

National Park Service

U.S. Department of the Interior
George Washington Memorial Parkway



Public Comment Analysis Summary Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect

December 2011

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1) INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE | 1 |
| a) Background | 1 |
| b) Public Review of EA/AoE..... | 1 |
| c) Public Meeting | 1 |
| d) Nature of Comments Received..... | 2 |
| e) The Comment Analysis Process | 3 |
| f) Definition of Terms | 4 |
| g) Guide to This Document..... | 4 |
| 2) COMMENT ANALYSIS REPORT | 6 |
| 3) PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY | 13 |
| a) Substantive Issues Report..... | 13 |
| b) Concern Statements by Comment Code | 58 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| TABLE 1: COMMENT DISTRIBUTION BY CODE | 6 |
| TABLE 2: CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY CORRESPONDENCE TYPE | 12 |
| TABLE 3: CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY STATE | 12 |

Appendices

| | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| Appendix A: | CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS |
| Appendix B: | CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF INDIVIDUALS |
| Appendix C: | INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE |
| Appendix D: | INDEX BY CODE |
| Appendix E: | COMMENTS SUBMITTED |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| AoE | Assessment of Effect |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| EA | Environmental Assessment |
| GWMP | George Washington Memorial Parkway |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended |
| NHPA | National Historic Preservation Act |
| PEPC | Planning, Environment and Public Comment |
| PVRB | Potomac Valley/Riverbend (Civic Association) |
| SDP | Site Development Plan |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedure |
| USC | United States Code |
| VDCR | Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation |
| VDEQ | Virginia Department of Environmental Quality |
| VDHR | Virginia Department of Historical Resources |
| VDOT | Virginia Department of Transportation |
| WWII | World War II |

1) INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE

a) Background

Pursuant to section 101(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, and the National Park Service Director's Order #12, *Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision Making* (NPS 2001), the National Park Service prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan. The EA included an Assessment of Effect (AoE) as part of the Section 106 process for the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). This Environmental Assessment / Assessment of Effects (EA/AoE) analyzed the potential impacts of three action alternatives, including a No-Action Alternative, on the natural, cultural, and human environment. The EA/AoE was developed considering the public comments received during the project scoping. This Public Comment Analysis Report focuses on public comments received during the public and agency review period of the EA/AoE.

b) Public Review of EA/AoE

The National Park Service held a 30-day public review period from September 6 to October 6, 2011, to solicit public comments on the EA/AoE. As a result of public comments at the public meeting, this comment period was extended to November 5, 2011 (total of 60 days). During this review period, the public was invited to comment on the presented alternatives and identify concerns they might have with the proposed project. The EA/AoE was made available on the PEPC website and public review copies of the EA/AoE were also made available at the following locations:

GWMP Headquarters
Turkey Run Park
McLean, VA 22101

Martha Washington Library
6614 Fort Hunt Road
Alexandria, VA 22307-1799

Beatley Central Library
5005 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22304-2903

Sherwood Regional Library
2501 Sherwood Hall Lane
Alexandria, VA 22306-2799

c) Public Meeting

On September 21, 2011, the National Park Service held a public meeting at Picnic Pavilion A at Fort Hunt Park in Fairfax County, Virginia. Public notices were published on the NPS website, posted at the park, and distributed to individuals and organizations, including Fort Hunt Park neighbors and WWII Veterans of P.O. Box 1142. The National Park Service also issued a press release to area-wide news organizations. At the public meeting, members of the public were invited to submit comments on the project electronically, through the PEPC Website, and by mailing written comments to the National Park Service.

The public meeting began at 6:00 p.m. and continued until 8:00 p.m. Meeting attendees were provided a brief overview of the meeting format as they signed-in upon arrival. The meeting was held in an open house format. National Park Service and project staff were on-hand to discuss

the project and process with the public until 8:00 p.m. Informational displays were arranged at various stations around the meeting room. Comment forms were available for written comments.

Fifty six (56) individuals signed-in as they entered the Pavilion. The majority of individuals who signed in at the meeting provided mailing addresses adjacent to Fort Hunt Park. A total of four (4) written comments were submitted at the meeting.

d) Nature of Comments Received

One-hundred and seventy-four (174) pieces of correspondence from 5 states and 2 countries were received during the public comment period. Individuals living within the vicinity of the project area (Virginia) submitted approximately 154 (approximately 88%) of those correspondence pieces. The majority of Virginia residents provided mailing addresses adjacent to Fort Hunt Park and several comments were received from the Potomac Valley/Riverbend Civic Association which borders the park to the west. Comments were also provided by the Circulo de Puerto Rico, Fort Hunt Elementary PTA President, National Parks Conservation Association, Virginia, Friends of Dyke Marsh, and World War II Veterans. Comments were provided by citizens associated with the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Collingwood Citizens Association, Community Association of Hollin Hills, Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association, Stratford on the Potomac Community Association, and Waynewood Citizens Association.

The following is an overview of comments, summarized by comment topic, received during the public scoping period.

- Alternatives – The majority of the comments received centered on the alternatives. Commenters cited support for the no action alternative, keeping the current uses of the park, or to restructure the existing permitting system for picnicking at the park. Two primary reasons for supporting the no action alternative were the imprudent use of government funding and removal of functional facilities that are currently used by the public. The alternative element “oppose removing the picnic facilities” received the most comments (48). However, two elements favored included the support for a new visitor center (25) and interpretative trail (22). Commenters also requested that the NPS seek more cost-effective ways to increase the historical interpretation at the park. To a lesser degree, commenters stated support for an interpretative trail only, improving restrooms, creating a visitor center without removing picnic pavilions, instituting speed bumps, providing improved maintenance at the park, and to provide some dog related amenities. Commenters also opposed removal of ball fields.
- Design – Comments expressed concerns with the trail design and width of the trail safety concerns.
- Park Resources – A considerably lower number of comments were received on park resources when compared to the alternatives. Commenters noted protection of bald eagle habitat and the overall preservation of natural resources as concerns.
- Public Involvement – Commenters expressed concerns about the format of the public meeting and that the meeting was not sufficiently advertised in advance of the meeting.

In addition to the public comments on the EA/AoE, agency comments were also received from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR), Department of Conservation and Recreation (VDCR) and Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ). VDEQ acts as

the clearinghouse for the other Virginia Agencies who submitted comments. The VDEQ provided a summary of agency comments and included the agency's Federal Consistency Determination. The DEQ letter goes through agency by agency their jurisdiction, applicable regulations and future compliance steps required. The following items are important points taken from the letters:

- Prior to any project plans, the NPS should contact the Center of Conservation Biology to determine if any new bald eagle nests were detected during the 2010 or 2011 surveys.
- VDOT and Fairfax County raised concerns about having no detailed analysis or traffic projections regarding future use of the park and potential increases in park visitation. Fairfax County suggested additional information should have been included in documentation.
- Fairfax County raised questions about the total impervious surface rationale used for the determining the environmentally preferred alternative. They stated the description is missing from the alternatives chapter (Chapter 2, although the discussion is addressed in Chapter 4). The County stated that the difference between Alternatives C and D is unclear because they appear very similar.
- Fairfax County stated the proposed construction of the visitor facility in Alternative C appears to be on a currently wooded site whereas the other alternatives are clear of trees. If C is selected, The County recommended efforts to site the visitor facility to maximum tree preservation.
- VDOT raise an idea to no longer brand the area as a park by calling it another name such as Fort Hunt Historical Area or Fort Hunt Cultural Resources Area.

VDHR concurred with the finding of No Historic Properties Affected and the approach that each individual project proposal would be sent to VDHR for review in accordance with the Section 106 of the NHPA.

A summary of the comments, as generated by the PEPC web based program, is provided in Comment Summary section of this report.

e) The Comment Analysis Process

Comment analysis is a process used to compile and combine similar public comments into a format that can be used by National Park Service. The comment analysis process includes five main components:

- developing a coding structure to organize comments by topics
- employing a comment database for comment management
- reading and coding public comments
- interpreting and analyzing the comments to identify issues and themes
- preparing a comment summary

A coding structure was developed to help sort comments into logical groups by topic and issue. The coding structure was derived from an analysis of the range of topics discussed during internal National Park Service scoping and from comments received from members of the public. The coding structure was designed to capture all comment content rather than to restrict or exclude any ideas.

The National Park Service PEPC database was used to manage and organize the comments. The database stores the full text of all correspondence and allows each comment to be coded by topic or issue. Outputs from the database, which are provided as tables in Chapter 2: Content Analysis Report and Chapter 3: Public Scoping Comment Summary, include tallies of the total number of pieces of correspondence and comments received, sorting and reporting of comments by a particular topic or issue, and demographic information about the sources of the comments. Analysis of the public comments in PEPC involves assigning the codes to statements made by the public in their letters, e-mail messages, Web forms, and comments provided at the public meetings. All comments received during the public scoping comment period were read and analyzed. Although the comment analysis process attempts to capture the full range of public concerns, comment analysis is not a vote-counting process and this report is not intended as a statistical analysis. This report is intended to be a summary of the different concerns and issues raised by the comments received. The emphasis is on content of the comments, rather than the number of times a particular comment was received.

f) **Definition of Terms**

Primary terms used in the document are defined below:

Correspondence: A correspondence is the entire document received from the public – including individuals, organizations, government officials, and agency representatives. It can be in the form of a letter, comment card, or PEPC Web site comment form. Each piece of correspondence is assigned a unique identification number in the PEPC system.

Comment: A comment is a portion of the text within a correspondence that addresses a single subject. It could include such information as an expression of support or opposition to a proposed activity, additional data regarding the existing condition, an opinion questioning a matter of policy, or an opinion regarding the adequacy of an analysis.

Code: A grouping centered on a common topic or subject matter with which the public is concerned. The codes were developed during the scoping process and are used to track major subjects throughout the NEPA process.

Concern: Concerns are subdivisions of codes. Each code was further separated into several concern statements to provide a better focus on the content of comments.

g) **Guide to This Document**

This report is organized as follows:

Content Analysis Report – This is the basic report produced from PEPC that provides information on the numbers and types of comments received, organized by code. The first section of the report provides a summary of the number of comments that were coded under each topic. The second section provides general demographic information, such as the states where commenters live, the number of letters received from different categories of organizations, etc.

Public Comment Summary – This report summarizes the substantive comments received during the Public Review of the EA/AoE. These comments are organized by codes and further organized into concern statements.

Correspondence Index of Organizations – This provides a listing of all groups that submitted comments, arranged and grouped by the following organization types as defined by PEPC (and

in this order): businesses; churches and religious groups; civic groups, conservation/preservation groups; federal government; the National Park Service employees; non-governmental groups; recreational groups; state government; town or city government; tribal government; unaffiliated individuals; university/professional society. Each piece of correspondence was assigned a unique identification number upon entry into PEPC. This number can be used to assist the public in identifying the way the National Park Service addressed their comments.

Correspondence Index of Individual Commenters – This provides a listing of all of the individuals who submitted comments during the public scoping period. Each correspondence was assigned a unique identification number which can be used to assist individuals in identifying the way in which the National Park Service addressed their comments. This list is organized alphabetically.

Index By Organization Type – This list identifies all of the codes that were assigned to each individual piece of correspondence and is arranged by organization type. Individual commenters are also included in this report and are identified as Unaffiliated Individuals.

Index by Code – This lists which commenters or authors (identified by PEPC organization type) commented on which topics, as identified by the codes used in this analysis. The report is organized by code, and under each code is a list of the authors who submitted comments that fell under that code, and their correspondence numbers. Those correspondences identified as N/A represent unaffiliated individuals.

2) COMMENT ANALYSIS REPORT

TABLE 1: COMMENT DISTRIBUTION BY CODE

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|-------------|---|---------------------|----------------------|
| AL3001 | Alternatives: Remove picnic pavilion that provides least revenue | Yes | 1 |
| AL4001 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Series of interpretive sites | Yes | 2 |
| AL4002 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Visitor center in Area D | Yes | 1 |
| AL4003 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Center only | Yes | 1 |
| AL4004 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use NCO Quarters as Visitor Facility | Yes | 5 |
| AL4005 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase interpretation by creating a documentary | Yes | 1 |
| AL4006 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Trail only | Yes | 7 |
| AL4007 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative involving new visitor center without removal of picnic facilities | Yes | 6 |
| AL4008 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Information kiosk instead of visitor center | Yes | 2 |
| AL4009 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Convert Pavilion A into a visitor center | Yes | 1 |
| AL4010 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, restructure the existing permit system | Yes | 24 |
| AL4011 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Turn over park management to Fairfax County | No | 1 |
| AL4012 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, provide increased police presence | Yes | 1 |
| AL4013 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, enforce stricter noise regulations | Yes | 1 |
| AL4013 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, enforce stricter noise regulations | Yes | 0 |
| AL4015 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, reassess NPS staff duties | Yes | 2 |
| AL4017 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Plan for management of Natural Resources | Yes | 1 |
| AL4018 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Improve maintenance of the park | Yes | 6 |
| AL4019 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Trash issues need to be managed | Yes | 2 |
| AL4020 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Institute controls for traffic speeds within park | Yes | 5 |
| AL4025 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use of bollards to separate vehicular traffic and pedestrians | Yes | 2 |
| AL4026 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reopen walk-in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road | Yes | 1 |
| AL4027 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Separate pedestrian and bike paths | Yes | 4 |
| AL4028 | Alternatives -New Alternatives/Elements: Separate bicycle/pedestrian trail from road | No | 1 |
| AL4030 | Alternatives: A temporary visitor's center | Yes | 1 |
| AL4035 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Relocate picnic pavilion | Yes | 1 |

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|--------|---|--------------|---------------|
| AL4052 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Picnic areas along interpretive trail | Yes | 3 |
| AL4055 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control visitor use | Yes | 2 |
| AL4056 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Add more picnic pavilions | Yes | 2 |
| AL4058 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control deterioration of cultural resources | Yes | 2 |
| AL4060 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Dog amenities | Yes | 5 |
| AL4065 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Additional playground equipment | Yes | 3 |
| AL4067 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrades to maintenance facility | No | 2 |
| AL4069 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrade to police facilities | No | 4 |
| AL4070 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Expanding/improving the hiking trails | Yes | 3 |
| AL4075 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Sidewalk along Fort Hunt Road | Yes | 1 |
| AL4079 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support drainage improvements | No | 1 |
| AL4080 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Retain Picnic Pavilions A, B, and D and associated ball fields | Yes | 2 |
| AL4085 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase in historical interpretation without decrease in recreational activities | Yes | 1 |
| AL4086 | Alternatives- New Alternatives/Elements: Rename park to de-emphasize recreational aspects | No | 1 |
| AL4087 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Restore historical viewshed to Potomac Reiver | Yes | 1 |
| AL4090 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reroute road through Ball field at Area B | Yes | 1 |
| AL4093 | Alternatives: Interpretive objectives not stated clearly | Yes | 1 |
| AL5030 | Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative | No | 31 |
| AL5040 | Alternatives: Oppose No Action Alternative | No | 3 |
| AL5050 | Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses | No | 22 |
| AL5060 | Design: Include construction schedule in SDP | No | 1 |
| AL5080 | Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative, due to concern with funding | No | 14 |
| AL5100 | Alternatives: Support less drastic changes | Yes | 5 |
| AL5130 | Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses; minimal historical interpretation | Yes | 9 |
| AL5200 | Support Alternative A or B | No | 1 |
| AL6030 | Alternatives: Support Alternative B | No | 5 |
| AL6035 | Alternatives: Support Alternative B with modifications | Yes | 1 |
| AL6038 | Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area B | No | 1 |
| AL6040 | Alternatives: Oppose Alternative B | No | 5 |

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|--------|--|--------------|---------------|
| AL7040 | Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area C | No | 3 |
| AL7045 | Alternatives: Oppose Removal of Picnic Area C | No | 1 |
| AL7050 | Alternatives: Oppose Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) | No | 5 |
| AL8030 | Alternatives: Support Alternative D | No | 2 |
| AL8040 | Alternatives: Oppose Alternative D | No | 6 |
| AL9005 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in impervious surface | No | 6 |
| AL9006 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to park access | No | 2 |
| AL9007 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to ADA accessibility | No | 1 |
| AL9009 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose encouraging tour buses in park | No | 1 |
| AL9010 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new entrance way | No | 3 |
| AL9012 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support realignment of entrance way | No | 2 |
| AL9013 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose closing pedestrian entrance off Fort Hunt Road | No | 3 |
| AL9015 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support preservation of historic structures | No | 6 |
| AL9020 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new visitor center | No | 14 |
| AL9023 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support new visitor center | No | 25 |
| AL9024 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support small visitor center | No | 5 |
| AL9025 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support interpretive trail | No | 22 |
| AL9026 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose interpretive trail | No | 1 |
| AL9027 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of infrastructure for interpretive trail | No | 1 |
| AL9028 | Alternatives - Elements of Alternatives: Support visitor center near park entrance | No | 7 |
| AL9029 | Alternatives - Elements of Alternatives: Restrict parking on neighborhood roads | No | 1 |
| AL9030 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support pedestrian/bicycle path | No | 7 |
| AL9031 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path | No | 6 |
| AL9032 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path on current paved road | No | 1 |
| AL9033 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to natural setting of trails | No | 1 |
| AL9034 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to trails | No | 3 |
| AL9035 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain full loop road | No | 3 |
| AL9036 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any plan to shorten bicycle path | No | 1 |
| AL9037 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing parking spaces | No | 6 |

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|--------|---|--------------|---------------|
| AL9038 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support additional parking spaces | No | 1 |
| AL9039 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reducing parking areas | No | 1 |
| AL9040 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of picnic facilities | No | 48 |
| AL9041 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing small picnic areas | No | 3 |
| AL9042 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of Picnic Pavilion A | No | 3 |
| AL9043 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to picnic facilities | No | 2 |
| AL9045 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of picnic facilities | No | 2 |
| AL9048 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining multiple picnic facilities | No | 9 |
| AL9049 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining open space | No | 3 |
| AL9050 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing restrooms | No | 6 |
| AL9055 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to restrooms | No | 10 |
| AL9056 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining Area E restroom | No | 1 |
| AL9057 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Open restrooms year-round | No | 2 |
| AL9060 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support one-way traffic | No | 2 |
| AL9061 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support two-way traffic | No | 2 |
| AL9065 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removing paved road between Areas D and E | No | 1 |
| AL9070 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of ball fields | No | 10 |
| AL9072 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of recreation areas | No | 1 |
| AL9073 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of playground | No | 1 |
| AL9074 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to recreation facilities | No | 4 |
| AL9075 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining one ball field | No | 1 |
| AL9076 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of Area B ball field | No | 1 |
| AL9077 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain Fort Hunt Concert Series | No | 1 |
| AL9078 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in use for picnics/parties | No | 2 |
| AL9079 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new trail on west side of park | No | 1 |
| AL9080 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain current road structure | No | 15 |
| AL9083 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support opening closed portion of road | No | 3 |
| AL9084 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any changes that would increase visitor presence along south and west of park | No | 6 |
| AL9085 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose opening closed portion of road | No | 4 |

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|--------|--|--------------|---------------|
| AL9086 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of loop road | No | 4 |
| AL9087 | Alternatives - Element of Alternatives: Have park entrance defer to Fort Hunt Road traffic | No | 1 |
| AL9090 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to historical interpretation | No | 15 |
| AL9092 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain character of park with respect to vegetation | No | 1 |
| AL9095 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support development of documentation/museum | No | 2 |
| AL9099 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support increase in natural habitat | No | 3 |
| AR4005 | Archeological Resources: Support preservation/protection of archeological resources | No | 2 |
| AR4200 | Archeological Resources: Impacts would be greater from action alternatives than from overuse | Yes | 1 |
| AR4300 | Archeological Resources: Conduct study to evaluate archeological resources | Yes | 2 |
| CC1000 | Consultation & Coordination: Further coordination | Yes | 5 |
| CR4100 | Cultural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of cultural resources | Yes | 1 |
| DR4100 | Drainage: Issues of drainage to park neighbors not addressed | Yes | 1 |
| DS5030 | Design: Trail width | No | 10 |
| DS5040 | Design: Support use of gravel trail material | No | 1 |
| DS5045 | Design: Pave bike trails | No | 2 |
| DS5050 | Design: Bike speed control | No | 1 |
| DS5055 | Design: Low Impact Development | No | 2 |
| DS5060 | Design: Replant grassy areas with native vegetation | No | 2 |
| DS5070 | Design: Stormwater Management plans | No | 3 |
| FN1000 | Funding: Cost analysis | Yes | 3 |
| FN1500 | Funding: Ensure funding is available for Preferred Alternative | No | 1 |
| FN2000 | Funding: Soliciting funds from other federal agencies | No | 1 |
| FN2100 | Funding: Add profitable activities to park | Yes | 1 |
| IV2000 | Issues - Visitor Use: Noise and parking are not issues | Yes | 2 |
| MT2000 | Miscellaneous Topics: Oppose fees for park use | No | 1 |
| MT2500 | Miscellaneous Topics: Request additional studies | Yes | 1 |
| MT3000 | Miscellaneous Topics: SDP should be more open-ended/flexible | No | 1 |
| MT3100 | Miscellaneous Topics: Raise and lower flag each day | No | 3 |
| MT3200 | Miscellaneous Topics: Connect park to local transit systems | Yes | 4 |
| MT3300 | Miscellaneous Topics: Continued use of park for community events | No | 1 |

| Code | Description | Substantive? | # of Comments |
|--------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|
| NR2000 | Natural Resources: Preserve natural resources | No | 5 |
| NR2100 | Natural Resources: Control invasive species | No | 4 |
| NR2150 | Natural Resources: Avoid impacts to rare, threatened, endangered species | No | 1 |
| NR2200 | Natural Resources: Protect Bald Eagle habitat | No | 5 |
| NR4100 | Natural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of natural resources | Yes | 1 |
| NR4200 | Natural Resources: Impacts - Impervious area calculations | Yes | 2 |
| PI2000 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Meeting not sufficiently advertised | Yes | 5 |
| PI2005 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Park neighbors/users not sufficiently informed of project | No | 2 |
| PI2050 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Additional public meeting | No | 1 |
| PI3000 | Public Involvement - NPS process excludes minorities | No | 1 |
| PN2010 | Purpose & Need: Purpose should focus on recreational uses | Yes | 1 |
| PN2015 | Purpose & Need: Recreational use not impacting resources | Yes | 1 |
| SE4000 | Socioeconomics - Impacts: Impacts not sufficiently addressed | Yes | 5 |
| VE1050 | Visitor Experience: EA does not sufficiently define "Visitor Experience" | Yes | 2 |
| VE4010 | Visitor Experience - Impacts: Increased focus on cultural resources should not detract from the natural beauty/setting of the park | No | 2 |
| VE4020 | Visitor Experience - Impacts: Large group picnics do not adversely impact visitor experience | Yes | 1 |
| VU2010 | Visitor Use: Estimate of visitor numbers and cars | Yes | 2 |
| VU2015 | Visitor Use: Provide traffic analysis/expected vehicular volume | Yes | 1 |
| VU2020 | Information regarding carrying capacity | Yes | 1 |
| VU4040 | Visitor Use: Removal of picnic facilities would reduce visitor numbers/enjoyment | Yes | 1 |
| Total | | | 600 |

TABLE 2: CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY CORRESPONDENCE TYPE

| Type | Number of Correspondences | Percentage |
|--------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Web Form | 156 | 90% |
| Park Form | 4 | 2% |
| Letter | 11 | 6% |
| Email | 3 | 2% |
| Total | 174 | |

TABLE 3: CORRESPONDENCE DISTRIBUTION BY STATE

| State | Number of Correspondences | Percentage |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| California | 1 | 1% |
| District of Columbia | 3 | 2% |
| Hawaii | 1 | 1% |
| Maryland | 12 | 7% |
| Unknown | 2 | 1% |
| Virginia | 154 | 88% |
| Outside United States | 1 | 1% |
| TOTAL | 174 | |

NOTE: "Unknown" indicates correspondence for which no state of origin was provided.

3) PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY

a) Substantive Issues Report

AL3001 Alternatives: Remove picnic pavilion that provides least revenue (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 122 **Comment Id:** 239071 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am in favor of a visitors center being constructed. Perhaps one pavillion could be given up and the visitors center be built where it stands so as to not have to increase the pavement footprint at the Park. Perhaps pick the location based upon the shelter that provides the least revenue in rental income?

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4001 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Series of interpretive sites (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239166 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: An option would be to place unmanned kiosks at strategic points around the park and have each one dedicated to a certain timeframe to better explain the multiple uses.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 238736 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I think there are better options for the visitors center. Rather than a visitors center in a building, recommend a series of interpretive sites accessible from the current parking lots and future bike/pedestrian trail around the park. Keep the low impact goals that you are striving for, and get the visitors out into the park like it is designed to support

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph D Ludovici **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4002 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Visitor center in Area D (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 238607 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I remember the "D" Section in High School. Yes, it was party central, but nobody ever did anything to harm the park. It was a place where friends met and had fun. I think that area should be considered for a visitor's center, being it is closed. The park has such history as a German prisoner of war camp, and has to remain so nobody ever forgets.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4003 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Center only (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238750 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: One individual in the audience suggested another "Alternative E" a plan to keep the park as is and build an Interpretive Center. Unfortunately Mr. Sheffer did not acknowledge this suggestion or even give this individual the decency of a response. Upon review it will be found that the course of action presented in this idea would accomplish most of the goals expressed by NPS in Alternatives B ?D and seems to have substantial merit. It should be added to the Comparison of Alternatives handout.

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4004 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use NCO Quarters as Visitor Facility (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 170 **Comment Id:** 240449 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Give priority to preservation and restoration of existing historic buildings (e.g., the NCO Quarters, the batteries) over the construction of new buildings, and use the old buildings as interpretive facilities, if such use is consistent with their preservation

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Commenter: W. David Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 53 **Comment Id:** 238791 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I support the use of the existing wood frame residential house as a visitor center.

Organization: American Society of Landscape Architects

Commenter: Mark LaPierre **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 64 **Comment Id:** 238881 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: why not simply fix up the house at the entrance with whatever history of the park is worth sharing and use that for what will likely be a limited number of visitors? a new structure would probably not be cost effective, and removing virtually all of the circulation for what appears to be an exaggerated concern for "resource protection" will achieve nothing

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 110 **Comment Id:** 239018 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I see no need to reduce the recreational aspects of the park to further that goal. I have often wondered why the white building at the entrance of the park is not used. That building would seem a logical choice as an information center.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 239066 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: It seems appropriate that the small white house at the entry could be the center of the historical presentation.

Organization: Collingwood resident

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4005 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase interpretation by creating a documentary (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 57 **Comment Id:** 238808 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: A documentary film was made in approximately 2005 about Camp Ritchie by a German filmmaker that tells a moving story about a handful of these veterans. Nothing comparable to that exists about Fort Hunt. Why can't that story be told through exhibits at a facility to be created at the site of the former Fort Hunt?

Organization: FRIENDS OF CAMP RITCHIE

Commenter: Bernard A LUBRAN **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4006 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Trail only (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 165 **Comment Id:** 239951 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Option "A" with an option of an interpretive trail sounds the best

Organization:

Commenter: Anonymous Anonymous **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 67 **Comment Id:** 238898 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Given the choices afforded in the study, I find myself looking for the None of the Above choice. There is no option that maintains the current Park uses essentially unaltered, while providing for an elaborated self-guided tour using the current roadways and paths.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 70 **Comment Id:** 238909 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If we are to acknowledge the park's historical significance, we can do that without destroying the pavilions or the ball fields. We can develop interpretative trails and maintain the family-orientation of the current park.

Organization: none

Commenter: William F Rhatican **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 71 **Comment Id:** 238913 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Second, enhance interpretive facilities. This important but somewhat neglected function should also be relatively noncontroversial. Presumably some level of interpretive trail development could be accomplished before making a decision on whether or not to construct a new visitor facility at area B or C.

Organization: PVRB Civic Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 238937 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: An interpretive trail is a great idea, but it doesn't require a building.

Organization:

Commenter: John H Powell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239105 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: None of the alternatives listed in the SDP allow for only improving the Park's access and modifying roads and trails, all of which I support. I also support outdoor improvements to the Park's historical interpretation (meaning no visitor's center). I recommend that these two objectives be approached together and without removal of existing, highly useful facilities such as the pavilions. I suggest that this approach be incorporated into the SDP and be the alternative NPS adopts for future improvements to the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239260 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I request that a new Action Alternative be added that leaves the existing loop road, picnic pavillions and rest rooms in place, adds an interpretive trail, adds other means for education (e.g., website), provides cultural and natural resources protections as I cite in comment (1) above, and provides operational means for managing visitor use.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4007 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative involving new visitor center without removal of picnic facilities (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239099 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I support making changes to the Park to promote its historical significance, but they should be made without removal of existing facilities, such as the pavilions.

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 78 **Comment Id:** 238931 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In addition, the following alternatives must be specifically evaluated. 1. Build a visitors' center while maintaining the existing 5 picnic pavilions. 2. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 4 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions. 3. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 3 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions. 4. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 2 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions.

Organization: concerned citizen

Commenter: Thomas A Gerard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 99 **Comment Id:** 238988 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I don't have a problem with one of the pavilions being converted to a visitor center, but I do have a problem with the rest of the pavilions and picnic areas being removed.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 111 **Comment Id:** 239022 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I also think there should be an alternative that isn't mentioned which is to simply add an interpretative section to the park if that is so important.

Organization: Hollin Hills

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 239039 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would appreciate a plan that incorporates a visitor center which provides historical information for patrons, but also continues to allow for use of the park as a recreational facility that includes pavillions, and perhaps also an enhanced/improved playground for toddlers.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 120 **Comment Id:** 239064 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The NPS can still build its "VISITOR CENTER" in Area "C" and erect any trails WITHOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF EITHER THE LOOP OR THE PAVILION/PICNIC FACILITIES.

Organization: "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53)

Commenter: Ronald B Greenleese **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4008 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Information kiosk instead of visitor center (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239164 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The NPS did not consider a much more cost effective incremental approach to expanding the historical aspect of Ft. Hunt. By this I mean establishing a kiosk or covered area and parking facility near the entrance to the park. This sort of facility could even be placed inside the retrofitted building that currently stands near the entrance. The facility could offer a good historical perspective of the park, maps, and pictures of how it looked at various stages in time. Currently this structure is not used.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239102 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: NPS should consider an open-air information kiosk, placed near the Park entrance. It could display historical photos, a large map of the Park, and provide handouts. A kiosk would be smaller and cheaper to build and requires no staffing, but it could be temporarily staffed when needed for special

events. Standing on its own, it could provide the majority of the information required to send visitors on their way through the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4009 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Convert Pavilion A into a visitor center (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 148 **Comment Id:** 239160 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: A new Visitor's Center on virgin ground is a mistake and a waste of money. If you, as you seem intent on doing, have to have a visitor's center, then why not rebuild the main pavilion at the front entrance of the park?? One could update the building, add a story and enlarge the facility already there. There is already plumbing electricity, parking etc. This project would cost a fraction of the cost of the project that you are proposing and not destroy the park as we know it. Plus, it would leave the larger portion of the park alone

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4010 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, restructure the existing permit system (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 171 **Comment Id:** 240470 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Eliminate the rental of picnic grounds and if you must continue to let Area A out, that it be limited to less than 175 people

Organization:

Commenter: Poul M Hertel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 11 **Comment Id:** 238608 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I think what needs to be done, is to make people take responsibility for their group; to clean up afterwards or pay a fine. The park should be left clean and each group should have that responsibility to make sure it's taken care of, that the site is left clean. I think, maybe having a deposit to rent the space, that is refundable after an inspection.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 14 **Comment Id:** 238622 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If the volume of use is causing damage to the park, then the volume can be controlled by granting fewer permits.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 238704 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: At the September 21 presentation, the reason given for removal of the pavilions was that the park was being "over utilized" during "peak periods", although no support material for this statement was presented. Further questioning from the public lead one ranger to explain that his department felt it was spending too much time overseeing the pavilion permitting process, and therefore, it did not leave them enough time to devote to explaining the history of the park. This comment is offensive because 1) it minimizes the recreational nature of park, which many people value; 2) it indicates that the park rangers feel that proper administration of the park, that is, managing its facilities for the benefit of users, is of less importance than historical interpretation. From the ranger's comments, it seems obvious that he'd rather not spend his time managing picnic permits. Conveniently, by proposing the elimination of the picnic pavilions, he and his department would be free to spend their time performing work they prefer, i.e., historical interpretation.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 238705 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If the issue is that permits are not applied for, or that the number of guests listed on the permit is exceeded by the actual number of guests who show up, I suggest the solution is enforcement of the permitting process and the permits as issued. If strong notices are posted stating that a violation of the rules will result in removal from the park or immediate forfeiture of the permit and this is strictly enforced for a meaningful period of time, then over utilization will be reduced.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 238706 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The Park Service might assign a non-ranger employee or volunteer to oversee the administrative component of the permitting process, and therefore free some of the park rangers' time. Park Service employees should do their jobs, not eliminate the parts of their jobs that are less enjoyable

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238755 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: As the meeting progressed it was revealed by NPS officials that the primary incident in the development of the Site Development Plan was the overuse of the park by picnic groups on the weekends during the summer. These large groups NPS officials suggest have a negative impact on the park in that they overcrowd existing facilities especially restrooms which rapidly and frequently run out of expendable supplies. While the NPS proposed solution is to control the number of individuals using the park by tearing down some of the existing pavilions - other commonsense alternatives exist. One of these would be to limit Park usage through a more stringent permit issuance and enforcement process. Such a plan might limit reservations to only one pavilion on the weekends. One of the NPS officials present stated that individuals filling out permit requests deliberately understated the amount of people that would be present at the event so as to save money on the usage fee. One solution to this problem would be to issue tickets to the group and then have an NPS representative (perhaps a summer intern) present at the event to collect the tickets. Those arriving without a ticket could be charged a usage fee or told that they could not attend the event. In terms of the impact on the restrooms large events customarily use Porta Potties to ease the impact on limited fixed facilities. Once again the cost of providing these Porta Potties would be passed on to the user group via an increased usage fee. Another solution would be to collect additional monies and have a staff member available to restock and resupply the restroom facilities as needed. This approach is commonly used for community teams (such as basketball leagues) that utilize school facilities and is a widely accepted cost of doing business.

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 63 **Comment Id:** 238877 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If the site hosts too many and too large events at this time, then the rules governing those events should be changed, fees raised, capacities limited.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 238935 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Instituting and enforcing lower permitted usage limits (say from 600 to 400 at Area A, for example) would mitigate the issue without firing up a single bulldozer or spending scarce federal dollars on expensive construction projects.

Organization:

Commenter: John H Powell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 91 **Comment Id:** 238965 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: NPS can just reduce the number of picnic permits it grants to bring park use into line with whatever parameters it feels are required.

Organization:

Commenter: Gene Gibbons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 95 **Comment Id:** 238974 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If there is an issue of over use on weekends during the Spring and Summer seasons ? restrict the permits or the number of people at each area during those times.

Organization:

Commenter: John Boertlein **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239116 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low - Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239117 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Looking closely at the data NPS provides in the SDP it would lead me to propose a solution that: - Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low - Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Uses additional portable toilets during peak seasons - Realigns picnic pavilion capacity with associated parking capacity by either increasing one or the other or both - Restricts parking in adjacent residential areas and tickets offenders - Puts noise restrictions on permits, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Improves handicap access to facilities to comply with ADA and ABA - Improves the interpretive signage for the historic resources (per Appendix D recommendations) - Uses physical barriers to protect historic resources - Conducts a study on the archeological resources and then either conducts a "dig" at these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them - Improves speed limit signage on Loop Rd, tickets offenders (as they do on the GWMP), and adds "speed bumps"

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 134 **Comment Id:** 239119 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I think that the answer isn't tearing down picnic pavilions or changing the facilities or mission of Fort Hunt Park. Instead, the answer lies in coming up with better controls over limiting the number of large picnics and changing the permitting process. Charge a security deposit for large events in order to guarantee a clean-up afterward. I might also consider charging automobiles (but not bikes or pedestrians) an entrance fee into the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 141 **Comment Id:** 239136 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If the people who use the park are abusing it by leaving debris & trash, those people should be fined & not allowed back. There must be a way to establish & enforce rules of conduct without taking the Park away from those of us who care about it & need this retreat in their lives. Perhaps, issuing passes (as in the Library passes) to gain entrance to the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 141 **Comment Id:** 239137 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: A suggestion: Try holding a large deposit from them that will only be returned upon inspection of the facility & finding it in relatively the same condition as before they used it--CLEAN.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239169 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am sure there is some way you can make the pavilions self-serve reservations or modify the process so as to free up valuable ranger time

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239170 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: There is also the option of not allowing the pavilions to be reserved - that the party must be the first to show up and claim a (new) park sign saying it is reserved. Next, for large parties there can be a larger fee for service.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 154 **Comment Id:** 239188 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The parking issues discussed in the plan are a reflection of parking and event policy. Policy can be adjusted to the optimum for events and the general public. This problem is of the Park Service's making and within thier purview to correct.

Organization:

Commenter: Connie D Graham **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 239193 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: With respect to the "overuse" problems noted in the EA/AoE, including neighborhood intrusion, noise, and environmental damage, we believe that permitting restrictions are a better solution than major changes to the Park.

Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc

Commenter: Bruce & Virginia Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239199 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB has been reasonably content with Fort Hunt Park as it is, so has reason to question the need for substantial changes at substantial taxpayer cost. In what has to be an oversight, the EA/AoE contains no Action Alternative that would mitigate the problems involving peak period overuse, as well as some problems affecting the environment, through revised use regulations and more restrictive permitting of picnics and parties. It seems that such an Action Alternative might be just as effective, and much less expensive to execute, than the substantial infrastructure changes envisioned in all the proposed Action Alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239214 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB members, as frequent visitors to the Park, strongly support tailoring visitation to existing facilities. That could probably be accomplished through restriction of permits.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239221 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB agrees that facilities are stressed and that some reduction in Park use for large activities would be beneficial. PVRB questions whether major infrastructure changes are needed to address this problem and would like NPS to explain why rules, regulations, permit restrictions and minor changes such as blocking off roads would not suffice.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239250 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that that problem could be solved by operational changes: adding custodial staff, limiting the number of large picnic groups/limiting the size of the permitting picnic groups, raising permit fees, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4012 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, provide increased police presence (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 36 **Comment Id:** 238730 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If anything, I would advocate for more park police presence

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4013 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, enforce stricter noise regulations (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 158 **Comment Id:** 239232 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The park's concert series are wonderful. However, it would be appropriate to enforce bans on the loudness of rock bands and their amplifiers hired for large group picnics. Some bands are so loud that their music can be heard throughout the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4015 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, reassess NPS staff duties (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 150 **Comment Id:** 239176 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Use our money wisely - hire some youth group to clean up after renting out the pavilions.

Organization: USAF retired

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 238717 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: What our Park Service needs to do is to look at the job specifications and the division of duties. We need those who will care for and ride the horses; those who monitor the traffic (and slow the speeders!!); and eventually those who would lead groups through a visitor's center and other areas of the park. We also need an administrative person to keep the calendar, scheduling the events using the pavilion areas, and scheduling groups for tours. This person could also manage the financial aspects and be responsible for instructing the groups on rules and responsibilities

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4017 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Plan for management of Natural Resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 63 **Comment Id:** 238879 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would also hope that a future plan for the park would include an effective plan to manage the natural resources of the site, which I did not see.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4018 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Improve maintenance of the park (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 169 **Comment Id:** 240441 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that Fort Hunt Park is a wonderful facility and needs no change. It does need continued maintenance and minor improvements for which I believe the NPS has proper funding. Remember, the new facilities would require increases in such maintenance funding, which may be limited in the present budget atmosphere

Organization:

Commenter: Samuel T Nicholson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 103 **Comment Id:** 238999 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: You should however, invest a little more time and money into the maintenance of the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Frank W Corley **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239101 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that NPS should use its limited funding to properly maintain and repair facilities and property that now exist, rather than construct, staff, operate, and maintain things like new buildings.

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 143 **Comment Id:** 239142 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would also like to limit the future recurring costs for the park. Any infrastructure has a recurring cost to maintain it. Something such as a visitor center may provide little benefit but would have a significant recurring maintenance cost. I would prefer such monies to go into the natural landscaping and maintaining of the basic park

Organization:

Commenter: David L Edwards **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 157 **Comment Id:** 239225 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If you have money to spend then clean up and renovate the bathrooms and get your service crew off their mobile appliances and check areas better. Start with the Battalion Commanders Station and clean out the Coke and soda bottles (unless of course they are left over from WWII).

Organization:

Commenter: Renee Priore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239250 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that that problem could be solved by operational changes: adding custodial staff, limiting the number of large picnic groups/limiting the size of the permitting picnic groups, raising permit fees, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4019 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Trash issues need to be managed (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 144 **Comment Id:** 239144 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I do think that the trash rules must be enforced by park officials and fine the guilty parties.

Organization: State Farm Insurance

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 239057 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Consider requiring users to take out all of their trash.

Organization: Friends of Dyke Marsh

Commenter: Glenda C Booth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4020 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Institute controls for traffic speeds within park (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 163 **Comment Id:** 239263 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: It is imperative that there be speed control measures to ensure safety. It is only a matter of time before there is an accident. Cars travel much too fast around the circle - this includes parents who are late to take their children to sports practice to people who have never been in the park and ignore the signs.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 102 **Comment Id:** 238993 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I think a hidden speed camera along the road would generate substantial income with one warning sign posted at the park entrance. Either that or regular speed monitoring by police on the weekends.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239117 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Looking closely at the data NPS provides in the SDP it would lead me to propose a solution that: - Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low - Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Uses additional portable toilets during peak seasons - Realigns picnic pavilion capacity with associated parking capacity by either increasing one or the other or both - Restricts parking in adjacent residential areas and tickets offenders - Puts noise restrictions on permits, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Improves handicap access to facilities to comply with ADA and ABA - Improves the interpretive signage for the historic resources (per Appendix D recommendations) - Uses physical barriers to protect historic resources - Conducts a study on the archeological resources and then either conducts a "dig" at these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them - Improves speed limit signage on Loop Rd, tickets offenders (as they do on the GWMP), and adds

"speed bumps"

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239210 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB definitely supports strict enforcement of speed limits in the Park. However, PVRB believes associated problems can be mitigated by strict enforcement and/or by physical measures such as installing stop signs or speed bumps

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239253 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I disagree with removing the existing Loop Road. I see very few incidences of speeding traffic, and these could be addressed by Police Enforcement of speed limits.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4025 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use of bollards to separate vehicular traffic and pedestrians (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 167 **Comment Id:** 239962 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Keep existing roadways and block them from vehicle traffic by placing pole baracades in place that will allow pedestrian and cycle traffic but not cars.

Organization:

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238753 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Many in the group expressed concern that the large two-lane roadways currently in existence were to be removed (56,700 sq ft) and replaced by narrow (9') wide paths in some of the options presented. Such a move would make it impossible for the various current Park user groups to coexist (as previously mentioned above). NPS seems to have ignored an obvious solution that is used in parks across the country. That is to install vertical poles 3 to 4 feet in height at 3 to 4 foot intervals across the existing roadways to prevent vehicular traffic while allowing pedestrians cyclists rollerbladers etc. to utilize the road way. Many times these posts have locking mechanisms which allow them to be removed by Park maintenance staff as needed. This approach is extremely cost effective and accomplishes the same objectives presented in these Alternatives

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4026 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reopen walk-in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 159 **Comment Id:** 239238 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: With the closing of the walk-in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road, safety issues increased. There appears to be no real reason why that gate was locked. It makes it so dangerous for neighbors on our end of Fort Hunt Road to have to walk where there are NO sidewalks around a curve that gives vehicles no visibility. We would like to use the park without being put in danger walking there. We ask that this walk-in gate be reopened.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4027 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Separate pedestrian and bike paths (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 171 **Comment Id:** 240482 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The report further suggests removal of the loop road and a replacement trail in which bicycles and pedestrian share 50% of the remaining portion of the road, and share a diminutive trail that winds at the periphery of the park. The Park Services ought to have sufficient evidence and experience with the problems on the Mount Vernon trail to know that these modes require separation in order to work

Organization:

Commenter: Poul M Hertel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 64 **Comment Id:** 238880 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: the circular road should stay-- and could be used by both cars and bikes. if anything changes , there might be a separate walking path so walkers don't get hit by speeding bikers (and, based on my observation, they are far more dangerous than the cars).

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 127 **Comment Id:** 239088 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: would much prefer to see the bike trail widened to accommodate both walkers and cyclist, maybe even making separate lanes for each.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret A Cathro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 171 **Comment Id:** 240472 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Set Park policy acknowledging the danger of combining Pedestrian and bicycles

Organization:

Commenter: Poul M Hertel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4030 Alternatives: A temporary visitor's center (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 32 **Comment Id:** 238720 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would then suggest a temporary facility to road test the visitor's center, placed near the park entrance

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4035 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Relocate picnic pavilion (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 151 **Comment Id:** 239177 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If it is truly necessary to destroy the pavilions, at least reconsider and dismantle them and place them in another area of the park. We were noticing that they were not that old and wished we had had them available years ago when we had GS day camp there in the hot month of June!

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne B Lepple **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4040 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Move pavilions above archeological sites (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 7 **Comment Id:** 238603 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: 4) If some of the current pavilions are above potential archeological sites, they could be moved rather than removed if necessary to protect future investigations and allow for appropriate markers.

Organization: Collingwood Citizens Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4050 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Cost-effective methods to increase historical interpretation (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 171 **Comment Id:** 240473 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Construct an interpretive trail starting at Area C and utilize existing pavilion for informational boards

Organization:

Commenter: Poul M Hertel **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 238611 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Adding an interpretive focus for the park's history has to be placed in perspective. This fort never fired a round in war, despite the gun emplacements. It's use as a WW-II POW site, interrogation facility and intelligence site can easily be explained through signage, as any evidence of that has been removed many years ago.

Organization:

Commenter: John H Kern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 238613 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: add interpretive signs

Organization:

Commenter: John H Kern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 29 **Comment Id:** 238707 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I like the idea of a visitor's center at the park; however, given current fiscal concerns, I believe interpretive signage along a trail in the park would be just as informative, as well as fiscally responsible

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238756 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In terms of the Interpretive Center several cost-effective alternatives exist. Signage (such as that on Civil War battlefields) could be placed at historically significant sites within the Park

without necessitating the removal of existing buildings. These signs could be used for both Park guided tours and self-guided tours

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 46 **Comment Id:** 238761 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The visitor center sounds interesting but I think that numbered plaques placed strategically around the park could serve just as well and people could take self guided tours. It is not necessary to spend the money for a visitors center at Fort Hunt Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 53 **Comment Id:** 238786 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I support the development of passive interpretive displays and access to historic elements of the grounds

Organization: American Society of Landscape Architects

Commenter: Mark LaPierre **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 56 **Comment Id:** 238802 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: However, the very interesting story of Ft. Hunt can be told by an interpretive trail on site and more extensive text, photos, diagrams, etc online

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 67 **Comment Id:** 238897 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: A passive, ranger-free, self-guided tour would be fully as effective and far less injurious to the important role the Park plays as a meeting place to persons, families and groups in the Mount Vernon community and the National Capital Region.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 238903 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I think a visitor facility is overkill and that improved interpretive signs will adequately address the need to explain the park's history.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 88 **Comment Id:** 238960 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Some interpretive boards outside would be useful.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 91 **Comment Id:** 238967 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: It seems to us the historic connections of Fort Hunt Park can be amply and inexpensively publicized by writing a leaflet documenting same and making it available to park visitors

Organization:

Commenter: Gene Gibbons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 100 **Comment Id:** 238990 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I suggest, instead of a museum, that you prepare a booklet and a walking trail for self guided tours.

Organization:

Commenter: MARY A MILLER **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 104 **Comment Id:** 239001 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am certain appropriate markers and informational signs could also designate it as a proper historical site and relay any information you desire.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel A Mica **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 105 **Comment Id:** 239004 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that the NPS can enhance the history experience using the existing facilities without the complete removal of the recreational facilities.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 130 **Comment Id:** 239096 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am certain appropriate markers and informational signs could also designate it as a proper historical site and relay any information you desire.

Organization:

Commenter: Katherine S Moore **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 151 **Comment Id:** 239179 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The history of the park could be told with more interpretive signs in under a pavilion such as Area C and there would be no need for an expensive visitor center to maintain

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne B Lepple **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 239195 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The funds needed to build such a center would be better spent on environmental protection/remediation and preservation of the existing facilities and historical sites, i.e., the batteries, the NCO Quarters, and the Battery Commander's Station.

Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc

Commenter: Bruce & Virginia Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 155 **Comment Id:** 239196 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Historical information and interpretation can be improved with additional signage.

Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc

Commenter: Bruce & Virginia Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239223 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB supports, in principle, provision of historical information and interpretation in the Park. Nevertheless, the EA/AoE does not provide Action Alternatives that might achieve that objective without substantial infrastructure changes and it does seem that some signage and perhaps some less ambitious construction might achieve the objective at far less cost. If substantial investment in the rich history of the Park is to be made, it should be made in preserving the historical features of the Park such

as the batteries.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 161 **Comment Id:** 239242 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: would be in favor of a more balanced approach that supports the construction of a self-guided trail with signage and a small visitor's center near the entrance to the park without the wholesale removal of picnic pavilions, ball fields, bathrooms, parking, etc.

Organization:

Commenter: Veronica A Cartier **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239247 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I agree that Fort Hunt Park has an interesting history that should be shared with the public. The first step, and likely the most economic one, would be to provide a robust website with links to historic information. It is exceedingly difficult to locate information on the Park's history on line.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239260 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I request that a new Action Alternative be added that leaves the existing loop road, picnic pavillions and rest rooms in place, adds an interpretive trail, adds other means for education (e.g., website), provides cultural and natural resources protections as I cite in comment (1) above, and provides operational means for managing visitor use.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 163 **Comment Id:** 239262 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: How does increasing the size of the visitor center and the number of park visitors reduce the impact to park neighbors? Why not build a much smaller visitor center and have kiosks throughout the park that people can walk to and use smart phones to get additional information.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 170 **Comment Id:** 240449 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Give priority to preservation and restoration of existing historic buildings (e.g., the NCO Quarters, the batteries) over the construction of new buildings, and use the old buildings as interpretive facilities, if such use is consistent with their preservation

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Commenter: W. David Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4052 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Picnic areas along interpretive trail (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 125 **Comment Id:** 239085 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: at least two picnic pavilions could be retained for the near future at Fort Hunt Park in the final SDP to commemorate that part of the park's history. Other picnic tables could also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups can have picnics, play in the park and also learn about the site's important history.

Organization:

Commenter: Daniel Gross **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 238886 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Small groups of picnic tables should also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups of limited size can have not only picnics and play in the park but also learn about the site's important history and be drawn into the visitor center to become more involved in our nation's history.

Organization: National Parks Conservation Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 72 **Comment Id:** 238915 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: we believe the community should not and need not be deprived of a picnic and biking/hiking area. Rather, we would encourage a similar dual emphasis at Fort Hunt Park, retaining some picnic pavilions and integrating picnic tables along the interpretative trail.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4055 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control visitor use (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239218 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB supports, in consonance with objectives to control peak visitor levels, the reduction of picnic pavilions and sports fields as proposed in the Action Alternatives. Having said that, PVRB would not necessarily support removal of the pavilions, rest rooms and other facilities that support the related activities; reduction of permits and other regulations could be used to control visitor levels at less expense and would retain the facilities for potential future use

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 238737 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I question the assessment of the use of the park, and do not believe that alternative means to control the use of the park were considered. I think the picnic pavilions are only available for reservation from Memorial Day to Labor Day. There must be ways to limit the use further, and limit the size of the party and number of vehicles, in lieu of demolishing all of the pavilions. Limit vendors, the inflatable party toys, volume of music/speakers, etc

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph D Ludovici **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4056 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Add more picnic pavilions (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239111 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If picnicking is the "root cause" of the problems (ie, "overwhelmed" restrooms and parking), then reducing the number of picnicking and restroom facilities runs counter to this. The NPS should not reduce them; in fact, the NPS makes the case for increasing the number of these facilities

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 68 **Comment Id:** 238899 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: What is needed are more pavillions

Organization: LSU Alumni Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4058 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control deterioration of cultural resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239117 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Looking closely at the data NPS provides in the SDP it would lead me to propose a solution that: - Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low - Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Uses additional portable toilets during peak seasons - Realigns picnic pavilion capacity with associated parking capacity by either increasing one or the other or both - Restricts parking in adjacent residential areas and tickets offenders - Puts noise restrictions on permits, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Improves handicap access to facilities to comply with ADA and ABA - Improves the interpretive signage for the historic resources (per Appendix D recommendations) - Uses physical barriers to protect historic resources - Conducts a study on the archeological resources and then either conducts a "dig" at these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them - Improves speed limit signage on Loop Rd, tickets offenders (as they do on the GWMP), and adds "speed bumps"

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 58 **Comment Id:** 238813 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: kids will continue to climb on the batteries as long as there is no pedestrian controls. Nowhere in this EA was there a mention of fencing, security lights, or pedestrian access controls. I know for certain these have not been implemented up to this point, so again no evidence these measures will not work

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly V Larkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4060 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Dog amenities (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 124 **Comment Id:** 239078 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would like to see an area designated for dogs to walk and/or play in. It used to be permitted in the area of the closed (for traffic) back loop.

