

Affected Environment

The National Park Service uses the term "impact topics" to refer to the resources and values of concern in the planning process. Impact topics are used to focus the planning process and the assessment of potential consequences of the alternatives. The National Park Service identified impact topics for the *Final General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, Rock Creek Park and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway* based on their recognition as resources or values that are:

- Cited in the establishing legislation for the park or the parkway;
- Critical to maintaining the significance and character of the park;
- Recognized as important by laws or regulations; or
- Of concern to the public during scoping for the general management plan.

Table 3 shows the criteria that helped establish each impact topic as appropriate for consideration in the general management plan and environmental impact statement.

The "Affected Environment" section of the general management plan and environmental impact statement characterizes the existing conditions for each of these impact topics. The intent was not to provide complete information on all aspects of these impact topics in the park. Instead, the "Affected Environment" section focused on those aspects of each impact topic that could be affected by the alternatives.

One of the primary concerns in the park and along the parkway is traffic. In 2003, traffic congestion in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area was identified as the third- worst in the nation. During the morning and evening commuting periods, traffic levels on arterial roadways in the vicinity of the park and parkway typically meet or exceed their capacities. These conditions also occur within the park and parkway, where several intersections routinely fail or function poorly in accommodating traffic volumes during the commuting periods.

Impact Topic	Cited in Establishing Legislation	Critical to Park Significance and Character	Recognized by Laws or Regulations	Cited During Scoping
Air quality			✓	✓
Rock Creek and its tributaries	✓	✓	✓	✓
Wetlands and floodplains			✓	✓
Deciduous forests	✓	✓	✓	✓
Protected and rare species			✓	✓
Other native wildlife	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cultural resources, including archeological resources, historic structures, and cultural landscapes		✓	✓	✓
Traditional park character and visitor experience	✓	✓		✓
Public health and safety			✓	✓
Local and regional transportation				✓
Community character				✓

Environmental Consequences

The environmental impact statement portion of the general management plan describes the effects of each alternative on each impact topic. The analysis involved the following steps.

- Identifying the regulations and policies that were applicable to each impact topic.
- Describing the methods that were used to conduct the analysis. This included defining thresholds for terms such as "minor" or "major" effects for the impact topic and establishing timeframes for long-term and short-term effects. For resources that are protected under the Organic Act's mandate to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life," this included establishing a criterion that defined impairment.
- Performing the analysis for the park and parkway, and in a more regional context to determine cumulative impacts. The analyses involved comparing conditions that would occur with changes in management (Alternatives A, C, and D, commonly called the "action alternatives") to conditions that would occur if current management practices continued (Alternative B, the "no action alternative").

The results of the analysis are summarized in Table 4. Complete information on effects is provided in the general management plan / environmental impact statement.

The analysis of environmental consequences found that all four alternatives would have fairly similar effects on air quality, the water quality and hydrology of Rock Creek and its tributaries, wetlands and floodplains, deciduous forests, and protected and rare species. These findings would be expected, based both on the NPS' mandate to protect these resources and the development of the alternatives from decision points that focus on traffic management, visitor interpretation and education, and effective administration and operations.

Some differences in effects on natural resources would occur. However, except for roadkill reductions, none of the differences in effects on natural resources among the alternatives would be major.

In the area of traditional park character and visitor experience, the improved education and interpretation facilities included in Alternatives A, C, and D would provide greater opportunities for the public to learn about and experience the park's natural and cultural resources, compared to Alternative B. The action alternatives would also enhance the efficiency of park administration and improve police services.

The greatest benefits to nonmotorized recreation would be associated with Alternative C, which would eliminate most of the automobile traffic in the park north of Broad Branch Road and would provide a broad, smooth surface in a quiet setting for activities such as walking and bicycling. However, Alternative C would eliminate the current visitor experience of automobile travel along the length of the park, including the gorge area, which would be a major adverse effect on the current visitor experience.

