

Slide 1: Title Slide

Good evening and welcome to the U.S. General Services Administration's public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Nebraska Avenue Complex Master Plan.

I am Thomas James, Deputy Assistant Regional Administrator, for the U.S. General Services Administration National Capital Region. With me presenting tonight are Suzanne Hill, GSA's National Environmental Policy Act Team Lead; James Clark, our consultant from MTF Architecture; Annie Sauser, our consultant from JMA; Laura Cacho, our consultant from AECOM; and Geoff Giffin, our consultant from Kimley-Horn. Also joining us tonight are several GSA and DHS representatives.

DHS representatives include: Beate Moss, Barry Wilson, and Ramon Garcia

GSA representatives include: Dawud Abdur-Rahman, Scott Battles, Carter Wormeley, and Suzanne Hill

Slide 2: Welcome

In carrying out our social and environmental responsibilities, GSA is committed to ensuring proper consideration is made to the environment when undertaking a major federal project. This meeting is an important opportunity for you (both as a vested community and as individual citizens) to provide your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS. We appreciate you making time in your evening to participate.

The following presentation will outline the alternatives for the NAC Master Plan and the findings of the Draft EIS.

Following this presentation, you will have the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIS. All comments, either received verbally tonight or written comments received during the comment period, will be responded to in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. *GSA and DHS will not be answering questions or addressing your comments during this meeting.* The written comment period ends on March 1, 2011.

If you have not already done so, you may sign up to provide verbal comments at the Welcome table at the back of the room.

Please note, tonight's meeting will be recorded so that we have a complete record of your comments.

Slide 3: Agenda

Tonight's agenda will include an overview of the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act as well as an update on the schedule.

We will provide a brief overview of the proposed Department of Homeland Security Master Plan including the location, site history, purpose and need for a master plan and the alternatives included in the Master Plan and analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We will then move to the findings of the Draft EIS and how you can comment on the Draft EIS during the public comment period. At the end of the presentation, an opportunity will be provided for verbal comments.

Slide 4: Overview of NEPA

This public hearing is being conducted in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, commonly referred to as NEPA.

NEPA was landmark environmental legislation that provides for the consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making.

NEPA states all Federal agencies, including GSA, must:

- Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for actions that may have significant environmental impacts.
- Consider a reasonable range of alternatives.
- Use a systematic, interdisciplinary approach in analyzing environmental impacts, and
- Factor environmental considerations when making decisions.

Slide 5: NEPA Timeline

Public involvement is considered to be the cornerstone of the NEPA process, and Federal agencies are required to encourage and facilitate public involvement during the decision-making process.

Scoping started with notice of intent in the federal register. During scoping GSA held a public meeting and met with stakeholder agencies such as NCPC, NPS, DDOT, DCOP, SHPO and CFA.

NEPA requires that federal agencies consider a range of alternatives, including a no action alternative during the decision making process. Using comments received during scoping, GSA developed a range of alternatives that varied in density and treatment of historic resources as well as urban design.

These alternatives are being assessed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was published on January 14th. The comment period for this Draft EIS will end on March 1st. All comments, either received verbally tonight or written comments by the deadline, will be responded to in the Final EIS. GSA may respond to substantive comments by revising alternatives, refining mitigation measures or refining the impacts analysis.

We anticipate the Final EIS will be distributed for a 30-day public review period this summer, and a Record of Decision in Fall 2011. After the Record of Decision, should GSA decide to proceed with the Master Plan, GSA would go through the National Capital Planning Commission's approval process. GSA would then implement the Master Plan based upon the alternative selected.

Slide 6: Section 106 of the NHPA

Because of the NAC's National Register eligibility, GSA is required to follow Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. Section 106 requires that all Federal Agencies identify cultural resources which may exist within the properties they own and that they make every effort to preserve and protect these resources.

