Public Hearing
Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Landover
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
Announce Decision
What is Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)?

- Requires Federal agencies to consider the impacts 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 Process and Execute Exchange Agreement
4. Construct and Occupy New HQ Facility
5. Convey JEH to Exchange Partner
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

Security Zone

Parking Structures

Truck Inspection and Remote Delivery Facility

Substation

Main Building

Visitor Center

Central Utility Plant

Stand-by Generators
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
Preliminary Resource Issues

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
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
- Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)
- Maryland – National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPCC)
- Prince George’s County
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
**Transportation Impacted Intersections**

**Landover Traffic Impacts**

**Corridor Impacts: Major Adverse**
- Landover Road

**Intersection impacts: Adverse**
- Martin Luther King Jr. Highway and Ardwick-Ardmore Road
- Brightseat Road and Ardwick-Ardmore Road

**Interstate impacts: Major Adverse**
- Capital Beltway northbound off-ramp
- Capital Beltway 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 ADVERSE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>MAJOR ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstates</td>
<td>NOT ANALYZED</td>
<td>MAJOR ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT ANALYZED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation

Transit/Non-Vehicular Impacts: Landover Alternative

No Measurable Impacts:
- Metrorail and Public Transit Capacity
- Parking
- Truck Access

Beneficial Impacts:
- Pedestrian Network
- Employee Shuttle Bus

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

Major Adverse Impacts:
- Bus Operations (due to traffic delays)
<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: Landover Alternative

No Measurable Impacts to:
- Wetlands (None present)
- Floodplains (None present)

Beneficial Impacts to:
- Stormwater Hydrology
- Groundwater

Adverse Impacts to:
- Surface Water
## Water Resources Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE AREA</th>
<th>GREENBELT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LANDOVER</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SPRINGFIELD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>Landover Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>Springfield Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>BENEFICIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>ADVERSE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td>NOT MEASURABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacts: Landover Alternative

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

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

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

Adverse Impacts to:
- Property Taxes
## 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: Landover 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></td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>No-action</td>
<td>No-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Not Measurable</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Measurable</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