

**Appendix E**

**Public Comments after Introductory Public Meeting  
December 13, 2011**

**Nonmotorized Boathouse Zone  
Feasibility Study**

This page intentionally left blank.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 1

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jack Carlson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3414 O Street, NW  
Washington, MA 20007  
USA  
E-mail: jack.l.carlson@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 12/20/2011 Date Received: 12/20/2011  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am glad that this study is happening, and I hope that it will not end up being a mere academic exercise but instead yield some concrete action toward approving the creation of a non-motorized boathouse zone. This zone would enrich and improvement everyone's engagement with and appreciation of a river which has long been enjoyed in non-motorized craft.

The Newsletter says: "In 2007, NPS started the EIS process for the proposed Georgetown University boathouse, but it was put on hold in 2008 pending further study of the non-motorized boathouse zone." It is truly sad and, to me, inexplicable that over three years have elapsed between the pause in the EIS for the Georgetown boathouse, and the beginning of this current study. The amount of time that has been hemorrhaged here is unbelievable. This current study, however, has the opportunity to accomplish something at long last.

I have spent my life in Georgetown, DC; in Cambridge, Massachusetts; and in Oxford, Oxfordshire. In the latter two places, boathouses for rowing boats are an asset in the creation of synergy between mankind and nature; the same character, serenity and synergy could be part of the Georgetown waterfront and the Potomac River. But if the unsightly and overcrowded "Thompson's Boat Center" and the decrepit, crumbling Washington Canoe Club remain, besides Potomac Boat Club, the only outlets for such usage, it will be an unfortunate waste.

I am a committed environmentalist and user of the National Parks and Georgetown waterfront. Adding one or two nice boathouses, provided they are sustainably and sensitively built, for using the river in non-motorized craft would be an improvement, not a detriment, to this space.

There has already been too much time wasted in moving forward on this and related studies. Undertake the study, then take action based on the study.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 2

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sally C. Strain  
Organization: Defenders of Potomac River Parkland  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Palisades neighborhood, Ward 3  
washington, DC 20016  
USA  
E-mail: seawalk@starpower.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/10/2012 Date Received: 01/10/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

- A. No private development should be permitted in the C&O Canal National Historical Park.
- B. The wooded area upriver from the Washington Canoe Club should be preserved.
- C. The NPS feasibility study should be comprehensive; therefore, the project zone should be extended downriver to include the Georgetown Waterfront Park and Thompson's Boathouse.

Thank you.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 3**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: sally c. strain  
Organization: Defenders of Potomac River Parkland  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Palisades, Ward 3  
washington, DC 20016  
USA  
E-mail: seawalk@starpower.net

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/11/2012 Date Received: 01/11/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

Mr. Peter May, Associate Regional Director January 11, 2012

National Capital Region

National Park Service

U.S. Department of the Interior

Washington, DC 20240

Re: NPS Feasibility Study to Implement a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront

Dear Mr. May:

The purpose of this letter is to express our appreciation to the National Park Service for the decision to do a feasibility study for a boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront, and to share with you the basic position of the Defenders of Potomac River Parkland:

- A. No private development should be permitted in the C&O Canal National Historical Park.
- B. The wooded area upriver from the Washington Canoe Club should be preserved.
- C. The NPS feasibility study should be comprehensive; therefore, the project zone should be extended downriver to include the Georgetown Waterfront Park and Thompson's Boathouse.

For almost nine years, the Defenders, a coalition of more than twenty organizations, has opposed the proposal to build a massive private Georgetown University boathouse in the C&O Canal National Historical Park. During those years, we have offered many reasons why the plan is not in the public interest, such as: the site is a scenic wooded section between the busy Capital Crescent Trail and the Potomac River; it is situated next to the fragile and historic Canal towpath; it is a tidal floodplain that contains wetlands; it lies within the Potomac Gorge, one of the most biologically rich areas on the East Coast; and the parkland is part of a national, regional and local treasure used by thousands of daily walkers, bikers, birders, history enthusiasts, and visitors to our Nation's capital. These technical, environmental, economic, safety and practical considerations remain relevant today.

Alternative locations outside of the C&O Canal NHP for new boating facilities would provide advantages for everyone, while protecting the park from inappropriate development. In addition, a more accessible location downstream from the C&O gateway corridor would provide an opportunity for new facilities to be shared with other boating communities, including high school boating programs, instead of being used by only one group of athletes from one private university, as proposed by NPS in the past. We have made these points: in our letter of October 16, 2009, to NPS Director Jonathan Jarvis; in EIS Scoping Comments of January 13, 2008; in earlier EA comments; and in many public meetings. These constructive alternatives remain available.

We look forward to working with you and other NPS officials to find a way to both protect the C&O Canal NHP from unnecessary private development and provide appropriate new boating opportunities outside the national historical park.

Sincerely,

Sally Strain, Coordinator

## Defenders of Potomac River Parkland

[www.savethecanal.org](http://www.savethecanal.org)

Member organizations are: American Canoe Association ; American Hiking Society; American Whitewater Association; Appalachian Mountain Club; Audubon Naturalist Society; Canoe Cruisers Association; Clean Water Action; C&O Canal Association; Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail; Dupont Circle Conservancy; East Coast Greenway Alliance; Friends of the Earth; Global Green; League of Women Voters of DC; National Parks Conservation Association; Potomac Appalachian Trail Club; Potomac Conservancy; Potomac Heritage Trail Association; Potomac Pedalers Touring Club; Quantico Orienteering Club; Rails to Trails Conservancy; Sierra Club-DC Chapter; Washington Area Roadskaters; Washington Canoe Club; Western Lands Project.

cc. Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton; Councilmember Mary Cheh; DCWater Georget S. Hawkins; DCDOE Director Christophe Tulou; DCSHPO Officer David Maloney; C&O Canal NHPark Superintendent Kevin Brandt

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 4

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Rachel L. Stewart  
Organization: C & O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Arlington, VA 22205  
USA  
E-mail: Rachelstewa@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/19/2012 Date Received: 01/19/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

On behalf of the C&O Canal Association, I welcome the Feasibility Study to implement a non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront. It is certainly useful and timely for the National Park Service to identify and consider ways to improve boating access to the Potomac River, a very worthwhile goal.

NPS' announcement states that the study "will look at potential scenarios related to the waterfront that are consistent with the necessary and appropriate uses for this zone." One scenario that is definitely not among those appropriate uses is the construction of an intrusive private boathouse on a site within the C&O Canal National Historical Park. I hope that this will be recognized from the outset.

The C&O Canal NHP is a unique treasure that combines natural beauty and historical importance. The canal park belongs to everyone, and no part of it should be surrendered for private use. To do that would run counter to the legislation that created the park and to established NPS policy.

The Association, with over one thousand members, is an independent citizens association concerned with the conservation of the natural and historical environment of the C&O Canal and the Potomac River Basin. The Association supports the National Park Service in its efforts to preserve and promote the 184-mile towpath and the open spaces within the C&O Canal NHP. The Association looks forward to the feasibility study as a step toward enhancing boating opportunities while preserving the integrity of the C&O Canal NHP.

Rachel Stewart, President  
C&O Canal Association

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 5**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:



E-mail:

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/23/2012 Date Received: 01/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

I think that the non-motorized zone is a great idea and should be expanded.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 6

### Author Information

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: [REDACTED]  
Organization: C&O Canal Association, and as an individual citizen  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: New                      Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/29/2012          Date Received: 01/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1        Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No        Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am writing to express my support for the Feasibility Study to implement a non-motorized boathouse zone down river from Key Bridge, along the Potomac River waterfront at Georgetown. I am also expressing support for those organizations and individuals who oppose the construction of a private boathouse within the C&O Canal National Historical Park ? or any private-use structure within any National Park.

To quote Rachel Stewart's comments from January 19, 2012: "The C&O Canal NHP is a unique treasure that combines natural beauty and historical importance. The canal park belongs to everyone, and no part of it should be surrendered for private use. To do that would run counter to the legislation that created the park and to established NPS policy."

I grew up along the Canal and the Potomac River. I watched my father, Ken Rollins, fight along with many, many others for many years, for both stretches of water and their beautiful bordering lands to gain national recognition. I watched his frustration as the private boathouse plans moved forward; as he tried repeatedly to point out that proper procedures had not been followed, and that the land exchange proposed by GU was in no way a fair trade, and that the whole thing should never have gotten this far. But here we are.

My lifetime is full of canal and river memories. I am familiar with all the views of the Potomac and the Canal along the towpath from the beginning of the Canal in Georgetown to Great Falls and beyond.

It would be shameful for C&O National Historical Park visitors to either begin or end their experience

with a view of a large, private, intrusive structure rather than the current scenic view of the river. I imagine Justice William O. Douglas, who championed the cause to save the Canal, would be appalled at the thought of it.

I hope that a plan can be realized which will accommodate both Georgetown and George Washington Universities' needs, while enhancing the waterfront and honoring the Potomac's status as an American Heritage River, and leaving the C&O Canal Historical Park property intact.

Sincerely,

Celeste Rollins

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 7

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ned Preston  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6306 Swords Way  
Bethesda MD 20817  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA  
E-mail: presto77@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/30/2012 Date Received: 01/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

January 30, 2012

Mr. Peter May, Associate Regional Director  
National Capital Region, National Park Service  
1100 Ohio Drive SW  
Washington DC 20242

Dear Mr. May:

I hope that the Feasibility Study to Implement a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along Georgetown Waterfront will result in a positive outcome. It should be possible to enhance boating access without infringing upon historical and scenic assets that belong to the public as a whole. The following are my personal observations on the study as it has developed so far.

The study should be comprehensive in scope and therefore include the area from 34th Street to the Thompson Boat Center. It is important to take into account the role that the downriver area plays in existing and potential boating activities.

To avoid repeating the futility of the past EA/EIS process, the feasibility study should recognize that the C&O Canal National Historical Park is not a proper space for private development. The C&OCNHP's authority to engage in land exchanges should be used to enhance the NHP, not to create new enclaves within it.

Excellent opportunities exist for development of boating facilities downriver from the C&OCNHP. An appropriate site for construction of boathouse(s) that could be used by rowing teams exists immediately upriver from 34th Street. Although owned and administered by NPS, this area is not being used as parkland and is probably the least environmentally-sensitive part of the zone's shoreline. It could be developed for boating by NPS, or by private universities on the basis of leasing or fair purchase/land exchange transactions. There are also other publically-owned properties near the 34th Street location that are not being used as parkland and may have potential as sites for boating support facilities.

The study should recognize: that team rowing is only one of several popular boating activities in the zone; that boating of all kinds is only one category of desirable recreation practiced there; and that all recreational goals must respect scenic, environmental, and historical values.

Sincerely,

Edmund (Ned) Preston  
6306 Swords Way  
Bethesda MD 20817

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 8

### Author Information

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: [REDACTED]  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 02/03/2012 Date Received: 02/03/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I'm a bicyclist. I regularly use the Capital Crescent Trail for commuting and casual cycling. I hope that any design plan will continue to allow for the free flow of bicycle and foot traffic along the trail. I'm particularly concerned about crew teams carrying their boats through the area. This already creates hazzards in front of Jack's Boathouse, but at least there is a wide road at that point. If teams start shuttling watercraft along the trail it will become impassable.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 9

### Author Information

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: [REDACTED]  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 02/14/2012 Date Received: 02/14/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Briefly, I hope to see you keep the Washington Canoe Club building. I'm born and raised in the greater DC area and only discovered the club a few years ago, I now think of it as one of the great hidden gems of the nations capitol. I've never been a member, but have attended many events there since discovering it.

As an architectural historian, I believe the building itself is also worth preserving. I recognize this is something of a debate. The building and the club, however, are clearly the cornerstone to this document. This is the oldest boathouse in the NPS non-motorized boathouse zone and therefore the foundation for this zone. Despite its weathered appearance, the WCC shows that it has been cared for by many generations of families. While some of the facilities obviously need a facelift, some parts of the building are beautiful in their current condition, primarily the trophy room with its polished floors and a hundred years of tarnished silver trophies and deserve to be preserved. It may not be in good shape now, but it is still a beautiful example of a Victorian boat house - the only one of its kind in DC.

And I hope the NPS will find a way to do this while respecting the history of the building and its users, preferably by allowing the people who have used it and cared for it for over 140 years to continue using it and opening it up to more people to discover. I worry that if the park service makes this a public only facility, some of the heart of the building (the family potlucks, the January oyster roast, the crab feast in the summer) will get lost and discarded. Hopefully the park service will move forward with sensitivity on this project, recognize the one building where these non-motorized boathouses all began, and do the right thing by preserving this fantastic treasure of the city.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 10

### Author Information

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:



E-mail: 

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 02/14/2012 Date Received: 02/14/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Thank you for the thorough presentation Dec.13 entitled -feasibility study to implement a nonmotorized boathouse zone along the georgetown waterfront. We wish to offer our opinion, comments, and suggestions regarding the proposal. We oppose the park services proposal, as it apparently ignores and avoids the largest stakeholders of the georgetown waterfront- namely the powerboaters of the entire chesapeake region. We believe, and it is unfortunate, that up to this point we have not been included in the process of improving and providing our expertise in the georgetown riverside experience. We believe that the previous plans and studies are outdated, non inclusive, and are irrelevant considering the modern needs of the boating community. The members of the National Potomac Yacht Club, The Potomac River Yacht Club Association, The Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association, independent boaters, and registered boaters of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia have grown substantially in the past 20 years since those studies were produced.

Powerboaters far outnumber non motorized boaters. The acute lack of docking facilities along the georgetown waterfront, and transient docking in all of Washington are obvious. Of the approximately 3000 feet of waterfront extending from thompsons boathouse north past the washington canoe club there is only 500 feet for powerboat docking. 100 feet had additionally been removed to provide for tour boats and police boat use. The new park as easy as it would have been, also failed to consider the needs of the boating community when it was built and did not include docking facilities. The remainder of approximately 2000 feet have been dedicated to canoes, rowboats kayaks and crew- a relatively small population. Considering some boats that now dock at the washington harbour exceed 80 feet in length, space is limited, forcing side by side raft ups on some days to exceed 10 boats and total volume to exceed 100 boats. The amount of waterfront that the non motorized boats use during the winter months or at night is easy to calculate-exactly zero, a total waste of space during that time. Many powerboats are on the river all year long and to a large extent at night and enjoy the Georgetown waters of the potomac river .

The amount of space, over 2000 feet including Thompsons, that you proposed dedicated to non powerboats sole use is unreasonable, a waste of prime real estate, and simply unfair. There is absolutely no reason not to allow and include powerboat docking in that area.

The waterfront at Georgetown is one of the prime, if not the prime destination spots on the Potomac River for powerboats. We believe that the river and the waterfront should be shared by all, and not restricted in any manner. The park is for the preservation and benefit of all of the public. There is absolutely no reason to limit the area in question to non powerboats. Non powerboats do not have any special needs or requirements for launching or storing. Additionally, note that the crew boats do in fact have motorized follow boats alongside. Rules of the road, navigation rules, and admiralty law applies to all water vessels. Furthermore, there is no safety issue regarding power and non power boats co-existing. There is obviously much room available for powerboat docking alongside crewboats and rowboat docking. The physical docks are similar.

We propose that at minimal cost and great benefit, that the plans for the zone in question include dockage for powerboats. We do not propose or request any other special needs such as electric, fuel, pumpout, or any structures- just an environmental friendly simple dock capable of handling power and non powerboats alike. As the largest stakeholder and user of the Potomac River and the Georgetown waterfront, we request and expect to be included in any further discussion and planning of the Georgetown waterfront. As stakeholders, the following entities and organizations should also be included in any discussions and planning of the Georgetown waterfront- The Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association, The Potomac River Yacht Club Association, The District Yacht Club, Seafarers Yacht Club, Capital Yacht Club, District Yacht Club, The National Potomac Yacht Club and all other yacht clubs in the Potomac region. Thank you for your kind attention...

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 11

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Chalres E. Holden  
Organization: Level walker C&O Canal  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Delaplane, VA 20144  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 02/23/2012 Date Received: 02/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Intrusion onto public lands should not take place without the facility serving the public. If this is to take place then the Boat House should be available for public use at all times it is open.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 12

### Author Information

Keep Private: Yes  
Name: [REDACTED]  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/02/2012 Date Received: 03/02/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am in full support of the public water access in Georgetown. Having lived in DC for the last 12 years it always bothered me the lack of any water access on Potomac in Georgetown area.

While the study has a footnote listing existing facilities for non-motorized launch zone (Canoe Club, Jack's Boathouse, Potomac Boat Club)it fails to mention that these access are private. In other words the policy of these establishments prevent launch of anybody unless you are part of the club or pay a fee. The general attitude of management of these clubs, "you are not a member - we don't want you here".

There is a huge water culture in the area with no access. With the emergence of Stand Up Paddling (SUP), I know dozens of people that struggle to get access to Potomac. The closest ares to launch is Fletcher's boathouse where one also have to pay a fee, but everybody launches from the park side. That, to my understanding is illegal but the only option nevertheless.

The other public launch place is by National Airport at Gravelly Point park likely 5 miles downstream.

Anyway, in conclusion let me reiterate my full support of public non-motorized launch place in Georgetown. I speak for many SUP and other water enthusiast of the DC area.

Thank you, Mike Blinov

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 13

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: DJ Manalo  
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association, Inc  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: P.O. Box 341, Greenbelt, MD 20768  
Greenbelt, MD 20768  
USA  
E-mail: dj.manalo@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/07/2012 Date Received: 03/07/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I. CPA Letter - NMBZ Georgetown Waterfront ? Feasibility Study Workshop

Ms. Tammy Stidman,  
National Park Service ? National Capital Region  
(202) 619-7474  
tammy\_stidham@nps.gov March 7, 2012

Dear Ms. Tammy Stidham,

We wish to thank you and the National Park Service for hosting and conducting the March 3rd Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone (NMBZ) Feasibility Study Workshop in such a highly organized, thoughtful and constructive manner. Both of us from the Chesapeake Paddlers Association (CPA) were very pleased to participate, and to experience the cooperative spirit that was demonstrated by all participants.

We were especially pleased to see that there was apparently universal support for including a General Public Access Site for all paddlers within the NMBZ Plan; a consensus that the Washington Canoe Club should be preserved to continue its contributions to the paddling community, in addition to its historical and cultural value; and general support for additional boathouses for Georgetown University and other collegiate rowing teams.

As detailed in the CPA information packet that we provided the NPS, CPA strongly supports the construction of a NPS-designated car-top boat launching site(s) for paddle craft in the proposed NPS

NMBZ Development Plan at Georgetown. During the workshop, we also requested that NPS consider the feasibility of expanding its NMBZ Development Plan to include a car-top launching site along NPS property in Rosslyn, Virginia.

Attached is our synopsis of topics that emerged during the workshop discussion and some recommendations. These are provided in the hope that they will be useful to you as this project moves forward.

In closing, we are encouraged and hopeful that these efforts will soon lead to the creation and development of a Georgetown Waterfront NMBZ. We look forward to working with the National Park Service to facilitate this process.

Sincerely,

Dom J. Manalo ("DJ")  
Charles R. Haberlein, Jr. ("Chuck")

Chesapeake Paddlers Association, Inc.  
P.O. Box 341  
Greenbelt, MD 20768  
www.CPAKayakers.com

---

## II: CPA Attachment: Summary Minutes/Comments during Feasibility Workshop (03-Mar-2012)

At the meeting, the provided site map was studied and the following approximate waterfront length of each proposed site was measured.

