Presentation Overview

• Overview of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)
• Proposed Action
• Alternatives
• Primary Resource Issues and Impacts
• Public Comment
What is NEPA?
The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 is legislation that requires Federal agencies to:
- Consider effects of their proposed actions on the natural and human environment
- Apply a systematic planning, analysis, and decision-making process
- Involve the public

What types of impacts are evaluated in the EIS?
- **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**: Result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions
NEPA Process Overview

Step 1: Initiate EIS
- Develop purpose and need
- Collect baseline data
- Conduct agency and public scoping meetings
- Hold 45-day public comment period
- Start developing alternatives

Step 2: Collect Data
- Analyze existing conditions
- Identify needed studies
- Begin preparation of the Draft EIS

Step 3: Analyze Alternatives
- Continue site analysis
- Analyze the environmental impacts of alternatives

Step 4: Publish Draft EIS
- Release Draft EIS to public
- Conduct public meetings
- Hold public comment period

Step 5: Publish Final EIS
- Review and develop responses to comments on the Draft EIS
- Prepare Final EIS addressing public/agency comments
- Hold 30-day public review period

Step 6: Make Decision
- Prepare and publish Record of Decision (ROD)

Opportunity for Public Comment
Opportunity for Public Comment
Opportunity for Public Comment
Announce Decision
What is Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)?

• Requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of projects they carry out, approve or fund on historic properties and cultural resources.

• The Section 106 process will result in a Programmatic Agreement.
What is GSA Proposing?

- The acquisition of a consolidated FBI HQ at a new permanent location; and
- The exchange of the J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) parcel.
J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) Parcel Exchange

1. Identify Exchange Partner Short List
2. Select Exchange Partner
3. Complete NEPA / Section 106 Processes and Execute Exchange Agreement
4. Construct and Occupy New HQ Facility
5. Convey JEH to Exchange Partner
JEH Redevelopment

How will GSA analyze the indirect impacts of the JEH redevelopment?

- GSA will use two reasonably foreseeable development scenarios (RFDS) as a tool to evaluate potential indirect impacts from the exchange of the JEH parcel in the EIS.

RFDS 1
- Assumes major interior renovations and future office commercial use.

RFDS 2
- Assumes demolition of the JEH building
- Assumes redevelopment of the parcel to maximize development capacity while adhering to applicable land use controls and applying recent trends in urban development.
FBI HQ Program Requirements/Facility Components
Overview of Alternatives

No Action Alternative
Under the No-action Alternative, FBI HQ staff and operations would remain dispersed at JEH and other leased facilities without consolidation at a new permanent location.

J. Edgar Hoover Parcel
Would continue to operate as the FBI HQ building.

Greenbelt Alternative
Consolidation of FBI HQ at the site known as the Greenbelt Metro Station, located near the intersection of Interstate 495 and the Greenbelt Station (exit 24) in Prince George’s County, Maryland.

Landover Alternative
Consolidation of FBI HQ at the site known as the former Landover Mall, located near the intersection of Interstate 495 and Landover Road (exit 17) in Prince George’s County, Maryland.

Springfield Alternative
Consolidation of FBI HQ at the site known as the GSA Franconia Warehouse Complex, located along Loisdale Road just south of the Franconia-Springfield Parkway overpass and east of Interstate 95 in Fairfax County, Virginia.

Existing FBI HQ (J. Edgar Hoover Parcel)
Following the construction and acceptance of the consolidated FBI HQ, GSA would exchange title for the J. Edgar Hoover (JEH) parcel to the chosen exchange partner to offset a portion of the cost of the consolidated FBI HQ. This EIS evaluates the indirect impacts from the exchange of JEH based on two Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenarios (RFDS). The RFDSs are GSA's estimate of what could be reasonably developed by a private developer on the parcel in the foreseeable future.

RFDS 1
The building would be retained and renovated using the existing footprint and building shell. RFDS 1 is similar to the No-Action Alternative.