If the Government foresees that an undertaking may have the potential to result in adverse effects to the historic resources identified, then they are required to mitigate those adverse effects to the satisfaction of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and other parties who may have an interest in the future of the historic resource. Further the Government is required to inform the public regarding an undertaking and solicit comments from any interested parties. GSA is integrating the public involvement processes for Section 106 and NEPA. Therefore, this meeting is part of the process to inform the public on how the proposed Master Plan project may affect the cultural resources at the NAC, and to solicit comment from the public.

Section 106 requires that any undertaking by a Federal Agency which includes or impacts historic and cultural resources must follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for their maintenance and for any new work, including any sub-grade work which may affect yet unknown archeological resources.

Slide 7: NHPA Timeline

GSA is currently in consultation, under Section 106, with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation.

As previously mentioned, Section 106 requires that GSA provide the public, agencies, and other interested parties the opportunity to comment on GSA actions impacting historic resources. The Draft EIS analyzed potential adverse effects on historic resources for each of the alternatives. Though comments on the Draft EIS are due by March 1st, comments on the Section 106 process will be accepted throughout GSA's consultation with the DC State Historic Preservation Office and ACHP.

Slide 8: Status of PA

A Programmatic Agreement is a document that spells out the terms of a formal, legally binding agreement between a Federal Agency(s) (GSA & DHS) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and/or The State Historic Preservation Officer (and sometimes other interested parties). It establishes a process for consultation, review and compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. In this case, it will lay out the procedures which all undertakings on the NAC campus must follow in order to assure the proper protection of existing cultural resources or to mitigate any adverse effects.

Alongside the development of the EIS and the Master Plan Alternatives, we are developing a draft Programmatic Agreement for presentation to the various consulting parties. We have also developed a list of potential consulting parties who may be interested in participating further in the consultation process. If you or the organization you represent were invited to this public meeting, you have been identified as a potential consulting party. In the very near future GSA will set up a meeting with

consulting parties and invite comments on a draft PA. Once a final draft has been agreed to by all signatories and consulting parties, it will be published in the Federal Register for sixty days.

Slide 9: What is the Proposed Action?

The purpose of the proposed action is to develop and implement a Master Plan for the Nebraska Avenue Complex as a campus capable of being maintained at the appropriate level of security to house the current tenant, the US Department of Homeland Security. The NAC is about 37 acres located adjacent to Ward Circle on Nebraska Avenue.

The proposed action is needed to support the goals of DHS housing master plan which consolidates over 30,000 DHS employees currently housed in 50 locations to 7 to 10 locations. The NAC site is one of the few sites in Washington, DC that can meet the security needs of DHS. A Master Plan will steer long range campus construction, renovation and maintenance to serve DHS mission needs and strengthen operational management capabilities.

Slide 10: Site Overview

As a neighbor and the architect for this Master Plan, I am dedicated to preserving the rich and fascinating history while enhancing this site as a part of our community.

Slide 11: Mount Vernon Seminary for Girls

In the early 20th Century, the site was developed as the Mount Vernon Seminary for Girls. The Georgian Revival Style architecture of buildings surrounding landscaped courtyards still dominates the site.

Slide 12: Naval Communications Annex

The second period of significance was when the US Navy took ownership of the property during World War Two for the US Naval Cryptanalysis operations. On this site, volunteers called the WAVES worked to break the coded messages of enemy forces. Several of the large brick buildings are from this period.

Slide 13: US Department of Homeland Security

Since 2003, the headquarters for the newly formed Department of Homeland Security has been located on this site. Their renovations have been historically appropriate and have incorporated sustainable principles.

Slides 14: How Were the Action Alternatives Developed?

In 2009, GSA presented 13 design principles to the public and stakeholders. Comments received regarding these principles were used to shape the action alternatives for the proposed Master Plan – these principles include:

Slide 15: Planning Principles: Visual Impact

Maintain and enhance the historic core while creating an appropriate presence on Ward Circle.