These figures, and the associated comments, may be useful for evaluating the various proposals:

- 1) Site A: Westernmost site -- 300 feet
- 2) Site B: Washington Canoe Club -- 150 feet;
- 3) Site C : -- 200 feet. Note: This site's full development potential may not be available for another ten to fifteen years, due to planning and possible construction of a sewage runoff catchment tunnel under the DC waterfront area from 2015-2025.
- 4) Potomac Boat Club -- 175 to 150 feet (The exact width of this site was a bit vague). Since the PBC site is already under private ownership, it is not a formal part of the NMBZ project;
- 5) Site D -- 125 to 150 feet (plus space possibly available under the DC end of Key Bridge). As it is adjacent to the Potomac Boat Club site, Side D's exact width was also a bit vague;
- 6) Site E -- Easternmost site, immediately east of Key Bridge) -- 250 feet.

### B. Analysis of the proposals made by the ten workshop teams:

1) There was a preponderance of support for "bookending" the development area with university boathouses, with six of the ten workshop teams preferring this option). This layout provides maximum waterfront length for the two school facilities, but has two very serious problems:

- (a) There was strong opposition from some participants to major development on site A.

(b) Site A would be difficult for large trucks & trailers to transport rowing shells and would require more roadwork along the entire development area.

2) Placing the two university boathouses on the eastern side of the NMBZ Development Plan (Sites D & E), with three or four workshop teams favoring this option. This plan would concentrate rowing activity adjacent to Georgetown Waterfront Park, while paddle-propelled craft would be concentrated in the western part of the Zone (Sites A-C). This arrangement would essentially subdivide the NMBZ boating zone into two sections ("city" and "country"), separated by the Aquaduct on the west side of the Potomac Boat Club.

(a) Advantages include: reduced road development along the NMBZ, maximum feasible turning space for rowing shell transport by trucks & trailers, less possible congestion/ by boaters, and limiting the impact of development at Site A.

(b) Disadvantages include: a much shorter site for one boathouse (possibly mitigated by use of space under Key bridge) and the necessity of moving Jack's somewhere else within the development area. During the team presentations, the owner of Jack's Boathouse, who was present, stated at the meeting that they own some property at the site to emphasize their stake at the current site adjacent to Key Bridge.

3) There was a clear (virtually unanimous) preference for keeping Washington Canoe Club "as is/where it is", with some recommendations that it be renovated for historical preservation. It was unclear how WCC could undertake renovation and rehabilitation efforts without special leasing and financing arrangements with the Park Service and/or other interests.

4) There was also clear support for having two public access boat launch sites, in addition to Jack's Boathouse: One for cartop/"carry-in" access and the other for rowing/sculling teams not affiliated with Georgetown and George Washington Universities.

In evaluating these complex issues, the CPA participants supported the recommendation for University rowing teams boathouse facilities at Sites D & E. This should satisfy the training and racing activities of collegiate rowing teams, while addressing the strong desire of various conservation and neighborhood groups that Site A not be heavily developed. Pending completion of the tunnel project by 2025, our workshop group (Team 9) reasoned that Section C would be minimally accessible and therefore should be minimally developed for kayak, canoe & SUP launching.

Finally, CPA supports recommendations by various teams that additional parking be made available on-site. We also wish to note that the current 2 hour time limits on Waterfront meters are much too short for typical paddlers use and recommend that maximum parking limits be increased to at least 4 hours, along the NMBZ. Also discussed was the feasibility of designating a NMBZ Car-top boat launch site at NPS property along the Rosslyn waterfront, which should significantly relieve pedestrian and traffic congestion along the NMBZ-Georgetown waterfront, as detailed in our submission brief to NPS at the meeting.

-----

Cc'd a Pdf copy to Tammy Stidham, NPS (tammy\_stidham@nps.gov)

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 14

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Christopher Niebyski  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: c2027426884n@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/08/2012 Date Received: 03/08/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The planned boathouse zone at the end of Water St. (trail head of the Capital Crescent Trail) has the potential to introduce significantly more motorized vehicle traffic along Water St. This comment focuses on the increase in traffic along Water St - outside of NPS jurisdiction. However, in so far as NPS will be working with DDOT on the entire site plan and development, traffic along Water St. should be considered as part of the overall NPS feasibility study.

As use of the boathouse facilities is likely to occur during warm-weather, daylight hours, the greatest influx of motor traffic is also likely to coincide with peak usage of the CCT trail by cyclists and pedestrians.

Currently, the traffic signage along Water St. is poorly located and produces an unintended effect. The "No Outlet" sign for Water St. is placed at the very end of the St. - at the trail head for the CCT. This means that vehicles (frequently out-of-town drivers who mistakenly think they are driving along the Whitehurst Freeway because of confusion with GPS/maps) end up driving all the way to the end of Water St. only to discover there the deadend. Frustrated, many of those drivers turn around and speed back up Water St. looking for a way out. Water St. is the access road for pedestrians and cyclists accessing the CCT and there is no sidewalk, nor are there any center-line markings after the intersection with 34th St. Frustrated drivers, pedestrians and cyclists, and these inadequate road conditions make for a dangerous mix.

As part of the boathouse zone development, additional " No Outlet" signage should be installed at the intersection of Water St. and Potomac St. (the last intersection along Water St. with an outlet). Such signage should help cut down on the amount of drivers mistakenly driving down Water St. in search of an

exit.

Please see a PDF with images of the above described: <http://min.us/mbdJVrZKuV>

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 15

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Bethesda, MD 20816  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/09/2012 Date Received: 03/09/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I strongly oppose the ceding of public land that benefits all citizens to the use of a single, private, elite organization i.e. Georgetown University for the purpose of building a boathouse that will benefit only a select few. This is a betrayal of the public trust and denial of the public interest. Georgetown University has no right to take over public land and deny the citizens the benefit thereof.

This land is environmentally sensitive, heavily used by the public, and contains rich historical assets. It is integral to free passage along the C&O Canal. The general public cannot go elsewhere. Georgetown University can.

It is wholly inappropriate for this private interest to seek to divert its use and deprive the public of it in order to satisfy its own greedy appetite.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 16

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Eric M. Fisher  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1639 Cecile St.  
McLean, VA 22101  
USA  
E-mail: efisher57@yahoo.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/13/2012 Date Received: 03/13/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I'm totally in favor of a non-motorized PUBLIC boathouse zone. Construction of private boathouses anywhere on public land on the Potomac should be forbidden until the demand for public space has been met. It's not clear from the March 3 slides to what extent this has been examined, but the statement about 85-100 additional racks for scholastic rowing is encouraging.

The NPS commissioned the draft assessment for the Arlington Boathouse in 2004. I wonder how they're progressing with that. If it is feasible to construct a boathouse in Virginia, the demand for space in Georgetown would be appreciably reduced, possibly even to the point where it would be conscionable to consider allowing another private boathouse.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 17

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Arne Paulson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/15/2012 Date Received: 03/15/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Yesterday, my wife and I were walking along the stretch of K Street, under the Whitehurst Freeway, near the Key Bridge end of the new Georgetown waterfront park. We noticed that while the park itself is beautiful, there are still a number of desolate looking vacant lots between the western end of the park and Jack's boathouse, which surely could be put to some more productive use. We both said, "why don't they use this land for the boathouses that the local universities want to build?" So, I was pleasantly surprised to read in the Georgetown Current this morning that this is, indeed, under consideration. As a DC native and longtime resident of the Foxhall Village area of Georgetown, I would strongly support use of those vacant lots for construction of a boathouse for university sculling crews, rather than sacrificing parkland in the C&O National Park.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 18

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carl A. Linden  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Bethesda, MD 20816  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/16/2012 Date Received: 03/16/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 14, 2012

Mr. Peter May  
Associate Regional Director  
National Capital Region  
National Park Service  
C/o Tammy Stidham  
1100 Ohio Drive, SW  
Washington, D.C 20242

Dear Mr. May,

Here are my comments on the NPS boathouse zone study that is currently being conducted under your direction.

It is important to keep in mind that the difficult issues that have swirled around the question of building boathouses along the Georgetown waterfront began with a false start. It is to be hoped that the Park Service this time will make a right start with its current feasibility study for a boating facility zone along the Georgetown waterfront.

The false start began when Georgetown University set out to convert part of a National Historical Park directly below the university into its private preserve. Its aim was to erect a giant boathouse there. Three

"alternatives" were presented soaring up to 20,000 sq. ft. with several stories rising at their peak even higher than the adjacent C&O Canal berm, the towpath and the canal.

That the site was ill-suited to accommodate a large boating facility evidently was not seen as an obstacle to the project. The oversized building would have been crammed into a tight spot hardly accessible by motor vehicles and with scarcely any space available for parking and would create a hazardous chokepoint at a major entrance way to the national park that has an inflow of some four million visitors per annum. An influx of cyclists, joggers and hikers passes this point daily.

It is hard to believe that the U.S. Code on administering our national parks or the strictures of the legislation establishing the C&O Canal National Historical Park were given much attention as this plan was being advanced. The Code asserts that no activities are to be authorized "in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been directly and specifically provided by Congress." [16 USC Sec 1-a-1 (2000)]. Public Law 91.064, which established the C&O Canal NHP, clearly states its purpose: "to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and to develop the potential of the canal for public recreation [emphasis added], including such restoration as may be needed." The intent of the legislation is clear. It does not contemplate accommodating the boating program of private institutions or ceding any of its territory to such a purpose.

The misconceived boathouse plan, which came close to realization as the "preferred alternative" of a draft Environmental Assessment, should not be considered as a possible outcome in the NPS study of the feasibility of boating facilities along the stipulated "zone" along the Georgetown waterfront. It should be clear that the site GU has sought in the past ought to be off limits, and that sites on the other side of Key Bridge are both defensible and appropriate for team rowing facilities

All best regards,

Carl Linden

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 19

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lorraine Minor  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Cabin John, MD 20818  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/16/2012 Date Received: 03/16/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am concerned about the possibility of building a non-motorized facility in the area being studied. It appears that such a facility would not be hidden from users of either the C&O Canal towpath or the Capital Crescent Trail and thus would intrude on the experience of people using these resources. In addition, during construction of such a facility, users would be severely impacted to the point that access may be denied and the fragile ecosystem and historic sites could be damaged. It would be much better to build such a facility outside the boundaries of the park.





# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 22

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary Mclaughlin  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 2451 39th PL NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: Mmclaughli@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/21/2012 Date Received: 03/21/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

After living in WDC over twenty years, and watching this issue swirl in the news every few years, I feel the current boathouse situation should stay the same. PBC, Jack's boathouse, the canoe club, and thompson's boathouse are all buildings that flood annually at peak rainfall. There is no place to add parking, Georgetown can find places in other parts of the city to go build and then row.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 23

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Susan Spaulding  
Organization: Potomac Boat Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Washington, DC 20016  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/22/2012 Date Received: 03/22/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I wholeheartedly support additional boathouse facilities along the Potomac River in Georgetown, upstream of the old aqueduct bridge, downstream of the old aqueduct bridge, anywhere! Public, private or co-mingled. Our community is sorely lacking to fulfill public demand for these types of resources.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 24

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John V. Surr  
Organization: C&O Canal Assn., Potomac Riverkeeper, Potomac Conservancy, etc.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 8217 Lilly Stone Dr.,  
Bethesda, MD 20817-4505  
USA  
E-mail: jsurr@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/22/2012 Date Received: 03/22/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Wild places in the District of Columbia are under continuing threat. The NPS should not add to those threats by allowing buildings and other signs of civilization along the riverbanks upstream from where they are today. Every time I drive along Canal Road and the Clara Barton Parkway or walk along the towpath I cherish the wilderness that penetrates downtown DC and Georgetown. Please don't mess with the glories of nature, increasingly threatened in this urban area. The incursions of a century or more ago have been quite enough. Because inholders have built up above the Key Bridge, more construction between those boathouses might be contemplated, as long as they don't upset the ecology or interfere with the riverscape in the area.



**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 26**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Diane D. summerhill  
Organization: C &O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 610 KleeMill Road  
westminster MD 21157  
Westminster, MD 21157  
USA  
E-mail: revmom34@msn.com

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

The C&O Canal is for the benefit and recreationh of all Ameraicans. I hope you don't gaive the Univaersity permission to build the boathouse on the canal . It can be built further down the river, where it won't impede travel on the towpath.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 27

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Bethesda, MD 20816  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am a native Washingtonian born in 1942. The C&O Canal has been a big part of my life as a youngster and presently continues as such. We are so lucky to have this wonderful park to enjoy in all seasons of the year. I bike to Georgetown quite often, and must be perfectly honest that the location of the proposed boat house at this point in time is a teal eyesore. I understand the problem of building on park land, but consider a place like Fletcher's Boat House which has been a benefit to our community ever since I can remember.

If the proposed site is developed in a style which is environmentally appropriate, I can only think it would enhance the beauty of the canal as one enters into Georgetown.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 28

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert D. Rales  
Organization: Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1738 Susquehannock Drive  
McLean VA 22101  
McLean, VA 22101  
USA  
E-mail: bobrakes@aol.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Go build the proposed boathouse someplace else and not on prime public property. I find the proposal disgusting. There are some entitled individuals who think the public park property is for their exclusive pleasure and recreation at the expense and exclusion of others.

I once read in the Washington Post that Jack Kent Cook used some of the public property adjacent to his DC home to enhance his driveway. I read that Ross Perot blasted away part of a coral formation in Bermuda so he would have a convenient place to dock his private boat.

The move and attempt to make some of the C&O Canal property for the use of a select group of people is not ethical and pretty selfish. I think the Park Service has a responsibility to maintain the C&O Canal Park for all.

Robert Rakes

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 29

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: michael bucci  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 114 woodland rd  
gaithersburg, MD 20877  
USA  
E-mail: bucci114@starpower.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I think it is a dangerous precedent to allow a private facility to be built within the confines of a National Park. I think it will not enhance the park experience. I believe there is land elsewhere that Georgetown U could use that would lessen its impact on the park.

I am lifelong (62 years so far) lover of the C&O, participate with NPS as a Level Walker, caring for 2 levels in Brunswick and Hancock. Please do not allow the boathouse to be built as planned.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 30

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Terry Proescholdt  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 104 East 5th street  
Frederick, MD 21701  
USA  
E-mail: terry.proescholdt@fda.hhs.gov

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The C&O canal and the Potomac valley are phenominal recreational and environmental assets. More land should be acquired for this corridor rather than taken away. This is especially critical in the urban aeas of the corridor; undeveloped areas are rare. Because of that, the proposed boathouse should not be built where proposed. Perhaps the university should build the structure on their property and be given an easement for a tunnel to the river.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 31

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Michael D. Miller  
Organization: C&O Canal  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1568 Runnymede Road  
Bunker Hill, WV 25413  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

"Progress" has claimed so many important public, historical venues already. Have the common sense to stop this before it escalates out of control.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 32**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Paul H. H. Meijer  
Organization: Catholic University  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1438 Geranium St. NW  
Washington, DC 20012  
USA  
E-mail: meijer@cua.edu

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/23/2012 Date Received: 03/23/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

Please NO private boathouse on NPS land!

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 33**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Alfred R. Sorkowitz  
Organization: Citizen of Virginia  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1216 N Evergreen St  
Arlington, VA 22205  
Arlington, VA 22205  
USA  
E-mail: sork1@hotmail.com

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/24/2012 Date Received: 03/24/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

The C&O National Park, like all other National Parks, is public land for the benefit of the public. It is not to be given away to the organizations with political clout.

Using political clout to take away National Park land is a process that should not be encouraged.

Respectfully,  
Alfred Sorkowitz

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 34

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mike Cianciosi  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3044 Talking Rock Drive  
Fairfax, VA 22031  
USA  
E-mail: chosi@cox.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New                      Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/24/2012              Date Received: 03/24/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1              Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No              Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

My biggest concern is that the remains of the old aqueduct be preserved. It is an important part of Georgetown's history.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 35

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization: C&O Canal association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
silver spring, MD 20902  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/24/2012 Date Received: 03/24/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The C&O Canal and towpath are a national treasure and it should not be compromised. I use the towpath regularly to cycle and enjoy it. It gives me great pride when I hear other languages spoken and know that they are enjoying not only DC but the towpath. I am currently ISO of a route in England and think of how nice it is to have this continuous path to cycle from DC to PA in my backyard. Why disturb and destroy a NHP that belongs to everyone for private use that only a few can enjoy? What happens with the 4 million+ visitors that use the NHP? I cannot believe this is even being considered. Justice Douglas created this national park for everyone not the rowing team. He created this park to protect it, so private enterprises are not created for the chosen few! DO NOT destroy the C&OCNHP.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 36

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John Barnett  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Washington, DC 20037-2639  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/24/2012 Date Received: 03/24/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

In my opinion, the only possible location for another boating facility would be on the land just east of the Key Bridge and ending at the newly developed Georgetown Waterfront Park. I also think that such a facility should be open to the Thompson's Boathouse concession with the understanding that GWU, GU and others would participate in its use as space allows. Further (and as I have written the media in the past) to me the most practical solution and one which would not violate space requirements as well as asthetic quality would be to take advantage of the growing desirability of the Anacostia River area where stunning change is taking place and where an ideal location could be found for boating facilities with plenty of parking space and boat storage, etc. and accessible via Metro.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 37

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Harold Hankins  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Chambersburg, PA 17201  
USA  
E-mail: hwhankins@yahoo.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I think that the boathouse should not be located on (or near) NHP land. The park was created to preserve a part of this nation's history. The park also provides a safe habitat for many species of plants and animals. Construction and maintenance of a boathouse would present too many oppertunities for irreparable damage to the canal, canal structures, and the habitats of the area. If there is a suitable piece of land further downstream, it should be used instead.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 38

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Shira Horowitz  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3621 Childs Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
USA  
E-mail: shira.horowitz@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I've biked the C&O Canal several times with lot of different people, and I think it is a resource worth protecting. The part of the zone that is within the C&OCNHP belongs to everyone -- it is not available for creation of a private enclave. Land exists downriver from the C&OCNHP that is suitable for new team rowing facilities.

Any new boating facilities should be appropriate to their environmental and historical settings.

PlESE protect this lovely resource for everyone!

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 39

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Rachael B. Hittinger  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Pittsburgh , PA 15232  
USA  
E-mail: Super7Rachael@gmail.com

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

My husband & I have been biking on the canal for nearly a decade. We started an annual ride to cumberland, and now ride to pittsburgh from DC. This year we'll be bringing our one year old daughter on this safe, family friendly, Public trail. It is so important that this trail remain open to the public. Please do not encourage the privatization of any part of this beautiful canal. I support a public non motorized boating area. It is unreasonable to make any part of this historic trail private. I hope that as my daughter grows she will continue to have access to the entire Historic canal area.  
Sincerely,  
Rachael

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 40

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John Belz  
Organization: C&O Canal Assn.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3840 Lorcom Lane  
Arlington, VA 22207  
USA  
E-mail: Jjbelz@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New                      Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012              Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1              Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No              Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am opposed to any large-scale private development along the canal on the order of what is being considered by the Georgetown boathouse. This area is too pristine and important to despoil with such a massive structure.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 41

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: nicholas p. russo  
Organization: C & o canal association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 7075 sandwich lane, fayetteville, pa 17222  
fayetteville, PA 17222  
USA  
E-mail: nrusso7075@comcast.net

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

The integrity of this wonderful national treasure that is enjoyed by millions internationally in Georgetown needs to

remain solely in the public domain, with no possible impact by a private enterprise.

All facilities are entrusted to the public domain and adjoining facilities and property need to be assured that there is no possible

encroachment of its mission and purpose.

Do not let private owners near this national treasure.



