

1

2

3

4

5 COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

6 joint with the

7 COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,

8 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

9 WASHINGTON, D.C.

10

11

12

13

14 INTERVIEW OF: SHANNON PARRY

15

16

17

18 Tuesday, April 9, 2024

19

20 Washington, D.C.

21

22

23 The interview in the above matter was held in room 164, Cannon House Office

24 Building, commencing at 9:59 a.m.

1 Appearances:

2

3

4

5 For the COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY:

6

7 [REDACTED], PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

8 [REDACTED], SENIOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

9 [REDACTED], PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBER

10 [REDACTED], DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL FOR OVERSIGHT

11 [REDACTED], MINORITY OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

12 [REDACTED], MINORITY OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

13

14

15

16 For the COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY:

17

18 [REDACTED], CHIEF OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

19 [REDACTED], SENIOR ADVISOR

20 [REDACTED], SENIOR ADVISOR

21 [REDACTED], MINORITY SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE RANKING MEMBER

22 [REDACTED], MINORITY CHIEF COUNSEL

23 [REDACTED], MINORITY DEPUTY CHIEF OVERSIGHT COUNSEL

1 For the FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION:

2

3 [REDACTED], ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

4 [REDACTED], GENERAL ATTORNEY, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

1 [REDACTED] Can we go on the record, please?

2 This is a transcribed interview of Ms. Shannon Parry. Chairman Jordan and
3 Chairman Comer have requested this interview as part of the committees' oversight of
4 the FBI and the GSA.

5 Would the witness please state your name for the record?

6 Ms. Parry. Shannon Parry.

7 [REDACTED] Could agency counsel please state your names for the record?

8 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED] On behalf of the committees, I want to thank you for appearing here
11 today to answer our questions. The chairman also appreciates your willingness to
12 appear voluntarily.

13 My name is [REDACTED] I am with Chairman Jordan's staff. I'll now have
14 everyone else from the committees who's here in the room introduce themselves as well.

15 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], with Chairman Jordan's staff.

16 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Chairman Jordan's staff.

17 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], with Chairman Comer.

18 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], with Chairman Comer.

19 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], with Ranking Member Nadler.

20 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], with Ranking Member Nadler.

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Oversight Committee, Ranking Member Raskin.

22 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Oversight Committee, with Ranking Member Raskin.

23 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Oversight Committee, Democratic staff.

24 [REDACTED] [REDACTED], Chairman Jordan's staff.

25 [REDACTED] Thank you.

1 I'd like to now go over the ground rules and guidelines that we will follow during
2 today's interview.

3 Our questioning will proceed in rounds. The majority will ask questions first for
4 1 hour, and then the minority will have an opportunity to ask questions for an equal
5 period of time if they choose. We will alternate back and forth until there are no more
6 questions and the interview is over.

7 Typically, we take a short break at the end of each hour, but if you would like to
8 take a break apart from that, please just let us know.

9 Ms. Parry. Okay.

10 [REDACTED] As you can see, there is an official court reporter taking down
11 everything we say to make a written record, so we ask that you give verbal responses to
12 all questions. Do you understand?

13 Ms. Parry. I do.

14 [REDACTED] So the court reporter can take down a clear record, we will do our best
15 to limit the number of people directing questions at you during any given hour to just
16 those people on the staff whose turn it is.

17 Please try and speak clearly so the court reporter can understand and so the folks
18 down at the end of the table can hear you. It is important that we don't talk over one
19 another or interrupt each other if we can help it, and that goes for everybody present at
20 today's interview.

21 We want you to answer our questions in the most complete and truthful manner
22 possible, so we will take our time. If you have any questions or if you do not understand
23 one of our questions, please let us know. Our questions will cover a wide range of
24 topics, so if you need clarification at any point, just say so.

25 If you honestly don't know the answer to a question or do not remember, it is best

1 not to guess. Please give us your best recollection. And it is okay to tell us if you
2 learned the information from someone else. Just indicate how you came to know the
3 information.

4 If there are things you don't know or can't remember, just say so, and please
5 inform us who, to the best of your knowledge, might be able to provide a more complete
6 answer to the question.

7 You should also understand that, although this interview is not under oath, that by
8 law you are required to answer questions from Congress truthfully. Do you understand
9 that?

10 Ms. Parry. I do.

11 [REDACTED] This also applies to questions posed by congressional staff in an
12 interview. Do you understand this?

13 Ms. Parry. I do.

14 [REDACTED] Witnesses that knowingly provide false testimony could be subject to
15 criminal prosecution for perjury or for making false statements under 18 USC Section
16 1001. Do you understand this?

17 Ms. Parry. I do.

18 [REDACTED] Is there any reason you are unable to provide truthful answers to
19 today's questions?

20 Ms. Parry. No.

21 [REDACTED] Finally, I'd like to make a note that the content of what we discuss
22 here today is confidential. We ask that you not speak about what we discuss in this
23 interview to any outside individuals to preserve the integrity of our investigation.

24 For the same reason, the marked exhibits that we will use today will remain with
25 the court reporter so that they can go in the official transcript, and any copies of those

1 exhibits will be returned to us when we wrap up.

2 That is the end of my preamble. Is there anything that my colleagues from the
3 minority would like to add?

4 [REDACTED] We just want to say thank you to Ms. Parry for being here
5 voluntarily.

6 Ms. Parry. Thank you.

7 [REDACTED] The clock now reads 10:03. We'll start the first hour of questioning.

8 EXAMINATION

9 BY [REDACTED]:

10 Q Can you describe your educational background for us?

11 A I received my bachelor's in politics and German from Saint Joseph's
12 University in Philadelphia; a master's degree in German from the University of Salzburg,
13 dual-conferred by Bowling Green State University. And my Ph.D. studies at Georgetown
14 University were in linguistics.

15 Q Are you fluent in German?

16 A I am.

17 Q And other than English and German, are you fluent in any other languages?

18 A Fluent, no.

19 Q Have you formally taught any of these languages in an educational setting --

20 A I have.

21 Q -- such as German?

22 A I have.

23 Q If so, where?

24 A I've taught English in Germany at a boys' boarding school. And I taught
25 German at both Bowling Green State University and Georgetown University.

1 Q Have you been able to apply your proficiency in German to positions that
2 you have held in the FBI?

3 A I have.

4 Q In what positions?

5 A I joined the Bureau as a German language analyst.

6 Q And when did you join the FBI?

7 A In 2003.

8 Q And what was your key motivation for joining the FBI?

9 A I was at Georgetown teaching German when 9/11 happened, and I knew
10 that I wanted to do something for my country. I answered an ad in The Washington
11 Post looking for speakers of German and Arabic.

12 Q And what is -- sorry. Where is your office based?

13 A My current office is in Winchester, Virginia.

14 Q And what are your roles and responsibilities in this position?

15 A As the Assistant Director of the Information Management Division, my
16 division is responsible for upholding the integrity of the FBI's records and promoting
17 public trust and access to those records.

18 Q Okay. And what subject matter areas do you work on?

19 A So, within the Information Management Division, our major programs are
20 Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act programs for the Bureau; the Enterprise
21 Vetting Center, which conducts vetting for employment suitability as well as immigration
22 benefits. We're responsible for setting standards through the Agency Records Office, as
23 well as working the technology to support FBI information and records.

24 Q Can you describe the organizational chart of your office for us?

25 A So, within my division, as Assistant Director, I lead the division. I have one

1 Deputy Assistant Director. I have five section chiefs, who are responsible -- they're
2 Senior Executive Service -- five section chiefs, who are responsible for their sub-programs;
3 and then, I believe, 9 assistant section chiefs who fall under them; and approximately
4 40 units that fall within the organization of the division.

5 Q Okay. And who is your direct supervisor?

6 A My direct supervisor is Associate Deputy Director Brian Turner.

7 Q And how many people are employed within the Winchester office?

8 A Within Winchester alone?

9 Q Yes.

10 A Approximately 900.

11 Q Okay.

12 And can you walk us through the various positions you've held at the FBI?

13 A I joined as a German linguist. I then moved into supervising as a
14 supervisory management and program analyst. I've been a unit chief. I've been a
15 section chief in two sections, a deputy assistant director, and now an assistant director.

16 Q Thank you.

17 And as Assistant Director of the Information Management Division, how often do
18 you interact with FBI Director Christopher Wray?

19 A Can you say that again?

20 Q Yes. As Assistant Director of the Information Management Division, how
21 often do you interact with the FBI Director, Christopher Wray?

22 A Not often.

23 Q Okay. And how often do you interact with FBI Deputy Director Paul
24 Abbate?

25 A Apart from sitting in a morning brief, not often.

1 Q Okay. And how often do you interact with FBI headquarters?

2 A Can you clarify that?

3 Q Yeah. Do you visit FBI headquarters often?

4 A Approximately once a month.

5 Q Okay.

6 A I'll come in once a month.

7 Q And when you do go to FBI headquarters, with whom do you interact with?

8 A Associate Deputy Director Brian Turner.

9 Q Okay.

10 And do you interact with Main Justice?

11 A Occasionally.

12 Q And when you do interact with Main Justice, with whom do you interact
13 with?

14 A With the National Security Division.

15 Q And how often?

16 A Monthly.

17 Q Okay.

18 And do you interact with the Attorney General's Office?

19 A No.

20 Q What kind of formal training, experience, or certifications do you have that
21 qualify you for your current role?

22 A Sorry. You're not making me cry. Remember that.

23 Can you repeat that?

24 Q Yes. What kind of formal training, experience, or certifications do you have
25 that qualify you for your current role?

1 A I have certifications in records management. I have training throughout my
2 Bureau career in leadership, in insider threats, in information management.

3 Q Thank you.

4 And during your tenure at the FBI, have you ever participated in a review of your
5 performance?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And do you generally receive good markings --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- on your performance reviews?

10 Okay. I'm going to go into the FBI headquarters project now.

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q When did you learn that you would serve as a representative on the site
13 selection panel of the FBI headquarters project?

14 A September 2022.

15 Q And who selected you to be a panelist?

16 A I received a phone call and then an email from Nick Dimos, who is the
17 Assistant Director of our Finance and Facilities Division. He had shared with me that he
18 had just left our seventh floor, where he had conversations with the Associate Deputy
19 Director, Brian Turner, as well as Deputy Director Abbate, where they selected me to
20 serve on the panel.

21 Q Okay. And why were you selected?

22 A I think there are three reasons that I was selected for this.

23 The first is that I had no previous engagement with any part of the headquarters
24 site selection process to date.

25 Q Uh-huh.

1 A That I oversee a very large division over six geographic locations, and so I
2 also have real estate background in my portfolio.

3 And the third is that I have developed processes for the Bureau, and so they know
4 that if there is a process and it has gaps, that I will mitigate those; that if there isn't a
5 process, I will create one; and if there is a process that's sound, I will follow it. And so I
6 have a history of developing strategies also for the Bureau.

7 And so I would think that for those reasons -- and that I'm also not in the
8 Washington, D.C., area.

9 Q Uh-huh.

10 A I live and operate out of Winchester.

11 Q Okay.

12 And was there a memo or any other formal written notification of your
13 assignment as a panelist?

14 A Assistant Director Dimos had sent an email to GSA doing a virtual
15 introduction between myself and the GSA representative.

16 Q Okay.

17 And who selected the rest of the site selection panel representatives?

18 A I don't know.

19 Q Okay.

20 And what duties and responsibilities did you have as a representative on the
21 panel?

22 A I'm going to refer to a timeline here, because there are a lot of dates.

23 We received in -- after that virtual introduction, we received -- in October of 2022,
24 we received a site selection plan and a schedule. And so within that site selection plan
25 roles and responsibilities are delineated.

1 I can't speak to every single thing that was in that plan, but basically that I was
2 responsible for reviewing all of the materials that were being provided, evaluate each of
3 the sites against the criteria, the five criteria that were delineated --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- and to submit a report -- that I would be joining two other panel members
6 to submit a report to the Site Selection Authority at the conclusion of our panel.