Historic park roads are considered a cultural resource. By closing them to motorized traffic, Alternative C would modify some of the design features that define their significance.

Cultural resources would be the only impact topic where one or more of the alternatives could cause irreversible and irretrievable losses of resources. Under the three action alternatives, the disturbance of sites in association with new construction could result in some irreversible and irretrievable loss of archeological or historic resources.

The traffic management measures of all three action alternatives would produce major improvements in visitor safety. Most of the improvements would be associated with the implementation of engineered traffic-calming devices, which would reduce vehicle speeds and the associated frequency and severity of accidents.



Level of service ratings are used by traffic engineers to measure and compare traffic conditions. The impact topics addressing regional and local transportation and community characteristics are affected by traffic levels. For Alternatives A, C, and D, the effects on these impact topics were determined by comparing the levels of service they would produce in the year 2020 with the levels of service that would occur in the year 2020 from the implementation of Alternative B.

- Alternative A and Alternative D would produce 2020 conditions similar (no differences in levels of service) to those in Alternative B. This result was expected, because Alternative A would affect traffic primarily outside the rush-hour periods and Alternative D was designed to minimize effects on rush-hour traffic.
- For Alternative C, improvements in levels of service within the park would be noticeable to major. Effects would include the elimination of automobile traffic on most of Beach Drive north of Broad Branch Road.
- Noticeable (change of one level of service) improvements in traffic would occur along most of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway with Alternative C.
- With Alternative C, eight road segments outside the park would have the benefits to traffic and community character of improved levels of service, while nine road segments would have decreased levels of service with associated adverse effects on traffic and community character. There would not be a disproportionate routing of traffic to disadvantaged areas or ethnic neighborhoods.

During the middle part of workdays, Alternatives C and D would have similar effects, diverting traffic that would use park roads under Alternative B onto nearby city streets. However, nearby streets and intersections would be operating well below their capacities during the mid-day period, even in the year 2020. While the diverted mid-day traffic would be perceptible on some city streets, it would not cause any changes in levels of service or in traffic-related community character.

With regard to the first decision point, Alternatives A, C, and D would reduce traffic speeds and volumes in the park compared to Alternative B.

- Alternative A would accomplish this by improving enforcement and implementing traffic-calming measures while maintaining the roads for automobile travel throughout weekdays.
- Alternative C would permanently eliminate automobile travel on some segments of Beach Drive and would implement traffic-reducing and traffic-calming measures in other areas.
- Alternative D would implement traffic-calming measures, and would close sections of Beach Drive to motorized traffic during the middle part of each weekday.

Regarding the second decision point, the levels of service for visitor interpretation and education would be equally improved under the identical measures of Alternatives A, C, and D. This would be accomplished by moving administrative and operations functions out of historic buildings and by rehabilitating these and other historic and educational structures. For the third decision point, Alternatives A, C, and D would provide the same level of improvements compared to Alternative B by moving administration and operations functions into modern facilities.



Cumulative Effects

For many of the impact topics, the action alternatives would produce beneficial effects on the natural and cultural resources of the park and parkway. However, on a regional basis, these alternatives would have only small incremental benefits, and would be overshadowed by the adverse effects resulting from continued population growth and development in the watershed. In addition, regardless of the management actions taken by the National Park Service, traffic in the region will continue to increase.

As a result, it will be important for the National Park Service to continue to participate in regional actions, such as the Chesapeake Bay Program and the Woodrow Wilson Bridge mitigation, which includes reestablishing migratory fish in upper Rock Creek. In addition, the improved education programs that would be implemented under the action alternatives could provide some of the most important beneficial effects by improving public awareness of environmental concerns and encouraging improved stewardship by citizens of resources outside the park and parkway.



Preferred Alternative and Environmentally Preferred Alternative

Alternative A is the NPS' preferred alternative. This is the alternative that the National Park Service believes would best accomplish its goals for managing Rock Creek Park and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Alternative A was selected as the NPS' preferred alternative based on its ability to effectively balance the recreational, environmental, and traffic considerations for the short- and long-term future of the park.