RFDS 2
The building on the JEH parcel would be demolished and the parcel would be redeveloped according to local zoning and land use controls.
Springfield Alternative
Landover Alternative
Greenbelt Alternative
The following resources were analyzed in the EIS

- Transportation
- Water Resources
- Land use and zoning
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Biological Resources
- Earth Resources
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Visual Resources
- Noise
- Hazardous Materials and Waste/Public Safety
- Utilities/Stormwater Management
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Methodology

Intensity

Intensity refers to the severity of impacts. The Draft EIS uses two intensity thresholds and identifies where there is incomplete or unavailable information:

- **No Measurable impacts**: indicates that the impact is localized and not measurable at the lowest level of detection.

- **Major impact**: indicates the effect is severely adverse, highly noticeable, and considered to be significant. Beneficial and adverse impacts that are measurable, but not major, are not assigned an intensity.

- **Insufficient information**: indicates that insufficient data exists to make a final conclusion with regards intensity and type (40 CFR 1502.22). Potential impacts are stated conditionally and qualitatively.

**Type**: Beneficial or Adverse

**Duration**: Short-term or Long-term

**Context**: Local or Regional
Transportation

Methodology
Transportation impacts were analyzed for the major transportation system components or modes of transportation, which include:

- Traffic
- Public Transit (Metrorail and bus)
- Pedestrian environment

- Bicycle Facilities
- Parking
- Truck Access

Consultation
Local and State Agencies consulted in the process:

- Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)
- Maryland – National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC)
- Prince George’s County

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
Greenbelt Transportation Intersection Study Map
Greenbelt Traffic Impacts

Intersection impact: **Adverse**
- Edmonston Road at Powder Mill Road
- Edmonston Road at Sunnyside Ave
- Cherrywood Lane at Ivy Lane intersection
- Cherrywood Lane at Springhill Drive

Interstate impact: **Major Adverse**
- I-95/I-495 northbound off-ramp
- I-95/I-495 southbound on ramp
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td>No-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersections</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>MAJOR AVERSE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>MAJOR AVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstates</td>
<td>NOT ANALYZED</td>
<td>MAJOR AVERSE</td>
<td>NOT ANALYZED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation

Transit/Non-Vehicular Impacts: Greenbelt Alternative

No Measurable Impacts:
- Metrorail
- Parking
- Truck Access

Beneficial Impacts:
- Pedestrian Network
- Bicycle Network

Adverse Impacts From Construction:
- Bus operations
- Pedestrian Network
- Bicycle Network

Major Adverse Impacts:
- Bus Operations (due to traffic delays)
## Other Transportation Impacts Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Capacity</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operations</td>
<td>MAJOR ADVERSE</td>
<td>MAJOR ADVERSE</td>
<td>MAJOR ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Network</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Network</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Access</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Water Resources

Impacts: Greenbelt Alternative

No Measurable Impacts to:
• Wetlands

Beneficial Impacts to:
• Surface Water
• Hydrology
• Groundwater

Adverse Impacts to:
• Hydrology
• Floodplains
## Water Resources Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socioeconomics & Environmental Justice

Impacts: Greenbelt Alternative

No Measurable Impacts for:
- Population
- Property Tax Revenue
- Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

Beneficial Impacts to:
- Employment and Income
- Sales and Income Tax Revenues

Insufficient Information for:
- Housing
- Schools and Community Services
- Recreation and Community Facilities

Adverse Impacts to:
- None
# Socioeconomics Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td>No Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Income</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use and Zoning

Impacts: Greenbelt Alternative

No Measurable Impacts to:
• Zoning

Beneficial Land Use Impacts:
• Alignment with regional and local land use studies

Adverse Land Use Impacts:
• Disagreements with regional and local land use studies,
• Strip takings required for the recommended transportation mitigations.
# Land Use and Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>Springfield Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE BENEFICIAL ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE BENEFICIAL ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to Comment?

Public involvement is a cornerstone of both NEPA and NHPA Section 106

How Can You Comment on the DEIS?
Comments may be emailed or mailed. Comments must be submitted or postmarked by January 6, 2016.
1. Comment orally tonight in person during the public hearing.
2. Comment online at: http://www.gsa.gov/fbihqconsolidation
3. Email comments with NEPA Draft EIS Comment in the subject line to: fbi-hq-consolidation@gsa.gov
4. Send written comments to:
   U.S. General Services Administration
   Attention: Denise Decker, NEPA Team Lead
   301 7th Street, SW, Room 4004
   Washington, D.C. 20407