Slide 16: Planning Principles: Property Edges

Property edges are to be compatible with neighboring properties.

Slide 17: Planning Principles: Site Access

Minimize the number of access points, provide on-site waiting areas, avoid left turns from streets

Slide 18: Planning Principles: Reduce Traffic

Create a pedestrian campus, encourage multimodal transportation and manage transportation.

Slide 19: Planning Principles: Parking

Consolidate parking, minimize visual impact, and minimize parking outside the site.

Slide 20: Planning Principles: Sustainability

Minimize the environmental impact and include stormwater strategies to reduce runoff.

Slide 21: No Action Alternative

NEPA requires that a no action alternative be considered to evaluate the environmental consequences of not undertaking the proposed action so that it can be compared against those of the action alternatives. The “No Action” alternative would result in the NAC continuing to operate in the existing facilities at the NAC. The total amount of floor space contained within the buildings on campus is approximately 650,000 GSF which accommodates about 2,390 seats. Seats represent the maximum number of employees on site at any one time. The existing site is dominated by parking lots and roadways. Existing building courtyards have become service yards, filled with non contributing to the historic fabric structures and mechanical infrastructure. From Ward Circle, untended brush and trees forms an untidy screen to parking lots. This will remain as part of a no action scenario. Buildings that do not contribute to the historic site would remain.

Slide 22: No Action Alternative – Access & Parking

There are 1,239 parking spaces on campus with entrances from Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues. Two large, asphalt surfaced parking areas dominate the site and extend from Ward Circle to Glover-Archbold Park in the rear of the site.

Slide 23: Alternative A – Low Density Development

Alternative A is a low density development option. Existing buildings and new construction would include about 1.1 million GSF for DHS accommodating 3,700 seats.

The existing buildings on campus would be concentrated along the north half of Nebraska Avenue, set back from the road. New buildings would be added to the rear of the site.

Slide 24: Alternative A – Access & Parking

The location and appearance of a really well designed parking structure would create a visible building on Ward Circle.

Existing entrances - two from Nebraska Avenue and one from Massachusetts Avenue – would be maintained. The transportation management plan allows for 1,025 parking spaces. Under this alternative, there would be 1,025 parking spaces, in accordance with the National Capital Planning Commission’s Comprehensive Plan: Transportation Element.

Slide 25: Alternative A – Landscaping

The landscape concept would be comprised of reestablishing historic courtyards, preserving trees and wooded buffers at the rear of the site, developing a pedestrian campus, adding sustainable design features. Facing Ward Circle, landscaping would surround the parking garage, complementing the design of the new structure.

Slide 26: Alternative B – Development

Alternative B is a mid density development option. Existing buildings and new construction would include about 1.2 million GSF for DHS accommodating 4,200 seats.

The location of a signature building on Ward Circle is one of the features of this alternative. Pushing parking to the back of the site and inviting a vibrant, sculptural office building on the circle would be in line with L’Enfant’s vision of creating framed vistas of prominent buildings in our City’s circled intersections.

Slide 27: Alternative B – Access & Parking

Two existing entrances - one from Nebraska Avenue and one from Massachusetts Avenue – would be maintained. There would also be an exit only driveway on Nebraska Avenue directly north of the Ward Circle. The transportation management plan allows for 1,150 parking spaces which comply with the National Capital Planning Commission’s requirements. A partially underground parking garage accommodating 1,050 spaces would be located at the rear of the site and the edges would be planted with vegetation. This alternative has an internal queuing lane for getting cars off of Nebraska Avenue, reducing the cars going into the site from Massachusetts Avenue.

Slide 28: Alternative B – Landscaping

The landscape concept would consist of the core elements found in concept A including reestablishing historic courtyards, preserving trees and wooded buffers at the rear of the site, developing a pedestrian campus and adding sustainable design features. At the corner of Ward Circle, a landscape would complement the design of a new signature building. This alternative allows for significant space between proposed Buildings A and B which recalls the open space that contained the terraced sports courts from the Mount Vernon Seminary historic campus.