The environmentally preferred alternative would best promote the national environmental policy expressed in the National Environmental Policy Act. This alternative would cause the least damage to the biological and physical environment, and best protect, preserve, and enhance historical, cultural, and natural resources.

The National Environmental Policy Act identifies six criteria be used to help determine the environmentally preferred alternative. Based on these criteria, Alternative D would be environmentally preferred by a close margin compared to the other action alternatives. Alternative B, which would continue current management, would not achieve the criteria as completely as the action alternatives.



Table 4: Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives

Park Feature	Alternative A: Improved Management of Established Park Uses	Alternative B: Continue Current Management/No Action	Alternative C: Nonmotorized Recreation Emphasis	Alternative D: Mid-Weekday Recreation Enhancement
Air quality	<p>Little effect on air quality because traffic patterns would not change from Alternative B and traffic would remain in the airshed.</p> <p>Carbon monoxide levels would be below National Ambient Air Quality Standard.</p> <p>The airshed's ozone status would not be affected.</p> <p>Best management practices would ensure that effects from construction would be negligible.</p> <p>No impairment of air quality resources.</p>	<p>Carbon monoxide levels would increase compared to current conditions because of traffic increases. However, carbon monoxide levels would remain well below the National Ambient Air Quality Standard.</p> <p>No impairment of air quality resources.</p>	<p>Effects would be the same as Alternative A. Although Alternative C would reroute traffic that would use Beach Drive under Alternative A or B, no traffic would be diverted to outside the airshed.</p>	<p>Effects would be same as Alternative A. Although Alternative D would reroute traffic that would use Beach Drive during the mid-day period under Alternative A or B, no traffic would be diverted to outside the airshed.</p>
Rock Creek and its tributaries	<p>Application of best management practices to park areas known to be contributing pollutants would produce beneficial, long-term, measurable effects on water quality.</p> <p>Construction at several sites would produce negligible, adverse, short-term effects on water quality and hydrology.</p> <p>Better education of the public could help reduce upstream pollutant loadings and storm water flows.</p> <p>Replacement of poorly designed trail segments with erosion problems would have a measurable, long-term, beneficial effect on water quality.</p> <p>Improved park-wide management of soils, vegetation, and water under an updated natural resources management plan would have a measurable, long-term, beneficial effect on water quality and hydrology.</p> <p>Continued inter-agency measures to maintain and improve sanitary and combined sewer systems would produce beneficial, long-term, major effects on water quality. Coordination could also produce beneficial, long-term, major reductions in streambed alterations such as scour and sedimentation.</p> <p>No impairment of water quality or hydrology resources.</p>	<p>The application of best management practices to park areas known to be contributing pollutants would produce beneficial, long-term, measurable effects on water quality.</p> <p>Continued inter-agency measures to maintain and improve sanitary and combined sewer systems would produce beneficial, long-term, major effects on water quality. Coordination could also produce beneficial, long-term, major reductions in streambed alterations such as scour and sedimentation.</p> <p>No impairment of water quality or hydrology resources.</p>	<p>Diversion of traffic to roads outside the park would redistribute car-related pollutants that wash into Rock Creek during storms but the change in pollutant loading in the watershed would be negligible.</p> <p>Other effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Diversion of traffic to roads outside the park during mid-day periods would redistribute car-related pollutants that wash into Rock Creek during storms but the change in pollutant loading in the watershed would be negligible.</p> <p>Other effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>

Table 4: Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives (Continued)

