

Draft Hearing Script: Project Overview plus Greenbelt Impacts

Slides 1 -16: Bill Dowd (GSA)

Slide 17 – 24: Mark Berger (Louis Berger)

Slide 25 – 30: Allison Anolik (Louis Berger)

Slide 31: Tim Canan (GSA)

Slide 1: Welcome & Introduction

Good evening and thank you for attending GSA's public hearing on the Draft EIS for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation Project.

My name is Bill Dowd, and I am the project executive for the GSA's Public Building Service. With me presenting tonight Mark Berger, Allison Anolik and Tim Canan, from our environmental and transportation consultant team at Louis Berger. Also in attendance this evening are several additional GSA representatives as well as team members from our cooperating agencies at the FBI, National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service. Several members of the government's consultant team are also in attendance. [Acknowledge any public officials.] I would also like to acknowledge that there are several public officials in attendance tonight. These include..... If I missed anyone, please let me know.

In carrying out our responsibilities on this project, GSA is committed to ensuring that we provide proper consideration to the quality of the natural and human environment. Tonight's hearing is one of several opportunities you have both as a community and as individual citizens to comment on the Draft EIS for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. We appreciate you taking the time to participate.

Slide 2: Presentation Overview

Before beginning the public comment portion of tonight's agenda, we want to provide some background information on the project. We will describe the processes for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act of

1969, and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. We will explain the action proposed by GSA, and its purpose and need. We will then give a brief overview of the proposed FBI Headquarters Consolidation alternatives, and finally we will provide an overview of the potential environmental and social impacts from these alternatives. Tonight's focus will be on the Greenbelt alternative. The Springfield and Landover alternatives are the focus of separate meetings held near those locations. At the conclusion of our presentation, we will review how you can make comments on the Draft EIS and then open up the floor to allow you to make oral comments here this evening.

Slide 3: NEPA Overview

GSA, with input from its cooperating agencies, has prepared the Draft EIS in accordance with the requirements of NEPA. NEPA is the nation's legislative charter for protection of the environment, providing for the consideration of environmental issues in Federal agency planning and decision making. NEPA requires GSA to prepare an EIS because the proposed action may significantly affect the quality of the natural and human environment. The EIS informs agency decision makers and the public about alternatives for the action, including the No-action Alternative. The EIS also provides full disclosure on environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of each alternative.

The regulations that implement NEPA outline three types of impacts that we evaluated for each of the alternatives in the Draft EIS: direct, indirect, and cumulative. Direct impacts occur at the same time and place as the Proposed Action. Indirect Impacts occur later in time or are farther removed in distance but still reasonably foreseeable. Cumulative impacts are the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency or entity undertakes these other actions.

Slide 4: Where we are in the process (include NEPA step graphic)

We are now on Step 4 of our NEPA process. This process began when a Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS was published in the Federal register on September 8, 2014. Since then, GSA, with help from its cooperating agencies, collected and analyzed data, identified and documented historic properties, and continued consultation with stakeholders and other government agencies in order to develop the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS was issued to the public and to regulatory agencies for a comment period beginning on November 6, 2015. The comment period ends on January 6, 2016. By the end of 2016, GSA plans to release the Final EIS to the public for a period of at least 30 days before making a final decision, at which point GSA will publish a Record of Decision. A Record of Decision is a public document that contains a statement of the decision made among the alternatives considered, and the applicable monitoring and enforcement plan for all mitigation adopted for the project.

Slide 5: Section 106

Concurrent with the NEPA process, GSA has also initiated consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the impacts of their actions on historic properties. In this case, GSA is responsible for the Section 106 review process, which includes identifying historic properties potentially affected by the project; determining the impacts of the project on those properties; and seeking ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse impacts on the identified historic properties.

GSA is currently consulting with Historic Preservation offices of the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia as well as other federal agencies and consulting parties to develop a Programmatic Agreement. This Programmatic Agreement will outline a series of procedures and project requirements that would avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse impacts of the proposed action on cultural resources.

Slide 6: Proposed Action

Within the regulatory framework described in the last two slides, GSA is proposing two things:

- The acquisition of a consolidated FBI Headquarters at a new permanent location; and
- The exchange of the J. Edgar Hoover parcel, the current home of the FBI Headquarters.

The proposed action would allow GSA to leverage its current asset to support the FBI Headquarters consolidation effort. The exchange would convey the Hoover parcel to a private sector exchange partner, consistent with local land use controls and redevelopment goals for Pennsylvania Avenue.