Slide 29: Alternative C – Development

Alternative C is a high density development option. Existing buildings and new construction would include about 1.3 million GSF for DHS accommodating 4,500 seats.

The parking garage with a green roof would be located off of Ward Circle and new buildings would be concentrated at the rear of the site.

Slide 30: Alternative C – Access & Parking

Existing entrances would be maintained – two from Nebraska and one from Massachusetts Avenues. The transportation management plan allows for 1,225 parking spaces which comply with the National Capital Planning Commission’s requirements.

Slide 31: Alternative C – Landscaping

Similar to alternatives A and B, the landscape concept would consist of reestablishing historic courtyards, preserving trees and wooded buffers at the rear of the site, developing a primarily pedestrian campus, adding sustainable design features. At the corner of Ward Circle, the green roof of the parking garage would be on level with the circle so that the vegetated roof, and not the parking structure, would be visible from the circle. The camouflaged parking structure would minimize the urban presence of the campus from this corner.

Slide 32: Building Height – Common to All Alternatives

In all alternatives, the original Building 1 remains the highest building on campus as viewed from Nebraska Avenue. You can see from these sections through the site that the topography of the site falls from Nebraska Avenue to Glover-Archbold Park. As such, the taller buildings are located in the rear of the site in order for the historic site to remain dominant when viewed from the street.

Slide 33: Elements Common to All Alternatives

Elements common to all alternatives also include the development of the Transportation Management Plan and the demolition of buildings that do not contribute to the historic site.

Slide 34: Alternatives

Four alternatives range in scope from no action, low, medium and high density. The alternatives endeavor to preserve significant historic aspects of the site while enhancing the NAC with appropriate contextual and sustainable design alternatives.

Slide 35: Issues addressed in DEIS

As required by NEPA, the EIS studies the impacts of a range of alternatives just described by Jim, including the No Action Alternative. Each of the alternatives studied in the Draft EIS would result in impacts to the human environment. Through the next few slides, I will describe each alternative's impacts by resource topic.

Slide 36: Land Use

Under all of the alternatives, no new land uses would be introduced to the site. Due to preexisting urban context of the site and the lack of room for additional future build-out, development at the NAC is not anticipated to spur development in the area.

Slide 37: Plans and Policies and Community Facilities

Implementation of the No Action Alternative would not comply with several policies found in the Federal Elements of the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital, including the creation of a Master Plan for federal facilities with multiple buildings.

The DC Green Agenda cites non-park federal sites as one of the top areas to increase the tree canopy. Under the No Action Alternative, no new trees are proposed; therefore, this alternative would not comply with the Agenda.

Each of the action alternatives, however, would conform with relevant plans and policies.

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no change in demand for community facilities. Under Alternatives A, B and C, additional people and additional facilities on the NAC site could potentially increase demand for community services. However, facilities and services such as child care, a security system, and a facility security force would be added on-site to help alleviate any additional demand created. The increase in demand under all three action alternatives would be marginal.

Slide 38: Visual Resources

In each of the action alternatives, the continuous line of open space at the edge of the campus along Nebraska Avenue would be reinforced due to the removal of Building 7.

New plantings between the fence and the curb along Nebraska Avenue would improve the connection between the streetscape and the NAC facilities beyond the fence.

Views from Glover-Archbold Park of buildings constructed near the park would be limited to the tops of the buildings and would be further screened by vegetation.

Tree buffers at rear of site and adjacent to residential area at Mass Ave would be maintained and enhanced.

As mentioned, in Alternatives A and B, a new structure and new landscaping would anchor Ward Circle and create visual interest. In Alternative C, the urban presence of the campus at Ward Circle would be minimized and new landscaping would be added.