7 Q And can you briefly explain how you evaluated each site?

8 A Sure.

9 We were given a list of five criteria and, in those instructions, were also advised to
10 read through -- there were in excess of 600 pages of materials to support each of those
11 criteria in total. And so I went through, I read 600-plus pages a number of times, looked
12 at the criteria.

13 They also had prepared sheets for us listing each of the criteria, where they had
14 already pre-populated some of the responses. Distance, for example, is a good one to
15 illustrate, where if the criteria is the distance between each of the three locations to an
16 airport, that they had already calculated what the miles were.

17 And so we were looking at what the mileage was for each of the sites. We then
18 had to assign a rating to each of the three sites, whether that was blue, green, or yellow,
19 blue being most advantageous to the government, green being second most
20 advantageous, and a yellow rating that would be designated as the third advantageous to
21 the government.

22 Q And there were only three voting panel members that filled out these
23 evaluations; is that --

24 A Correct.

25 Q -- correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And when you were brought on as a representative, did you have any
3 concerns about participating in the project?

4 A No.

5 Q And why was it decided to have two GSA officials and only one FBI official
6 serve on the panel?

7 A I don't know.

8 Q Do you know when all the panel members were selected and finalized?

9 A I don't. I just know that the first email that we received that I referenced,
10 where we received that site selection plan --

11 Q Uh-huh.

12 A -- and the schedule, that there were the names of my two other panelists on
13 that email. So it must've been by October 4th, 2022.

14 Q And who are the other GSA officials who served on the panel?

15 A Tim Sheckler; he served as our chair for the panel. And Brett Banks; he was
16 the second GSA panelist.

17 Q And how did the reporting structure of the site selection panel work?

18 A Tim was designated as chair. That was in the materials that we had
19 received, is that there would be three panel voting participants, two from GSA and one
20 from FBI, with one from GSA serving as the panel's chair.

21 Q And how often did the site selection panel meet?

22 A There was a prescribed period of time -- so, from that initial email where the
23 schedule was sent back in October of 2022, there were several emails that were sent at
24 different times asking for our availability. And then when we thought we were going to
25 meet, then we didn't meet.

1 And so by the time we actually came together as a panel, that was in July of 2023.

2 And we first started meeting on July 27th, 2023. And that was our kickoff meeting.

3 Q Okay. So you never met with the representatives prior, whether that was
4 virtually or in person --

5 A No.

6 Q -- until July 27th?

7 A Correct.

8 Q Okay.

9 And who called the meeting to order?

10 A That was Aaron Hassinger. That was the same gentleman from GSA who I
11 was virtually introduced back in 2022.

12 Q Okay.

13 And for the FBI headquarters project, who did you report to within the FBI?

14 A I didn't report anything about the headquarters project to anyone --

15 Q Okay.

16 A -- while I was on the panel.

17 BY [REDACTED]:

18 Q Just one clarifying question. You said Tim was the chair?

19 A Aaron Hassinger --

20 Q Oh, okay.

21 A -- led the kickoff meeting.

22 Q Oh, okay.

23 A And Tim Sheckler was the chair of the panel, yes.

24 Q For the panelists, the materials of the GSA -- that someone from GSA be the
25 chair, did it specify which of the two GSA representatives?

1 A Say that again?

2 Q So on the panel you have the two GSA representatives and then yourself.

3 And you said that the materials referenced that someone from GSA would be the chair; is
4 that right?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Was it specific in that it identified who from GSA, which of the two?

7 A Yes. Yes.

8 Q Okay. Thank you.

9 A It was Tim.

10 BY [REDACTED]:

11 Q When did you find out that Ms. Nina Albert was assigned as the Site
12 Selection Authority?

13 A That would have been October 2022, when we received the initial email with
14 the site selection plan and the schedule.

15 Q And did you ever personally meet with Ms. Albert during her capacity as Site
16 Selection Authority?

17 A She attended our meetings when we started in July of 2023, but outside of
18 those days of the meetings during the panel, no.

19 Q And as a representative, did you report to Ms. Albert for the FBI
20 headquarters project?

21 A No.

22 Q Do you know if Ms. Albert met with any of the other representatives?

23 A I don't know.

24 Q Did you have any concerns about Ms. Albert's appointment as Site Selection
25 Authority at any point in the site selection process?

1 A Concerns about her appointment as Site Selection Authority?

2 Q Yes.

3 A No.

4 Q Did you have any other concerns about her status or background before she
5 became Site Selection Authority?

6 A I didn't know about her background while I was going through the panel.

7 Q Did you end up learning about her background at some point?

8 A I did.

9 Q And when did you learn about her background?

10 A That was in October or November of 2023.

11 Q And, to clarify, this was her background as a previous employee of WMATA?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And did you have any concerns about that?

14 A No. Concerns? No.

15 Q Do you know if anyone in the FBI had any concerns about her prior
16 employment with WMATA?

17 A I believe, looking at the process and -- the process that was outlined for the
18 panel and then as compared to the process outlined for the Site Selection Authority, I
19 believe that there -- the questions about the Site Selection Authority's previous employer
20 was called into question with regard to how that may have or may not have influenced
21 that process. But whether it influenced the panel's process, through my perspective?
22 No.

23 Q Okay.

24 BY [REDACTED]:

25 Q To your understanding, who had those questions or concerns?

1 A Our Director referenced a letter that he had authored to GSA asking about
2 the process itself.

3 Q And did you have any conversations directly with the Director?

4 A No.

5 Q Did you have any conversations with anyone at FBI about the Director's
6 letter?

7 A No.

8 BY [REDACTED]:

9 Q I'd like to enter an October 12th, 2023, letter from FBI Director Wray to
10 Administrator Carnahan into the record as exhibit 1.

11 [Parry Exhibit No. 1

12 was marked for identification.]

13 Ms. Parry. This is all the same, right?

14 [REDACTED] Yes.

15 Ms. Parry. Okay.

16 BY [REDACTED]:

17 Q All right. I'll give you some time to review --

18 A To read it?

19 Q Yeah. I have some specific passages that I'll read out and then ask
20 questions about them.

21 Let me know when you're ready.

22 A Okay.

23 Q Okay.

24 On the first page, in the second paragraph of the letter, it states, "The FBI's
25 September 22, 2023, memorandum and follow-up questions submitted to your team

1 described in detail our concerns and need for additional clarification regarding the site
2 selection process. GSA provided two draft versions of the site selection decision
3 document, along with a briefing of the decision. These three iterations of
4 communication to the FBI conveyed, at times, different explanations and rationales for
5 how key components of the site selection decision were considered."

6 Why do you think that the FBI felt that it received different explanations?

7 A Say that again?

8 Q Why do you think that the FBI felt that it received different explanations
9 from the Site Selection Authority on her decision to choose the Greenbelt site over the
10 Springfield site?

11 A I don't know why the FBI may have felt they received different -- what was
12 your -- how you phrased that?

13 Q Received different explanations.

14 A Different explanations.

15 It's possible that -- the Site Selection Authority submitted a report, just as the
16 panel did. And so there is written documentation.

17 But my understanding through the site selection plan that I was provided back in
18 2022 was that the process would also be orally briefed to the FBI, that following the
19 report submitted by the Site Selection Authority, that that Authority would also brief
20 members of the FBI on the decision.

21 And so it's possible -- I was not at that briefing, but it's possible that you have a
22 written report as well as a verbal briefing. Perhaps those are the references made there
23 to multiple explanations.

24 Q Do you know when Ms. Albert submitted her site selection decision report?

25 A I don't. I don't know the exact date.

1 Q Does September 30th --

2 A Makes sense.

3 Q -- sound accurate?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And did Ms. Albert release a pre-deliberative decision report to the site
6 selection panel as she completed it?

7 A No.

8 Q When did you find out that Ms. Albert chose the Greenbelt site over the
9 Springfield site?

10 A It was sometime in -- it was sometime in October, through the media.

11 Q October of what year?

12 A October 2023. And then I received -- in November of 2023, the panel
13 received from GSA the SSA's final report. But I had learned prior to receiving that, just
14 through the media.

15 Q Do you know if anyone in the FBI received the report or heard that
16 Ms. Albert's decision was going to be the Greenbelt site before you did?

17 A I believe that the Director had learned of the Site Selection Authority's
18 decision and report prior to me hearing about it, as I heard about it through the media.

19 Q And are you aware of a briefing that took place in August between the FBI
20 and GSA?

21 A No.

22 Q So you wouldn't be in attendance?

23 A No.

24 BY [REDACTED]:

25 Q Okay.

1 And what was your reaction to Ms. Albert's differing decision?

2 A I thought back to the very first day of the panel's meeting, in July of 2023.
3 GSA had kept very good records of -- anytime we met, they had a meeting log. Anytime
4 we had a question, we were asked to enter it into a question log.

5 I took full advantage of the question log, as one of my very first questions was
6 about the Site Selection Authority and the language that was in the plan that included her
7 ability to use the 600-and-plus pages that we were given, as well as -- and I can't recall
8 the exact wording -- but as well as any additional information not provided to the panel.

9 I had asked about that, whether or not the panel would receive that same
10 information or any type of clarification as to what that information could be --

11 Q Uh-huh.

12 A -- as 600-plus pages of a panel packet is quite robust. And so I was just
13 curious, back in July, of what that might be, just trying to better understand the process
14 from beginning to end.

15 And so, when I learned of the decision, I immediately thought that the Site
16 Selection Authority must have used that other information that was referenced that I had
17 no idea what that was, but that that must've been the reason why she had decided on a
18 different site than the panel.

19 Q Were you surprised that she chose a different site?

20 A No.

21 Q Why were you not surprised?

22 A There was a meeting during -- after the panel convened in July. July 27th
23 was our first meeting. We were given a lot of instruction on what we were to do as
24 individuals, and so our first, sort of, responsibility was to read through that 600-plus-page
25 packet and not talk to our other panel members about that and to independently

1 evaluate each of the sites against the criteria using the information that we were
2 provided.

3 We then, a few days later, came back as a group when we had each evaluated
4 singularly to then move into what they were calling "consensus meetings." I think that
5 they had planned for 2 days of consensus meetings. We only needed a morning to
6 achieve consensus, because each of the panelists evaluated each of the criteria and each
7 of the locations exactly the same way, and so we didn't need as much time in consensus.

8 That was the morning of -- July 31st was the morning that we achieved consensus.
9 According to our schedule, we would have gone into the report-writing phase.

10 We were going to take a break that morning after we achieved consensus. At
11 that meeting, everyone said their thank-yous. The Site Selection Authority was in that
12 meeting, as well, thanking everyone for their time and for their participation, and that we
13 would be moving into the report-writing phase.

14 We took a break, and as we came back that same afternoon into what I thought
15 would be instructions as to how we would move forward with a format and the
16 timeframe that we would be given to write the report, we were brought back into what
17 GSA in their meeting log called a "back-check," where, in my opinion, we relitigated and
18 had to go through each of the decisions that we had made in the morning.

19 And the Site Selection Authority was quite active in that meeting, so much so that
20 at the conclusion of that meeting, before we went into the report writing, I called the
21 attorney who was assigned to this panel from the FBI side as an advisor. I called all of
22 the FBI folks who were serving as technical advisors and just thanked them on my behalf
23 as we were moving into the process that was just writing a report, but that the panel had
24 concluded.

25 And I posed to him a rhetorical question, and I asked him what he felt like,

1 whether the Site Selection Authority would reverse the decision. I asked that rhetorical
2 question because I, through the questions that she posed in the back-check, felt as
3 though there was some direction that we were taking that the panel didn't take. We
4 kept pure to the process that we followed and consistent to the consensus we achieved
5 and submitted a report that was consistent to that process, but that the types of
6 questions that were being posed led me to that question.

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A And rhetorically when I posed it and then later learned that the Site
9 Selection Authority had gone in a different direction, I immediately thought back to that
10 day.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q What were those questions that she posed to the committee during the
13 back-check?

14 A So it was a combination of questions and statements. None of the
15 panelists responded to them. I certainly didn't respond.

16 I looked at it more -- at the time that it was happening, I looked at it more as an
17 opportunity for the panel to really articulate in the report these areas that she's calling
18 out. So I took it as a good opportunity to ensure that as we, the three of us, moved into
19 the panel reporting process that we would pay particular attention to some of the areas
20 that she was drawing attention to.

