Building as determined by the RECO."

A92 Union Response: Parking costs will not be covered. See next answer.

Q93. Will transit cards be able to cover parking garage expenses when we move?

A93. No, the Mass Transit benefits are only eligible for mass transit usage and authorized van pools.

A93 Union Response: While Van Pools are a good benefit, it doesn't resolve the issue.

Q94. Is the 1% floodplain requirement a strict necessity? It appears to severely limit the search area, and in reality, we probably can't use transit to get to work if there's a flood anyway. Some of the transit stations appear to be in the floodplain, so they would not be usable in a flood event.

A94. A Lease will not be awarded for any offered Property located within a 1-percent-annual-chance floodplain (formerly referred to as 100-year floodplain) unless the Government has determined that there is no practicable alternative.

A94 Union Response: It seems the government shot themselves in the foot by listing Jersey City locations in the 1% floodplain as possibilities.

Q95. In the new District Office's location, would the size of cubicles be about the same as what we have now? I have many books that I use on a daily basis, and it would be less productive for me if the new shelf space is much smaller than the current one. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share my concern with you.

A95. The RLP currently states that “The ideal solution would provide for a similar open office space with similar dimension of cubicles and height adjustable workstations for personnel (6’-0” x 8’-0”).”

A95 Union Response: This is not consistent with what has been discussed in PDT meetings.

Q96. With regards to the relocation, is the 1760 ft from the intrastate rail line from walking distance or radial distance? Depending on how this is measured, it can put us in a different city. Thank you.

A96. The RLP specifies that the rail station must be within a walkable 1,760 ft to the principal functional entrance to the building.

A96 Union Response: No Response.

Q97. Is it true the District will be moving to Newport in Jersey City?

A97. The building location has not been selected yet, but that is one area of consideration within Jersey City.

A96 Union Response: No Response.

Q98: Regarding 26 Fed Relocation:

1. **I've reviewed all of the FAQs and there still does not appear to be a clear answer as to why a multi-office solution is not being considered. I understand the importance of having a centralized district/HQ type office (which based on the directive must now be in NJ) but why can’t satellite/field offices on Long Island or NYC be considered. Understanding this is a directive and we must follow, it just seems like there are long term implications like impacts to workforce moral, staffing levels, and proximity to projects within the district is not being accounted for at all due to the rapid schedule being imposed on the district. Can you please provide an explanation why multiple offices are not being considered. If the answer is just "because the ASA(CW) said so" can you explain what senior management is doing to protect and defend the interests of the district staff who clearly are extremely concerned about this move and the disruptions it will cause.**
2. **To what degree is employee input being factored into the move decision making? It feels like any and all concerns fall on deaf ears from senior management. Is**

senior management trying to negotiate with the ASA(CW) regarding the directive or is the ASACW just dictating how it goes without any consideration of input?

3. **Who is the final decision maker on where we will be moving? Is the final decision being made at the District Level, Division Level, HQ Level, ASA(CW) Level, Dept. of Army Level, Dep. of War/Defense Level?**

A98: We will not consider splitting the District HQ into multiple locations since that will not allow for the most efficient way of executing our mission. Discussions were held with the ASA(CW) when he was briefed by NAD and his direction remained the same. The Corporate Board is currently discussing possible mitigation measures to help mitigate some impacts of the relocation. We are considering employee input through data gathering such as the transit survey and submissions to the Commander. The relocation PDT that has been established will also consider employee input when making recommendations for the new office space once a location is selected. The evaluation team is comprised of representatives from NAN and NAD who will recommend a specific location to the NAN and NAD Commanders who will then make a formal recommendation to the ASA(CW) for final approval of the selected location.

A98 Union Response: This answered question 2 and maybe 3, but nothing else.

Q99: Will parking be available at the new facility?

A99: The RLP requires "Parking facilities with an adequate availability of parking spaces open to the general public to accommodate employees and visitors must be located within the immediate vicinity of the Building but generally not exceeding a walkable two thousand, six hundred forty (2,640) feet of the employee entrance of the offered Building as determined by the RECO."

A99 Union Response: The parking will not be free though.

Q 100: For the NAN/NAD relocation, a lot of the reasons given for less-than-ideal choices have to do with the time demand. The time demand almost guarantees a suboptimal outcome with the highest potential for government waste, and procedures/approvals being skipped. Has the district requested more time? If spending more time saves millions or more, then it makes sense to spend a little extra time to make sure it's done properly, as the stated objective is cost savings.