Slide 39: Cultural and Historic Resources

Under the No Action Alternative, no preservation plan or guidelines would be put into place, which could cause the site to lose further historic integrity over time. Building 11 would be demolished as part of planned perimeter security. A final determination has not been made regarding the status of Building 11. If Building 11 is identified as a contributing resource to the National Register-eligible historic district, its demolition would create an adverse impact.

Under each of the action alternatives, Buildings 5, 15, and 18 would be demolished. As Building 5 is a contributing building, its demolition would create an adverse impact. A final determination on the status of Buildings 15 and 18 within the proposed historic district is unresolved. If Buildings 15 and 18 are also determined to be contributing, their removal would further create an adverse impact.

Slide 40: Cultural and Historic Resources

As Jim discussed, each of the action alternatives would seek preserve and rehabilitate contributing landscape features. Under Alternative B, building and spatial relationships in the central athletic historic area would be maintained.

Construction under Alternatives A and C would result in the loss of one historic willow oak tree.

Construction would require excavation and grading of portions of the site. As the area was previously disturbed during the construction of the buildings and the installation of site utilities, it is unlikely that intact archaeological resources would be disturbed in these locations. However, where previous construction activities may not have involved substantial excavation archaeological resources could potentially be disturbed.

Slide 41: Geologic Resources, Soils, and Topography

In the No Action Alternative, no changes would occur for geologic resources. Under each of the action alternatives, excavation would occur and would range from one to three levels below ground.

Each of the action alternatives would also involve clearing, grading and other construction activities for new buildings. The site is already highly urbanized due to past development and most of the site consists of soils that have previously been highly disturbed, cut or filled through past construction activities.

Development would largely avoid steep slopes and primarily be situated within previously disturbed areas. As seen on the map, the steepest slopes mostly line the southern and eastern perimeter of the NAC, particularly along its border with Glover-Archbold Park.

Slide 42: Water Resources, Water Quality, and Stormwater Management

Under the No Action Alternative, no stormwater management controls would be added and uncontrolled runoff would continue, negatively impacting water resources and water quality, including the Foundry Branch stream.

In Alternatives A, B and C, impervious surface cover would be reduced and low impact development practices would be implemented.

Under Alternatives A and C, grading and construction would occur on the location of the southern drainage stream and adjacent low-lying area located near Ward Circle. Under Alternative B, grading and construction would occur in the vicinity of, but not over, the stream and low-lying area. Prior to construction, a detailed study of the drainage system would be conducted and used to design mitigation.

Slide 43: Vegetation

Under the No Action Alternative, one historic spruce tree would be removed due to utility work currently underway that is not associated with a Master Plan. The current tree canopy covers approximately 30% of the site.

Construction in Alternatives A and C would remove one historic willow oak tree.

Each of the action alternatives would incorporate historic landscape features such as courtyards and open green spaces. The existing wooded buffers at the site edges would be retained and new trees

would be added to the site, increasing the tree canopy by at least 10%, for a total tree canopy of approximately 40%.

Slide 44: Hazardous Materials, Waste, and Contamination

In each of the alternatives, it was determined that no further environmental action would be necessary for previously contaminated areas on the site, shown on the map. However, it is recommended that current conditions be evaluated prior to any disturbance to determine proper waste management and maintain worker safety, in the event that undocumented hazardous substances are present on the site.

During renovation and demolition of buildings, any asbestos containing materials, lead based paint, mercury or PCB containing units would be identified, handled, and disposed of according to the appropriate regulations.

Slide 45: Infrastructure/Utilities and Air Quality

During construction under Alternatives A, B and C, some of the on-site utilities infrastructure would be consolidated or replaced with more energy-efficient technology. New sustainable practices on site would also help offset additional demand.

In regard to air quality, under Alternatives A, B and C, mobile source emissions would increase due to the increased number of employees accessing the site. However, gains in energy efficiency from the installation of more energy efficient technologies could also contribute to a decrease in air emissions.