Organization:

Commenter: Allan Dickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 16 **Comment Id:** 238633 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Finally, there is one small item that I think should be included in your grand plan -- a doggie water bowl. At the Stratford Landing park there is a bowl, bolted into the ground beneath a hand pump where you can pump fresh water for the dogs, and it is so greatly enjoyed by so many -- but it's a long walk there for an old dog and an old lady on a hot summer day.

Organization:

Commenter: Marilyn P McCullough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 47 **Comment Id:** 238767 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: An enclosed area for dogs to run in would be nice (maybe in the back loop).

Organization:

Commenter: Allan M Dickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 53 **Comment Id:** 238789 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I support the introduction of an off-leash dog area that is open for interaction and play, including mown lawn fields and woodlands. I do not support the introduction of a small fenced-in sod-less enclosure for that purpose

Organization: American Society of Landscape Architects

Commenter: Mark LaPierre **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 96 **Comment Id:** 238980 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would like to see an area designated for dogs to walk and/or play in.

Organization: retired Air Force

Commenter: Allan M Dickson **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4065 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Additional playground equipment (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 239039 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I would appreciate a plan that incorporates a visitor center which provides historical information for patrons, but also continues to allow for use of the park as a recreational facility that includes pavillions, and perhaps also an enhanced/improved playground for toddlers.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 238904 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I also agree that improved playground facilities are necessary. I suggest adding additional playground equipment to at least one other area.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 87 **Comment Id:** 238954 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: My vote is for a new and improved playground facility.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4070 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Expanding/improving the hiking trails (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 69 **Comment Id:** 238907 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I suggest improving the current unpaved trails, playground equipment, and interpretive signs, and restrooms and leaving the rest as it is.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 50 **Comment Id:** 238774 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: 5. Expanding/improving the hiking trails is a great idea.

Organization:

Commenter: Frederick B Hewitt **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 53 **Comment Id:** 238792 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I support the repair and maintenance of the existing woodland paths, without further expansion or disruption of the woodlands.

Organization: American Society of Landscape Architects

Commenter: Mark LaPierre **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4075 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Sidewalk along Fort Hunt Road (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 127 **Comment Id:** 239089 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Alternatively, we could add a sidewalk all along Fort Hunt Road so that one could safely walk to the shops.

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret A Cathro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4080 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Retain Picnic Pavilions A, B, and D and associated ball fields (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 28 **Comment Id:** 238701 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Retention of Pavilions A, B and D with associated play fields and recreation should be considered for not only the Status Quo, but for influx of new tourists that appears planned. Many, may wish to spend a little more time than a quick run through by a Guide and or a Ranger.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 12 **Comment Id:** 238614 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Do not eliminate picnic structures or the circular roadway

Organization:

Commenter: John H Kern **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4085 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase in historical interpretation without decrease in recreational activities (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 161 **Comment Id:** 239241 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The historic importance of this park should not be overlooked; however, preservation of such does not mandate the elimination or strict reduction of the recreational aspect of the park as outlined in the alternatives presented by the National Park Service.

Organization:

Commenter: Veronica A Cartier **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4087 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Restore historical viewshed to Potomac Reiver (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 170 **Comment Id:** 240443 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Consider restoring the historical viewshed down to the Potomac River and across to Fort Washington from one of the batteries in the park

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Commenter: W. David Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL4090 Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reroute road through Ball field at Area B (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 28 **Comment Id:** 238699 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The Softball area adjacent to Pavilion B could be removed, allowing for a newly designed paved roadway to be made. This would allow for an earlier break off for pedestrians, bicyclists and the like.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL4093 Alternatives: Interpretive objectives not stated clearly (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 78 **Comment Id:** 238929 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The interpretation objectives are not clearly stated and must be subject to a discussion of public comment.

Organization: concerned citizen

Commenter: Thomas A Gerard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL5100 Alternatives: Support less drastic changes (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239199 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB has been reasonably content with Fort Hunt Park as it is, so has reason to question the need for substantial changes at substantial taxpayer cost. In what has to be an oversight, the EA/AoE contains no Action Alternative that would mitigate the problems involving peak period overuse, as well as some problems affecting the environment, through revised use regulations and more restrictive permitting of picnics and parties. It seems that such an Action Alternative might be just as effective, and much less expensive to execute, than the substantial infrastructure changes envisioned in all the proposed Action Alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 30 **Comment Id:** 238713 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In better economic times the NPS could put some emphasis on the historic aspect of the park but not now, and certainly not per Alternatives B,C,& D. They are extremes. Reevaluate!

Organization: Potomac Valley Riverbend Civic Association

Commenter: Mary J Mengershauser **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 31 **Comment Id:** 238715 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Where is the option that has the least impact yet yields a visitor center? Where is the option that does not include a ridiculous use of our tax dollars? As noted in the NPS material, this park is used by many area residents. Ripping it up in such a drastic manner is not a good idea. We need another option, and not one that loses so much of the essence of the nature of the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Lauren Cardillo **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 38 **Comment Id:** 238733 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Please have someone give serious thought (with the assistance of those who use the park) to a common sense program of providing an interpretation facility (perhaps using the currently unused house) and making other minimally invasive changes that will result in serving all those who use or might use this wonderful resource

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239163 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Unfortunately, the Park Service did not include an option that would keep current structures while pursuing the goal of reducing paved surfaces and drawing in historical tourists. Considering the number of problems the project faces and other more legitimate needs across NPS properties, I suggest the NPS scale back the proposal.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AL5130 Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses; minimal historical interpretation (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 151 **Comment Id:** 239180 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The history of the park could be told with more interpretive signs in under a pavilion such as Area C and there would be no need for an expensive visitor center to maintain

Organization:

Commenter: Suzanne B Lepple **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 42 **Comment Id:** 238746 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I see the present plan as a big over-reach, as I see no reason at all why there cannot continue to be space for picnicking, sports and walking/ jogging/biking along with a modest increase in the attention to the park history. I do not see this history competing in a major way with the many historical and important landmarks in the Washington area - an interesting history, yes, but no reason to steal a true gem of a park fro the public. As many have noted, this should NOT be a priority for development by the Park Service - in an era of major budget shortfalls, removing space from public enjoyment should NOT be a priority, especially for such modest historical reasons. Please keep this park for public enjoyment, in much the form it currently has. Changes for enhancing historical presentation should be modest and incremental.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 60 **Comment Id:** 238868 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: That obvious and most cost effective solution is to make minimal changes to the recreation facilities, add the historical interpretive trail, and realign the entrance.

Organization: Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn.

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 94 **Comment Id:** 238972 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I understand the very important historical significance of the park, but feel strongly that it can be even better acknowledged with its' current usage continuing without change

Organization: Waynewood Citizens Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 112 **Comment Id:** 239027 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Find an option to protect the recreational areas AND mark the history and support from the public and our officials will be effusive.

Organization: None

Commenter: William R Clontz **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 121 **Comment Id:** 239065 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am strongly in favor of keeping the park as a recreational retreat as well as highlighting the important historical heritage.

Organization: Collingwood resident

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 122 **Comment Id:** 239069 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Instead of removing the road, field or pavillion I suggest the placement of a wayside informational sign in a prominent location at the site that does not interfere with the current use of the site.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239104 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Increase the Park's historical attributes but do not remove other Park facilities

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 131 **Comment Id:** 239106 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I believe that the historical aspects of FHP can and should be enhanced, provided that those changes coexist with the current use of the Park as a recreation area. Please leave the pavilions in place.

Organization:

Commenter: Roy A Rathburn **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AL6035 Alternatives: Support Alternative B with modifications (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 56 **Comment Id:** 238801 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In short, I would vote for Plan B minus the new visitor facility and with Picnic Pavilion B and adjacent ball field not removed

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

AR4200 Archeological Resources: Impacts would be greater from action alternatives than from overuse (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 81 **Comment Id:** 238938 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Environmentally, assertions about overuse wearing down soil to potentially put archeological finds at risk seem benign compared to bulldozing facilities and trees, regrading roads and digging new building foundations.

Organization:

Commenter: John H Powell **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

AR4300 Archeological Resources: Conduct study to evaluate archeological resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 170 **Comment Id:** 240450 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: -Conduct archeological fieldwork and incorporate it into a new "living historical park" design so that visitors can see and learn on a continuing bases what is being discovered about Fort Hunt's history form 14,000 years ago to the present, and

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Commenter: W. David Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239117 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Looking closely at the data NPS provides in the SDP it would lead me to propose a solution that: - Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low - Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Uses additional portable toilets during peak seasons - Realigns picnic pavilion capacity with associated parking capacity by either increasing one or the other or both - Restricts parking in adjacent residential areas and tickets offenders - Puts noise restrictions on permits, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded - Improves handicap access to facilities to comply with ADA and ABA - Improves the interpretive signage for the historic resources (per Appendix D recommendations) - Uses physical barriers to protect historic resources - Conducts a study on the archeological resources and then either conducts a "dig" at these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them - Improves speed limit signage on Loop Rd, tickets offenders (as they do on the GWMP), and adds "speed bumps"

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

CC1000 Consultation & Coordination: Further coordination (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 149 **Comment Id:** 239172 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: encourage you to revisit the proposal with an eye towards what is realistic and communicating more with those who do regularly use the park. It is disturbing that the first time many of us in the neighborhood first heard about the possible changes was so late in the process. I know it is difficult, but I am sure if you revisited the proposal and encouraged more local groups to participate in the

process, you would have a much better chance of securing local support.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 13 **Comment Id:** 238619 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Show your knowledge of how government functions by working through the elected officials in the area, the civic associations in the area and the other unaffiliated users of the park. These officers and organizations have offices and regular meetings where ideas can be discussed before holding what seemed like a "take it or write-in as individuals" last chance meeting. These local civic officers and groups have their constituents' interests at heart every day. They are a wealth of knowledge and expertise in what makes the Mt. Vernon area tick. They could be very helpful in determining what the public sentiment toward the project is and extremely effective at helping NPS get buy-in from the surrounding residents for a thoughtful and studied approach. Do not rush to judgment on this unfunded project? share the lifting with your employers, the public.

Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend Civic Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 58 **Comment Id:** 238810 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Additionally, the scoping was severely lacking with no citizens groups to comment on the alternatives, and no notice to the Mount Vernon Civic Association. Perhaps more coordination would lead to a better understanding of purpose. And better alternatives.

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly V Larkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 58 **Comment Id:** 238815 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Additionally, a citizens group should be created to review the true purpose and need of this project to provide better alternatives for all.

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly V Larkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 239055 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Work with neighboring property owners to encourage uses compatible with the restoration and conservation of natural resources.

Organization: Friends of Dyke Marsh

Commenter: Glenda C Booth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

CR4100 Cultural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of cultural resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239243 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The Alternatives contain no actions to protect cultural or natural resources at the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

DR4100 Drainage: Issues of drainage to park neighbors not addressed (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 159 **Comment Id:** 239237 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Issues of drainage from the park onto neighbor's properties were not addressed. To say it is not a problem is incorrect. Any construction can cause additional problems.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

FN1000 Funding: Cost analysis (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 165 **Comment Id:** 239953 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: MUST include COST ESTIMATES Post cost associated with any decision on the web site now

Organization:

Commenter: Anonymous Anonymous **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 34 **Comment Id:** 238723 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I am curious that there doesn't seem to be a review of costs. We should be understanding costs as we evaluate the alternatives. Particularly in the current budget situation, I really have to question expending the funds for this study, let alone significant upgrades to the park

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238752 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In this time of fiscal constraint one questions why demolishing existing structures (especially restrooms) and removing paved surfaces is even being contemplated. It should be noted that of the 4 options presented at this hearing, only "Option A ? No Action" can be implemented with no additional taxpayer funding. Although the NPS officials making the presentation readily admitted to the group that none of the Alternative plans had been "coasted out", it is obvious from the scope of work listed in these proposals that millions of tax payer's dollars would be required to bring them to fruition. The fact that the various options did not have costs associated with them was bewildering to many in the audience. Who in today's economy contemplates an expenditure of funds without "costing out" the proposed plan? Also, how can the various options be intelligently compare to each other when the costs of competing plans aren't identified?

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

FN2100 Funding: Add profitable activities to park (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 127 **Comment Id:** 239091 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: If you are looking for a way to bring in revenue, I might suggest a little petting zoo with pony rides, situated near the police horses

Organization:

Commenter: Margaret A Cathro **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

IV2000 Issues - Visitor Use: Noise and parking are not issues (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 108 **Comment Id:** 239009 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Even at its busiest times in the Spring and Summer, there is never an issue with parking, bathroom facilities, or overuse of any part of the park.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 19 **Comment Id:** 238654 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Also, to address the EA/AoE concerns about for residential neighborhoods at its north and west boundaries that "during peak picnic season, visitors sometimes create noise and parking issues for park neighbors" - please disregard because I live on the western boundary and noise and parking are not issues at all.

Organization: park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association

Commenter: Patricia A Brown **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

MT2500 Miscellaneous Topics: Request additional studies (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 28 **Comment Id:** 238700 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: There should be a Study, to reflect Physical Impact to the Humans locally, for Traffic Noise, movement - flow and what improvements will be needed in the adjoining County of Fairfax, State of Virginia.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

MT3200 Miscellaneous Topics: Connect park to local transit systems (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 170 **Comment Id:** 240451 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Work with the county to create a bus stop at the park to avoid an increase in traffic

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.

Commenter: W. David Plummer **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 239050 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Actively promote use of public transit to the site, especially the Fairfax Connector bus which currently passes by the park many times a day. Work with the county to create a bus stop at the park.

Organization: Friends of Dyke Marsh

Commenter: Glenda C Booth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 118 **Comment Id:** 239051 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Work with the county and local tourist agencies to create a hop-on, hop-off bus for visitors touring sites in the Mount Vernon area.

Organization: Friends of Dyke Marsh

Commenter: Glenda C Booth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 119 **Comment Id:** 239060 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Please work with the county to establish and promote a Fairfax Connector bus stop there so that traffic will not increase.

Organization:

Commenter: Glenda C Booth **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NR4100 Natural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of natural resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239243 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The Alternatives contain no actions to protect cultural or natural resources at the Park.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

NR4200 Natural Resources: Impacts - Impervious area calculations (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 172 **Comment Id:** 249957 **Coder Name:** MPS

Comment Text: Although the total impervious surface area is discussed in the soils section of Chapter 4 (Environmental Consequences), it is not addressed in Chapter 2's comparison of alternatives. It is also unclear how Alternative C adds 3.5 acres of total impervious area while only adding 0.9 acre of pavement. Alternatives C and D appear fairly similar, and it is not clear where the difference in added area (1.3) is made up.

Organization: VA Department of Environmental Quality

Commenter: Ellie L Irons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 165 **Comment Id:** 239952 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: No way your option "C" reduction in pavement is accurate. Seems intentionally misleading as you do not include the addition of hte bike path pavement

Organization:

Commenter: Anonymous Anonymous **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

PI2000 Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Meeting not sufficiently advertised (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 165 **Comment Id:** 239955 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: What does Jerry Connelly think? -What does Jerry Hyland think? - Why aren't they here? Why werern't they

Organization:

Commenter: Anonymous Anonymous **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 23 **Comment Id:** 238665 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: There have been no community notices about these changes in the Alexandria Gazette, no mention from local politicians. I fear that these changes will be enacted without community input as they seem to be moving forward with little if any community involvement.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 24 **Comment Id:** 238678 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: INADEQUATE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY ABOUT THIS CHANGE IN MASTER PLAN FOR FORT HUNT PARK. I am am a regular user of the park and live proximate to it. Completely inadequate notice has been given to the community about possibly changes in the park. The Park Service needs to properly notify the local community and extend the comment period. As to your question about how I heard about the NPS document - that is exactly the problem. There has been no direct contact, no coverage in the local press that I have seen (and I closely read the local papers), no coverage in the Mt. Vernon Council, no notice sent to users, no notice sent to local home owners. I doubt that you are in compliance with NEPA and other notification requirements. Regardless, the notice has been completely inadequate.

Organization:

Commenter: Alex Echols **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 44 **Comment Id:** 238749 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Lending credence to this impression was the fact that NPS officials acknowledged that absolutely no attempt was made to inform the hundreds of individuals who use the Park on a daily basis of this meeting. This action could have easily accomplished by placing signage at conspicuous locations in the Park where regular users would see these notices a week or two prior to the event. Since there is only one Park entrance this task could have easily been accomplished. Further, (according to those present) NPS officials also took no action to inform elected officials or members of the media of this meeting. Those representing elected officials who were present stated that they were informed of the meeting by concerned constituents and the local media was conspicuously absent with the noted exception of Ed Simmons, Jr.

Organization: National Association for Health Fitness

Commenter: Bert Knitter **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 133 **Comment Id:** 239112 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Finally, public engagement was late and minimized; hence, the 30 day comment period extension and the "new" announcement signage.

Organization: self, citizen

Commenter: jeff N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

PN2010 Purpose & Need: Purpose should focus on recreational uses (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 78 **Comment Id:** 238928 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The purpose of the SDP should be to maximize the availability of the park facilities for recreational use consistent with protection of its resources, safety and interpretation objectives.

Organization: concerned citizen

Commenter: Thomas A Gerard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

PN2015 Purpose & Need: Recreational use not impacting resources (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 78 **Comment Id:** 238930 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The recreational use has little impact on the resources negating a resource protection as a major consideration.

Organization: concerned citizen

Commenter: Thomas A Gerard **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

SE4000 Socioeconomics - Impacts: Impacts not sufficiently addressed (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 115 **Comment Id:** 239040 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The facilities and amenities also add value to the community and neighboring properties, and in a time of economic and real-estate turmoil, proposed construction changes could potentially have a negative impact.

Organization:

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

Correspondence Id: 93 **Comment Id:** 238970 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The proposal to transform Ft. Hunt park lacks due consideration of the impact of the proposed changes on the surrounding community, and will result in a beloved community asset being turned into a place devoid of the people it is meant to serve.

Organization: Hollin Hills

Commenter: Gaill C Weigl **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 75 **Comment Id:** 238920 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: The most important objection to changing Fort Hunt Park, however, is in the areas of the social and cultural role Fort Hunt Park and its pavilions play in hosting groups from across the DC-Area. Social groups of all kinds use that park for picnic meetings and socializing. Many of these are minority groups which don't have affordable alternatives. Most of these groups, whether African American, Puerto Rican or others, live some distance from the park.

Organization: N/A

Commenter: John J Kohout **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 58 **Comment Id:** 238811 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: These pavilions and ballfields are a necessity for visitors from around the area and globe. Visitors from Mount Vernon stop here to picnic, the community uses these facilities, and families hold reunions. These are not only affordable for large families, but their loss could adversely affect minority and low income families also not addressed in the EA

Organization:

Commenter: Kimberly V Larkin **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 40 **Comment Id:** 238735 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: Upon review of the document, I find that you did not sufficiently address the cultural and socio-economic impacts to the environment. The surrounding community is the environment which this park resides, and the enjoyment by all citizens was not sufficiently addressed

Organization:

Commenter: Joseph D Ludovici **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VE1050 Visitor Experience: EA does not sufficiently define "Visitor Experience" (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239202 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: the EA/AoE proposals for Action Alternatives base many of the most significant changes on improving the visitor experience. It's fair to guess that some visitors value the picnic areas and the loop road as their favorite experiences. Definitions and links to law and policy are needed.

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 156 **Comment Id:** 239201 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: PVRB members, as frequent visitors to Fort Hunt Park, are interested the visitor experience and many of the proposals for changes in the Action Alternatives are justified by the need to

"enhance visitor experience." Significant change proposals, including the closing of picnic areas/ball fields and the construction of a visitor facility, are based on the need to "enhance visitor experience." Yet there is nothing in the laws, regulations or policies referred to in the paper that address "visitor experience," nor does the term appear in the Glossary of Terms. The objective to "enhance visitor experience" thus appears to be an undefined figment of the NPS staff -- and that is not good enough to justify major undertakings

Organization:

Commenter: Bruce C Bade **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VE4020 Visitor Experience - Impacts: Large group picnics do not adversely impact visitor experience (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 162 **Comment Id:** 239249 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: I do not agree with the statements throughout the EA that the large group picnics adversely impact other users of the park.

Organization:

Commenter: Dorothy E Keough **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VU2010 Visitor Use: Estimate of visitor numbers and cars (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 172 **Comment Id:** 249948 **Coder Name:** MPS

Comment Text: The EA states that none of the alternatives would impact the roadways outside of the park as the only changes would occur on the internal roads. While the EA states that during peak months the parking areas and facilities (i.e. restrooms) get overwhelmed, the report does not provide any specific number of vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians coming to the site. Without this baseline information, it is difficult to assess what type of increased/decreased traffic would be generated for the proposed uses.

Organization: VA Department of Environmental Quality

Commenter: Ellie L Irons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

Correspondence Id: 65 **Comment Id:** 238892 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: In the final SDP, the NPS needs to address quantitatively the expected annual number of visitors to the visitor center and to the entire park and the number of cars and then compare those estimated numbers to the current average number of visitors and cars per year

Organization: National Parks Conservation Association

Commenter: Kept Private **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: Yes

VU2015 Visitor Use: Provide traffic analysis/expected vehicular volume (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 172 **Comment Id:** 249954 **Coder Name:** MPS

Comment Text: No traffic analysis details or expected vehicular volumes are provided to support dismissing transportation from further analysis. More details supporting the conclusion that the surrounding roadway network would not be impacted should have been part of the assessment. However, while the report indicates that interpretation use at the park may be expanded, it also indicates that permitted picnic areas may be reduced, and it is clear that some transportation related issues were considered.

Organization: VA Department of Environmental Quality

Commenter: Ellie L Irons **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VU2020 Information regarding carrying capacity (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 173 **Comment Id:** 249962 **Coder Name:** MPS

Comment Text: The development plan says that visitation exceeds the park's carrying capacity and I was curious by how much, if there are any numbers available. Do you have any information regarding reservation history for the picnic areas?

Organization: Fairfax County Park Authority

Commenter: Dereth J Bush **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

VU4040 Visitor Use: Removal of picnic facilities would reduce visitor numbers/enjoyment (Substantive)

Correspondence Id: 52 **Comment Id:** 238785 **Coder Name:** TBLACK

Comment Text: By removing these pavilions, the number of visitors and their enjoyment of the park, would be significantly reduced. This impact was not considered in the written assessment.

Organization:

Commenter: N/A N/A **Page:** **Paragraph:**

Kept Private: No

b) **Concern Statements by Comment Code**

AL3001 - Alternatives: Remove picnic pavilion that provides least revenue

Concern ID: 35049

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that the visitor center be placed in the location of the picnic pavilion that provides the least revenue.

AL4001 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Series of interpretive sites

Concern ID: 35050

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a new alternative be proposed to install a series of interpretive sites as opposed to a visitor center.

AL4002 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Visitor center in Area D

Concern ID: 35051

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a visitor center in Area D.

AL4003 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Center only

Concern ID: 35052

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a new alternative be proposed to build an interpretive center and make no other changes to the park.

AL4004 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use NCO Quarters as Visitor Facility

Concern ID: 35053

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that the NCO Quarters be renovated as a Visitor Facility.

AL4005 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase interpretation by creating a documentary

Concern ID: 35054

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a documentary on Fort Hunt be produced.

AL4006 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Trail only

Concern ID: 35055

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest an alternative to include the interpretive trail and no other changes to the park.

AL4007 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative involving new visitor center without removal of picnic facilities

Concern ID: 35056

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest alternatives be examined to include a visitor center without removing picnic facilities or by removing less picnic pavilions than the current alternatives.

AL4008 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Information kiosk instead of visitor center

Concern ID: 35057

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest an open-air kiosk to provide historical information.

AL4009 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Convert Pavilion A into a visitor center

Concern ID: 35058

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that Picnic Pavilion A be converted into a visitor center.

AL4010 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, restructure the existing permit system

Concern ID: 35059

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend other methods to reduce overuse and expenditures (as opposed to removing picnic pavilions) through increased enforcement of permits and/or additional fees.

AL4011 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Turn over park management to Fairfax County

AL4012 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, provide increased police presence

Concern ID: 35060

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest increasing police presence within the park.

AL4013 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, enforce stricter noise regulations

Concern ID: 35061

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that lower noise levels be enforced, especially regarding the Fort Hunt concert series.

AL4015 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, reassess NPS staff duties

Concern ID: 35062

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend examining NPS job specifications and the division of duties.

AL4017 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Plan for management of Natural Resources

Concern ID: 35063

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that this study should include a plan for the management of natural resources.

AL4018 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Improve maintenance of the park

AL4019 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Trash issues need to be managed

Concern ID: 35064
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that trash be managed better in the park, perhaps by enforcing fines or requiring users to take out all of their trash.

AL4020 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Institute controls for traffic speeds within park

Concern ID: 35065
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that the park institute speed controls such as a speed camera.

AL4025 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use of bollards to separate vehicular traffic and pedestrians

Concern ID: 35066
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a new alternative be proposed to separate vehicular traffic and pedestrians; by installing vertical poles 3 to 4 feet in height at 3 to 4 foot intervals across the existing roadways.

AL4026 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reopen walk-in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road

Concern ID: 35067
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest the gate to the park along Fort Hunt Road be reopened.

AL4027 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Separate pedestrian and bike paths

Concern ID: 35068
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest separate paths for walking and biking to protect walkers from speeding bikers .

AL4028 - Alternatives -New Alternatives/Elements: Separate bicycle/pedestrian trail from road

AL4030 - Alternatives: A temporary visitor's center

Concern ID: 35069
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest a temporary facility to road test the visitor's center.

AL4035 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Relocate picnic pavilion

Concern ID: 35070
CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that the picnic pavilion removed to construct the visitor center be reasssembled at another location in the park.

AL4040 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Move pavilions above archeological sites

Concern ID: 35086

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend that current pavilions above potential archeological sites be moved rather than removed to protect future investigations and allow for appropriate markers.

AL4050 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Cost-effective methods to increase historical interpretation

Concern ID: 35071

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend cost-effective methods to increase historical interpretation to include signage, self-guided tours, pamphlets, and an increase in online information.

AL4052 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Picnic areas along interpretive trail

Concern ID: 35072

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that small groups of picnic tables be positioned along the interpretive trail.

AL4055 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control visitor use

Concern ID: 35073

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that alternative means to control the use of the park were not considered, such as limiting the size of reservations and the use of vendors.

AL4056 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Add more picnic pavilions

Concern ID: 35074

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that additional picnic pavilions be added to the park to meet the high demand for these facilities.

AL4058 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control deterioration of cultural resources

Concern ID: 35075

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that methods to control visitor access to historic resources, including fencing, security lights, or pedestrian access controls were not assessed in the EA.

AL4060 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Dog amenities

Concern ID: 35076

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend amenities for dog owners to include an enclosed dog park and a dog water bowl.

AL4065 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Additional playground equipment

Concern ID: 35077

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend adding to the playground equipment and/or

STATEMENT: creating an additional playground area.

AL4067 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrades to maintenance facility

AL4069 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrade to police facilities

AL4070 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Expanding/improving the hiking trails

Concern ID: 35078

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend expanding/improving the hiking trails.

AL4075 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Sidewalk along Fort Hunt Road

Concern ID: 35079

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest adding a sidewalk along Fort Hunt Road for pedestrian access/safety.

AL4079 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support drainage improvements

AL4080 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Retain Picnic Pavilions A, B, and D and associated ball fields

Concern ID: 35080

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend retaining Picnic Pavilions A, B, and D and associated ball fields.

AL4085 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase in historical interpretation without decrease in recreational activities

AL4086 - Alternatives- New Alternatives/Elements: Rename park to de-emphasize recreational aspects

AL4087 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Restore historical viewshed to Potomac Reiver

AL4090 - Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reroute road through Ball field at Area B

Concern ID: 35081

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend rerouting the road through the Ball field at Area B to shorten the loop road.

AL4093 - Alternatives: Interpretive objectives not stated clearly

Concern ID: 35082

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the EA does not discuss the interpretation objectives and public input is needed.

AL5030 - Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative

AL5040 - Alternatives: Oppose No Action Alternative

AL5050 - Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses

AL5060 - Design: Include construction schedule in SDP

AL5080 - Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative, due to concern with funding

AL5100 - Alternatives: Support less drastic changes

Concern ID: 35083

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters supports less drastic changes than those in Alternatives B, C, and D.

AL5130 - Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses; minimal historical interpretation

Concern ID: 35084

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support retaining current park uses with minimal increases in historical interpretation.

AL5200 - Support Alternative A or B

AL6030 - Alternatives: Support Alternative B

AL6035 - Alternatives: Support Alternative B with modifications

Concern ID: 35085

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters support Alternative B without visitor facility and retaining Picnic Pavilion B and associated ball field.

AL6038 - Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area B

AL6040 - Alternatives: Oppose Alternative B

AL7030 - Alternatives: Support Alternative C

AL7040 - Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area C

AL7045 - Alternatives: Oppose Removal of Picnic Area C

AL7050 - Alternatives: Oppose Preferred Alternative (Alternative C)

AL8030 - Alternatives: Support Alternative D

AL8040 - Alternatives: Oppose Alternative D

AL9005 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in impervious surface

AL9006 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to park access

AL9007 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to ADA accessibility

- AL9009 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose encouraging tour buses in park***
- AL9010 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new entrance way***
- AL9012 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support realignment of entrance way***
- AL9013 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose closing pedestrian entrance off Fort Hunt Road***
- AL9015 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support preservation of historic structures***
- AL9020 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new visitor center***
- AL9023 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support new visitor center***
- AL9024 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support small visitor center***
- AL9025 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support interpretive trail***
- AL9026 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose interpretive trail***
- AL9027 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of infrastructure for interpretive trail***
- AL9028 - Alternatives - Elements of Alternatives: Support visitor center near park entrance***
- AL9029 - Alternatives - Elements of Alternatives: Restrict parking on neighborhood roads***
- AL9030 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support pedestrian/bicycle path***
- AL9031 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path***
- AL9032 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path on current paved road***
- AL9033 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to natural setting of trails***
- AL9034 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to trails***
- AL9035 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain full loop road***
- AL9036 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any plan to shorten bicycle path***
- AL9037 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing parking spaces***
- AL9038 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support additional parking spaces***
- AL9039 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reducing parking areas***

- AL9040 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of picnic facilities***
- AL9041 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing small picnic areas***
- AL9042 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of Picnic Pavilion A***
- AL9043 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to picnic facilities***
- AL9045 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of picnic facilities***
- AL9048 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining multiple picnic facilities***
- AL9049 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining open space***
- AL9050 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing restrooms***
- AL9055 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to restrooms***
- AL9056 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining Area E restroom***
- AL9057 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Open restrooms year-round***
- AL9060 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support one-way traffic***
- AL9061 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support two-way traffic***
- AL9065 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removing paved road between Areas D and E***
- AL9070 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of ball fields***
- AL9072 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of recreation areas***
- AL9073 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of playground***
- AL9074 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to recreation facilities***
- AL9075 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining one ball field***
- AL9076 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of Area B ball field***
- AL9077 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain Fort Hunt Concert Series***
- AL9078 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in use for picnics/parties***
- AL9079 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new trail on west side of park***
- AL9080 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain current road structure***

AL9083 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support opening closed portion of road

AL9084 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any changes that would increase visitor presence along south and west of park

AL9085 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose opening closed portion of road

AL9086 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of loop road

AL9087 - Alternatives - Element of Alternatives: Have park entrance defer to Fort Hunt Road traffic

AL9090 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to historical interpretation

AL9092 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain character of park with respect to vegetation

AL9095 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support development of documentation/museum

AL9099 - Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support increase in natural habitat

AR4005 - Archeological Resources: Support preservation/protection of archeological resources

AR4200 - Archeological Resources: Impacts would be greater from action alternatives than from overuse

Concern ID: 35087

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the impacts to archeological resources would be greater from the demolition of structures than from the current overuse of the park.

AR4300 - Archeological Resources: Conduct study to evaluate archeological resources

Concern ID: 35088

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that a study should be conducted on the archeological resources and then either excavate these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them.

CC1000 - Consultation & Coordination: Further coordination

Concern ID: 35089

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters recommend coordination with elected officials in the area, the civic associations in the area, other unaffiliated users of the park, and park neighbors.

CR4100 - Cultural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of cultural resources

Concern ID: 35091

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that, although protection of cultural resources are listed as a goal of the SDP, the EA does not address how these resources will be protected.

DR4100 - Drainage: Issues of drainage to park neighbors not addressed

Concern ID: 35090

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the EA does not discuss issues of stormwater drainage onto neighboring properties.

DS5030 - Design: Trail width

DS5040 - Design: Support use of gravel trail material

DS5045 - Design: Pave bike trails

DS5050 - Design: Bike speed control

DS5055 - Design: Low Impact Development

DS5060 - Design: Replant grassy areas with native vegetation

DS5070 - Design: Stormwater Management plans

FN1000 - Funding: Cost analysis

Concern ID: 35092

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters request a cost analysis of the alternatives.

FN1500 - Funding: Ensure funding is available for Preferred Alternative

FN2000 - Funding: Soliciting funds from other federal agencies

FN2100 - Funding: Add profitable activities to park

Concern ID: 35093

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest adding various attractions to earn funds including a petting zoo.

IV2000 - Issues - Visitor Use: Noise and parking are not issues

Concern ID: 35094

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters disagree with statement that noise and parking are issues for park neighbors.

MT2000 - Miscellaneous Topics: Oppose fees for park use

MT2500 - Miscellaneous Topics: Request additional studies

Concern ID: 35095

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters request additional studies regarding Physical Impact to the Humans locally, for Traffic Noise, movement - flow and what improvements will be needed in the adjoining County of Fairfax, State of

Virginia.

MT3000 - Miscellaneous Topics: SDP should be more open-ended/flexible

MT3100 - Miscellaneous Topics: Raise and lower flag each day

MT3200 - Miscellaneous Topics: Connect park to local transit systems

Concern ID: 35096

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters suggest that a bus stop be created at the park to connect with Fairfax County Public Transit.

MT3300 - Miscellaneous Topics: Continued use of park for community events

Concern ID: 35097

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters were concerned that the EA did not discuss the continued use of the park for community events including the Fort Hunt PTA Fox Trot Race.

NR2000 - Natural Resources: Preserve natural resources

NR2100 - Natural Resources: Control invasive species

NR2150 - Natural Resources: Avoid impacts to rare, threatened, endangered species

NR2200 - Natural Resources: Protect Bald Eagle habitat

NR4100 - Natural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of natural resources

Concern ID: 35098

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that, although protection of natural resources are listed as a goal of the SDP, the EA does not address how these resources will be protected.

NR4200 - Natural Resources: Impacts - Impervious area calculations

Concern ID: 35099

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that they do not believe the impervious area calculations are stated correctly in the EA.

PI2000 - Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Meeting not sufficiently advertised

Concern ID: 35100

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters are concerned that the Public and elected officials were not sufficiently informed about the September public meeting.

PI2005 - Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Park neighbors/users not sufficiently informed of project

Concern ID: 35101

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the park neighbors and park users have not been

STATEMENT: sufficiently informed about this project and should be kept up to date on changes to park.

PI2050 - Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Additional public meeting

Concern ID: 35102

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters request an additional public meeting with an informed presentation on each of the Alternatives and with the pros and cons of each plan as well as the proposed cost.

PI3000 - Public Involvement - NPS process excludes minorities

PN2010 - Purpose & Need: Purpose should focus on recreational uses

Concern ID: 35103

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the purpose of the SDP should focus on recreational uses, with integration of resource protection and interpretation.

PN2015 - Purpose & Need: Recreational use not impacting resources

Concern ID: 35104

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the recreational use has little impact on the park's resources and should not be considered a project need.

SE4000 - Socioeconomics - Impacts: Impacts not sufficiently addressed

Concern ID: 35105

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters found that the Environmental Assessment does not sufficiently address the cultural and socio-economic impacts to the environment and to low-income and minority populations.

VE1050 - Visitor Experience: EA does not sufficiently define "Visitor Experience"

Concern ID: 35106

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the project need to "enhance visitor experience" is not clearly defined.

VE4010 - Visitor Experience - Impacts: Increased focus on cultural resources should not detract from the natural beauty/setting of the park

VE4020 - Visitor Experience - Impacts: Large group picnics do not adversely impact visitor experience

Concern ID: 35107

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters do not agree with the statements throughout the EA that the large group picnics adversely impact other users of the park.

VU2010 - Visitor Use: Estimate of visitor numbers and cars

Concern ID: 35108

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the final report should include an estimate of the

STATEMENT: expected visitors to the visitor center, the number of cars expected, and a comparison to current visitor and car numbers.

VU2015 - Visitor Use: Provide traffic analysis/expected vehicular volume

VU2020 - Information regarding carrying capacity

VU4040 - Visitor Use: Removal of picnic facilities would reduce visitor numbers/enjoyment

Concern ID: 35109

CONCERN STATEMENT: Commenters state that the decrease in visitors and visitor enjoyment resulting from removal of picnic facilities would have impacts that were not assessed in the EA.

VU5010 - Visitor Use: Park cannot support an increase in visitor use

**APPENDIX A:
CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS**

| Correspondence ID | Name | Organization | Form Letter |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------|
| State Government | | | |
| 174 | Baird, Alli | VA Department of Conservation and Recreation | No |
| 172 | Irons, Ellie L. | VA Department of Environmental Quality | No |
| 123 | Eaton, Ethel R. | Virginia Department of Historic Resources | No |
| County Government | | | |
| 173 | Bush, Dereth J. | Fairfax County Park Authority | No |
| Unaffiliated Individual | | | |
| 165 | Anonymous | | No |
| 166 | Anonymous | | No |
| 156 | Bade, Bruce C. | | No |
| 95 | Boertlein, John | | No |
| 119 | Booth, Glenda C. | | No |
| 140 | Carbone, Joe | | No |
| 31 | Cardillo, Lauren | | No |
| 161 | Cartier, Veronica A. | | No |
| 127 | Cathro, Margaret A. | | No |
| 112 | Clontz, William R. | | No |
| 103 | Corley, Frank W. | | No |
| 6 | Culham, Mary W. | | No |
| 109 | Cunningham, Maureen | | No |
| 4 | Dean, John G. | | No |
| 124 | Dickson, Allan | | No |
| 47 | Dickson, Allan M. | | No |
| 59 | Dumermuth, Andre C. & Madison | | No |
| 24 | Echols, Alex | | No |
| 143 | Edwards, David L. | | No |
| 83 | Fina, Robert W. | | No |
| 78 | Gerard, Thomas A. | | No |
| 91 | Gibbons, Gene | | No |
| 61 | Gonzales, Orlando E. | | No |
| 154 | Graham, Connie D. | | No |
| 125 | Gross, Daniel | | No |
| 20 | Hartzell, Tiffany | | No |
| 171 | Hertel, Poul M. | | No |
| 128 | Hess, William W. | | No |
| 50 | Hewitt, Frederick B. | | No |

| Correspondence ID | Name | Organization | Form Letter |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 92 | Johnson, Sydney H. | | No |
| 162 | Keough, Dorothy E. | | No |
| 1 | Kept Private | | No |
| 2 | Kept Private | | No |
| 3 | Kept Private | | No |
| 9 | Kept Private | | No |
| 10 | Kept Private | | No |
| 11 | Kept Private | | No |
| 14 | Kept Private | | No |
| 22 | Kept Private | | No |
| 23 | Kept Private | | No |
| 25 | Kept Private | | No |
| 27 | Kept Private | | No |
| 28 | Kept Private | | No |
| 29 | Kept Private | | No |
| 32 | Kept Private | | No |
| 34 | Kept Private | | No |
| 35 | Kept Private | | No |
| 36 | Kept Private | | No |
| 38 | Kept Private | | No |
| 39 | Kept Private | | No |
| 42 | Kept Private | | No |
| 46 | Kept Private | | No |
| 49 | Kept Private | | No |
| 51 | Kept Private | | No |
| 54 | Kept Private | | No |
| 55 | Kept Private | | No |
| 56 | Kept Private | | No |
| 62 | Kept Private | | No |
| 63 | Kept Private | | No |
| 64 | Kept Private | | No |
| 66 | Kept Private | | No |
| 67 | Kept Private | | No |
| 73 | Kept Private | | No |
| 74 | Kept Private | | No |
| 82 | Kept Private | | No |
| 88 | Kept Private | | No |
| 90 | Kept Private | | No |
| 98 | Kept Private | | No |

| Correspondence ID | Name | Organization | Form Letter |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 99 | Kept Private | | No |
| 101 | Kept Private | | No |
| 102 | Kept Private | | No |
| 105 | Kept Private | | No |
| 106 | Kept Private | | No |
| 107 | Kept Private | | No |
| 110 | Kept Private | | No |
| 113 | Kept Private | | No |
| 114 | Kept Private | | No |
| 115 | Kept Private | | No |
| 117 | Kept Private | | No |
| 122 | Kept Private | | No |
| 126 | Kept Private | | No |
| 134 | Kept Private | | No |
| 135 | Kept Private | | No |
| 137 | Kept Private | | No |
| 138 | Kept Private | | No |
| 141 | Kept Private | | No |
| 142 | Kept Private | | No |
| 145 | Kept Private | | No |
| 146 | Kept Private | | No |
| 148 | Kept Private | | No |
| 149 | Kept Private | | No |
| 152 | Kept Private | | No |
| 153 | Kept Private | | No |
| 158 | Kept Private | | No |
| 159 | Kept Private | | No |
| 160 | Kept Private | | No |
| 163 | Kept Private | | No |
| 164 | Kept Private | | No |
| 12 | Kern, John H. | | No |
| 167 | Knitter, Bert | | No |
| 75 | Kohout, John J. | | No |
| 58 | Larkin, Kimberly V. | | No |
| 151 | Lepple, Suzanne B. | | No |
| 40 | Ludovici, Joseph D. | | No |
| 168 | Lundeberg, Philip K. | | No |
| 129 | Mang, Carly | | No |
| 77 | Mann, Barbara C. | | No |

| Correspondence ID | Name | Organization | Form Letter |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|-------------|
| 5 | McConville, Jay E. | | No |
| 16 | McCullough, Marilyn P. | | No |
| 104 | Mica, Daniel A. | | No |
| 139 | Michel, Werner E. | | No |
| 100 | Miller, Mary A. | | No |
| 130 | Moore, Katherine S. | | No |
| 33 | Muckerman, Edward C. | | No |
| 133 | N/A, Jeff | | No |
| 37 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 52 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 69 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 72 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 84 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 87 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 97 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 108 | N/A, N/A | | No |
| 76 | N/A, Rebecca | | No |
| 169 | Nicholson, Samuel T. | | No |
| 81 | Powell, John H. | | No |
| 21 | Priore, Renee | | No |
| 157 | Priore, Renee | | No |
| 131 | Rathburn, Roy A. | | No |
| 70 | Rhatican, William F. | | No |
| 89 | Rogers, Sandi Evans | | No |
| 8 | Ruggiero, Donna E. | | No |
| 48 | Skopp, Martin J. | | No |
| 79 | Stryker, Jerry | | No |
| 132 | White, Dorothy | | No |
| 120 | Greenleese, Ronald B. | "The Walkers" i.e. (ages 90,83,75,53) | No |
| 53 | LaPierre, Mark | American Society of Landscape Architects | No |
| 43 | Negroni, Hector A. | Circulo de Puerto Rico | No |
| 7 | Kept Private | Collingwood Citizens Association | No |
| 121 | Kept Private | Collingwood Resident | No |
| 80 | Jordan, Archer A. | Community Association of Hollin Hills | No |
| 57 | Lubran, Bernard A. | Friends Of Camp Ritchie | No |
| 118 | Booth, Glenda C | Friends of Dyke Marsh | No |

| Correspondence ID | Name | Organization | Form Letter |
|-------------------|------------------------|---|-------------|
| 136 | Culver, Cory | Ft. Hunt Elementary PTA President | No |
| 93 | Weigl, Gaill C. | Hollin Hills | No |
| 111 | N/A, N/A | Hollin Hills | No |
| 68 | Kept Private | LSU Alumni Association | No |
| 170 | Plummer, W. David | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | No |
| 17 | Diernisse, Lisa | Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association | No |
| 18 | Habib, Michael J. | Mt. VerInon Civic Association | No |
| 85 | Kept Private | NPCA | No |
| 86 | Ramirez, Natalie | NPCA | No |
| 44 | Knitter, Bert | National Association for Health Fitness | No |
| 41 | Kept Private | National Parks Conservation Association | No |
| 45 | Kept Private | National Parks Conservation Association | No |
| 65 | Kept Private | National Parks Conservation Association | No |
| 147 | Goddard, Pamela E. | National Parks Conservation Association | No |
| 19 | Brown, Patricia A. | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | No |
| 71 | Kept Private | PVRB Civic Association | No |
| 155 | Bade, Bruce & Virginia | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | No |
| 13 | Kept Private | Potomac Valley River Bend Civic Association | No |
| 30 | Mengenhauser, Mary J. | Potomac Valley Riverbend Civic Association | No |
| 15 | Kept Private | Potomac Valley-River Bend Neighborhood Association | No |
| 96 | Dickson, Allan M. | Retired Air Force | No |
| 144 | Kept Private | State Farm Insurance | No |
| 60 | Kept Private | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. | No |
| 150 | Kept Private | USAF retired | No |
| 116 | Slusser, Bob S. | VA Dept of Conservation & Recreation | No |
| 26 | Kept Private | Waba | No |
| 94 | Kept Private | Waynewood Citizens Association | No |

APPENDIX B:
CORRESPONDENCE INDEX OF INDIVIDUAL COMMENTERS

| Correspondence ID | Form Letter? | Name |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| 165 | No | Anonymous |
| 166 | No | Anonymous |
| 155 | No | Bade, Bruce & Virginia |
| 156 | No | Bade, Bruce C. |
| 174 | No | Baird, Alli |
| 95 | No | Boertlein, John |
| 118 | No | Booth, Glenda C |
| 119 | No | Booth, Glenda C. |
| 19 | No | Brown, Patricia A. |
| 173 | No | Bush, Dereth J. |
| 140 | No | Carbone, Joe |
| 31 | No | Cardillo, Lauren |
| 161 | No | Cartier, Veronica A. |
| 127 | No | Cathro, Margaret A. |
| 112 | No | Clontz, William R. |
| 103 | No | Corley, Frank W. |
| 6 | No | Culham, Mary W. |
| 136 | No | Culver, Cory |
| 109 | No | Cunningham, Maureen |
| 4 | No | Dean, John G. |
| 124 | No | Dickson, Allan |
| 47 | No | Dickson, Allan M. |
| 96 | No | Dickson, Allan M. |
| 17 | No | Diernisse, Lisa |
| 59 | No | Dumermuth, Andre C. & Madison |
| 123 | No | Eaton, Ethel R. |
| 24 | No | Echols, Alex |
| 143 | No | Edwards, David L. |
| 83 | No | Fina, Robert W. |
| 78 | No | Gerard, Thomas A. |
| 91 | No | Gibbons, Gene |
| 147 | No | Goddard, Pamela E. |
| 61 | No | Gonzales, Orlando E. |
| 154 | No | Graham, Connie D. |
| 120 | No | Greenleese, Ronald B. |
| 125 | No | Gross, Daniel |
| 18 | No | Habib, Michael J. |
| 20 | No | Hartzell, Tiffany |
| 171 | No | Hertel, Poul M. |
| 128 | No | Hess, William W. |

| Correspondence ID | Form Letter? | Name |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 50 | No | Hewitt, Frederick B. |
| 172 | No | Irons, Ellie L. |
| 92 | No | Johnson, Sydney H. |
| 80 | No | Jordan, Archer A. |
| 162 | No | Keough, Dorothy E. |
| 1 | No | Kept Private |
| 2 | No | Kept Private |
| 3 | No | Kept Private |
| 9 | No | Kept Private |
| 10 | No | Kept Private |
| 11 | No | Kept Private |
| 14 | No | Kept Private |
| 22 | No | Kept Private |
| 23 | No | Kept Private |
| 25 | No | Kept Private |
| 27 | No | Kept Private |
| 28 | No | Kept Private |
| 29 | No | Kept Private |
| 32 | No | Kept Private |
| 34 | No | Kept Private |
| 35 | No | Kept Private |
| 36 | No | Kept Private |
| 38 | No | Kept Private |
| 39 | No | Kept Private |
| 42 | No | Kept Private |
| 46 | No | Kept Private |
| 49 | No | Kept Private |
| 51 | No | Kept Private |
| 54 | No | Kept Private |
| 55 | No | Kept Private |
| 56 | No | Kept Private |
| 62 | No | Kept Private |
| 63 | No | Kept Private |
| 64 | No | Kept Private |
| 66 | No | Kept Private |
| 67 | No | Kept Private |
| 73 | No | Kept Private |
| 74 | No | Kept Private |
| 82 | No | Kept Private |
| 88 | No | Kept Private |

| Correspondence ID | Form Letter? | Name |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| 90 | No | Kept Private |
| 98 | No | Kept Private |
| 99 | No | Kept Private |
| 101 | No | Kept Private |
| 102 | No | Kept Private |
| 105 | No | Kept Private |
| 106 | No | Kept Private |
| 107 | No | Kept Private |
| 110 | No | Kept Private |
| 113 | No | Kept Private |
| 114 | No | Kept Private |
| 115 | No | Kept Private |
| 117 | No | Kept Private |
| 122 | No | Kept Private |
| 126 | No | Kept Private |
| 134 | No | Kept Private |
| 135 | No | Kept Private |
| 137 | No | Kept Private |
| 138 | No | Kept Private |
| 141 | No | Kept Private |
| 142 | No | Kept Private |
| 145 | No | Kept Private |
| 146 | No | Kept Private |
| 148 | No | Kept Private |
| 149 | No | Kept Private |
| 152 | No | Kept Private |
| 153 | No | Kept Private |
| 158 | No | Kept Private |
| 159 | No | Kept Private |
| 160 | No | Kept Private |
| 163 | No | Kept Private |
| 164 | No | Kept Private |
| 7 | No | Kept Private |
| 121 | No | Kept Private |
| 68 | No | Kept Private |
| 85 | No | Kept Private |
| 41 | No | Kept Private |
| 45 | No | Kept Private |
| 65 | No | Kept Private |
| 71 | No | Kept Private |

| Correspondence ID | Form Letter? | Name |
|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| 13 | No | Kept Private |
| 15 | No | Kept Private |
| 144 | No | Kept Private |
| 60 | No | Kept Private |
| 150 | No | Kept Private |
| 26 | No | Kept Private |
| 94 | No | Kept Private |
| 12 | No | Kern, John H. |
| 167 | No | Knitter, Bert |
| 44 | No | Knitter, Bert |
| 75 | No | Kohout, John J. |
| 53 | No | LaPierre, Mark |
| 58 | No | Larkin, Kimberly V. |
| 151 | No | Lepple, Suzanne B. |
| 57 | No | Lubran, Bernard A. |
| 40 | No | Ludovici, Joseph D. |
| 168 | No | Lundeberg, Philip K. |
| 129 | No | Mang, Carly |
| 77 | No | Mann, Barbara C. |
| 5 | No | McConville, Jay E. |
| 16 | No | McCullough, Marilyn P. |
| 30 | No | Mengenhauser, Mary J. |
| 104 | No | Mica, Daniel A. |
| 139 | No | Michel, Werner E. |
| 100 | No | Miller, Mary A. |
| 130 | No | Moore, Katherine S. |
| 33 | No | Muckerman, Edward C. |
| 133 | No | N/A, Jeff |
| 37 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 52 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 69 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 72 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 84 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 87 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 97 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 108 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 111 | No | N/A, N/A |
| 76 | No | N/A, Rebecca |
| 43 | No | Negrioni, Hector A. |
| 169 | No | Nicholson, Samuel T. |

| Correspondence ID | Form Letter? | Name |
|-------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 170 | No | Plummer, W. David |
| 81 | No | Powell, John H. |
| 21 | No | Priore, Renee |
| 157 | No | Priore, Renee |
| 86 | No | Ramirez, Natalie |
| 131 | No | Rathburn, Roy A. |
| 70 | No | Rhatican, William F. |
| 89 | No | Rogers, Sandi Evans |
| 8 | No | Ruggiero, Donna E. |
| 48 | No | Skopp, Martin J. |
| 116 | No | Slusser, Bob S. |
| 79 | No | Stryker, Jerry |
| 93 | No | Weigl, Gail C. |
| 132 | No | White, Dorothy |

