



# **Civil War Defenses of Washington**

## **General Management Plan Amendment/ Environmental Assessment**

**May 2026**

## Civil War Defenses of Washington General Management Plan Amendment/ Environmental Assessment

### Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND NEED</b>	<b>4</b>
Introduction	4
Background and Project Area	7
Issues and Impact Topics Dismissed from Detailed Analysis	11
<b>CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES</b>	<b>13</b>
Alternative A: No Action	13
Alternative B: Management Plan Amendment (NPS Preferred)	20
Mitigation Measures of the Proposed Action	36
Alternatives Dismissed from Further Consideration	37
<b>CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES</b>	<b>38</b>
Historic Districts and Cultural Landscapes	38
Visitor Use and Experience	45
<b>CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>FIGURES</b>	
Figure 1: Project Area	5
Figure 2: Focus Areas	9
Figure 3: GWMP & ROCR West, 2004 GMP (Existing)	16
Figure 4: ROCR East, 2004 GMP (Existing)	17
Figure 5: NACE North, 2004 GMP (Existing)	18
Figure 6: NACE South, 2004 GMP (Existing)	19
Figure 7: GWMP & ROCR West Areas (Proposed Management Zones)	27
Figure 8: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for GWMP & ROCR West Areas	28
Figure 9: ROCR East Area (Proposed Management Zones)	29
Figure 10: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for ROCR East Area	30
Figure 11: NACE North Area (Proposed Management Zones)	32

Figure 12: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for  
NACE North Area 33

Figure 13: NACE South Area (Proposed Management Zones) 34

Figure 14: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for  
NACE South Area 35

**TABLES**

Table 1: Proposed Management Zone and Application Changes 41

Table 2: Visitor Facilities by Focus Area 45

Table 3: Proposed Management Zone Changes Area 48

## CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND NEED

### INTRODUCTION

The National Park Service (NPS) has developed a General Management Plan (GMP) Amendment and Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Civil War Defenses of Washington parks (CWDW) in the District of Columbia (DC), McLean (Virginia), and Fort Washington (Maryland) to evaluate updates to previous management zone designations. These management zone updates are intended to enhance visitor experience, access, recreation opportunities, circulation, and interpretation while also protecting natural and cultural resources.

This GMP Amendment/EA will serve as an amendment to the 2004 Fort Circle Parks GMP<sup>1</sup> and will designate management zones and evaluate appropriate land uses and their applicable general locations. Eighteen fort sites are administered by the NPS across approximately 1,315 acres. Land use and zoning will be evaluated for all fort sites, Shepherd Parkway, and the greenbelt connecting corridor therein (Fort Circle Drive). Management of Battleground National Cemetery is handled under separate NPS directives and was not included in this plan amendment.

The existing greenbelt of parks along the ridge surrounding the city make the CWDW a significant open space element in the nation's capital and surrounding environs (see **Figure 1**). Park sites contain remains of forts, batteries, and rifle trenches that deterred the invasion of DC during the Civil War, including the remains of forts that were engaged in the Battle of Fort Stevens, the only battle that took place in DC. The CWDW parks are managed by the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), National Capital Parks-East (NACE), and Rock Creek Park (ROCR).

The NPS completed the GMP for the CWDW in 2004. It placed the park areas into separate management zones focusing on cultural (historic) resource protection, recreation, natural resource protection, and visitor services, among others.

In the 20 years since the GMP's completion, the NPS has recognized that many of the open spaces within the CWDW are isolated and lack connectivity with other CWDW areas and to community facilities and resources outside of the CWDW. In addition, significant archeological and natural resources have been identified since 2004. As a result, some archeological resources were located outside of cultural and natural resource zoning designations.


This EA describes two alternatives for the proposed management of the CWDW parks, an action alternative and the no-action alternative, and analyzes the environmental consequences of implementing the alternatives. The NPS prepared this EA in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.); the U.S. Department of the Interior Handbook of (NEPA) Implementing Procedures, the U.S. Department of the Interior NEPA regulations (43 CFR Part 46); and NPS Director's Order 12: Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision-making and its accompanying NPS NEPA Handbook.

---

<sup>1</sup> The CWDW was previously referred to as Fort Circle Parks.

In conjunction with this EA, the GMP Amendment is undergoing a review of potential effects on historic resources in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966.

Figure 1: Project Area



## Purpose

The purpose of the CWDW GMP Amendment is the following:

- Review existing resource management zones to ensure that allowed uses are compatible with the protection of historic and natural resources.
- In areas where appropriate, carefully consider changes in the GMP Amendment's zoning to allow for additional, compatible visitor use.
- Enable consistent application across the CWDW of appropriate visitor use based on each area's zoning.
- Define visitor capacity for the CWDW, based on the protection of historic and natural resources.

## Need

The CWDW GMP Amendment is needed to address the following concerns:

- Existing management zones do not consistently reflect best practices to protect important natural and historic resources throughout the CWDW.
- The city's recreational needs are growing with an increasing population, and often the only land available in some neighborhoods for recreational use is within the CWDW.
- The existing 2004 GMP maintains open spaces throughout the CWDW. Organizations and individuals have proposed uses and improvements for these areas that are inconsistent with the CWDW's significance, frequently because the CWDW's importance and value are not readily apparent to the public.
- Many of the open spaces within the CWDW are isolated and lack connectivity with other CWDW areas and to community facilities and resources outside of the CWDW.
- Significant archeological and natural resources have been identified since the adoption of the existing 2004 GMP. As a result, some archeological resources were located outside of cultural and natural resource zoning designations.
- The existing 2004 GMP does not adequately accommodate future planning, changes that have occurred since its adoption, or outline expectations for potential administrative tools to enhance park management, such as partnerships with civic associations, transfers of jurisdictions, or other mechanisms.
- The existing 2004 GMP does not adequately address current recreational activities that occur within areas that have sensitive cultural resources.
- Multiple parcels have been added to the CWDW since the adoption of the 2004 GMP and therefore do not have management zone designations.

## BACKGROUND AND PROJECT AREA

The CWDW, formerly called “Fort Circle Parks,” came under the jurisdiction of the NPS in 1933 through the Capper-Cramton Act (PL 71-284). The CWDW are comprised of Forts Marcy, Bayard, Reno, DeRussy, Stevens, Slocum, Totten, Bunker Hill, Mahan, Chaplin, Dupont, Davis, Ricketts, Stanton, Greble, and Foote; Batteries Carroll and Kemble; the Battleground National Cemetery; and the connecting corridors between them associated with Fort Drive. The CWDW are administered by GWMP, NACE, and ROCR through a site manager that works collectively with all three park units. The Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail has overlapping administration across the entirety of the Civil War Defenses of Washington Trail, providing authoritative data for the trail connections between the forts.

The CWDW were constructed as a circle of fortifications on the high ground surrounding DC to protect the city during the Civil War. By 1865, 68 forts and 93 batteries armed with over 800 cannons encircled DC. Beginning as early as 1872, several plans called for creating a continuous thread of public parks surrounding the city where the defenses had once kept watch. The 1902 McMillan Plan was a comprehensive planning document that called for the improvement of DC parks, including linking the city’s Civil War forts via a grand drive.

With roots in the City Beautiful Movement, the McMillan Plan sought to realize sections of the city’s original L’Enfant Plan that had never been implemented. Hoping to renew areas of the city that were by then overlooked and undervalued, the McMillan scheme sought, in part, to create a parkway connecting the Civil War forts of DC as a chain of public parkland. This proposed scheme was promoted not only to preserve the forts and their history, but also as a critical move to secure necessary public green space for the city. After the initial enthusiasm for the plan, however, the ensuing 45 years of land acquisition hurdles and rising construction costs ultimately led to the project’s demise in 1947.

Though never fully realized, the parkway initiative inspired other preservation initiatives and public investment in the forts. By the mid-20th century, these remnants of a Civil War that divided the country took on new social value as federal parks and public space for DC and its regional neighbors. Several civic associations formed to advocate for the other forts’ preservation, emphasizing their significance as both historic sites and public assets. In their transition from charged battleground to circumferential greenway, the CWDW became part of the city’s historic, civic, social, and environmental infrastructure. The 18 historic forts and parcels of land purchased for the drive (not including Battleground National Cemetery) are now managed by the NPS and make up a greenbelt with prominent views of the city.

The approximately 1,315-acre project area is composed of open green spaces, wooded areas, recreation areas, corridors, and remaining structures from the fortification system, all categorized under different management zone designations. Additionally, approximately 63 miles of the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail serve as a connection across the CWDW parks, as shown in **Figure 2**.

For the purposes of this document, the CWDW are grouped into four main areas, with associated focus areas, as shown and numbered in **Figure 2**. Park properties that are within the project area but not included within the focus areas shown below would not experience a change in management zones.

**GWMP & ROCR West** (CWDW sites administered by GWMP and ROCR)

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36<sup>th</sup> Street NW (ROCR)

**ROCR East** (CWDW sites administered by ROCR)

7. Missouri Avenue Corridor
8. Fort Slocum
9. Fort Totten
10. Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
11. Barnard Hill Park


**NACE North** (CWDW sites administered by NACE)

12. Fort Mahan
13. Fort Dupont Park
14. Fort Stanton

**NACE South** (CWDW sites administered by NACE)

15. Shepherd Parkway
16. Fort Foote Park

Figure 2: Focus Areas



Note: Numbers correspond with focus areas listed above.

## ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS RETAINED FOR DETAILED ANALYSIS

The NPS, participating agencies and stakeholders, and the public identified issues and impact topics for detailed analysis during the internal and public scoping processes. These issues and concerns are included in the impact topics that are discussed in the “Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences” section of this EA. The proposed GMP Amendment affirms protective resource management zones that should remain restricted in use. It also explores alternatives with more flexibility in zoning and land use to meet changing community needs and emerging NPS goals, particularly in the lands between fort sites that were acquired for the purposes of a never-built scenic drive in a portion of the NACE-administered CWDW parkland, such as Shepherd Parkway.

**Cultural Landscapes and Historic Districts.** The NPS prepared several Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) reports for cultural landscapes associated with the CWDW. Preliminary documentation was completed for the CWDW parent cultural landscape in 1996, which was followed by the completion of several component cultural landscapes including Fort Stevens (2010), Fort Mahan (2013), Fort Dupont (2013), Fort DeRussy (2014), Fort Foote (2014), Battleground National Cemetery (2014), Fort Marcy (2015), Fort Bunker Hill (2017), and Fort Drive—Fort Slocum to Fort Totten (2021). The CLIs identify contributing spatial organization, circulation, views and vistas, vegetation, buildings and structures, small scale features, land use, topography, archeological sites, and natural systems and features within these CWDW sites. The proposed GMP Amendment has the potential to result in impacts to these features due to proposed changes to pedestrian circulation, visitor facilities, interpretation and education, administration, operations, and safety. As a result, these cultural resources are analyzed in the Historic Districts and Cultural Landscapes section of this EA.

