



Site Selection Plan (Amendment 2)
Federal Bureau of Investigation Suburban Headquarters

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND: As part of the Fiscal Year 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act (Public Law No. 117-103), Congress directed the Administrator of General Services to “select a site from one of the three listed in the General Services Administration Fiscal Year 2017 PNCR–FBI–NCR17 prospectus for a new fully consolidated Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI) headquarters.” Those three previously identified sites are more generally described as:

1. Greenbelt, Maryland: Approximately 61 acres of land owned by the State of Maryland and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Located at the Greenbelt Metrorail Station, in Prince George’s County, Maryland.
2. Landover, Maryland: Approximately 80 acres are privately owned. Located at the site of the former Landover Mall, in Prince George’s County, Maryland.
3. Springfield, Virginia: Approximately 58 acres of federally owned land under the jurisdiction, custody, and control of GSA. Located at the current site of the GSA Franconia Warehouse Complex in Fairfax County, Virginia.

On September 22, 2022, the General Services Administration (GSA) released its Site Selection Plan (“SSP”) for the Federal Bureau of Investigation Suburban Headquarters. On November 18, 2022, GSA issued Amendment 1 to the SSP. As directed by Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (P.L. 117-328), representatives from GSA and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) met with the “individuals representing the sites from the State of Maryland and Commonwealth of Virginia” to discuss the SSP. Following those discussions, GSA is releasing this update to the SSP (Amendment 2).

II. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS: In order to assist the selection authority with determining which site is most advantageous to the United States, the General Services Administration (GSA) will convene a site selection panel composed of full-time government employees to independently and collectively assess which site is the most advantageous to the United States using the following five site selection criteria: (1) FBI proximity to mission-related locations; (2) transportation access; (3) site development flexibility and schedule risk (4) promoting sustainable siting and advancing equity; and (5) cost. As set forth further herein, the site selection panel is tasked with evaluating and/or otherwise applying a

color rating to each criterion for each site and providing a recommendation to the site selection authority. As noted further below, the site selection authority will determine which site is most advantageous to the United States, based on all factors considered, including the consensus ratings provided by the panel. The site selection authority is authorized to select a site that the authority believes is most advantageous to the United States without regard to the requirements contained in the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA). Further, site selection is not an acquisition of goods and/or services; therefore, the provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) do not apply to this selection process.

III. SITE SELECTION PANEL: The site selection authority will appoint a site selection panel consisting of two GSA employees (with one serving as the chairperson) and one FBI employee to review information regarding each site. The materials provided will include information gathered and compiled by the Government on the identified sites, including information provided by Maryland and Virginia. Each panel member will separately review the information and independently evaluate the sites using the panel member site evaluation rating sheet. The panel will then come together as a group to discuss their individual ratings and develop a consensus evaluation for each criterion, which will be documented on the panel consensus site evaluation rating sheet.

IV. SITE SELECTION AUTHORITY: The site selection authority is a full-time federal employee who is a member of the Senior Executive Service. The site selection authority derives this authority from a delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] will serve as the site selection authority.

V. DUTIES OF THE VARIOUS PARTICIPANTS IN THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS

A. Site Selection Authority: The site selection authority is responsible for:

- Establishing the site selection team tailored for this particular effort, including appropriate contracting, legal, logistical, technical, and other expertise;
- Reviewing and approving the site selection plan;
- Appointing the voting and non-voting members of the site selection panel;
- Appointing the site selection panel chairperson;
- Providing a briefing to FBI and GSA senior leadership prior to executing the final decision document; and
- After review of the full record of the site selection panel, executing the final decision document that selects the site and sets forth the rationale as to why the selected site is the most advantageous to the United States.

B. Site Selection Panel: The site selection panel is responsible for:

- Reviewing and applying an overall evaluation to each site in accordance with this site selection plan;
- Reaching a consensus rating for each evaluation criteria;
- Accurately recording individual and consensus evaluations; and
- Providing the evaluations and results of the panel's consensus to the site selection authority.