**APPENDIX C:
INDEX BY ORGANIZATION TYPE**

| Organization Type | Number of Correspondences |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| State Government | 3 |
| County Government | 1 |
| Unaffiliated Individual | 170 |
| Total | 174 |

**APPENDIX D:
INDEX BY CODE**

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|---|
| AL3001 | Alternatives: Remove picnic pavilion that provides least revenue | N/A | 122 |
| AL4001 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Series of interpretive sites | N/A | 40 149 |
| AL4002 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Visitor center in Area D | N/A | 11 |
| AL4003 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Center only | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| AL4004 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use NCO Quarters as Visitor Facility | American Society of Landscape Architects Collingwood resident Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. N/A | 53 121 170 64 110 |
| AL4005 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase interpretation by creating a documentary | FRIENDS OF CAMP RITCHIE | 57 |
| AL4006 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Interpretive Trail only | PVRB Civic Association none N/A | 71 70 67 81 131 162 165 |
| AL4007 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative involving new visitor center without removal of picnic facilities | "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53) Hollin Hills concerned citizen N/A | 120 111 78 99 115 131 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|---|
| AL4008 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Information kiosk instead of visitor center | N/A | 131 149 |
| AL4009 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Convert Pavilion A into a visitor center | N/A | 148 |
| AL4010 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, restructure the existing permit system | National Association for Health Fitness Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc self, citizen N/A | 44 155 133 11 14 29 63 81 91 95 134 141 149 154 156 162 171 |
| AL4011 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Turn over park management to Fairfax County | N/A | 64 |
| AL4012 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, provide increased police presence | N/A | 36 |
| AL4013 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, enforce stricter noise regulations | N/A | 158 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| AL4015 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, reassess NPS staff duties | USAF retired | 150 |
| | | N/A | 32 |
| AL4017 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Plan for management of Natural Resources | N/A | 63 |
| AL4018 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Improve maintenance of the park | N/A | 103 |
| | | | 131 |
| | | | 143 |
| | | | 157 |
| | | | 162 |
| AL4019 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Management Solutions, Trash issues need to be managed | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | State Farm Insurance | 144 |
| AL4020 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Institute controls for traffic speeds within park | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 102 |
| | | | 156 |
| | | | 162 |
| AL4025 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Use of bollards to separate vehicular traffic and pedestrians | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| | | N/A | 167 |
| AL4026 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reopen walk- in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road | N/A | 159 |
| AL4027 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Separate pedestrian and bike paths | N/A | 64 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|---|----------|
| | | | 127 |
| | | | 171 |
| AL4028 | Alternatives -New Alternatives/Elements: Separate bicycle/pedestrian trail from road | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| AL4030 | Alternatives: A temporary visitor's center | N/A | 32 |
| AL4035 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Relocate picnic pavilion | N/A | 151 |
| AL4040 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Move pavilions above archeological sites | Collingwood Citizens Association | 7 |
| AL4050 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Cost-effective methods to increase historical interpretation | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | N/A | 12 |
| | | | 29 |
| | | | 46 |
| | | | 56 |
| | | | 67 |
| | | | 69 |
| | | | 88 |
| | | | 91 |
| | | | 100 |
| | | | 104 |
| | | | 105 |
| | | | 130 |
| | | | 151 |
| | | | 156 |
| | | | 161 |
| | | | 162 |
| | | | 163 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | 171 |
| AL4052 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Picnic areas along interpretive trail | National Parks Conservation Association N/A | 65 72 125 |
| AL4055 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control visitor use | N/A | 40 156 |
| AL4056 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Add more picnic pavilions | LSU Alumni Association self, citizen | 68 133 |
| AL4058 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Alternative means to control deterioration of cultural resources | self, citizen N/A | 133 58 |
| AL4060 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Dog amenities | American Society of Landscape Architects retired Air Force N/A | 53 96 16 47 124 |
| AL4065 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Additional playground equipment | N/A | 69 87 115 |
| AL4067 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrades to maintenance facility | N/A | 49 113 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|----------|
| AL4069 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support upgrade to police facilities | Collingwood resident | 121 |
| | | N/A | 32 |
| | | | 113 |
| | | | 163 |
| AL4070 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Expanding/improving the hiking trails | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | N/A | 50 |
| | | | 69 |
| AL4075 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Sidewalk along Fort Hunt Road | N/A | 127 |
| AL4079 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Support drainage improvements | N/A | 49 |
| AL4080 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Retain Picnic Pavilions A, B, and D and associated ball fields | N/A | 12 |
| | | | 28 |
| AL4085 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Increase in historical interpretation without decrease in recreational activities | N/A | 161 |
| AL4086 | Alternatives- New Alternatives/Elements: Rename park to de-emphasize recreational aspects | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| AL4087 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Restore historical viewshed to Potomac Reiver | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| AL4090 | Alternatives - New Alternatives/Elements: Reroute road through Ball field at Area B | N/A | 28 |
| AL4093 | Alternatives: Interpretive objectives not stated clearly | concerned citizen | 78 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|--|----------|
| AL5030 | Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative | "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53) | 120 |
| | | Ft Hunt Elementary PTA President | 136 |
| | | Mt. VerInon Civic Association | 18 |
| | | N/A | 75 |
| | | None | 112 |
| | | PVRB Civic Association | 71 |
| | | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 19 |
| | | N/A | 2 |
| | | | 3 |
| | | | 27 |
| | | | 31 |
| | | | 32 |
| | | | 34 |
| | | | 35 |
| | | | 58 |
| | | | 73 |
| | | | 74 |
| | | | 79 |
| | | | 81 |
| | | | 90 |
| | 91 | | |
| | 95 | | |
| | 105 | | |
| | 106 | | |
| | 117 | | |
| | 131 | | |
| | 134 | | |
| | 143 | | |
| | 146 | | |
| | 148 | | |
| | 169 | | |
| AL5040 | Alternatives: Oppose No Action Alternative | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | N/A | 152 |
| AL5050 | Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Citizen | 5 |
| | | Potomac Valley-River Bend Neighborhood Association | 15 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | State Farm Insurance | 144 |
| | | N/A | 10 |
| | | | 14 |
| | | | 48 |
| | | | 55 |
| | | | 76 |
| | | | 77 |
| | | | 82 |
| | | | 84 |
| | | | 88 |
| | | | 103 |
| | | | 104 |
| | | | 108 |
| | | | 127 |
| | | | 130 |
| | | | 141 |
| | | | 154 |
| | | | 164 |
| AL5060 | Design: Include construction schedule in SDP | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| AL5080 | Alternatives: Support No Action Alternative, due to concern with funding | N/A | 75 |
| | | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| | | Potomac Valley Riverbend Civic Association | 30 |
| | | SELF | 39 |
| | | concerned citizen | 78 |
| | | N/A | 2 |
| | | | 9 |
| | | | 46 |
| | | | 58 |
| | | | 84 |
| | | | 91 |
| | | | 105 |
| | | | 114 |
| | | | 169 |
| AL5100 | Alternatives: Support less drastic changes | Potomac Valley Riverbend Civic Association | 30 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | N/A | 31 |
| | | | 38 |
| | | | 149 |
| | | | 156 |
| AL5130 | Alternatives: Support retaining current park uses; minimal historical interpretation | Collingwood resident | 121 |
| | | None | 112 |
| | | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. | 60 |
| | | Waynewood Citizens Association | 94 |
| | | N/A | 42 |
| | | | 122 |
| | | | 131 |
| | | | 151 |
| AL5200 | Support Alternative A or B | N/A | 36 |
| AL6030 | Alternatives: Support Alternative B | Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association | 17 |
| | | N/A | 33 |
| | | | 66 |
| | | | 158 |
| AL6035 | Alternatives: Support Alternative B with modifications | N/A | 56 |
| AL6038 | Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area B | N/A | 124 |
| AL6040 | Alternatives: Oppose Alternative B | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 83 |
| AL7030 | Alternatives: Support Alternative C | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| | | none. Local resident | 109 |
| | | N/A | 16 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | | 83 |
| | | | 97 |
| | | | 145 |
| | | | 152 |
| AL7040 | Alternatives: Support visitor facility in Area C | N/A | 28 |
| | | | 29 |
| | | | 159 |
| AL7045 | Alternatives: Oppose Removal of Picnic Area C | N/A | 126 |
| AL7050 | Alternatives: Oppose Preferred Alternative (Alternative C) | "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53) | 120 |
| | | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) | 155 |
| | | Civic Assoc | 133 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 158 |
| AL8030 | Alternatives: Support Alternative D | N/A | 1 |
| | | | 106 |
| AL8040 | Alternatives: Oppose Alternative D | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) | 155 |
| | | Civic Assoc | 133 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 83 |
| | | | 158 |
| AL9005 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in impervious surface | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | National Parks Conservation Association | 147 |
| | | N/A | 83 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|----------|
| | | | 102 |
| | | | 149 |
| AL9006 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to park access | N/A | 131 |
| AL9007 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to ADA accessibility | self, citizen | 133 |
| AL9009 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose encouraging tour buses in park | N/A | 159 |
| AL9010 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new entrance way | N/A | 34 |
| | | | 69 |
| | | | 159 |
| AL9012 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support realignment of entrance way | PVRB Civic Association | 71 |
| | | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. | 60 |
| AL9013 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose closing pedestrian entrance off Fort Hunt Road | N/A | 110 |
| | | | 156 |
| | | | 165 |
| AL9015 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support preservation of historic structures | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | N/A | 12 |
| | | | 32 |
| | | | 81 |
| | | | 114 |
| | | | 156 |
| AL9020 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new visitor center | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 60 |
| | | N/A | 19 |
| | | | 14 |
| | | | 27 |
| | | | 34 |
| | | | 56 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | | 69 |
| | | | 88 |
| | | | 131 |
| | | | 143 |
| | | | 148 |
| | | | 162 |
| AL9023 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support new visitor center | NPCA | 85 |
| | | | 86 |
| | | National Parks Conservation Association | 41 |
| | | | 45 |
| | | | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | retired Air Force | 96 |
| | | N/A | 47 |
| | | | 51 |
| | | | 59 |
| | | | 72 |
| | | | 114 |
| | | | 122 |
| | | | 124 |
| | | | 125 |
| | | | 128 |
| | | | 135 |
| | | | 137 |
| | | | 140 |
| | | | 142 |
| | | | 158 |
| | | | 159 |
| | | | 160 |
| AL9024 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support small visitor center | N/A | 25 |
| | | | 67 |
| | | | 95 |
| | | | 140 |
| | | | 163 |
| AL9025 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support interpretive trail | NPCA | 85 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | | 86 |
| | | National Parks Conservation Association | 41 |
| | | | 45 |
| | | | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | None | 112 |
| | | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. | 60 |
| | | N/A | 34 |
| | | | 51 |
| | | | 59 |
| | | | 72 |
| | | | 125 |
| | | | 128 |
| | | | 135 |
| | | | 137 |
| | | | 160 |
| | | | 162 |
| | | | 166 |
| | | | 171 |
| AL9026 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose interpretive trail | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 19 |
| AL9027 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of infrastructure for interpretive trail | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| AL9028 | Alternatives - Elements of Alternatives: Support visitor center near park entrance | N/A | 16 |
| | | | 37 |
| | | | 58 |
| | | | 83 |
| | | | 113 |
| | | | 162 |
| | | | 166 |
| AL9029 | Alternatives - Elements of | self, citizen | 133 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|---|----------|
| | Alternatives: Restrict parking on neighborhood roads | | |
| AL9030 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support pedestrian/bicycle path | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | | 147 |
| | | N/A | 3 |
| | | | 16 |
| | | | 29 |
| | | | 140 |
| AL9031 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path | American Society of Landscape Architects park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 53 |
| | | N/A | 19 |
| | | | 81 |
| | | | 84 |
| | | | 156 |
| | | | 169 |
| AL9032 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose pedestrian/bicycle path on current paved road | N/A | 69 |
| AL9033 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to natural setting of trails | N/A | 3 |
| AL9034 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose changes to trails | retired Air Force | 96 |
| | | N/A | 14 |
| | | | 124 |
| AL9035 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain full loop road | Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association | 17 |
| | | Waba | 26 |
| | | N/A | 162 |
| AL9036 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any plan to shorten bicycle path | N/A | 110 |
| AL9037 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing parking spaces | None | 112 |
| | | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 19 |
| | | retired Air Force | 96 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|--|----------|
| | | N/A | 110 |
| | | | 124 |
| | | | 171 |
| AL9038 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support additional parking spaces | N/A | 51 |
| AL9039 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reducing parking areas | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| AL9040 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of picnic facilities | | 101 |
| | | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Circulo de Puerto Rico | 43 |
| | | Community Association of Hollin Hills | 80 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | Mt. Verlnon Civic Association | 18 |
| | | None | 112 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend Civic Association | 13 |
| | | Retired | 61 |
| | | USAF retired | 150 |
| | | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 19 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 8 |
| | | | 12 |
| | | | 14 |
| | | | 20 |
| | | | 23 |
| | | | 25 |
| | | | 29 |
| | | | 32 |
| | | | 46 |
| | | | 47 |
| | | | 51 |
| | | | 54 |
| | | | 55 |
| | | | 59 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|----------|
| | | | 63 |
| | | | 69 |
| | | | 73 |
| | | | 77 |
| | | | 88 |
| | | | 89 |
| | | | 102 |
| | | | 105 |
| | | | 110 |
| | | | 114 |
| | | | 131 |
| | | | 132 |
| | | | 138 |
| | | | 140 |
| | | | 159 |
| | | | 162 |
| | | | 164 |
| AL9041 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing small picnic areas | Collingwood Citizens Association | 7 |
| | | N/A | 3 |
| AL9042 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of Picnic Pavilion A | N/A | 114 |
| | | | 158 |
| | | | 166 |
| AL9043 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to picnic facilities | N/A | 27 |
| | | | 47 |
| AL9045 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of picnic facilities | N/A | 83 |
| | | | 97 |
| AL9048 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining multiple picnic facilities | Collingwood Citizens Association | 7 |
| | | National Parks Conservation Association | 41 |
| | | | 45 |
| | | | 65 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|---|----------|
| | | N/A | 50 |
| | | | 72 |
| | | | 113 |
| | | | 125 |
| AL9049 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining open space | National Parks Conservation Association | 147 |
| | | N/A | 83 |
| | | | 140 |
| AL9050 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removing restrooms | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| | | N/A | 16 |
| | | | 23 |
| | | | 63 |
| | | | 162 |
| AL9055 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to restrooms | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Hollin Hills | 111 |
| | | retired Air Force | 96 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 47 |
| | | | 69 |
| | | | 95 |
| | | | 124 |
| | | | 157 |
| | | | 166 |
| AL9056 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining Area E restroom | N/A | 28 |
| AL9057 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Open restrooms year-round | retired Air Force | 96 |
| | | N/A | 124 |
| AL9060 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support one-way traffic | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | N/A | 46 |
| AL9061 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support two-way traffic | N/A | 51 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|--|
| | | | 124 |
| AL9065 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removing paved road between Areas D and E | N/A | 29 |
| AL9070 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of ball fields | American Society of Landscape Architects Mt. VerInon Civic Association park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association retired Air Force N/A | 53 18 19 96 20 23 47 54 |
| | | | 110 |
| | | | 124 |
| AL9072 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of recreation areas | N/A | 62 |
| AL9073 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose removal of playground | N/A | 20 |
| AL9074 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to recreation facilities | National Parks Conservation Association N/A | 65 69 166 |
| AL9075 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support retaining one ball field | N/A | 50 |
| AL9076 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of Area B ball field | N/A | 28 |
| AL9077 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain Fort Hunt Concert Series | N/A | 114 |
| AL9078 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support reduction in use for picnics/parties | N/A | 156 158 |
| AL9079 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose new trail on west side of park | N/A | 156 |
| AL9080 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Retain current road structure | "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53) | 120 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|---|--|----------|
| | | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | USAF retired | 150 |
| | | N/A | 3 |
| | | | 12 |
| | | | 14 |
| | | | 47 |
| | | | 64 |
| | | | 84 |
| | | | 122 |
| | | | 132 |
| | | | 138 |
| | | | 163 |
| | | | 171 |
| AL9083 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support opening closed portion of road | American Society of Landscape Architects | 53 |
| | | Hollin Hills | 111 |
| | | N/A | 114 |
| AL9084 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose any changes that would increase visitor presence along south and west of park | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | N/A | 156 |
| | | | 169 |
| | | | 171 |
| AL9085 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Oppose opening closed portion of road | Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc | 155 |
| | | N/A | 156 |
| AL9086 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support removal of loop road | N/A | 16 |
| | | | 32 |
| | | | 102 |
| | | | 106 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| AL9087 | Alternatives - Element of Alternatives: Have park entrance defer to Fort Hunt Road traffic | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| AL9090 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support improvements to historical interpretation | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | National Parks Conservation Association | 147 |
| | | Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn. | 60 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| | | N/A | 50 |
| | | | 63 |
| | | | 97 |
| | | | 98 |
| | | | 114 |
| | | | 119 |
| | | | 139 |
| | | | 151 |
| | | | 152 |
| AL9092 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Maintain character of park with respect to vegetation | N/A | 156 |
| AL9095 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support development of documentation/museum | FRIENDS OF CAMP RITCHIE | 57 |
| | | N/A | 4 |
| AL9099 | Alternatives- Element of Alternatives: Support increase in natural habitat | N/A | 1 |
| | | | 97 |
| | | | 162 |
| AR4005 | Archeological Resources: Support preservation/protection of archeological resources | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | N/A | 156 |
| AR4200 | Archeological Resources: Impacts would be greater from action alternatives than from overuse | N/A | 81 |
| AR4300 | Archeological Resources: Conduct study to evaluate archeological resources | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | self, citizen | 133 |
| CC1000 | Consultation & Coordination: Further coordination | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Potomac Valley River Bend Civic Association | 13 |
| | | N/A | 58 |
| | | | 149 |
| CR4100 | Cultural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of cultural resources | N/A | 162 |
| DR4100 | Drainage: Issues of drainage to park neighbors not addressed | N/A | 159 |
| DS5030 | Design: Trail width | Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association | 17 |
| | | N/A | 34 |
| | | | 127 |
| | | | 143 |
| | | | 145 |
| | | | 153 |
| | | | 163 |
| | | | 165 |
| | | | 167 |
| DS5040 | Design: Support use of gravel trail material | N/A | 16 |
| DS5045 | Design: Pave bike trails | Waba | 26 |
| | | N/A | 140 |
| DS5050 | Design: Bike speed control | N/A | 29 |
| DS5055 | Design: Low Impact Development | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| DS5060 | Design: Replant grassy areas with native vegetation | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | VA Dept of Conservation & Recreation | 116 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| DS5070 | Design: Stormwater Management plans | VA Dept of Conservation & Recreation | 116 |
| | | N/A | 162 |
| FN1000 | Funding: Cost analysis | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| | | N/A | 34 |
| | | | 165 |
| FN1500 | Funding: Ensure funding is available for Preferred Alternative | National Parks Conservation Association | 147 |
| FN2000 | Funding: Soliciting funds from other federal agencies | N/A | 28 |
| FN2100 | Funding: Add profitable activities to park | N/A | 127 |
| IV2000 | Issues - Visitor Use: Noise and parking are not issues | park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association | 19 |
| | | N/A | 108 |
| MT2000 | Miscellaneous Topics: Oppose fees for park use | N/A | 22 |
| MT2500 | Miscellaneous Topics: Request additional studies | N/A | 28 |
| MT3000 | Miscellaneous Topics: SDP should be more open-ended/flexible | PVRB Civic Association | 71 |
| MT3100 | Miscellaneous Topics: Raise and lower flag each day | retired Air Force | 96 |
| | | N/A | 124 |
| | | | 157 |
| MT3200 | Miscellaneous Topics: Connect park to local transit systems | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | N/A | 119 |
| | | | |
| MT3300 | Miscellaneous Topics: Continued use of park for community events | Ft Hunt Elementary PTA President | 136 |
| NR2000 | Natural Resources: Preserve natural resources | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | N/A | 110 |
| | | | 119 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|--|----------|
| | | | 162 |
| NR2100 | Natural Resources: Control invasive species | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| | | N/A | 151 |
| | | | 162 |
| NR2150 | Natural Resources: Avoid impacts to rare, threatened, endangered species | Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. | 170 |
| NR2200 | Natural Resources: Protect Bald Eagle habitat | Friends of Dyke Marsh | 118 |
| | | VA Department of Conservation and Recreation | 174 |
| | | N/A | 114 |
| | | | 148 |
| | | | 162 |
| NR4100 | Natural Resources: The EA does not sufficiently address protection of natural resources | N/A | 162 |
| NR4200 | Natural Resources: Impacts - Impervious area calculations | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| | | N/A | 165 |
| PI2000 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Meeting not sufficiently advertised | National Association for Health Fitness self, citizen | 44 |
| | | | 133 |
| | | N/A | 23 |
| | | | 24 |
| | | | 165 |
| PI2005 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Park neighbors/users not sufficiently informed of project | N/A | 91 |
| | | | 162 |
| PI2050 | Public Involvement - Public Meeting: Additional public meeting | National Association for Health Fitness | 44 |
| PI3000 | Public Involvement - NPS process excludes minorities | N/A | 75 |
| PN2010 | Purpose & Need: Purpose should | concerned citizen | 78 |

| Code | Description | Organization | Corr. ID |
|--------|--|---|----------|
| | focus on recreational uses | | |
| PN2015 | Purpose & Need: Recreational use not impacting resources | concerned citizen | 78 |
| SE4000 | Socioeconomics - Impacts: Impacts not sufficiently addressed | Hollin Hills | 93 |
| | | N/A | 75 |
| | | N/A | 40 |
| | | | 58 |
| | | | 115 |
| VE1050 | Visitor Experience: EA does not sufficiently define "Visitor Experience" | N/A | 156 |
| VE4010 | Visitor Experience - Impacts: Increased focus on cultural resources should not detract from the natural beauty/setting of the park | N/A | 37 |
| | | | 122 |
| VE4020 | Visitor Experience - Impacts: Large group picnics do not adversely impact visitor experience | N/A | 162 |
| VU2010 | Visitor Use: Estimate of visitor numbers and cars | National Parks Conservation Association | 65 |
| | | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| VU2015 | Visitor Use: Provide traffic analysis/expected vehicular volume | VA Department of Environmental Quality | 172 |
| VU2020 | Information regarding carrying capacity | Fairfax County Park Authority | 173 |
| VU4040 | Visitor Use: Removal of picnic facilities would reduce visitor numbers/enjoyment | N/A | 52 |
| VU5010 | Visitor Use: Park cannot support an increase in visitor use | Citizen | 5 |

**APPENDIX E:
COMMENTS SUBMITTED**

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 1

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/07/2011 Date Received: 09/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have read through the 4 choices NPS presented. I like alternative "D" the best. The concept of removing asphalt parking and concrete sidewalks and ballfields is an excellent idea. Returning some of the area to a more natural state is cost-effective and more valuable to the wildlife who need the land to survive the onslaught of human encroachment. Humans can enjoy the bounty of wildlife that will return here through nature walks.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 2

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/07/2011 Date Received: 09/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

My family uses Ft. Hunt Park frequently for picnics. We favor taking no action. The park adequately serves the needs of the local community. The favored alternative eliminates picnic and playground spaces and will involve funding the construction of new facilities. The proposed alternative requires spending which our nation cannot afford in this time of soaring national debt. Rather than proposing funding of projects such as this, the Park Service should be looking at ways to reduce its size and fund only the maintenance of current parklands.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 3

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/07/2011 Date Received: 09/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a long time neighbor and user of Fort Hunt Park, I strongly object to Alternatives B,C, and D. Enhance the walking and biking trails, yes, but don't remove all but one of the picnic areas!!

Picnic Areas: Anyone who has been to the park knows that the picnic areas are essential to the park's character: baseball practices, soccer parties, 6th grade outings, and birthday parties, peacefully coexisting with girl scout camp, company picnics, family outings, etc. The picnic areas do nothing to take away from the bucolic setting of the park, but enhance it, as a place that can be used by everyone. Many people use the parking areas as a base for their walk or bike ride around the park. The picnic pavilion that will remain is way too big for a simple family picnic, which only requires only a picnic table, a grill, a trash can and a place to park. Also, it was nice in the past few years to walk on the rustic trail that ran parallel to the parkway behind the ball field-- please don't ruin the setting by grooming the trail too much -- its fun for the kids to have to climb over a big log! Coming from DC, I spent my childhood in Rock Creek Park, which had a lot of similar picnic areas and a nice bike trail; my kids have been fortunate enough to have Fort Hunt. Please don't ruin it so that my grandkids have nowhere to go!

Road: the plan to make the road come to a cul-de-sac halfway through the park is ridiculous -- it will cause no end of jam-ups, especially when there's a big company picnic and people who don't know the park get lost in it and end up there.... As a biker who uses the park, doing "laps" around the park is part of the fun, and bikers, cars, runners and walkers have co-existed in this way in my memory for 20 years. It seems that this plan will discourage bikers. If this is the case, you'll lose a good deal of the neighbors who use the park year-round.

Its great that the park service wants to conserve the land, but the joy of Fort Hunt has always been that it is "user-friendly" - whether you're there for a concert, picnic, nature hike, or a simple bike ride, its an inviting, safe place to go and enjoy -- isn't that what a park is for?

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 4

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: john G. dean
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 29 Blvd Jules Sandeau
Paris, UN 75116
FRA
E-mail: johnmartinedean@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/09/2011 Date Received: 09/09/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear friends,

Living in Europe I can not attend the September 21 meeting in Alexandria. As for the development of Fort Hunt, I believe others are in a better position than me to give advice.

I do care about the P.O. Box 1142 operation at Fort Hunt, where I served from 1944 to 1946 and I believe one aspect of the development plan should build up the document/museum section at Fort Hunt, giving visitors and the public an idea how to humanize interrogation programs and how prisoners can be treated in America. I think this was one of the lessons learnt at Fort Hunt which is very pertinent today. In this task I am always ready to help.

John Gunther Dean (former U.S.ambassador)
29 boulevard Jules Sandeau
75116 Paris, France
Tel: OO 33 1 45 04 71 84
E-mail: johnmartinedean@aol.com

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 5

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jay E. McConville
Organization: Citizen
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1003 Emerald Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: jay@gojay.org

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/14/2011 Date Received: 09/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sir or Madam:

I would like to reiterate my earlier comments in support of the "No Action Alternative" to the proposed Site Development Plan of Ft. Hunt Park.

Ft. Hunt Park serves as a wonderful place for residents and visitors alike to enjoy our beautiful area in quiet and relaxing surroundings. The park requires no development to continue to provide an excellent respite for people of all ages. It is well maintained in a natural state, and well used by local residents and visitors from around the country. The existing pavilions provide all the necessary services to use the park in this manner. Further development will only damage these positive attributes.

Another reason for supporting the "No Action Alternative" is that the park does not have the capacity to accommodate many more visitors, either in its internal spaces or in relation to vehicle traffic. The park is on a very narrow roadway entrance off the already over-burdened GW Parkway. Efforts to boost user volume will only make this traffic situation worse.

Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 6

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mary W. Culham
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 4711 Quebec Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20016
Washington, DC 20016
USA
E-mail: maryculham@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/21/2011 Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Fort Hunt Park played a huge part in my teenage years (I am now 55). It was/is clean, well-policed, safe, open for pick-up games of frisbee or whatever, and a great meeting place for reunions of all ages. Bicycling to and around it is excellent exercise, the remains of the "forts" provide great historical background, it is a boon to the environment and should continue to be kept up and open for use by all (before dark).

Very appreciatively,

Mary Culham

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 7

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Collingwood Citizens Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/21/2011 Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

While I think a modest visitor center with interpretive functions would be a welcome addition to Fort Hunt Park, these proposals appear to take away from recreational functions more than necessary to satisfy planning objectives. Permitted picnicking could be regulated by limiting the size and frequency of large group use.

My thoughts are:

- 1) At least one other picnic pavilion besides the one in area A should be kept. This is important for girl scout and boy scout use and any scheduled use by school groups.
- 2) I have not observed a problem over mixed use of the park loop road. I bike there quite a bit and have no trouble with pedestrians or cars. If part of the road loop is closed, use most of the rest for bikes. At least one plan shows a new bike trail through a area now largely wooded.
- 3) Keep plenty of picnic areas. Park Service representatives I spoke with on Sept. 21 at the park said all picnic tables would remain, but the SDP does not make this clear.
- 4) If some of the current pavilions are above potential archeological sites, they could be moved rather than removed if necessary to protect future investigations and allow for appropriate markers.
- 5) If there is to be Ranger presence at the park for interpretive functions, there can also be better supervision of park activities.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 8**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Donna E. Ruggiero
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1014 Dalebrook Drive
Alexandria, Va 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: jdmonacci@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

DON'T close the Pavillions at Fort Hunt Park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 9

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Why are any changes to the Park needed? It is accessible, quiet, safe, neighborhood friendly and recently had facilities updated. The GW Parkway could use more attention as well as the bike trail. Please leave the Park alone. It is a safe place for walkers, picnicker's and recreational bikers. Money could be better spent elsewhere.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 10**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please do NOT change the way Fort Hunt Park is being used unless you add the the existing infrastructure.
Thank You

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 11

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am 48 years old, and have been going to Fort Hunt Park since I was a little girl. My Dad's office picnics, softball games, Fort Hunt H.S. Reunion picnics, used to fly my kite there! Now I ride my bike, and enjoy the summer music there. It has to remain a park, for the people of the area to enjoy.

I remember the "D" Section in High School. Yes, it was party central, but nobody ever did anything to harm the park. It was a place where friends met and had fun.

I think that area should be considered for a visitor's center, being it is closed.

The park has such history as a German prisoner of war camp, and has to remain so nobody ever forgets.

I have recently seen the new covered facilities built in other sections, and think it's great! Where else can a group gather and have an event in the area?

I think what needs to be done, is to make people take responsibility for their group; to clean up afterwards or pay a fine. The park should be left clean and each group should have that responsibility to make sure it's taken care of, that the site is left clean. I think, maybe having a deposit to rent the space, that is refundable after an inspection.

Fort Hunt Park needs to remain a park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 12

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John H. Kern
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9025 Beatty Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308-2808
USA
E-mail: johnhkern@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

22 September 2011

Dear Sir:

I have read the proposal for changing the Fort Hunt Park and am opposed to the Park Service proposals. The proposals make the park harder to use and less friendly to the public. You propose removing most of the picnic pavilions and facilities. This makes the park less usable.

Removing the circular road or establishing a separate trail beside it are poorly designed ideas. There is little or no problem with walkers and cars as the road is one way. Similarly there are few problems with bicycles and cars based on the speeds.

Adding an interpretive focus for the park's history has to be placed in perspective. This fort never fired a round in war, despite the gun emplacements. It's use as a WW-II POW site, interrogation facility and intelligence site can easily be explained through signage, as any evidence of that has been removed many years ago. The other uses as storage and training facilities are negligible. However, I agree that the gun emplacements should be preserved and that the full history of the park should be told.

Despite the fact that this is a national park, it is also a neighborhood park and I have used it for over 50

years as a nearby resident. I feel that after that amount of time, I might have as good a view on its use as the Park Service. I enjoy that the open fields and that facilities can be reserved for picnics by organizations and companies and that local residents walk and bike there every day.

My advice is to keep the character of the park intact to attract visitors and to add interpretive signs. Do not eliminate picnic structures or the circular roadway. Your justifications do not support the prudent expenditure of funds.

John H. Kern
9025 Beatty Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
703-799-9117
johnhkern@aol.com

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 13

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend Civic Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

After attending Wednesday evening's meeting at Fort Hunt Park, I have one general observation and three comments about the specific project.

General

As a proud retired federal employee I never imagined that it would be necessary to remind employees of the citizenry (feds) that in this divided and polarized political climate every federal employee and organization must be keenly aware of a growing anti-government and act accordingly. If you do not have the staff to properly scope and present a project to the public, you should hire them or contract for the expertise in those skill sets.

What could have been and should have been a cooperative and collaborative meeting about an exciting project turned into a debacle of the first order. The National Park Service (NPS) turned a positive aspect, having a very high ranking NPS official attend, into an embarrassment by letting him speak about the details of the project which he was not sufficiently informed about. In addition he set the tone for a "us versus them" adversarial evening when there was every opportunity to make it a collaborative, tell us how we can work with and for you, discussion of the possibilities. The young man who chaired the event was too young, nervous and unarmed with enough facts to lead the motivated public on a productive melding of public and private interests in the asset that is Fort Hunt Park.

Specifics

Show that you are thoughtful stewards of the public fisc by using the existing infrastructure and how new knowledge and information can be incorporated in an effort to improve the Park in a value-added manner. The Park is loved, used and has extensive opportunities as is (pavilions for picnics, ball fields/courts for activities, playgrounds for play, bathroom facilities, trails, roads, trees, grass, etc.). Why would you suggest removing any of the existing assets unless there is an overwhelming safety or upkeep issue? In

other words, baring information not brought forth as yet, keep most of what exists at Fort Hunt Park. Do not squander sunk costs without a strong reason for doing it.

Show your knowledge of how government functions by working through the elected officials in the area, the civic associations in the area and the other unaffiliated users of the park. These officers and organizations have offices and regular meetings where ideas can be discussed before holding what seemed like a "take it or write-in as individuals" last chance meeting. These local civic officers and groups have their constituents' interests at heart every day. They are a wealth of knowledge and expertise in what makes the Mt. Vernon area tick. They could be very helpful in determining what the public sentiment toward the project is and extremely effective at helping NPS get buy-in from the surrounding residents for a thoughtful and studied approach. Do not rush to judgment on this unfunded project? share the lifting with your employers, the public.

Be wise in proposing changes that incorporate the historical elements of the park and sensitive to how residents feel about a facility that is part of the reason they live where they do. You might as well say you are going to turn Mt Vernon into an amusement park. Every other aspect of modern life that I am aware of bases change on "evidence based" information. In this case, a credible usage study that gives NPS and the public some data with which to triangulate with NPS' aspirations and residents' loyalties is an absolute must. Rethink your options B, C, and D. Incorporate more of the public's desires and provide some convincing rationale for NPS' plans to highlight the historic aspects of the park. Most importantly, do not do anything until the evidence is acquired, analyzed and incorporated as a basis for the plan.

My hope is that NPS and the local elected officials, civic associations, and general public can seize this unbelievable opportunity for public and private collaboration to enhance a jewel of an asset that happens to be in my front yard. A success could serve as a model for how democratic government should work and prove to the misinformed that the government (and its agencies) is us, the public. It is not and never has been an "us versus them" proposition.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 14

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a resident of Fairfax County and a frequent user of Ft. Hunt park over the past 15 years. My wife and I walk our dogs in the park, we ride our bikes and rollerblade in the park, and we have attended permitted picnics in the park's pavillions.

This is a park that does not need a visitor center. There are signs in the park now which describe the structures present on the grounds and the history of the park's usage. This low-key approach fits the park's atmosphere.

The pavillions should not be removed. They are pretty, well-constructed structures that provide excellent picnic spots and protection from the weather. If the volume of use is causing damage to the park, then the volume can be controlled by granting fewer permits. There is no reason for construction nor deconstruction.

The current paved oval in the park suits it. The road meanders a bit, is well-marked, and is unobtrusive.

There are trails in the woods now which give the park a natural feel, off the paved ovals. there is no need for more trails, nor any need to improve the trails--because they don't "go" anywhere. They just allow the park user a chance to walk in the woods.

Please leave the park the way it is. We love it.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 15

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: J Griffin Crump
Organization: Potomac Valley-River Bend Neighborhood Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8924 Battery Road, Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: jgcrump@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I think NPS' proposals for redevelopment of Ft. Hunt Park would diminish the recreational resources of our neighborhood and the greater Mount Vernon area. The money should be spent, instead, to eradicate the invasive plants which are killing the Parkway's trees.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 16

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Marilyn P. McCullough
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1605 River Farm Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: marilynMcC@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/22/2011 Date Received: 09/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for meeting with the neighbors of Fort Hunt Park last evening to explain your proposals for possible changes to the facilities at the park. We have lived next door to the park for 35 years; The park attracted us to this area and the park has kept us here despite years of ungodly commutes for work, school, and sports practices. Fort Hunt Park is a very special place, offering open space for recreation, sites of historical significance, and wildlife habitat.

At last evening's meeting I was pleased to learn that the Park Police station and the stables are to remain in place. Also, that the park would continue to have but one entrance and that entrance would soon be better marked. Security is important for such a large, wooded, unlit area. It was reassuring when we had a formidable figure like Hank Snyder living in the house at the park's entrance; however, I understand the environmental concerns which forced the park service to close this building.

Removing parts of the traffic circle would be a positive step. There's just something about a loop that compels people to jump into their pick-up trucks, customized vehicles, motorcycles, or (in packs of 20 or more) high tech racing bicycles and drive 'round and 'round simply for the sake of being seen driving 'round. It seems like a silly waste of energy, but it's constant and it's perilous for those on foot. Separate paths for vehicles and pedestrians would be splendid. Although I did not hear an official statement concerning the materials proposed to build a separate hiking trail, I read on some web postings that you may use gravel instead of blacktop and that too would be a splendid improvement. Already we have about 10 miles of blacktop trails running along the riverbank; that's plenty of asphalt. Let's keep the park

trails as natural as possible.

Plan "C" as proposed appears to be the most logical approach and the most attractive; however, I would prefer to have a visitor's center located closer to the entrance and to leave the back part of the park undisturbed. Scout groups and school groups use this area, and seriously, how much fun would it be to pitch your tent beside the visitor's center parking lot? It is our duty to instill in children a love of nature and a respect for all the creatures with which we share our space; if we fail in this mission, they will grow up, cut down all the trees, and build amusement parks instead. Also, having been responsible for keeping tabs on an entire pack of cub scouts or an entire bus load of school children, I can assure you that visitor's centers and parking lots are best avoided. So, consider conserving the natural spaces and keep the tourist centers, museums, and buildings nearer the entrance. But, come to think of it, maybe you could leave those restrooms.

Finally, there is one small item that I think should be included in your grand plan -- a doggie water bowl. At the Stratford Landing park there is a bowl, bolted into the ground beneath a hand pump where you can pump fresh water for the dogs, and it is so greatly enjoyed by so many -- but it's a long walk there for an old dog and an old lady on a hot summer day.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 17

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Lisa Diernisse
Organization: Mount Vernon Manor Citizens Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8631 Gateshead Road
Alexandria, VA 22309
Fairfax County, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: alfonsejr@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/23/2011 Date Received: 09/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support alternative B of the proposed park development plans. I support this because it keeps the road intact and I use the park for biking and it appears to me that biking in the park will only be feasible if the road is kept in place. I would not use any proposed trail for biking if there is still a loop road in place.

The proposed bike/pedestrian trail suggested in some plans does not appear to be wide enough to accomodate bikers and pedestrians at the same time. This presents a very dangerous situation, similar to that experienced on the Mt. Vernon bike trail, in that bikers cannot safely pass pedestrians without running head on into oncoming bikers and pedestians going in the opposite direction.

Regardless of the plan developed, the NPS should consult with a knowledgeable trails organization, such as Rails to TRails, and confer with them to ensure any new trail is really appropriate for, and adequately wide enough, for multi-use. Putting signs and lane stripings on a trail to try to force "lane discipline" is not sufficient to ensure safety of users. Experience on the C&O canal towpath trail and Mt. Vernon trail has shown many trail users are unwilling or unable to adhere to such markings (i.e., dogs, children, people not proficient in english, etc.) and many accidents and injuries ensue when trails are too narrow for multi-use.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 18

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: michael j. habib
Organization: Mt. VerInon Civic Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9512 ferry harbour ct.
alexandria, va. 22309
alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: godihabib@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/23/2011 Date Received: 09/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Mt. Vernon Civic Association (MVCA) represents some 450 households within a 3-4 mile distnce from Ft. Hunt Park. Association members regularly use the park's faciites; the park was the site of our annual picnic three years ago.

On Sept. 20, the MVCA Board of Directors voted unanimously to oppose all of the 3 alternative scenarios outlined in the National Park Service's development plan for the future of Ft. Hunt Park. Those three scenarios all envisage the removal of 4 of the 5 pavilions and one of the ball fields at Ft. Hunt Park. The board was strongly of the view that the present configuration of the park, particularly its pavilions and ball fields, should be retained. The removal of these facilites would represent a draconian change to the very nature of a park which is widely used and enjoyed by our members.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 19

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Patricia A. Brown
Organization: park neighbor, PVRB Civic Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8818 Camfield Dr., Alexandria, VA. 22038
Alexandria, VA 2308
USA
E-mail: patbrown98052@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/23/2011 Date Received: 09/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Sirs,
The ideas proposed by the Park Service at the public meeting held 9/27/11 concerning Fort Hunt Park are very disturbing. It is almost as though the people who came up with the idea that Fort Hunt Park needs fixing are unfamiliar with the park and how well used and loved it is. Is it the Park Service's motive to remove the human element from the park? Those historic features in the park are enjoyed and appreciated, but there can be nothing on site that could convince me we need fewer families and less fun on that public space. I suggest that you look into the motives of those proposing the changes. They do not have the best interests of the park or the community in mind.
Let me go on record saying that I want it to remain as is. I do not want a bike path - gravel or otherwise, or the pavilions and playing fields removed. I do not want an oral history walking trail or a visitors center. I do not want fewer parking spaces. I do not want guided tours and if the current park staff do not like how things are at Fort Hunt, let them find a park that is more to their liking. If they don't like dealing with the public on a service basis, referring here to the scheduling of pavilion use, and prefer the role of an educator, by all means, encourage them to go into education. Oh no, wait, I'm afraid they will find that's not a 'one note' job either. Do not waste my money making changes that I, and I'm sure most of the community, if they knew what you have in mind, want. Do not do this. Find some other project if you must "fix" something, but leave Fort Hunt alone.
Also, to address the EA/AoE concerns about for residential neighborhoods at its north and west boundaries that "during peak picnic season, visitors sometimes create noise and parking issues for park neighbors" - please disregard because I live on the western boundary and noise and parking are not

issues at all.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion. Pat Brown

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 20**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: TIFFANY HARTZELL
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7700 Ridgecrest Dr
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: tiffanyhartzell@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/24/2011 Date Received: 09/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please preserve the fields, playgrounds, and pavillions at Fort Hunt Park. It is a much appreciated and heavily used part of our community.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 21

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Renee Priore
Organization: Self
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8803 Mansion Farm Place
Alexandria, Fairfax County, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: rpriore@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/25/2011 Date Received: 09/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

If you restrict picnics and other activities from the Ft Hunt park you will be denying a local population of much pleasure!
How can you plan a visitors center when you can not manage to raise the U.S. Flag on the pole that exists.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 22

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/25/2011 Date Received: 09/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Fort Hunt Park Rangers,
We are students from Stratford Landing ES. Today when we went running, biking, and rollerblading on the track. Our soccer team always has a fun practice on one of your fields. We would be very sad if we did not have these opportunities. Three of us first learned to ride our bikes in the parking areas and golf in the fields. We love bringing our dogs to the park as well and take them for walks. Picnics are also very fun and we would be very sad if we couldn't have them any more. When Sonya and Siena were young, they had lots of fun at the Girl Scout camps, held at the park each summer. The forts are awesome to play on! We love to run around and play on them and read about their history. We believe you should keep free access to the park for the community. People enjoy coming here to run and play and it will be harder to come if you have to pay. There are plenty of other ways to make money, like having festivals where people will have to pay for their food, a visitor center, and more summer camps. Please take our thoughts into consideration. Thank you very much!

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 23

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/26/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Some of the reasons people love Fort Hunt Park are its benefits to the community. It is a benefit to home sales in the area. The community uses it for school celebrations & activities, scouts activities, sports celebrations, school reunion picnics, concerts, club gatherings, family reunions and picnics among other things. It is rarely, if ever, overcrowded and I resent the implications in these changes. There have been no community notices about these changes in the Alexandria Gazette, no mention from local politicians. I fear that these changes will be enacted without community input as they seem to be moving forward with little if any community involvement. This is not what the park neighborhood wants or needs. Keep the pavilions, the bathrooms, the picnic areas, the ball fields, etc. There is plenty of room to add an information center if desired, but please do not cut off this beautiful community park from use by its local citizens! I would like to have a community weigh-in with adequate notice for attendance, unlike the meeting held on September 21st, which had absolutely no community notification!

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 24

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Alex Echols
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8700 Plymouth Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: echols@conrod.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/26/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

INADEQUATE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY ABOUT THIS CHANGE IN MASTER PLAN FOR FORT HUNT PARK.

I am a regular user of the park and live proximate to it. Completely inadequate notice has been given to the community about possibly changes in the park.

The Park Service needs to properly notify the local community and extend the comment period.

Feel free to contact me at 703/660-2366.

As to your question about how I heard about the NPS document - that is exactly the problem. There has been no direct contact, no coverage in the local press that I have seen (and I closely read the local papers), no coverage in the Mt. Vernon Council, no notice sent to users, no notice sent to local home owners. I doubt that you are in compliance with NEPA and other notification requirements. Regardless, the notice has been completely inadequate.

Best
Alex Echols

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 25

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/26/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was surprised to read that because of the success of this park in attracting picnickers, the number of picnic pavilions would be reduced from 5 to 1. I do not think we should be discouraging people from using a park. I agree with the Park Service that a small interpretative center would be nice, however, it should be done without severely impacting the parks recreational use.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 26**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Waba
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/26/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please keep a paved road loop at Fort Hunt Park. I am one of numerous road cyclists who routinely ride in the park. We are not allowed to ride on the GW Parkway and we cannot safely ride the Mt. Vernon trail at the speed at which we like to train (15 mph), so this is one of the only places for Alexandria residents to ride. And, only a paved road is acceptable. Cyclists who ride road bikes cannot use gravel trails or anything other than a paved surface. Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 27

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/26/2011 Date Received: 09/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Voorhees family prefers the No Action alternative as it is the only option that maintains the desired recreational uses of Fort Hunt Park.

The Fort Hunt Development Site Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect assumes that the no action alternative would not enhance visitor's experience at the Park. From whose perspective? Likewise, whose perspective believes that visitors of Fort Hunt Park want one picnic pavilion and one area for picnics and the remainder of the park having its picnic facilities removed.

The Voorhees family moved to the Fort Hunt area as a young couple. Fort Hunt Park was the place for the George Mason School of Law 5K run as well as the spot our employer found for its annual picnics (US Patent and Trademark Office - now that the PTO has 7X the number of examiners as in the 1980s, the annual picnic is for individual Tech Centers and my Tech Center had its picnic there this past June).

Our children were brought to Fort Hunt Park to explore the grounds and we hiked the closed loop as well as trails through Picnic area E and ended up at the crosswalk at the GWMPWY. Mom and Dad brought our children to the loop to further their bike riding skills. There was no problem with traffic. In the more than 20 years that we lived here, to our knowledge, there never has been a collision between biker and driver on the Fort Hunt Park loop. When our daughter turned 16, she was brought to the Fort Hunt Park loop to further her driving skills. The loop experience is part of the Fort Hunt Park experience. Our children have both run round the loop in school sponsored "Runs".

When our children began preschool, Fort Hunt Park was where class picnics were held and the children

loved exploring the battery. Through grade school, Fort Hunt Park became the site for holding scout picnics as well as class picnics and end of season sport picnics. Fort Hunt Park is the place to go for picnics. The Environment Assessment mentions that all of the park pavilions and picnic areas are used during the peak summer months. As a classroom parent, I was thankful when the reservation system becoming an online registration system. As the Environmental Assessment pointed out, people rented all of the pavilions and all of the picnic areas were used on weekends during the warm spring, summer and warm fall weekends.

Why does the National Park Service want to change the use of Fort Hunt Park? Are you trying to discourage families from using the park, if picnics are involved? If Fort Hunt Park merely had one picnic pavilion and a loop, I suspect that the US PTO would have had its picnics there and some school runs would have occurred there. But, the experiences that we, as a growing family, have of playing at the playground at area A while at a picnic at area B, and of hiking around the Fort and to the Potomac may not have happened. People use Fort Hunt Park as a picnic venue and play softball, soccer, frisbee, etc. while at these functions. In other words, the picnic facilities enhance the visitor's experience.

A visitor center is entirely unnecessary and a waste of NPS funds. If the NPS has money to spend, improve the pavilions and the picnic facilities.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 28

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/27/2011 Date Received: 09/27/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

September 27, 2011.

Good day,

I realize that the rangers and consultants provided "The Face of Good Intent" and were overwhelmed with the audience. They handled the flack very well and a better understanding was felt by many. There were also those entrenched and resistant to changes.

I would like to suggest a few modifications to the presentation heard at FH Park 09/21/2011 and the documents reviewed on line prior to the open forum.

I will refer to my proposal as FH Park 09/27/2011-Manolas.

I suggest the visitors center be Constructed in area C and retain area E restrooms etc. The Softball area adjacent to Pavilion B could be removed, allowing for a newly designed paved roadway to be made. This would allow for an earlier break off for pedestrians, bicyclists and the like.

There should be a Study, to reflect Physical Impact to the Humans locally, for Traffic Noise, movement - flow and what improvements will be needed in the adjoining County of Fairfax, State of Virginia.

Retention of Pavilions A, B and D with associated play fields and recreation should be considered for not only the Status Quo, but for influx of new tourists that appears planned. Many, may wish to spend a little

more time than a quick run through by a Guide and or a Ranger.

I have grown up in the area since 1960, when my parents work brought them to this area. I grew up riding my bicycle to the park, playing sports and as time went on socializing as a young adult. I graduated from the now closed Fort Hunt High School. I have frequented the park anywhere from 3 to 10 times a year, spending from 10 minutes to an afternoon. We just had our Class reunion in July and use to reserve area A and or B for The Company I am retired from.

We should, from a Financial stand point look to solicit Funds for any project approved at Fort Hunt Park from all of the following, given the new emphases on History and presenting a broader social experience: US Department Education, US Department of Defense, US Game & Fisheries, US Park Service, US Environmental Protection Agency, and if We are receiving feedback from "France" etc, The US State Department.

Yes this makes this a "Joint Venture", but contacting the right individuals will streamline both the time and increase the values that will be recognized.

Please contact the writer as you wish, I would like to see this enhancement move forward.

.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 29

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/27/2011 Date Received: 09/27/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Superintendent
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Dear Sir,

I am happy that the Park Service recognizes the historical significance of Fort Hunt Park and seeks the opportunity to relate its unique history to the greater public. However, the proposals presented on September 21, 2011 will drastically change the nature of the current park, and this I do not support.

For many years, Fort Hunt Park has served as a place for gathering, recreation and relaxation, not only for the immediate neighborhood, but for groups from the greater Washington, DC area, as well as visitors from outside the metro area. Those seeking a green space in which to picnic and recreate have found Fort Hunt Park an ideal location. The recreational value of the park should be preserved. I therefore do not agree with the proposal to remove ANY of the picnic pavilions currently located in the park. The pavilions are beautiful and utilized frequently. They are also fairly new, having been installed only within the last 6 years or so. Removal of the pavilions would be incredibly wasteful of taxpayer money, given that their installation also followed a lengthy design and construction process that has only been recently completed.