21 And so we spent a lot of time talking about Criteria 2, I believe, and
22 distances -- distances between the proposed site and the Metro, and comments about
23 walking distance and, you know, knowing how people can walk at different paces, and
24 what really is a marginal difference that we were describing in terms of point-something
25 in walking distance.

1 She made comments that walking distance is very different depending on weather
2 conditions and depending on someone's physical ability to walk, and that she was
3 surprised that we had evaluated particularly that criteria in the way that we did, and
4 using the words "marginal" that we had used to describe what was a 0.3 or 0.4 difference
5 in distance.

6 So that was an example. I think most of the --

7 Q So she took issue with the wording used about the distance between the
8 Metro and the site for each of those sites?

9 A Yes.

10 BY [REDACTED]:

11 Q What was her tone when she was making these comments and asking these
12 questions?

13 A I don't remember the tone. I certainly would have remembered it if it were
14 argumentative or -- I really, at that time, was trying to process why we were going
15 through this, again, being a process person and thinking that I was going into a meeting to
16 move into the report writing, considering in the morning when we achieved consensus
17 they had even time-stamped when we had achieved consensus.

18 And so I was really just processing why we were having this conversation and
19 going back to each of the evaluations that we had already done in the morning. So tone
20 didn't strike me in any way, other than, why are we doing this and why are we
21 reevaluating something that we had already closed the door and said thank-yous, and
22 why are we not moving into writing the report.

23 BY [REDACTED]:

24 Q Did you or your other panel members pose that question during this
25 back-check?

1 A No.

2 Q Is there a reason you, particularly, didn't pose it?

3 A There's no reason. I thought that if this is -- if we hadn't moved into the
4 report-writing phase, I may have, but I figured this was going to move us into the
5 report-writing phase, and I didn't ask why we were doing it.

6 Q So, at this point, you believed that you guys were still on the same path.
7 You were just going to -- you took this as more information you needed provided in your
8 report as to why you came to your decision on some of those selection criteria?

9 A Correct.

10 BY [REDACTED]:

11 Q How long did the back-check last for?

12 A I don't remember the exact timing. It was no more than 30 minutes.

13 Q And who was in the room in the morning when you were trying to reach
14 consensus initially?

15 A Everyone. So all of our meetings, nothing was in person. It was all via
16 Skype. And so all of the panelists were there. The GSA POCs were there. The
17 contracting officer, the Site Selection Authority -- everyone who had been in the previous
18 meetings were there on this last day.

19 Q Okay. And so, to your understanding, it was the same people in the
20 morning and in the afternoon?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay.

23 A And, again, the meeting log that they kept had all of the attendees. They
24 dated when we had a meeting, what the theme of that meeting was, who was in
25 attendance, and then they provided a brief description of what the meeting was about.

1 BY [REDACTED]:

2 Q And real quick, speaking of the meeting log, you also mentioned the
3 question log.

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q You particularly posed the one question that you mentioned -- you,
6 obviously, put in several, but the one question regarding the site selection that you
7 mentioned a moment ago.

8 Did you ever get an answer to that question?

9 A Yes and no. The "yes" is, the question was answered. And the content of
10 that question -- or the content of that response, rather, was that the panel was to
11 concentrate on the 600-page-plus packet and that that was our responsibility.

12 Q And who answered, to your knowledge, those questions? Where did those
13 answers come from?

14 A Those came -- the log itself provided a name of who provided the answers to
15 that. So I believe that that would have been Aaron Hassinger who responded to that
16 one.

17 Q And is that, to your knowledge -- obviously, Aaron responded to that
18 particular one, but the authority to answer said questions, was that just vested in with
19 the panel technical advisors? Or did that come from the Site Selection Authority?

20 A I don't know.

21 BY [REDACTED]:

22 Q So, after the panel achieved consensus and decided to choose the Springfield
23 site, would you say that Ms. Albert seemed confused about the decision and was trying to
24 understand?

25 A I don't know that I would say "confused about the decision," but I would say

1 that during the back-check and the questions or statements that she posed I thought that
2 it was geared towards better understanding how we came to the decision and statements
3 that I took as rhetorical statements of disagreement to our evaluation.

4 BY [REDACTED]:

5 Q Did the Site Selection Authority, during that back-check or at any point,
6 express directly to you guys the disappointment in that decision?

7 A She said she was surprised.

8 Q Did she give a reason of her surprise?

9 A She said she was surprised at the evaluations particularly of transportation
10 and our use of the word "marginal" -- "marginal differences."

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q You've noted marginal differences, especially walking, a couple times.
13 Were there any other factors, examples that you recall her raising?

14 A Still within that transportation Criteria 2, I would say, was where she was
15 most vocal in stating various things, not necessarily questions.

16 She drew attention to the bus lines, I remember. It was one of the sub-criteria
17 for No. 2, was the access to bus lines. I can't recall the exact numbers of bus lines, but
18 she had made a statement that nobody really takes the bus and many more people would
19 take the Metro, and so she felt that that was a more important criteria of the sub-criteria.

20 Q In the initial packet of materials that you were tasked with reviewing, was
21 there any language, to your recollection, of whether the type of transportation, bus
22 versus Metro, should be weighed more heavily?

23 A No. Each of the sub-criteria were to be evaluated the same way. And so,
24 within the criteria, if there were two sub-criteria or -- Criteria 4 had several
25 sub-criteria -- each of the sub-criteria were to be evaluated equally.

1 Q As it relates to Ms. Albert's comments about Metro versus the bus, do you
2 recall her making any statements or asking questions disagreeing with how the panel
3 assessed those two options? Or was it more that weight -- greater weight should've
4 been given to one form of transportation over the other?

5 A Can you say that again?

6 Q Sure. So, two answers earlier, you said that she had said something to the
7 effect of that no one takes the bus and that the sub-criteria as it relates to the Metro
8 should've been weighed more heavily.

9 Just as a clarifying question, was she disagreeing with anything that the panel had
10 found as it related to the Metro or the bus? Or was it a step above that, that the Metro
11 as a whole should've been weighed more heavily than the bus?

12 A I thought both. I thought that the original statements about the
13 "marginal" -- our "marginal" definition and decision between the walking distance to
14 Metro sites was a point that she was making; as well as the point about the buses, that
15 despite Springfield having more bus lines than Greenbelt or Landover, that that didn't
16 matter as much because people didn't really take the bus.

17 Q And what did you make of her comment, that latter comment, that some of
18 the sub-criteria should've been weighed differently than they were outlined in the
19 materials provided to you?

20 A I took it as, we needed to ensure that, in our writing of the report, in our
21 submission of the report, that we outlined the process and the consistent process and the
22 application of our definition of "marginal" that needed to apply throughout all of the
23 criteria.

24 Q You'd mentioned that you -- if I recall an answer earlier correctly -- that you
25 didn't respond to any of Ms. Albert's either rhetorical questions or --

1 A I didn't.

2 Q Did anyone else during the back-check?

3 A I don't recall. I don't think so.

4 BY [REDACTED]:

5 Q After the back-check was happening, did you speak with any of the panel
6 members about what Ms. Albert was bringing up?

7 A When we went into the report-writing phase, we talked about those
8 sections, particularly the Criteria 2, where we needed to ensure that we explain how we
9 define "marginal," that we needed to do a very good job of making it clear why we
10 assigned a blue rating versus a green rating. That's what we talked about.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q And so we've talked in depth about marginality between the two, Metro and
13 bus lines. What other areas did she bring up of concern with the panel's site selection?

14 A Criteria 4 was another of the criteria that in the back-check there was
15 attention paid to Criteria 4, again, not so much posed as questions but just more of a
16 statement.

17 Criteria 4 was also a criteria that we had spent a lot of time -- we had received a
18 separate briefing from a member of GSA on Criteria 4 with a slide show and lots of
19 different data that was included in our 600-plus pages.

20 But during the back-check, Criteria 4, the comments were that it was very clear
21 that the Greenbelt location would serve a greater socio- -- would have a greater
22 socioeconomic impact than the Springfield location.

23 Q And what was your response to those statements?

24 A I didn't respond to any of the statements. But I --

25 Q What did you interpolate, feel, from the discussion, like, yourself?

1 A The panel had assigned a blue rating to both locations in Prince George's
2 County. So I felt like that's -- we had assigned a blue rating and assigned that Prince
3 George's County -- either of the locations in Prince George's County, according to the
4 criteria, were most advantageous to the government.

5 We assigned a green rating to Fairfax County and the Springfield location as
6 second most advantageous.

7 I just felt like it was a statement of the obvious from what the panel had already
8 provided.

9 Q And how long did that particular Criteria 4 conversation go on?

10 A I don't know.

11 Q Okay.

12 BY [REDACTED]:

13 Q Did Ms. Albert or anyone provide reasons for why they believed there was a
14 greater socioeconomic benefit for one site versus another?

15 A During that back-check?

16 Q Yes.

17 A No.

18 BY [REDACTED]:

19 Q But just for the record and for clarification, the panel had already given
20 those two sites in Maryland the highest rating that they could give?

21 A Yes.

22 Q But they still went on to discuss and tell you why that needed to occur?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And then real quickly, regarding the back-check and the meeting that you
25 guys had that day leading into the report-writing phase, I know we've talked briefly about

1 the people in attendance and that that log is very clear of who's there. To your
2 recollection, was anyone in attendance in any of those two sessions that day that
3 were other than GSA and FBI?

4 A No.

5 Q No other government agencies, officials from any other government agency
6 were in attendance?

7 A No other people who hadn't already been in one of the previous meetings
8 were in that back-check meeting.

9 Q Were any of those folks in the previous meetings not associated with GSA or
10 FBI?

11 A I don't believe so.

12 Q Okay.

13 BY [REDACTED]:

14 Q So, when you were in the report-writing phase, who spearheaded writing the
15 report?

16 A The chair, Tim.

17 Q Okay. Did you have any penmanship in the report-writing process?

18 A Yes. So the way that we divided labor was that Tim said that he would
19 provide a rough outline of the report, that he had been given a template for the very
20 beginning portions of the report anyway and that he would just start documenting a lot of
21 what we had talked about in achieving consensus.

22 And, then, we were doing that report on a Google site that was a live -- sort of,
23 live writing and live editing. And so he said in the very beginning, just give me 2 hours
24 and let me come up with a framework, and then, you and Brett, let's just go in and just
25 start having, you know, just conversations and live editing. And so that's what we did.

1 Q And how long did it take to write the report?

2 A We started writing the afternoon of the 31st, and I know that I -- of July.

3 Sorry. And I know that I digitally signed the report on August the 8th. Tim had signed
4 it a day earlier, and Brett and I signed it the day after.

5 Q And when you signed off on the report on August the 8th, did you send it to
6 the FBI or --

7 A No.

8 Q -- to Ms. Albert?

9 A Did I? No.

10 Q Okay. Did anyone on the panel send that to the Site Selection Authority?

11 A I don't know for certain, but we submitted it onto the GSA site that everyone
12 had been working.

13 Q Uh-huh.

14 A And Tim had advised Aaron Hassinger that we had completed it.

15 Q So when did the FBI learn about the panel's decision to choose the
16 Springfield site in this report?

17 A I don't know.

18 [REDACTED] Can you be more specific? You're speaking --

19 [REDACTED] Yeah.

20 [REDACTED] -- to the FBI writ large as a large enterprise. It would be helpful
21 for --

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q Say, Nick Dimos, when did he learn about the site selection panel's decision?

24 A I don't know exactly when Nick Dimos would have learned about the panel's
25 report, or the recommendation of the panel's report. I would imagine that that came at

1 the same time of the Site Selection Authority's report, where it highlights areas where the
2 Authority differed from the panel.

3 BY [REDACTED]:

4 Q The 600 pages of materials that you referenced that was provided to you,
5 who provided those materials to you and the other panelists?

6 A They were loaded onto that site that I referenced, and so that was GSA.

7 Aaron Hassinger really served as -- I don't know his exact title in the process, but
8 he served as the central point of contact. And so he was the one who emailed me back
9 in 2022 with the plan itself.