There are two primary decisions to be made by GSA, in cooperation with FBI, NCPC, and the National Park Service: the first is whether or not to consolidate the FBI Headquarters through the exchange of the Hoover parcel. The second is at which site to consolidate the FBI Headquarters; either Greenbelt, Landover, or Springfield. The preferred site for a consolidated FBI Headquarters will be identified in the Final EIS. Information from the NEPA process is one of several factors that GSA will use to inform its decision. Other factors that will be considered in the decision-making process include, but are not limited to, the ability of each site to meet the FBI's mission and the cost to develop a consolidated FBI Headquarters at each site, including required mitigation.

Slide 7: J. Edgar Hoover Building Exchange

Concurrent with the NEPA process, GSA is also in the process of identifying an exchange partner through a two-phase development solicitation. The short-listed exchange partners will submit proposals on one or more of the available sites to help GSA identify a Preferred Alternative for the consolidated FBI Headquarters. The exchange of the Hoover parcel would occur after a Record of Decision and Programmatic Agreement are executed, and the new facility has been built and occupied. Once the facility is complete and accepted by the government, title of the

Hoover parcel would be conveyed to the exchange partner to offset a portion of the cost of the consolidated FBI Headquarters. The exchange partner would then redevelop the parcel according to applicable law and regulations.

Slide 8: JEH Redevelopment

Since the exchange of the Hoover parcel is considered a part of the proposed action, GSA has assessed the indirect impacts of the parcel's redevelopment, even though it will occur later in time than the exchange. To do this, GSA has developed two Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenarios, which are GSA's estimate of what could be reasonably developed on the parcel in the foreseeable future. They are not GSA's suggestions or proposals for future use or design of the Hoover parcel, and have been developed for analysis purposes only.

- Scenario 1 anticipates adaptive reuse of the existing building, and
- Scenario 2 anticipates that the existing building would be demolished and the parcel would be redeveloped consistent with land use plans and proposed zoning.

During this evening's presentation, we will not be reviewing the indirect impact findings for the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenarios evaluated in the Draft EIS. However, for those interested, Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS provides a comprehensive evaluation of anticipated impacts.

Slide 9: FBI Program Requirements/Facility Components

This slide shows the basic components of a consolidated FBI headquarters facility. The FBI identified a need to consolidate approximately 2.5 million gross square feet of secure office and shared use space as well as parking and ancillary facilities. The main components of the facility would include the Main Building, Parking structures and limited surface parking, Visitor Center, Truck Inspection and remote delivery facility, and a Central Utility Plant and associated infrastructure.

Slide 10: Overview of Alternatives

GSA and FBI undertook a comprehensive, multi-step process to identify alternative sites for evaluation in the Draft EIS that best meet the government's criteria. After careful review, three sites were selected: Greenbelt, Landover, and Springfield. The Draft EIS evaluates the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action for each site alternative. GSA also evaluated a No-action Alternative at each site, as required by NEPA, where the FBI would remain in its current facilities, and consolidation would not occur at any of the three sites.

Slide 11: Springfield

The Springfield Alternative comprises the GSA Franconia warehouse complex and is located along Loisdale Road just south of the Franconia-Springfield Parkway overpass and east of Interstate 95 in Fairfax County, Virginia. It is currently owned and occupied by GSA and contains two warehouse facilities and a number of ancillary buildings and structures. Potential sites for the relocation of the existing tenants have not yet been identified. If the Springfield site is selected, GSA would prepare the appropriate NEPA documentation for tenant relocation.

Slide 12: Landover

The Landover Alternative is known as the former Landover Mall and is located along Brightseat Road near the intersection of the Capital Beltway and Landover Road in Prince George's County, Maryland. It is composed of vacant land on the site of the former Landover Mall.

Slide 13: Greenbelt

The Greenbelt site is currently known as the Greenbelt Metro Station and is located near the intersection of the Capital Beltway and the Greenbelt Metro Station exit in Prince George's County, Maryland. It is composed of a portion of the Greenbelt Metro Station parking lot as well land owned by the State of Maryland and associated with Indian Creek.

Slide 14: Preliminary Resource Issues

To assess the potential environmental impacts under each alternative, we collected and analyzed information in the resource categories shown on

this slide. We will focus tonight's discussion on transportation, water resources, land use and zoning, and socioeconomics and environmental justice, since these resources are the most highly impacted or were raised as important issues during the public scoping process. Detailed evaluations of the other resource issues are available in the Draft EIS.