**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 43**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Marion Robertson  
Organization: C and O canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Chevy Chase, MD 20815  
USA

E-mail:

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 03/25/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

I am opposed to the Boathouse being built on NPS land. This area is for the use of all people and not just a few boaters. There is land downriver that would be suitable for such an enterprise, however, and I urge you to consider that option. Thank you for your consideration. Marion Robertson

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 44**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Pamela K. Lantz  
Organization: C&O CANAL ASSOCIATION member  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 2305 45Th street  
Parkersburg, WV 26104  
USA  
E-mail: pamlantz@suddenlink.net

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

I stand with the C&O CANAL Association in their opposition

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 45

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Reader:

The construction of a private boathouse within the C&O Canal NHP is a bad idea, and one that will only serve to degrade the park.

The C&O NHP belongs to the public; sections of it should not be taken away for the use of private institutions.

There are land parcels nearby, outside of the NHP, that Georgetown University could acquire through a traditional private market purchase.

The entry to the C&O Canal NHP near this proposed boathouse is one of the busiest in the NHP. This facility will impede the public's access.

This proposed facility is not in keeping with the historic or environmental setting of the canal.

This project is not a good idea and it will harm the park.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 46**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Vicki Dodson  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1004 Union Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21211  
USA  
E-mail: vicki.dodson@gmail.com

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

No Georgetown boathouse...Please limit development along the entire Potomac River, regardless of function. Areas along the West Virginia and Virginia banks are already developed, detracting from natural views. The Potomac is where many thousands of people seek nature, recreation and an escape from visual reminders of "the hand of man." Please help it remain so.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 47

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Maston Gray  
Organization: Self and C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 8718 Higdon Dr  
Vienna / Tysons Corner, VA 22182  
USA  
E-mail: maston.gray@cox.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I have used the C&O Canal NP since 1977 on a regular basis for hiking, running, bicycle camping, and annual Christmas and Easter Family Walks. Wm O. Douglas performed a miracle when he saved the Canal from becoming a modern highway. We treasure it because it gets us back to our roots, as a persona and common good. No national park should be "leased" to a private group, with influence, for their needs against the basis for establishing the Park in the first place. I am strongly opposed to the encroachment and all it stands for, and so is my Organizaton - C&O Canal Association.

Here are some points to focus the decision makeing:

1. The part of the zone that is within the C&OCNHP belongs to everyone -- it is not available for creation of a private enclave.
2. Land exists downriver from the C&OCNHP that is suitable for new team rowing facilities.
3. Georgetown area is one of the busiest gateways to the C&OCNHP, which had more than 4 million visitors in 2011.
4. Any new boating facilities should be appropriate to their environmental and historical settings.
5. Favoring specific groups for "utilization" of public lands and National Parks is a trend we as taxpayers cannot support. Why not drill for oil on the C&O NHP lands? Why not open it up to all terrain vehicles for "mud courses" to drive and tear up?

If you owned property on the river as a Family, would you want a private boathouse from an influential and powerful university built next door?

We cannot give away our future children's park land for the benefit of a select group that thinks they are above the NPS laws and have the money and influence to make this even a topic of discussion.

ML Gray



# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 49

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William H. Justice  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 19114 Cherry Tree Dr  
Hagerstown, MD 21742  
USA  
E-mail: whjustice@msn.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

When taking action which may reduce the public wellbeing (access to public facilities, personal pleasure, scenic pleasure, freedom from adverse distraction, etc) it should be foremost in consideration that the action be taken will be irreversible and that any loss to the public wellbeing will be permanent. The boathouse as presently planned will benefit few and will detract from the pleasure of many. There are alternative sites that would not be so intrusive and that should satisfy the needs or desires of the boaters/partiers of Georgetown U.  
What is that term? DO NO HARM!!

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 50

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William Holdsworth  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 10 Radburn Ct.  
Rockville, MD 20850  
USA  
E-mail: w.holdsworth@att.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/26/2012 Date Received: 03/26/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I welcome the park service efforts to facilitate the recreation use of the Potomac River in Georgetown. I have concerns that I hope the park service will consider in any recommendations it makes.

The land upstream from Alexandria Aqueduct is not suitable for a large boathouse. This area is the start of Capital Crescent Trail. The physical site is constrained the C&O Canal towpath. Construction of a large building will inevitably constrict users of the trail. Vehicular access to a boathouse in this area would create even more problems for users of the trail.

Public parkland should not be used for private purposes. Georgetown University has proposed a land swap that would allow them to build a large boathouse immediately upstream from the Washington Canoe Club. Such usage of public parkland is inappropriate. I don't see how such a land swap benefits the thousands of users of the C&O Canal and the Capital Crescent Trail.

The exclusion of Thompson's boathouse from the study is a serious omission. That facility is an important part of addressing the needs of the rowing community. In developing a plan for all non-motorized boat usage, options for that site should be considered.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 51

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Grant C. Reynolds  
Organization: Tinmouth Historical and Genealogical Society  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 45 Mountain View Road  
Tinmouth, VT 05773  
USA  
E-mail: grant62@vermontel.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/27/2012 Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

1. While expanding the boathouse zone to the east is desirable, it should go all the way to Thompson's boathouse. The proposal still squeezes possible boathouses into a small amount of shoreline.
2. No private boathouses should be permitted on National Park land. If boathouses are to be erected on parkland, they should be publically owned and open to all. College crews should be required to share space with other college and high school crews.
3. Any new boathouses, public or private, should be in scale with their surroundings, and limited to a facility for storage and launching of boats. The Georgetown proposal was far too large. Its size resulted from the inclusion of elements not required for the storage and launching of rowing shells, such as what was essentially a party house. Had they stuck to the original proposal of 4000 square feet, just for boating purposes, they'd have been rowing out of it years ago. Only that proposal, not the later gigantic one, was approved by the the C&O Canal Commission.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 52

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ernest C. Raskauskas  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3109 South St NW  
Washington DC 20007  
Washinton, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: constant777@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/27/2012 Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I urge the following points concerning the C&O Canal Park:

- a) The C&O Canal Park deserves protection from private development. The east end of the canal, passing through Georgetown, already has an intense amount of private development immediately adjacent to the Park, that provides food, goods, and services of every imaginable description. There is no need to extend this commercialization to intrude into the parkland and river, which represent a very scarce resource for park users.
- b) Commercialization of the Canal Park would adversely affect the many persons who use the park for photography opportunities. The sight lines would be encroached, and the existing gorgeous nature would be adversely impacted.
- c) Commercialization of the Canal Park will add to trash problems in the park, making the park less hospitable to wild life, as well as unsightly and unsanitary for park users.
- d) Commercialization of the park will not bring visitors to the C & O Canal who primarily are interested in the beautiful nature, but rather "shoppers" looking for another "food court" as in a shopping mall, or simply another commercial experience, rather than a unique urban parkland.
- e) The wooded tidal flood plain northwest of the Washington Canoe Club also needs additional protection and preservation in its wilder state. The area provides essential habitat for wild life, especially birds. Bird watchers access the park and its bird watching opportunities in this area.

f) The boathouse study zone needs extension further down the river to include the Thompson Boat Center and all locations along the route. This is necessary to protect wildlife, control trash, water pollution from some watercraft, and because it is a necessary supporting and contributing area adjacent to the Canal Park which is already intensely developed. The fragile Park that is left can not support additional commercialization.

g) The C&O Canal Park is already well-used by visitors for many purposes. Added commercialization would greatly, and perhaps dangerously add to the visitors to the Canal Park, which is a fragile ecosystem. A substantial increase in human visitors using the C&O Canal Park would make the narrow paths dangerous and not useable as they currently are used by walkers, runners, bicyclists, bird and nature watchers, who all are currently mutually respectful in sharing the narrow path together. Dense crowding will adversely impact the comity that currently exists, and will increase injuries of people using the paths.

h) I am often awestruck by the beautiful contrast of the herons alighting along the canal stretch in Georgetown. This beautiful sight will be lost to the elderly, disabled, and parents with small children who access the canal in Georgetown or at Fletcher's Boathouse to use the stretch along the Georgetown waterfront if commercial development scares away wild life from using these areas themselves.

As a native Washingtonian, I have taken friends and relatives from all of the country and the world to see our city's beauties, for many years. As I child, I encountered Justice Douglas along the C&O Canal, and recall the attraction to the canal of the new arrivals to Washington during the rage of 50 Mile Hikes. All are so greatly impressed by the uniqueness of the C&O Canal Park, which so greatly contributes to Washington's reputation as a beautiful green city. Let's not destroy this with floating restaurants and mini-malls, nor impact the "wild and natural" look of the Canal Park by leaving only manicured landscaping to represent "nature".

Thank-you for your consideration of these points. Please protect the park.

Very truly yours,

Ernest C. Raskauskas, Jr.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 53

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: richard b. whitmire  
Organization: Washington Canoe Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1726 n. wayne st  
arlington va  
arlington, VA 22201  
USA  
E-mail: richard.whitmire@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/27/2012 Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I joined the Washington Canoe Club soon after arriving in Washington in 1981 to take a job as a journalist. My wife and I each have a sprint kayak stored at the site. We are regular paddlers and strong supporters of having a contingent of kayakers on the Potomac -- not just rowers. The vitality of the Washington waterfront depends on having multiple uses on the water. If that is nurtured by the NPS and others, I can envision a day when the Washington waterfront will become a major tourist attraction. Not only would there be more rowers/paddlers on the river, but there would be more spectators as well. When I say that, I have the Philadelphia waterfront in mind, a site with a fraction of the resource potential we have here with the Potomac/Kennedy Center, monuments, etc.

I hope the NPS does everything possible to support kayakers on the Potomac.

Thanks, Richard Whitmire

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 54

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Grant C. Reynolds  
Organization: Tinmouth Historical and Genealogical Society  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 45 Mountain View Road  
Tinmouth, VT 05773  
USA  
E-mail: grant62@vermontel.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/27/2012 Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

1. While expanding the boathouse zone to the east is desirable, it should go all the way to Thompson's boathouse. The proposal still squeezes possible boathouses into a small amount of shoreline.
2. No private boathouses should be permitted on National Park land. If boathouses are to be erected on parkland, they should be publically owned and open to all. College crews should be required to share space with other college and high school crews.
3. Any new boathouses, public or private, should be in scale with their surroundings, and limited to a facility for storage and launching of boats. The Georgetown proposal was far too large. Its size resulted from the inclusion of elements not required for the storage and launching of rowing shells, such as what was essentially a party house. Had they stuck to the original proposal of 4000 square feet, just for boating purposes, they'd have been rowing out of it years ago. Only that proposal, not the later gigantic one, was approved by the the C&O Canal Commission.



# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 56

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Arlington, VA 22203  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/28/2012 Date Received: 03/28/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am concerned about the emphasis on rowing on the Georgetown Potomac waterfront. An expensive watersport, rowing is not a sport for all people. Canoeing, in contrast, is much more affordable. I would like to see a greater emphasis on access for canoeists and kayakers. I was dismayed that the new waterfront park did not include a launch site for canoes and kayaks. Currently one must go 2 miles upstream to Fletchers to launch on the river. There are some spots of open waterfront that one can informally launch at, but if those become developed, they will disappear.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 57

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Susan H. Johnston  
Organization: Washington Canoe Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Washington, DC 20027  
USA  
E-mail: susanhjohnston@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/28/2012 Date Received: 03/28/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Stidhan,

I am a member of the Washington Canoe Club, and have been since 1992. The plan for a non-motorized boat zone in our area is very welcome in the over-all discussion of the waterfront area. Despite the designation as a no-wake zone in our training area, some motor boaters tend to use their motors at a high speed indiscriminately, not noticing the havoc in their wake. Catching wake is no fun in the summer, but rather dangerous in the winter. We train year-round, so this is a concern.

WCC contributes significantly to the paddling/rowing community, despite the loss of the use of our 100 year-old boathouse. It's been very encouraging to see our programs expand to Wounded Warrior training and events, events for underprivileged neighborhoods for whom the river would otherwise be an inaccessible resource, partnership with NPS in the Canal Stewardship Program, opportunities for competitive paddling in regattas as well as recreational paddling, and training for young paddlers some of whom go on to Olympic Training Camps. All of these projects have come about despite the lack of restrooms, changing space and indoor training and meeting rooms, which used to be provided by our boathouse. Interest in river sports is growing exponentially, and improving the existing paddling/rowing areas can only benefit everyone.

Thank you for consideration,

Susan Johnston

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 58

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David A. Biss  
Organization: Washington Canoe Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6668 Barrett Road  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
Falls Church, VA 22042  
USA  
E-mail: davidbiss@cox.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/28/2012 Date Received: 03/28/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

As a family member of the Washington Canoe Club, and a long time avid paddler of the Potomac River, I am very anxious that the club as well as access to the river continues to remain available.

As a kayaker, a traveler to many bodies of water, and a member past and present of many of the paddling clubs and organizations in the Washington DC metropolitan area, I have a strong feeling of the importance of water access. Access to the water, especially around metropolitan areas is very important. It allows many individuals to explore their environment, escape the confines of the community, and find an exciting way to keep in shape.

While it is a difficult process to balance free or low cost, public access to our water ways with the demand of real estate, this is an important issue to many many individuals.

As we know many different requests for water access are currently being made by many different organizations and types of paddlers, power boaters, and even swimmers. It is my belief from my time spent launching into the Potomac along the DC border that it is possible to make access available to all the desired requests. And it my experience from being a part of the Washington Canoe Club for the past 10 years or so that the club is very open to making this happen. I know that the site of the WCC can possibly be made to work for many forms of access in order to meet the requests of the changing face of water activity in today's DC.

I support the effort which the NPS has been making towards finding a solution to the allocation of resources to all the demands for water access in this area, and do hope that accommodations can be made

for as many, if not all, forms of usage as possible. As a member of the Washington Canoe Club, I would gratefully do all I can to support the effort.

Thank you,  
Dave Biss

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 59**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Peter G. Thompson  
Organization: Rock Creek Rowing Inc.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6608 32nd Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
Washington, DC 20015  
USA  
E-mail: pthompson@tljlaw.com

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

Rock Creek Rowing Inc.  
608 32nd Place NW, Washington DC 20015  
info.RockCreekRowing@gmail.com  
www.RockCreekRowing.org

March 29, 2012

Mr. Stephen Whitesell  
Regional Director-Capital Region  
National Park Service  
11 Ohio Drive, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20242

Subject: Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone and Thompson Boat Center ? Statement of Position by Rock Creek Rowing Inc.

Dear Mr. Whitesell:

I am privileged to serve as president of Rock Creek Rowing Inc. ("RCR"), an independent, masters-level competitive rowing club of approximately fifty members, which rows at or before dawn four days per

week out of the Thompson Boat Center ("TBC") facility. On March 3, I and several other RCR members attended the NPS Workshop on the "Feasibility Study for a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront." The event was a stimulating and impressive mix of a great range of interested parties in the rowing community, as well as the recreational paddling and water sports communities. We also were impressed by, and endorse and appreciate, the comprehensive approach the National Park Service is taking in planning for the needs of the many overlapping rowing and recreational organizations, and we welcome this opportunity to submit our comments concerning the various components of the study.

Many of RCR's members, which include equal numbers of adult men and women, have been involved in the rowing community for years. Some have been rowers in their own right for decades. Others were first introduced to rowing as parents of scholastic rowers whose love of the sport, and of the Potomac, served as a catalyst for us to take up rowing ourselves. Many of us began rowing through learn-to-row programs offered at TBC. Whatever our paths may have been, collectively our membership has a long history with, and keen appreciation of, the Potomac River and the Georgetown Waterfront area not only as one of the nation's premier rowing venues but as a recreational and natural resource for the entire community. We also have a keen appreciation of the significant limitations presented by the existing boathouse facilities on the DC side of the Potomac (including TBC) and the benefits ? recreational and aesthetic ? that would flow from the carefully planned introduction of additional boathouses along the Georgetown Waterfront for rowing and other non-motorized boating disciplines.

From this background, we wanted to forward a statement of position of Rock Creek Rowing concerning the various components of the subject study, and we look forward to NPS making a decision soon to permit construction of additional boathouse capacity in the Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront.

As was abundantly clear at the workshop, the overlapping needs (existing and potential) of rowers and other recreational users of the Potomac mean that a comprehensive approach to planning is required. We also firmly believe that such planning must include not only the construction of new boathouses in new locations but a concerted effort to improve and expand the existing TBC facility.

Specifically, RCR believes that the following points are paramount:

- ? RCR supports the efforts of Georgetown and George Washington Universities to build two new University boathouses that would not require public funding. The construction of these boathouses would have a profound effect on the community's enjoyment of the Potomac, including opening up the overcrowded TBC facility (see below).

- ? Georgetown Waterfront Park should remain as it is, consistent with the original intent to provide high quality access to the spaces and view corridors along the Potomac.

- ? WASA should be required to specify, at the earliest possible date, the location and size of the access shafts required for the tunnel work.

- ? Modification or replacement of Thompson Boat Center should be included in the study. Key points relating to TBC include the following:

- o TBC has eminently fulfilled its original purpose of serving as a catalyst for community access to the Potomac and for the growth of a thriving rowing community. After fifty years, however, the time has come for this facility to step forward into the 21st century on a prime site in our nation's capital.

- o Given the incredible aesthetic potential of the TBC site, and the benefits that would flow from improved accessibility to this community resource, the improvement or replacement of this existing facility would have a high impact on the quality of experience for all visitors to the waterfront.

o Taken in the context of the relatively new Swedish Embassy building, and its location in sight of the Kennedy Center, Thompson Boat Center is now part of a high quality building corridor. As such, TBC can and should build on the perceived quality of this context.

o The value of TBC could also be enhanced by an innovative approach to year-round programming. Several boathouses throughout the U.S. are redefining and expanding their purpose to reach a broader community. Currently the unheated TBC facility is closed completely four months of the year. When it is open, its use, especially during the week, tends to be concentrated in the very early morning hours and in the late afternoons, with lighter use during the middle of the day and none after dark. We believe that there is significant untapped potential for expanded use of an improved TBC facility both during the winter months and year-round.

We look forward to participating in future reviews and workshops going forward. We hope that the foregoing points may be helpful in driving a planning process that will take full advantage of the incredible potential of the Georgetown waterfront for all parties involved.

Sincerely yours,

Pete Thompson  
President  
Rock Creek Rowing Inc.

cc: Rep. Eleanor Holmes-Norton, US House of Representatives  
Rep. James P. Moran, US House of Representatives  
Chairman Kwame R. Brown, DC City Council  
Council Member Jack Evans, DC City Council  
Council Member Mary Cheh, DC City Council  
George S. Hawkins, WASA General Manager

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 60

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary R. Rollefson  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 4515 Q Street NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: Maryrollefson@starpower.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 28, 2012

Comments on Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront

I am a neighbor (Foxhall) of the Georgetown waterfront, a rower (out of Potomac Boat Club), a bicyclist and roller-blader (on the Capital Crescent), a canoe paddler, and an appreciator of the natural area along the river right above Georgetown that the C&O Canal NHP provides. So I am a frequent user of the area being studied and have a lot of interest in its design and management. I have 3 concerns and 3 suggestions as you move forward with planning for the Georgetown waterfront.

Concerns

1) Area being considered ? It makes no sense to be limiting consideration of facilities to an area from 34th St to upstream of the Washington Canoe Club. Since opportunities for rowing and other boating activities are paramount goals of the study, Thompsons Boat Center as well as the Georgetown Waterfront Park need to be part of the study area, since both areas can and should be contributors to the solution; making decisions without including these areas is illogical.

2) Safety ? On-river safety, doing everything possible to avoid collisions and conflicts between rowing shells and other paddle craft, should be a high priority. Similarly, safety for walkers, runners, and other users of the Capital Crescent Trail must be improved; the very confusing terminus of the Trail just west of the Aqueduct Arch, where half a dozen user groups (including errant automobiles) collide with each other, deserves careful study and a new design.