C. **Site Selection Panel Chairperson:** The chairperson is responsible for:

- Conducting and scheduling site selection panel meetings;
- Providing overall planning, direction and execution of the site selection panel's activities;
- Ensuring that site selection panel members are provided with the resources and information necessary for them to perform their responsibilities; and
- Submitting the site selection panel's individual and consensus documentation to the site selection authority.

D. **Non-Voting Technical Advisors:** The non-voting technical advisors are responsible for gathering and disseminating information to the site selection panel in accordance with this site selection plan for use by the panel members in evaluating the sites. The advisors may, operating under the direction of the contracting officer, assist the panel members with interpreting or understanding any data, information, or other materials.

E. **Contracting Officer:** The contracting officer is responsible for:

- Providing guidance and input to the site selection panel;
- Providing the site selection panel and technical advisors with appropriate guidance and specific instructions, as necessary, for conducting the evaluation;
- Safeguarding sensitive material, including any Controlled Unclassified Information;
- Ensuring that the site selection panel appropriately and contemporaneously documents its individual and consensus ratings;
- Administering and retaining Non-Disclosure Agreements and Statements of Conflict of Interest;
- Reviewing potential conflicts of interest among evaluators, including persons serving on the site selection panel or as non-voting technical advisors; and
- Other duties as requested by the site selection authority related to the administration of the site selection process.

F. **Non-Voting Legal Advisors:** A member from the GSA/Office of the General Counsel will serve as the principal legal advisor to the contracting officer, site selection authority, and site selection panel members. This GSA individual may be supported by others in the GSA/Office of the General Counsel. In addition, the FBI may designate one (1) attorney to participate in the site

selection process. The FBI-designated attorney will provide advice in coordination with GSA counsel.

G. Specifically Designated Participants

Voting Panel Members

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

Technical Advisors (Non-Voting)

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

Contracting Officer (Non-Voting)

- [REDACTED]

Legal Advisors (Non-Voting)

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

A. Briefings, Updates, or Questions by Agency Leadership: In the event that senior agency leadership from the FBI and/or GSA requests any briefings, updates, or questions during the site evaluation process, all such requests must be forwarded to the contracting officer to handle. As a general matter, the information provided to agency leadership should be limited to:

- Updates on the timing, progress, or schedule related to the panel’s evaluations and deliberations;
- Updates on the timing, progress, or schedule related to the site selection authority’s determination; and
- Important matters of law, policy, or similar issues that would ordinarily require input, advice, or guidance from agency leadership.

B. Communications (in general): The individual panel members, contracting officer, and the non-voting panel members (excluding legal counsel) must not:

- Disclose, discuss, or otherwise reveal any non-public information to any person, entity, or organization that is not specifically named in this site selection plan.
- Disclose, discuss, or otherwise reveal any non-public information concerning the evaluation process, including but not limited to the individual or consensus ratings, except to the individuals specifically named in this site selection plan.
- Contact any outside entities, parties, or organizations to obtain additional information about the sites.

VII. THE SITE SELECTION PANEL PROCESS: The contracting officer will provide all the information necessary for the panel to review and hold a kick-off meeting to explain the process and answer any questions. Each site selection panel member will individually review the provided site information and then evaluate each site as set forth in more detail below. The site selection panel should address any questions to the contracting officer.

After each voting member finishes their respective individual evaluations, the panel will convene to attempt to arrive at an overall consensus evaluation for each criterion. The chairperson is responsible for recording the consensus rating and will prepare a narrative documenting the discussed reason for the rating, noting the panel’s views of the relative differences between each site. For any criteria where a consensus cannot be obtained, the chairperson will prepare a narrative for the site selection authority explaining the discussion of the panel members and the reasons for the impasse.