Slide 15: Methodology

Before we move into discussing impacts, we want to explain how impacts are assessed for each action alternative. The impacts at Greenbelt, Springfield, and Landover are assessed by comparing conditions under each alternative to the conditions under the No-Action alternative as a baseline. At the Landover and Springfield sites, there are no planned developments or substantial changes planned for the sites. However, there are development approvals for the Greenbelt Station North Core, which includes the Greenbelt site, for a high-density mixed use development, including 800 residential units, over 3 million gross square feet of retail and office space, and two hotels. The impacts for the Greenbelt Alternative are assessed using the impacts from this development as a baseline.

The Draft EIS characterizes impacts to these resource topics based on their intensity, type, duration, and context. Intensity refers to the severity of the impact. The Draft EIS uses two intensity thresholds – not measurable and major. Major impacts are those considered significant under NEPA regulations. A finding of significance allows decision makers to focus mitigations and make an informed decision. Beneficial and adverse impacts that are measurable, but not major, are not assigned an intensity. The Draft EIS also identifies where information is insufficient to make an impact determination.

The type of impact describes the beneficial or adverse nature of the impact.

The duration of an impact considers how long the impacts are expected to last. Short-term impacts are defined as either those associated with the construction period, or those lasting less than 1 year; while long-term impacts are defined as those occurring throughout the operational period of the consolidated headquarters campus. Lastly, context refers to the spatial

and social scale over which impacts would occur. The Draft EIS evaluates impacts at the local and regional level, as appropriate, for each resource topic.

I will now turn over the presentation to Mark Berger to discuss the transportation impacts under the Greenbelt Alternative.

Slide 16: Transportation

Thank you Bill. Based on the feedback we received during public scoping, it was apparent that transportation impacts were of great concern to the community. The process of evaluating transportation impacts started by collecting data such as vehicle volumes, intersection configurations, traffic signal timings, transit ridership volumes, and transit operations. Then, we developed assumptions that help us forecast how many new trips would be created by the consolidated FBI Headquarters at each site, and what form of transportation each trip would use. Vehicular trips were distributed on the road network based on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments transportation model and FBI employee zip codes. The number of parking spaces assumed for each site in this analysis was derived from NCPC guidance. It should be noted that since NCPC guidance on parking numbers near “end-of-line Metro stations” should be considered relative to their unique situation, GSA and FBI are currently re-assessing the level of parking that might be needed to support FBI’s operations at Greenbelt and Springfield. Any changes that may arise from this assessment will be fully analyzed before completing the NEPA process. The assumptions used in the Draft EIS were vetted during the scoping process with local, state, and regional transportation agencies listed on the screen.

Once we collected the data and finalized the assumptions, we evaluated the impacts using a suite of transportation planning tools to determine how each studied facility would function with the addition of FBI trips during the morning and afternoon rush hour. One performance measure used is a

Level of Service rating, which indicate the driver or passenger's perception of delay or inconvenience. A facility's Level of Service is measured by assigning an "A" through "F" rating. We assessed the level of service for all turning movements as well as assigning an overall intersection rating. For this presentation, I will limit my descriptions to the locations where the overall level of service fails.

We reviewed all components of the transportation system, including vehicular traffic, bus and Metrorail service, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, parking, and truck access. The traffic analysis looked at intersection operations, vehicle queuing, and interstate facilities while the transit analysis considered Metrorail capacity, station capacity, and bus capacity. First, I will cover the traffic impacts.

Slide 17: Greenbelt Transportation Intersection Study Map

For the Greenbelt Alternative, traffic conditions were assessed at 21 intersections and 4 interstate facilities, as shown on this map. Eight of the intersections evaluated do not currently exist, as they are associated with the planned extension of Greenbelt Station Parkway through the planned North Core development. The Cherrywood Lane, Edmonston Road and Kenilworth Avenue, and the future Greenbelt Station Parkway corridors were the primary areas of focus. The impacts caused by additional vehicular trips under the Greenbelt Alternative were compared to estimated conditions in the opening year of the facility with the proposed North Core development in place, based on background growth from outside the study area, planned developments and any planned road improvements. The impact methodology was also developed based on appropriate local and regional agency guidance.