10 And then the materials, that 600-page packet, that was provided on the
11 Google -- GSA Google site.

12 Q Do you know if he prepared those materials himself or compiled them
13 himself?

14 A I don't know.

15 Q The instructions that were given at the first meeting with the site selection
16 panel, who gave those instructions? Was that Aaron Hassinger?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then you mentioned that the chair of the panel obtained a template for
19 the panel's recommendation report. Do you know where he obtained that template?
20 Was that also from Aaron Hassinger?

21 A I believe so, yes.

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q When you described the back-check meeting, you said it was not something
24 that you had expected was going to occur; it wasn't on the schedule or agenda. And
25 when you were describing it, at one point you used the word "relitigate."

1 Was there anything that the Site Selection Authority said during that time that
2 indicated she wanted the panel to think about maybe going back and rethinking that
3 consensus that the panel had just arrived at?

4 A I thought that the statement and questions and the concentration on the
5 term "marginal" and "do you really think that's marginal," "I don't think that that's
6 marginal when we're talking about walking" --

7 Q Uh-huh.

8 A -- I don't know whether that was stated to elicit a response. I just chose
9 not to respond to it. I don't know if it was stated to elicit a conversation about going
10 back and reevaluating. None of us took the opportunity to respond to it.

11 Q Okay.

12 One other thing. When you talked about -- when, again, did you find out that
13 Nina Albert was the Site Selection Authority?

14 A That was in the document, in the site selection plan. I believe she was
15 named.

16 Q And that was back when you first --

17 A That was back --

18 Q -- were named to the panel?

19 A Yes.

20 Q So there were two prior, apparently, Site Selection Authorities for this. So
21 were those -- was that -- that was prior to the time that you were named to the panel?

22 A It must -- perhaps. I only know Nina Albert as being the Site Selection
23 Authority --

24 Q Okay.

25 A -- and the one who participated when we actually convened.

1 Q Okay.

2 BY [REDACTED]:

3 Q So, if I understand you correctly, you got 600 pages of material that was
4 given to you; you had the site selection plan. And what I'm interpreting there is that you
5 had to consider that almost as though you had blinders on. Like, this is the universe of
6 information that I am allowed to consider to make a recommendation and ultimately
7 write the report. Is that right?

8 A Correct.

9 Q So, I mean, with that much focus on the term "marginal" and walking
10 distance, one, I'm just curious, did you ever go walk those two distances yourself?

11 A No.

12 Q Have you ever been to either of the sites?

13 A No. I've driven by them.

14 Q You've driven by them.

15 A In previous years.

16 Q Okay.

17 So, in that 600 pages, in the materials that you were given, was there any
18 discussion, though, of how many people would actually use the Metro to get to the FBI
19 headquarters?

20 A No. We didn't discuss it.

21 Q I'm sorry? You didn't discuss -- okay. You didn't --

22 A The panel didn't discuss it.

23 Q So somebody else had done that work, and it was yours to go based on that
24 alone?

25 A The criteria for that No. 2 and the sub-criteria didn't address the number of

1 users of any of the modes of transportation but, rather, the individual modes of
2 transportation, whether it was walking distance or the number of bus lines. It was never
3 about ridership.

4 Q So, when you said it was "marginal," that meant to you that it's six of one,
5 half a dozen of the other, in terms of walking from, I guess, the Metro station to the
6 facility, not "marginal" because no one's gonna use it so no one cares?

7 A Correct.

8 Q All right.

9 You also mentioned the briefing that you got stressing the socioeconomic benefit
10 to --

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q Now, time-wise, did you get that after you had made your
13 recommendations?

14 A No.

1 [10:59 a.m.]

2 BY [REDACTED]:

3 Q No. But you seemed to characterize it as, kind of -- you called it a
4 statement of the obvious, because you had already given blue ratings to both of the
5 Maryland sites.

6 Did you feel like somebody was trying to stress the importance of this at those
7 particular sites, or did you think it was just part of the process that you get briefed on all
8 the elements or all the criteria as part of this?

9 A At the time we were given the specific briefing from someone else in GSA
10 about Criteria 4 --

11 Q Right.

12 A -- that was before we had been set to do our individual ratings. That was in
13 that kickoff meeting --

14 Q Uh-huh.

15 A -- where we went through the packet of information, were reminded to only
16 use that information that was in the packet.

17 When we hit Criteria 4, there was a separate person who came -- or, who was in
18 the meeting already but who was sort of given the floor to provide a briefing using a slide
19 deck that was already in the 600 pages. We hadn't gone through the 600 pages at all
20 page by page, but this slide deck we did. And a woman named Karen had briefed that
21 slide deck.

22 Q Okay. So that was the only criteria -- that was the only -- do I get that right,
23 that that was the only thing that they took extra time to go through with you?

24 A Yes.

25 Q How did that strike you? And why that?

1 A That was the same question that I had. I --

2 Q You thought it was quizzical?

3 A I didn't -- by the time we hit Criteria 4, it was clear to me that the
4 information that we needed to use was in the packet itself. And I knew that this slide
5 deck that she was briefing was in the packet and that I would, whether it was briefed or
6 not, be reading that packet, multiple times.

7 Q No, I get that, but -- but that was the only criteria that they took the time to
8 focus on, over and above the others?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay.

11 Did you ever look at the other information that the Site Selection Authority
12 apparently used to make a different decision?

13 A I didn't. I don't know what that information is or was.

14 Q I mean, how did you deal with seeing that come out? I mean, you had
15 done all this work, you've read all those pages, you got the briefings, you've done all this
16 hard work, and then the final decision was so different than what you all had been -- the
17 conclusions that you all had drawn based on the information that you had been given.
18 How does that make you feel about the process?

19 A I know the process by which the panel approached our responsibility and the
20 consistent application of the criteria in how we evaluated. I go back to my original
21 question in the log of, what is the different information that the Site Selection Authority
22 had at her disposal that we didn't that must have led her to a different opinion?

23 Q And you've never had a chance to see that?

24 A No.

25 Q Okay.

1 That's all I've got. Thanks.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 [REDACTED]: We can go off the record.

4 [Recess.]

5 [REDACTED]: All right. We'll go back on the record. The time is 11:18.

6 Ms. Parry, my name is [REDACTED]. I'll be asking you a few questions this hour.

7 And I think, first and foremost, I just want to thank you for coming here today. I know

8 you made a long trek from Winchester. We really appreciate you taking the time to

9 speak with us.

10 Ms. Parry. It's not that far, to be fair.

11 [REDACTED] Fair enough.

12 Ms. Parry. The weather's nice.

13 EXAMINATION

14 BY [REDACTED]:

15 Q So I'd like to take a step back and review the entire site selection process,

16 beyond just your evaluation.

17 GSA began searching for a new site for a new FBI headquarters in 2013. Is that

18 right?

19 A I don't have those dates. I don't know exactly the full process outside of

20 my panel process.

21 Q Sure. And I guess I will cite the first page of the "Site Selection Panel
22 Recommendation Report." And I'll represent to you that in the first paragraph the panel

23 wrote, "Beginning in or around 2013, the U.S. General Services Administration ('GSA')

24 embarked on the process of finding a new headquarters location for the FBI."

25 Does that sound accurate?

1 A Yes.

2 Q So, given the fact that this process began in 2013, it's fair to say that the site
3 selection process had been proceeding for over a decade?

4 A Uh-huh. Yes.

5 Q To your knowledge, has the FBI been coordinating with GSA, the General
6 Services Administration, since the beginning of this process?

7 A I don't know.

8 Q And discussing the J. Edgar Hoover Building in particular, the FBI has
9 occupied that building since 1974. Does that sound right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And the J. Edgar Hoover Building here in D.C., that's where the FBI
12 headquarters is located. Is --

13 A Yes.

14 Q -- that right? Great. Can you describe the current condition of the J.
15 Edgar Hoover Building?

16 A I can, because as I drove to D.C. yesterday and drove into the building today,
17 it's a very different building than I've experienced even in the years that I reported there.

18 As I drove my vehicle into the parking garage -- I park in the third level of the
19 basement -- there are steel beams, now, constructed in different parts of that floor.

20 Q Uh-huh.

21 A I'm not certain whether they're also on the other parking levels as well, but
22 there are steel-beam structures that are taking up what used to be parking places that
23 you now sort of park around or have to drive around.

24 3B has -- I typically, when I was assigned to headquarters, would park in 3B --

25 Q Uh-huh.

1 A -- in the executive parking there. The concrete of the parking itself was
2 never a smooth surface, but, my goodness, it's certainly become much more -- so many
3 more holes --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- so many more steel structures that seem to be supporting the ceiling
6 above it.

7 I reported to headquarters at the time where the netting went up because, we
8 were told, of falling fragments. I was on the 11th floor at the time the netting actually
9 did go up.

10 And so it certainly --- the headquarters that I drove into this morning is
11 deteriorating.

12 Q Sure.

13 BY [REDACTED]:

14 Q And, sorry, the netting you were talking about, can you explain what that
15 netting is for?

16 A I don't know for certain, but I will say that we were told, when it was going
17 up, that it was just to ensure that any fragments -- falling fragments from the building
18 would be caught in that netting, that the building was crumbling, pieces of the building.

19 Q So that netting is there to make sure that pieces of concrete don't fall onto
20 FBI staff in the building?

21 A That's what I recall hearing.

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q And, similarly, why do you believe the steel beams are now there?

24 A I believe that, structurally, those beams are being placed to provide a more
25 structurally sound building.

1 Q Is it fair to say the J. Edgar Hoover Building needs more structural support
2 because of its deteriorating nature?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that one of the reasons why GSA and FBI
5 were collectively exploring sites for a new FBI headquarters building is because the J.
6 Edgar Hoover Building is in such bad shape?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Now, I'd like to turn back to your role as a site selection panelist. And I
9 know you discussed this a bit in our prior hour, but can you remind me, when were you
10 appointed a site selection panelist?

11 A August -- September -- excuse me -- September 2022.

12 Q Okay. And your duties as a site selection panelist were governed by the
13 site selection plan published by GSA. Is that right?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And there were multiple iterations of the site selection plan. Is that right?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. And, in particular, the site selection plan that you relied on to
18 conduct your evaluation was the second amended site selection plan. Does that sound
19 right?

20 A That sounds right.

21 Q And I'm going to mark as exhibit 2 the "Site Selection Plan (Amendment 2),"
22 which was published in July of 2023.

23 [Parry Exhibit No. 2

24 Was marked for identification.]

25 BY [REDACTED]:

1 Q And, now, Ms. Parry -- and I'm sorry, I should've asked this earlier -- again,
2 your role as a site selection panelist was governed strictly by the site selection plan. Is
3 that right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the site selection plan in front of you?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And, again, this is the site selection plan that you relied on when conducting
8 your evaluation. Is that fair to say?

9 A This is the plan outlining the process, in addition to the 600-page packet that
10 I relied on.

11 Q Fair enough. So this outlined the duties of the site selection panel and the
12 process they would follow, correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Great.

15 And I'd like to, I guess, dive into the responsibilities of the panel compared to the
16 Site Selection Authority.

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q If could you turn to page 13 for me, under XI, titled "Selecting the Most
19 Advantageous Site." Do you see that?

20 A I do.

21 Q So the first sentence reads here, "The site selection authority will use the
22 evaluation report developed by the site selection panel to help guide and inform a final
23 decision as to which property is in the best interest of the United States."

24 Did that match your understanding of the process between the site selection
25 panel and the Site Selection Authority?

1 A Yes.

2 Q That the site selection panel was designed to help and inform a final decision
3 by the Site Selection Authority.

4 A Yes.

5 [REDACTED] And I'll turn it over to my colleague.

6 [REDACTED] Thanks, [REDACTED].

7 BY [REDACTED]:

8 Q So, generally speaking, the role of the site selection panel was to review the
9 information that was provided, evaluate each site under each criteria, and provide a
10 report that would document your consensus rating for each criteria to the Site Selection
11 Authority. Is that accurate?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And, in particular, the panel would review each of the three sites and
14 provide a recommendation to the Site Selection Authority, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Is it your understanding that each of the three sites had already been
17 determined to meet the mission needs of the FBI?