Historic properties are documented in the Civil War Defenses of Washington Historic District National Register of Historic Place (NRHP) nomination form (NPS 1978), the Civil War Defenses of Washington Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) (NPS 1996), and other CLIs for specific resources within the CWDW. A draft update to the NRHP nomination for the Civil War Defense of Washington/Fort Circle Parks is in progress as of 2022, but has not been completed.

The NRHP-listed CWDW historic district generally comprises a string of contiguous and discontinuous parkland situated along a ridge that encircles downtown DC, forming a partial ring of green space around the city. The historic district includes Battery Kemble, Fort Bayard, Fort Reno, Fort DeRussy, Fort Stevens, Fort Slocum, Fort Totten, Fort Bunker Hill, Fort Mahan, Fort Chaplin, Fort Dupont, Fort Davis, Battery Ricketts, Fort Stanton, Fort Carroll, Fort Greble, Fort Foote, Fort Marcy, and Battleground National Cemetery, which is not included in this plan.

In this EA, historic properties are addressed collectively to best describe the impacts of the proposed plan on the Area of Potential Effect (APE) due to the overlapping nature of the CWDW historic district and cultural landscape and the individually documented cultural landscapes located within the CWDW. No historic properties would be affected by the actions in the proposed plan. Historic properties are analyzed in the Historic Districts and Cultural Landscapes section of this EA.

**Visitor Use and Experience.** The proposed GMP Amendment would improve accessibility and alter circulation patterns within the project area. The GMP Amendment would enable addition of

trails to support connections in specific areas, renovate or replace existing non-historic structures, and add picnic areas and grills. The GMP Amendment would also change pedestrian circulation within the project area and add new directional/wayfinding signage. The GMP Amendment's potential impacts to the visitor experience, opportunities, and circulation within the project area are analyzed in the Visitor Use and Experience section of this EA.

### **ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS DISMISSED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS**

Some issues and concerns identified during scoping were considered by the NPS but ultimately dismissed from detailed analysis because they were determined not central to the proposal or not of critical importance. This section will provide brief descriptions of the issues and concerns determined to not warrant further consideration, as well as a summary justification for the dismissal of each issue.

**Archeological Resources.** The project area includes areas of both precontact and historic archeological potential. No archeological resources would be affected by the actions in the proposed GMP Amendment. The NPS would initiate individual consultations for any proposed site-specific projects that may occur in the future. The proposed park management zone changes would not generate subsurface disturbance, thereby avoiding impact on archeological resources. As a result, archeological resources were dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Wetlands.** An estimated 14 acres of the approximately 1,315-acre project area (one percent) are classified as wetlands according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS 2025). Wetlands are located throughout the project area along the CWDW's creeks and their tributaries and include freshwater pond, riverine, freshwater forested/shrub wetlands, and an elevated reservoir managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed GMP Amendment would not alter existing wetlands within the project area or their management. As a result, this topic was dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Floodplains.** An estimated 40 acres of CWDW land are within the 100-year floodplain and an estimated six acres are within the 500-year floodplain, representing up to a combined estimated three percent of the total CWDW land area (FEMA 2016). The proposed GMP Amendment would not change floodplain conditions or alter areas within the floodplain. Therefore, this topic was dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Water Resources.** The project area spans across various waterscapes in Virginia, Maryland, and DC, including streams and creeks, such as Rock Creek, Oxon Run, and Anacostia River tributaries. The parkland is situated over the Coastal Plain and Piedmont physiographic provinces, which hold some groundwater reserves. The proposed GMP Amendment would not alter streams, add impervious surfaces that increase stormwater runoff, or construct new facilities leading to potential sediment. The proposed GMP Amendment would not alter existing water resources. As a result, this topic was dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Vegetation.** The CWDW are made up of remnant eastern deciduous forest communities and meadows that provide habitat to a variety of native plants and wildlife. While the CWDW are largely dominated by forests, the CWDW also contain open green spaces, meadows, transitional areas (from grassland to forest), and wetland areas scattered throughout. Canopy trees include red, white, and chestnut oaks; maples; tulip poplar; beech; and Virginia and loblolly pine trees,

among others. Other vegetation includes mountain laurel, arrowwood, spicebush, Christmas ferns, and wildflowers including some orchid species. The proposed GMP Amendment would support vegetation management across the approximately 1,315-acre project area and approximately 130 miles of the existing trail network, oriented towards the reduction of invasive species, preservation of native species and existing trails, and overall improvements to accessibility and interpretation. As a result, this topic was dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Wildlife And Wildlife Habitat.** The CWDW's natural areas serve as habitat for many species of wildlife. This includes many species of birds including forest interior nesting species, white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), eastern cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), numerous small mammals, and some species of reptiles and amphibians. The parks contain habitat conducive to reptiles, amphibians, and fish. The parks also provide habitat for birds, with both resident and migratory species utilizing abundance edge habitat and permanent water sources.

Updates in management zone designations associated with the proposed GMP Amendment have the potential to enable removal of invasive vegetation or other vegetation, consistent with NPS management practices, that provide habitat for common species of animal wildlife. It is anticipated that many of the displaced species would relocate to other areas of habitat, including vegetation on-site. As a result, this topic was dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

**Threatened And Endangered Species.** In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the NPS consulted with the USFWS, DC Department of Energy and the Environment (DOEE), Virginia Departments of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and Wildlife Resources (DWR), and Maryland Departments of the Environment (DOE) and Natural Resources (DNR). According to the USFWS Information for Planning Consultation (IPaC) online portal, CWDW parkland hosts, both permanently and seasonally, federally listed, proposed, and candidate species protected under the Endangered Species Act, including the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), Hay's Spring amphipod (*Stygobromus hayi*), tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) and the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) (see **Appendix A**). IPaC also indicated that bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*), and 28 other bird species that are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and/or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act can be found at CWDW parkland (USFWS, 2024).

Prior to and during the implementation period of the proposed GMP Amendment, the NPS would continue to consult with the USFWS, DC DOEE, Virginia DCR and DWR, and Maryland DOE and DNR to identify activities included in the proposed plan that would have the potential to impact federally and state listed threatened and endangered species.

Through ongoing consultation with the USFWS (and the District and State-level departments as needed), and adherence to applicable minimization or mitigation measures identified during the consultation process, it is anticipated that the proposed GMP Amendment would have no adverse impacts to federally or state-listed threatened and endangered species occurring at the parks. As a result, threatened and endangered species were dismissed from further analysis in this EA.

## CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES

This EA analyzes the potential environmental consequences of two alternatives, including an action alternative and a no-action alternative. The elements of these alternatives are described in detail in this chapter. Impacts associated with the actions proposed under each alternative are outlined in the “Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences” chapter of this EA. In addition, several options were dismissed from further consideration and are described in this chapter under “Alternatives Considered but Dismissed.”

### ALTERNATIVE A: NO ACTION

The No Action Alternative would maintain existing management of the CWDW, as proposed in the 2004 GMP. The existing application of management zones, described below, would continue. The management zones, their desired visitor experience, desired resource conditions, and appropriate activities or facilities are summarized below.

#### Existing 2004 GMP Management Zone Descriptions

##### Cultural Resource Zone

The cultural resource management zone contains lands that are managed primarily for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of their cultural resource values, but the zone also could require management consideration of preserving natural resource values.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Wayfinding, brochures, wayside exhibits, encounters with NPS staff.
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Protection of archeological and historic features, documented and interpreted.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Few to no facilities. Focus on preservation of natural landscape and archeological resources.

##### Connecting Corridor Zone

The connecting corridor management zone constitutes a pleasant corridor through a mix of trees and open spaces with limited views of the surrounding city.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Drive/bike/walk in maintained road/sidewalk/designated (unpaved) trails. Temporary high traffic accepted.
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Substantial modification of landscape. Mix of local and exotic (non-native) plants to shape the landscape.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Drive, walk, jog, and cycling. More intensive landscape management, rehabilitate certain areas for visitor safety (limited capacity and speed on roadways).

### Recreation Zone

The recreation management zone contains areas where recreational facilities have been developed or those areas that have been designated for specific activities; for example, picnic areas, community gardens, or baseball, basketball, or softball/soccer fields, along with associated parking areas.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Areas of intense (fields) and quiet (gardens) activities, high tolerance for noise, mostly for local and regional visitors.
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Ballfields and picnic areas with intense maintenance. Provision of tools and equipment for community gardens.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Formal and spontaneous recreational activities, more established and reliable facilities for high use, including parking and restrooms. Access to drinking water sources.

### Natural Resource Zone

The natural resource management zone includes areas for natural scenery and forest preservation, some with cultural resources, with minimal modifications of the landscape, and only for preservation purposes and visitor safety. The zone maintains a low tolerance for resource degradation and is the largest zone in CWDW.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Hiking and overall pedestrian circulation in unpaved trails, only essential wayfinding (media) in strategic areas.
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Retention of natural resources, avoiding clearings or any new facilities that may interrupt natural areas, corridors and trails.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Primarily passive pedestrian activities (birding, walking, nature study).

### Visitor Services Zone

The visitor services management zone provides information, orientation, interpretation, and education about the CWDW, as well as other visitor services. These services can be offered in commercial structures outside park boundaries or in adapted historic or non-historic structures in any of the CWDW units. No locations within the CWDW are currently designated as the visitor services management zone.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Access to information/park resources in a safe, convenient and inviting manner, interactions with NPS staff
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Compatibility with surrounding park landscape and historical/natural features
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Kiosks, visitor center, restrooms, staging areas for small events and programs, parking in some cases, all infrastructure blending into the surrounding landscape

### Administrative Zone

The administrative management zone covers NPS areas that are an important component of the CWDW but are not normally seen by visitors.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Not applicable
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Support/maintenance facilities, without impacting natural and cultural resources or altering the visitor experience in the surrounding park area.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Operational activities done by NPS staff

### Special Use Zone

The special use management zone encompasses the areas of the CWDW that are given over to facilities or uses not fully under the control of the NPS.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Limited access, depending on context.
- **Desired Resource Conditions.** Facilities to be compatible with park context.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Existing, permitted activities,

### **Existing 2004 GMP Management Zone Application**

The management zones described above are applied throughout the CWDW (see **Figure 2**). The following illustrate the focus areas shown in **Figure 3**, **Figure 4**, **Figure 5**, and **Figure 6**.

### **Park Management, Operations, and Safety**

Under Alternative A, no changes to park management, operations, and safety would occur. Vegetation management of non-native invasive species would continue.