A 100: The District has not requested additional time. Should it be required as the process continues then an appropriate request can be made.

A100 Union Response: Why not?

A101 Union Response: Where is Q101 and A101?

Q 102: Despite the formal return-to-office mandate, many staff members had already been consistently working on-site through the adoption of hybrid schedules, demonstrating both flexibility and commitment to organizational needs. Given this reality, it is strongly recommended that leadership reconsider the value of hybrid work

arrangements, particularly as a way to help mitigate the significant personal and financial burdens employees may face as a result of relocation.

Reinstating hybrid options could serve as a practical and compassionate approach, balancing operational goals with employee well-being. Without such considerations, the decision may be perceived as disregarding the challenges faced by staff, potentially impacting morale, trust, and overall engagement within the organization.

A 102: We are required to follow the directive that employees return to in person work and therefore cannot implement a hybrid approach. Supervisors will continue to have the authority to grant situational telework in accordance with DOD guidance and alternate work schedules will remain available. We will have a meeting with Supervisors to reinforce the flexibilities granted to them regarding situational telework.

A102 Union Response: It should be noted that the return to office mandate is still disputed because a) we have an Memorandum-of-Understanding that supersedes Executive Orders and b) we never completed impacts and implementation bargaining. The statute says that the status quo, providing NAN employees with 3 telework days a week and NAD employees with 4 telework days a week, must be maintained until negotiations are completed.

Q 103: Please explain why we are doing the survey, and will the results be shared with the District? If a majority of people are inconvenienced by the move will that make a difference in the decision to move the District?

A 103: The transit survey results have been posted to the NAN FAQ page. The survey was performed to help the Corporate Board, evaluation panel, and other decision makers understand the impacts. The evaluation panel can use this information during their evaluation and comparison of sites.

A103 Union Response: So yes. And no.

Q 104: Please explain how the overall Federal Government saves money by paying rent to a private firm instead of GSA?

A104: The direction from the DoW is to reduce the military departments lease costs by at least 30 percent. The direction does not consider the overall impact to the nation's budget, rather, the focus is to reduce the USACE rent costs.

A104 Union Response: Doesn't answer the question.

Q 105: Why did you not do a NEPA analysis? Please do not say you will because that is not how NEPA works. It should have been done already. Please ask a NEPA expert not the Chief of Real Estate.

A 105: The DOD NEPA implementing procedures provide that Federal agencies, including the Department of the Army, maintain lists of actions that are "categorically excluded" from detailed NEPA review because they do not significantly affect the environment. Routine administrative actions, such as office relocations, reorganizations and leasing of commercial office space typically fall under these exclusions.

In addition, in the case of the District relocation, although NEPA considers the “human environment”, social and economic impacts (like employee commute changes or local job loss) only trigger a full study if they are linked to physical environmental changes, such as new large-scale construction or major land-use shifts. As the NAN headquarters is moving into an established urban center and likely into existing office infrastructure, the move is viewed as an internal management decision rather than a "major federal action" with significant environmental consequences.

A105 Union Response: This is not a “routine” administrative action by any definition. While there are waivers to the NEPA analysis, a waiver must first be filed.

Q 106: Will housing be provided or some housing programs be put forth as a retention incentive?

A 106: Housing will not be provided, nor will a housing program be considered as a retention incentive. The move will be within the defined commuting distance.

A106 Union Response: What commuting distance?

Q 107: When we moved from other floors within 26 Fed Plaza to our current location, each USACE employee was given two crates to fill with personal & work-related items. How will this upcoming move be handled? Should we start taking home one picture/item at a time?

A 107: The Move PDT will be looking at how the move will be accomplished, including the number of boxes allocated to each person. As they develop the plan, additional information will be made available to assist you in your planning.

A107 Union Response: The Union should also have impact and implementation bargaining, but so far it hasn’t been granted in good faith.

Q 108: There are several references to a goal of less than $10,000 per full-time equivalent (FTE) in the NAN/NAD FAQ. Where did this goal come from? This is more than a 50% reduction in cost, far exceeding the 33% requirement. Was NYC excluded from the RFP because it did not meet the goal of less than $10,000 per FTE?

A 108: During market research, it was identified that there could be significant cost savings realized in areas of New Jersey, whereas New York market research did not demonstrate similar cost savings.

A108 Union Response: It should be noted that the Agency admitted to not factoring any other costs into this consideration.

Q 109: How is the walkability/safety of these areas being evaluated? I have walked distance mentioned in the RLP for some of these areas. While google or other mapping

programs say they are walkable, some areas do not have suitable sidewalks, and I have walked in the road.

