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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 one of our cooperating agencies at the FBI. 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.

1. 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 Springfield alternative. The Landover and Greenbelt alternatives were 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. Proposed Action

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

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

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

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

1. 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.

1. JEH Redevelopment

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

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

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

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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.

1. 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 Springfield site, there are no planned developments or substantial changes planned for the site, so the No-action Alternative at the Springfield site 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 Springfield Alternative.

1. Transportation

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

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

1. Springfield Transportation Intersection Study Map

For the Springfield Alternative, traffic conditions were assessed at 26 intersections and 8 freeway facilities, as shown on this map. The Frontier Drive, Loisdale Road, and Franconia Road corridors, were the primary areas of focus. The impacts caused by additional vehicular trips under the Springfield 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.

1. Traffic Impacted Intersections

Traffic impacts were defined at three primary contexts: isolated intersections, road corridors encompassing multiple intersections, and regional impacts to traffic on the Capital Beltway and Interstate 95. Our analysis showed that most of the signalized study area intersections would operate at acceptable levels during the morning and afternoon rush hours under the Springfield Alternative. However, a few intersections in the study area would operate with overall unacceptable conditions, contributing to adverse impacts for isolated intersections and major adverse impacts for the Frontier Drive and Loisdale Road corridors. These intersections are shown on the map as orange or red, indicating LOS E or LOS F. However, the majority of intersections evaluated are within the Commercial Revitalization District and the Transit Service Area in the Franconia-Springfield Comprehensive Plan. According to the plan, LOS E is acceptable within these boundaries.

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 the Franconia-Springfield Parkway, Manchester Boulevard and Beulah Street fail due to delays and queuing contained to this intersection.

CORRIDORS

[Animation change] Our analysis found that there would be delays along the Frontier Drive corridor during both the morning and afternoon rush hour and along the Loisdale Road corridor during the afternoon rush hour. During the morning rush, delays along southbound Frontier Drive would begin at Franconia-Springfield Parkway and extend to Franconia Road. Frontier Drive at Franconia Springfield Parkway fails at both intersections serving the Franconia-Springfield Parkway on and off-ramps. During the afternoon rush hour, delays would occur in the northbound direction along this same stretch of Frontier Drive and along Loisdale Road beginning at Franconia Road and extending to Spring Mall Drive. Together these conditions would result in direct, long-term, major adverse impacts due to a combination of intersection delays and extensive queuing through these half mile stretches of Frontier Drive and Loisdale 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 no Interstate facilities would fail based on the forecasted traffic volumes.

1. Traffic Mitigation

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

The more substantial improvements recommended based on failing turning movements and queuing are as follows:

At the Franconia-Springfield Parkway eastbound off-ramp to Frontier Drive, we recommend adding a new right-turning lane.

At Franconia Road and Frontier Drive, we recommend constructing a pedestrian bridge and lengthening the left-turning lanes along northbound Frontier Drive.

At Franconia Road and Loisdale Road, we recommend lengthening the left-turning lanes along northbound Loisdale Road and lengthening the right-turning lane along eastbound Franconia Road.

At Loisdale Road and Spring Mall Drive, we recommend leaving the Spring Mall Drive westbound approach and Loisdale Road northbound departing lanes the same as the existing and not revising them based on the planned roadway improvements.

At Loisdale Road and the Frontier Drive Extension, we recommend revising the planned roadway improvement to add a second left-turn lane along southbound Loisdale Road.

At the Frontier Drive Extension and Metropolitan Center Drive Extension, we recommend revising the planned roadway improvement to include a two-lane roundabout.

At the Frontier Drive Extension and FBI Consolidated HQ south entry, we recommend adding a new left-turning lane along Frontier Drive eastbound.

At the intersection of Franconia-Springfield Parkway, Beulah Street and Manchester Boulevard, we recommend adding a fourth through lane along westbound Manchester Boulevard extending onto the Franconia-Springfield Parkway.

At the intersection of Loisdale Road and Newington Road, we recommend lengthening the right-turning lane along westbound Newington Road.

At the intersection of Fairfax County Parkway and Loisdale Road, we recommend lengthening the left-turning lanes along southbound Fairfax County Parkway, lengthening the right-turning lane along northbound Fairfax County Parkway, and lengthening the right-turning lane along westbound Loisdale Road.

1. 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 Landover 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 6 of the Draft EIS.

1. Transit Impacts

There would be a variety of impacts to other modes of transportation. Our analysis found no measurable impacts to public transit capacity, parking, or truck access. There would also be no measurable impacts to the bicycle network, as a series of planned improvements associated mainly with the extension of Frontier Drive would be implemented in the no-build condition.

We found there would be direct, long-term adverse impacts to bus operations caused by the potential traffic delays forecasted along Loisdale Road. Additionally, the same bus line that regularly services Springfield Center Drive and Loisdale Road would encounter direct, short-term, adverse impacts caused by construction vehicles blocking some or all of the lanes and intermittent closures to accommodate construction activities.

It is assumed that Metro would follow their long-term plan to address growth-related capacity issues for both bus and rail operations.

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 between the Franconia-Springfield Metro Station and the Springfield site. An improved pedestrian connection between the Springfield site and the Metro Station would provide additional enhancements to the pedestrian network in the study area.

1. 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.

1. 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 Springfield Alternative, as there are no streams, ponds, wetlands or floodplains within the site or within close proximity to the recommended traffic mitigations.

We found there would be direct, long-term, beneficial impacts to hydrology and groundwater. We estimate a 45 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.

1. Water Resource Impacts Comparison Table

This slide outlines a comparison of the impacts to water resources for all sites considered for the FBI Headquarters Consolidation. You can see that both the Greenbelt and Landover Alternatives have both beneficial and adverse impacts to hydrology, and beneficial impacts to Groundwater, similar to the Springfield Alternative. Additionally, the Greenbelt Alternative has beneficial impacts to surface water, and adverse impacts to floodplains.

1. 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 Virginia, Fairfax County Police Department, Fairfax County Schools and the Fairfax County Planning Department.

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

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 Springfield 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 Fairfax County.

1. 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.

1. 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 Springfield Alternative, we examined existing planning studies including Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan for the Franconia – Springfield Area, the Springfield Connectivity Study, and the Franconia-Springfield Station Vision Plan to understand the current planning goals for the area. All three plans envision revitalization of this area of Springfield and enhancements in the connectivity of roads and pedestrian networks, and the mixed-use redevelopment of the Springfield site.

Our analysis found that there would be direct, long-term, beneficial impacts under the Springfield Alternative, as it would encourage revitalization by enhancing economic competition of local businesses, and the transportation mitigation measures would foster connectivity through street design. However, there would also be direct, long-term, adverse impacts because the Springfield Alternative would not consist of high density mixed use development, wayfinding systems through the site would be limited, and a mixture of uses beyond the normal working hours would not be provided, as outlined in the Fairfax County Comprehensive Plan for Franconia and Springfield Area.

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 transportation mitigations. These mitigations would require property strip takings at two intersections, along the extension of the westbound approach of the Fairfax County Parkway to Loisdale Road, and 400 feet of strip takings along the Frontier Drive extension.

1. 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 Springfield 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.

1. 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 Richard Byrd 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

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

*[Signal to court reporter to begin transcript.]* The first person to present comments is\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

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, as time permits

Have a safe trip home.