### **Visitor Facilities**

Under Alternative A, the existing visitor use facilities of the CWDW would be maintained. Visitor use facilities listed below would be retained or added, if appropriate, in the cultural resource zone, recreation zone, natural resource zone, and visitor services zone:

- Structures, such as picnic shelters
- Picnic tables
- Comfort stations
- Directional, wayfinding, and interpretation facilities
- Stages



Figure 4: ROCR East, 2004 GMP (Existing)



Figure 5: NACE North, 2004 GMP (Existing)





Figure 6: NACE South, 2004 GMP (Existing)



## **ALTERNATIVE B: MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT (NPS PREFERRED)**

Alternative B would adjust the existing GMP through changes to management zone definitions, management zone designations, and the boundaries of sites covered by management zones, and through the addition of new management zones. Alternative B would adjust existing and add new management zone definitions to better maintain resource protection and expand allowed visitor uses in ways that are compatible with resource protection. Alternative B would also change the application of management zones in multiple locations within the CWDW, including locations that were previously undesignated. Alternative B does not describe how individual programs or projects would be implemented, nor does it include design or physical changes.

### **Management Zones Description and Scope/Permitted Activities**

#### Cultural Resource Management Zone

The cultural resource management zone would contain lands that are managed primarily for the preservation, protection, and interpretation of their cultural resource values, but the zone also could require management consideration of preserving natural resource values. Typically, lands in this zone would include key cultural resources related to the significance and purposes of the CWDW parks. Examples of such resources are earthworks and any associated archeological features. The tolerance for resource degradation in this zone would be low. Additionally, this zone includes protection or re-establishment of viewsheds that contribute to cultural landscapes and historic significance.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Visitors would have the opportunity to learn about and explore CWDW resources in the parks and gain a sense of their history and significance before, during, and after the Civil War. They would learn about the resources mainly through interpretive media, the NPS website, the NPS app, and/or other non-personnel services, including wayside exhibits installed in the landscape and/or other methods that do not involve direct interaction with park staff. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible. A visitor can expect a low to moderate number of encounters with other visitors or NPS personnel.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Archeological and historic features would be preserved and protected. Viewsheds would be maintained or reestablished. Cultural resources in the zone would be documented and significant stories and resources interpreted.

In Cultural Resource zones, natural resources would be managed to support preservation of cultural resources. This includes maintaining vegetation to keep important views open and to manage landscapes to reflect their historic character. A mix of native plant species would be added to create a pleasant visual landscape. Non-native plant species generally would be avoided or used sparingly only if consistent with management objectives.

- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Activities would be limited to those compatible with maintaining the integrity and character of the featured cultural and/or natural resources. The siting of facilities in these areas would be considered carefully to prioritize the protection of cultural resources and to retain the existing (often natural) landscape surrounding the earthworks and other historic features. Landscape

management would include activities such as mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, planting of compatible native species, and invasive, non-native plant control, to support the maintenance of these areas.

### Connecting Corridor Management Zone

The connecting corridor management zone would contain areas of the CWDW that were historically acquired for the construction of a parkway connecting fort resources. Historic earthworks would not be included in this zone, which would be made up mainly of small parcels of mown turf, meadows, and trees maintained as green space.

This management zone would constitute a corridor featuring a mix of trees and open spaces. Some areas would include views of the surrounding city. Landscapes in this zone would be highly maintained through turf mowing and trimming, weed removal, tree trimming and other methods commonly used in urban environments. The defining features of this zone would be preserved, and park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Visitors would be able to drive, bicycle, or walk along well-maintained, accessible paved roads, sidewalks, or designated trails through this zone. Visitors would have the opportunity to understand and/or learn about initiatives to create a “greenway” connecting the CWDW. Routes would allow surrounding communities to connect with and access sites. The encounter rate with other visitors in this zone may be high at times, and periodic heavy vehicular traffic would be accepted.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** The landscape in the connecting corridor management zone may be substantially modified from natural conditions. A mix of native plant materials would be prioritized to create an aesthetically pleasing landscape. Non-native plant species generally would be avoided or used sparingly only if consistent with management objectives.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Visitor activities in the connecting corridor management zone would include driving, jogging, bicycling, walking, roller skating, and micromobility<sup>2</sup> options. Facilities could include paved or unpaved trails, sidewalks, and roads. Landscape management would be more intensive than in natural resource management zones, including such activities as mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control. Some intersections or other points would be redesigned for visitor safety or aesthetics. Amenities, such as drinking fountains, wayfinding installations, and lighting may be provided in this zone. However, amenities would be designed to minimize impacts.

### Recreation Management Zone

The recreation management zone would contain areas where recreational facilities have been developed or those areas that have been designated for specific activities. This could include picnic areas; baseball/softball or soccer fields; basketball courts; playgrounds; organized cultural

---

<sup>2</sup> Micromobility is defined as transportation over short distances provided by lightweight, usually single-person vehicles (such as bicycles and scooters).

and education events or festivals; and associated parking areas. These would be relatively small nodes of intense activity in portions of the CWDW that do not contain earthworks or other cultural resources. The background setting would consist of well-maintained turf, vegetation, and park structures. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** The recreation management zone would encompass areas where large groups of people actively use the facilities or passively watch the activities of others. Higher noise levels may be expected around ballfields and picnic areas in this zone. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Ballfields and picnic areas would be maintained in good condition while allowing for concentrated visitor use. A mix of native plant materials would be prioritized to create an aesthetically pleasing landscape around the recreational facilities. Non-native plant species generally would be avoided or used sparingly only if consistent with management objectives.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Organized and informal recreational activities would be the primary use of the recreation management zone. Facilities would be highly specialized and designed for high use. Parking and restroom facilities would be appropriate in this zone. Amenities -- such as drinking fountains, coordinated signage and wayfinding installations, lighting, picnic shelters, sports fields, and commercial services to support programming -- may be provided in this zone. Landscape management would include activities such as mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control.

#### Site Sensitive Recreation Management Zone

The new site sensitive recreation management zone would contain open space that could accommodate passive recreation that does not impede management of cultural resources and natural values. Recreational facilities may be introduced or modified when designed and managed in ways that avoid impacts to the site's sensitive cultural and natural resources. Facilities that involve minimal or carefully controlled ground-disturbing activity, such as the informal placement of picnic tables or small-scale improvements that do not compromise below-ground resources or the historic character of the landscape, may be considered. The NPS would initiate individual consultations for proposed site-specific projects that may be developed in the future.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** The site sensitive recreation management zone would encompass areas of moderately intense activity where groups of people actively use the location for gathering, informal recreation, or to passively watch the activities of others. There would be a moderate tolerance for noise. Most of the visitation in this zone would be local or regional. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible to the extent practicable.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Open space would be maintained in good condition to prevent overgrowth and allow for visitor use. Anticipated maintenance is expected to include picnic table repairs, maintenance of trails and other visitor circulation areas, mowing, and other vegetation management.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Informal recreational activities and learning about cultural resources would be the primary uses of the site sensitive recreation

management zone. Facilities would be flexible and designed for moderate use. Parking and restroom facilities would not be appropriate in this zone. Landscape management would include activities such as mowing and trimming. Tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control would only occur when activities do not adversely impact cultural resources.

### Community Garden Management Zone

The new community garden management zone would contain areas with existing community gardens and would not expand these areas. These gardens have multiple small plots available for public cultivation of vegetables and fruit for personal consumption or donation. In addition to the recreational opportunities (fresh air, physical exercise) they provide, the community gardens also represent significant historical value, ethnographic value, and opportunities for public interaction and collaboration.

These are areas within CWDW that do not contain earthworks or other historic or archeological resources. The background setting would consist of mowed turf and/or maintained vegetation. Trails around or through this zone would allow visitors to connect with other zones in the CWDW.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** The community garden management zone would encompass areas where individuals and small groups of people actively cultivate the available land, using organic and environmentally responsible practices. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible to the extent practicable.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Community gardens would maintain an overall orderly and attractive appearance. Gardeners would be responsible for maintaining garden pathways and shared space, as well as their individual plots, in good condition befitting the nearby park area. Any structures such as sheds, fences, kiosks, and trellis would be minimal and unobtrusive.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Authorized and prohibited activities would be specifically identified in permit conditions or other written agreements between the NPS and each garden management association. Water would be provided to gardeners for use at the community garden site. Landscape management would include visitor activities related to gardening, as well as potential mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control.

### Natural Resource Management Zone

The natural resource management zone would comprise areas of the parks that are managed primarily to maintain forests and natural scenery, but they may also contain cultural resources. Native vegetation would dominate except where intervention is needed to protect or restore disturbed natural areas or to preserve cultural resources such as earthworks. Such areas might include stream valleys, woods, prominent forest corridors or other sensitive natural areas not included in the cultural resource zone.

Resources could be minimally modified for visitor needs, safety (such as trail improvements and targeted non-native invasive species removal/treatment) and native species enhancement or preservation, but only after careful review of alternatives consistent with regulation, policy and

NPS resource management plans. The tolerance for resource degradation in this zone would be low.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Visitors in the natural resource management zone would be able to hike along forested trails in some areas and experience some of the best bird-watching habitat locations in DC. Scenic quality and natural sound would be essential. The trails would be mostly unpaved, as opposed to the mostly paved sidewalks in the connecting corridor management zone. The probability of encountering other visitors and NPS staff would be moderate. The interpretive infrastructure in this zone, which would be as unobtrusive as possible, would be placed in adjacent, more intensive use zones. Some natural areas (stream valleys, topographically challenging areas) would remain free of new trails or development. Park amenities and visitor experiences would be accessible to the extent practicable.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Natural processes would predominate in the natural resource zone. Proposed future changes to the zone would be evaluated for environmental and cultural resource impacts. The prominent forested ridgelines that serve as a backdrop for the cityscape would be maintained as contiguous corridors and tree canopy cover could be increased. Clearings and new facilities that interrupt these contiguous corridors would be avoided to the greatest extent possible. A mix of native plant materials would be utilized to fill in the natural vegetation where needed.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Birding, hiking, walking, jogging, and nature study would be appropriate activities for the natural resource zone. Appropriate facilities would be maintained in good condition, and any new trails and maintenance roads would be unpaved. Orientation and compatible interpretive signs would be appropriate, especially if they are directly adjacent to more developed zones. Other limited structures would be appropriate only if they are installed and maintained to preserve cultural or natural resources. Landscape management would include tree planting, and invasive, non-native plant control. Mowing, trimming, and other removal activities would be limited and only utilized if consistent with management objectives.

#### Visitor Services Management Zone

The visitor services management zone would present information, orientation, recreation, interpretation, and education about the CWDW, as well as other visitor services. These services could be offered in adapted historic or non-historic structures. In specific cases, such services could be offered in commercial structures outside park boundaries (if visitor services are developed outside the boundaries of the CWDW, there would be no need for this zone).