18 A Can you say that again?

19 Q Is it your understanding that each of the three sites that you were choosing
20 from had already been determined to meet the FBI's mission needs?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And that the panel was charged with evaluating the three sites, applying a
23 color rating --

24 A Uh-huh.

25 Q -- and providing a recommendation to the Site Selection Authority?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. And so your role, as a panelist, was to provide only, like, a
3 recommendation to the Site Selection Authority. Is that right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And it was your understanding that the Site Selection Authority was
6 the person who was authorized to make the final decision, correct?

7 A Correct.

8 Q Okay.

9 So the panel submitted its consensus report, I believe you said, August 2023? Is
10 that correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And in your report that the panel submitted, did that correctly reflect your
13 recommendations?

14 A Does the panel report -- can you say that again?

15 Q Reflect your recommendations and ratings?

16 A The panel report reflects the panel's consensus of a recommendation, yes.

17 Q Okay. So no one instructed you to change your recommendation?

18 A No.

19 Q Okay.

20 [REDACTED] And when you say that it reflected the panel's recommendation,
21 that includes your input as part of that panel. Is that right?

22 Ms. Parry. Yes.

23 BY [REDACTED]:

24 Q Okay.

25 So I'd like to turn to some of the specifics of the evaluation process to make sure

1 I'm understanding correctly.

2 So each panelist conducted an individual review of the information --

3 A Correct.

4 Q -- on their own first. Okay.

5 And you assigned -- or the panel, when they met together, that was when they
6 assigned overall consensus ratings of the sites indicated by the three different colors. Is
7 that correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q And as a panelist, you exercised your judgment in conducting these
10 evaluations. Is that correct?

11 A Judgment in what way?

12 Q You're not a robot, right? So you spoke --

13 A Right.

14 Q -- earlier about some examples where you used your judgment or the panel
15 used your combined judgment to determine when the contrasting factors were marginal
16 or not, whether the differences were marginal?

17 A Correct.

18 Q Okay. And is the word "marginal" defined in the site selection plan?

19 A In the plan, no.

20 Q Okay.

21 So, if we turn to the panel's evaluation -- so, in the panel's recommendation
22 report, it states things like "in the panel's view," or you've made references to "marginal
23 differences." So you exercised some judgment in order to arrive at your
24 recommendations.

25 And so is it fair to say that there were, kind of, like, three ingredients in your

1 recommendation, right? There's the packet of information that you received from GSA.
2 There's the rules and the criteria which are laid out in the site selection plan. And then
3 there's, sort of, the judgment that you and your fellow panelists exercised in coming to
4 your recommendation. Is that correct?

5 A I would frame it as, the panel was -- our roles and responsibilities were
6 delineated in the plan. They were directed to review and evaluate the materials in the
7 package, and, in assigning ratings, that we used that information to then assign ratings for
8 each site.

9 BY [REDACTED]:

10 Q And I guess my colleague's question is just, you know, you have these rules
11 and you have these facts, and you need to put those two together to arrive at a rating.

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q And I think -- and, you know, this is kind of a simple question, but -- to go
14 from the bare facts to a recommendation to the Site Selection Authority, you kind of
15 applied your best judgment and your reasoning to the facts to arrive at a
16 recommendation.

17 A I would say that the materials in the packet and the criteria in the directive
18 sheets that we were given already laid out much of the information in terms of distance,
19 for example. And so I don't believe that I would use the word "judgment" when you
20 have very discrete criteria. I would use it more in the panel's report of differentiating
21 parts of the criteria.

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q So, if I may, in your recommendation report, on page 30 in particular, I'll
24 represent to you that the panel wrote, quote, "That is to say, the panel consciously
25 avoided applying a rote, mathematical computation in making its recommendation."

1 So there was no -- the criteria did not define a decision for you, right? You had
2 to reach a decision, as my colleague outlined, by applying the facts to the criteria. Is --

3 A Yes.

4 Q -- that right? And is it fair to say reasonable minds can differ on reaching
5 the conclusions that the panel did?

6 BY [REDACTED]:

7 Q Let me ask the question slightly differently.

8 On page 26, for example, when you're describing Criteria --

9 A I don't have that report. If I --

10 Q Sure.

11 A -- need to see it, I don't have it.

12 Q We were discussing Criteria 4 earlier, and the last sentence in there -- well,
13 the last sentence on page 26 says, "In the panel's judgment, Fairfax County did not
14 warrant a least favorable rating."

15 Ms. Parry. Thank you.

16 [REDACTED] Uh-huh.

17 Ms. Parry. Can you give me that again?

18 [REDACTED] Sure. Page 26, at the very bottom.

19 [REDACTED] And we'll introduce this as exhibit 3.

20 [Parry Exhibit No. 3

21 Was marked for identification.]

22 Ms. Parry. I'm with you.

23 BY [REDACTED]:

24 Q So you see, in that last sentence, it talks about the panel's judgment?

25 A Yes.

1 Q So that's all we're asking about. You know, this is not a rote process.

2 A Sure.

3 Q You know, there are three site selection panelists, assisted by technical
4 advisors. And, you know, you described at the beginning why you were chosen.

5 And so the point is just, you were given some rules --

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q -- you were given a packet of information, and then you and your fellow
8 panelists applied your judgment to get from the rules and the packet to a consensus
9 recommendation for the Site Selection Authority. Is --

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- that fair?

12 A Uh-huh.

13 BY [REDACTED]:

14 Q And, I guess, to build on that, when you and your co-panelists met to discuss
15 your evaluations, arrive at consensus ratings for each site and each criterion, am I correct
16 in understanding that, across the 5 criteria and the 12 sub-criteria, you and your panelists
17 found that each site had its pluses and minuses?

18 A That wasn't part of the evaluation criteria, in terms of "pros and cons" or
19 "pluses and minuses."

20 Q Okay. Would it be fair to describe them as things that counted against one
21 site or boosted one site as compared to another site?

22 A I think that the way that I would put it is the way that the plan did, and that
23 was: Through the evaluation of the criteria and assigning a color rating to each of the
24 criteria, it was looking at what was most advantageous to the U.S. Government.

25 Q Right.

1 BY [REDACTED]:

2 Q To build off my colleague's questions, I think what we're getting at, very
3 simply, is there were five criteria, and each criteria had a number of sub-criteria.

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q And I think each of the sites had at least one blue rating where it was the
6 top, at least one green rating where it was in the middle, and one yellow rating where it
7 was the last, right?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So I think when my colleague talked about pluses and minuses, the idea is,
10 it's not like one of the sites was number one, number one, number one, number one,
11 down the line, across each criteria and each sub-criteria.

12 A Correct.

13 Q So each of the sites had certain criteria or sub-criteria where it was better
14 than the other sites, and each of the sites had some criteria or sub-criteria where it was
15 less good than the other sites. Is that fair?

16 A I would say that, of the criteria and the evaluation, that some of the sites for
17 some of the criteria were more advantageous to the government, and in another criteria
18 perhaps a different site was most advantageous to the government.

19 Q But what all three of these sites had in common, I think as you explained
20 earlier, was that they had all been pre-selected to satisfy the FBI's basic operational
21 needs.

22 A Correct.

23 [REDACTED] And on that point, Ms. Parry, just to go back a little bit, did you have
24 any role in determining the site selection plan?

25 Ms. Parry. No.

1 [REDACTED] So, when we were just talking about, sort of, one site being better at
2 one criteria, another site being most advantageous for another criteria, to take just one
3 example, Criteria 1, which was, I think, FBI proximity to mission-related locations, you and
4 your fellow panelists found that Springfield was the best site and applied a blue rating,
5 correct?

6 [REDACTED] And I believe that's reflected on page 13 --

7 Ms. Parry. Thank you.

8 [REDACTED] -- of the recommendation report.

9 Ms. Parry. Thank you.

10 Yes.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q But on Criteria 5, on the other hand, which is cost, you found that the
13 Greenbelt site was the best place and applied a blue rating. Is that correct?

14 A The panel's recommendation was the Greenbelt received a blue rating as
15 being most advantageous, yes.

16 Q And I'm quoting from page 27 of your panel recommendation report here,
17 which says about halfway down, "On slide 109...the Greenbelt site is shown to have the
18 lowest total cost of the site acquisition with a projected amount of [\$26.1 million]. This
19 is significantly less than the other two sites," end quote.

20 Is that correct?

21 A That is what page 27 says, yes.

22 Q Okay.

23 So, again, each of the three sites that you evaluated had been determined to meet
24 the FBI missions, correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Okay. And you're choosing among three sites, all of which have their
2 positives, their negatives. And you're applying your judgment in your assessment of all
3 the information that you received, correct?

4 A I think we've talked about the -- yes -- the combination of the roles and
5 responsibilities mixed with the information in the packet and then each individual and
6 then joining consensus of interpreting what we have and applying judgment to reach the
7 evaluation we did.

8 Q Thank you.

9 BY [REDACTED]:

10 Q I just have a couple housekeeping questions, just to make sure I've got my
11 facts right.

12 The kickoff meeting I think you explained was on July 27th?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And then July 31st is when you reached your consensus recommendation?

15 A Correct.

16 Q So that's 4 or 5 days. Is that right?

17 A From the 27th --

18 Q --7th to the 31st --

19 A -- kickoff meeting to the -- yes.

20 Q Okay. And so is it fair to say that the bulk of your evaluation work was
21 done in those 4 to 5 days?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And then it was about another week or so of just writing the report to
24 correctly reflect your input and that of your fellow panelists and explaining your
25 consensus recommendation?

1 A Yes. It was less than a week.

2 We had started report-writing and had completed it -- we were initially given a
3 deadline of August the 4th to submit that report. We were told we really needed to get
4 that in by the 4th of August because the Site Selection Authority was going on vacation
5 and wanted to have the panel's recommendation prior to leaving.

6 We didn't meet that 4th deadline. I think it was a weekend. I believe we
7 finished on the 6th, and then Tim signed on the 7th, and Brett and I signed on the 8th.

8 Q And, then, you discussed with my colleagues this meeting on July 31st.

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q I can't remember how you --

11 A GSA called it a "back-check." In their meeting log, it's referenced as a
12 "back-check."

13 Q Back-check, got it. Thank you.

14 And I think as you described it earlier, you said that Ms. Albert, the Site Selection
15 Authority, was interested in having a better understanding of how the panelists came to
16 their consensus recommendation. Is that fair? I think those were the words you used
17 to describe it earlier.

18 A We certainly started that back-check talking about the consensus and the
19 criteria that we had already discussed in the morning, yes.

20 Q And explaining to her -- she was asking questions to get an understanding of
21 how you arrived at that decision. Is that right?

22 A I don't know why she was posing the questions. I don't know what her
23 motivation was in posing them. I just know that those were the questions or statements
24 that she either made or posed during that time. But why she did it, I don't know.

25 Q And you took that to heart, because I think you described how you and your

1 fellow panelists decided, hey, well, let's make sure that our recommendation report kind
2 of addresses these questions and explains why we thought this distance was marginal or
3 not marginal and, you know, how we arrived at our decisions. Is that fair?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Because your role and those of the other panelists in formulating this
6 recommendation was to help guide and inform the Site Selection Authority's final
7 decision. Is that fair?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So you wanted the report to be as helpful to her in that process as possible.

10 A Yes.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q Ms. Parry, you mentioned that before this back-check the panel had reached
13 a consensus, and you mentioned that it was stamped. Could you describe that a little bit
14 more?

15 A I just recall, I believe it was Aaron who stated during the meeting, "I would
16 like to state that consensus was achieved on July 31st at" -- whatever the time was. It
17 was a statement that was made during the meeting.

18 Q Fair enough. So the panel reaches consensus, and then, following that, you
19 hold this back-check meeting. Is that right?

20 A Correct.

21 Q So the panel had already reached consensus on what they felt was the best
22 site to recommend to the Site Selection Authority, correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And during this back-check meeting, you mentioned that, you know, various
25 questions were posed. Were you ever instructed to change your consensus rating?