Park Feature	Alternative A: Improved Management of Established Park Uses	Alternative B: Continue Current Management/No Action	Alternative C: Nonmotorized Recreation Emphasis	Alternative D: Mid-Weekday Recreation Enhancement
Wetlands and floodplains	<p>No temporary or permanent adverse effects would occur on wetlands. Better education of the public on the need to control upstream storm water runoff could benefit wetlands.</p> <p>Minor, temporary, adverse effects on floodplains would result from rehabilitation at the Peirce Mill complex and construction of improvements on some trails along Rock Creek. Effects would be controlled using best management practices.</p> <p>No impairment of wetland or floodplain resources.</p>	<p>No effects would occur. Wetlands and floodplains would continue to be protected in conformance with Executive Orders 11990 and 11988, respectively.</p> <p>No impairment of wetland or floodplain resources.</p>	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.
Deciduous forests	<p>Current management practices would continue to protect the deciduous forest.</p> <p>Conversion of about a half acre of forested land to new paved trail area would be a long-term, minor, adverse effect on the deciduous forest.</p> <p>Disturbance of up to 5.8 acres of forest for a trail construction zone would be a minor, short-term, adverse effect.</p> <p>Rerouting trails currently on steep slopes, erosion-prone areas, riparian zones, or rare biotic communities would be a major, long-term, beneficial effect.</p> <p>No impairment of deciduous forest resources.</p>	<p>Current management practices would continue to protect deciduous forests.</p> <p>Erosion problems along heavily used or improperly designed trails would continue and probably worsen.</p> <p>No impairment of deciduous forest resources</p>	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.
Protected and rare species	<p>Long-term protection of endangered amphipods could be enhanced by implementing more active protection.</p> <p>Improved education and interpretation may increase the public's appreciation for these species and lead to better protection outside the park.</p> <p>No impairment of protected or rare species.</p>	<p>The National Park Service would continue to protect rare species and their supporting habitats.</p> <p>No impairment of protected or rare species.</p>	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.	Effects would be the same as Alternative A.

Table 4: Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives (Continued)

Park Feature	Alternative A: Improved Management of Established Park Uses	Alternative B: Continue Current Management/No Action	Alternative C: Nonmotorized Recreation Emphasis	Alternative D: Mid-Weekday Recreation Enhancement
Other native wildlife	<p>Current management practices would continue to protect native wildlife.</p> <p>Minor, short-term, adverse effects from trail improvements and realignments would be controlled using best management practices.</p> <p>Reduced traffic speeds and volumes would reduce wildlife roadkill, a beneficial effect. For most species, the effect would be negligible. Effects on the box turtle would be moderate. Effects on the gray fox would be major.</p> <p>Better education of the public on the adverse effects of moving box turtles or removing them from the park would provide a moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on box turtles.</p> <p>No impairment of native wildlife resources.</p>	<p>Current management practices would continue to protect native wildlife in the park.</p> <p>No impairment of native wildlife resources.</p>	<p>Closure of portions of Beach Drive to motorized traffic would further reduce the number of terrestrial wildlife roadkills compared to Alternative B. For most species, the effect would be negligible. Effects on the box turtle would be moderate. Effects on the gray fox would be major.</p> <p>Other effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Closure of portions of Beach Drive to motorized traffic during mid-weekdays would reduce the number of terrestrial wildlife roadkills, especially for species that are active during the day. For most species, the effect would be negligible. Effects on the box turtle would be moderate. Effects on the gray fox would be major.</p> <p>Other effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>
Archeological resources	<p>No significant adverse effect would occur because because the National Park Service would relocate any facilities that would disturb sites that potentially were eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>Increased monitoring and improved visitor education would reduce the potential for non-construction-related significant adverse effects.</p> <p>The disturbance of sites could result in some irretrievable and irreversible loss of archeological resources.</p> <p>No impairment of archeological resources.</p>	<p>Current incremental degradation of sites and features would continue.</p> <p>No impairment of archeological resources.</p>	<p>Effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>
Historic structures and cultural landscapes	<p>A significant beneficial impact would occur to the Peirce-Kingle Mansion and Lodge House, which would be rehabilitated to preserve their architecturally significant features and would be used in accordance with park resource values.</p> <p>A significant beneficial impact would occur to historic trails where improvements or rehabilitation would enhance their integrity and preservation.</p>	<p>Historic structures and cultural landscapes would be protected, preserved, and interpreted in a manner consistent with NPS policies.</p> <p>No impairment of historic structures and cultural landscapes.</p>	<p>Effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Effects would be the same as Alternative A.</p>