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Visitor services in this zone would be convenient, inviting, and easily accessible. The types of interpretive information offered would allow visitors to enjoy the parks on their own or with a guide brochure, or to take advantage of park programs from which they could gain a greater understanding of the parks' natural and cultural resources. The probability of encountering other visitors and NPS staff would be high.

- **Desired Resource Condition.** In the visitor services management zone, special attention would be paid to compatibility with the surrounding park landscape and with historic and natural features.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Appropriate facilities in the visitor services management zone would be kiosks, visitor centers, visitor contact stations, and restrooms. Small amphitheaters designed to offer orientation to the CWDW would be appropriate along with directions to other units and interpretation of the overall importance of the forts. Parking areas might be appropriate at some sites. Any structures would blend with their natural and cultural environments. Landscape management would include activities such as mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control, to support the visitor experience.

### Administrative Management Zone

The administrative management zone covers NPS areas that are an important component of the CWDW but are not normally seen by visitors, such as offices and maintenance areas.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Administrative areas would not be managed with a view toward visitor experience as these are employee areas that support the broader park operations.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Because the administrative management zone would support facilities, areas in the zone would be landscaped to be as unobtrusive as possible. Maintaining the scenic quality of the surrounding area would be important. Noise levels in this zone could be higher than elsewhere, particularly if maintenance activities are involved.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** The facilities in the administrative management zone would be those that are necessary for the operation of the CWDW but not generally used by visitors, such as offices, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, internal roads, and staff parking. Landscape management would include activities such as mowing and trimming, tree planting or removal, and invasive, non-native plant control, to support the maintenance of these areas.

### Special Use Management Zone

The special use management zone would encompass areas of the CWDW that are owned, managed, leased, or under a transfer of jurisdiction to other federal and municipal entities. Examples are the water reservoirs at Forts Reno and Stanton, schools and playgrounds, the Anacostia Museum, and recreational centers operated by the District of Columbia.

- **Desired Visitor Experience.** Desired visitor services in this zone would not be applicable.
- **Desired Resource Condition.** Desired resource conditions in this zone would not be applicable.
- **Appropriate Activities or Facilities.** Appropriate activities in the special use management zone would be those that are outlined in existing agreements for the use of these areas.

## Zoning Application by Focus Area

Although Alternative B would retain much of the existing management zoning designations, some locations would have new or different management zoning designations. The designations identified in Alternative B are shown below and in more detail in **Appendix B**.

### GWMP & ROCR West

The management zone changes in GWMP and ROCR West area are shown in **Figure 7** and **Figure 8** and include the following:

- **Fort Reno:** Adds site sensitive recreation management zone, visitor services management zone, and community garden management zone and allows for a formal trail connection between Fessenden Street NW, the park, and Alice Deal Middle School, located northwest of Fort Reno Park
- **Nebraska Avenue:** Adds connecting corridor management zone
- **Reservoir Batter # 2:** Adds cultural resource management zone
- **36<sup>th</sup> Street NW:** Adds natural resource management zone

### ROCR East

The management zone changes in the ROCR East area are shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10 and include the following:

- **Missouri Avenue Corridor:** Adds recreation and community garden management zones
- **Fort Slocum:** Adds recreation management zone
- **Fort Totten:** Adds connecting corridor, community garden and site sensitive recreation management zones
- **Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors:** Adds natural resource and recreation management zones along the corridors
- **Barnard Hill Park:** Adds connecting corridor, natural resource, and site sensitive recreation management zones

Figure 7: GWMP & ROCR West Areas (Proposed Management Zones)





Figure 8: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for GWMP & ROCR West Areas



GWMP & ROCR West (CWDW sites administered by GWMP and ROCR)

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36<sup>th</sup> Street NW (ROCR)

Figure 9: ROCR East Area (Proposed Management Zones)





Figure 10: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for ROCR East Area



ROCR East

- 7. Missouri Avenue Corridor
- 8. Fort Slocum
- 9. Fort Totten
- 10. Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
- 11. Barnard Hill Park

### NACE North

The management zone changes in the NACE North area are shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12 and include the following:

- **Fort Mahan:** Adds site sensitive recreation management zone and expands recreation management zone
- **Connector between Fort Mahan and Fort Chaplin:** Adds recreation management zone to the northern and southern ends and adds connecting corridor zone in between the ends
- **Fort Chaplin South:** Adds recreation management zone along Burns Street SE and 40th Place SE, and access point along C Street SE
- **Fort Dupont-Anacostia link:** Changes area along northern edge to recreation management zone
- **Fort Dupont Park:** Adds recreation, site sensitive recreation, community garden, and connecting corridor management zones
- **Fort Stanton:** Adds site sensitive recreation management zone, changes area along Marion Barry Avenue SE to connecting corridor management zone, and changes natural resource zone to recreation management zone
- **Anacostia Community Museum:** Changes area at Erie Street SE to special use management zone
- **Suitland Parkway:** Changes to connecting corridor management zone

### NACE South

The management zone changes in the NACE South area are shown in Figure 13 and Figure 14 and include the following:

- **Shepherd Parkway (excluding Parkland):** Adds connecting corridor and site sensitive recreation management zones to eastern edge and site sensitive recreation management zone at Fort Greble
- **Parkland:** Adds recreation management zone
- **Fort Foote Park:** Adds site sensitive recreation and cultural resource management zones and enables internal trail

Figure 11: NACE North Area (Proposed Management Zones)






Figure 12: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for NACE North Area



Existing Conditions

Alternative Concept

NACE North

- 12. Fort Mahan
- 13. Fort Dupont Park
- 14. Fort Stanton

Figure 13: NACE South Area (Proposed Management Zones)





Figure 14: Comparison of 2004 GMP Management Zones and Proposed Management Zones for NACE South Area



NACE South

- 15. Shepherd Parkway
- 16. Fort Foote Park

## **Park Management, Operations, and Safety**

The NPS would explore partnerships coordinated with other organizations or District government agencies to achieve the goals of this plan. The NPS would identify opportunities for park projects to include partnering that would advance NPS goals, consistent with the management zones described under Alternative B. Examples of potential projects could include vegetation maintenance and the identification and implementation of trails to provide increased access and connectivity to the CWDW. The NPS would evaluate partnership proposals from other organizations for consistency with the goals and management zones described under Alternative B. For those proposals that meet the criteria, the NPS would explore opportunities for collaboration.

The NPS would use various vegetation management practices throughout the CWDW parks. The planting and maintenance of meadows, wooded areas, mown turf and open grass would be conducted consistent with the management zones and resource considerations described in the management zones above.

## **Visitor Facilities**

The existing visitor use facilities of the CWDW would be maintained. Other visitor use facilities listed below would be retained or added, if appropriate, in the designated management zone:

- Structures, such as picnic shelters
- Picnic tables
- Comfort stations
- Directional, wayfinding, and interpretation facilities, which could include kiosks or signage with links to digital content

The NPS would enable accessible visitor facilities and experiences, when possible. Priority for these facilities would include locations with interpretive programs, including Fort Reno, Fort Stevens, Fort Slocum, and Fort Dupont.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION**

Mitigation, according to NEPA (40 CFR 1508.20), includes the avoidance or minimization of impacts to resources. Mitigation measures would be implemented under the proposed action, whenever feasible, for resource protection and to minimize disruption to visitors. The exact mitigation measures would depend upon the individual project designs and plan approvals by relevant agencies. The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce impacts as a result of the proposed action. Mitigation measures may be mandatory, such as those measures required by law or NPS policy, or as a condition of a permit or other authorizations. Some measures are voluntary, including those measures implemented into the final design as a best practice to reduce resource impacts or visitor disruption.

## **Historic Districts and Cultural Landscapes**

Alternative B would minimize impacts to the historic district and cultural landscapes by avoiding changes to earthworks, minimizing or eliminating subsurface disturbance in sensitive resource

areas, and maintaining existing contributing views. Vegetation would be managed to preserve views from fort sites that help interpret their historical significance. If changes are proposed to historic resources as part of implementation of this plan, NPS would consult with all local, state, tribal and federal agencies and commissioners as required under the NHPA and other law, policy and regulation.

### **Visitor Use and Experience**

To minimize impacts to the visitor use and experience as uses change, the NPS would provide information through media, such as the CWDW website or signs, to notify visitors of changes in allowed uses at the site.

### **ALTERNATIVES DISMISSED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

The NPS considered alternative options during scoping for this plan that were ultimately dismissed from further consideration. Because management zoning is a crucial feature of general management plans, alternatives considered but dismissed focused on specific potential management zone definitions and applications. As part of the analysis and alternative development process, the NPS considered maintaining the existing natural resource management zone at the northern, eastern, and southern edges of Fort Dupont Park. During the scoping period, comments received supported increased connectivity in this area rather than continuing the existing natural resource management zone at the edge of urban roadways. After consideration of these and other comments, the NPS determined that the connecting corridor management zone would be more appropriate in this location in order to best improve visitor access to the CWDW.

## CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter describes current environmental conditions in and around the project area. The discussion is focused on resources that could potentially be affected by the implementation of the proposed plan and provides a baseline for understanding the current condition of those resources. This chapter also provides an analysis of the potential environmental consequences of implementing the GMP Amendment organized by impact topic. The project team considers these topics to be the key issues that would inform the NPS decision on how to proceed with this project.

The Affected Environment description is followed by the Environmental Consequences analysis for each resource topic. The resource topics analyzed here correspond to the planning issues and concerns described in the Purpose and Need section of this EA.

The environmental consequences analysis includes the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts potentially resulting from the proposed alternatives. The intensity of the impacts is assessed in the context of the park's purpose and significance, and any resource-specific context that may be applicable. Where appropriate, mitigating measures for adverse impacts are described and their effect on the severity of the impact is noted. The methods used to assess impacts vary depending on the resource being considered but are generally based on a review of pertinent literature and park studies, information provided by on-site experts and other agencies, professional judgment, and park staff knowledge and insight.

### HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPES

#### Affected Environment

Historic properties were identified within the project's APE, which is the project area identified in **Figure 1**. As defined by 36 CFR 800.16(d), the APE represents "the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist." Historic properties in the APE are documented in the Civil War Defenses of Washington Historic District NRHP nomination form (NPS 1978) and a draft update to the nomination form, the Civil War Defenses of Washington CLI (Handley 1996), and other CLIs for specific resources within the CWDW.

In this EA, the historic properties are addressed collectively to best describe the impacts of the proposed plan on the APE due to the overlapping nature of the CWDW historic district and cultural landscape and the individually documented cultural landscapes located within the CWDW.

