

## Draft Hearing Script: Project Overview plus Landover 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 (Louis Berger)

### **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 are 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 Landover alternative. The Springfield and Greenbelt 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 impact 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 effects of their actions on historic properties. In this case, GSA is responsible for the Section 106 review process, which includes identifying historic properties within the area of potential effect, determining the impacts of the project on those properties; and seeking ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any adverse effects 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 in 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: J. Edgar Hoover parcel 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: Greenbelt**

The Greenbelt Alternative 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 12: 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 13: 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 demolished Landover Mall. As part of the conceptual site plan, we created a southbound exit from the site, which would cross under Landover Road and connect to Brightseat Road. This additional roadway is being suggested to reduce the volume of

FBI employee trips along Landover Road, which Mark will discuss in a few minutes.

**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 site, there are no planned developments or substantial changes planned for the site, so the No-action Alternative is comparable to the existing condition.

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 Landover 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 NCPG guidance. 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 indicates 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: Landover Transportation Intersection Study Map**

For the Landover Alternative, traffic conditions were assessed at 27 intersections and 4 interstate facilities, as shown on this map. The Landover Road and Brightseat Road corridors, as well as the Arena Drive and Landover Road beltway interchanges, were the primary areas of focus. The impacts caused by additional vehicular trips under the Landover Alternative were compared to estimated conditions in the opening year of the facility, 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 Intersection**

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 many 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 Landover Alternative. However, several intersections in the study area would operate with overall unacceptable conditions, contributing to adverse impacts for isolated intersections and major adverse impacts for the Landover Road corridor. These intersections are shown on the map as orange or red, indicating LOS E or LOS F.

**ISOLATED INTERSECTION**

[Animation change] We found that there would be direct, long-term, and adverse impacts to isolated intersections within the study area. During both the morning and afternoon rush hours, the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Highway and Ardwick-Ardmore Road would fail, and the STOP-sign controlled approach along Brightseat Road at the intersection of

Brightseat Road and Ardwick-Ardmore Road would fail. Both of these intersections would fail due to delays and queuing contained to these intersections.

## LANDOVER ROAD CORRIDOR

[Animation change] Our analysis found that there would be delays along the Landover Road corridor during both the morning and afternoon rush hour if FBI Headquarters were not consolidated at the Landover site. The delays would be further worsened with the consolidated FBI headquarters in operation. Several intersections along the Landover Road corridor would fail during both the morning and afternoon rush hour, including:

- The intersection of Landover Road and Brightseat Road;
- The intersection of Landover Road and the Capital Beltway Northbound Off-ramp; and
- The intersection of Landover Road, St. Joseph's Drive, and McCormick Drive. It is important to note that this intersection fails even if FBI Headquarters is not consolidated at the Landover site.

[Animation change] During the morning rush, delays along westbound Landover Road would begin at Brightseat Road and extend past the Beltway. The intersection of Landover Road, Kent Town Place, and 75th Avenue; and the intersection of Brightseat Road and Arena Drive would fail. It is important to note that that intersection of Landover Road, Kent Town Place, and 75th Avenue fails even if FBI Headquarters is not consolidated at the Landover site.

[Animation change] During the afternoon rush hour, delays along eastbound Landover Road would extend from McCormick Road and St. Joseph's Drive to Brightseat Road. The intersection of Landover Road and Lottsford Road and the intersection of Landover Road and the Capital Beltway Southbound On-ramp would fail. Together these conditions would result in direct, long-term, major adverse impacts due to a combination of intersection delays and extensive queuing through this mile-long stretch of Landover Road.

## 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 Northbound between Arena Drive and Landover Road would fail. During the afternoon rush, the Beltway Southbound between Arena Drive and Central Avenue would fail.

### **Slide 19: Traffic Mitigation**

In order to address the significant impacts created by increased vehicular traffic under the Landover 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 Landover Alternative to a level comparable to the anticipated future conditions without the addition of FBI-related trips.

The more substantial improvements recommended are as follows:

- At the Landover Road at Brightseat Road intersection, we recommend adding turning lanes along the westbound, northbound, and southbound approaches; and adding a new eastbound through lane along Landover Road.
- At the Landover Road and Capital Beltway Interchange, we recommend adding a new eastbound and westbound through lane along Landover Road and adding an additional left-turning lane along the northbound off-ramp.
- At Landover Road and Lottsford Road, we recommend adding an additional left-turn lane along southbound Lottsford Road.
- At the Arena Drive and Capital Beltway Interchange, we recommend replacing the signalized intersections with a two-lane roundabout at each location.