At the September 21 presentation, the reason given for removal of the pavilions was that the park was being "over utilized" during "peak periods", although no support material for this statement was presented.

Further questioning from the public lead one ranger to explain that his department felt it was spending too much time overseeing the pavilion permitting process, and therefore, it did not leave them enough time to devote to explaining the history of the park. This comment is offensive because 1) it minimizes the recreational nature of park, which many people value; 2) it indicates that the park rangers feel that proper administration of the park, that is, managing its facilities for the benefit of users, is of less importance than historical interpretation. From the ranger's comments, it seems obvious that he'd rather not spend his time managing picnic permits. Conveniently, by proposing the elimination of the picnic pavilions, he and his department would be free to spend their time performing work they prefer, i.e., historical interpretation.

If the issue is that permits are not applied for, or that the number of guests listed on the permit is exceeded by the actual number of guests who show up, I suggest the solution is enforcement of the permitting process and the permits as issued. If strong notices are posted stating that a violation of the rules will result in removal from the park or immediate forfeiture of the permit and this is strictly enforced for a meaningful period of time, then over utilization will be reduced. The Park Service might assign a non-ranger employee or volunteer to oversee the administrative component of the permitting process, and therefore free some of the park rangers' time. Park Service employees should do their jobs, not eliminate the parts of their jobs that are less enjoyable.

I like the idea of a visitor's center at the park; however, given current fiscal concerns, I believe interpretive signage along a trail in the park would be just as informative, as well as fiscally responsible. In the event a visitor's center is approved, locating the visitor's center at current Area C is preferable to Area B. Area B is too close to the houses along Fort Hunt Road, who may experience increased vehicle noise from visitors entering and exiting the visitor's center. Area C is more removed from houses in the neighborhood. Additionally, locating the visitor's center at Area C will draw visitors deeper into the park, so they may experience more of its beauty and character.

I applaud the concept of removing the current paved road between Picnic Areas D and E towards an effort to make the park more pedestrian friendly, and encourage people to exit their vehicles. I also support the separation of vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle traffic by the construction of a walk/bike path parallel to the road, for safety and aesthetic reasons. With respect to the proposed walking-bike trail, measures should be taken to prevent cyclists from traveling at excessive speed on the trail. Currently along the paved route through the park, there are some bike riders who present as much danger of injury to pedestrians as do vehicles!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park. My hope is that the recreational nature of the park enjoyed by so many, both residing within the neighborhood and from outside our area, can be preserved and enhanced, while at the same time additional opportunities to learn about Fort Hunt Park's unique history are afforded.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 30**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mary J. Mengenhauser
Organization: Potomac Valley Riverbend Civic Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8905 Camfield Dr. Alexandria VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: janemeng@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/27/2011 Date Received: 09/27/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

9/27/11

I have reviewed the Comparison of the Alternatives for the Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan. My choice is:

Alternative A - NO ACTION

I have come to this decision because there are other serious problems that the NPS should attend to prior to spending money on the Park.

For example:

Consider the invasive vines killing trees on Mount Vernon Parkway. The NPS is remiss in attending to this and the removal of dead branches on many trees. Also the lack of planting more "red bud" trees that at one time added to the beauty of the Parkway in the Spring.

Out of control speeding on the Mount Vernon Parkway with rare NPS police action.

Use of commercial vehicles on the Parkway with no action taken.

Life-threatening situations caused by bikers' use of the parkway. In spite of the TWO signs (there are just TWO signs) barring bikers, they are ignored by bikers and Park Police.

Fort Hunt Park and the Mount Vernon Parkway are adjacent to my neighborhood. I use them both. In better economic times the NPS could put some emphasis on the historic aspect of the park but not now, and certainly not per Alternatives B,C,& D. They are extremes. Reevaluate!

The NPS open meeting held on Sept,23 at Pavilion A in Fort Hunt Park was less than successful and the NPS representatives were not well prepared to answer questions.

Mary J Mengenhauser

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 31**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Lauren Cardillo
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/28/2011 Date Received: 09/28/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

While I applaud the NPS desire to develop Fort Hunt Park and highlight its military history, the reality is only Option A is acceptable to most of the residents who live near the park. Where is the option that has the least impact yet yields a visitor center? Where is the option that does not include a ridiculous use of our tax dollars? As noted in the NPS material, this park is used by many area residents. Ripping it up in such a drastic manner is not a good idea. We need another option, and not one that loses so much of the essence of the nature of the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 32

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/28/2011 Date Received: 09/28/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

RE: Proposed Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan

To Whom It May Concern:

The Fort Hunt Park issue does affect us, as we live right next door, and some of us consider this our back yard.

I am all for bringing this park into the limelight, publicizing all the historically significant trivia, and even building a visitor's center. I have come to this park, on a daily basis at times, for much of the past 39 years of my life. I have enjoyed the 'unveiling' of the forts, and listening to fascination of my children who explore them. What I do not welcome is a total upheaval of the park, doing away with pavilions (some that are brand new) or with any part of the road.

Go to the park in the early morning hours, any day of the week, and you will see walkers, runners, dog walkers, roller bladers, and bike riders, going around the loop again and again. It isn't boring, because the scene changes a little bit each time ? someone you've never met or haven't seen in a while, a fascinating bird or bug, the colors of leaves on the trees. Afternoons, evenings and weekends bring school field trips, reunions, picnics, dog walkers, Girl Scouts, and even zombies, to take their brief moment with nature. Many an up-and-coming driver has gotten his start circling the park, negotiating his way into a parking space. Many a new bicyclist has made his first strides without training wheels, without the danger of being in a suburban street. Spring and summer weekends bring loads of people to the park, which should be a good thing. I thought that the new pavilions were built because that space was in such demand on

weekend days.

What our Park Service needs to do is to look at the job specifications and the division of duties. We need those who will care for and ride the horses; those who monitor the traffic (and slow the speeders!!); and eventually those who would lead groups through a visitor's center and other areas of the park. We also need an administrative person to keep the calendar, scheduling the events using the pavilion areas, and scheduling groups for tours. This person could also manage the financial aspects and be responsible for instructing the groups on rules and responsibilities.

We can make this park an even better place without spending so many federal dollars. The police center that exists on the property is likely in need of an upgrade. The 'house' that stands near the entrance gate needs to be used or removed. I would then suggest a temporary facility to road test the visitor's center, placed near the park entrance.

We can keep moving forward without damaging the integrity of the park that already exists. In this day when the economy is suffering so greatly, we look more toward those activities that are free to us. In such an electronic age, we welcome those times that we can spend face to face with family and friends, sharing a meal, some fresh air, and physical activity. We need to spend less federal money on unnecessary changes to a park that is not broken.

If forced to choose one of the four proposed scenarios, I would go with option A ? do nothing. I am not opposed to change, but I am opposed to the changes suggested in the other three scenarios.

Thank you for your consideration.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 33**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Edward C. Muckerman
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1008 DEWOLFE DR
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: gmacked@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/28/2011 Date Received: 09/28/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Department of the Interior has done an excellent job in reaching out to the citizens of the surrounding communities to keep them apprised of the options and potential impacts that could happen at Fort Hunt Park. I know that whatever option is chosen, it will be done with the greatest taste and lowest impact to the community.

I have always admired the work that the Park service does to maintain the park and the George Washington Parkway. The alternative that appeals to me is Option B.

The one comment that I would have is to somehow get the river front area developed with volunteers to help clean up the thousands of bottles and cans that wash up there.

I would be a volunteer to help coordinate that effort.

Thanks and keep up the great job - Department of Interior!

I am a past President of the Waynewood Citizens Association and Waynewood Recreation Association and I would be happy to help you all in your outreach efforts.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 34

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/28/2011 Date Received: 09/28/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I appreciate the desire to continuously improve the NPS facilities. The goals are laudatory. I am curious that there doesn't seem to be a review of costs. We should be understanding costs as we evaluate the alternatives. Particularly in the current budget situation, I really have to question expending the funds for this study, let alone significant upgrades to the park. I imagine many people would like to see improvements to the route one corridor with their tax dollars before improvements to the park.

I favor the do the least option.

- I am concerned that the bike/pedestrian routes will not be wide enough to take all the traffic. The one lane, low MPH limit, single direction is very pleasant for recreational use. The pedestrian lane along the parkway is dangerous on the weekends when the large variety of users are all on an 8' path at the same time. keep the road.

- The natural feel of the park is perfect the way it is.

- we don't need a fancy entrance way.

- we don't need a fancy visitor center at this time; an interpretative trail would suffice

- if you insist on not letting bicycles on the parkway, use the money to improve the path so it is less dangerous with all the weekend usage. Make it wider to accommodate the runners, roller bladers, families on bikes, walkers, strollers, and dogs.

I understand there is a use or lose it mentality with federal funding and NPS has a window to get and use funds that may not come again in a long time. This approach to budgeting has to change, and the change has to start somewhere. Let it start here and put funds to the highest priority in the Mount Vernon area.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 35**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please don't change Fort Hunt Park and choose alternative A! Why mess up a good thing?!?!

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 36**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I opt for Alternative A or Alternative B. If anything, I would advocate for more park police presence and keep the park as is.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 37

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

While maintaining or increasing focus on the historical value of Ft. Hunt Park, please do not detract from the natural beauty and peacefulness of the park. I am not opposed to removing pavilions and structures, but it would be nice if there were still places people could go to picnic or cook out.

At first I was opposed to the thought of removing all the pavilions, but the more I thought about what it is that I like about the park, I realized it's the solitude the park offers, which is often lacking on a weekend when large groups of 100 or more people are gathered at any number of pavilions. And then there's the trash that is inevitably left behind.

I like the current mixed usage of the roadway, where cars are secondary to strollers, walkers, bikers, and joggers. A visitor's center should be near the entrance of the park, and the remainder of the park should be left "as is" for everyone to enjoy the natural beauty and openness of the park.

thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 38

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposals to change Fort Hunt Park. Like many others, in the neighborhoods surrounding the park, I have serious concerns about the possibility of doing more harm than good. I understand that it is a national, not a state or local, facility, which does not exist only to serve those in the immediate area. However, it seems that a few relatively simple changes could be made to enhance the historical and informative aspects without destroying any of the aspects that daily serve so many of us (of all ages) who take advantage of its unique features. For example, removing well-used pavilions that were recently constructed can easily be interpreted as an unreasonable proposal put forward by faceless federal bureaucrats with little real world understanding of the subject. (Either they shouldn't have been built in the first place or they shouldn't be torn down now. Either way, it is difficult to have confidence in the process.) As a former government employee, I do not condone bureaucrat bashing, but neither do I enjoy the throwing out of "red meat" for those who do. Please have someone give serious thought (with the assistance of those who use the park) to a common sense program of providing an interpretation facility (perhaps using the currently unused house) and making other minimally invasive changes that will result in serving all those who use or might use this wonderful resource.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 39

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: SELF
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As an historian by training, I am more conscious than many people of the importance of historical interpretation. Nevertheless, I oppose any of the listed plans which change the current status of Fort Hunt Park.

I fail to see how creating changes aimed at historical interpretation can impact peak usage of the park except negatively by taking away usage space for additional structures.

I cannot conceive other than that the statement that there is a public demand for an interpretative center at Fort Hunt Park is anything but gas and wind on the part of the NPS planners.

There should not be any monies spent on a Park which is fine as it is.

The less-visited parts of the park provide an excellent buffer between the park and the homes on Charles Augustine Drive and on Battery Road which abut the Fort Hunt Park. Moreover, those same areas are habitate for, among other animals, deer, red foxes, and grey foxes.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 40

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Joseph D. Ludovici
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1143 Greenway Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: joeandsam@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Upon review of the document, I find that you did not sufficiently address the cultural and socio-economic impacts to the environment. The surrounding community is the environment which this park resides, and the enjoyment by all citizens was not sufficiently addressed.

I think there are better options for the visitors center. Rather than a visitors center in a building, recommend a series of interpretive sites accessible from the current parking lots and future bike/pedestrian trail around the park. Keep the low impact goals that you are striving for, and get the visitors out into the park like it is designed to support.

I question the assessment of the use of the park, and do not believe that alternative means to control the use of the park were considered. I think the picnic pavilions are only available for reservation from Memorial Day to Labor Day. There must be ways to limit the use further, and limit the size of the party and number of vehicles, in lieu of demolishing all of the pavilions. Limit vendors, the inflatable party toys, volume of music/speakers, etc.

I support the separate path for pedestrians and bicycles, but you should retain the full loop road to allow visitors to enjoy the park from the vehicle.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 41

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: National Parks Conservation Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a long time supporter and frequent visitor of the National Parks and member of the National Parks Conservation Association. Based upon the research that the National Park Service (NPS) has performed that has uncovered the inspiring story and highly educational sotry of P.O. Box 1142, the top secret military installation that existed at Fort Hunt Park in World War II, as well as the other important historic activities at the site in the earlier part of the 20th century, I believe that it is key that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park to tell these stories and display the artifacts that have been and will continue to be collected. Such a center is a key part of the three action alternatives in the proposed Site Development Plan (SDP). The center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control and fire protection and provide sufficient security for the collections. Room should also be allotted for an auditorium to show videos on the cultural resources of the park. Also the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. However, if it is possible, at least two picnic pavilions should be retained for the near future at Fort Hunt Park in the final SDP to commemorate that part of the park's history. Small groups of picnic tables should also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups can have picnics, play in the park and also learn about the site's important history. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 42

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a former resident of Potomac Valley River Bend neighborhood immediately adjacent to Fort Hunt Park, and my children spent many wonderful hours there. We moved away, but we visit the area frequently, staying with friends, and I was here today, and ran three miles in the park as I have done many, many times in the past. As a family picnic and playground area, a place for sports and outings, it was a wonderful place, and a HUGE benefit to my family, and to our many friends and neighbors. I see the present plan as a big over-reach, as I see no reason at all why there cannot continue to be space for picnicking, sports and walking/ jogging/biking along with a modest increase in the attention to the park history. I do not see this history competing in a major way with the many historical and important landmarks in the Washington area - an interesting history, yes, but no reason to steal a true gem of a park fro the public. As many have noted, this should NOT be a priority for development by the Park Service - in an era of major budget shortfalls, removing space from public enjoyment should NOT be a priority, especially for such modest historical reasons. Please keep this park for public enjoyment, in much the form it currently has. Changes for enhancing historical presentation should be modest and incremental.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 43**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Hector A. Negroni
Organization: Circulo de Puerto Rico
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2003 Annies Way
Vienna, VA 22182
USA
E-mail: hanegroni@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Circulo de Puerto Rico, Inc is a civic group located in Northern Virginia and Southern Maryland founded in 1946. Our organization holds at least two family picnics every year at Fort Hunt. We would be severely affected if our use were to be restricted.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 44

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bert Knitter
Organization: National Association for Health Fitness
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1803 Trenton Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: byubert@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

TO: The National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior
FROM: Bert Knitter
SUBJECT: Fort Hunt Site Development Plan

I am writing as a frequent user of Fort Hunt Park in Alexandria, Virginia (hereafter referred to as "the Park") to express my concerns regarding any proposed changes to this facility. Hundreds of local residents as well as visitors from outside of the area enjoy the Park daily and are extremely grateful to have such an outstanding community asset. Most of us like it just the way it is and request that more consideration be given to any proposed changes. Especially since these plans will cost tax payers millions of dollars.

Additionally I wish to express my disappointment with the Public Meeting conducted on September 21 regarding the Park Site Development Plan. The National Park Service (hereafter referred to as "NPS") officials in charge of this meeting appeared to be disinterested and unprepared.

The impression these NPS officials gave to many of the community residents attending this public forum was that it was simply a check the box meeting and was not designed to either inform the public of the planned renovations or designed to get any public input regarding the various alternatives proposed by NPS.

Lending credence to this impression was the fact that NPS officials acknowledged that absolutely no

attempt was made to inform the hundreds of individuals who use the Park on a daily basis of this meeting. This action could have easily been accomplished by placing signage at conspicuous locations in the Park where regular users would see these notices a week or two prior to the event. Since there is only one Park entrance this task could have easily been accomplished.

Further, (according to those present) NPS officials also took no action to inform elected officials or members of the media of this meeting. Those representing elected officials who were present stated that they were informed of the meeting by concerned constituents and the local media was conspicuously absent with the noted exception of Ed Simmons, Jr.

While this public meeting was scheduled to be conducted from 6:00 to 8:00 PM, it started late and ended early, thus shortcutting the public's access to learn about this Site Development Plan from NPS officials. In fact the meeting didn't start until 6:20 PM because one of the presenters ("JJ") was late due to traffic problems. This was interesting because at least 50 citizens arrived ready to participate by 6:00 PM without any difficulty. Not only did the meeting start late it also ended early when Community Planner Thomas Sheffer decided to break up the group form - which was working well and generating very productive dialogue - into smaller discussion groups. This action was independently taken by Mr. Sheffer despite the objection of at least four individuals in the audience who spoke for the majority of those present. These individuals suggested that in the large group format one person could raise a concern shared by many and that the issue could be addressed for all to hear. Mr. Sheffer was totally unreceptive to these repeated suggestions and decided to abruptly stop addressing the group. He said we would have to break up into small groups rather than one large one if we wanted to discuss this matter further. The net effect of this action was to cut off discussion entirely and most people who had gathered for the meeting simply left. This was just after 7:30 PM. So the scheduled 2 hr meeting in actuality only ran 1 hr.

Prior to the disbanding of the public forum one of the more articulate individuals in the audience stated that the NPS was missing a great opportunity to get input from those gathered. I agree with him 100% as did most of those present from the applause he received for his comment.

The local residents who were present represented the various daily user groups of the Park: dog walkers, cyclists, rollerblades, joggers and walkers. Unrepresented were the children in day care who often use the playground areas, bird watchers, high school athletes who run in the Park or the parents who regularly bring their children to the Park in strollers or on bicycles, tricycles or scooters. The consensus view of those present was that the existing roadways should not be removed or reduced in width. Many expressed concerns that Fort Hunt Park is the only local area where these various constituencies listed above can mutually coexist. All agreed that the Mt. Vernon Trail (only 9 ft wide) is too narrow to allow for joint usage and ends up pitting cyclists, walkers, and runners etc. against each other.

At this point "JJ" addressed the group and said that no plans were being made to remove existing roadways even though as one audience member pointed out to him that 3 of the 4 alternatives listed call for the removal of from 4,300 to 56,700 sq ft of paved surfacing.

During the Power Point portion of Mr. Sheffer's presentation his lack of presentation revealed itself. While he showed slides of maps depicting how the Park would look following the implementation of Alternatives B through D, he did not share with those present the advantages or disadvantages of any of these options although he was asked to do so repeatedly by those in the audience. Additionally when a member of the audience asked Thomas Sheffer how many people currently use the park on a daily basis he indicated that NPS did not know. In other words a major planning effort has been undertaken without even knowing current regular usage patterns of the Park. This seems to be an extremely unusual course of action and is directly contrary to any planning concepts with which I am familiar.

You should also know that while there were at least 10 uniformed NPS employees present at this event none were acting in a note taking capacity. Instead meeting participants were told that if they wanted their views heard they would have to put them in writing and send them via e-mail or letter to NPS. Thus, another opportunity was missed by NPS to show its interest in input from the general public. There was no reason why one or more of these employees (who basically stood around the periphery of the group the entire meeting) couldn't have jotted down the excellent suggestions made by attendees Better yet they could have jotted them down on a blackboard or poster board for all to see. This facilitator capacity would have demonstrated clearly that NPS was generally interested in input to this proposed project. The fact that the aforementioned actions were not taken reinforced the impression on many in the audience that NPS had already selected a course of action and that it was a done deal. One audience member pointed out that this apparently appeared to be the case as that the Alternative Comparison List handout listed Alternative C. was noted as the "preferred alternative."

One individual in the audience suggested another "Alternative E" a plan to keep the park as is and build an Interpretive Center. Unfortunately Mr. Sheffer did not acknowledge this suggestion or even give this individual the decency of a response. Upon review it will be found that the course of action presented in this idea would accomplish most of the goals expressed by NPS in Alternatives B ?D and seems to have substantial merit. It should be added to the Comparison of Alternatives handout.

Representatives of the Citizen Associations from communities that surround the Park were conspicuous in the audience. They represent thousands of local residents who have a stake in the Park. NPS owes these citizens a chance to show up in full force at a future public meeting and hear an informed presentation on each of the existing Alternative's and "Alternative E" and with the pros and cons of each plan as well as the proposed cost. Taking the time to hold one more Public Meeting prior to any decision will be a positive step in the right direction. Additionally prior to this event NPS should make a concerted effort to notify regular park users as well as members of the media and elected officials.

In this time of fiscal constraint one questions why demolishing existing structures (especially restrooms) and removing paved surfaces is even being contemplated. It should be noted that of the 4 options presented at this hearing, only "Option A ? No Action" can be implemented with no additional taxpayer funding. Although the NPS officials making the presentation readily admitted to the group that none of the Alternative plans had been "coasted out", it is obvious from the scope of work listed in these proposals that millions of tax payer's dollars would be required to bring them to fruition. The fact that the various options did not have costs associated with them was bewildering to many in the audience. Who in today's economy contemplates an expenditure of funds without "costing out" the proposed plan? Also, how can the various options be intelligently compare to each other when the costs of competing plans aren't identified?

Many in the group expressed concern that the large two-lane roadways currently in existence were to be removed (56,700 sq ft) and replaced by narrow (9') wide paths in some of the options presented. Such a move would make it impossible for the various current Park user groups to coexist (as previously mentioned above). NPS seems to have ignored an obvious solution that is used in parks across the country. That is to install vertical poles 3 to 4 feet in height at 3 to 4 foot intervals across the existing roadways to prevent vehicular traffic while allowing pedestrians cyclists rollerbladers etc. to utilize the road way. Many times these posts have locking mechanisms which allow them to be removed by Park maintenance staff as needed. This approach is extremely cost effective and accomplishes the same objectives presented in these Alternatives.

Also removing rest rooms ? the one Park asset that could conceivably be used by all park visitors - makes absolutely no sense at all, especially if the Alternative plans are being proposed to increase park usage.

Some present at the meeting expressed the fear that the demolition phase of some plans may be accomplished and then no funding would be available for constructing the proposed Bicycle/Pedestrian trails. The net result of course would be to diminish the usage capabilities of the Park.

As the meeting progressed it was revealed by NPS officials that the primary incident in the development of the Site Development Plan was the overuse of the park by picnic groups on the weekends during the summer. These large groups NPS officials suggest have a negative impact on the park in that they overcrowd existing facilities especially restrooms which rapidly and frequently run out of expendable supplies. While the NPS proposed solution is to control the number of individuals using the park by tearing down some of the existing pavilions - other commonsense alternatives exist.

One of these would be to limit Park usage through a more stringent permit issuance and enforcement process. Such a plan might limit reservations to only one pavilion on the weekends. One of the NPS officials present stated that individuals filling out permit requests deliberately understated the amount of people that would be present at the event so as to save money on the usage fee. One solution to this problem would be to issue tickets to the group and then have an NPS representative (perhaps a summer intern) present at the event to collect the tickets. Those arriving without a ticket could be charged a usage fee or told that they could not attend the event.

In terms of the impact on the restrooms large events customarily use Porta Potties to ease the impact on limited fixed facilities. Once again the cost of providing these Porta Potties would be passed on to the user group via an increased usage fee. Another solution would be to collect additional monies and have a staff member available to restock and resupply the restroom facilities as needed. This approach is commonly used for community teams (such as basketball leagues) that utilize school facilities and is a widely accepted cost of doing business.

Since revenue generation was never expressed as a reason for any of the Alternative plans a lower than normal intake of money for pavilion use would not be a consideration. Further the millions of dollars that would be required to tear down existing pavilions would be saved.

In terms of the Interpretive Center several cost-effective alternatives exist. Signage (such as that on Civil War battlefields) could be placed at historically significant sites within the Park without necessitating the removal of existing buildings. These signs could be used for both Park guided tours and self-guided tours.

In summary, from the public input given at the September 21 meeting it appears that the existing Alternative plans require further consideration especially from a cost standpoint. It is also clear that other low-cost options exist to accomplish the same objectives expressed in the various plans. I urge NPS to consider the ideas suggested herein and to extend the deadline for action on this project until another Public Meeting can be held.

Sincerely,

Bert Knitter, Concerned Regular Park User

byubert@cox.net

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 45

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: National Parks Conservation Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a long time supporter on the National Parks and the National Parks Conservation Association. Based upon the research that the National Park Service (NPS) has performed that has revealed the engrossing and inspiring story of P.O. Box 1142, the top secret military installation that existed at Fort Hunt Park in World War II, as well as the other important historic activities at the site in the earlier part of the 20th century, I believe that it is critical that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park to tell these stories and display the artifacts that have been and will continue to be collected. The center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control and fire protection and provide sufficient security for the collections. Also the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System was not designed just for picnicking and urban recreation. However, if it is possible at least two picnic pavilions should be retained for the near future at Fort Hunt Park to commemorate that part of the park's history. Small groups of picnic tables should also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups can have picnics, play in the park and also learn about the site's important history. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception.
Fort Hunt Park belongs not only to the nearby residents and current users, but to the Nation as well.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 46

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have reviewed the document from NPS highlighting the various options for alternatives to the current use of Fort Hunt Park, a place I go every day to walk my dog. Upon hearing of the plan to change a park I use and love, I immediately thought that that they might be trying to encourage more use of the park since I rarely see people at the pavillions except for major holidays. It's always pretty quiet over there, but I do like it that way. I was surprised to hear from folks that the preferred plan is to do away with pavillions and ball parks as they produced too much trash and rubbish and took rangers away from more cultural interpretive objectives related to education.

While it is important to treasure and protect our parks they also serve an important purpose--to give folks a place to gather together outside to celebrate holidays and other events. Removing the pavillions, which are fairly new and must have cost a significant amount, seems to send the message to people to stay away, a message that the parks are for the past and not the present.

The visitor center sounds interesting but I think that numbered plaques placed strategically around the park could serve just as well and people could take self guided tours. It is not necessary to spend the money for a visitors center at Fort Hunt Park.

Regarding the roads and paths I think that the current road is good in that it is one way only. I actually think that two way traffic should end at parking lot "A and not extend all the way to B. It's nice to have the width so that dog walkers, bikers and cars can all use it and pass where necessary. If a trail were built it might be so narrow that I could not walk my dog comfortably--the reason I avoid the bike trail along the parkway.

I understand that the other facilities such as the stables need upgrades and I support that but I think that the park is fine the way it is and am recommending NO ACTION both because I have no real complaints about the existing park and because I cannot justify spending taxpayer dollars to make these changes.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 47

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Allan M. Dickson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8813 Camfield Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308-2817
USA
E-mail: a.dickson@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have walked with my dog in the park/woods four miles per day for years. We like the park just as it is. All of the ball fields, picnic areas, and roads should be retained just as they are. The restrooms and the picnic area pavilions should be improved, however.

I think that a new visitor center with historical information would be a good idea.

An enclosed area for dogs to run in would be nice (maybe in the back loop).

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 48**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Martin J. Skopp
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8408 Morey Lane
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: ironchiro@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

This park should remain available for local use. I enjoy cycling, spending time with family, going to local events at Fort Hunt Park. Do not take away local community use.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 49

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

We appreciate the fact that the NPS has provided easy access for the public to the study document for Fort Hunt Park and has extended the comment period.

I take no issue with the mechanics of the study itself, which seems to be a comprehensive job. One could probably propose additional nuanced alternatives, but those presented appear to address what the NPS identified as its major concerns.

Frankly, I don't see much merit in those concerns. The park's so-called overuse does not seem to be doing any appreciable harm and could indeed be viewed as a success. So thousands of people picnic at FHP and have a good time. This is cause for alarm? I don't think so.

No doubt the rundown maintenance facility at FHP and perhaps the drainage could and should be improved with some additional modest investment. Beyond that, however, the need for the expenditures proposed in Alternatives B, C and D is not convincing. Given the budget problems of the NPS, I am surprised that this study was even done and I can't imagine that the prospects for funding a major makeover of FHP are anything but remote. In fact, given the well known maintenance backlogs in the National Parks System, I truly hope that the prospects are nil. I say that as a lifelong fan of the NPS and proponent of its mission.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 50

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Frederick B. Hewitt
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: BartHewitt@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I live a few miles from Fort Hunt Park. I use it at least four or five times per week. Most times I ride to it on my bike down the GW Parkway path and into the park. Once in the park, I typically ride several loops around the car/walking road.

I have observed the following:

1. The pavilions are used to some extent, but not enough to warrant keeping all of them. I would keep two maximum - the main one near the entrance, and one of the heavily wooded ones toward the back of the park.
2. As another alternative, why not keep just the one main pavilion near the entrance, but expand it somewhat so that it could accommodate two groups. This would be a relatively cheap solution. This one also has the rest rooms, which is an added MUST.
3. I have rarely seen the ballfields used for actual ball games. Occasionally I see a few people playing bat-and-catch, but not often. Less often do I ever see large groups using the fields. But again, why not keep just one ball field, the one closest to the main pavilion?
4. I enthusiastically support upgrading the historical information provided in the park. This could also be done in a single location near the one pavilion.

5. Expanding/improving the hiking trails is a great idea.

The park is a wonderful resource. Thanks millions for all you do to make it a fine resource for everyone.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 51

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have reviewed the Fort Hunt Development Plan. I am opposed to closing all 4 picnic pavilions, and also opposed to closing the road around the park. I am not opposed to building a visitor's center and trail. I would like to see two-way traffic between the first two picnic areas, and some additional parking spaces to help during busy times.

I am a Mount Vernon resident and my family and I have used the park for many years. I ride my bike through the park most weeks in the spring and summer. I feel that the park should support the people first, and history buffs second. History is important, but we need to balance history with the fact that there are few family recreation areas in the locality with facilities comparing to Fort Hunt park.

Removing all 4 pavilions and closing the loop road would make it difficult for families, walkers, and bikers to enjoy the park, and cut down on utilization. The Park service should be looking for ways to increase utilization to maximize the value of the Fort Hunt investment instead of restricting utilization and increasing the average cost to maintain per visitor.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 52

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/30/2011 Date Received: 09/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Fort Hunt Park is enjoyed by many visitors, especially because of the picnic pavilions. By removing these pavilions, the number of visitors and their enjoyment of the park, would be significantly reduced. This impact was not considered in the written assessment.

The minor improvements to cultural heritage by the visitor's and interpretive center would be enjoyed by far fewer visitors. While this might be more convenient for the park staff to manage, it would not fulfill the purposes of the NPS to promote enjoyment of the parks while preserving them.

If the NPS were to install picnic pavilions in other park facilities in the GWPS, it would ease their heavy use at Fort Hunt Park which would allow the cultural improvements to Fort Hunt Park to proceed while continuing the same level of service to park visitors.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 53

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Mark LaPierre
Organization: American Society of Landscape Architects
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1814 DRURY LANE
Alexandria VA 22307
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22307-1914
USA
E-mail: mxlapierre@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a weekly visitor and facility user at Ft Hunt Park. I support the development of passive interpretive displays and access to historic elements of the grounds. I support shared use of the existing roads for auto, bicycling, and pedestrian use. I support reopening of the currently closed road circuit. I support retention and renovation/upgrading to the public restroom facilities; preferably as they are currently located instead of one centralized facility. I support the presence of pets, namely dogs. I support the introduction of an off-leash dog area that is open for interaction and play, including mown lawn fields and woodlands. I do not support the introduction of a small fenced-in sod-less enclosure for that purpose. I support retention of the newly constructed picnic pavilions, and the retention of open play fields that may be used for ball games, soccer, and any other form of field activity. I do not support the loss of any existing facilities in the interest of replacing them with an interpretive walk or pathway system. I support the use of the existing wood frame residential house as a visitor center. I support the repair and maintenance of the existing woodland paths, without further expansion or disruption of the woodlands. I do not support the removal of existing roads or the interruption of the roadway loop as a shared use. I do not support the creation of a new perimeter pedestrian/bike path that would interfere with neighboring land uses, and thus promote conflicts between neighboring residents and park users. I support the park rangers being less aggressive in their patrolling of the park and their intimidation of dog owners. I do not support the development of the park as an outlet for park ranger interpretation activities and further advancing their police-like tactics. I support the use of the park as a public national resource located within an established, historic residential community; one that does not need to become a national public

attraction just because it is owned by the federal government. This is a community-oriented facility that should recognize its historic basis and should celebrate that legacy without harm to daily users who are not only its primary visitor/user group, but also its greatest protector, whether the park service wishes to acknowledge that fact or not. Any overpowering change to the park will result in a negative backlash from a surprisingly diverse user population that has been dedicated to the continuity of the park for many generations. This park should be enhanced for its current uses, and not become a theme park opportunity for bureaucratic national interests.

Therefore, I do not support any of the proposed Alternatives, and I am aggressively opposed to the preferred alternative. Any successful new plan must be responsive to sustaining passive non ranger-related activities, multiple uses, dogs, ball fields, and all other forms of active uses, and not be focused on the mummification of the site as an archaeological, ranger-oriented, theme park. I believe the historic, environmental, and cultural interests of the park service, and its need to perform its duty as stewards of the land, can be pursued in a more thoughtful, balanced, open-minded approach without harm to eagle habitats, historic artifacts, neighborhood and community resident users, ball players, kite fliers, dog walkers, bicyclists, and picnickers; while continuing to preserve and enhance our national population's linkage to their cultural heritage and greater understanding of our heritage as it exists within this unique site.

Mark X. LaPierre, ASLA

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 54

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Good Afternoon:

First I would like to say that the public meeting held in Fort Hunt Park on 21 September was a very well kept secret. I glad to see that the comment period has been extended until 5 November.

Second, I would like to say that the plan as presented is less than adequate and not very well thought out. Its most basic flaw is that it ignores people, which is problematic when it comes to parks.

Third, I do not like the idea of having my tax dollars used to demolish picnic pavilions which were built using tax dollars. While I have never used the park to picnic, it is always busy in season and what it the world is wrong with that?

Fourth, I don't use the athletic fields, but a number of people do, and I see no reason they should not continue to be able to enjoy using them.

Finally, Fort Hunt Park doesn't need to be "interpreted." If anyone in the Park Service had a clue they would look across the river at Ft. Washington, which is an amazing example of the development of fortifications from the Revolution until today, as a site that could be interpreted.

Instead we're going to interpret a bulldozed POW camp on which two of the pavilions now stand as a justification for their removal? Should we rebuilt the temporary barracks that housed the prisoners?

My point is that this is an ill-conceived "development plan" presented at a time when wasting money the Park Service doesn't have compounds its folly.

Superintendent James appealed to residents to submit their comments in writing. I would appeal to Superintendent Jones to put this plan where it belongs: in the circular file.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 55

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a graduate of Woodlawn Elementary School, Walt Whitman Middle School and Mt. Vernon High School, I can recall having class picnics at many of the pavilion areas within Ft. Hunt park. As a graduate of the class of 1995, we held our ten year reunion at Ft. Hunt park. My family and I also hold an annual picnic at the park, where old friends and neighbors from our childhood travel from as far away as Colorado and Pennsylvania to attend. I find any proposal to reduce the number of picnic pavilions and gathering areas to be completely unacceptable, and I doubt that I am alone in this sentiment. I would prefer that no changes be made to the park at al. Even if the pavilions were underutilized, I would be against changing it, but to complain that the park is overused is absurd. It would seem to me that the park is not lacking in popularity in its current form, and that alone should be enough evidence to scuttle any plans to change it in any way.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 56

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I believe the Ft. Hunt Park Site Development Plan is flawed. It identifies as a major reason of the need for action the fact that current use periodically exceeds the park's carrying capacity. It then justifies its proposed action by its desire to meet an increased demand for an additional activity.

We know that NPS funds and personnel are severely stretched and that future government funding is unlikely to improve the situation. If the closing of one or two of the picnic pavilions and adjacent parking areas is needed to decrease use in peak periods in order to balance maintenance requirements and capabilities, it may, unfortunately, be necessary. But realigning roads, cutting new roadways or bike trails through the woods, and building (& staffing and maintaining) a visitor center, in order to accommodate an additional task isn't sensible.

The interests and preferences of potential park users may differ. There may be difficult choices to make in balancing them. However, the very interesting story of Ft. Hunt can be told by an interpretive trail on site and more extensive text, photos, diagrams, etc online. History buffs can be reached at their computers; picnickers, ball players, bicyclists, walkers, bird watchers, and nature lovers are the ones whose interest in Ft. Hunt Park should be considered paramount.

In short, I would vote for Plan B minus the new visitor facility and with Picnic Pavilion B and adjacent ball field not removed.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 57

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bernard A. LUBRAN
Organization: FRIENDS OF CAMP RITCHIE
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1 McCormick Court
Rockville, MD 20850-3069
USA
E-mail: bernielubran@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My late Father, Walter Lubran, was stationed at Camp Ritchie, Maryland, from February 1944 to September 1944. During his stay at the Military Intelligence Training Center at Camp Ritchie, he as trained in techniques for interrogating German Prisoners of War. During the time that he was at Camp Ritchie, me was sent to Fort Hunt for approximately 4 weeks in mid-1944. I don't know what he did there as it was classified as top secret and he never mentioned it while he was alive (he passed away in 2000).

The only way I know that he was there was because I had found a shoe box with hundreds of letters and v-mail that my late Mother saved during my Father's service from 1943 through January 1946. Among them were several that had the return address of PO Box 1142.

I became aware of Fort Hunt after an article about a reunion of veterans of PO Box 1142 appeared in the Washington Post a few years ago. I have done some research since then and found that little has been written about this top-secret military facility. One of the few articles that I've found was a Congressional Resolution published in October 2007 that describes the incredibly important work conducted there and the contributions that the veterans who worked there made.

Fort Hunt played a small but valuable role in the military's effort to gather intelligence about the activities and plans of our enemies to continue to wage war against the United States and its allies. I feel strongly that our nation should preserve and remember

I am a volunteer working with veterans who attended Camp Ritchie and the Military Intelligence Training Center during World War II. While that story is also little known, there are a number of surviving veterans who have been continuing to tell the stories of their training and important accomplishments during WWII.

* A documentary film was made in approximately 2005 about Camp Ritchie by a German filmmaker that tells a moving story about a handful of these veterans. Nothing comparable to that exists about Fort Hunt. Why can't that story be told through exhibits at a facility to be created at the site of the former Fort Hunt?

* A museum in Farmington Hills, Michigan is currently staging an exhibition on the veterans who attended Camp Ritchie that will travel around the United States and tell their story. Where will the story of Fort Hunt be told if not through some type of permanent exhibition?

* Many of the physical facilities of Camp Ritchie are still intact and the current owner of the property has promised to create space where memorabilia and documents about Camp Ritchie can be put on public display. If there is no facility at Fort Hunt, how will people know about its history during WWII.

Are we to let the lessons learned at Fort Hunt disappear into oblivion? Are the contributions of the men and women who labored there to be forgotten? Will future soldiers not want to study the interrogation techniques that were developed and practiced there to avoid costly intelligence errors or failures? At a day and age when we have a privately-owned Spy Museum that tells incredible stories about famous Americans and the valuable work they did in War time and Peace time to help keep our people safe and our nation free, why can't we have a publicly funded museum to tell the public the details of this missing story.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 58

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Kimberly V. Larkin
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8721 Waterford Road
Alexandria, VA
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: turtlelarkin@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/01/2011 Date Received: 10/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The outcome of this EA appears to be predetermined, and feasible alternatives set aside without the use citizens input. It states the park is overused and the fear of historic features being degraded from the use is why this is proposed. The historic batteries are more prone to being overtaken by the invasive species that surround them. No evidence of overuse is presented, no numbers of park visitors, and no maintenance issues noted. Additionally, the scoping was severely lacking with no citizens groups to comment on the alternatives, and no notice to the Mount Vernon Civic Association. Perhaps more coordination would lead to a better understanding of purpose. And better alternatives.

These pavilions and ballfields are a necessity for visitors from around the area and globe. Visitors from Mount Vernon stop here to picnic, the community uses these facilities, and families hold reunions. These are not only affordable for large families, but their loss could adversely affect minority and low income families also not addressed in the EA. Their destruction is a crime, and is highly objectionable. Given the distance of pavilions D & E from the historic resources that this EA wants to protect, as well as the two nearby ballfields, there does not appear to be sufficient evidence to support their destruction.

The best place for a visitors center is near the front of the park where the rangers can keep an eye on the resources. Cars will stop there, and kids will continue to climb on the batteries as long as there is no pedestrian controls. Nowhere in this EA was there a mention of fencing, security lights, or pedestrian access controls. I know for certain these have not been implemented up to this point, so again no

evidence these measures will not work.

Given the state of the economy other feasible options to sheer destruction should be reviewed and analyzed fully. Additionally, a citizens group should be created to review the true purpose and need of this project to provide better alternatives for all.

Given the lack of reasonable alternatives I select the no build until more alternatives and community involvement (including minority and low income users) is incorporated into the alternatives.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 59

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Andree C. Dumermuth/Madison
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8719 Mt Vernon Hwy; Alexandria VA 22309
Alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: andree@arrisinc.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It is wonderful that the Park Service is planning on opening an interpretative center at the Ft. Hunt park site, in which the park's history - including Indian settlement activity and the WW2 POW-intelligence gathering activities - will be "brought to life" for visitors. I do not think this is mutually exclusive with the need to take out most of the existing picnic-facilities. These picnic areas bring more - and more DIFFERENT kinds - of people to the park than might normally even consider coming to a park that (under current NPS proposals) would ONLY be a park essentially for devoted "history buffs".

I know for a fact that area Cub Scout and Boy Scout troops use that park's picnic facilities regularly - in activities ranging from scouting "field days" to Eagle Scout ceremonies. Other frequent users include family reunions/celebrations; church and corporate groups; state societies (e.g., Louisiana State Society); as well as class reunions and graduation groups (from kindergarten to college). As far as I know, picnickers have been for the most part respectful of the park's rules and property. Picnic-facility users represent people of ALL ages and ALL socioeconomic backgrounds. This is a GREAT way to ensure that the park's history and amenities are made available to the broadest possible audience; as such, the picnic facilities can be seen as a rather effective "loss leader" for the Park - bringing in many people who may otherwise never know of its remarkable history and lovely setting. It should not be too difficult to combine some interpretation of the Indian settlement and POW activities with the existant picnic facilities - especially since there are currently no existing (remaining) structures from these time periods.

Finally, this park has become a regional fixture. It represents for many people the one big wide-open,

green space in which people can congregate joyfully, safely, and rather freely. Please keep all of the park's picnic facilities open AND please put up as many interpretative signs and information around these sites as necessary to inform all the people who attend various events there of its unique and very interesting history. Ft. Hunt Park can become a benchmark for other National Park sites that feature a unique history -effectively combining the needs of the living with the great and important need to preserve and elucidate what is significant and interesting from our past.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 60

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Stratford on the Potomac Community Assn.
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

None of the alternatives proposed or rejected include the most obvious solution to the problem of developing the cultural and historical resources in the park. That obvious and most cost effective solution is to make minimal changes to the recreation facilities, add the historical interpretive trail, and realign the entrance. The concerns stated about overuse of the restroom and parking facilities in the park is discounted by the fact that all of the alternatives except the "do nothing" alternative remove restroom and parking facilities from the park. The clear message is that the NPS wants fewer people to use this park. Based on my decade of experience walking and cycling through the park, I've never seen the parking areas full or all the picnic pavilions used at the same time, so the claim that the facilities are overused seems overstated. Does the NPS have usage data to back this assertion up? I agree the current entrance alignment is confusing and potentially dangerous, so moving the entrance to a location on Ft. Hunt Rd may make sense. I also agree that the historical resources in the park are inadequately developed. The signage on the batteries is not very helpful in understanding how the fort was used through the years, so a historical interpretive trail would be a great improvement. I note that the picnic pavilions to be removed are located nowhere near the proposed historical interpretive trail alignment, so the claim that the pavilions and parking lots impact historical resources rings a bit hollow. The addition of a visitor center seems to be an unnecessary construction, maintenance and personnel cost. If this were a civil war battlefield with a complicated series of historical events to explain, then a visitor center might make sense, but the history of Ft. Hunt could be easily explained with signs complemented with a few exhibit gazebos on the historical walking trail. Ft Hunt as it is used now is a great community regional recreational resource. Sacrificing the recreational features for historical interpretation seems to be a false choice and a use of diminishing NPS funding that could be better spent maintaining existing resources elsewhere in the National Park system.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 61

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Orlando E. Gonzales
Organization: Retired
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8311 Riverton Lane, Alexandria
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: orliegonzales@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am an 80 year old retired military that lives about two miles from Fort Hunt Park. I walk to the park every day, usually walk all around the oval and return home. I thoroughly enjoy the park and appreciate how well our park service people maintain it and how pleasant and polite they are when I meet up with them. I enjoy seeing all those families who use the facilities. The pavilions were built a very short time ago. It would be a shame to see them go and all that construction money wasted. I strongly recommend keeping them and do not believe it would conflict with nicely laid out tours. Orlando E Gonzales, Major General, US Army (Ret) Phone: 703 799 4680

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 62

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please reconsider your proposal for demolishing the recreation areas of Fort Hunt Park. According to this document your own web site, <http://www.nps.gov/gwmp/upload/From%20In-Depth%20-%20FH%20-%20The%20Forgotten%20Story.pdf>, the park was turned over to the National Park Service to be developed as a recreational site. It already had historic significance by this time as a Spanish-American War defense fort, and its development as a recreational park continued after its use as a POW camp during World War II. No one seemed to feel a need at the time to make the site a strictly historic park. There is plenty of room to add historical interpretation without shutting out the community for whom the present day park was designed. Local residents use this park daily to walk and cycle, take their children to the playground, and use the pavilions for Eagle Scout ceremonies, family picnics, and recently, a ceremony to honor first responders involved on 9/11. Please, please don't destroy a beloved and vital part of our community.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 63

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

To whom it may concern:

Planning for the future of Fort Hunt Park is a valuable activity, whether the plan is implemented this decade or next.

The limited number of options considered for the park is lamentable, however. Fort Hunt Park does have a fascinating history, and it sits on a site that is valuable for local use and operational use for the George Washington Parkway. What a wonderful combination. I fully support the elevation of the history of the site to become the main focus of the park experience.

At this point I have one comment that is in opposition to the plans presented. All the plans that elevated the history of the site were tied to removing most or all of the existing pavilions and restrooms on the site, which I think is a completely incorrect approach to the site's future. There is no intrinsic conflict between most of the existing pavilions and the interpretation of the site. Only some limited, formulaic approach to visitor management would suggest that the entire acreage needs to be used in the story. There is no need to so completely limit the variety of activities that occur on the site, since Fort Hunt's history can be told in a dynamic way, without destroying valuable assets that the park now uses.

If the site hosts too many and too large events at this time, then the rules governing those events should be changed, fees raised, capacities limited. Removing the pavilions is the sort of activity that so enrages the American public. It is such a waste that the agency involved looks as if it utterly disregards the expense of its plans. The restroom facilities may need to be modified, in order to make them less

expensive to operate, but I would like to think that the NPS is the agency to figure that out. But to remove the existing structures, that are in outstanding condition, is just too wasteful and limited to be condoned.

I would also hope that a future plan for the park would include an effective plan to manage the natural resources of the site, which I did not see. The forested areas of the park are so infested with invasive exotic vines that the forest itself may cease to exist. This can not be historically and is an ecological travesty. This section of the plan should be expanded.

Thank you for your efforts, and I hope you will consider a less extreme plan that both elevates the history of the site, and allows multiple uses for the site that are so popular today.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 64

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Whatever happened to your worthy goal of " Achieving a balance between population and resource use that would permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities"?

Like far too many plans for the future that i have seen recently (esp in this area of the National Capital Region) , this proposal overemphasizes a few politically-correct points at the expense of reality. Parks should be for people, esp when they are in rapidly urbanizing areas. Trying to turn back the clock is not the answer-- finding a balance that meets real needs is.

i do not live near fort hunt, but have visited there often-- have pointed out to friends the remnants of the fascinating wwII history, and enjoyed the opportunity to walk through a truly beautiful park (and for several years joined with other dog owners early in the morning at one corner of the park where our dogs romped while we socialized.Wwas taking away that simple amenity the harbinger of worse things to come?) . Unlike the trail along the Potomac, where latex-clad speeding bicyclists are an increasing danger, one can actually stroll through Ft Hunt Park (except on the circular rd) without fear of being knocked down by a bicyclist

i see little to be gained from the Park service's preferred alternative. little remains of the historic sites hat can't be viewed from a bus or a car-- and i seriously doubt that this park would ever become a tourist destination per se.

more shocking is the proposal to make the park unusable for those who really do use and enjoy it (and don't seem to have harmed it). Although i attended a very nice event at one of the picnic areas, i don't

regularly eat there. but people who do, have a chance to socialize and enjoy a wonderful outdoor setting. They probably appreciate nature much more because their access isn't being restricted. If they are jammed together in a small area, they will have less incentive to keep areas clean. .

What is the intended goal of taking away the circular road? it will only further crowd the entrance area and deprive park users of alternatives. the circular road should stay-- and could be used by both cars and bikes. if anything changes , there might be a separate walking path so walkers don't get hit by speeding bikers (and, based on my observation, they are far more dangerous than the cars).

why not simply fix up the house at the entrance with whatever history of the park is worth sharing and use that for what will likely be a limited number of visitors? a new structure would probably not be cost effective, and removing virtually all of the circulation for what appears to be an exaggerated concern for "resource protection" will achieve nothing.

if this is being done because the Park Service doesn't want to monitor and maintain the park, then it might consider turning it over to Fairfax County, which seems to have limitless bond funds to acquire lands but then doesn't want to provide amenities like the picnic areas that are already there. that would be a win for the govt (cut the debt), and for the county (and no doubt the County could find room for a curator for the historical exhibits.

i urge the Park Service to look at this site not in isolation, but in context of the whole parkway park system and its amenities. Fort Hunt, with its 50+ acres, has become a refuge for many who have been crowded out of the riverside trail and park area; throwing them out of Ft Hunt will only make things worse because these people have nowhere else to go.

As a former city planner, i am familiar with how the "metrics" of planning can sometimes take precedence over common sense. i sincerely hope the Park Service will rethink this flawed plan.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 65

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: National Parks Conservation Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/02/2011 Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

This is to support the construction of a Visitor Center, interpretive trail, and dedicated biking/pedestrian trail at Fort Hunt Park, as well as the removal of picnic pavilions at the Park, as part of the final Site Development Plan for the park.

I am devoted supporter of the National Park System, having visited over 200 units in the system, and have been a volunteer for the National Parks Conservation Association in numerous capacities for more than 23 years. I have visited Fort Hunt Park a number of times and have read numerous publications about the park and PO Box 1142, the top secret military installation located there in World War II. In particular, I have read the book "By the River Potomac" by Matthew Laird, which provides details on the site's rich history from thousands of years ago through its inclusion as part of George Washington's River Farm, on to the construction of a fort there for the Spanish American War, three batteries of which still exist in the park, and through all of the uses to which it was put in the twentieth century. I have also read the draft Fort Hunt Site Development Plan (SDP) and attended the September 21, 2011, public meeting.

I believe that the primary purpose of Fort Hunt Park should be to protect, preserve and interpret cultural resources, including archeological resources. This belief is based upon my knowledge of the National Park Service (NPS) and its mission and goals as stated in the NPS Organic Act of 1916 and subsequent laws, rules and regulations, of the rich history and cultural resources of the site and of the key information that NPS staff have uncovered through their research on its use in World War, particularly through oral history interviews with veterans who served at PO Box 1142. Hence, I wholeheartedly support the construction of a visitor center at Fort Hunt Park to tell the story of PO Box 1142 and the other historical activities at the site and to display the artifacts that have been collected and will be donated in the future.

A visitor center is a key part of the three action alternatives in the National Park Service's (NPS) proposed Site Development Plan (SDP). When built, the center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control and fire protection and provide sufficient security for the collections. It should be large enough to contain a small auditorium for viewing videos about the historical activities and to provide space for scholars to study the historical materials.

I also enthusiastically support the construction of an interpretive trail originating at the visitor center as proposed by the NPS.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. However, if it is possible, two picnic pavilions should be retained at Fort Hunt Park in the final SDP to commemorate that part of the park's history. If retaining more than one picnic pavilion will conflict with the preservation of cultural resources, however, the NPS needs to fully and convincingly explain in the final SDP why four pavilions should be removed.