The project area includes the CWDW historic district and cultural landscape. The period of significance for the CWDW begins during the Civil War, where a circle of fortifications on the high ground surrounding Washington, D.C. were constructed to protect the city. At the time, the entire system formed a 37-mile band around the city. The defenses were constructed on what was originally farmland, woodland, meadows, and some privately owned homes. After the war, many of the fortifications were dismantled and the land they occupied was returned to the original

owners. The NPS currently administers more than 30 CWDW-affiliated sites across 18 forts that remain (Handley 1996).

The historic district, originally listed in the NRHP on September 6, 1973, comprises a string of contiguous and discontinuous parkland situated along a ridge that encircles downtown DC, forming a partial ring of green space around the city. The historic district is significant under NRHP Criteria A, C, and D in the following areas: military; engineering; ethnic heritage (Black); community planning and development; and archeology (historic, non-Aboriginal). The period of significance for the historic district starts in 1861 with the beginning of the Civil War and initial construction of the defensive system built to protect Washington, D.C. and ends in 1972 with completion of recreational facilities within parks stipulated in the 1968 Fort Circle Parks Master Plan. In these sites, cultural landscape remnants of the CWDW retain some of their location, design, feeling, workmanship, materials, and association.

The CWDW historic district includes the following:

- Battery Kemble
- Fort Bayard
- Fort Reno
- Fort DeRussy
- Fort Stevens
- Fort Slocum
- Fort Totten
- Fort Bunker Hill
- Battleground National Cemetery (not included in this GMP Amendment)
- Fort Mahan
- Fort Chaplin
- Fort Dupont
- Fort Davis
- Battery Ricketts
- Fort Stanton
- Fort Carroll
- Fort Greble
- Fort Foote
- Fort Marcy

In addition, the NPS has prepared CLIs for several of the individual forts that comprise the CWDW. Cultural landscapes consist of “a geographic area (including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein) associated with a historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values.” Cultural landscapes include the

features and systems that compose the existing landscape and convey the historic character of the landscape associated with the period of significance. Landscape characteristics include spatial organization, circulation, views and vistas, vegetation, buildings and structures, small scale features, land use, topography, archeological sites, and natural systems and features that contribute to the landscape's historic character.

At many of the forts, open, unobstructed views and vistas were critical in the site selection and design to ensure that the army had a clear line of sight for enemy troops approaching the city. Today, one of the best views of the city can be seen from Fort Stanton, which provides an idea of what the view was like for soldiers who defended the fort. Currently, many of the vistas from the forts are overgrown with vegetation and have been blocked by development over time. Individually documented cultural landscapes within the APE include the following:

- Fort Stevens (2010)
- Fort Mahan (2013)
- Fort Bunker Hill (2013)
- Fort Dupont (2013)
- Fort DeRussy (2014)
- Fort Foote (2014)
- Fort Marcy (2015)
- Fort Chaplin (2017)
- Fort Drive (2021)

The cultural landscapes contain multiple resources, including buildings, structures, and vegetation. Contributing elements to the cultural landscapes within the APE include the following:

- Views from different points across DC, Virginia, and Maryland, including those at Fort Marcy, Fort Reno, and Fort Stanton
- Spatial organization, including development of natural resource, cultural resource, and recreation management zones
- Circulation within the park, including the biking and hiking trails, and parking later integrated by NPS
- Vegetation, including meadows and woodlands across CWDW parkland
- Archeological sites
- Buildings and structures, including recreation facilities at Fort Dupont and wayfinding across CWDW parkland
- Natural systems, including but not limited to streams and other key environmental resources

**About the Analysis**

Potential impacts to cultural landscapes affect the historic character and integrity of the landscape as defined by CLIs. The impacts, direct or indirect, adverse or beneficial, are analyzed in consideration of additional regulations and guidance provided by NEPA, Section 106 of the NHPA, the *Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes, NPS Management Policies 2006, Director’s Order 28,* and other NPS guidance for the treatment of cultural landscapes.

**Impacts of Alternative A: No Action**

Under the No Action Alternative, no changes to management within the CWDW would occur. The existing management zoning would continue and no changes to visitor use would occur. As a result, Alternative A would result in no adverse impacts to historic districts and cultural landscapes.

**Impacts of Alternative B: Action Alternative**

Alternative B would change management definitions and the application of management zones at multiple locations within the CWDW. Management actions under Alternative B have the potential to result in both beneficial and adverse impacts to cultural resources within the park. However, specific development or construction projects are not part of this GMP Amendment. Any proposed project would require additional NEPA and NHPA compliance and consultation, separate from this GMP Amendment. No historic properties would be affected by the actions proposed in the GMP Amendment.

Under Alternative B, each of the management zones call for accessible park amenities and visitor experiences. The following changes in management zone definitions and application are summarized below in **Table 1**. Site-specific impacts are discussed below.

*Table 1: Proposed Management Zone and Application Changes*

<b>Management Zone</b>	<b>Changes to Management Zone Definition</b>	<b>Changes in Management Zone Application</b>
Cultural resource zone	Expanded definition and use of interpretive media	Reservoir Battery #2
Connecting corridor zone	Potential meadow vegetation and avoidance of exotic vegetation  Interpretation of initiatives to create a “greenway” connecting the CWDW	Nebraska Avenue Corridor, Barnard Hill Park, Fort Dupont Park, Suitland Parkway, Shepherd Parkway

<b>Management Zone</b>	<b>Changes to Management Zone Definition</b>	<b>Changes in Management Zone Application</b>
Recreation zone	Community gardens are separated as a distinct management zone  Expanded listing of amenities that could be provided	Missouri Avenue, Barnard Hill Park and Fort Totten Corridors, Connector between Fort Mahan and Fort Chaplin, Fort Chaplin South, Fort Dupont-Anacostia Park link, Fort Dupont Park, Parkland
Site sensitive recreation zone	New zone would accommodate recreation that does not result in ground-disturbing activities in areas with identified cultural resources	Fort Reno, Fort Totten, Barnard Hill Park, Fort Mahan, Fort Dupont Park, Fort Stanton, Shepherd Parkway, Fort Foote Park
Community garden zone	Separates community garden management zone from recreation management zone; notes recreation and other values of community gardens	Fort Reno, Missouri Avenue, Fort Totten, Fort Dupont
Natural resource zone	Identifies maintenance of forested ridgelines that serve as backdrop for the cityscape to be maintained as contiguous corridors	36th Street NW, Barnard Hill Park and Fort Totten Corridors, Barnard Hill Park
Visitor services zone	No change	Fort Reno
Administrative zone	Specified use of landscaping	Fort Dupont Park
Special use zone	Expanded definition of areas for potential inclusion	Fort Stanton

### Fort Reno

Alternative B would change much of the zoning designations at Fort Reno from the recreation management zone to site sensitive recreation, community garden, and visitor services management zones. The site sensitive recreation management zone would reduce the potential for impacts to archeological resources by removing potentially ground-disturbing recreation as a

visitor use. Although a new trail from Fessenden Street NW to Alice Deal Middle School would alter official circulation within the site, the change would be consistent with existing management zone practices and would not change the existing contributing circulation features. Designating a visitor services management zone would accommodate visitor services in Chesapeake House, a two-story structure in the southwest corner of the park that currently is under renovation to provide visitor services. The rezoning from a recreation to community garden management zone would not alter the historic district or cultural landscape.

### Fort Slocum

Alternative B would add a recreation management zone along the southern and eastern portions of Fort Slocum. The change would allow visitor services within the open turf area but would not alter the open character for the site. Changes to contributing features, including the earthworks, would not be altered.

### Fort Totten

Alternative B would establish a site sensitive recreation management zone within Fort Totten Park and would change the designation of areas outside of the earthworks from the cultural resource management zone to the site sensitive recreation management zone. These open space areas would offer opportunities for recreation but not alter existing earthworks, contributing vegetation, or other contributing features. A connecting corridor zone would be added between Fort Totten Drive NE and 1<sup>st</sup> Place NE, which would support the Metropolitan Branch Trail. The Metropolitan Branch Trail is a non-NPS multi-modal trail system in Washington that runs along the Metropolitan Branch Line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, and currently connects the Takoma neighborhood to Union Station. The rezoning from a recreation to community garden management zone and other changes would not alter the historic district or cultural landscape.

### Fort Mahan

Alternative B would change the existing cultural resource management zone to the site sensitive recreation management zone, which would not alter the contributing features of Fort Mahan, including the earthworks. Alternative B would expand the recreation management zone, which would enable parking at the site. Combined, these changes would not alter the contributing features of Fort Mahan.

### Fort Dupont

Alternative B would change a portion of the Fort Dupont administrative management zone, including the amphitheater, to the recreation management zone. Similarly, the community garden area would change from the recreation management zone to the community garden management zone. These changes better reflect existing activities but would not alter elements of the historic district or cultural landscape.

Similarly, the area around the historic fort would be designated as a site sensitive recreation management zone. This action would offer opportunities for recreation but not alter existing earthworks, contributing vegetation, or other contributing features. Designation of transportation corridors within Fort Dupont Park and along the adjacent roadways to the north, east, and south as connecting corridor management zones would enable circulation pathways and encourage

access to the park. These features would be located along the border of Fort Dupont Park, outside of the Fort Dupont cultural landscape, and would not alter elements of the historic district or cultural landscape.

#### Fort Stanton

Alternative B would designate Fort Stanton, which did not have a management zone designation in the 2004 GMP, as a site sensitive recreation management zone. The changes would enable recreation in the open space that would not change or impact contributing features of the site.

#### Fort Greble

Alternative B would change the cultural resource management zone to the site sensitive recreation management zone, which would not alter the contributing features of Fort Greble, including the earthworks.

#### Fort Foote

Alternative B would add a site sensitive recreation management zone at Fort Foote, which would enable alteration of the existing open space near the cultural resource management zone. Additionally, an area along the Potomac River would be designated as a cultural resource management zone, which would emphasize vegetation management to maintain the contributing view across the Potomac River. Combined, these would not alter the contributing features of Fort Foote.

#### Connecting Corridors and Other Areas

At locations that would retain their existing zoning designations or are located outside of the forts listed above, the change to the management zone definitions would not result in impacts to contributing landscape characteristics including spatial organization, circulation, buildings and structures, or natural systems of the historic district or cultural landscapes within the CWDW.

In summary, Alternative B would not change historic districts and cultural landscapes. Each action would be evaluated for NEPA and NHPA compliance separate from this GMP Amendment. As a result, Alternative B would not result in impacts to historic districts and cultural landscapes.

**VISITOR USE AND EXPERIENCE**

**Affected Environment**

The CWDW offer a variety of visitor uses and experiences, including both recreational and cultural. The CWDW offer interpretation of historic resources, as well as recreational opportunities, especially to nearby communities.