Table 4: Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives (Continued)

Park Feature	Alternative A: Improved Management of Established Park Uses	Alternative B: Continue Current Management/No Action	Alternative C: Nonmotorized Recreation Emphasis	Alternative D: Mid-Weekday Recreation Enhancement
Historic structures and cultural landscapes (continued)	<p>Rehabilitation of the significant cultural landscape features and attributes of the Linnaean Hill and Peirce Mill areas would enhance park preservation and visitor understanding of park's historic settings.</p> <p>The disturbance of sites during new construction could result in some irretrievable and irreversible loss of resources.</p> <p>No impairment of historic structures and cultural landscapes.</p>			
Traditional park character and visitor experience	<p>The traditional character and appearance of the park would not change.</p> <p>Reduced noise because of reduced traffic speeds and volumes would have negligible to minor, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p> <p>Improvements to trails would have a moderate, long-term, beneficial impact.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of historic building and landscapes would have a moderate, long-term, beneficial impact.</p> <p>Improved education and interpretation facilities and staffing levels would enhance opportunities to learn about and experience the park's natural and cultural resources, a moderate, long-term, beneficial impact.</p> <p>Improved working conditions would result in a moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on park operations, but the intensity of the beneficial impact perceived by the public probably would be minor.</p> <p>Moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on recreational opportunities would occur because of slower traffic and improved education and interpretation opportunities.</p> <p>Improved access to many facilities throughout the park for individuals with impaired mobility would be a moderate, long-term, beneficial impact.</p>	<p>The traditional character and appearance of the park would not change.</p> <p>Park visitors would be adversely affected by escalating nonrecreational traffic in the park and on the parkway.</p> <p>Eroding trail segments could lead to unsightly and potentially unsafe conditions.</p> <p>Education and interpretation would continue to be limited by inaccurate, worn, and dated facilities and exhibits and insufficient staff levels.</p> <p>Inadequate administration and operation facilities could have a deleterious effect on visitors experience and safety.</p> <p>A large number of visitors would continue to participate in a wide spectrum of recreation opportunities, but recreation quality and opportunities for interpretation and education would continue to decline.</p> <p>Individuals with impaired mobility would continue to encounter access impediments in park buildings and on trails.</p>	<p>The elimination of the visitor experience of automobile travel along the length of the park, including the gorge area, would be a major adverse impact.</p> <p>A moderate, long-term, beneficial effect would result from the improved ability for park visitors to participate in non-motorized recreation along Beach Drive throughout the week.</p> <p>Reduced noise on the closed segments of Beach Drive would have minor to moderate, long-term, beneficial impacts.</p> <p>Effects from trail improvements, rehabilitation of historic buildings and landscapes, improved education and interpretation facilities and staffing, and improved working conditions would be the same as Alternative A.</p> <p>While the quality of recreation experiences would improve, there would be decreases in park use and the spectrum of opportunities.</p> <p>Improved access for people with impaired mobility would be a moderate, long-term, beneficial impact. Changes in access on the closed segments of Beach Drive would have moderate impacts but each person's perception would determine if they were beneficial or adverse.</p>	<p>The traditional character and appearance of the park would not change.</p> <p>The mid-day closures of Beach Drive segments would have a minor, adverse effect on automobile travel along the length of the park.</p> <p>A moderate, long-term, beneficial effect would result from the improved ability for park visitors to participate in non-motorized recreation along Beach Drive during workday and mid-day periods.</p> <p>Reduced noise on the closed segments of Beach Drive would have minor to moderate long-term, beneficial impacts.</p> <p>Effects from trail improvements, rehabilitation of historic buildings and landscapes, improved education and interpretation facilities and staffing, and improved working conditions would be the same as Alternative A.</p> <p>Daily installation and removal of traffic barriers would have a negligible to minor adverse effect on park operations.</p> <p>Moderate, long-term, beneficial effect on recreational opportunities would occur because of improved quality, the greatest spectrum, and improved education and interpretation opportunities.</p> <p>Effect on people with impaired mobility would be like Alternative C.</p>