3) Natural area ? I am dismayed to see the natural area along the Potomac upstream of Washington Canoe Club even being considered for development. Right there, behind the canoe club, is the "gateway into nature" for city people, and it should not be compromised with more building?especially since this is floodplain. There is a mile of developed or developable waterfront between there and the mouth of Rock Creek, and that should be the area where any new facilities are built. The fact that a good portion of that

mile has recently been developed as Georgetown Waterfront Park should not preclude consideration for access and facilities there; the NPS knew full well when it designed and developed the park that there was huge pressure for additional facilities for public to access the river, and went ahead with the construction anyway. Fairness dictates that the waterfront park continue to be part of the solution of public access down to the river (not just alongside the river).

#### Suggestions

- 1) Sharing ? Even if the boathouse zone is going to be expanded, there still are many arguments for designing and building shared facilities, especially for rowers (where there seems to be the greatest pressure for more storage and dock space). While I understand the desire of the universities to have boathouses for their exclusive use, it makes no sense in the tight space available to build possibly three new facilities (Georgetown, George Washington, and high schools). At the March 3 public meeting a boathouse in Cambridge, MA was mentioned as being able to store and handle a huge number of rowing shells; that "universal" boathouse should be an inspiration and a model for the Georgetown waterfront. Paddlers are already sharing facilities; racing, recreational, special needs, and stand-up paddlers are currently sharing facilities at Washington Canoe Club.
  - 2) Group "like with like" ? The needs of paddlers and rowers differ. Any plan should put paddling facilities next to other paddling facilities, and rowing with rowing. A patchwork of facilities will create potential for increased long-term conflict. A fundamental principle of any plan should be to "group like with like."
  - 3) Limit new riverside facilities to those that MUST be at riverside ? Obviously places for rowers and paddlers to launch their craft and to keep and launch coaches' motorboats must be immediately adjacent to the river. But designers need to creatively think about what facilitates ? locker rooms, rowing tanks, social rooms, boat maintenance equipment, and even boat storage could be setback from the river's edge. At the workshop on March 3, there was a good deal of discussion of about utilizing building space north of Water St. for these non-river-dependent uses and that makes a lot of sense.
- Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Rollefson

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 61

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Frederick I. Mopsik  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6415 79th St.  
Cabin John, ME 20818  
USA  
E-mail: Fred.mopsik@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

March 29, 2012

It has been about four years since the Georgetown Boathouse issue has been put down after much controversy. While the desire for river based activities, as embodied in the original proposal are quite sincere, the original proposal suffered from many flaws, which in that proposal were pushed aside.

One of the major flaws in the original proposal and the studies used to justify it was that the Boathouse clearly impinged in the C&O National Historic Park, a resource that the National Park Service is sworn to promote and protect. The original Environmental Impact Statement considered the needs of Georgetown University and almost completely ignored the C&O NHP. Despite many objection and points raised, this flaw was never addressed. No consideration of the uses of the park were included. Instead, it did contain a proposed horror story of an alternative boathouse upstream that was clearly fictitious as it could not be possibly built as drawn. It lacked any allowable access, not to mention severe grade problems, safety issues and local legal requirements.

Other problems in that study were its dismissing of obvious detrimental visual impacts as well as conflicts with other, pre-existing uses. These included a rather critical and heavily used section of the towpath as it enters the waterfront, and in which any further degradation would be extremely detrimental to its existence.

The National Park Service is charged with protecting all National Parks, including the C&O, and they are required to protect them. Removing from use a section of a park for private use is not permissible or consistent with the mission of the National Park Service unless it can be clearly shown to be an

improvement in the condition of the Park and in its best interest.

The last examination of the Boathouse scene gave only minor attention to this issue using very poor criteria. There were no attempts to examine alternatives, using Georgetown University's desires in preference to the advocates for the park. A clear degradation of the Park was ignored, for example, by using viewpoints outside the park and not part of the immediate environment, which was ignored. A justification of a landswap was used showing a threat of a hypothetical boathouse on Georgetown University's land that could not be built due to physical limitations of the parcel and the granting of rights that they do not possess, including legal limitations on an easement that does not convey any use rights. There was certainly no true demonstration of improvements to the park, including the environment immediately adjacent to the towpath, a critical feature that is essential to its existence. There was no mention of items, such as an imposing roof line, that impacted the park and not examined for being essential to the proposed uses. The Park should not be diminished for uses, such as school social events for the sole benefit of a private entity to the detriment of the public and which occurred in the previous study.

It is welcome that an expanded field of study is being used. The park does not exist by itself and the river front through Georgetown has many desired uses. The park itself is one of these and is heavily used. Its very existence plays a major role in the uses along the river and, being a National Park, must not be compromised. The Park is public and must have preference to any desired private demands and this objective must be honored. It is held in trust not only for those immediately adjacent to the Potomac but the entire nation as a tribute to both the history of the growth of the nation, the witness it bore to conflict and to honor a Supreme Court Justice who promoted environmental preservation as part of the nation's heritage. Any alternative uses must be justified with these aims and are required to be given precedence.

Frederick I. Mopsik  
fred.mopsik@verizon.net  
301-320-2111

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 62

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Andrew G. Soles  
Organization: Washington Canoe Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 3700 K St NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: andrewsoles@hotmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

3/29/12

Comments of the Washington Canoe Club (WCC)  
on "Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study along the Georgetown Waterfront"  
Summary

WCC is very supportive of the National Park Service (NPS)'s vision for a holistic solution that improves safety and increases public access to the Potomac River. In addition, we want to ensure the conservation of the natural, historic, and cultural resources presently found in the area, and to be certain that proposed solutions take into account all river and park user groups.

WCC supports construction of additional facilities on both sides of Water Street, from below Key Bridge to just downstream of WCC, including possible shared facilities such as a rowing tank. WCC believes that safety will be improved by grouping similar river uses together, as recommended by the Potomac River Safety Committee. In addition, our historic clubhouse and other downstream facilities (as well as developing paddlers) greatly benefit from the natural shoreline upstream of the WCC clubhouse.

#### Introduction

For over a century paddlers and rowers (along with swimmers and fishermen) have shared the Potomac River in Georgetown. Other users ? bicyclists, motor boats, joggers, sailors, in-line skaters, stand-up paddlers ? have emerged as important constituencies, but the popularity and importance of paddling and rowing in the community has endured, with hundreds of thousands participating in these on-water, muscle-powered sports each year. They are an important part of Washington's heritage and, with their attributes of promoting healthy life-styles, building a sense of community, and increasing appreciation and stewardship of the Nation's river, they align very closely with the mission of the NPS.

Paddling and rowing include both solo and team experiences, and recreational as well as competitive components. While there are many similarities in the needs of the paddling and rowing communities, they

diverge in certain important respects. At the March 3 public workshop, five different paddling entities were represented: the Washington Canoe Club (home base for both racers and recreational users), Canoe Cruisers Association (representing recreational paddlers that have no public launch facilities in Georgetown), Jacks Boathouse (which provides outstanding canoe and kayak rental opportunities to the general public), stand-up paddlers (a new and growing use), and paddlers with disabilities who need special facilities to reach the water.

The comments below reflect the needs and views of the paddling community and specifically those of the Washington Canoe Club.

#### General issues

1) Access ? More access to the river is needed for all users. Trails and walking paths along the river are also important, but they do not serve the same purpose, and are not the same as, access to the water for boaters. More access to the river for public and private users alike ? including at least one public launch site which meets accessibility standards - must be the central thrust of any plan.

2) Capital Crescent Trail ? The Capital Crescent Trail is the signature feature of the Georgetown waterfront for tens of thousands of users and visitors. It also serves as an access route and staging point for river events for disabled veterans held at the WCC. An uncompromised, fully accessible Capital Crescent Trail (whose capacity is in no way diminished by additional development) should be a paramount objective in any proposal.

3) Parking ? With the dedication of 1/3 mile (about 50%) of the Georgetown waterfront to a single use (passive park) and the removal of what had been large parking lots, parking for all users has become an enormous frustration and constraint. Any plan must address this critical need for public parking.

4) Safety ? The area on each side of the Aqueduct Arch can become a dangerous and frustrating bottleneck for waterfront users. Here converge frequent misguided autos (thinking they are headed west up a continuing Water St and then finding they must turn around), jogging clubs, event organizers with tables, runners, bicyclists, dog-walkers, WCC and Potomac Boat Club members and guests accessing their facilities, trailers carrying rowing shells or outrigger canoes, and visitors approaching Jacks boats, creating confusion at many busy times of the day and year and mayhem on many weekends. WASA now proposes even more development and construction in the area during the next decade. A plan must deal with this locus of real and potential conflict; the plan should include better signage for cars and recreationists and enough space for event organizers to set up tables, for trailers to load and unload, and for all users to pass through (at presumably slower speeds) safely and efficiently.

5) Comprehensiveness and longevity ? While the point has been argued and re-argued, we remain convinced that the boundaries of the "boathouse zone" being considered must be expanded to provide an accurate and full picture of river use, now and in the future. Thompson's Boat Center and indeed the whole formerly industrial area now in developed parkland on the waterfront should logically be part of any overall plan for river access in Georgetown. Similarly, if all options are to be on the table, the site that Georgetown University (GU) owns a mile upstream of Key Bridge (where, in theory, GU could build a boat house, using their legal ROW along the Capital Crescent Trail) should also be part of the planning area. The NPS needs to start afresh with the full deck of cards on the table.

6) Historic preservation ? The C&O Canal, Aqueduct Arch, Potomac Boat Club, and Washington Canoe Club all date back 100 years or more and are enormously important to the character of the Potomac Waterfront and should be preserved in form and function.

7) Natural preservation ? The transition from city to wild land that occurs just above Key Bridge is a crucial aesthetic threshold that makes this waterfront area so appealing and so important to users on both land and water. The bar should be set very high for any further development upstream of the Aqueduct Arch (and would presumably require additional analysis under NEPA).

8) Avoiding Use Conflicts ? As explained below, the pattern of use on the river itself has developed over time to safely accommodate rowing and paddling with a minimum of conflict by separating the two uses in critical areas. Any design should support this pattern.

9) Temporal issues ? The needs of various user groups vary widely over the hours of the day. For example, competitive paddlers and many rowers tend to be on the river early in the morning or late afternoon, whereas other users may be more active mid-day or in evenings. Any plan should take into consideration the opportunities that these patterns of use present.

10) Effective use of limited space ? As pointed out at the March 3 workshop, sharing of facilities should be a major component of any waterfront plan, and the basis for an equitable solution to the overcrowding issues at Thompson's boathouse. The present number of high school programs will remain overcrowded in Thompson's even with the departure of both GW and Georgetown Universities, yet neither university has agreed to host a single high school program (note that Potomac Boat Club has hosted W-L High School rowing for over 50 years). The high schools will not have the resources, clout or available space to construct a boathouse by themselves, and must be supported by the larger community. We believe the Harry Parker boathouse in Cambridge, MA, is a good example (shared by the NPS at the March 3 workshop) of a facility that could house many of the DC rowing programs that currently need a base. Rowing tanks at one central facility (which could be used by rowers and paddlers alike) is another example to be explored. Similarly, shared land training or boat repair facilities, as well as trailer parking, could be considered.

11) New approaches. ? Perhaps the greatest opportunity for new approaches on the waterfront is the utilization of buildings on the north side of Water St (west of 34th St.) While these buildings are not currently used for boathouse facilities, leases or purchase should be explored and new construction considered, as this additional space could be used for shared, non-river-dependent facilities and would dramatically alter the need for large new structures right on the riverbank. Uses could include land training or boat maintenance facilities - perhaps shared among boathouses, as noted above - as just two examples.

#### General paddling needs

As has been stated in focus groups and previous communications, the overall paddling community (which, by NPS estimates, currently includes almost 140,000 visits a year in this zone) has a number of needs to be addressed:

? Safe access to the river for paddlers of all abilities ? The historic division of the river into paddling and rowing zones in certain areas, as reinforced by the Potomac River Safety Committee, helps to avoid collisions and conflicts between river users. The backward facing position of the rower makes rowing shells much more difficult to navigate, and in most cases the ratio of attending motorboats is much higher with rowing teams. The location of any new facilities should take into account the landing and launching patterns of paddling and rowing users.

? Access for private boaters with their own boats (canoes, kayaks, stand-up paddle boards). The riprap and boulders lining the Potomac shoreline make access difficult for private users. A safe (and no- or low-fee) public non-motorized boat launch area should be available to all, similar to the motorized boat launching area near Regan Airport.

? Access for paddlers with disabilities

? Full range of opportunities to rent paddle craft

? Adequate facilities for changing, temporary storage of personal belongings, toilet facilities

#### Washington Canoe Club needs

Recognition of the status of the Washington Canoe Club ? At the March 3 public workshop, there emerged a wide-spread impression that the WCC site was "available" for consideration for various uses, that the clubhouse had been condemned and might be demolished, and that the NPS considers that all options are on the table for the site. The fact that the club itself is alive and well, with a very active membership and all its programs thriving, was not acknowledged. Superintendent Kevin Brandt (after a WCC member prompted meeting organizers) spoke up to try and clarify the situation. But the fact remains that what the public saw and was hearing from the consultants was in marked contrast to facts on the ground and what WCC officers have been hearing in private from NPS (that NPS wants to find a way

for WCC to remain on-site and occupy the building). The NPS must find ways to publicly clarify this situation.

The Washington Canoe Club is a major presence in the waterfront community, providing both racing (including Olympic) opportunities for its members and a wide range of community events for the public, including opportunities for local schools and community groups to experience the river and learn to paddle. The club is particularly proud of its partnerships with adaptive athletic programs, bringing such groups as Wounded Warriors down to the river. WCC is also currently working with the American Canoe Association, the United States Canoe and Kayak Team (USACK), Team River Runner, and Project Enduring Pride to also make the sport available to disabled athletes who are not veterans. The club has collaborated with several neighborhood groups, as well as Wilderness Inquiry and the NPS, to give diverse populations a positive river experience. With its waterfront presence and skilled membership, WCC also provides an important safety contribution on the Potomac; several times a year WCC members are able to help out with rescues long before the Harbor Police can get there. The club spearheads efforts to clean up the Potomac and its riverbank in collaboration with the Alice Ferguson Foundation, the C&O Canal Trust, and Surfrider Foundation (and has also pitched in on Canal clean-ups). Several times a year WCC hosts national level regattas to develop Washingtonians into world-class competitors and it also hosts at least six events each year that are open to the public. In short, WCC is a major private contributor to a sense of community along the Georgetown waterfront and a crucial partner with the NPS as it fulfills its mission.

To conduct these far-flung programs for its members and the public, the WCC specifically needs:

? A safe, unobstructed race course with proximity to the club ? We need an agreed-on traffic pattern, which includes a race course, such as the one established by the Potomac River Safety Committee, to help avoid conflict and collisions. The historic canoe and kayak race course, starting 1000 meters up river from the club and finishing at WCC, has allowed paddling races and training sessions to be held without interfering with rowing activities on the main channel of the river. Introduction of new boater access upstream of WCC could be a huge disruption to both the racing and recreation programs of the WCC and a significant safety issue.

? Adjacent undeveloped river bank (another safety concern) ? Beginning paddlers are more likely to flip than other disciplines and, if no dock is nearby, it is beneficial that they have the option of climbing out on the river bank (something they couldn't do where the bank is a built concrete seawall)

? Upstream protection from floodwaters and debris - We note the importance of the forested area upstream from WCC, which has long provided critical flood protection to the historic clubhouse. Any clearing upstream of the building would reduce the natural buffer for debris (and reduction of water speed the buffer provides) and affect the building's ability to resist and rebound from regular flooding (the Potomac River spilled its banks five times in 2011 alone).

? Indoor and outdoor storage space for boats (approx. 200 indoor and 200 outdoor); (WCC boats range in lengths from 14-43 feet; most are under 20 feet long)

? Access for club-based activities that rely on club-owned equipment such as team boats (6-person outrigger canoes, 4-person racing kayaks, 6-12 person canoes, etc.) and instructional sessions.

? 100 feet of dock space to safely launch during peak periods

? Dock space to store two motorboats.

? Vehicular access (including turning and parking room for trailers) for the 3-5 regattas that WCC hosts each year

? Temporary storage, changing space, and washroom facilities (e.g., locker rooms) for local members and visiting competitors and guests

? Space for land work-outs (weight training facilities and paddling ergometers, for example). WCC is very supportive of developing of a shared indoor tank facility that could be used by both rowing and paddling. WCC currently trains at the David Taylor research center in Great Falls during the winter, but the distance, hours, and security restrictions make something nearby much more attractive.

? Kitchen and other indoor cooking facilities

? Space for boat repair and maintenance (again, possibly part of a shared facility)

? River access that accommodates a variety of non-motorized paddling craft

Conclusion

The Washington Canoe Club looks forward to participating in the continuing dialogue on the future of the Georgetown Waterfront and to a final win-win solution for all parties.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 63**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jo Reynolds  
Organization: Former C&O Canal Commissioner  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Tinmouth, VT 05773  
USA

E-mail:

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

Having served on the Commission for over 20 years, I am keenly aware of the struggle to remove private users from public land, in this case the C& O Canal National Historical Park. A private boat house is totally unacceptable. Period!

More boat houses are needed and the space is limited on the Potomac. The Anacostia Waterfront seems to be the logical place to expand.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 64

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Lawrence C. Schuette  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
McLean, VA 22101  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 03/29/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Sirs,

I write to comment on the study regarding a non-motorized boathouse zone. As a frequent user of the C&O Canal National Historic Park and the Capital Crescent Trail I hope that the study director remembers as the study is designed that a portion of the non-motorized zone is in a National Historic Park.

I mention this because the efforts in the prior decade to site the largest boathouse on the East Coast inside that National Park was an affront akin to allowing Stanford University to building a climbing lodge at the base of El Capaton in Yosemite. Much of the public outrage had to do with the scale of the GU Boathouse and the repeated technical errors by GU and promulgated by NPS which misrepresented to the public the size and potential impact that it would have on the C&O Canal.

Accordingly, any study needs to consider the impact on the C&O Canal and the underlying fragility of the structure, the historic views that it allows (regardless of vegetation) and that the portion of the non-motorized boathouse zone is the "Gateway of the Potomac River Gorge". In my line of work we use "One in a Million" as a probability of risk when determining safety to structures. I believe that the study should assume such a probability of risk to the C&O Canal when siting and determining the size of any new structures. I note that the original boathouse zone study assume relatively small structures in the non-motorized boathouse zone specifically to minimize impact to the C&O Canal.

This study should be looking at the absolute minimum size structure needed to house boats. Facilities beyond boat storage should be built elsewhere. The sizes of the University boathouses should not be

dictated by their desires but by balancing their minimum needs against the greater public good.

This study should also examine what dockage could be placed in the C&O Canal to allow people to launch canoes/kayaks/rowboats/shells in the historic canal.

This study should place great weight on the use of the C&O Canal & CCT by the public.

Additionally as a Washington Canoe Club member I agree with the Board of Directors that the study should consider the following facts:

- \* WCC is the only place on the Georgetown Waterfront offering competitive paddling and a clear path for Olympic hopefuls.
- \* WCC offers virtually unlimited recreational paddling.
- \* WCC needs about 100' of dock to safely launch during peak times.
- \* WCC hosts community outreach and competitive events throughout the year to include:
  - \* Wounded Warrior events with three separate WW groups that require storage of special equipment, handicapped access, and proximity to Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and Bethesda Naval Hospital.
  - \* Events for underprivileged neighborhoods to experience the river with the help of experienced boaters.
  - \* Local and National-level regattas that help develop Washingtonians into world-class competitors.