Slide 18: Traffic Impacted Intersections

Traffic impacts were defined at three primary contexts: isolated intersections, road corridors encompassing multiple intersections, and regional impacts to traffic on the Capital Beltway. Our analysis showed that most of the signalized study area intersections and road corridors within the study area would operate at acceptable levels during the morning and

afternoon rush hours under the Greenbelt Alternative. However, three intersections in the study area would operate with overall unacceptable conditions during the afternoon rush hour, contributing to adverse impacts for the Edmonston Road corridor and isolated intersections in the study area. These intersections are shown on the map as orange or red, indicating LOS E or LOS F.

CORRIDORS

Our analysis found that there would be delays along the Edmonston Road corridor during the afternoon rush hour if the FBI Headquarters are not consolidated at the Greenbelt site. The delays would be further worsened with the consolidated FBI headquarters in operation. Delays along northbound Edmonston Road would begin at Powder Mill Road and extend to Cherrywood Lane.

ISOLATED INTERSECTIONS

[Animation change] We found that there would be direct, long-term, and adverse impacts to isolated intersections within the study area, due to delays and queuing contained to these intersections. Two intersections along the Edmonston Road corridor would fail during the afternoon rush hour, including:

- The intersection of Edmonston Road and Sunnyside Avenue, and
- The intersection of Edmonston Road (MD 201) and Powder Mill Road

[Animation change] The STOP-sign controlled approach at the intersection of Cherrywood Lane and Ivy Lane as well as the intersection of Cherrywood Lane and Springhill Drive would fail during the afternoon rush hour if FBI Headquarters is not consolidated at the Greenbelt site. Conditions at these intersections would worsen with the consolidated FBI headquarters in operation. Following the Prince George's County unsignalized intersection guidance, the added delay was not enough to warrant improvements to these intersections.

INTERSTATES

[Animation change] Our analysis also examined the primary interstate off-ramps serving inbound FBI vehicle trips in the morning, and the interstate on-ramps serving the outbound FBI vehicle trips in the afternoon during the

peak traffic period. We found that two Interstate facilities would fail based on the forecasted volumes. During the morning rush, the Beltway southbound between U.S. Route 1 and Greenbelt Station Parkway would fail. During the afternoon rush, the Beltway northbound between Greenbelt Station Parkway and U.S. Route 1 would fail. These facilities were not mitigated as part of the Draft EIS, but are part of an ongoing study by Maryland State Highway Administration.

Slide 19: Traffic Mitigation

In order to address the significant impacts created by increased vehicular traffic under the Greenbelt Alternative, we have recommended a series of mitigations to improve the traffic level at these intersections. These improvements would mitigate the forecasted amount of future traffic under the Greenbelt Alternative to a level comparable to the anticipated future conditions without the addition of FBI-related trips.

The more substantial improvements recommended would occur at the following locations:

- Edmonston Road and Powder Mill Road
- Edmonston Road and Sunnyside Road
- Greenbelt Road and Cherrywood Lane and 60th Avenue
- Greenbelt Station Parkway and I-95/I-495 off-ramps and Kiss & Ride
- Greenbelt Metro Drive and consolidated FBI headquarters exit roadway

Slide 20: Transportation Impacts Comparison Table

This slide outlines a comparison of the traffic impacts of all sites considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can see that both Landover and Springfield also have direct, long-term, adverse impacts, some major, to the traffic network. More information about impacts under these alternatives can be found in Chapters 6 and 7 of the Draft EIS.

Slide 21: Transit Impacts

There would be a variety of impacts to other modes of transportation. Our analysis found no measurable impacts to Metrorail Capacity, the bicycle network, parking, or truck access.

We found there would be direct, long-term, major adverse impacts to bus operations due to the overall delays from traffic along the Edmonston Road Corridor.

Lastly, we found beneficial impacts to the pedestrian network at the Greenbelt site due to improvements in sidewalks and other pedestrian infrastructure within the site, especially with regard to the accessibility of the Greenbelt Metro Station.

Slide 22: Transit Impacts Comparison table

This slide outlines a comparison of the transit, pedestrian, bicycle, parking, and truck impacts of all alternatives considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can see that there are a range of beneficial and adverse impacts across the alternatives.

I will now turn the presentation over to Allison Anolik to discuss impacts to water resources, socioeconomics, and land use and zoning.

Slide 23: Water Resources

Thank you Mark.