1 A No.

2 Q Was it ever implied to you, change your consensus rating?

3 A No.

4 BY [REDACTED]:

5 Q And, then, just a last couple questions.

6 You and your fellow panelists wrote this 32-page report that you all signed off on,
7 right?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And, then, after that, the Site Selection Authority, who was charged with
10 making the final decision, she wrote her own site selection decision, which is a 38-page
11 document. And, in that decision, she lays out places where she arrived at a different
12 conclusion than the panel and explains why, in her judgment, she was going with one
13 decision as opposed to the panel's different recommendation.

14 A Yes.

15 Q Do you have any reason to believe that she omitted from this report any
16 reasons for her arriving at a different conclusion than the panel's recommendation?

17 A I can't speak to her own report and the writing of that report.

18 Q But the discussions from the back-check that you discussed, these are
19 reflected in her final site selection decision, aren't they?

20 A I don't know. I can't respond to that. I don't know the details of that
21 report as much as I do the report that the panel wrote.

22 Q But you have no reason to disagree with the fact that the site selection
23 decision kind of explains why she arrived at those different conclusions than the
24 recommendations of the panel?

25 A When I see the report, I see a similar structure to the panel's report,

1 assigning a color rating to each of the locations and a justification for doing so.

2 Q And a discussion for where her decision is different from the panel's
3 decision.

4 A Correct.

5 Q And an explanation for why she arrived at a different conclusion.

6 A Correct.

7 [Discussion off the record.]

8 [REDACTED] We'll go off the record.

9 Ms. Parry. Okay. Thanks.

10 [Recess.]

11 [REDACTED] Back on the record.

12 BY [REDACTED]:

13 Q I'm just going to go back to a couple questions we discussed in the previous
14 2 hours.

15 So, in the last hour, my colleagues were speaking to you about the report and
16 turning it in and all of that. And, now, did I understand correctly that you guys turned
17 the report in early because someone was leaving?

18 A No. The timeline that we were given had us submitting that report by
19 August the 4th --

20 Q Okay.

21 A -- but when we knew that we were not going to meet August the 4th, we
22 advised that we were going to need more time. Then we took the time we needed to
23 submit the report that we needed to submit.

24 Q Okay. And at any point during that time, was there a mention about
25 someone going on vacation?

1 A Yes. The reason why the deadline was given to us was that the Site
2 Selection Authority was headed on a vacation and that she wanted to have the report in
3 hand prior to going on vacation.

4 Q Okay. But you guys weren't able to do that because --

5 A We did not, no.

6 Q Okay.

7 BY [REDACTED]:

8 Q Was there any date that had been given previously?

9 A That was the date given previously. It wasn't that it was changed in any
10 way. It was the date that was given in the timeline that they provided. But they did
11 make mention that if we could, you know, definitely get it in by then, that, you know, it
12 would be great.

13 Q Did you communicate with them whether you thought that was enough time
14 when you first received the date?

15 A We didn't comment on whether or not it was enough time. We knew that
16 when we started writing the report and continued in the report-writing phase that we
17 were not going to meet the deadline that they had given us, and so Tim went with back,
18 as the chair, and said that we would need another day or two.

19 Q Do you know how that was communicated?

20 A I don't.

21 Q Do you recall when he communicated -- or do you know when he -- like, how
22 far before the 14th he said you would not be able to --

23 A I don't, no.

24 BY [REDACTED]:

25 Q So, going back to the information that you guys were provided -- the big

1 packet, the 600 pages, plus the site selection plan -- all of those were what you used to
2 determine your individual recommendation and then the other collective three's
3 recommendation. Is that --

4 A Correct.

5 Q -- right? And, to your knowledge, do you know where that information
6 came from? Like, who compiled that information that was put into that packet that you
7 received?

8 A I don't know.

9 Q And do you know for, during that process -- during that time -- I mean, you
10 got it from GSA. Is that correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. So, in theory -- or, to your knowledge, the information that you guys
13 used was the best information that they had to provide to you guys?

14 A Whether it was the best or not, it was the information that we were given.
15 I do recall hearing that it was GSA and FBI working groups that had worked on building
16 that information, but I can't comment on whether it was the best or not.

17 Q Fair. Very fair.

18 With that being said, we've talked a lot about how the SSA, Ms. Albert, used
19 different information to come to a different conclusion from you guys. Is it fair to say, or
20 to your knowledge, that that information could have been included in the information
21 you guys received in order for you to make --

22 [REDACTED] You're calling for speculation here. If you could reframe?

23 [REDACTED] Absolutely.

24 BY [REDACTED]:

25 Q So the information that you were not provided is what you believe was used

1 for her to make the different decision from your decision?

2 A I thought that there must have been other information that was cited in the
3 original plan that the Site Selection Authority could use that must have been relied on to
4 reach a different decision.

5 Q Okay. And -- hang on just a little bit.

6 BY [REDACTED]:

7 Q Can you recall, like, specifically what kind of information that you thought
8 was different? Like, what information was the Site Selection Authority citing that you
9 felt the panel didn't have access to this information?

10 A I don't know the different information. It was the original question that I
11 had posed when we met as a group, was to provide clarity on what type of information
12 might be used and whether or not that information would be given to the panel. And
13 the response to that was, the panel should only use the 600-plus-page packet. But I
14 received no clarity on what the other information could be or was.

15 BY [REDACTED]:

16 Q So you guys were actually limited to the information provided; you were not
17 able to use any other information?

18 A The packet of the material was the only information that we were to
19 evaluate.

20 Q So the only person in this process that was able to use outside information
21 was the Site Selection Authority?

22 A In the plan, that is the language that the plan states.

23 Q I'm going to draw you back to exhibit 3 --

24 A Okay.

25 Q -- and, specifically, we're going to go to page 16.

1 A Uh-huh.

2 Q So here on page 16 -- in the last hour, my colleagues brought up Criteria No.
3 5, in that I think we all, from reading this document, can understand that the location for
4 Greenbelt was the least expensive location to acquire --

5 A I don't think the page number is correct. Page 16 is in the middle of
6 Criteria No. 3. And cost would've been --

7 Q Yes, excuse me, it is Site Criteria No. 3.

8 A Okay.

9 Q We are on the right --

10 A Yep.

11 Q I just used the wrong site number -- excuse me, criteria number.

12 But the cost of acquiring the property was the least expensive of the three. Is
13 that correct?

14 A The cost was Criteria No. 5. The page that we're on is talking about Criteria
15 3, which was site development flexibility and schedule risk.

16 Q Yes. So we're going to go into a particular bullet here.

17 A Okay.

18 Q I think more I was just trying for the record --

19 A Okay.

20 Q -- that the cost -- when you guys did the criteria selection --

21 A Yes.

22 Q -- that the cost of Greenbelt -- was that the least expensive --

23 A Correct.

24 Q -- of the three to acquire?

25 A Correct.

1 Q All right. Sorry about that.

2 A Yep.

3 Q So, moving on -- and, then, if I could have you -- for the record, if you could
4 read, on the bottom of page 16 into page 17, the third sub-bullet, starting with, "The
5 Greenbelt site has"?

6 A Just read it?

7 Q Yes, to put it into the record, please.

8 A "The Greenbelt site has the smallest buildable area (11.26 acres) of all the
9 sites. The site has an irregular triangular configuration, and appears to have less
10 flexibility for development due to the irregular configuration, wetlands bordering the site
11 to the south, and the limited number of roads for access points to the site. While the
12 overall site has a similar total buildable acreage when compared to Springfield; the detail
13 provided in slide 66 data from the FBI HQ Draft EIS that shows the impact from those
14 development constraints with a potential site layout of a much smaller 4.59 acres as
15 compared to a similar site layout/development area on the Springfield site of 9.28 acres.
16 Based on similar data from the FBI HQ Draft EIS, which uses the FBI's requirements as
17 detailed on slide 70, the Springfield site offers 100% larger buildable area when compared
18 to Greenbelt."

19 Q Thank you.

20 And just for all of our understanding, was cost of construction a criteria that you
21 guys were tasked with considering?

22 A I'd have to look at the cost --

23 Q I would represent to everyone here, we're all in agreement that the cost was
24 not -- the cost of construction is not considered.

25 [REDACTED] I think if we could stick to the nomenclature used in the actual

1 report, it would be helpful for directing the witness to the specific criteria you're asking
2 her about.

3 BY [REDACTED]:

4 Q It's that it doesn't exist.

5 The criteria of cost of construction is not one of the criterias that you guys were
6 asked to look at when making your recommendation. Does that sound right?

7 A Cost of the construction --

8 Q Construction cost was not --

9 A Correct.

10 Q Yes.

11 A Yes.

12 Q So, with that being said, while Greenbelt was the cheapest to acquire, to
13 purchase, I think I would state that reasonable minds can conclude that building upwards
14 versus building out costs more money. Structural, all of the -- in your experience with
15 real estate and the buildings that you currently have with your particular area of
16 expertise, it's reasonable to say that building up would be more expensive than building
17 out?

18 A I can't state that for sure.

19 Q Uh-huh. That's fine.

20 Is it irregular to you that you would not have to consider the cost of something for
21 recommending the best site? In your opinion.

22 A Yeah.

23 Q You were not asked to consider the cost to build the new headquarters. All
24 of this is about a new headquarters that in the last hour I think we established the FBI
25 needs. But you guys were not asked to consider the actual cost of building the

1 headquarters. Is that correct?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q Is that odd to you?

4 A I think that the criteria that was established was established by groups that
5 agreed that these would be the criteria for a panel to convene and evaluate those criteria.
6 I don't think that -- I think that's a question better posed to them, quite frankly, of
7 whether they considered that or, if they didn't, why they didn't.

8 Q Okay.

9 BY [REDACTED]:

10 Q And, I guess, going back to the passage you just read, did the panel discuss
11 wetlands as an issue to build on?

12 A We didn't.

13 Q Okay.

14 And when the panel finished the report, did you let your supervisors know, like
15 Brian Turner, Nick Dimos, or [REDACTED]?

16 A On the 8th, I sent an email to the Associate Deputy Director, Brian Turner,
17 and Assistant Director Nick Dimos that I was finished with the panel process.

18 Q Okay. And is that when you concluded your, I guess, tenure with the
19 panel?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. So, since that moment, you haven't had any, I guess, relationship to
22 the headquarters project?

23 A No.

24 Q Okay.

25 And what evidence was there for you to select the Springfield site as the best site?

1 A The criteria that we evaluated and the ratings that we provided to each of
2 the criteria. When we achieved consensus, it was the Springfield site, for the
3 information that we were provided in the packet --

4 Q Uh-huh.

5 A -- evaluating it against the five criteria that we were given.

6 Q But what information specifically led you to that option?

7 A The information that was in the panel packet.

8 Q Okay.

9 So, I guess, going to cost, which was Criteria 5, why was that the best site to
10 choose?

11 A Which site are you talking about?

12 Q The Springfield site.

13 A In the evaluation of cost --

14 Q Yes.

15 A -- the panel provided a blue consensus rating for the Greenbelt site.

16 Q And why is that?

17 A The Greenbelt site showed the lowest total cost, and it's outlined in the
18 criteria of what was -- of what that cost included.

19 Q Okay.

20 And then going to Criteria 4, which was promoting sustainability and equity, I
21 think --

22 A Uh-huh.

23 Q -- why did the panel choose the Springfield site as --

24 [Discussion off the record.]

25 BY [REDACTED]:

1 Q So, considering this criteria in totality, why did the panel still choose the
2 Springfield site?

3 A Again, I would refer to the report itself where each of the criteria was
4 evaluated against the information in the packet. Each of those criteria had a
5 predetermined weight of that criteria. And the conclusion of the panel is in the report
6 and for all of the reasons that we documented.

7 Q Okay.

8 And has the site selection panel seen an instance like this before, where the panel
9 chooses the Springfield site and then the Site Selection Authority chooses a different site,
10 like Greenbelt?

11 A This is my first experience in site selection like this, and so I can't speak to
12 whether this was an exception or not.