Small groups of picnic tables should also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups of limited size can have not only picnics and play in the park but also learn about the site's important history and be drawn into the visitor center to become more involved in our nation's history. One person at the September 21 public meeting made the comment that school buses of children from distant locales stop at Fort Hunt Park for the children to have lunch, play and use the bathroom before or after visiting Mount Vernon. How much more meaningful would their experience be if they could also stop in the visitor center and walk on the interpretive trail and learn that the park in which they are recreating was once part of the River Farm owned by George Washington and much later played an important role in WWII. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception.

Of the alternatives presented in the draft SDP, I believe that Alternative C modified to retain two picnic pavilions would be the best alternative since it would result in an advantageous location for the Visitor Center, the removal of the greatest amount of paved road, the creation of a separate bike/pedestrian trail, the upgrading of a ball field, volleyball courts and the playground, and the greatest preservation of natural resources. The volleyball courts and playground are in great need of upgrading. Photos from September 21, 2011, are available but could not be added to these comments.

Alternative A in the draft SDP is totally unacceptable since it will result in continued degradation of cultural and natural resources and is not in compliance with the Organic Act and goals/mission of the NPS. As noted above, even the playground and volleyball courts need substantial work.

Alternative B is much less acceptable than Alternative C since it maintains the shared road/bike trail, yields only a small decrease in pavement and locates the visitor center in a more crowded area.

Alternative D is unacceptable. It will be the most disruptive to the natural environment. Although there will be a net decrease of 5,500 square feet of paved road from the existing 86,700 square feet, 81,200 square feet of new paved surface will be added. Hence, significant amounts of paved roads will be removed and added. Moreover, the newly situated road will cross new the interpretive trail creating safety hazards. Further, under this alternative no picnic pavilion is proposed for retention at which picnics can be scheduled in advance.

Neighboring residents and proponents of the No Action alternative have raised the issue of estimated

visitation to the new visitor center. In the final SDP, the NPS needs to address quantitatively the expected annual number of visitors to the visitor center and to the entire park and the number of cars and then compare those estimated numbers to the current average number of visitors and cars per year. Further, it would be most useful to compare the annual expected numbers of visitors to the new center to actual annual visitors for the past three years at nearby Clara Barton National Historic Site (NHS), Frederick Douglass NHS, and Monocacy National Battlefield and explain why more or fewer visitors are expected at Fort Hunt Park. Assumptions for the estimate should be provided in the discussion.

The final SDP should address whether the entire park is expected to be closed during the construction of the Visitor Center and alterations to the road system, etc., or just parts of it, when funds available to undertake final SDP become available. It would be a decided plus if specific parts of the park could remain open throughout the site development process.

In summary, the final SDP should include a state-of-the-art visitor center, an interpretative trail, a dedicated biking trail and, if possible, two picnic pavilions, as well as upgrading of the ball field, playground and volley ball courts. It is understood that neighbors and other local residents have enjoyed using Fort Hunt Park as a recreational area and consider it their park. But it is far more than their park. It is a park for the whole nation with an important history and resources that need to be interpreted to enrich the cultural heritage of our children and grandchildren. It would be a distinct disservice to the veterans who served at PO Box 1142 and to all veterans of WWII not to construct the visitor center and tell their important stories.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 66

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I believe Plan B would be best and give this wonderful park a needed face lift. This park is well loved by those of us that live within walking distance. It will be good to see it get some attention and care. Thank you!

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 67

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Frankly find recommendations for changes to the Park absurd. The NPS contends the Park is overused and therefore should be re-engineered, apparently with the goal of discouraging use by the general public in favor of a presumably smaller potential universe of history junkies.

Let me be clear, I find the history of Ft. Hunt Park (FHP) fascinating and enriching. At the same time, I have watched as open spaces throughout the National Park System have been systematically taken out of general service and replaced with interpretive centers and overblown monumental installations. The truth is, other than its GPS coordinates, there is nothing left at FHP (other than the remaining gun emplacements, which are already both evocative and marked) that correlates to the past uses of the site. A visitor center would be a pleasant addition, but should not be an elaborate, unsustainable (and given current budget realities perhaps unbuildable) museum. A passive, ranger-free, self-guided tour would be fully as effective and far less injurious to the important role the Park plays as a meeting place to persons, families and groups in the Mount Vernon community and the National Capital Region.

The proposal to essentially "de-park" FHP and turn it into an historical interpretive center would not only be a misallocation of NPS funds and energies but also would seem to ignore the living history of the site, which has been one of evolution and adaptation to a changing region and nation. It has shifted in its tracks over the centuries from wild lands to a portion of George Washington's holdings to an active role in the defense of the Capital to wartime prison and intelligence center to public gathering place. This story should be remembered and communicated to those who visit the Park, but not through a strategy that will actively discourage citizens from using the facility.

To do so, to somehow de-nature the current use in favor of an ossified celebration of past uses, is to deny the course and legitimacy of that change. Celebrate the Park's history? Certainly. Change the Park's

present and future? No.

Given the choices afforded in the study, I find myself looking for the None of the Above choice. There is no option that maintains the current Park uses essentially unaltered, while providing for an elaborated self-guided tour using the current roadways and paths. I urge the NPS to consider this common-sense, low-cost option, which has the benefit of fulfilling the NPS mandates without adversely impinging on the citizens' use of Fort Hunt Park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 68

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: LSU Alumni Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I cannot believe you are even considering removing the pavillions. Having been there with my family and friends many times for events and seen the Park filled to capacity, where would you even come up with such an idea. What is needed are more pavillions.The last time I was there, we had over 1,000 folks at the event. We have to put up tents and use blankets at most of the functions because there are not enough! Why else would we go to Fort Hunt except for picnicing and events? I did notice last time I was there, the Park Service employees had a very different attitude towards us users. They complained when I put a small open house type sign in the ground to indicate what my group was. They were less than friendly too. It is sad to see this change.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 69**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Priscilla Lane
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Despite the fact that I live only two blocks from Fort Hunt Park I never received any mailings about the meetings and have only recently found out about the proposed changes through the September 29 Mount Vernon Gazette article.

I strongly oppose moving the entrance of the park to Fort Hunt Road.

I also oppose elimination of all picnic areas except area A. I have been to picnics for many groups at each of the areas and I feel they serve a vital need for the community. I think a visitor facility is overkill and that improved interpretive signs will adequately address the need to explain the park's history. I also agree that improved playground facilities are necessary. I suggest adding additional playground equipment to at least one other area.

By removing half of the width of the paved road for the proposed biker/walker trail it will adversely impact the use by slowing the bikers and creating the same crowded conditions that currently exist on the Mount Vernon Trail.

If picnic areas are eliminated and a nature center built it will encourage more traffic from buses that add Fort Hunt Park as an historical destination on the way to Mount Vernon.

I suggest improving the current unpaved trails, playground equipment, and interpretive signs, and restrooms and leaving the rest as it is. Focusing so much on the park's historical significance is unnecessary.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 70

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William F. Rhatican
Organization: none
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 912 Danton Lane
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: wrhatican@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have just finished reading the September 20 article on Fort Hunt Park and the National Park Service's proposals for the park. As a former press secretary for the Interior Department, of which the National Park is an integral member, I have had some experience with the NPS. We have known for some time that the Park has some historical significance throughout our history. We have also known for some time that the Park is heavily used ? not just by nearby residents but by individuals and organizations throughout the Washington metropolitan area as a welcome and convenient site for picnics, recreational outings and concerts.

In fact, I was astounded by the proposal's shift because, according to your story, "peak visitation periods exceed the park's carrying capacity." What the NPS is really saying is that too many people are enjoying the park so we must cut down on the number of people enjoying themselves.

I can understand the importance of recognizing the park's historical significance. After all, I taught social studies at West Potomac High School for ten years and now teach American history as an adjunct professor at NOVA, Woodbridge. Both professionally and personally, I am sympathetic to the restoration of historical sites.

However, when the "emphasis on history" masks the real reason, that is, "different types of visitor use?with resource protection" I must stand against my former colleagues and tell them to just leave it alone.

If we are to acknowledge the park's historical significance, we can do that without destroying the pavilions or the ball fields. We can develop interpretative trails and maintain the family-orientation of the current park.

To even consider the demolition of the pavilions is to come to the conclusion that the NPS clearly knows better than the people who use the park ? and will continually use the park. Those of us who spent some time in the national government recognize the symptoms of "Big Brother" telling us what is good for us. While the Tea Parties of both left and right are mounting offensives against the national government, the National Park Service goes along with it's "I know what is best for you" attitude that flies clearly in the face of the electorate. They will discover that, regardless of the "good guy" persona the NPS has enjoyed for years, they will be lumped in as the "bad guys" by the anti-government attitude that is sweeping the nation.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 71

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: PVRB Civic Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

3 October 2011

National Park Service website: parkplanning.nps.gov/forthunt

Thank you for undertaking a long-term initiative to enhance Fort Hunt Park. We attended the NPS public meeting 21 September 2011 and appreciated being informed on potential plans to improve and rebalance use of this historic site.

Despite unnecessarily hostile audience reactions, some combination of actions (beyond maintaining status quo) should ultimately be implemented. Fort Hunt Park is a national resource not just a site for local area residents (like us). Because site development is currently unfunded, the NPS development plan should be open-ended, incremental and flexible which (if effectively communicated) would likely defuse some of the initial negativity.

While maintaining most provisions of Alternative A, we recommend development of two generally agreed upon elements of various action alternatives. First, realign the entrance road. This element is common to all action alternatives and shouldn't be objectionable to "status quo" proponents. This step would initiate NPS's funding stream and an attractive entrance (with new fence & gate) would demonstrate progress. Second, enhance interpretive facilities. This important but somewhat neglected function should also be relatively noncontroversial. Presumably some level of interpretive trail development could be accomplished before making a decision on whether or not to construct a new visitor facility at area B or C.

After NPS secures the necessary funding to realign the entrance and initiate improvements to education/interpretation, follow-on funding and public support for subsequent development should fall into place more easily. NPS should continue efforts to build public consensus for subsequent Fort Hunt development while seeking budgetary approval for construction and pavement removal proposals. At this point there's no hurry and little to be gained by pressing major elements (e.g. construction of a visitor facility and removal of pavement) while funding and public support remain uncertain.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 72

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Potomac, MD 20854
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As people drive between our Nation's Capital and the home of our Nation's first President, perhaps they reflect on what freedom means and the cost to ensure its preservation. The continuation of freedom comes at a steep price and depends on the bravery of individuals willing to take risks. Sometimes bravery is publically applauded; sometimes bravery is intentionally unacknowledged. But always bravery provides the foundation for our country's existence. P.O. Box 1142, a top secret World War II military installation on that road between Washington, DC and Mt. Vernon, was the home of brave men and women whose courage contributed to our success in World War II. Even before P.O. Box 1142 was established, the site was the location of other important historic activities in the earlier part of the 20th century, most of which are likely unknown to the general public.

Unheralded at the time for obvious reasons, the location and the people and the work done at P.O. Box 1142 now can and should be commemorated as the National Park Service (NPS) is proposing to do through construction of a Visitor Center and interpretative trail at Fort Hunt Park. The Visitor Center is a key part of the three action alternatives in the proposed Site Development Plan. The NPS' research has uncovered (and will continue to uncover) artifacts that, along with personal recollections from those associated with P.O. Box 1142, tell an engrossing and inspiring story too long hidden. The state-of-the-art (e.g., climate control; fire protection; security for collections) Visitor Center will finally bring this story to light and accord an amply deserved and overdue thank you to those who dedicated themselves to our country's survival.

Yet, as long time supporters of the National Parks and the National Parks Conservation Association, we recognize that the NPS' role encompasses both education and recreation, which clearly are not mutually exclusive. In light of the fact that Fort Hunt Park has been a popular urban recreation site for over 60 years, we believe the community should not and need not be deprived of a picnic and biking/hiking area. Rather, we would encourage a similar dual emphasis at Fort Hunt Park, retaining some picnic pavilions and integrating picnic tables along the interpretative trail. In this way, as people continue to visit Fort Hunt Park in the future to avail themselves of the relaxing location, they will have the opportunity to learn about the site's important history. They will have the opportunity to place the site into a broader context and celebrate the efforts of those who bravely and surreptitiously successfully labored to protect what Americans hold most dear: our freedom.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 73**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly support Alternative A - no change. Please keep all picnic pavillions as they are currently. It is the perfect picnic event location in the greater Washington, DC area. I have read the documentation and remain unpersuaded that any change is necessary. I value this park greatly and see its current usage as maximizing the park's efficiency and healthy community impact.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 74**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please keep Ft. Hunt Park as is, that is, Alternative A. It has provided and still provides a peaceful respite to our family and community.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 75

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John J. Kohout
Organization: N/A
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 824 Waynewood Boulevard
Alexandria, VA 22308-2606
USA
E-mail: jjkohout@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park depart from a series of false premises as to the contributions that park should make to the nation, the Washington DC-Area and the local community: the visitor experience is diminished by all but the no-build alternative A; cultural and natural resources represented by Fort Hunt would be diminished by the proposed alternatives B, C, and D; and there are no facilities needs sufficient to justify new construction or changes to the currently useable pavements in the park, particularly at a time of enormous Federal debts.

The claim that "peak visitation periods exceed the park's carrying capacity" is a transparent "red herring". Pavilion use by significant groups of visitors is by reservation. The reservation system is manageable. The assertion that there has been a "recent discovery of the site's rich history" that creates a need for additional interpretation is absurd. Anyone with the slightest historical literacy knows the core history of Fort Hunt and can delve deeper as they so choose. None of the NPS claimed goals and needs for changing Fort Hunt Park justify compromising the natural environment of the park by new construction of facilities. If NPS fascination with additional interpretation is an itch that must be scratched, place information displays and possibly a dedicated part-time interpreter in the existing NCO Quarters-itself a historical structure.

My point of view on Fort Hunt and its cultural role is that of a retired public servant neighbor of Fort Hunt Park for a number of decades. I am interested in its military history, both coastal artillery and World War II, but I don't need NPS to assign some one to explain it to me. I value Fort Hunt as a pleasant place to

stroll and ride a bike and see no advantage in digging up or adding to pavements to facilitate those activities. I enjoy observing the wildlife resident in Fort Hunt Park, particularly the eagles nesting there, evidently unthreatened by the park's current configuration and use patterns.

The most important objection to changing Fort Hunt Park, however, is in the areas of the social and cultural role Fort Hunt Park and its pavilions play in hosting groups from across the DC-Area. Social groups of all kinds use that park for picnic meetings and socializing. Many of these are minority groups which don't have affordable alternatives. Most of these groups, whether African American, Puerto Rican or others, live some distance from the park. Many participating individuals travel some distance to gather there and enjoy Fort Hunt Park's current facilities. While the NPS approach to gathering public comment on the notion of reconfiguring the park might be proceeding in accordance with bureaucratic rules and legal requirements, it effectively excludes minority users from having a say in the future of the park. This is not right.

For these reasons I strongly disagree with all but the no-build alternative.

John Kohout

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 76

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Rebecca N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22306
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Parks are for people! These plans completely eliminate the recreational aspects of the park, which I cherish. I, and my husband, are one of those frequent users of park for cycling, hiking, picnicking, walking, and running. Any plans should include maintaining these attributes of the park. Please reconsider.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 77

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Barbara C. Mann
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8716 Falkstone Lane
Alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: speech.solutions@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

It seems to me, given the focus of public concern about debt reduction, that removing well used park pavilions at the Ft. Hunt Park to make way for an unfunded proposal is unwise. Such removal will entail not only the expense of removal but also the monitoring of the park to comply with the unfunded proposed use.

It is truly amazing that the Park Service did not know that Ft. Hunt was used as a secret interrogation prison for German POWs during World War II, since those of us in the area have known that for years. Why, then, in a period of economic crisis in the government and the land, is there a big hurry to develop something that just came on your radar. Save our money. Let's continue to use Ft. Hunt Park as it is currently being used and skip this item on your agenda.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 78

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Thomas A. Gerard
Organization: concerned citizen
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2417 Londonderry Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: tomgerard1354@yahoo.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

"The purpose of the proposed SDP is to identify an overall direction for park management of Fort Hunt Park, by clearly defining specific resource conditions and the desired visitor experience in order to improve the balance of recreational use of the park with resource protection and interpretation objectives."

This purpose statement implies an out of balance which in reality does not exist. The purpose of the SDP should be to maximize the availability of the park facilities for recreational use consistent with protection of its resources, safety and interpretation objectives. The interpretation objectives are not clearly stated and must be subject to a discussion of public comment. The recreational use has little impact on the resources negating a resource protection as a major consideration.

The SDP is required to document the analysis of the "carrying capacity" and how that limit was determined. Is it measured by number of parked cars, people on acres, pedestrians on roads, players on ballfields? Once this limit is better defined how many times is it really exceeded? I believe you will find almost never. The reason that the carrying capacity is almost never exceeded is because the Park is self limiting. If there is no parking, or no picnic areas, or no ballfields, participants leave, reducing the population below the carrying capacity.

In addition, the following alternatives must be specifically evaluated.

1. Build a visitors' center while maintaining the existing 5 picnic pavilions.

2. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 4 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions.
3. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 3 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions.
4. Build a visitors' center while maintaining 2 of the 5 existing picnic pavilions.

Given the current federal budget pressures, the no action alternative makes the most sense.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 79

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Jerry Stryker
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2310 Sherwood Hall Lane. Hollin Hills, VA 22306
Hollin Hills, VA 22306
USA
E-mail: jstryker@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

If I were able to vote on this proposal, I would definitely cast a vote for Alternative A -- NO ACTION.

149 pages loaded with pompous official gobbledegook. Ugh! A good editor could reduce the document to no more than 20 pages of plain understandable English. Also, why that super-stylish font which is very difficult to read? What's wrong with good old 10-pt Arial?

Fort Hunt Park is fine as is. Why change it? If it ain't busted, don't fix it.

Too many visitors at peak periods? One, I don't believe it, and Two, so what? Lots of people using the park is a good thing. That's what parks are for.

Finally, I am mystified as to why the NPS -- which I greatly admire and of which I am a great fan -- went to the trouble of spending all this time and money dreaming up a proposal which any sensible planner should know would meet with unanimous opposition from all nearby residents. Do any local people support the project? I doubt that there is a single one.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 80**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Archer A. Jordan
Organization: Community Association of Hollin Hills
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1949 Marthas Rd.
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: insbuysrv@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As an area resident for 60 years I am appalled by the recommendations for for demolishing 4 of the 5 picnic pavilions and destroying the circumnavigational road. I have come to the park at least 4 or 5 weekends nearly every one of those 60 years. I frequently ride my bicycle around the park. I have attended High School reunion picnics, the annual ACLU picnic, concerts in the main pavilion both as an attendee and performer, the Crawfish Boil and played softball, thrown frisbee and explored the battlements. This is one of the most important recreational parks in the area. I have always been able to find a place to park and can't imagine why anyone would consider the park overused.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 81

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John H. Powell
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: jpowell8@gmu.edu

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/03/2011 Date Received: 10/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear NPS,

Thank you for extending the comment deadline to allow the community to address this significant project. Unfortunately after reviewing the documents and alternatives presented, I find them to be striking in their lack of variety and imagination. All of the action alternatives present minor variations on the apparently forgone conclusion that the pavilions must be removed, the road must be rebuilt and a visitors center must be created. Furthermore, the justification for these draconian actions is thin at best.

Was any consideration given to non-construction/demolition alternatives? The largest and most legitimate issue cited is the overuse of the facilities by permitted picnickers during peak use times. These are "permitted" uses, and thus controllable by the Park Service. Instituting and enforcing lower permitted usage limits (say from 600 to 400 at Area A, for example) would mitigate the issue without firing up a single bulldozer or spending scarce federal dollars on expensive construction projects. Limiting usage permits is a strategy used to great effect in other high demand National Parks.

The traffic safety issue is greatly overblown. It seems to have been derived from individual comments about cars traveling too fast. In my experience using the park several times a week in all levels of congestion by bicycle, car, running, walking, with dogs and children, etc., the current traffic separation scheme is utterly safe and I have never seen or heard of an incident. The roadway is plenty wide to accommodate all uses and the one-way, separated lanes for vehicles and peds is clear and safe,

probably safer than putting bicyclists and pedestrians together on a narrow path. If vehicle speed is an issue, enforcement works wonders. Is there a history of traffic incidents? There should be something other than isolated personal opinions documented before embarking on intrusive and costly traffic changes.

The benefit of the visitor's center is not described despite being featured in every action alternative. The visitor facility is described as including "exhibit space, work and storage space, a multipurpose room, administration support space, restroom facilities, and outdoor space." Apart from the exhibit space, there seems to be little interpretive value. An interpretive trail is a great idea, but it doesn't require a building.

Environmentally, assertions about overuse wearing down soil to potentially put archeological finds at risk seem benign compared to bulldozing facilities and trees, regrading roads and digging new building foundations.

Meanwhile, none of the alternatives addresses the lack of protection/preservation of the existing historical structures. These should be the focal point of the interpretive experience, rather than some static display in a visitors center. They are also by far the most dangerous area of the park as currently administered, with visitors allowed to clamber around unprotected concrete ledges with 10+ ft dropoffs.

To summarize, I feel that the NPS has a preconceived notion that the park requires repurposing and reconstruction on a grand scale without exploring lower impact, less costly solutions, or even fully evaluating the existing issues or benefits of the proposed alternatives. While I applaud the initiative to improve the park experience and protect the cultural heritage of the park, I cannot support any of the proposed action alternatives. I recommend that "no action" (Alternative A) be taken until the NPS can explore a richer array of alternatives that better address the park's true issues and are less obtrusive to the park and its many happy visitors.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 82**

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Why can't we just leave it that way it is? its like the old saying "If its not broke don't fix it". the govement is in debt enough we DO NOT need to spend money to change the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 83

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: robert w. fina
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22306
USA
E-mail: Robert@fina-co.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have long been a user of Fort Hunt park, both as a bike rider and dog walker, and as such have noticed that there are several rather glaring problems with the park. The most obvious of which is that for a small park there is a tremendous amount of paved area, both in roads and parking lots. There are even paved roads and parking areas that are closed to traffic. I have often wondered why these have not been removed.

The main loop for walking and biking is open to vehicular traffic, which seems inconsistent with a natural space, as well as somewhat unsafe. The loop road through the park also means that you can never get out of ear shot of traffic when you are in the park, as you are never more than a 100 yards or so away from the road. In our densely populated region, I find it a criminal waste to run a loop road through one of our very few natural areas. I firmly reject the notion that for a park to be desirable or useful that you have to be able to drive to within feet of your destination. It's a park, not a strip mall.

The second problem is the picnic pavilions. Perhaps on summer weekends these are fully used, but when I have seen them they are usually just big, unused, ugly buildings taking up space, requiring huge parking lots, creating runoff, and blighting the landscape. When they are used the users are usually blasting music, degrading the park experience for everyone else.

The creation of a visitor center to explore the parks rich history sounds to me like an excellent idea. I wholeheartedly support any change that reduces the amount of asphalt, the number of picnic pavilions, and restores the park to a more natural, and more biker and pedestrian friendly area.

Alternatives B and D in my view leave too much pavement. Alternative C seems like the best of the choices, although I would prefer to see the proposed visitor center closer to Pavilion A or B, so the length of the road would be reduced, and a larger area of the park would be road and car free. I applaud the parks services thoughtful effort to celebrate the heritage of this site, as well as to restore it to a more natural area.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 84

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Do nothing to Fort Hunt Park. All options other than the status quo involve replacing a portion of the loop road with a path which is highly undesirable as the loop road is heavily used by walkers, joggers, roller bladers and cyclists. This is especially true during the winter when other places are not cleared of snow.

In addition, this is not the appropriate time to be spending tax dollars on new visitor centers.

Thanks for the opportunity to express my opinions.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 85

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: NPCA
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a long time member of the National Parks Conservation Association (21592738). The National Park Service (NPS) has revealed the engrossing and inspiring story of P.O. Box 1142, the top secret military installation that existed at Fort Hunt Park in World War II, as well as the other important historic activities at the site in the earlier part of the 20th century. I strongly support building a Visitor Center at at Fort Hunt Park in order to preserve the history (and associated artifacts) documenting the contributions made there by America to defeat the Nazis.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception. It belongs not only to the nearby residents but to all America as well. Our nation would be diminished if future generations did not have access to the story of P.O. Box 1142 and see the site where it was located, as well as learn about the soldiers who contributed to helping end WWII more quickly.

The center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control, fire protection, and provide sufficient security for the collections. Also, the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built. It would be a disservice to the veterans who served at PO Box 1142 and their families and to all veterans of WWII not to construct the Visitor Center.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 86**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Natalie Ramirez
Organization: NPCA
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Alexandria, VA 22303
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a long time supporter on the National Park System. In recent years the National Park Service has performed research that has revealed the engrossing and inspiring story of P.O. Box 1142, the top secret military installation that existed at Fort Hunt Park in World War II, as well as the other important historic activities at the site in the earlier part of the 20th century. I believe that it is critical that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park without delay to tell these stories and display the artifacts that have been collected and will be donated in the future. The center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control and fire protection and provide sufficient security for the collections. Also, the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built. Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 87

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My vote is for a new and improved playground facility. While not quite in line with the NPS goal of historic preservation/interpretation, the current equipment is old, outdated, and virtually unusable on a hot summer day (esp the slide). Improved play equipment would bring more families to enjoy and explore the historical and natural elements of the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 88

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please do not change the park.
Please do not tear down any pavilions.
Please do not restrict the current public uses.
Please do not build an interpretive center, but keep it natural.
Please do not build any more "hard-scape"
Some interpretive boards outside would be useful.
The Park is wonderful and well used. Please don;t change it.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 89**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sandi Evans Rogers
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2505 Mill Race Road
Frederick, MD 21701
Frederick, MD 21701
USA
E-mail: Revmom2@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Having grown up playing and enjoying Ft. Hunt Park as a great recreation facility, I cannot imagine it any other way; open to the community. The community it has helped us all build over the years cannot be replaced, and it continues to build and renew this community today by hosting picnics and reunions after reunions. I do not have a problem with the park being used to teach its' historical significance...but a big part of that history is being a place to build and support community. I would not be in favor of redesigning the park in such a way that large picnics and reunions can not be hosted in the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 90

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I live a few miles away from Fort Hunt Park. I have lived in this area since 1989. I have many great memories in the park, from meeting with a local playgroup for our annual picnics to celebrating my son's 3rd birthday at a picnic bench as a family.

I understand it is a National Park, but it is really much more than that to our community. I absolutely support Plan A - No action. I love the idea of adding a visitor center as well as upgrading the park in general, but not at the expense of our local citizens.

Our local school holds our 6th grade picnics there and I have my oldest in 6th grade this year. I am not sure where we could go as an alternative, as most of the other Fairfax Parks in the area are not close enough or big enough to allow us to utilize them for this purpose.

This park is such as asset to our community, has there been any estimation of how many people an upgrade will bring to the park? Can the surrounding areas handle the additional traffic? After the BRAC traffic issues on Route 1, we really don't need to funnel more people into our quiet community.

I can't imagine people would pick Fort Hunt as a vacation destination over all that DC has to offer. Perhaps as a side trip to Mount Vernon, but how much interest is there in this nationally? Is it really worth all the money?

Please consider doing park improvements with the local community in mind. We are your biggest supporters!

Thank you for listening.

Mom to 4 students who hope to use Fort Hunt for the school picnics for years to come.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 91

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Gene Gibbons
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 907 DeWolfe Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: ggsabre28@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My wife and I strongly favor No Action Alternative. We have resided in the Fort Hunt area for more than 40 years, and often enjoy the use of Fort Hunt Park for walking, biking and picnicing. Not once in more than four decades have we experienced overcrowding. If this is indeed a problem, there is a simple, no cost solution: NPS can just reduce the number of picnic permits it grants to bring park use into line with whatever parameters it feels are required.

We strongly believe each of the NPS's three proposed options for change violate the first principle of public stewardship: if it ain't broke, don't fix it. We also believe they don't even begin to compute in terms of government spending priorities.

It seems to us the historic connections of Fort Hunt Park can be amply and inexpensively publicized by writing a leaflet documenting same and making it available to park visitors. Each of NPS's three options for change screams "boondoogie." We feel they are unnecessary and ill-advised.

Finally, we're troubled that it was only through an alert neighbor that we learned of the Fort Hunt Site Development Plan. We are fairly well informed citizens, but would have remained ignorant of the proposed changes otherwise. We believe that NPS needs to do a better job of letting neighbors of Fort Hunt Park know of proposed changes of such consequence through the news media, mails or other means of communication.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 92

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Sydney H. Johnson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7404 Rebecca Drive
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: syneyhj@msn.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/04/2011 Date Received: 10/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I especially like the mix of quiet secluded areas with the happy celebrations that go on around the pavilions--and the diversity of people who gather there--all ages, many ethnicities, the wonderful aromas of outdoor cooking, the park police horses. The history is interesting too but I don't think it warrants a visitor center in this economic climate. I love to go there, chat with other dog walkers and get good exercise! When visitors from out of town and even the extended metropolitan area visit me I always take them there. Everyone loves it. Thank you for this park. It is wonderful!

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 93

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Gaill C. Weigl
Organization: Hollin Hills
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2001 Bedford Lane
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: Weiglga@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The proposal to transform Ft. Hunt park lacks due consideration of the impact of the proposed changes on the surrounding community, and will result in a beloved community asset being turned into a place devoid of the people it is meant to serve. Parks are a critical resource, not only for those who have adequate outdoor spaces in which to play and rest, but most especially for those who live in homes without land or landscaping to provide the nurture nature brings. We need our green spaces, not as sites to be viewed, and admired, preserved in aspic as it were, but as places in which to enjoy play and exercise, picnics and games, relaxing beneath a tree. Please consider the people as you make your plans for the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 94

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Waynewood Citizens Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom I May Concern:

My husband and I were dumbfounded when we learned of the proposed changes at Fort Hunt Park. It is a classic example of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it," especially at a time when our federal government is in a debt crises like never before. Just for beginners, it was only a few years ago that the pavillions were constucted in the park. The loss of these picnic areas would affect, not just those of us who live nearby, but a wide range of visitors and organizations from the greater Washington area. It is a "back yard" for those who live near and far in crowded apartment complexes.

For me, the park has been my destination for biking and walking, for countless years. During those years, I have observed the constant usage of the facilities. The serious bicyclists are prohibited on the Parkway(excellent policy), so the loop road is a perfect training option site for them. During the winter months, the road provides an exercise venue, relatively free of ice and snow. My husband, a runner, uses it as an alternative to the Mount Vernon bike path, where melting is very slow.

I understand the very important historical significance of the park, but feel strongly that it can be even better acknowledged with its' current usage continuing without change. What better way to honor its past, than to allow healthy, peaceful activities side by side with a visitors center and guided tours? The word will spread!

It is my ardent hope that some of the current proposals, which defy reason, will be moderated to accommodate picnickers, walkers, runners, bycyclists, concert goers and history!!

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 95

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: John Boertlein
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Mt. Vernon, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Of the proposed Alternatives I support Alternative A- doing nothing at Ft. Hunt Park. If there is an issue of over use on weekends during the Spring and Summer seasons ? restrict the permits or the number of people at each area during those times. In August my family had my 60th Birthday Celebration at Area B and the pavilion provided a great venue for our 130 guest. Three of the pavilions are only several years old. I use the park for walks and me and many other bicyclist use the Park for training. Which now with no bikes allowed on the GW Park Way is one of the few places for safe riding. If you have funds the restrooms in Areas B & E could be upgraded and a small kiosk with information on the Parks history would be nice.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 96

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Allan M. Dickson
Organization: retired Air Force
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8813 Camfield Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308-2817
USA
E-mail: a.dickson@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. Sheffer:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park.

I and my dog have walked in the park four miles every day for years (two 2-mile excursions). We use the paved road until reaching the woods trail and then continue on from there. See my comments on change ideas below:

1. I think most of the restrooms should be improved. The pavilion one seems to be in good condition, but perhaps should have a greater capacity. I would also like for the restrooms to be open year round.
2. In view of the new historical information becoming available, I think a Visitor Center is a good idea. Perhaps a good place would be in Area B where it would be seen early in a visitor's experience.
3. Please don't remove any of the ball fields. Their use should be encouraged.
4. I think that the main road looping the park should be kept as is, but with two-way traffic.
5. I'm neutral on a bike/walking path. We are happy with using the existing road loop.

6. I would like to see an area designated for dogs to walk and/or play in. It used to be permitted in the area of the closed (for traffic) back loop. Probably an enclosing fence would be a good idea.

7. I am happy with the trail through the woods as it is. Paving the trail might be an interesting idea, but not immediately necessary.

8. Please find someone to raise and lower the flag each day. This is a classy park and an empty flag pole is an embarrassment to our community!

9. The existing parking lots should all be retained. This will spread out the visitor traffic.

Allan Dickson
703-780-6885

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 97

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly support the preferred alternative C. I agree with removal of the majority of picnic areas and restoration of the park as a nature and historical resource. Currently, the park is used heavily on the weekends (Friday/Saturday/Sunday) as a party location with extremely loud music and a great number of people simply eating at picnic tables; not a good use of a valuable national park area. These types of large social gatherings with are focused on eating and entertaining should be at a county facility; there is no reason to continue to destroy/compromise the wilderness trails and historical areas of the park with large gatherings of people who are only using the area to cook, play on inflatable slides, and play loud music. Nothing wrong with any of those things, but they bring a lot of noise and traffic into an area that is of historical and natural significance. Please push forward to restore Ft Hunt into a real national park instead of the loud music/picnic trash/speeding car destination of choice.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 98

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the National Parks and the National Parks Conservation Association. I recently learned of the Richie Boys and the substantial contribution they made in the defense of our country during World War II by gleaning vital information during their interrogation of German prisoners of war at a facility known as P.O. Box 1142, now known as Fort Hunt Park. I have also recently learned of efforts underway to establish a center at Fort Hunt Park to permanently memorialize the contribution that the Richie Boys made to the war effort and the eventual victory over totalitarianism. I strongly urge that this center be constructed asap before the last of the now aged Richie Boys disappear from our midst and so that they and their recollections and contributions can be memorialized. I am also aware that local interests would like the Park to remain a picnic ground for their personal use and enjoyment. Leaving the Park "as is" would satisfy the local few but it would deprive the rest of the Nation of a historical site and the education of the significance of what took place there in the defense of our liberty. Nothing would be more fitting than a modern, all encompassing facility that will be visited by Americans now, and those yet to be born, so that they may learn of, and appreciate, the Richie Boys and the debt all citizens owe them.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 99

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I don't have a problem with one of the pavilions being converted to a visitor center, but I do have a problem with the rest of the pavilions and picnic areas being removed. This reduces the number of public locations for visitors to gather in this community and virtually eliminates them at Ft. Hunt Park. For 30 years, I've been attending picnics and day camps at this park and this plan would negatively affect the community's ability to continue holding these types of events. No where in the document does it say why it is necessary to remove the pavilions.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 100

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: MARY A. MILLER
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: eaglesailor75@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

My husband and I live in Waynewood and are frequent visitors to the Fort Hunt Park for picnics as well as the summer concert series. I am very concerned and distressed that the park service wants to tear down the pavillions and remove the picnic and play areas in order to build a museum. It is hard to believe that you spent \$250,000 on this ill conceived study alone and now wants to spend much more to degrade this asset to our community in a time when our nation faces a deficit which will destroy us if steps are not taken to bring unwise and unnecessary government spending under control. Fort Hunt has an interesting history, but few people are interested enough to seek it out. I suggest, instead of a museum, that you prepare a booklet and a walking trail for self guided tours. Sell the booklet at a price which pays for its publication and the cost of setting up the walking tour. Those few tourists who venture to Fort Hunt will learn of its history. Those many who live nearby and regularly frequent the picnic areas and pavillions will continue to enjoy this beautiful park and play space.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 101

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

This is ridiculous. I have gone to Fort Hunt Park ever since i was a baby, and i have been perfectly fine with it! The people who want to tear the park pavillions down only care about themselves. They dont care about people, nature, or anything!
The people dont like it, so do not tear it down! What is the point anyways! The public does not want to destroy the park, it is not helping nature to tear down the beautiful pavillions.
It is dangerous to do all this! We are having troubles all over the world, and you decide too spend alot of money on this!
All this money could easily go to the oil spill, Hati's earthquake, and the tsunami in Japan, you could be helping all of those!
But instead, you are spending all this money on something noone wants! So you maybe want to think about the community, the people, and the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 102

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

While I agree that the park may be underutilized from a historic and educational viewpoint, I question the proposed solution to remedy this. Our family has lived near the park for 15 years, and I am in the park every day weather dependending. I have rarely seen it overcrowded, but it has happened on summer weekends when parking has spilled out onto the neighborhoods roads. This may occur a handful of times each summer.

Given the fact that the pavilions are relatively new & in stellar shape, is tearing them down the best solution or even a practical one? It actually seems wasteful from both a natural resources and financial standpoint. Also, given the current federal financial status, why eliminate the pavilions when they are a solid source of income? Quite frankly, I would raise the rental rates on the pavilions to generate more income, ie., raise funds for enhancing the park. Then perhaps relocate any pavilions that are directly located on a historical site.

As it is now, the historical markers are in a sad state. Many times, I have taken a bag & cleared trash/debris from them and the park itself.

I also agree that the posted speed limit of 15mph is virtually never adhered to by visitors. On at least two occasions I witnessed vehicles braking quite suddenly at high speeds, entering into a skid to prevent an accident with bikers/pedestrians. I think a hidden speed camera along the road would generate substantial income with one warning sign posted at the park entrance. Either that or regular speed monitoring by police on the weekends.

I am not opposed to the elimination of some asphalt (the closed back loop that is only used by walkers could be converted into a trail.) Also remove the main road from Pavilion D to A, with a turn around installed there, or perhaps even moving that last pavilion to Area E with a turn around there.

These above solutions may not be acceptable, but honestly, the proposed one is not reasonable either. I believe, the park is busy during summer weekends, and also feel that some of the natural resources & historical areas are being affected, but given the current financial situation of both the Federal Government and the National Park Service, I would recommend finding a balance between both income generating picnic visitors and historical interests. Can they not coexist together?

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 103**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Frank W. Corley
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am NOT in favor of any of the plans for Ft Hunt Park. I have been using the park for over 40 years and my children will use the park in the future. You have not stated why this redevelopment is necessary and why it is necessary to remove pavillions and ball fields - which is why probably 90% of the visitors to the park are there!

There is some interesting history to Ft Hunt Park, but believe me, it isn't THAT interesting. I have read all there is to read about the park, but we come because of the open space; this place isn't ever going to be on any tourist's must-do list, therefore you should not redevelop the park.

You should however, invest a little more time and money into the maintenance of the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 104

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Daniel A. Mica
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7307 Burtonwood Drive
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I read with interest the recent article in the Mount Vernon Gazette about proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park. Having lived near the park for the past 40 years and seeing my family, friends and neighbors take advantage of its facilities, I was surprised to learn that anyone would suggest tearing down the pavilions to make it a passive historical site. I feel strongly that the park should continue as it has in the past, as an active and beautiful recreational facility for our community. I am certain appropriate markers and informational signs could also designate it as a proper historical site and relay any information you desire. If community effort is needed to allow this to happen, I would be happy to be involved. Please let me know what I can do.

Sincerely,

Honorable Daniel A. Mica, Member of Congress (Ret.)
7307 Burtonwood Drive, Alexandria, VA 22307

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 105

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Although I appreciate the NPS desire to enhance the history experience at Fort Hunt Park, I'm extremely disappointed that the NPS preferred alternative results in the removal of the majority of the picnic and recreation areas. As a long time resident of the area, I have attended numerous events at Fort Hunt Park. It is one of the few parks in the area that can accommodate large groups with families for picnics and recreation. As indicated in the presentation, the park is very popular with large groups. It's removal for this use will create a severe strain on the few remaining facilities that can accommodate such groups.

As a taxpayer, I'm disturbed that the NPS would want to spend millions of dollars on this project when there are so many other National Parks in dire need of improvements.

I also question the demand for visitors for the proposed alternative. I believe that the NPS can enhance the history experience using the existing facilities without the complete removal of the recreational facilities.

Accordingly, I am in favor of Alternative A - no action.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 106

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/06/2011 Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like the park as a gathering place and have used it that way for almost 30 years now. Shifting the focus to education could harm a great place for nearby communities to play adult sports, have large family gatherings, and hear family friendly music. I much prefer the do-nothing approach.

If there were no choice but to change, alternative D is least distasteful as it appears to keep the most picnic grounds.

The currently closed utility road which goes around picnic area E could be removed and reduce the paved area somewhat while impacting nothing else. There's no reason to keep it even if Alternative A is selected.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 107

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

This plan is an outrage to take away the public enjoyment aspect of a National Park that families, church groups, scout troops and others have enjoyed the educational and fantastic aspects of a community outdoor area for decades. The National Park Service should absolutely be ashamed to present such an idea even though I am well aware of the financial pressures and monitoring of public gathering. Ken Burns would be stunned! There must be another way to meet the challenges the Park Service faces than to put up a sign that says the equivalent of "Ft. Hunt Park -- wild animals only. People who want to sit down and have a picnic or play outdoor games with family, friends, children and neighbors are not permitted."

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 108

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Ft. Hunt Park is a local treasure. As regular visitors to the park, my family bikes, walks, participates in organized events, and brings the dog for outings. Visitors to the park are courteous; bikers, walkers, and drivers share the road nicely; and there is always a friendly atmosphere.

Even at its busiest times in the Spring and Summer, there is never an issue with parking, bathroom facilities, or overuse of any part of the park. In addition, the park facilities are kept up very nicely.

My family has reviewed the plans and feel that there is no real need for changing the park. We hope our inputs have been valuable.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 109

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: none. Local resident
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/07/2011 Date Received: 10/07/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I was pleased when I heard the Park Service was going to improve the historically important Fort Hunt Park. I concur fully with the move to limit free for all picnic area, dog poo area, and suncontrolled visitor to one that will align it with the other historical sites in the area. (Alternative C my favorite). Fort Hunt is unique in many ways and the idea of focusing on this aspect is terrific. I'm perplexed at some of the attitudes of my neighbors but chalk much of it down to an inability or uncomfortable feeling toward change (just look at the struggle for a small change to Alexandria waterfront). The changes proposed in the document will enhance the park, not detract from it. So much of our history is bulldozed over for houses and shopping malls, I am very glad to see some thought to try and save what we can. The plan is realistic for this area and does provide multiple use without destroying what is being preserved. Go for it...and don't worry about the nay-sayers. Once it is finished, I suspect you will have converted quite a few minds. It is a federal site after all, not a neighborhood park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 110

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/08/2011 Date Received: 10/08/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I stongly object to the plan to remove some of the pavillions that are presently in Ft Hunt Park. The pavillions and the park are used by a diverse population. Often all of the pavillions are reserved on weekends or holidays. The fields are used by children and adults. Please do not remove the fields. Do not reduce the parking areas. I, myself, use the path around the park to ride my bicycle. Please do not make the bicycle path shorter. Do not close the side entrance to the park that is located on Fort Hunt Road.For the first time in my life (I'm over 65) I have finally seen a bluebird this past June. Do not remove any of the trees.

I appreciate the upkeep of the park: dead branches are removed after storms; the grass is mowed and the street is mostly kept clean. I haven't used the restrooms myself, but other members of my family have and they appreciate the clean restrooms.

I understand that the park service would like to use recently discovered historical information to educate the public. That is a fine aim, but I see no need to reduce the recreational aspects of the park to further that goal. I have often wondered why the white building at the entrance of the park is not used. That building would seem a logical choice as an information center.

I support the idea of using the park for both recreation and education without reducing the recreational opportunities.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 111

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: N/A N/A
Organization: Hollin Hills
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Alexandria, VA 22306
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/09/2011 Date Received: 10/09/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

A couple of thoughts. Overall, I believe the park is fine as is but if the NPS can afford to completely change the park, which I find surprising given that the park service seems to be lacking funds to do other things like maintaining existing park property, then the NPS can afford to expand the bathroom facilities they claim is an issue now at the park.

The NPS could also open up the closed roads in the park.

I also think there should be an alternative that isn't mentioned which is to simply add an interpretative section to the park if that is so important.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 112

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William R. Clontz
Organization: None
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8308 Crown Court Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: bill@theclontz.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/09/2011 Date Received: 10/09/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I regret to say that after reviewing all available NPS documents, I understand fully the public's rejection of the proposed changes. If indeed the options before are those listed as Options A-D, I would strongly favor Option A - no change. I very much hope the NPS will relook its proposal and offer an alternative that honors the importance of Fort Hunt as a vital and much loved recreation and nature center, while acknowledging its various historical benchmarks.

The citation that the park is overused (no data presented) is then followed up with proposals to dramatically reduce the very facilities in demand. This is illogical and not in the public interest.

Alternatives have been proposed to provide interpretive signs, trail markers etc - all worthy ideas that deserve NPS support. Fort Hunt is a prime recreation facility that has a varied but minor historical element to its credit. The NPS seeks to dramatically reverse that arrangement, with little justification and a major expenditure of funds at a time when such expenditures must be exercised carefully; this proposal simply does not pass the good judgement standard.

We are fortunate to live in an area rich in American history and welcome opportunities to mark our sites accordingly. We also have a pressing need for quality recreation sites - the amount of pavilion and parking space at Fort Hunt are rare indeed in this region and deserve protection and support.

Find an option to protect the recreational areas AND mark the history and support from the public and our officials will be effusive. Pursue the current offerings and expect quite the opposite.

Thank you for your consideration. Let's get this right, please.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 113

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Well, the recent proposals have certainly awakened a heretofore sleepy community. Fort Hunt Park is a marvelous place, both as a nature preserve and as a public playground. People living in a congested metropolitan area value such a place as a retreat, and many wild animals would be homeless if their habitat were to be diminished.

The park is also strategically located on the river within 15 miles of Washington, DC, traveling by water or by land. And it is directly under the flight path into National Airport. It has wide open fields for playing ball games and also, in an emergency, landing a helicopter. True, until recently, it's pavilions have been customarily reserved by church groups and scout troops. But have we already forgotten about the rally assembled by the right-to-carry-arms organization? Nothing happened; they turned out to be peaceful -- but the surrounding neighborhoods sure got spun up about it for the moment.

I agree with my neighbors that the Park Service should leave some pavilions and bathrooms in place -- but only as many pavilions as the Park Service feels they have the resources to patrol and control. It would be an injustice to the Park Service to demand that they retain all five pavilions and later hold them accountable should some less-than-peaceful organizations chose to rally there. Unless the Park Service can pick and choose its visitors to assure that only the well-meaning and benign get permits, we should respect their limitations.

I am delighted that the proposals include the Park Police headquarters and stables -- and I think it would be really swell if you could plan for quarters for the officers to be as nice as those provided for the horses.

I think that the Park Service deserves some sort of headquarters and perhaps even a visitor center if and when such funding should become available, but I disagree that it should be located at the back of the park and across the road from the police and stables. It should be at the main entrance for several reasons: it would improve supervision and security; it would keep the rest of the park in its more natural state; it would cause less disruption for the horses; it would allow use of the back part of the park for children's groups such as school and scout groups because any responsible group leader knows to keep a large group of children away from visitor centers.

I continue to have difficulty appreciating the historical interpretation aspects of the proposal -- a hundred years ago there were some gun mounts there, but the guns are now gone. Records were once stored there but have now been relocated. The King of England visited there, among many other places in the area. A secret interrogation unit once operated there but disappeared without a trace and if we do find any archeological remains, well, shame on them. There's nothing left to see. Historical markers would be fine, but do we really need to re-purpose the entire park?

We live in uncertain times. Our country is at war -- although so many of us remain oblivious to it. Our society, economy, and our very way-of-life is under attack. Terrorist seem fixated on bringing down our commercial airplanes and Libya just announced that they misplaced 20,000 small, ground to air, self-guided missiles. Fort Hunt Park is lovely and people from near and far enjoy it, but its space also remains strategically important, and security should become a driving force in planning for its future.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 114

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support the development of Ft Hunt Park for interpretation of its historical significance. However any development should be measured. I support a visitor center and improvement of the batteries at the park entrance. The picnic pavilions should stay as they were recently added and are used heavily by the public. I support trails in the park, but there is a nesting bald eagle pair located in the park boundaries. Therefore amplified noise should be limited and care should be taken on trails. The back loop should be reopened and care should be taken to recognize the boundaries of the park and neighborhood. The main pavilion should stay as it is a gathering place, and can be used for park interpretation events.

The Ft Hunt concert series should continue.

As the Federal budget is very tight, I am surprised that development of Ft Hunt Park is being considered, especially as heavily used National Parks staff and resources are being cut. We should maintain what we have first and if development money is allocated to Ft Hunt Park, it should be minimally developed.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 115

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/12/2011 Date Received: 10/12/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thanks for the extended opportunity to comment. While the proposed plan seems comprehensive, the recommendation for removal of the pavillions is disappointing. As a user of the park, and nearby resident within just a few blocks, I have enjoyed and hope to continue to enjoy the park for its historical and recreational use, but primarily the latter. Because I enjoy learning about area history, I would appreciate a plan that incorporates a visitor center which provides historical information for patrons, but also continues to allow for use of the park as a recreational facility that includes pavillions, and perhaps also an enhanced/improved playground for toddlers. Fort Hunt is unique for its availability of pavillions which always seem to be in use when I've visited the park. I'm a single working mother with a toddler, who enjoys weekends walking and picnicking in the park, playing soccer there with my daughter, and teaching her how to ride a bike. I just moved to the area from Del Ray but used Fort Hunt Park long before I became a nearby resident. Fort Hunt Park was one of the neighborhood attractions that influenced my decision to live within walking distance to the park. The facilities and amenities also add value to the community and neighboring properties, and in a time of economic and real-estate turmoil, proposed construction changes could potentially have a negative impact.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
Fort Hunt Area Resident & Patr

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 116

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bob S. Slusser
Organization: VA Dept of Conservation & Recreation
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 6902 Clemson Dr. Alexandria, VA 22307
Potomac Watershed Office, 98 Alexandria Pike, Suite 33, Warrenton, VA 20186
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: bob.slusser@dcr.virginia.gov

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/13/2011 Date Received: 10/13/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Your contractor did a good job under difficult circumstances from local residents. My concern is primarily with compaction on the property from either foot traffic or hard surface runoff of precipitation and increasing the possibility of precipitation infiltration into the groundwater network.

Does your forage management plan include aeration techniques to counteract the heavy foot traffic the large grass area will receive from summer time influx of visitors.

Is there a possibility to incorporate a native plant meadow within your plan. This would be an excellent educational tool for plant identification for schools K through college. I am not unaware of what that would do for the deer population, but that can also be an educational opportunity.

Would the NPS consider incorporating stormwater harvesting techniques beyond conventional practices next to the hard surfaces of buildings and road surfaces?

Because of the central location this site would be excellent for a demonstration of increased infiltration within a meadow site and the normal lawn approach now being conducted. Is the NPS open to further discussions along these lines or is it your desire to retain this park as a resting/holding area for the tourist traffic that passes up and down the GWPRKWAY.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 117

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/13/2011 Date Received: 10/13/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

My family and I have used Fort Hunt Park every day for the past 17 years. The pavilions were a great addition, and the NPS crew does an amazing job of tree trimming, grass cutting, and maintaining the park. We have always felt that this was our very own "Central Park" in the middle of Alexandria with all of the young families, international groups, and office outings that utilize this facility. It truly is a national treasure and would be a devastating loss to our community if the Assessment Plan as described moves forward.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 118

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Glenda C. Booth
Organization: Friends of Dyke Marsh
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: PO Box 7183
Alexandria, VA 22307
USA
E-mail: gbooth123@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The Friends of Dyke Marsh reiterate the comments we submitted on March 1, 2011, with one addition at the end on protecting bald eagle habitat.

Fort Hunt Park is an important local resource, significant national park, historic site and partly natural area in the "chain" of natural areas along the Virginia shoreline of the Potomac River. While not directly connected to the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, we do appreciate and support the preservation and restoration of natural areas and support enhancing their interconnectedness, especially for birds and other animals that move across habitats.

Given the serious degradation of natural resources in Fairfax County and the long history of development at the expense of natural resources, many people look to the National Park Service and its conservation mission to preserve what little of our natural resources remain.