Other needs/requirements that should be considered in the study include:

- \* A space that supports high-use during early mornings, late afternoons, and all day on weekends Spring through Fall.
- \* River access that accommodates a variety of non-motorized paddling craft.
- \* Indoor and outdoor storage of boats.
- \* Temporary storage and changing space (e.g. locker rooms) for local members and visiting competitors and guests.
- \* A race course with proximity to the club that is separated from the rowers course and general path on the river.

Thank you for this opportunity to help shape the study. I know that many individuals and national groups will be watching closely.

VR

Lawrence C. Schuette, Ph.D.



specific area of human-powered recreation, local entities who are certified by nationally-recognized bodies such as The American Canoe Association and United States Canoe and Kayak should be given the opportunity to operate under the normal requirements of the CUA process.

Thank you for your kind consideration and let's make DC the paddling / rowing capital of the world!

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 66

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Kent Slowinski  
Organization: ANC 3D01  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 4505 Dexter Street NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: wksla@aol.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New                                      Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012                      Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1                      Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No                      Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I'd like to thank the National Park Service for their consideration in organizing this effort.

I grew up about a mile north of the site and have fond memories of biking on the C&O Canal tow path, ice skating on the canal, paddling on the canal, motor boating on the river, sculling lessons at Thompson's Boathouse and putting pennies on the railroad tracks. I remember finding a duck's nest on Three Sister's Island - what a smart bird! The colors of the eggs was spectacular. I found my first snapping turtle upriver from the Washington Canoe Club. We used to see several albino deer in the area. It's an excellent place for birdwatching. This is a special place.

I'd like to see the area upriver of the Old Aqueduct Bridge stay as undisturbed parkland, as much as possible. If the Potomac River is to become swimmable in the near future, perhaps a facility to allow swimming in the river or relocating Jack's would be appropriate. The Sycamore Island Canoe Club is a good example of what this area could be if the Washington Canoe Club is restored. These activities would not interfere with existing river traffic patterns and would minimize any intrusion on the C&O Canal National Historical Park and the Capital Crescent Trail.

There is room for two boathouses adjacent to Key Bridge, south of the Potomac Boat Club, with better vehicular access and parking. These sites would also minimize conflicts with existing river traffic patterns. These boathouses could provide a transition between the Georgetown Waterfront Park and Key Bridge. The area under Key Bridge could be used for boat storage. The non-motorized boathouse zone study area should be expanded to include Thompson's Boathouse which should be expanded or rebuilt.

But please, let the Old Aqueduct Bridge be the upriver terminus for all new construction along the

Georgetown Waterfront and the beginning of the Capital Crescent Trail. The Old Aqueduct Bridge makes a wonderful gateway and a spectacular terminus.

Thank you.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 67

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William Warren  
Organization: C and O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Charles Town, WV 25414  
USA  
E-mail: billwarren2000@aol.com

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Please, NO MORE turning over park property to private users for private use! When I was at George Washington in the 60's, our crew used the Thompson's Boat House. There are other options the Georgetown as well that do not require taking public land private, or at least out of public enjoyment.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 68

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Julia Haidemenos  
Organization: Foxhall Community Citizens Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 4434 Reservoir Road NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
USA  
E-mail: jhaidemenos@comcast.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Please do not allow Georgetown University to have its way with our parkland and river access at the Georgetown water front. We've lived in Foxhall Village for over 30 years and have had to push back constantly on GU's attempts to take away/destroy public parklands. For example, we've fought their soccer and rugby teams tearing up the field at 44th and Reservoir and turning an idyllic setting into a huge mud pit. Also, without our protests, GU would have destroyed trees and constructed a loop road in the woods above the same field. These woods provide a critical buffer for noise and light between their institution and Foxhall Village. Georgetown U students can easily access a boathouse slightly down river instead of permanently changing the character and open space of the existing water front at the foot of Key Bridge. Thank you.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 69

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John H. Wheeler  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 4304 Yuma St., NW  
Washington, DC 20016  
USA  
E-mail: wheeler.compostman@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

First, I think there should be no private development of the C&O Canal National Historical Park. If the decision is to allow private development in the boathouse zone, it should be down-river from Key Bridge. I think it's also important to separate the launching areas for boats that are paddled forwards (e.g., canoes and kayaks) and boats that are paddled backwards (e.g., shells and sculls). Because of the size of shells, where they managed on-shore is limited. Vehicle access is critical for them. If at all possible, they should be located where there is limited other public use of the area. This is definitely not the area where the Capitol Resent Trail exists. Allowing shells along that portion of the waterfront is just asking for life threatening disaster. Canoes and kayaks can more easily be accommodated in that area.

I think the Park Service should also not limit this study to original boathouse zone area. It certainly should include down-river areas, especially the existing Thompson's Boathouse. E.g., can improvements be made there to accommodate more boats?

I think the Park Service has placed too much interest in accommodating private uses on the river. It should place more emphasis in public use. To that extent, any uses that it allows on the river, especially above Key Bridge, should be public uses and all facilities that may be built should be publically owned and accessible to all members of the public.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 70

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Valerie Wheeler  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 4304 Yuma St., NW  
Washington, FL 20016  
USA  
E-mail: valthepotter@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

While I agree that it is important to provide for water-related recreational use of the Potomac waterfront, it's also important not to unreasonably interfere with land based uses of the park. For the Potomac River, the most likely place where the two uses could conflict are up-river of the Key Bridge. Therefore, I think it's important to accommodate the river recreational uses downstream from the Key Bridge. It's also important that any water-based uses within the C&O National Historical Park be public uses that would not interfere with land-based public uses.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 71

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Bernice A. Lochstampfor  
Organization: C&O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Washington, DC 20036  
USA  
E-mail: ann.lochstampfor@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park is now at the crossroads of history. The NPS must decide whether to maintain the Park's mission [see below] -- or to allow Georgetown University, one of the Nation's richest, most prestigious private universities, to build a colossal boathouse, primarily for the use of GU students, near the Georgetown gateway to the Canal.

The 34th Street entrance to the proposed boathouse zone is only a 15-20 minute walk from The White House (17th Street side.) This site embraces Potomac shoreline now in a wooded, tidal floodplain area. The NPS has yet to disclose what the "fair market value" of this treasured section of the Park would be -- if it were privately owned.

Since the C&OCNHP is funded by all American taxpayers not just those in DC and Maryland, the C&OCNHP is owned by and belongs to all Americans. They have a vested interest in preserving their "National Treasure" for all Americans, present and future. This transfer of the public wealth ? history as well as financial -- to a wealthy private university should not be allowed.

This historic part of the C&O Canal, begun in 1828, should be protected from private development. The sight of a soaring boathouse here would be seen as the "Pyramid on the Potomac" and could not avoid becoming a glitzy tourist destination -- bringing even more traffic congestion to Georgetown.

The sight of a large parking lot crowded with 80-foot-long boat trailers [60-feet for the boat and 20-feet for the trailer cab] would diminish if not destroy the traditional mule-drawn boat rides enjoyed by Park visitors for decades.

In the past, from April - October, a replica 1880's canal boat offered the public roundtrip rides between the 31st Street Bridge and Key Bridge. [The 31st Street Bridge, located one block down from the intersection of 31st and M Streets, is as long as the Canal is wide.]

Although the boat operations in Georgetown are not linked to the Feasibility Study, the future of the public historic reenactment of a vanished way of early American life would be adversely impacted by the activities associated with the boathouse zone.

Another casualty of the proposed privatization of this part of the C&OCNHP would be the lost opportunities to educate tens of thousands of Park visitors annually about the importance of the C&O Canal to Washington's early history in a quiet, little-known section of the city where that history still survives.

Unfortunately, on July 13, 2011, the very old Georgetown boat, the Georgetown, had to be dismantled after a crack was discovered in its hull. The Superintendent recently announced that repairing the damage is too costly and that he has not decided whether to fundraise for a new boat. If the NPS envisions the transformation of the C&OCNHP by private developers, then there may not be a need to raise funds for a new Georgetown boat.

For reasons stated above, I believe the proposed twenty-first century urbanization of a National Historical Park in the heart of the Nation's capital should be denied.

May the guiding spirit of Justice William O. Douglas prevail.

Submitted by: Ann Lochstampf for March 30, 2012

[16 USC Sec 1-a-1 (2000)] Public Law 91.064: "to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and to develop the potential of the canal for public recreation, including such restoration as may be needed."

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 72

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: N/A N/A  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Saint Leonard, MD 20685  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I do not agree with the location of a private boathouse within the C & O Canal National Historical Park. This use of the park for a private will set a precedent for possible other development within the park. I am also concerned that this structure will mar the view from the canal as hikers and bikers use the area, and create congestion in the area. Other options using improvements of existing areas that would not encroach the C & O Canal should be considered as part of the study.

**PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565  
Correspondence: 73**

**Author Information**

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ernie Brooks  
Organization: Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1543 Hemlock St NW  
Washington, DC 20012  
USA  
E-mail: brooksew@hotmail.com

**Correspondence Information**

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

**Correspondence Text**

Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail  
P.O. Box 30703  
Bethesda, MD 20824

---

March 29, 2012

Mr. Peter May  
Associate Regional Director  
National Capital Region  
National Park Service  
C/o Tammy Stidham  
1100 Ohio Drive, SW  
Washington, DC 20242

ATTN: Please make this document part of the public record for the 2012 study of the Georgetown Waterfront Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study.

Dear Mr. May:

I am writing you on behalf of the Board of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail (CCCT), our 2200 members, and many thousands of Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) users to express our thoughts on the Georgetown Waterfront Boathouse Zone Feasibility Study. The CCCT appreciates your consideration of our concerns as you move forward with the development of the study. It is the CCCT's understanding that this current study is intended to take a fresh look at the opportunities for boating & boathouses along the waterfront, taking into account developments in that area since the previous studies were conducted in the late 1980's. Without question, one of the most significant changes to the proposed boathouse zone since those earlier studies has been the addition of the Capital Crescent Trail. A Trail Use Survey was conducted in 2006, and it determined that there were approximately a million annual user visits to the CCT in the area included in the feasibility study. Given the narrow nature of the proposed boathouse zone in the section through which the CCT passes, as well as the possible negative environmental impacts that could arise from heavy development in that area, we hope that your study will place appropriate limits on what can be done along that section of the boathouse zone.

As an attendee & participant at the December informational meeting, the February stakeholder interviews, and the March workshop, I was impressed with the range of topics covered, and the information that was being taken into the study by the Berger Group. I also understand that this is intended to be a fresh look at the area from the point of view of developing a boathouse zone, and that we shouldn't be biased by what transpired in earlier attempts along those lines. However, we can't ignore the most controversial aspect of that prior effort, which was the size & possible usage of the boathouse proposed for the upstream end of the zone. Having seen the negative response from trail users, environmentalists, and the public at large to the proposal of such an oversized structure, it doesn't make sense to the CCCT that this study wouldn't place limits on what can be done in the part of the zone which is inside the C&O Canal NHP, abutting the CCT. In order to preserve the historical setting, not to mention river views from the Towpath, we would recommend that no building upriver from the Aqueduct Bridge should have a roof height above the elevation of the Towpath. Given the results shown in the hydrological analysis performed in your 2006 Environmental Analysis, which showed that a building occupying approximately 80' of the 100' between the CCT and the river would cause flow velocities along the canal embankment to increase to dangerous, if not catastrophic levels when the river is at flood stage, we think the maximum building dimension in that direction should be in the 40'-50' range. The length of the building along the CCT also has an impact on the flow velocities, as well as the CCT user experience, and for that reason we suggest an individual building should be limited to a length sufficient to house the larger crafts used at that facility (e.g. a building length of 80' would accommodate a rowing shell which uses an 8 member crew), and, if multiple buildings are needed, they should have significant open space between them. Even a building having these smaller dimensions would have to have a hydrological analysis performed to ascertain whether it would yield flow velocities low enough to remove the threat to the embankment.

We also feel that restrictions should be placed on the usage of any boathouses located within the C&O Canal NHP. Such restrictions would limit activities to those directly related to the boating activities of that facility. Out of respect for the public nature of the park they're located within, no private social functions should be allowed at these facilities.

A final comment concerns the physical location of the CCT. For the 26 years of the CCCT's existence we have worked very hard to keep the trail located along the centerline of the old railroad right-of-way, both horizontally & vertically. At the March workshop someone mentioned the possibility of shifting the trail off that alignment, and I just wanted to repeat what I said at that time, which is that such proposals are complete non-starters for our members, and the trail users.

We look forward to the results of your feasibility study, and working with you to achieve the best possible outcome for trail users and boating advocates within the proposed boathouse zone.

Sincerely,

Ernie Brooks  
Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail  
brooksew@hotmail.com  
contact@cctrail.org  
(202) 726-6040

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 74

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: William E. Elcome  
Organization: Washington Area Bicyclist Assn  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 1826 16th St, NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
washington, DC 20009  
USA  
E-mail: wm.elcome@verizon.net

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I bicycle the Capital Crescent Trail every day and knowing it so well, I am strenuously opposed to building any new structures, especially private ones requiring motorized vehicle access, beyond the remnant of the historic aqueduct upriver from Key Bridge for safety sake.

The aqueduct is a natural choke point for all traffic on the Capital Crescent Trail and to add vehicles particularly trucks with trailers with eight person rowing shells thereon presents a serious hazard to the one million plus people who transit the trail every year.

Beyond the aqueduct simple inspection and measurement of the area that I as an engineer have done will demonstrate that there is simply not enough area to safely accommodate a turnaround for ninety foot plus truck and trailer combinations without seriously interrupting traffic flow.

To suggest otherwise is denying the realities of the space and will subject trail users to hazards.

I strongly encourage you to support construction of boathouses down stream of the aqueduct and NOT upstream. The universities and scholastic boaters deserve more facilities, just not upstream of the aqueduct.

Sincerely,  
William E. Elcome III

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 75

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: David E. Winer  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address:  
Bethesda, MD 29816  
USA  
E-mail: david1winer@yahoo.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

You can avoid the wrath of huge numbers of concerned citizens by considering no private boathouses in the C&O Canal National Historical Park.

The old Dempsey site would be an excellent location for a boathouse.

There is room for boathouses below 34th Street in the Georgetown Riverfront Park. This large park was created without input from citizens outside Georgetown so is fair for conversion to other recreational use (without seriously impinging on the quality of the park).

Recognize that the small parcel of land upriver, owned by Georgetown University, has very little value. The C&O Canal NHP has no need for it. It is patently unsuitable for use as a boathouse for many reasons. Thus it must not be considered a bargaining chip in locating a boathouse for the University.

Input from all citizens concerned with the non-motorized boathouse zone must be solicited and heeded. Fortunately this now appears to be the case, in contrast with the previous inept, one sided handling of these issues by NPS managers.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 76

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carol M. Purcell  
Organization: C & O Canal Association  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Boyds, MD 20841  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

It would be a shame to allow the Georgetown Boat House to be built on National Park land. I feel that such an act would allow a foot in the door to every other group, person, organization that would like to build on park land, be it a fishing shack, ranch building, hotel, or any other intrusive structure. In this instance, the C & O National Historical Park is a refuge from the city and a marvelous hiking trail that leads from tidal waters to the mountains. Please do not allow this treasure to be sold to the highest bidder, thus opening the flood gates to other incursions in the park.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 77

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Martin Lowenfish  
Organization: Washington Canoe Club  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Washington, DC 20012  
USA  
E-mail: martin\_lowenfish@yahoo.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I am a long time user of the Potomac River in DC and appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed non-motorized boathouse zone. During my time on the river, there has been a tremendous growth of interest by the public in paddlesports and rowing, and I think it is great that NPS is taking active steps to support this activity with the boathouse zone. I am a member of the Washington Canoe Club feel that this historic club and the structure fill a unique role down on the river for the following reasons: WCC is the only place on the Georgetown Waterfront offering competitive paddling and a clear path for Olympic hopefuls.

WCC offers virtually unlimited recreational paddling.

WCC hosts community outreach and competitive events throughout the year to include:

Wounded Warrior events with three separate WW groups that require storage of special equipment, handicapped access, and proximity to Walter Reed National Military Medical Center and Bethesda Naval Hospital.

WCC hosts important events including:

Events for underprivileged neighborhoods to experience the river with the help of experienced boaters.

Partnership with Surfrider Foundation to help preserve and protect the river and environment.

Local and National-level regattas that help develop Washingtonians into world-class competitors.

Partnership with NPS in the Canal Stewardship program (WCC has adopted Mile 2).

In order to provide these services and host these events the club needs:

About 100' of dock to safely launch during peak times.

A space that supports high-use during early mornings, late afternoons, and all day on weekends Spring through Fall.

River access that accommodates a variety of non-motorized paddling craft.

Indoor and outdoor storage of boats.

Temporary storage and changing space (e.g. locker rooms) for local members and visiting competitors and guests.

A race course with proximity to the club. The historic race course ending at the center of the WCC clubhouse and starting 1000m upstream.

In addition to these comments specifically related to the WCC, I feel that the boathouse zone needs to provide some free public launching facilities for those members of the public who want to launch their craft. Currently, the closest free public access to the river is at Columbia Island.

Further I think that all development of boathouses should take into account the traffic pattern of launches and landings of boats and that boathouses that are primarily paddling and those that are primarily rowing should be grouped together to reduce the potential for collisions and conflict.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 78

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Margie Orrick  
Organization: Rock Creek Rowing  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA  
E-mail: margie.orrick@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

For the past decade I have been a frequent visitor to the Georgetown waterfront area of the non-motorized boathouse zone. I row out of Thompson Boat Center at least 4 mornings a week for 8 months of the year.

Your Interview Findings of current uses ? team rowing - excluded adult masters rowers from Thompson Boat Center and Potomac Boat Club. Just considering the competitive masters team I row with, Rock Creek Rowing, there are over 5,000 uses annually (an average of 36 RCR rowers per day x 4 days per week x 35 weeks). Please include us in your statistics of Current Uses.

I support the non-motorized boathouse zone. I support returning the land use to that of 1922 as show in one of your photos displayed at the March 3, 2012 meeting. This photo shows Key Bridge, the Aquaduct Bridge next to it, and multiple boathouses and docks upstream of the Aquaduct Bridge. NPS has an opportunity to provide water access to meet the growing demand of an increasingly health-conscious public.

I support the construction of at least 2 boathouses, for Georgetown and GW Universities, and also for a third boathouse ? the demand is there, they would be appropriately used.

I support Thompson Boat Center being included in the study area. It is an outmoded structure whose time has come to be replaced or significantly upgraded to accommodate a broader segment of the public. Currently TBC is not handicap accessible nor heated. The current TBC docks are not structured to accommodate wakeless launches. The bulkhead is subsiding. The rack space is not used effectively. NPS has an opportunity to make TBC a LEED certified structure which is Energy Star compliant, offering

innovative programming throughout the day and throughout the year. TBC could be a gem of the National Park Service.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 79

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John Spoko  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
not provided, DC 20242  
USA  
E-mail: jsopko@akingump.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/06/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I was out of town and not able to attend the Saturday meeting but the PRC was represented by three other members who I hope introduced themselves to you. Again, on behalf of the unaffiliated rowers on the Potomac, we have serious concerns that our interests are either ignored, or more importantly, harmed in the process of creating this zone for the University and High School teams. We strongly support the building of boat houses to support the colleges and nearby high schools but not at the expense of the unaffiliated rowers who are basically rowing out of TBC. We heard unofficially that the Park Service is planning on banning us from TBC and turning that facility into a program only for club sweep rowing. If true, we would literally be out on the street. Let me add, that there are probably a hundred or more unaffiliated scullers in TBC and probably many more who are on the wait list to obtain a slip there who should not be ignored in this process. I hope as this process proceeds you continue to keep our interests in mind along with all of the organized clubs and schools.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 80

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary Catherine Bain  
Organization: Surfrider Foundation - DC Chapter  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
Washington, DC 20242  
USA  
E-mail: marycbain@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/06/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

I was not able to make the workshop on Saturday, but heard a lot of positive things about it! While I know many were there, representing and vocalizing (probably better than I could) the needs of public access to the river, I just wanted to voice a few thoughts too. I am an avid stand-up paddler, Surfrider Foundation member and River Outreach Coordinator, DC resident, and I work in Georgetown (on Thomas Jefferson St) and therefore have (and continue to) spend a LOT of time along the Georgetown waterfront area.