At the conclusion of its deliberations, the chairperson will provide a final, written product to the contracting officer that contains: (1) the complete set of worksheets developed by the panel members; (2) the overall consensus rating developed by the panel for each criterion; and (3) narrative documentation for consensus ratings and for any criteria upon which the panel could not arrive at a consensus.

VIII. SELECTION CRITERIA OVERVIEW: The panel will assign an overall color to each of the Five Criteria listed below. Each panel member will separately assign a color to each of the subcriteria before convening as a group to assign an overall color rating to the criteria.

Criteria #1: FBI Proximity to Mission-Related Locations (subcriteria are of equal importance)

- 1.a: The Proximity of the Site to the FBI’s Quantico Facility
- 1.b: The Proximity of the Site to Non-Consolidating Operationally Significant FBI/NCR Real Estate Assets
- 1.c: The Proximity of the Site to Downtown Facilities (U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Capitol, and White House)

Criteria #2: Transportation Access (subcriteria are of equal importance)

- 2.a: The Walking Distance from the Site to a Station on the Metrorail System Operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
- 2.b: The Walking Distance from the Site to Virginia Railway Express (VRE) or the Maryland Area Regional Commuter (MARC)
- 2.c: Accessibility to Major Bus Line Stop(s)
- 2.d: The Site’s Proximity to the Nearest Commercial Airport

Criteria #3: Site Development Flexibility and Schedule Risk (subcriteria are of equal importance)

- 3.a: Site area and Site Geometry
- 3.b: Schedule Risk

Criteria #4: Promoting Sustainable Siting and Advancing Equity (subcriteria are of equal importance)

- 4.a: Advancing racial equity and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government
- 4.b: Promoting sustainable locations for Federal facilities and strengthening the vitality and livability of the communities in which Federal facilities are located

Criteria #5: Cost (cost elements are added together)

- Cost to Acquire Site + Cost to Prepare Site + Cost of Off-Site Improvements + Relative Cost Difference of Expected Construction Start Dates

IX. OVERVIEW OF THE COLOR SCHEME, WEIGHTS, AND PROCESS

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>BLUE</u>	<u>GREEN</u>	<u>YELLOW</u>
All	Most advantageous to the Government, relative to the other sites (ties are allowed if differences are marginal)	Second most advantageous to the Government, relative to the other sites (ties are allowed if differences are marginal)	Third most advantageous to the Government, relative to the other sites (ties are allowed if differences are marginal)

A. For All Criteria: The panelists will individually evaluate each site against one another by assigning a color to each subcriteria. The individual panelists will **not** assign a color to the overall criteria, but will wait until the panel convenes as a group to do so. Using the subcriteria colors, the panel will determine the predominant color for each site per criteria.

The panel must assign one Blue, at a minimum, for each criteria or subcriteria; however, it is possible for each panelist and the panel as a group to assign the same color to more than one site. Therefore, it is possible, for instance, for the panel to assign two Blues and one Green and zero Yellows for a given criteria.

B. The Weighting of Each Criteria: The overall color rating for each criterion will be weighted per the predetermined multiplier. The criteria colors will be totaled per the following weighting formula once all criteria are evaluated:

- Criteria #1: 25 /100
- Criteria #2: 20 /100
- Criteria #3: 15 /100
- Criteria #4: 20 /100
- Criteria #5: 20 /100

X. BREAKDOWN OF THE SELECTION CRITERIA

CRITERIA #1: FBI PROXIMITY TO MISSION-RELATED LOCATIONS

(subcriteria are of equal importance)

Subcriteria 1.a: The Proximity of the Site to the FBI’s Quantico Facility: The panel will consider the driving distance from the site to the FBI’s Quantico facility in Quantico, Virginia. For purposes of this site selection criteria, the driving distance will be determined by calculating the shortest driving distance from the approximate boundary of each site to the FBI Quantico Facility’s Russell Road vehicle gate. To calculate the driving distance, the panel will be provided with the distance based on the average results from each of the following two commercial web mapping platforms: Google Maps and Apple Maps. The Government prefers a site that is as close to the FBI’s Quantico facility as possible.