Another resource topic for which we received a lot of public interest is water resources, especially those associated with the riparian forest surrounding Indian Creek at the Greenbelt site. As part of our NEPA evaluation process, we collected and analyzed data about surface water, hydrology, ground water, wetlands and floodplains. The Greenbelt site is located within the Upper Anacostia River Watershed and the larger Chesapeake Bay watershed, and the hydrology of the site is composed of both stormwater and natural surface waters. Indian Creek, a perennial freshwater stream

and tributary to the Anacostia River, flows through the site from northeast to south west. This channel is braided within the site boundary, and surrounded by wetlands and floodplains.

Because of these conditions, water resources are of a high concern. We found that there would be indirect, adverse impacts to hydrology resulting from the construction of traffic mitigations in the study area and beneficial impacts as a result of improved conditions on the site, including a reduction of stormwater runoff, reduction of impervious surfaces, and other improvements to the hydrologic process.

In terms of wetlands, we found the potential for adverse impacts to wetlands under the No-action Alternative from construction activities, and due to the risk of disturbing or removing portions of the 25 foot non-tidal wetland buffer, required by Maryland Department of Environment, along the easterly limit of disturbance. The Consolidation of FBI Headquarters at the Greenbelt site would keep all surveyed wetlands and their associated buffers outside of the secure perimeter, resulting in no measurable impacts.

In terms of floodplains, no buildings would be placed within the 100-year floodplain. However, portions of the perimeter fence, including fencing along Greenbelt Metro Drive, and the associated clear zone and perimeter road adjacent to the eastern side of the Main building, would be placed within and directly impact the floodplain. Just under 1 acre of 100-year floodplain, according to FEMA's revised preliminary flood insurance rate map, would be within the secure perimeter and subject to alteration. The area would be cleared of all vegetation except low grasses and possibly graded and covered with an impervious surface. This would directly, however minimally, impact the ability of the floodplain to provide storage capacity for flood waters, minimize erosive processes and sediment transport, and attenuate flood flows. Any adverse impacts would be minimized and offset through the implementation of BMPs and mitigation measures.

Lastly, we found a range of beneficial impacts to surface water, groundwater, and hydrology resulting from the increase in pervious surface and vegetation, improved groundwater recharge and protection of water quality within the site.

Slide 24: Water Resource Impacts Comparison Table

This slide outlines a comparison of the impacts to water resources of all sites considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can see that both the Springfield and Landover Alternatives have both beneficial and adverse impacts to hydrology, and beneficial impacts to Groundwater, similar to the Greenbelt Alternative. Additionally, the Greenbelt Alternative has beneficial impacts to surface water, and adverse impacts to floodplains. The No-action Alternative at the Greenbelt site has indirect, short-term, adverse impacts to wetlands.

Slide 25: Socio-economics and Environmental Justice Impacts

Bill mentioned earlier that NEPA requires an analysis of the impact of the Proposed Action on the human environment. In considering impacts on the human environment, we analyzed the social and economic impacts of the proposed consolidation on the surrounding community. We evaluated Population and Housing, Employment and Income, Taxes, Schools and Community Services, and Recreation and Other Community Facilities. Additionally, we considered whether there are low-income or minority neighborhoods in the study area, and if impacts to these communities would be disproportionate to the study area at large. This Environmental Justice analysis is meant to identify and mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts of the proposed action on minority and low-income populations.

We gathered information and data for the analysis from a range of sources, including the Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor statistics, Bureau of Economic Analysis, State of Maryland, Prince George's County Police Department, Prince George's County Schools and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

For employment and income, we found a range of beneficial impacts under the Greenbelt Alternative. Our analysis showed that there would be long-term beneficial impacts to employment and sales, because of the increase in spending from FBI Headquarters employees. Additionally, there would be indirect, short-term, beneficial impacts as a result of the temporary relocation of construction workers to Prince George's County.

Since the transfer of the Greenbelt site would be from ownership by WMATA and the State of Maryland to a federally owned parcel there would be no change to property tax revenues in Prince George's County, as there are currently no property taxes paid on the property, and this condition would continue if the property is transferred to the Federal Government. However, there would be short-term, beneficial impacts the local economy as a result of construction spending.

In reviewing Environmental Justice, we found there would be no environmental justice impacts because there would be no disproportionate long-term, adverse impacts to minority or low income communities, and impacts would be mitigated to the extent practicable and permitted by law.