Has the current PDT team walked these areas during the normal commuting times to determine the walkability?

A 109: The team evaluating the lease proposals will review the walkability and safety to the sites being proposed and will consider their findings in the ranking of proposals. During the evaluation process, the evaluation panel will perform site visits to all potential buildings as well, to evaluate just those sorts of issues.

A109 Union Response: No Response.

Q 110: We all got a survey asking about our commutes to various New Jersey locations. But there was not any data being collected regarding what is the maximum commute we are willing to endure before leaving USACE. The commuting times to each location is likely not useful without knowing if those fall within or outside our limits.

A 110: The Commander is amenable to doing additional surveys if he believes that the results will provide useful data that will help in the selection decision.

A110 Union Response: There is a nice survey by the Planning Division that is still on the table.

Q 111: When will the 26 Fed lease be terminated? Would NAN be paying for the two leases (26 Fed and new location) at the same time?

A 111: The lease at 26 Fed will end on 31 December so there will be a short time where we are paying for 2 leases.

A111 Union Response: Further proof that this is not a cost-savings measure.

Q 112: It was mentioned that NJ teammates have been paying double tax BUT it was their choice when they accepted the job. Currently, it is not a choice for teammates who live in NY. The cost of living in NJ is significantly different than NY. If the goal is to reduce rent by 33% and if splitting office into 2 different location helps to achieve that goal, why is it not considered? We already have existing field offices in NY/NJ/Upstate areas, why are we not expanding those for different departments? District has been working efficiently with other field offices and been doing so during full telework and hybrid models so even if the office is split into 2 different areas, it will not affect the NAN work but will actually help to achieve the reduction of rent cost! The directive doesn't restrict splitting office into two different spaces!

A 112: We will not consider splitting the District HQ into multiple locations since that will not allow for the most efficient way of executing our mission.

A112 Union Response: Source of this claim is not found.

Q 113: In the RLP I did not see a requirement for a lactation room. Is this something that can be expected in our new office space? If an amenity like this is not expected in our new space, would there be flexibility for temporary remote work for new mothers pumping and safely storing breastmilk/washing pump parts?

A 113: A lactation room will be provided even though it is not a current requirement in the RLP.

A113 Union Response: If it's not in the RLP, how can you guarantee this?

Q 114: Good morning! At a relocation-related Town Hall, I asked "what *is* in our control" to help our people through the move. Colonel Young acknowledged it is a good idea to think about and to get the relocation PDT to work on it. I haven't heard anything about this yet, which is surprising given a Newsday article said we are developing a "robust set of mitigation strategies to support them through this transition and maximize retention." Who is the "we" developing mitigation strategies? Is there an opportunity for staff to provide suggestions on strategies to consider? Are we able to provide feedback on suggested strategies? Please and thank you!

A 114: The Corporate Board has been discussing possible mitigation strategies. We invite staff to provide their suggestions through the anonymous box or through your division/office chief, or your relocation PDT member.

A114 Union Response: It's clear in the first 100 responses how they like our proposed mitigation strategies.

Q 115: Just wondering as ASA (CW) Telle is so concerned with our costs why, if we are concerned with cost discipline, we are not including the cost of sunk furniture, cost of the previous move, the expense of movers, time of employees going through files and packing their offices/cubicles are NOT being factored into the cost of this relocation? Since we will eventually have to pass these costs along to our customers we really should add all of this in.

A 115: The directive from the DoW on the reduction of costs was directed to the reduction of rental costs which would not include the costs to physically move the office, which are one-time costs, rather than the annual costs like rent.

A115 Union Response: The costs to move the IT equipment alone would be just over $3 million according to documents received through FOIA requests. Furthermore, this doesn't address the fact that paying rent to a private lessor is undoubtedly more costly to the federal government than paying rent for a federally-owned property.

Q 116: I am wondering why our Command has sent out a survey twice asking about our commuting time and not whether we are willing to commute to Northern New Jersey? Why hasn't the question: Will you commute to New Jersey, or will you resign if we move to New Jersey been asked? It seems like you don't care about current employees (conspiracy theorists amongst us suggest that you are trying to shed employees.)

A 116: The intent of the move is not to encourage people to leave, and we hope that everyone will at least give the new location a chance. The Commander is amenable to doing additional surveys if he believes that the results will provide meaningful data that will help in the selection decision.

<u>A116 Union Response</u>: This doesn't answer the question.