We applaud the National Park Service for its attention to the site and for involving the public in its decision-making. We appreciate NPS's attention to goal of interpreting the varied and interesting history of the park. We will not comment on the historic preservation aspects, as our organization's focus has traditionally been on the restoration and conservation of natural resources. By not addressing the historic resources there, we do not mean to suggest that that preserving and interpreting that history is not important. It is.

Rather, given our mission, we will comment largely on the natural resources aspects of the park. We are very encouraged to learn that a rare arthropod species new to science may be present in the park and look forward to your conclusions.

We share the following statistics so that NPS can better understand some of the "local context."
"Sick" Streams: Fort Hunt Park is in the Little Hunting Creek watershed. The Fairfax County Little Hunting Creek Watershed Plan states that the streams in this watershed have poor habitat quality, with 10 miles of degraded buffers and eroded stream banks. Little Hunting Creek has heavy sedimentation and 95 to 99 percent of the organisms in Paul Spring Branch are pollution-tolerant species.

Of 7,000 acres in the watershed, 25 percent is impervious. The Center for Watershed Protection says that stream quality is threatened when watershed development exceeds 10-15 percent of impervious cover or one house every one to two acres.

Potomac River Got a "C": The Potomac received a "C" grade in 2010, thus denoting moderate ecosystem health, by the University of Maryland Center for Environmental Sciences. The Potomac River has consistently gotten grades of D and C by the Potomac Conservancy. Parts of the river are on the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency's impaired rivers list. The river is under a PCB fish consumption advisory. The Potomac Conservancy has called the river "toxic," because of the presence of endocrine disrupting compounds, perhaps linked to intersex fish (fish with male and female reproductive organs.)

Unhealthy Air: Fairfax County does not meet federal ozone air quality standards. The American Lung Association in April 2009 gave the Washington, D.C. area an F grade for smog, the 14th worst area in the U.S. for smog. ALA gave the 22308 ZIP code a grade of F for ozone and for particulate pollution in April 2009. Ozone measurements at the now terminated Mount Vernon air monitor have recorded some of the worst ozone levels in the county in the past decade.

Trees Lost: The county's tree cover has declined from 75 percent in the 1970s to around 41 percent today, according to EQAC and the Urban Forestry Division. If we do nothing, the tree cover will drop to 37 percent. To reach 50 percent by 2030, the county needs 1.9 million trees or 80,000 a year.

The Chesapeake Bay region has lost forested land at a rate of 100 acres per day since the mid-1980s and suburban sprawl has chewed up over three quarters of a million acres in the last 30 years, The State of Chesapeake Forests found in 2007.

Invasives Common: Many parks and nature preserves in Virginia typically consist of between 25 and 34 percent of non-native plants, according to your data. Much of the county's biodiversity has been lost to non-native trees and plants and to monocultures like grassy lawns.

Recommendations:

? Do not expand impervious surfaces in the park, including parking lots and roofs and use low-impact development approaches in addressing stormwater runoff, designed to retain stormwater on-site instead of sending it into streams and into the Potomac River.

? Use pervious surfaces when parking lots need repairs or replacement and consider reducing the size of parking lots.

? Control invasive species and plant only native trees and plants, to create and enhance native habitat.

? Conduct a complete biological survey before initiating major construction or changes.

? Actively promote use of public transit to the site, especially the Fairfax Connector bus which currently passes by the park many times a day. Work with the county to create a bus stop at the park.

? Work with the county and local tourist agencies to create a hop-on, hop-off bus for visitors touring sites in the Mount Vernon area.

? Replace some of the grassy areas with native groundcover or other native vegetation.

? Develop interpretative programs to explain how native Americans used the area and moved among the areas along the Potomac River, including the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve.

? Enhance interpretative programs that help visitors better understand the natural resources of the river, the parkway, the park and the larger area and the importance of natural connectivity.

- ? Work with neighboring property owners to encourage uses compatible with the restoration and conservation of natural resources.
- ? Continue to require dogs and pets to be on a leash.
- ? Consider requiring users to take out all of their trash.
- ? Protect the bald eagle nesting and foraging habitat.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 119**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Glenda C. Booth
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support your efforts to preserve and interpret the important history of Fort Hunt Park and your efforts to preserve and restore natural resources at the park.

Please work with the county to establish and promote a Fairfax Connector bus stop there so that traffic will not increase. Many people take the 101 bus to Mount Vernon Estate and Gardens daily, thus getting cars off our roads and reducing vehicular pollution.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 120

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ronald B. Greenleese
Organization: "the Walkers" ie (ages 90,83,75,53)
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8722 Eugene Place
Alexandria, VA 22308-2630
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/14/2011 Date Received: 10/14/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Oct 14,2010

Dear NPS

For 15 years I have been an almost DAILY user of the Fort Hunt Park. I write to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Park's facilities. Simply put, in my judgment, three of the four alternatives are far more destructive than necessary. It is my contention that the NPS NEED NOT DESTROY TO CREATE. Among the FOUR ALTERNATIVES, the only one that did not destroy was ALTERNATIVE ONE, the Status Quo.

The "preferred alternative" WIPES-OUT the most VISITOR-WORTHY ASSET ADDITIONS the PARK has seen in 25 yrs.: the "new" Pavilion/Picnic areas and their parking areas, ball fields and rest rooms. This alternative is wasteful and unnecessary.

Secondly, but just as important, this "Preferred Alternative" alters the existing "LOOP" so it is TOTALLY INTERRUPTED AND NO LONGER CONTINUOUS. The NPS' planners should recognize that this 1.25 mile LOOP OF PAVED ROADWAY IS THE HUB OF THE PARK'S WHEEL. Because it is PAVED and has WIDTH and is SAFE, it is THE HAVEN for walkers, joggers, cyclists, baby coaches, rollerbladers, birders, and others. The "LOOP"

should be retained "as is" with no paved surfacing removed.

The NPS can still build its "VISITOR CENTER" in Area "C" and erect any trails WITHOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF EITHER THE LOOP OR THE PAVILION/PICNIC FACILITIES. The Park's existing assets need not be destroyed to successfully memorialize the PARK'S history. The existing and the "new" can co-exist for the benefit of both.

The NPS proposed alternatives and their presentation on Sept 21st made me wonder if, in fact, the NPS has already determined what you will do with FORT HUNT PARK and your solicitation of public commentary was strictly to get in compliance with Federal law. I hope that is not the case. Hence, I trust you will be willing to re-examine the issues and put credence in the above constructive criticisms.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald B.Greenleese rbgadg@aol.com
8722 Eugene Place, 703-360-6695
Alexandria, VA 22308

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 121

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: Collingwood resident
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/15/2011 Date Received: 10/15/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am strongly in favor of keeping the park as a recreational retreat as well as highlighting the important historical heritage. I think the park is currently safe for walkers, bicylists, and cars at slow speeds. The pavilions are used extensively, and I think they actually bring in revenue when they are reserved for functions.

It seems appropriate that the small white house at the entry could be the center of the historical presentation. I understand that leaving the house intact might be important, and there appears to be enough space adjacent to it to expand that entry area into a meaningful visitor/historical center.

I also hope that the park police stable and horses will remain. Their presence is a much beloved asset to the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 122

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/16/2011 Date Received: 10/16/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Thank you for extending the comment period on future development plans for FT Hunt Park (FHP).

I support the goal of the National Park Service (NPS) to highlight the rich historical significance of FHP, and believe that goal can be achieved using a balanced approach of preserving and showcasing what is left of the Park's structures while preserving and showcasing the natural beauty and recreational opportunities the Park affords it's visitors.

I understand that perhaps the loop road, a ball field and a pavillion are currently situated where historical structures once stood. That is unfortunate, but it is fact. Instead of removing the road, field or pavillion I suggest the placement of a wayside informational sign in a prominent location at the site that does not interfere with the current use of the site. I am unaware of any plans to reconstruct a mock-up of, for example, a barracks where prisoners were held. Visitors will be left to visualize the barracks after reading the informational sign...which is as easily done looking at a ball field as looking at a grassy field. Most of the surviving historical structures at FHP already have wayside informational signs posted in front of them and posting similar signs where historical structures once stood would be in keeping with already established practices. Leaving the ball fields and pavillions in place benefit all visitors to FHP, in addition to providing a revenue source to the NPS, and would not prevent the historical aspects of the Park from being highlighted.

Personally, I would beg the NPS to leave the loop road as it is...two lanes is wide enough for walkers, bikers and motorists to comfortably share and with a convenient-for-all traffic pattern. While not relevant

to the historical significance of the park, the loop road provides a safe walking and biking path heavily used by locals. In this congested area a few miles from our nation's capital, the recreational uses of this road are of extreme importance to the locals who use it frequently and the out of town visitors who use it occasionally. The Mount Vernon Trail is a treasured gem provided by the NPS. However, it is so heavily used that it has become unsafe and, as such, I don't use it anymore. The narrow trail's lovely winding path puts pedestrians and bicyclists in too close proximity for comfort and safety in my opinion. {As an aside, I would love to see the MT Vernon Trail expanded to both sides of the Parkway with one side being for bicycles and one side being for pedestrians.} The NPS should be a good neighbor and leave the loop road as wide as it is to allow its multiple current uses to continue.

I am in favor of a visitors center being constructed. Perhaps one pavillion could be given up and the visitors center be built where it stands so as to not have to increase the pavement footprint at the Park. Perhaps pick the location based upon the shelter that provides the least revenue in rental income?

In October 2010, I attended an event sponsored by the NPS at Fort Hunt Park that offered exhibits and guided tours of the remaining batteries and other structures. It was a very well done event and I learned a lot of fascinating facts about this national park. The activities that occurred at Fort Hunt Park during times of various wars are part of our history. FHP is not the site of a former torture camp. FHP is not a burial ground. FHP does not have a dark and sinister past. What Fort Hunt Park does have is an opportunity for the National Park Service to instruct, preserve and showcase the former uses of the Park during important times in our Nation's history as well as an opportunity to maintain a Park that invites locals and tourists to get outdoors and find pleasure and knowledge while surrounded by the Parks historic and natural surroundings. Both endeavors - showcasing the historical aspects of FHP and offering recreational opportunities - can be achieved without causing detriment to the other.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 123

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ethel R. Eaton
Organization: Virginia Department of Historic Resources  Official Rep.
Organization Type: S - State Government
Address: 2801 Kensington Avenue
Richmond, VA 23221
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/05/2011 Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail

Notes:

Correspondence Text

October 5, 2011

Dottie P. Marshall, Superintendent
National Park Service
George Washington Memorial Parkway
Turkey Run Park
McLean, Virginia 22101

Re: Site Development Plan Fort Hunt Park
Fairfax County, Virginia
DHR File No. 2011-0141

Dear Ms. Marshall:

Thank you for your letter of September 2, 2011 requesting our comments on the Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan Environmental Assessment and Assessment of Effect. The document is well-written and thorough. As you know, we have earlier agreed with your approach to development of the plan and have concurred that the National Park Service' planning process here will not restrict the subsequent consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate any future undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties. We have no further comments on the plan.

We look forward to working with you and the other consulting parties on any individual undertakings that may arise from the site development plan under the 2008 Service-wide Programmatic Agreement. If you have any questions concerning our comments, or if we may provide any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (804)482-6088; fax (804) 367-2391; e-mail ethel.eaton@dhr.virginia.gov.

Sincerely,

Ethel R. Eaton, Ph.D., Senior Policy Analyst
Division of Resource Services and Review

c. Matthew Virta, Cultural Resource Manager

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 124

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Allan Dickson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8813 Camfield Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: a.dickson@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. Sheffer:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park.

I and my dog have walked in the park four miles every day for years (two 2-mile excursions). We use the paved road until reaching the woods trail and then continue on from there. See my comments on change ideas below:

1. I think most of the restrooms should be improved. The pavilion one seems to be in good condition, but perhaps should have a greater capacity.
I would also like for the restrooms to be open year round.
2. In view of the new historical information becoming available, I think a Visitor Center is a good idea. Perhaps a good place would be in Area B where it would be seen early in a visitor's experience.
3. Please don't remove any of the ball fields. Their use should be encouraged.
4. I think that the main road looping the park should be kept as is, but with two-way traffic.
5. I'm neutral on a bike/walking path. We are happy with using the existing road loop.

6. I would like to see an area designated for dogs to walk and/or play in. It used to be permitted in the area of the closed (for traffic) back loop. Probably an enclosing fence would be a good idea.

7. I am happy with the trail through the woods as it is. Paving the trail might be an interesting idea, but not immediately necessary.

8. Please find someone to raise and lower the flag each day. This is a classy park and an empty flag pole is an embarrassment to our community!

9. The existing parking lots should all be retained. This will spread out the visitor traffic.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 125

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Daniel Gross
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 5005 Bangor Drive, Kensington MD 20895-1215
Kensington, MD 20895
USA
E-mail: dangr2@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/22/2011 Date Received: 10/22/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have spent the last seven years learning as much as possible about the Ritchie Boys, who were intelligence officers trained at Camp Ritchie in northern Maryland. Some of the Ritchie Boys were stationed at PO Box 1142 where they contributed greatly to the war effort while others served directly in North Africa, Europe and Asia obtaining vital information from prisoners of war and civilians. In 2006, I became a National Park Service volunteer on the Fort Hunt Project in support of their efforts to capture oral histories from surviving veterans of PO Box 1142 and the NPS has already taken oral histories from over 70 veterans of PO Box 1142. One of my most memorable experiences was getting to meet a number of the World War II veterans who served at PO Box 1142 during the reunion in October 2007.

Based upon this and other research that the National Park Service has performed, I believe that it is critical that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park without delay to tell these stories and to display the artifacts that have been and will continue to be collected. Fort Hunt Park has also been the site of other historic activities since its establishment in 1898 and these should also become part of the overall history. The center should be state-of-the-art in terms of climate control and fire protection and provide sufficient security for the collections. It should also contain a small auditorium for viewing videos, which would include video segments from the recollections of its World War II veterans. Such a center is a key part of the three action alternatives in the proposed Site Development Plan (SDP) that the NPS has issued for the site. Also the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is

part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. However, if it is possible, at least two picnic pavilions could be retained for the near future at Fort Hunt Park in the final SDP to commemorate that part of the park's history. Other picnic tables could also be positioned along the interpretive trail so that students, families and other groups can have picnics, play in the park and also learn about the site's important history. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception. It belongs not only to the nearby residents but to the Nation as well.

Please do not miss the opportunity to make the work of the NPS historians and volunteers available to all future visitors to Fort Hunt Park. And let's not forget the important work which our servicemen and women did at PO Box 1142 during World War II.

Daniel Gross
NPS Volunteer
Home Phone: 301-949-5663

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 126

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/23/2011 Date Received: 10/23/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I prefer the options that keep picnic area "C" open.

This covered pavilion is one of the few in the entire metropolitan area that provides picnic space for moderate size groups, and allows beer/wine.

I'm a member of a group that has members spanning the entire Baltimore/Washington Metro area, and twice a year we all drive down to Ft. Hunt park JUST to use area C-002. We haven't found an equivalent space anywhere else in the area.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 127

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Margaret A. Cathro
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1110 Chadwick Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/08/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Superintendent:

I would like to comment you and the NPS on soliciting the public's opinions on the proposed redevelopment project and on extending the comment period to allow more interested parties to respond. I stand firmly in my belief that any new development in Fort Hunt Park would be unwelcome.

The one way road around the park is used continuously by locals who enjoy the open road to walk, jog and cycle. Because the loop goes nowhere, it is not used by commuters and is, thus, quiet and peaceful. I am certain many people move to our area because of the quality of life. The park, as it now stands, is a big part of that quality.

I would also like to address the public use of the fields and pavilions. While I do not use these areas myself, I do enjoy seeing all the various activities that are going on as I take my walks. Again, the park currently invites people to remain physical while enjoying beautiful, natural surroundings. Surely this is the most valuable and productive use of Fort Hunt Park.

If we have surplus money (do we?) to spend, I would much prefer to see the bike trail widened to accommodate both walkers and cyclist, maybe even making separate lanes for each. Alternatively, we could add a sidewalk all along Fort Hunt Road so that one could safely walk to the shops. Both these expenditures would enhance the area and encourage a healthier community.

If you are looking for a way to bring in revenue, I might suggest a little petting zoo with pony rides, situated near the police horses. This, of course, would benefit mostly the local population. Somehow, I just do not see even a fancy visitor center pulling in a large number of tourists from out-of-state as we live in an area with so many other, better-known attractions. I do hope that the building project is not just an

ego-booster for some politician or architect.
Sincerely,
Margaret A. Cathro

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 128

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: William W. Hess
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 15211 Elkridge Way
Silver Spring, MD 20906
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Superintendent Marshall:

I am a World War II veteran who trained at the Camp Ritchie Military Intelligence Training Center in Cascade, MD. After that I served at P.O. Box 1142, the site of the current Fort Hunt Park. P.O. Box 1142 was a top-secret military installation at which high value German prisoners of war were interrogated, where the escape and evasion program to assist pilots and others downed behind enemy lines was conducted, and where military intelligence research was performed. After the war, the buildings at P.O. Box 1142 were demolished and all records burned. Those of us who served there were sworn to secrecy about the site.

In the 1990s records about the site at the National Archives were declassified. The National Park Service (NPS) started researching the site and was able to identify some veterans who had served at P.O. Box 1142, who then told them about additional veterans who worked there. I was interviewed by NPS several years ago about my service at PO Box 1142. I understand that the NPS has conducted over 70 oral histories, not just of US veterans but also of some German prisoners of war who were interrogated there. I have been aware that the NPS is engaged in a process to build a Visitor Center at Fort Hunt Park to memorialize the story of P.O. Box 1142, as well as the entire history of the site so that all future visitors will understand how this park served its country in war and peace.

I believe that it is critical that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park without delay to tell these stories

and display the artifacts that have been and will continue to be collected. The center should be state-of-the-art and contain a small auditorium for viewing videos. Also the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception. It belongs not only to the nearby residents but to the nation as well. Our nation would be diminished if future generations did not have access to the story of P.O. Box 1142 and see the site where it was located, as well as learn about the soldiers who contributed to helping end WWII quicker.

I personally hope that the Visitor Center is built as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
William W. Hess

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 129

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Carly Mang
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2408 Wittington Blvd
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Fort Hunt Park Council,

My name is Carly Mang and I am a 6th grader from Fort Hunt Elementary School. When I was reading in the Mount Vernon Gazette I realized that you might demolish the park pavilions mean a lot to me and other people. I have lived here since 2008 and every moment at Fort Hunt Park has been great. I have had practices, parties and playdates there as well as just walking my dog with my family. It is what makes the park attractive to other kids. My elementary school has had their Fort Hunt Fox Trot there every November and the location can't be beat. Waking up in with the crisp cool November air and running with our friends is something we all look forward to. lots of new kindergarteners are looking forward to this as well. If you make the park a strictly historical site and get rid of the pavilions, it will change the Fox Trot forever!

I think there should be more historical and educational things but part of the reason people come to the park are the memories. Many people lived here as children and would like to carry on their memories with their own children ... if you get rid of the pavilions, this won't happen. Picnics with family are an important part of childhood and Fort Hunt Park is the perfect place for this. I hope you will take this into consideration when you make a decision about the fate of the park.

Sincerely,
Carly Mang

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 130

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Katherine S. Moore
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8637 Winthrop Dr.
Alexandria, VA 22308-2549
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/18/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

To Whom It May Concern,
The enclosed letters explain my feelings better than I can ? Please read both of them.
It's too bad agencies don't work together, as it would make sense to include the Fort Hunt Park history as part of the new Army Museum at Fort Belvoir. Then if people were really interested, they could make a trip to the park.
Thank you for taking time to read the letters

Katherine S. Moore

Attached ? Letter to the editor from Mount Vernon Gazette

"To the Editor:

I read with interest the recent article in the Mount Vernon Gazette about proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park. Having lived near the park for the past 40 years and seeing my family, friends and neighbors take advantage of its facilities, I was surprised to learn that anyone would suggest tearing down the pavilions to make it a passive historical site. I feel strongly that the park should continue as it had in the past, as an active and beautiful recreational facility for our community.

I am certain appropriate markers and informational signs could also designate it as a proper historical site and relay any information you desire. If community effort is needed to allow this to happen, I would be happy to be involved.

Daniel A. Mica

Member of Congress (Ret.)
Alexandria"

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 131

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Roy A. Rathburn
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8706 Camden Street
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/10/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Ms. Marshall:

Good day to you. You are free to use my name, address, and these comments for any official NPS business. Please withhold my phone number from public distribution.

I am a frequent user of the southern end of GWMP including Fort Hunt Park (Park FHP), and I have lived nearby Stratford Landing neighborhood almost adjacent to the Park since 1993. I am also an NPS volunteer, in service since 2005. All questions I ask below are rhetorical, and I do not expect a personal reply to these comments.

Comment Summary:

Given the choice of alternatives in the SDP, I recommend Alternative A - no action alternative. If NPS is open to alternatives not listed in the SDP, I offer one below under the Additional Explanation for my Note 3 near the end of this letter.

1. Visitor Center

I am firmly opposed to building a visitor center, which would consume NPS funds to build, staff, operate, and maintain.

2. Removal of pavilions and restrooms

I support making changes to the Park to promote its historical significance, but they should be made without removal of existing facilities, such as the pavilions. I support altering roadways, building trails, and making other improvements to Park access.

Additional Explanation:

1. Visitor Center

With the general scarcity of funding these days, I am surprised that NPS would propose to build something as costly as a permanent visitor's center. The Park is nearly empty in the cool months, particularly on weekdays, and such a center would probably not be in operation for a good portion of the year. If NPS kept the center open year-round I believe it would be a waste of resources, given the few visitors it would attract in the off-season.

I believe that NPS should use its limited funding to properly maintain and repair facilities and property that now exist, rather than construct, staff, operate, and maintain things like new buildings. For example, the drinking water line and fountains between FHP and Mr. Vernon have been out of service for years. The Mount Vernon Trail had needed widening for a decade or more, to improve safety and properly handle traffic. Overhead canopies are needed at rest stops to protect visitors from storms. Scrubby bushes have grown into wide, ugly trees that obstruct the water view at many overlooks, and trimming or removal of them is necessary. As an NPS volunteer on the MV Trail since 2005, believe me when I say that I could list many more items!

Please spend taxpayer money on these things before investing in new, potentially underused, buildings. As an alternative to a visitor center, NPS should consider an open-air information kiosk, placed near the Park entrance. It could display historical photos, a large map of the Park, and provide handouts. A kiosk would be smaller and cheaper to build and requires no staffing, but it could be temporarily staffed when needed for special events. Standing on its own, it could provide the majority of the information required to send visitors on their way through the Park.

2. Removal of pavilions and restrooms

I recommend that NPS not tear the picnic pavilions down?period. For NPS to now come out and say ? after 65 years ? that the Park is not intended as a recreation area for visitors and people who might live nearby is elitist and downright haughty. I'm frankly ashamed NPS would feel this way about the Park. Such a view indicates to me that NPS is out of touch with its "customers" ? its most frequent visitors, including the Park's neighbors. For most of those 65 years, the original use of the Park as a POW camp was kept out of the public eye, and now NPS wants to promote that history as the primary reason for the Park's existence? Few major physical relics of the POW camp exist. There are gun batteries from earlier times, but not one gun. The Park has a degree of historical significance, but quite limited physical attractions. The sum of all of this does not justify a major shift from recreational use to historical interpretation.

3. Increase the Park's historical attributes but do not remove other Park facilities; I propose a new alternative

None of the alternatives listed in the SDP allow for only improving the Park's access and modifying roads and trails, all of which I support. I also support outdoor improvements to the Park's historical interpretation (meaning no visitor's center). I recommend that these two objectives be approached together and without removal of existing, highly useful facilities such as the pavilions. I suggest that this approach be incorporated into the SDP and be the alternative NPS adopts for future improvements to the Park.

Let me momentarily digress a bit?FHP is not, in my opinion, comparable to the massive Ft. Washington Park as a tourist attraction. I wonder if the pending changes to FHP are partially motivated by a desire to "compete" with Ft. Washington as a historically significant destination? GWMP and other NPS bureaucracies compete for funding, and I feel that this could be a part of the debate here.

Conclusion

I believe that the historical aspects of FHP can and should be enhanced, provided that those changes coexist with the current use of the Park as a recreation area. Please leave the pavilions in place. And

don't waste taxpayer money on a visitor's center.

FHP can and should be maintained as a public resource that serves and benefits a variety of historical, cultural, social, and community purposes and interested at the same time.

Respectfully submitted,

Roy A. Rathburn

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 132

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dorothy White
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8716 Standish Rd
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 10/06/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Mr. James,
I am writing in regard to the changes proposed to Ft. Hunt Park.
You were quoted in the newspaper that it is not "our park." I beg to differ with you. It is "ours" ? the community, the county, the state, federal and national ? all made up of people!
We have lived by the park for 50+ years. We are proud of the history of the park. Thanks to the people who in years past have made what Ft. Hunt Park is today ? their lives have given us a place where families can enjoy our heritage.
Many parks in Virginia and the USA are historical. They have signs, maps, etc. in the park telling about the history, Ft. Hunt could too.
The park is used by a wide variety of groups. Just this week the news came out, a picture of a group of first responders to 9-11 was taken at one of the pavilions ? in the same paper. Why take down the pavilions? They were only constructed a few years ago. Their construction and design is a work of art.
Ft. Hunt is a family friendly park. There are many family reunions, picnic, and company picnics plus concerts. Wonderful for walking, biking and driving through.
It is a beautiful park the year round. Especially when the leaves turn color. People come every year from far and near to take pictures.
The family units are under so much stress now. This is a quiet safe place to take your children to run, play and just close to nature. No drinking is allowed so it is a pleasant safe surroundings.
The roads are in excellent condition ? because 50 years ago they were very well built.
Please reconsider disturbing a good thing ? "when something is working (well) why change it."

Sincerely,
Dorothy White

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 133

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: jeff N/A
Organization: self, citizen
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
alexandria, VA 22313
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/24/2011 Date Received: 10/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Below are my comments on the Fort Hunt Site Development Plan, Environmental Assessment and Assessment of Effect, dated 5 Sep 2011

NOTE: I have provided a copy of these comments to Congressman Jim Moran

General comment: my wife and I use the park every Saturday and Sunday morning to walk ourselves and our small dog. The first time we became aware of this proposal was on the weekend of 15-16 October by seeing only two signs: one at the entry into the park where the entry road intersects with Loop Rd (near the NCO Quarters) and at the foot path entry near the northwest corner of the park opposite Loop Rd from parking area B. Obviously, this was after the original open comment date closed (6 Oct) and after the sole public meeting (21 Sep).

In your SDP, section titled "Purpose of and Need for the Action" you write the following:

The SDP is needed "because peak visitation periods exceed the park's carrying capacity, which creates a need to balance the different types of visitor use with resource protection. Fort Hunt Park has seen increased visitation in the last five years. Fort Hunt Park sees the majority of visitors in the spring and summer months, when the picnic areas throughout the park are available for reservation. Use of the picnicking facilities often overwhelms the park infrastructure, including restrooms and parking, which may deter those wishing to utilize the park for other uses. This intensity of recreational use also puts park

resources, particularly cultural resources, at risk to impacts and disturbance. Actions to reduce permitted picnic areas as well as the realignment of vehicular circulation are in line with reducing these risks."

My summary of the above:

- ? The park is "at capacity"
- ? The NPS wants to protect the park's resources
- ? The park is very popular and its popularity is increasing
- ? Peak use (presumably when its "at capacity") is limited to spring and summer months
- ? "At capacity" is defined by use of picnicking facilities "overwhelming" restrooms and parking
- ? Park's cultural resources are at risk when the park is "at capacity"; ie, the "overwhelmed" restrooms and parking put the cultural resources at risk
- ? The NPS solution to protect these cultural resources is to reduce the amount of picnicking and "vehicular circulation" (ie, eliminate the Loop Rd by eliminating various portions of it)

Given that these are the NPS concerns, then proposed alternatives B, C, and D are illogical and do not follow from these concerns.

If picnicking is the "root cause" of the problems (ie, "overwhelmed" restrooms and parking), then reducing the number of picnicking and restroom facilities runs counter to this. The NPS should not reduce them; in fact, the NPS makes the case for increasing the number of these facilities.

The NPS avers and implies that the current configuration of Fort Hunt (ie, current number of picnic areas, restrooms, and path of Loop Rd) somehow "impacts and disturbs" the cultural resources. Based on the NPS proposed alternatives B, C, and D, it appears that the NPS wants to preserve these cultural resources for the public, yet would prefer to protect them by reducing access to them by the public and actually minimize their enjoyment by the public it serves. It seems that this actually runs counter to the NPS project objective to "enhance the visitor experience".

In fact, in Table 3 and again in chapter 4, you state that the current park configuration has only "minor impacts" to the "cultural landscapes" and all alternative actions would also have "minor impacts" to the same. Similarly, the "archeological resources". Even more so, regarding the "Historic Structures or Districts" you state that alternative A ("no action") has no impacts on the park while alternatives B, C, and D all have impacts (albeit minor) on the park. These alternatives seem to run counter to the stated "Purpose and Need for the Action" and in fact makes the argument for "no action" or leave the park as is.

In your SDP, section titled "Project Objectives" you write that "The SDP involves environmental effects over a broad time horizon and the detail of the impact analysis is fairly general in nature because individual project plans are not fully developed."

Further, in your SDP, section titled "NPS Management Policies, Section 4.1.3."you write that:

"The NPS will ensure that the environmental costs and benefits of proposed actions are fully and openly evaluated before implementing actions that may impact the natural resources of parks. The process of evaluation must include public engagement; the analysis of scientific and technical information in the planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes; the involvement of interdisciplinary teams; and the

full incorporation of mitigation measures and other principles of sustainable park management (NPS 2006b)."

I have not seen anywhere in this SDP and its appendices or in the "FOHU Open House Presentation" that the NPS has followed this. I do not see any cost analysis of the various alternatives. Further, by the NPS' own admission (quoted above), "the impact analysis is fairly general in nature because individual project plans are not fully developed." Finally, public engagement was late and minimized; hence, the 30 day comment period extension and the "new" announcement signage.

In your SDP, section titled "Previous and Related Planning Studies" you mention a variety of studies that have been done for the areas within which Fort Hunt is included. You state that your project meets the goals and objectives of these plans and policies, but you do not state whether these plans and policies make any recommendations regarding current negative impacts by Fort Hunt or make recommendations to improve Fort Hunt and with which your proposed alternatives comply.

In your SDP, section titled "Scoping Process and Public Participation" you summarize "a number of specific considerations and concerns" provided by the public, none of which implies or can be interpreted to lead one to any of your alternatives B, C, or D. In fact, it seems that your proposed alternatives run counter to the public "considerations and concerns". Further, in this section, you state that the NPS "looked at potential designs, costs, and resource constraints" yet I do not see any cost analysis data anywhere in the SDP or its related documents.

In your SDP, section titled "Impairment" you write "According to NPS Management Policies (2006), an action constitutes an impairment when an impact would harm the integrity of park resources or values, including the opportunities that otherwise would be present for the enjoyment of those resources or values." Additionally, you write "An impact on any park resource or value may constitute an impairment, but an impact would be more likely to constitute an impairment to the extent that it affects a resource or value whose conservation is key to the opportunity for enjoyment of the park; or identified as a goal in the park's general management plan or other relevant NPS planning documents." These statements are generally confirmed in Appendices A and D.

Yet you dismiss this and state that there are no impairment findings. It seems to me that the picnic areas (which were recently refurbished and I presume at a premium cost) are facilities that are being "enjoyed" at a rate that according to the NPS and stated in the SDP, are increasingly popular; therefore, a reduction in these facilities (alternatives B, C, and D) would seem to me to be an "impairment" as defined in the SDP.

Furthermore, you state in your SDP, section titled "Visitor Use and Experience" that regarding the picnic pavilions and areas in the spring and summer months, "Providing this recreational access to the community is important to maintaining an enjoyable visitor experience." And that "the NPS is committed to providing appropriate, high quality opportunities for visitors to enjoy parks, and maintain an open, inviting, and accessible atmosphere within parks for every segment of society." This would also seem to support the notion that alternatives B, C, and D create "impairments" as defined in the document, plus runs counter to the above stated "commitment" by the NPS.

Finally, this would seem to make the case that Table 3 and chapter 4, regarding the analyses of the "Visitor Use and Experience" for alternatives B, C, and D are flawed considering they would have a permanent negative impact in this area since they reduce the number of picnic pavilions which the NPS makes the case is an important and growing part of the "visitor use and experience" at Fort Hunt Park.

General comments:

- ? no cost analysis of alternatives
- ? alternative C put forth as the "preferred alternative"

Summary: While it appears that Fort Hunt does indeed have some problems and concerns that would serve the public by remedying, root cause analysis does not lead me to any of the alternatives the NPS proposes; rather, it leads me to strongly oppose any of the 3 action alternatives and their own SDP makes the case not to do any of them. It seems to me the real problem NPS is putting forth is that there are too many picnickers during limited peak times and this is overwhelming the restroom and parking facilities. Looking closely at the data NPS provides in the SDP it would lead me to propose a solution that:

- ? Increases picnic permit fees since they are too low
- ? Tasks NPS rangers to police the permitted picnics to ensure the participants do not exceed the number of picnickers allowed on the permit, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded
- ? Uses additional portable toilets during peak seasons
- ? Realigns picnic pavilion capacity with associated parking capacity by either increasing one or the other or both
- ? Restricts parking in adjacent residential areas and tickets offenders
- ? Puts noise restrictions on permits, perhaps charges a "fine" if exceeded
- ? Improves handicap access to facilities to comply with ADA and ABA
- ? Improves the interpretive signage for the historic resources (per Appendix D recommendations)
- ? Uses physical barriers to protect historic resources
- ? Conducts a study on the archeological resources and then either conducts a "dig" at these sites or uses physical barriers to protect them
- ? Improves speed limit signage on Loop Rd, tickets offenders (as they do on the GWMP), and adds "speed bumps"

Additionally, while I have experienced numerous occasions of cars speeding by me as I walked on Loop Rd, I have had a far greater number of incidences both on Loop Rd and the closed access road with bikers who bike on the left and have nearly run me, my wife, or my little dog down. So I would also add that the solution:

- ? Changes and adds signage to reflect that pedestrians should stay left, while cars and bikes should stay to the right

Finally, since I have on numerous occasions observed that the NPS "blocks out" all of the parking lots regardless of the size of the picnic reservation resulting in many open and unused parking spaces that force other visitors to undesirably park, I would also add that the solution:

- ? Blocks out only a sufficient number of parking spaces to reflect the number requested on the permit

Conclusion: While I agree that Fort Hunt has problems that need to be solved, and while I applaud the NPS for its endeavors to make improvements, I strongly believe that their efforts have been misguided. I believe their root cause analysis and logic are flawed, and the process seems to predetermine a foregone

solution that appears to be on someone's "agenda". I believe that in this fiscally constrained time, we cannot afford to unnecessarily spend money on a solution that doesn't solve the problems. There are much cheaper and less "offensive" solutions to resolving the Fort Hunt problems.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 134

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/24/2011 Date Received: 10/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a life-long resident of the Mount Vernon/Fort Hunt area, I've enjoyed Fort Hunt Park for well over 40 years. Like many good things, Fort Hunt Park is apparently being threatened by its own popularity and the many virtues that make it a great place to visit.

I support the "No Action" alternative, but with a caveat.

Personally, I think that the answer isn't tearing down picnic pavilions or changing the facilities or mission of Fort Hunt Park. Instead, the answer lies in coming up with better controls over limiting the number of large picnics and changing the permitting process. Charge a security deposit for large events in order to guarantee a clean-up afterward. I might also consider charging automobiles (but not bikes or pedestrians) an entrance fee into the Park.

Otherwise, leave the Park as it is.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 135

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/24/2011 Date Received: 10/24/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a former resident of Washington, DC, and a supporter of the National Park System. Recently I became aware of P.O. Box 1142, a top-secret military installation at which high value German prisoners of war were interrogated, where the escape and evasion program to assist pilots and others downed behind enemy lines was conducted, and where military intelligence research was performed. After the war, the buildings at P.O. Box 1142 were demolished and records destroyed. Those who served there were sworn to secrecy about the site. When the records about the site at the National Archives were declassified, the National Park Service (NPS) started researching the site and was able to identify veterans who had served at P.O. Box 1142, who then told them about additional veterans who worked there. The NPS has conducted over 70 oral histories, mostly of US veterans but also of some German prisoners of war who were interrogated there. I have been aware that the NPS is engaged in a process to build a Visitor Center at Fort Hunt Park to memorialize the story of P.O. Box 1142, as well as the stories of other important historic activities that took place there.

I believe that it is of key importance that a Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park as soon as possible to tell these stories and display the artifacts that have been collected. Also the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS should be built. It will serve two purposes, to inform the visitors and to provide hiking opportunities.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but by no means the only part. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception. It belongs not only to the nearby residents but to

the nation as well. Our nation would be diminished if future generations did not have access to the story of P.O. Box 1142 and see the site where it was located, as well as learn about the soldiers who contributed to helping end WWII more quickly.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 136

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Cory Culver
Organization: Ft Hunt Elementary PTA President
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8832 Linton Ln
Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: cory.culver@navy.mil

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/25/2011 Date Received: 10/25/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

At a public meeting at Ft. Hunt Park, held on September 21, 2011, the National Park Service proposed three options representing significant changes to the use of Ft Hunt Park by the public. The Ft. Hunt Elementary School PTA opposes any option other than Option 1 ? no change. Ft Hunt Elementary School has used Ft Hunt Park for our annual Fox Trot race for the past 10 years. Any of the proposed options to change the park from a neighborhood use focus to an historical educational focus would jeopardize our ability to continue to use this resource. Furthermore, there is no mention in the Environmental Assessment/ Assessment of Effect about organizations such as the Ft Hunt PTA being able to continue to use the Park for community events such as the Fox Trot race if one of the proposed change options is pursued. While the proposed changes to the Park include the existence of walking trails in lieu of the loop road, it is doubtful that this type of infrastructure would be sufficient to support a race typically attended by a few hundred racers and observers. The Fox Trot race is one of the most popular and highly attended family events the Ft Hunt Elementary PTA sponsors, including participation by other neighborhood running clubs. The loss of our school's namesake park as a venue for this event would be a significant setback for the PTA's goal of community building. We request that the National Park Service reassess its proposals.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 137

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/26/2011 Date Received: 10/26/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I strongly support the construction of the Visitor Center and interpretive trail at Fort Hunt Park. The Visitor Center would be a unique facility celebrating the historic events that took place on this site. This is the only site where three different World War II intelligence activities took place; namely, the interrogation of high value German prisoners of war, the evasion and escape program for American soldiers in Europe and North Africa and the intelligence research service. I have travelled extensively throughout the United States and in all areas seek out National Park units. I have found these unfailingly informative, and they shed light upon many diverse aspects of US history. A number of the subjects covered and displayed by these National Parks were previously unknown to me.

I understand that there is opposition in the local community to building the Visitor Center and interpretive trail at Fort Hunt Park because it will result in the elimination of existing picnic areas. Although having a close by picnic area is a convenience for that community, other areas are available for picnicking along the nearby George Washington Memorial Parkway and in local and State parks. There is only one site at which such important World War II activities took place, as well as other activities important in the first half of the twentieth century. It is the goal and mission of the National Park System to preserve and interpret these stories and educate the American public.

There is no comparison between leaving a picnic and hiking park AS IS and interpreting important events for current and future generations of the citizens of the US and the world.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 138

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/27/2011 Date Received: 10/27/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I appreciate your providing additional comment time.
First and foremost: "We the People" include city, county & state RESIDENTS. Therefore, when Federal Governmental Officials refer to "land" or "facility" as belonging to the Federal Government - it would be nice for them to recognize a. "we" are the government b. "we" pay the salaries of "officials. c. Not every single piece of "federal land" needs to be 1. sold or converted to some civilian business or management. 2. Be CONVERTED back to a monument for historical recognition of the Indians, prisoners of war, etc. (All of America belonged to the Indians).

I LOVE Fort Hunt Park. All of it. As a member of the Air National Guard, we had our annual picnics here. As a home owner I have walked, biked, hiked, played touch football, baseball, sat with many to enjoy the outdoor concerts, taken many friends to see & read the historical markers. I have done this before the septic problem with the rangers house & after there was no longer a ranger living there - darn. I did this before the gates were locked to stop the destruction of the areas. I have talked with many the WWII vets about the facility and weapons storage. We probably exaggerated some of the historical facts and significance between Ft Washington & Ft Hunt. All of this has been a LIVING FACILITY. The horses, rangers, newcomers, & old timers truly love this park.

The idea of taking tax dollars to destroy pavillions that are not only utilized by we the people, but make money for the park. The idea of changing the traffic pattern which has made the park a copleately safe park for the old, young & in between. All of the changes you speak of are to STERILIZE Ft Hunt at the

expense of all tax payers & the enjoyment of the parks neighbors of near & far. If you have so much money when all are trying to cut social security & medicare - maybe we need to cut your budget. I would prefer not to because I believe in the parks as long as the temporary employees retain their open view of the BIG PICTURE and not just to alter to make another visitor center to walk thru & eventually decide to "civilize" it for some profit for some fat cat.

Please keep at least the parks & forests for all Americans to enjoy. Use our money wisely - hire some youth group to clean up after renting out the pavillions. Just incorporate the last 50 years of the parks history & not so far back that we wonder why TODAY'S officials aren't as wise as the ones that preserved CENTRAL PARK or formed all of our National Parks before POLITICAL OFFICIALS started selling for private profit or altering & destroying the very feeling of AMERICA & PROTECT HER, DEFEND HER, & SHE IS YOUR LAND, MY LAND -- remember -- or are all of you too young??

Thank you for reading - please reflect.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 139

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: werner E. Michel
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8426 Sulky Court, Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: Werner1michel@gmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/29/2011 Date Received: 10/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

In early 1945, probably due to my background as a refugee from Nazi Germany and as a native German linguist, I was transferred from the Infantry and trained as an interrogator at the then Military Intelligence Training Center at Camp Ritchie, MD. Through coincidence I met my cousin Fred Michel there. (We had not met since leaving our hometown in Germany.) At the completion of training, I was sent to Europe and commanded a tactical interrogation detachment supporting an infantry regiment of the 9th Infantry Division. Fred was transferred to PO Box 1142 at Fort Hunt. At the time, until some fifty years later, I knew nothing of the activities there. Eventually, both of our families established our homes in the Mt. Vernon area and both of my children graduated from the old Ft. Hunt high school. Through Fred and the NPS rangers at Ft. Hunt I subsequently learned about the important mission of PO Box 1142. Since then I have become ever more convinced of the historic significance of the contribution the activities at Ft. Hunt made in obtaining national level intelligence and thus contributing to US victory in Europe. Having resided in the immediate neighborhood for over forty years, I am certainly aware of concerns that the enjoyment of picnics, concerts, recreational and athletic activities might be affected. However, the contribution of PO Box 1142 activities during WWII should be preserved for future generations and I thus strongly support the NPS plan for Fort Hunt.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 140

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Joe Carbone
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address:
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: jcarbone1993@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/30/2011 Date Received: 10/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I support a visitor center at Ft. Hunt Park to provide visitor and interpretive services to the public. I do not support a proposal that changes the current use of the park as open space for outdoor gatherings. The federal government is working hard to promote outdoor recreation and a connection with nature, especially targeting youth, families, and minority populations (see America's Great Outdoors initiative).

Ft. Hunt has a history rooted in the needs of the times. Design a modest visitor center with room for expansion as needs change, keep pavilions, and maintain access to promote outdoor family and group activities. A hard-surface bike lane/path that can be shared with walkers and runners, and those on bikes, roller blades, and scooters promotes opportunities for families and groups to enjoy the outdoors.

Pavilions provide space for groups to gather outdoors, despite the weather.

Provide for and promote the park's picnic and modest playground facilities as well as history interpretation to visitors. This is a perfect place for DC and Mt. Vernon visitors to have lunch or diner in a kid-friendly environment while on vacation. At the same time, this should serve the local community needs and connections with Ft. Hunt.

I have heard comments that point out how Ft. Hunt is a "National Park" vs. a local park. Dismissing local connections will undermine local support, support that would otherwise help gain congressional funding for the park as well as local non-profit and business in-kind and fund-raising support. Consider the various groups that have a "sense of place" connection with Ft. Hunt. From local families, to military history buffs, to the Girl Scouts who have been there as day-campers, to all the families who hold reunions - these are the supporters of Ft. Hunt Park. It would be a shame to lose their support, and more importantly a shame for them to lose a connection with nature, history, and culture.

As you design the visitor facilities and services for the park, keep in mind how the park best promotes our current needs. That is the legacy of Ft. Hunt Park that needs to be preserved - one that honors the Park's place throughout history. Its place in history today is to promote the connection of people with outdoor recreation, history, and nature. Please make sure the design does that.

Feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss these ideas further and would like some local help connecting with groups and individualsto further the dialogue. I have experience in National Environmental Policy Act, public involvement, group facilitation, and recreation, heritage, and volunteer programs.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 141

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/30/2011 Date Received: 10/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I have lived in Stratford Landing--22308 since 1965, before that in 22307, & before that in 22303. I spent from 9 yrs of age in Fairfax Co Public Schools. I obtained my undergraduate degree from George Mason University in Fairfax. I married & own a home in Fairfax Co. I am a long time resident of Fairfax Co. We pay taxes; we enjoy our neighborhood. I also enjoy walking in Fort Hunt Regional Park. I've attended picnics, church gatherings, the summer band, & for the past 7 years, walking my dog in the peaceful & beautiful nature of Fort Hunt Park. Please do not make this natural park into a commercial venture that gives tours-- taking away one of the few nature retreats left in the DC metro area open to anyone who wishes to enjoy it. This Park was intended to be for the American public--& more specifically, Fairfax County Residents as a free unstructured, natural park, similar to I think maybe Central Park in New York City though of course not as large, but just as beautiful. If the people who use the park are abusing it by leaving debris & trash, those people should be fined & not allowed back. There must be a way to establish & enforce rules of conduct without taking the Park away from those of us who care about it & need this retreat in their lives. Perhaps, issuing passes (as in the Library passes) to gain entrance to the Park.

There are countless people who love the Park for bike riding, walking, playing games with their children, holding events such as reunions, church picnics. I'm sure there is a fee & registration to reserve the Park for large gatherings. I understand that the Park Police have complained about cleaning up messes from large events. A suggestion: Try holding a large deposit from them that will only be returned upon inspection of the facility & finding it in relatively the same condition as before they used it--CLEAN.

Most of us are good citizens who respect & enjoy the Park as well as our neighborhoods. I simply ask:

Please do not take it away.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 142

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/30/2011 Date Received: 10/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am the retired Chairman of the Department of Anesthesiology at the George Washington University Medical Center (GWUMC). I have been a long time admirer of the work of the National Parks Service and the National Parks Conservation Association.

In the winter of 2010, the magazine of the Association featured an article on P.O. Box 1142. To my great surprise, it included a photograph of one of my mentors at the G.W. Medical School, Dr. George Mandel. Dr. Mandel later became the chair of the Department of Pharmacology at GWUMC when I was on the faculty. We were close friends and associates for decades.

I became fascinated with his exploits at P.O Box 1142 during World War II and have been investigating the many resources on the subject. These include a DVD which recorded a panel discussion (11/6/2008) sponsored by the American Veterans Center and a three part series by NPR (8/2008). I also attended a seminar sponsored by the National Parks Service on 9/13/2010. I then assisted in organizing a presentation at GWUMC featuring Dr. Mandel and National Park Service, Chief Ranger Victor Santucci, on 1/26/2011.

All of the resources mentioned above are unknown to the majority of Americans, including many World War II historians. This is largely related to the clandestine nature of the work and that the military stationed there were sworn to secrecy. In addition, the records and facility were destroyed after the war.

I visited Fort Hunt Park in 2011. This expansive area has no remnants of its function during World War II. I can think of no better location to establish a Visitors Center where the story can be told to visitors from

throughout the world. I urge you to support this endeavor.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 143

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: David L. Edwards
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8737 Fort Hunt Road
Alexandria, VA 22308-2506
USA
E-mail: jersey1971@aol.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/30/2011 Date Received: 10/30/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

I am a nearby resident and have lived here since 1992.

My preference is Alternative A, no major changes.

While it is nice to see Fort Hunt Park getting attention I do not believe it will benefit by having a visitor center nor promoting its history. The park has done well as a low-key benefit for the local people and as a picnic/recreation site for locals as well as those who travel from nearby communities, including office groups from Washington DC.

I particularly enjoy walking around the loop which has not posed problems of sharing it with cars, and the wide width of the loop makes it safer to share the route with bicycles and other various forms of travel (in-line skates, ..) as well as ordinary pedestrians.

My concern with a visitor center is that it may increase traffic while decreasing the enjoyment of walking the paths - the paths may not be wide enough to share with the various modes of walking and biking.

I would also like to limit the future recurring costs for the park. Any infrastructure has a recurring cost to maintain it. Something such as a visitor center may provide little benefit but would have a significant recurring maintenance cost. I would prefer such monies to go into the natural landscaping and maintaining of the basic park.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

David Edwards

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 144

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: State Farm Insurance
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/01/2011 Date Received: 11/01/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please do not disturb the private use of the park by neighbors. This is the only venue the Fort Hunt area residents have for celebrations, concerts, weekend strolls and bike outings. I do think that the trash rules must be enforced by park officials and fine the guilty parties. I also do not think that there will be a great need for ushered trips through the park by rangers.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 145

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/02/2011 Date Received: 11/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I like the park just the way it is. However, if changes are made in the future at Fort Hunt Park, I would like to have the walking trail remain wide enough so that pedestrians are not in conflict with cyclists and skaters. I have been walking around the loop for years and we enjoy the park often. I live close enough to walk to and from the park, so no gasoline is consumed. The way things are now is just fine, but comparing alternatives B-C-D, I like Alternative C best. My fear is that the walking trail will be reduced in width to something similar in size as the George Washington Parkway trail and this is way to narrow to accomodate cyclists along with walkers/runners and inline skaters. This park is a neighborhood gem. It would be a shame to disrupt the use of the park for a handful of tourists who may come to visit the historical site. If lots of tourist come to visit, then our neighborhoods will be disrupted.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 146

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/02/2011 Date Received: 11/02/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please leave the park the way it is. I switched to the park from the parkway bike path because it is so much safer. I was always afraid my dog would get hit, bikers never let us know they were coming. We have had many close calls,. At Fort Hunt Park there is plenty of room for everyone, bikers, walkers and dogs.
It is a beautiful park, why change it. We all enjoy it and use it often.

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 147**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Pamela E. Goddard
Organization: National Parks Conservation Association
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 777 6th Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
USA
E-mail: pgoddard@npca.org

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/03/2011 Date Received: 11/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Pamela E. Goddard
Chesapeake & Virginia Program Manager
National Parks Conservation Association
777 6th St., NW, # 700
Washington, DC 20001

November 3, 2011

Superintendent
George Washington Memorial Parkway
Turkey Run Park
McLean, VA 22101

RE: Comments on Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan, George Washington Memorial Parkway

Dear Superintendent:

I am writing on behalf of the National Parks Conservation Association to comment on the Site

Development Plan for Fort Hunt Park. NPCA is a nonpartisan advocacy organization that is dedicated to protecting and enhancing America's national parks for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. NPCA has more than 600,000 members and supporters.

NPCA writes in support of Preferred Alternative C which will allow for significantly expanded interpretation of the many stories Fort Hunt has to tell and will relieve the pressures the park is currently facing due to overuse. NPCA fully supports the small footprint of the proposed visitor center, the interpretive walking trail, and the dedicated bicycle/walking path. We are pleased with the net decrease of 56,700 square feet of pavement in Alternative C and the proposed restoration of vegetation throughout the park.

As you know, Fort Hunt has a long and storied history spanning many years. Native Americans inhabited the site before European colonization. Fort Hunt Park was part of George Washington's River Farm plantation. Batteries were built there during the Spanish-American War to defend the nation's capital. Fort Hunt was used as a facility for World War I Bonus Marches and a camp for the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Recently declassified documents unveiled yet another chapter of Fort Hunt's history. During World War II, Fort Hunt was used as a top secret intelligence operation for the interrogation of German prisoners of war. From July 1942 to November 1946, the United States military brought more than 4,000 prisoners of war to Fort Hunt to gather intelligence. Among those interrogated were rocket scientist Wernher von Braun, spy Reinhard Gehlen and Heinz Schlicke, who invented infrared detection. The secrets these men and other prisoners revealed changed the course of World War II.