My biggest concern and objective for this NPS study, particularly as a paddler and Surfrider member, is for increased, FREE public access to the river. Currently, the access is extremely limited. While we know the rowing community is wellrepresented through many high schools, colleges and universities and the general public, we worry the Stand Up Paddlers (and other type of non-motorized river user other than rowers) are very UNDER-represented and could be at risk of losing the already extremely limited access to the river during this process.

I know our Surfrider Chair, Cheryl Norcross already submitted a thorough letter outlining Surfrider's goals, which I agree with whole-heartedly:

- 1) to protect public river access for recreation, and
- 2) to protect and promote the growth of stand up paddling and prone paddling in Washington, DC.

And in addition, I think the biggest point is that whether we are paddlers, rowers, boathouses or businesses, we are all on the same team. All of the groups involved are likely active river users (or hikers/bikers) who love the Georgetown waterfront and the Potomac River. And although we may not participate in the same sports, we love the same body of water and know that we can work together to protect it! Look forward to the next workshop(s) and staying involved on this matter in any way! Please keep the updates coming!

Thanks so much!

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 81

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jimmie McClellan  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
not provide, VA 20242  
USA  
E-mail: jmcclellan@nvcc.edu

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

The Potomac is a great asset. It not only adds beauty to our City and provides us with our water supply, it is a place for recreation. Many different uses are made of the river for this purpose: fishing, skiing, excursions, rowing, paddling. While all of these activities use the river, not all uses are necessarily compatible.

The idea of securing an area of the river free from motorized boats would be advantageous to rowers and paddlers.

The wakes from motor boats present problems to kayaks and canoes. These wakes can cause a canoe or kayak to overturn. This is a problem anytime of the year and can be lifethreatening in winter.

If an area from Georgetown to above Key Bridge could be designated free of motor boats it would provide security for paddlers and rowers and a greater sense of tranquility for all without eliminating motorized travel in the miles of river below Georgetown.

Rounding the bend in the river upstream from Georgetown, the city and the 21st century disappear. It would be nice to have that area free from the noise and wakes.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 82

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Pete Thompson  
Organization: Rock Creek Rowing Inc.  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: 6608 32nd Place NW  
Washington, DC 20015  
USA  
E-mail: RockCreekRowing@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/29/2012 Date Received: 04/09/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. Whitesell:

I am privileged to serve as president of Rock Creek Rowing Inc. (RCR"), an independent, masters-level competitive rowing club of approximately fifty members, which rows at or before dawn four days per week out of the Thompson Boat Center ("TBC") facility. On March 3, I and several other RCR members attended the NPS Workshop on the "Feasibility Study for a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront." The event was a stimulating and impressive mix of a great range of interested parties in the rowing community, as well as the recreational paddling and water sports communities. We also were impressed by, and endorse and appreciate, the comprehensive approach the National Park Service is taking in planning for the needs of the many overlapping rowing and recreational organizations, and we welcome this opportunity to submit our comments concerning the various components of the study.

Many of RCR's members, which include equal numbers of adult men and women, have been involved in the rowing community for years. Some have been rowers in their own right for decades. Others were first introduced to rowing as parents of scholastic rowers whose love of the sport, and of the Potomac, served as a catalyst for us to take up rowing ourselves. Many of us began rowing through learn-to-row programs offered at TBC. Whatever our paths may have been, collectively our membership has a long history with, and keen appreciation of, the Potomac River and the Georgetown Waterfront area not only as one of the nation's premier rowing venues but as a recreational and natural resource for the entire community. We also have a keen appreciation of the significant limitations presented by the existing boathouse facilities on the DC side of the Potomac (including TBC) and the benefits ' recreational and aesthetic ' that would flow from the carefully planned introduction of

additional boathouses along the Georgetown Waterfront for rowing and other non-motorized boating disciplines.

From this background, we wanted to forward a statement of position of Rock Creek Rowing concerning the various components of the subject study, and we look forward to NPS making a decision soon to permit construction of additional boathouse capacity in the Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the Georgetown Waterfront.

As was abundantly clear at the workshop, the overlapping needs (existing and potential) of rowers and other recreational users of the Potomac mean that a comprehensive approach to planning is required. We also firmly believe that such planning must include not only the construction of new boathouses in new locations but a concerted effort to improve and expand the existing TBC facility.

Specifically, RCR believes that the following points are paramount:

? RCR supports the efforts of Georgetown and George Washington Universities to build two new University boathouses that would not require public funding. The construction of these boathouses would have a profound effect on the community's enjoyment of the Potomac, including opening up the overcrowded TBC facility (see below).

? Georgetown Waterfront Park should remain as it is, consistent with the original intent to provide high quality access to the spaces and view corridors along the Potomac.

? WASA should be required to specify, at the earliest possible date, the location and size of the access shafts required for the tunnel work.

? Modification or replacement of Thompson Boat Center should be included in the study.

? TBC has eminently fulfilled its original purpose of serving as a catalyst for community access to the Potomac and for the growth of a thriving rowing community. After fifty years, however, the time has come for this facility to step forward into the 21st century on a prime site in our nation's capital.

? Given the incredible aesthetic potential of the TBC site, and the benefits that would flow from improved accessibility to this community resource, the improvement or replacement of this existing facility would have a high impact on the quality of experience for all visitors to the waterfront.

? Taken in the context of the relatively new Swedish Embassy building, and its location in sight of the Kennedy Center, Thompson Boat Center is now part of a high quality building corridor. As such, TBC can and should build on the perceived quality of this context.

? The value of TBC could also be enhanced by an innovative approach to yearround programming. Several boathouses throughout the U.S. are redefining and expanding their purpose to reach a broader community. Currently the unheated TBC facility is closed completely four months of the year. When it is

open, its use, especially during the week, tends to be concentrated in the very early morning hours and in the late afternoons, with lighter use during the middle of the day and none after dark. We believe that there is significant untapped potential for expanded use of an improved TBC facility both during the winter months and year-round.

We look forward to participating in future reviews and workshops going forward. We hope that the foregoing points may be helpful in driving a planning process that will take full advantage of the incredible potential of the Georgetown waterfront for all parties involved.

Sincerely yours,  
Pete Thompson  
President  
Rock Creek Rowing Inc.

cc: Rep. Eleanor Holmes-Norton, US House of Representatives  
Rep. James P. Moran, US House of Representatives  
Chairman Kwame R. Brown, DC City Council  
Council Member Jack Evans, DC City Council  
Council Member Mary Cheh, DC City Council  
George S. Hawkins, WASA General Manager

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 83

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Marilyn Magnus  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 2888 East Peacham Road  
Barnet, VT 05821  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/25/2012 Date Received: 06/04/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. May,

I am a member of the C&O Canal Association. I have biked the C&O twice. It is a wonderful national treasure.

I am not in favor of a private facility being built in the C&O Canal NHP.

The preservation of the C&O Canal park is of the utmost importance. Development of any kind will only diminish its natural status.

Sincerely Yours,  
Marilyn Magnus

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 84

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: DJ Manalo  
Organization: Chesapeake Paddlers Association  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: H - Recreational Groups  
Address: not provided  
          washington, DC 20242  
          USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New                      Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent:                      Date Received: 03/03/2012  
Number of Signatures: 4      Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No      Type: Other  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

NMBZ Georgetown: CPA Potomac River Accessibility Taskforce

I. CPA NMBZ Workshop Mission

A. History - The Chesapeake Paddlers Association, Inc. (CPA) is an all volunteer-run organization that is currently comprised of ~700 regional sea kayakers who organize trips and activities throughout the Chesapeake Bay region since 1990. In 2011 alone, CPA led 85 activities that included kayak trips, kayak camping trips, award-winning instructional workshops, and evening paddles (aka "CPA Piracies": Pirates of Georgetown, plus 5 others in DEIMDIDCNA region). In addition, CPA members volunteered to provide numerous kayak swim support duties, including The Nation's Tr~ The DC Tn, and The Great Chesapeake Bay Swim, in close coordination with its organizers and the NPS.

B. Mission ' CPA's mission to promote the growing paddling sport of sea kayaking by combines water and personal safety awareness for communities along the Chesapeake Basin.

C. NMBZ ' Basis Potomac River Access from Georgetown for Recreational Paddlers - CPA seeks to take an active and productive role towards the establishment for a NPS designated Car-top boat launch site that ultimately permits greater accessibility into the Potomac River at the Georgetown/Rosslyn section for all paddlers. CPA representatives are eager to work closely and productively with the National Park Service and all vested parties, on behalf of its membership and paddling community.

II. CPA ' Recommendations for a NPS-designated NMBZ at Georgetown

A. General Stakeholders - Public NMBZ Cartop Launch site:

- CPA supports a Public-Use Only NPS-designated NMBZ Cartop Launch site at the NMBZ Georgetown Waterfront that permits accessibility for all CPA members, as well as the general recreational paddling community (SUP5, Rowers, etc).
- NMBZ Launch Site must operate for Public-Use Only, independent of Jack's Boathouse, Washington Canoe Club, Potomac Boat Club, Thompsons Boathouse, other businesses.

#### B. ~. Physical Site and Use Considerations

- CPA recommends that NPS consider the following features for recreational paddlers.

##### 1. Specific Parking Use Only '

? Access should be restricted to cartop boats users only (possibly some spots for trailers w/min 3 kayaks/boats) upon entry to discourage opportunistic parking

?NMBZ Parking must be special use only, possibly electronically-gated; with day tickets posted on windshield.

?Parking tickets should be issued for that day only, and clearly dated.

?Total Parking/Boat ramp fees should not exceed cost of renting at on-site outfitters.

? Reserve limited parking blocks for non-commercial special events/ activities

##### 2. Operational hours

? Ideally open 18-24hrs/day

?Parking privileges will expire at end of day (12mid).

##### 3. Fees/Passes

- Cartop boat ramp/launch fees should be considered to reduce opportunistic parking by nonpaddlers.

- CPA recommends that boat launch fees are comparably or equivalent to Regional and State Park systems in VA/MD, or similar to NPS fees at Great Falls - C&O Canal.

(For example, \$5/day boat ramp fees are required at reservoirs at Fountainhead, Little Seneca, Triadelphia Reservoirs, whereas a 3 day permit is charged at Great Falls NP in MD and VA.)

- A daily or multiday parking fee (paddle boat) could be assessed, but total costs should not exceed average cost for renting paddle boats locally.

- A parking system needs to be established to prevent abuse of parking privileges

##### 4. Boat Ramp Launch Access/Design considerations

? NPS should designate a kayak/canoe drop-off zone only.

? A boat ramp fee may be applied, providing parking is provided.

? Cars can opt to park at the special-use boat ramp parking zone, established by NPS.

? Consider wide access points into Potomac NMBZ (low docks and/or beach/dirt).

? Consider kayak roller ramp (similar to other parks).

? Consider removable rubberized-mats (seasonal) atop concrete ramp and/or sandy beach areas (see Fountainhead RP)

? 4-6 inch curbsides are ideal for safer unloading/load high-top boats from SUVs/Vans/Trucks.

? Fishing on docks should be prohibited.

#### 5. Facilities

? Restrooms similar to Columbia Island Marina, Shelters/picnic area/waste/trash.

? Paddling Info station:

? Park maps which outline paddle routes w/approximate distance and total paddle times.

? Points of interests should be highlighted.

? Tide map could be shown, but likely not necessary this far up.

? Park maps which outline paddle routes w/approximate distance and total paddle times.

? Points of interests should be highlighted.

? Tide map could be shown, but likely not necessary this far up.

#### C. : CPA Interaction with current facilities

? Washington Canoe Club (WCC) :: CPA has structured its weekly paddling series in close coordination with members of WCC who permitted free launches from its boat docks

? Jack's Boathouse (JB):: CPA members are granted access to the Potomac from the boat docks.

? While CPA members greatly appreciate these efforts, regular visits to Georgetown among members and groups are often limited given parking restrictive issues and special events by existing establishments.

#### D. ~: Kayakers Impact on Local Businesses (Economic)::

? CPA members take advantage of the resource value offered at Thompsons and JB, that would include access to kayak rentals for members of its trip party.

? CPA group activities routinely include luncheons or dining at establishments at Georgetown, following its paddling trips from WCC.

? Addition of a Public Cartop launch sites will likely encourage other regional kayaking clubs like (Washington Kayak Club, Chesapeake Kayak Adventures and Watersedge Kayak Club) to organize larger and more frequent paddling trips to Georgetown and vicinity.

#### Identify Opportunities

1. NPS might consider expanding NMBZ project to NPS site at Rosslyn, VA~ (See Attachment 1)

? CPA members identified a potential NMBZ at Rosslyn that could ideally serve, as an additional Public Cartop Launch Site to the Potomac at the Key Bridge.

This site is already on NPS Property and located directly across the Francis Scott Key Memorial Bridge at Rosslyn on partially-developed land

? This proposed NMBZ launch site is easily accessible from GWP Northbound lane, as well as from Pedestrian Crosswalk adjacent and just north of the parking entrance to Roosevelt Island (alternate parking advantage).

? CPA has outlined the feasibility for an NMBZ-Rosslyn site in the Attachment I below.

2. Advantages for a Cartop Launch Site at NMBZ-Rosslyn:

? CPA argues that the designation and development for a NMBZ-Rosslyn site together

with NMBZ-Georgetown will satisfy NPS Objectives #1, #2, #6, #7,#8.

Development of the site will not interfere with current parking limits/space available at the Roosevelt Island Visitor parking lot.

? NMBZ-Rosslyn site would better relieve traffic congestion at NMBZ-Georgetown  
NMBZ-Rosslyn provides easier and practical accessibility and a short distance to NMBZ-Georgetown

? More space can be dedicated at NMBZ-Georgetown to WCC, PBC, Jack's, GWU and Georgetown Univ rowing/paddling members and its activities.

? NPS could utilize additional revenue (leasing agreements/fees) to maintain both NMBZ-Rosslyn site, if integrated into a single project.

? CPA volunteers can support cleanup/maintenance along water trails/NMB Access sites, similar to annual cleanup efforts along the Patuxent River Park Water trails.

#### IV. CPA Board Members

##### A. CPA Kayak Accessibility Taskforce Volunteers ' NMBZ Georgetown Project

- DJ Manalo (Lead, dj.manaio~qmaiLcom; 410-507-4799 cell)

- Chuck Haberlein (CHaberlein~aoI.com; 703-307-0137 cell)

- Gina Cikatello (consults)

- Peter Henry (consults)

##### B. CPA Board Members:

Jay Gitomer (Coordinator) Sue Stevens (Secretary)

Rich Stevens (Treasurer) Catriona Miller (Steering Committee)

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 85

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Thomas O'Dea  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6404 Kenhowe Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/06/2012 Date Received: 03/13/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes: This letter was sent to Secretary Salazar as well as Tammy Stidham, project manager. Both letters were the same and are attached

### Correspondence Text

Dear Secretary Salazar:

The C&O Canal National Historical Park is not a proper space for private development. The C&OCNHP's authority to engage in land exchanges should be used to enhance the NHP, not to create new enclaves within it.

Excellent opportunities exist for development of boating facilities downriver from the C&OCNHP. An appropriate site for construction of boathouse(s) that could be used by rowing teams exists immediately upriver from 34th Street, Although owned and administered by NPS, this area is not being used as parkland and is probably the least environmentally-sensitive part of the zone's shoreline. It could be developed for boating by NPS. or by private universities on the basis of leasing or fair purchase/land exchange transactions. There are also other publically-owned properties near the 34th Street location that are not being used as parkland and may have potential as sites for boating support facilities.

The Park Service should recognize: that team rowing is only one of several popular boating activities in the zone; that boating of all kinds is only one category of desirable recreation practiced there; and that all recreational goals must respect scenic, environmental, and historical values.

Yours truly,

Thomas O'Dea

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 86

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary Pierce  
Organization: C & O Canal National Historical Park  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
not provided, MD 20242  
USA  
E-mail: pierce222@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 05/01/2012 Date Received: 05/01/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. May:

Please find attached the approved position paper of the C & O Canal National Historical Park Federal Advisory Commission submitted to the National Park Service (NPS) on January 18, 2008 as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for the then-proposed Georgetown University Boathouse. Commission concerns were focused on impact of the use on C & O Canal National Historical Park property and on the legislated historical and recreational mission of the Park.

Although the Commission as an official body expired in 2010 members continue to meet pending passage of legislation to re-establish. Four years later the concerns expressed in the 2008 document remain applicable as stated to any proposed construction and use of boathouses in the vicinity of the Park in Georgetown. I am asking that this position paper be included in the public record for the current NPS Feasibility Study as it progresses through its required phases.

Please contact us should you have any questions about the issues discussed in the document. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the public comment process.

Sincerely,  
Mcwy L. Pierce  
Merrily Pierce, Commissioner (2004-2010)  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
Pierce222@gmail.com

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 87

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert vom Eigen  
Organization: Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: O - Civic Groups  
Address: P.O. Box 3653  
Washington, DC 20027  
USA  
E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Transcript  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

#### FRIENDS OF GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT PARK

Statement of Position on NPS's Feasibility Study to Implement a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Along the Georgetown Waterfront

The Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park (FOGWP) is a non-profit corporation established to support the construction, maintenance and continuing enjoyment of the ten acre National Park located on the Potomac River between 31st Street and 34th Street on the Georgetown waterfront. The design of the Park was intended to enhance the ability of the general public to view and participate in the crew races and regattas that are conducted on the Potomac. One of the long ago validated needs on this portion of the river has been for construction of additional boathouse capacity to permit the proper storage of the shells used by the university and high school rowing teams that are currently unable to find adequate space in Thompson's Boat Center. FOGWP is very concerned that the Feasibility Study, as now defined, will not accelerate the construction of additional boathouse capacity along the Georgetown waterfront, and misses the opportunity to move that process forward.

#### Background

In January 1987, the Georgetown Waterfront Park Plan was approved by the Director of the National Capital Region of the National Park Service after the draft plan had been reviewed and supported by the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Office of Planning, the Commission of Fine Arts, the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Review Board and the C&O Canal National Historic Advisory Board. That plan contained a series of action steps that were to promote the preservation, restoration and enhancement of the historic resources of the area. Included was a

recommendation to redesign Thompson's Boat Center to improve its appearance and to redesign the parking lot to accommodate crowds during boating events.

Citing a recent NPS study that found "considerable unmet demand for non-motorized boating facilities," the Plan designates an area where the construction of "new boathouses is appropriate." This area "...does not extend further west of Key Bridge than about 1,100 feet because of the policy aimed at preservation of the natural appearance of the Palisades. To the east of Key Bridge, the boundary embraces the site of the proposed floating restaurant. Should the restaurant not be installed (sic), the area is appropriate for boating facilities."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup>See Action items 12 and 13 in the Plan attached hereto.

<sup>2</sup>Id at Action Item 14.

31d.