Table 4: Summary of Impacts of the Alternatives (Continued)

Park Feature	Alternative A: Improved Management of Established Park Uses	Alternative B: Continue Current Management/No Action	Alternative C: Nonmotorized Recreation Emphasis	Alternative D: Mid-Weekday Recreation Enhancement
Public health and safety	Long-term, major, beneficial effects on public health and safety would occur, primarily because of the effectiveness of traffic-calming measures in reducing the number and severity of traffic accidents. Effects on crimes against persons and the effectiveness of emergency evacuations would be negligible.	Public health and safety would decline over time. Already high traffic volumes that would continue to increase throughout the park and on the parkway would represent the greatest threats to public health and safety.	Permanent closures of three segments of Beach Drive would have a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial effect on safety. Other effects of this alternative would be the same as Alternative A.	Mid-day closures of three segments of Beach Drive would have a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial effect on safety. Other effects of this alternative would be the same as Alternative A.
Regional and local transportation	<p>During rush-hour periods, effects on traffic speeds and volumes would be negligible compared to Alternative B.</p> <p>Outside the rush-hour periods, traffic-calming measures and reduced speed limits would slow the speed of traffic. They also would reduce traffic volumes because some drivers who were not planning other recreation in the park would voluntarily use Ross Drive or non-park routes. The effects on levels of service would be negligible compared to Alternative B. However, the reduced motorized traffic volumes and speeds would reduce conflicts between automobile use and nonmotorized travel in the Rock Creek Valley.</p> <p>Throughout the day, improvements to recreation trails would enhance nonmotorized transportation in the park. During non-rush-hour periods, reduced automobile traffic speeds and volumes may increase nonmotorized travel on Beach Drive, particularly bicycle travel.</p>	<p>Congestion would continue to increase with increased traffic in the park and throughout the area.</p> <p>Continued conflicts would occur between recreational and nonrecreational users of park roads.</p>	<p>Nonrecreational traffic would be eliminated or substantially reduced in the park. Nonmotorized travel would be enhanced.</p> <p>Levels of service would improve on most segments of the parkway.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in the neighborhoods to the north of the park could increase in the short term until drivers learned alternate patterns. There would not be any long-term changes in levels of service in these neighborhoods.</p> <p>Changes in levels of service on city streets outside the park would be mixed, with some improvements and some decreases. Changes would be negligible to considerable.</p>	<p>Outside of mid-weekday closure periods, transportation conditions would be like those of Alternative A.</p> <p>During mid-weekday closures, nonrecreational traffic would be eliminated or substantially reduced in the park. Nonmotorized travel would be enhanced.</p> <p>During weekday Beach Drive closures, effects on traffic volumes in nearby neighborhoods would be the same as those described for Alternative C.</p>
Community character	<p>Negligible effects, relative to Alternative B, on community character and the quality of life of area residents or the economic health of businesses.</p> <p>Trail improvements and traffic control would improve nonmotorized recreation, benefiting citizens who use the park and park vicinity for these purposes.</p> <p>Environmental justice: No disproportionate routing of traffic to disadvantaged areas or ethnic neighborhoods would occur.</p>	Changes in community character from park management activities would be minor compared to changes from social and economic conditions outside the park.	<p>Eight segments would experience noticeably improved community characteristics associated with lower traffic levels during one or both of the peak-hours on weekdays.</p> <p>Nine road segments would experience a noticeable to considerable decline.</p> <p>Moderate beneficial effects would occur on regional opportunities for nonmotorized recreation.</p> <p>Environmental justice: No disproportionate routing of traffic to disadvantaged areas or ethnic neighborhoods would occur.</p>	<p>Except during mid-day closures on weekdays, effects would be the same as Alternative B.</p> <p>During the middle portion of weekdays, moderate beneficial effects would occur on regional opportunities for nonmotorized recreation.</p> <p>Environmental justice: No disproportionate routing of traffic to disadvantaged areas or ethnic neighborhoods would occur.</p>