When news of this chapter in America's history came to light, National Park Service staff sought out the citizens who had worked at Fort Hunt who were still living. More than 70 people were interviewed and stories were shared of multiple top-secret programs. These oral histories were captured on tape and are ready to be heard by the public. It is now time to properly and thoroughly share the many layers of Fort Hunt history with the American people with a new site design.

It is obvious from the Park's own research that Fort Hunt Park is overused by outdoor recreationists. It cannot currently support the many demands upon it. Heavy park use in the Spring and Summer months overwhelms the picnic areas, restrooms, and parking. This use also has degraded the vegetation and both the playground and volleyball areas. NPCA supports and encourages enjoyment of our national parks by everyone. However, as you know the mission and goals of the National Park Service are to protect, preserve and interpret cultural resources, including archeological resources. Therefore, a new site design should highlight and protect Fort Hunt's many stories while allowing for public enjoyment of the outdoors.

We have examined all four alternatives offered in the site development plan. Alternative A which is "no action" is not acceptable as it precludes any development and presentation of the vast history of Fort Hunt Park from being shared with the public in a meaningful manner. It also would allow continued degradation of the cultural resources and structures. Finally, the negative impact of park overuse to the vegetation and natural resources would continue unabated.

Although Alternative B proposes creation of a visitors' center to tell Fort Hunt Park's stories, the flaws of this alternative make it also unacceptable. Alternative B presents a safety issue as it keeps motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians sharing the same roadway. Although the road would be widened and the bicycle/pedestrian trail would have stripes and signage to identify its use, safety concerns remain a key issue. Placement of the proposed visitor center is in a crowded area of the park, too near the road and

traffic. Finally Alternative B presents only a small decrease in pavement throughout the park.

Alternative D is the most disruptive to the natural environment of Fort Hunt Park. It calls for significant sections of paved road to be removed then additional pavement to be added to the park. This new road would cross over the planned interpretive trail, creating a safety concern for pedestrians. Alternative D seeks removal of the picnic pavilions that are currently available for reservations by the public. This will negatively impact those park patrons who come to Fort Hunt for picnicking.

We strongly support Alternative C with one caveat. We urge the National Park Service to retain two picnic pavilions rather than one, if possible. This will allow park visitors to continue using the park for outdoor celebrations while mitigating negative impacts of overuse. However we support this caveat only if it does not interfere with the implementation of Alternative C. Alternative C calls for upgrading a ball field, refurbishing the volleyball courts and playground and replanting damaged vegetation ? all of which will add to outdoor enjoyment.

In conclusion, Alternative C's small visitor center, interpretive walking trail and the dedicated bicycle/walking path make it the best option for future development of Fort Hunt Park. Adding new signage at the park entrance would help guests learn more about the park's place in history. Creating a state-of-the-art visitor center will finally allow the full and rich history of Fort Hunt's many stories to be shared widely. We urge the National Park Service to ensure that sufficient financial resources are available to accomplish the goals outlined in Alternative C. This critical funding will help to restore Fort Hunt Park's natural beauty and to give it the proper platform that will allow park visitors to learn about its fascinating place in American history.

Sincerely,

Pamela E. Goddard
Chesapeake & Virginia Program Manager
National Parks Conservation Association

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 148

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/03/2011 Date Received: 11/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

November 3, 2011

SUBJECT: Fort Hunt Site Development Plan Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect

Dear National Park Service and Superintendent

To whom it may Concern,

I am writing to you to express my disappointment and dismay at the NPS plans for the development of Fort Hunt Park. This little park is an oasis of Nature where the local citizens can truly recuperate from the stress of our over populated area on a daily basis.

Having grown up in this area, I have had over 45 years of experience enjoying Ft. Hunt Park. My old high school, Fort Hunt High School, was named after Fort Hunt. Every reunion we have ever planned has included a picnic on one day at Ft. Hunt Park. We grew up here and we brought back our children and grandchildren here. My parents would go walking at all seasons of the year as long as they were physically able. Picnickers have always been there on weekends in the summer months but with the change of weather they also leave the park for the other 3 seasons of the year. Living within 10 minutes from the park, I am one of the people that walk in the park everyday at all times of the year. Fort Hunt Park is like a member of my family. I witness the drama of migration (they stop on their migration for a short period of time to regain their strength right where you are planning on felling the trees and building your center!) Raptors winter in Fort Hunt Park. Not to speak of the wonder of the nesting bald eagles and glimpses of bird species that one just doesn't see anymore in Fairfax County since the "development" of the Mt. Vernon area, Route 66 and Prince William County. Not just the birds, but there are terrapins and

other reptiles, deer, ground hogs, foxes and other wildlife that have no other place to go if more people are attracted to Fort Hunt Park on a regular basis. When I grew up there was so much natural forest and typical Virginia now it is all gone. My quality of life will be diminished if you build a new visitor's center.

The pavilions and picnic areas that were built not more than 3 years ago are still new. They naturally attracted more picnickers! You want to tear them down and start over. Why are you wasting my and the taxpayers' money?? A new Visitor's Center on virgin ground is a mistake and a waste of money. If you, as you seem intent on doing, have to have a visitor's center, then why not rebuild the main pavilion at the front entrance of the park?? One could update the building, add a story and enlarge the facility already there. There is already plumbing electricity, parking etc. This project would cost a fraction of the cost of the project that you are proposing and not destroy the park as we know it. Plus, it would leave the larger portion of the park alone. My first choice would be to leave Fort Hunt Park as undisturbed as possible.

Logically a new visitor's center for "Historic Fort Hunt Park" with more parking will attract?even MORE visitors. Widening the road will bring in the tourist busses that can't access Fort Hunt Park now. I highly object to your plans for a project to develop this gem of a natural park so close to the Washington Metro area into a tourist attraction. I would call this a form of tourist industrialization (see Mt. Vernon) that poor little Fort Hunt Park and we the nearby living citizens and wildlife of Mt. Vernon do not need!

Please include me on your mailing list for any information concerning this project.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 149

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/03/2011 Date Received: 11/03/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Ft. Hunt Future:

After reading the proposals for the future of Ft. Hunt Park I was dismayed, to put it politely. It appears that the Park Service has decided that the pavilions, except for pavilion A, must be removed and the park's focus turn mainly to out-of-town tourists and away from those who have traditionally used the park. The alternatives presented were variations of this theme and all very costly. Unfortunately, the Park Service did not include an option that would keep current structures while pursuing the goal of reducing paved surfaces and drawing in historical tourists. Considering the number of problems the project faces and other more legitimate needs across NPS properties, I suggest the NPS scale back the proposal.

Here are some concerns:

1. The NPS did not consider a much more cost effective incremental approach to expanding the historical aspect of Ft. Hunt. By this I mean establishing a kiosk or covered area and parking facility near the entrance to the park. This sort of facility could even be placed inside the retrofitted building that currently stands near the entrance. The facility could offer a good historical perspective of the park, maps, and pictures of how it looked at various stages in time. Currently this structure is not used. Instead, the option of a 6400 sq. ft. multi-use facility is suggested which will provide office space, storage, meeting rooms and display areas and more in order to enhance the visitors experience. But the massive structure begs the question of how long would the average tourist spend in such a facility when the goal is to get them outside and walking around? In my experience I do not believe it would be used by many tourists at all, except as a rest room stop or refuge from oppressive heat and humidity.
2. Considering few historical structures are left, except a commander's battery station, two battery

stations and the NCO quarters, there is little for visitors to 'see' unless the facilities are reconstructed. Because the land was used in multiple ways over the years, it will be difficult to accommodate each period's use of the land. Even the plans recognize this problem and do little to improve visitors experience beyond walking tours and exhibits. An option would be to place unmanned kiosks at strategic points around the park and have each one dedicated to a certain timeframe to better explain the multiple uses.

3. The goal of reducing paved surface is laudable, but misses a huge fact ? that the overflow area is used rarely ? once or twice a year by my understanding. You could easily have that road ripped up and achieve your goal of reducing paved areas without changing anything at the park. I am confused as to why this is even a goal. First, the minimal use of the existing road surface by automobile traffic means that very little pollution is jettisoned into the Potomac. Second, if the goal is to reduce conflicts between cars, cyclists and pedestrians, one inexpensive option may be to install more speed bumps to keep traffic speed down. Except for high-use weekends, my experience has been that there is little if no problems between cars and other users.

4. The complaint that the park employee's time could be better used if they did not have to spend so much time dealing with pavilion reservations is laughable when those same employees spend a number of weekends teaching kids to ride their bike through your "ride with a ranger" program. I don't recall exactly what the title is, but I do question why a ranger should be tasked with teaching local kids to ride their bike. Next, I am sure there is some way you can make the pavilions self-serve reservations or modify the process so as to free up valuable ranger time. There is also the option of not allowing the pavilions to be reserved - that the party must be the first to show up and claim a (new) park sign saying it is reserved. Next, for large parties there can be a larger fee for service. There are some very smart people at NPS that I am positive would have some good ideas on how to do this.

5. Finally, I was dismayed that none of the options really worked to find a balance between current users and where the NPS would like to move the park into the future. The comment that the park is used by the locals is true, because we are there. I'm sure this is a complaint heard near most federal parks. Those near Yellowstone use it a heck of a lot more than visitors, however the options presented don't seem to try to find more of a balance between the vision and the reality of how and who uses the current park. While I am encouraged that the NPS wants to attract more tourists, a separate study should be done as to what tourists really do visit when they come to the greater DC area. There is a lot to see, and if the focus is going to be on a specific group of tourists, what is their potential size and visit rate? Will it be a one-time visit and then never again? Will there be ongoing presentations and lectures about the historical nature of the site? Considering few if any are left from those days who can speak authoritatively on WWII uses and none from the Spanish America War timeframe, who would be the beneficiaries of this sort of endeavor?

I encourage you to revisit the proposal with an eye towards what is realistic and communicating more with those who do regularly use the park. It is disturbing that the first time many of us in the neighborhood first heard about the possible changes was so late in the process. I know it is difficult, but I am sure if you revisited the proposal and encouraged more local groups to participate in the process, you would have a much better chance of securing local support.

I look forward to using the park property for many years to come.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 150

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization: USAF retired
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I appreciate your providing additional comment time. First and foremost: "We the People" include city, county & state RESIDENTS. Therefore, when Federal Governmental Officials refer to "land" or "facility" as belonging to the Federal Government - it would be nice for them to recognize. a. "We" are the government. b. "We" pay the salaries of "officials. c. Not every single piece of "federal land" needs to be. 1. Sold or converted to some civilian business or management. 2. Be CONVERTED back to a monument for historical recognition of the Indians, prisoners of war, etc. (All of America belonged to the Indians). I LOVE Fort Hunt Park, all of it as it is. As a member of the Air National Guard, we had our annual picnics here. As a home owner I have walked, biked, hiked, played touch football, baseball, sat with many to enjoy the outdoor concerts, taken many friends to see & read the historical markers. I have done this before the septic problem with the rangers house & after there was no longer a ranger living there - darn. I did this before the gates/doors were locked to stop the destruction of some areas. I spoke with many the WWII vets when I lived here before in 80's & 90's, about the facility and weapons storage. We probably exaggerated some of the historical facts and significance between Ft Washington & Ft Hunt. All of this has been a LIVING FACILITY. The horses, rangers, newcomers, & old timers truly love this park.

The idea of taking tax dollars to destroy pavilions that are not only utilized by we the people, but make money for the park. Changing the traffic pattern is another idea that I wish you would reconsider. If you frequently visited, enjoyed, or just sat & breathed in Fort Hunt at the current preservation, you might not be so quick to alter it to some sort of sterile/cold monument that is not much different than buying a dvd. Why do you not see the value of preserving what remains of the fort & include even more historical markers (if you like), but spend all of your study money & tear down money for improvents to the condition of existing facilities or roads and leave for others to enjoy many centuries from now. The park and current

traffic pattern has made the park a completely safe park for drivers, walkers, bikers, skaters the old, young & in between. All of the changes you speak of to STERILIZE Ft Hunt are at the expense of all tax payers & the enjoyment of the parks neighbors (Americans & part of WE THE GOVERNMENT) of near & far. If you have so much money when other GOVERNMENT people are trying to cut social security & medicare ? then maybe we need to cut your budget. I would prefer not to because I believe in the parks as long as the temporary employees retain their open view of the BIG PICTURE and not just to alter to make another visitor center to walk thru & eventually decide to "civilianize" it for the profit for some fat cat. Teddy Roosevelt, FDR & a few others believed in keeping A LOT of AMERICA for AMERICANS to enjoy NATURALLY.

Please keep at least the parks & forests for all Americans to enjoy. Use our money wisely - hire some youth group to clean up after renting out the pavilions. Just incorporate the last 50 years of the parks history & not so far back that we wonder why TODAY'S officials aren't as wise as the ones that preserved CENTRAL PARK or formed all of our National Parks before POLITICAL OFFICIALS started selling for private profit or altering & destroying the very feeling of AMERICA & PROTECT HER, DEFEND HER, & SHE IS YOUR LAND, MY LAND -- remember -- or are all of you too young??
Thank you for reading - please reflect.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 151

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Suzanne B. Lepple
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 2613 Woodlawn Lane, Alexandria, VA
ALExandria, VA 22306
USA
E-mail: lepples@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

After reading the extensive document several times and reading the articles in the local paper, we just want to comment that we are very surprised the NPS is going to this great expense to change Ft. Hunt Park. Yes, as stated at the meetings, this is primarily used by local residents but when locals have friends in town the out-of-state and foreign visitors are often brought to this site. Over thirty years our family has biked to Ft. Hunt Park, assisted with many cleanups along the GW Parkway, conducted Girl Scout day camps at Ft. Hunt Park, Walked in many CROP Walks for Hunger through the park, etc.

Most recently, in August 2011, our daughter rented Pavilion C for her wedding picnic/brunch and the 100 people who attended (including 15 from New Zealand, one from Finland, two from England, and friends from at least one dozen different states) had a wonderful time. Just like when she was a Girl Scout, our daughter and everyone else left the area cleaner than when we arrived. Prior to the picnic we sent everyone photos of the interpretive signs that are already at the park and told them the history of the park. We thought the pavilion was beautifully constructed and are in shock that you would tear it down. If it is truly necessary to destroy the pavilions, at least reconsider and dismantle them and place them in another area of the park. We were noticing that they were not that old and wished we had had them available years ago when we had GS day camp there in the hot month of June!

The history of the park could be told with more interpretive signs in under a pavilion such as Area C and there would be no need for an expensive visitor center to maintain. With all the historical attractions in the DC area, this will not be one of the major ones that visitors will flock to although we do think that the

current signs could be updated.

We wish that some of the money being spent on this overhaul would be spent instead on removal of all the invasive species - especially the vines that are on the trees there and along the GW Parkway. And a reminder that the \$200 charged for renting each pavilion pays for the minimal upkeep NPS currently does perform. Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 152

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

My wife and I have lived adjacent to the Mt. Vernon Parkway, two miles north of Ft. Hunt Park, for over 32 years. We have been using Ft. Hunt Park for many years, on two levels.

First, we use the current auto loop for exercise. The 1.25 mile loop allows us to get exactly 5 miles of vigorous walking without worrying about approaching bikers or cars, in a lovely quiet location.

Second, we are history buffs, especially interested in military history, and our first visits to Ft. Hunt involved tours of the various forts defending Washington. I am also a Trustee on the Civil War Trust, a non-profit that works with NPS to protect land within, adjacent to, and outside the parks commemorating the battles of the Civil War.

Historic preservation and interpretation is the primary justification for NPS sites set aside to mark our history. While recreation (athletic play, picnics, Easter egg hunts) are also important uses for such sites, the focus of facilities, trails and roadways, landscaping, and interpretative signage must be to preserve and respect the historic events that occurred on the site.

Thus, we do not favor the "do nothing" alternative (Option A). Fort Hunt today is primarily serving as a recreational site, with very little interpretation of its historic roles. Our awareness of the events that occurred there has principally been derived from occasional newspaper stories or magazine articles, and from visiting other U.S. fortifications that were built or modified via the Endicott system in the 1890s. The interpretative signage in the Park is old, worn, and limited in information. This is a shame.

As between the other three alternatives, we do not have a strong preference. All put emphasis on the development of the historical resources. We would be quite happy with the Preferred Alternative of NPS (Option C).

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 153

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

I regularly use Ft. Hunt Park - often several, or more, times per week to exercise by riding my bike. I have also attended some concerts there.

Because my primary form of exercise is bicycling, I am concerned that the new walking/biking trails in Alternatives B, C and D would not be wide enough to accommodate the myriad of uses to which the current loop road is put. On any given evening or weekend, there are walkers, often with dogs (usually leashed, but sometimes not), bicyclists, joggers, children (both in and out of strollers), cars (often travelling the wrong way on the one-way portion of the loop), and in-line skaters. Currently, I am able to avoid all of the other users when biking and keep up a good, steady pace. When I use the Mt. Vernon Trail, I am constantly having to stop or slow to a virtual crawl in order to safely negotiate around the other users.

A significant cause of accidents on any roadway (or bike/pedestrian trail) is the difference in the speed(s) of the users. Walkers may not be aware that a cyclist is approaching from behind at a speed 3-6X faster than theirs. sometimes warnings are not given. Occasionally accidents occur.

The current loop road allows a number of users to interact with fewer conflicts than on the Mt. Vernon Trail. Multiple users need to be accommodated at the same time.

Ft. Hunt Park is great community resource.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 154

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Connie D. Graham
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1217 Michigan Court
Alexandria, VA 22314
Alexandria , VA 22314
USA
E-mail: connie_g@hotmail.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Ft. Hunt is a NPS gem on the Potomac near Mt. Vernon, and right off of the George Washington Memorial Parkway. It should remain as is. In other words, do not fix it if it is not broken. The parking issues discussed in the plan are a reflection of parking and event policy. Policy can be adjusted to the optimum for events and the general public. This problem is of the Park Service's making and within thier purview to correct.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 155

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bruce & Virginia Bade
Organization: Potomac Valley River Bend (PVRB) Civic Assoc
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9009 Vernon View Drive, Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria (Fairfax County), VA 22308
USA
E-mail: bruce.bade@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As frequent users of Fort Hunt Park and members of the community with properties adjacent to Fort Hunt Park (development of River Bend Estates), we have a strong interest in the Park Services plan for the Park. We join the consensus of the citizens belonging to the Potomac Valley/River Bend Citizens Association (PVRB) and offer the following comments on the Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan and Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect (EA/AoE) dated September 5, 2011.

We believe the Action Alternatives in the EA/AoE are not supported by sufficient factual information or adequate analyses and do not favor the Action Alternatives put forth in the EA/AoE.

We are opposed to changes in Fort Hunt Park that would increase visitor presence along the west and south sides of the Park adjacent to PVRB properties, specifically those proposals in the Action Alternatives that would open or add trails in those areas.

We are particularly and strongly opposed to the closing/interruption of the loop road around the Park currently used by vehicles and to the removal of pavilions or picnic areas, as well as to the proposals that would increase use of the loop road behind Picnic Area E that is presently closed to vehicle traffic. The current traffic pattern seems most satisfactory and is effectively and safely used by walkers and bicyclists as well as motorists. The current traffic pattern moves vehicle traffic through the Park effectively and safely without confusing visitors.

With respect to the "overuse" problems noted in the EA/AoE, including neighborhood intrusion, noise, and environmental damage, we believe that permitting restrictions are a better solution than major changes to the Park.

Although not necessarily opposed to a visitor center, we do not believe such a center is necessary to achieve the objective of improving visitor experience and historical interpretation. The funds needed to build such a center would be better spent on environmental protection/remediation and preservation of the existing facilities and historical sites, i.e., the batteries, the NCO Quarters, and the Battery Commander's Station. Historical information and interpretation can be improved with additional signage.

We urge the National Park Service to put forth other alternatives to deal with the peak use capacity of the Park and to expand historical interpretation through additional signage and Web site use rather than by making major changes to the Park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 156

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bruce C. Bade
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 9009 Vernon View Drive, Alexandria, VA 22308
Alexandria (Fairfax County), VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

The following was drafted as an analysis to support comments on the NPS Site Development Plan.

DRAFT

A Potomac Valley/River Bend Civic Association Perspective
on the

Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan
Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect
dated September 5, 2011

I. The Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect (EA/AoE):

The National Park Service has developed proposals to change Fort Hunt Park to mitigate problems that have begun to affect the Park and surrounding communities and to bring use into compliance with laws, regulations and policies.

Several alternative proposals would make significant changes to Fort Hunt Park. All would eliminate several of the picnic areas and pavilions, along with associated ball fields (these changes are aimed at reducing peak period visitor activity). Of most interest to PVRB are those changes that would alter the roads and trails: all of these proposed changes would increase trail and/or road activity in areas close to PVRB properties.

II. The EA/AoE is flawed.

As an adjacent neighbor, PVRB supports improvements to Fort Hunt Park in principle. With respect to the EA/AoE, PVRB can agree that some Park use changes are desirable and particularly that some reduction in the Park's use for picnics and parties would be beneficial.

Nevertheless, while there are issues associated with Fort Hunt Park and its use that should be addressed, this EA/AoE suffers from:

Inconsistencies in its justification for proposed actions, using some of the same justifications to support changes that it uses to deplore existing conditions.

Proposals based on guesses rather than established facts or serious studies (e.g., some very specific proposals are based on protection of "archeological resources" but such resources are based only on suppositions).

Proposals for changes justified by what seem to be NPS preferences rather than law, regulation, policy or community interest (e.g., using "enhanced visitor experience" as a justification for significant and substantial changes with out defining "enhanced," "visitor," or "experience" and without substantiating this objective by reference to applicable law, regulation or policy).

III. PVRB Special Interests

PVRB is especially interested in proposed changes that would bring Park visitors in closer proximity to PVRB neighborhoods. PVRB is not in favor of proposed changes that would increase visitor presence along the west and south sides of the Park, notably the proposals to increase use of the south loop road that encircles Picnic Area E and to build a new trail along the west side of the Park.

IV. Fundamental Issues with the EA/AoE

Mitigation without construction? PVRB has been reasonably content with Fort Hunt Park as it is, so has reason to question the need for substantial changes at substantial taxpayer cost. In what has to be an oversight, the EA/AoE contains no Action Alternative that would mitigate the problems involving peak period overuse, as well as some problems affecting the environment, through revised use regulations and more restrictive permitting of picnics and parties. It seems that such an Action Alternative might be just as effective, and much less expensive to execute, than the substantial infrastructure changes envisioned in all the proposed Action Alternatives. Roads and unauthorized paths could be blocked off, signs could advise visitors of approved and disapproved activities, and permits for picnics and sports activities could be denied, all at minimal expense compared to the Action Alternative proposals in the EA/AoE.

If any of the objectives aimed at improving the Park could be achieved in such a manner, an additional Action Alternative should be developed. Alternatively, the No Action Alternative should note that this is possible -- or substantiate that problems identified cannot be resolved in such a manner.

Visitor Experience? PVRB members, as frequent visitors to Fort Hunt Park, are interested in the visitor experience and many of the proposals for changes in the Action Alternatives are justified by the need to "enhance visitor experience." Significant change proposals, including the closing of picnic areas/ball fields and the construction of a visitor facility, are based on the need to "enhance visitor experience." Yet there is nothing in the laws, regulations or policies referred to in the paper that address "visitor experience," nor does the term appear in the Glossary of Terms. The objective to "enhance visitor experience" thus appears to be an undefined figment of the NPS staff -- and that is not good enough to justify major undertakings.

The EA/EoA notes only the following policy with respect to the NPS responsibility for visitor experience: "NPS Management Policies (2006) state that the enjoyment of park resources and values by the people of the United States is part of the fundamental purpose of all parks, and that NPS is committed to providing appropriate high-quality opportunities for visitors to enjoy the parks." Under that policy, one could easily justify the existing picnic areas and ball fields that NPS evidently desires to eliminate.

With respect to visitor experience, the EA/AoE finds current Park use has "minor adverse impacts":

"Under the No Action Alternative, no new facilities would be constructed. Use of the picnicking facilities would continue to overwhelm the park infrastructure during peak visitation. Restrooms and parking would not be able to provide appropriate level of facilities for visitors during peak visitation periods. Circulation patterns would not be changed. Current maintenance and operation procedures would continue. No new interpretive resources would be added to the park. Visitor use and experience would be adversely affected because park resources would continue to be overwhelmed during peak visitor use and interpretive resources would not tell the full history of Fort Hunt Park. Interpretive capabilities would offer limited visitor contact and not provide a comprehensive interpretive experience at the park. Although there would be no change from current visitor services, the park's ability to provide information on park natural and cultural resources and to answer visitor questions would not realize the park's potential, resulting in a parkwide long-term minor adverse effect on visitor use and experience.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions have or could have cumulative impacts to visitor use and experience in the geographic boundaries. The geographic boundary for cumulative impacts was defined as the southern portion of the GWMP and Mount Vernon area. The No Action Alternative would have long-term minor adverse impacts on visitor use and experience and therefore would contribute to the effects of other actions although the contribution would be minor. Overall, there would be long-term beneficial cumulative impacts to visitor use and experience from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. The minor adverse impact from the No Action Alternative would have a very minor contribution to the overall cumulative impact.

CONCLUSION

The No Action Alternative would result in long-term minor adverse impacts to visitor use and experience because park resources would continue to be overwhelmed during peak visitor use and interpretive resources would not fully describe the history of Fort Hunt Park. The No Action Alternative would have long-term minor adverse cumulative impacts."

Nevertheless, the EA/AoE proposals for Action Alternatives base many of the most significant changes on improving the visitor experience. It's fair to guess that some visitors value the picnic areas and the loop road as their favorite experiences. Definitions and links to law and policy are needed.

Archeological significance? Changes proposed by the EA/AoE that affect routing of roads and trails are of special interest to PVRB. Proposals in the EA/AoE to remove the section of the loop road between Picnic Areas E and D are justified on the basis of protecting archeological resources, yet the EA/AoE concludes under all of the Alternatives that both existing conditions and proposed changes would have minimal adverse effects and minimal potential benefits.

Evidently, the archeological resources that would be affected by this change to the loop road are estimated on the basis of best guess inasmuch as there does not appear to have been any serious survey. Planned changes justified on protection of archeological resources that involve major changes or expensive reconstruction should await more definitive studies.

Historic preservation? The EA/AoE contains many proposals that would require investment, yet acknowledges that no plans are included for preservation of existing historical buildings. Inasmuch as the batteries and associated buildings seem to be the Park features of most interest to visitors, and the EA/AoE seems aimed at "enhancing visitor experience," failure to address preservation of these features requires explanation.

V. Issues in which PVRB has an interest:

1. Revision of roads and trails:

PVRB opposes the Action Alternative proposals that would permit vehicle traffic on the south loop road, presently closed to traffic, that surrounds Picnic Area E. This road is in very close proximity to PVRB residences. Its present very light use as a bike and walking trail is acceptable but increasing either vehicle or foot traffic on that road would have a detrimental effect on neighboring properties. Increasing use of this road would increase the potential for trespassing into PVRB properties.

For similar reasons, PVRB also opposes building a new trail to the west of the Park Police facility on the west end of the Park.

The Action Alternatives of the EA/AoE all propose to eliminate the section of the loop road between Picnic Areas E and D and to construct new trails for biking and walking. If the expense to perform such construction is to be incurred, relocating the roads and trails away from the south and west borders of the Park should be part of the plan.

2. Peak Visitation Periods Cause Impacts to Park Neighbors:

The EA/AoE notes that this pertains to "residential neighborhoods at its north and west boundaries. During peak picnic season, visitors sometimes create noise and parking issues for park neighbors." PVRB notes that the use of the Park also affects the residential neighborhood on the south boundary and, because of potential "Impacts to Park Neighbors," PVRB has encouraged the NPS to keep the loop road behind Picnic Area E closed to vehicle traffic.

PVRB, from the perspective of an adjacent neighborhood, believes that reduction of visitors during peak use periods would mitigate adverse effects such as noise and visitor intrusion into adjacent neighborhoods.

3. Maintain Open Space and Keep Existing Tree Cover:

"The public raised issues citing the need to maintain open space and keep existing tree cover." PVRB strongly supports maintaining the character of the Park with respect to vegetation.

4. Placement of Visitor Facility:

- PVRB has interest in placement of a proposed visitor facility to the extent that its placement affects placement of roads, trails and visitor activity in proximity of Park borders. PVRB would favor placement that minimized roads and trails in proximity to the west and south borders of the Park.

5. Control Motor Vehicle Speed in the Park and Provide Better Accessibility:

"During the project scoping, the public raised safety concerns regarding how fast motor vehicles go in the park."

PVRB definitely supports strict enforcement of speed limits in the Park. However, PVRB believes associated problems can be mitigated by strict enforcement and/or by physical measures such as

installing stop signs or speed bumps.

6. Better accessibility from neighborhood:

"Another issue raised during scoping was to provide better accessibility to the park from the neighborhood and maintain access points."

- PVRB wants existing access to the Park maintained, specifically the trail from Bushrod Road and the gate in the fence at the northwest corner of the Park.

7. Park Operations and Management:

"Peak visitation periods exceed the park's carrying capacity and overwhelm the park infrastructure, including restrooms and parking. Conflicts occur with park neighbors during times of peak visitation when parking overflows onto adjacent streets and large picnics result in noise issues."

- PVRB members, as frequent visitors to the Park, strongly support tailoring visitation to existing facilities. That could probably be accomplished through restriction of permits.

8. Reduction of recreation areas:

PVRB supports, in consonance with objectives to control peak visitor levels, the reduction of picnic pavilions and sports fields as proposed in the Action Alternatives. Having said that, PVRB would not necessarily support removal of the pavilions, rest rooms and other facilities that support the related activities; reduction of permits and other regulations could be used to control visitor levels at less expense and would retain the facilities for potential future use.

- The Action Alternatives propose retention of ball fields but all of them propose to eliminate the one at Picnic Area D. Inasmuch as an objective seems to be to limit noise intrusion into adjacent neighborhoods and Picnic Area D is remote from Park borders, it seems retention of Picnic Area D facilities would be preferable to retention of Picnic Area B.

9. Conflicts between Pedestrians/Bicyclists and Motorists on Loop Road:

PVRB members have not witnessed any severe problems. Conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians are non-existent. Conflicts between bicyclists and motorists are rare and could be addressed through Park Police enforcement of rules. Extensive demolition and construction to separate "roadway" from "trail" seems like overkill.

10. Park Visitor Use in Certain Historic Core Areas Contribute To Soil Compaction and Drainage Problems:

"At various locations throughout the park, particularly surrounding permitted picnic areas, park visitors have created social trails by taking shortcuts from designated roadways, parking lots, and trails to ball fields, picnic pavilions, etc." "... locations throughout the park tend to have water pooling and other drainage issues occur during storm events."

PVRB has no particular position on soil compaction and drainage but can agree that if these are problems that need to be addressed, the NPS should take action. It does seem, however, that mitigation of any problems could be achieved without all of the changes proposed in the Action Alternatives of this EA/AoE. For example, social trails could be eliminated through strategic planting of vegetation, installation of artificial barriers, or changes or restrictions in permitting.

11. Large Permitted Picnics adversely Affect Other Visitor Uses:

PVRB agrees that facilities are stressed and that some reduction in Park use for large activities would be beneficial. PVRB questions whether major infrastructure changes are needed to address this problem

and would like NPS to explain why rules, regulations, permit restrictions and minor changes such as blocking off roads would not suffice.

12. Inappropriate Visitor Uses Have Potential to Affect Archeological Sites or Other Resources: PVRB supports, in principle, the protection of archeological sites and "other resources." However, the EA/AoE fails to define "Inappropriate Visitor Use" and fails to identify "Archeological Sites." Until these failures are addressed, the EA/AoE cannot address the solutions. The EA/AoE also justifies many of the change proposals in the Action Alternatives on the protection or development of "sensitive cultural resources" or "sensitive resource areas," but fails to establish the sensitivity and does not focus changes on the historical or assumed archeological sites.

13. Lack of Interpretive Focus of Rich History: PVRB supports, in principle, provision of historical information and interpretation in the Park. Nevertheless, the EA/AoE does not provide Action Alternatives that might achieve that objective without substantial infrastructure changes and it does seem that some signage and perhaps some less ambitious construction might achieve the objective at far less cost. If substantial investment in the rich history of the Park is to be made, it should be made in preserving the historical features of the Park such as the batteries.

A proposed "chronological interpretive trail" does not appear to align interpretation with any of the historical buildings, areas or artifacts in the Park; its purpose and routing are therefore questionable. If the purpose of this trail is to control visitors, the EA/AoE should say so.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 157

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Renee Priore
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8803 Mansion Farm Place
Alexandria, VA 22309
USA
E-mail: rpriore@verizon.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Leave well enough alone! BUT start raising a flag (American) on the flag pole that was donated to you some time back. I have not seen a US flag on that pole for over a year. If you can't figure out how to do it ask the community that you wish to disrupt to donate an electrical outlet so you can shine a light on the flag day and night.

What you have was erected within the past ten years and has served this community well.

Your concerns with regard to so many people on weekends could be controlled with some ingenuity.

If you have money to spend then clean up and renovate the bathrooms and get your service crew off their mobile appliances and check areas better.

Start with the Battalion Commanders Station and clean out the Coke and soda bottles (unless of course they are left over from WWII).

Take down the snow fence that has been by the underpass to Ft Hunt. It is not preventing people from crossing your precious grass and it is ugly.

Your other plans have absolutely no regard for the citizens use of this park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 158

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/04/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

We strongly urge adoption of Alternative B. We love Fort Hunt Park and visit it on the average of 3 times per week.

Most of what you are planning is worthy. However, Alternatives C and D restrict vehicular access so much, that we would be forced to walk or ride bicycles to enjoy most of the park. As aging seniors--one of whom has mobility problems--we feel that Alternatives C and D would deny us the access that we have enjoyed for the past 25 years.

We are delighted at the prospect of a new Visitor Facility. We assume recently declassified World War II information will be described in the facility. We are eager to learn more about the site's rich history.

[Lee's father -- a reserve officer in the Army Corps of engineers -- was called into active duty at Ft. Belvoir just before Pearl Harbor. He recalls his father driving to Ft. Hunt (with Lee and his mother in tow). They waited in the car while his father attended a short meeting -- or possibly an interview. His father finished his service in the War Department and later in Europe documenting Army Engineer activities.]

The removal of some picnic pavilions is reasonable. We favor keeping Picnic Pavilion A. It would be good for Ft. Hunt to set (and enforce) reasonable maximums on the size of organizations which have at times overwhelmed Ft. Hunt and denied access to other visitors.

The park's concert series are wonderful. However, it would be appropriate to enforce bans on the loudness of rock bands and their amplifiers hired for large group picnics. Some bands are so loud that

their music can be heard throughout the park. Ft. Hunt's neighbors probably hate the noise more than we do.

We assume there will be rest room facilities in the new Visitor Facility.

The colors of the autumn leaves every year are spectacular along the Parkway AND in Fort Hunt Park. We urge you to adopt Alternative B so those with mobility issues can continue to drive THROUGH the fall colors rather than have to view them from afar.

Please notify us if more meetings are held on this subject. We would like to attend.

Thank you.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 159

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: NO
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

While I am not opposed to a visitor's museum to celebrate Fort Hunt Park's history, I am definitely opposed to having tour buses in the park to visit the museum. The location of the museum as described in Alternative C is the best location as there is existing parking/asphalt there already. But the turnaround allows buses to bring even more people to the park who would sometimes also picnic there and use facilities. This is totally inconsistent with the proposal's statement that the current usage of Fort Hunt Park "exceeds the park's carrying capacity".

Also, the removal of existing facilities and pavilions is not logical to the neighbors and general public, but appears to be another example of wasting taxpayer dollars, especially when some of those pavilions proposed to be removed were only constructed very recently. Moving pavilions to another park is still a waste of taxpayer money.

The second major concern I see in the proposal is regarding the realignment of Fort Hunt Road. To straighten the road immediately inside the entrance to the park seems unnecessary and again a waste of money. Does not a curved road keep vehicle speeds lower?

If the concern is that the entrance to the Fort Hunt Park is not distinct and visible, would not a larger, new sign saying "Fort Hunt Park Entrance" solve that problem? Perhaps a more attractive entrance would also aid the solution. This could be accomplished without the expensive realignment of the road proposed.

Issues of drainage from the park onto neighbor's properties were not addressed. To say it is not a problem is incorrect. Any construction can cause additional problems. And the current drainage is indeed

causing flooding and erosion on our property at 8977 Fort Hunt Road.

With the closing of the walk-in gate across from 8971 Fort Hunt Road, safety issues increased. There appears to be no real reason why that gate was locked. It makes it so dangerous for neighbors on our end of Fort Hunt Road to have to walk where there are NO sidewalks around a curve that gives vehicles no visibility. We would like to use the park without being put in danger walking there. We ask that this walk-in gate be reopened.

I sincerely hope that this will not be another case of the government following procedure by letting citizens have their say and then proceeding to do what they(government officials) had planned to do all along.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 160

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

As a local resident who feels extraordinarily fortunate to have easy access to the beauty, history, and educational resources offered by the National Park Service (NPS) in the Washington area, I have often visited or passed through Fort Hunt Park. I only recently learned about the rich history associated with the park, including the fact that it was once part of George Washington's River Farm and that a fort was constructed there during the Spanish American War. While visiting the park, I had noticed the remains of the batteries there, but I always assumed them to be connected to the Civil War, and never knew of their connection to the Spanish American War. But most importantly, I was also fascinated to learn of the history of the park during the first half of the twentieth century.

Of unique historical significance is "P.O. Box 1142", the top-secret military installation where high value German prisoners of war were interrogated, where the escape and evasion program to assist pilots and others downed behind enemy lines was conducted, and where military intelligence research was performed. Sadly, after the war the buildings were razed and on-site documents were burned, thus removing all traces of the existence of this amazing group of activities. These uses of this site were kept secret for some 50 years. Had it not been for the commitment and diligence of the NPS and veterans who worked there, a number of whom were German immigrants who fled the Nazi regime of terror and destruction, the nation would not now have the opportunity to learn the amazing story of what happened there.

I believe that it is true national importance that a state of the art Visitor Center be built at Fort Hunt Park in order to tell these stories and to display the artifacts that have been collected, and that it should be complemented by the interpretive trail proposed by the NPS.

Fort Hunt Park has been used primarily as a picnic and biking/hiking area for over 60 years. That too is part of its history, but certainly not the most important part, and certainly not a unique one. The National Park System is designed for more than picnicking and urban recreation. The National Parks are an important part of the nation's educational system, and Fort Hunt Park should not be an exception. We have been presented with an extraordinary opportunity to improve the national value and appeal of an NPS site; we must remember that parks belongs not only to nearby residents, but are to be shared with the nation.

Our country would be diminished if future generations did not have access to the story of P.O. Box 1142 and see the site where it was located, as well as learn about the members of the armed forces who contributed to ending WWII more quickly.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 161

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Veronica A. Cartier
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 8009 Karl Rd, Alexandria, VA 22308
(Alexandria) Fairfax County, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: veron44@earthlink.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

This is in response to the National Park Service (NPS) request for comments on the Fort Hunt Site Development Plan.

Fort Hunt Park is rich in history and beauty. The historic importance of this park should not be overlooked; however, preservation of such does not mandate the elimination or strict reduction of the recreational aspect of the park as outlined in the alternatives presented by the National Park Service.

I would be in favor of a more balanced approach that supports the construction of a self-guided trail with signage and a small visitor's center near the entrance to the park without the wholesale removal of picnic pavilions, ball fields, bathrooms, parking, etc.

Fort Hunt Park provides a venue for picnics and family playtime which is just as important in these troubled times as a reminder of our history. It is a treasure and a quiet refuge enjoyed by many and I ask that the National Park Service take into consideration those of us who use the park on a daily basis before making drastic changes.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 162

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dorothy E. Keough
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 7922 Wellington Road
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

1. I applaud the stated objectives (page 2) to "protect cultural and natural resources", and to "enhance visitor experience and manage visitor use". Unfortunately, none of the Project Alternatives adequately address these objectives. The Alternatives contain no actions to protect cultural or natural resources at the Park. The major visible cultural resources on site are the gun batteries (which are open to foot traffic, and are being damaged by people climbing on them and by people spraying graffiti on them); the Battery Commander's Station (also being physically marred); the NCO house (which remains unrestored and partially unsecured); and, the rows of historic trees that do not receive arborist care for their disease and damage. None of the Alternatives propose measures to halt these ongoing problems to protect the resources. For the natural resources, the most significant threat is invasive/exotic vegetation. None of the Alternatives propose measures to control invasive/exotic vegetation. Other ongoing problems include the existing informal walking trail right next to the active bald eagle nest, and the severe erosion caused by the complete lack of stormwater control at the Park. None of the Alternatives propose measures to control these problems to protect natural resources. In order to meet the stated project objectives of protecting cultural and natural resources, the Action Alternatives need to be revised to address these issues. Regarding the second objective, the only method NPS appears to be proposing to manage visitor use is by removing picnic and bathroom facilities, and by reducing parking spaces. It appears that by "manage" NPS means to "reduce". I cannot see how that will "enhance" visitor use.

2. I agree that Fort Hunt Park has an interesting history that should be shared with the public. The first step, and likely the most economic one, would be to provide a robust website with links to historic information. It is exceedingly difficult to locate information on the Park's history on line. The Alternatives

should address this.

3. I question the economic viability of NPS constructing, and staffing, a Visitor Center 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. NPS does not appear to have sufficient resources to protect and maintain the existing park resources; I do not see how they can take on an additional facility. I would prefer to see NPS take better care of what they have rather than spread their resources even thinner.

4. I am a regular user of Fort Hunt Park, visiting the park almost daily for the past 23 years. I do not agree with the statements throughout the EA that the large group picnics adversely impact other users of the park. I am an exercise walker, bike rider, dog walker, bird watcher, casual picnicker, and I have never had my use disrupted by a picnic group. In fact, I very much enjoy seeing the events and listening to the different cultural music groups. The Park would be so much more sterile without that vibrant use. I request that this use continue.

5. Except for the awesome Quander Family Reunion, I have never seen a time where the Park was overwhelmed by a large group picnic. At the Public meeting, NPS staff stated that their interpretive staff are overwhelmed by custodial duty following picnic events. I believe that that problem could be solved by operational changes: adding custodial staff, limiting the number of large picnic groups/limiting the size of the permitting picnic groups, raising permit fees, etc. Except for the Quander Family Reunion, I have never seen Park users park outside the park boundaries. Again, there are operational means to control this if it is truly a problem.

6. I disagree with removing the pavillions that were only constructed a couple years ago. These pavillions are used by many more persons than just large picnic groups. I have seen art classes, school groups, family picnics. Walkers rest, or take shelter from the rain, there. The pavillions provide much-needed shade during the summer. I believe all of the pavillions should remain in place; that removal of nearly new pavillions would be a disservice to Park users and a waste of tax dollars.

7. I disagree with removing the existing Loop Road. I see very few incidences of speeding traffic, and these could be addressed by Police Enforcement of speed limits. The existing 1.25 mile loop road is very well used by walkers, runners, bike riders, skaters, even by persons underdoing rehabilitation/physical therapy. I long ago gave up riding or walking the Mount Vernon Trail due to its safety issues. The Loop Road is perfectly safe road and can easily accommodate numerous and varied users. NPS should leave the existing Loop Road in place for its users. The existing road is in good shape. It makes no economic sense to tear it out and replace it with a new road, or a new paved bicycle/pedestrian trail elsewhere on the Park.

8. If NPS decides to construct a Visitor Center (which again I do not see the economic viability of), it should be located at the Park Entrance. Locating the Center in the back of the Park will increase traffic into the heart of the park. At the Public Meeting, NPS staff indicated their intent to attract bus groups to the Visitor Center. All the more reason to keep that facility at the entrance and not despoil the interior of the park with traffic.

9. I disagree with the removal of the existing restrooms in the back of the Park. Families with young children need handy restrooms. The current restrooms are open sunup to sundown (April - Nov). Visitor Centers are typically open 9 - 5, which would greatly limit restroom availability during the summer months.

10. I would like to see an interpretive trail and I agree with the location shown in the EA. All the Action Alternatives indicate that such a trail would be located through the center of the Park, where it would not conflict with any of the existing picnic pavillions or the existing loop road. Another reason that removal of the road and the pavillions is not necessary.

9. The EA document provides numbers of visitation, but NPS staff at the Public Meeting stated that they do not keep counts of visitation; and they are not able to produce records of actual use. The EA should explain where these numbers come from and give a sense of their accuracy.

10. The entire planning process seems to have been selective. At the Public Meeting NPS staff stated that they only invited the adjoining community to participate. My community several miles away did not receive any information, and the NPS staff said there were no publications made in local newspapers. I

believe that NPS should have reached out to the broader community in scoping this project and doing the planning. NPS should recognize the large hispanic community that uses the Park.

11. The environmental baseline data and impact assessment sections are not adequate. They seem to have been written desk-top without making any field visits to the Park. Given the small size of the Park, wetlands should have been field identified. A stream pereniality assessment should have been made. (Both of these are necessary to determine the RPA limits.) I do not believe that Fairfax County made the stream pereniality determination on this federal property. Double check this. The fact that the RPA map (Figure 3) and the Floodplain map (Figure 4) are identical, suggests that Fairfax County used the published FEMA Floodplain map to generate the RPA map without coming onto the Park. My experience elsewhere is that the Fairfax County RPA maps are not always accurate. Similarly, NWI maps are not always accurate. The Park has wetlands and seep areas in the wooded area toward the Potomac River. Since, this wooded area could be affected by stormwater management facility construction and by bicycle/pedestrian trail construction on all the Action Alternatives, these natural resources should have been more accurately evaluated.

12. I am opposed to any construction within the wooded areas of the Park. The Action Alternatives appear to necessitate significant tree removal for the new bicycle/pedestrian trail. Clearing trees for this trail could result in a direct line of sight between the trail and the bald eagle nest. This impact on natural resouces is in conflict with the state project objectives and should not be proposed.

13. I am opposed to the removal of any natural habitats for construction on the Park. Fort Hunt Park provides valuable habitat to an impressive diversity of bird species throughout the year. This should have been better addressed in the EA and Park planning efforts need to take this into consideration.

14. I believe the EA should address MS4 Permit Compliance, EISA 438 Compliance, the Chesapeake Bay Executive Order and the Chesapeake Bay TMDLs. The Coastal Zone Consistency Determination incorrectly states that state regulations require erosion and sediment control for disturbances of 10,000 sq ft. It should be 2,500 sq ft.

15. I request that a new Action Alternative be added that leaves the existing loop road, picnic pavillions and rest rooms in place, adds an interpretive trail, adds other means for education (e.g., website), provides cultural and natural resources protections as I cite in comment (1) above, and provides operational means for managing visitor use. I believe that this would provide the best service to Park users, entail the most reasonable cost to NPS and provide the best protection to cultural and natural resources. If a Visitor Center is to be included in this alternative, it should be at the entrance to the Park. Its architecture could be designed to be compatible with the nearby cultural resources.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 163

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

The plan does not adequately address the needs of the individuals who use the park on a regular basis. Why spend the money to remove the existing road around the park when it suits the needs of walkers, bikers, people with dogs - simultaneously. If you reduce the size of the dedicated road by 505 there will be no room to walk together or pass each other. Yesterday I encountered a dog walker and a lady at the side of the road with her stroller at the same time. There was also a car coming. Because of the current size of the road we could all pass safely.

Why is the visitor center so large? 6400 square feet??? How does increasing the size of the visitor center and the number of park visitors reduce the impact to park neighbors? Why not build a much smaller visitor center and have kiosks throughout the park that people can walk to and use smart phones to get additional information.

One of the most important issues that was not address sufficiently is the SPEED of cars in the park. It is imperative that there be speed control measures to ensure safety. It is only a matter of time before there is an accident. Cars travel much too fast around the circle - this includes parents who are late to take their children to sports practice to people who have never been in the park and ignore the signs. The current plan brings additional traffic to the park; however, the current speed issue has not been addressed and will only get worse.

I think the plan should include improvements to the Park Police Building. They are a vital part of our neighborhood and the park, and instead of spending money on removing pavement the plan should spend those funds improving their facility and the stables for the horses.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 164

Author Information

Keep Private: Yes
Name: Kept Private
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: Kept Private
E-mail: Kept Private

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/05/2011 Date Received: 11/05/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Web Form

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Fort Hunt Park is a wonderful place and should remain as it is. I walked to the park this morning to see the spectacular fall foliage. As I walked the circular road, I saw many bikers and walkers, a learn to bike program offered by the park staff, a get together of the Minnesota State Society, and an awards ceremony at the end of a Tony Snow memorial run raising funds for colon cancer. All of this activity!

In the past I have seen the Alexandria Police Canine corps practicing, north/south parkway bikers and walkers stopping to use the restrooms and refill their water bottles, and many families or groups having picnics - even offices having staff meetings. I understand that there is not Park Service staff available to raise the flag on the WWII commemorative flag pole. How do you have funds to construct and staff an interpretative center? Some of the pavilions are new, why take them down? It's important to remember what happened at the Fort during WWII, but administrators at the time took the buildings down and their action is part of the history. We should respect their action.

In this period of austerity, we should appreciate and continue to provide to the public the natural beauty of the park and keep it as the outstanding gem that it is.

Tank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 165

Author Information

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

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

- Need more public opinion
- Option "A" with an option of an interpretive trail sounds the best
- No way your option "C" reduction in pavement is accurate. Seems intentionally misleading as you do not include the addition of hte bike path pavement
- MUST include COST ESTIMATES
- Safety - bike paths are dangerous for the majority of Walkers unless wide enough as they go too fast.
- What does Jerry Connelly think?
- What does Jerry Hyland think?
- Why aren't they here? Why werern't they
- Please make public comments available for us all to see
- Why did Park Service stop West Potomac High School Cross Country
- Keep walk in gates on Ft Hunt Road
- How many 911 calls have resulted from the large groups caused
- * - Post cost associated with any decision on the web site now
- more data

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 166

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Anonymous Anonymous
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: N/A
N/A, UN N/A
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

One of the most used parts of this park is the playground at Area A. In the options that upgrade the playground, the visitors center is on the other side of the park from the playground. It would seem to make more sense to locate the two together.

In all the action options, there do not appear to be enough restroom facilities. Even just a small facility for dog walkers on the "back loop" area would be helpful.

I like the "figure 8" interpretive trail.

I think its important to keep a large pavilion (as Pavilion A) for large gatherings (reunions, community events, large picnics, etc.). There should be playground facilities there (see comment 1)

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 167

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Bert Knitter
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1803 Trenton Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail: byubert@cox.net

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Please send me a complete copy (156 pages) of this plan.
Thank you,
Bert Knitter
1803 Trenton Drive
Alexandria, VA 22308

Do not reduce the width of walking, riding, skating paths - roadways.
Making a multi-use path less wide will create an environment where cyclists, dog walkers, walkers, runners will be fighting each other for space.

Keep existing roadways and block them from vehicle traffic by placing pole baracades in place that will allow pedestrian and cycle traffic but not cars.

[A sketch was including showing the use of 4-5 foot high poles to block vehicular traffic]

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 168

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Philip K. Lundeberg
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1104 Croton Dr.
Alexandria, VA 22308
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: Date Received: 09/21/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Park Form
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Bibliography relevant to Fort Hunt in World War II:
Samuel E Morison, The Atlantic Battle Won, Boston, 1955
Ladislav Farago, Tenth Fleet, New York, 1962
Timothy Runyan, To Die Gallantly, London, Boulder, 1994

Lawrence Paterson, Black Flag, Minneapolis, 2009
Paul Just, Von Seeflieger gun U-Boat-Fabrer, 1979
C.O. of U-546

Deals with treatment of eight survivors of U-546 after V-E Day at the "Flag Fur" detail resulting taped during oral history interview at the Naval Historical Foundation - Dr. David Winkley (202) 678-4333 x 2
Philip K. Lundeberg
Curator Emeritus
National Museum of American History
Smithsonian Institute
Life Member, Naval Historical Foundation

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 169

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Samuel T. Nicholson
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: N/A
N/A, UN N/A
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/11/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Sir:

By this letter I am providing my comments on the proposed changes to Fort Hunt Park in Fairfax County, VA. My first is that in this time of budget constraints, I do not believe it is in the best interest of the Country that the National Park Service spend funds to modify what is an excellent facility. Rather I would propose that the NPS use these funds to maintain what it has and to revisit such modifications once our budget problems have eased.