No alternative would interfere with the attainment or maintenance of National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Slide 46: Noise Assessment

The effects of the proposed project on ambient noise levels would primarily be associated with construction activities on the site, and subsequent to construction, the operation of the site and the operation of additional motor vehicles in the vicinity of the site. Increases in ambient noise would be negligible.

The construction contractor would be responsible for ensuring compliance with the DC Noise Control Act. Construction activities should also be limited to the daytime hours, ideally between 7am and 7pm. The surrounding community would also be notified when a major construction project is scheduled to begin.

Slide 47: Climate Change and Sustainability

Under the No Action Alternative, inefficient buildings and lack of stormwater management techniques would remain in place.

Under the three action alternatives, emissions of greenhouse gases would have a minor adverse impact on global climate change as estimated emissions would be slightly greater than the 25,000 metric tons/year indicator level.

Under each action alternative, there would be an increased employment of sustainable practices, such as installing green roofs, increasing the number of trees on-site, implementing a transportation management plan to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips to the site, renovating existing buildings, and constructing new buildings to meet GSA's LEED Gold requirement, at a minimum.

Slide 48: How were Transportation Impacts Analyzed?

A transportation study was performed as part of the Draft EIS. This study was performed in accordance with DDOT standards and as agreed upon during a scoping meeting with DDOT and NCPC.

The scenarios analyzed were existing, 2020 without and with the NAC Master Plan, and 2030 without and with the NAC Master Plan.

The comprehensive study included 27 intersections as shown on the graphic. The study consisted of existing traffic volumes, future traffic volumes based on the regional traffic growth as determined using the MWCOG travel demand model, traffic projections from nearby developments (AU, Wesley Theological Seminary Expansion, and the Wisconsin Avenue Giant PUD), and the NAC Master Plan trips. These traffic volumes were used in the study analyses.

Slide 49: How were Transportation Impacts Analyzed?

The study analyses included intersection capacity analyses at each intersection. The analyses considered vehicular and pedestrian traffic volumes.

At the NAC driveways, queue and signal warrant analyses were also performed. The analyses considered driveway turn movement restrictions and proposed circulation with the Master Plan.

The trips generated by the NAC Master Plan were calculated based on the proposed number of parking spaces for each scenario.

Slide 50: What are the Impacts to Transportation?

Under all alternatives, two intersections would operate at a LOS below D, which is DDOT's LOS threshold for transportation studies:

- Albemarle Street and Fort Drive/40th Street
- Massachusetts Avenue and Ward Circle (West).

Albemarle Street and Fort Drive/40th Street currently operates at a LOS F. The intersection of Ward Circle and Massachusetts Avenue (West) is projected to decline to LOS E by 2020 under the No Action Alternative. The action alternatives would cause a negligible increase in delay.

In each of the action alternatives, the number of employee parking spaces would be reduced from the existing number of parking spaces consistent with NCPC's requirement of 1 parking space per 4 employee parking ratio.

No Action Alternative would continue to provide 1,239 parking spaces and would not comply with NCPC's requirement.

Alternative A would provide 1,025 parking spaces.

Alternative B would provide 1,050 parking spaces.

Alternative C would provide 1,125 parking spaces.

Slide 51: What is a Transportation Management Plan?

Due to the permanent reduction of parking spaces (from existing conditions), implementation of the Transportation Management Plan, or TMP, would be essential in order to avoid spillover parking in the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Along with the DEIS, a transportation management plan has been developed to evaluate current transportation conditions on and near the project site and to propose measures that should be taken to reduce the impact of traffic and transportation. The purpose of a TMP is to reduce vehicle trips and influence mode split changes (away from single occupancy vehicle use) in order to reduce congestion and air pollution levels.