Visitor Use and Activities/Facilities

The CWDW offer multiple resources for various types of recreation (see **Table 2**). Hiking can occur in much of the CWDW, which contain multiple hiking or other designated trail areas. These trails areas can occur in natural resource, recreation, or connecting corridor management zones.

Visitors to the CWDW often use designated picnic areas, both with and without shelters, with tables and grills; these picnic areas are most frequently found in areas designated under recreation management zones.

The CWDW feature athletic fields and courts for organized and informal recreation. Of these facilities, DC permits 12 recreation fields and courts, covering three acres, including Fort Reno, Fort Mahan, Fort Dupont, Fort Davis, and Shepherd Parkway. The athletic fields and courts are found within the recreation management zone.

The CWDW also offer performance, programming, and other activities. Fort Dupont has a large amphitheater located in the administrative management zone. Fort Reno contains a stage located within the recreation management zone.

Community gardens within the CWDW are frequently used by local residents. Six community gardens totaling approximately 17 acres are found across the CWDW parks, including five in ROCR’s Fort Reno, Missouri Avenue Corridor, and Fort Totten locations, and one at NACE’s Fort Dupont. The community gardens are currently found within the recreation management zone.

*Table 2: Visitor Facilities by Focus Area*

Fort/Site	Hiking Trails	Picnic Areas	Sport Fields/Courts	Stages	Community Gardens	Comfort Stations	On-Site Parking
<b>GWMP &amp; ROCR West</b>							
Fort Marcy	X	-	-	-	-	-	X
Reservoir Battery #2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Battery Kemble & Palisades Park	X	X	-	-	-	-	X
Nebraska Avenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fort Reno	X	X	X	X	X	-	-

Fort/Site	Hiking Trails	Picnic Areas	Sport Fields/Courts	Stages	Community Gardens	Comfort Stations	On-Site Parking
36 <sup>th</sup> Street NW	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>ROCR East</b>							
Missouri Avenue Corridors	X	-	-	-	X	-	-
Fort Slocum	-	X	-	-	-	-	-
Fort Totten	X	X	X	-	X	-	-
Barnard Hill & Fort Totten Corridors	X	X	-	-	-	-	-
Barnard Hill	X	X	X	-	-	-	-
<b>NACE North</b>							
Fort Mahan	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fort Dupont	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fort Stanton	X	X	-	-	-	-	-
<b>NACE South</b>							
Shepherd Parkway	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fort Foote	X	X	-	-	-	X	X

*Note: X indicates presence of facilities, - indicates lack of facilities.*

### Access, Circulation, and Parking

CWDW parkland can be accessed by transit, car, bicycle, or foot. The CWDW trail network provides approximately 130 miles of hiking and multi-use trails for continued pedestrian and bike access. People can connect to the CWDW using the eight Metrorail stations within a half-mile radius of CWDW parks. Bus transit stops and Capital Bikeshare stations are also located near the CWDW.

Four sites (Fort Marcy, Fort Dupont, Fort Foote, and Battery Kemble) have on-site parking. Surrounding neighborhoods adjacent to other CWDW sites offer on-street parallel parking. Parking availability at each site is summarized in **Table 2**.

Social trails are also present within the CWDW. Visitors have worn paths at multiple locations, including between Fessenden Street NW and Alice Deal Middle School at Fort Reno, between Gallatin and Galloway Streets NE, and along Shepherd Parkway.

### Interpretation and Wayfinding

The CWDW offers interpretation at each fort. Interpretive signs convey information to visitors highlighting the history of the sites. Brochures are available at some destinations, such as Fort

Dupont Park. Wayfinding signs are interspersed throughout the park. Special programs, such as guided walks, occur periodically.

### **About the Analysis**

Potential impacts to visitor use and experience within and near the project area were analyzed. The analysis considered current visitor uses, activities, and circulation; the proposed changes in management zones; and the estimated changes in visitor access and experiences that would result from the implementation of each alternative.

### **Impacts of Alternative A: No Action**

Alternative A would not change visitor use amenities, access, circulation, parking, interpretation or wayfinding, or other management within the project area. No impacts would occur to visitor use and experience under Alternative A.

### **Impacts of Alternative B: Action Alternative**

#### Visitor Use and Activities/Facilities

Under Alternative B, visitor uses within the CWDW would be altered through the changes in management zone definitions and application of management zones (see **Table 1**). Informal recreation and gatherings, such as picnics, would be allowed in the new site sensitive recreation management zone (101 acres) while the recreation management zone would be reduced by 68 acres (47 percent). Of that reduction, the decline of approximately 17 acres would be due to the designation of a new community garden management zone for existing community garden activities in currently established locations. The areas within the cultural resource management zone would be reduced by 20 acres (11 percent). The areas located within the natural resource management zone would be reduced by 77 acres (9 percent). The total area of zoning is included in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Proposed Management Zone Changes Area

Management Zone	Existing Area (in acres)	Existing Area (%)	Proposed Area (in acres)	Proposed Area (%)	Change (in acres)	% Change
Cultural Resource	182	14%	162	12%	-20	-11%
Connecting Corridor	71	5%	140	11%	69	97%
Recreation	146	11%	78	6%	-68	-47%
Site Sensitive Recreation	N/A	0%	101	8%	101	Increase*
Community Garden	N/A	0%	17	1%	17	Increase*
Natural Resource	872	66%	795	60%	-77	-9%
Visitor Services	0	0%	0.5	< 0.1%	0.5	Increase*
Administrative	16	1%	8	1%	-8	-50%
Special Use	11	1%	13	1%	2	18%
Unzoned	19	1%	0	0%	-19	-100%

Note: \*The percentage increase in entirely new management zones cannot be calculated and is therefore noted simply as an increase.

#### Access, Circulation, and Parking

Alternative B would enable the formalization of multiple informal trails, addition of new trails, and parking areas within the CWDW. Social trails, such as between Fessenden Street NW and Alice Deal Middle School at Fort Reno and between Gallatin and Galloway Streets NE near Fort Totten, could be formalized through future projects. New pedestrian paths would be enabled within the CWDW, including at Fort Dupont and within Shepherd Parkway. The NPS would work with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) to facilitate connections to new and proposed trail networks.

Invasive vegetation along trails would be removed, which would improve access and visibility. These changes would enhance safety and reduce the potential for illegal dumping. Parking would continue to be enabled within the recreation management zone. Additionally, the NPS would work with DDOT and other stakeholders to facilitate efficient parking improvements to support access.

#### Interpretation and Wayfinding

Alternative B would support interpretation and wayfinding within the CWDW. The designation of Chesapeake House within the visitor services management zone would enhance the interpretation, programming, and accessibility of the CWDW. Additional interpretation and wayfinding signage would be considered appropriate within the CWDW.

In summary, Alternative B would have beneficial impacts to visitor use and experience through the expansion of areas accessible for recreation, as well as improved access, circulation, interpretation, and wayfinding.

## CHAPTER 4: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

During the NEPA process, the NPS provided an opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed GMP Amendment. The NPS also consulted and coordinated with federal and state agencies and other interested parties to refine potential alternatives and identify issues and/or concerns related to park resources. This section provides a summary of the public involvement and agency consultation and coordination that occurred during planning.

- The NPS held one public scoping meeting during the 45-day public scoping comment period, at which time the public, agencies, and interested parties were invited to submit comments on the proposed project.
- The NPS distributed early consultation on the proposed GMP Amendment to the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts (CFA) and the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) on March 31, 2025.
- The NPS initiated consultation with State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) including DC SHPO, Virginia SHPO, and Maryland SHPO in letters dated April 9, 2025.
- The NPS initiated Section 7 consultation via the USUSFWS online IPaC system on August 18, 2024, and again on March 30, 2026. Ongoing consultation would occur during implementation of any proposed action.
- NCPC reviewed the proposed GMP Amendment concept and provided comments on May 1, 2025. The NPS plans to submit the proposed GMP Amendment for Preliminary Review on May 1, 2026.

## LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS

### NPS GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY

Jennifer Madello, Superintendent  
Megan Bailey, Cultural Resources Program Manager  
Maureen Joseph, Chief of Resource Management

### NPS ROCK CREEK PARK

Brian Joyner, Superintendent  
Nick Bartolomeo, Resources Manager  
Jamie Euken, Environmental Protection Specialist  
Cortney Gjesfeld, Cultural Resources Program Manager  
Franice Sewell, Former Acting Chief of Staff  
Bryan Cheeseboro, Historian and Park Ranger

### NPS NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS – EAST

Mike Commisso, Deputy Superintendent  
Hannah Thomas, Cultural Resources Program Manager  
Vince Vaise, Visitor Services Program Manager  
Rebecca George, Volunteers-In-Parks Program Coordinator  
Jerome Bussey, Facilities, Grounds, Roads and Trails Program  
Manager Julie Kutruff, Special Events Manager

### NPS POTOMAC HERITAGE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL

Jeri DeYoung, Superintendent  
Cassidy Renninger, GIS Specialist  
Alexandra Silio, GIS Fellow

### NPS NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Tammy Stidham, Associate Area Director – Lands and Planning  
Christine Bruins, Portfolio Manager  
Joel Gorder, Regional Environmental Coordinator  
Aleksandra Voznitza, Invasive Plant Management Team Liaison

### AECOM

Alan Harwood, Project Director  
Claire Sale, Project Manager  
Lauren Tuttle, Environmental Planner  
Lorena Kowalewski, Planner  
Naomi Tariku, Planner  
Yike Xu, Landscape Designer

## REFERENCES

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2016 (April). National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Status. Available <https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd> Accessed September 10, 2025.
- Handly J. 1996. Civil War Defenses of Washington, D.C.: A Cultural Landscape Inventory. Cultural Landscapes Inventory Report. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. Falls Church Office, Denver Service Center.
- NPS. 1978. Civil War Fort Sites National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2004. Final Management Plan Fort Circle Parks. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2010. Fort Stevens, Rock Creek Park – Fort Circle Park – North Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2012. Civil War Defenses of Washington Long-Range Interpretive Plan. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2013a. Fort Dupont, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Parks – East Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2013b. Fort Mahan, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Parks – East Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2014a. Fort Foote, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Parks – East Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2014b. Repair and Connectivity Improvements of the Civil War Defenses of Washington Hiker-Mountain Biker Trail. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2014c. Fort DeRussy, Rock Creek Park – Fort Circle Park – North Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2017. Fort Bunker Hill, Rock Creek Park – Fort Circle Park – North Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington DC
- NPS. 2017. Fort Chaplin, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Parks – East Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- NPS. 2015. Fort Marcy, George Washington Memorial Parkway Cultural Landscapes Inventory. Washington, DC.
- USFWS. 2025. National Wetland Inventory Mapper. Available at <https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>

## APPENDIX A



# United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
Chesapeake Bay Ecological Services Field Office  
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive  
Annapolis, MD 21401-7307  
Phone: (410) 573-4599 Fax: (410) 266-9127

In Reply Refer To:  
Project Code: 2026-0069078  
Project Name: CWDW GMP Amendment

03/30/2026 12:59:01 UTC

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

## To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological

evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

<https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/endangered-species-consultation-handbook.pdf>

**Migratory Birds:** In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts, see <https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-bird-permit/what-we-do>.