I have reviewed the alternative plans and have some general comments. The first is that one of the problems listed that these plans would alleviate is that the park gets overloaded, yet the plans other than "A" actually reduce facilities such a ball fields and picnic pavilions. This really doesn't make sense. Also the plans tend to realign auto routing such that cars will now pass closer to private homes near the present police station. This really doesn't make sense from the perspective of maintaining property values and peace and quiet.

Recently the NPS has closed the George Washington Parkway to bicycles, an action which I fully support for safety of bikers and auto drivers. This action does tend to have bike racers use the present bike trail for practicing (not a safe alternative due to walkers, runners, and recreational bikers on that trail, but that is another subject.) As an alternative, such bikers canuse the present layout of the roads in Fort Hunt Park to safely practice because of the width of these road ways. Also, exercise bikers can use these roadways safe reasonable speed runs. The proposed alternatives "B" through "D" would preclude such

use.

I know this letter is late in the review cycle, but I have only recently learned of this planning and review cycle. I hope that my comments are considered, for I believe that Fort Hunt Park is a wonderful facility and needs no change. It does need continued maintenance and minor improvements for which I believe the NPS has proper funding. Remember, the new facilities would require increases in such maintenance funding, which may be limited in the present budget atmosphere.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 170

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: W. David Plummer

Organization: Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc.  Member

Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual

Address: P.O. Box 203
Mount Vernon, VA 22121-0203
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 11/01/2011 Date Received: 11/11/2011

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Dear Superintendent,
I am writing as the representative of the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. (MVCCA), to provide comment on the proposed Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan options for restructuring Fort Hunt Park facilities and grounds.

On Wednesday, October 26th 2011, the MVCCA General Council passed a resolution, attached, regarding the aforementioned issue by a vote of 22-0-0. This resolution contains several suggestions to the proposed options that strongly reflect our member associations' views.

The Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc., is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization of citizens' associations in the Mount Vernon Magisterial District of Fairfax County, Virginia. In 2011, almost 60 community, civic, and homeowner associations are members, which represents an overwhelming majority of citizens in the District.

Since 1969, the Mount Vernon Council has represented and promoted the interests of its member associations and advocated for the common good and general welfare of the residents of the Mount Vernon Magisterial District. The Council takes positions on issues of concern to its members and then presents those views to Mount Vernon and Fairfax County elected officials, as well as the Virginia General Assembly, United States Congress, and other officials or entities as appropriate. Leadership and administration is vested in three co-chairs and the Board of Directors. For more information, please visit

our website noted in the letterhead.

Sincerely, W. David Plummer, Co-Chair
MVCCA

Attached:
E&R-2011-03
Resolution on the National Park Service (NPS) Site Development Plan for Fort Hunt Park

WHEREAS, the National Park Service (NPS) has issued a draft Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan, George Washington Memorial Parkway: Environmental Assessment and Assessment of Effect (EA) on options for restructuring Fort Hunt Park facilities and grounds to help preserve its history and enhance the historical interpretation of its features for the public, and has requested public comment on the draft EA before November 6, 2011;

WHEREAS, the draft EA offers four alternatives, including a "no action" alternative (A);

WHEREAS, the three alternatives (B, C, and D) to the "no action" alternative (A) would all eliminate multiple pavilions, a restroom, and recreation fields; and

WHEREAS, alternatives B, C, and D would all add a visitor's center and chronological interpretive trail and would realign existing roads and bicycle trails, with the result that (to varying degrees) existing mature woods would be removed (especially under the NPS-preferred alternative C, but also under alternative D) and impervious surfaces would be added;

WHEREAS, the land disturbance required by alternatives B, C, and D will lead to the further spread of the already large number of exotic invasive plants and vines in Fort Hunt Park;

WHEREAS, while preserving the history and providing enhanced interpretation of the park are important and valuable objectives for this NPS park, the current recreational facilities of the park are highly valued by park visitors;

WHEREAS, thousands of visitors every year are attracted to Fort Hunt Park because of its spacious recreational facilities and wide roadways;

WHEREAS, Fort Hunt Park is one of only two parks with reservable picnic tables in the Mount Vernon area north of the Occoquan River, and is a popular destination for local residents;

WHEREAS, management of the large number of park visitors by the National Park Service can be accomplished by means other than removing all but one of the picnic pavilions and restrooms;

WHEREAS, the historical interpretation of Fort Hunt Park can be enhanced without eliminating the current recreational facilities;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mount Vernon Council of Citizens' Associations, Inc. (MVCCA) asks the National Park Service to develop one or more additional alternative designs for Fort Hunt Park that would:

?Create enhanced facilities and programs for interpreting the long and rich history of Fort Hunt Park, whether in the form of interpretive trails, signage, and/or a visitor's center,

?Consider restoring the historical viewshed down to the Potomac River and across to Fort Washington from one of the batteries in the park,

?Preserve the picnic pavilions and restroom facilities,

?Preserve mature woodlands by not placing new trails and facilities there, or replace any trees destroyed with native trees,

?Employ Low Impact Development practices (e.g., pervious concrete) in order to not increase, and preferably to reduce, the amount of impervious surface in the park,

?Conduct a complete biological survey of the park,

- ?Avoid impacts to any state or federally-listed endangered or threatened species,
- ?Include as part of the overall plan a natural resources management plan to eliminate the large number of exotic invasive plants currently in the park, to restore invaded areas with native plants, and to prevent the further spread of exotic invasives, especially on land disturbed by new construction or removal of old roadbed,
- ?Give priority to preservation and restoration of existing historic buildings (e.g., the NCO Quarters, the batteries) over the construction of new buildings, and use the old buildings as interpretive facilities, if such use is consistent with their preservation,
- ?Conduct archeological fieldwork and incorporate it into a new "living historical park" design so that visitors can see and learn on a continuing bases what is being discovered about Fort Hunt's history form 14,000 years ago to the present, and
- ?Work with the county to create a bus stop at the park to avoid an increase in traffic.
- ?Retain the current one-way traffic around the park.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 171

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Poul M. Hertel
Organization:
Organization Type: I - Unaffiliated Individual
Address: 1217 Michigan Court
Alexandria, VA 22314
USA
E-mail: poulh@erols.com

Correspondence Information

Status: Reviewed Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 11/04/2011 Date Received: 11/11/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Comments on the Fort Hunt Site Development Plan

Thank you for extending the public comment period on the "Environmental Assessment/Assessment of Effect Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan." The gesture was very much appreciated. However, I respectfully submit that the Report takes a very narrow interpretation in order to accomplish a constricted objective, and in doing so, departs from the very essence of why the National Park System was created in the first place.

The National Park Service was created in 1916 to preserve landscapes of important aesthetic value for all to enjoy. The currently recommended alternative, as well as the considered change alternatives violate this fundamental principle by catering to group settings at the expense of the individual and families. BY confusing the need to preserve with an operational problem, the Report recommends that the Park be off limits to all, except for specialty groups, during the very time of the year when the weather is most conducive to being outside. The exception is for specialty groups renting in pavilion A, which is the original source of the concern about the overuse of the park.

Trap of Your Own Making

The document starts out on page I with the following statement that describes the problem as being one of an overused park; "One reason the SDP is needed is because peak visitation periods exceed the park's carrying capacity, which creates a need to balance the different types of visitor use (recreation, permitted picnicking, and interpretation) with resource protection." The current Park Services Policy is encouraging this overuse.

This Report provides figures relating to available parking and maximum permitted attendance at each

pavilion as advertised on the Park Service web site. As you can see, the implicit assumption regarding how many people per car varies considerable from 2.5 to 4 persons per car at pavilion A and D.

[Commenter included Table 5 from EA/AoE]

This has resulted in numerous parking overflows or spillover into the remaining parking areas. In some circumstances, the Park Services has allowed the organizers to combine, thereby effectively taking over the most of the parking in the park. This is occurring particularly in the months where the weather permits outdoor activities.

As a result, families and individuals are currently relegated to parking E, which is the most limited, having only a few parking spaces in comparison. So in effect, the Park Services is lending out most of the Park to specialty groups, who are there for other reasons than to celebrate the specific sites or history.

Although the Park Services Policy is encouraging this overuse, it now wishes to curtail overuse by eliminating most of the Park parking while still renting out Pavilion A to 600 people. Given the actual experience and using assumptions that are more realistic suggests that we can expect Pavilion A parking to spill over into the visitor parking area.

While neighbors and specialty groups can be accommodated under the new proposal, individual persons and families not living in the neighborhood will find themselves not welcome. This is like driving to the Grand Canyon just to be turned away because a specialty group is having its annual picnic there.

The late Ellen Pickering and Jean Caldwell of the Alexandria group Save the Parkway believed that parks should be for people, and this proposal breaks that tenet. Furthermore, as more open space is removed, Fort Hunt Park becomes even more iconic and important to all people. Instead, a better option would be to make the maximum visitors allowed commensurate with realistic use parking assumptions. Instead of renting out to large groups, a better option is to limit the rent outs to levels that can be accommodated in the park, or eliminated the rentals altogether, since they are the problem.

Asking individual visitors to endure the most of the change by simply taking parking out while still accommodating specialty groups out is unreasonable. The current policy must also be questioned in light of statement on page 114; Fairfax County has nearby recreational parks that offer shelters and pavilions for group picnicking.

The second point is that the roadway along the southern loop road would be reduced by 50 percent (Page 101). "Alternative C would create a dedicated pedestrian/bicycle path around the park. The adverse impact of the additional surface pavement with the APE would be offset by the beneficial impact of the improved recreational opportunities at the park. Alternative C would also retain two ball fields (in Areas A and B)". page 101

I have been a bicycle rider who rode over 35 miles a day, a jogger, and advent walker and currently leisure walker, and one thing that my experience has taught me is that Bicycles and walkers do not mix. In fact, pedestrians need to be protected from the bicycles, which the current conditions provide. The existing circular road has two lanes one for walkers, and one for bicycles and cars. Any design must start from a pedestrian perspective, having the ability of two people walking side by side and wide enough for a third to cross in the opposite direction, with no bicycles in that environment. They must have a totally separate lane.

I therefore encourage you to keep the current loop as is. The loop takes the pedestrian and bicyclist to all major points in the park in a respectful and accommodating manner. Furthermore, the proposed trail takes you away from all the open space and relegates you to the boundaries of the residential properties behind the horse barn and Park Police trailers, a significant diminution of the walking experience.

Conclusion

The report starts by stating a problem of overuse of the park, that when scrutinized, is the result of a deliberate Park Services policy to overcommit the park for use by groups for picnicking despite acknowledging that "Regionally, Fairfax County has nearby recreational parks that offer shelters and pavilions for group picnicking" (Page 114). Yet the recommended alternative would still cater to these groupings and do so at levels that, using reasonable assumptions, saturates the proposed available

parking. Moreover, there is nothing to suggest why the supervision problem would go away if the policy of leasing out to mega groups is continued.

The report further suggests removal of the loop road and a replacement trail in which bicycles and pedestrian share 50% of the remaining portion of the road, and share a diminutive trail that winds at the periphery of the park. The Park Services ought to have sufficient evidence and experience with the problems on the Mount Vernon trail to know that these modes require separation in order to work.

Under these circumstances, it is very tempting to say no build. However, there is the policy failure that needs to be addressed, as well as "Recent discoveries have increased knowledge regarding the site's rich history and have created expanded opportunities and increased demand by the public for additional interpretation. During World War II (WWII), Fort Hunt was utilized as a top secret intelligence operation for the interrogation of German prisoners of war (POWs) (NPS, n.d.b)."

The number of visitors can easily be diminished with a policy geared toward limiting or eliminating the permits for the group visitors, which would address the following concern that: "Currently, park police and staff are overwhelmed during times of peak visitor use due to the vast number of visitors utilizing the park's picnic facilities".

However, the report has chosen to simply close off the park for everyone else by eliminating access to most of it in order to address the policy failure. As stated on page 118. "The reduction in permitted picnics and total visitors using the park for this purpose would require fewer park police and staff to be on site to monitor these activities, providing a benefit to park operations and management. Alternative C would result in a beneficial impact to park operations and management because of the reduction in supervision necessary for permitted picnics." Page 118.

This is unacceptable, and I suggest that instead,

? Eliminate the rental of picnic grounds and if you must continue to let Area A out, that it be limited to less than 175 people.

? Maintain the existing road Loop as is and do not construct bicycle/pedestrian trail on the periphery of the park.

? Set Park policy acknowledging the danger of combining Pedestrian and bicycles.

? Construct an interpretive trail starting at Area C and utilize existing pavilion for informational boards.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to Ft. Hunt Park. This is a lovely park that is currently enjoyed and beloved by a variety of people. With only a small change in policy, sound management can prevail.

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922 Correspondence: 172

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Ellie L. Irons
Organization: VA Department of Environmental Quality  Member
Organization Type: S - State Government
Address: 629 East Main Street
Richmond, VA 23219
USA
E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 10/31/2011 Date Received: 10/31/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter
Notes: T: 804-698-4021
www.deq.virginia.gov

Correspondence Text

October 31, 2011

Superintendent
George Washington Memorial Parkway
C/O Turkey Run Park
Mclean, VA 22101

RE: Draft Environmental Assessment and Federal Consistency Determination: Fort Hunt Site Development Plan (DEQ 11-157F) Dear Sir or Madam:
The Commonwealth of Virginia has completed its review of the above-referenced draft environmental assessment (EA), which includes a federal consistency determination (FCD). The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is responsible for coordinating Virginia's review of federal environmental documents prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and responding to appropriate federal officials on behalf of the Commonwealth. DEQ is also responsible for coordinating state reviews of FCDs submitted under the Coastal Zone Management Act. The following agencies and locality joined in this review:

Department of Environmental Quality Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Department of Health
Department of Conservation and Recreation Department of Historic Resources Department of

Transportation
Marine Resources Commission
Fairfax County

The Northern Virginia Regional Commission also was invited to comment.

PROPOSED ACTION

The National Park Service (NPS) submitted a draft EA and FCD for the Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan. Fort Hunt Park, a 105-acre area, in Fairfax County is managed by the George Washington Memorial Parkway, which is part of the NPS. The EA analyzes four alternatives, including a no action alternative. Under the proposed action alternative, the the entrance road would be realigned, a new visitor facility would be constructed and several items, including a picnic pavilion and parking lot, would be removed to provide open spaces. The EA states that the site development plan provides the basis for future development at the Fort Hunt Park. The plan does not eliminate the need for future site-specific environmental review; however, the determination of additional analysis will be made on a case-by-case basis. The FCD states that the project would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program (VCP).

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA COMMENTS

1. Fisheries Management. According to the EA (Appendix C, page 2), the proposed alternatives do not involve the disturbance of open waters.

1(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF) and the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) administer the fisheries management enforceable policy of the VCP.

1(b) Agency Findings. The Potomac River, which is located adjacent to the park site, has been designated an Anadromous Fish Use Area. It does not appear that any instream work is necessary to perform the proposed upgrades at the park. Therefore, DGIF does not anticipate this project to result in adverse impacts upon this resource. It also does not appear that significant encroachment into any currently undisturbed riparian vegetation is necessary.

1(c) Agency Recommendation. DGIF recommends the following for site-specific projects discussed in the plan:

- ? Maintain undisturbed, naturally vegetated buffers along streams and rivers, particularly those designated as important fisheries resources, such as the Potomac.
- ? Adhere to erosion and sediment controls during ground disturbance.

1(d) Conclusion. Assuming adherence to strict erosion and sediment controls, DGIF finds the project consistent with the fisheries management enforceable policy of the VCP.

2. Wetlands Management and Water Quality. The EA (Appendix C, page 2) states that a small nontidal wetland area is within the southern area of the park. Under the

alternatives, wetland disturbance would be avoided. The wetlands are approximately 400 feet from any proposed construction activities.

2(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The State Water Control Board promulgates Virginia's water regulations, covering a variety of permits to include Virginia Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit, Virginia Pollution Abatement Permit, Surface and Groundwater Withdrawal Permit, and the VWP Permit. The VWP Permit is a state permit which governs wetlands, surface water and surface water withdrawals /impoundments. It also serves as 401 certification of the federal Clean Water Act 404 permits for dredge and fill activities in waters of the United States. The VWP Permit Program is under the Office of Wetlands and Water Protection and Compliance within the DEQ Division of Water Quality Programs. In addition to central office staff who review and issue VWP Permits for transportation and water withdrawal projects, the six DEQ regional offices perform permit application reviews and issue permits for the covered activities.

2(b) Agency Comments. The DEQ Northern Regional Office (NRO) states that the information provided indicates that the project will not result in any impacts to surface waters. However, a VWP permit from DEQ may be required should impacts to surface waters be necessary. Upon receipt of a Joint Permit Application (JPA) for the proposed surface water impacts, DEQ will review the proposed project in accordance with the VWP permit program regulations and current VWP permit program guidance.

2(c) Agency Recommendations. DEQ has the following recommendations to consider when choosing a final plan:

- ? Avoid and minimize surface water impacts to the maximum extent practicable.
- ? If site-specific projects include impacts to surface waters, coordinate with DEQ regarding applicable VWP requirements.

2(d) Conclusion. Provided site-specific projects comply with applicable requirements, it would be consistent with the wetlands management enforceable policy of the VCP.

3. Subaqueous Lands Management. The EA (Appendix C, page 2) states there are no submerged lands at Fort Hunt Park and no impacts to bottomlands of the Potomac River would be required by the proposed alternatives.

3(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) regulates encroachments in, on or over state-owned subaqueous beds as well as tidal wetlands pursuant to 28.2-1200 through 1400 of the Code of Virginia.

The VMRC serves as the clearinghouse for the JPA used by the:

- ? U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for issuing permits pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act;
- ? DEQ for issuance of a Virginia Water Protection (VWP) permit;

- ? VMRC for encroachments on or over state-owned subaqueous beds as well as tidal wetlands; and
- ? local wetlands board for impacts to wetlands.

The VMRC will distribute the completed JPA to the appropriate agencies. The Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) serves in a technical advisory role to VMRC during the JPA process.

3(b) Agency Comment. The VMRC, pursuant to Section 28.2-1200 et seq. of the Code of Virginia, has jurisdiction over any encroachments in, on, or over the beds of the bays, ocean, rivers, streams, or creeks which are the property of the Commonwealth. Accordingly, if any portion of the subject project involves any encroachments channelward of ordinary high water along natural rivers and streams above the fall line or mean low water below the fall line, a permit may be required from VMRC.

3(c) Agency Recommendation. Coordinate with VMRC regarding the submission of a JPA, as necessary, for future site-specific projects and include this coordination when planning for future projects.

4. Air Pollution Control. The EA (Appendix C, page 4) states that none of the alternatives would result in a long-term increase in emission at Fort Hunt Park. Temporary increases in emissions would occur due to the use of equipment during construction.

4(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The DEQ Air Division, on behalf of the Air Pollution Control Board, is responsible for developing regulations that become Virginia's Air Pollution Control Law. DEQ is charged with carrying out mandates of the state law and related regulations as well as Virginia's federal obligations under the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990. The objective is to protect and enhance public health and quality of life through control and mitigation of air pollution. The division ensures the safety and quality of air

in Virginia by monitoring and analyzing air quality data, regulating sources of air pollution, and working with local, state and federal agencies to plan and implement strategies to protect Virginia's air quality. The appropriate regional office is directly responsible for the issue of necessary permits to construct and operate all stationary sources in the region as well as to monitor emissions from these sources for compliance. As a part of this mandate, the environmental documents of new projects to be undertaken in the state are also reviewed. In the case of certain projects, additional evaluation and demonstration must be made under the general conformity provisions of state and federal law.

4(b) Fugitive Dust. Construction plans should ensure that fugitive dust is kept to a minimum during construction activities by using control methods outlined in 9VAC5-50-60 through 9VAC5-50-120 of the Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution. These precautions include, but are not limited to, the following:

? Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for dust control;

? Installation and use of hoods, fans and fabric filters to enclose and vent the handling of dusty materials;

? Covering of open equipment for conveying materials; and

? Prompt removal of spilled or tracked dirt or other materials from paved streets and removal of dried sediments resulting from soil erosion.

4(c) Open Burning. If activities proposed by the plan include the burning of vegetative debris or construction or demolition material, this activity must meet the requirements under 9VAC5-130-10 through 9VAC5-130-60 and 9VAC5-130-100 of the regulations for open burning, and it may require a permit. The regulations provide for, but do not require, the local adoption of a model ordinance concerning open burning. The project

developer should contact officials with the locality to determine what local requirements, if any, exist.

4(d) Conclusion. Provided site-specific projects comply with applicable requirements, it would be consistent with the air pollution control enforceable policy of the VCP.

5. Nonpoint Pollution Control. The EA (Appendix C, page 3) states that the proposed action alternative would require ground disturbances of greater than 10,000 square feet. All alternatives would include site drainage improvements to prevent soil erosion.

5(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCA) Division of Stormwater Management administers the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law and Regulations (VESCL&R) and Virginia Stormwater Management Law and Regulations (VSWML&R).

5(b) Recommendations.

? Ensure that future site-specific projects are in accordance with the following laws and regulations, as applicable:

- o Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Law 10.1-563.0;
- o Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Regulations 4VAC50-30-30 and 4VAC50-30-40;
- o Virginia Stormwater Act 10.1-603.1 et seq.;
- o Virginia Stormwater Management Program Permit Regulations 4VAC50 et seq.

? Site-specific environmental documents should adequately describe site conditions, potential impacts, protection and mitigation methods, permitting and regulatory requirements, including local requirements, and any other applicable information.

Questions regarding annual erosion and sediment control specifications should be directed to OCR (Larry Gavan at 804-786-4508). Specific questions regarding the VSMP General Permit for Construction Activities requirements should be directed to

OCR (Holly Sepety at 804-225-2613). Detailed comments from OCR are attached for guidance.

6. Coastal Lands Management. The EA (Appendix C, page 4) states that there are areas of land analogous to Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) in the area of the forested wetlands, which are in the southern portion of the park.

6(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The OCR Division of Stormwater Management - Local Implementation (DSWM - LI) (previously called the Division of Chesapeake Bay Local Implementation) administers the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (Virginia Code 10.1-2100-10.1-2114) and Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area Designation and Management Regulations (9VAC10-20 et seq.).

6(b) Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. OCR states that the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, as locally implemented through the Fairfax County Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance, strictly controls land disturbance in environmentally sensitive lands:

? Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) include tidal wetlands, non-tidal wetlands connected by surface flow and contiguous to tidal wetlands or perennial water bodies, tidal shores and those areas within a 100-foot vegetated buffer located adjacent to and landward of the any of the above-referenced features and along both sides of any water body with perennial flow.

? All other land areas, known as Resource Management Areas (RMAs), are subject to the county's jurisdiction-wide performance criteria for development activities.

6(c) Agency Findings. OCR states that the proposed project is within lands analogous to locally designated Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas (CBPAs). Based on the submitted documents and a review of Fairfax County CBPA maps, it appears that the project will occur on lands analogous to RMA, but will not impact lands analogous to RPA. It does not appear that the No Action Alternative, nor Alternatives B, C or D will have any impact on the RPA.

6(d) Requirements. Future projects that involve the disturbance of lands analogous to CBPAs should ensure that the following requirements are satisfied:

? RPAs and RMAs are subject to general performance criteria found in 9VAC10-20-120 of the Regulations, including requirements to minimize land disturbance, preserve indigenous vegetation, and minimize post-development impervious surfaces.

? Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, federal activities affecting Virginia's coastal resources or coastal uses must be consistent with Virginia's Coastal Zone Management Program (VCP) (307(c)(1) of the

Coastal Zone Management Act and 15 CFR Part 930, sub-part C of the Federal Consistency Regulations).

? While Chesapeake Bay Preservation Areas (CBPA) are not locally designated on federal lands, this does not relieve federal agencies of their responsibility to be consistent with the provisions of the CBPA Regulations, 9VAC10-20-10 et seq., which administers the coastal lands management policy, one of the enforceable policies of the VCP. Federal actions on installations located within Tidewater Virginia are required to be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the performance criteria of the regulations on lands analogous to locally designated CBPAs.

? Projects that include land-disturbing activity must adhere to the general performance criteria, especially with respect to minimizing land disturbance (including access and staging areas), retaining indigenous vegetation and minimizing impervious cover.

? For land disturbance of 2,500 square feet or more, the project must comply with the requirements of the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook, Third Edition, 1992.

? Additionally stormwater management criteria consistent with water quality protection provisions (4VAC50-60-60 et seq.) of the Virginia Stormwater Management Regulations(4VAC50-60) shall be satisfied and with the VSMP.

6(e) Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified Plan. The 1998 Federal Agencies' Chesapeake Ecosystem Unified

Plan requires the signatories to fully cooperate with local and state governments in carrying out voluntary and mandatory actions to comply with the management of stormwater. In that Plan, the agencies also committed to encouraging construction design that:

- ? minimizes natural area loss on new and rehabilitated federal facilities;
- ? adopts low-impact development and best management technologies for stormwater, sediment and erosion control, and reduces impervious surfaces; and
- ? considers the Conservation Landscaping and Bay-Scapes Guide for Federal Land Managers.

6(f) Chesapeake 2000 Agreement. The Chesapeake 2000 Agreement committed the government agency signatories to a number of sound land use and stormwater quality controls. The signatories additionally committed their agencies to lead by example with respect to controlling nutrient, sediment and chemical contaminant runoff from government properties. In December 2001, the Executive Council of the Chesapeake Bay Program issued Directive No. 01-1, Managing Storm Water on State, Federal and District-owned Lands and Facilities, which includes specific commitments for agencies to lead by example with respect to stormwater control.

6(g) Recommendation. Plans for site-specific projects should ensure that the above referenced requirements will be met in order to be consistent with the coastal lands management enforceable policy.

7. Natural Heritage Resources. The EA (page 56) indicates that the NPS is aware and has conducted coordination regarding the Bald eagle nest at the park. In addition, the EA (pages 85 to 90) indicate that while construction activities may disturb habitat, the creation of open space could provide additional wildlife habitat.

7(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The mission of DCR is to conserve Virginia's natural and recreational resources. The OCR Division of Natural Heritage's (DNH) mission is conserving Virginia's biodiversity through inventory, protection and stewardship. The Virginia Natural Area Preserves Act, 10.1-209 through 217 of the Code of Virginia, was passed in 1989 and codified OCR's powers and duties related to statewide biological inventory: maintaining a statewide database for conservation planning and project review, land protection for the conservation of biodiversity, and the protection and ecological management of natural heritage resources (the habitats of rare, threatened and endangered species, significant natural communities, geologic sites, and other natural features).

7(b) Agency Findings. According to the information currently in OCR's files, this site is located within the Mount Vernon Shoreline Conservation Site. Conservation sites are tools for representing key areas of the landscape that warrant further review for possible conservation action because of the natural heritage resources and habitat they support. Conservation sites are polygons built around one or more rare plant, animal or natural community designed to include the element and, where possible, its associated habitat, and buffer or other adjacent land thought necessary for the element's conservation. Conservation sites are given a biodiversity significance ranking based on the rarity, quality and number of element occurrences they contain with on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being most significant. Mount Vernon Shoreline Conservation Site has been given a biodiversity significance ranking of B5, which represents a site of general significance. The natural heritage resource of concern at this site is the Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*, G5/S2S3B, S3N/NULT).

The Bald eagle breeds from Alaska eastward through Canada and the Great Lakes region, along coastal

areas off the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and the Gulf of Mexico, and in pockets throughout the western United States (NatureServe, 2009). In Virginia, it primarily breeds along the large Atlantic slope rivers (James, Rappahannock, Potomac, etc.) with a few records at inland sites near large reservoirs (Byrd, 1991). Bald eagle nest sites are often found in the midst of large wooded areas near marshes or other bodies of water (Byrd, 1991). Bald eagles feed on fish, waterfowl, seabirds (Campbell et. al., 1990), various mammals and carrion (Terres, 1980). This species is classified as threatened by the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF). Threats to this species include human disturbance of nest sites (Byrd, 1991), habitat loss, biocide contamination, decreasing food supply and illegal shooting (Herkert, 1992).

7(c) Threatened and Endangered Plant and Insect Species. The Endangered Plant and Insect Species Act of 1979, Chapter 39, 3.1-102- through 1030 of the Code of Virginia, as amended, authorizes the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS) to conserve, protect and manage endangered species of plants and insects. The VDACS Virginia Endangered Plant and Insect Species Program personnel cooperates with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, OCR DNH and other agencies and organizations on the recovery, protection or conservation of listed threatened or endangered species and designated plant and insect species that are rare throughout their worldwide ranges. In those instances where recovery plans, developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are available, adherence to the order and tasks outlined in the plans are followed to the extent possible. VDACS has regulatory authority to conserve rare and endangered plant and insect species through the Virginia Endangered Plant and Insect Species Act.

Under a Memorandum of Agreement established between VDACS and OCR, OCR has the authority to report for VDACS on state-listed plant and insect species. DNH found that the current activity will not affect any documented state-listed plant and insect species.

7(d) State Natural Area Preserves. OCR's files do not indicate the presence of any State Natural Area Preserves under the agency's jurisdiction.

7(e) Agency Recommendations. OCR has the following recommendations:

? Since new and updated information is continually added to the Biotics Data System, contact OCR DNH for updated information if a significant amount of time passes before a project discussed in the plan is implemented.

? Utilize the Center for Conservation Biology's Virginia Bald Eagle Information Website at www.ccb-wm.org/virginiaeagles/eag/eData.php to obtain updated Bald eagle information. |

? If Bald eagle nests are identified within .25 miles of a project area, coordinate with DGIF to ensure compliance with protected species legislation prior.

8. Wildlife Resources. The EA (pages 85 to 90) indicates that construction activities would not occur in Bald eagle protective buffer zones.

B(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF), as the Commonwealth's wildlife and freshwater fish management agency, exercises enforcement and regulatory jurisdiction over wildlife and freshwater fish, including state or federally listed endangered or threatened species, but excluding listed insects (Virginia Code Title 29.1). DGIF is a consulting agency under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. sections 661 et seq.) and provides environmental analysis of projects or permit applications coordinated through DEQ and several other state and federal agencies. DGIF

determines likely impacts upon fish and wildlife resources and habitat, and recommends appropriate measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for those impacts.

B(b) Agency Findings. According to DGIF's records, and as detailed in the site development EA, a state-listed threatened bald eagle's nest has been documented within park boundaries. Assuming the NPS adheres to FWS and DGIF recommendations for the protection of the documented nest and its residents as outlined in the EA, DGIF does not anticipate the development of this site to result in adverse impacts upon this species. However, it is possible that new bald eagle nests have been constructed in or near the project area during the 2010 and/or 2011 nesting season and may be adversely impacted by the project activities.

B(c) Agency Recommendations.

To protect state-listed threatened bald eagles:

- ? Contact the Center for Conservation Biology to determine if any new bald eagle nests were detected during the 2010 or 2011 surveys; and
- ? If a new nest was documented within 0.25 mile (1,320 feet) of the project area, contact DGIF to facilitate further consultation regarding the new nest(s).
- ? Coordinate with the FWS regarding possible impacts upon eagles and whether an eagle disturbance/take permit is required under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

To minimize overall impacts to wildlife and natural resources, DGIF has the following recommendations about development activities:

- ? Maintain undisturbed wooded buffers of at least 100 feet in width around all on site wetlands and on both sides of all perennial and intermittent streams;
- ? Avoid and minimize impacts to undisturbed forest, wetlands, and streams to the fullest extent practicable ;
- ? Maintain wooded lots to the fullest extent possible;
- ? Design stormwater controls to replicate and maintain the hydrographic condition of the site prior to the change in landscape. This should include, but not be limited to, utilizing bioretention areas, and minimizing the use of curb and gutter in favor of grassed swales. Bioretention areas (also called rain gardens) and grass swales are components of low impact development. They are designed to capture stormwater runoff as close to the source as possible and allow it to slowly infiltrate into the surrounding soil. They benefit natural resources by filtering pollutants and decreasing downstream runoff volumes; and
- ? Ensure that all tree removal and ground clearing adhere to a time-of-year restriction from March 15 through August 15 of any year to protect nesting resident and migratory songbirds.

9. Planning and Recreational Resources.

9(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The DCR Division of Planning and Recreational Resources (DPRR) administers

the Virginia Scenic Rivers, Virginia Byways, and state trails programs and is responsible for developing the Virginia Outdoors Plan (VOP), the state's comprehensive outdoor recreation and open space plan. The VOP recognizes the importance of scenery to Virginians and many of the top ten activities are water based.

9(b) Agency Comments. OCR states that the George Washington Parkway's status needs to be clarified in the document. The EA (page 24) describes the parkway as a scenic route; however, the parkway was designated an "All American Road," the highest designation under the National Scenic Byway Program, by the Federal Highway Administration in September 2005.

9(c) NPS Response. NPS states that the parkway is designated as an "All American Road."

9(d) Agency Recommendations. OCR has the following recommendations to consider when planning for development:

? Any development along the corridor needs to follow the corridor management plan, which is required for national designation, and that any proposed development is described in context with the goals and objectives of the plan and the national program.

? Replace the phrase, "provide recreation," with the statement, "provides access to recreation."

10. Historic Architectural Resources. The EA (pages 91 to 95) addresses the impacts associated with the alternatives. The alternatives would have different degrees of impact to historic resources located at the park.

10(a) Agency Jurisdiction. DHR conducts reviews of projects to determine their effect on historic structures or cultural resources under its jurisdiction. DHR, as the designated State's Historic Preservation Office, ensures that federal actions comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulation at 36 CFR Part 800. The preservation act requires federal agencies to consider the effects of federal projects on properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 also applies if there are any federal involvements, such as licenses, permits, approvals or funding. DHR also provides comments to DEQ through the state environmental impact report review process.

10(b) Agency Recommendation. DHR requests that the NPS consult directly with DHR pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires federal agencies to consider the impacts of their projects on historic properties.

11. Public Water Supply.

11(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia Department of Health (VDH) Office of Drinking Water (ODW) reviews projects for the potential to impact public drinking water sources (groundwater wells, springs and surface water intakes).

11(b) Agency Findings. VDH ODW states that there are no apparent impacts to public drinking water sources due to this project. No groundwater wells are within a 1-mile radius of the project site. No surface water intakes are located within a 5-mile radius of the project site. The project does not fall within Zone 1 (up to 5 miles into the

watershed) or Zone 2 (greater than 5 miles into the watershed) of any public surface water sources.

Contact VDH (Barry E. Matthews at 804-864-7515) for additional information.

11(c) Requirements. Installation of new water lines and appurtenances must comply with the state's waterworks regulations. VDH administers both federal and state laws governing waterworks operation. Also, VDH states that potential impacts to public water distribution systems must be verified by the local utility.

11(d) Water Conservation Recommendations. DEQ recommends that NPS considers the following water conservation measures to the extent practicable when planning for development activities:

? Grounds should be landscaped with hardy native plant species to conserve water as well as minimize the need to use fertilizers and pesticides.

? Convert turf to low water-use landscaping such as drought resistant grass, plants, shrubs and trees.

? Consider installing low-flow restrictors/aerators to faucets.

? Improve irrigation practices by:

- o upgrading with a sprinkler clock; watering at night, if possible, to reduce evapotranspiration (lawns need only 1 inch of water per week and do not need to be watered daily; over watering causes 85 percent of turf problems);

- o installing a rain shutoff device; and

- o collecting rainwater with a rain bucket or cistern system with drip lines.

? Consider replacement of old equipment with new high-efficiency machines to reduce water usage by 30-50 percent per use.

? Check for and repair leaks during routine maintenance activities.

12. Sewage System. The EA (Appendix C, page 3) indicates that Fairfax County provides utilities to the park.

12(a) Discharging Sewer System Regulations. DEQ has approval authority for most discharging sewage collection systems and treatment works, except for single family home (less than 1,000 gallon per day) systems. This authority is contained in the Sewage Collection and Treatment (SCAT) Regulations (9VAC25-790 et seq.). Additional information is available on the DEQ website at <http://www.deq.virginia.gov/wastewater>. Construction of sanitary wastewater collection systems must comply with the state's sewerage regulations.

12(b) Requirements. Contact DEQ NRO (Bryant Thomas at 703-583-3843 or Bryant.Thomas@deq.virginia.gov) to ensure compliance with the Sewage Collection and Treatment (SCAT) Regulations, as applicable, during planning. Potential impacts to sanitary sewage collection systems must be verified by the local utility.

13. Transportation Impacts.

13(a) Agency Jurisdiction. The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provides comments pertaining to potential impacts to existing and future transportation systems.

13(b) Agency Comments. The VDOT Northern Virginia District Office has the following comments:

Planning Section

? The EA states that none of the alternatives would impact the roadways outside of the park as the only changes would occur on the internal roads. While the EA states that during peak months the parking areas and facilities (i.e. restrooms)

get overwhelmed, the report does not provide any specific number of vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians coming to the site. Without this baseline information, it is

difficult to assess what type of increased/decreased traffic would be generated for the proposed uses.

? The general theme of the EA is that the current site generates too many recreation users that are adversely affecting the historical and cultural resources on the site.

? The Human Health and Safety impacts were dismissed for further study.

Land Development Section

? The alternatives remove several of the picnic areas on the site. This would suggest that there will be less vehicular traffic.

? The existing entrance to the park is at a "Y" in the road at Fort Hunt Road which appears to act more like a driveway entrance at a sharp bend in the road.

? The alternatives propose a new alignment of the entrance that would provide access to Fort Hunt Road via a "T" intersection.

13(c) Agency Recommendations. VDOT has the following recommendations to consider when planning for development activities:

? Include the following phrase in the chosen alternative, "such actions as a separate bicycle/pedestrian trail for the road that would help to minimize potential conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists."

? Consider no longer branding this park and instead call it the Fort Hunt Historical Area or the Fort Hunt Cultural Resource area, thereby de-emphasizing the recreational aspects of the site since the alternatives eliminate all but one of the picnic pavilions.

? If Fort Hunt Road has a larger volume of traffic after the proposed changes, it would be preferable, and most likely safer, to the traveling public to reverse the "T" so that the park entrance defers to the Fort Hunt Road traffic.

14. Local and Regional Comments.

14(a) Jurisdiction. In accordance with the Code of Virginia, Section 15.2-4207, planning district commissions encourage and facilitate local government cooperation and state-local cooperation in addressing, on a regional basis, problems of greater than local significance. The cooperation resulting from this is intended to facilitate the recognition and analysis of regional opportunities and take account of regional influences in planning and implementing public policies and services. Planning district commissions promote the orderly and efficient development of the physical, social and economic elements of the districts by planning, and encouraging and assisting localities to plan for the future.

14(b) Regional Comments. The Northern Virginia Regional Commission did not respond to DEQ's request for comments.

14(c) Local Comments. Fairfax County states that the Parks Authority will submit comments directly to NPS. A summary follows. Detailed comments are attached.

? Fairfax County commends the NPS in its efforts to enhance the visitor experience at Fort Hunt Park while also creating opportunities to promote alternative modes of transportation, reduce impervious surfaces and provide environmental best practices in the design, construction and removal of proposed facilities.

? Transportation

o No traffic analysis details or expected vehicular volumes are provided to support dismissing transportation from further analysis. More details supporting the conclusion that the surrounding roadway network would not be impacted should have been part of the assessment. However, while the report indicates that interpretation use at the park may be expanded, it

also indicates that permitted picnic areas may be reduced, and it is clear that some transportation related issues were considered.

o It appears that there may be a realignment of vehicular circulation within the park, including a realignment of the park entrance.

o It is good that consideration has been given to pedestrians and bicycle access, and that a clear separation between the roadway system and trail system is needed.

o It also appears the entrance road realignment plans would make the park entrance road more prominent and reduce current confusion associated with this intersection, and a new entry sign and gate would be included to clearly designate the park entrance to visitors. The county encourages these types of efforts to improve safety and provide efficient pedestrian and bicycle access.

? Impervious Surface Area Addition and Removal

All action alternatives involve the addition of impervious surfaces in some areas (new visitor center, new roadway or bicycle trail construction), as well as the removal of impervious areas through the removal of picnic pavilions, restrooms and roadway segments. The amount of impervious area addition and removal varies with each alternative. Table 1 below shows the amount of roadway pavement that will be added or removed in each action alternative (as reported in Chapter 2 of the EA) as well as the total amount of impervious surface area added/removed in each alternative (as reported in Chapter 4, p. 78-80).

Table 1: Addition and Removal of Pavement and Impervious Surface Area under Action Alternatives*

..

*Alternative A 1s not shown because it is a 'No Action' alternative and would neither add nor remove impervious surfaces;

1As reported in Chapter 2, p. 33-41; 2As reported in Chapter 4, p. 78-80

DEO 11-157F

The basis for Alternative C's selection as the Environmentally Preferred Alternative (p. 46-48) is partly based on the fact that it removes the most pavement area, contributing towards a reduction in impervious surfaces by 1.3 acres. However, this does not address the fact that the overall impervious surface area (pavement plus other structures) would increase by 1.2 acres in this alternative (see Table 1). Under Alternative D there is not as much pavement removed, but the overall impervious surface would decrease by 0.2 acre, and it is the only alternative that would provide a net loss in total impervious surfaces.

Although the total impervious surface area is discussed in the soils section of Chapter 4 (Environmental Consequences), it is not addressed in Chapter 2's comparison of alternatives. It is also unclear how Alternative C adds 3.5 acres of total impervious area while only adding 0.9 acre of pavement. Alternatives C and D appear fairly similar, and it is not clear where the difference in added area (1.3) is made up.

? Stormwater

o As per Chapter 2 p. 31, sustainable design practices that follow principles established by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and the Sustainable Sites Initiative (SSIT) for planning of architectural and site features would also be incorporated in the design or removal plans for park facilities. The county commends the NPS for this statement.

o In 2005, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors approved the Little Hunting Creek Watershed Management Plan. The only project recommended for the immediate area of Fort Hunt Park is project LH9706, a wetland restoration just north of the George Washington Parkway. The Little Hunting Creek Watershed Management Plan is available online.

? Historic/Cultural Assets

o Expanded interpretation of the park's history has been identified as a need in the EA. Construction of a visitor facility and interpretive trail identified in the Action Alternatives would help fulfill this need. Each of the action alternatives addresses the protection and preservation of a National Register of Historic Places property located in Fairfax County, Fort Hunt, a site within the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Protecting, preserving and interpreting the property reinforce the importance of nationally significant heritage resources to the local community.

? Other Considerations

o The proposed location for the construction of a new visitor center in Alternative C appears to be a site currently wooded with mature trees, whereas the other action alternatives locate the facility on sites that are clear

of vegetation. If this alternative is chosen, it is recommended that efforts be made to site the center so that the maximum tree preservation is provided. The Countywide Trails Plan Map (www.fairfaxcounty.gov/parks/trails/frame.htm) indicates planned minor paved trails along Ft. Hunt Road, Battery Road and Charles Augustine Drive.

14(d) Local Recommendations. Fairfax County has the following recommendations:

? Transit access, safe ingress/egress, and adequate sight distance should be ensured.

? Internal circulation improvements should be constructed in a manner as to not impede safe and efficient traffic operations on the external roadway system.

? Incorporate the total impervious area figures into the comparisons of the alternatives in Chapter 2.

? Since Alternative D is the only alternative that would reduce impervious surface area, clarify what drawbacks may outweigh the beneficial net removal of impervious area that would eliminate this alternative as being considered the Environmentally Preferred Alternative.

? Clarify and detail the calculations for the other impervious areas that comprise the total impervious surface under each scenario. Without these considerations and clarification, staff cannot adequately assess the best alternative.

? Use soil amendments in areas that are known to be compacted to increase infiltration capabilities. Treating the stormwater where it falls through infiltration would reduce the potential of eroding downstream waterways as well as replenish local ground water tables. Grassy fields and ball fields would benefit

from the yearly addition of compost to help break up the tightly bound hydric soils and add void space to allow for infiltration.

? Care should be taken when applying fertilizers in areas that drain to Little Hunting Creek.

? Attain LEEDStormwater Design credits as applicable.

? Consider implementing several low impact development or Best Management Practices (BMPs) throughout the facility.

? Any consideration the NPS may give towards accommodating a future linkage between the proposed trail system in the Fort Hunt Site Development Plan and those indicated in the county's plans is encouraged.

FEDERAL CONSISTENCY UNDER THE COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, federal activities located inside or outside of Virginia's designated coastal management area that can have reasonably foreseeable effects on coastal resources or coastal uses must, to the maximum extent practicable, be implemented in a manner consistent with the Virginia Coastal Zone Management Program (VCP) (previously called the Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program). The VCP consists of a network of programs

administered by several agencies. DEQ coordinates the review of FCDs with agencies administering the enforceable and advisory policies of the VCP.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with 15 CFR 930.2, the public was invited to participate in the Commonwealth's review of the FCD. A public notice of this proposed action was published on the DEQ website from October 24, 2011, to October 27, 2011. No public comments were received in response to the notice.

CONSISTENCY CONCURRENCE

Based on the information provided in the draft EA and FCD, and the comments of agencies administering the enforceable policies of the VCP, DEQ concurs that the proposed activity is consistent with the VCP and has no objection to the implementation of the proposed action provided that NPS complies with all requirements of applicable permits and other authorizations that may be required. NPS must ensure that the proposed action is consistent with the enforceable policies and that this project is constructed and operated in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. However, there may be other applicable state and federal requirements that are not included in the state's concurrence with the FCD.

REGULATORY AND COORDINATION NEEDS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

1. Natural Heritage Resources. Contact the OCR DNH at (804) 371-2708 if a significant amount of time passes before the plan is finalized since new and updated information is continually added to the Biotics Data System.

2. Historic Resources. Coordinate the plan with DHR to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR 800. Contact DHR (Roger Kirchen at 804-367-2323, extension 153 or Roger.Kirchen@dhr.virginia.gov) for additional information and coordination.

3. Protected Species.

? Contact the Center for Conservation Biology (757-221-2247 or <http://ccb.wm.org/virginiaeagles>) to determine if any new bald eagle nests were detected during the 2010 or 2011 surveys; and

? If a new nest was documented within 0.25 mile (1,320 feet) of the project area, contact DGIF (Amy Ewing at Amy.Ewing@dgif.virginia.gov) to facilitate further consultation regarding the new nest(s).

? Coordinate with the FWS (Tylan Dean at tylan_dean@fws.gov) regarding possible impacts upon eagles and whether an eagle disturbance/take permit is required under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act for activities described in the plan.

4. Site-Specific Reviews. Site-specific environmental documents prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act should be submitted to the DEQ Office of Environmental Impact Review (Attention: Ms. Ellie Irons), P.O. Box 1105, Richmond, VA 23218. Please submit one hard copy for DEQ and each affected locality and associated planning district commission as well as 16 compact discs (COs) with electronic copies or provide a website or FTP site for distribution during a coordinated review.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft EA and FCD. NPS should ensure that any future projects in Virginia are constructed and operated in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations. We look forward to reviewing future, site-specific projects located in Virginia, as applicable. Detailed comments of reviewing agencies are attached for your review. Please contact me at (804) 698-4325 or Julia Wellman at (804) 698-4326 for clarification of these comments.

Sincerely,

[:],

Ellie L. Irons, Program Manager
Environmental Impact Review

Enclosures

cc: Mark G. Gibb, NVRC
Anthony Griffin, Fairfax County

ec: Thomas Sheffer, NPS Amy Ewing, DGIF Robbie Rhur, OCR Barry Matthews, DHR Richard Criqui,
DLPR David Hartshorn, DEQ Roger Kirchen, DHR
Alfred Ray/James Cromwell, VDOT Dan Bacon, VMRC
Scott Brown, Fairfax County

**PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922
Correspondence: 173**

Author Information

Keep Private: No
Name: Dereth J. Bush
Organization: Fairfax County Park Authority  Member
Organization Type: C - County Government
Address: 12055 Government Center Pkwy.
Suite 927
Fairfax, VA 22035
USA
E-mail: Dereth.Bush2@fairfaxcounty.gov

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:
Date Sent: 09/29/2011 Date Received: 09/29/2011
Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No
Contains Request(s): No Type: E-mail
Notes:

Correspondence Text

Hi Thomas,

I'm reviewing the development plan for Fort Hunt Park and I have a question about the picnic areas. The development plan says that visitation exceeds the park's carrying capacity and I was curious by how much, if there are any numbers available. Do you have any information regarding reservation history for the picnic areas? I'm trying to gauge what impact the change in use (loss of picnic areas) at Fort Hunt may have on surrounding parks in Fairfax County.

Any information you could share I'd appreciate.

Thanks,
Dereth Bush
Park Planner
Planning and Development Division
Fairfax County Park Authority

PEPC Project ID: 33621, DocumentID: 42922

Correspondence: 174

Author Information

Keep Private: No

Name: Alli Baird

Organization: VA Department of Conservation and Recreation  Member

Organization Type: S - State Government

Address: 217 Governor Street
Richmond, VA 23219
USA

E-mail:

Correspondence Information

Status: New Park Correspondence Log:

Date Sent: 09/23/2011 Date Received: 09/23/2011

Number of Signatures: 1 Form Letter: No

Contains Request(s): No Type: Letter

Notes:

Correspondence Text

Re: Fort Hunt Park Site Development Plan

Dear Ms. Marshall:

The Department of Conservation and Recreation's Division of Natural Heritage (DCR) has searched its Biotics Data System for occurrences of natural heritage resources from the area outlined on the submitted map. Natural heritage resources are defined as the habitat of rare, threatened, or endangered plant and animal species, unique or exemplary natural communities, and significant geologic formations.

According to the information currently in our files, this site is located within the Mount Vernon Shoreline Conservation Site. Conservation sites are tools for representing key areas of the landscape that warrant further review for possible conservation action because of the natural heritage resources and habitat they support. Conservation sites are polygons built around one or more rare plant, animal, or natural community designed to include the element and, where possible, its associated habitat, and buffer or other adjacent land thought necessary for the element's conservation. Conservation sites are given a biodiversity significance ranking based on the rarity, quality, and number of element occurrences they contain; on a scale of 1-5, 1 being most significant. Mount Vernon Shoreline Conservation Site has been given a biodiversity significance ranking of B5, which represents a site of general significance. The natural heritage resource of concern at this site is:

Haliaeetus leucocephalus Bald eagle G5/S2S3B, S3N/NL/LT

The Bald eagle breeds from Alaska eastward through Canada and the Great Lakes region, along coastal areas off the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and the Gulf of Mexico, and in pockets throughout the western United States (NatureServe, 2009). In Virginia, it primarily breeds along the large Atlantic slope rivers (James, Rappahannock, Potomac, etc) with a few records at inland sites near large reservoirs (Byrd, 1991). Bald eagles feed on fish, waterfowl, seabirds (Campbell et. al., 1990), various mammals and carrion (Terres, 1980). Please note that this species is currently classified as threatened by the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF).

Threats to this species include human disturbance of nest sites (Byrd, 1991), habitat loss, biocide contamination, decreasing food supply and illegal shooting (Herkert, 1992).

DCR recommends utilizing the Center for Conservation Biology's Virginia Bald Eagle Information Website at <http://www.ccb-wm.org/virginiaeagles/eagleData.php> to obtain updated Bald eagle information. If Bald eagle nests are identified within .25 miles of the project area, DCR also recommends coordination with VDGIF to ensure compliance with protected species legislation.

Under a Memorandum of Agreement established between the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (VDACS) and the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), DCR represents VDACS in comments regarding potential impacts on state-listed threatened and endangered plant and insect species. The current activity will not affect any documented state-listed plants or insects.

There are no State Natural Area Preserves under DCR's jurisdiction in the project vicinity.

New and updated information is continually added to Biotics. Please contact DCR for an update on this natural heritage information if a significant amount of time passes before it is utilized.

The Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries maintains a database of wildlife locations, including threatened and endangered species, trout streams, and anadromous fish waters that may contain information not documented in this letter. Their database may be accessed from <http://vafwis.org/fwis/> or contact Shirl Dressler at (804) 367-6913.

Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at 804-692-0984. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sincerely,
Alli Baird, LA, ASLA
Coastal Zone Locality Liaison

Cc:Amy Ewing, VDGIF