Subcriteria 1.b: The Proximity of the Site to Non-Consolidating Operationally Significant FBI/NCR Real Estate Assets: The panel will consider the cumulative driving distance from each site to the FBI’s operationally significant FBI real estate assets, measured in miles. The Government prefers a site that is as close to the real estate assets as possible.

“Non-Consolidating Operationally Significant FBI/NCR Real Estate Assets” means:

- “Operational Airports” (airports housing FBI aviation assets); and
- Federally owned or leased facilities with over 500 available seats, excluding the FBI’s Quantico facility, not planned to consolidate.

The information provided to the panel will show the shortest driving distance from the approximate boundary of each site to each of the real estate assets. The driving distance will be calculated based on the average results from each of the following two commercial web mapping platforms: Google Maps and Apple Maps. The panel will use the total cumulative driving distance to compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 1.c: The Proximity of the Site to Downtown Facilities (U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Capitol, and White House): The panel will consider the cumulative driving distance from the approximate boundary of each site to the following downtown facilities: the headquarters of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ); the U.S. Capitol; and, the White House, in miles. The panel will use the total cumulative driving distance calculated by using the results from each of the following two commercial web mapping tools, Google Maps and Apple Maps. The Government prefers a site that is as close to the downtown facilities as possible.

CRITERIA #2: TRANSPORTATION ACCESS **(subcriteria are of equal importance)**

Subcriteria 2.a: The Walking Distance from the Site to a Station on the Metrorail System operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority: The panel will consider the walking distance of the site to a Metro Station to evaluate which site will best expand public transportation use and access. For purposes of this criteria, Metro Station means a station operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The information provided to the panel will include the walking distance from the site to the nearest Metro Station as calculated in the 2016 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. A site that is as close to a Metro station as possible is preferred. Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 2.b: The Walking Distance from the Site to a Virginia Railway Express (VRE) or Maryland Area Regional Commuter (MARC) Station: The panel will consider the distance of the site to a commuter rail station to evaluate which site will best expand public transportation use and access. For purposes of this criteria a commuter rail station means one that is operated by the VRE or the MARC Train System. The information provided to the panel will include the walking distance from the site to the nearest commuter rail station as calculated in the 2016 Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Government prefers a site that is as close to a commuter rail station as possible. Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 2.c: Accessibility to Bus Line Stops: The panel will consider the number of bus lines servicing stops within 1/2 mile of each site to evaluate which site that will best expand public transportation use and access. The information provided to the panel will include the

number of lines per site as calculated in the 2016 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and updated for current conditions. The Government's preference is for a site that has as many bus line stops within the immediate vicinity of the site as possible. Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 2.d: The Site's Proximity to the Nearest Commercial Airport: The panel will consider the driving distance from the site to the nearest Commercial Airport, measured in miles. The Government prefers a site with the shortest distance. "Commercial Airport" means:

- Washington Dulles International Airport; 1 Saarinen Cir, Dulles, VA 20166;
- Reagan National Airport; 2401 Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Access Rd, Arlington, VA 22202; or
- Baltimore/Washington Thurgood Marshall Airport; 7050 Friendship Rd, Baltimore, MD 21240.

The information provided to the panel will show the shortest driving distance from the anticipated boundary of each site under consideration to each Commercial Airport. The distance will be calculated based on the results from each of the following two commercial web mapping platforms: Google Maps and Apple Maps. Based on the information provided, the panel will use the distance to compare the sites and assign a color.