Q 117: Curious as to how a "move out of 26 Federal Plaza will also alleviate the security concerns some have about being located here as well as concerns about the lack of amenities in the building or about its aging systems" will actually work? I've seen nothing in the RFP posted in [SAM.gov](SAM.gov) addresses any of these. What sort of "security" are you looking for in a new building? Will they have 24-hour security guards/ metal detectors and bag screening for ALL visitors to the building, and CAC or similar entrance requirements for everyone to the building; or will it just be on our floors? If not, how does that enhance our safety? Someone with a bomb or other type of device can just leave it on the floor below us. And what sort of extra amenities are we looking for that we are lacking on 26 Fed?

A 117: Security is one of the evaluation factors included in the RLP. For those interested in the detailed requirements we recommend that you review Attachment D to the RLP, Minimum Security Requirements. Regarding amenities, many commercial office spaces have amenities such as a fitness center, food options, and quiet spaces that aren't available to us in 26 FP. As the evaluation panel reviews the proposals and conducts site visits, they will learn about and consider the amenities being offered.

<u>A117 Union Response</u>: No Response

Q 118: Could you please explain why the deadline was extended? Did we not receive any bids? Will this affect the relocation timeline?

A 118: The deadline for the receipt of proposals was extended to maximize the opportunity for interested lessors to submit proposals. It is not expected to have any impact on the deadline.

<u>A118 Union Response</u>: No Response

Q 119: The RFLP closing date was this Monday, 20 April so the proposals being considered are presumably in hand. Will employees be privy to the locations associated with these proposals? If so, when?

A 119: The closing date was extended to 27 April. However, even when proposals are received, the locations, names or number of offerors, etc. cannot be made available. Such information is procurement sensitive and cannot be released.

<u>A119 Union Response</u>: Why not?

Q. 120: The commuting results should be using median data, not averages. Please have someone who is knowledgeable in statistics perform these studies for you, so you are not misleading yourself and the entire district.

A. 120: In the case of the commuting results data, the average and the median were almost identical:

	Morning Commute		Evening Commute	
Office Location	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
26 Federal Plaza (Current Duty Station)	68.2	68	74.8	75
Hoboken PATH/ Train Station	85.8	85	90.8	90
Newport PATH Station	86.4	88	91	90
Exchange Place PATH Station	85.8	85	90.4	90
Grove Street PATH Station	87.2	88	91.5	90
Journal Square PATH Station	91.1	90	95.4	90
Newark Penn/ PATH Station	92.3	90	96.9	90

A120 Union Response: No Response.

Q. 121: It appears that the majority of employees will have their commute times increased if we relocate. However, the survey did not ask what people's theoretical maximum commute would be. So, there is no data on how many people might quit due to the relocation.

A. 121: The survey will be used to help inform the evaluation committee about commuting times to the different potential locations. Once the new office location is identified, each employee will have to evaluate the impacts personally, weigh the pros and cons, and make a decision for themselves.

A121 Union Response: Keep in mind that in several previous comments, they committed to considering impacts to the employees last.

Q. 122: The LA district was recently given a similar directive to relocate their office within 6 months. They are looking at a hub and spoke model. If other districts are looking into this model, why aren't we?

A. 122: We do not believe that a hub and spoke model will work for the District, nor will it help achieve the mandated rental savings. LA District also currently operates as a hub and spoke District now, whereas we work together in one District headquarters.

A121 Union Response: Why don't we consider it? That has never been answered.

Q. 123: With the office moving, will the Fitness Program rules be relaxed? We currently cannot use it before or at the end of our workday. Since many people have their home gym/fitness studios (that have contracts) within a reasonable distance from the NYC office, going to the gym would no longer be feasible in New Jersey. It would help employee retention and physical/mental health if we were allowed to use the fitness program to leave the NJ office to go to the gym at the end of our workday. We are already required to show proof, if asked, that we have engaged in physical activity regardless, so I am not sure why this rule cannot be relaxed?

A. 123: Thank you for your question. We will look into the matter and provide an answer asap.

A123 Union Response: No Response. Awaiting Answer.

Q. 124: The latest Relocation FAQs noted that the Corporate Board are discussing possible mitigation measures/strategies. Can you share what these measures or strategies will be? When it comes to commuting, there will likely be a strong dependence on the PATH system. In particular, the Newark–World Trade Center line is prone to frequent mechanical issues, delays, and occasional service suspensions. Rush hour overcrowding and ongoing infrastructure upgrades further add to consistent service disruptions. Compared to New York City, public transportation options to and within New Jersey are more limited.