13 Q So you don't know whether this has happened before at all?

14 A I don't know if it's happened before.

15 Q Okay. Did any of the panel members mention that this has happened
16 before or has happened before?

17 A I have not spoken to the panel members since the conclusion of our
18 report-writing. So I've not spoken to them since the Site Selection Authority issued her
19 report.

20 Q Okay.

21 BY [REDACTED]:

22 Q Given your experience with the site selection process -- you mentioned your
23 previous experience and methodical and planning and what you put into your career
24 doing those things and why, probably, you were selected to be the FBI representative.
25 And given how much time and information you guys had to pore through, or time given

1 and then information poured through, would you want to do this again, given that you
2 guys were overrode without given, really, the information as to why?

3 A I think if the question is would I, upon request of the FBI, serve in a capacity
4 where they felt I was best suited, the answer is yes.

5 BY [REDACTED]:

6 Q In your opinion, why do you think Ms. Albert disagreed with the panel's
7 decision?

8 A I think you would have to ask her, and I think that her report would outline
9 those reasons that she documented.

10 Q So, during the committee's briefing that we had with the FBI in January, Nick
11 Dimos discussed that the FBI and GSA had a briefing on August 31st, and he stated that
12 Ms. Albert said to him, "I started with the premise that Greenbelt was the best site."

13 Are you aware of this statement?

14 A I'm not.

15 Q What is your reaction to the statement?

16 A I don't know that I have a reaction as much as -- can you say the statement
17 again?

18 Q "I started with the premise that Greenbelt was the best site."

19 A I don't have a reaction on that statement. I think that, as she submitted in
20 her report, Greenbelt is the ultimate selection from the Site Selection Authority, and she
21 outlined the reasons why she made that decision in her report.

22 BY [REDACTED]:

23 Q During your evaluation of all the information that you received, you and the
24 other two panelists, did you communicate with anyone outside of those other two
25 panelists and the people on the -- the technical advisors, all of that?

1 A Outside of the panel and the technical advisors, no one.

2 Q Did anyone attempt to communicate with you regarding any of that?

3 A No.

4 BY MS. THIES:

5 Q So, when you learned that Ms. Albert was -- her prior employment was with
6 WMATA, did you believe that caused a conflict of interest or a perception of a conflict of
7 interest?

8 A When I learned -- can you say that again? When I learned of it?

9 Q Yeah. So, after you found out that Ms. Albert was previously employed
10 with WMATA, and WMATA owns the Greenbelt site, do you think that is a conflict of
11 interest or is a perception of a conflict of interest?

12 A I can't comment whether I believe it's a conflict of interest. I think that the
13 naming of a Site Selection Authority is a process in and of itself, and that would have been
14 covered during that process.

15 I think that in looking at processes in general and building of processes, perception
16 of conflicts of interest or deliberate conflicts of interest are woven into processes,
17 whether that's hiring and nepotism processes. It's something that certainly is a factor.

18 Q Are you aware that the FBI Director and Nick Dimos believe that it's a
19 perception of a conflict of interest?

20 A I believe the letter that the Director sent includes language of the Site
21 Selection Authority's previous employment, yes.

22 Q And how does that make you feel, knowing that, I guess, this decision is
23 under scrutiny?

24 A I don't know that it makes me feel any certain way as much as a view into
25 process is always, in my opinion, a good view. As you look to build a process or evaluate

1 a process or watch a process at the tail end of something, those are all good things, in my
2 opinion.

3 BY [REDACTED]:

4 Q Turning back to the back-check that you guys had after your consensus
5 meeting, can you just quickly explain to us, when you guys had the consensus meeting
6 before the back-check, how did you guys go about telling each other, or how did that
7 work, about how each of you came to your decision?

8 A So we went criteria by criteria, and then in each sub-criteria, each of us, sort
9 off in a round-robin fashion, would state, for Criteria 1, Sub-Criteria A, what was your
10 individual rating for this? And then I would state, Brett would state, Tim would state.

11 And we went all the way down through each of the sub-criteria and then criteria
12 and then went back around to look at it as a whole.

13 Q And was anyone at that time able to ask questions to you guys, or were you
14 just purely stating --

15 A We were purely stating where we were.

16 Q And everyone that was in the back-check meeting was also in that meeting;
17 is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 BY [REDACTED]:

20 Q For the Criterion 4 briefing that we discussed earlier, you said it was [REDACTED]
21 who had provided the briefing?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Do you recall [REDACTED] last name?

24 A I don't recall it, but it would be certainly in the GSA's documentation that
25 they provided. She was listed on the site selection plan. It might've been redacted

1 here, but she would have been in the technical advisors. Her name would've been listed
2 there.

3 Q And at what point during the morning did she begin that briefing? Do you
4 recall?

5 A I don't remember, no.

6 Q Do you recall if she gave, at the outset, a set of reasons why she felt it was
7 necessary to provide that briefing?

8 A We were told that [REDACTED] was going to give us the briefing with the slides
9 because she had been primarily responsible for that criteria itself and that, because there
10 were so many sub-criteria to Criteria 4, that they wanted to give her the opportunity to
11 explain what all of the slides meant, and that's why they were doing it.

12 Q And who told you that?

13 A Aaron.

14 Q And do you recall when Aaron told you that?

15 A This all happened during our first kickoff meeting, so that would've been July
16 31st. But I don't know what time it was.

17 BY [REDACTED]:

18 Q Did you receive the 600-page packet of information prior to the kickoff
19 meeting so you had time to review it? Or did you get the packet, like, day of, on
20 July 27th?

21 A I recall getting it the day of.

22 Q Okay.

23 A Yeah.

1 [12:24 p.m.]

2 BY [REDACTED]:

3 Q Turning back to the back-check meeting, we've gone over a couple of the
4 transportation-related topics, the socioeconomic criterion. Do you recall any other
5 topics that Ms. Albert raised during the back-check meeting?

6 A I'm just refreshing on the criteria, each one.

7 No. The only other conversation that we had would've fallen under Criteria 2,
8 and that was a small discussion on airports. But that's Criteria 2.

9 Q And what's your recollection of what was discussed regarding airports?

10 A That the distances that we were provided in that overview sheet were
11 distances to Reagan National from each of the three sites. And in the back-check,
12 Ms. Albert brought up that of course there are other airports that were in the 600-page
13 packet that could be considered, not only Reagan National.

14 Q I'm sorry, did you say -- I want to know about that. So it was in -- the
15 600-page only provided the distances to Reagan National, but other airports were listed?

16 A I recall the distances for all three -- BWI, National, and Dulles. All of the
17 airports were discussed in that 600-page packet. Distances were provided.

18 But I believe the reason that we were only looking at National is that National was
19 the closest airport to any of the three. And so the focus became National and not, for
20 example, an aggregate distance between each site and each of the three.

21 Q And was that -- the decision to focus on the closest airport as opposed to
22 aggregating the three closest or some other factor, was that just based off instructions in
23 the packet?

24 A Correct. Yes.

25 Q During this back-check meeting, can you walk us through again just -- you

1 reach consensus in the morning.

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q It's earlier than maybe initially it was scheduled or expected. Is there a
4 break for lunch or just a natural breaking point?

5 A There was a break, yes.

6 Q So folks log back on, or everyone's gathered again.

7 A Uh-huh.

8 Q At the start of the meeting, did you know it was going to be a back-check
9 meeting? Or how did you -- you said, initially you thought it was to get support --

10 A Correct.

11 Q How did you become aware that this was going to be a back-check meeting?

12 A When I believe it was Aaron said, "We just want to spend a few minutes
13 talking about some of the criteria," and he turned it to the Site Selection Authority.

14 Q Do you know who Aaron had spoken to in that interim period?

15 A No.

16 [REDACTED] The Site Selection Authority led the back-check portion of your
17 afternoon meeting?

18 Ms. Parry. Yes.

19 BY [REDACTED]:

20 Q When going through the topics -- we went through several of the
21 transportation-related topics -- airports, bus versus Metro -- and socioeconomic factors.
22 Did anyone besides Ms. Albert make statements about these factors?

23 A Say that again?

24 Q Sure. Just at a higher level, you mentioned that you didn't respond or
25 anything like that, but do you remember who was participating in that discussion, not

1 just, like, attending, but actively participating and making comments during this segment
2 of the back-check?

3 A No. I just recall Ms. Albert stating what we've already talked about, but no
4 one else sort of adding additional comments or posing any questions.

5 Q So, for this period when she's going through the transportation-related --

6 A Uh-huh.

7 Q -- concerns, the socioeconomic, she's the only one speaking in the meeting?

8 A Yes.

9 Q During the morning meeting when you reached consensus, were you able to
10 see or tell in any way the reaction of folks as you were delivering your findings and the
11 other panelists were delivering their findings?

12 A No.

13 BY [REDACTED]:

14 Q How long was Ms. Albert speaking for during the back-check discussion?

15 A I don't know. It --

16 Q Thirty minutes? An hour?

17 A Not an hour. It was less than 30 minutes, but I couldn't tell you exactly
18 how long it was.

19 Q Okay.

20 And, then, after Ms. Albert was speaking about some of the issues that she had,
21 what happened after that?

22 A I can't recall whether we took another break and got off of the call and came
23 back or whether it was just a shift from the back-check into the report-writing, but we
24 shifted into the report-writing process.

25 [REDACTED] And was Ms. Albert there for that, for the report-writing process?

1 Ms. Parry. No.

2 BY [REDACTED]:

3 Q Once you get into the report-writing process, did the other two
4 members -- did anyone make a comment about Ms. Albert's concerns or what had just
5 been discussed over that afternoon?

6 A Comments about what she brought up, no, but discussion about the parts of
7 the report where we focused on language about "marginal." We spent some time
8 making sure that we felt comfortable and confident in the writing of that portion.

9 Q If I remember your testimony from the first hour correctly, you said you
10 spoke to one of the FBI technical leads that was in the meeting about --

11 A Legal advisor. Yes.

12 Q Yeah. Do you recall who it was?

13 A His name is [REDACTED] (ph).

14 Q And other than your discussions with Mr. [REDACTED], did you have any other
15 discussions with anyone else in that meeting --

16 A No.

17 Q -- following Ms. Albert's presentation?

18 A No.

19 Q Who was in the meeting for the report development part of the afternoon?

20 A I believe it -- I would confirm this with the meeting log with GSA, but I
21 believe that everyone who had been part of all of the meetings, with the exception of
22 Ms. Albert, was in that meeting -- in that portion of that meeting.

23 [REDACTED] So, from your perspective, given this entire process, everything that
24 you did, all the information you reviewed, do you still believe, from the information you
25 had to review, that your recommendation of Springfield was still the best

1 recommendation?

2 Ms. Parry. I believe that the information that we had and the evaluation that I
3 did individually and then as part of a panel that reached consensus without any type of
4 discussion of differing opinion is the recommendation that I put forward.

5 BY [REDACTED]:

6 Q For the afternoon meeting, once you began working on the report, do you
7 recall if there was any carryover effect with the tone or, kind of, tenor of the meeting as it
8 related to the report draft meeting following Ms. Albert's comments?

9 A I don't.

10 Q Do you recall feeling any degree of frustration of Ms. Albert's statements as
11 it related to whether the sub-criteria should have been weighted differently, given that
12 that was something that was out of your control?

13 A Frustration? No.

14 BY [REDACTED]:

15 Q I do have some questions.

16 So, in March 2023, GSA and FBI met with Virginia and Maryland delegations, and
17 after that they released an amended site selection plan.

18 Were you a part of these meetings with those --

19 A No.

20 Q -- delegations?

21 A No.

22 Q Do you know who was?

23 A I don't.

24 Q Okay.

25 [REDACTED] And just for clarification, did you or your other two panel members

1 have any involvement in the creation of the plans -- the original or any of the
2 amendments to the plans itself?

3 Ms. Parry. I know that I didn't. I can't speak to the other two panelists.

4 [REDACTED] Okay.

5 BY [REDACTED]:

6 Q And now that a decision has been made, do you have any responsibilities for
7 the FBI headquarters project?

8 A The only responsibility that I have is just like any other assistant director in
9 the FBI, and that is, as we move into the construction process, we're starting to be asked
10 to start thinking about what space needs each of our divisions may need in a new
11 headquarters. But we haven't received any official taskings or requests for information.
12 But that is just sort of what we've been told as a group, is to start thinking about what
13 space requirements we would have.