It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures, see <https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/threats-birds>.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit <https://www.fws.gov/partner/council-conservation-migratory-birds>.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Code in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

**Note:** IPaC has provided all available attachments because this project is in multiple field office jurisdictions.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries
- Bald & Golden Eagles
- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

## OFFICIAL SPECIES LIST

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

### **Chesapeake Bay Ecological Services Field Office**

177 Admiral Cochrane Drive  
Annapolis, MD 21401-7307  
(410) 573-4599

This project's location is within the jurisdiction of multiple offices. However, only one species list document will be provided for all offices. The species and critical habitats in this document reflect the aggregation of those that fall in each of the affiliated office's jurisdiction. Other offices affiliated with the project:

### **Virginia Ecological Services Field Office**

6669 Short Lane  
Gloucester, VA 23061-4410  
(804) 693-6694

## PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Code: 2026-0069078

Project Name: CWDW GMP Amendment

Project Type: Land Management Plans - NWR

Project Description: The National Park Service has developed a General Management Plan (GMP)

Amendment and Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Civil War Defenses of Washington

parks (CWDW) in the District of Columbia (DC), McLean (Virginia), and Fort Washington

(Maryland) to evaluate updates to previous management zone designations. These management zone updates are intended to enhance visitor experience, access, recreation opportunities, circulation, and interpretation while also protecting natural and cultural resources. This GMP Amendment/EA will serve as an amendment to the 2004 Fort Circle Parks GMP and will designate management zones and evaluate appropriate land uses and their applicable general locations.

Project Location:

The approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps/@38.87702255,-76.9507634587053,14z>



Counties: District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia

## ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SPECIES

There is a total of 4 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries<sup>1</sup>, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

- 
1. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

## MAMMALS

NAME	STATUS
Northern Long-eared Bat <i>Myotis septentrionalis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045</a>	Endangered
Tricolored Bat <i>Perimyotis subflavus</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10515">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10515</a>	Proposed Endangered

## INSECTS

NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i> There is <b>proposed</b> critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743</a>	Proposed Threatened

## CRUSTACEANS

NAME	STATUS
Hay's Spring Amphipod <i>Stygobromus hayi</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8410">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8410</a>	Endangered

## CRITICAL HABITATS

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

YOU ARE STILL REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF YOUR PROJECT(S) MAY HAVE EFFECTS ON ALL ABOVE LISTED SPECIES.

## USFWS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE LANDS AND FISH HATCHERIES

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the [National Wildlife Refuge](#) system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS OR FISH HATCHERIES WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

# BALD & GOLDEN EAGLES

Bald and Golden Eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act <sup>2</sup> and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) <sup>1</sup>. Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to Bald or Golden Eagles, or their habitats, should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures, as described in the various links on this page.

---

1. The [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) of 1940.
2. The [Migratory Birds Treaty Act](#) of 1918.
3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

There are Bald Eagles and/or Golden Eagles in your [project](#) area.

## Measures for Proactively Minimizing Eagle Impacts

For information on how to best avoid and minimize disturbance to nesting bald eagles, please review the [National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines](#). You may employ the timing and activity-specific distance recommendations in this document when designing your project/activity to avoid and minimize eagle impacts. For bald eagle information specific to Alaska, please refer to [Bald Eagle Nesting and Sensitivity to Human Activity](#).

The FWS does not currently have guidelines for avoiding and minimizing disturbance to nesting Golden Eagles. For site-specific recommendations regarding nesting Golden Eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional [Migratory Bird Office](#) or [Ecological Services Field Office](#).

If disturbance or take of eagles cannot be avoided, an [incidental take permit](#) may be available to authorize any take that results from, but is not the purpose of, an otherwise lawful activity. For assistance making this determination for Bald Eagles, visit the [Do I Need A Permit Tool](#). For assistance making this determination for golden eagles, please consult with the appropriate Regional [Migratory Bird Office](#) or [Ecological Services Field Office](#).

## Ensure Your Eagle List is Accurate and Complete

If your project area is in a poorly surveyed area in IPaC, your list may not be complete and you may need to rely on other resources to determine what species may be present (e.g. your local FWS field office, state surveys, your own surveys). Please review the [Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles](#), to help you properly interpret the report for your specified location, including determining if there is sufficient data to ensure your list is accurate.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to bald or golden eagles on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these bald or golden eagles are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.



Golden Eagle  
Non-BCC  
Vulnerable



Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incident-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds <https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf>
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC <https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action>

## MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) <sup>1</sup> prohibits the take (including killing, capturing, selling, trading, and transport) of protected migratory bird species without prior authorization by the Department of Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service).

- 
1. The [Migratory Birds Treaty Act](#) of 1918.
  2. The [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#) of 1940.
  3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, see the "Probability of Presence Summary" below to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
American Oystercatcher <i>Haematopus palliatus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8935">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8935</a>	Breeds Apr 15 to Aug 31
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626</a>	Breeds Sep 1 to Aug 31

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<p><b>Black-billed Cuckoo</b> <i>Coccyzus erythrophthalmus</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9399">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9399</a></p>	Breeds May 15 to Oct 10
<p><b>Blue-winged Warbler</b> <i>Vermivora cyanoptera</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9509">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9509</a></p>	Breeds May 1 to Jun 30
<p><b>Bobolink</b> <i>Dolichonyx oryzivorus</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9454">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9454</a></p>	Breeds May 20 to Jul 31
<p><b>Canada Warbler</b> <i>Cardellina canadensis</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9643">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9643</a></p>	Breeds May 20 to Aug 10
<p><b>Cerulean Warbler</b> <i>Setophaga cerulea</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2974">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/2974</a></p>	Breeds Apr 28 to Jul 20
<p><b>Chimney Swift</b> <i>Chaetura pelagica</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9406">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9406</a></p>	Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 25
<p><b>Chuck-will's-widow</b> <i>Antrostomus carolinensis</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9604">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9604</a></p>	Breeds May 10 to Jul 10
<p><b>Eastern Whip-poor-will</b> <i>Antrostomus vociferus</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10678">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10678</a></p>	Breeds May 1 to Aug 20
<p><b>Golden Eagle</b> <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>            This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1680</a></p>	Breeds elsewhere
<p><b>Grasshopper Sparrow</b> <i>Ammodramus savannarum perpallidus</i>            This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA  <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8329">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8329</a></p>	Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 20

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<p>Hudsonian Godwit <i>Limosa haemastica</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9482">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9482</a></p>	Breeds elsewhere
<p>Kentucky Warbler <i>Geothlypis formosa</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9443">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9443</a></p>	Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 20
<p>King Rail <i>Rallus elegans</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8936">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8936</a></p>	Breeds May 1 to Sep 5
<p>Least Tern <i>Sternula antillarum antillarum</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11919">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11919</a></p>	Breeds Apr 25 to Sep 5
<p>Lesser Yellowlegs <i>Tringa flavipes</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679</a></p>	Breeds elsewhere
<p>Long-eared Owl <i>asio otus</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3631">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3631</a></p>	Breeds Mar 1 to Jul 15
<p>Pectoral Sandpiper <i>Calidris melanotos</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9561">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9561</a></p>	Breeds elsewhere
<p>Prairie Warbler <i>Setophaga discolor</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9513">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9513</a></p>	Breeds May 1 to Jul 31
<p>Prothonotary Warbler <i>Protonotaria citrea</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9439">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9439</a></p>	Breeds Apr 1 to Jul 31
<p>Red-headed Woodpecker <i>Melanerpes erythrocephalus</i></p> <p>This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.</p> <p><a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9398">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9398</a></p>	Breeds May 10 to Sep 10

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
<b>Ruddy Turnstone</b> <i>Arenaria interpres morinella</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10633">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10633</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Rusty Blackbird</b> <i>Euphagus carolinus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9478">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9478</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Scarlet Tanager</b> <i>Piranga olivacea</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11967">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11967</a>	Breeds May 10 to Aug 10
<b>Semipalmated Sandpiper</b> <i>Calidris pusilla</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9603">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9603</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Short-billed Dowitcher</b> <i>Limnodromus griseus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9480">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9480</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Whimbrel</b> <i>Numenius phaeopus hudsonicus</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11991">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/11991</a>	Breeds elsewhere
<b>Willet</b> <i>Tringa semipalmata</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10669">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10669</a>	Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 5
<b>Wood Thrush</b> <i>Hylocichla mustelina</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9431">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9431</a>	Breeds May 10 to Aug 31

## PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read "[Supplemental Information on Migratory Birds and Eagles](#)", specifically the FAQ section titled "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

### Probability of Presence (■)

Green bars; the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during that week of the year.

**Breeding Season (■)**

Yellow bars; liberal estimate of the timeframe inside which the bird breeds across its entire range.


**Survey Effort (|)**


Vertical black lines; the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps.

**No Data (-)**

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.







Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Eagle Management <https://www.fws.gov/program/eagle-management>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incident-take-migratory-birds>
- Nationwide avoidance and minimization measures for birds
- Supplemental Information for Migratory Birds and Eagles in IPaC <https://www.fws.gov/media/supplemental-information-migratory-birds-and-bald-and-golden-eagles-may-occur-project-action>

## WETLANDS

Impacts to [NWI wetlands](#) and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District](#).