Next Steps

Where can I review a full copy of the final general management plan and environmental impact statement?

This summary presents only the highlights of the final general management plan and environmental impact statement. If you want to review the entire document, public reading copies are available from several sources, including local libraries and NPS offices.

The complete document can be reviewed and downloaded from links available on the Rock Creek Park site on the Internet at

<http://www.nps.gov/rocr/pphtml/documents.html>.

A limited number of printed copies are available from the National Park Service. A copy can be requested by calling 202-895-6000 or by writing to

National Park Service, Rock Creek Park
Superintendent
3545 Williamsburg Lane NW
Washington, D.C. 20008-1207

Copies were sent to the following libraries in the region. You may want to call in advance to confirm the availability of the document.

Chevy Chase Library
Cleveland Park Library
Georgetown Library
Juanita E. Thornton-Shepherd Park Library
Langston Community Library
Library of Congress
Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library
Mt. Pleasant Library
Northeast Library
Petworth Library
Tenley-Friendship Library
Watha T. Daniel/Shaw Library
Woodridge Library

Can I comment on the plan?

Yes. However, you should not duplicate the comments that already were made, either by you or others, on the draft general management plan and environmental impact statement. Those comments were addressed in the final general management plan and environmental impact statement and will not be revisited.

Summaries of all comments that were received from the public on the draft plan and environmental impact statement, and the NPS' responses to those comments, are provided in the companion volume entitled *Volume 2: Comments and Responses on the Draft Rock Creek Park and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement*. Copies of Volume 2 are available at the same locations as the final general management plan and environmental impact statement. Volume 2 also is available through the Internet links identified above.



All comments should be substantive. Substantive comments are defined as comments that:

- Reasonably question the accuracy of information in the document;
- Reasonably question the accuracy of the environmental analysis;
- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the document; or
- Cause changes or revisions in the proposal.

Comments in favor of or against the proposed action or alternatives, or that only agree or disagree with NPS policy, are not considered substantive and will not receive consideration.

Written comments will be accepted for 60 days following publication of notification of availability of the final general management plan and environmental impact statement in the *Federal Register*.

Written comments can be sent to:

National Park Service, Rock Creek Park
Superintendent
3545 Williamsburg Lane NW
Washington, D.C. 20008-1207

You may comment by e-mail by sending comments to:
rocr_superintendent@nps.gov

The National Park Service also will accept comments sent by the Internet. A link through which you can provide comments electronically is available at

<http://www.nps.gov/rocr/pphtml/documents.html>

Regardless of how you comment, please include your name and street address with your message. Please submit electronic comments as a text file, avoiding the use of special characters or any form of encryption.

If you have questions about this document, you can call

Adrienne Coleman, Park Superintendent,
at 202-895-6000.

What happens to my comments?

The planning team will log every written comment that is received and review it to determine if it is substantive and raises concerns other than those already addressed. Appropriate changes will be made to address new, substantive comments.

What happens after the comment period ends?

At least 30 days after the close of the comment period, the National Park Service will issue a record of its final decision. Thereafter, the National Park Service will begin to implement the selected action.





As the nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has the responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
National Park Service, Rock Creek Park
Superintendent
3545 Williamsburg Lane NW
Washington, D.C. 20008-1207

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
PERMIT NO. G-83