14 Q So do you know currently what stage in the process the FBI headquarters
15 project is in?

16 A I don't.

17 Q And have you spoken with anyone at GSA regarding the selection?

18 A No.

19 Q And when is the last time you spoke with Ms. Albert?

20 A The last time -- I never really directly spoke with Ms. Albert, but the last time
21 that we would have been together would have been in that back-check meeting in July of
22 2023.

23 Q Okay. And are you aware that Ms. Albert left GSA a couple days or -- I
24 don't know, however many days -- after she made her decision?

25 A I don't know the timeframe, but I learned, just through media, that she had

1 left GSA.

2 Q What is your reaction to her leaving so soon after making a decision of that
3 magnitude?

4 A I don't really have a reaction. I don't have a reaction to that.

5 [REDACTED] We'll go ahead and go off the record.

6 Ms. Parry. Thank you.

7 [Recess.]

8 [REDACTED] We'll go back on the record.

9 Hi, Ms. Parry. My name is [REDACTED]. I'm with the House Judiciary
10 Committee. Thank you again for being here today.

11 Ms. Parry. Sure.

12 BY [REDACTED]:

13 Q I have a few clarifying questions. I'm just going to ask you to maybe repeat
14 some of what you've said, but I just want to get a clear record, so that's why I'm asking
15 duplicative questions.

16 So you said that the first official meeting of the panel was on July 27th, 2023,
17 correct?

18 A Correct.

19 Q And was that the date that you received the approximately 600-page body of
20 documents that you were going to be using for your recommendations?

21 A I believe so, yes.

22 Q It was approximately on that date?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And you said that the panel reached consensus on a recommendation on
25 July 31st, correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q So you had approximately 4 days to review that body of documents and
3 come together to reach consensus, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q To the best of your recollection, how many times did the panel meet in this
6 approximately 4-day period?

7 A The meeting log would give you that definite answer from GSA, but from our
8 kickoff meeting to -- you're asking the consensus meeting?

9 Q Yes.

10 A Perhaps three or four. But, again, I would direct you to the GSA meeting
11 log to give you that definite answer.

12 Q Sure.

13 To the best of your recollection, approximately how long were those meetings?
14 Like, would they be a full day? Half a day? A few hours? If you can recall.

15 A I can't.

16 I know that the kickoff meeting was a robust meeting where we went through all
17 of the different materials. And they walked us through the different meeting logs and
18 question logs and how to pose questions and the records that they would be keeping -- as
19 a records person -- the records that they would be keeping. And so that was the
20 longest.

21 And then the check-in sort of meetings of how are things going would have been
22 less time than that kickoff meeting, but I can't recall the exact duration.

23 Q Okay. And, again, to repeat, those meetings would've happened in about
24 that 4-day period?

25 A Correct.

1 Q Okay.

2 And you had a back-check meeting on July 31st, correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And that, as you said in the prior hour, lasted less than 30 minutes, correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you said you signed the report on August 8th, 2023, correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q So, from that back-check meeting to your signing of the report, the
9 report-writing process took about a week, correct?

10 A A little less. We had finished the draft, and I think Tim forwarded it for
11 formatting, and then it was sent for signature -- electronic signature.

12 Q Okay. So this entire process from that kickoff meeting on July 27th to your
13 signature on August 8th was approximately 12 days, correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay.

16 And in your experience in the site selection process, you didn't witness any
17 misconduct, correct? In your experience on the panel.

18 A I would ask for -- I was not -- "misconduct" I would want to see defined, as
19 misconduct --

20 Q You felt the panel conducted itself professionally and you made your
21 recommendations according to the guidelines that were prescribed to you?

22 A Yes. I felt that, within the instructions that we were provided and the
23 responsibility that we had, I had no question that I and the panel members followed
24 those instructions and provided the recommendation in the way that we were asked to.

25 Q Okay. Thank you.

1 [REDACTED]?

2 [REDACTED] Off the record.

3 [Recess.]

4 [REDACTED] We'll go back on the record.

5 BY [REDACTED]:

6 Q During the back-check portion of this, did you take any notes?

7 A No.

8 Q To your knowledge, did anyone else take any notes?

9 A I don't know.

10 Q And for each concern raised, was the concern -- excuse me.

11 BY [REDACTED]:

12 Q In the back-check meeting, there were a number of concerns and topics that
13 Ms. Albert raised during the meeting related to transportation, socioeconomic benefits.

14 For each concern that she raised, if the criteria was assessed the way that
15 Ms. Albert was suggesting, would that be to the Greenbelt site's favorability?

16 A I don't know. I can't answer that, as to whether or not she was asking
17 about things that would have favored one site over the other.

18 Q So, with the walkability --

19 A Uh-huh.

20 Q -- whether it was marginal or not, did she say anything to the effect of
21 whether one of the sites was more advantageous because it was a shorter walk?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And which site was that?

24 A Greenbelt.

25 Q And for the airports, based off the packet and the instructions provided

1 there, you were looking at just everything as it related to Reagan National.

2 A Yes.

3 Q When Ms. Albert noted that there were other airports in the area, did she
4 mention which of the three sites was closest in the aggregate to all three airports in the
5 area?

6 A She didn't.

7 Q Okay. Did she mention how far the Greenbelt location was from BWI?

8 A I don't recall her talking about exact distances for the airports.

9 Q In relation to Ms. Albert's comments about the bus lines versus the Metro
10 and more people take the Metro, to your understanding of the three sites, which
11 benefited the most by access to bus lines?

12 A The data showed more bus lines for the Springfield site than for the
13 Landover or Greenbelt site.

14 Q And so, if the criteria were changed so that greater weight was given toward
15 Metro access as opposed to access to bus lines, that would favor the other two sites
16 besides the Springfield site. Is that right?

17 A Say that again?

18 Q Sure. So the Springfield site had greater access to the bus lines?

19 A Correct.

20 Q And Ms. Albert had suggested that the access to Metro lines should've been
21 weighted more heavily than access to bus lines because more people use the Metro. Is
22 that right?

23 A Yes.

24 Q If the packet had said that access to the Metro should be weighted more
25 heavily than access to the bus lines, which sites would that benefit?

1 A The way the criteria were presented to the panel, there was -- no matter the
2 number of sub-criteria, each of those sub-criteria were to be weighted equally.

3 If the sub-criteria were weighted differently, if that's what you're suggesting, I
4 would have to see what that would look like. But in pure data alone, the distance
5 between the proposed site to a Metro in Greenbelt was a shorter distance than the
6 distance between the Springfield site and a Metro, versus the number of bus lines that
7 served the Springfield site versus the number of bus lines that served the Greenbelt site.

8 The panel evaluated the sub-criteria as we were told, equally. Whether that
9 shifted is a hypothetical that, if different criteria are weighted differently, I would imagine
10 that an outcome would happen. Whether that's different than the one that we reached,
11 I can't say.

12 Q When Ms. Albert was talking about that the Metro should've been weighted
13 more heavily because more people take the Metro --

14 A Right.

15 Q -- than bus lines, just based on how the statement was delivered, was it a
16 remark geared toward you and the other two panelists in particular, or was she just more
17 broadly speaking and expressing a disagreement with what was ultimately in the packet?

18 A I don't know the motivation of why she said what she said. I only know
19 that that's what she said during the back-check.

20 Q Did you get a sense that she was speaking off of notes or delivering remarks
21 that she had written down in any way?

22 A I didn't get a sense, no.

23 Q In the previous round, there were a couple questions at the end about if you
24 saw any misconduct or anything like that, and you asked for a clarifying definition.

25 Throughout this process, was there anything that you saw that gave you concern

1 about how the process was being conducted?

2 A Say that again?

3 Q Sure. Throughout this process, was there anything you saw that gave you
4 concern?

5 A The back-check. We've talked about that. I was not -- the back-check was
6 not in the original schedule, that we would have that. And so, again, from a process
7 perspective and looking at an agenda of dates and what we would be doing during those
8 dates, the back-check was a concern because it wasn't documented as part of the
9 process.

10 Q For a concern like the back-check, once that occurred, that it's outside of the
11 pre-planned process, normally what is the protocol? Is there any sort of obligation to
12 report those concerns or share those with anybody in particular?

13 A Say that again?

14 Q Once there's a deviation from the processes as you understood them, to
15 your understanding, was there any sort of duty or obligation to share that concern with
16 anyone in the FBI?

17 A No.

18 Q Okay.

19 I think it was [REDACTED] you said was the FBI technical lead you spoke to?

20 A Legal advisor, yes.

21 Q Legal advisor. Why did you speak to him in particular?

22 A I called each of the FBI's technical advisors when we completed the
23 consensus and before we moved into report-writing. I just gave a call to each of the
24 technical advisors on the FBI side to just thank them for their support in whatever role
25 that they had. And so I talked to not only [REDACTED] but there were two other FBI

1 technical advisors, and I just called and thanked them as well.

2 Q And as it relates to the back-check meeting, what is your recollection of what
3 Mr. English said?

4 [REDACTED] Can I confer with the client for a second?

5 [REDACTED] Yeah.

6 [Discussion off the record.]

7 Ms. Parry. I forgot the question.

8 BY [REDACTED]:

9 Q Your conversation with [REDACTED] --

10 A Yes.

11 Q -- was there any part of the discussion that referenced the back-check
12 meeting, to your recollection?

13 A No. The only thing outside of thanking him as I did the others was my
14 rhetorical comment about, what's the probability that the Site Selection Authority
15 changes the decision from the panel's recommendation?

16 Q And other than what you've testified, do you remember anything else?
17 Was there anything else that was discussed between you and [REDACTED] --

18 A No.

19 Q -- as it related to the site selection?

20 A No.

21 Q If you'd like to take a look at the topics one more time -- but now that we've
22 had a chance to refresh your memory and talk about the back-check meeting, are there
23 any other topics that come to mind that Ms. Albert had raised during the meeting besides
24 the transportation topics and the socioeconomic benefit topic that we've discussed?

25 A No.

1 [REDACTED] We'll go off the record.

2 [Recess.]

3 [REDACTED] On the record.

4 BY [REDACTED]:

5 Q Just very quickly, the back-check meeting, that occurred on July 31st; is that
6 right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And before the back-check meeting, you and your fellow panelists had
9 already arrived at your consensus recommendation on all the sub-criteria and the criteria
10 i and the final recommendation, correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And this back-check meeting lasted, I think you said, less than 30 minutes?

13 A Yes.

14 Q I think you described it as Nina Albert trying to get a better understanding of
15 how the panelists arrived at your decision. Is that right?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And then you and your fellow panelists wrote this panel recommendation
18 report --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- that reflected your recommendations.

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. And your recommendations did not change from before the
23 back-check meeting to after the back-check meeting?

24 A Correct.

25 Q No one pressured you to change your recommendations between July 31st

1 and the date you signed this report?

2 A Say that again?

3 Q Sure. This report reflects your recommendations based on your evaluation
4 and your discussions with your fellow panelists. Is that --

5 A Yes.

6 Q -- fair?

7 [REDACTED] Off the record.

8 [Recess.]

9 [REDACTED] We'll go back on the record.

10 BY [REDACTED]:

11 Q Was there any pressure to change the consensus reached from the time of
12 the back-check meeting until you signed the report?

13 A I can't answer whether there was pressure. Whether anything that
14 occurred during the back-check meeting influenced the panel in what we had already
15 received or achieved as consensus and whether anything influenced the writing of the
16 report and the submission of the report that I signed, no.

17 Q To your understanding, was there an attempt to pressure when the
18 consensus had been reached?

19 A I can't speak to what someone's motivation may or may not have been. I
20 can't speak to that.

21 [REDACTED] Can we go off the record, please?

22 All right. Thank you so much.

23 Ms. Parry. No, thank you, guys. Thank you.

24 [Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the interview was concluded.]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Certificate of Deponent/Interviewee

I have read the foregoing ____ pages, which contain the correct transcript of the answers made by me to the questions therein recorded.

Witness Name

Date