CRITERIA #3: SITE DEVELOPMENT FLEXIBILITY AND SCHEDULE RISK
(subcriteria are of equal importance)

Subcriteria 3.a: Site Area and Site Geometry: The panel will consider whether the site is flexible enough to allow for expansion and build-out to accommodate future growth. The site should have the flexibility to support future programmatic changes due to unforeseen changing mission requirements. To support future growth or consolidation, a site should have the capacity to support additional buildings and/or operational functions. For instance, the panel might consider, among other aspects, the number of acres, or fractions thereof, of usable additional land on the parcel that will remain available following construction of the anticipated facility on the site. Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 3.b: Schedule Risk: This criterion considers the potential schedule risks to meeting the expected construction start date at any of the sites. These risks include acquiring the site, relocating tenants, demolition of existing facilities, remediating the soil, and taking other necessary actions. The sooner the site is available for the commencement of construction activities, at the least risk to the Government, the better. Based on the information provided, the panel will analyze the risks associated with each site and then compare, contrast, and weigh those risks against one another to evaluate the degree of future schedule risk to the Government and assign a color.

CRITERIA #4: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE SITING AND ADVANCING EQUITY
(subcriteria are of equal importance)

This criterion considers the likelihood that selecting the site will advance the policies and goals contained in Executive Orders 13985, 14057, and 14091 to:

- Advance racial equity and support for underserved communities through the Federal Government; and
- Promote sustainable locations for Federal facilities and strengthen the vitality and livability of the communities in which Federal facilities are located.

Subcriteria 4.a: Advancing racial equity and support for underserved communities

through the Federal Government: Executive Order 13985 established that the Federal Government should pursue a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for all and creating opportunities for the improvement of communities that have been historically underserved. Section 1 of the order states:

It is therefore the policy of my Administration that the Federal Government should pursue a comprehensive approach to advancing equity for all, including people of color and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent poverty and inequality. Affirmatively advancing equity, civil rights, racial justice, and equal opportunity is the responsibility of the whole of our Government. Because advancing equity requires a systematic approach to embedding fairness in decision-making processes, executive departments and agencies (agencies) must recognize and work to redress inequities in their policies and programs that serve as barriers to equal opportunity.

By advancing equity across the Federal Government, we can create opportunities for the improvement of communities that have been historically underserved, which benefits everyone.

In addition, Executive Order 14091, *Further Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through The Federal Government* (Feb. 16, 2023), “builds upon [] previous equity-related Executive Orders by extending and strengthening equity-advancing requirements for agencies, and it positions agencies to deliver better outcomes for the American people.” Furthermore, E.O. 14091 instructs agencies to “undertake efforts...to strengthen urban equitable development policies and practices,

such as advancing community wealth building projects [and] facilitating equitable flows of private capital, including to underserved communities....”

Accordingly, the panel will consider aspects of each site that may advance the policy goals set forth in E.O. 13985 and 14091 including but not limited to: (i) whether federal resources have been or are equitably distributed to people of color and others who have been historically underserved, marginalized, and adversely affected by persistent poverty and inequality in the county where the site is located (versus the county in which the other site is located) that have historically been disadvantaged when it comes to federal investment; (ii) the share of the county’s federal office space (using the data from the Federal Real Property Profile) in the community where the site is located versus the county in which the other site is located; (iii) the median household income of the county where the site is located versus the county in which the other site is located; (iv) the percentage of federal jobs located in the county where the site is located versus the county in which the other site is located; (v) whether the site is located in an “underserved community,” as that term is defined in E.O. 13985; (vi) whether locating the facility at the site could provide increased employment opportunities for an “underserved community,” as that term is defined in E.O. 13985; (vii) whether locating the site at the facility could create middle-skill, high-paying jobs (defined as those in excess of the median individual income in the county where the site is located) in an “underserved community,” as that term is defined in E.O. 13985; and (viii) whether locating the site at the location could create opportunities for the improvement of communities that have been historically underserved.

Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

Subcriteria 4.b: Promoting sustainable locations for Federal facilities and strengthening the vitality and livability of the communities in which Federal facilities are located: Section 510(b) of E.O. 14057 instructed the Chair of Council on Economic Quality (“CEQ”), in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to “consider issuing guidance for agencies to promote sustainable locations for Federal facilities and strengthen the vitality and livability of the communities in which Federal facilities are located.” In August 2022, CEQ issued “Implementing Instructions for Executive Order 14057 Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability.” The implementing instruction note that when making siting decisions for Federal workplaces, agencies should advance:

- **Sustainable land use that promotes conservation of natural resources, reduced GHG emissions, and increased resilience to the impacts of climate change;**
- Efficient use of and integration with existing local infrastructure;
- Expanded use of and broad access to public transportation;

- **Equitable development that promotes environmental justice and spurs economic opportunity for disadvantaged communities that historically have been marginalized and overburdened by pollution and underinvestment;** and
- **Coordination and alignment with the development plans of Tribal, State, and local governments that advance these and related goals.**

For purposes of Criteria 4, the panel will review information pertaining to the first, fourth, and fifth bullets. GSA took the second bullet into consideration during the previous site selection activities to winnow the potential list of sites to Springfield, Landover, and Greenbelt. Criteria 2 (transportation access) addresses the third bullet.

Based on the information provided, the panel will compare the sites and assign a color.

CRITERIA #5: COST

(cost elements are added together)

- **Cost of Site Acquisition:** If the Government needs to purchase the site, the cost to acquire the site is the one provided by the owner of the site to the Government. The panelists will be provided with the statement of price provided to the Government. A site provided to the Government at no cost would have no acquisition cost.
- **Cost of Site Preparation:** The estimated, reasonable costs to prepare the site for any future construction. This includes relocating tenants not already planned for relocation, demolishing existing facilities, remediating the soil, and taking other necessary actions. The panelists will be provided with the statements of costs estimated by the Government.
- **Cost of Off-Site Improvements:** The difference, if any, between the anticipated off-site infrastructure improvements to be paid for by third parties and the cost, if any, of any such improvements that will need to be paid by the Government. That is to say, the total costs for the off-site improvements is \$X, and the third parties will be assuming responsibility for \$Y. This criterion will take into the account the delta, if any, between \$X (-) \$Y. The information provided to the panelists will include these costs.
- **Relative Cost Differences of Expected Construction Start Dates:** This allows for the recognition of relative cost differences, if any, due to an earlier expected construction start date at any of the sites. A later construction start date would push the final completion of the overall project to a later date. The cost applied here will consist of two elements: (1) construction escalation; and (2) J. Edgar Hoover Building sustainment/carrying costs. These two elements will then be multiplied by the time difference (in months), if any.

Based on the information provided, the panel will add the various costs for each site and then compare the total cost of each site against one another and assign this criteria a color.

XI. SELECTING THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS SITE: The site selection authority will use the evaluation report developed by the site selection panel to help guide and inform a final decision as to which property is in the best interest of the United States; however, the site selection authority is vested with the discretion to fully evaluate all attributes of the sites and select the site which is truly most advantageous to the Government, regardless of the recommendation provided by the panel. The site selection authority may consider any and all information in making a decision, including the full record of the site selection panel but also information, data, or other materials not considered or evaluated by the site selection panel. Prior to making a public announcement regarding the final decision, the site selection authority will provide a briefing for the Associate Deputy Director of the FBI, the Chief Financial Officer of the FBI, and the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service.

- Signatures on following page -

Approval

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Site Selection Authority

Date

Concurrence (for legal sufficiency)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Office of the General Counsel

Date

Disclaimer: GSA site selection plans are deliberative in nature and are not routinely released prior to selecting a site. GSA is choosing to release the site selection plan in this instance for the sole purpose of facilitating transparency in the Federal Bureau of Investigation Headquarters site selection. The unique statutory and regulatory underpinnings of this particular site selection provide sufficient safeguards to mitigate against the possibility that the release of the site selection plan might compromise the integrity of the deliberative process itself where the exposure of that process would result in harm. The release of the site selection plan only waives the deliberative process privilege for that particular document, and not for related materials. Further, GSA reserves the right to withhold site selection plans as deliberative materials in all other instances.

- END -