A subsequent NPS publication, *Special Study - Nonmotorized Boating in the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers*~ Washington, D.C., (Preliminary Report, January 1989) identifies five sites potentially available for boathouses: (1) the site west of the location of the boathouse used by the Washington Canoe Club; (2) the Dempsey site, east of the Canoe Club extending to the remains of the Aqueduct Bridge (which site the Study acknowledges sits astride a major outlet chamber of the Dulles Interceptor Sewer and would require "major repair"); (3) the site between the Potomac Boat Club and Key Bridge currently occupied by three townhouses and Jack's Boats; (4) the Ice House Building site to the north of Water Street, which would require access to the river via the parcel to the east of Key Bridge, which at the time of the study was assumed to be the location of the floating restaurant; and (5) in the event the restaurant were not built, the site between Key Bridge and the foot of 34th Street on the south side of Water Street. Georgetown University proposed in 2006 to construct its boathouse on the site west of the location of the Washington Canoe Club, and an environmental assessment (EA) was conducted by the NPS. FOGWP filed comments supportive of the construction of the boathouse on that site. Based upon this EA and comments received, NPS determined that an environmental impact statement would be needed, and it is believed that Georgetown University funded the preparation of the draft EIS (as well as the prior EA). However, the draft EIS has never been released by NPS for public comment, and progress on constructing a boathouse has been held in limbo during the succeeding six years.

During this hiatus, it has become apparent that the DC Clean Rivers Project of the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority (WASA) could have a significant impact upon the Georgetown waterfront. The project is mandated by a consent decree between the Environment Protection Agency and WASA to eliminate most of the dumping of raw sewerage into the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers during periods of precipitation run-offs through a combined sewer system constructed in the 19th century. Although design of the Potomac River portion of the project will not be completed until 2018, it is understood that an enormous runoff storage tunnel several thousand feet long and 100 feet underground will need to be bored, and that two access shafts and a pumping station will need to be constructed along the waterfront. It is clear that no investment in boathouse construction will be made until the locations and magnitude of the access shafts are determined.

#### Comments on the Nature and Scope of the Feasibility Study

(1) The study should provide the grounds upon which NPS can make a decision to permit construction of additional boathouse capacity. Numerous studies on the riverfront have been conducted since the 1970's.<sup>4</sup> It's time for the NPS to make a decision on where and what size boathouses it will permit to be constructed along the Georgetown waterfront. However, during the outreach session in which FOGWP representatives met with representatives of Louis Berger and NPS on January 30, 2012,

we learned that this Feasibility Study would not be a decision document. This is a lost opportunity, and draws into question the wisdom of consuming the time and money of the government and interested parties simply to create another document to put on the shelf along with all the preceding studies. The rowing community and those who wish to enjoy watching their efforts deserve to see progress towards building boating facilities that free up space at Thompsons Boat Center to accommodate high school crews. Construction of two university boathouses is the best way to achieve that goal. These boathouses can be built relatively quickly, and will not required public funds.

(2) WASA should be required to specify the location and size of its access shafts, and to describe the level of disruption on the Georgetown Waterfront. WASA may not at this time be able to make a final decision on the design of the Potomac River storage tunnel, pumping station and access shafts until environmental impact studies have been made. However, they can provide guidance on where the most likely sites for those facilities will be constructed and the level of disruption that is likely to occur. No investment by private parties or the universities will be made along the riverfront without WASA commitment on these details.

(3) Potential modifications to the Thompson Boat Center should be included within the scope of the Feasibility Study. The obvious rowing facility curiously not included in the study is Thompson Boat Center. Opened in 1960 specifically to attract "large intercollegiate and interscholastic rowing competitions Washington ... Superintendent Harry T. Thompson said, 'We hope that colleges and universities and secondary schools will make it their headquarters in future years.'" Thompson's needs to be improved, repaired and upgraded to continue to meet this vision, and this is surely the time to work toward that result. With interior redesign, it can be much more functional and more esthetically pleasing on this prominent riverfront site. The option of increasing the capacity of Thompson's Boat Center or even the feasibility of constructing a facility on adjacent land should be explored as part of this study. Modifications to this facility were contemplated in the 1987 Georgetown Waterfront Park Plan, and the Feasibility Study should decide what is to be done with this facility. Thompson's is a critical link in boathouse planning for the river.

(4) FOGWP is adamant that the long-awaited and recently opened Georgetown Waterfront Park must not be cannibalized for space, whether for boathouses. WASA installations or anything else. Nearly, \$24 million of Federal, District of Columbia, foundation and private donor funds have been expended to build this gem on the Georgetown waterfront, and it should not be regarded as available open space for other projects. There is a covenant among FOGWP, NPS and the donors that helped build it that this park resource should remain as is in perpetuity.

~ The 1989 Special Study speaks about the accomplishment of goals: "If this study and the plans and action that result from it are to be successful, they will have positively addressed the following goal statements.. [which include] encouraging the installation of two or three additional architecturally compatible boathouse facilities...." During the 22 intervening years, no progress has been made, and today we face yet another study with no decision by the NPS contemplated. 6 Evening Star, September 25, 1960.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 88

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: JMC INC.  
Organization: Yorktown High School  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: L - Non-Governmental  
Address: 3408 N. Venice Street  
Arlington, VA Arlington  
USA  
E-mail: andy@andybacas.com

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/01/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 4 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Ms. Tammy Stidham  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
National Capital Region  
1100 Ohio Drive SW  
Washington, DC 20242

Ms. Margaret C. Stewart  
Senior Planner  
The Lewis Berger Group, Inc.  
1250 23rd Street, NW

Washington, DC 20037

Re: COMMENTS OF YORKTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA TO  
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ON THE PROPOSED NON-MOTORIZED  
BOATHOUSE ZONE IN GEORGETOWN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dear Tammy and Margaret:

Yorktown High School (Yorktown) has approximately 1700 students attending grades 9 to 12 and is one of three traditional public high schools located in Arlington, Virginia. The Yorktown rowing team is 44-years old. Since the team's inception in 1968, Yorktown has been a tenant in Thompson Boat Center (TBC) on

the upper Potomac River. Today, rowing is the school's second largest sport in terms of active student athletes. This year, our rowing program registered over 120 student athletes, making it one of the largest rowing programs on the upper Potomac. However, the program's continued growth and viability is dependent upon adequate and safe access to the river. Unlike in 1968, TBC is now at absolute capacity, spurred by the increased popularity of rowing as a sport in the Washington, D.C. region. The overcrowding threatens Yorktown's ability to accommodate and develop all of its student athletes. Overcrowding also creates logistical and safety concerns for all users of the boathouse facility. Thus, new boathouse facilities are essential if the sport can continue to grow at Yorktown and regionally. Development of the non-motorized boathouse zone (NMBZ) is a critical and important step in meeting the increased demand for rowing facilities on the upper Potomac, and is strongly supported by Yorktown.

Comments on NPS's Proposed Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone Along the Georgetown Waterfront.

1. NPS's evaluation of the proposed NMBZ should strongly consider the views of high school rowing programs that utilize and depend upon access to the Potomac River. High school crews have relied upon Potomac River access for decades. For example, Washington-Lee High School, also in Arlington, Virginia, has been a tenant/member of the Potomac Boat Club (PBC) since 1949. Since Yorktown became a tenant at TBC, occupancy of that facility has expanded considerably. In 1968, Yorktown was one of only two local high schools that rented rack space there. Today, twelve public and private high schools based in Maryland, D.C., and Virginia rent rack space at TBC. Together, these teams bring hundreds of student athletes to TBC during the spring and fall crew racing seasons. On race days, these numbers swell with the inclusion of guest teams, parents, school administrators, and team supporters. High school rowing programs are an important Potomac River constituency that should have a voice in the NMBZ review process.

2. Yorktown strongly favors creation of the NMBZ. The NMBZ will permit the two local universities that rent rack space at TBC to build their own boathouses on the upper Potomac. Yorktown understands that both Georgetown University and George Washington University have proposed to build standalone boathouses to support their rowing programs if the NMBZ is approved. The exit of the college teams from TBC will free up a significant amount of space for the high school teams, currently constrained. Specifically, with added space at TBC, Yorktown would be able to store more equipment and accommodate more of the rowers in its program. Based on the equipment it is able to store today, Yorktown can only "float" 82 of its approximately 120 athletes at any given time. This prevents almost one-third of its student athletes from rowing an afternoon practice.<sup>1</sup> The constraint impairs their potential development as rowing athletes and creates management, discipline and safety challenges for the coaching staff and boosters.<sup>2</sup>

3. The building of two new attractive college boathouse venues on the upper Potomac would likely make the Potomac River a more attractive racing venue in the month of April each year. While the nation's capital's iconic landmarks make the Potomac River a racing destination for teams across the country, the river currently

does not have the infrastructure to support large races (regattas) that other cities, like Philadelphia, can support. While racing does occur on the Potomac, to compete our students often have to travel to the Occoquan River in southern Fairfax County, Virginia or out of town for at great expense to the students and the program. The college programs, however, have the money and manpower to maintain a buoyed racecourse on the Potomac during the racing season that the high school teams could use to remain local. New boathouses, only possible with the NMBZ, provide the colleges with greater incentives and more resources to maintain a buoyed racecourse that hosts local regattas, benefitting local student athletes on the college and high school levels. Additional weekend regattas on the Potomac River would also benefit local businesses in the Washington Harbor complex during otherwise slow periods (Saturday and Sunday mornings).

-----  
1 Yorktown, rowing is a "no-cut" sport. That means that it is open to every athlete at our school regardless of ability. Thus, we are unable to limit the size of our team regardless of space constraints at TBC. Moreover, the school's population is expected to grow, which will put more pressure on existing resources, including crew.

2 The TBC facility is further constrained by limited dock space to secure coaching launches. Yorktown is able to rent only three spaces at the TBC facility. We store two other launches at the "Jack's" facility near Potomac Boat Club.

-----  
4. The building of new boathouses in a NMBZ would increase safety by lessening congestion at TBC without dramatically increasing traffic flow on the Potomac River. Congestion increases the potential for boating accidents and resulting injuries. Although college programs at TBC create space constraints for high school equipment storage, those programs tend to row morning practices while the high school teams row afternoon practices. The addition of new boathouses would not change this traffic pattern. Traffic flow would experience a marginal increase as additional facilities could accommodate more students. However, by dispersing the launch and recovery traffic from a single boathouse location to multiple locations (new boathouses, plus the existing PBC and TBC), much of the congestion currently experienced can be reduced. Yorktown would also consider moving its program to one of the new college boathouses to further reduce congestion at TBC if legally feasible.

5. In addition to the proposed NMBZ, Yorktown supports any efforts by NPS to examine the feasibility of making improvements at TBC that would better meet the needs of the rowing community, provide an anchor facility for racing on the upper Potomac, and provide an attractive landmark facility that would benefit the city and the Georgetown Waterfront. Yorktown also supports the consideration of a future Arlington Boathouse on the river's Virginia side that could support existing high school teams, or offer additional, specialized uses of the river such as small sculling boats and recreational paddle craft.

## Conclusion

High school rowing has been an integral part of the upper Potomac for more than 60 years. Yorktown's rowing program has experienced steady growth in the number of

athletes over the past ten years. This growth mirrors local and national interest in rowing, and the subsequent growth pressures facing Yorktown's program are similar to those of other area high schools. However, we believe that these pressures should not discourage rowing on the upper Potomac. We view rowing as directly aligned with Arlington County's and the President's goal of encouraging vigorous exercise and a healthy lifestyle. Moreover, rowing has an enormous impact on our students. It positively develops character, promotes discipline, and creates lifelong friendships. Also, generations of student rowers from the D.C. region have gone on to represent the United States in the Olympic games as well as other prestigious international events. This development must continue and the needs of area high schools must not be ignored by NPS as it considers the NMBZ initiative.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this excellent initiative. Yorktown appreciates and welcomes any opportunity to provide NPS with additional comments on this issue~

With best regards,  
Andrew R. Bacas, Head Coach of Men's Rowing, Yorktown HS  
Carol Dinion, Head Coach of Women's Rowing, Yorktown HS  
Michael Krulfeld, Activities Director, Yorktown HS  
Joanne Stump, President, Yorktown Crew Boosters, Inc.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 89

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Robert vom Eigen  
Organization: Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: O - Civic Groups  
Address: PO Box 3653  
Washington, DC 20027  
USA  
E-mail: rvomeigen@foley.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/16/2012 Date Received: 02/16/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Mr. Stephen Whitesell  
Officers Regional Director ' Capital Region  
National Park Service  
1100 Ohio Dnve, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20242  
Subject: Renewal of Concession to Thompson's Boat Center

Dear Mr. Whitesell:

Representing the Friends of Georgetown Waterfront Park (FOGWP), Ann Directors Satterthwaite, and I recently attended an outreach session in connection with the Ann Salterthwaite, Chair Feasibility Study for the Non-motorized Boat House Zone along the Potomac Gretchen Eilsworth River in Georgetown. At that meeting, we were surprised and disappointed to Grace Bateman learn that Thompson s Boat Center would not be part of the study.

FOGWP supports the creation of additional crew team storage facilities Anthony Barnes, AIA along the Potomac River, and believes that changes to the current structure of Corinne Bronfman Thompson's Boat Center or construction of an additional structure on Park Service land in the vicinity of Thompson's could potentially provide additional Edith MacArthur boat house capacity to address the shortage of facilities that has been recognized Linda for decades. We will be filing formal comments in connection with the study, which will include a recommendation to expand the scope of the study to encompass Thompson's Boat Center as a possible resource for adding boathouse capacity along the river.

We also learned at the meeting that the renewal of the concession that encompasses Thompson's Boat House is under active review by the Park Service, although the Park Service representative who participated in the meeting did not have precise information on where that process stands. FOGWP strongly recommends that no long-term renewal of the concession to manage Thompson's Boat Center be granted by the Park Service until such time as the potential for making modifications to the facility has been examined, and a final decision has been made to proceed or not to proceed with such modifications. The Park Service should take no steps that would restrict its ability to explore options for expanding boat house facilities along the Potomac in or near Georgetown.

We would appreciate learning of the status of the process for renewing the concession governing Thompson's Boat Center, and whether that process would in any way preclude a decision to constructing boat house capacity at or near the Thompson's Boat Center.

Robert P. vom Eigen  
cc: Peter May  
Doug Jacobs  
Tammy Stidham

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 90

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Harold Seigel  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 2133 Dominion Heights Court  
Fall Church, VA 22043  
USA  
E-mail: hmandds@aol.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/22/2012 Date Received: 01/31/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Mr May:

Thank you for the thorough presentation Dec.13 entitled -feasibility study to implement a nonmotorized boathouse zone along the georgetown waterfront. We wish to offer our opinion, comments, and suggestions regarding the proposal. We strongly oppose the park services proposal, as it apparently ignores and avoids the largest stakeholders of the georgetown waterfront- namely the powerboaters of the entire chesapeake region. We believe, and it is unfortunate, that up to this point we have not been included in the process of improving and providing our expertise in the georgetown riverside experience. We believe that the previous plans and studies are outdated, non inclusive and are irrelevant considering the modern needs of the boating community. The members of the National Potomac Yacht Club, The Potomac River Yacht Club Association, the Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association, independent boaters, and registered boaters of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia have grown substantially in the past 20 years since those studies were produced. Powerboaters far outnumber non motorized boaters. The acute lack of docking facilities along the georgetown waterfront, and transient docking in all of Washington are obvious. Of the approximately 3000 feet of waterfront extending from Thompsons boathouse north past the Washington Canoe Club there is only 500 feet for powerboat docking. 100 feet had additionally been removed to provide for tour boats and police boat use. The new park, as easy as it would have been, also failed to consider the needs of the boating community when it was built and did not include docking facilities. The remainder of approximately 2000 feet have been dedicated to canoes, rowboats, kayaks, and crew. A relatively small population: Considering some boats that now dock at the Washington Harbour exceed 80 feet in length, space is limited, forcing side by side raft ups on some days to exceed 10 boats and total volume to exceed 100 boats. The amount

of waterfront that the non motorized boats use during the winter months or at night is easy to calculate- exactly zero, a total waste of space during that time. Many powerboats are on the river all year long and to a large extent at night and enjoy the

Georgetown waters of the potomac river. The amount of space, over 2000 feet including Thompsons, that you proposed dedicated to non powerboats sole use is unreasonable, a waste of prime real estate, and simply unfair. There is absolutely no reason not to allow and include powerboat docking in that area. The waterfront at georgetown is one of the prime, if not the prime destination spots on the potomac river for powerboats. We believe that the river and the waterfront should be shared by all, and not restricted in any manner. The park is for the preservation and benefit of all of the public. There is absolutely no reason to limit the area in question to non powerboats. Non powerboats do not have any special needs or requirements for launching or storing. Additionally, note that the crew boats do in fact have motorized follow boats alongside. Rules of the road, navigation rules, and admiralty law applies to all water vessels. Furthermore, there is no safety issue regarding power and non power boats co existing. There is obviously much room available for powerboat docking alongside crewboats and rowboat docking. The physical docks are similar.

We propose that at minimal cost and great benefit, that the plans for the zone in question include dockage for powerboats along with a possible launching ramp. We do not propose or request any other special needs such as electric, fuel, pumpout, or any structures- just an enviromental friendly simple dock capable of handling power and non powerboats alike. As the largest stakeholder and user of the potomac river and the georgetown waterfront, we request and expect to be included in any further discussion and planning of the georgetown waterfront. As stakeholders, the following entities and organizations should also be included in any discussions and planning of the georgetown waterfront- The Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association The Potomac River Yacht Club Association, The District Yach. Club, Seafarers Yacht Club, Capital Yacht Club, District Yacht Club, and all other yacht clubs in the potomac region. I would like to be kept informed of all developments and would like to set up a meeting with you and with those who will make the decisions regarding the waterfront development to offer insight, opini~ and 7, further discussion of this issue.

Thank you for your kind attention  
Harold Seigel  
hmandds@aol.com 703 3629111  
Member, Fleet Captain, Past Commodore  
The National Potomac Yacht Club, Wash. DC  
Member, Old Dominion Yacht Club Alexandria, VA  
Member, Eastport Yacht Club, Annapolis Md

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 91

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Sally Strain  
Organization: Defenders of the Potomac River Parkland  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: P - Conservation/Preservation  
Address: not provided  
not provided, DC 20242  
USA  
E-mail: seawalk@starpower.net

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 01/11/2012 Date Received: 01/11/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Mr. Peter May, Associate Regional Director  
January 11, 2012  
National Capital Region  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, DC 20240

Re: NPS Feasibility Study to Implement a Non-Motorized Boathouse Zone along the  
Georgetown Waterfront

Dear Mr. May:

The purpose of this letter is to express our appreciation to the National Park Service for the decision to do a feasibility study for a boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront, and to share with you the basic position of the Defenders of Potomac River Parkland:

- A. No private development should be permitted in the C&O Canal National Historical Park.
- B. The wooded area upriver from the Washington Canoe Club should be preserved.
- C. The NPS feasibility study should be comprehensive; therefore, the project zone should be extended downriver to include the Georgetown Waterfront Park and Thompson's Boathouse.

For almost nine years, the Defenders, a coalition of more than twenty organizations, has opposed the proposal to build a massive private Georgetown University boathouse in the C&O

Canal National Historical Park. During those years, we have offered many reasons why the plan is not in the public interest, such as: the site is a scenic wooded section between the busy Capital Crescent Trail and the Potomac River; it is situated next to the fragile and historic Canal towpath; it is a tidal floodplain that contains wetlands; it lies within the Potomac Gorge, one of the most biologically rich areas on the East Coast; and the parkland is part of a national, regional and local treasure used by thousands of daily walkers, bikers, birders, history enthusiasts, and visitors to our Nations capital. These technical, environmental, economic, safety and practical considerations remain relevant today.

Alternative locations outside of the C&O Canal NHP for new boating facilities would provide advantages for everyone, while protecting the park from inappropriate development. In addition, a more accessible location downstream from the C&O gateway corridor would provide an opportunity for new facilities to be shared with other boating communities, including high school boating programs, instead of being used by only one group of athletes from one private university, as proposed by NPS in the past. We have made these points: in our letter of October 16, 2009, to NPS Director Jonathan Jarvis; in EIS Scoping Comments of January 13, 2008; in earlier EA comments; and in many public meetings. These constructive alternatives remain available.