A. 124: Possible mitigation measures are being considered. Mitigation measures that are determined to be beneficial to district employees will be shared.

A124 Union Response: We are yet to hear about these mitigation measures.

Q. 125: Following up on Question 108, did the market research in NYC show any places met the 33% cost reduction requirement? If so, why was NYC not included in the area of consideration for the RLP? Your previous answer just says that there could be significant cost savings in New Jersey vs New York. But if a place in NYC met the 33%, then you would have met the requirement and perhaps kept people at ease that NYC could at least be considered.

A. 125: The 33% savings requirement is the minimum required savings, it is the DoW goal to achieve even greater savings. Based on the market research, the team determined that the greatest savings would be achieved by a move to NJ.

A125 Union Response: There is no market research received through FOIA requests that shows this is the case.

Q. 126: With several positions that have opened on USAJOBS for NAN, whereas the duty location is being listed as NY/NY, what guidance can be given to potential applicants as far as timeline is concerned? For some, the idea of moving the office to NJ could be beneficial but the commute to NY would be more difficult and vice versa. Since the extension has now closed, can any information be released concerning whether or not any bids were received and are now under consideration? It would be helpful information when discussing potential job opportunities with our families.

A. 126: The hiring manager should provide candidates with information about the District relocation. The timeline in the directive, relocating the District office out of 26 FP by 31 DEC 2026 still stands.

A126 Union Response: This is still a bad answer. The posting should also have this information.

Q. 127: What does complying with RTO look like to management, and how will it evolve as we transition to a new office space? As an employee that is fully complying with the RTO order, I (or any other employee complying with the RTO order) can tell you aside from that one day the ASA dropped by, RTO is not mandatory for all employees. The point in writing this is not to complain about fellow employees that have Reasonable Accommodations, or to violate HIPAA, but to ask the tough, genuine questions that many employees are asking amongst themselves. It has been made clear by management that barring natural disaster-type emergencies telework accommodations are to be made at the discretion of the supervisors. Does management hold supervisors accountable for being too strict or too lenient regarding requests for situational telework? Has management provided any training or guidance for the supervisors to assist them in these complicated situations?

Can this guidance or training be shared widespread with the district so that all employees can have a better understanding of what qualifies as a reasonable situational telework request? Is there any accountability for supervisors that are taking advantage of situational telework themselves?

There are many employees that have received reasonable accommodations and over the past year that have not needed to comply with the mandatory RTO order. It is DPMAPS season and I would like to know if personnel are being rated the same or different based on whether they come in to the office or not?

The way that it is setup implies that individuals complying with RTO will be rated the same as those that do not. Many employees that have received reasonable accommodations that state that they are allowed to telework for a certain amount of days each week or fulltime have had no issues with reporting for TDY to attend a prospect course or a site visit.

It is truly upsetting to find out personnel with RAs that cannot RTO are getting opportunities to be TDY while people who are in the office commuting each day are not getting those opportunities instead. If personnel need reasonable accommodations and cannot come into the office each day, how can they take a plane or drive to be on TDY where they will also need to be in person on TDY each day?

Next, Employees that are fully complying with the mandatory RTO order are being held to a different standard than those that are not. They are not being compensated, rewarded, or recognized for their additional hours of unpaid commuting time they are subjected to

every day. The quality of life which is talked about so much is not the same for employees that come to the office each day compared to those who telework.

According to the results of the Commuting Survey, the average commute for almost 70% of employees will increase by an additional 63.4 minutes per day. That is on top of the 136-minute average daily commute to & from 26 Federal Plaza each day. Raising commutes for personnel complying with RTO by 63.4 minutes per day adds 5 hours of commuting each week and 10 hours of commuting each pay period. This is a serious quality of life disturbance. How will management address the inequity that the mandatory RTO order has caused in the district?

A. 127: District employees are complying with RTO requirements. Each person's job is different, with some staff having more work requirements in the field and some having more work requirements in the office. The District senior leaders will be providing additional training to all levels of supervisors to ensure they are aware of the situational telework flexibilities available to us as well as other tools to improve life-work balance. Employees are entitled to go on training for their professional development so those skills learned can improve their work and the organization as a whole. The FY27 PROSPECT Training survey will be available soon, and it encourages that you request relevant courses for your professional development.

With respect to DPMAPs, your performance evaluation is based on the objectives in your individual performance plan, based on your successes of your work products.

A127 Union Response: The contents of this training must be made available.