- North of the site, we recommend extending Evarts Street over the Capital Beltway, connecting to Evarts Street in the Woodmore Town Center. At Brightseat Road and Ardwick-Ardmore Road, we recommend installing a traffic signal
- At Brightseat Road and the new FBI HQ Consolidation south exit, we recommend installing a new traffic signal
- Along Brightseat Road between the FBI HQ Consolidation south exit and existing four-lane roadway, we recommend widening Brightseat Road in the southbound direction by one lane.
- At Brightseat Road and Arena Drive, we recommend extending the existing southbound approach left turn lane from Brightseat Road to Arena Drive.

The interstate impacts would not be mitigated as part of the Draft EIS but are being studied by the Maryland SHA to determine the best option to address the failures. It is anticipated that a separate environmental review would be undertaken as the Maryland SHA designs advance. However, these failing roadways would result in direct, long-term, major adverse impacts due to the regional nature of the Interstate system.

**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 Greenbelt 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 5 and 7 of the Draft EIS. Additionally, the Greenbelt and Springfield public hearings provide a similar description of traffic and other transportation issues specific to those sites.

**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, parking, or truck access.

We found there would be direct, short-term, adverse impacts to bus operations, the pedestrian network, and the bicycle network due to

disruptions caused by road and sidewalk closures and other construction activities. Over the long term, there would be major adverse impacts to bus operations due to the overall traffic delays from traffic along the Brightseat Road and Landover Road corridors. Metrobus Route F14 would continue to have capacity issues during peak hours. In order to mitigate this impact, it is recommended that Metro perform a study of Metrobus Route F14 and develop recommendations to improve capacity during peak hours. The operational issues would be addressed through the traffic mitigation.

Lastly, we found long-term beneficial impacts to the pedestrian network due to enhanced connectivity in the study area. In order to encourage transit use, FBI would provide shuttle bus service for its employees to a nearby metrorail station. The DEIS studied shuttle bus service between the Largo Town Center Metro Station and the Landover site, which would result in long-term beneficial impacts.

**Slide 22: Other Transportation 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. We found that there would be no measurable impacts to surface water, wetlands or floodplains under the Landover Alternative, as there are no streams, ponds, wetlands or floodplains within the site or within close proximity to the recommended

traffic mitigations. Any potential water resource impacts as a result of improvements to the capital beltway would be evaluated in a separate environmental review.

We found there would be direct, long-term, beneficial impacts to hydrology and groundwater. We estimate a 43 percent increase in pervious area on the site, which would reduce stormwater runoff volume, improve groundwater recharge, and protect water quality. The use of stormwater best management practices and low impact development measures would further prevent or minimize pollutant loading during and after construction and improve water resources relative to existing conditions.

There would also be direct, short-term, adverse impacts to hydrology as a result of temporary changes in surface water quality during construction of the Consolidated FBI Headquarters and the associated transportation mitigation measures, which Mark just discussed. Construction activities would be required to comply with permitting requirements designed to minimize adverse impacts to surface water, including the implementation of a sediment and erosion control plan, and a pollution prevention plan.

**Slide 24: Water Resources 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 Greenbelt and Springfield Alternatives have both beneficial and adverse impacts to hydrology, and beneficial impacts to groundwater, similar to the Landover Alternative. Additionally, the Greenbelt Alternative has beneficial impacts to surface water, and adverse impacts to floodplains.

**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 of its programs, policies, and activities 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 Landover 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 Landover site would be from a privately owned parcel of land to a federally owned parcel there would be long-term, adverse impacts to property tax revenues in Prince George's County. 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 under this alternative, and adverse 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 Landover 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 Landover Alternative, we examined existing planning studies including Plan Prince George's County 2035 and the Landover Gateway Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment to understand the current planning goals for the area. Both plans envision redevelopment of the Landover site into a vibrant mixed use community and economic and employment center for the county.

Our analysis found that there would be direct, long-term, beneficial impacts under the Landover 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 reduce density and limit walkability and connectivity through the site, compared to what these plans envision.

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 three intersections, along Brightseat Road in the northbound direction, and the addition of a new access road between the southern site boundary and Brightseat Road.

**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 Landover 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 Glenarden Branch Library. 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. or after the last commenter. Anyone who still wishes to offer oral comments privately after that time may speak to the court reporter. He will be available up to 30 minutes after the last commenter.

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

**Slide 30: 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.