The NAC currently does not have a formal TMP. The proposed TMP will be adopted as part of the Master Plan. The TMP will build upon existing transportation management measures currently in operation and will utilize existing transportation infrastructure (DHS shuttles, transit service, pedestrian and bicycle facilities). The main objective is to reduce single occupant vehicles (SOV's) thus minimizing new traffic and parking demand.

The table shows some of the goals established as part of TMP. The goals include reducing the number of SOV's by half, increasing transit ridership by 25%, and tripling the number of employees who work from home.

Slide 52: Transportation Management Plan – Key Components

The key components of the TMP include the appointment of an employee transportation coordinator (ETC), regular meetings of a Community Transportation Working Group, and providing incentives, alternative work schedules, and limiting parking to encourage non-SOV travel mode choice. A comprehensive list of the proposed travel demand management measures can be found in the TMP.

Slide 53: Transportation Management Plan – Commitments and Monitoring

With the approval and implementation of the NAC Master Plan, DHS commits to the following as part of the TMP:

- Appoint an ETC – upon approval of the Master Plan
- Maintain and enhance the existing DHS shuttle service
- Meet regularly with the Community Transportation Working Group
- Update the TMP at key construction phases
- Enforce parking rules at the NAC

The ETC will monitor transportation performance against the TMP goals and objectives. Data that will be collect includes:

- Employee surveys

- DHS shuttle ridership
- Driveway traffic counts
- Parking counts
- Annual parking permits

The TMP is a living document that will be revised and updated as the Master Plan is implemented. Revisions will be based on the data collected during the monitoring/evaluation process as well as from feedback from the Community Transportation Working Group.

Slide 54: Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are the combined, incremental effects of human activity. While they may be insignificant by themselves, cumulative impacts accumulate over time, from one or more sources, and can result in the degradation of important resources. Depending on other projects implemented in the area, cumulative impacts could occur to stormwater management, climate change, transportation, air quality, and noise. Projects that could contribute to cumulative impacts include the American University Master Plan, the DC Neighborhood Sustainability Indicators Project, the Glover Park Commercial District Study, Rock Creek West 2 Livability Study, and the New Tenleytown Library. Given the potential for cumulative impacts to transportation, the transportation study performed as part of the EIS process took into account the development of the American University campus using the best data available at the time of the study. Our team also met with AU to better understand their future plans. Since publication of the Draft EIS, AU has released new information. Therefore, in the Final EIS, we may revise the cumulative impacts section to incorporate the new information released.

Slide 55: Dismissed Topics

As with any environmental analysis, there are topics that are dismissed from further analysis because the proposed action would either cause a negligible or no impact or because the resource was not present within the study area or area of impact. Negligible impacts are localized and immeasurable at the lowest levels of detection.

The topics that were dismissed from further analysis in this Draft EIS include: economic/fiscal resources, floodplains, threatened and endangered species, wildlife, and demographics and environmental justice populations.

Slide 56:

Now, we will open the floor up to those of you who would like to make formal comments. We welcome any of our public officials to speak first. I will then call people to speak in the order in which they have signed up. Again, if you have not done so, you may sign up at the Welcome table at the back of the room. As a reminder, we will be recording your comment tonight for an official record. GSA and DHS will not be answering questions or addressing your comments during this meeting. The purpose of this meeting is not about debating the merits of the project, but rather to provide an opportunity to the public to provide comments and for GSA to listen to your comments. All comments, either received verbally tonight or written comments received by March 1st, will be responded to in the Final EIS. GSA

may respond to substantive comments by revising alternatives, refining mitigation measures or refining the impacts analysis.

For more information, you can view the entire DEIS which is available at the Palisades, Cleveland Park and Tenley-Friendship public libraries or on the website.

In order to accommodate everyone who would like to speak, we ask that you limit your comments to 3 minutes. At 2 minutes, you will be given a one-minute reminder.

When you come forward, please state and spell your name slowly for the record.

Slide 57: Thank you

Thank you for attending the presentation today. We appreciate your input on this Draft EIS.