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

### RIVERINE

- R5UBH
- R4SBC
- R2UBHh

- R2UBHx
- R3UBH
- R1UBV

FRESHWATER FORESTED/SHRUB WETLAND

- PFO1C
- PFO1R
- PFO1A

## **IPAC USER CONTACT INFORMATION**

Agency: Private Entity  
Name: Lauren Tuttle  
Address: 2000 K Street NW, Suite 800  
City: Washington  
State: DC  
Zip: 20006  
Email: lauren.tuttle@aecom.com  
Phone: 2027720668

## **LEAD AGENCY CONTACT INFORMATION**

Lead Agency: National Park Service

## **APPENDIX B**



# Civil War Defenses of Washington

## General Management Plan Amendment/Environmental Assessment

Alternatives Detail  
May 2026



# Focus Areas

## GWMP & ROCR West

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36th Street NW (ROCR)

## ROCR East


7. Missouri Ave. Corridor
8. Fort Slocum
9. Fort Totten
10. Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
11. Barnard Hill Park

## NACE North

12. Fort Mahan
13. Fort Dupont Park
14. Fort Stanton

## NACE South

15. Shepherd Parkway
16. Fort Foote Park






# GWMP & ROCR West

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36th Street NW (ROCR)

## Existing Conditions




### CWDW 2004 Management Zones

- Administrative Zone
- Connecting Corridor Zone
- Cultural Resource Zone
- Natural Resource Zone
- Recreation Zone
- Special Use Zone

### NPS Trails Connecting CWDW Project Area

- Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail Route
- Viewpoint Area





# GWMP & ROCR West

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36th Street NW (ROCR)

## Alternative Concept


- **Fort Marcy:** No changes
- **Reservoir Battery #2:** Adds Cultural Resource Zone
- **Battery Kemble & Palisades Park:** No changes
- **Nebraska Avenue:** Adds Connecting Corridor Zone
- **Fort Reno:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone, Visitor Services Zone (southwest corner), Community Garden Zone (southwest), and enables hiking trail
- **36th Street:** Adds Natural Resource Zone

### Proposed Management Zones

- Administrative Zone
- Connecting Corridor Zone
- Cultural Resource Zone
- Natural Resource Zone
- Recreation Zone
- Site Sensitive Recreation Zone
- Community Garden Zone
- Visitor Services Zone
- Special Use Zone


### NPS Trails Connecting CWDW Project Area

- Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail Route
- Viewpoint Area






# GWMP & ROCR West



## Existing Conditions

1. Fort Marcy (GWMP)
2. Reservoir Battery 2 (ROCR)
3. Battery Kemble & Palisades Park (ROCR)
4. Nebraska Avenue (ROCR)
5. Fort Reno (ROCR)
6. 36th Street NW (ROCR)



## Alternative Concept

**Fort Marcy:** No changes

**Reservoir Battery #2:** Adds Cultural Resource Zone

**Battery Kemble & Palisades Park:** No changes


**Nebraska Avenue:** Adds Connecting Corridor Zone

**Fort Reno:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone, Visitor Services Zone (southwest corner), Community Garden Zone (southwest), and enables hiking trail


**36th Street:** Adds Natural Resource Zone



# Fort Marcy



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept

- No changes



# Reservoir Battery #2



Existing Conditions





Alternative Concept

- Adds **Cultural Resource Zone** in area not previously zoned



# Battery Kemble & Palisades Park




Existing Conditions

Alternative Concept


- No changes



# Nebraska Avenue



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept


- Adds **Connecting Corridor Zone** in area not previously zoned



# Fort Reno



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept

- Adds **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** in former Recreation Zone areas
- Changes to **Visitor Services Zone** from Recreation Zone
- Changes to **Community Garden Zone** from Recreation Zone
- Enables **walking/hiking trail** located at western edge of Alice Deal Middle School



# 36th Street NW



Existing Conditions



Alternative Concept



- Adds **Natural Resource Zone** in area not previously zoned



# ROCR East

- 7. Missouri Ave. Corridor
- 8. Fort Slocum
- 9. Fort Totten
- 10. Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
- 11. Barnard Hill Park

## Existing Conditions






# ROCR East

7. Missouri Ave. Corridor
8. Fort Slocum
9. Fort Totten
10. Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
11. Barnard Hill Park


## Alternative Concept

- **Missouri Ave. Corridor:** Adds Recreation and Community Garden Zones
- **Fort Slocum:** Adds Recreation Zone
- **Fort Totten:** Adds Community Garden, Site Sensitive Recreation, and Connecting Corridor Zones
- **Barnard Hill Park and Fort Totten Corridors:** Adds Natural Resource and Recreation Zones along the corridors
- **Barnard Hill Park:** Adds Connecting Corridor, Natural Resource, and Site Sensitive Recreation Zones






# ROCR East



## Existing Conditions

- Missouri Ave. Corridor
- Fort Slocum
- Fort Totten
- Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors
- Barnard Hill Park




## Alternative Concept


- Missouri Ave. Corridor:** Adds Recreation and Community Garden Zones
- Fort Slocum:** Adds Recreation Zone
- Fort Totten:** Adds Community Garden, Site Sensitive Recreation, and Connecting Corridor Zones
- Barnard Hill Park and Fort Totten Corridors:** Adds Natural Resource and Recreation Zones along the corridors
- Barnard Hill Park:** Adds Connecting Corridor, Natural Resource, and Site Sensitive Recreation Zones



# Missouri Ave. Corridor



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept

- Changes to **Community Garden Zone** from Recreation Zone along Peabody St NW and 13th Pl NW
- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Connecting Corridors Zone located north of Missouri Ave NW



# Fort Slocum



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept


- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Cultural Resource Zone along the southern and eastern edges of Fort Slocum



# Fort Totten



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept

- Changes to **Community Garden Zone** from Recreation Zone
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Natural Resource Zone along South Dakota Ave NE (near New Hampshire Ave NE intersection) and in southwest portion of Fort Totten park
- Changes to **Connecting Corridor Zone** from Natural Resource Zone and Recreation Zone along Gallatin St. NE and the Metropolitan Branch Trail



# Barnard Hill Park & Fort Totten Corridors



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept


- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Connecting Corridor Zone along South Dakota Ave. NE and Gallatin St. NE
- Changes to **Natural Resource Zone** from Connecting Corridor Zone on central and eastern portions of the park



# Barnard Hill Park



Existing Conditions



Alternative Concept



- Changes to **Connecting Corridor Zone** from Recreation Zone in northern corner of the site
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Recreation Zone in area within the inner hiking loop
- Changes to **Natural Resource Zone** from Recreation Zone in dense vegetation areas around the inner hiking loop



# NACE North

- 12. Fort Mahan
- 13. Fort Dupont Park
- 14. Fort Stanton

## Existing Conditions





# NACE North


12. Fort Mahan

13. Fort Dupont Park

14. Fort Stanton



## Alternative Concept

- **Fort Mahan:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone and expands Recreation Zone
- **Connector between Fort Mahan and Fort Chaplin:** Adds Recreation Zone to the northern and southern edges, changes natural resource area to Connecting Corridor
- **Fort Chaplin South:** Adds Recreation Zone along Burns St SE and 40th PI SE and access point along C St SE
- **Fort Dupont-Anacostia link:** Changes area along northern edge to Recreation Zone
- **Fort Dupont Park:** Adds Recreation, Site Sensitive Recreation, Community Garden, and Connecting Corridor Zones
- **Fort Stanton:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone and changes eastern edge to Recreation Zone
- **Anacostia Community Museum:** Changes area at Erie St SE to Recreation Zone
- **Suitland Parkway:** Changes to Connecting Corridor Zone





# NACE North



## Existing Conditions


- 12. Fort Mahan
- 13. Fort Dupont Park
- 14. Fort Stanton

## Alternative Concept


- 12. **Fort Mahan:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone and expands Recreation Zone
- Connector between Fort Mahan and Fort Chaplin:** Adds Recreation Zone to the northern and southern edges, changes to Connecting Corridor Zone from Natural Resource area
- 13. **Fort Chaplin South:** Adds Recreation Zone along Burns St SE and 40th PI SE and access point along C St SE
- Fort Dupont-Anacostia link:** Changes area along northern edge to Recreation Zone
- 14. **Fort Dupont Park:** Adds Recreation, Site Sensitive Recreation, Community Garden, and Connecting Corridor Zones
- Fort Stanton:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation Zone and changes eastern edge to Recreation Zone
- Anacostia Community Museum:** Changes area at Erie St SE to Special Use Zone
- Suitland Parkway:** Changes to Connecting Corridor Zone



# Fort Mahan



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept


- Expands **Recreation Zone** to include northwest side of trail in former Natural Resource Zone
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Cultural Resource Zone in central open space
- Changes to **Recreation and Connecting Corridor Zones** from Natural Resource Zone south of Benning Rd. NE



# Fort Dupont Park



Existing Conditions




Alternative Concept

- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Natural Resource Zone along northern edge parcel close to Anacostia Park and from Administrative Zone near northwest portion of Fort Dupont Park
- Changes to **Community Garden Zone** from Recreation Zone at the central portion of Fort Dupont Park
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Recreation and Natural Resource Zones at northern edge of Fort Dupont Park
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation and Natural Resource Zones** from Recreation Zone at southeastern edge of Fort Dupont
- Changes to **Connecting Corridor Zone** along Mississippi Ave. SE, Massachusetts Ave. SE, Ridge Rd. SE, Fort Dupont Dr. SE., and Fort Davis Dr. SE



# Fort Stanton



Existing Conditions



Viewpoint Area



Anacostia Community Museum



Alternative Concept

- Changes to **Connecting Corridor Zone** from Natural Resource Zone along Marion Barry Ave. SE and Suitland Parkway
- Adds **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** at viewpoint area in area not previously zoned
- Adds **Special Use Zone** for Anacostia Community Museum jurisdiction area
- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Natural Resource Zone along eastern edge





# NACE South

15. Shepherd Parkway

16. Fort Foote Park

## Existing Conditions






# NACE South

15. Shepherd Parkway

16. Fort Foote Park


## Alternative Concept

- **Shepherd Parkway (excluding Parkland):** Adds Connecting Corridor and Site Sensitive Recreation Zone to eastern edge and Site Sensitive Recreation Zone at Fort Greble
- **Parkland:** Adds Recreation Zone
- **Fort Foote Park:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation and Cultural Resource zones and enables internal trail






# NACE South



Existing Conditions

- 15. Shepherd Parkway
- 16. Fort Foote Park




Alternative Concept


- 15. **Shepherd Parkway (excluding Parkland):** Adds Connecting Corridor and Site Sensitive Recreation Zone to eastern edge and Site Sensitive Recreation Zone at Fort Greble  
**Parkland:** Adds Recreation Zone
- 16. **Fort Foote Park:** Adds Site Sensitive Recreation and Cultural Resource zones and enables internal trail



# Shepherd Parkway



Existing Conditions



Alternative Concept

- Adds **Connecting Corridor Zone** buffer along east edge of the park, with **Site Sensitive Recreation Zones** at key site access and viewpoint areas in previous Natural Resource Zone
- Changes to **Recreation Zone** from Natural Resource Zone at Parkland parcel
- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Cultural Resource Zone at Fort Greble



# Fort Foote Park



Existing Conditions

Viewpoint Area



Alternative Concept

- Changes to **Site Sensitive Recreation Zone** from Natural Resource Zone at site main access and around trail spaces
- Changes to **Cultural Resource Zone** from Natural Resource Zone to include areas near main site access
- Adds **Cultural Resource Zone** at viewpoint area
- Enables internal **walking/hiking trail** along proposed Site Sensitive Recreation and Cultural Resource Zones