We look forward to working with you and other NPS officials to find a way to both protect the C&O Canal NHP from unnecessary private development and provide appropriate new boating opportunities outside the national historical park.

Sincerely,  
Sally Strain, Coordinator  
Defenders of Potomac River Parkland

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 92

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Carl Linden  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: 6406 Ridge Drive  
Bethesda, MD 20816  
USA  
E-mail:

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/14/2012 Date Received: 03/20/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Mr. Peter May  
Associate Regional Director  
National Capital Region  
National Park Service  
C/o Tammy Stidham  
1100 Ohio Drive, SW  
Washington, D.C 20242

Dear Mr. May,

Here are my comments on the NPS boathouse zone study that is currently being conducted under your direction.

It is important to keep in mind that the difficult issues that have swirled around the question of building boathouses along the Georgetown waterfront began with a false start. It is to be hoped that the Park Service this time will make a right start with its current feasibility study for a boating facility zone along the Georgetown waterfront.

The false start began when Georgetown University set Out to convert part of a National Historical Park directly below the university into its private preserve. Its aim was to erect a giant boathouse there. Three "alternatives" were presented soaring up to 20,000 sq. ft. with several stories rising at their peak even higher than the adjacent C&O Canal berm, the towpath and the canal.

That the site was ill-suited to accommodate a large boating facility evidently was not seen as an obstacle to the project. The oversized building would have been crammed into a tight spot hardly accessible by motor vehicles and with scarcely any space available for parking and would create a hazardous chokepoint at a major entrance way to the national park that has an inflow of some four million visitors per annum. An influx of cyclists, joggers and hikers passes this point daily.

It is hard to believe that the U.S. Code on administering our national parks or the strictures of the legislation establishing the C&O Canal National Historical Park were given much attention as this plan was being advanced. The Code asserts that no activities are to be authorized "in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been directly and specifically provided by Congress." [16 USC Sec 1-a-i (2000)]. Public Law 91.064, which established the C&O Canal NHP, clearly states its purpose: "to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and to develop the potential of the canal for public recreation [emphasis added], including such restoration as may be needed." The intent of the legislation is clear. It does not contemplate accommodating the boating program of private institutions or ceding any of its territory to such a purpose.

The misconceived boathouse plan, which came close to realization as the "preferred alternative" of a draft Environmental Assessment, should not be considered as a possible outcome in the NPS study of the feasibility of boating facilities along the stipulated "zone" along the Georgetown waterfront. It should be clear that the site GU has sought in the past ought to be off limits, and that sites on the other side of Key Bridge are both defensible and appropriate for team rowing facilities

All best regards,  
Carl Linden

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 93

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Ann Lochstampfor  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
not provided, DC 20242  
USA  
E-mail: ann.lochstampfor@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 03/30/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

NPS Feasibility Study Submission by Ann Lochstampfor on March 30, 2012 about 3:40 pm

The Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park is now at the crossroads of history. The NPS must decide whether to maintain the Park's mission [see below] -- or to allow Georgetown University, one of the Nation's richest, most prestigious private universities, to build a colossal boathouse, primarily for the use of GU students, near the Georgetown gateway to the Canal.

The 34th Street entrance to the proposed boathouse zone is only a 15-20 minute walk from The White House (17th Street side.) This site embraces Potomac shoreline now in a wooded, tidal floodplain area. The NPS has yet to disclose what the "fair market value" of this treasured section of the Park would be -- if it were privately owned.

Since the C&OCNHP is funded by all American taxpayers not just those in DC and Maryland, the C&OCNHP is owned by and belongs to all Americans. They have a vested interest in preserving their "National Treasure" for all Americans, present and future. This transfer of the public wealth ? history as well as financial -- to a wealthy private university should not be allowed.

This historic part of the C&O Canal, begun in 1828, should be protected from private development. The sight of a soaring boathouse here would be seen as the "Pyramid on the Potomac" and could not avoid becoming a glitzy tourist destination -- bringing even more traffic congestion to Georgetown.

The sight of a large parking lot crowded with 80-foot-long boat trailers [60-feet for the boat and 20-feet for the trailer cab] would diminish if not destroy the traditional mule-drawn boat rides enjoyed by Park

visitors for decades.

In the past, from April - October, a replica 1880's canal boat offered the public roundtrip rides between the 31st Street Bridge and Key Bridge. [The 31st Street Bridge, located one block down from the intersection of 31st and M Streets, is as long as the Canal is wide.]

Although the boat operations in Georgetown are not linked to the Feasibility Study, the future of the public historic reenactment of a vanished way of early American life would be adversely impacted by the activities associated with the boathouse zone.

Another casualty of the proposed privatization of this part of the C&OCNHP would be the lost opportunities to educate tens of thousands of Park visitors annually about the importance of the C&O Canal to Washington's early history in a quiet, little-known section of the city where that history still survives.

Unfortunately, on July 13, 2011, the very old Georgetown boat, the Georgetown, had to be dismantled after a crack was discovered in its hull. The Superintendent recently announced that repairing the damage is too costly and that he has not decided whether to fundraise for a new boat. If the NPS envisions the transformation of the C&OCNHP by private developers, then there may not be a need to raise funds for a new Georgetown boat.

For reasons stated above, I believe the proposed twenty-first century urbanization of a National Historical Park in the heart of the Nation's capital should be denied.

May the guiding spirit of Justice William O. Douglas prevail.

Submitted by: Ann Lochstampfor March 30, 2012

[16USC Sec 1-a-1 (2000)] Public Law 91.064: "to preserve and interpret the historic and scenic features of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal and to develop the potential of the canal for public recreation, including such restoration as may be needed."

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 94

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Stu Ross  
Organization: ANC 3D  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: PO Box 40486  
Palisades Station  
Washington, DC 20016  
USA

E-mail:

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/30/2012 Date Received: 04/02/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Mr. Peter May  
National Park Service  
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20242

Dear Mr. May:

Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3D reaffirms its support for protecting the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park from private development'this time in reference to the non-motorized boathouse feasibility study that the National Park Service is conducting. The boundaries of our organization extend from Georgetown to the Maryland line and include the Potomac River.

Our Advisory Neighborhood Commission has gone on record with regard to ensuring the public trust of this Federal parkland. We urge the National Park Service to preserve the wooded area'the tidal floodplain just upstream of the Washington Canoe Club'land that belongs to everyone. We favor open accessibility to the property and its stewardship by the National Park Service.

We recommend that the Park Service expand the boathouse study zone downriver to the built environment of Thompson's Boat Center and other locations, looking to long-term growth as the Potomac River, the C&O Canal, the towpath, and the Capital Crescent Trail attract increasing numbers of people seeking recreational activities.

Along with enjoying the C&O National Historical Park for its opportunities for running, hiking, birding, bicycling, and boating with Fletcher's Boat House a neighborhood amenity our community participates in removing invasive species, conducting bird censuses, and monitoring runoff and floods. We care about this park.

The green space of the C&O National Historical Park is precious to our community. We value its character and quality, recognizing the restorative effect of nature's peace and quiet and woods and water. The historic achievement of Justice Douglas decades ago in preventing the conversion of the land in the nation's capital to a highway is a legacy that we seek to ensure.

We support the conservation mission of the National Park Service.

Sincerely,  
Stu Ross, Chair

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 95

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Quentin Borges-Silva  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: not provided  
not provided, UN unknown  
USA  
E-mail: emiko.quentin@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 12/07/2011 Date Received: 12/07/2011  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Hello.

I see from your brochure that you are not accepting public comments at the upcoming meeting in December, which I just heard about. Since it appears you haven't incorporated into your planning or received comments about your proposal from motorized boat owners, I thought I might share some observations with you. My experiences on the water tell me that increasing the density of rowers on the water will only make a bad situation much, much worse.

I own a classic 52' motoryacht that I regularly take to Three Sisters. The boat weighs 50,000 pounds and, as you can imagine, has no brakes that can rapidly bring it to a halt when someone in a rental kayak suddenly decides (like an easily distracted puppy) that he or she wants to go to the far side of the river. I cannot tell you the number of times I have felt certain I was going to run one of these people down, in spite of my best efforts to avoid doing just that. I sometimes tap my horn to alert paddlers of my presence. This angers some, who apparently do not grasp that horn use is required by the "Rules of the Road," which I am required to both know and obey. By their behavior, it's clear that the vast majority of paddlers are completely unaware of maritime law and not particularly caring of their own safety; they frequently display the same sensibilities as people who want to pet wild bison. Worse, when inexperienced paddlers finally do realize that they are putting themselves in danger, they frequently panic when I tap my horn. They immediately lose what little control they had over their vessels, and it is common for them to

paddle so close that I lose sight of them entirely below my gunwale. This is especially surprising when the paddlers are not in any danger at all, and I am just giving a courtesy signal letting them know I'll be passing ~50 feet away. They freak out when they realize a big boat is coming and make maximum speed on a direct collision course, creating danger when absolutely none existed before! An intelligent society does not put children's parks in shipping hubs so that kids play amongst the 18-wheelers; why must we encourage children-at-heart to paddle amongst 50,000 pound boats that are under way?

The situation is little better with more experienced rowers. My vessel is constrained by draft--she needs lots of water to get by. Paddlers, by comparison, need only a few inches. The Rules of the Road clearly give priority channel access to draft-restricted vessels. Yet experienced rowers and rental paddlers alike regularly clog up the relatively narrow deep channel in all DC waters, but especially in the vicinity of the proposed boathouse area. Experienced kayakers in very beautiful and expensive boats regularly bear down on my bow, apparently intent on a head-on collision and forcing me to take evasive maneuvers (e.g. full throttle reverse). The unofficial "Rule of Tonnage" means no more to them than the official rules about shallow draft boats yielding to draft restricted ones. As the kayakers go by, they frequently yell about my use of the channel--as if they and they alone have exclusive rights to use it. Mind you, out of the full width of the river the usable space through which I can safely pass is in some places limited to 100 feet or so. Paddlers can use the remaining 90 percent or more of the river's width without even the possibility of a collision. But they instead insist on using the full width of the river. And for reasons that baffle this old mariner, they seem to especially want to use the little bit of space that I absolutely need to transit the area.

Education about safety on the water cannot possibly cure this problem; you might as well toss your keys to a 10 year-old and tell them to drive safely before sending them out during rush hour. Unless you intend to put up fences to keep the nonmotorized boats contained in the shallows and create and enforce laws that require them to stay there, please do not create an environment in which more oblivious paddlers will increase the odds of a collision.

I require no response to this message but would appreciate it if you could add it to the docket the next time you are taking public comments on this issue.

Regards,  
Quentin Borges-Silva

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 96

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Jimmie R. McClellan  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Unknown  
Unknown, UN unknown  
USA  
E-mail: jmcclellan@nvcc.edu

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/27/2012 Date Received: 03/27/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms Stidham,

The Potomac is a great asset. It not only adds beauty to our City and provides us with our water supply, it is a place for recreation. Many different uses are made of the river for this purpose: fishing, skiing, excursions, rowing, paddling. While all of these activities use the river, not all uses are necessarily compatible.

The idea of securing an area of the river free from motorized boats would be advantageous to rowers and paddlers.

The wakes from motor boats present problems to kayaks and canoes. These wakes can cause a canoe or kayak to overturn. This is a problem anytime of the year and can be lifethreatening in winter.

If an area from Georgetown to above Key Bridge could be designated free of motor boats it would provide security for paddlers and rowers and a greater sense of tranquility for all without eliminating motorized travel in the miles of river below Georgetown.

Rounding the bend in the river upstream from Georgetown, the city and the 21st century disappear. It would be nice to have that area free from the noise and wakes.

Jim McClellan, PhD  
Dean of Liberal Arts

Alexandria Campus  
Northern Virginia Community College

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 97

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: John Sopko  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Unknown  
Unknown, UN Unknown  
USA  
E-mail: jsopko@akingump.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/06/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Tammy, I was out of town and not able to attend the Saturday meeting but the PRC was represented by three other members who I hope introduced themselves to you. Again, on behalf of the unaffiliated rowers on the Potomac, we have serious concerns that our interests are either ignored, or more importantly, harmed in the process of creating this zone for the University and High School teams. We strongly support the building of boat houses to support the colleges and nearby high schools but not at the expense of the unaffiliated rowers who are basically rowing out of TBC. We heard unofficially that the Park Service is planning on banning us from TBC and turning that facility into a program only for club sweep rowing. If true, we would literally be out on the street. Let me add, that there are probably a hundred or more unaffiliated scullers in TBC and probably many more who are on the wait list to obtain a slip there who should not be ignored in this process. I hope as this process proceeds you continue to keep our interests in mind along with all of the organized clubs and schools.

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 98

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mark Navo  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Unknown  
Unknown, UN Unknown  
USA  
E-mail: allan.navo@gmail.com

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/03/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Stidham,

I am writing to you in regards to the Public River Access Workshop. I am a Stand Up Paddle Boarder and enjoy the paddling in the Georgetown Waterfront Area. The area is a fantastic place to take in the views and enjoy the interaction with the community.

As you plan for the development of this area, please consider the following:

- Extremely limited access to the water. There are no free launch sites and it is against the law to launch from the rivers edge, plus it is dangerous to you and your board to launch from the rivers edge.
- Storage is limited and expensive and there isn't any inside storage available
- Safety issues. As the weather becomes nicer, the river becomes very crowded between boaters and the paddlers (to include SUP, canoes, and kayakers)
- Please consider parking in the area. I don't think there is enough parking in the area for the community to include the paddler and those that are going for a bike ride or a run/walk along the canal.

The limited parking makes it extremely difficult to transport my board from the car to a place where I can access the river (e.g. Jack's or Thompson's)

I have seen the SUP community grow in the last year and expect it to continue to grow in the future. Please consider a paddler's concerns in the development of this area.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

v/r,

Allan Navo

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 99

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Susan Green  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Unknown  
Washington, DC Unknown  
USA  
E-mail: sgreend@earthlink.net

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 03/01/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Stidham:

I am a D.C resident and a sea kayaker who kayaks on the Potomac and other waters nearby. I would like to voice my opinion that in addition to boathouses, such as Jack's and the Washington Canoe Club, there should also be a public Cartop Boat Launch/Ramp spot, with appropriate parking, for kayakers and canoers within the Non-Motorized Boating Zone along the Georgetown waterfront.

This property is, after all, part of the National Park Service holdings and, as such, should make the area available to the public in the broadest sense possible.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Regards,

Susan Green

S. Green Dispute Resolutions

Tel: +1-202-362-7619 [www.sgreenadr.com](http://www.sgreenadr.com)

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565

## Correspondence: 100

### Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Erik Meyers  
Organization:  
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual  
Address: Unknown  
Unknown, UN Unknown  
USA  
E-mail: emeyers@conservationfund.org

### Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: Date Received: 02/21/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail  
Notes:

### Correspondence Text

Thank you for the message and invitation, Ms. Stidham.

Prior to the workshop, I think it might be helpful if the hosts were prepared to answer a few questions. First, I'm curious as to how the use levels at Thompson's will be factored into the conversation. It would seem to make sense to connect what is taking place at TBC with the discussions of defining an upstream zone. The stakeholders who participated in the development of the Georgetown Waterfront Park plan upstream from and connecting to Thompson's held a number of discussions about additional boathouses and the park was, in part, designed to reflect commitments among the parties. Will those agreements be described? Since the notice states that this study is being connected with the use of the Capital Crescent Trail and only a small portion that trail is located within the area under discussion, it would make sense to connect the workshop with the current use levels and condition of Thompson's. It's hard to imagine having a productive conversation without that connection.

Second, I'm very concerned with the implications of a portion of the text about the goals of the study. Specifically your notice states:

Establish a programmatic approach to allowing access to the river for a variety of uses, not just non-motorized boat uses.

What is meant by access in this context? While I understand that the study is intended to come up with a plan that will harmonize use of the waterfront area among a variety of uses ranging from cyclists and runners to passive enjoyment of the Waterfront Park, only non-motorized boat usage of the river would require direct access to the water since, as far as I know, the River is still not deemed swimmable despite the

periodic DC Triathlon. The term "non-motorized" covers rowing shells, kayaks and canoes, outrigger canoes, dragon boats, paddle boards and board sailors, and sailboats, all of various sizes and all of which use this area now. I'm alarmed at the implications of this text that seems to indicate you feel compelled to jam motorized boats or other inconsistent uses of the area into this small area. There are many other points of access to the river for motorized boats and I trust the workshop/NPS will clarify that it is under no obligation to provide more marinas or access at this point on the river.

And, finally, I am also wondering how the Potomac Boat Club and its operation will be described. Those who are familiar with the waterfront will know that it is and always has been located on private land and is privately owned and operated, but many coming to this workshop may not appreciate that critical fact. While WCC and Jack's are located on federal land and operate at the sufferance of and under the rules imposed by NPS, Potomac Boat Club is not. That is an important distinction. It is particularly important if you are also factor into the conversation PBC's historic, but role in hosting programs such as the present day Washington-Lee HS Crew and, in the past, Jeb Stuart HS and Georgetown University crews. There are no guarantees that PBC will continue to offer space other programs. The demand from post-graduate rowers has been beyond PBC's ability to accommodate for decades. One day that demand may overwhelm support among its members to hosting the W-L program.

I am planning to attend the workshop and participate in the discussion but wanted to ask for clarification on these few points in advance.

Thank you,  
Erik J. Meyers  
President, Potomac River Sports Foundation

# PEPC Project ID: 39727, DocumentID: 44565 Correspondence: 101

## Author Information

Keep Private: No  
Name: Mary M. Cheh  
Organization: Council of the District of Columbia  Official Rep.  
Organization Type: T - Town or City Government  
Address: 1350 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
USA  
E-mail: mcheh@dccouncil.us

## Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:  
Date Sent: 03/21/2012 Date Received: 03/22/2012  
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No  
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter  
Notes:

## Correspondence Text

Peter May  
Associate Regional Director  
National Park Service, National Capital Region  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, D.C. 20240  
Dear Mr. May:  
March 21, 2012  
Office (202) 724-8062  
Fax (202) 724-8118  
mcheh@dccouncil.us  
www.marycheh.com

I am writing to provide comments on the proposed feasibility study to examine the possibilities for a non-motorized boathouse zone along the Georgetown waterfront.

As the feasibility study will recommend items for further investigation rather than provide concrete proposals for projects, the study should assess the efficacy of several different options. In particular, I would suggest that the National Park Service identify options that do not include private development in the C&O Historical Park and that preserve the wooded area upriver of the Washington Canoe Club. Although I know you've heard these concerns previously, it is worth repeating that the wooded area is a tidal floodplain containing wetlands and provides a natural barrier between the welltraveled Capital Crescent Trail and the Potomac River.

Also, the feasibility study would seem incomplete without including the Georgetown Waterfront Park and

the area surrounding Thompson's Boathouse. While the Georgetown Waterfront Park was only recently completed, it is worth exploring whether the park could integrate a boathouse or other structures that might enhance the park while preserving other, undeveloped areas. Similarly, I understand that Thompson's Boathouse is operating at capacity, but perhaps some expansion of the site might provide an alternative to new development.

I would like to thank the National Park Service for the opportunity to comment on the proposed feasibility study and for the outreach it has provided to residents. I know this issue has been a contentious one, with studies on the matter dating back to the mid-1980s. I do, however, believe that if adequate consideration is given to many different options-including those discussed in this letter- NPS will be able to proceed with the option that is most suitable for the area, its environment, and its residents.

Sincerely,  
Mary M. Cheh