As for Protection of Children, we were able to conclude that there could be some impacts to children, such as releases of odor and dust during the construction, and long-term increases in vehicular traffic that may impact children living in the neighborhoods in proximity to the Greenbelt site. However, these impacts would not have a disproportionately high and adverse impact to children. Therefore, no measurable impacts to children are expected to occur as a result of this alternative.

Lastly, we found that there was insufficient information to assess impacts to housing, community services, schools, and recreation and other community facilities due to uncertainties regarding the future distribution of FBI employees in the National Capital Region and within Prince George's County.

Slide 26: Socio-Economics and Environmental Justice Impacts Comparison Table

This slide outlines a comparison of the socioeconomic impacts of all alternatives considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can

see there are beneficial impacts to taxes and employment and income for all alternatives. There is either insufficient information or no measurable impact to housing, schools and community services, recreation and community facilities, environmental justice, and protection of children, and as such these topics are not shown in this table.

Slide 27: Land Use and Zoning Methodology

Land use was a topic for which we received many public scoping comments. To identify land use impacts for the Greenbelt Alternative, we examined existing planning studies including Plan Prince George's County 2035 and the Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment to best understand the current planning goals for the area. Both plans envision redevelopment of the Greenbelt site into a sustainable, transit-oriented mixed use development and economic and employment center for the county.

Our analysis found that there would be direct, long-term, beneficial impacts under the Greenbelt Alternative, as the site would become an employment center that would facilitate economic growth. However, there would also be direct, long-term, adverse impacts as a result of several inconsistencies with regional and local land use plans. The consolidation of FBI Headquarters at this site would not result in a mix of uses, would reduce density and limit walkability and connectivity through the site, as envisioned in these plans

We also looked at any property takings required to implement the transportation mitigations. We found that there would be direct, long-term, adverse impacts to land use associated with the recommended transportation mitigations. These mitigations would require strip takings at two intersections, and along Edmonston Road to accommodate the addition of new traffic lanes.

Slide 28: Land Use and Zoning

This table presents a comparison of land use and zoning impacts for all sites considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can see that

there is a range of beneficial and adverse impacts at all the sites based on each alternative's agreements and contradictions with various aspects of the relevant local and regional plans, similar to the Greenbelt Alternative.

I will now hand the presentation to Tim Canan who will explain the procedures for commenting tonight. He will also facilitate tonight's formal comment period.

Slide 29: How to Make a Comments

Thank you Allison.

This public hearing provides you with the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIS and the Section 106 historic preservation considerations for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. Copies of the Draft EIS are available at the website shown on the screen, and a hardcopy is available for public review at the Greenbelt and College Park Libraries. This hearing provides a venue for raising issues you believe were not addressed, or were not adequately addressed, in the Draft EIS. We want to remind you that comments expressing an opinion about the project itself are not considered substantive, and therefore would not be addressed in the Final EIS.

There are several different avenues for you to submit your comments. To provide written comments, you may use the comment form that is available at the sign-in table, and either leave it here tonight or you can mail, or email them to GSA at the addresses listed on the comment form, newsletter, and on screen. Comments can also be provided through a form on the FBI Headquarters Consolidation website. All comments on the Draft EIS are due to GSA by 11: 59 PM, January 6, 2016. Written comments must be postmarked by January 6 to be accepted.

You may also provide oral comments here this evening. We will now open the floor to those of you who would like to make formal comments. Elected officials or representatives of their offices will be called first. Otherwise you will be called to speak in the order you signed up. If you would like to speak and have not yet signed up, please do so in the back of the room.

When you come up front, please state and spell your name clearly into the microphone for the record. To accommodate everyone who would like to speak, we ask that you limit your comments to three minutes for individuals and five minutes for organizations. GSA will provide a one minute warning to all speakers before the conclusion of their allotted time. Please remember, GSA will not be responding to your comments this evening.

This hearing will end at 8:30 p.m. Anyone who still wishes to offer oral comments privately after that time may speak to the court reporter. He will be available until 9:00 p.m.

Before you leave, we welcome you to sign up for the project's mailing list at the sign-in table if you have not already done so

Commenting Tonight (not an actual slide in the slide deck)

[Signal to court reporter to begin transcript.] The first person to present comments is_____.

[After all comments are completed]

This concludes the public hearing for the Draft EIS on the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. The court reporter is available for those who would prefer to provide oral comments privately. Have a safe trip home